

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 7, No. 2

© 1968 Intercontinental Press.

January 20, 1969

50c



SMRKOVSKY. Still a hero to Czechoslovak workers?

## Moscow Tries New Clampdown in Prague

### Documents from Czechoslovakia

Nixon Sends  
Boston War-Horse  
to Paris Parley

**Ernest Mandel:**

## On Workers Democracy

ROSTOW LISTS MAJOR KENNEDY-JOHNSON ACHIEVEMENTS

What were the most outstanding achievements of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations?

A man who should know, Walt W. Rostow, a central figure, if not the key figure, for the past eight years in the White House policy-planning circle, listed them in an interview given front-page prominence in the January 5 issue of the New York Times.

No. 1 on his list of the nine greatest successes was not the flight of Apollo 8 around the moon, as might have been expected, but something much more down to earth -- the isolation of Cuba.

"First," he said, "we worked to isolate Castro. We have worked bilaterally and otherwise with some of the countries under pressure from infiltration from Cuba and managed to prevent the achievement of a guerrilla war base on the mainland of Latin America, which was -- and remained -- Castro's main objective. Some quiet preventive medicine was done here...."

"There are many problems ahead. Castro is a nuisance, dangerous still -- but manageable. And equally important, there is no serious group in Latin America which looks to Cuba and Communism as the model for solving Latin America's problems."

Rostow's selection of the temporary stalemate in this conflict as the most important success registered by Washington since 1960 says much about the way the imperialist circles of America view the world and their perspectives in face of the mounting revolutionary pressure on all sides. Goliath boasts about his prowess in besting David as the youthful challenger looks for another stone!

No. 2 in Rostow's list is the war in Vietnam. Many persons in the United States, not to mention other countries, would dispute that this was a great success for the Pentagon.

Rostow is not altogether uncritical of the way the U.S. got into a land war in Southeast Asia. He thinks it should have been done much earlier -- in 1962 to be exact. He explains:

"We had a side understanding with the Soviet Union that they would take responsibility for keeping Hanoi out of Laos, but Khrushchev could not or would not implement that agreement.

"It was perhaps the greatest error of this period that we did not insist toward the end of 1962, when the treaty

came into effect and we knew that Hanoi was not honoring it, that we should have made it an absolutely fundamental diplomatic and military position that it be scrupulously honored."

The Times interviewers asked how Moscow could be compelled to live up to a secret deal like the one mentioned:

"Q. Could you say how we might have made the Soviets live up to the side agreement to keep Hanoi out of Laos?"

"A. We could have made it a very important diplomatic issue and, at a time when things were going rather well, we could have taken the kind of steps that we took later.

"Q. Send military force? A. Yes."

Kennedy's success in the crisis over Berlin and the Caribbean in 1961-62 is given a No. 3 rating.

No. 4 is the victory of the neo-colonialist regimes in Africa. "Fourth, we had Africa, and there, working patiently with the forces of African nationalism, using the United Nations, and having faith in Africans, we have seen emerge a situation in which the Africans are more and more taking over their own destiny through regional and subregional institutions."

Success No. 5 was keeping NATO afloat in Europe despite the "French defection."

No. 6 was the "continuous prosperity" in the United States. "The Soviet rate of growth has slowed down, ours has accelerated. The vision of the Soviet Union as a fast-moving No. 2 closing in on a sluggish No. 1 has gone from the world."

As for No. 7, this is the prosperity among Washington's client countries in the "developing world." According to Rostow, "there are success stories from South Korea to Iran, from Taiwan to Mexico and Colombia." In contrast, "There is not a single success story in the Communist world -- neither Cuba nor Communist China where production in 1968 is probably less than 1958 -- North Korea, nor North Vietnam."

Despite the fierce competition with the Communist world, Rostow finds room for a major achievement in the interrelationship between the two camps. No. 8 in his list is Moscow's increasing responsiveness to Washington's policies.

"Despite Vietnam and other crises,"

says Rostow, "we have managed to move our relations with the Soviet Union from one of across-the-board hostility to a relationship in which we isolate areas of common interest of both sides and work systematically in those areas to produce agreement."

Last, but not least, in his list, Rostow cites Johnson's remarkable record in putting the U.S. in Southeast Asia to just the right degree -- neither too little nor too much. "He set about in 1966 to head off a great debate over isolationism versus United States over-

involvement. He did so not by talk, but by building an alternative relationship of the United States to the world -- a relationship somewhere between isolationism and what many people regard as excessive United States involvement."

Rostow left unmentioned the culminating No. 10 -- the most applauded achievement of the Johnson administration -- when the grand champion, all nine blue ribbons glowing on color television, announced his abdication and slunk off the stage, tail tucked between his legs.

### MOSCOW TRIES ANOTHER CLAMPDOWN IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By Les Evans

A high-ranking Soviet delegation headed by Konstantin F. Katushev left Czechoslovakia January 10 after a two-week visit that saw a tightening of controls and warnings by Czech party officials of a possible new Soviet invasion if the movement for socialist democracy is not curtailed.

The first move in the new campaign came in the form of a statement issued by the Presidium of the Czechoslovak Communist party January 4 after an all-night session. The 21-member body, now dominated by those who support or accept Moscow's demands, warned indirectly in its statement that the country might be condemned to suffer another Soviet intervention if dissent were not curbed. "The society cannot live and work permanently in the throes of dissensions and tensions, on the brink of political crisis in which even trivialities can result in tragic conflict." The Presidium also referred to "certain ill-advised invectives" which it said were "complicating relations with our allies. If we do not achieve an early rectification this can seriously heighten the political crisis in our country."

In particular the party leadership demanded what it called "a high degree of political maturity" from the mass communications media. This was spelled out the following week.

The January 4 statement also denounced the campaign in support of Josef Smrkovský, the most popular of the reformers in the party leadership. The Kremlin has demanded a downgrading of Smrkovský from his present post as chairman of the National Assembly. The creation of a federated Czech and Slovak state January 1 gave the Stalinists in the Czechoslovak leadership an opportunity to demote Smrkovský in the process of creating the new bicameral legislature. They were especially upset, however, at the threat of the

900,000-member metal workers union to stage a strike if Smrkovský were removed from his post.

The Presidium declared that the campaign on behalf of the National Assembly chairman "provides scope for the operation of extremist forces that could manipulate also the well-intentioned endeavours of honest people. We consider it to be particularly disquieting that...even strikes are being threatened, though this means is quite without justification."

The Presidium claimed that Gustav Husak, head of the separate Slovak Communist party and the leading collaborator in the government, was the victim of "false accusations." The day before, Husak had been denounced by the chairman of the metal workers union as an "extremist" for having referred to the metal workers as "rightist forces." The union leader described Husak's call for the demotion of Smrkovský, a Czech -- on the grounds of creating a post for a Slovak in the national government -- as an attack on the reform movement and "a stab in the back to both nations in this unsettled situation."

The threat of mass action, if any move were made against Smrkovský, became so great that the government was able to avert it only by having Smrkovský himself make an appeal on national television -- a sorry comment on the authority among the Czechoslovak masses of those leaders who have chosen to collaborate with the Soviet bureaucrats.

Smrkovský, saying that he would accept the decision of the party leadership, asked workers not to strike if he was removed from his post. This left the way clear for his demotion, and the Presidium announced January 7 that Peter Colotka, a Slovak, would be named chairman of the new two-chamber federal assembly. The action will become final at a meeting of

the assembly later this month. Smrkovský will be first deputy chairman of both chambers and will sit as head of one of the bodies, the House of Peoples. A concession to the popular sentiment could be seen in the fact that Colotka is sympathetic to the reform movement.

A new government offensive, accompanied by dire threats of Soviet military action, then followed. On January 9 it was announced that the renewal of press censorship, legalized in September, would now be enforced. Editors of newspapers and magazines were called in and instructed that "voluntary" censorship meant that they were to publish only "positive" resolutions from unions and student organizations; calls for protest strikes should no longer be mentioned; and direct and indirect criticism of the Soviet Union should be eliminated. The same day the metal workers union announced that it would not strike over the demotion of Josef Smrkovský.

On January 10, Gustav Husak made a speech demanding the strengthening of "internal discipline" and warning against "private meetings in apartments for inventing campaigns." This was widely taken as a threat that arrests would be made among opponents of the invasion. Reports were said to be circulating in Prague that the government would send censors to the editorial offices of publications such as the trade-union paper Prace and Reportér magazine.

#### CZECH COMMUNISTS FIGHT FOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH

[There are fresh rumors coming out of Czechoslovakia that the Moscow bureaucrats are considering another crackdown to put a stop "once and for all" to the persistent efforts of the Czech Communists to maintain freedom of speech in the invaded country. After working for five months to reestablish a Stalinist censorship of the press, the occupation forces are still far from having succeeded. Defiance from all sides thwarts them.

[A good example of the kind of material that seems particularly irritating to Moscow is the following item which appeared in the December 25 issue of the Prague weekly Reportér. It is typical of the material considered by the Soviet proconsuls to be subversive and even downright counterrevolutionary.

[The article appeared under the title, "A Christmas Message." The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

So, we have another year behind

Up to now the Czech press has remained courageously outspoken. The student and union organizations have defended their independence and refused to be coerced into a passive acceptance of the reimposition of Stalinist controls.

Even the threat of a new Soviet invasion has not successfully cowed the Czech masses in their fight for socialist democracy. But carrying out the threat poses very serious problems for the Kremlin.

What possible justification could the Soviet bureaucrats advance for such an action? Various pretexts were invented for the August invasion: The defenses at the West German border were allegedly weak; today Soviet troops occupy that area. A nameless group of party leaders had appealed for aid against their colleagues to prevent a "counterrevolution"; today the party leadership is already collaborating with Soviet authorities. It was claimed that an armed group of conspirators had been softening the country up for a restoration of capitalism and a possible coup; why were none of them uncovered by the August invasion?

Moscow would have to admit that its invasion had failed. A new intervention would naturally pose the question of how a new "counterrevolution" was able to sprout in a workers state under the very noses of Soviet occupation troops.

us. Three hundred sixty-six days, fifty-two weeks. And today you are getting your forty-seventh issue of the Reportér [five issues were banned]. We are careful not to call our magazine a "weekly." Because fate, represented by the August interventionists and Mme. Vohnoutova's consistory of censors, has made the Reportér for all of us more of an occasional periodical than a weekly.

Believe us, nothing vexes us more than the five issues we owe you, which despite our best intentions we could not make up. We are sorry for that. But we do not regret occasional "attacks." Those critical weeks in which we were forced into silence were also the time when we received our greatest reward as journalists.

This reward came from you, our readers. It was your unanimous support and your appreciation of our work. We could, then, write wholeheartedly, "Thank you, thank you very much." But that would not be the way to show our thanks. We want to do this in another way. We will

express our gratitude by keeping our magazine what it has been, so that you will continue to get the Reportér you have come to expect.

Maybe that is a simple thing. Maybe it will not be such a simple thing. But as long as you readers stand by us, we journalists will stand by you. This alliance is a firm guarantee that we will overcome all the snares of fate, by whatever agency they come.

The year before us will not be an easy one. It will not be an easy year for anyone in our country, neither for you nor for us. We already see ominous signs. Politics is again retreating behind the closed doors of government offices. The right to undoctored news is no longer recognized as a self-evident right of the citizens in a socialist state.

Again the midgets who want to control the wind and the rain, although they can't run a bathhouse, are raising their heads. If these pigmies manage to clamber up into top, key positions, they need only one thing more to lead a contented existence -- an uninformed people. They can make a good racket out of representing such a people. And for this, these "representatives" need the most servile brand of journalists to conceal their game from the people by dulling their minds with false verbiage.

These midgets' needs are in direct contradiction to yours and ours. You need up-to-the-minute, honest news. Our fundamental and only duty is to provide you with this honest news. Believe us, we have no other ambition than to discharge that duty.

But since our possibilities have already come into conflict with our obligations, we may have to apply the maxim "Politics is the art of the possible" to our magazine. Thus, journalism also may have to be the art of the possible. Do not fear, we are not considering any "normalization" of our work. We only mean -- and promise -- by this that if we are unable to write about some subject, we will not consciously write lies. That is the line from which we cannot retreat.

We rely, naturally, on your support. We all see how journalists and in general the TRT [Tisk, Rozhlas, Televizia -- Press, Radio, Television], that nice bureaucratic rubric for the communications media, can be accused of anything.

First it was the Jews, then the Zionists, next the intellectuals, and now journalists are in style -- at least here in Czechoslovakia. And so we learn that we are counterrevolutionaries and revisionists, busybodies and scribblers,

and heaven knows what else we are or will become. Thus far we have not seen, however, any accusations that the workers as a whole are revisionists. That fact offers a real chance for us and for you. As long as we stand by each other, no disaster can befall us.

In the coming year we will appeal for unity. Not only for the sake of the Reportér, or of freedom of the press; but for the sake of our entire country, of Czechoslovakia's future. We all know that we did a good thing between January and August. We know that we are right and that nothing can change that, not even the strong-arm technique. And when you are right, you cannot be defeated, at least not in the long run, because your actions are part of an inexorable process.

If we lack unity, however, we might have to wait an unpleasantly long time for the victory of truth, and this interval would be filled with a series of greater or lesser defeats. That would be unfortunate, because every defeat we suffer is a victory for those "masters of the wind and the rain" under whose domination we worked so long to achieve...the present order. And without the unity of the entire nation it would be much easier for us to suddenly lose what little we still have.

This will not be an easy year. Among other things, we will have to imitate Odysseus. We will have to stuff our ears with wax against the wailing of the most diverse sirens. These moaners fear our unity because it is incomprehensible to them and might be imitated elsewhere than between the Sumava and the Tatras [the borders of Czechoslovakia].

Let us not forget either that we committed heresy this year. We threw off the domination of midgets who represented no one and understood nothing, whose only merit was knowing when to raise their hands and when to wax indignant. They did not have to ponder over when to do either of these things. This burden was assumed by others. And since this breed of functionary is not native to only Czechoslovakia, our kicking out these midgets was a great and unforgivable sin.

It is to be hoped that all of them will tolerate this heresy a while longer. But do not expect anyone to praise us for our undertaking, although it is already a risky one.

In the confrontations and duels which inevitably await us in such a situation, the Reportér wants to be -- as it has always been -- on the right side. On the side of progress of course. And so, until 1969, we greet you with our favorite slogan -- We Are With You, Be With Us.

THE CZECHOSLOVAK QUESTION AND ITS SOLUTION

[The following article has been translated by Intercontinental Press from the December 25, 1968, issue of the Prague weekly Reportér. The author is Zdeněk Jiša.]

\* \* \*

In the past weeks Czechoslovak citizens have been virtually overwhelmed at every turn by the wide repercussions our post-January course set off which is still reverberating internationally. From countries far and near we hear of demonstrations for or against this development, of petitions, of trials, of the actions of international bodies, and of the positions taken by the great and small of the world toward the post-January course. Not a day has passed that we have not been encouraged, worried, or excited by this news.

Naturally, the post-January development has been interpreted diversely abroad, since the observers and interpreters have their different points of view. That, after all, is the way it has always been and will always be and there is no reason why we should expect our case to be an exception.

However, the intensity and persistence of this international interest in our post-January course -- and most of all the clear-cut positions which have been taken toward it -- show that something happened in Czechoslovakia which deeply stirred the minds and conscience of all humanity and made the Czechoslovak question a question of worldwide importance.

We must ask ourselves what in fact happened here that almost overnight made Czechoslovakia, so to speak, a new star of Bethlehem for the world?

(1) Was it perhaps our economic reform that electrified the world? Hardly.

-- The form and direction of the economic reform in Czechoslovakia was known to the world from the time of the Thirteenth Congress of the KSC [Komunistická Strana Československa -- Communist party of Czechoslovakia], that is, 1966, and it has undergone no changes since.

-- And while the Czechoslovak economic reform provides for extensive use of the market forces; the plan remains the chief regulator of the development of production and demand; and social ownership of the means of production is untouched. This reform did not entail a return to capitalism or even some kind of new version of the NEP, which was introduced in the Soviet Union at one time.

-- Economic reforms of a type similar to those in Czechoslovakia were adopted in other socialist states and aroused no great attention in the world.

(2) Was it perhaps, then, the renewal of Czechoslovak political and social life which so aroused international, public opinion? Hardly.

-- The renewal of our political and social life in the post-January development was understood internationally for the most part as a logical extension of the renewal process begun in the Soviet Union with the liquidation of the Stalinist cult of the individual and the drastic methods characteristic of his regime of personal power.

-- Only the methods of work and administration were changed. There was no change in political direction or in the state and social system.

(3) Was it perhaps the danger of revisionism and an attempt to upset the balance of power? Hardly.

-- The argument over what is or is not a revision of Marxist thought, or who is or is not a revisionist, has gone on in the Marxist movement for many years already. And this argument has not electrified world public opinion, not at first when Yugoslavia was called revisionist, nor later when Albania was, or China, or most recently the Soviet Union.

-- The Communist party of Czechoslovakia was and remained in the post-January period the leading political force in the country, it conducted a consistently socialist policy and that policy was supported by all the people of this country. There was no question either here or abroad about Czechoslovakia's loyalty to the socialist alliance.

-- And if the 40,000 counterrevolutionaries in Czechoslovakia, which some foreign papers talk about, did exist, and if there were a threat of an overturn of the regime, could anyone in the world doubt that the Communist party of Czechoslovakia, supported by the entire state apparatus, 14,000,000 Czechs and Slovaks, and the entire economic and military potential of the Warsaw Pact countries could not have dealt with this threat in time?

It seems then that these various circumstances, while they might have interested specialists, the world press, and some groups of politicians, could not by themselves have provoked any great

response throughout the entire world.  
What was it then?

We all know that for millennia humanity and its great minds have striven to create a form of social organization that would enable every member of society to live a peaceful, rich, and creative life -- and above all to live his life with the greatest human dignity. The idea of organizing such a society runs like a red thread through all of known history. The attempt to realize such a society is not only the main stimulus for social advance but the degree of success achieved in this attempt is the measure of progress and backwardness in societies. It cannot be wondered at, then, that any effort to realize this ideal -- whether political, economic, philosophical, or religious in character -- should rightly become the focus of attention for all people. Nor ought it to surprise us that this attempt should provoke a response not only from those who support it but from those who cannot or will not understand it. World history offers many examples of such clashes between progressive and reactionary forces.

For the Czech and Slovak peoples, subjected for long centuries to national, economic, and spiritual oppression by their powerful neighbors, the realization of these liberating ideas is a vital and essential concern. It would be difficult to count how many times in their history these peoples have had to defend their national existence and their freedom, arms in hand. It need not be pointed out how dearly they have paid for every extra crumb of bread and every step forward in their economic development. It would be hard to count the number of the best sons of these two peoples who have had to sacrifice themselves so that the ancient idea of social and political equality and freedom and brotherhood among peoples could take on form and reality.

And we did not struggle alone or just for ourselves. We always had the full support of all the oppressed; our victories were their victories and our defeats were their defeats. We are well aware of that and so is the rest of the civilized world.

There are few places in the world where such a hard and instinctive fight has been waged for these ideas as in our country. Not everywhere have these values been so strongly cherished as here. It is certainly no coincidence that a world church council [the Council of Constance] condemned the dean of Czech higher education, Jan Hus, for his progressive ideas. It was not accidental that these progressive ideas became a legacy not only for the Czech and Slovak peoples but for the entire reform movement that followed.

It was certainly not by chance that the most reactionary powers in Europe sent hundreds of thousands of troops against a handful of Hussites struggling for social equality and political and moral renewal.

It is certainly not by chance that for centuries reactionary clerical, noble, and political circles concentrated on expunging these ideas from the minds and hearts of the Czechs and Slovaks, and it is certainly not by chance that they did not succeed. Sooner or later we have always been able to achieve these ideas. After more than three centuries the Czech and Slovak peoples succeeded in regaining their independence and returning to their revolutionary, democratic, and humanistic traditions.

It is certainly not by chance that free Czechoslovakia, which was a very democratic country for its time, was one of the first victims of Hitler Germany and of world fascism. And it was not a coincidence that the occupation of Czechoslovakia by foreign troops was the signal for the greatest confrontation between the forces of progress and reaction until that time.

Finally, it is not by chance that the people of Czechoslovakia almost immediately after the end of the second world war resolutely and voluntarily set out on the road to socialism and that the Communist party of Czechoslovakia became the leading force in society through a free vote of the nation.

And that is not all. Never in their history have the Czech and Slovak peoples oppressed the people of another country, not even when they had the opportunity. They never stole other peoples' land, nor forced their ideas, their political concepts, or their way of life on anyone.

The Czech and Slovak peoples did not have to learn the ideas of democracy, social progress, and internationalism prior to the twentieth century from foreign pamphlets, or other forms of education, or finally in prison camps. These ideas were theirs from the very beginning of their national existence; their lives are bound up with them as vitally as with their native soil.

All this must be taken into account and understood, if we want to understand what was taking place here during the post-January development -- why this development became the focus of world attention. This development was another struggle against everything outdated and outworn. It was another struggle for a fuller, freer and more dignified life for man.

Only an ignoramus or a liar could

claim anything different, only a naïve or uninformed man could believe that our post-January development was the result of a reactionary plot, that it was an effort to turn the clock back. Such views are a profound insult not only to the post-January development but most of all to the whole progressive history of this country, and to its people, living and dead.

The Czechoslovak people did not abandon the ideas of Marx and Engels in their post-January course, although, as in all movements, errors were made. They tried to put these ideas into practice. They did not leave the socialist road but rather took a step forward on that road because, in the spirit of Marx and Engels' ideas, they sought a modern synthesis of democracy and social progress. They did not weaken the international workers and Communist movement.

Rather, as the response of the other workers and Communist parties shows, they gave this movement new hope and new attractiveness. Men do not want to be puppets. They want to be men. It was this new hope, this new attractive power of the post-January development which aroused strong sympathy on the one hand and on the other fear, hatred, and a longing for new Councils of Constance, new witch trials, new resort to violence.

Therefore, the Czechoslovak question is the question of the modern age and also a question for the entire world.

We do not ask understanding from those who, because of class or power interests, cannot or will not understand us. Their interests are not our interests, their desires are not and cannot be our desires.

In the name of our progressive traditions, in the name of our common goals, we have the right, however, to ask full understanding from those who claim to be our class brothers, from those who like us struggle for social progress and the freedom of man -- the peoples and Communist parties of the other socialist countries.

We know that it will not be easy to achieve such understanding. Each of these countries started out on the road to socialism on the basis of its own history, experience, and conditions. In many socialist countries the workers movement worked under feudal or semifeudal conditions until practically the end of the second world war. Its leaders were either underground or in emigration. For fifteen years the German workers movement was stifled and ideologically demoral-

ized by the fascist regime. Only in the second half of the twentieth century -- for the first time in the history of Germany -- did it experience a democratic constitution and a democratic state.

There are, moreover, other factors as well. Although, for example, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have already carried out a socialist transformation of their societies, some other socialist states must still tolerate the existence of small commodity production and class antagonisms in their countries. While some socialist states are on the level of developing countries, others already rank among the economically and culturally advanced countries of the world.

We cannot forget either the feelings aroused by the events of the last weeks and months. We cannot hide the fact that the terrible misunderstandings arising from a series of confusions threaten today not only the relations between the socialist countries but the entire workers and progressive movement. We cannot hide the fact that this plays into the hands of those opposed to social progress. It is rightly feared that the reactionary forces in the world want to use these misunderstandings to their own advantage and that they are preparing an attack for the near future.

It is high time to turn away from secondary questions and to seek a common language. Mutual understanding is possible.

(a) Together we strive to build a socialist and Communist world.

(b) Together we base ourselves on the Marxist world outlook and on the progress of human society.

(c) Together we struggle for progress, peace and understanding among nations.

(d) Together we have an interest in the free development of the human personality.

There is no doubt that we can come to an understanding as long as we treat one another as brothers, as equals, if we fully respect one another. That will not be easy, but it is vital.

History teaches, moreover, that attempts to solve the Czechoslovak question by force lead sooner or later to world conflicts and tragic consequences for entire generations.

There can be no retreat on these principles of equality. The lessons of history have once again come to the forefront.



BAYONETS AT SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE?

In 1964 it was Berkeley. Last year it was Columbia. Now San Francisco State College, just across the bay from Berkeley, has become the front line of the student struggle for basic changes in American colleges and universities. The student strike that began at the San Francisco college November 6 ended its second month January 6 with no sign of weakening.

In fact the anniversary, the first day of school after an extended three-week Christmas holiday, was celebrated by the faculty going out on strike as well, to demand union recognition, salary increases and other improvements.

California's governor, former film star Ronald Reagan, discussed the situation with newsmen the day before the school reopened. His lines sounded like something from an early talkie:

San Francisco State College must be kept open, he said, "at the point of a bayonet if necessary." When asked if he had considered calling out the national guard, he replied (deliberately, after a short pause for effect), "It has to be kept open if you have to surround the college with whatever forces necessary. I don't care what force it takes. That force must be applied. This confrontation must be won."

Perhaps the situation reminded him of those days gone by when he led the U.S. cavalry charges that always arrived in the nick of time to finish off the hostile bands of Hollywood extras dressed as Indians. Or he may have been inspired by Chicago's Mayor Daley who told his police to "shoot to kill."

What Reagan quickly discovered, however, was that the new generation of Indians are not as obliging as those on Hollywood payrolls.

The strike was initiated by the Black Students Union to win ten demands, mainly for the implementation of promises for an autonomous black studies department, an increase in black enrollment, and the rehiring of Black Panther party Minister of Information George Murray who had been fired from the college for making a political speech. Black people constitute 20 percent of the population of San Francisco, but less than 4 percent of the students at S.F. State are black. The Third World Liberation Front joined the black student group in the leadership of the strike.

The college's recently appointed president, semanticist S.I. Hayakawa, has used city police for massive attacks on student rallies and picket lines on numer-



GOV. "BAYONETS" REAGAN

ous occasions. Many students have been injured.

Reagan had another threat for striking faculty members. Anyone who missed five days of instruction, he said, would be considered as having resigned. The teachers' strike is spreading to other schools. The American Federation of Teachers has called a strike at San José State College in support of the strike at San Francisco State. Many community organizations, representing Afro-Americans, Chinese-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Chicanos (Mexican-Americans) are supporting the teachers and students in their united struggle.

The strike was estimated at 80 percent effective when school reopened on January 6. The New York Times described the college as "a microcosm of the times."

ROMULO OPENS CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE U.S.

Upon assuming office as Foreign Secretary of the Philippines government, Carlos P. Romulo called for a reappraisal of U.S.-Philippine relations. In a statement January 2 and an interview two days later, Romulo indicated that the Marcos regime was considering questioning the necessity of U.S. military bases in the Philippines and the present military alliance.

Romulo's statements created a ripple in Washington, coming as they did during the Paris negotiations and the foundering of the Johnson administration as a result of the military adventure in Southeast Asia.

"The world has changed since the days when the Philippines gained independence and entered into defense and other agreements with the United States," Romulo said. "After World War II we thought in terms of the bipolarization of the two superpowers, the United States and Russia and all that. Now you have Red China and even General de Gaulle. The big power polarization has been fragmented, and the giants cannot use the strength of giants."

In support of this view, Romulo called attention to Cuba's success in maintaining her independence and Vietnam's capacity to resist American military power. He also noted the growing antiwar mood in the U.S.

"After Vietnam," he continued, "I do not think the American people will ever again consent to involving their troops in Asia. Thus an American defense of the Philippines in the future is highly dubious. The Americans must now think of themselves, and I don't blame them."

Romulo was quite vague about what course the Marcos regime intended to take as an alternative to the present policy. But he hinted about overtures in the direction of China. He said that the

Philippines would reexamine her opposition to UN membership for China and to recognition of the Mao regime. To emphasize this, he reported that Foreign Office personnel had been told January 3 to begin referring to the "People's Republic of China" instead of "Communist China" as in the past. He also retracted an order forbidding Foreign Office personnel from having contacts with officials of Communist countries.

This was not all. Romulo raised the question of the trade preferences and special status granted to Americans doing business and owning property in the Philippines.

Do these statements indicate that Romulo, a representative of the Philippines national bourgeoisie, is about to take a revolutionary course? The answer is, no.

It was noted in Washington that among Romulo's points was a not-at-all casual reference to Spain, which with a five-year contract on military bases and a "large payment" had a "better deal" than the Philippines.

The New York Times, in an editorial January 9, indicated that it had caught the point made by "an old friend." "If received with tact and understanding, the Romulo challenge to American policies in the Pacific presents opportunities as well as problems for the Nixon Administration."

And Times correspondent Tillman Durdin, writing from Hong Kong, spelled it out even more clearly in the January 12 issue of America's most authoritative capitalist journal: "The Philippines is about to engage in a series of discussions with the United States on bases, aid and economic relationships, and Mr. Romulo was no doubt stating a bargaining position and presumably not trying to usher the United States out of East Asia."

PEKING ADDS UP GAINS OF "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

The Chinese news agency Hsinhua reported January 2 that during the "cultural revolution," from 1966 to the end of November 1968, more than 150,000,000 sets of the Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung were printed, plus more than 140,000,000 copies of Selected Readings from Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Works, plus more than 740,000,000 copies of Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, plus 2,000,000,000 copies of Chairman Mao's Three Constantly Read Articles, Five Constantly Read Arti-

cles, and other "brilliant works."

By way of dessert for this mental feast, 96,000,000 copies of Chairman Mao's Poems were run off the presses.

Hsinhua did not report how much of this thought was produced by Mao during the cultural revolution. Nor did it mention whether anyone else involved in the cultural revolution had had any thoughts worth publishing during the three-year mammoth renaissance.

NIXON NAMES WAR-HORSE AS PARIS NEGOTIATOR

Nixon made his first move in the Vietnam war January 5 when he appointed Henry Cabot Lodge as chief United States negotiator at the Paris "peace" talks. The choice of the aristocratic Boston war-horse indicated a readiness on Nixon's part to continue the American aggression in Southeast Asia.

Lodge, who was chief U.S. representative at the United Nations during the Eisenhower administration and Nixon's running mate against Kennedy and Johnson in 1960, served twice as American ambassador to Saigon. There he acted as a diplomatic triggerman, first for Kennedy and then for Johnson. He helped, for example, to engineer the liquidation of Washington's erstwhile ally, Ngo Dinh Diem, in 1963. He is also said to be on particularly good terms with Hitler-loving Nguyen Cao Ky. C.L. Sulzberger, writing in the January 8 New York Times, said:



"Lodge, who played a quiet role in dumping the Ngo brothers for President Kennedy, during his first term as Ambassador in Saigon, later became renowned for his close relations with Air Marshal Ky, now Vice President."

The Saigon delegation in Paris was described as "jubilant" at news of Lodge's appointment.

Nixon's other appointments in this area do little to alter the impression. His decision to retain Ellsworth Bunker as present ambassador in Saigon was widely regarded as an endorsement of the war hawks in Johnson's entourage.

Another unsavory operator was chosen as Lodge's assistant in Paris: Marshall Green, U.S. ambassador to Indonesia. Green played a role in the CIA-inspired coup in 1965 that resulted in the slaughter of 500,000 Indonesian Communists and workers.

Nixon's appointment of U. Alexis Johnson to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs also suggested a decision to continue the war policy of his predecessor. U. Alexis Johnson served as deputy ambassador in Saigon under Maxwell Taylor in 1964-65 and is a champion of imperialist action there.

James A. Wechsler in his January 10 column in the New York Post said that Nixon's new Secretary of State William P. Rogers is in substantial agreement with State Department and military officials committed to further escalation of the Vietnam war in the hope of salvaging an imperialist victory. "The impression in Washington," Wechsler writes, "is that

BOSTON WAR-HORSE

Rogers is disposed to accept their estimate that certain misfortunes of the past were really the prologue to an historic turning point in our favor."

Critical of present policy as ultimately highly dangerous to capitalist stability at home, Wechsler warned the president-elect:

"Even as one writes these lines, it remains hard to believe that Nixon will finally decide to duplicate the calamitous errors that transformed the high hope of the Johnson era into a period of domestic discord so convulsive that LBJ felt obliged to abdicate. A resumption of the bombings and an expansion of hostilities will ignite a new, explosive antiwar protest, on and off the campus. It will intensify all the divisions and resentments and alienation that already shadow the landscape as the Inaugural nears. It could make the nation virtually ungovernable."

Wechsler states the case quite well. Nixon appears to have chosen to press on despite the warnings. If at some point he discovers the overhead is too great, however, he has carefully provided himself with a team that is skilled in disposing of embarrassing allies.

An Editorial

NO, JULIA MARIE, THERE ISN'T ANY SANTA CLAUS

The American capitalist press is currently featuring articles on the tenth anniversary of the victory of the Cuban revolution. One of the main points in these "balance sheets" is that the Cuban economy functions only with great difficulty, that there are serious shortages, and that the government has had to ration virtually all consumer goods.

The common conclusion of all these pieces is that a planned economy won't work and that Cuba has gone downhill since the capitalist system was overturned.

Conspicuously absent from this propaganda is any account of the role of the blockade enforced by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations on the tiny island and the cost to Cuba of having to maintain a sizeable and efficient military deterrent to the ever-present threat of another American invasion.

Also conspicuously absent from these snide attacks is any explanation of the difficulties faced by Cuba in having to reorient its economy away from the complete dependence on the nearby American continent which resulted from more than a half-century of intensive imperialist exploitation.

That the Cubans have been able to register such impressive achievements as they have in face of the enormous pressure exerted by the mightiest military power on earth is in reality the most eloquent testimony to the potentialities of economic planning.

When Washington began its blockade of Cuba, spokesmen of the administration averred that this was not intended to reduce the Cuban population to starvation. It was especially emphasized that Cuba would still be free to purchase medical supplies in the U.S.

This was nothing but lying propaganda designed to assuage the conscience of Americans who might go along with an

embargo on military matériel but who would certainly protest denying medicines to the country.

The most recent proof of the fraudulent nature of Washington's propaganda was an incident reported in the press January 7.

Carl Simmons, administrator of the St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee, told reporters that a batch of antileukemia drugs air-mailed on December 30 to a five-year-old child in Cuba had been halted by U.S. postal authorities in Miami and returned to the hospital without explanation.

The drugs were sent in response to an appeal during Christmas week from Dr. Hugo Benazet, whose daughter, Julia Marie, has leukemia. The physician sent a telegram to Miami radio station WQAM after he heard the station broadcast a report telling of a new drug compound developed by the Memphis hospital that had ended leukemia symptoms in 21 out of 24 children to whom it was administered.

WQAM called the hospital which in turn called Dr. Benazet to get the case history.

Simmons told the press January 6: "This is starting to get critical for that little girl. It's been a week now since the drugs were shipped and we hoped they'd have been there by this time."

"We've called Miami," he added, "and are attempting to find out what happened."

It's very clear what happened. The postal authorities in Miami, loyal to the American Way of Life, are simply following orders aimed to prove that a planned economy won't work.

They and their superiors forget that such actions show in the most graphic way precisely how the capitalist system works when it comes to compassion and the brotherhood of humanity.

SPANISH POLITICAL PRISONERS ON HUNGER STRIKE

Le Monde reported January 9 that forty-six prisoners, including Communists, anarchists, socialists, and members of a Basque revolutionary group, were still on a hunger strike which they began last December in the prison at Soria, Spain.

Their main demand was that they be granted the status of political prisoners as provided in Spanish law.

Forty of them were in such grave condition that they had to be hospitalized.



IN EL FRONTON. Three political prisoners, including Trotskyist peasant leader Hugo Blanco (right), in Peru's island prison. Shown with Blanco in this recent photograph are José Castro Vera, a peasant leader, and the Argentinian Trotskyist Eduardo Creus (left). Creus, held since 1962, was arrested on charges of being connected with students who held up a

bank in Lima to raise funds for guerrilla struggle. When the others were released in 1967, Creus was kept in prison for having taken part in Hugo Blanco's movement. He and Blanco were among the signers of the letter published in the last issue of Intercontinental Press exposing the brutal treatment of political prisoners by sadistic police and prison guards.

AUSTRIAN CP REAFFIRMS OPPOSITION TO CZECH INVASION

At the final session of its congress January 6, the Austrian Communist party adopted a resolution stating that there could be no return to the situation prevailing in Czechoslovakia prior to January 1968 when the movement for socialist democracy gained impetus.

The resolution recalled that the

Central Committee of the Austrian CP had disapproved the military action of the five Warsaw Pact allies.

The delegates voted unanimously for the resolution which also called for a world conference of Communist parties to safeguard the unity of the international Communist movement.

MAO'S NEW PARTY CONSTITUTION

An English translation of the text of a proposed new constitution for the Chinese Communist party was published by the New York Times January 8. The draft is reportedly being circulated and discussed in China in preparation for a forthcoming congress, the first in more than twelve years.

While the translation is not official, the text not having been released to the general public by the Chinese CP, it is probably close enough so that the proposed constitution can be evaluated without much risk of gross misinterpretation.

As one of the end products of the "Cultural Revolution," it casts a revealing light on the propaganda of the Maoist faction. One of Mao's alleged aims in the struggle against his factional opponents was to institute proletarian democracy along the lines of the Paris Commune. Nothing of the kind is to be found in this document.

There is not a single word in it protecting the rights of minorities. In fact they are limited to solely one right: "A party member has the right to criticize and make suggestions to a party organization and leading persons at all levels."

This is meaningless in the absence of the right to form tendencies or factions enjoying full opportunities in regular discussion periods to present their views to the membership and to win a majority.

Instead, the new constitution strictly enjoins the minority on its duties -- "the minority shall obey the majority..."

That was not the rule followed by Mao in the "Cultural Revolution." His slogan was "to seize power" from those elected at the previous congress, including those holding the highest offices in the country.

This contradiction is handled neatly in the proposed constitution. Mao is elevated by law into the position of a living god, standing in his infallibility high above minorities and majorities:

"The Communist party of China takes Marxism, Leninism, and the thought of Mao Tse-tung as the theoretical basis guiding its thought. The thought of Mao Tse-tung is Marxism-Leninism of the era

in which imperialism is heading toward total collapse while Socialism is heading toward worldwide victory.

"In the past half century, in leading China in the great struggle to fulfill the new democratic revolution, in leading the great struggle of Socialist revolution and Socialist construction of China, and in the great struggle of the present international Communist movement against imperialism, modern revisionism, and the reactionaries of all countries, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has combined the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution, has inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism, and lifted it to a completely new stage."

In accordance with this pattern of thought, the problem of selecting a successor to the inheritor of universal truth is not left up to a majority decision of the party, nor even a majority decision of the Central Committee, nor any other party body.

The constitution itself designates a successor to Mao, as if it were a dynasty that was being set up:

"Comrade Lin Piao has consistently held high the great red banner of the thought of Mao Tse-tung and most loyally and resolutely carried out and defended Comrade Mao Tse-tung's proletarian revolutionary line. Comrade Lin Piao is Comrade Mao Tse-tung's close comrade-in-arms and successor."

This still does not exhaust the precautions taken against the possibility of workers democracy raising its head in the Chinese Communist party. A party congress is to be held -- not every year, not every two years, not every three years, but only every five years. That's less often than the Republican and Democratic parties in the imperialist U.S. hold their conventions.

Even this rule is subject to an escape clause. Under "special circumstances," a party congress "may be held ahead of schedule or postponed."

It is not specified how long it may be postponed. Mao or his successor, presumably, will decide what constitutes "special circumstances."

Mao evidently has decided that no matter how reasonable it is for schools of thought to contend, this is not the time for a hundred flowers to bloom.

## FOCK ADMITS WIDE OPPOSITION IN HUNGARY TO CZECH INVASION

In a television interview, reported in the January 5 issue of the London Observer, Premier Jeno Fock of Hungary admitted that there is wide opposition in Hungary to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in which his government participated. He now knows, he said, that "the steps on 20 August were against the wishes of the entire Hungarian nation and they are now faced with a widespread demand -- in spite of the presence of a large Soviet occupation army -- to redress the damage done to Hungary's honour."

Fock sought to smear the opposition, however, by stating that "the adversaries include deliberate enemies of the system, who stand up against the law, commit acts of subversion, illegal organization and political crime. These people

must be treated with the utmost rigour of the law."

The Hungarian government, in fact, has taken measures of the kind indicated by Premier Fock. A number of well-known scholars, including Professor Gyorgy Markus and his wife and Dr. Vilmos Sos, who are members of the Hungarian Academy of Science, have been expelled from the Communist party. Their "political crime" was to have publicly condemned the invasion of Czechoslovakia and to have refused to recant.

The scholars had drawn up a memorandum denouncing Hungary's participation in the invasion. They were accused, in addition, of trying to organize support and acceptance of the memorandum by the Academy of Science.

## ULBRICHT REORGANIZES THE UNIVERSITIES

The Ulbricht regime has begun a major reorganization of East German universities in an attempt to integrate institutions of higher learning closely into the day-to-day functioning of state industry.

At the University of Jena, for example, all research facilities in the fields of physics and chemistry have been turned over to Zeisswerke, the state-owned precision optical equipment manufacturer. Students and professors will undertake projects for Zeiss at the university, or work directly in Zeiss plant laboratories. A number of Zeiss plant managers will be added to the university's executive council.

It is reported that 900 institutions and departments at the forty-one universities and colleges are to be concentrated into 190 "sections" by the end of this year. Almost 100 sections have already been formed. The official reason for the change is to increase "efficiency" in industry and the universities.

Certainly the breakdown of the artificial separation of intellectual and manual labor has always been a goal of the socialist movement. Nevertheless, there may have been other considerations in the reorganization.

A similar project was carried out in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev, but had to be abandoned as unproductive. Its resurrection now comes after a year of great student unrest from which East Germany was not exempt. It cannot have escaped Ulbricht and his colleagues that a few old-line bureaucrats from industrial management would serve as a good counter

to demands for student power or university autonomy.

Marxists have criticized capitalism for its narrow overspecialization of labor, reducing men to one-sided technicians with no overall view of society. Yet one of the effects of the projected university reorganization would be a downgrading of the humanities and social sciences in favor of mathematics and engineering. Even the "hard" sciences would have a more technical orientation at the expense of more general research.

Was one of Ulbricht's considerations the fact that it is from the social science students that the strongest opposition to bureaucratic rule has come in all the East European workers states? The German Democratic Republic saw its share of this, and there are a number of students still in prison there today for protesting their government's participation in the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The attention of the radical press in the West centered on the release in November of some of the best known young defenders of socialist democracy: the two sons of Professor Robert Havemann and five others. The London Times "Diary" reported December 11 that "...other youths -- some as young as 15 -- are still in prison after receiving heavy sentences, often of two years or more....Some estimates have it that there are as many as 100 of them. But the Commission of Free Jurists in west Berlin is rather sceptical about there being as many. I am confidently informed, however, that there are at least 15 youths in prison, and almost certainly six more."

A BAN ON THE NEO-NAZI PARTY?

By Peter Brandt

[The following article appeared in the October 1968 issue of Was Tun ("What Is to Be Done?"), published by the left wing of the West German SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- German Socialist Student Union). The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

The Bundestag elections are approaching and fear of troublesome competition from the NPD [Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands -- National Democratic party of Germany -- the neo-Nazi party] is growing. Demands for banning the NPD formerly came primarily from the trade-union bureaucrats. However, more and more appeals for a constitutional ruling against the NPD are now emanating from the government camp.

Among the APO [Ausserparlamentarische Opposition -- Extraparliamentary Opposition] there are two opposing views on this question. The KPD [Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands -- Communist party of Germany] and all its followers see the NPD as a new fascist danger. They maintain that it is necessary to move early against the NPD in a united front with all those ready to do so.

Many SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- Socialist German Student Union] members, however, hold the view that this party is a relic of the past. They say that the real fascist danger comes from the camp of the established parties and therefore any campaign against the NPD would be wasted effort.

What is decisive for Marxists regarding fascism is not its ideology but its social function. The role of the NSDAP [Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter-Partei -- National Socialist German Workers party -- the full name of Hitler's party] -- to use the handiest example -- was to crush all the workers organizations, even the reformist ones, by terror and to eliminate the last vestiges of parliamentary rule and bourgeois legality by means of a petty-bourgeois mass movement. The big bourgeoisie gave the green light to Hitler only after all other possibilities to resolve the capitalist crisis had failed. In the mortal crisis of German capitalism, the mere survival of the reformist trade unions and the Social Democracy constituted a danger because the existence of any workers organization left open the possibility for a defensive struggle by the workers.

The present-day neocapitalism in

the Federal Republic cannot be equated unqualifiedly with the capitalism of the twenties. The fundamental contradictions are the same in the present system but there are shifts in emphasis.

The capitalist contradictions stemming from structural shifts seem to have taken on a greater weight. The decline of the labor-intensive branches of production and the development of new industries, the advances in automation, and the international concentration of capital threaten the jobs of all categories of wage earners.

The threat of crises of overproduction could be averted up to now by measures partially reminiscent of fascism -- arms spending, government orders, and subsidies. But let us not deceive ourselves. The tendency toward a "strong state" which can be noted in all West European countries is not aimed at crushing the workers organizations but much more at tying them to the state. The unions' freedom of maneuver, even in the economic realm, is to be continually reduced. "Emergencies" are being prepared for by antistrike legislation.

It would be a grave error to equate modern tendencies toward integrating the unions into the state with traditional fascism. For us, the criterion of bourgeois democracy is not decisive. If it were so, there would be scarcely any country in the capitalist world that is not becoming more and more fascist. What is decisive is freedom of action for the working class. While the steady "democratic" limitation of this freedom of action increasingly hinders the workers struggle, it leaves the possibility for organized resistance essentially open. The class struggle continues.

The French May should have convinced the greatest skeptics that working-class resistance can break through all these restraints with more momentum than the most orthodox Marxists had assumed. The theories of creeping and peaceful establishment of fascism received a blow from which, hopefully, they will never recover; because these theories assume that the working class will not defend itself against such tendencies.

Clearly also the NPD represents no present fascist danger. To be sure, in its ideology and social composition it strongly resembles Hitler's party. However, the NSDAP was not simply the party of the petty bourgeoisie, but of the petty bourgeoisie that had been impoverished and reduced to a proletarian exist-





ADOLF VON THADDEN, HEAD OF THE NDP

the refugee politicians\* of the three established parties [the Christian Democrats, the Social Democrats, and the Free Democratic liberals]. And Von Thadden [the leader of the NPD] still does not even dare dream of a rally like the one called by the Social Democrat Schütz\*\* in answer to the Berlin Vietnam demonstration of February 1968.

In their attempts to break up NPD meetings, many APO comrades have been able to see how relatively tamely the "fascists" reacted.

At this time the NPD plays another role. It serves the established parties as a bogeyman. Everyone is supposed to keep a transfixed gaze on the NPD while these parties pursue their reactionary policies. Once again the Social Democrats feel compelled to distinguish between a greater and a lesser evil (this argument is not new, and we know where its conclusions have already led).

However, other disadvantages for the establishment counterbalance this advantage. The NPD is stealing votes from the other parties. It is striking new tones in the electoral campaigns which are raising angry frowns among party politicians ensconced in their armchairs.

Only the smallest number of NPD voters can be characterized as "fascists." Many more are "protest voters" who are taken in by the NPD's demagogic attacks against bourgeois parliamentarianism.

However, let us assume that the advocates of banning the NPD succeed in winning their demand. What would be the result? The ruling parties could represent themselves as defenders of Western freedoms and thereby win the opportunity to aim their next blow against the left, for example, the SDS. They could use the motto, "Strike Hard Against the Right and

tence by the depression, of the lumpen-proletariat, and of the desperate and ruined of all classes. Only this social force, which is lacking today, enabled the Nazis to create and maintain a mass petty-bourgeois terrorist organization.

Perhaps a fascism in the style of Hitler and Mussolini could again become a possibility if the most recent period of capitalist prosperity were to give way to an era of profound economic crises and social and political struggles.

However, let us leave open the question of whether in such a situation the NPD would be predestined to become a new fascist mass movement.

Up to now the largest assemblies of a fascist character in the Federal Republic are still being organized by

---

\* The West German population includes a substantial number of refugees from the former German territories in Eastern Europe. Fascist-tinted refugee organizations calling for the recovery of the Eastern territories are an important factor in West German politics and are courted by all the established parties. -- I.P.

\*\* Using his powers as mayor of West Berlin, Schütz organized all the reactionary forces in that city in a counterdemonstration against the student anti-Vietnam-war demonstration of February 18, 1968. Schütz's prowar demonstration was marked by violent attacks on young people who looked like students and by Nazi-flavored slogans. See "Behind the Shooting of Rudi Dutschke" in World Outlook, April 26, 1968, p. 369. -- I.P.

Left Extremist Enemies of Democracy!"

The APO has not the slightest reason to support or encourage such a maneuver by the ruling parties. We should accordingly clearly oppose all attempts to ban the NPD or the Nationalzeitung,\* etc. However, that by no means suggests that we must not fight against the NPD. The NPD still constitutes the extreme right wing of our political system and a potential fascist danger. In many places, moreover, the fight against the NPD has been very important for the APO in mobilizing around this issue.

But we must be careful to clearly differentiate our struggle from the one

---

\* The National und Soldaten Zeitung is the largest-circulation ultraright paper in West Germany. Although it supports the neo-Nazis, it has no formal connection with the NPD, whose main organ is Deutsche Nachrichten. -- I.P.

the established parties and the trade-union bureaucrats are waging against the competition from the NPD, which they find troublesome at the moment. We must by no means support these establishment forces and give them the advantage of another democratic fig leaf.

Our enemy is neocapitalism; and the underpinning of neocapitalism in West Germany is not the NPD but the parliamentarianism supported by the three parties. We must expose all the parliamentary tricks of these parties and make it clear to radical democratic antifascists that a fight against the NPD makes sense only as part of the class struggle.

At the same time a campaign must be mounted to reach the politically backward NPD protest voters to expose the demagogy of their leaders and to present the extraparliamentary opposition to them as the only radical alternative to parliamentarianism and capitalism.

WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT DECIDES NOT TO BAN NEO-NAZIS

West German Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger has reportedly decided not to seek a court ban on the neo-Nazi National Democratic party [NPD] "at this time."

The New York Times said January 10 that an "unimpeachable diplomatic source" had revealed that Bonn felt it "did not have enough evidence now to win a court case." It was made clear that Kiesinger intended to keep his options open. The Times added, "It is understood that the Government intends to keep collecting in-

formation on the party and the former Nazis who lead it and would be prepared to seek a ban in the future if new information was uncovered."

The decision for the immediate future will be confirmed at a cabinet meeting in the next few weeks.

A source close to the government reportedly said the greatest reason for not acting at this time to outlaw the NPD lay in "the great risk of losing the case."

DEFENDANTS IN TEHERAN POLITICAL TRIAL CHARGE TORTURE

The political trial of fourteen Iranian intellectuals in Teheran, which opened December 30, is proving troublesome to the government of the shah.

On January 7 the military prosecutor general of Iran, General Farseou, appeared in court personally to reply to charges by the defendants that they had been tortured while being held incommunicado for more than six months while awaiting trial.

The general also defended the indictment against the fourteen, who face from three to ten years at hard labor under the charge of "plotting against the security of the state."

General Farseou presented to the

court a medical report signed by four court doctors. He claimed that in examining the accused, the doctors had found no evidence of mistreatment.

The January 9 Le Monde reported that the medical affidavit did mention the complaints made by the prisoners.

"Two of the accused complained of ear trouble, one of pain in his eyes, several of either rheumatism or pain in their kidneys or heart. And, lastly, two complained of pain in the genitals, one of them with passing of blood."

In view of these revelations, the prosecutor asked that a new examination be held in the court itself.

FOR WORKERS DEMOCRACY

By Ernest Mandel

[Roger Garaudy, one of the leading intellectuals of the Communist party of France, visited Belgium November 5 to give a lecture on "May 1968 in France," at the request of the Communist Student Union of Brussels University. It was not surprising that radical students considered a lecture on this topic by a representative of the French CP as a provocation.

[In any case, when the meeting started, a few dozen Maoists carrying portraits of Chairman Mao and anarchists carrying a black flag persistently tried -- for the most part successfully -- to prevent Garaudy from addressing the audience.

[A confused debate followed in which the question of whether Garaudy should be allowed to speak was mixed with the question of whether or not a revolutionary situation had existed in France in May.

[Finally, the Maoists and anarchists ended the debate by pushing Garaudy out of the meeting hall.

[This incident raised serious questions about the norms of democratic debate and behavior in the working-class and socialist movement. In answer to some of the questions raised, Ernest Mandel, the well-known Marxist economist and editor of the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche, wrote an article on the subject of workers democracy which appeared in two parts in the November 16 and November 23 issues of La Gauche. Because of the timeliness of the topic, we are reproducing the article below. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

The lamentable incidents which occurred at the ULB [Universitaire Libre de Bruxelles -- Free University of Brussels] when Garaudy came to speak there have induced me to explain once again why we adhere to the principles of workers democracy.

Workers democracy has always been a basic tenet of the proletarian movement. It was a tradition in the socialist and communist movement to firmly support this principle in the time of Marx and Engels as well as Lenin and Trotsky. It took the Stalinist dictatorship in the USSR to shake this tradition. The temporary victory of fascism in West and Central Europe also helped to undermine it. However, the origins of this challenge to workers democracy are deeper and older; they lie in

the bureaucratization of the large workers organizations.

Bureaucracy Against Workers Democracy

The Social Democratic and trade-union bureaucrats were the first to begin to undermine the principles of workers democracy. They started calling general membership meetings at infrequent intervals. Then they began to rig them, or often to do away with them altogether. They began likewise to restrict or abolish freedom of discussion and criticism within their organizations. They did not hesitate even to appeal to the police (including the secret police) for help in fighting revolutionary minorities. At the time of the first world war, the German Social Democracy set a dismal example of collusion with the state repressive forces. In subsequent years, the Social Democrats everywhere followed this example.

The Soviet bureaucracy first and then the bureaucrats in the Stalinist Communist parties (or in trade unions under Stalinist leadership) simply followed the pattern established by the Social Democrats, extending it further and further. They abolished freedom of discussion and of tendencies. Slander and lies replaced argument and debate with opponent tendencies. They made massive use of physical force to prevent their opponents from "causing any harm." Thus, the entire Bolshevik old guard which led the October Revolution and the majority of the members of Lenin's Central Committee were exterminated by Stalin during the dark years of the Great Purge (1935-38).

The young generation of anti-imperialist and anticapitalist militants now developing a revolutionary consciousness are spontaneously returning to the traditions of workers democracy. This was apparent in France in May and June when freedom of speech for all tendencies was jealously safeguarded in the assemblies of students and revolutionary workers and students. But this new generation is not always conscious of all the principled and practical reasons for workers democracy.

This is why the youth can be vulnerable to a kind of Stalinist-derived demagoguery being spread by certain pro-Chinese sects, which seek to make people believe that workers democracy is contrary to "the interests of the revolution." Therefore, it is necessary to reaffirm these reasons strongly.

The workers movement fights for the emancipation of the proletariat. But

Workers Democracy Required  
for Unity in Action

this emancipation requires the abolition of all forms of exploitation to which the workers are subjected. Rejecting workers democracy means quite simply that you want to maintain a situation like the one today in which the masses of workers are unable to make their opinions heard.

The Marxist critique of bourgeois democracy starts from the idea that this democracy is only formal because the workers do not have the material means to exercise the rights which the bourgeois constitutions formally grant all citizens. Freedom of the press is just a formality when only the capitalists and their agents are able to get together the millions of dollars needed to establish a daily newspaper.

But the conclusion that follows from this critique of bourgeois democracy, obviously, is that means must be created enabling all the workers to have access to the media for disseminating ideas (printing presses, meeting halls, radio and television, posters, etc.). If, on the contrary, you conclude from this that only a self-proclaimed "leading party of the proletariat" -- or even a little sect which declares that it alone is "genuinely revolutionary" -- has the right to speak, to use the press, or to propagate its ideas, then you risk increasing the political oppression of the workers rather than abolishing it.

The Stalinists often reply that abolition of the capitalist system equals emancipation of the workers. We agree that abolition of private ownership of the means of production, of the profit economy, and of the bourgeois state are essential conditions for the emancipation of the workers. But saying that these are "essential" conditions does not mean that they are "sufficient." Because as soon as the capitalist system is abolished, the question arises of who is going to run the factories, the economy, the municipalities, the state, the schools and universities.

If a single party claims the right to administer the state and the society; if it imposes a monopoly of power by terror; if it does not permit the mass of workers to express their opinions, their criticisms, their worries, and their demands; if it excludes the workers from administration -- then it is inevitable that a widening gulf will develop between this omnipotent bureaucracy and the mass of workers.

Then, emancipation of the workers is only a deception. And without real workers democracy in all areas, including freedom of organization and press, real emancipation of the workers is impossible.

These principled reasons are reinforced by practical ones. Like all social classes in history, the working class is not homogeneous. It has common class interests, both immediate interests and historical interests. But this community of interests is interwoven with differences which have various origins -- immediate special interests (professional, group, regional, craft interests, etc.) and different levels of consciousness. Many strata of the working class have not yet become conscious of their historical interests. Others have been influenced by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies. Still others are weighed down by the burden of past defeats and failures, of skepticism, or of the degradation caused by capitalist society, etc.

However, the capitalist system cannot be overthrown unless the entire working class is mobilized in action against it. And this unity in action can only be obtained if these various special interests and levels of consciousness can be expressed in, and little by little neutralized through, debate and persuasion. Denying this diversity can only result in a breakdown of unity in action and in driving successive groups of workers into passivity or into the camp of the enemy.

Anyone with experience in strikes has been able to see in practice that the most successful actions are prepared and conducted through numerous assemblies, first of the unionized workers and later of all the workers concerned. In these assemblies, all the reasons in favor of the strike can be developed, all opinions can be expressed, and all the class enemy's arguments can be exposed. If a strike is launched without the benefit of such democracy, there is much more risk that many workers will observe it halfheartedly, if at all.

If this is true for an isolated strike, it holds all the more for a general strike or for a revolution. All the great revolutionary mobilizations of the workers -- from the Russian revolution to the revolutionary upsurge of May and June 1968 in France and including the German and Spanish revolutions, to cite only these examples -- have been characterized by veritable explosions of workers democracy. In these instances, many working-class tendencies coexisted, expressed themselves freely in speeches and in the press, and debated before the entire class.

The word "soviet" -- council of workers delegates -- expresses this unity of opposites -- the unity of the workers in the diversity of their tendencies.

In the Second Congress of Russian Soviets, which took power in the October Revolution, there were a dozen different tendencies and parties. Every attempt to repress this workers democracy -- by the Social Democracy in Germany, by the Stalinists in Spain -- has presaged, if not expressed, a setback or defeat for the revolution.

Without Workers Democracy  
No Correct Political Line

The absence of workers democracy not only hampers unity in action, it also obstructs working out a correct political line.

It is true that the workers movement has an excellent theoretical instrument to guide it in the often extremely complicated twists and turns of economic, social, and political struggles -- revolutionary Marxism. But this tool must still be used correctly. And no one person has a monopoly on its correct application.

Without any doubt, Marx and Lenin were geniuses. But life and history ceaselessly pose new problems which cannot be solved simply by turning to the scriptures. Stalin, who was considered by many honest Communists before his death to be "infallible," in reality committed many errors, to say nothing of crimes, some of which -- as in agricultural policy -- have had pernicious consequences for three decades for the entire Soviet people. Mao Tse-tung, whom other naive souls also consider "infallible," endorsed the policy of Aidit, the leader of the Indonesian CP, up until the eve of the military coup d'état. This policy was at least partially responsible for the deaths of 500,000 Indonesian Communists and workers.

As for the myth that the Central Committee of a party is "always right," or that the majority of this committee is "always right," Mao himself rejected it in the famous resolution passed by the CC of the CCP [Chinese Communist party] on the "cultural revolution" in April 1967.

But if no person or group has a monopoly on truth and wisdom, then discussion is indispensable to determine a correct political line. Rejection of discussion under any pretext (and the pretext that a political opponent is "counterrevolutionary" or an "enemy agent" is as old as bureaucracy), or substituting epithets or physical violence for debate, means condemning oneself to remain the victim of false ideas, inadequate analyses, and errors with debilitating if not catastrophic consequences.

Marxism is a guide to action, they often say. That is true. But Marxism is distinguished from utopian socialism by its appeal to scientific analysis. It does not focus on action per se. It fo-

cuses on action which can influence historical reality, which can change it in a given direction -- in the direction of socialist revolution, toward the emancipation of the workers and of all humanity.

Out of the clash of ideas and tendencies, the truth emerges which can serve as a guide to action. Action inspired by "monolithic," bookish, and infantile thought -- which is not subjected to the uninhibited criticism possible only in a climate of workers democracy -- is condemned to certain failure. It can only result, in the case of small groups, in the disillusionment and demoralization of individuals; in the case of unions or larger parties, in defeats for the class; and where the mass of the workers is concerned, in defeats with a long train of humiliations, privations, and impoverishment, if not casualties.

Often these arguments in favor of the principles and practice of workers democracy are countered in Stalinist circles by the assertion that workers democracy cannot be extended to the "enemies of socialism" inside the workers movement. Curiously, certain groups which claim to be antibureaucratic and very left take a similar line to justify booing and hissing or resorting to physical violence as a substitute for debate with their political opponents.

Both the Stalinists and the ultraleftists cry: "You don't argue with revisionists, capitalist forces, and the representatives of the enemy." In practice, the Stalinists try to replace debate by repression, if not murder and the use of tanks against the workers (from the Moscow Trials to the intervention in Hungary and Czechoslovakia). The ultraleftists limit themselves more modestly to preventing Garaudy from speaking, doubtless until the dreamed-of day when they can use more "effective" means modeled on the Stalinist ones.

No Democracy for the "Revisionists"

The defense of these inadmissible practices on alleged revolutionary grounds arises from a threefold confusion. First of all, free debate is not a "privilege" which revolutionary Marxists are free to either grant or not grant to "revisionists." It is a right which Marxists demand for themselves.

One would have to be blind not to see that in the great majority of cases it is the Social Democratic and Khrushchevite "revisionists" who hold the positions of power in the unions and the other workers organizations. It is the Marxists and the revolutionists who are in the minority and demand the right for free discussion (which is too often denied them).

Is it not evident that if the "revisionists" are prevented from speaking, in those rare cases when they are in a minority position, this weakens the struggle for workers democracy wherever the bureaucracy still decides the rules of the game?

Very often during the May days, the PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party] leaders prevented students and representatives of revolutionary groups from speaking in workers' assemblies, sometimes even using physical violence. The Marxists responded vigorously to this and tried, not without success, to convince the workers that these practices were harmful to the interests of the working class. But if they in turn had resorted to the same methods, their argument would have lost all validity. The workers would have condemned them as hypocrites and fakers.

Moreover, to talk about "revisionists," overlooking the little detail that these class collaborationists still enjoy relative confidence and a following among the majority of the organized workers -- as the events in France have just confirmed -- is obviously self-defeating. It means hamstringing yourself beforehand in the struggle to win these sectors of workers away from their baneful influence.

It is impossible to succeed in this task, which is one of the most difficult faced by Marxists in Western Europe, without raising the workers' level of consciousness and political understanding. And this requires ever more convincing debate and ideological confrontations. Denunciation, epithets, or blows will not convince the workers still under the control of the Social Democracy nor those who follow the Khrushchevite CP; because they think it is, despite everything, still Communist. Those who use these methods will only convince those already convinced, that is, a tiny minority.

Finally, it must be carefully explained that calling the "revisionist" Social Democrats or Khrushchevites "capitalists," or "capitalist agents" shows a dangerous theoretical confusion.

#### Revisionists Are Not Capitalists

Of course, the working-class bureaucracies objectively act in the interests of capital, primarily by channeling the workers' periodic revolutionary explosions toward reformist outlets and thereby blocking opportunities to overthrow capitalism. They play the same role by influencing the workers on a day-to-day basis in favor of class collaboration, undermining their class consciousness with ideas taken from the bourgeois world.

But the objective function and

role of these bureaucracies is not confined to maintaining class peace. In pursuing their routine reformist activities, they come in conflict with the everyday interests of capitalism. The wage increases and social welfare laws won by the reformists -- in exchange for their pledge to keep the workers' demands within limits that do not threaten the bases of the system -- reduce the capitalists' profits somewhat. The trade-union organizations which they lead inject the collective power of labor into the daily relationships between the bosses and the workers. And as a result, these conflicts have an altogether different outcome from the past century, when the strength of the trade unions was slight or nonexistent.

When the capitalist economy is flourishing, the bourgeoisie is willing to pay the price represented by these concessions in return for "social peace." But when the capitalist economy is in a bad way, these same concessions rapidly become unacceptable to the bourgeoisie. Then, it is in the capitalists' interest to eliminate these organizations completely, even the most moderate and reformist ones. The very existence of the unions becomes incompatible with the survival of the system.

This shows the real nature of the reformist bureaucracy in the workers movement. This bureaucracy is not composed of owners of capital who buy labor power in order to appropriate surplus value. It is composed of salaried employees (of the workers organizations or the state) who vacillate and waver between the camp of capital and of the proletariat, sometimes leaning toward one, sometimes toward the other, depending on their particular interests and the pressures to which they are subjected. And, in facing the class enemy, the vanguard workers have every reason to do their utmost to force these bureaucrats to return to their camp. Otherwise, the common defense would be greatly weakened.

#### Contradictions Among the People And Contradictions Between Capital and Labor

Overlooking these elementary truths leads to the worst of catastrophes. The workers movement learned this to its cost during the rise of fascism. At that time, the "genius" Stalin invented the theory of "Social Fascism." According to this theory there was no difference between the "revisionist" Social Democrats and fascists. It was even proclaimed that the Social Democracy had to be defeated before the struggle against the Nazis could be won.

While the Social Democratic and Communist workers were happily bashing each other's heads in -- the reformist leaders shared the responsibility this time equally

with their Stalinist counterparts -- Hitler came to power, massacred thousands of worker militants, and dissolved all the workers organizations. Thus, he made possible a temporary, if somewhat embittered, reconciliation between the Social Democrats and the Communists...in the concentration camps. Would it not have been better, while not making any concessions in the ideological struggle against revisionism, to fight together against the Nazis and prevent them from taking power?

On an infinitely smaller and less tragic scale, the situation in the university can lead to a dilemma of the same type overnight. All the left tendencies are fighting to gain recognition of their right to carry on "political activities" on the campus. But it is quite possible that the administration will take the incidents surrounding Garaudy's visit as a pretext for banning any more political lectures. What other course, then, is there but to fight together to win minimum political freedom in the university? Would it not be preferable to respect the rules of workers democracy from now on, since they conform to the common interests of the workers movement and the student confrontation movement?

In 1957, in response to the official revelation of Stalin's crimes made at the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party (which he approved of at the time), Mao Tse-tung stressed the necessity of distinguishing carefully between how to settle differences among the people -- by persuasion, debate, practical experience -- and how to proceed in conflicts with the class enemy. Here he was only implicitly reaffirming the need to uphold workers democracy "among the people."

But this distinction has meaning only if it is based on objective criteria. The capitalists (and in less industrialized countries, the landlords) are the enemy. The people are the mass of producers, white-collar workers, and, in semicolonial countries, the poor peasants.

If subjective criteria ("Anybody who doesn't support every one of my tactical turns is a capitalist and a counter-revolutionary, even if he served as president of the People's Republic of China and vice-chairman of the Chinese Communist party for twenty years!") are substituted for these objective criteria, then you fall into complete arbitrariness. You end, of course, by wiping out the distinction between "contradictions among the people" and "conflicts with the class enemy," treating the former more and more like the latter.

Of course, it is impossible to make an absolute and total separation between the two. Marginal cases are possible. We

advocate frank debate in meetings of strikers. We do not think that we need restrict ourselves to polit discussion with strike-breakers.

In every marginal case, however, we must distinguish acts (or crimes) from opinions and ideological tendencies. Acts must be proved and judged according to clearly established, well-defined criteria of the workers' interest (or after the overthrow of capitalism, of socialist legality) so as to prevent arbitrariness. Failure to distinguish between acts and opinions can only result in extinguishing workers democracy, lowering the level of consciousness and mobilization of the workers, and progressively robbing the revolutionists themselves of their ability to orient themselves politically.

#### Does This Involve Relationship of Forces Or Is It a Question of Principle?

Some persons peremptorily declare that the question of democracy is only a question of the relationship of forces! When the bureaucrats are stronger they suppress us. When we are stronger why not suppress them?

That is at once cynical and naïve. And when groups calling themselves "anarchist," "libertarian," or "antiorganizational" apply such maxims, they display the most aberrant illogicality. It is impossible to inspire the least confidence, to gain the least credit among the broader masses if you trample on your own principles.

In the last analysis, this question is a very simple one. If you have confidence in your ideas, if you are convinced that you are right, you will not fear to debate with anyone. We strengthen ourselves by defending our ideas against all comers. We increase our strength by developing consciousness in at least a part of the audience. (Only an audience composed exclusively of people whose social and material interests present an insuperable barrier to their understanding may be unmovable -- and even then!) Garaudy was handed an easy victory when he was prevented from speaking. Demolishing him in a debate, showing the emptiness of his argument and the pernicious role his party played during the May-June events would have dealt him a smashing defeat.

From the psychological standpoint, to refuse to discuss and to resort to insults or "arguments of force" reflects a lack of confidence, an unhealthy timidity and inferiority (or guilt) complex.

But when these manifestations of individual psychological problems are expressed collectively in groups or tendencies, then the sociologist's verdict concurs with the psychiatrist's. These tendencies invariably fear the masses, have no

confidence in the masses, want to substitute themselves for the masses, want to prevent the workers from emancipating themselves, seek the advantages of privi-

leged groups. And therefore they must be combated, because their activity is harmful to the liberating struggle of the exploited.

IS ANTI-SEMITISM A FACTOR IN KURON AND MODZELEWSKI TRIAL?

The trial of left-Communist student leaders Jacek Kuron and Karol Modzelewski entered its second week January 11 behind the closed doors of Room 246 of Warsaw's Central Courthouse.

The two ousted Warsaw University teaching assistants are accused of having led student demonstrations last March in opposition to the Gomulka regime. They are also charged with having ties to the Fourth International, the World Party of Socialist Revolution, founded by Leon Trotsky.

The government had reportedly planned to hold public show trials of arrested students, but decided on secret sessions after widespread charges that anti-Semitism had played a role in the selection of the defendants. Warsaw papers have gone out of their way, for ex-

ample, to identify the Jews among the prisoners, and they are frequently falsely accused of being "Zionists."

In Modzelewski's case, his apparently non-Jewish name prompted the press to print the name of his Jewish mother.

Little information is yet available on the proceedings in Room 246. Kuron has reportedly denied that he held an "illegal" meeting in his home to write a protest letter to the Sejm [parliament]. He is said to have declared that every citizen has the right to petition the legislature.

The two are charged specifically with having received a mimeograph machine and stencils allegedly sent from Belgium by the Fourth International in a box of medical supplies.

In this issue

Page

DRAWING: Josef Smrkovský .....	33
Rostow Lists Major Kennedy-Johnson Achievements .....	34
Moscow Tries Another Clampdown in Czechoslovakia -- by Les Evans .....	35
Czech Communists Fight for Freedom of Speech .....	36
The Czechoslovak Question and Its Solution .....	38
Bayonets at San Francisco State College? .....	41
DRAWING: Ronald Reagan .....	41
Romulo Opens Contract Negotiations with the U.S. ....	42
Peking Adds Up Gains of "Cultural Revolution" .....	42
Nixon Names War-Horse as Paris Negotiator .....	43
DRAWING: Henry Cabot Lodge .....	43
No, Julia Marie, There Isn't Any Santa Claus [An Editorial] .....	44
Spanish Political Prisoners on Hunger Strike .....	44
PHOTO: Hugo Blanco, Eduardo Creus, José Castro Vera .....	45
Austrian CP Reaffirms Opposition to Czech Invasion .....	45
Mao's New Party Constitution .....	46
Fock Admits Wide Opposition in Hungary to Czech Invasion .....	47
Ulbricht Reorganizes the Universities .....	47
A Ban on the Neo-Nazi Party? -- by Peter Brandt .....	48
DRAWING: Adolf Von Thadden .....	49
West German Government Decides Not to Ban Neo-Nazis .....	50
Defendants in Teheran Political Trial Charge Torture .....	50
For Workers Democracy -- by Ernest Mandel .....	51
Is Anti-Semitism a Factor in Kuron and Modzelewski Trial? .....	56

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

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

New York, N. Y. 10010



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

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