

## Resistance to Franco Mounts in Spain

**Poland:  
Toward a New October?**



AYUB KHAN: "Release political prisoners!" say opponents. See p. 171.

## **Venezuelan Guerrillas Open Front in Cities**

**One Day Strike Paralyzes Italy**

**LSE Students Win Wide Support**

**Kenyatta's Police Evict Nairobi University Students**

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S MESSAGE TO THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following is the text of a message from Bertrand Russell to the conference on Czechoslovakia held in Stockholm February 1 and 2 under the sponsorship of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation.]

\* \* \*

The developments in Czechoslovakia in the past twelve months are of the greatest significance, forming a landmark in twentieth-century socialism. In January 1968 the Czechoslovak Communist party determined to create what it called "socialism with a human face."

This involved dismantling the old bureaucracy and the secret police, correcting injustices of the past, ending censorship, beginning to tell the people the truth and taking other necessary steps towards socialist democracy. This new direction gained massive popular support, and it is clear that this support remains to this day.

The continuation, in new circumstances, of the demands for socialist democratisation by vast numbers of workers, students and intellectuals is an extraordinary, heroic phenomenon, which requires both our understanding and our support. The persistence with which these demands are maintained despite the scant support of Western socialists and the false "sympathy" of NATO is a measure of the quality of Czechoslovak socialism.

If NATO sympathises with socialist democracy, let them welcome it in Greece or Spain. Meanwhile, however, tragedy advances in Czechoslovakia.

When a man burns himself to an agonising death for political reasons, he is appealing to the world after all other appeals have failed. I doubt that we have understood sufficiently the nature of the sacrifice made by Jan Palach and those who follow him, or the desperation prompted by Soviet suppression and the inactivity of Western socialists.

Both before and since the Soviet invasion of last August, the Czechoslovak leadership has been subjected to intolerable intimidation and blackmail, and to inhuman pressures daily. It cannot be said too often that such conduct has no

place in socialist behaviour. It is clear to me that the Soviet Union's policy is to discredit the leadership, break the will of the people and reintroduce bureaucratic rule.

The Russians calculate that by intimidating the leaders, they will compel the country to capitulate, and much of their own dirty work will have been done for them. From the Soviet point of view, it is far easier for popular demands to be crushed by Czechoslovak leaders than by Russian tanks.

Equally clearly, however, the Czechoslovak people are in no mood to compromise on their basic liberties. Why does the leadership repeatedly make appeals not to act, not to defy the occupation, not to oppose the censorship, not to strike? It is because these appeals are falling on deaf ears, and the people, rightly, wish to ignore them.

I see as a great tragedy the role of those Czechoslovak leaders who have chosen the road of compromise. Their failure to resist Soviet demands, for reasons which I fully understand, will lead inevitably to their discrediting themselves.

They must understand that they are compromising with an occupation which represents insatiable demands. Every compromise will be followed by Soviet demands for further compromises, until the whole hope of 1968 is destroyed. That road leads only to demoralisation and defeat. The suggestion that important aspects of the post-January programme can be saved in this manner is an illusion.

Asking for time, patience and calm in this situation of advanced popular consciousness is equivalent to asking for mass apathy. It is this for which the Soviet leaders are working, because it is the necessary condition for the reimposition of all aspects of Stalinist control.

These questions concern every socialist, East and West. How we understand and act on them will, I believe, help to shape the future of socialism in industrialised countries for the rest of this century. It is for these reasons that I have called this conference, and I wish it every success.

STALIN PEACE PRIZE, OF COURSE

Todor Pavlov, a member of the Politbureau of the Bulgarian Communist party, suggested February 9 that a world peace prize be awarded to the Soviet Union, Po-

land, Hungary, East Germany and Bulgaria for having invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia last August, according to Tanjug, the Yugoslav press agency.

RUSSELL CONFERENCE CONDEMNS SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following is the full text of the declaration on the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia adopted by the conference of socialists and communists held in Stockholm February 1 and 2 under the auspices of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. The conference called on communists to boycott the congress of Communist parties scheduled to be held in Moscow in May and attend a meeting in London, May 2-5 to protest the invasion of Czechoslovakia.]

[The proposed agenda for the London meeting, approved in Stockholm, included these points: "1. What was the situation in the spring and what is the real situation now in Czechoslovakia? 2. What is the significance and what are the repercussions of the situation for the international socialist movement? 3. What are the reasons and nature of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and what are the theoretical implications?"

[Following the text of the declaration is a list of the delegates to the Stockholm conference. The Russell foundation has announced that papers presented to the conference will be published in the near future.]

\* \* \*

The dominant feature of the world situation today is the subjection of the majority of mankind to misery, exploitation and oppression. These conditions are essentially the result of a specific system, the system of imperialism. It is the duty of socialists and communists throughout the world to fight against this system. We have seen that the first country to overthrow capitalism, the USSR, does not contribute to this struggle as it naturally ought to do.

For socialists and communists deeply engaged in the struggle for the liberation of all workers, the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia, a country building socialism, by a great power itself also claiming to be socialist is indeed a very serious blow to the fundamental political values of the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist struggle.

1. The invasion of Czechoslovakia was not an unforeseeable accident but the logical consequence of an authoritarian and dogmatic conception of how socialism should be built.

2. For the Soviet leaders the building of socialism can only be successful if it essentially conforms to the pattern Stalin developed and imposed. Except for a few formal modifications, this pat-

tern is still regarded as the only valid one.

3. Although they challenged neither the ruling role of the Communist party nor their own commitments with regard to the Warsaw Pact and Comecon, the Prague leaders laid themselves open to invasion because they put an end to monolithic party rule and because they allowed the political debate which had begun within the party to be conducted in the public arena as well. This intervention is in flagrant contradiction with the right of peoples to self-determination and with respect for their sovereignty recognized in principle by the USSR and by different international Communist bodies as well.

4. Censorship had to be reimposed since control of public opinion is necessary, in the Soviet view, for the building of socialism. In other words, all opposition, criticism and dissidence had to be suppressed.

5. For the USSR, which maintains severe censorship at home, it is intolerable that its pattern of socialism is questioned within its sphere of influence. Were it to tolerate this, it would run the risk of the existing pattern being contested within the USSR itself.

6. The Czechoslovak invasion, which has made the struggle against U.S. imperialism more difficult, was provoked, not just by the struggle for independence of a people subject to Soviet domination, but by the spontaneous birth of original forms of direct democracy leading towards the strengthening of socialism and self-management in Czechoslovakia.

7. The purpose of our action is to mobilize socialist and communist opinion in defense of Czechoslovakia's independent initiatives towards socialism without identifying ourselves with all the theories advanced within the working-class movement in Czechoslovakia.

8. We must by our action endeavour to demonstrate that the Soviet intervention will be increasingly criticized and therefore that the Soviet Union will be increasingly isolated. We must also convince the peoples of the Soviet Union that condemnation of their leaders' action by many foreign communists and by certain courageous Soviet citizens is not dictated by hostility to the Soviet Union or to socialism, but by hostility to a conservative policy prejudicial to the interests and objectives of socialism.

9. The struggle for socialism in the capitalist countries is compromised because

the present dominant pattern of socialism is a bureaucratic and authoritarian one. On the other hand, the weakness of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries in struggling against imperialism slows down the struggle against bureaucracy and authoritarianism in the countries of Eastern Europe. This double aspect of the situation also seriously weakens the struggle for national and social liberation in the so-called Third World.

To disapprove of the invasion of Czechoslovakia is not enough. To participate in the forthcoming international Moscow conference of Communist parties is to accept the fait accompli and, indirectly, to put oneself in line with Soviet policy.

To regard as a positive fact the agreements imposed by force on the Prague leaders in Moscow last August is to encourage the drift towards the evident capitulation in Czechoslovakia and to underwrite neo-Stalinism within the international Communist movement.

For these reasons, the Preliminary Conference CALLS UPON the Communist parties and all communists not to participate in the world conference to be held in Moscow unless the foreign troops are first withdrawn from Czechoslovakia.

If that condition is not met, the Preliminary Conference APPEALS to the Communist parties and to all communists to boycott the Moscow conference but to take part in the London meeting of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation on Czechoslovakia to be held May 2 through 5.

At the same time the Preliminary Conference INVITES all socialist parties, all true socialists, trade unions and other working-class organizations which have adopted clearly anti-imperialist positions to participate in the London meeting.

This conference calls for the immediate release of all those imprisoned or exiled following their protest against the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia.

The Preliminary Conference assures Czechoslovak workers and intellectuals of its determination to help them and to give active support to their resistance to foreign invasion and all attempts to reinstate a bureaucratic regime in their country.

\* \* \*

Delegates to the Stockholm  
Preliminary Conference on Czechoslovakia

Ken Coates, chairman of the conference: British sociologist, a director of the Russell Foundation, and a member of the Council of the Institute for Workers

Control. Author of Can Workers Run Industry?

Christopher Farley, served as chairman for the last session: British journalist, a director of the Russell Foundation, personal secretary to Bertrand Russell.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Joseph Pokstefl: Member of the law faculty of Charles University in Prague, member of the Communist party and convoker of the Fourteenth Party Congress, held underground during the occupation.

Lubomir Holocek: Past president of the Czechoslovak Union of Students, he delivered the eulogy at the mass funeral for Jan Palach. He was the last person to see Palach before his immolation.

GREAT BRITAIN

Lawrence Daly: General secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers. He visited Vietnam as a member of the International War Crimes Tribunal.

C.L.R. James: West Indian author, journalist, and Marxist historian.

John Berger: British critic, essayist and novelist. He is a frequent visitor to Eastern Europe and was last in Prague in August 1968.

Anya Berger: Translator of political and artistic books, including works by Ernst Fischer, Ilya Ehrenberg, Wilhelm Reich, Franz Mehring, and Bertolt Brecht.

Emanuel Litvinoff: Author and journalist. Editor of the quarterly journal, Jews in Eastern Europe.

Stephen Bodington: Economist and author. He has written on Marxist economics and socialism.

UNITED STATES

José Yglesias: Author of numerous works on Cuba, socialism and the arts.

Ralph Schoenman: Secretary general of the International War Crimes Tribunal and director of the Russell Foundation.

Joan Mellen: Professor of Literature at Temple University.

Michael McCabe: West Coast executive secretary of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation.

FRANCE

Serge Mallet: Member of the editorial board of La Nouvel Observateur; author of La Nouvelle Classe Ouvrière; member of the Parti Socialiste Unifié [PSU -- United

Socialist party].

Victor Fay: Writer for Le Monde Diplomatique; member of the PSU.

Lucien Goldmann: Professor at l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes in Paris, and author of The Hidden God.

Daniel Guérin: Author of a history of the French Revolution, La lutte de classes sous la Première République.

Jean-Marie Vincent: Member of the National Directory of the PSU.

Dubina Oldrich: Former president of the Communist Student Union of Czechoslovakia.

Pierre Mania: Writer. He is a member of a leftist opposition within the French Communist party, and a member of the national committee of the Fédération des Déportés.

#### NORWAY

Tore Linné Eriksen: Deputy for Finn Gustavsen, and editor of Orientering published by the Socialist Peoples party.

#### ICELAND:

Magnús Kjartansson: Editor of Reykjavik daily Thjodviljiun, member of the Icelandic parliament, and author of books on Cuba, China, and Vietnam.

#### SWEDEN

Göran Therborn: Editor of the socialist journal Zenit.

Bo Hammar: Editor of the weekly Tidsignal.

Ulf Renmark: Member of the editorial board of Kommentar.

Christer Hogstedt: Chairman of the Socialist Union.

#### ONE-DAY GENERAL STRIKE PARALYZES ITALY

Millions of striking workers paralyzed Italy February 5 in a one-day general strike for increased pensions. The action saw rare cooperation between the three major union federations. Union leaders estimated that sixteen million workers took part in the strike. The Paris daily Le Monde reported February 7 that the strike was 90 percent effective.

Many major industries were shut down. No newspapers or live television programs appeared. Ten flights of Alitalia, the national airline, were canceled. Bus drivers, in agreement with union leaders, struck for only two hours in major cities, but this was during the morning rush hour and tied up traffic throughout Italy. Small shopkeepers turned off electric signs as a token of solidarity with the strike. One indication of the impact of the action was the closing of the Fiat complex at Turin, where management has frequently boasted of its immunity to workers' actions. Fiat officials acknowledged that "most" of the 120,000 production workers did not show up for work.

The issue in the strike is a sensitive one for Italian workers. Minimum pensions are presently only 12,000 lire [US\$19.20] a month. A large percentage of retired workers receive little more than 30,000 lire a month. The unions have demanded that the maximum pension be raised to 74 percent of final wages -- after forty years of work -- and that this be increased to 80 percent by 1973.

If union leaders have been forced by rank-and-file pressure to take a more militant stand, they have not succeeded

in outflanking the growing opposition to their left. Le Monde reported February 7 that in a number of areas workers carried signs in marches during the strike "which challenged the union leaders themselves."

The strike was accompanied by student demonstrations throughout the country, especially in Rome. On February 3 farm workers blocked railroad tracks at Fondi, north of Naples on the road to Rome. They were protesting a sharp drop in the price of citrus fruit. The action followed numerous protest marches, some of which went as far as Rome, where workers gave away oranges to passersby on the street in front of the offices of the Minister of Agriculture.

The capitalist world is keeping a careful eye on developments in Italy. The authoritative New York Times in a January 25 editorial urged the Rumor government to proceed with "vigor" to carry out "overdue reforms in education, local government, social security, taxation and many other fields." The Times made it plain that it was not motivated by a sudden philanthropic concern for the well-being of the Italian working class. It pointed instead to "concern lest Italy plunge into the chaos that France experienced last May."

The day after the general strike, transportation workers in Milan, the nation's most important industrial city, struck for six hours for better working conditions. Teachers have announced a nationwide strike in all secondary schools February 19.

From Czechoslovakia

REVOLUTIONS CAN DEGENERATE

[Under the title "A Challenge to History," the following article by František Samalík appeared in the November 11, 1968, issue of Politika, the theoretical magazine of the Czechoslovak Communist party. This was the issue that celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the Russian revolution. It was also the final issue of Politika.

[The ban came as a result of pressure from Moscow. But it has also been reported that Dubček was quite annoyed with the way Politika celebrated the first successful proletarian revolution, feeling that it had increased his difficulties in dealing with Stalin's heirs.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Great ideas cannot be realized without the release of great energies. Marx's vision of the new society developed within European culture. It represented the culmination and extension of European civilization. But, for many reasons, this idea was first put into practice in a Russia profoundly blighted by despotism. In the Russian October, Marx's idea was translated into action, and action, in turn, enriched it. To use Gramsci's expression, "October was an act of fundamental philosophic challenge. It was a challenge to history. Men demanded to be treated like men."

The revolution opened up new roads. It generated an activism that broke down fatalistic conceptions. It showed that men are the prisoners of conditions and situations only insofar as they patiently suffer them. But how should conditions be changed? Since men are unshackled during revolutions, the most diverse programs spring up at such times.

The rainbow of positions and conceptions appearing at the time of the Russian revolution narrowed in subsequent years to a monochromatic official "wave-length." In this transformation the "philosophical meaning" of October was at once impoverished and mythicized. It was crowded into the background by the specific forms acquired by Soviet socialism in an encircled and imperiled backward country.

It was precisely these specific forms and specific experiences which formed the basic elements of the official Stalinist theory of socialism. The more this theory accommodated to the reality, the more independent of reality, in fact,

it was conceived. Thus, restricting, confining schemata arose which obstructed a creative quest for more suitable and richer forms of realizing socialism.

The October revolution was open to the world because its "creators" conceived it as part of the worldwide socialist struggle. They sought to give impetus to all forces capable of strengthening the democratic and socialist movement and the liberation struggle in general. This was the basis for their every decision.

This openness to the world was clearly undermined to some extent by the concept and the necessity of "socialism in one country." Socialism acquired a state form, which may not have been entirely beneficial because relations among states are different from the relations among socialist forces throughout the world. Moreover, this state establishment of socialism created tendencies to ranking the "socialist state" higher than socialist forces still lacking state power. Fundamentally, these tendencies had a static effect because the potential of socialist movements without state power belonged to an uncertain future. In this static conception, the "socialist state" was no longer considered a force giving impetus to all socialist movements. To the contrary, the socialist movements were seen more as instruments serving the needs and goals of the state than the needs and goals of socialism.

The Twentieth Party Congress called this deformation by its right name. But the greatness of an idea cannot be destroyed by the empirical forms in which it is realized. As yet no great movement has been able to prevent the appearance in the course of its surges of despotically inclined "consolidators" and "simplifiers" who dam up its ideological and moral wellsprings.

But the extent of the deformation also shows that every great revolution is open to all possibilities -- to creativity and dogmatic ossification, to freedom and the suppression of freedom, to democracy and to the bureaucratic centralist suppression of democracy. Revolutions are entirely open to deformations which arise spontaneously and unpredictably in society.

In just this way October opened up the door to all possibilities. But in the legacy of October, which has entered into history and opened the way to new history, the purity of its great idea of free men in a free society continues to shine forth as brightly as ever. And it is through this idea that the October revolution offers

mankind a universal, international program.

It was on the basis of this idea of freedom that we criticized the social and political system which existed here before January 1968. And the fervor of our criti-

cism was stirred by the fact that this system was far removed from the philosophical and moral truths of October. This reality must forbid self-satisfaction. It must lead us to continually weigh our acts against our ideas, to continually question how much our actions reflect our ideas.

#### 4,500 PARIS STUDENTS AT DISCUSSION ON REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Paris

About 4,500 people jammed the great hall of the Mutualité here January 31 to hear a discussion on "Constructing the Revolutionary Party." The audience, composed largely of students, but with a good contingent of young workers, filled all the seats and packed the aisles of the huge auditorium, which was decorated with red flags and pictures of Lenin and Trotsky. The meeting was sponsored by the newspapers Lutte Ouvrière and Rouge.

Lutte Ouvrière represents the views of a tendency which split from the Fourth International in the 1940's. Rouge supporters include former members of the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire and the Parti Communiste Internationaliste [the French section of the Fourth International]. All three groups were banned by de Gaulle after the May revolutionary upsurge.

The continuing impact of the May events on the revolutionary youth vanguard was shown by the great interest in the discussion on the lessons to be drawn. Almost the entire audience stayed through three-and-a-half hours of discussion and debate between the two tendencies.

Spokesmen for Lutte Ouvrière proposed the unification of their group, Rouge supporters, and "the Maoists and anarchists." Rouge spokesmen replied that a Leninist combat party must be based on a clear program, and urged that the differences between Lutte Ouvrière and Rouge be frankly discussed. One of these differences concerns the analysis of the workers states. Lutte Ouvrière holds, for example, that Cuba is a "petty-bourgeois" state, while Rouge views Cuba as a workers state and supports its revolutionary leadership.

Speakers for Rouge also urged that as an immediate step, while the discussion continues, the two tendencies cooperate in holding meetings in working-class areas on such topics as workers control, and that they work together in the factories.

The meeting heard an appeal from Spanish revolutionary socialists, read by a member of the editorial board of Rouge.

The response was immediate. The entire audience began singing "The Internationale."

\* \* \*

The Paris daily Le Monde (February 2-3) evidently considered the meeting at the Mutualité of some significance as it devoted more space to it than it customarily does to such events. Le Monde suggested that the meeting was the prelude to the creation of a new revolutionary party based on the "Trotskyist tendencies" whose organizations were banned in June.

"All the speakers emphasized the gains of the May days," Le Monde said, "which were marked, according to them, by the revival of revolutionary ideas, and which proved that a centralized power could be forced to capitulate when faced with a general strike.

"M. Laumonier, of Rouge, drew the lesson of the relative defeat of the movement, showing the necessity to go beyond the stage of 'grouplets,' and even of 'groups,' and the need for a real party. He advocated the creation of a Bolshevik-type formation, for which he used Lenin's definition: 'democratic centralism'...

"M. Daniel Ben Saïd, of Rouge, affirmed that 'the industrial proletariat' has preserved its revolutionary potential and emphasized that 'the margin for maneuver of the bourgeoisie' has become 'so restricted' that this 'ruling class' had to call for 'participation' of the workers to save itself. He particularly blamed the Communist party for taking the road of participation, especially in the university program.

"'But,' M. Ben Saïd declared, 'We do not want to content ourselves with filling the space on the left which the reformism of the CP has created. We must win ground where people work, in the factories.'

"Another speaker, M. Schroedt (Lutte Ouvrière), referred to the strength 'of the Stalinist apparatus in the factories' and denounced the harm done by the CP and its bureaucratic and reformist spirit. He believed, nevertheless, that the crisis of May, which had 'shaken the old order, had also shaken the CP, which was part and parcel of it.'"

WORKERS, STUDENTS RESIST FRANCO'S "STATE OF EMERGENCY"

The crackdown which Franco began January 24 with his proclamation of a "state of emergency" is encountering mounting resistance. The sharpest counter-attack has been launched by the clandestine labor movement which the fascist regime had singled out as a major target in the new repression.

The various outlawed workers organizations called a day of protest for January 31. This touched off spreading strikes and demonstrations.

In the Basque port of Bilbao, 35,000 workers stopped work. Some 5,000 workers also downed tools in the nearby town of Eibar.

In Madrid strikes took place in a number of factories and leaflets were distributed in the streets calling for "struggle against the dictatorship." Lightning demonstrations organized by the Comisiones Obreras [Workers Commissions] were held throughout the city.

On February 3 the Franco government hit back at these actions by ordering the closing of the Altos Hornos foundry in Bilbao where 6,000 workers had staged on-the-job protest meetings January 31 and February 1.

The government's lockout was answered by a solidarity strike of an estimated 15,000 workers in the port city, including the workers in the shipyards.

On February 5 the government ordered the plant reopened; but the workers refused to return to work. Slogans appeared on factory walls throughout the city. Typical ones were: "We Have Had Enough!" "Against the Wage Freeze!" "Against the New Trade-Union Laws!" "Against the Arbitrary Jailings!" "Fight for Free and Democratic Unions!"

The next day, the strike seemed to be extending rapidly. Some 25,000 metal workers were reported on strike in Bilbao, a city of about 335,000 inhabitants. The shipyards were closed. The industrial nerve centers of the city, Baracaldo and Sestao, were occupied by troops.

On the student front, by February 5 the universities of Madrid, Barcelona, Zaragoza, and Deusto were closed. The universities of Granada and Malaga were on strike, as well as two schools of the university in Navarre run by Opus Dei, a powerful rightist, semisecret Catholic lay organization which is one of the pillars of the fascist regime. Incidents have occurred at the University of Valladolid. The police entered the campus of the

School of Economic Sciences in Bilbao.

In Pamplona on February 2 students publicly burned copies of newspapers to protest the reintroduction of full censorship. The demonstration resulted in twelve arrests.

The resistance reached into the prisons, according to the February 7 Le Monde. When an attempt was made to take about thirty Comisiones Obreras leaders out of the Carabanchel prison in Madrid for questioning on February 5, the other prisoners protested so violently that the police had to be sent into the penitentiary to restore order.

Lawyers for persons arrested since the January 24 decree report that 315 political prisoners are being held at Carabanchel and 86 are being detained uncharged at the Madrid police station.

The extent of the repression inaugurated by the "state of emergency" indicates how insecure the Franco government feels in face of the decay of Spanish fascism and the rise of popular resistance. The purge has extended even to the Christian Democrats and moderates, the semi-official opposition.

On the night of January 30-31, twelve prominent Christian Democrats and Social Democrats, eleven lawyers and one university professor, were picked up by the police. After being arrested, they were exiled to remote towns in Castile and Andalusia.

Included in this group were several lawyers associated with Dr. Ruiz Giménez, the president of Pax Romana and a former minister of education in Franco's cabinet. Ruiz Giménez, recognized as the leader of the Christian Democrats, has specialized in defending arrested members of the Comisiones Obreras. It is rumored that he himself may be arrested in spite of his prominence and his powerful international connections.

However, despite the breadth of the repression, its main focus seems to be on the revolutionary left and the liberal wing of the Catholic church, whose opposition threatens to deprive the fascist regime of one of its principal props.

Le Monde's special correspondent Marcel Niedergang wrote on February 2: "It has been noted in Madrid that none of the known members of the pro-Soviet Communist party has been arrested, at least up till now. However, the 'ultra-left' revolutionists and the Catholic progressives are being energetically tracked down."



Interview with Francisco Prada

VENEZUELAN GUERRILLAS OPEN A FRONT IN CITIES

[The following interview was granted by Francisco Prada to Patricio García, a special correspondent of the Chilean magazine Punto Final.

[Francisco Prada is well known throughout Latin America as one of the main guerrilla leaders in Venezuela. He began his political career as a member of the Venezuelan Communist party. As he became aware of its conservatism, he moved to the left. At the OLAS [Organización Latinoamericana de Solidaridad] conference in August 1967, he spearheaded the attack on the right-wing leaders of the Venezuelan Communist party for their betrayal of the revolutionary struggle.

[The interview made a sensation in Venezuela and was republished in the January 27 issue of the Caracas daily La República "because of its great interest to Venezuelan public opinion." This is the source from which we have taken it.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Somewhere in Caracas

It is almost one o'clock in the morning of Friday, December 13. I am alone in this big house where I spoke for four hours with Comandante Francisco Prada, the guerrilla leader commanding the Fabricio Ojeda Mobile Brigade of the FALN [Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional -- National Liberation Armed Forces] and the José Félix Ribas youth column. What wouldn't SIFA [Servicio de Inteligencia de las Fuerzas Armadas -- the army intelligence service] and DIGEPOL [Dirección General de Policía -- General Police Administration -- the political police] give to get their hands on this bold fighter who, right under their noses, occupied the Central University of Venezuela in downtown Caracas for hours to advance the FALN's operation "Abstención Militante" [Militant Abstention]!

Outside, as I was getting my notes together, the dogs in this working-class neighborhood barked furiously. They had been aroused by the sharp report of a gun. Had Comandante Prada been discovered? Hardly five minutes had passed since he left the house under heavy guard and drove away in the same car that brought me here and which I must await to return me to Sabana Grande. In the suspense of waiting, a montage flashed through my head of the operation which this tall, thin man with the build of Don Quixote had led during his twenty-odd days in the Venezuelan

capital. His presence in this city and his activities here have been the sharpest rebuttal to claims that the guerrillas in Venezuela are becalmed and hidden away in the mountains.

It has been impossible to keep ambushes and commando attacks on army and police patrols quiet. Both before and after the presidential campaign, the big papers in Caracas carried discreet reports of these incidents. Participating in these attacks, Comandante Prada told me, were Chilean fighters who had been with the guerrillas for some time -- a sublime example of revolutionary solidarity.

I heard an automobile come to a stop at the door. Two guerrillas opened the door to tell me that they were ready for the return trip. Comandante Prada was again installed in a safe place and would very soon be ready to return to the mountains, his mission successfully completed. I gathered my notes and went out into the street. The dogs had quieted down and the skyscrapers of the great city were visible in the distance. They blindfolded me and started driving rapidly toward Caracas. Fifteen minutes later I was in downtown Caracas, dazzled by the neon lights. There was a farewell, brief and nervous but full of human warmth. Besides the firm handclaps that remain as memories, I gained this interview, which sums up the main topics of the conversation I had with the guerrilla comandante.

Question: What is your opinion of the presidential election and its results?

Answer: For consistent revolutionists, the electoral process which has just concluded was only one more farce. The great majority of our people will come to realize this quicker than many people think. The inability of "representative democracy" to solve the problems of the masses, retrieve the national patrimony, and restore dignity, sovereignty, and independence to our country will become evident as Caldera's fascist-tinted Social Christians proceed in their administration of the government.

The spectacle of the Consejo Supremo Electoral [Supreme Electoral Council] wheeling and dealing with the election results; the accusations and counteraccusations by Acción Democrática [Democratic Action -- the party of Romulo Betancourt] and COPEI [Comité Organizado por Elecciones Independientes -- Committee for Independent Political Action -- the Social Christian party]; the theft and destruction of ballot boxes and affidavits; the circumlocutions, contradictions and double-

talk on the part of the election officials make the manifold fraudulent aspects of these "free elections," which were applauded by reactionaries throughout the entire world, obvious to the most naïve observer.

The one thing that is clear is that a decision was made only after the powers-that-be -- the military brass, the big economic interests, and the American embassy -- reached the conclusion that the people had to be kept out of the act by any means. They decided that Caldera would be the new executive director of their interests, turning their backs on their AD flunkey. In this game they had the collaboration also of the vacillating, conciliationist, and opportunist sectors of all the parties. And they had the collusion of self-proclaimed revolutionists who dignified the farce by participating in the elections -- whose sole aim was to retain their legality, at whatever price.

Q: Does your statement mean that the Partido Comunista Venezolano [PCV -- Venezuelan Communist party] was also an accomplice in this farce?

A: Exactly. Under the mask of UPA [Unión para Avanzar -- Union for Progress], the PCV concretized the policy of capitulation and conciliation that its revisionist leadership has been developing for years. Its participation in this electoral fraud was already implicit in its "retreat thesis" formulated in November 1965 in the San Carlos prison. The first stage was to liquidate the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional. This was the price that the "gorilla" and AD establishment demanded to let them set up a legal apparatus for electoral purposes.

The Venezuelan people gave these revisionists and conciliationists, who disgrace the name "Communist," a slap in the face. Fortunately, the principled elements still in the ranks of the PCV have begun to realize what a swamp they have been led into. A reaction has begun among them that will lead to new splits in the not too distant future. Bridges exist between these elements in the CP and the genuinely revolutionary movement, which will be receptive toward them and will give them encouragement. Their task is to give critical and self-critical depth to this final period in the life of the PCV.

Q: Then you think that there is no road to liberation for Venezuela but that of armed struggle?

A: For the FLN-FALN movement the situation is absolutely clear. At the beginning of our movement, when we denounced the PCV's capitulation and its policy of liquidating the armed struggle, we point-

ed out the objective conditions that had led us to decide to continue the course of revolutionary war as the only road for achieving the liberation of our country. Then we were a small group of cadres with some guerrilla nuclei in the mountains and cities. Today, we have developed a political-military movement of national scope with ties to broad sectors of the population. We have accumulated valuable experiences. We have fought hard battles against deviations of the left and right within our own movement and waged a military campaign, combining all forms of struggle within the general framework of one political-military strategy.

Thus the Christian Democrats' electoral victory is only a fortuitous incident in the political development of our country that changes nothing in the objectives of the liberation movement or the strategy we have been formulating to achieve these objectives. The only road to the liberation of our country is that of revolutionary war; and revolutionary war is an uninterrupted process that will not be halted or diverted by the incidental fact that the Yankee monopolies and the native oligarchy have carried out a changing of the guard. This development calls only for tactical adjustments.

Today COPEI has become the tactical political target. We always maintained that the Christian Democracy, now the No. 1 political enemy to beat in the immediate future, was imperialism's strategic reserve.

Militarily the principal target is still the army, in particular the Cuerpos de Cazadores [Rangers], and also the repressive police forces -- the SIFA and the DIGEPOL, as they choose to call it, providing it in this way with a cover.

In the meantime, we are continuing to build a powerful people's army and an alliance of classes -- a real Frente de Liberación Nacional [National Liberation Front] rallying all Marxist-Leninists participating in the liberation struggle in tightly disciplined nuclei. Reinforcement of the guerrilla columns and bases is the supreme task of the revolutionary movement. The tactical objective of our struggle is the creation of a broad Frente Patriótico Antifascista [Antifascist Patriotic Front] which would progressively become the organizational instrument of people's power. [Emphasis in original.]

Q: A possible coup d'état was one of the threats most widely rumored during and after the elections. Do you believe that a coup may be imminent?

A: Coups d'état are the reverse side of "free elections" in our country. The moneyed classes resort to force to control the situation while they work out

how to overcome the danger to their continued rule. We revolutionists are absolutely clear on the antipopular character of coups. And the sharpness which the contradictions among the different sectors of the ruling classes in Venezuela have acquired can touch one off.

The very existence of a people's army is sufficient to make our class enemies stop and think. It gives them strong cause to consider the real danger of a violent struggle among their factions temporarily dislocating their power and thereby setting off a revolt by the popular movement backed up by the armed instrument which this movement has been constructing.

It is clear to us that in the final instance we will have to face the war-making potential of imperialism. But for the time being the most immediate danger is the [Venezuelan] army. A regroupment of forces has begun within the army around the more specific interests of the military. It has shown a marked tendency to free itself from the influence of political parties and act like an organized caste. In this sense, it can be said that the army has overcome the division in its ranks which was patent during the electoral farce and that it has emerged today as a coherent power which will make its weight felt to perfection in an alliance with the imperialist monopolies.

It will be the best guarantee against change. Only as a last resort, if COPEI tries to violate its arrangements with imperialism, will it act "to restore order and democracy." Then, of course, it will have to deal directly with the FALN.

Q: It is frequently repeated that there are serious ideological differences in the FLN-FALN. What truth is there in this?

A: The FLN-FALN movement has undergone a process of development marked by an acute ideological struggle. This has been a positive thing. It has led us to deepen the formulation and application of our line, to tighten up our ranks, and to defeat tendencies both of the left and right.

This process has been expressed in some cadres and members splitting or being expelled from the movement. Some right-wing, fundamentally opportunist, elements, who had long paralyzed the revolutionary energies of broad sectors of the movement, were expelled. These elements came from the PCV and ended up in the swamp of electoral compromise, running on parliamentary slates.

On the other hand, a leftist tendency in our armed nuclei which wanted to apply Debray's concepts to our reality in

a mechanical way ended by splitting from our ranks and forming a separate armed nucleus.

Unlike the first group, these are revolutionary fighters who have differences with us, not on questions of principle, but on how to conduct the war. With them we seek to strengthen our relations, coordinate plans, and together carry forward the tasks of the revolution. The differences which exist today will assuredly be overcome in the heat of battle.

Our ranks are more united than ever. The factional struggle has been overcome. And the two operational campaigns carried out this year give evidence that we are following the correct path, that we are winning ever greater support among the people and that our line is penetrating more and more among the masses. Our commander in chief Douglas Bravo has been able to keep us moving in this direction which will certainly lead to the liberation of our people.

Q: Do you have differences with the MIR [Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionario -- Movement of the Revolutionary Left -- a revolutionary grouping of non-Communist origin]? What are these differences and do you think that they can be overcome?

A: We do in fact have differences with the MIR but I am confident that they will be resolved very quickly. I am sure that then we will cease to be two different movements and will merge into one organization with a unified strategy and tactics and unified political-military leading bodies. I want to specify that these differences show up fundamentally at the tactical and operational level. They involve different approaches to the problem of how to conduct the war, in what zones, and what objectives to attack.

In our view, the line of combined insurrection represents the creative application of Marxism to the concrete conditions of Venezuela after the Cuban revolution. [Emphasis in original.] It incorporates what is specific in our historical, economic, and social reality and what in the Cuban experience, what general laws, are valid for the continent. The classical schema of prolonged war is not suited to our reality. Neither is the schema of a pure guerrilla foco, understanding by this the narrow and mechanical interpretation that has been made of the extraordinary strategic vision Che expressed in his theory of the guerrilla foco.

We think the entire territory of the country must be a theater for waging war, especially the major strategic areas where the military, economic, and polit-

ical power of the enemy is concentrated. We must fight in the countryside, in the cities, and in the belts surrounding the cities. And we must maintain a front of ideological, political, and logistic work within the regular army. We think that fighting only in the countryside would be underestimating the importance of the reserve of energy and resources which the cities offer and have traditionally offered to the revolutionary movement. We regard the repressive forces, traitors, imperialist agents, the army, and in particular the mercenary Cuerpo de Cazadores as military targets wherever they are, in the city as well as in the country.

Our recent experience has shown us that the Cazadores are more vulnerable to ambushes and commando attacks in the cities than in the countryside. Therefore, we must hit them in the cities and make them permanent targets. We believe that our entire organization must transform itself into a war machine encompassing and mastering the most varied forms of military-political struggle, a machine able to lead the people in their insurrectional struggle. Therefore, our structures must be highly centralized with vertical chains of command. We must give a new form to internal democracy, emphasizing that revolutionary practice is the most important element in the ideological and political training of cadres and militants.

I would like to point out, regarding your question, that we are engaged in a campaign to reach concrete accords with the MIR and all the armed groups.

Q: A recent Agence France-Presse dispatch, datelined Paris, reported that another guerrilla group, "independent of Moscow, Peking, and Havana," is operating in Venezuela. It is supposed to be called MONSAN and to be led by a former FALN commander, Lunar Márquez. What can you tell us about this?

A: I know the dispatch you are referring to. What first called my attention to it was the noisy publicity all the big press and the imperialist news agencies gave this report. However, in view of the seriousness with which we must treat all questions involving the unity of the Venezuelan revolutionary movement, any opinion regarding this matter must be based on official knowledge of the document the dispatch claims Márquez published. Despite the contacts we maintain with members of this movement, we have received no official information.

We noticed especially that this report was issued in Paris, and anonymously, in the name of fighters struggling in the mountains, who have given their quota of blood for liberation. The tone of this report, in which accusations traditionally

made against us by reactionaries and revisionists are joined with the names of accredited revolutionists, leads us to think that we may be faced with provocateurs who have infiltrated the revolutionary movement and that they will probably be categorically condemned by the very people in whose name they claim to speak. It is inconceivable that revolutionists would have attacked those who have proved themselves zealous defenders of the Venezuelan liberation movement.

Q: What is your opinion of the Cuban revolution?

A: The Cuban revolution is the vanguard of the Latin-American revolution and a continual source of inspiration for all peoples struggling for their freedom and independence, not only in Latin America but throughout the world.

It is the firmest bulwark of the liberation struggles on this continent, their first liberated base. Thus, real coordination between this vanguard and the rest of the continent, in particular with the Venezuelan revolutionary movement because of our movement's front-line position, becomes indispensable.

It is essential, in order to formulate a revolutionary strategy for the entire continent, to draw a balance sheet of the experiences accumulated by all the people in their victories and defeats, their advances and retreats. The process of ideological and political clarification which the traditional "revolutionary" parties, especially the Communist parties, are going through, and the emergence of armed vanguards in several countries make it possible that efforts to achieve strategic coordination can be fruitful. The continent-wide character of the revolution makes such coordination, which moreover is vital for the advance and consolidation of the liberation struggle in each one of our countries, an immediate necessity.

Q: What is the position of the FLN-FALN toward Debray's conceptions?

A: On this question, let me quote you a passage our commander in chief Douglas Bravo wrote in a letter dated January 1, 1968. He wrote: "On these questions -- of the party and the front -- I do not accept Debray's propositions. I consider his book to be of great importance and -- in general terms -- it is a contribution to this epoch of great transformations in Latin America. But we cannot cover up his errors, which if applied would lead to more defeats for the people's movement in Latin America. I know Debray personally and I think he will soon rectify his errors."

You are familiar with Debray's

thesis on the policy of seeking allies, that is, forming a national liberation front, and also his theses on the Marxist-Leninist party, the struggle in the cities, and his characterization of urban guerrillas as "bourgeois."\*

We maintain, and we have guided all our policy and revolutionary action by this principle, that after the Cuban revolution the essential prerequisite for achieving victory is to draw all sectors of the population which have an objective interest in liberation, together with the Marxist-Leninists participating in the struggle, into an organizational struc-

---

\* Debray maintains in his book Revolution in the Revolution? that "the weaker the revolutionary nucleus the more it must mistrust alliances..." "A national front, heterogeneous by nature, is the scene of political wrangling, debates, endless deliberations, and temporary compromises..." When the guerrillas are strong enough, however, they can set up a front.

On the party, Debray fails to examine the pernicious role of Stalinism in shaping the existing Communist parties in Latin America. He takes up the cudgels against what he presents as the "orthodox" concept of the party. In opposition to this, Debray argues that the whole theory of the party must be reevaluated. "The vanguard party can exist in the form of the guerrilla foco itself," he contends. "The guerrilla force is the party in embryo."

Debray considers the cities to be deadly traps rather than centers of enormous revolutionary potential that can be developed by a revolutionary combat party with the correct strategy and tactics. The bourgeoisie, in his opinion, enjoy such crushing military superiority in the cities as to make them virtually invulnerable. All the guerrillas can do there at best is wait for the final stages of the struggle in the countryside when certain contingents can possibly play a diversionary role.

In addition, the cities are hotbeds of moral corruption in which revolutionists cannot be expected to maintain their revolutionary integrity. "...any man, even a comrade, who spends his life in a city is unwittingly bourgeois in comparison with a guerrillero." There is no recourse but to leave, and undergo the baptism by fire of guerrilla war in the countryside. "As we know, the mountain proletarianizes the bourgeois and peasant elements, and the city can bourgeoisify the proletarians." For those who are too old, or too weak physically, to withstand the rigors of guerrilla war in the mountains, there is little hope, as Debray sees it. -- I.P.

ture. [Emphasis in the original.] Whether this organization is called a party, nucleus, or movement, it must set its class imprint on the liberation movement, guaranteeing its subsequent development to socialism. And this process must unfold during the struggle, not after the victory.

We also hold, in the concrete conditions of our country, that part of the guerrilla army must be located in the cities and areas around the cities because the enemy's strategic targets and concentrations are unreachable from the mountains.

Of course, the mountains are the zones of concentration and development for the principal nuclei of the People's Army, and it is there that the spine of the enemy army must be broken and the embryos of people's power created. We are convinced that life has proved us right. We think that as Debray carries his analysis further he will reach the same conclusions.

Q: Comandante Prada, I would like to return to the analyses of the elections now that we have more information about them. Do you think that the "militant abstention" campaign pushed by the FLN-FALN was successful?

A: It is interesting to note the silence of the Consejo Supremo Electoral [National Board of Elections] about the extent of blank ballots and abstentions. None of the official reports published up to now has said anything about this. We raised the slogan of "Militant Abstention" and conducted a whole campaign to expose the fraudulent character of the elections.

We think that this campaign made an impact among the popular sectors both in the cities and in the countryside. I promise you a complete analysis when we have more data and opinions. Today I would like to point out what Hugo Briceño Salas, a spokesman for COPEI, said about the elections in a district of the state of Barinas, the Pedraza district. Of 16,000 registered voters in that district, 4,000 did not vote and there were 400 blank ballots.

That is an appreciable number of abstentions and it should be noted that the authorities and the parties are capable of a great deal of intimidation in the countryside because the social structure in our rural areas enables the big landowners to exercise almost absolute control over the peasants. If 4,000 out of 16,000 abstained in Pedraza, we can deduce that the percentage of abstentions nationwide fluctuated between 15 and 20 percent. This is a high percentage if you take into consideration that voting is compulsory and that a whole campaign of

intimidation was mounted preceding the elections.

Q: What do you think about the large vote won by the former dictator Pérez Jiménez?

A: The reformist and pseudorevolutionary elements have interpreted this in varying ways. Their explanations range from blaming the people for the support they give the ex-dictator to such puerile explanations as the claim that the voters got confused because Pérez Jiménez's movement, the Cruzada Cívica Nacionalista [Nationalist Civic Crusade] used a ballot colored red, a color which the Communist party shamefully dropped, that they really wanted to vote for the CP slates and not for the ex-dictator's.

For us revolutionists, these explanations are idiotic. We think that the underlying cause of the high vote in favor of Pérez Jiménez was rooted primarily in the frustration the masses felt with regard to representative democracy as a means for solving their problems.

At the base of this vote also was the failure of the revolutionary movement to carry out the profound transformations which the country was ripe for when the dictatorship was overthrown. There is no question but that broad sectors of the masses have suffered a tremendous disillusionment with the ten years of "democracy" we have experienced with Acción Democrática in power.

Our country's problems have increased, its subordination to the imperialist monopolies has deepened, and the repression has gotten a hundred, a thousand times worse than it was under Pérez Jiménez. And I am not exaggerating. You can count those whom Pérez Jiménez killed on your fingers. Betancourt and Leoni killed thousands, and not only in the revolutionary camp but among the reformists and even in parties like COPEI, Acción Democrática itself, and the URD [Unión Democrática Republicana -- Democratic Republican Union].

The fate of political prisoners in our country is certain death, if they are revolutionists, if they are guerrilla fighters, if they have been sincere and consistent in defending the interests of the people. Pérez Jiménez stopped short of this. Only well-known leaders who fell into his hands were murdered. I am not whitewashing the pernicious Pérez Jiménez dictatorship, but in strict historical truth we must point out that AD's democracy is more murderous, that Rómulo Betancourt and Raúl Leoni's democracy has been more murderous than the tyranny of Pérez Jiménez was.

Q: The international news agencies

have stressed how "peacefully" the presidential election proceeded. Does this picture reveal inactivity on the part of the revolutionary movement?

A: That is not true. I would like you to note the operational campaign which the FALN carried out in the midst of the electoral farce. As we can see from the copy of the FALN's national organ, El Combatiente, which I have just given you, an intensive two-stage campaign was waged this year. The first stage came early in the year between February and March, and the other between June and December, reaching its peak in the latter month. More than twenty military operations were carried out, both in the mountains and the cities, which cost the enemy high casualties.

The José Antonio Páez, José Leonardo Chirinos, and Simón Bolívar guerrilla columns made several ambushes which are described in the war *communiqués* I attached, and some of them were reported in the press. The latest ambush by the José Leonardo Chirinos column was reported, for example. There was an action in the Las Trincheras zone, on the most important overland traffic artery in the country, the road that links Caracas with Puerto Cabello. There were also ambushes in Caracas against the military forces, full-scale battles, in which units of the FALN, the people's militias, and broad sectors of the masses participated.

Many of these actions were reported in the press, others were not. Our means of getting out information are very limited; the enemy's means of suppressing and distorting news about us is unlimited. For example, in Caracas last week and in the week after the elections, we carried out nine military operations. Five grenades were thrown at police and army vehicles. Two ambushes were carried out resulting in enemy casualties. A whole series of agitational actions were carried out -- six vehicles were burned and a mobilization was organized in the poor districts headed by the FALN. Today, for example, a report appeared in El Universal on an ambush last night in Dos Cerritos in the San José parish, but at the same time this story included a very brief summary of all the operations this week. It noted that police vehicles and DIGEPOL and army patrols were fired on every day this week in different neighborhoods in Caracas.

A recent operation which the press played up was the attempt -- because the operation failed -- to blow up the gas line feeding the Arrecife thermoelectric plant which supplies electricity to a large part of Caracas. Unfortunately, the mechanism failed and the bomb did not go off. It is also worth noting the fire at Sears Roebuck in San Martín, which was quickly brought under control. And the

day before yesterday the José A. Páez column, which operates in the southern plains in Apure, made an ambush resulting in two casualties for the enemy and the capture of arms, which was reported in the press.

Other actions were the attack on a squad of Cazadores guarding a ballot box in the working-class district of 23 de Enero, which cost the enemy two casualties; the machine-gunning of the offices of the Consejo Electoral [Board of Elections] in Maracay; the harassing actions against the DIGEPOL headquarters in Valencia and the military base in Palo Negro.

We did not mount actions against the masses taking part in the voting inasmuch as we were convinced that such measures would be counterproductive. Intimidation and physical liquidation of voters would be an incorrect basis for trying to convince the people of the uselessness of voting. Our line on this question is based on a process of persuasion in which battles will progressively create consciousness in the masses until the road of revolutionary warfare is impressed on the minds of the people as the sure road to the liberation of our country.

Q: What impression did the capture of the Cuban fishing boat, the Alecrín, make on the revolutionary movement?

A: We knew that an international provocation, either against Cuba or Guyana, was contemplated in the so-called "Plan República Dos" which the army drew up for the elections. The High Command's plans included capturing a Cuban boat sailing near Venezuelan territorial waters or a simulated bombing of an important city as a pretext for a public accusation against the Cuban revolution.

The former is what occurred. The boat Alecrín was fishing international waters near the island of Las Aves, as the press reported. That is not difficult to prove. You can go to the documentary sources of the Military High Command itself. Let them reveal what was contained in the report of the officers who directed the capture of the Alecrín.

It leaked to the press that the General Command of the navy and the Military High Command rejected the report drawn up by the officers of the destroyer and the patrol launch which attacked and captured the Alecrín because it specified that the boat was not in our country's territorial waters.

This report was rejected and in its place the High Command drew up another one which many of the officers on the attacking ships refused to sign, creating an internal problem of some gravity in the navy. The officers' version flatly contra-

dicts the claims made by the puppet Leoni and the High Command that the boat was carrying supplies or men for the Venezuelan guerrillas.

We replied to this provocation against the Cuban revolution by the Venezuelan oligarchy by carrying out three operations which we called successively "Operation Alecrín 1, 2, and 3."

The first was an ambush by the Rider Colina detachment of the José Leonardo Chirinos column under the command of Hilario Navarro. This detachment ambushed some Cazadores on November 27 in a place called La Caridad near the Cabure Counterinsurgency Command in the state of Falcón.

The José Antonio Páez column led by Captain Antonio Zamora was responsible for Operation Alecrín 2. This operation consisted of taking the town of San Vicente, destroying the communications and arms in the town, and holding a mass meeting there.

Operation Alecrín 3 was an attack on the guard posts in the town of Trincheras by the Simón Bolívar column under the command of Captain Freddy Cárquez. It resulted in two casualties for the enemy and the capture of arms.

This was the revolutionary forces' answer to the provocation from Yankee imperialism and the Leoni government.

This response, furthermore, said that the bonds of friendship between the peoples of Cuba and Venezuela will never be weakened by such actions, that our historical interests are identical, and that we will march together to the total liberation of the continent.

Q: Comandante Prada, do you have anything to say to the people of Chile?

A: I take this opportunity to greet the revolutionary forces of our sister people of Chile and to declare to them that the experiences accumulated by the revolutionary movement of Venezuela are at their disposal when the time comes for them to take up arms to confront the Chilean oligarchy.

I want to tell them that there are Chilean fighters in our ranks, in the mountains of our country, who have come to exchange experiences, to teach us some things and learn others.

When the right time comes, and perhaps that will be soon, we will send them graphic material so that they can get to know the people who are fighting with us.

THE ARRESTS CONTINUE IN MEXICO

By Ricardo Ochoa

Mexico City

The Díaz Ordaz government is keeping up its witch-hunt.

In the January 22 issue of Siempre, Alberto Domingo writes: "In the wake of the turbulent year of 1968 -- to mention only the cases reported in this magazine -- the youth José Guadalupe Mayorga was arrested in Ciudad Mante, in the state of Tamaulipas, and the youth Moisés Pacheco González met the same fate in Oaxaca City. Last Friday, January 3, the youth Rodolfo Echeverría vanished while he was visiting imprisoned friends in the Lecumberri Preventive Jail right here in Mexico City. His whereabouts became known only five days later. He had been imprisoned with several other students -- two of them women -- under accusation of being leaders of the 1968 student movement and of having committed grave new crimes."

The students imprisoned with Echeverría, all of them from the University of Mexico, were: Roberta Avendaño Martínez, Ana Ignacia Ramírez, Salvador Díaz Villegas, and Antonio Pérez Sánchez.

On January 16 Professor Fausto Trejo was placed under formal accusation. His list of alleged crimes is impressive, including rebellion, conspiracy, sedition, malicious mischief, blocking the public streets, robbery, looting, stockpiling arms, murdering and injuring representatives of the law.

To believe the attorney general's office, there is a good deal of evidence against him, all extracted from statements wrung from important leaders of the old Consejo Nacional de Huelga [CNH -- National Strike Council] such as Gilberto Guevara Niebla, who was arrested during the massacre in Tlatelolco on October 2; Luis Oscar González de Alba; Professor Elí de Gortari; and others.

Of course, Professor Fausto Trejo's real "crime" is that he was one of the most prominent leaders of the Coalición Pro Libertades Democráticas de los Maestros de Enseñanza Media y Superior [High School and University Teachers Coalition for Democratic Freedoms].

A good example of the depths to which the Díaz Ordaz regime has sunk is the case of the architect Salomón de Swann, who was arrested September 18, the day the army occupied the University of Mexico.

On December 29 the police took him out of prison, hauled him to the airport

and put him on a plane for Chile. They refused to let him call his wife or any of his friends. They even refused to let him change out of his prison uniform.

The police had ruled that he was an "alien" because he happened to be born in Chile, although his parents had brought him to Mexico as a child.

To place him under a cloud upon his arrival in Santiago, a slanderous article about his alleged international connections was published before he was deported. According to this item in the December 8 issue of Novedades, Salomón de Swann is something other than an architect. He is allegedly "an agent of the Soviet KGB [Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti pri Sovete Ministrov -- Committee on State Security Under the Council of Ministers -- the Soviet intelligence service], the link between the Mexican student leaders and the 'May Revolution' radical group in Paris."

Also, with fine disregard for the most elementary political logic, he is accused of being a "Castroite" agent, since he visited Cuba several times.

The truth is that he made one visit to Cuba, going as a scenarist with a Mexican company participating in a Latin-American theatrical contest.

According to the article, he was arrested while haranguing leaders of the CNH at the University of Mexico. In reality he was arrested in his home in the presence of his wife and other relatives by agents of the Dirección Federal de Seguridad [Federal Security Administration].

Today de Swann finds himself forced to begin life again in a strange country, the country "of his birth," as the Díaz Ordaz regime sees it.

Human rights are violated in other ways. The president of the PEN Club of Mexico, the poet Marco Antonio Montes de Oca, referred to a case in a press release January 9:

"The PEN Club of Mexico vigorously protests the unjust and insulting search to which María Teresa Retes de Revueltas was subjected yesterday at Lecumberri Prison. We cannot ascertain whether this shameful incident was premeditated in an attempt to intimidate Revueltas [José Revueltas, a prominent Mexican intellectual imprisoned on the accusation of being the "intellectual leader" of the student movement]. In a letter dated November 19, 1968, members of our organization appealed to



the president of the republic to extend just and humane treatment to this illustrious novelist.

"Up to now this respectful request has been only half fulfilled. In addition to his cell being searched, he has not been allowed to have the books he needs, and, still graver, three chapters of his new novel have been confiscated.

"We honestly believe that this is no proper treatment for a person who has won such respect among the writers of the entire world."

All these crimes and provocations are stirring up the students. Since January 13, the University of Mexico and the Polytechnic Institute have begun to regain their old look.

The students are engaging in new assemblies, new marches, new actions. There is talk of another big strike.

Some of the Comités de Lucha [Struggle Committees] have come to life. Others have re-formed and are preparing for a new offensive.

Moreover, we have seen something that would have appeared strange a year ago in the student movement. The College of Engineering has taken the lead.

On January 15, this college staged a strike that may turn out to be the first in a new series.



JOSÉ REVUELTAS

"THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES," JOSÉ REVUELTAS DECLARES

José Revueltas, the well-known novelist held in Lecumberri prison by the Díaz Ordaz regime as the alleged "intellectual leader" of the Mexican student revolt, called January 30 for the formation of "a new revolutionary socialist party."

This has become necessary, Revueltas said, because of the incapacity of all the traditional left groups in Mexico, including the Communist party, to "transform a world where it is no longer possible to breathe or to love."

Revueltas assailed the established reformist left for opposing the revolutionary student and people's movement that has appeared in Mexico since last July: "These parties have not been able or even willing to understand this movement, They have limited themselves to slandering it."

The real beauty of the emerging

revolutionary movement, Revueltas said, lies in its fundamental opposition to the existing society: "We are against everything because we are against the very existence of these institutions.

"For example, we are opposed to the police not because they beat us and torture us but because by their very nature they must beat and torture people."

The end of the student strike does not mean the end of the tempestuous movement which began last summer, Revueltas said. "The struggle continues..." It must only "be conceived in different forms."

The students should not regard the return to classes as a surrender, he said, but must convert it into a revolutionary action. "The return to the university must be regarded as a revolutionary occupation like the occupation of the Renault plant [in France] by the workers in May."

JOMO KENYATTA'S POLICE EVICT 1,800 NAIROBI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

When students at the Nairobi University College learned January 24 that the authorities had canceled a campus meeting at which Jaramogi Oginga Odinga, the main leader of the political opposition in Kenya, had been scheduled to speak, they decided to boycott all lectures until Minister for Education Dr. Kiano agreed to meet with a delegation to "clarify" the government's "interference in university affairs."

The students told the press that they were supporting academic freedom. "We do not demonstrate because we like Mr. Odinga, or because we are KPU [Kenya People's Union], but because we feel we have the right to form our own individual opinions," said President Awori of the Students Union.

The government ordered the students to return to classes. When they defied the order, President Jomo Kenyatta himself intervened, issuing an order closing down the university indefinitely.

More than 200 riot police armed with batons, shields, and tear-gas grenades, and supported by members of the General Service Unit armed with rifles, moved immediately onto the campus.

When students resisted being hustled out of their residential halls, the police used force, seriously wounding one student.

Some 1,800 students were evicted, including hundreds of foreign students. Many of them had no money for travel and nowhere to stay. Students from Zambia, Malawi, Mauritius, South Africa, Rhodesia, and the United States said they were now refugees. "Many of us will be arrested for vagrancy," a student from New York said.

The University Students Union of Dar es Salaam appealed to the Kenya Ministry of Education January 28 to revoke its order closing down the University College in Nairobi and reinstate the students, for the blow to their education would "fall mercilessly on the peasants and workers of Africa."

The executive of the union said in a statement: "We have a strong feeling that this is a case of denial of academic freedom for which every university aspires. We do not think that university

students, especially in Africa, can be divorced from politics. It remains a fact that they are the leaders of tomorrow."

The statement stressed that what was wrong in the situation was to deny the students the opportunity to hear Oginga Odinga. "We would not like to be misunderstood as taking sides in Kenya politics, but what we would like to make amply clear is that it is wrong of any person to arrest the search for truth which is the only justification for a university."

Kenyatta's minister of education announced January 28 that individual letters would be sent to all the students specifying the conditions under which they would be readmitted. These included recognition of the government's prerogative in deciding who should or should not be invited to speak on the campus.

Many students were already on their way back to their homes in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania. Embassies were providing tickets for some of the foreign students.

In Kampala, Uganda, January 30, some 2,000 students at the Makerere University College stayed away from classes in a demonstration of sympathy with the students of Nairobi University College.

They ignored the pleas of their principal, Yusufu Lule to return to classes. Instead they staged a demonstration and closed down the library building.

Police stood by but did not intervene, and no violence was reported.

In Dar es Salaam, members of the African Revolutionary Front were said to be preparing to demonstrate at the Dar es Salaam University. They invited Oginga Odinga to give a lecture there on the struggle against imperialism. He accepted the invitation.

Students throughout East Africa appear to have been aroused by Jomo Kenyatta's arrogant and brutal violations of academic freedom in Kenya. Their readiness to engage in solidarity demonstrations, as shown in Uganda and Tanzania, reveals a mood among the youth that is not likely to be extinguished by such reprisals as closing down the schools.

INDONESIAN ARMY CLAIMS CAPTURE OF 170 "COMMUNIST GUERRILLAS"

Troops of the Suharto dictatorship, operating in Sumatra and Borneo, claimed January 31 that they had rounded up more

than 170 "Communists" in major operations against guerrillas. The exact identity of the victims, however, remained obscure.

STUDENTS AT LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS WIN WIDE SUPPORT

More than 1,500 students of the London School of Economics [LSE], half of the total enrollment, met off campus February 3 and voted overwhelmingly to endorse a militant list of demands to be presented in negotiations with the LSE administration. The school has been closed by authorities since students removed a number of steel "security" gates January 24. The gates had been installed following the student occupation of the LSE during the massive October 27 antiwar demonstration last year.

The LSE administration and the Labour government have sought to make examples of student leaders in this case.

The night the gates were removed, police were called onto the campus and students at a social were forced to walk through a cordon where a number of them were fingered by administration officials and professors. Twenty-five persons, mostly students, are scheduled to be tried February 18 on a variety of charges arising from this incident.

The government made an unusual intervention January 29 when Edward Short, Minister of Education and Science, denounced the students as "thugs" and hinted that local authorities should deprive student leaders of government grants.

The LSE has remained under heavy police guard, and numerous student marches have been refused entrance to the campus. The administration has obtained a court writ claiming damages for "conspiracy" against thirteen people said to have been present on January 24.

Students insist that the whole thing was a deliberate provocation on the part of the administration, especially Director Walter Adams. The gates were put up without the consent of either the student body or the faculty. Adams publicly apologized to the faculty for having had the gates installed, but refused to remove them. His aim, the students say, was to have the campus cleared by police to facilitate the expulsion of a preselected list of campus radicals.

"The victimizations prove this," one student leaflet declared. "The absurd charges like giving a speech at a Union meeting, being seen carrying a gate out of the school, revealing the confidence of a professor, being present in the Senior Common Room, are not worth massive injunctions. It is clear that the authorities drew up a list of the students that they wanted to expel and then searched for reasons to charge them."

The demands adopted by the Febru-

ary 3 meeting of the LSE Students' Union included, (1) no victimization of staff, students or workers; (2) an end to "staff informing"; and (3) reopening of the school "without gates or policemen."

The size of the meeting gave the lie to the accusation raised by Minister Short that the demonstrators represented only a "tiny cell" of militants. Short noted that only 300 of the LSE's 3,000 students took part in removing the gates. These, he said, were inspired by a hard core of only thirty, four of whom were "Americans." By February 3 the thirty had grown to more than 1,500.

Following the meeting, the LSE students, joined by several hundred others from campuses throughout Great Britain, marched to the Ministry of Education shouting, "Short Out!" "Export Short!" and "Free, Free, LSE, Take It From the Bourgeoisie!"

The marchers stopped on their way to demonstrate in front of the South African and French tourist offices. At the latter they shouted, "De Gaulle, Assasin!" Students have charged that members of the LSE's Board of Governors are closely tied to corporations doing business in South Africa and Rhodesia; that research projects are undertaken for the benefit of these companies; and that LSE funds are invested in the apartheid economies of the white racist regimes of southern Africa.

The demonstrators stopped in front of the LSE building and tried to enter the campus. A line of police four deep barred the entrance and mounted cops forced a detour. The students then marched down Fleet Street, where many London newspapers have their offices. The papers locked their doors as the marchers went by. The march ended with a rally in a public square.

The papers have carried a campaign against the LSE students. The January 29 Guardian featured a call by one education official for wholesale expulsions:

"Universities should dismiss troublemakers even if this meant as many as 1,000 students being sent down at once," Sir William Alexander, secretary of the Association of Education Committees, said yesterday."

Relatively small meetings of "moderate" students have been widely reported. These groups have passed motions condemning the removal of the LSE gates. It is notable, however, that in almost every case the motions included a demand for permanent removal of the gates by the ad-

ministration.

The Guardian reported January 29: "The National Union of Students has warned students at other universities and colleges not to take sides in the dispute at the London School of Economics."

The London correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Florence Mouckley, expanded on this theme in the February 1 issue for the benefit of the American audience:

"A counterrevolution against militant university students is being mounted in Britain. The government, university authorities, and moderate students all have had their patience stretched thin by the violence [sic] perpetrated on the night of Jan. 24 by student agitators at the London School of Economics."

It cannot be denied that the government and the LSE administration have done their best to stir up a "counterrevolution." But there are few indications that they have succeeded in convincing the mass of British students.

On January 27 about 250 LSE students occupied the University of London Union building, where they set up the "LSE in exile." Though the occupation was maintained for only a day as a demonstrative gesture, it was notable that a large number of students from other colleges voted to continue the occupation.

Solidarity resolutions and actions were initiated at colleges throughout the country. More than 200 students staged a twenty-four-hour sit-in in the library at the University of Warwick January 27.

The January 28 Guardian reported, "At other universities emergency meetings were summoned -- mostly by Socialist societies, including the Revolutionary Socialist Students' Federation -- at which motions were passed condemning Dr Walter Adams, director of LSE, for closing the

school....there is no doubt large numbers of students are perturbed at the closure of LSE, whatever their views about the way students removed the gates that the LSE authorities put up."

About 200 students at the Regent Street Polytechnic in London passed a resolution of solidarity. At Sussex the students union sent a telegram to Dr. Adams January 27 calling for the reopening of the LSE. More than 250 students at a meeting at Sussex passed a resolution demanding that their vice-chancellor publicly condemn Dr. Adams. Similar motions were passed at York and Dunham. Leicester students condemned Adams' action.

Petitions have also been circulated in support of the LSE students at Essex and Lancaster. At Cambridge on January 27 students carried away the gates from King's College and Caius College.

Leaflets distributed February 3 by LSE students said resolutions of support had been passed at twenty colleges and universities; demonstrations had been held at thirteen; while another eight had been occupied as a gesture of solidarity.

The Guardian, in reporting the hostile stand taken by the National Union of Students, admitted that the NUS would have a hard time persuading its constituents to accept its "neutral" position.

"NUS officials," the January 29 Guardian said, "will spend next week going round the universities to try to counteract the impact made by LSE militants who toured at least 20 universities last week putting their point of view. As a result, emergency union debates have ended with the students voting in sympathy with LSE students."

The Guardian indicated that the response was not limited to students: "Messages of support for LSE students have also come from London factories and building sites."

#### WITNESS ADMONISHES JUDGE IN TRIAL OF POLISH STUDENTS

The latest in the series of trials of students accused of "instigating" the March 1968 demonstrations and sit-ins in Poland took an unusual turn February 3. The court called Le Monde's Warsaw correspondent Bernard Margueritte to testify on his talking with Adam Michnik and Henrik Szlajfer, two of the four young dissidents being tried. (The other two are Barbara Toruńczyk and Wiktor Górecki.)

Margueritte told the court that all the information he had gathered was in his articles which were available to everyone. He refused to answer questions

about whom he had spoken to, citing his right to protect his sources.

The French correspondent admonished the presiding judge for his attempt to prosecute Polish citizens for talking to Western journalists. "I also drew his attention to the importance of the verdict he would hand down and which would constitute a precedent. The question which is posed in fact is this: Can a Western journalist meet with a Polish friend without the latter finding himself accused before a tribunal on this account?"

MAOIST "EXTREMISTS" DEFEATED AT PRO-CHINESE CP CONGRESS IN INDIA

Bombay

"The Ernakulam Congress of the Communist Party (Marxist) has been a very delicate but deft operation on the part of the party leaders. The congress took place in the midst of much publicised forebodings about a further split in the party, jockeying for leadership and the impossibility of establishing a programmatic-ideological platform for the party's unity and cohesion. That the pressures within the party and in its periphery were quite formidable were self-evident considering the recent activities of extremists in Kerala which were an open challenge to the Marxist party's political as well as organisational positions."

This is how the weekly Link of Delhi (January 5) summed up the outcome of the CPI(M) congress, the second since its formation after the split in the Communist party of India (CPI) in 1964.

Link adds: "These pressures have been fairly effectively contained by the leadership and their expression in the Congress was found no more forceful than differences in a communist party would normally be. Finally the leadership had enough support even to drop some of the more intractable elements, like Jagjit Singh Lyallpuri, Sankaraiah, Upadhyaya and Dinkar Mehta, from the leadership body, the Central Committee."

The success of the leadership at the congress is ascribable to two developments. The Maoist "extremists" by the very logic of their positions engaged in adventurist actions before the congress met. The shrewder among them had earlier been counseling patience till the congress, so they could convert it into a platform for an effective struggle against the leadership.

They had hoped to manoeuvre things in such a way that it would result in a split in the party at a formal congress. They counted on such a split to provide an effective foundation for founding still another Maoist Communist party on their own factional platform.

But the "adventurist elements" forced the pace prematurely and counted themselves out both organisationally and politically, leaving the leadership in better command of the party. Of course, in the process the organisational strength of the party suffered a serious decline. Its membership dropped from 1,10,000 at the time of its formation to 75,000. "The organisation had thus become more manageable."

The other development was that the party leaders managed to patch up their differences for the time being. A serious tussle had appeared likely at one stage over the office of general secretary.

B.T. Ranadive, the chief party theoretician, is known to have been in the running for that position with the active support of Promode Das Gupta of West Bengal. But E.M.S. Namboodiripad and Jyoti Basu stood in the way. Even though Sundarayya had been assertive for sometime, he lost much of his strength after the debacle of the party unit in his home state of Andhra, where Nagi Reddy and his followers have revolted. Sundarayya was therefore acceptable as general secretary.

The real problem in this context was the question of attitude towards the Kerala ministry, which the party controls, and defence of its continuation in office.

Jyoti Basu, meanwhile, was concerned with the coming midterm poll in West Bengal and the supposed possibility of the United Front\* returning to power in the state with the CPI(M) retaining its position as the largest group in it.

But a powerful trend existed within the leadership led by B.T. Ranadive which had no use for the ministries and CPI(M) participation in them. Sundarayya reportedly went along with this trend at one time but has switched his position and joined with E.M.S. Namboodiripad and Jyoti Basu in defence of the party's participation in ministries and, in particular, maintaining the Kerala ministry at all costs. His reelection as general secretary and the strong defence of the Kerala ministry and parliamentary struggle at the Ernakulam Congress, in fact, "represent a signal triumph for E.M.S. and Jyoti Basu."

The rejection of the amendment favoring an immediate split in the All-India Trade Union Congress because the pro-Moscow CPI exercises dominant influence in its leadership, is a parallel to this development. Ranadive is known to be "the inspirer of the split move though he thought it more discreet not to come into the open in the congress itself."

---

\* The United Front government in West Bengal was dismissed by the central government in November 1967. It was a class-collaborationist alliance of "non-Congress" parties, including left-wing, bourgeois, and communalist political formations. It was dominated by the CPI(M).

It thus became the baby of only the staunch Maoist faction still within the CPI(M) and was lost by a heavy margin. If Ranadive had succeeded in pushing it through, it would not have squared with the more moderate political platform of the congress, which finally laid much emphasis on "Left and democratic unity," a slogan which had earlier been derided by the CPI(M) leaders.

The decisive defeat of the Maoist elements in the congress, however, came on basic political and ideological issues which found the entire leadership fully united. Two key amendments were submitted on the political resolutions -- one calling for unconditional loyalty to the Chinese ideological line (Mao's thought), and the other characterising the present Congress government of Mrs. Indira Gandhi at the centre as "the stooge of American imperialism."

Both these amendments were rejected. The ground for the rejection of the first amendment had been laid well in advance and it was doomed by the intemperate attacks that the Chinese Maoists have chosen to direct at the CPI(M) leadership.

But the rejection of the second is considered by the supporters of the Dangeite CPI\* especially as "even more significant in the present situation of the party."

Leaving aside all the semantics of raging controversies within the international Stalinist movement which finally resulted in the split of the CPI, a prominent question has always been the characterisation of the Congress government.

"It is useful to recall," says

---

\* The pro-Moscow Communist party led by old-line Stalinist S.A. Dange.

Link, which is known for its pro-Dange bias, "that the Founding Congress of the CP(M) had described the present Government as a lackey of American imperialism and this had been probably the most important line of demarcation between the two Communist parties. If the CP(M) leaders have now changed their opinion, as they have frankly done at the Ernakulam Congress, the essential reason for the split vanishes. The rejection of this amendment and the call for Left and democratic unity are thus the most significant basis for united action, if not immediate unity of the two parties."

The weekly adds: "It should now be expected that the fierce rivalry which was the principal feature of the relations between the two parties after the split will now begin to abate and their relations develop along a more friendly and cooperative basis not only in the coming midterm elections but also in the mass organisations and mass movements."

It is indeed excluded that the CP(M) or for that matter even the Dangeite CPI will opt for organisational unity in the near future. Besides the formal denunciation of the CPI as revisionist, particularly some of its leaders, which the CP(M) leaders have to keep up at least "for the sake of morale in their ranks," an organisational split once accomplished has left many scars. The fact that the Ernakulam Congress is claimed by the CP(M) as its eighth even though it is just the second after its birth suggests that it does not recognise the existence of the CPI.

But it is a matter of some significance that on the very morrow of the congress, A.K. Gopalan invited the CPI unit in Kerala to meet his Kerala Committee "to iron out differences by discussion and resolve the tension which has been sharp between the two parties in Kerala."

#### DR. EDUARDO MONDLANE ASSASSINATED

The African freedom movement received a setback with the assassination of Dr. Eduardo Mondlane in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, February 3. Described as Portugal's "most wanted" man, he was the leader of FRELIMO [Frente de Libertação de Moçambique], which claims control over a fifth of the Portuguese colony. He was killed by a bomb, apparently sent through the mail.

Mondlane returned to Africa from the United States in 1963. He held a doctorate in anthropology from Northwestern University, had taught at Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York, and once served as an official in trusteeship affairs at the United Nations.

Despite Mondlane's reputation for pro-Western sympathies, FRELIMO initiated armed struggle under his leadership and was reputed to have made considerable headway in recent years.

Operating from bases in Tanzania, and more recently in Zambia, the organization carried out frequent raids into Mozambique. Shortly before his death, Mondlane claimed that FRELIMO commanded an army of 25,000 men, 15,000 of whom were fighting inside Mozambique. FRELIMO is said to receive weapons and material support from both China and the Soviet Union, as well as the Organization of African Unity. The Tanzanian government gave Mondlane a hero's funeral.

POLAND: TOWARD A NEW OCTOBER?

By Jacques Bauduin

[The following article entitled "Pologne: Vers un nouvel Octobre?" appeared in the February 1 issue of the Belgian revolutionary-socialist weekly La Gauche. It reviews the development of a new left opposition in Poland since the 1956 antibureaucratic revolts, and discusses the prospects for a political revolution overthrowing the bureaucratic regime and establishing revolutionary-socialist democracy in that country. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

The Polish October of 1956 already pointed the way leftward. The demand for socialist democracy at that time took concrete form in mushrooming workers councils in the factories and in attempts to coordinate these bodies that were leading toward the creation of a central organization of workers councils.

Workers control of production was demanded as well as the abolition of the laws concerning discipline in the factories. An increase in wages was sought.

The masses struggled against the bureaucracy and for socialism. The militants of that time saw the workers councils as the organs of working-class political and economic power, the natural instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But the experience could not be carried through to the end. The workers were not organized independently as a class struggling for power with their own party (or their own parties). The October left was not clearly differentiated from the anti-Stalinist social front as a specifically proletarian movement. In these conditions it could not help but be drawn into Gomulka's game and become an auxiliary of the liberal bureaucracy which was to take the leadership of the party at the Eighth Plenum of the Central Committee in October 1956.

The victory of the Gomulka center meant internal reform for the sake of preserving the bureaucratic order. The basis of this reform was limited liberalization measures and economic concessions capable of satisfying various social layers. A rise in wages lasting until 1959 and the tapping of economic reserves created the social bases for stabilizing the reformed bureaucracy's power and enabled it to liquidate all the gains of 1956 gradually and safely.

After its reserves were exhausted, weighed down by an overcentralized system of management and by continued emphasis

on expanding the means of production and the resultant lag in the development of the consumers goods sector, the Polish economy entered a prolonged crisis.

The workers' buying power dropped, unemployment increased, social and cultural expenditures were cut, agricultural production stagnated. Today an overwhelming majority of the population (that is, all the workers, most of the lower white-collar workers, almost all the peasantry, and the youth) find their hopes for improving their lives blocked by the system.

In this situation, the bureaucracy has lost the popular bases of its authority; its power now rests solely on economic, administrative, and police constraint. All popular initiative is a potential danger to it. Any movement for freedom of expression and information threatens to unleash the energies of the working class and the intellectuals. And any such movement would be doubly explosive if it were coupled with another demand which is intolerable for the bureaucracy -- the right to organize independently, which the students were the first to demand.

The best example of this threat was the revolutionary potential displayed in early 1968 after a minor incident, the banning of the play Dziady [Forefathers Eve].\* This crisis revealed the political tensions gripping all of Polish society.

In actions denouncing the repressive and reactionary character of the bureaucracy, the students declared their revolutionary solidarity with the working class. "Workers, Your Cause Is Our Cause" was a significant slogan in these actions. Many young workers fought side by side with the students.

The workers responded to the systematic witch-hunt campaign, drummed up by a government that had no qualms about appealing to anti-Semitic prejudices, by deserting the party-organized demonstrations and concretely expressing their solidarity with the student movement.

---

\* Forefathers Eve is a holiday in honor of the dead celebrated in Poland on All-Souls Day. It provided the motif for a patriotic play in several parts by the greatest Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz, who was exiled permanently from Poland some years before the Polish revolution of 1831 for his membership in nationalist organizations. The play was banned because it contained anti-Russian passages.

If the workers did not join in this struggle en masse, it was because they had drawn the lessons of the failure of the Polish October. In the absence of an independent vanguard organization based on a consistent working-class program, they no longer wanted to be the pawns of any faction of the bureaucracy.

Confronting a general social crisis of the system, will the Polish bureaucracy be able to divert new popular pressure into safe channels? Will it be capable of reforming itself a second time by developing factions capable of assuring it control of the situation? Its participation in the invasion of Czechoslovakia will certainly not make its task any easier.

In any case, the bureaucracy cannot hope that General Moczar's neo-Stalinist "partisans" can play such a role. In the face of the inability of the 1956 "liberals" to consolidate their power, Moczar's group represents the authoritarian tendencies which reflect the new repressive conditions of the bureaucracy's rule. The ideology of the "partisans" (nationalism mixed with anti-Semitism and anti-intellectual superproletarianism) is sad testimony to the ideological depths to which the bureaucracy has sunk with the foundering of Stalinism.

While the Fifth Congress of the United Polish Workers party [Polska Zjednoczona Partija Robotnicza] reinforced the position of the "partisans" in the leadership, it did not definitively establish Moczar's sway. On the other hand, the Gomulka old guard is on the wane, and a third personality may come to epitomize the bureaucracy's instinct for self-preservation.

In fact, the appeal for administrative reforms launched by the Upper Silesian party secretary Edward Gierek, who represents the technocratic stratum, received considerable attention. This layer has no well-defined ideology, save perhaps a fierce opposition to "revisionists" (!) or "anarcho-Trotskyists," i.e., the left opposition. However, it wants to get away from Gomulka's economic sterility. Will Gierek be able to force through "economic reforms" benefiting the technocrats? Will he be the Polish Dubček?

His task seems complex. The technocratic layer alone cannot provide a social base for his projects. Facing a more conscious left opposition than existed in Czechoslovakia, one that has created a new vanguard, starting a liberalization process would lead to political suicide.

This is evident not only in view of the post-January Czech experience but precisely because of the existence at the outset of a revolutionary Marxist vanguard, a left force freed from technocratic illu-

sions and equipped with a program for anti-bureaucratic revolution. It was the absence of such a program in Czechoslovakia in January which permitted the Dubček faction



MAJ. GEN. MIECZYSLAW MOCZAR

initially to divert the dynamism of the masses into safe channels.

In Czechoslovakia, while the development of the process objectively raised the perspective of such a vanguard emerging (which was the main reason for the intervention by Russian tanks), for it to have actually come into existence would have required exposing Dubček's capitulation and dilly-dallying under cover of the subtle game of appealing for national unity in face of the Soviet threats, his main object obviously being to block the Czech masses from organizing themselves and striking out on the road to a political revolution.

Gierek, then, will never be able to apply the skillful policy that Dubček followed in his fight against Novotny and the "Old Communists" in which he based himself first on mobilizing the intellectuals and then the workers. Gierek's projected "economic reforms," whose sole ef-



fect would be to give decision-making powers to a layer of plant managers, cannot create any long-lasting illusions. The Polish bureaucracy seems to be caught squarely in an impasse.

Poland's enormous advantage is that it has a young vanguard which maintains that "the economic reform we need must be consistent and total"; that is, "it must take into consideration the interdependence of economic, political, and organizational solutions" (the Warsaw University Declaration of March 28, 1968). Poland has a vanguard conscious of the necessity of organizing independently of the party structures and of advancing a working-class program. It has a vanguard clearly conscious of the international character of its struggle. After the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the antibureaucratic revolution cannot be seen as a solely Polish affair.

It is to the enduring honor of Kuroń and Modzelewski that they were the first to formulate such a program in the East European countries since the annihilation of the Left Opposition.

In their Open Letter to Members of the Communist Party,\* Kuroń and Modzelewski denounced the counterrevolutionary role of the Soviet bureaucracy, whose activity is guided by the principle that "Socialism extends no further than our army." They denounced the Soviet bureaucrats, who -- by their foreign policy based on dividing up the world with imperialism into spheres of influence and safeguarding the status quo and by their ideology in justification of this policy and their influence over the official Communist parties -- have held back the development of the colonial revolution, blocked the revolution in the advanced capitalist countries, and suppressed the first antibureaucratic revolutions. They see the struggle against the dictatorship of the bureaucracy, and this is an eminently internationalist point of view far removed from the ideological stew of "national roads to socialism," as assisting the world workers movement to liberate itself from bureaucratic tutelage. The victorious antibureaucratic revolution will put an end to this tutelage. It is the natural ally of the worldwide revolutionary movement.

Kuroń and Modzelewski bring merciless criticism to bear on the Yugoslav system and any form of the "socialism of

\* Revolutionary Marxist Students in Poland Speak Out, 1964-1968. Merit Publishers, 873 Broadway, New York, 10003. \$1.25. Published in German as Monopolsozialismus, Hoffman und Campe Verlag, Hamburg. A French edition is also available from the Paris office of Intercontinental Press.

plant managers." Since no variant of it changes the situation of the workers, but simply maintains bureaucratic exploitation and power, it represents a new form of dictatorship over the working class and the majority of the peasants and intellectuals. "It is possible that the 'socialism of plant managers' will come about, but it will not avert the revolution...in relation to workers democracy it would represent a sort of 'Thermidor.'" "

They give a forceful answer to those who raise the counterargument that a revolutionary process could culminate in the triumph of antisocialist forces. They place the blame for the existence of right-wing tendencies squarely on the bureaucratic system itself. Indeed, the traditional rightist elements have no base in the decisive sectors of the economy -- industry, construction, transport, and banking. The petty-bourgeois elements -- "private initiative" in the cities and the rich peasantry -- exist on the margin of the economy and the social structures.

But by crushing all opposition from the left, the bureaucracy creates favorable conditions for the spread of rightist ideology among the masses who are in search of a form in which to express their protest against the dictatorship. The only effective means of fighting these rightist tendencies is to fight the bureaucracy and unmask it from a left position, which serves the interests of the masses and will quickly win their support.

Therefore, Kuroń and Modzelewski developed a real working-class program which alone will permit the realization of the interests of society as a whole in a system where the organized working class will be the master of its labor and its labor product, where it will determine the distribution of the national product and provide the basis for solving the contradiction between the productive capacity developed and the slow level of aggregate consumption.

These are the principal points of their program:

(1) Workers democracy in the plants through the creation of workers councils to run the enterprises. The plant managers will be employees subordinate to councils, supervised, hired and fired by them.

(2) Workers democracy in the state through a system of councils of worker delegates headed up by a central council of delegates. In this way, workers democracy will be complemented by workers power at the highest political level.

By this system the working class will determine the national economic plan, making the necessary decisions and supervising the execution of the plan at

every step.

(3) The workers must organize themselves on the basis of a plurality of parties, a plurality which reflects the character of the workers state. The workers politically emancipate the entire society.

(4) The workers must be able to defend themselves against their own state by means of absolutely independent unions with the right to call economic and political strikes.

(5) In order to make the organs of workers democracy centers of real mass working-class activity, several hours with pay must be set aside from the regular work week and devoted to general education of the workers.

(6) Abolition of the political police and replacement of the regular army by workers militia with control over permanent specialized units.

(7) A series of measures to assure the advancement of the peasantry and to guarantee their political independence by granting the peasant producers national political representation.

(8) The antibureaucratic revolution is part of the world revolutionary movement.

In addition to its programmatic section, the Open Letter offers a Marxist analysis of the structure of Polish society. A critical reading of this analysis provides the basis for a fruitful discussion of the social nature of the "people's democracies" and a state "of the entire people" and for opposing the "revisionist" interpretations which speak of a restoration of capitalism.

Kuroń and Modzelewski make a distinction between the technocrats and the central political bureaucracy. They char-

acterize the latter as the "ruling class of the society." One might ask whether it is not, rather than a class, a social stratum whose privileges are derived from the exploitation of the state and not from a given set of productive relations, a layer in which contradictions set different factions against each other.

But the essential thing is that their class position is clear. They do not equate American imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy. They have understood that while state ownership of the means of production and economic planning are not a sufficient basis for characterizing the societies in the Soviet bloc as "socialist," these criteria permit us to call them workers states, which while bureaucratically deformed are not state capitalist systems. Thus Kuroń and Modzelewski's program for antibureaucratic proletarian revolution approximates the program for political revolution which Trotsky formulated in the Revolution Betrayed.

It is no accident that in their analyses, Kuroń and Modzelewski identify themselves with the prewar Polish CP and the struggle of the Left Opposition in the USSR.

\* \* \*

For all young revolutionary Marxists, anticapitalist and antibureaucratic struggle are inseparable. These revolutionists will reply proudly with Cohn-Bendit's formula: We are all named Kuroń-Modzelewski.\*

---

\* Daniel Cohn-Bendit told a West German court January 24 that he had changed his name to Kuroń-Modzelewski in solidarity with the two imprisoned Polish revolutionists. See "Daniel Cohn-Bendit Changes His Name," Intercontinental Press, February 10, 1969, p. 141.

RUSSELL ANSWERS "ZYCIE WARSZAWY" ON ANTI-SEMITISM IN POLAND

[The following statement on anti-Semitism as a political weapon of the Gomulka regime was released to the press by Bertrand Russell February 5.]

\* \* \*

On December 12 I issued to the press the text of an open letter on anti-Semitism in Poland which I had sent to Mr. Gomulka. Two days later I was attacked in predictable terms in Tribuna Ludu and Zycie Warszawy in an item sent from the Polish Press Agency in London. It is instructive to observe what the Polish people are permitted to read and expected to

believe.

Agitation in Western Europe about anti-Semitism has "an expressively anti-Polish character". (It is not suggested, however, by the Polish journalist that when I criticise Mr. Wilson I am anti-British.) The "increased frequency of these actions" demonstrates not the need for them but the "campaign-like character of the operations". Persons such as myself, the item continues, are "intrinsically honest" but of "little understanding". Our trouble is that we fail to observe what a paradise Poland is for her small Jewish population.

If only we would study the reports of the Polish Press Agency with greater diligence and zeal, the blindness that has smitten us would be lifted and we would see the Truth.

Needless to say, Polish readers were not permitted to read one word of my open letter to Mr. Gomulka, so that they might judge for themselves my "little understanding" of anti-Semitism and the "expressively anti-Polish character" of my criticisms.

The final falsehood in this short item was the allegation that my open letter was not prompted by events in Poland but by Jews in London "known for their anti-Polish speeches". The Polish Press Agency writer, unable to imagine anyone thinking for himself, falls back upon the invention of a conspiracy.

It does not require a conspiracy to recognise a fact. Perhaps the Polish Press Agency will find some new technique

to dismiss a further document which has come into my hands recently. The material in question is an internal document of the Lodz Centre for Party Propaganda written by Wladyslaw Kmitowski and circulated last April by the ruling United Workers' Party (hardly an anti-Polish source).

This is a further horrifying document revealing crude anti-Semitism being peddled by the Party for the instruction of its members.

It alleges that Jews have "a programme for ruling over the world" and even drags up the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion". Every Jew, it states, is a potential intelligence agent and thousands of Polish Jews have "still to be checked and evaluated". This is a clear warning from the Party of precisely that harassment and repression which is as unacceptable in Poland as anywhere else. I hope that people everywhere will condemn the officially inspired victimisation of Polish Jews.

#### "RELEASE POLITICAL PRISONERS!" OPPOSITION TELLS AYUB KHAN

General Mohammad Ayub Khan, following nearly two months of demonstrations by students and workers that have continued despite fierce government repression, announced February 6 that he would meet opposition leaders "to discuss the political problems that are agitating the people's mind."

More than thirty people had been killed by the army and police at the time of Ayub's announcement, but the movement for democratic reforms showed no signs of abating. The progovernment Dacca daily Pakistan Observer at the end of January called it an "almost-revolutionary situation." Troops were called out in Dacca, Lahore, Khulna, Peshawar, and Karachi.

Students battled police in Lahore on February 6, when the cops sought to break up a march following a protest rally. The students were demanding a reduction in school fees, the freeing of imprisoned student leaders, and the barring of police from the schools.

In Dacca, according to the February 6 Le Monde, more than 300 journalists went on strike February 4. The strikers were protesting the arrest of a number of journalists and attacks on newspapermen in several big cities.

Ayub's offer to negotiate was made to Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, the convener of the Central Democratic Action Committee. This is a coalition of eight opposition parties, ranging from the right-wing Muslim orthodox Jamaat Im-Islami to the pro-Moscow National Awami party. Ayub did not invite specific political figures or

parties to the negotiations, scheduled for February 17. Instead he left the invitations to Nasrullah Khan with the proviso that he would meet only with "responsible" opposition leaders. This move was evidently aimed at provoking a split among the heterogeneous groups in the Central Democratic Action Committee.

Nasrullah Khan has said that it is "essential" that the state of emergency (imposed in 1965 during the war with India) be lifted, and that political prisoners be released before any talks begin. The February 7 New York Times reported that Ayub replied: "All these matters are negotiable. When we get together, this can be looked into. However, if there are genuine cases against some of them, how can you release them in a hurry?"

Yet to be raised is the central demand of the student movement: abolition of the system of "basic democracy." Instituted after the 1958 coup, the franchise is restricted to 120,000 "basic democrats" who regularly reelect Ayub to the "presidency."

The forces being set in motion, however, go far beyond any reforms that Ayub is prepared to make, and beyond the limited restructuring envisaged by most of the professional "opposition." The New York Times described the situation January 31: "Every time a student is killed by a police bullet in one town, a dozen processions of protesting students face the police in other towns. And when those students are beaten and shot, the resentment of the public rises to a fever pitch."

Solzhenitsyn's New Novel

PAVEL NIKOLAYEVICH RUSANOV, THE BUREAUCRAT

By George Saunders

[Continued from last issue.]

The figure of the bureaucrat has become quite common in post-Stalin literature. Among the more notorious portraits have been Drozdov in Not by Bread Alone and Public Prosecutor Globov in The Trial Begins (a production for which Andrei Sinjavsky is confined in a labor camp today.)

But the portrait of Pavel Nikolayevich Rusanov in Cancer Ward crowns all previous efforts of this kind, for it combines the most astute social and psychological analysis with the most unmerciful satire.

Such "character studies" are worth close study by revolutionists, for they are more than exercises of the pen; they are the nearest thing to a probing sociological description and analysis of the Soviet bureaucracy that we have yet obtained from the current crop of Soviet anti-Stalinists.

\* \* \*

Pavel Nikolayevich Rusanov is "a prominent man, a very important official," as his wife, Kapitolina, tells the nurse during the procedure of his entering the hospital. ("Kapa," heavy and big in her fur coat, tries unsuccessfully to bribe the nurse to guarantee special attention for "Pavlik." The Rusanovs are well-off: "I would bring a nurse at our own expense, but they say that is impossible," she complains.)

Rusanov is used to having things his way. When he finds he cannot get into a Moscow hospital, he calls up some fellow bureaucrats to "fix" it for him. Although they cannot get him to Moscow, they do arrange some privileges for him in the local hospital (despite the terrible overcrowding and pressure of work on the staff). He is permitted to bypass the usual reception routine and wear his own, not the hospital's, pajamas.

What a comedown it is for this bigwig to have to mix with the masses as a common ward patient may be judged from Solzhenitsyn's description of the job he holds and how he behaves in it.

His work is in the dossier department of a large industrial plant. He has been in "personnel" work for over twenty years, on the borderline of secret police work. He nearly joined the NKVD in 1939 but decided against it. This may have been just as well, he feels, considering

Beria's fate. Still, Beria had been the model and inspiration of the Rusanov household: they even named their son Lavrenty after him.

Solzhenitsyn ironically refers to Rusanov's "poetic-political" work ("what subtle work this was, and what talent it required"). He likens the various forms an employee has to fill out to countless invisible threads "linking that person forever with the local center of the dossier department...Constant awareness of these invisible threads naturally bred respect for the people in charge of that most intricate dossier department. It bolstered their authority."

A certain look, a certain way of greeting an employee, of calling him into the office, of having him fill out a form -- all were ways of alarming a person, of "putting him in his place."

"The poetry of the work lay in the awareness that you held a man completely in your grasp, though you had not really brought any pressure to bear on him."

"Rusanov's unique and mysterious position (half within another world) in the table of organization gratified him because of the deep knowledge it gave him of the true processes of life. The life visible to all (work, conferences, items in the factory house organ, the trade union committee's bulletin board in the lobby of the plant, the applications for this or that, the dining room, the club) was not real, it only seemed so to the uninitiated.

"The real state of affairs was decided without hue and cry, very calmly, in quiet offices, between two or three people who understood one another, or through friendly exchanges over the telephone."

The profoundly antidemocratic nature of this "Communist" official's work is also expressed in the way his office is preserved as an isolated inner sanctum, into which fearful employees are admitted only by special appointment -- through a double set of doors. These doors "could delay the visitor only a second or two as he closed one door behind him and opened the next.

"In those seconds before the decisive talk, however, he landed in brief detention, where there was, as it were, no light for him and no air. This made him feel how utterly insignificant he was

as compared with the person into whose presence he was about to come. If he had any insolence in him, or a mind of his own, he would lay them both aside, right there, in the dark."

In a passage of remarkable power Solzhenitsyn describes, with full understanding, though not with sympathy, the thought processes of the bureaucrat, his elitist views, his guilt-fear, and his loyalty to his own kind, an attitude approximating to ruling-class consciousness.

"Owing to the dialectical interaction of all phenomena, Pavel Nikolayevich's behavior at work could not, of course, help telling on his way of life in general." He and his wife avoided crowds and public conveyances. "One could be insulted there too, for these vehicles were invaded by construction workers and laborers in dirty overalls covered with grease or lime that might rub off on your clothes." The Rusanovs travel only by automobile or, between cities, in carriages with enclosed sleeping compartments.

"At a hotel a room was always reserved for Rusanov -- needless to say, so that he should not find himself sharing a room with strangers. It goes without saying, too, that where sanatoria were concerned the Rusanovs did not go to just any of them, but only to those where a person received the proper respect and the best conditions, where the sanatorium swimming pools and promenades were fenced off from the general public.

"When the doctors prescribed walking for Kapitolina Matveyevna, therefore, she really had no place to walk except in just such a sanatorium, among her equals. Though retaining in principle their fondness for the people's custom of promenading en masse, the Rusanovs had come to prefer the safer and cleaner lanes in the sanatorium with executives and administrators."

"The Rusanovs loved the people -- their great people! They served the people and were ready to die for the people.

"But as the years drifted by they developed a growing aversion to the public. That refractory, forever duty-evading, forever carping and moreover demanding public!

"And so they came to beware of the slovenly dressed, the impudent and sometimes intoxicated people one could meet on suburban electric trains, near the draft beer counters, or at the bus and railway stations. The poorly dressed person was always dangerous, for he was sure to have little sense of responsibility and probably had little to lose, or otherwise he would be well dressed. The mili-

tia and the law, of course, protected the Rusanovs from those who dressed poorly, but such protection inevitably came late.

"It would arrive only in time to punish the culprit after the fact. When face to face with him, Pavel Nikolayevich was essentially helpless. Neither his position nor acknowledged services could protect him then, while the fellow could insult him without provocation, heap curses on him, punch him in the face for no reason at all, tear his suit or dirty it, or even strip him of it.

"Thus, though not afraid of anything in the world, Rusanov came to feel a perfectly normal and justified anxiety about uncurbed, half-drunk people, or more exactly -- a straight punch in the face."

In the same breath this "Communist" thinks of himself as "a resolute, conscientious, new Soviet man."

He deploras the fact that the workers have become overly cash conscious, have lost their "sense of honor." He and Kapa, when they had worked in a factory years before, had not sought special gain. And in later years he had always accepted his "legitimate salary and bonuses" without asking for extra (mainly because he got plenty).

The workers, however, had become unscrupulous about forcing the payment of tips, especially for labor done in the homes of the privileged elite. "We mustn't corrupt these men. When they're given a tip, how does it differ from a bribe?...Appeasement here would be...an utterly unprincipled surrender to anarchy and to everything that was petty-bourgeois."

In his own career Rusanov has not been inspired by purely moral incentives, as Solzhenitsyn shows. He abandoned productive work in the plant early in the game and entered the ranks of the functionaries. The Rusanovs had climbed the ladder of the hierarchy...by acting as informers in the Great Purges!

Rusanov started as an informer when he denounced his best friend in order to get the other room in the flat that their two families shared. "It seemed ridiculous now," Rusanov muses in 1954 when his victim has been rehabilitated, "that an eighteen-by-nine foot room in an apartment without a gas range could have seemed so important."

Still Rusanov thinks with pride of the "civic duties" he performed in the purges. "In that wonderful, honest time, in 1937-1938, the atmosphere of society had been cleansed and it became so easy to breathe! All the liars, slanderers,

overly smart intellectuals and noisy critics vanished, shut their mouths or hid away, while people of principle, firm and devoted men, like Rusanov and his friends, walked in dignity, their heads high."

Rusanov represents the ranks of the bureaucracy, numbering in the millions, who do not understand and cannot agree with de-Stalinization. They don't recognize it as a palliative move by the central leadership in order to head off an explosion.

"What if Beria did turn out to be a double-dealer, a bourgeois nationalist who had made a bid for power? All right, try him, shoot him, but in private, discreetly. Why tell the ordinary people all about it? Why shake their faith? Why raise their doubts? In the last analysis, a secret circular, explaining everything, could have been distributed quietly to a certain level of officialdom, while the newspapers could have said he died of heart failure and was buried with honors."

The mass of bureaucrats live in deadly fear that they will have to pay for their lucrative crimes. In his nightmare Rusanov cries out in terror: "I wasn't the only one in this! Why have you singled me out for judgment? Who didn't do these things? How could I have kept my post if I hadn't cooperated?" [Emphasis in original.]

The bureaucrat's civic principles are reduced to the desire to keep his post. Likewise, his noble motive in old age -- in fact, the "dream of his life" -- is a high-paying pension.

Solzhenitsyn probes further into Rusanov's economic views. The party official harbors unmitigated hatred for speculators, for those who steal or deal illegitimately with state property for private gain.

He considers this a question of principle, like that of tipping. On one occasion he argues in favor of a five-year jail term for a truck driver who, stuck in a snowstorm in near-zero weather, abandoned his truck. Staying in the truck would have meant sure death by freezing; still, to Rusanov the man was criminally negligent, for a case of macaroni disappeared from the abandoned truck during the night.

"How can you leave state property unguarded and walk off?" asks Rusanov. "If you pardon one man, all the truckers will begin to leave their posts -- and they'll pick the state clean..."

"How many loopholes there are!" he exclaims on another occasion. "How many ways of robbing the government!" This porcine functionary thinks that, just because

distribution is entrusted to the state, the product of the workers' labor in a planned economy is the special concern of government personnel only! And that any "unauthorized" decision-making should be punished by the severest measures.

Solzhenitsyn elaborates: "Over the years Rusanov had formed the growing, by now unshakable conviction that all our underfulfillment of plans, the shortcomings and shortages -- all of them -- came from speculation. From petty speculation, such as the sale of green onions, radishes and flowers by uncertified vendors, of eggs and milk by women at the bazaar, of sour milk, apples, woolen socks and even fried fish at the railroad stations. Also from big speculation, when truckloads were driven somewhere 'leftward' from state warehouses. If both these kinds of speculation could be eradicated, everything would soon straighten out and our progress would be even more astonishing.

"There was nothing wrong in improving one's personal situation by a high salary from the state or by a large pension (Pavel Nikolayevich himself hoped for one of the generous special pensions reserved for important persons). In that case an automobile, a country home, or a small mansion were honestly earned acquisitions. The same automobile, and the same standard-design country home, however, became quite different -- became criminal objects -- if bought with money derived from speculation. Pavel Nikolayevich therefore yearned, yes, yearned for the introduction of public executions of speculators. Public executions could cure our society quickly and completely."

This is an obvious comment on the policy of death sentences for economic crimes instituted in 1961 as part of the "building of communism." In general, the thinking that lies behind much Soviet economic policy is exposed by the novelist as the fruit of the special position and narrow interests of the bureaucracy. Many of the concepts and analyses developed by Trotsky and other Marxists critical of the Soviet bureaucracy seem to acquire flesh and blood in the pages of this book.

One of the most important secondary characters in the novel is Maxim Petrovich Chaly, who stands in a special relation to Rusanov. For all that the bureaucrat hates speculation, he finds a strange attractiveness about Chaly, whose livelihood turns out to be made quite illegitimately. Chaly is what is known in the Soviet Union as a tolkach, a "pusher," or "expediter." He sees to it that certain goods become available to his clients whether they are on the open market or not.

This fixer describes his work to Rusanov after they have become friendly. If railroad tickets, good tires, fresh

vegetables, or such are needed, he knows who to pay off to get them. His approach in making bribes is to ask, "Don't you want to live?" And, he tells Rusanov, when he slips the bills across, "life wins out."

On the surface it seems to be Chaly's optimism that makes him attractive to Rusanov: that he is cheerful despite his serious illness. Rusanov's liking for Chaly isn't dimmed when it turns out he is a bigamist. (Several different "wives" visit him at the hospital. "It's convenient for traveling men," he explains. "In each town they can find a room waiting, with a chicken leg.")

There is something "pleasantly carnivorous" about Chaly in Rusanov's view. The key to their relation is that they share the same social attitude: "We live only once, why live badly?" The notion that there are values or a cause dearer than an individual's own life is as foreign to the "pusher" as to the official party man.

Solzhenitsyn brings out an even deeper tie than a shared social philosophy. The "pusher" is needed by the bureaucrat to ensure the supply of "good things in life" that the mere holding of an official post does not necessarily provide. Someone had to guarantee the supply of good tires to Central Asia so that the bureaucrats of the area who have Moskvich cars, as Rusanov does, can enjoy driving and owning them. It is precisely on this basis that upon leaving the hospital, Rusanov reluctantly gives his phone number to Chaly. Rusanov would prefer not to have ties with this unsavory character, but there remains the matter of the tires. Rusanov decides to maintain contact with

this repulsive but socially necessary type.

How necessary the Chalys are to the regime of the Rusanovs is made clear in a speech where Chaly discusses the fact that coal is considered the necessary "bread" for industry, and therefore is supplied, but "tomatoes for people -- no-no, they don't have them. If business-like people didn't bring them in, there wouldn't be any. People even offer sixteen rubles a pound for them, and say thank you, too...[Chaly gets them for forty kopeks a pound.]

"And what idiots there are in Karaganda [the coal supply center to which no tomatoes are officially supplied]...They hire guards, and instead of sending them to bring in apples, they could get maybe forty carloads or so, they set up these guards on all the steppe roads to seize any apples that sellers might bring into Karaganda."

Because of bureaucratic mismanagement, goods that are needed for both production and consumption do not get provided in many cases. Yet the demand remains. Speculators respond by illegitimately procuring the goods, amassing private fortunes in the process, threatening the very basis of socialist economy. Yet the bureaucrats prefer to deal with this problem by having speculators shot, or making an accommodation with them, rather than turn over the economy to the rational control of the producers themselves, who could create a plan flexible enough to extend to unmet needs. To the bureaucrat that is anathema, because it means his own elimination.

[To be continued.]

#### PALESTINIAN GUERRILLAS HOUNDED BY LEBANESE GOVERNMENT

It was the opinion in many circles that the December 28 raid on the Beirut airport was intended by the Israelis to put pressure on the Lebanese government to move against the Palestinian guerrillas. The raid appears to have had the desired effect.

The Lebanese have begun a campaign of harassment against the Palestinian resistance movement and its supporters, according to the January 27 issue of Al-Hurria [Freedom], the official organ of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

Al Hurria reports three developments:

(1) Persons suspected of being in sympathy with the guerrillas have been arrested in southern Lebanon and the

Baquaa' region. Al Fatah is one of the targets.

(2) The government is attempting to cut off food supplies to the areas where the Feda'yeen guerrillas are assumed to have bases.

(3) The Palestinian leftist writer Naji 'Allush was ordered deported. In the cultural field, he is known as a defender and supporter of the resistance movement.

In addition to this, the government is seeking to curtail news about its campaign which might meet with a hostile public response.

Evidently the plan is to quietly liquidate the guerrillas by stages while a public show is put on of supporting the Palestinian resistance movement.

BRING THE CAGED LIONS BACK HOME

The February issue of Atlas magazine published the following item concerning the problem it can sometimes be to entertain the American troops in Vietnam:

"Raquel Welch, the reigning sex goddess who helped Bob Hope entertain in Vietnam, is quoted in the Hong Kong Far Eastern Economic Review, of all places, as making a plea for sex-starved G.I.'s:

"'Sending girls like me to Vietnam to entertain the troops is like teasing a caged lion with a piece of raw meat...I'm not criticizing our boys' thoughts or

feelings one bit, I'm just telling you that I know what is going through their minds...There they are fighting an aimless war in a foreign land where they aren't wanted...Deep down inside, I think it would be best if stars like me stayed home and the Government sent off troupes of prostitutes instead. After all, when you get right down to it, those boys want relief, not more frustration."

Or, when you get right down to it, you could ship them back home to the caged lionesses. Less frustrating. More moral.

4,000 DOCTORS STRIKE FOR HIGHER PAY IN VENEZUELA

Some 4,000 doctors in 62 hospitals under the Ministry of Health in Venezuela went on strike February 4, demanding a salary increase and the right to participate in planning and modernizing the min-

istry's departments. The government said that as public functionaries, doctors had no right to strike. Lisandro Latuff, head of the Federation of Doctors, replied that the strike would continue until won.

In this issue

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Mohammad Ayub Khan .....	145
Bertrand Russell's Message to the Stockholm Conference on Czechoslovakia .....	146
Stalin Peace Prize, of Course .....	146
Russell Conference Condemns Soviet Invasion of Czechoslovakia .....	147
One-Day General Strike Paralyzes Italy .....	149
From Czechoslovakia: Revolutions Can Degenerate .....	150
4,500 Paris Students at Discussion on Revolutionary Party .....	151
Workers, Students Resist Franco's "State of Emergency" .....	152
Interview with Francisco Prada: Venezuelan Guerrillas Open a Front in Cities .....	153
The Arrests Continue in Mexico -- by Ricardo Ochoa .....	160
DRAWING: José Revueltas .....	161
"The Struggle Continues," José Revueltas Declares .....	161
Jomo Kenyatta's Police Evict 1,800 Nairobi University Students .....	162
Indonesian Army Claims Capture of 170 "Communist Guerrillas" .....	162
Students at London School of Economics Win Wide Support .....	163
Witness Admonishes Judge in Trial of Polish Students .....	164
Maoist "Extremists" Defeated at Pro-Chinese CP Congress in India .....	165
Dr. Eduardo Mondlane Assassinated .....	166
Poland: Toward a New October?-- by Jacques Bauduin .....	167
DRAWING: Mieczyslaw Moczar .....	168
Russell Answers "Zycie Warszawy" on Anti-Semitism in Poland .....	170
"Release Political Prisoners!" Opposition Tells Ayub Khan .....	171
Solzhenitsyn's New Novel: Pavel Nikolayevich Rusanov, the Bureaucrat .....	172
-- by George Saunders .....	175
Palestinian Guerrillas Hounded by Lebanese Government .....	176
Bring the Caged Lions Back Home .....	176
4,000 Doctors Strike for Higher Pay in Venezuela .....	176

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

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

Martin, Paris 10, France. INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. Copyright © 1969 by Intercontinental Press.