

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 7, No. 8

© 1969 Intercontinental Press

March 3, 1969

50c



ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO: Appealing for Nixon's support? See page 202.

**Turkish Students Protest
Visit of U.S. Warships**

Suharto Continues Arrests in Indonesia

Ayub Khan Steps Down, But Not Out

Madame Binh:

**'The Bombs Cannot
Kill Everyone'**

**How U.S. Congressmen
Got Themselves an
Automatic Pay Increase**

Hugo Blanco:

**The Revolutionary
Movement in Peru**

AYUB KHAN STEPS DOWN, BUT NOT OUT

Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan announced over the radio February 21 that he would not run for reelection in Pakistan's March 1970 presidential elections. The dictator's move came exactly a week after a one-day general strike, called by opposition parties and student organizations, had paralyzed the entire country.

Ayub's police and troops have been unable to suppress the violent student and worker demonstrations against the dictatorship that have mounted steadily for the last four months. The government acknowledged that at least seventy-six demonstrators had been killed by the time of Ayub's broadcast to the nation. Student leaders charge that the real toll is much higher.

In face of this powerful movement, the president made several important concessions before deciding not to seek reelection. On February 17 he lifted the state of emergency, in effect since the 1965 war with India, giving him wide arbitrary police powers. Many political prisoners were released, including former Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

On February 22 Sheik Mujibur Rahman was freed after being held in prison in East Pakistan for three years. He was recently tried on charges of plotting the "secession" of East Pakistan in collusion with India.

The jockeying for position among the bourgeois opposition parties has already begun in a contest to determine who will be Ayub's successor. The Democratic Action Committee, a coalition of eight parties ranging from right-wing religious formations to the pro-Moscow section of the National Awami party, reportedly favors a series of reforms essentially limited to weakening the office of president and the imposition of a cabinet system of parliamentary rule.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the most prominent of the opposition politicians, appears to be mending his relations with Washington to strengthen his bid for the presidency. Bhutto is frequently accused of "pro-Peking" sympathies by the American press. Selig Harrison, after a ninety-minute interview with the former foreign minister, wrote in the February 19 New York Post that Bhutto "says relations between Pakistan and the U.S. 'will not be impaired and might very well improve' if opposition groups succeed in their current campaign to oust President Ayub Khan."

Bhutto reportedly said: "We do not want the U.S. to abandon Asia. The role

of the U.S. in Asia is important. I am confident that a new period is opening up now in which a gradually improved climate should be possible between the U.S. and China, and this would remove one of the existing obstacles in the relations between our two countries."

If the bourgeois reporter is to be believed, Bhutto crudely suggested that he would be in a better position to sell a proimperialist policy to the Pakistani masses than was Ayub. Harrison wrote:

"If Ayub makes a friendly gesture to the U.S., Bhutto added, 'the people know he has pursued a pro-west policy and it is discounted. But if a trusted popular leader says that circumstances have changed and that it is necessary to realize the need for new adjustments, people will accept it.'"

Despite these assurances, the American press seemed somewhat piqued at the imminent return of "democracy" to Pakistan. Pakistan has long been touted as a "model" of American-style "development." The New York Times in a February 19 editorial noted the risks for imperialism in staking too much on such regimes, but still declared: "President Ayub represents perhaps the best of a breed of relatively enlightened but arbitrary military rulers whom the United States has increasingly tended to support as guarantors of stability and instruments of development."

Yet massive infusions of American aid served after a decade only to enrich a tiny layer of the population, the pro-imperialist ruling class. After ten years of Ayub's rule only 16 percent of Pakistan's 125 million people can read or write.

The Times, nevertheless, was plainly sorry to see the dictator go. "Ayub's decision to retire gives democracy a second chance in Pakistan," the Times said editorially February 22. "Whether this will be a change for the better depends largely on the performance of Pakistan's once discredited and long-silent political leaders."

But Ayub Khan is not gone yet. He is insisting on serving out the remaining thirteen months of his term. This is a long time; long enough, perhaps, to see the demobilization of the Pakistani masses, in which case Ayub could rescind his "retirement." In any case, he will fight to choose his own successor and to preserve the system intact if he can.

The bourgeois opposition has temporized on allowing Ayub to finish out his term. The mass of students and workers are insisting on the overthrow of the dictator-

ship. Giant student marches have taken up the chant, "Hang Ayub!" Massive crowds assembled to demand that "opposition" leaders not meet with Ayub -- indicating a widespread distrust of the opposition parties and leaders.

To secure its victory, the revolutionary mass movement must press forward for the immediate removal of Ayub Khan. In the process the masses may go far beyond the limited demands of their present leaders.

STUDENTS IN KOBE BADLY BURNED BY POLICE TEAR GAS

Tokyo

Hyogo prefectural police staged a massive attack on Kwansai Gakuin University near Kobe City February 10 to end an occupation of the campus by anti-Yoyogi [anti-Japan Communist party] Zengakuren students. During the battle, which lasted about twenty hours, water was hosed on the resisting students and some 800 tear-gas bombs were fired on the campus. The tear-gas compound contained chlorine acetophenone powder, which causes severe burns.

About thirty-two students who had entrenched themselves in the No. 5 Annex of the school were burned on their necks, hands, and legs.

Three other students, two of them coeds, were hospitalized in serious condition from tear-gas burns. Doctors told the press that the lower parts of the victims' bodies were covered with blisters varying in size from a baby's head to a thumb.

The Asahi Evening News reported February 14 that doctors had said even if the burns healed the patients will be left with keloid scars. The three students are being kept under sedation to ease the pain.

The students were protesting a proposed hike in tuition fees and other expenses.

The Japan Socialist party reportedly intends to question the Sato government in the Diet [parliament] on the use of tear gas by police in the Kwansai Gakuin University dispute.

"The virulence of chlorine acetophenone in tear gas and a chemical liquid used by police became a Diet issue about a year ago," Asahi said February 15, after demonstrators suffered burns when they protested against the port call of the U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carrier Enterprise at Sasebo Port, Nagasaki Prefecture, Kyushu.

In the Tokyo University struggle, where student occupiers were dislodged after a protracted battle with police January 19, an investigation by a lawyer has revealed that 109 students injured in the clashes with police suffered burns. Thirty-five were seriously injured by tear gas. Some students were burned so badly that the court suspended detention of them. The defense council for those arrested at Tokyo University plans to raise a complaint against the government on the grounds of "humanity's cause."

IRINA BELGORODSKAYA SENTENCED BY MOSCOW COURT FOR CIRCULATING PETITION

Irina Belgorodskaya, the 29-year-old daughter of a secret police officer, was sentenced to a year in prison for "anti-Soviet activities" in Moscow February 19.

Miss Belgorodskaya was arrested after a handbag she left in a taxi was turned over to the police. It reportedly contained 60 copies of a petition signed by eight well-known dissidents calling for the release of Anatoly T. Marchenko. Marchenko was arrested for "vagrancy" last July 29 after he had written a letter to Rudé Právo, the daily paper of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia, expressing his shame at Soviet efforts to block the democratization in that country. He was sentenced to a year at hard labor Au-

gust 21, the day of the Soviet Union's intervention.

New York Times correspondent Henry Kamm reported from Moscow February 19 that Miss Belgorodskaya was cheered as she was taken from the court building after sentencing. Friends of hers, including five of the eight signers of the petition she was accused of circulating, had gathered in front of the building.

As she came down the stairs they took bouquets of daffodils and red tulips from under their coats and threw them before her. Kamm wrote: "She caught one of the bouquets. The others were trampled by many plainclothes members of the state security police...."

RIFTS APPEAR IN FRANCO REGIME AS WORKERS PRESS STRIKES

Four weeks after the Franco government imposed a "state of emergency" January 24, tens of thousands of workers continue striking in defiance of the government crackdown, and the front of opposition to the dictatorship seems to be broadening.

In the northern port of Bilbao, which has been the main center of working-class resistance, 25,000 workers have kept up walkouts since January 31. About 19,000 workers have been out for this entire period. Shipyards and foundries, including the Altos Hornos plant which alone accounts for 40 percent of Spanish steel production, have been closed down virtually the whole month of February.

Intermittent strikes involving thousands of workers have been reported throughout the first three weeks of February in various industries in Bilbao and other cities in the northern region such as San Sebastián and Oviedo, as well as in Barcelona and Madrid.

The managers of the General Electric plant in Bilbao were only able to avert a prolonged walkout, according to correspondent Richard Eder in the February 17 New York Times, by granting their workers 10 percent raises and thereby undercutting the government's 5.9 percent ceiling on wage increases.

Eder reported, moreover, that the workers' leaders are convinced by now that the strikes cannot remain confined to a few localities for very long: "Censorship has muted the effect of the Bilbao strikes on the rest of Spain. But labor leaders here believe that with wage negotiations due throughout Spain in the next few months and with the controversial syndicate [trade-union] law up for adoption, their example will spread."

The workers' militancy in the face of Franco's new repression apparently caught their leaders by surprise. A veteran socialist told Eder: "If we were able to do this much despite the state of exception [emergency], it means that there are unsuspected capabilities of will and resistance among our workers."

Arrests have continued since the big roundup that followed the "state of emergency" declaration. About 120 workers were reported arrested in Bilbao February 11-12 and other arrests have been reported in Madrid and Barcelona.

One of Franco's major aims in re-instituting direct police rule appeared to be to suppress the liberal wing of the Catholic Church and restore ecclesiastical unity behind the regime. Le Monde's

correspondent Marcel Niedergang wrote February 2 that Catholic progressives, along with the revolutionary left, were key targets of the repression.

It seems clear that despite numerous arrests of opposition priests the government has failed so far to rally the decisive circles in the church. Franco's support even among the top clergy now seems quite shaky.

The bishop of Santander and apostolic administrator of Bilbao, Msgr. Cijarda, condemned the "state of emergency" in a pastoral letter that was read in all churches in the port city February 9. Along with this letter, thirty priests in the working-class districts of the city read a statement of solidarity with the striking workers.

On February 12, the new primate of Spain, Msgr. Vicente Enrique y Tarancon, defended the right of students to engage in political activity: "It is not enough for students to limit themselves strictly to their studies. They must get to know the social, political, and economic reality of the country they live in."

A number of high ecclesiastical figures have disavowed a statement issued by the Permanent Commission of the Spanish Council of Bishops shortly after the declaration of the "state of emergency" which supported the government's move. The pastoral letter of Msgr. Cijarda on February 9 already had this effect. The archbishop of Granada and the bishops of Jaen, Cadiz, Malaga, Murcia, and Almeria in the southern province of Andalusia declared their disagreement with the council statement on February 11. On February 17, the archbishop of Pamplona, Msgr. Tabera, came out against the "state of emergency."

Le Monde's special correspondent in Madrid claimed February 17 that sources close to the Spanish episcopate are saying that Msgr. Morcillo, the archbishop of Madrid, and Msgr. Guerra Campos, the auxiliary bishop, wrote the progovernment statement without consulting the other bishops. Both are Franco-appointed deputies in the fascist parliament. It is also reported that authoritative rumors are circulating that the Vatican has asked these two to resign.

The fascist regime is closely bound up with the Catholic hierarchy. The resignation of these two ecclesiastical deputies would cause serious problems for the Franco government. Morcillo, in fact, is one of the three members of the Consejo del Reino [Council of the Realm] which is to choose Franco's successor.

CAMPUS STRUGGLES ON THE RISE IN CANADA

By Paul Kent

Montréal

Most of a group of ninety-seven students who had been held incommunicado for more than a week were released on bail here February 19. They were arrested February 11 at Sir George Williams University when a student occupation of the campus in solidarity with black students' demands was ended by a police attack at the invitation of university authorities. The youths still face trial on a variety of charges.

Twenty-four of the jailed students are black, citizens of several Caribbean countries. Their governments have provided lawyers for their defense. The accused include the son of Cheddi Jagan, former prime minister of Guyana.

Scores of riot-squad police barred friends and relatives of the defendants from pretrial hearings. Only one observer was permitted to attend the proceedings: the Reverend A. Kendall Smith of New York, representing the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. He had made a special appeal to Chief Judge Champagne.

University officials have filed 363 complaints against the defendants. Each is accused of conspiracy to commit arson, and three counts of conspiracy to commit mischief.

The students were arrested after a two-week occupation of the ninth floor of the twelve-story Hall building of the university in downtown Montréal. The occupation was brought to a violent end when the administration gave the go-ahead to police, who launched a truncheon and tear-gas assault on the students. In the melee, two computers, estimated to be worth more than a million dollars, were seriously damaged. The action immediately followed the administration's abrupt termination of its farcical ten-month "investigation" of charges of racism leveled by black students against an assistant professor of biology.

The Sir George Williams incident is being used to mount a campaign against student militants in a number of cities.

The administration of the University of Windsor, across the river-border from Detroit, Michigan, used the incident as an excuse to terminate negotiations with students who occupied the administration building there February 11.

The Windsor students are seeking equal representation with the faculty on departmental committees, open meetings of the board of governors and the university senate, and the reinstatement of a professor.

There have been a series of leaks to the press from unnamed official sources that in the future there will be more intense security checks on foreign students and a closer scrutiny of loans and grants allocated to them. Prime Minister Trudeau has said there will be a general tightening up of the border against persons entering "for seditious purposes."

Sir George Williams students are now being denied "right of access or entry" into any part of the university, and all students, faculty and staff are being admitted into the Hall building only on identification.

Officials of nearby McGill University, the site of several protests in recent months, have established a system of "security checks" throughout the campus.

It is expected that this antistudent campaign may have some effect on the Vancouver trial of seven Simon Fraser University students slated to open February 25. They were among 114 students arrested last fall for their occupation of the administration building of the West Coast university.

Supporters of the jailed students in Montréal plan to set up a committee of inquiry to investigate the circumstances leading up to the February 11 incident at Sir George Williams University. Figures from the academic community and members of student governments will be asked to participate.

KENYA STUDENTS RETURN TO NAIROBI COLLEGE

Students began returning to the University College in Nairobi during the second week in February. They had been driven from the campus by club-swinging police on January 27, hours after declaring a strike for the right to hear opposi-

tion political speakers. The Kenyatta government forced each student, as a condition for reinstatement, to sign a pledge that they would not take part in "unauthorized" demonstrations and would abide by all government regulations.

VISIT OF U.S. CARRIER STIRS NEW UPSURGE OF TURKISH STUDENTS

Tens of thousands of students and young people launched a week of militant demonstrations throughout Turkey February 10 protesting a visit by ships of the U.S. Sixth Fleet, including the aircraft carrier Forrestal. At least four persons were killed and hundreds injured in sharp clashes with police and right-wing terrorists.

Large contingents of Turkish military police battled students in Istanbul February 10 after a rock was thrown through the windshield of the first American car to leave the landing area. More than 2,000 soldiers were held in reserve in a nearby stadium. In a dispatch from Istanbul February 11 New York Times correspondent Anthony Lewis said: "The extraordinary security precautions in a country long rated one of the most friendly and faithful of allies of the United States reflected the amount of anti-American emotion that has been aroused lately in Turkey."

Military police attacked a crowd of nearly 1,000 students, driving them from the landing area back to the campus of the Istanbul Technical University on a nearby hill. American shore-patrol units, reinforced by Turkish plainclothes police, were deployed at six key points around the city. Sailors went ashore after a delay of several hours, advised to remain in groups of four or more. They were given maps of the city with university campuses marked as places to be avoided. Officers were told to wear coats to hide their insignia.

The Times reporter described the elaborate advance preparations to shield the sailors from contact with the angry students:

"American Navy officers spent three days with Turkish police and Government officials making plans for the visit ... The men on the Forrestal were given indoctrination on the political situation in Turkey and the danger of student unrest." The navy brass refused to disclose the nature of the "indoctrination" provided for sailors.

A group of student organizations meeting February 8-9 issued a joint statement calling the Sixth Fleet the "guardian of a rotten order that is the enemy of the people....it is guarding the imperialism that is stripping Turkey. We believe that the people, who will see the true face of the fleet, will throw this enemy out of Turkey."

On February 12 an estimated 2,000 students marched through the streets of Istanbul shouting "Independence! Justice!"

The demonstrations quickly spread to other cities: Ankara, Ismir, Trabzon, Adana, and Gaziantep.

The February 19 Christian Science Monitor carried reports received from Ankara of major violence at Eregli on the Black Sea coast, where a large American-financed steel mill complex is located. Police were said to have killed two demonstrators with gunfire. "Army troops moved in. The government arrested seven security officials, including the town's police commissioners." The Monitor added: "It is not clear whether the plant's large staff of employees and workers was involved."

At Ankara, students burned an American flag in front of a statue of Kemal Ataturk in the center of the city.

The bloodiest clash took place in Istanbul February 16. The New York Times (February 17) reported that right-wing hooligans "firing guns, waving knives and swinging nail-spiked clubs" charged into a giant demonstration estimated at between 10,000 and 20,000. At least two persons were killed and more than 100 were injured, no less than twenty-four critically.

Police, having been "unable" to prevent the attack, finally intervened with tear gas. The Times reported: "Hospitals were jammed with injured persons and the Istanbul radio interrupted programs to appeal for blood donors."

The attacks have been attributed to paramilitary "commando" groups organized by followers of Colonel Alparslan Turkes, leader of the extreme right-wing Republican Nationalist Peasants party. Ali Kazancigil, writing in the February 18 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, declared that the "favorite activity" of the groups of the extreme right ("whose lack of imagination and poverty of ideas are unequalled") is to attack demonstrators while screaming, "To Moscow!" The police, he says, have often been criticized for showing "too great a complacency toward these groups, even when they carry out attacks against meetings organized with the permission of the authorities."

The Le Monde correspondent noted the unprecedented scope of the student demonstrations:

"With the apparent exception of the Americans themselves, observers are now convinced that anti-American sentiment is no longer the special property of a few intellectuals. The American ambassador to Turkey was still able to declare recently that this was all the doings of a very tiny minority."

If Washington chooses to appear dense as to the causes behind the new student upsurge threatening one of its "most friendly and faithful of allies," the demonstrators have done their best to spell it out. On January 6 students in Ankara burned the car of U.S. Ambassador Robert Komer, who had recently been appointed by then-President Johnson. Komer played a key role in the imperialist aggression against the Vietnamese people, serving as deputy for pacification and redevelopment at the American Embassy in Saigon before his appointment to Turkey. The new ambassador has served to polarize the widespread opposition to the U.S. war in Vietnam.

New demonstrations broke out in late January when it was learned that the "butcher of Vietnam," as the students call him, was plying his old trade: lecturing on Vietnam to top Turkish army staff officers. The New York Times, in a February 18 editorial entitled "Anti-

Americanism in Turkey," suggested that Nixon provide the "vulnerable" Mr. Komer with "another change of scene," to some place where the record of his "Vietnam duty" would not be an embarrassment. The Times did not suggest where that might be.

Other important issues include opposition among students to Turkey's continued membership in NATO, the decline in American aid -- and the strings attached to "aid" that is provided -- and the sizable U.S. military establishment in Turkey.

More than 10,000 U.S. troops are stationed in the country. There are another 20,000 American civilian employees of U.S. bases and companies. With their families this makes a sizable imperialist colony. Anthony Lewis noted in the February 17 New York Times that "an American Air Force sergeant may live at the level of a Turkish Cabinet minister."

HOW "L'HUMANITE" ANSWERS THE REVOLUTIONARY YOUTH IN FRANCE

By Jean Ravel

Paris

After May 1968, revolutionary ideas took hold among the masses, becoming a material force whose power the Gaullist regime has not forgotten. The vanguard movements' organizational network and, most of all, their following expanded, giving them capacities and responsibilities which their marginal role in the class struggle before had always denied them.

This new situation has not escaped the Stalinist bureaucrats of the Parti Communiste Français (PCF) [French Communist party] and the Confédération Générale du Travail (CGT) [General Confederation of Labor]. Furthermore, campaigning against "ultraleftists" is all the more opportune as a diversion the more these bureaucrats prove themselves incapable of mobilizing the workers and the students against the Gaullist regime, which is still in a state of general crisis.

It is significant that the February 5 issue of l'Humanité, the organ of the PCF, devoted a front-page article, almost an editorial, to a January 31 meeting jointly organized by the Trotskyist currents around the newspapers Lutte Ouvrière and Rouge.

A simple summation of the article, signed by Léo Figueres and enticingly entitled "Whatever Its Garb, Anti-Communism Always Serves the Capitalists," gives the best picture of the Stalinists' method.

(1) First come a few innocuous generalities about the basic irreconcilable historical conflict between the "party of the working class" (the PCF) and "French big capital" -- not capitalism, only the "monopolies"!

(2) This conflict, the article proceeds, shows the source of periodic "anti-Communist" campaigns. All criticism of the tops in the PCF and the CGT, in the eyes of these bureaucrats, is inspired from the same source and is, hence, "anti-Communist."

(3) Now the stage has been set for a crude amalgam and juxtaposition of various "anti-Communisms." After a denunciation of fascist and right-wing hooligans, l'Humanité "enlightens" its readers as to the "true" character of the revolutionary student vanguard:

"Anti-Communism, today as in the past, hides behind innumerable disguises. But whatever its form, it always serves the aims and interests of capitalism.

"It is from this viewpoint that one must appreciate the orientation of certain 'leftist' groups which operate in the student milieu, whose anti-Communism is disguised, more and more badly, behind ultrarevolutionary phraseology."

(4) After all of these tortuous preliminaries we finally arrive at the point of the whole exercise: the meeting at the Mutualité. Rouge, the readers of l'Humanité

té are informed, is a group which "specializes" in "the anti-Communist struggle in the University."

Since many supporters of Rouge are former members of the now-outlawed Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire which was in the forefront of the battles against de Gaulle's police in May and June, one might think Rouge would be charged with "specializing" in the "anti-capitalist struggle." Of course, the PCF "theoretician," unable to claim any such distinction for his own party during the May-June events, carefully avoided any discussion of the real activities of the supporters of Rouge and Lutte Ouvrière.

It need not be added that l'Humanité did not report the attendance at the meeting -- more than 4,000 persons, a third of them workers -- nor the content of the speeches.

The article did not fail, however, to make a finger-pointing personal assault on Comrade Daniel Bensaïd. Writing his name as two words so that none of its readers would miss the point that it is of Arab origin, l'Humanité stigmatized him as "known for his ferocious hostility to Communists."

Bensaïd is well-known in the student movement as a mass leader, especially at Nanterre, where he, together with Daniel Cohn-Bendit (whom l'Humanité branded a "German"), led the March 22 Movement. Bensaïd is the editor of Rouge, and is co-author of a Marxist analysis of the May events recently published by Maspero: Mai 1968 -- Une Répétition Générale.

What really upset the PCF bureaucrats was the topic for discussion that was able to draw the thousands of young people in the audience: "Constructing the Revolutionary Party." Despite their professed scorn for the potential success of such a project, the PCF tops, by their reaction, indicated that they took the discussion quite seriously and were worried at this threat to their own privilege and power in the working-class movement.

In classic Stalinist fashion, l'Humanité declared: "It is certain that the bourgeoisie would not be in favor of such projects unless they were to its advantage." l'Humanité offered no evidence to support this remarkable assertion that the bourgeoisie was in favor of building a revolutionary party to aid in overthrowing itself. Indeed, this "favor" is expressed in strange ways, considering that it was the JCR and the Union Communiste (many of whose former members now support the paper Lutte Ouvrière) that were outlawed by de Gaulle, while the PCF was welcomed into the government's phony "participation."

In concluding its attack, l'Humanité advised the workers: "Communists or not" to "respond with vigor to any attempts at using anti-Communism to divide them, from wherever they come."

The Stalinist bureaucrats have a long history of physically suppressing revolutionary elements under the pretext of preserving the "unity" of the workers. The May-June days offered numerous examples of this. Among other things, Stalinist goon squads prevented revolutionary students from talking to the workers in the occupied plants. In this context, such an appeal must be seen as a threat of stepped-up physical assaults on all forces to the left of the PCF, especially in the unions and among the workers.

Moreover, the content of this article, the prime spot l'Humanité accorded it, and the time lag between the event that inspired it and its publication, all indicate that it was no routine newspaper commentary. All these facts suggest that this attack represented an official declaration originating at a high level in the PCF -- probably the Political Bureau.

The reformists now feel the revolutionary left threatening them continuously and at all levels. We must expect that they will defend themselves with the weapons and methods that are characteristic of them.

LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS REOPENS

Students staged a triumphal re-entry of the London School of Economics, singing songs and carrying banners, when officials reopened the school February 19. The LSE was closed January 24 after students removed a number of steel "security" gates put up to prevent occupations of the campus. A mass meeting of students the day of the opening voted to condemn the victimization of those arrested in the gate incident. The meeting called for

an inquiry into the "archaic structure" of the LSE administration. Many students demanded the immediate occupation of the school.

The students won an important victory February 6 in their struggle against the lockout when the Academic Board voted to demand the immediate reopening of the LSE. This body is composed of all permanent staff -- professors and lecturers.

Interview with Hugo Blanco

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN PERU

[The following interview with Hugo Blanco appeared in the February 15 issue of the Guardian, a radical weekly published in New York, under the title "Hugo Blanco and Peru's revolution." The Trotskyist Peruvian peasant leader was interviewed by James Petras, a specialist on Latin America who teaches at Pennsylvania State University, in July 1968 in El Frontón prison where Hugo Blanco is serving a twenty-five-year sentence for his role in organizing peasant unions.]

[The editors of the Guardian did not indicate why publication of the interview was delayed so long. Nevertheless, the Trotskyist leader's comments remain as timely today as they were last summer. Of particular interest is his insistence on the need for a revolutionary party in Peru and his suggestion to the students to become integrated in the mass movement.]

* * *

How do the other prisoners regard the political prisoners?

The prisoners from the provinces generally know what we fought for and are sympathetic. The prisoners from the big city slums have absolutely no confidence in any political person and do not have any trust in any political solution.

Have you any thoughts on contemporary Peruvian political developments?

The key problem today is the absence of an organized vanguard in politics. In the past four years the spirit of struggle has persisted among the peasants, workers and students, but these struggles have occurred as isolated actions, isolated from groups which could provide political leadership.

Before we go on further, I'd like you to note that one of the peasant leaders, Gerardo Carpio, has been persecuted by the police ever since, after finishing his term here at El Frontón, he returned and spoke at the May Day meeting at La Convención.

What has happened to the peasant unions that you organized and led in the Cuzco area?

They continue to function, though many who have received land have achieved a major demand in our struggle. The problem now is between the government, which is demanding that the peasants pay the old landowners, and the peasants, who, having the land in hand, see no reason to

impoverish themselves by paying their old exploiters. The majority of peasants are refusing to pay.

Outside of this small area, where some peasants obtained land through revolutionary struggle, there is growing discontent. At this time two factors are exacerbating the situation in the countryside: the severe drought and the complete failure of the Belaúnde government's agrarian reform to solve the agrarian problem. This has led to increasing pressure by the campesinos for action. Up to now, however, in the Sierra -- unlike in Cuzco -- the campesinos are isolated and lack a strong organizational structure.

What do you think of the Peruvian agrarian reform law?

The agrarian reform law has been merely a means of legitimizing land already seized by the peasants themselves in areas such as La Convención, Cerro del Pasco, etc. In areas such [as] Puno and Ayacucho where the peasants have not moved onto land yet, the law has done nothing to alleviate their plight.

What is the role of the peasantry in the revolutionary process?

The peasantry in Peru today is a major revolutionary force, but in the long run once they obtain land, the peasants become bourgeois. The working class is the only guarantee in the long run of a socialist revolution. Our work was concentrated in the countryside, but only our limited resources prevented us from developing the struggle on a national basis -- in the factories as well as in the fields.

Would you care to evaluate Peruvian left-wing politics today?

Two positive factors have emerged in recent years on the Peruvian left: the breaking down of sectarianism, including amongst our own people, and the willingness to work with other revolutionaries; and the growing tendency among the left to see the need for armed struggle. The big problem for the Peruvian left continues to be its isolation from the mass struggle.

How do you explain the exceptional nature of your own career, the fact that you left the university and became a revolutionary socialist organizer when 95% of Latin-American left-wing students upon graduation become bourgeois conformists?

Up till now the Peruvian students

have lacked the will to integrate themselves on a continuous and serious basis in the workers' and peasants' struggles. When the students take this leap it will be magnificent. Students with great heroism preferred to go to the mountains and become guerrillas but not to work with the masses. Many are disposed to die for the revolution, but few are willing to live to make the revolution. There is great revolutionary potential in the Peruvian masses that students have not seriously considered. For example, when the sol was recently devaluated, thousands of Peruvian workers spontaneously struck, but since there was no political leadership little else occurred.

The peasants also have great revolutionary potential. In Puno and Juarez there is a very militant peasant movement, but they lack a revolutionary vanguard. In Puno, the wealthy bourgeois family, the Caciros brothers, end up directing

the discontented peasantry.

What is your view of the recent guerrilla struggles?

The guerrillas were not successful mainly because they did not have a firm social base. They had little mass popular backing to sustain them.

What do you think of Régis Debray's book, "Revolution in the Revolution?"?

My main criticism is that he lacks a conception of a party, he sees the foco as a panacea for all Latin America. There is no specific analysis of the conditions in each country. Peruvian revolutionary politics cannot be advanced by such an arbitrary approach. Only by being part of a mass movement will the armed struggle develop successfully.

PARIS STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST GAULLIST REPRESSION

Paris

Thousands of youth staged lightning actions in several parts of Paris February 14 in defiance of the Gaullist ban on demonstrations, giving a militant answer to the government's new persecutions of student revolutionists.

Some 2,000 young people staged a surprise march around the Reully recruiting center. They stoned the building and burned an effigy of a uniformed military man. The students completed their demonstration and dispersed peacefully before the police arrived.

At the Gare de l'Est train station 2,000 assembled for a demonstration but were barred from entering by a heavy deployment of uniformed police and plainclothesmen. About 100 students were able to enter the station on trains from the suburbs. They distributed leaflets to commuters, shouted slogans, and sang the "Internationale" before they were attacked by the police.

The cops threw a dragnet around the station. All those who looked like students and could not prove that they lived in the suburbs were arrested and sent to the Beaujon police station for identification. Police later told the press that 694 persons were taken in for questioning.

Other demonstrations took place late the same afternoon in the Rue du 4-Septembre and the Rue Réaumur.

The demonstrations were called to

protest the drafting of eleven student activists who lost their military deferments when they were expelled from the Sorbonne February 3 along with twenty-three other revolutionary-socialist student leaders.

The expelled students were accused of organizing two "invasions" of university property: one was a showing of banned films of the May events at the Lycée Saint-Louis; the other was a mass meeting in the Sorbonne courtyard to protest the rescinding of scholarships of politically active students.

The Paris daily Le Monde conceded February 15 that the student action at Reully at least had been a notable success. It granted that the size of the turnout was significant, given the conditions under which it had to be organized and the fact that two broad campus organizations had opposed the action: the UNEF [Union Nationale des Etudiants Français -- National Union of French Students] and SNESup [Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Supérieur -- National University Teachers Union].

The aspect of the February 14 events which most disturbed the astute capitalist journal was the harsh attitude taken by the police, which threatened to touch off new explosions by French youth.

Referring to the mass round-up of young people in the vicinity of the Gare de l'Est, Le Monde asked if the government did not risk "institutionalizing a kind of masked civil war between youth and the police."

PORTOCARRERO'S SAN QUINTIN MESSAGE

[Efforts are being continued to bring international pressure to bear against the military junta in Peru to grant Elio Portocarrero Ríos his democratic rights. As reported in Intercontinental Press February 10, he is still being held in Lambayeque prison under inhuman conditions in reprisal for joining with the prisoners in his previous jail in protesting the diversion of funds earmarked for kitchen supplies.

[The following message from him, written while he was being held in San Quintín prison, provides additional details concerning his case.]

* * *

The APRA-Belaúnde* regime, the lackey of imperialism and the proved enemy of the Peruvian people, is trying to silence protests by jailings and tortures. It is trying to subdue and break revolutionists by "disappearances" and murders.

They are persecuting the fighters of 1965 with the sinister intention of physically liquidating them. Our enemies are well aware of the liberating power that lies in the example of the guerrilla commanders, who fell in battle, and of the danger constituted by the survival of men who know how to fight, arms in hand.

Many guerrillas and revolutionists have perished as victims of this criminal repressive policy. Carlos Valderrama, Máximo Velando, Basilio Chanta, Edwin García, and Enrique Amaya, among others, were murdered after their capture, in flagrant violation of the judicial norms in this country.

Finally it was my fate to fall into the hands of the repressive forces. I

* From the 1963 elections to the military coup ousting President Belaúnde Terry last October, control of parliament was divided between two rivals: the Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana [American People's Revolutionary Alliance], an old reformist party turned rightward; and Belaúnde's latecoming reformist party, Acción Popular [People's Action]. -- I.P.

was tortured both physically and mentally. I was held in seclusion for a month in the División de Seguridad del Estado [State Security Division]. My wife was shot in the hand when I was arrested, and other members of my family have been arrested, threatened, or tortured. They have tried by every means to force them to inform on my comrades in struggle and to make me betray my revolutionary convictions.

But the repressive bodies are not satisfied. To top all this off, I am to be "tried" by a military tribunal which will sit as judge and jury. Like Hugo Blanco, Héctor Béjar, Ricardo Gadea, and other imprisoned revolutionists, I am threatened with the death penalty, that is, with legalized murder.

In the next few days I am to be taken to the city of Chiclayo by members of the Policía de Investigaciones [the ill-famed Peruvian political police]. I cannot be sure that they will not take advantage of this occasion to have me "commit suicide" -- as in the case of Velando -- or murder me openly on a pretext of "attempted escape" -- as the peasant leader Juan Paucarcaya was murdered in Satipo.

However, whatever the penalties this corrupt and antipopular government may subject me to, I maintain and will maintain publicly the revolutionary positions which I have defended, arms in hand. Without a revolution our country cannot escape from the abysmal vassalage and exploitation to which American imperialism subjects us. And there is no other road for the Peruvian revolution than the road of guerrilla struggle.

As a member and leader of the MIR [Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria -- Movement of the Revolutionary left], the organization of Luis de la Puente, Guillermo Lobatón, and Máximo Velando, I call on the Peruvian people to continue their revolutionary struggle indefatigably until the final victory. Neither repression, murders, nor Yankee intervention can long prevent our national and social liberation.

San Quintín
September 24, 1968

VENEZUELAN DOCTORS END THEIR STRIKE

Some 4,000 doctors attached to the Ministry of Health in Venezuela ended a two-week strike, according to the February 16-17 Le Monde. The doctors struck February 4 for wage increases, moderniza-

tion of equipment, and the right to participate in planning. President elect Caldera promised a "favorable and honorable" settlement, but there was no indication of the terms of the agreement.

THE ARRESTS CONTINUE IN INDONESIA

By Les Evans

Indonesia's General Suharto is continuing his bloody purge more than three years after the counterrevolution that brought him to power. A new wave of arrests and executions has mounted steadily in the aftermath of a six-week campaign against alleged "Communist guerrillas" in eastern Java last summer.

The brutal military regime claims to have captured or killed more than 1,000 guerrillas in the area around the town of Blitar, including a major part of the Communist party leadership that survived the mass exterminations in 1965-66.

The full extent of this new slaughter is still unknown. The first scanty report on the Blitar campaign, published in the October 29, 1968, New York Times, put the number of killed or captured at 2,000. The first details appeared only in mid-February in another Times report that cut this figure in half. At the same time it was revealed that the Blitar campaign had marked the beginning of a new spiral of arrests and killings by the Indonesian dictatorship. The six-month delay before reporting this information is an indication of extreme secrecy on the part of the generals in Djakarta, which may well be combined with deliberate suppression of the news by the Western press.

According to the report from Blitar by Philip Shabecoff in the February 13 New York Times, "Ten of the 15 members of the Communist party's Central Committee were killed or captured in Blitar along with most of the party's military and ideological leaders. Perhaps even more important, information forced from the captured Communists disclosed a wide network of party agents and sympathizers within the Government and armed forces."

The chance to dictate the contents of "confessions" extracted under torture seems to have been seized by General Suharto as an opportunity to settle accounts with a wide range of political foes. "The purge based on this information produced a wave of arrests spreading from East Java throughout Indonesia. Among those seized since last summer's operation were the governor of Bandung, an army general and approximately 200 other officers, many of them in sensitive positions."

The Times reporter adds: "Almost weekly there are new announcements of arrests. Two weeks ago, for example, the Government disclosed that 23 officers of the elite Siliwangi Division, the army unit that first moved against the Commu-

nists during the coup attempt and that still holds the key to power in Jakarta, had been imprisoned as Communist infiltrators. Many more arrests are expected as the armed forces press what one foreign military observer called 'a superbly professional intelligence operation' against suspected agents within their ranks.

"We still have a large number of Communists among us," an army intelligence officer said. "We know who they are and we are watching them. When we collect enough evidence we will arrest them."

"Evidence" has never played much role in the mass executions carried out by the U.S.-supported regime. The Times correspondent testifies that there are still hundreds of thousands of political prisoners in Indonesia. The government has announced that it will not release them, nor will they be brought to trial. In eastern Borneo, Shabecoff reports, about 60,000 Indonesians of Chinese ancestry are being held in "protective custody."

"According to an authoritative source in Jakarta, there are more than 150,000 political prisoners on Java alone. These prisoners will not be brought to trial but will be moved en masse to a large island where they will be given tools to build houses and start farms..."

The Nazis, it will be remembered, told a similar story to the Jews to persuade them to peacefully board trains bound for the extermination camps.

The "final solution" to the problem of working-class insurgency was hinted at by one "highly placed general" in Djakarta, who told the Times reporter: "As long as there is one Communist left in Indonesia he must be regarded as a threat -- and there are more than one, let me assure you."

In 1965, in fact, there were 3,000,000 members of the Indonesian Communist party [PKI], with a youth organization of 3,000,000 more. The party was in the leadership of unions and other mass organizations with a membership of more than 20,000,000 in a total population of 100,000,000.

Shabecoff outlines the Times' present version of the destruction of the PKI:

"Estimates of the number of Indonesians killed in battle or murdered dur-

ing and after the 1965 coup attempt range upward from 300,000. Thousands of Communist party members were imprisoned. The political tremors that followed toppled President Sukarno from power in March,

that the total could be far more than half a million. The killings still go on in some places."

Shabecoff's further subtleties include the suggestion that the "Communists" were "imprisoned," while those killed "in battle" or murdered were "Indonesians" of unstated political belief. "Killed in battle," which is put at the top of the list, is meant to suggest that many died in military clashes initiated by the Communists in their alleged "coup attempt." The real coup -- the one staged by Suharto and Nasution -- has been magically transformed into nothing more than "political tremors."

The Times carried this theme further in its February 17 issue, where Shabecoff said: "Even critics of the Jakarta Government concede that it is not a Latin American-style military junta. President Suharto's accession to the Presidency was legitimized by the Indonesian Legislature after he ousted President Sukarno. General Suharto adheres strictly to constitutional forms in governing the country."

This is a crude whitewash of the Indonesian butchers. The so-called Communist-led coup was carried out on September 30, 1965, by a small group of left-wing officers, led by Colonel Untung, who had discovered Suharto's illegal "Council of Generals," a group plotting to overthrow Sukarno. Suharto and Nasution, protégés of the U.S. CIA, finally admitted the existence of the conspiratorial "Council of Generals" on December 15, 1965 -- after they had suppressed the abortive attempt to stop their coup, and carried out their original plan to overthrow the Sukarno government.

Seymour Topping, in the Times dispatch quoted above, testified that "there is no substantial evidence that the Communists had large supplies of weapons or were planning a mass nationwide uprising to seize total power in the near future."

As for the "battles," the press accounts at the time were very clear as to how the Indonesian Communists were murdered. Topping wrote, in the same article: "Army leaders say that most of the killing of Communists was done by the aroused population. On a tour of the principal former centers of Communist political influence, this reporter found that the executions were usually carried out by the military in Central Java and that the people in East Java and in Bali were incited by the army and the police to kill."

"The military executed Communists by shooting, but the population was left to behold the victims or disembowel them



GENERAL SUHARTO

1966, installed General Suharto in his place and caused Indonesia to veer from its increasingly close alliance with Communist China."

The truth is that more than 500,000 Communists, workers, and peasants were murdered by the army and its accomplices after the generals seized power in October 1965. The Times today is quietly reducing its own figures published several years ago on the number slain, which were even then regarded by the European press as conservative. In the August 24, 1966, issue of the Times, for example, Seymour Topping wrote from Djakarta:

"The best-informed sources estimate 150,000 to 400,000, but they concede

with knives, swords and bamboo spears, often with ritual forms of extreme cruelty."

The International Socialist Journal of January-February 1966 published a report from Bali describing the methods used by the army to "incite" the population:

"The Army technique was to send in the paratroopers who enter the villages and demand that the local communists be pointed out. If the headman refuses, they shoot him. If he agrees, the paratroopers tell the other villagers that the one way they can prove they are not communists is to murder the communists -- which thereupon they usually do."

C.L. Sulzberger, writing from Djakarta in the April 13, 1966, issue of the New York Times provided details of the grisly massacre:

"In February public beheadings were still being held outside Ende, capital of Flores Island. Each night soldiers were trucking groups of 20 or more P.K.I. suspects from the prison and out of town to decapitate them with heavy machetes. Sometimes heads were left on the ledge of a monument in Ende's central square....

"Near coastal Surabaya early risers in March were pushing bodies away from jetties before their houses. Jails near Jogjakarta are said still to be crammed with P.K.I. suspects who are not tried, but taken out in nightly batches and killed. Unburied bodies recently littered village streets in central Java. Recently a traveler was told of a bullock cart loaded with human heads."

Today's hounded guerrilla bands are the remnants of the largest Communist party in the capitalist world, whose destruction marked the greatest defeat for the world working-class movement since the advent of Hitler to power in 1933.

As the survivors of the PKI leadership have recognized, the tragic debacle was the fruit of a policy of uncritical support of the bourgeois Sukarno regime by the PKI. In a November 1967 statement on the party's new program, the Political Bureau said that the surviving leaders "most strongly criticized the opportunist and revisionist mistake made by the Party leadership during the period between 1951 and 1965."

"The essence of the mistake committed by the Party during this period," the Political Bureau continued, "was the failure to carry out the principle of Marxism-Leninism on revolution, namely the seizure of political power by armed force.... The Sixth Party Congress [held in 1959]

had aggravated the mistake by adopting the line of Khrushchevite modern revisionism, namely the line of peaceful transition, in the programme of the Party.... It is clear that the Party programme since the Fifth Party Congress was an opportunist and revisionist programme."

A second introduction to the new 1967 program, appearing in the December 1968 issue of the OISRAA Bulletin, published in Peking by the Indonesian Organization for Afro-Asian People's Solidarity, described the document as "a brilliant victory of Mao Tse-tung's Thought within the P.K.I." The article, in fact, was entitled, "The Road of the Indonesian Revolution Is Illuminated by the Guiding Star of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's Thought."

All this might suggest that the PKI under Aidit's leadership was a pro-Moscow party and only awoke to the revolutionary teachings of Maoism after its debacle. Yet the PKI supported Peking as against Moscow, and the PKI leaders were the featured guests of honor at innumerable banquets staged by the Maoist team, and Mao himself paid glowing public tribute to Aidit's course up to four months before the coup.

Here are a few samples from Mao's personal message of greetings to the PKI Central Committee on the forty-fifth anniversary of the party's founding, May 20, 1965, as issued in an official translation May 23, 1965, by Hsinhua, the Chinese government news agency:

"The central committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia headed by Comrade D.N. Aidit has skillfully and creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism in the light of the revolutionary practice of its own country; it has Indonesianized Marxism-Leninism with outstanding success, independently worked out its revolutionary line and policies which conform to the basic interests of the Indonesian people, and led Indonesia's revolutionary struggle from victory to victory. The Communist Party of China is very proud to have such a close and staunch comrade-in-arms as the Communist Party of Indonesia."

Mao denied any trace of revisionism in PKI policy: "We shall firmly stand together with you in the struggle against imperialism, reaction and modern revisionism, fight side-by-side and advance shoulder-to-shoulder."

Mao then outlined his program for the Indonesian masses, and expressed his belief that the PKI was energetically carrying it out:

"We are deeply convinced that the Communist Party of Indonesia will further enhance its fighting capacity, consolidate and expand the national democratic united front based on the worker-peasant alliance, unite all the progressive patriotic forces and lead the national democratic revolution of the Indonesian people to a new upsurge and new victories. A completely independent, democratic, prosperous and advanced Indonesia is sure to arise, standing proud and erect in the world. Long live the glorious, great and heroic Communist Party of Indonesia!"

Nowhere does Mao mention a socialist Indonesia. The "national democratic united front," of course, in Maoist usage, includes the "progressive national bourgeoisie."

It was in accordance with this formula that Aidit -- and Mao -- were able to praise Sukarno as a "great Marxist-Leninist" and Mao was able to picture the most abject class-collaborationist policy to the world as an example of the unity of "all the progressive patriotic forces."

Suharto and Nasution, it will be remembered, were long and loyal servants of the Sukarno regime, before the time came to smash the working-class organizations that had been disarmed by Aidit and Mao's policy of class collaboration.

The present leaders of the PKI have taken a step forward in advocating

and practicing armed struggle against the Suharto-Nasution dictatorship. But by covering up the real causes of the degeneration of their party they have reincorporated in their "new" program many of the Maoist formulas that led to collaboration with Sukarno.

The PKI Political Bureau, for example, recommends its new program to "patriotic businessmen" as well as workers, peasants and oppressed layers of the population. The revolution is directed against "imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism," a list that conspicuously omits private industry. The revolution is described as a "bourgeois democratic revolution."

"Towards the national bourgeoisie," the program declares, "the working class must follow the policy of unity and struggle." Under economic tasks after a popular victory, the program advocates: "The State shall protect and assist the development of private national industry, to the extent that it will neither control the life of the people nor develop into a monopoly." While promising to confiscate the land of "feudalists" and "plantations," the program declares, "Lands and other properties owned by rich peasants shall not be confiscated."

The door is left open for new coalitions with the "progressive" national bourgeoisie, new Sukarnos, and new triumphs for the thought of Mao.

ANTONI ZAMBROWSKI PUT ON TRIAL IN WARSAW

The latest in a series of closed-door trials of dissident Polish students began in Warsaw February 18 against Antoni Zambrowski, one of the most prominent young critics of the regime. He is charged with "distributing foreign and tendentious publications, as well as his own writings, which presented the social and political relations in the People's Republic of Poland and other socialist countries in a false light," and "publicly slandering the Polish nation."

Zambrowski had previously been expelled from the party and fired from his job as an instructor at the University of Warsaw for the views he expressed in a declaration to a party control commission in 1966. This declaration was published in the London Times March 22, 1968. In it Zambrowski defined his general political position this way:

"I am a Marxist and communist, and for this reason I am a member of our party. For me, joining the party was a simple consequence of my way of life. As a 13-year-old boy I distributed pamphlets

for the Polish Workers' (Communist) Party at the 1947 elections. In that same year I joined the Young Communists' League. But I must confess that, while accepting the ideological foundations of our party, I have a mass of reservations with respect to its current policy. I feel more sympathy with the standpoint of such Communist parties as the Italian Communist Party (PCI) and for the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia (SKJ). In my view, if we applied the policies of the PCI or the SKJ in Poland we should have less political difficulties and considerably more influence in society."

Zambrowski's father, Roman Zambrowski, who is of Jewish origin, was forced to resign from the Political Bureau of the Polish CP in 1963 under pressure from the anti-Semitic "Partisan" group in the party led by General Moczar. When his son was arrested in the roundup of oppositionist students after the March 1968 demonstrations in many Polish universities, he was fired from his position as vice-chairman of the state board of audit and expelled from the party.

HOW U.S. CONGRESSMEN GOT THEMSELVES AN AUTOMATIC PAY INCREASE

The policies of the Johnson administration, including such items as the war in Vietnam, accelerated the already strong inflationary pressures in the American economy. The great man was alarmed about this. Up to the last moment, when he was packing his cowboy boots embossed with the Great Seal of the United States to go back to Texas, he was still talking about the need to do something to stem the tide.

Thus, just before Nixon's inauguration, administration spokesmen appealed for "guideposts" on wage increases, pricing and profits. In 1969, they said, wage increases ought to be kept "a little below" 5 percent, that is, less than the 6.5 percent average of 1968.

As for business, they appealed to the captains of industry to absorb the first 1 percent increase in total costs for each unit of output without increasing prices. Or, if this was inadvisable, they should "aim" at a profit margin no greater than the average of 1967 and 1968.

The important item of course was the pressure on the workers. "Only 5 percent!" warned the Johnson administration.

At the very moment this propaganda was being run off the government mimeographs, a different kind of handout was being prepared for the boys in government.

First came a recommendation from Johnson that the president's pay should be increased 100 percent. That is, the president's salary should be raised from \$100,000 a year to \$200,000.

It required careful timing to put that over. Under the law no president can receive a pay increase during his term of office. It has to be approved by Congress just before he is sworn in.

But Congress was up to it. The precision, smoothness, and speed of the ponderous legislative machinery met the highest standards of American efficiency. On January 15, five days before Nixon took the oath of office inside his bullet-proof glass cage, the Senate approved the bill introduced by Johnson to double the new man's pay.

It should be remembered that besides the not insignificant sum of \$100,000 a year, the president was entitled to an additional \$50,000 to defray expenses resulting from official duties, plus another \$40,000 for travel and entertainment. Along with this went a pension of \$25,000 a year, free mailing privileges, free office space, and up to \$65,000 a year for "office help." Besides

this, a president's widow was entitled to a pension of \$10,000 a year.

In the Senate debate over the proposal to increase the president's salary, only one serious objection was raised. This came from John J. Williams, Republican of Delaware. He maintained that the boost was "just a prelude to raising Congressional salaries."

It is not recorded whether there was laughter among the lawmakers at this prediction. In any case, Williams proved to be a gifted reader of the crystal ball. The very same day the Senate voted to approve the philanthropic recommendation from the outgoing Democratic chieftain to make a generous contribution to the family budget of his Republican successor, Johnson sent his annual proposed budget for the United States government to the Congress. In this he included a series of recommendations on salary increases for top officials, including congressmen.

Johnson explained in his budget message: "Prompt action is now needed to lessen the financial sacrifice currently required of high-ranking Federal officials."

Had it been his custom to keep an eye on the accuracy of his statements, Johnson might better have said that even prompt action could hardly block his recommendation from going through.

In the past, congressmen have felt that any pay increases they legislated for themselves carried a political liability. The inconvenience is even worse when they have to talk about the need for "austerity" and for "guideposts" to hold down wage increases which some of the low-ranking brackets claim they need to keep up with prices. Necessity often being the mother of invention, the lawmakers worked out a highly ingenious way to eliminate the political embarrassment.

In 1967 they passed a law setting up a permanent procedure to handle pay boosts for themselves. A special Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries must bring in recommendations every four years -- not to Congress but to the president.

To give greater objectivity to its work, the commission is not even headed by a congressman. The current chairman is Frederick R. Kappel, a former chairman of the board of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, one of the world's giant corporations. He is a man with inside knowledge of, and great sensitivity to, the kind of problems that

its independence.

Congress is supposed to do the legislating. The president has only veto power (which Congress can override by a two-thirds vote). In this instance, the president in effect does the legislating and Congress exercises the veto power.

That is, theoretically Congress exercises veto power. To organize a majority to veto a pay boost recommended by the president would be difficult in the best of circumstances. The thirty-day deadline makes it virtually impossible.

This year, the first time it went into effect, the congressmen as an added precaution called a ten-day recess during the thirty-day period to fill speaking engagements on Lincoln's birthday and similar patriotic obligations. This reduced the time to twenty days.

A few senators nevertheless decided that it was good politics to offer token resistance. They put up a three-hour debate February 4 before rolling over exhausted.

John J. Williams, who led the opposition, argued that the senators should not "insulate" themselves "from inflation, for which we as members of Congress are primarily responsible."

"This action today," he warned, "may very well trigger another serious round of inflation from which the American dollar may not recover."

But he was no match for the mellifluous, pear-voiced Everett Dirksen. The Republican minority leader came almost to tears as he described the plight of the nation's lawmakers.

When they started out at the founding of the republic, they got only \$6 a day -- the days they attended sessions.

By 1855 they had worked up to only \$3,000. And how slowly things went until 1946 when they reached \$15,000 a year.

Dirksen himself took a leading part in the courageous battle of 1946, a landmark in the long struggle to improve the standard of living of some of the world's most devoted public servants. Members came to him and pleaded: "Please don't have a roll-call. I'd like that pay increase, but I don't want to expose myself."

Pointing to the high cost of real estate in the nation's capital, to his own campaign for prayer in the public schools, and to the staggering rate of crime in the District of Columbia, the



EVERETT DIRKSEN, U.S. Senate minority leader: "Isn't it time to be a little realistic and remember Senators have to eat too?"

must be taken into consideration in dealing with such a delicate subject.

The president can modify the commission's recommendations up or down (Johnson pared them down). Then he in turn makes a recommendation to Congress. Now comes the point where the ribbons go on the package of goodies.

Unless Congress vetoes the president's recommendations within thirty days, the recommendations automatically go into effect.

Thus Congress and the top government officials have a mechanism to insure themselves against inflation. It operates like a sliding scale of pay, or an escalator clause in a wage contract.

On the constitutional level, the precedent is worth noting. The procedure is just the reverse of that followed in the United States since the country won

white-haired senator rose to the heights of impassioned oratory: "Isn't it time to be a little realistic and remember Senators have to eat too?"

Mike Mansfield, the Democratic majority leader, rose to the occasion in similar style. Courage was required. He and his fellow lawmakers would no doubt be pilloried in the press and pictured as having "bloated bellies, cigar in our mouths and bowlers on our head." Nevertheless he hoped that his colleagues would stand up for their principles and demonstrate "gumption."

Thus February 4 went down as another historic day for the Senate, the day of victory over any talk of vetoing the president's recommendation for a pay increase.

The House lagged behind the Senate by a full day. But perhaps it was worth it. Things went so smoothly that it was not even necessary to debate the question or vote on it. The House Rules Committee simply refused to clear for floor action a resolution to veto the pay boost.

Thus all the "high-ranking" government men got an automatic increase in wages, and ordinary people got a lesson on how effective united action can be under competent political leadership.

Congressional salaries went up 41 percent -- \$12,500 a year to \$42,500. The last pay increase before that was only \$7,500 -- from \$22,500 to \$30,000 in 1964. And before 1964 they hadn't had an increase since 1955 when they upped their checks 80 percent, from \$12,500 to \$22,500.

The latest increase likewise means an automatic increase in pensions -- a very desirable feature, as many senior citizens in the United States may be prepared to testify. A congressman with 32 years' service can now retire on \$24,000 a year.

The federal tax deduction for living expenses was raised from \$3,000 to \$5,500 a year. A deduction for "living expenses" would be a welcome category to many Americans now filling out their income tax returns. Unfortunately the president didn't recommend it, and if he had it would not have automatically become law as in the case of the lucky congressmen.

Other officials got increases that were obviously called for by the strain which inflation has put on family budgets in Washington in recent years.

The vice-president and the speaker of the House of Representatives, who had to make do on a miserable \$43,000 a year, now get \$62,500.

The Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate and the president pro tempore get \$55,000, a bonus of \$12,500 for the extra it takes out of a person to hold down these posts.

The justices of the Supreme Court were awarded pay increases of \$20,500, going in one jump from \$39,500 to \$60,000. The raise for the chief justice was fairly and equitably adjusted to \$22,500, a raise from \$40,000 to \$62,500.

The pay of cabinet members was increased from \$35,000 to \$60,000. To them of course this may not be any raise, coming as they do from corporation and banking circles where such takes are common.

The heads of departments under cabinet members were raised from \$29,500 to \$40,000.

Similar pay increases went into effect for all the "high-ranking" brackets of the government bureaucracy.

The low-ranking brackets, both in and out of the government, may feel that an injustice was committed. They forget. The Supreme Court justices themselves were involved in this. Every aspect was weighed with all due deliberation by those in the high-ranking brackets, who of course know best since they're running the country.

Their feeling is that the lower classes have learned how to get along on less and thus it is not so essential to come to their rescue in the battle against inflation.

In any case, a special problem was uppermost in the deliberations of the Kappel Commission. Unless the pay is sufficiently attractive in Washington, you won't be able to get people to work there, and that could lead to "an erosion in the quality of leadership throughout the fabric of Government."

When you're up against that kind of pressure, when people just won't work unless they get an income adequate enough to keep up the standard of living they're accustomed to, and entitled to, nothing can be done but let them have an increase, inflation or no inflation.

A lot of bosses have had to learn that the hard way, as every good union militant can tell you.

Solzhenitsyn's New Novel

ALEXEI FILIPPOVICH SHULUBIN, THE DECAYED BOLSHEVIK

By George Saunders

[Continued from last issue.]

If the speculator Chaly represents a socially necessary consequence of the bureaucratic rule of the Rusanovs, another secondary character in Cancer Ward, Alexei Filippovich Shulubin, represents a layer that stands in complementary relation to the rebel Kostoglotov and the millions oppressed by Stalinism. Shulubin was a pre-1917 rank-and-file Bolshevik who as a party activist in the thirties went along with the majority, acquiescing in the purges and show trials.

Most of his generation knew full well the charges were false, but they were intimidated. His personal account illustrates what a life of terror, humiliation, and inner suffering was the lot of those who held their tongues, were spared imprisonment, and remained in the party. He confessed errors, recanted, gave up his professorship in agricultural science, accepted a demotion to librarian in a remote city, in which capacity he secretly burned books based on lists signed by the party and secret police. "But I managed to raise a family."

Shulubin discusses with Kostoglotov the grim experiences they have each undergone. "All my life I lived in fear of your fate," he tells the ex-prisoner, "but now I wish I had changed places with you." He feels himself a traitor to the revolution he had fought for. "At least you lied less," he tells Kostoglotov, "and cringed less. Be glad of that."

Kostoglotov's reply brings out a significant point. Those who wrote denunciations and acted as witnesses were the real traitors, he says, not the Shulubins, and "if you figure one informer to each two prisoners -- all right, to each three," there are millions.

That being true, a sweeping de-Stalinization would have brought reprisals against a social layer of millions, most of whom occupy official posts, if often minor ones. It's easy to see why de-Stalinization stopped short, why the bureaucracy has not "reformed itself."

It's also easy to see why a novel that brings up such issues is particularly distasteful to the Rusanovs who rule the country. Shulubin's discussion with Kostoglotov on the experience of the Stalin era, which takes less than one chapter, would by itself have been enough to prompt the banning of the book. The

discussion probes toward the very heart of the question of Stalinism, how it could have arisen, what actually happened that gave rise to it.

"Tell me," says Shulubin, "what is the riddle of these changing periods in history? With one and the same people, the whole society loses its drive in just a decade or so, and the courageous impulses change their signs from plus to minus and become cowardly impulses." He recalls the bold decisiveness that he and his Bolshevik comrades knew in the Revolution and Civil War.

"We didn't guard our lives, we were simply glad to give them for the world revolution! What happened to us? Why did we give in?"

Leaving aside what role the ranks of the party actually played in permitting Stalin's rise, he raises the question about the leadership. "All right, I'm a nonentity, but what about Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya, Lenin's widow? Didn't she understand, didn't she see? Why didn't she raise her voice? How much a single statement from her would have meant for all of us, even if it cost her life! Maybe we could all have changed, maybe we would all have balked, and would have stopped it from going further?"

Solzhenitsyn does not point to Trotsky, coleader of 1917, and the others of the Left Opposition who did raise their voices -- precisely at the cost of their lives in most cases. Nor does he recall that Krupskaya at one point did speak out as one of the Opposition, only to back down in confusion under the Stalinists' pressure and recant together with Kamenev, Zinoviev, and others.

Is he ignorant of that phase of Soviet history? Or is he deliberately trying to point to it by the reference to Krupskaya, subtly -- to dodge the censor's pen? Whichever is the case, he has voiced questions that will not be put to rest by the mere banning of his book.

In trying to puzzle out what happened in the Stalin era, Shulubin decisively rejects one argument: that his generation of Bolsheviks were fooled by Stalin's lies and smoke screens.

"In the old days, when the lord of the manor addressed the village from his porch and talked nonsense, the muzhiks quietly smiled into their beards, and the lord of the manor saw it and the steward

standing at the side saw it, but when the time came for the muzhiks to bow down and swear fealty, they all bowed 'as one man.' Did this mean the muzhiks believed the lord of the manor?"

Shulubin thus denies that most party members believed Stalin's absurd charges, even though they all raised their cards and voted for imprisonment or execution of the victims.

"Suddenly the best division commanders of the Civil War were German-Japanese spies, and they believed it? Or all of Lenin's old guard were vile renegades -- and they believed it? Suddenly all their friends and acquaintances were enemies of the people....Then they were told millions of Russian soldiers betrayed their country....Entire nationalities, from the babes-in-arms to the graybeards, were uprooted, and they believed it all? Then what were they themselves -- fools? Surely the whole nation can't consist of fools."

As a result of his "twenty-five years of cringing and recanting," Shulubin has thought long and deeply on the problems of building socialism. "I recanted and I went on thinking...I tossed books into the furnace, and I turned things over in my mind."

In rejecting Stalinism, he has by no means turned against socialism or the revolution. Solzhenitsyn makes this clear, and those ultralefts who like to condemn the Soviet oppositionists of today as "capitalist restorationists" should take careful note of the following passage.

Shulubin is curious whether Kostoglotov, a man born after the revolution and unjustly imprisoned by the regime, has become disillusioned with socialism.

"I don't know," Kostoglotov replies. "Sometimes you got so burned up in the camp that you thought you'd grasp at anything." It is a real problem, then, Solzhenitsyn is telling us; bureaucratic arbitrariness drives its victims to consider alternatives dangerous to the revolution itself.

"Just don't make that mistake!" is Shulubin's response. "Don't conclude, just because of your sufferings and those hard years, that socialism was to blame. That is, no matter how you feel, history has nevertheless rejected capitalism forever."

"In the camp," Kostoglotov persists, indicating what a political hotbed it was, "they used to argue that there was a lot of good in private enterprise. It provides an easier life. You can get everything. And finding it is no problem."

"But listen, that's philistine reasoning!" Shulubin replies. "Yes, private enterprise is very flexible, but it's good only within narrow limits. If private enterprise isn't held tight in iron claws, it produces beasts, the people of the stock exchanges, who don't want to accept any restraint on their desires and their greed."

Kostoglotov counters that he has seen "right in our own midst" people who accept no restraint on their desires and greed. Shulubin has an answer to this, too, "Because it may be socialism, but what kind of socialism? We made a quick change, we thought it would be enough to change the mode of production, and people would change immediately." A different kind of socialism is needed, he argues.

Solzhenitsyn shows that while some antibureaucratic rebels are willing to consider even counterrevolutionary alternatives in moments of desperation, they are primarily responsive to Leninist socialist programs.

Shulubin's solution is to call for "moral socialism," as though a moral breakdown were the main cause of the degeneration of the Soviet Union under Stalin. For all its philosophical abstractness, his concept of egalitarianism inspires more confidence than the dogmas of "building communism in one country," as adopted by the bureaucracy at the Twenty-Second Congress. "When we have white loaves to trample under our heels," Shulubin argues, "and we're choking on milk, it won't make us happy at all. But if we shared our meager portion, we could be happy right now. If we think only of 'happiness' and 'growth,' we shall fill up the earth senselessly and create a frightening society."

His program of "moral socialism" is interesting as a sample of the kind of thinking that must be going on among Soviet dissidents as they search for a plan and perspective to put in place of the Stalinist travesty.

"Present the world with a society in which all relationships, principles and laws would be based on morality and on nothing else! All calculations -- how should children be raised? what should they be trained for? toward what ends should adult labor be directed? how should man spend his leisure? -- all this should be decided only on the basis of morality. Scientific research? Only research that does not inflict harm on morality, and on the morality of the researchers themselves first of all. Foreign policy, too: So that the question of any frontier would be not how much the action enriches us or strengthens us or raises our prestige, but only: How moral would it be?"

For all their rather bizarre phrasing, Shulubin's ideas are attempts to grapple with the same problems that Guevara was working on with his notion of "moral incentives." It is fully compatible with the Cubans' opposition to narrowly conceived material incentives and market mechanisms. (Shulubin, for one, condemns above all "the idols of the marketplace.")

Again, if publication and discussion of Solzhenitsyn's book were allowed, discussion of concepts of "moral socialism," including Guevara's ideas, would logically have followed. These concepts were particularly obnoxious to some of the bureaucrats responsible for banning the book. "'Moral socialism,' is a philistine socialism. It is old and primitive, and I don't understand how anyone could fail to understand this, how anyone could find anything in it," declared one of them at a Writers Union meeting on whether to print the book.

Shulubin's concept resembles the Czechoslovak ideal of "socialism with a human face," even though it lacks clear class analysis either of the bureaucracy itself or of the forces necessary to abolish it. Thus, it does not pose the need for workers councils nor discuss the possibility of the workers themselves deciding "toward what ends adult labor

should be directed."

To come out in support of workers councils as the controllers of Soviet government and society would of course have guaranteed nonpublication of the novel. We can assume it was written partly in Aesopian style with the aim of getting it published. Thus, one cannot be sure whether "moral socialism" actually expresses Solzhenitsyn's own view. In other works, he has clearly pointed to the need for the producers to have direct voice in allocating their labor and its product and gives a vivid picture of the alienation resulting from total control from the top down.

In "moral socialism" the author may be portraying the thinking going on in certain sections of the party and intelligentsia that interests him.

Does the author himself have a clearly worked out program? It is unlikely. His sympathies are generally toward Leninism, but his main interest is in literature, especially as an expression of humanist values. But on the main political problem, there is no doubt he stands four-square against the bureaucracy and with the prosocialist forces struggling to be free of it.

[To be continued.]

PUBLISHING TREND IN THE U.S. REFLECTS GROWING RADICALIZATION

Current market trends in the publishing industry in the United States provide a graphic index of the impact of the black liberation movement and the deepening radicalization on American life and literature.

The tenth annual supplement on paperbacks, included in the book review section of the February 16 New York Times, reports that in addition to the best-selling staples, the largest increases in sales over the past year have been scored by books dealing with blacks and with revolutionary themes.

Among the higher-priced paperbacks published prior to 1968, The Autobiography of Malcolm X is the foremost seller. Grove Press reports that sales jumped from 200,000 copies in 1967 to 400,000 in 1968. This has become a classic of American literature comparable to the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin.

Frantz Fanon's The Wretched of the Earth rose from sales of 30,000 in 1967 to 155,000 last year.

Three of the better-selling paperbacks on the black struggle and the Cuban revolution originated with Merit Publishers.

In 1967, 50,000 copies were sold of Malcolm X Speaks, a collection edited by George Breitman. The rate continued in 1968, bringing the cumulative total well over 100,000 copies.

George Breitman's The Last Year of Malcolm X, published in November 1968, is already in its third printing. Shoken Books, which has issued a popular series of Sourcebooks in American History since 1964, reports that this analysis of the black leader's political development is the strongest title in the series. More than 20,000 copies have been printed.

According to Grove Press, Che Guevara Speaks, a compilation of the revolutionary leader's writings edited by George Lavan, sold 30,000 copies in the first year of its paperback edition. Merit published the original edition and continues to publish the hardcover.

Interview with Madame Binh

"THE BOMBS CANNOT KILL EVERYONE"

"We know that our sacrifice is necessary. If the bombs do not fall on you, they fall on friends....It is useless to be a pessimist. One day, we will win a beautiful life, if not for ourselves then for our children."

This was how Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, deputy head of the National Liberation Front delegation to the Paris negotiations, summed up the struggle of the Vietnamese people against the Saigon dictatorship and the American imperialist invasion in an interview with Martha Gellhorn that appeared in the January 27 London Times.

Madame Binh, who is 41, is a member of the Central Committee of the NLF. The interviewer chose to avoid general political questions and sought details instead concerning the personal history of the liberation fighter. She found Madame Binh somewhat reluctant to discuss her own life when so many lives hung in the balance in Vietnam.

"The press," Martha Gellhorn writes, "has found an easy adjective to describe Madame Binh: she is 'austere'. Austere, according to my dictionary, means 'harsh, stern'; this she is not at all. She wears the long Vietnamese tunic and trousers with a European woollen jacket for warmth. She uses neither make-up nor a hairdresser. She is small, very thin, pitifully and heroically tired, undaunted, probably shy and certainly modest. She has great dignity, her eyes are sad. Yet she laughed...when I said with wonder that she has no lines on her face, not a single one, after such a life. Madame Binh does not think her life is special; it is how Vietnamese 'patriots' live."

Nguyen Thi Binh was 18 when World War II ended and the Japanese imperialists were driven out of Vietnam. She had just finished her education in a lycée established by the French colonial administration.

"I learned French, and French history. Not our history. Our ancestors were the Gauls," she said with an ironic smile, "I had vague patriotic ideas. We were despised by the colonialists; I was often indignant, humiliated. I saw how poor my people were. I wanted then to be a doctor, to help my people. I saw how they went to doctors and were asked first how much money they had."

The Times reporter describes the young girl's family:



MADAME NGUYEN THI BINH

"Her grandfather had been a famous patriot, imprisoned in his day by the French, but he died before she was born. Her father was a civil servant, 'a small fonctionnaire, neither rich nor poor'. She was the oldest of six children, her mother was dead. In 1945, they were full of hope, the war was over, now they would live in peace, at home among themselves.

"But the French returned; the 'patriots' were cheated of their nationhood, again to become second-class citizens in a colony. So the 'patriots' took up arms a second time in September 1945, and Madame Binh's father joined them....

"'From 1945, we had no money. After he was arrested two or three times by the French, my father had to escape to the

maquis. I stayed; there were five children to look after."

The young patriot taught children in Saigon to earn a little money. She became active in student organizations, and later in women's groups and among intellectuals. "Me, I never received any political education," she told the Times reporter, "I learned from experience. We organized protest marches against the arrests of patriots, we distributed leaflets, we met and discussed."

When she was 24, she was arrested by the French. She spent four years in prison. "And I was tortured too, you know, to make me confess to subversive activities and to say I was a communist. I did not speak, but they wrote anything they liked in anyone's dossier."

Martha Gellhorn asked who had tortured her. "Vietnamese," the NLF leader answered, "with the French directing. Just as now it is Vietnamese who torture, with Americans directing. There are people like that in every country. Mercenaries, who torture their own for money...."

"When I was in prison there were hundreds and hundreds of women with me who did not even know why they were there. They asked, what have we done? They did not know when they came but when they left, they knew. They left as patriots."

When the French were defeated at Dienbienphu, Nguyen Thi Binh was released from prison. Her father returned and her brothers and sisters were reunited. They had been scattered in the homes of friends during the years their older sister was imprisoned.

"In that short spell of hope," Martha Gellhorn writes, "she married 'someone I had known for a long time. For a few months, we were all together.' This is the best memory; her eyes shone. For a few months in 1954 is the only time they have been 'all together'. Madame Binh is now 41 years old and the mother of two and she has never had a home with her husband and children."

The American government intervened after the French imperialists had been defeated. A demonstration in Saigon to celebrate the Geneva Agreement was fired on by the police. Nguyen Thi Binh was in the crowd. A girl who was a close friend of hers was killed. When Diem consolidated his power under Washington's auspices, the repression grew. Madame Binh described those years:

"There would be a police raid, closing both ends of the street, and the police would look at identity cards and collect the young men and take them away to the army; it happened like that even

in cinemas. And patriots were arrested and shot. Later even whole villages would be decimated with machine guns. They pulled the guillotine through the streets of towns and villages to intimidate the people. They executed people openly in market squares and made their families watch.

"And that division of our country, it was to last only two years until we could vote, and instead it lasted for always. Children do not remember ever seeing their fathers who went north with our army as the treaty planned. We have a profound tradition of the family in Vietnam; men and women remain faithful, all these years, without ever knowing happiness."

In 1955 her husband had to flee Saigon. Her father, too, had left. Nguyen Thi Binh taught mathematics in a Saigon lycée and helped to organize protest marches and demonstrations. She saw her husband only rarely and in secret because of the great danger.

In 1957 she, too, had to flee to the countryside, "moving from one place to another, always moving. Sometimes we would arrive and be told no, you must go on at once. We lived underground often, never coming out into the air except at night. 1957 through 1959: those were the black years. By 1960, the people could not bear it any longer. They demanded the right to fight and protect themselves.

"We organized village by village. Those who knew how to fight taught the others. It was the third time we fought, you know. The Geneva Agreement was torn up by Diem; we knew we would never have the vote to decide how our country should live. And then the Americans came. I think the whole world knows that our patriots are brave."

During her first year in hiding Nguyen Thi Binh bore a son. Four years later she had a daughter. Her children, now aged twelve and eight, live with friends in South Vietnam. "I can count the days," their mother said, " -- not weeks, not months -- in all these years that I have seen my husband. My children count the time they have seen me or their father in days. People say we are accustomed to this life. But we have the same desires and wants as everyone else. The same. It is difficult to live as we do."

The NLF leader described the hospitals and schools of the liberated zones. The Times reporter asked how her children survived the American bombings.

"The little girl is more sensitive," Nguyen Thi Binh answered, "When she hears planes she runs quickly to the shelter. The boy is harder; he waits a minute and looks at the sky before he

goes. But we tell our children that the bombs cannot kill everyone; they must not be afraid.

"We know that our sacrifice is necessary. If the bombs do not fall on you, they fall on friends. We accept fate. We are calm. It is useless to be a pessimist. One day, we will win a beautiful life, if not for ourselves then for our children.

"But there will be a whole army of children in Vietnam who will never have a beautiful life: the amputees, the blind, the mutilated, the orphans, the tuberculous, the small ones who have gone insane.

"They bomb even our work animals, the oxen. As they spray poison on the

fields so the people will starve or become refugees in the cities."

Martha Gellhorn asked if the Vietnamese would not always hate the Americans. In affirming her confidence in ultimate victory, Nguyen Thi Binh replied:

"No, you must not believe that. My people are touched by all the acts -- the small as well as the large -- that the American people make against this war. We are really moved. We do distinguish between people of goodwill everywhere and governments. We feel that the public opinion of the world has understood us...We do not want hate and war. We want only peace and the right to be independent in our own land."

DIRECT ACTION BY LONDON'S HOMELESS

London

An organization called London Squatters has initiated direct action here to occupy empty houses, flats and even business offices in order to house 9,000 people now put up in municipal hos-

tels. Four houses in the Ilford area and two in the Notting Hill section were invaded at the beginning of February. According to London Squatters, there are no less than 170,000 families eligible for city-controlled housing, with little prospect of finding decent accommodations.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Zulfikar Ali Bhutto	201
Ayub Khan Steps Down, But Not Out	202
Students in Kobe Badly Burned by Police Tear Gas	203
Irina Belgorodskaya Sentenced by Moscow Court for Circulating Petition	203
Rifts Appear in Franco Regime as Workers Press Strikes	204
Campus Struggles on the Rise in Canada -- by Paul Kent	205
Kenya Students Return to Nairobi College	205
Visit of U.S. Carrier Stirs New Upsurge of Turkish Students	206
How "l'Humanité" Answers the Revolutionary Youth in France	207
London School of Economics Reopens	208
Interview with Hugo Blanco: The Revolutionary Movement in Peru	209
Paris Students Demonstrate Against Gaullist Repression	210
Portocarrero's San Quintín Message	211
Venezuelan Doctors End Their Strike	211
The Arrests Continue in Indonesia -- by Les Evans	212
DRAWING: General Suharto	213
Antoni Zambrowski Put on Trial in Warsaw	215
How U.S. Congressmen Got Themselves an Automatic Pay Increase	216
DRAWING: Everett Dirksen	217
Solzhenitsyn's New Novel: Alexei Filippovich Shulubin, the Decayed Bolshevik -- by George Saunders	219
Publishing Trend in the U.S. Reflects Growing Radicalization	221
Interview with Madame Binh: "The Bombs Cannot Kill Everyone"	222
DRAWING: Madame Nguyen Thi Binh	222
Direct Action by London's Homeless	224

