

More of the Same

Nixon Steps Up the Arms Race

Jose Valdes:

The Chilean Elections

General Strike in France

Report from Guatemala:

Where the Guerrilla Groups Stand Today



MORE OF THE SAME -- NIXON STEPS UP THE ARMS RACE

By Les Evans

President Nixon gave a boost to the nuclear arms race March 14 by approving the construction of the multibillion-dollar Sentinel antiballistic missile [ABM] system.

The decision to go ahead with the controversial missile network was a significant indicator of the real priorities in Washington, inasmuch as important sectors of the ruling class were opposed to the project. A majority of the Senate, some fifty-four members, let it be known that they did not favor the Sentinel system. The New York Times, speaking for powerful interests among the Eastern capitalist establishment, publicly warned Nixon not to endorse the ABM.

Despite the division in the top circles of American government, Nixon gave his blessing to the Sentinel. The only concession he made to his critics was to introduce minor modifications in the system and rename it "Safeguard" -- as though it were a deodorant or a laundry soap.

In fact, there was little compromise in Nixon's modifications. The original plan, approved by former President Johnson, called for the deployment of short-range Spring and intermediate-range Spartan missiles around a number of important cities. These missiles were to constitute a "thin" shield against a minimal or accidental nuclear attack. This plan was viewed by proponents and opponents alike as only the first step in the construction of a "thick" system involving many more missiles at incalculable cost.

In the event of a full-scale nuclear war even a "thick" system would be virtually useless in protecting cities because of the development of multiple warhead missiles and decoys that would draw the fire of ABM's, not to mention missiles launched from orbiting space stations -- which may be a reality by the time the Sentinel system is completed.

Nixon's "modification" of the Sentinel project consisted in moving it away from major cities, with the exception of Washington. The total cost of the operation, however, was increased, not decreased. It went from \$5.8 billion proposed by Johnson to "\$6-\$7 billion" estimated by Nixon. When the final bill is presented, it may run much higher. The New York Times commented March 15, "Moreover, all experience with the spending habits of the Pentagon suggests that this project will wind up costing much more than any initial projection."

Max Lerner, in a column in the March 17 New York Post, noted that "many experts doubt piecemeal effectiveness of the ABMs, and predict that the thin shield is bound to escalate into a heavy one and the cost from \$7 billion to something more like \$70 billion."

Few observers accepted Nixon's declaration that the move away from the cities was because of a decision not to build a "thick" antimissile system.

James Reston wrote in the March 16 New York Times, "[Nixon] did not reverse the Johnson Administration's decision to build an antiballistic-missile system, but modified it. He moved it out of the cities, where every missile site would have been a center of student demonstrations, to military bases in Montana and North Dakota, where students and demonstrations are less visible and less popular."

Sophisticated capitalist spokesmen like Reston made it plain that they were opposed to pouring new billions down the ABM drain and relying too heavily on hardware instead of allocating some money for defusing the social crisis building up in American cities.

"The control of military arms is undoubtedly the most important political question in the world today," Reston wrote, "for the arms race devours the money and influences all other questions of poverty, race, jobs and housing, both here and abroad."

The New York Times posed the question bluntly in a March 17 editorial:

"President Nixon's decision to deploy a modified Sentinel antiballistic missile system is not the end of a great debate but the beginning. Its purpose will be to determine whether the United States intends to plunge ever deeper into an expensive and illusory security race or to turn actively toward the pursuit of peace and domestic progress."

The Times was scornful of Nixon's rationale for the ABM:

"The President has sought to disarm critics of the original Sentinel project by putting forward the most plausible variant of what is now acknowledged to have been a nonsensical original plan to protect American cities against nuclear attack -- a plan that by Mr. Nixon's own estimate would have left a minimum of 30 to 40 million Americans dead after the first enemy thrust."

"The new plan for building deterrents around the nation's existing 'deterrent' system of offensive weapons is advanced by the White House as the one least likely to be considered provocative by Moscow....[Nixon] cites as a major impellent toward his decision...the installation of 67 ABM's around Moscow, weapons the Pentagon recognizes as already obsolete.

"The further irony in all this is that even before effective missile defenses have been set in place the offensive answer has appeared in the form of MIRV [multiple-warhead missiles], which can saturate any predictable defense."

When Nixon's decision was first announced, the Times, in a March 15 editorial, called the president's plan a "delusive compromise." "The increased measure of protection," said the Times, "is decidedly marginal. It is simply not a sensible way for this country to invest several billion dollars in this tense period of domestic crisis....It is not necessary to add this Maginot Line in the sky when there are so many alternative uses for the money here at home."

The Times called on the Senate to refuse to approve Nixon's proposal:

"It is now up to the Senate to defend the national interest. The ABM system is a project as wasteful as the Pyramids and not much more useful. It is not necessary for a majority of the Senate to remain in bondage to the Pentagon pyramid-builders in order to show that they care about the defense of this country."

A number of powerful political figures in the Democratic and Republican parties took their distance from the administration. Most of them viewed the ABM as a parochial interest of the Pentagon and of industries with big Defense Department contracts, and not a necessary component of imperialist strategy. These critics used the opportunity to picture themselves as promoters of peace and progress.

Senator Edward Kennedy, for example, said Nixon had "missed a number of important opportunities to advance our common cause of peace in the world and our goal of improving the quality of life of all Americans."

Senator McCarthy said, "This is the President's first serious mistake."

Senator Albert Gore, chairman of the Foreign Relations Disarmament Subcommittee, declared: "This battle is not over by any means." He called the project "but the camel's nose under the tent" leading to a much expanded system.

The Sentinel-"Safeguard" network

is to begin with units at two Minutemen missile bases: Malmstrom, Montana, and Grand Forks, North Dakota. Ten other sites will be added later.

This initial setup is not expected to be operational until 1973. Many scientists have said that the whole system will be obsolete before it is built.

Nixon avoided this question in his March 14 news conference. For example, he did not mention the effect of multiple-warhead missiles on such a network.

The defenders of the ABM do not even have the virtue of consistency. When it was first proposed, ABM strategists granted that to surround intercontinental missile bases with short-range "defensive" missiles would provoke a similar action from the Soviet Union in self-defense. This was Johnson's reason for calling for the deployment of ABM's around cities. This argument was in vogue until Nixon's press conference, when the president admitted that surrounding cities with "defensive" missiles would be taken as a preparation for an American "first strike" against the USSR. Returning to the original concept of "hardening" rural missile sites is merely an admission that the whole plan is just a further escalation of the arms race, an escalation whose military advantage is nil.

It should be clear, therefore, that Nixon had some other, less public motive for going ahead with the ABM.

On the one hand, his action set a political tone. It informed the people of the world that the prestige and power of the American military establishment was not to be slighted in a clash with civilian politicians, regardless of the issues.

The decision also provided a guarantee of continued high subsidies to American big business through contracts to build the Sentinel system. The recipients of Washington's largesse include some very powerful interests who maintain a strong Washington lobby to see to it that they are not overlooked.

The prime contractor for the Sentinel is Bell Telephone Laboratories, a part of American Telephone and Telegraph, which in 1968 received \$775,927,000 in Defense Department contracts. Other corporations that will divide the Sentinel pie include the McDonnell-Douglas Co., General Electric, Sperry-Rand, Raytheon Co., AVCO, Hughes Aircraft, and Radio Corporation of America.

Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, in their March 17 nationally syndicated column, commented, "All had their financial interests at stake when they pulled wires behind the scenes on Capitol Hill."

ONE-DAY GENERAL STRIKE IN FRANCE

European money markets teetered on the brink of a new financial crisis in anticipation of the one-day general strike that paralyzed France March 11. Gold prices soared to more than \$48 an ounce in the Paris market and touched \$44 in London and Zurich.

The new gold rush was symptomatic of the fear in Europe of a repetition of the May-June upheaval in France.

On the eve of the strike, Zurich bankers estimated that French businessmen and wealthy hoarders had cornered about \$7 billion worth of the metal, roughly one-sixth of the total world monetary reserve and nearly twice the \$4 billion in gold held by the French government.

The Gaullist regime denounced the workers for demanding new salary increases which, the government claimed, would spur inflation and provoke a possible devaluation of the franc.

The strike was called by union leaders March 6 after meeting for three days with government and employers' representatives to negotiate new wage demands.

The "rendezvous of March" had been scheduled during the May-June events last year. The government and the employers, however, refused to discuss wage increases. De Gaulle announced a few days earlier that he would authorize a flat 4 percent pay rise, in two steps, for the nationalized industries.

The government made clear that it expected this to set a pattern for the civil service and private industry.

The unions demanded a 12 percent increase, pointing to the steep rise in prices that has wiped out much of the gains made last May.

At the negotiations in the Rue de Tilsitt the government and employers restricted themselves to debating how much wages, prices and taxes had risen since last summer.

The government claimed that wages had gone up an average of 15.5 percent as compared to a price increase of 5.3 percent in the same period.

The unions replied that price increases were really 7.3 percent and that workers were merely catching up for the years when raises had been negligible. They pointed out that the income of the working class, computed from July 1, would show a decrease because of changes

in buying power.

The union bureaucrats restricted the negotiations to the economic sphere and avoided questions of workers control or political demands.

The March 11 strike showed once again the immense organized power of the French working class, even when brought into play for strictly limited objectives. The March 12 New York Times reported:

"A telephone survey of key cities indicated that a major portion of the country's heavy industry closed -- partly because of a power cutoff. Harbors were generally paralyzed. Train service was at less than one-third of normal, plane service at about one-third, and in most cities public transit was either totally or largely halted.

"Mail was not delivered, except in rural areas. Automatic telephones worked, but manual ones did not. Post office, banks, stores and private offices mostly opened with reduced staffs, but generally did little business. Many schools were closed by teacher strikes...."

The workers staged mass demonstrations throughout the country. A march in Paris was estimated by the Times at close to 200,000 persons.

In most places the bureaucrats of the Communist party-led CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail -- General Confederation of Labor] organized large squads of "monitors" to prevent student contingents from joining demonstrations and to confiscate banners with political slogans.

The March 13 Paris daily Le Monde reported: "In several places, the presence of UNEF [Union Nationale des Etudiants de France -- National Union of French Students] students and groups of leftist extremists provoked brief incidents with the CGT. At Dijon, the CFDT [Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail -- French Democratic Federation of Labor] refused to participate in the march because of the conditions the CGTists wanted to impose on the students.

In Paris the giant crowd of workers marched from the Place de la République to the Place de la Bastille. The parade was sponsored by the CGT, the CFDT and the FEN [Fédération de l'Education Nationale -- National Teachers Federation]. The unions insisted that the demonstration put forward only "trade-union demands" and no political slogans.

Hundreds of prepared banners were

on hand with slogans for higher wages, a 40-hour week, a wage-price escalator clause, lower taxes, and retirement at 60 years of age.

Le Monde described the march:

"The procession began to march a little after 3 p.m. Meanwhile a group of anarchists with black flags tried to intrude into the front ranks; they were to succeed in this a little later.

"Singing of the Internationale alternated with appeals for unity, appeals which resounded throughout the length of the procession, especially in the ranks of the UNEF-Renouveau.

"The other UNEF was some hundreds of yards behind, following the SNESup [Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Supérieur -- University Teachers Union] group. As on March 1, all the observers between the Place de la République and the Place de la Nation had the impression of witnessing a 'second' demonstration. Behind the union leaders, with M. Herzberg in the lead, was a flowering of red flags and, on a banner, the inscription, 'De Gaulle Out!' accompanied by new slogans:

"National Interest = the Capitalists Interest!"; 'For Le Mans and Sochaux, Yes; for Tilsitt and Grenelle, No!'; which followed the habitual 'This Is Only the Beginning, Continue the Struggle!'

"Other groups also showed their evident desire to politicalize the action: The CFDT carried posters reading, 'Unite With the Students,' and the railroad workers stressed: 'Tomorrow the Struggle Continues!'"

At the close of the march, students formed small groups to talk to the workers. When the CGT monitors asked the crowd to disperse, about 600 young people remained. They were later attacked by police and some 200 were taken to a police station for "identity checks."

In Clermont-Ferrand the General Association of Students [Association Générale des Etudiants], affiliated to the UNEF, was excluded from the demonstration at the insistence of the local CGT leadership which delivered an ultimatum to the CFDT and the FEN that the CGT would not participate in a united action with the students.

More than 10,000 persons marched from the Place Leviste to the Place Jules-Ferry in Lyon. About 400 students who took part as a group were surrounded by monitors of the CGT to isolate them from the rest of the demonstration.

Several thousand persons demon-

strated in Toulouse. Monitors of the CGT intervened to prevent students from displaying black flags.

At Bordeaux about 10,000 persons marched. A scuffle reportedly took place between union monitors and a group of students who attempted to join the demonstration.

In a March 11 television broadcast, de Gaulle attacked the strike as "a new offensive, led by the same assailants, backed by the same accomplices, using the same means and threatening again to sink money, economy and republic." The following day Information Minister Joel Le Theule announced that the government would insist on its decision to prevent wage increases of more than 4 percent.

De Gaulle's red-baiting charges were refuted and denounced by virtually all opposition political figures and union leaders. The National Teachers Federation [FEN], for example, issued the following statement:

"Once again the chief of state is writing history to suit himself. Once again, he is dividing Frenchmen into two categories. The good Frenchmen are those who follow him blindly. The others, in particular the workers, who demand a better life and want to talk to the government and the employers about this, are accused of endangering the economy and the republic."

Georges Séguy, speaking for the CGT, called de Gaulle's speech "malevolent and gratuitous."

Despite the sharp interchange, the capitalist press noted that the CGT had avoided any real challenge to de Gaulle. The New York Times commented March 12:

"France weathered a 24-hour general strike today in nearly total calm and relatively good humor. Fears subsided that the strike might touch off a wildcat movement like the upheaval of last May....No effort to occupy factories was registered. In sign of relief, the price of gold fell sharply and French stocks rose strongly on the Paris Bourse...."

Le Monde, nevertheless, reported a few small exceptions to this harmonious picture:

"However, a hundred workers at the Renault plant at Havre and several dozen others at the BP [British Petroleum] refinery at Dunkirk have not resumed work. The force with which the unions' orders have been followed in the nationalized sector, education and the PTT [Postes, Télégraphes et Téléphones] expresses the determination of the employees to secure the reopening of the discussions with the 'government-boss.'"

Report from Guatemala

WHERE THE GUERRILLA GROUPS STAND TODAY

By Rudi Fion

Guatemala

November 13, 1960, was the date chosen by a group of young officers to rise up in arms to take power and overthrow General Ydígoras, the president of Guatemala at the time. They were opposed to his government, among other reasons, for having carried out a purge within the army. Three days were sufficient for Ydígoras to crush the rebels, forcing them to take refuge in the neighboring Republic of Honduras.

In 1961 some of these officers returned to Guatemala, determined to continue the struggle. They were aware that they would have to fight not only the Ydígoras regime but also Yankee imperialism. This lesson had already been learned during the 1960 uprising.

The guerrilla struggle began in Guatemala with the help of the PGT [Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo -- Guatemalan Labor party (the Communist party)] and the student vanguard. During March and April of 1962 they precipitated a crisis in the government, compelling it to replace its civilian cabinet with one composed entirely of military men.

The revolutionary organization was consolidated later, in December of that year. Marco Antonio Yon Sosa was named Comandante en Jefe [Commander in Chief] and Luis Augusto Turcios Lima was named Comandante. Three guerrilla fronts were planned: one in the western mountains of the country (San Marcos); another in the Granadillo Mountains (Zacapa); and a third in the Sierra del Mico (Izabal).

In 1962, the Posadistas [followers of Juan Posadas], who had usurped the name of the Fourth International, appeared on the scene in Guatemala. Winning Yon Sosa's confidence, they contributed positive and negative elements to the Guatemalan revolutionary movement.

On the one hand, they oriented us toward a program of socialist revolution; and, on the other, they argued for the inevitability of a nuclear world war and advanced all kinds of sectarian concepts. This provoked the separation of Compañero Turcios Lima, who held that the road to power lay in a prolonged people's war.

On May 15, 1966, a public document was issued by the Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre [MR-13], signed by Yon Sosa, in which we announced the expul-

sion of the Posadistas from our ranks.* The Posadistas had been previously expelled from the Fourth International (1962) because of their flagrant violations of the principles of democratic centralism. Now in the case of their expulsion from the MR-13, the reason was their mishandling of MR-13 funds. They appropriated 20,000 quetzales [1 quetzal = US\$1] without authorization from Comrade Yon Sosa. The Posadas group intended to use this in other countries.

The MR-13 document cited above explained: "In brief the reason why the defendants were submitted to trial was the disloyal, opportunistic and premeditated way in which, taking advantage of the confidence placed in them by the Party, they utilized our resources. At no time were they accused of diverting funds for their personal benefit; and there was complete clarity about this in the Court. In their defense, no matter how they tried, they could not distort the facts...THE MR-13 ...REAFFIRMS ITS UNSWERVING DECISION TO CONTINUE ARMED STRUGGLE FOR THE PROGRAM OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION."

Thus it is clear that the MR-13 was able to extract what little good there was in the Posadista line, while it threw out all its dogmas and sectarian concepts. This experience also shortened the time which, under other conditions, would have been required to develop our program of socialist revolution as the banner of struggle of the MR-13.

With the opening of 1968, the people of Guatemala, as well as revolutionists throughout the world, heard the apparently good news that the Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes [FAR] and the MR-13 had been consolidated into a single organization. This news was published in a bulletin signed by Yon Sosa and César Montes (for the MR-13 and the FAR, respectively). The organization was to be named the Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes; its commanding officers would be the two compañeros mentioned above, in that order. A single political-military line would be established, as well as a single strategic conception of the development of revolutionary war. However, one could observe in these statements the absence of a program of struggle, the empiricism involved and the lack

*For the text of this and related documents, including a statement by the Posadistas on their position, see World Outlook (now Intercontinental Press), July 15, 1966, p. 28.

of political maturity of the comrades in the leadership.

When this bulletin was published, the most surprised were the militants of the MR-13, because we were completely unaware of the decision and because we believe in and practice democratic centralism. We therefore witnessed with sadness how our leadership had taken an enormous step backward, abandoning an entire organizational structure, an entire program of socialist revolution, to fall in with another organization that had no program or clearly defined political line.

In a meeting held somewhere in rebel territory, Comrade Yon Sosa addressed three of our comrades as follows: "Three possible roads are open to you. You can go to the mountains as combatants in the People's Army in process of organization. You can stay in the city to set off bombs; or, finally, you can abandon the Guatemalan revolutionary movement in case you don't approve of these new forms of struggle."

Our compañeros explained that they were not in favor of the unification and that they would consult the rank and file before making any decision. They added that "although we don't want the enemy to deal you a setback, we are convinced that that is what is going to happen in view of the existing conditions and the mistaken attempt to try to create a people's army to meet the enemy in open combat, knowing full well that the enemy is tremendously superior in weapons and number of men; also in view of the inapplicability and antirevolutionary character of terrorism as a form of struggle, and the lack of a program."

As a result of this situation, meetings were held in all the cells of the MR-13, and general agreement was reached on issuing a communiqué based on the following points:

(1) To oppose the "unification," which was correctly characterized as a fusion in which the FAR absorbed a group from the MR-13.

(2) To affirm our decision to continue the struggle, furthering the program of socialist revolution.

(3) To continue to call our organization the Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre.

It was also decided to republish the movement's program, better known as the "Declaration of the Sierra de las Minas," to seek the necessary international solidarity to be able to face the class enemy, and to collaborate with other revolutionists so as to struggle against imperialism on a worldwide scale.

Unfortunately, a series of setbacks (without tragic consequences) have hampered the full realization of the above objectives. But we are in process of reorganizing and this will soon be a reality.

It requires no genius to note the fact that the guerrillas and the Guatemalan revolutionary movement in general are undergoing an acute crisis at present, one made worse by the famous "unification" and its erroneous "forms of struggle." Compañeros like Randolpho Vásquez, Nestor Valle, Camilo Sánchez and others have fallen, and the revolutionary movement of our country has been split up even more.

One sector of the PGT is presently working more or less in agreement with a group from the old FAR who are against the "unification."

Another group from the PGT has tried to work jointly with us (but this has not succeeded).

Then there is also the new (united) FAR.

In the course of time, events have attested to the validity of the MR-13 program. We can cite the following items:

- Our breaking of relations with the PGT -- before the FAR did.
- We had a clear idea of the nature of the PGT, and we made it public.
- Notwithstanding the barrage of criticisms from the compañeros in the FAR, we unfurled the banner of the program of socialist revolution before the Cuban leadership did.

We are witnessing the crisis we predicted in relation to the unfeasibility of a prolonged people's war, of a people's army, and of terrorism as substitutes for a program that can win the support of the working people.

We have learned that the masses are not brought together by a man, by a leader, but rather by a program that is adjusted to the needs and aspirations of the people; in this case, a program of socialist revolution. We wish to make clear, however, that we are not at odds with Comrade Yon Sosa, but rather have political differences which are not sufficiently great as to put us at odds. On the contrary, we maintain the hope that we can unify our forces in the near future without any further deterioration in relations.

In conclusion, we wish to state

that the MR-13 continues to carry forward a program of genuine socialist revolution in spite of the multiple problems facing us, and that the future will reveal to the world proletariat, and in particular to the oppressed people of Guatemala, the

real vanguard of the revolution.

Workers, students, peasants, to arms!

February 1969

MILITANT ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION IN BRUSSELS

Thousands of militant students and young workers gave a new combative character to the annual antiwar demonstration in Brussels March 9. The demonstration was also distinguished by the clear way it focused protest against NATO and the Vietnam war.

The political spectrum of participation was very broad, including representatives of the Belgian Communist and Socialist parties, peace groups, various Maoist groups, student rebels, and revolutionary socialists. Delegations from several other European countries also marched in the demonstration, including groups from Spain, Greece, and Turkey. This year a group of Palestinian freedom fighters joined the demonstration.

All of the participants marched behind the militant official slogans of the demonstration: "Withdraw Foreign Troops from Vietnam and Czechoslovakia!" "Foreign Bases Out of Belgium!" Other slogans prevalent on the march were "Withdraw from NATO, Drive Out SHAPE!" "The NLF [National Liberation Front of South Vietnam] Will Win!" "Support the Just Struggle of the Palestinian People!" Again and again demonstrators began singing the "Internationale."

Unlike previous years, the demonstration began with a mass meeting featuring a wide range of speakers. Many militant speeches gave a strong send-off to the march through Brussels.

Despite heavy concentrations of Belgian security forces along the parade route -- especially around the American embassy and on the road leading to SHAPE headquarters -- no serious clashes between police and demonstrators were reported.

The big Belgian capitalist papers differed widely the day after the demonstration in their estimates of the number of participants. De Standaard claimed barely 4,000 -- a disastrous decline from "a few years ago" when "a similar demonstration numbered 20,000 participants."

Vooruit set the number at 14,000. The right-wing Brussels paper La Libre Belgique made no estimate of its own but noted that the police had estimated

10,000 and the organizers of the demonstration 20,000.

All the papers agreed, however, that the young demonstrators had lent this year's march a revolutionary tone. The reactionary Flemish paper De Standaard said the march had become "an entire Communist demonstration."

The night of March 8, 1,500 young revolutionists from all over Belgium and most of Western Europe had promised that the peace march would be "something different from a traditional procession." They met at the University of Brussels under auspices of the Belgian Jeunes Gardes Socialistes [Socialist Young Guard] to discuss "the concrete development of international struggle against the capitalist system."

Representatives of a large number of revolutionary organizations addressed the assembly from a stage backed by a huge banner bearing the slogan "The Duty of Every Revolutionary Is to Make the Revolution" as well as portraits of Marx, Lenin, and Trotsky.

The meeting opened with the reading of telegrams of support from revolutionary youth organizations in Canada, the United States, and Japan.

The first speaker was Ernest Mandel, the editor of the Belgian revolutionary socialist weekly La Gauche and a member of the Confédération Socialiste des Travailleurs [Socialist Workers Confederation]. The discussion was concluded with a speech by Mattieu Desclin, the national secretary of the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes.

The speakers included a leader of the German SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- Socialist German Student League]; Daniel Bensaid, a founder of the March 22 Movement in France; and Peter Camejo, a leader of the Socialist Workers party of the United States and one of the leaders of the Berkeley student movement.

The speakers said that the struggle against NATO was one of the keys to defeating international capitalism and advancing the world socialist revolution.

From Czechoslovakia

THE CASE FOR WORKERS SELF-MANAGEMENT

[In their congress in Prague the first week of March, the Czechoslovak trade unions continued to press the demands that put them in the forefront of the struggle for workers democracy even before Novotny's fall. This congress, which Radio Prague called "the most democratic in the history of the revolutionary trade-union movement," passed resolutions calling for trade-union independence and the establishment and extension of workers councils in the factories.

[A lengthy "theoretical" article in Pravda denouncing "anarcho-syndicalism" was timed to coincide with the opening of the Czechoslovak trade-union congress. This article, published March 4, denied that workers have a right to strike or to organize independent unions in workers states, condemning the opposite view as "anarchist." Pravda leveled an especially strong attack on workers control of the factories.

[Pravda's anonymous "theoretician" wrote: "Turning over the plants to the ownership and exclusive management of the crew of producers would mean undermining democratic centralism in the operation of socialist governments. It would in fact destroy the major advantage of socialism over capitalism which flows from collective ownership of the means of production -- the possibility for planned development of the economy. This would mean a return to dependence on natural forces, to competition, creating imbalances, crises, to unemployment, etc. The transformation of the productive crews into owners would lead to the breakdown of the main economic basis of socialism -- nationalized property, to the growth of local egotism, to the interests of certain regions predominating over national interests. All this would undermine the leading role of the party and the socialist government. It would break away the masses of workers from their natural leader -- the Communist party."

[Pravda's "theoretician" was, of course, correct in his estimate that the creation of organs of direct workers democracy controlling the basic units of the economy and society would undermine the "leading role" of the Communist parties as they are now constituted. Such a development would sound the death knell of the privileged bureaucracy and its instrument of rule, the Communist party.

[However, the discussion leading up to this conclusion in the Pravda article did introduce some novel concepts. The idea that direct workers control of the factories could be a step toward cap-

italism hardly jibes with the claim of the bureaucracy that the "stage of communism" has been reached in the Soviet Union. That stage means, according to Marxism, that a classless society has been achieved. Thus, if Pravda is right, communism can spawn a new class society; namely, capitalism, unless the workers are kept under totalitarian control.

[Actually, of course, Pravda was only admitting in its own way that the rule of the bureaucracy is so obnoxious to the workers that giving them any freedom to make their own decisions would be disastrous for the system as it exists now.

[The Czechs replied with considerable wit and sophistication to many such "theoretical" admonitions from Moscow before the August 21 invasion. Unfortunately, the capitulation of the Czech leaders to Soviet pressure in recent months prevents them from speaking out today.

[The following article by František Samalík is a good example of the sort of theoretical defense of workers self-management that was being published before the latest crackdown. It is taken from the November 11 issue of Politika, the former theoretical weekly of the Czechoslovak Communist party. Publication of Politika was suspended with this issue. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

It is as certain as it is natural that not all of us acknowledge "workers self-management" as one of the foundations of our new political orientation. The conservative wing which has so touchingly proclaimed itself to be the true spokesman of the workers and of socialism has done nothing to further workers self-management and has no intention of doing so in the future. The reluctance of the conservatives to accord the workers more freedom of choice and more power in the economy is too well known to surprise anybody.

At bottom the "conservatives" stand for a centralist orientation which would be overturned if the "workers" (which means all employed persons) became self-governing in their plants. A kind of veiled power interest prevails among these conservatives.

Distinct from this strain of opposition to self-management is the technocratic tendency. The technocratically oriented "progressives" put economic ra-

tionality and efficiency ahead of democracy, or at least above democratization. Thus, they also have no enthusiasm for self-management.

Of course, at every stage in the development of our socialist system, everyone has been for "participation of the workers in economic administration." The disputes have been over the extent and forms of such participation. It cannot be said, perhaps, that we lacked inventiveness in seeking forms for such participation. We created an almost wondrous variety of such forms. Unfortunately, we can say with equal certainty that these forms did not permit effective participation by the workers. They were totally dominated by a centralist concept completely averse to the establishment of self-governing social and productive units.

Thus, the concept of self-management was formulated after January essentially to achieve what none of these rich forms of "participation" had -- real social and political elevation of the working class and all the working people and their emancipation from subordination to the economic and administrative apparatus.

No one can deny that the realization of this concept of self-management would mean a radical change in the entire administrative and political system. It would transfer the monopolistic powers of the various apparatuses to the working class and the working people. It would, furthermore, sharply increase the direct influence of the workers in shaping our economic and social life.

It is precisely for this reason that we can regard the idea of self-management as the key element in the post-January policy. It was this element which gave the post-January policy its clear socialist direction, because it was to magnify the economic, political, and organizational role of the working class in an unprecedented way.

All these implications of self-management and other changes (e.g., in the hierarchy of social prestige, a new division of powers among the party, the unions, self-management bodies, etc.) clearly aroused the hesitations characteristic of the post-January development. And it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between conservative and technocratic pressures producing these hesitations. Gradually, however, the idea of self-management -- even if in a form somewhat adapted to technocratic standards -- won acceptance in official documents.

Self-management was accepted, however, with all due caution, or -- as it was euphemistically put -- with technical prudence. It was not accepted as a

political program, as political action through which the working class and the working people should concretely exercise their leadership. This technocratic, or -- if you will -- efficiency-oriented "experimentation" (this word tells the whole story) differed markedly from the Polish democratization of 1956. In Poland the idea of self-management became a reality through the actions of the workers and was officially endorsed only after the fact.

In any case, the experimental introduction of "factory councils" (by now it is apparent that the scope of this experiment was not entirely determined by its official organizers) meant at least that the vague term "participation" acquired more precise contours. Therefore, I was both shocked and surprised when the government declared October 24 that "it is not expedient to extend this experiment" and that "workers participation in economic administration cannot be confined solely to factory councils" because "other forms of workers participation which have proved themselves and been much neglected in the past must be developed."

I can well imagine for whom the extension of factory councils is inexpedient. But I can scarcely imagine that the government means those forces -- at least insofar as I can judge on the basis of its programmatic statements. Perhaps the government is taking into consideration all of the technocratic objections (which are based on economic efficiency). However, it is hardly likely that these objections have become so much more convincing recently or that the experiences up to now have been so negative that they could motivate this surprising decision.

I do not know if there is any relationship between this decision and the politically and ideologically motivated criticisms of self-management which are being pressed on us from abroad (our country also raised such criticisms in the past, apparently on its own initiative, against Poland and Yugoslavia). Most of these critics press on us the view expressed by Bakunin in his remark: "There are perhaps 40,000 Germans. Are all of them to be members of the government?" A great revolutionist answered this argument: "Certainly. Because the government is based on self-governing communes." (Marx, Engels, Works [in Czech], XVIII, p. 648.)

So, in fact, I don't know now what meaning the government has assigned to "workers councils" if it conceives them as something narrower than "workers participation in management." Indeed, the concept "participation" was always criticized precisely because it reduced the

influence of the workers to unreal or only half real forms of expression incapable of greatly changing the social structure in production. Self-management (insofar as it was not to be like the pseudo self-management, or self-management only in petty details, exemplified in capitalist plants) was conceived as transcending "participation." For it put the decision-making power in the hands of today's producers (i.e., their representative bodies) and transforms today's overseers of labor into executors of the will of the self-governing workers.

It would be logical if we said that the concept of "workers councils" cannot be limited to mere "participation." For "participation" is subsumed in self-management. Self-management is the culmination of "participation." In the past, self-management did not have a clear meaning, or -- more precisely -- there was little self-management content in the concept that was held.

While earlier we saw a progressive shift from "participation" to self-management, today -- if in a vague way -- we see a shift in the reverse direction. The reasons for this may be political, ideological, or based on the demands of economic efficiency. Let us hope that we will learn the real reasons as soon as possible. Let us hope further, for the success of this endeavor, that there will be a confrontation of the various positions and lines which will be acceptable to all. I say this because self-management is primarily a matter involving ideological, moral, and ethical choice.

SOVIET DISSIDENTS BEGIN HUNGER STRIKE IN MORDOVIA LABOR CAMP

The writer Yuli Daniel and seven other Soviet dissidents imprisoned in a remote Russian area are reported to have begun a hunger strike March 14. The eight are demanding the right to be designated as political prisoners.

The nonconformist young writers Aleksandr I. Ginzburg and Yuri T. Galanskov are reported to be among the participants. Ginzburg and Galanskov were sentenced to five- and seven-year prison terms respectively on January 12, 1968, for circulating a transcript of Daniel's trial as well as writing for independent clandestine publications.

After they were sentenced, some Soviet papers charged them with espionage and contacts with anti-Soviet émigré organizations, but no such accusations were made in court.*

The government will make its final decision in consultation with the URO [Ustřední Rada Odboru -- Central Trade-Union Council], that is, in consultation with the organization which had a monopoly on "participation" and whose work would be profoundly changed by self-management. I do not mean to suggest that the trade-union heads are hostile to self-management, although it is unlikely that such hostility would not develop among them, perhaps in some even unconscious form.

This, of course, is a rather general statement which does not weigh heavily against the positive attitude toward self-management that exists in the trade-union bodies and the great work for self-management that the trade-union press, and Prace in particular, has done.

Thus, we can assume that the unions and still more the party -- which by the nature of things need not defer so much to the technocratic efficiency arguments -- will enrich the self-management discussion.

We can suppose that they will give more precise formulation to the strivings of the workers and the working people to achieve a more prominent and more important place in government and administration. We can suppose that they will further this quest of the workers and the working people for a place that would enable them to play a fuller role than previously in the social, political, and moral shaping of our era and in the determination of our goals.

The hunger strike was provoked by penalties which were imposed by prison camp authorities on another dissident intellectual, Valery Ronkin. Instead of answering the roll call in the approved form, "Prisoner Ronkin," he replied: "Ronkin, political prisoner." As a result, he was denied visits from relatives. Even in normal circumstances, visits are usually permitted only once a year.

Ronkin, a Leningrad engineer, was arrested in 1965 and sentenced to seven years in prison. He was one of a group charged with putting out the underground journal Kolokol [Bell], named after Aleksandr Herzen's famous journal, the first important opposition journal in Russian.

Moscow, like Washington, does not accord the status of political prisoner to jailed opponents of the regime.

* See "Mrs. Lyudmila I. Ginsburg Protests Slander of Her Son" in World Outlook (now

Intercontinental Press), February 16, 1968, p. 126.



BEATRICE HANSEN

Beatrice Hansen, a member of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers party, died unexpectedly in Los Angeles, California, March 9. The medical report on the exact cause of death is not yet available.

Bea was part of the proletarian core that has sustained and advanced the American Trotskyist movement in face of the greatest objective difficulties since it was founded in 1928.

The youngest of the four children of Raymond and Laura Albro, she was born in Flint, Michigan, September 28, 1925. Both her father and mother were of pioneer families, in America so long that they had lost trace of their country of origin.

At the age of eleven, under the influence of her older sister Genora Johnson (now Dollinger), she joined the Red Falcons of the Socialist party. This was a year or so before the Trotskyists were expelled from that organization by the right-wing leadership.

When the Socialist Workers party was formed in 1938, Bea wanted to sign up as a charter member. The organizer of the Flint branch considered her to be under age and refused to accept her application. She assumed the role of "active sympathizer" until finally, around 1940, she succeeded in battering down the formal barrier.

Bea was really a child of the great depression. What the scourge of unemployment can do to the families of workers, left memories that shaped her forever.

Her mother died in 1948, a victim of cancer. A year later, her father died of a heart attack at the gates of the Buick plant where he worked in the foundry. He had six months to go before reaching sixty-five and the small pension that would have been his.

Bea's hatred of capitalism was ingrained. Equally ingrained was her appreciation of the capacities of the American working class and how this relates to the struggle for socialism.

In 1936 and 1937, Flint saw some of the hardest fought and most decisive sitdown strikes marking the rise of the CIO. Bea was in the thick of it.

Her brother, Jarvis Albro, was a leader of the General Motors strikers. Her brother-in-law Kermit Johnson, a worker in Chevrolet Plant 4, was a strike strategist whose daring brought victory

in the bitter struggle with the giant corporation and the police. Her sister Genora gained national fame as the organizer and leader of the Women's Emergency Brigade that backed the strikers in the plants with the most militant tactics. The bright, extremely courageous little girl, Bea, distributed leaflets, ran supplies -- and sometimes got stuck with baby-sitting for the fighters.

Upon graduating from high school, Bea continued her education in the auto plants of Detroit and in the activities of the revolutionary socialist movement. In her pursuit of an ever deeper understanding of society and its evolution, she was a star student in the classes and schools sponsored by the Socialist Workers party, becoming a capable educator herself.

In the many years Bea spent in the auto plants, she served almost continuously as a steward and became well-known in left-wing circles of the United Auto Workers for her militancy and level-headedness. She could easily have gained a lucrative union post. But she had a higher goal. Her ambition was to become a full-time revolutionist. Like many cadres of the Socialist Workers party, she lived a Spartan life, saving what she could so as to free herself for a period for party work before having to go back on the line.

Bea long ago became recognized in the SWP as one of its most capable organizers. She was especially effective in difficult situations requiring great self-sacrifice and sustained effort, or in sudden openings where tight discipline and energetic action could assure swift gains.

With the radicalization of the campus youth in the past six to eight years, Bea played a stellar role in recruiting the new generation of rebels and integrating them into the party. In fact she directly influenced the personal development of scores of young revolutionists, who are now extending the SWP and the Young Socialist Alliance into new areas.

Besides Detroit, Bea spent many years in party work in New York and Chicago. During the past two years, she served in Los Angeles as secretary to James P. Cannon and as a leading figure in the SWP local there.

Bea did not develop her talents as a writer. She preferred the spoken word. Excellent on the floor, whether in the union or the party, she was most at ease and most powerful and effective in mobilizing workers in action.

She represented the best in the American proletariat. A rare figure today, millions will arise in her image.

PEASANTS IN TURKEY SEIZE STATE LANDS

Peasants in several Turkish villages recently initiated mass seizures of state lands to press their demand for land reform. A report from Istanbul in the March 6 Christian Science Monitor described some of these actions:

"In the village of Gollüce, on the Aegean coast, most of its 700 inhabitants, headed by women holding children in their arms, occupied property belonging to the state treasury. They claimed that the land was farmed by a rich landlady, Mrs. Mesude Evliyazade, an aunt of Adnan Menderes, former Premier who was overthrown by an army coup in 1960 and later executed.

"The peasants said that Mrs. Evliyazade stopped employing them because they had asked for the distribution of the treasury land, and that she brought farmers from other villages to work her land."

The Monitor correspondent quoted a spokesman for the landless peasants:

"The landlady has left us to starve. We have no land and no means to work. The land we occupied belongs to the state. We have more right on it than the lady. We are going to till it and not return it."

In Atalan, another Aegean coast village, some 200 landless agricultural workers seized a tract of state property. They had suffered growing impoverishment because of a shift from cotton to wheat.

The peasants insist their struggle is constitutional. They cite Article 37 of the new constitution which promises land to farmers who are landless or whose land is inadequate to sustain their families. Peasants from Atalan and three nearby villages have issued a joint statement saying they will fight against "the landlords and their collaborators." They call their movement the "constitutional land struggle."

A group of peasants from Odabasi

village in Konya province met with opposition leaders in Ankara recently to protest a landlord's occupation of plots distributed to them by the state. The peasants charged that authorities had stopped distributing land, at the request of the landlord. They said they would occupy the land if it was not returned to them.

Significantly, local authorities have not dared to use force to expel the peasants from the land they have occupied. Thus far there have been no clashes.

The Monitor correspondent noted, "Opposition circles here say this is the first time that the peasants have taken such action and describe it as 'the awakening of the peasantry' in Turkey.

"They say that any move short of land distribution will fail to satisfy the farmers and will lead to more occupation of state land by destitute peasants."

The great majority of Turkey's 32-million population -- 70 percent -- live in the countryside and depend on agriculture for their livelihood. Nearly seven million peasants have no land at all or own plots too small to be viable. The government has not carried out pledges of land reform incorporated in the constitution and in economic development plans.

Premier Suleyman Demirel has refused to consider land distribution. Instead he has proposed an "agricultural reform," promising credit and technical aid but leaving the semifeudal relations in the countryside untouched.

Minister of Agriculture Behri Dagdas has announced that an "agricultural reform bill" will be presented to parliament soon. But he made clear in advance that Turkey's peasants could expect little help from that quarter. Dagdas said the bill would be debated. "But," he added, "we are strongly opposed to a Marxist reform which Socialist countries have been trying to propagate in the developing countries."

DEMAND RISES IN JAPAN TO END USE OF OKINAWA AS U.S. BOMBER BASE

Japan's Premier Eisaku Sato, faced with mounting pressure to seek an end to the continued American occupation of Okinawa, suggested for the first time March 10 that he would oppose the continued deployment of nuclear weapons on U.S. bases if the island were returned to Japan.

Sato's speech, made before a committee of the upper house of the Diet (parliament), created a sensation. The premier, notorious for his servility to Washington, has been a staunch defender of the military alliance between the United States and Japan. He is scheduled to meet Nixon in Washington in November

to negotiate the Okinawa issue.

The March 12 New York Times summarized the points Sato made in his Diet speech, noting that he hedged them "with qualifications":

"Okinawa should be returned to Japan within three to five years.

"When it is returned, unless some special provision is made, the American bases there should be governed by the military security treaty now in existence between Japan and the United States.

"As this treaty has been interpreted by Japan, nuclear warheads are not allowed in Japanese territory. The United States must undertake 'prior consultations' before bringing in such weapons, and Japan will always answer 'no' to such requests. The Sato Cabinet will uphold the three 'nonnuclear principles' -- non-manufacture, nonpossession and nonintroduction of nuclear weapons."

The Times noted, "These comments contrasted markedly with previous statements by the Premier, in which he stressed that Japan could afford to keep nuclear weapons out of the home islands only because the United States had the unrestricted use of military facilities in Okinawa."

Sato announced at the end of January that he would ask Nixon to agree to a definite date for the reversion of Okinawa to Japan. At that time he implied that U.S. bases in Okinawa would be granted a "special" status not permitted to bases in the main Japanese islands. This drew a storm of protest from opposition parties and student organizations.

Sato's latest bid is a gamble aimed at showing that collaboration with Washington can produce results. The premier's popularity has plummeted drastically since he publicly endorsed American aggression in Vietnam following a meeting with former President Johnson in December 1967. Sato had hoped then to secure a pledge for the return of the Ryukyu islands (of which Okinawa is the largest), occupied by the U.S. since the end of World War II. Johnson refused to consider giving up the bases that were even then being used for B-52 bombing raids on South and North Vietnam. He brushed Sato aside with a promise to return the tiny Bonin islands, which play no role in U.S. military deployment.

Now Sato's time is running out. In November, the Socialist and Communist-backed candidate, running on a platform of immediate return of Okinawa to Japan, defeated the candidate of Sato's Liberal Democratic party for chief executive of

the Ryukyus.

General elections are scheduled for sometime this year. Sato has publicly stated that he favors elections in November after his meeting with Nixon. But if Nixon refuses to grant Sato's request, it would mean a serious setback for the Liberal Democrats at the polls.

Nixon has so far refused to commit himself. Okinawa is a virtual American colony, and is a key U.S. military base in the Pacific. In addition to its use for air attacks on Vietnam, nuclear missiles are stockpiled there for possible use against China.

The New York Times reported that "some of Mr. Sato's closest advisers fear that Washington, and particularly the Pentagon, will never accept a nonnuclear, restricted status for military installations in Okinawa....They fear that if Mr. Sato presses Japanese demands too unyieldingly, an emotional confrontation could well up between the Japanese and American peoples [sic] and endanger the whole security treaty structure."

Another major factor operating against Sato is the student movement. Plans have been under way for more than a year to mount massive demonstrations against the renewal of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty scheduled for renegotiation in 1970.

Any indication that the government is planning concessions to Washington on the Okinawa issue could touch off militant protests.

A confrontation is expected in the Diet at the end of March over the question of the examination system in the universities. Student organizations have vowed to disrupt the examinations, which begin soon, in a drive to change the elite and restrictive character of Japanese higher education. Reactionary elements in the Diet have threatened to introduce legislation giving the police sweeping repressive powers to crush the campus protests. The Japan Socialist party has announced that it will fight this restrictive legislation.

The government has hinted that it might use this confrontation to dissolve the lower house of the Diet and call new elections early. This would be to Sato's advantage if he had reason to believe that Nixon had no intention of relinquishing the U.S. grip on the Ryukyus.

In an election held shortly after a "tough" speech in the Diet, Sato might hope to do better than in an election held after returning once again from Washington empty-handed.

PHILIPPINE PRESIDENT MARCOS ACCUSED OF STOCK MANIPULATION

Mass student protests and a teachers' strike in recent months are signs of new social unrest in the Philippines. In the midst of this turmoil, the government found itself involved in a major scandal March 12 when two Senate committees voted to investigate charges that President Ferdinand E. Marcos had violated the anti-graft law in the manipulation of stock.

The year has already proved to be a stormy one for Marcos. On January 27, as he delivered his state of the nation message to the Philippine Congress, 6,000 students gathered outside to denounce him and his administration for graft and corruption. Three days before, some 5,000 students stoned the administration building of the University of the Far East in Manila. They were protesting exorbitant fees and overcrowding of classes.

The February 25 issue of Laging Una, "Voice of the Filipino People," reported a one-day strike by some 13,000 Manila public school teachers January 20. Ninety-four elementary and high schools with an enrollment of 275,000 students were affected.

The teachers were protesting the failure of the government to pay their salaries on time. The strike was sparked when the teachers did not receive their pay on January 15. Marcos himself intervened, ordering the payment of current wages. Another grievance that has not yet been settled is the failure of the Manila city government to disburse salary increases due as far back as July 1967. The teachers have threatened to strike again if these promised raises are not paid.

The public outcry against government corruption touched off some repercussions in the Philippine Congress. Senator Jovito Salonga accused Marcos of using his public office to make a person-

al profit by delaying a pending merger between Benguet Consolidated, Inc., a Philippine mining company, and the Grand Bahamas Port Authority Ltd., a land and resort developing company that has built gambling casinos in the Bahamas.

Salonga in a March 10 speech contended that "the unprecedented and unusual action of the President in directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to suspend action on the Benguet-Bahama stock swap placed him in a position to manipulate the movement of stock on the market."

He accused Marcos of "having a material interest in that he is the biggest creditor of the estate of Mrs. Idonah Slade Perkins, whose only asset is 33,002 shares in Benguet." Salonga said Marcos expected to collect a good part of the stock in payment for attorneys' fees against the Perkins estate.

The March 13 New York Times said Marcos was also accused of having "caused the remittance of \$4.7-million to two of his friends who bought Benguet stock in the United States during fluctuations prior to approval" of the merger.

The Philippine Securities and Exchange Commission, apparently under pressure from capitalist interests that did not stand to gain from the stock manipulation, granted conditional approval in January to the merger that Marcos had tried to postpone.

Marcos issued a statement March 12 expressing his "desire" to waive his immunity from lawsuits "if I could do so legally" to allow an inquiry into the charges. He added that he had asked the Secretary of Justice to give him a legal opinion on such a waiver.

SLUM DWELLERS CLASH WITH POLICE IN CHILE

Five persons were killed and thirty-seven wounded, five of them severely, in a clash between slum dwellers and police in the small southern Chilean city of Puerto Montt March 10.

Police attacked and fired on more than 1,000 inhabitants of the shanty belt around the town when they tried to set up homes on land owned by the municipality.

Puerto Montt, with a population of about 20,000, is located approximately

700 miles south of Santiago de Chile.

Among those arrested in the police charge was Luis Espinosa, a Socialist alderman elected March 2. The undersecretary of state for interior affairs has accused Espinosa of being the "instigator" of the occupation and of leading "armed brigades."

An air-force colonel has been named governor of Puerto Montt. The undersecretary of state declared, according to Agence France-Presse March 10, that if the disturbances continued, a state of emergency might be declared in the town.

MARIETTA CAGANG: "WE WERE TAUGHT TO HELP THE PEOPLE"

[The following report appeared in the February 25 issue of Laging Una, "Voice of the Filipino People," published in Los Angeles, California.]

* * *

Self-assured and not at all inclined to apologize for her role as a warrior in the fighting ranks of the insurgent Huks, a 15-year-old girl, captured Jan. 9 in an encounter between Philippine government forces and Huks in Bataan province, declared she was proud of her comrades-in-arms.

In the battle at Sibul village, town of Orani, 16 Huks were killed. Among them were Marietta Cagang's husband Eddie Parangao, and her grandfather, Fermin Tolentino, known in the guerrilla ranks as Commander Cavitenio.

Marietta was taken to Constabulary headquarters at Camp Olivas, Pampanga. She talked with newsmen Jan. 12 and, unexpectedly, with President Marcos, who evidently was curious about the character and attitude of so youthful a rebel girl. During World War II Marcos had engaged in guerrilla warfare against the Japanese.

"I do not know what other people think of them," said Marietta during a two-and-a-half-hour interview, "but I am proud of them and the HMB (Hukbong Mapagpalayan Bayan, or Army of National Liberation)."

She admitted crying, when alone, as she thought of her slain husband, grandfather and other casualties, including the head of her group, Efren Lopez, known as Commander Freddie.

Marietta said in answer to questions: "I do not believe we did anything wrong. We never took advantage of the poor. We were taught about the revolution of the masses but we did not ask them to take up arms. We were told that our strength would be in our numbers. We were told that we probably now have 10 million sympathizers."

"We were taught to help the people," the young captive continued, "That was our policy. We were instructed to converse with the people, to help mothers

take care of their children."

Marietta told of her childhood. "When I was seven years old I wanted to be a secret agent. It seemed exciting until my uncle, who was a government secret agent, was killed. Then I wanted to become a nurse. But I changed my mind when I discovered I could not stand the sight of blood. Now I dream of becoming a teacher."

Telling of some of her experiences on the guerrilla trail, Marietta said: "We listened to Radio Peking on a transistor radio that we kept in our knapsack. There is a woman and a man who broadcast in Tagalog."

The prisoner spoke in that language throughout the interview, saying she had been taught that English is a foreign language and that they should speak "only what is our dialect, be it Tagalog, Pampango, Visayan or Ilocano."

Marietta said she met her 18-year-old husband, who was killed in the Jan. 9 clash, at the tailor shop of her uncle in Hermosa, Bataan. Eddie Parangao "was neither good-looking nor ugly, but I liked his character."

"We were married by Ka Robert (Felix Mundala, or Commander Robert) on Aug. 25, 1968, at Mount Mulawin in Orani. All those present fired once in the air."

During the encounter that led to her capture, Marietta said she fired a carbine once, "but I did not aim at anybody. We were taught how to cock the gun, release the safety, and to pull the trigger, but we had no target practice."

President Marcos asked the girl if the Huks would surrender if he granted an amnesty. She replied that she didn't know how they would respond to such an offer. The President then asked why the Huks had been "liquidating" people like Mayor Levi Panlilio of San Fernando and Mayor Joaquin Pineda of Santo Tomas. Marietta said she knew nothing about these killings.

Assuming a pose of paternal concern, Marcos said he would probably ask his wife "what I should do with you. We shall see how we can help you. Perhaps we can see that you go back to school."

ANOTHER "PLOT" AGAINST BARRIENTOS

At a press conference held in La Paz March 8, Minister of the Interior David Fernandez announced discovery of another "plot" against President Barrientos. Fourteen rifles and a machine gun

had been found in the home of Salustio Choque, one of Che Guevara's guerrilla comrades, he said. Nine persons connected with the Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista had been arrested.

Solzhenitsyn's New Novel

OF SHARKS, PIRATES, COPYRIGHTS, AND BUREAUCRATS

By George Saunders

[Continued from last issue.]

Cancer Ward is available now in two rival paperback editions, both for \$1.25. One is the Rebecca Frank translation I have quoted from in this review, published by Dell; the other is a translation by Nicholas Bethell and David Burg, published by Bantam.

Once again, as in the case of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and other "controversial" Soviet works, we are treated to the spectacle of publishing sharks snapping and tearing at each other over exclusive right to fat morsels from pirated editions. Meanwhile, according to Solzhenitsyn, the Soviet bureaucrats (whose refusal to publish the novel in the USSR made it so controversial in the first place) are chiding him with "supporting capitalism" because he does not collect royalties on these editions -- ones that he never authorized and that he has specifically denounced. (Of course, if he did collect, he'd be a "paid agent of bourgeois ideology.")

The Dell edition is the better translation, in my opinion, though both are "spoiled by haste," as Solzhenitsyn predicted in protesting the pirating. The Dell translation still has many rough spots but the power of the original comes through.

The Bantam edition is valuable for a different reason. As a gimmick to put it ahead of the Dell edition, its editor printed a number of documents besides the novel itself. These include protest letters by Solzhenitsyn concerning not only this novel but previous works and controversies around the Soviet novelist as well.

Ever since Solzhenitsyn appeared on the Soviet literary scene with his powerful account of life in Stalin's camps, he has been a bone in the throat for the apparatchiks.

The 1961 publication of Ivan Denisovich provoked a wide and deep discussion and had repercussions so harmful to the bureaucratic regime that a campaign had to be launched against "bourgeois ideology" within a month of its printing. Khrushchev himself publicly complained about the flood of manuscripts on "the camp theme" that poured into the publishing houses.

Other, shorter works by this writer, in 1962-1964, provoked sharp polemics between pro- and anti-Stalinists. In particular For the Good of the Cause, which was about a group of students who enthusiastically built their own school facilities, contributing volunteer labor, only to have them taken over by a powerful local official to get a feather in his own cap.

Around early 1965, a de facto ban on Solzhenitsyn's works went into effect, simultaneously with tendencies to rehabilitate Stalin and to curb the critical intelligentsia generally.

In May 1967, at the Writers Union congress, Solzhenitsyn issued an open letter protesting not only the censorship that stifles Soviet literature overall but also the fact that his own work was being "smothered, gagged, and slandered." Unpublished works of his had been seized, he charged; published works were not being reprinted; new works were being refused publication; and a slander campaign on the part of officials and secret police was being waged against him.

He repeated these charges and elaborated on them in another letter September 12, 1967.*

The Bantam paperback of Cancer Ward has its own translations of these two documents in the front of the book. In the back are other documents, previously not widely available either. The most important of these is a record of a meeting of the Secretariat of the Board of the Soviet Writers Union in which Solzhenitsyn participated, on the subject of his writings and protest letters, to which we shall return.

In both his letters Solzhenitsyn, among other things, protested the refusal to publish Cancer Ward although it had been "approved for publication by the prose department of the Moscow writers' organization" and "the magazine Novy Mir would like to publish it but has not received the necessary authorization."

* For a summary of the open letter of May and of the text of the later one of September 12 (mistakenly dated December 10), see World Outlook (now Intercontinental Press), June 30, 1967, p. 651, and February 16, 1968, p. 129).

The harassment of Solzhenitsyn became a major issue after his May letter. An important section of the Soviet intelligentsia pressed for publication of his works, especially of Cancer Ward. Alexander Tvardovsky, editor of the liberal monthly Novy Mir and former alternate member of the party's Central Committee, played a leading role in this effort.

For several months the party tops wavered (as later they did over Czechoslovakia). Tvardovsky's Novy Mir set the novel in galleys, and waited for official word. Meanwhile, private copies of the book circulated by the thousands.

Such unofficial circulation, called samizdat ("self-publication"), has been a major target of the official tightening-up in recent years. One of the many dissidents arrested over the past year, Ilya Burmistrovich, a mathematician about 30, is accused of playing a major role in this kind of clandestine publishing.

The intent of Solzhenitsyn's September letter was precisely to warn that unless official publication was carried through, such unauthorized versions would inevitably reach the West and be published there first.

In December 1967, apparently, publication of Cancer Ward was finally vetoed (the same month, incidentally, that the Kremlin bureaucracy's troubles with Czechoslovakia began in earnest).

After that, Solzhenitsyn appealed to Western publishers not to print the book, warning that the KGB, the Soviet secret police, was interested in having that happen so as to discredit him as "pro-Western." The possible role of the notorious Victor Louis in getting a copy to the West for the KGB is suggested in another Solzhenitsyn letter printed in the Bantam edition.

In a further letter, which appeared on June 4, 1968, in the Italian Communist paper L'Unità, and on June 14, 1968, in the Moscow Literaturnaya Gazeta, Solzhenitsyn denounced the fact that his writings were being made "the plunder of foreign publishing houses" instead of being printed in his own country. He also wrote, "I do not recognize as legal any publication of this novel without my authorization...and I do not grant the copyright to anyone," commenting sarcastically that publishers were "already fighting over the copyright....despite the fact that the author is still living."

"I already know from my own experience that all the translations of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich were spoiled by haste. Evidently the same fate awaits Cancer Ward as well. But besides money, there is literature."

Bantam Books has had the unscrupulous gall to print these statements, which were aimed at its own plundering, pilfering, and blind money-grubbing, among others, and then to declare that the "front and back matter of [the] American edition" is copyrighted. Solzhenitsyn's denunciations of their violation of copyright are copyrighted by them. Perhaps they did not understand what those money-earning words they printed meant? Such is the power of the commodity fetish.

But to return to the notes of the session of the Writers Union Secretariat, in which we find perhaps the most distinctive contributions to critical appraisal of Cancer Ward, in the form of brutal, bureaucratic digs at Solzhenitsyn himself. (I have followed the Bantam wording in the following quotes, though other presumably "copyright" versions are available.)

The session, chaired by the head of the Writers Union, Konstantin Fedin, was convened on September 22, 1967, to take up Solzhenitsyn's protests of May and September 12.

Some of the choice remarks by the various "secretaries" of the Union could have come right out of the mouth of Rusanov. For example, one hack writer, Kozhevnikov, complains that the novel has a "feeling of vengeance for past suffering."

"Cancer Ward evokes revulsion from the abundance of naturalism, from the surfeit of all manner of horrors. All the same, its basic orientation is not medical, but rather social...And it is apparently from this that the title of the work is derived." He felt the novel still required "further work."

Ozerov said the novel should be printed only if corrected and the corrections discussed. The sum of suggested corrections during the course of the session would have resulted in a total rewrite. For example, "Most objectionable is the penchant for sloganeering and caricatures. I would ask that quite a number of things be deleted, things which we simply do not have time to discuss now. [Clearly, every caricature of bureaucrats or the bureaucratic set-up.] The philosophy of moral socialism does not belong merely to the hero. One senses that it is being defended by the author. This cannot be permitted."

Surkov declared that the mood "Be damned, the whole lot of you!" pervades Cancer Ward. "Having suffered so much, you had a right to be angry as a human being, Alexander Isaevich, but after all you are also a writer! I have known Communists who were sent to camps, but this in no measure affected their world-view."

No, your story does not approach fundamental problems in philosophical terms, but in political terms.

"If Cancer Ward were to be published it would be used against us, and it would be more dangerous than Svetlana's memoirs....Of course, our reader is now so developed and so sophisticated that no measly little book is going to alienate him from Communism. All the same, the works of Solzhenitsyn are more dangerous to us than those of Pasternak: Pasternak was a man divorced from life, while Solzhenitsyn, with his animated, militant, ideological temperament, is a man of principle."

Riurikov demanded Solzhenitsyn renounce "the title of 'standard-bearer of Russian realism.'"

Baruzdin, aside from objecting to the "naive and primitive" depictions of Stalin, Abakumov, and Poskrebyshev in Solzhenitsyn's other novel, First Circle, branded Cancer Ward an "anti-humanitarian work. The end of the story leads to the conclusion that 'a different road should have been taken.'"

Abdumomunov argued, "If we publish Cancer Ward, there will be more commotion and harm than there was from his first letter to the congress...In the story there are the Rusanovs and the great martyrs from the camp -- but is that all? And where is Soviet society? One shouldn't lay it on so thick and make the story so gloomy. There are many tedious passages, twists and turns, and naturalistic scenes -- all these should be eliminated."

Brovka: "The people have already seen through Svetlana's notes -- that fishwife twaddle -- and are laughing at them. But before us stands a generally acknowledged talent, and therein lies the danger of publication...Cancer Ward is too gloomy and should not be printed."

Yashen: "The author is not tortured by injustice; he is rather poisoned by hatred....I would like to propose his expulsion from the Union....As for the siege of Leningrad, he now blames 'still others' besides Hitler. Whom? We don't know. Is it Beria? Or today's outstanding leaders? [!] He should speak out plainly."

Kerbabaev: "Everyone is a former prisoner, everything is gloomy, there is not a single word of warmth...Why does the author see only the black? Why don't I write about the black? I always strive to write only about joyful things."

Sharipov: "...expel him from the Union...let him repudiate Cancer Ward."

Novichenko, one of the worst of the "neo-Stalinist" hacks, objected to

the novel's "base interference in our literary life -- the caricatured scene with Rusanov's daughter, which is not congruent with our literary traditions." He also observed that "moral socialism is the negation of Marxism-Leninism"; and he concluded: "Even if this novel were put into some kind of shape, it would not be a novel of socialist realism, but only an ordinarily competent work."

Under this barrage, the liberal writers -- in the minority in the top bodies of the Union -- were not very outspoken, although Tvardovsky insisted he could work with Solzhenitsyn to edit the novel into acceptable shape. (To Tvardovsky's credit, after the final refusal to print Cancer Ward, he himself sent a protest letter to Fedin totally supporting Solzhenitsyn's protests and urged reversal of the decision. Publication of Cancer Ward, said Tvardovsky, "in itself would be a literary event to the indisputable benefit of Soviet literature; it would remove the atmosphere of gloomy silence.")

An interesting example of how the liberal writers behaved when their left wing, Solzhenitsyn, was under attack were the comments of the liberal Salynsky:

"I shall speak of Cancer Ward. I believe that it should be printed -- it is a vivid and powerful work. To be sure, it contains descriptions of disease in pathological terms, and the reader involuntarily develops a phobia about cancer -- a phobia which is already widespread in our century. Somehow this aspect of the book should be eliminated. The caustic, topical-satirical style should also be eliminated. Another negative feature is that the destinies of almost all the characters are connected with the concentration camp or with camp life in one form or another. This may be all right in the case of Kostoglotov or Rusanov, but why does it have to be applied to Vadim, to Shulubin, and even to the soldier? At the very end we learn that he is no ordinary soldier from the army, that he is a camp guard. Still, the basic orientation of the novel is to discuss the end of the difficult era of our past.

"And now a few words about moral socialism, a concept expounded in the novel. In my opinion, there is nothing bad about this. It would be bad if Solzhenitsyn were preaching amoral socialism. If he were preaching national socialism or the Chinese version of national socialism -- it would have been bad. Each person is free to form his own ideas on socialism and its development. I personally believe that socialism is determined by economic laws. But of course there is room for argument. Why not print the story then?" Salynsky also called upon the Secretariat to issue a statement

refuting the slanders against Solzhenitsyn.

Even if in a confused way, Salynsky is interested in a discussion on the issues raised by the novel, and considers them important. Here we see a germ of the kind of political education that could have resulted from the book's appearance in the Soviet Union. A greater extension of free speech and of the press would have resulted, another step toward workers democracy, giving more elbow room to organize a movement to oust the bureaucratic usurpers.

In discussing "morality," perhaps a truly Marxist view of the question might have been brought forth, such as Trotsky's in Their Morals and Ours. Moral,

said Trotsky, is whatever leads "to the increase of the power of man over nature and to the abolition of the power of man over man."

Likewise, Trotsky described the components of revolutionary morality as those means which "unite the revolutionary proletariat, fill their hearts with irreconcilable hostility to oppression, teach them contempt for official morality and its democratic echoers, imbue them with consciousness of their own historic mission, raise their courage and spirit of self-sacrifice in the struggle." Solzhenitsyn's writings are very much in that spirit.

[End.]

AUSTRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY HAILS "CANCER WARD"

Weg und Ziel [Way and End], the theoretical monthly of the Austrian Communist party featured a review of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's book Cancer Ward in its January issue. This book has not yet received much attention in the press of the Communist parties. It is to be hoped that the Austrian CP periodical has broken the ice on this subject.

The Weg und Ziel review is not a bad start toward a socialist and realist appraisal of Solzhenitsyn's book. It begins by acknowledging the great artistic truth and worth of this work: "As soon as you have read the first few pages of this book, you realize that a great writer is at work. Every century has only a few writers of such stature. Every figure lives its own full-blooded life and is palpably alive."

Although realism is the official literary canon in the Soviet Union, it is seldom to be found in the works the bureaucracy allows to be published. The official realism is only cardboard decoration for the bureaucratic system. Weg und Ziel's reviewer finds this unusual quality, genuine realism, in Solzhenitsyn's book:

"And we learn something else from Solzhenitsyn -- that form is not the decisive thing but rather the creator and artist who stands behind this form. Solzhenitsyn is a realist. One is almost tempted to say -- a realist of the old school. He portrays everything precisely and in detail."

Many members of the official Communist parties, while aware of the bureaucratic distortions in Soviet life, prefer to close their eyes to them. This fear of facing reality can be exploited by unscrupulous bureaucrats. Pravda's editor Zim-

yanin attacked Solzhenitsyn in these terms in October 1967: "His works are directed against the Soviet government. He can see nothing in it but ulcers and tumors; he is incapable of seeing the positive things in our society."* Similar accusations have appeared in the world Communist press and seem to be believed by some sincere Communists.

The reviewer in Weg und Ziel, however, was sensitive enough to perceive the revolutionary morality and hopefulness in Solzhenitsyn's book: "We are confronted with an unvanquished past [Stalinism], which is successfully -- all too successfully resisting being overcome.... And at the same time we come to know men whose spiritual purity and strength inspires and sustains our faith in a human future -- even if it is still not near enough to touch."

If Solzhenitsyn's penetrating sketch shows some elements of Soviet society in an unflattering light, his book nonetheless offers strong testimony in many respects to the underlying strength of the ideals held by the founders of the Soviet Union.

"This is not the first time that a great critically minded Russian writer has done more for the honor of his homeland than the many petty bearers of incense pots."

It is "disturbing," the Austrian Communist reviewer writes, "that this novel of Solzhenitsyn's -- and not only this one -- has not yet been published in the Soviet Union."

* See "Editor of Pravda Denounces Solzhenitsyn" in World Outlook (now Intercontinental Press), February 16, 1968, p. 128.

BACHMANN SENTENCED FOR ATTEMPT TO ASSASSINATE RUDI DUTSCHKE

The trial of Josef Bachmann, who attempted to assassinate Rudi Dutschke, began in Berlin March 5. Hearings opened almost exactly eleven months after Bachmann fired three shots at Dutschke on West Berlin's Kurfürstendamm April 11, 1968, gravely wounding the revolutionary German student leader.

Dutschke survived but lost 30 percent of his vision as a result of a bullet that lodged in his brain. The attempted assassination came at the height of a red-baiting campaign conducted by the yellow press against the student movement. The students responded by massive demonstrations against the Springer monopoly which controls most of West Germany's mass-circulation publications.

Bachmann admired "strong" historical personalities such as Hitler and Napoleon. One theme has been repeated over and over in his varying explanations of his motives. He only did what the majority of right-thinking people desired but did not dare do. "I would like to bet that 70 percent of the population quietly rubbed their hands."

Bachmann admitted the second day of his trial, after denying it at first, that he got most of his information from Bild-Zeitung [Picture Newspaper -- one of the Springer chain]. The slogans of this gutter press clearly affected his testimony.

Dutschke, while still in serious condition, wrote Bachmann: "You wanted to get rid of me, but even if you had, the ruling clique from Kiesinger to Springer to Barzel to Thadden [leader of the neo-Nazis] would have gotten rid of you."

In the style of a yellow-press editorial, Bachmann replied: "If I understand correctly, you and your comrades want to achieve a better system than the present one. But the question then arises, what should that system be and how can you change something that is not about to be changed. The broad strata of the people



RUDI DUTSCHKE

are so content that they have no intention of letting anyone palm anything different off on them."

The court pronounced Bachmann guilty of attempted first-degree murder March 14 and sentenced him to seven years in prison. The verdict said that he had acted from "low personal motives."

NIXON'S MAN GETS HOT RECEPTION IN LIMA

John N. Irwin 2nd, Nixon's special emissary to the junta in Peru, received a hot reception in Lima March 15. Workers marched through the downtown area, shouting "Down with Nixon!"

According to UPI, Nixon sent his representative to smooth over the friction that has arisen between Washington and the junta.

The new government expropriated the holdings of the Rockefeller-owned International Petroleum Corporation and brought the law down on U.S. fishing boats in Peruvian waters.

Nixon's man may succeed in dazzling the junta, but the workers showed that it will not be easy to smooth them over with soft soap and Yankee dollars.

ANALYSIS OF THE CHILEAN ELECTIONS

By José Valdés

Santiago de Chile

prior to the surge of the DC.

Elections were held in Chile March 2 for all seats in the Chamber of Deputies and some of the seats in the Senate. The results are shown in the table below.

From the standpoint of the relationship of class forces, the elections indicate no important changes. The bourgeois parties (the DC, PN, PR, DN) held on to 66% of the vote. The vote of the workers parties (PS, PC, USP) remained at a little over 30%, the usual figure in Chilean elections for some decades.

The Christian Democrats [DC] registered a clear decline. The vote dropped from the 42.3% received in 1965, when the party won dominance in the government, to 31.1%. The DC lost votes among the well-off petty bourgeoisie hit by inflation and rising taxes. The DC also lost votes among the organized factory workers but kept its position among agricultural workers, peasants, and the unorganized workers in the suburban belts around the cities.

The Partido Nacional [PN], the product of a fusion between the Conservadores [Conservatives] and Liberales [Liberals] in 1966, scored a considerable increase -- from 14.3% to 20% -- by appealing to the electorate to take a step toward putting the rightist former President Jorge Alessandri (1948-64) back into office. The well-off petty bourgeoisie responded by returning to their old pattern of voting. Despite its gains, the PN was unable to recover the 30% total it had

The Communist party [PC] vote increased about 2%. The PC gained especially in areas where industrial and mine workers are concentrated. It won a small increase in peasant areas, where its vote, however, still stands at only about 9%.

Despite the 1967 split that gave birth to the Unión Socialista Popular, the Socialist party [PS] held its electoral positions. The Socialists could have won a small increase if they had remained united.

In bourgeois political circles, the results have revived a series of projections for the 1970 presidential elections. The PN has projected the candidacy of Jorge Alessandri, although he has not yet accepted. His candidacy, or possibly that of Felipe Herrera, can count on sympathetic support from the Yankee imperialists.

The PC has stepped up its campaign for a new popular front that would include the Radicals and "rebel" Christian Democrats (not the dominant faction) to whom it is appealing. Up to now the Socialists have rejected participating in a new popular front. But there are right and center wings in the PS which are ready to accept such a front, above all if the candidate is a Socialist. The "rebel" sectors in the DC have publicly declared their willingness to participate with the Communists and Socialists in a front supporting a joint candidate against Alessandri "to prevent the return of the right." The center tendency in the

	<u>1961</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>Total 1969</u>
Partido Demócrata Cristiano [Christian Democrats]	15.4%	42.3%	35.6%	31.1%	710,064
Partido Nacional [Nationalist party]	30.4	12.5	14.3	20.0	477,112
Partido Comunista [Communist party]	11.4	12.4	14.8	16.6	380,721
Partido Radical [Radical party -- liberals]	21.4	13.3	16.1	12.9	307,126
Partido Socialista [Socialist party]	10.7	10.3	13.9	12.8	292,954
Unión Socialista Popular [People's Socialist Union]	--	--	--	2.2	51,629
Partido Democrático Nacional [National Democrats]	6.9	3.2	2.4	1.9	44,564
Blank and Void Ballots	3.3	3.0	2.2	4.2	101,305
Abstentions*	25.5	19.4	23.7	26.4	856,876

* Not counted in figuring percentages of votes cast.

DC is pressing for a purely DC candidate, who would not be expressly backed by the PC but who would "accept" their votes. The national convention of the DC next June will sharpen the internal crisis in this party, already accelerated by its setback in the election.

From now until the September 1970 elections, all these parties will try to

divert the discontent of the masses into parliamentary channels. But this will not eliminate the social struggles that will take place in the coming months over the rising cost of living and declining buying power despite wage increases. The analysis of the economic situation in Chile and of the trend toward social struggles published in Intercontinental Press December 16, 1968, remains valid.

IRREGULARITIES REPORTED IN IRANIAN TRIAL

Mme. Henri Garidou, the only foreign observer at the February 28 appeal in Teheran of fourteen Iranians convicted of "plotting against state security," told a press conference in Paris -- reported in the March 6 Le Monde -- of numerous irregularities in the hearing of this case. Mme. Garidou went to Teheran as a representative of the Fédération Internationale des Droits de l'Homme [International Human Rights Federation]. She said the trial was held in absolute secrecy. Only two members of each prisoner's family were allowed to attend.

No witnesses were called to support the government's charges. The case rested entirely on reports by the secret political police (Savak). The accused had no freedom to choose their legal representatives. They had to pick three lawyers from a list of thirty-nine retired officers. These lawyers refused to discuss the case with Mme. Garidou, declaring that they themselves were subordinate to the military officers conducting the trial. The prisoners were also denied the jury trial they were entitled to under Article 79 of the Iranian constitution.

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Richard Nixon	281
More of the Same -- Nixon Steps Up the Arms Race -- by Les Evans	282
One-Day General Strike in France	284
Report from Guatemala:	
Where the Guerrilla Groups Stand Today -- by Rudi Fion	286
Militant Antiwar Demonstration in Brussels	288
From Czechoslovakia:	
The Case for Workers Self-Management	289
Soviet Dissidents Begin Hunger Strike in Mordovia Labor Camp	291
PHOTO: Beatrice Hansen	292
Beatrice Hansen	293
Peasants in Turkey Seize State Lands	294
Demand Rises in Japan to End Use of Okinawa as U.S. Bomber Base	294
Philippine President Marcos Accused of Stock Manipulation	296
Slum Dwellers Clash with Police in Chile	296
Marietta Cagang: "We Were Taught to Help the People"	297
Another "Plot" Against Barrientos	297
Solzhenitsyn's New Novel: Of Sharks, Pirates, Copyrights, and Bureaucrats	
-- by George Saunders	298
Austrian Communist Party Hails "Cancer Ward"	301
Bachmann Sentenced for Attempt to Assassinate Rudi Dutschke	302
DRAWING: Rudi Dutschke	302
Nixon's Man Gets Hot Reception in Lima	302
Analysis of the Chilean Elections -- by José Valdés	303
Irregularities Reported in Iranian Trial	304

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

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