



"NATO OUT!" Demonstrators are part of the crowd of 20,000 that marched in Brussels March 9 against the Vietnam war and NATO. Delegations participated from several European countries. Mili-

tant youth succeeded in transforming the traditionally staid anti-nuclear march. Above is one of the banners carried by supporters of the Fourth International.

## Pressure Mounts for U.S. to Get Out of Vietnam

*People's Tribunals Set Up in East Pakistan*

PRESSURE MOUNTS FOR THE U.S. TO GET OUT OF VIETNAM

The spring offensive of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam entered its fifth week March 24. On March 20 the U.S. military command in Saigon released the casualty figures for the first three weeks of the NLF offensive: 1,140 American GI's killed, only 219 less than in the first three weeks of the devastating Tet offensive of last year. The new increment brought the total American deaths in the war of aggression against the people of Vietnam to 33,063, barely less than the Korean war figure of 33,629.

The Nixon administration attempted to decrease the political effect at home of the stunning blows it was receiving on the battlefield. The New York Times revealed a little of this story on March 13 when it reported: "Investigations in the field have indicated in case after case that the intensity and results of the current enemy offensive were understated in communiqués and by official allied spokesmen." But the impact of the casualty statistics went a long way toward dispelling popular illusions that the Paris talks presaged an imminent end to the war.

The findings of a Harris public opinion survey published March 20 showed that 46 percent of those questioned said they were more concerned that "the military fighting in Vietnam come to an end" than that Washington win a "satisfactory political settlement," i.e., a U.S. victory of some sort. Only 24 percent gave priority to a "satisfactory" settlement.

The new rise in public pressure to end the war was reflected in revived activity among Senate "doves." Senators Fulbright, McGovern, Gore and Mathias all took their distance from Nixon in mid-March. Others, like Edward Kennedy, chose a more oblique escape route, to be used if Nixon were to inherit the public anathema that plagued Johnson. They publicly criticized Nixon's decision to build the multibillion-dollar Sentinel antiballistic missile system, while privately hinting that their real target was the Vietnam war planners in the Pentagon.

The new NLF offensive left Nixon with little room for maneuver. In Saigon, March 10, Defense Secretary Laird suggested that 40,000 to 50,000 American troops would be withdrawn from Vietnam this year. But on March 19, Laird, following Nixon's lead, took the promise back. "I do not think there is a possibility," he said, "for any troop withdrawals in any significant numbers today." This retreat further deepened the gulf between the government and the mass sentiment against the war. This was especially true inasmuch as a reduction by 50,000 of the U.S. force



Corky, Philippines Herald

**"If Saigon can only have 500,000 more men, air and naval superiority and \$60 million a day, we can easily de-Americanize the war."**

of 550,000 would be only a token in any event. The New York Times commented March 23 that "so long as the numbers of troops withdrawn were no more than 50,000 to 100,000 in the first year, the primary motive would be to win support from the American public."

Even this token was to be contingent on the replacement of American troops in combat by "South Vietnamese" soldiers. The idea that such a "de-Americanization" of the war would be anything but nominal is a fraud. Nixon knows perfectly well that the Saigon dictatorship would collapse in a week without the massive American occupation force -- as Laird's own testimony, at the time of his return from Saigon, on the present state of the South Vietnamese army clearly indicated.

Nixon has relied thus far on public relations maneuvers to appease his antiwar critics. But his time is running out. Senator Fulbright bluntly expressed his fears to Laird during the March 21 hearings of the disarmament subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "You've got to do something radical to change this war," Fulbright said, "or we're going down the drain."

On March 23 Nixon went into secret conference with Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. ambassador to Saigon, and General Andrew Goodpaster, deputy American commander in Vietnam. The press was informed that this little group in its clandestine sessions would undertake a "review" of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Massive antiwar demonstrations are scheduled in a number of major cities for April 5 and 6. There the American people, having made their own review, can voice their conclusions: that the only way to end the war is to get out of Vietnam now!

PEOPLE'S TRIBUNALS SET UP IN EAST PAKISTAN

By Les Evans

Crowds of workers and students in cities and villages throughout East Pakistan have begun to defend themselves against the police and hired thugs of the Ayub Khan regime. The New York Times reported March 20 in a dispatch from Manikganj: "Hundreds of villages in East Pakistan have been razed, thousands of Bengalis left homeless and more than 150 persons have been killed in 10 days of mob executions. In most parts of East Pakistan, demoralized and outnumbered village policemen are virtually cowering in their barracks as mobs of villagers roam the countryside...."

"Police stations have been attacked and officials clubbed to death.... In most cases, the mobs' targets have been thieves or suspected criminals who bolstered the ruling Moslem League's authority in rural areas.

"Villagers have also attacked unpopular police officials, rent collectors and village council chiefs, the so-called basic democrats who form the lower tier in President Ayub's indirect system of elections."

The popular reprisals against hated officials come after months of savage police attacks on peaceful demonstrations, in which an unknown number of students and workers lost their lives.

General Ayub had hoped to defuse the popular movement with his announcement March 13 that he had reached a "broad agreement" with opposition leaders for the introduction of a parliamentary reform and elections on the basis of direct adult franchise. But these purely legalistic promises failed to answer demands of the Pakistani masses for fundamental social change: for higher wages, an end to government corruption, and an end to the economic and social oppression of East Pakistan by the military and political center in West Pakistan.

Several of the most important opposition leaders, sensing the popular mood, refused to participate in the negotiations with Ayub. Former Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto stayed away from the talks at Rawalpindi. Sheik Mujibur Rahman, head of the Awami League of East Pakistan, withdrew his party from the Democratic Action Committee, the eight-party coalition that had negotiated with Ayub.

Ayub's concessions, including his pledge not to seek reelection -- though he refused to step down until the end of his term -- were too little and too late

to derail the mass movement. On March 17 about 2.5 million workers in West Pakistan staged a one-day general strike to press their demands for better living conditions, higher wages, the right to strike and the freedom to form unions.

Giant workers' demonstrations were held in all major cities. The general strike followed important strikes by dock workers and industrial laborers in Karachi at the beginning of March.

Pakistan had been a showpiece for Washington. The United States aid mission in Karachi has published a brochure which describes the country as one of "the major success stories in development." It is true that a massive infusion of American aid produced an annual over-all growth rate of 6 percent between 1960 and 1968. But real industrial wages actually declined during this period. About 84 percent of the population is illiterate.

Pakistan's average per capita income is only \$84 a year, one of the lowest in the world. In East Pakistan, which is treated as a virtual colony of the West, there has actually been a decline in the over-all growth rate for the past five years, and the per capita income stands at about \$36 per year.

This grinding poverty stands side by side with vast wealth in the hands of the capitalist government bureaucracy. The March 9 New York Times, in a "conservative" estimate, put the holdings amassed by the Ayub family in the last ten years at "between \$11-million and \$22-million. If the official rate of exchange were used, these figures would be doubled."

Ayub's son, Capt. Gohar Ayub, has used his father's monopoly of government licenses to build a truck assembly empire worth millions of dollars. Two of Ayub's daughters are married to sons of the Wali of Swat. Ayub has granted the Wali special dispensation to maintain his princely fief, where he exploits an emerald mine, tax free.

If these glaring inequities have a powerful impact in West Pakistan, they are multiplied many times in the East. Some 70 million of the 125 million Pakistanis live in East Pakistan. The East accounts for more than two-thirds of the country's foreign earnings through the sale of jute and tea. But most of this income is siphoned off to the government in Karachi, more than a thousand miles away across the Indian subcontinent. Only a third of the government's investment in development projects goes to East Paki-

stan, and less than a quarter of the American aid. The government is planning to export food, while hunger is widespread in the East.

From the standpoint of national origin there is little to tie the two physically separate territories together. The people of East Pakistan are Bengalis. Under British rule this area was united in a single province with what is now the Indian state of West Bengal, whose people share a common language and tradition. They differ only in religion, the Indians being Hindu, and the Pakistanis, Muslim. The peoples of West Pakistan, on the other hand, speak mostly Urdu, not Bengali, and have little but religion in common with the Pakistanis in the East.

Thus the movement in East Pakistan is more far-reaching than in the West, including demands for national autonomy and even separation. Sheik Mujib has demanded that the capital be shifted from Islamabad to Dacca.

Ayub has used armed thugs to break up antigovernment demonstrations. These hoodlums have killed a large number of students in the past few months. This government terror has brought to the surface all the bitter grievances of the East Pakistani masses. The March 15 London Economist reported:

"In the university town of Rajshahi...500 houses have been burned by mobs taking vengeance on supporters of the regime....While the armchair politicians were debating their own future as much as the country's, the air was thick with rumours -- supported by both Asghar Khan and Bhutto, and denied by the defense minister, Admiral A.R. Khan -- that martial law is on the way to deal with mounting disorder."

The New York Times reported the formation of "people's courts" under the leadership of radical student organizations:

"In many villages students have set up 'people's courts,' to fine basic democrats and members of the ruling Moslem League. A student leader, Ferdoush Hasan Azad, said:

"We are traveling through villages pleading with people not to resort to killings. We have asked them to set up courts and fine Moslem Leaguers. In a way it has been successful. They are paying up in the thousands rather than have their houses burned."

The Paris daily Le Monde (March 20) reported the appearance of revolutionary wall posters throughout Dacca. At Kurigram, north of Dacca, "the population has set up 'people's tribunals' to judge the



AYUB KHAN

'oppressors.'" Le Monde added that sentences passed by these tribunals "are immediately carried out."

A dispatch from New Delhi in the March 19 Christian Science Monitor said that the government had virtually collapsed in East Pakistan:

"One disturbing report said that government councils were losing control throughout the province and are being replaced by people's 'soviets' formed by leftist politicians....Refugees crossing into India's West Bengal bring stories that many persons, including progovernment politicians, have been killed in the violence....Fatalities in the turmoil are now given as several hundred."

The Monitor correspondent said the Indian government is deeply concerned at the possible outcome in East Pakistan:

"The possible secession of East Pakistan has New Delhi worried. Indian officials think the Communist-dominated Indian state of West Bengal might try to merge with an independent East Pakistan to form a Bengali nation."

It has been reported that two shiploads of troops have been dispatched from Karachi to suppress the mass uprising. Whether they will succeed is another question. The revolt has gone very deep. The Times reported: "Gov. Monem Khan has not ventured out of his residence for several weeks and his authority does not appear to extend beyond his office walls. A police uniform has not been seen on the

streets of Dacca for two weeks. But the governor, some members of his family and his immediate advisers made a secret dash to the airport tonight [March 19] and flew to Lahore, 24 hours after militant student organizations threatened to invade his official residence unless he was dismissed by next Monday." (In fact, Ayub Khan dismissed the East Pakistan governor March 21.)

The Times gave an indication of the breadth of the popular movement:

"Industry, commerce and Government business in Dacca have come to a standstill. Strikers from every profession, trade and occupation, from doctors to railway laborers and power station engineers, parade through the streets almost every hour demanding more pay and better working conditions....Bank officials cannot estimate the flight of capital from [the] eastern province, but they describe it as 'fantastic.'"

Nicholas Tomalin, writing from Dacca in the March 16 London Sunday Times, gave a picture of the forces in the leadership of the movement in East Pakistan, describing Sheik Mujib as a "Right Wing leader" whose aims are limited to securing more autonomy for the area.

"Improbably enough," Tomalin said, "under student pressure, he also committed himself to 11 even more exigent demands, formulated by Dacca students, which included nationalisation of industries and the banks and withdrawal from the Western CENTO and SEATO alliances...."

"Sheikh Mujib is in a particularly difficult position. At present he is the hero of East Pakistan, the newly released martyr of Ayub's prisons. But as a moderate in an immoderate situation, he is at the mercy of events and of extremists to the Left.

"Maulana Bhashani, leader of the Maoist National Awami Party, is also extremely powerful in East Pakistan. If

Sheikh Mujib cannot deliver the goods, he will sooner or later be usurped by a new hero -- and Bhashani or some other Communist is the obvious alternative."

But by far the strongest force at present is the student movement. Tomalin continued:

"An extraordinary factor in Dacca is the power of the students. At present, no other authority has any sway. The Governor...is too terrified to leave his home, the police concentrate on directing traffic, and the Army's loyalty is suspect. Only the students can control the people.

"At the moment, 5,000 students from Dacca University virtually run the capital, if not the countryside...."

"All last week, assorted student processions moved through the streets, shouting a variety of slogans -- 'Ho Chi Minh' vying with 'Regional Autonomy.'.... They have succeeded, where the British and even the French students failed, in mobilizing the workers and peasants to their side."

Thus the students, who are organized in a province-wide Students Action Committee, provided the catalyst that has brought the working class into struggle. The perspective has opened for a socialist revolution in East Pakistan. The greatest weakness of the immense mass mobilization is the absence of a revolutionary party to unify the struggle and carry it through to victory. It remains to be seen whether the students or any other presently organized grouping can play this role.

For Ayub's part, no matter what the outcome, it will not be easy for him to drive the masses off the political stage. He has already suffered important blows at the hands of the Pakistani people, and his one ace, the army, is unlikely to be very reliable, whether it comes from West Pakistan or East.

#### MORE PRISON TERMS DECREED FOR OPPONENTS OF GREEK JUNTA

The military tribunal in Athens, Greece, handed down a new series of sentences against opponents of the junta March 17.

The tribunal condemned Kharalambos Kalantzis, a merchant and alleged member of the outlawed Greek Communist party, to ten years in prison.

Kalantzis was pronounced guilty of "subversive activities aimed at overthrowing the existing social system by force

and violence."

Nikolaos Oikonomakos, a clerk, and Georgios Votsis, a journalist, were convicted on the same charge. Both were given five-year prison sentences in absentia.

Votsis left Greece several months ago. He has organized demonstrations against the military dictatorship in collaboration with the well-known actress Melina Mercouri, who was stripped of her Greek citizenship by the colonels.

THE "RENDEZVOUS OF MARCH" IN PARIS

By Jean Ravel

Paris

The agreements the trade unions obtained from the government and the bosses on the Rue de Grenelle in late May 1968 brought the workers important material gains. These gains, however, were only the price that the bourgeoisie was forced to pay to halt the general strike which then threatened to topple the capitalist system. The second round of wage negotiations provided for in the Grenelle accords showed the ephemeral character of these concessions.

The Grenelle agreements specified that the "social partners" -- the government, the trade unions, and the bosses -- were to meet in March 1969 to examine the comparative development of wages and prices and discuss what adjustments in the accords the trend required. This meeting was held on the Rue de Tilsitt March 4-6.

At the Tilsitt conference the bourgeoisie staged a test of strength. Prime Minister Couve de Murville bluntly declared that the "workers' demands seem absurd." In other words what the bourgeoisie wanted at the Rue de Tilsitt was "a clarification of the issues," an "exchange of views" on the economic situation. It was not interested in discussing any of the workers' demands and it was even less interested in making any concessions.

However, at the same time that the employers' position has hardened, the militancy of the workers is on the upswing again. For some weeks now the situation in France has been developing steadily in the direction of increased social instability and reviving working-class struggles.

The combativity of the workers has been shown by a national strike in the PME [Petites et Moyennes Entreprises -- Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises] and in flare-ups of struggle at the Renault plant in Le Mans and at the Peugeot plant in Sochaux.

Increasing unrest among the workers has been paralleled by a partial remobilization of the student movement. On February 14, the students staged a militant demonstration at the Reuilly recruiting station to protest the induction of revolutionary students whose deferments were canceled. On February 28, the Comités d'Action [Action Committees] called a big anti-Nixon demonstration. This demonstration, coinciding with one called by its Italian "sister party," forced the

PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party] to mobilize its own forces and much reduced youth contingents for a demonstration on March 1.

In the present circumstances, where increasing worker-student militancy is going hand in hand with a hard line by the bourgeoisie, it is by no means certain that the bureaucratic leaderships can demobilize the workers as easily as they did in the late spring of 1968. It is by no means certain that the bureaucrats will be able to exhaust the combativity of the workers in the "campaign" extending from Tilsitt to the April referendum\* as effectively as they did in the electioneering between the Grenelle accords and the disaster in the June vote.

As a result of the breakdown of the Rue de Tilsitt meeting, the union federations were forced to call a one-day general strike and mass demonstration for March 11. The trade-union apparatuses, of course, tried to keep this protest within the narrowest possible limits.

The march was to be strictly a union march and raise only economic demands; all political slogans were banned. The route chosen was the all-too-familiar one from the Place de la République to the Place de la Bastille, the traditional route of the CP's dull, mechanical, manipulated demonstrations. (After May, one would have thought that they would not dare propose this route again.)

However, despite all the attempts to emasculate the March 11 demonstration, the workers still came out in large numbers.\*\* But the fact that there were about 200,000 workers on the street is less important than the new combative tone the demonstration struck. The numbers were less important than the political significance of the composition and slogans of certain sections of the march.

Contingents of CFDT [French Democratic Federation of Labor] members from the working-class suburbs carried banners

---

\* The referendum April 27 on de Gaulle's demagogic "participation" proposals.

\*\* We can safely disregard the ridiculous police estimate of 65,000 participants. But for once, the estimate of 200,000 demonstrators given by l'Humanité, which is known for exaggerating the size of demonstrations where the CP is involved, seemed a bare minimum. Was l'Humanité trying to minimize this demonstration because it fears that the workers' militancy is getting out of hand?



calling for workers' control. Some -- although still only a few -- CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail -- General Confederation of Labor] delegations raised slogans that went beyond trade-union demands. They raised slogans challenging the regime politically.

Finally, for the first time, a left-wing contingent of "unparalleled size" (estimates run from 15,000 to 60,000) was able to march the entire route of the parade. The Stalinist parade marshals could not break it up or divert it. It marched behind a wave of red flags and its own banners. It shouted its own slogans and sang the "Internationale," "La Jeune Garde" [The Young Guard], and the "Comintern" song.

The revolutionary section of the parade chanted such slogans as "The National Interest Is the Capitalists' Interest!"; "The Bosses Won't Pay, Struggle Pays!"; "Tilsitt-Grenelle, No! Sochaux-Le Mans, Yes!"; and "The Power Is Here!" The spectators who massed on the sidewalks cheered the revolutionists' slogans, indicating the following the "leftists" have.

Since the Renault strike in Le Mans everyone realizes that a large, well-defined revolutionary current exists

which is gaining on the Communist party, a current which is strengthening its political network and increasing its following among the workers. The supporters of the revolutionary journal Rouge, for instance, played a notable role in getting out information on the Le Mans strike to the workers in all the Renault plants when the bourgeois press and the trade-union bureaucrats tried to suppress all reports on this struggle. After the March 11 demonstration, where the left-wing contingent marched behind Rouge's banner, the public is even more aware of the growth of the revolutionary current.

The press attacks on the left-wing elements in the demonstration left no room for doubt that the papers know which way the wind is blowing. L'Humanité, of course, distinguished itself for its virulence. It printed an article, "Outside the Demonstration," on March 13 which was a model of Stalinist vilification. In fact, the author of this article was so clumsy in his excommunication of the left that he got confused about his own line.

He wrote that the revolutionists were "less interested in attacking the government than in insulting the unions (... which were called corrupt by some)." But according to the line the CP-led unions set, this was supposed to be a nonpolitical demonstration.

#### STUDENTS IN TANZANIA DEMAND EXPULSION OF AMERICAN LECTURERS

Scores of East African students demonstrated at the Law Faculty building of the University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, March 13, demanding student control of the curriculum and the expulsion of American lecturers. Participants in the demonstration waved portraits of Che Guevara and Tanzanian President Nyerere as well as placards denouncing American teachers at the university as agents of imperialism.

The protest was touched off by the inclusion of military law and public finance in the curriculum against the wishes of the students. It is believed that class work in these subjects will serve as a cover for American intelligence work in Tanzania. The strong American influence at the university has long been a cause of discontent. Moreover, the students resent having only a token role in making important decisions, such as those relating to choice of curriculum.

While the demonstration in front of the law school building was going on, representatives of the Law Faculty Vigilance Committee, the law students organization, met with the Faculty Board. According to the Dar es Salaam Standard,

the students' delegates raised three demands at this meeting: (1) that the new curriculum be revoked; (2) that all United States lecturers be expelled immediately; and (3) that there be complete control of the school by East Africans.

The students' demands were tabled. The board made the following declaration, reported in the Standard: "The board... requests the special committee elected at the last meeting to consider proposals for making student participation in the forthcoming curriculum discussions more representative and effective than it was in the past year..."

The chairman of the Law Faculty Vigilance Committee, Charles Kileo, declared that the students would continue to put pressure on the board, that they intend to assume a much larger role in running the university and would impose changes.

"These changes," Kileo said, "will be brought about by people on this campus. These people are students." The student leader announced at the same time that Vigilance Committees would be created in every school of the university and that

these committees "will run the university. The college must be run by East Africans."

The Standard took the student actions seriously. In a March 14 editorial the paper said:

"The rumblings and demands for

greater student power from the Law Faculty -- ironically probably the most progressive on the Hill -- could engulf the entire campus. Students, who since the events of 1966 have been quiet, are watching from the other faculties to see the outcome of the present confrontation."

#### TEXT OF GRIGORENKO-YAKHIMOVICH APPEAL ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[Printed below is the full text of the petition for withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia being circulated in the Soviet Union by former Major General Pyotr G. Grigorenko and former collective-farm chairman Ivan A. Yakhimovich. The translation from the original Russian -- which has become available in the West -- is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

The campaign of self-immolation initiated on January 16, 1969, by the Prague student Jan Palach as a protest against the intervention in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic has not ended. Another human torch [the student Jan Zajic], the latest, flared up in Prague's Wenceslas Square on February 21.

This protest, which took such a frightful form, was intended above all for us, Soviet citizens. It is the unsolicited and unjustified presence of our troops that arouses such anger and despair among the Czechoslovak people. For good reason the death of Jan V. Palach stirred the whole of working Czechoslovakia into action.

We all share a part of the guilt for his death, as well as for the death of other Czechoslovak brothers who have committed suicide. By our approving the venture of our troops, justifying it, or simply keeping silent, we contribute to the continued burning of human torches in the squares of Prague and other cities. The Czechs and Slovaks always considered

us their brothers. Will we let the word "Soviet" become synonymous in their eyes with the word "foe"?

Citizens of our great country!

The greatness of a country is not shown by the power of its armies being brought down upon a small, freedom-loving people, but by its moral power.

Shall we really continue to look on in silence while our brothers perish?

By now it is clear to everyone that the presence of our troops on the territory of the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic is not called for by the defense needs of our country nor the needs of the socialist community.

Do we not have enough courage to admit that a tragic mistake has been made and to do everything in our power to correct it? That is our right and our duty!

We call upon all Soviet people, without doing anything rash or hasty and by all legal methods, to bring about the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and the renunciation of interference in its internal affairs. Only by this means can the friendship between our peoples be restored.

Long live the heroic Czechoslovak people!

Long live Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship!

#### STUDENTS SEIZE GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS IN RURAL COLOMBIA

Student unrest was reported sweeping the provinces of Colombia during the third week of March. In the small city of Cienaga de Oro in the province of Cordoba, student oppositionists seized the telephone, telegraph, and radio communications centers and stormed the official buildings with rocks and clubs. The government had to send in troops from Monteria, the provincial capital, in order to regain control of the situation.

President Lleras Restrepo went on radio and television on the evening of March 18 to issue a warning to the students and other protesters: "The country will not founder in anarchy while I am president." The commander of the armed forces, General Gutierrez, reportedly summoned the top officers of the eleven army brigades to Bogotá to draw up plans for suppressing the opposition demonstrations throughout the country.



TOWARD A NEW CONFRONTATION IN FRANCE

[The following is a transcript of a speech by the French revolutionary socialist youth leader Daniel Bensaïd to the March 8 conference in Brussels of the Jeune Garde Socialiste (Socialist Young Guard). The text is from the Belgian revolutionary socialist weekly La Gauche. The introductory note by La Gauche is also given. The translation is by Inter-continental Press.]

\* \* \*

It is still too early to draw the balance of the movement of strikes and demands now sweeping France. This movement is important not only because of its breadth but because of the decisive test it represents. It will determine the real significance of the events of last May and June. We are at last going to see if the French workers regarded the return to work in June as a defeat, if their returning to work reduced their combativity, or if, on the contrary, the workers went back into the plants to seize control of them over a more or less extended period.

Daniel Bensaïd, one of the leaders of the banned JCR [Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire -- Revolutionary Communist Youth] and an editor of Rouge, spoke at the Jeune Garde Socialiste meeting on March 8 which preceded the nuclear disarmament march. On the basis of reliable indications, he ventured a prediction about how the March 11 demonstration\* would turn out.

His prediction has been fully confirmed. Among the tens of thousands of workers who demonstrated March 11 in Paris, there were about 10,000 "leftists" marching behind red flags.

They were easily recognizable by their twelve-foot-high banners and their slogans. And contrary to what the press said, their slogans were very well received in the march. (The incidents the papers referred to involved only a group of unorganized and isolated individuals.)

Daniel Bensaïd's speech, the first part of which we are printing here, came before de Gaulle's.\*\* It will stand up

---

\* Mass marches were held throughout France to accompany the March 11 one-day general strike called by major unions to bolster wage negotiations. -- I.P.

\*\* De Gaulle made a television broadcast March 12 denouncing the workers' protests as a plot to "lock our people into the totalitarian prison." -- I.P.

longer...

\* \* \*

French capitalism with de Gaulle at its head is indulging in tantrums and self-assertiveness. But after the big fright the French capitalists got in May-June 1968, these independent gestures are just the preparation for a more impassioned reconciliation with Nixon during his visit to France.

The French bourgeoisie knows how much it still needs the support of the international bourgeoisie, how much its future still depends on the military and political aid of imperialism. It has good reason to realize this because, despite what was said after the May crisis and the braggadocio of the French capitalists, the French workers have not slipped back into their niche. Despite the shilly-shallying of the trade-union bureaucrats, despite the repression, despite the reactionary attitude of the bosses and the police, they are getting ready today for a national strike on March 11. They are exhibiting their combativity; they are proving that the struggle against capitalism in France continues in new and sometimes more acute forms.

You have to understand what an impasse French capitalism has gotten into in the present international situation. To recover the losses represented by its economic concessions to the working class, it had to turn to a policy of repression. It had to do this not just by wiping out wage increases through price rises or even by also stepping up productivity by using the goad of layoffs -- often for political reasons -- and unemployment. It had to attack the working class directly to reestablish its international prerogatives and its position on the world market as soon as possible. But this course cannot fail to run into contradictions. The French economy has been driven into a corner. There is no way out for it except through the political struggle of the working class and its vanguard.

The French bourgeoisie cannot afford the luxury of a Wilson-type Social Democratic regime. After their defeat in the June elections, the Social Democratic forces are too discredited and scattered. Nor for the immediate future can the French bourgeoisie crush the working class, destroy its organizations and indulge in that other luxury -- a fascist regime through which it could rule exclusively.

Thus the bourgeoisie finds itself in the following dilemma. It must either conciliate the working class, continue a

policy of concessions to the middle layers and the petty bourgeoisie, accept a revival of pressure groups, and return to the anarchy of parliamentary democracy -- which has become outmoded for the capitalists -- or it has to reestablish a strong state, like the Gaullist regime after 1958, as soon as possible.

I would not hesitate to say that the bourgeoisie has shown any reluctance, either, in systematically imposing its policy of repression, including against revolutionary students. It has even gone so far as to draft some comrades into the army. Here I think the example of our American comrades deserves attention in Europe. The fight for political rights for soldiers will bring the ideas driven from the universities and taken up by the unemployed young workers into the barracks.

The important thing to recognize now is that the French bourgeoisie, caught in an economic blind alley, no longer has any freedom to maneuver and that the working class has not left the field of battle defeated. It left the battle disillusioned and sometimes disappointed, but not defeated. And that is what is important today.

But sometimes the workers went back disoriented. Why were they disoriented? Because the workers are paying the price in France for forty years of Social Democratic and Stalinist leadership. Since the electoral road, the only perspective that Stalinist and Social Democratic leaderships have offered for forty years, has been blocked, the workers don't know what political solution to look to today.

Some workers probably support a policy of doggedly defending their gains, contesting every inch of ground. Certainly, they will fight this battle with a great deal of courage and determination but without any idea of what political solution they could achieve. They say, "We want to get back what was taken from us in June, but when will we finally have a guarantee that our gains will be really secure, and what regime will provide such a guarantee?"

Other workers, the vanguard militants in May, are ready to resume the battle, to go much further. But here too, sticking to the schemata of the Social Democracy and Stalinism, they think in terms of a maximum program, in terms of abstract phrases about socialist revolution. They are unable to give concrete expression to the demands of the mass of workers and, on the basis of these demands, to reunite the French working class against capitalism and the French bourgeoisie.

These are the tasks that face us today and this is where our problems lie. However, despite this political disarray, for which, it must again be said, forty years of ossification in the people's organizations is responsible -- despite this disarray, the workers are showing their capacity for struggle.

Moreover, they are showing this capacity for struggle in spite of the maneuvers of the bureaucracy in the workers organizations, maneuvers like the one of February 12. At that time, on the national day of action, the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail -- General Confederation of Labor -- the CP-controlled union federation] did everything it could to dissipate the energy of the workers by fragmenting the struggle. By launching diverse, minimal, and multifarious actions, it did everything possible to erode the collective resolution of the workers.

But in spite of all these strait-jackets, the working class demonstrated its potential for struggle. We saw the Renault workers in Le Mans and the Peugeot workers in Sochaux turn to direct action, show that they learned the lessons of May, that they are really fed up, that they are "at the end of their tether," as they say, that they are ready, even alone, even without leadership, to plunge into struggle. They proved how ready the workers in France are today for real combat.

It must be understood also that these actions at Renault, at all the Renault plants, at Peugeot, and in many small construction companies throughout the country, are but the first expressions of a struggle which, while it still lacks direction, is groping to find the right path. We should notice how the workers in Le Mans recognized a call to arms in the struggle of the Sochaux workers.

We should also see that today the bourgeoisie has to confront another type of threat -- the unrest of the classical petty bourgeoisie, the small merchants, the owners of small enterprises. More than anyone else, they have had to pay the price of transforming French capitalism. They have been driven to economic and political despair, since they no longer have the traditional, independent, radical\* political formations to defend them. Ten years of Gaullism has wiped all these forces off the political map.

Facing this situation, these petty-

---

\* In France the word "radical" in this sense refers to the traditional politics of the lower middle class -- anticlerical and antiestablishment but nationalistic and pro private enterprise. -- I.P.

bourgeois layers are mobilizing en masse. This has gone as far as demonstrations of 10,000 small merchants and petty bourgeois in Bordeaux, Grenoble, and Lille. Of course these are the first seeds of a fascist danger. But the ideology of these strata is far from being finally determined. Their mobilizing is the expression of a political crisis. At present the Gaullists themselves are channeling this force, seeking to make it into a pressure group within the ruling majority. But it is by no means certain that the Gaullists have captured this element. By its diffuseness and by its absence of traditions, this contingent more than others represents an element of irrationality, a deviant element which threatens the equilibrium of the bourgeoisie on another front. And this force can bring down the Gaullist regime faster than people think, faster than those singing the praises of the regime after the June elections think. It can bring the government down in the coming months and even weeks.

#### The Left

Despite the bureaucrats' desire to dam up the struggles, despite the paranoid campaign against the left that is being whipped up today, all the radio reports on the Tilsitt\* conference talked about "leftists" in the unions, leftists in the plants. They said that the union leaders' hands were tied. This testifies to the fact that there is a left-wing base with firm views, left views.

In the same way, during the anti-Nixon demonstration, the heads of the march led by the Communist party complained about scattering forces in the face of the police in order to justify putting a rein on the more militant elements. But it made its excuses more nervously because it felt the pressure of 10,000 left-wing demonstrators behind it.

These "leftists" are the ones who have organized the largest force the French Communist party has ever seen out-

---

\* The conference held on the Rue de Tilsitt in Paris in early March in which representatives of the bosses, the government, and labor discussed wage increases for 1969. The union representatives walked out March 6 when the government refused to consider raises above 4 percent. The trade-union federations called the one-day national strike for March 11 after the negotiations had broken down.  
-- I.P.

flanking it from the left.

Despite their fears, the unions -- the CFDT [Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail -- French Democratic Workers Federation], the CGT, the Fédération de l'Education Nationale [National Teachers Union] -- have called a national strike for March 11 and a supporting demonstration. They too are afraid of the power of the small merchants; they have been compelled to respond firmly to the attack mounted by the government and the bosses.

It is quite evident, and we must realize it, that this demonstration is aimed at restoring a familiar mechanism. This mechanism consists of putting limited trade-union pressure on the government for purely economic demands. Such pressure then becomes a tool in the electoral by-play. Thus, this demonstration is meant to signify a massive "no" vote in the referendum.\* This is the mechanism the PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party] is trying to establish. It is a mechanism we became very familiar with over the previous years -- the big May Day parades complemented by motions of censure in parliament.

The big question today is whether, instructed by the example of May, the workers in France will permit this mechanism to function again. Moreover, the PCF has chosen the route from the Place de la République to the Place de la Bastille to reinstitute this system. In the eyes of militants this is the traditional route of the dreary, spiritless demonstrations with no perspective that the CP took them on for six years without leading them anywhere.

Instead of being a safety valve for the bureaucrats, March 11 can mark the first release of energy, a renewal of the class struggle on the national scale. And it can offer us, we are convinced by the indications we have seen, a tumultuous spring, if not a spring of intransigent class confrontation in France.

---

\* The referendum on "participation" scheduled for April 27 which is supposed to provide a vote of confidence for de Gaulle's alternative to socialism. -- I.P.

#### GREEK RESISTANCE LEADER DENIED PERMISSION TO SPEAK IN U.S.

The leader of the Greek resistance organization PAM [Patriotiko Antidiktatoriko Metopo -- Patriotic Antidictatorial

Front], Antonis Ampatielos, was denied a visa to speak in the U.S. March 24. Ampatielos has been touring Canada.

ISRAELI SOCIALISTS DEMAND WITHDRAWAL FROM OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

[The following are excerpts from a manifesto issued January 1 by the Israeli Socialist Organization (ISO), which publishes the magazine Matzpen (Compass). The manifesto draws a balance sheet of developments in Israel since the June 1967 war. The ISO, which has both Jewish and Arab members, has been one of the only organizations in Israel to defend the rights of the Palestinian refugees and to oppose the chauvinist hysteria in which the country has been caught up since the June war.]

[The excerpts from the ISO's manifesto are taken from the March 8 issue of the Belgian revolutionary socialist weekly La Gauche, where it was reported that the document is being distributed in Europe by the Israeli Revolutionary Action Committee Abroad. This committee was formed in February to combat the influence of Zionist propaganda outside of Israel. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Shortly after hostilities ended in June 1967, Israeli Minister of Defense Moshe Dayan declared that he expected a call from the Arabs within forty-eight hours asking him to negotiate an Israeli-Arab agreement. No such telephone conversation took place. This bright remark is now remembered as a sad joke.

At the same time, the current crop of Israeli strategists repeated that the new frontiers (that is, "the presence of the Israeli army on new lines from the Hermon Heights along the Jordan to the banks of the canal and the Straits of Solomon...") provided security. Hundreds of dead and thousands of wounded on the Israeli side were sacrificed on the altar of this false security. The official spokesmen declared after the war that the Egyptian military apparatus was completely annihilated and that it would be several years before it was rebuilt. They say now that it has been reconstructed, strengthened, and improved and that "a new war danger threatens Israel."

In the meantime, the activity of the Palestinian military organizations has been stepped up. The official predictions circulated at the beginning of the year, that a deterioration of morale, desertion, and the dubious worth of their men condemned these organizations to attrition, have proved false. There is nothing surprising in this if you consider the lessons to be drawn from the struggles waged by other peoples in other countries. One would have to be blind to suppose that these organizations would remain on their initial footing. To the contrary,



MOSHE DAYAN

they will enlarge their ranks and increase their influence and combat potential.

The official version, claiming that the Israeli occupation is one of the most liberal and that the Palestinian masses are in actuality resigned to their status, has also been refuted by the reality. (Moreover, what other occupation regime are they comparing the Israeli occupation to when they say that it is distinguished by its liberalism? Which one exactly?) You have only to look at the strikes and demonstrations that have inflamed all the cities in the occupied territories in recent months -- from Jenin and Nablus, through Ramallah and Jerusalem to Hebron and Gaza.

In these conditions, with armed resistance, strikes, and demonstrations, Israeli repression has become a daily sight. Administrative pressures -- collec-

tive punishments in the form of curfews, mass searches, and limitations on movement -- have become the standard operating procedure of the occupation authorities. The revolting spectacle of homes being dynamited brands the "liberalism" of the occupation with infamy. Deportation of leaders and political figures, as well as unknown men and women, with nothing against them but their political activity, has become a norm.

It can be noted that those most systematically hit with deportation are the same people who were persecuted formerly by the Jordanian security forces. The deportees include, among other elements, socialists and communists of various tendencies. Underground bulletins circulate in the occupied territories which give detailed stories of arbitrary procedures and tortures (with dates, names, and addresses). These facts are hidden from the people of Israel and the press does not mention them.

#### The Domestic Political Scene

The Zionist character of the state and its leadership has been accentuated. Before the last war, Zionism was considered outmoded even by many orthodox Zionists. Now we are seeing a revival of the Zionist ideology. This is at the bottom of all the discussions on annexing the occupied territories and establishing Jewish colonies there and on the danger of the state's losing its Jewish character because of the size of the Arab community (the "demographic problem"), etc.

Against this background we see chauvinist-fascist forces shaping up in Israel along the classical lines, which are not restricted to any particular people. There is more and more talk today about "national superiority," "sacred historical values," "the cradle of the original culture," "the duties of war and blood alliance," etc. This is being spread by every means, by the radio and television, by the press, in the schools, in the army, and among the youth organizations. We also hear the demand being raised more and more persistently for a "strong leadership" and for "a strong man," as well as insistence on maintaining "national unity."

Parallel to this, we see a tightening of administrative and police repression against the Arab citizens of Israel. Hundreds and thousands have suffered restrictions of their freedom of movement through the country, house arrest, administrative detention, searches and harassment, the loss of all opportunity to organize independently. Anti-Arab hysteria in Israel is reaching heights previously unknown, as in the anti-Arab riots in Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Tel Aviv.

In Israel as well as in the occupied territories, British colonial laws are still being applied. The laws in question, the 1945 Defense (Emergency) Regulations, are well known for their iniquitous character. They were vigorously denounced in the past by the leaders of the Jewish community, who compared them to the Nazi laws (to repeat the analogy made by the present Israeli minister of justice, J.S. Shapira, in a speech delivered in Tel Aviv at a meeting of Jewish lawyers February 7, 1946, and printed in Hapraklit the same month).

\* \* \*

We believe that a profound transformation of the regimes of all the countries in the area -- that is, a socialist revolution -- is required for a solution to the principal problems confronting the Middle East. In Israel, the socialist revolution will completely transform the character of the state and transform it from a Zionist state, an instrument for continuing the Zionist colonization and a natural ally of imperialism, into a state expressing the real interests of the Jewish and Arab masses, a state oriented toward integration in a united socialist Middle East.

But in the present conditions, work toward this end cannot be envisaged without a resolute struggle at the same time against continued occupation of the Arab territories by Israel. Only such a struggle will make it possible to mobilize the Jewish and Arab masses for socialism.

\* \* \*

We call upon the workers of Israel to struggle against the worsening manifestations of chauvinism and against the fascist tendencies taking root in the Jewish public!

Defense of the interests of the working class must be combined with a reinforcement of Jewish-Arab solidarity!

All workers must struggle together for equal pay for Jewish and Arab workers!

The Jewish workers must not let themselves be taken in by racist provocations in their shops, in the streets, or in the neighborhoods.

The Jewish workers must defend their Arab brothers during racist riots or pogroms!

This is in the interest of the workers of Israel -- in the last analysis it is they who will suffer from the persistence of the occupation regime and of war.

We call on the students and youth to reject categorically propaganda for annexing the territories and to organize demonstrations in the universities and schools against increasing fascist indoctrination.

We call on the youth to demonstrate against the suppression of democratic freedoms, carried out under the pretext of the demands of security, as well as against the oppression of the Arab population of Israel and against anti-Arab

hysteria.

This is in the interest of the youth of Israel -- it is they also who will suffer from the persistence of the occupation and of war.

Demonstrations, meetings, protest picketing, petitions, and letters to the newspapers are all legal ways of struggling for the evacuation of the occupied territories!

#### PAUL BOUTELLE WAGES SOCIALIST CAMPAIGN IN NEW YORK

More than 12,000 New York City high-school and college students made the long bus trip to the state capital in Albany March 18 to demonstrate against moves by the state and city administrations to cut the city's school budget. When capitalist politicians tried to monopolize the microphone on the capitol steps, black and Puerto Rican students moved in and escorted them off the platform.

One candidate, however, was invited to speak and drew cheers when he denounced the proposed cutbacks and supported the efforts of Afro-American students to win control of school programs in which they are involved. He was Paul Boutelle, the Socialist Workers party candidate for mayor of New York City.



PAUL BOUTELLE

The incident typified the hard-hitting campaign being mounted by the SWP against Republican Mayor John Lindsay and the plethora of capitalist office seekers who have entered the race. Boutelle, who was the party's vice-presidential candidate in the 1968 elections, is using the mayoralty campaign to reach a wide audience with revolutionary socialist ideas, at the same time promoting the day-to-day struggles of students, black people and workers.

In particular, Boutelle is demanding the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam and the right of black and Puerto Rican people to control their own communities and schools. He has also sought to expose the deteriorating conditions of life that capitalist rule imposes on the working people of the giant metropolis.

During his vice-presidential campaign last year Boutelle made several national speaking tours, appeared on radio and television, and helped to win hundreds of young people to the revolutionary socialist movement. He went to Paris at the height of the May events, where he addressed a crowd of more than 6,000 at the Mutualité.

The most dynamic issue in the New York election concerns black and Puerto Rican community control of schools, a demand that is being fought for with increasing militancy in ghettos throughout the country. The question reached its sharpest pitch in New York during the teachers' strike last fall, when teachers' union leaders and city officials sought to pit the Jewish community against the blacks by raising the fraudulent specter of "black anti-Semitism."

Paul Boutelle declared in announcing his candidacy, "I accuse Mayor Lindsay of fomenting antiblack sentiment in the Jewish community around the issue of black control of the black schools and among the mass of white voters around the phony issue of 'law and order.'"



JESUS LARA'S RESIGNATION FROM THE BOLIVIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

[The following is the text of the letter of resignation from the Bolivian Communist party written by Jesús Lara, a party regional leader in Cochabamba. This document provides new information on the role of the Bolivian CP leaders in betraying the guerrilla movement led by Che Guevara -- particularly the charge that aid was withheld from Che's surviving comrades when they sought to make their way to Chile after Che was killed.]

[Lara's letter was published in the February 25 issue of the Chilean weekly Punto Final. Punto Final reported that Lara's resignation had a sharp impact on the Bolivian CP. Lara is well known for his poetry in Quechua, the Bolivian Indian language. Also given below is Punto Final's summation of an exchange between the Bolivian CP leadership and Lara following his resignation. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Comrade members of the Regional Committee of the PCB [Partido Comunista de Bolivia -- Communist party of Bolivia]:

I consider it necessary to resign from the Partido Comunista de Bolivia because I can no longer put up with unprincipled and deceitful national leaders whose abilities are dubious. I can no longer tolerate leaders who, when they do not immerse themselves in stale Byzantine theorizing, lapse benumbed into an atmosphere of inaction and torpor.

Terms and concepts appeared in the Central Committee's "Salute to the [party's] Twentieth Anniversary," which not even the lackeys of imperialism and reaction would dare express. This statement arbitrarily equated Maoism and so-called foquismo [the theory of guerrilla nuclei advocated by Che Guevara].

They dreamed up the term foquismo to avoid directly revealing their unthinking anti-Cuban position. The Central Committee insisted on not recognizing that the Maoists, who favor deification of the leader, are trying to move closer to the Yankee imperialists because they want to join with them in a great anti-Soviet front, and that this is why they are at odds with the international Communist movement. At the same time, they do not take into consideration that the foquistas, by one means or another but honestly and devotedly, are seeking to liberate the oppressed peoples of Latin America.

I am no enthusiast for foquismo, but I think that the Central Committee was firing blindly in linking it to imperialist positions. In my opinion, guer-

rilla warfare cannot be and is not the only road that can lead to annihilating the enemies of the people. Nor can the formation and development of a Marxist-Leninist Communist party depend solely on the progress of guerrilla warfare, as Debray incorrectly maintains.

But guerrilla warfare is one of the forms of armed struggle and in certain circumstances it can facilitate the seizure of power. At the least, it helps to exhaust the enemy and drain him of his strength. Condemning guerrilla warfare would be to deny the theory of class struggle, "the motive force in the history of all societies composed of antagonistic classes" (G. Glezerman and V. Smenov).

In the second paragraph of the "Salute," it says: "The foquista conception of guerrilla warfare had its Waterloo in Bolivia. It served only to reinforce the shaky props of military rule and international reaction." My stupefaction at this assertion was too great for words. But I soon remembered two paragraphs which the Central Committee endorsed in a memorable document that was discussed and approved in its plenary session of January 19, 1968, only a year ago. These passages say word for word:

"First of all, we offer fervent homage to the heroic guerrillas who, by shedding their noble blood, have begun to open up the road to true liberation for our country. The Partido Comunista de Bolivia takes pride in the fact that Bolivian Communists, tempered and educated in our ranks, gave their lives at the side of the heroic Latin-American patriot, Che Guevara."

"The names of Roberto Peredo, Luis Méndez, Jorge Vásquez, Benjamín Coronado, Fredy Maimura, Lorgio Vaca, Antonio Jiménez, Aniceto Reinaga, Mario Gutiérrez Campero, and (Walter) Arancibia will be remembered by posterity as the names of forerunners of the socialist revolution in Bolivia. Their example will inspire our members until the final victory."

At the time the Central Committee paid such a heartfelt tribute to the heroes who fell at Nancahuazú, Comrade Che Guevara's diary was not known in its entirety, nor were the additional documents found in the guerrilla leader's pack yet published. No one suspected then that the diary contained accusations against the top leaders of the Bolivian party. Probably these leaders rested comfortably in the conviction that their conduct would never be known. They did not think there was a chance that First Secretary Mario Monje would be unmasked and that other leaders would come in for their share of the blame.

We were preoccupied with the guerrilla question in Cochabamba from the time the hostilities started. The Regional Committee discussed this question on several occasions with Secretary Jorge Kolle. This person spent all his energy in trying to convince us that our national leaders had had no part in the preparations for the guerrilla action. But his arguments always revealed more cunning than truthfulness. They did not clear up any of the unknowns in the situation.

To put any faith in the secretary's word, you would have had to believe that the guerrillas sprouted in the subsoil of Nancahuazú by magic or fell there from the sky like shooting stars. It is said that even a poor peddler's home is his castle, that no one can open his door if he doesn't unlock it, and that no one can tell him what to do there without his agreeing to it. But Kolle's explanations would make you think that Bolivia is a country where there are no such poor peddlers.

The discussion culminated last November. In the last session I brought a series of accusations against the Monje-Kolle duo. These accusations were based on facts that came to the attention of dozens of party members and on reliable reports from the survivors of Nancahuazú. The national secretaries were revealed to have been agents of foquismo and participants in the preparation of the guerrilla struggle. The hasty excuses offered by Secretary Kolle were less than convincing, and he chose to withdraw from the discussion before it could come to any conclusions, leaving the questions unanswered.

My accusations can be summed up as follows:

(1) In 1962, by order of the Monje-Kolle duo, the party took charge of conducting a group of Peruvian foquistas through Bolivian territory to a certain point on the border between Peru and Bolivia. In the same year and in the same manner a group of Argentine foquistas trained in Cuba were taken to the Bolivian-Argentine border.

Both operations were carried out on the basis of agreements concluded between the Bolivian leaders and the Cuban foquistas.

(2) The Cuban Communist Ricardo, who later died at Nancahuazú, remained in Bolivia, except for brief intervals, from 1962 to 1966. He was the one who chose and ordered the purchase of the ranch of that name for the guerrillas' camp. During his stay in Bolivia, this comrade had the assistance of Jorge Kolle.

(3) By decision of the Monje-Kolle duo, many party and youth militants went

to receive foquista training. And to top it off, Mario Monje himself spent four months in Cuba in the same foquista school.

(4) During the Tricontinental Conference, First Secretary Mario Monje agreed with the Cuban foquistas to begin armed struggle immediately in Bolivia.

(5) Toward the middle of 1966, Monje sent Che Guevara four party militants -- Roberto Peredo, Luis Méndez, Jorge Vásquez Viaña, and Rodolfo Saldaña -- as helpers. Monje sent them, according to his own confession, "to protect him [Che] in his passage and, if possible, to follow him later" (in the guerrilla struggle). The first three comrades died at Nancahuazú.

(6) Some of those who went to Cuba for guerrilla training were warned by Monje not to show their faces in their homes on their return but to go directly to the field of struggle. Monje himself went around for a while ingeniously and lugubriously predicting that his wife would probably soon be a widow.

(7) In execution of an express agreement with Comrade Fidel Castro, First Secretary Monje went to meet with Comrade Che Guevara in Nancahuazú on December 31, 1966.

There, this Bolivian leader demanded that military leadership of the guerrilla struggle be turned over to him. When he was refused he promised to resign as first secretary of the party and join the group as an ordinary guerrilla. He later reneged on this without explanation.

(8) In its January 1967 letter to Comrade Fidel Castro, the Central Committee made no reference to arbitrariness or any intrusion of Cuban foquistas into our country. Nor did it disavow or reject the guerrilla struggle. It did not even say that this struggle was prepared behind its back. It limited itself to noting mildly "the assessment that the Bolivian revolution must be led by Bolivians." The Central Committee took no measure in regard to the cadres and militants who had joined the guerrillas.

(9) In February 1967 Secretary Jorge Kolle told Comrade Fidel Castro that he "had not been informed of the continental magnitude of the task." Once informed, he said that he was prepared to collaborate with the guerrillas "on a basis" which had to be discussed with Comrade Guevara, as the diary says and as Kolle does not deny.

(10) While the fighting was going on, in May 1967, Kolle gave an interview to the Chilean magazine Flash in which he made sensationalistic statements suggesting that he was not uninvolved in preparing and leading the guerrilla struggle. He said, among other things, that the survival

of the guerrillas was "a strategic military problem which has been carefully studied." He added: "We never considered the possibility of the guerrillas being crushed by the army."

Later, I made grave accusations against Secretary Kalle in matters regarding the survivors. The Rescue Committee had to let the foquistas of the Ejército de Liberación Nacional [ELN -- National Liberation Army] participate in the work, because they came with a note from Kalle. Shortly afterward, under a feeble pretext, he refused to give the essential credentials to an emissary that Cochabamba sent to Chile to secure the cooperation of the Chilean comrades in helping to get the survivors into that country. At the same time, he refused the proposals the Chileans made for assuring the final steps in the rescue. Later, he failed to follow consistently the plan developed for the guerrillas' exit from the country. For that reason the three Cubans continued their trip under the care of elements of the ELN.

Finally, as he confessed to me personally, Kalle took no security measures to guarantee the success of the operation, which resulted in the humiliating scenes in Sabaya, where the Cubans were on the verge of falling into the hands of the Bolivian army.

The denunciations that I made and the way I pressed them resulted in the rumor in a certain sector of the party that my attitude came from the mere fact that I am Comrade Inti Peredo's father-in-law. This ingenious response reminds me of the rumor that the Maoists started up some years ago against Secretary Jorge Kalle -- that he was an agent of the MNR because he is the brother of Colonel León Kalle, a confidant of Paz Estenssoro. Naturally, these are entirely different cases, but the intent seems the same in both.

In conclusion, I repeat that I can no longer continue functioning as a party member under the leadership of the cadres who presently head the party, that I find resignation preferable.

Sincerely,

Jesús Lara

P.S. I publicly declare that my resignation is irrevocable and that therefore I am not a member of the PCB. Farewell.

\* \* \*

#### An "Expulsion"

Four days after publishing Jesús Lara's letter of resignation, the Cocha-

bamba paper Los Tiempos carried a "Communique" signed by the Regional Committee of the PCB reporting that the Quechua poet had been expelled "for his antiparty activity, his ideological degeneration, his acts of informing, and his betrayal of the party and the Bolivian working class and people."

On February 1, Jesús Lara replied in a letter in the Cochabamba daily Prensa Libre. He refused to admit that the document from the Regional Committee was genuine since the majority had always backed his positions. He added that there could be no explanation for a turn as "indecent as the one the Central Committee made in one year's time, portraying the guerrillas in 1968 as the 'forerunners of the socialist revolution in Bolivia' and pillorying them in January 1969 as the protagonists of a dismal Waterloo.

"This means that the 'Communique' was concocted behind the backs of the majority and has all the characteristics of a forgery. Such procedures are not unusual in a certain section of the party, the section whose teacher is Mario Monje. This leader falsified the list of candidates for the Central Committee in the Second Party Congress, removing some names and replacing them with those of the most dangerous Maoists."

"It must be pointed out," Lara added, "that the forgery was the exclusive work of three members of the Regional Committee, of whom I will say only that they are distinguished by their blind obedience to Monje-Kolle. Their action was aimed at protecting the guilty leaders and not the principles and conceptions of the party."

"The people," he continued, "must be my just and stern judge, the people who read my works and who see the fight I wage."

"This cloud of imputations appeared without warning and is the result solely of my letter of resignation. Before this letter, no one, not even the followers of the duo, thought of making any accusations of this nature. The only previous occasion was when Jorge Kalle threw out an accusation at me in the last Regional Committee discussion, which I think was meant as a warning. Driven into a corner by my denunciations and my arguments, and above all because I accused him to his face of being unprincipled and a liar, he shouted 'anti-party!' at me. Kalle not only considers himself the master of the party, but the party itself. Because the party belongs to him, anyone who attacks him is 'anti-party.'"

Lara's letter goes on: "Before all this, because of my insistence on pinning down the responsibility in the guerrilla affair, a high national leader -- later seconded by Jorge Kalle -- made me a

tempting offer of a vacation in the Soviet Union on the pretext that I needed rest because of my age and my work."

"I took the offer of a trip," Lara added, "as an attempted bribe."

"Jorge Kolle's gravest guilt lies in his behavior during the final operation in the rescue of the survivors, that is, their journey to Chile. Presumably for the purpose of confusing me and thus moderating the extent of my denunciations, I was sent a surprise visitor even before my letter was in the hands of the papers. It was a functionary in the national leadership who came from La Paz and wanted to get together with me and pay a call. But the man went about his task with an excess of candor and a singular lack of tact. He started out by asking me if I had spoken with Inti Peredo since he came back. When I said no, he beamed. And, very sure of himself, he began to speak his piece. It was a typical attempt to mislead, in the style of the CIA. Of course, this harangue attributed all the innocence of Pontius Pilate to Kolle."

Jesús Lara's letter ended with the following paragraph:

#### NEW UNREST IN SPANISH UNIVERSITIES

The Franco government's state of emergency decree seems to have failed to achieve its stated purpose. This police-rule decree was instituted, according to its advocates in the fascist parliament, to "end agitation in the universities."

Under strong international pressure, the regime has promised that the state of emergency will be lifted on March 24. Only a few days before this date, widespread opposition activity was still being reported in the major Spanish universities.

Ten thousand students went on strike in Bilbao March 14 to protest the shooting of twenty-four-year-old student Jesús Omenaras by police the previous day. Police wounded Omenaras as he tried to escape arrest.

The first day of the strike was marked by violent actions. In the morning, hundreds of students waged a pitched battle against the police who tried to block the entrance to the University of Bilbao school of economics.

In the early afternoon groups of students roamed through the streets, demonstrating and stoning police. Several hundred young demonstrators tried to hold a protest meeting on the Plaza de José

"This arbitrary form of expulsion was a clearly Stalinist method. It first appeared in Bolivia as a weapon manufactured by PIR [Partido de la Izquierda Revolucionaria -- Party of the Revolutionary Left -- a party formed by the Stalinists in 1940 and dissolved in 1952]. You could not renounce membership in the PIR. Anyone who sent in a letter of resignation was automatically hit with expulsion.

"In the early years of its existence, the Partido Comunista de Bolivia recognized this method as a bad legacy. But later, because this weapon was considered ridiculous, absurd, and counterproductive, provisions for expulsions of this sort were removed from the statutes and given a deep burial. The statutes in force no longer recognize this measure.

"Despite everything, there are those today who are trying to dig up this method and use it as a weapon. But using it today is like trying to hit the mark with a musket. This is what losing your balance and insisting on defending the guilty leads to. This is how I was expelled belatedly by a false document behind the backs of the majority of the Regional Committee."

Antonio [named after the ideological father of Spanish fascism] but were dispersed by brutal police attacks.

On Monday, March 18, armed police occupied the Bilbao school of economics, stationing guards in the corridors, the classrooms, and at the main entrance. The police also invaded the Jesuit-run University of Deusto in Bilbao where striking students were sitting in. It is rumored that the Deusto authorities have decided to close the school indefinitely.

Hundreds of students marched through the main streets of Bilbao in the afternoon, March 18, calling for the release of their arrested comrades. No incidents were reported.

The student opposition movement at the University of Barcelona has revived since that school was reopened at the end of February. About a dozen students were arrested March 19 as the government continued its efforts to pacify the university.

As arrests of militant students continued in Barcelona, a number of Christian Democrats arrested earlier on the accusation of belonging to the autonomist Democratic Union of Catalonia were reported released.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN ITALY

By Livio Maitan

[The following is a report on the development of the Italian political and social crisis given to the congress this month of the Gruppi dei Comunisti Rivoluzionari (GCR -- Revolutionary Communist Groups -- the Italian Section of the Fourth International). Livio Maitan is the national secretary of the GCR. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

For the broader political analysis, let me begin by repeating a passage from the outline for pre-congress discussion which summarized our evaluation of the situation as of the first days of December:

"The exceptional depth of the Italian crisis is therefore produced by the accumulation and combination of international tensions, by the profound decrepitude of the system in Italy together with the irruption of social tensions and conflicts at many levels, and the breakdown of the traditional bureaucratic restraints.

"In other words, we are facing a situation in which various lower social strata and groups are being driven by overpowering pressures to break out of the old patterns, to overturn the old taboos, to break all restraints and move 'freely' in accordance with the logic of their most direct interests and most immediate aspirations. From this, the tendency arises for the spread of spontaneous mobilizations, inasmuch as no political force is in control of them, functioning as a general catalyst. In this lies the strength of the movement which is tending to broaden and deepen (consider for example both the ferment among the workers and the extension of the high-school students' movement in recent weeks).

"However, this spontaneous character also sets a limit to the movement. Because in the absence of a unifying and coordinating force capable of projecting an overall strategy and thus of proposing a way out through a decisive political conflict, all the driving forces remain disparate. Centrifugal forces tend to prevail. And at times of generalized struggle (general strikes in cities or regions, etc.), the various movements fall under the sway of the bureaucratic apparatuses and thus do not get beyond the level of protest or pressure."

In the two and one-half months that have passed since this draft document was drawn up, the situation has developed

essentially along these lines. A whole series of pressures, tensions, and explosions have continued to develop on various levels. However, this trend has not acquired a general political expression. The apparatuses of the traditional parties are unable to give this unrest a political expression because the solution they seek conflicts with the logic of the developing movements. On the other hand, the revolutionary left cannot give a comprehensive political form to the struggle because of its limited forces, its lack of coordination, and its fragmentation. In reality, if there has been no leap toward a prerevolutionary or revolutionary situation in Italy, it is principally owing to the absence of unifying political direction. To come to the more specific developments of recent weeks, alongside the new waves of strikes and student mobilizations, the tendencies in the bourgeoisie that we stressed in our January meeting have taken sharper form. The bourgeois leadership is continuing to founder in the midst of insoluble difficulties. In fact, it has not emerged from the crisis into which it was precipitated last fall. However, the bloc of the ruling classes, to the extent that we can speak today of a ruling-class front, is working on two levels. It is developing both a reformist and a repressive alternative.

Our class enemies cannot permit the present situation to continue indefinitely. They cannot allow explosive material to continue to accumulate. They cannot let a situation develop where, to a greater or lesser degree, the battles around renewal of the NATO pact and the struggles over new contracts in the major industries would interlock with all the other problems still unsettled. Therefore, the maneuver of the ruling classes is to defuse certain issues. They already tried to accomplish this with the agreement on pensions and, partially, with the agreement on job classifications for the state enterprises. And it is quite probable -- despite the indications in recent days -- that in the not too distant future, in any case before the big new contract disputes begin, an agreement will be reached on job classifications in private industry. There is some room for concessions in this area. Above all, a compelling political necessity exists for the conservative classes to make these attempts. The pension agreement obviously has not solved the central problems. (It clearly could not incorporate the transitional demand for real workers management of the pension funds.) However, from a quantitative standpoint it involved not insignificant gains. Other examples of such attempts can be

found at more local levels or in certain industries. We need only think of the Pirelli agreement and the Milan street-car operators' agreement. Both of these agreements were considered quite positive, at least in some aspects, even by the rank-and-file committees. Both were evidently granted to prevent continuation of tense situations which were dangerous both for the employers and the trade-union apparatuses.

We must indeed study the question of the room available for concessions from an economic standpoint but we must also, and above all, consider this question from the political point of view. On the purely economic level, there obviously are variables. In general, in this period, the economic margin for concessions is not great. This is true above all because of the ever more decisive importance of international competition. Significant concessions would inevitably endanger the government's whole economic policy. But from the political standpoint I think the ruling class has no alternative but to give concessions. More specifically this means that, to the extent that it has been able to stay on its feet and continue to stagger along, the precariously existing center-left government has managed to make certain economic concessions. These concessions at least reduce the explosiveness in some sectors of the working class and restore a certain authority to the unions. This means, finally, that while in the abstract the margin for concessions is not great, extremely strong political pressure exists for exploiting the available margin to the fullest. The same pressure exists in the educational system, where the government intends to put forth considerable effort.

What results can these new reformist maneuvers produce? It is not certain, it is not entirely certain, that in a situation like the present one, concessions can demobilize or slow the movement. In the case of the students, who are a completely special political and social force and have attained a high level of consciousness, it is clear that all these reformist maneuvers have little chance of success -- at least insofar as the present tendencies continue. But, in a context of social conflicts and enormous political tension, achieving certain practical demands would not automatically produce a relaxation in working-class strata or a reabsorption of combativity. On the contrary, such a victory could inspire the workers with more self-confidence, with a greater faith in the rewards of struggle, in the new methods of struggle that have developed. Thus, even considering that reformist-type maneuvers are unavoidable -- at least as long as a center-left government exists -- these maneuvers are contained by the narrow limits of the present context.

There is, therefore, a second fundamental tendency which we have already had occasion to speak of. This tendency springs from an ever more widespread awareness in various sectors of the ruling class that it would be extremely dangerous, if not intolerable, for the disintegration that developed in the political contingents and apparatuses in 1968 to continue six months or a year more. Calls for action to compensate for the "default of the state" have become a frequent theme in the right-wing press. The incidents in Viareggio offered a good pretext for launching a campaign of this type. In recent days, there have been clearer and more concrete indications -- for example, during the demonstration against Nixon in Rome -- that certain groups and forces, probably linked to sections of the police, intend to push a more aggressive policy or even provoke some grave incident in order to justify an escalation of repression. Next, we should consider the various attempts to use goon squads in many cities. Naples was the most sensational example. We should take account of demonstrations like those of certain parents in some Milan schools or like the so-called fathers' demonstration in Rome organized by the daily Il Tempo. The scope attained by this demonstration was by no means inconsiderable. Thus, there is a whole campaign of action to organize the right. But perhaps it is still excessive to speak of fascist-type movements. Old structures or instruments of a fascist type have of course been used, for the lack of anything better. However, in order to properly call a movement fascist, it would have to have the support at least of some petty-bourgeois sectors.

On the level of organizing goon squads, however, certain advances have been achieved. And this is an important element to take into consideration. In this phase, the promoters of these tendencies do not propose to win political leadership but to exercise pressures, to achieve a certain weight and give a determined orientation to the repressive forces. The campaign to win a social base, especially among the petty bourgeoisie, is under way. This operation consists of appealing to those sectors which are hurt or at least seriously disturbed by the continuation of the present situation. It seeks to incite them to protest and rebellion at the lack of prospects for a solution to the crisis in progress. This is shown already, in my opinion, in the changed attitude of certain sectors of the petty bourgeoisie toward the student movement. The attitude of these sectors today is quite a bit less favorable than it was a year or six months ago. There are dangers here. Let us not forget that for almost a year the right-wing forces were unable to organize a single demonstration but today they can organize street demonstrations and confront the student movement. In certain circumstances they can even use groups of stu-



dents.

Unquestionably, the right may make mistakes. If, for example, it chose to force a general test of strength today, it would probably be defeated, since the student movement may revive and the fighting potential of the working class is intact. But, obviously, we cannot base our outlook on the assumption that our enemy may fumble.

As for the much discussed possibility that a way out of the crisis may be sought by bringing the Communist party into the government, it seems to me that this would be difficult to achieve today. This is not to say that there are not elements in the bourgeoisie that favor this idea, and sections of the Communist party well disposed toward it. It is probable in fact that both the bourgeois and Communist forces favoring such a maneuver will grow stronger as the situation heats up. But the objective obstacles remain considerable. If the Communist leaders want to keep firm ties with the masses -- which in the last analysis is the basis of their strength -- they would have to win greater concessions than the bourgeoisie is able to make. The obstacle represented by the problem of the NATO pact would also have to be removed. And the bourgeoisie is less willing than ever to give any ground on this question. Moreover, it is clear that if the tendency were toward stagnation or passivity of the mass movement, the operation of bringing the CP into the government might be attempted or carried out. But, as we have seen, this is not the situation now and such a development is not foreseeable in the immediate future.

Let me say a few words here on the balance sheet of the struggles in 1968, on which I think we all agree. What has occurred has been of enormous importance. And if our analyses are critical or qualified, there must be no mistake about one thing -- we start from the established fact of the enormous portent of the events of last year and the early months of 1969. In brief, the developments among working-class social forces have produced broad changes in the panorama of Italian political life. They have reversed all the tendencies toward stagnation and passivity, etc., which were the basis of the theories familiar to us [that is, theories writing off the workers as a revolutionary force -- I.P.]. The tendency for the bureaucratic leaderships to lose control is now a general trend and is a constant in the Italian situation. We have always been the ones who maintained that such a situation would inevitably develop at a certain point. It would be ridiculous for us today -- perhaps as a result of the grave difficulties our movement has experienced in this period -- to close our eyes to this situation or try

to minimize it now that it has appeared. The fact remains, however, that the tendencies involved have not assumed a generalized focus, or where this has occurred, the focus was again provided by the big bureaucratic apparatuses. Thus, while the logic which set these various forces in motion is the same, the forces have not been able to develop and achieve hegemony, except on the local level and in specific industries.

In regard to the student movement, I think we must reaffirm the basic analysis we developed in our March conference last year. Our conception is that the student movement is a political and social phenomenon produced by the specific reality of this phase in the history of the advanced capitalist countries. (We will discuss the character of the student movement in other parts of the world today in a later conference when we examine the documents for the world congress of the Fourth International.) In other words, the student struggle is not a narrowly political development caused by the maturing of vanguard nuclei, but a profound social phenomenon in countries that have attained a certain level of industrial and technological advancement. On the basis of this premise, we must assume that while the movement may have its ups and downs, and even suffer severe defeats, it is destined to remain a constant factor. We must assume, then, that it can revive impetuously after falling to a low point. This premise also implies that the student movement necessarily follows the logic of a mass political movement, that it develops in accordance with its own fundamental dynamic. This dynamic may be parallel or convergent with that of the workers movement, depending on the circumstances, but nonetheless it represents a logic peculiar to a mass movement.

Here we must introduce a distinction, if we want to avoid repeated confusion. Functioning as a mass movement having its own dynamic, the student movement critically disrupts the equilibrium of the system, thus aiding the struggle of the working class through action convergent with it. The student vanguard groups, however, are another matter. These groups, arriving at an overall vanguard view of the struggle against capitalism, participate with workers' groups, or with political groups more generally, in specific actions aimed at the factories. They consider this an essential task. For a movement like ours in the present phase, this work is in fact a fundamental task. But it would be an error in basic assessment to maintain that the student movement as such must center its activity around groups intervening in the working class. This would be too restricted a view of the student movement -- if, in fact, such a concept were not simply the product of a conviction that the mass student movement had

run out of steam and that there was nothing else to do for student revolutionists who wanted to continue to struggle. Such a tendency was, perhaps, predominant in Rome until the most recent days when it was seen that the movement could again develop its potential -- if on a more limited scale.

Actually here we run up against the essential contradiction of the student movement. It cannot develop and achieve its goal of completely changing the overall university and scholastic structures without exceeding the bounds of capitalist society. But the students cannot break out of these limitations without a general social crisis that would overturn the system as a whole. Thus the movement develops, mounts, but then runs into the obstacle represented by the fact that it is not paralleled by an overall revolutionary crisis. So it halts, begins to retreat, and seeks other outlets.

If we fail to understand this logic, we will not understand the real drama of the student movement -- which rather may look like a farce insofar as it is reflected in the attitudes of individual personalities, whose limitations and distortions are only too apparent.

Therefore, we must clearly distinguish the two levels I have indicated. We must stress that the student movement has to be conceived fundamentally as a mass movement, as the expression of objective social contradictions. And we must furthermore realize that if worker fractions can carry on factory activity in a radically different atmosphere today, it is because of the appearance of the mass student movement, which has mobilized tens of thousands of university and high-school students in the streets of Italy. It is because of this movement, which has clashed with repression and drawn the hostility of the ruling class.

All this means that we must not only uphold the idea of a mass student movement but also fight to get the student movement organized as a political movement and on a national scale. The arguments we heard at the Central Committee meeting in October -- that we should not try to build a national organization because, in the given situation, leading groups with an incorrect line (they spoke more specifically about Turin) would probably be dominant in it -- were absurd, sectarian, and shortsightedly tactical arguments. They revealed a lack of confidence in the dynamic of the movement. If you have confidence in this dynamic, you will understand that this movement -- which has had such a great impact even in the form, primarily, of spontaneous explosions of a "random" character and limited duration -- would have an incom-

parably greater impact if it moved as a cohesive and organized force, no matter what leaderships arose temporarily. Moreover, many international experiences fully confirm this need for organization both positively and negatively. The first of these is the experience of the French May when, despite its substantial weakness and contradictory character, UNEF [Union Nationale des Etudiants Français -- National Union of French Students] was able to act as a catalyst at critical moments.

As for the objectives of the student movement, we should stress that while this movement has an anticapitalist logic, it nonetheless faces certain dangers. The student movement has an anticapitalist logic because, except in an overall revolutionary context, it cannot solve the fundamental problems of the universities and the educational system in general, which are linked to the underlying problems of the society as a whole. The dangers confronting the movement are juxtaposed -- ending up in petty reformism or falling into verbal revolutionism pure and simple, into a stultifying repetition that all problems can be solved only with the overthrow of capitalism. We do not deny in the least that it is also necessary to develop general propaganda aimed at layers of the student movement, but the problem is to find the proper guidelines for the mass movement as such. On this level, the only possible slogans are transitional ones. In Italy, this approach is expressed primarily in the formula of "student power" -- used with certain meanings. In other countries, the formula used is that of "the red university." Used in France and elsewhere, this slogan has also begun to circulate more recently in Italy as well. It means that in view of the political development of broad layers of students, the universities and all the schools can become fortresses of the revolutionary movement and the anticapitalist movement in general. It means that all educational institutions can become positions of strength which must be fully exploited in the present situation as well. In other words, these positions must constitute conquests for the movement as such. This would be similar to what happened in certain phases of the history of the workers movement when conquests of permanent value were won (e.g., the unions), whatever may be said about the degenerative processes they have undergone. In the worst variant, that is, in case major social conflict fails to emerge, these conquests will mean the creation of valuable positions of strength for the overall anticapitalist movement. In the most favorable variant, if the situation matures, centers of dual power will begin to develop.

This must be the basic line. No other is objectively possible. Obviously

this is no panacea. Every conquest will have to be continually reinforced and renewed. On the other hand, we must fight against conceptions that underestimate or outrightly reject limited demands and objectives. Movements acquire confidence, develop, and consolidate precisely on the basis of the results they obtain. One of the reasons that the student movement has taken a downturn, leading it from the mobilization of tens of thousands of people to activating groups of a few hundred persons in various centers, must be sought in the movement's incapacity to assume a basic line like the one I described and, similarly, in its constant vacillation between a correct propaganda line, but correct only in the abstract, and narrow reformism in practice. Let me add that, in the day-to-day situation, given the specific characteristics of the student movement, the danger that limited gains may serve to emasculate the movement or reintegrate it is extremely small. The greater danger, on the other hand, is that the student movement will degenerate into maximalist agitation, that it will come alive only on certain special occasions and through taking tactical advantage of the enemy's mistakes during repressions.

All this helps us also to understand many developments in sections of the working class, developments that in the last analysis are at the root of certain profound crises that all the vanguard movements experienced over the past year. To characterize the main tendencies in the politicalized mass student movement, we must say that there is no doubt that ultraleft tendencies, in the Leninist sense of the word, have predominated. The roots of these tendencies are easily identifiable. The social nature of the student movement inevitably produces such currents, which a conscious political leadership must combat.

The fundamental criticism we make of certain comrades who have left our organization is certainly not that they involved themselves deeply in the student movement -- such a criticism would be ab-

surd on the face of it. Our criticism is that they completely submerged themselves in the movement, that they capitulated politically to the tendencies predominating from time to time, and thus acted without a line and without a clearly defined perspective.

Ultraleft tendencies will be a constant factor in the period we find ourselves in. We are living in an objectively revolutionary phase. Enormous explosive forces are at work and ever broader strata realize the necessity of overthrowing capitalist society. (But on the other hand, great bureaucratic apparatuses exist which will serve as powerful brakes. In such a situation, it is natural for some forces to take the path of ultraleftism. Another historical period in which the phenomenon of ultraleftism appeared, although on a smaller scale than today, was the period immediately following the first world war. There were great revolutionary opportunities in Europe and the Social Democratic parties played the same stabilizing role that today not only the Social Democratic but also the Communist parties play. At that time, the Communist parties themselves were attacked by waves of extremism. It was at that time precisely that Lenin wrote "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder, which may be recommended for rereading. Far from being outmoded, its arguments have an acute timeliness. For example, the polemics against the unions come to mind. Today, too, people are dismissing the unions on the basis of wholly subjectivist criteria, without considering whether or not they objectively represent an indispensable function in the workers movement. The result is that there is an abundance of literature filled with absurd formulations, which, far from harming the apparatuses, benefit them. Moreover, anyone with experience in fraction work knows how often the most ultraleft groups indulge in the narrowest trade unionism when they are confronted with the reality in the factories.

[To be continued.]

#### BARRICADES STILL UP AT TOKYO UNIVERSITY

Yasuda Hall at Tokyo University, where students fought off police for two days before being overwhelmed last January 19, is still closed. Barricades that were first set up more than a year ago are still in place. Despite the police occupation, three out of ten of the university's faculties are still on strike. Entrance examinations for the year have been canceled by the government.

Meanwhile, the tactics of the con-

tinuing struggle are being fought out among the student organizations. Minsei, the group led by the Japan Communist party, "is calling for full-scale resumption of classes," according to the March 15-17 Christian Science Monitor. "The Minsei's hated rivals," the Monitor correspondent added, " -- the extreme Marxists who belong to the Sampa Rengo (three-factions) group -- insist upon a longer student strike until the university bows to every student demand."

NEW FACTS UNCOVERED IN MONDLANE ASSASSINATION

The bomb that killed Dr. Eduardo Chivambo Mondlane, the president of FRELIMO [Frente de Libertação de Moçambique -- Mozambique Liberation Front], was sent in a package from a European country, it was reported in Dar es Salaam March 14. The daily Standard in the Tanzanian capital city summarized a report published March 13 in the FRELIMO bulletin Mozambique Revolution which described the circumstances of Mondlane's death.

According to this report, Mondlane received the bomb, disguised as a book, in his mail at the FRELIMO office on Nkrumah Street. He picked up the package at 10 a.m. on February 3 and went to the

Msasani beach house of Miss Betty King, a director of the Tanzania Gem Exporting Company. There, he opened the package and the bomb exploded, killing him.

The Standard said that the FRELIMO bulletin disclosed that an attempt was also made on the life of Dr. Marcelino Dos Santos, a member of the political department and the Central Committee of FRELIMO.

A few days after Mondlane's death, Dos Santos received a book mailed from Europe. He sent the package to the Tanzanian Criminal Investigation Department, whose operatives found and defused a bomb contained in the book.

YUGOSLAV COURT SENTENCES SEVEN FOR "INCITING NATIONAL HATRED"

Seven members of the Albanian ethnic minority were sentenced to prison terms of three to six years March 22 in Skoplje, the capital city of the Yugoslav republic of Macedonia. According to reports in Belgrade, the defendants were accused of "maliciously inciting national

hatred and intolerance among the people."

About a million ethnic Albanians are included in the Macedonian republic, which borders Albania. Unlike other nationalities in Yugoslavia, the Albanians have no autonomous republic of their own.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
PHOTO: March 9 Demonstration in Brussels Against the Vietnam War and NATO .....	305
Pressure Mounts for the U.S. to Get Out of Vietnam .....	306
People's Tribunals Set Up in East Pakistan -- by Les Evans .....	307
DRAWING: Ayub Khan .....	308
More Prison Terms Decreed for Opponents of Greek Junta .....	309
The "Rendezvous of March" in Paris -- by Jean Ravel .....	310
Students in Tanzania Demand Expulsion of American Lecturers .....	311
Text of Grigorenko-Yakhimovich Appeal on Czechoslovakia .....	312
Students Seize Government Buildings in Rural Colombia .....	312
Toward a New Confrontation in France .....	313
Greek Resistance Leader Denied Permission to Speak in U.S. ....	315
Israeli Socialists Demand Withdrawal from Occupied Territories .....	316
DRAWING: Moshe Dayan .....	316
Paul Boutelle Wages Socialist Campaign in New York .....	318
PHOTO: Paul Boutelle .....	318
Jesús Lara's Resignation from the Bolivian Communist Party .....	319
New Unrest in Spanish Universities .....	322
Barricades Still Up at Tokyo University .....	327
New Facts Uncovered in Mondlane Assassination .....	328
Yugoslav Court Sentences Seven for "Inciting National Hatred" .....	328
Document:	
The Political Situation in Italy -- by Livio Maitan .....	323

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

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

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