

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 7, No. 21

© 1969 Intercontinental Press

June 2, 1969

50c

Student Rebellion in Argentina

**Women's March
in London**

**Pyotr Yakir's
Indictment of Stalin**

**Daniel Camejo
Sentenced in Mexico**



Krivine Campaign News

STUDENT REVOLTS FLARE THROUGHOUT ARGENTINA

By Gerry Foley

Explosive confrontations between Argentinian students and workers and the police and army escalated to a new level May 23 when both of the country's major trade-union federations called a nationwide general strike in support of protests sweeping the country. One of the union federations, the CGT-Participacionista [the Participationist Confederación General de Trabajadores (General Confederation of Workers)], had previously collaborated with the military dictatorship.

A general strike had already totally paralyzed Rosario, Argentina's second largest city, on May 22. The local labor movement called the strike in defiance of the martial law established in the city early that morning when the army moved in to quell mass protests against police brutality.

The outbreak occurred when police shot and killed a fifteen-year-old youth on the night of May 21 in the course of demonstrations protesting police shootings of two students the preceding week.

Infuriated by this latest killing, the demonstrators seized a fifty-block area in the central part of the city and sealed it off with barricades and bonfires. After about a dozen more students and young bystanders were seriously wounded by police bullets, the crowd besieged the police station. A group of students seized a radio station and tried to broadcast a revolutionary appeal.

An eyewitness report of the fighting was quoted in the New York Times May 23, which described the situation this way:

"It was open warfare. After the shootings the police locked themselves up inside headquarters for protection. The students were controlling the city center."

At 3 a.m., contingents of troops were rushed into the city with orders to fire on groups who refused to disperse. Some 100 persons were injured and twenty-five were arrested by the time the fighting died down.

Protests have been spreading in Argentina since April. In mid-May students and workers began battling the repressive forces in clashes that have broadened and grown more violent. The battle in Rosario May 21-22 marked the sixth straight night of militant actions sweeping most large cities throughout the country.

During the week of May 12-17, major flare-ups occurred in the cities of Córdoba, Corrientes, Resistencia, and Rosario.

In Corrientes the police turned their guns on a student demonstration,



ONGANIA: Spare the club, spoil the student.

killing the medical student Juan José Cabral. In Córdoba, the police touched off a battle lasting for hours when they tried to prevent automobile workers from meeting in their union hall. In Resistencia, student protests brought academic life to a standstill.

The student outbursts appear to have been touched off by a government decision to more than double the price of meals in student cafeterias. The student Juan Cabral was reportedly shot to death in the University of Corrientes cafeteria during the protest there.

However, unrest in the universities has been seething since the junta, led by General Onganía, abolished university autonomy in 1966. The university rectors appointed by the military dictatorship are particularly hated by students and faculty alike. In the course of the recent pro-

tests, for example, 100 professors at the Universidad del Nordeste [University of the Northeast] sent a petition to the government calling for the removal of the rector and administrative officials at their school. This protest was lodged in the face of recent government purges of opposition professors.

The workers and the general population also have new grievances against the dictatorship. The government has just raised the price of gasoline 20 percent, the cost of public transportation 25 percent, and has abolished the 9 percent weekly bonuses for overtime that were in effect in five provinces.

The unrest appeared to have spread far beyond the limits of previous opposition to the regime. Henri Janières, the special correspondent for Le Monde, wrote May 17:

"It is not true as the authorities tend to suggest, that the unrest occurring since last month in several provinces is due to extreme left agitators. In all the demonstrations you see as many nationalists, who have traditionally been considered rightists, as you do Peronists, or far leftists."

On May 17 students in Rosario organized a demonstration in support of their comrades in Corrientes and in protest against the killing of Juan José Cabral. Once again the police fired on a student demonstration. Twenty-two-year-old economics student Ramón Bello was shot to death -- not in the fighting, his fellow demonstrators say, but executed out of hand by the cops.

On May 19 the government ordered the University of Corrientes closed for one week, the University of Rosario for three days, and the University of La Plata and Seaboard University in Santa Fe for one day each. The students called strikes in Mendoza and Cuyo. Fighting broke out between police and students in Buenos Aires.

In an article written May 20, Janières commented: "To judge from the development of the situation in Corrientes since Thursday [May 15], the demon-

strations seem not to be limited to students alone. The killing of two students one after another has, in fact, upset the people of the cities where the clashes have taken place and provoked demonstrations condemning the police and the authorities."

On May 20 the Argentinian national student association called demonstrations for the following day.

On May 21 the students in Mendoza, the capital of the province bordering Chile, occupied the schools of letters and political science at their university.

In Córdoba the police fired tear gas at about 1,000 students as they left memorial services for the slain youths.

At the University of Buenos Aires, the police dispersed a meeting of 500 students in the law and social science school and attacked 300 students in the school of letters and philosophy, arresting twenty. The CGT organized a collection of funds to aid the students.

On May 22 demonstrations of protest occurred in Buenos Aires against one-month jail terms given to students arrested in fighting May 19. There were no trials; the police have the authority to arbitrarily jail persons, accused of causing public disorders, for up to thirty days.

The largest demonstration occurred, however, when about 1,000 students from the Catholic University of El Salvador tried to hold a protest march after leaving a memorial mass for the murdered demonstrators. "A priest was beaten by the police when he loudly accused them of 'criminal behavior,'" the New York Times reported.

On May 23, according to a Reuters dispatch, "New student street violence was reported...in Buenos Aires, Santa Fe, Tucumán, La Plata, and other cities." The sparks of conflagration seemed to be still spreading. On May 24 Buenos Aires was reported closed down and the government threatened to reimpose the death penalty -- which was abolished in 1916 -- in Rosario.

NATIONWIDE PROTESTS IN VENEZUELA AGAINST SHOOTING OF STUDENTS

Nearly all Venezuelan universities were shut down by a general strike May 17 while thousands of university and high-school students demonstrated to protest the death of a student gunned down by police in the provincial city of Mérida two days before. Four other students were badly wounded May 15 at Los Andes University

in Mérida, 400 miles southwest of Caracas, when police fired on a demonstration in support of academic reform.

In the provincial towns of Maracay and Barquisimeto sixteen demonstrators were wounded by police gunfire May 17. One student was shot in the back.

DANIEL CAMEJO, OTHER POLITICAL PRISONERS, SENTENCED IN MEXICO

Mexico City

On May 14 at about 9:15 in the evening, fourteen political prisoners who had been held in Lecumberri prison for almost two years were called out of their cells in groups of two or three to appear before Judge Raúl Jiménez O'Farrill to hear his decision in the "trial" he has been conducting of their cases.

He found all of them guilty of "conspiracy, inciting rebellion, and damaging public property," and issued the following sentences:

Adán Nieto Castillo, José Luis Calva Téllez, Pablo Alvarado Barrera, Roberto Iriarte Jiménez, Hugo David Uriarte y Bonilla -- eight years, ten months in prison and a 20,000-peso fine [one peso = US\$.125].

Adrián Campos Díaz -- six years and a 5,000-peso fine.

Miguel Angel Flores Bernal, Eduardo Fuentes de la Fuente, Raúl Contreras Alcántara, César Catalán Sánchez, Silvestre E. Marengo Martínez -- five years, six months and a 15,000-peso fine.

Daniel Camejo Guanche -- five years and a 5,000-peso fine.

Miguel Méndez Prado and Enrique Escudero Mastache -- two years, and a 3,000-peso fine.

The fourteen appealed the sentences. Camejo told the judge: "The entire legal case was a farce, whose only purpose was to intimidate the Mexican people and those who struggle for their rights."

The case began in July 1967 when the Díaz Ordaz regime staged a series of raids in Mexico City. It was alleged that a "Communist plot" had been uncovered to overthrow the Mexican government. To substantiate the charge, seventeen to twenty tons of books, magazines, pamphlets, and newspapers were seized in a bookstore featuring Maoist literature. The press ran sensational photographs of this haul with portraits of Mao, Lenin, Castro placed against the heap.

A small group of Maoists, alleged to have planned guerrilla war and to have tried to dynamite an army truck, was arrested. To provide a "Moscow" angle, the would-be guerrillas were charged with using an automobile made in the USSR. A "Trotskyist" twist was introduced by the arrest of Daniel Camejo, and an anti-Cuban note was injected with references to Havana and the arrest of several per-



CAMEJO: "The entire legal case was a farce, whose only purpose was to intimidate the Mexican people and those who struggle for their rights."

sons said to have engaged in guerrilla war either in Cuba or Central America. [See World Outlook (now Intercontinental Press), August 11, 1967, pp. 715-727 for full details on the case.]

The witch-hunt was staged on the eve of the OLAS conference. In fact many delegates, observers, and journalists were in Mexico City on their way to Cuba when the raids occurred.

How flimsy the government's case was can be judged from the fact that a number of the alleged "conspirators" met for the first time in prison.

The police sought to gain hard evidence through their favorite means -- torture. Those who "confessed" repudiated their "confessions" when the case finally reached a judge.

The verdict, as in a number of other recent cases in Mexico, was based on no other crime than that of being in opposition to the Díaz Ordaz regime.

MORE POLITICAL TRIALS IN GREECE

After two years in power, the Greek junta headed by Colonel George Papadopoulos still apparently finds it difficult to achieve the smooth coordination



PAPADOPOULOS: Torture? In sunny Greece?

of repression and democratic posturing which the U.S. State Department recommends for such governments (this strategy was reportedly termed the "Brazilian formula" in Washington). The colonels seem unable to overcome a certain clumsiness in their timing.

Shortly after their much-publicized promise at the beginning of April to restore some democratic rights, the Greek dictators launched a whole series of political trials. In a single two-week period in mid-May, eighty-six persons were brought before the Athens tribunal. Fifty-five of these have already been sentenced. At the same time, large trials have been held in a number of Greek provincial cities.

The trial of thirty-nine alleged members of the Patriotiko Metopo [Patriotic Front], the Communist party-supported resistance organization, began in Salonika on May 14. The hearings, however, have been delayed -- apparently only briefly -- by a series of embarrassing incidents.

Mrs. Parthena Keramyda, a twenty-five-year-old former member of the Lam-

brakis Youth, disavowed her testimony May 16, charging that it had been extorted by torture. Since a previous witness, Alexandros Barros, had already repudiated his testimony on the same grounds, the judge decided to suspend the hearings and order an investigation.

Barros had told the court that several of his ribs had been broken. The Associated Press reported that he appeared to be in a "state of collapse."

When the sessions resumed May 17, another witness, Georgios Phoundoulakis, announced that he had been subjected to illegal pressures to give false testimony.

Six intellectuals went on trial in Athens May 20, accused of building a network of Demokratike Amena [Democratic Defense], the resistance organization sponsored by the bourgeois-democratic Center Union party.

The two principal defendants, Vassilios Philiass and Spyros Plaskovitis, have international reputations. The first is known as the author of a treatise on the sociology of Max Weber and of two books, Freedom of the Press and The Problem of Productive Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries. The second is considered to be one of the leading writers of the postwar generation.

The prosecution is asking a life sentence for Philiass, who courageously indicted the dictatorship during his defense.

Two groups of alleged Trotskyists have been sentenced in the latest trials.

On May 21 the Athens tribunal handed down sentences of life imprisonment against three persons accused of being members of a Trotskyist resistance organization. They were charged with publishing underground leaflets as well as a journal called Spartacus. The principal defendant, Panagiotis Doulas, protested to the court that he had been tortured while in the hands of the police.

On May 25 a group of six accused of being Trotskyists received prison terms ranging from six months to life. The principal defendant, Ioannis Nikas, a cabinetmaker, was sentenced to life imprisonment for disseminating "subversive propaganda." On top of this sentence, he was given twenty years for allegedly bombing the American mission in Athens. Two of his comrades received twenty-year sentences. Nikas also protested that he had been brutally tortured at the hands of the police.

IRAQ MAKES PEACE OFFER AFTER NEW KURDISH OFFENSIVE

General Saadoun Ghaidan, a member of the five-man military junta in Iraq, announced May 23 that a new law would be



GEN. MUSTAFA AL-BARZANI

issued "soon" to grant autonomy to the country's 1.5 million Kurdish tribesmen -- about a fourth of Iraq's population. The Kurds, who have been fighting for independence off and on for eight years, launched a major offensive in northern Iraq at the beginning of March under the leadership of General Mustafa al-Barzani. The government has made similar promises to the Kurds in the past.

According to radio broadcasts from the insurgent Kurds reprinted in the Iranian press May 21, Barzani's forces had seized 100 military vehicles, several cases of grenades, 300 rifles, and other matériel. Agence France-Presse reported the same day: "The losses of the Ba'athist forces were said to be 560 regular troops and 120 Kurdish partisan supporters of the Baghdad regime." The Iraqi government bombed Kurdish positions, but the Kurds claimed to have shot down three MIG-17s and captured the pilots.

A major reason for the government's new promises is the Kurdish threat to Iraq's oil industry, which provides \$400 million a year, some 65 percent of the national income. The new Kurdish offensive opened March 1 with a mortar attack on installations of the Iraq Petroleum Company in Kirkuk, about sixty miles north of Baghdad. Barzani threatened to cripple oil production if the government did not grant Kurdish autonomy. The threat brought pressure to bear on Baghdad from several big imperialist oil monopolies. The New York Times reported May 24: "The threat has...been a cause of profound concern to British Petroleum, Shell, the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) and Mobil Oil, the holding companies that own International Petroleum."

The Kurds have indicated they will keep fighting until they are certain that the government's offer is genuine.

DUTCH POLICE ATTACK STUDENT SIT-IN

Twelve students and four policemen were seriously wounded when police intervened to end a sit-in in the administration building of the University of Amsterdam May 21. Some 400 demonstrators had occupied the administrative offices in the Maison de la Pucelle [House of the Virgin] to press demands for democracy in the university. They were supported by 5,000 other demonstrators ringing the building.

Violence developed when the president of the university, M.A. Belinfante, called in the police to end the protests.

In addition to the students injured, twenty-five others were arrested. There were no reports that the students had damaged the building or its furnishings. However, some of the occupiers were reported to have made photocopies of confidential documents.

After the police intervention at the university, Netherlands premier Piet de Jong announced in a television interview that the government fully endorsed the actions of the president and administration of the school. A parliamentary debate on the situation was scheduled.



"WE WANT EQUAL PAY!" May 18 women's march from Victoria Embankment to Trafalgar Square.

WOMEN IN BRITAIN DEMONSTRATE FOR EQUAL PAY

By Sue Pascoe

London

Nearly 2,000 working-class women demonstrated in Trafalgar Square here May 18 demanding equal pay with men. The march and rally was organised by the National Joint Action Campaign Committee for Women's Equal Rights.

Posters included such slogans as "Equal Pay for Equal Work" and "Barbara's Got It -- We Want It -- Equal Pay Now!" The Barbara concerned was Labour MP Barbara Castle, ex-left-winger and ex-supporter of the equal rights campaign, now devoting her energy to promoting the government's antistrike legislation and opposing the equal-pay movement.

The demonstrators braved cold wind and rain to hear speeches by women trade unionists and MPs and a few left-wing men. Speakers made it plain that the employers, and not male workers, are responsible for the discriminatory wage rates for women.

One speaker declared: "You have supported the employers for years by the difference between equal pay and the miserable wages you get."

The campaign's five-point charter was read. It called for the removal of sex discrimination against women in employment, education, social, and public life; and the inclusion of equal pay for equal work in all agreements between employers and the unions.

Amongst the unions represented were the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers; Society of Allied and Graphical Trades; Amalgamated Engineering Federation; and the Transport and General Workers Union.

Although the numbers on the demonstration were not large, this was the first national women's demonstration in Britain for nearly thirty years, and many of the participants came as representatives of factories.

THE STUDENT STRUGGLE IN MEXICO TODAY

By Dick Roberts

What was the reaction of the Mexican people to the October 2 massacre last year? What has been the fate of those who were imprisoned? What is the present stage of the student struggle?

These were the first questions I asked Ricardo Ochoa.* Ochoa has written extensively on the 1968 upsurge in Mexico City for Intercontinental Press and, as his own accounts clearly indicate, has been an active participant in the student struggles.

"Since the massacre in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas there have been many developments," Ochoa began.

"The first thing we have to underline is that this massacre made a great impact in the mass movement. Can you imagine, five hundred people murdered? It astonished and horrified the people.

"The students became more fearful of developments, too; but in the student movement I think the general reaction was one of moral indignation -- a greater moral indignation against the government. This spirit was reflected in the way the December demonstration** was organized."

Between the October 2 massacre at Tlatelolco and December 13, Ochoa explained, there had been a decline in the student movement. This was not only because of the Olympic games, but because of the leadership of the National Strike Council. I asked Ochoa many questions about this because it was the first time I had heard details about the student struggle after the murderous police attack.

"The National Strike Council," he explained, "was now directed by a secondary leadership, because the most important cadres of the first leadership were in jail, killed in the massacre, or simply hiding from the police. This gave the Communist party its chance to become -- the great organizer of defeats!

* Jane Porter, a correspondent for the Black Dwarf, participated in this interview. -- D.R.

** On December 13 close to 25,000 students in Mexico City attempted to march from the University of Mexico through the city to El Casco de Santo Tomás. The police and army surrounded the university, blocked the march and arrested 3,000 students. (See the account in the January 3 issue of the revolutionary socialist weekly The Militant, published in New York.)

"The first leadership of the National Strike Council, the most well-known leadership, the leadership that was developing when the movement was attacked, had evolved from students who had fought against reformist and class-collaborationist policies within the student movement.

"This leadership had the attention of the masses, and before October 2 it had more and more impact on the masses. This was one of the reasons for the massacre, to stop this development.

"The student movement had gained a wide range of followers in the masses and it began to make inroads into the working class of Mexico City.

"But the problem was that the first student leadership had no organizational structure outside of the National Strike Council, no organization like the Communist party--and this is why the CP could come in and provide a leadership to fill the vacuum created by the loss of these leaders."

Ochoa emphasized that the CP was not alone in constituting the new leadership but that those who were not in the CP did not have the clear orientation of the old leadership and tended to follow CP policies.

"The Communist party moved in, after the movement had been attacked, and worsened the catastrophe. The National Strike Council began to capitulate on principled questions; for example, at this point secret negotiations began with the government."*

The Communist party wanted to stop the strike. "It said it very clearly, even in its newspaper, Voz de Mexico [Voice of Mexico]."

Here Ochoa briefly outlined what had happened after the Olympic games had ended: "The military left the university, permitting the civil authorities to administer, and the movement started up again, but on a reduced level.

* These negotiations began several days after the massacre, violating the principle of public negotiations which had previously been demanded by the student strike council. The demand for release of all political prisoners, one of the central demands of the strike struggle, was replaced by a demand for the release of prisoners taken since the student struggle opened in July. -- D.R.

"The situation was not clear when classes opened in November. Two weeks before the official reopening of courses, the National Strike Council was panicked by government officials who said, in the secret negotiations, that the military would intervene again if it didn't lift the strike.

"All of a sudden in the assemblies of students -- these had resumed at the end of the Olympic games, but, of course, not at the level of those before October 2 -- the new National Strike Council leadership announced that the strike would have to be ended to prevent the military from returning to the university.

"Even though the demands that had been raised were reformist, the students respected the new leadership; their authority was undisputed. Consequently the students were very confused because the leaders could not give convincing explanations of why the strike should end."

The December 13 protest took place against this background. "The rank and file of the students wanted to fight, even then. What is the evidence? On December 13 there was a demonstration that had easily 20,000 students. The government deployed enormous forces, military and police. This demonstration was scheduled to go from the university to the polytechnic, through the city. But the government deployed the army around the university and prevented it from leaving the university.

"The number of students in this demonstration shows that the ranks wanted to fight."

The government meanwhile stepped up its offensive against the student movement by continuing to make sporadic arrests and seizures of student leaders for "questioning." At the same time it released all but the top leadership of the students seized in previous waves of arrests.

"The negotiations ended when school reopened.* The new leadership asserted 'now we will have to struggle by other means,' 'the struggle continues' -- of course, the struggle continues, but not with them, and even against them. There is a good saying at the university which explains a lot, more than long speeches: The student comrades say of these leaders, 'they are enjoying the change of tactics in Paris!'"

* At this time the National Strike Council became the National Struggle Committee, reflecting the fact that the four-month student strike had ended. (See Intercontinental Press, January 27, p. 64.)

I asked Ricardo Ochoa to review the arrests and the present situation of the political prisoners.

"All of those who were arrested December 13 were set free within two or three days. The charges against them were dropped -- they were set free in the same arbitrary way they had been arrested.

"Before that the arrests of the political leaders, of the experienced leaders who were feared by the government, took place in three 'harvests.' The first was the most arbitrary, the most inexplicable, the great mass of arrests July 26. This included the Communist party leaders of Mexico City.

"The second harvest, during the military occupation of the university, took some of the most important leaders of the National Strike Council, but more secondary leaders. And the October 2 harvest -- this was not a harvest but a mass slaughter -- included the arrest of almost the complete leadership of the National Council.

"In the whole process there were over 4,000 arrests, but the vast majority have been released. I would guess that about 100 now remain, but of course these are the leaders, the most important.

"The arrests were so arbitrary that there were cases where they made investigations and found that those arrested didn't have any political background at all.

"I know of a case of a boy sixteen years old who couldn't go to the political prison because he was too young and so he was sent to reform school. He stayed there three months, from September to December. They finally discovered that he had nothing to do with politics and he was set free."

Ochoa pointed out that this was not exceptional and that literally hundreds of students had been held for a long time, ultimately to be released without any charges ever having been filed against them. He said that to his knowledge the treatment of prisoners fell into two almost opposite groupings: those who were taken directly to the prisons and consequently did not suffer interrogations at the hands of the police; and those who, on the contrary, were tortured in the most horrible way by the police and the military. The prisoners taken during the university occupations were generally in the first grouping; those arrested October 2, particularly the National Strike Council leaders, came under the second category:

"Two or three comrades have reported through friends how they were treated. Soldiers took them to the military camp of

Mexico City, and there they were submitted to the most barbarous tortures that you can imagine. Beatings -- I cannot describe them here. I will give you one example -- they passed through this kind of torture: They were put against the wall with their eyes open in front of a firing squad. The soldiers were ordered to fire at them -- only with blanks. And they went through this two times. One of them is now completely epileptic."

Ochoa described the present stage of the student movement. "There haven't been mass meetings of the National Struggle Committee itself; meetings have been reduced in size and limited to various subcommittee meetings -- the committee on organization, committee on propaganda, etc.

"I would say that the stage is one of organization more than political agitation. In the two most important subcommittees -- the coordinating subcommittees of the two educational systems [the university and the polytechnic] -- they are working out a new strategy to solve the problems created at this stage by the repression.

"Above all they want to determine what kind of organization they should build and what kind of activity they should undertake. The key problem being discussed is the role of the university, the role of the students.

"We have made the university a 'red university' in a certain sense. We have made it a spokesman of the political problems of the population. Now we have to crystallize the liaison that students have made with the people. The problem is how to take more concrete steps towards mobilizing the workers."

Ochoa amplified these points: "The student movement knows that it can play the role of a vanguard, that it can lead struggles and influence society. The problem is how to combat the repression, how to cope with these strong forces that are mobilized against the students -- in

other words, how to link up with other sectors of society in order to combat the great power of the government.

"The slogan of 'unity of the students and workers' is not being debated now. It is something the students feel they have to resolve in practice, but they do not have a clear idea of how to do it.

"The role of revolutionary activists is to make clear these ideas. The most conscious are trying to link the struggle committees of students with delegations, and if possible, with struggle committees, of workers. They are trying to prepare students for new mobilizations with more profound aims, to link up with the workers, but not in a spontaneous way -- rather in a conscious and planned way."

I asked Ochoa if there were currents in the student movement who favored guerrilla warfare.

"The problem is, I think, that guerrilla warfare in Mexico, in the near future -- even if it is on the agenda in the heads of a lot of people! -- is not on the agenda in reality.

"I don't want to say that there will not be guerrillas in Mexico -- this is not my point at all -- but I think that many things will have to happen first. One of the first sources of guerrilla fighters will be the students, but before this, the students have to pass through new stages."

Ricardo Ochoa returned to the central point he had emphasized: "The most conscious debates are on how to mobilize in this new stage, how to organize against repression. There has been much clarification of the great task ahead, but there is a missing link, how to reach this stage -- the struggle for power -- from the present stage.

"There is clarification of the tasks but there is a lack of political experience on how to deal with the specific problems that face us right now."

STUDENTS CLOSE DOWN IVORY COAST UNIVERSITY

A student strike May 21 completely emptied the University of Abidjan, in the capital of the Ivory Coast. Trying to put down the student action, the police (who had been withdrawn from the campus only two days before, after having occupied it) surrounded the university and the student living areas. A number of students were arrested.

It has become known in official circles, according to Agence France-

Presse, that the French rector of the University of Abidjan, Renaud Paulian, has resigned. Paulian's resignation has not, however, been announced publicly nor has any explanation been offered for it.

The pro-French president of the Ivory Coast, Houphouët-Boigny, was reported to have called a special meeting of the National Council of the ruling Parti Démocratique de Côte d'Ivoire [Democratic party of the Ivory Coast] May 23.

"LE MONDE'S" ASSESSMENT OF ALAIN KRIVINE

[The success of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League -- the French section of the Fourth International) in mobilizing wide support for Alain Krivine, whom it is running for president of France, has forced the bourgeois press to pay special attention to the Trotskyist campaign. Political commentators of the established parties and journals seemed particularly surprised at the ability of the Ligue Communiste to secure 230 signatures of mayors and councilors -- more than double the required number -- to place Krivine on the ballot.

[Le Monde, one of the most influential Paris dailies, assigned one of its leading writers, Jean Lacouture, to provide a sketch of Krivine and the French Trotskyist movement. His article, which we have translated below, appeared in the May 17 issue of Le Monde under the title "Alain Krivine -- From One May to Another." Jean Lacouture is the author of Vietnam: Between Two Truces. He has also written a biography of Ho Chi Minh.]

* * *

The political history of the French army is rich in episodes. From the soldiers of the Year II* to the transistors of Algiers,** from the marshals of the empire to Captain Dreyfus, this Great Silent Force*** has been able to participate in public life in an infinite variety of ways. Soldiers have often been called on as providential political leaders -- but rarely privates. Never before has a candidate for the presidency of the republic come from this lowest rank in the army. But that is what has happened now.

Leaving the barracks of the 150th Infantry Regiment in Verdun on a "special" furlough, a twenty-seven-year-old ordinary soldier is going to compete with Pompidou, Poher, and company for the votes of 27,000,000 electors. For about an hour and a half between May 15 and June 1, televiewers will see a new face -- new at any rate to official French television -- the face of Alain Krivine, a graduate student in history, a revolu-

* The second year after the adoption of the revolutionary constitution of 1791. -- I.P.

** The French command in Algeria made extensive use of radio propaganda in their campaign against the Front de Libération Nationale. -- I.P.

*** The French army has been called this because soldiers were denied the vote until recently. -- I.P.

tionary militant, and the "red" candidate of the Ligue Communiste [Communist League] (the "red" comes from the organ of this movement, which is called precisely Rouge [Red] and whose slogan is "For a Red Campaign"). Camouflage is not the fashion among the Trotskyists.

But let no one make any mistake. It is not provocation or empty agitation that Alain Krivine and his comrades are preparing for. The campaign which the Ligue Communiste kicked off Thursday [May 15] will be highly "political." Rouge's editorials do not concentrate solely on denouncing "parliamentary cretinism" and "electoralism." They also blast "the reverse side of this cretinism, ultraleftism, the infantile and naïve doctrine that dismisses and sweepingly condemns all use of the parliamentary possibilities offered by the bourgeois-democratic system."

Krivine is going to exploit these "possibilities" by stressing themes that might, it is said, be summed up as follows: If de Gaulle fell, it was because the May movement broke him. And what was the May movement? It was not the seething up of a hairy populace of automobile burners. It was a powerful expression of political will which would not have made such an impact nor had so many reverberations if it had not reflected something very strong and deep in the country. It is this something that the "red" candidate proposes to give voice to. "May" will figure prominently in the Trotskyist candidate's declarations. But the May he talks about will not be the May of superficial journalists but the May of the militants.

A Nonconformist Militant

For such a program, the Ligue Communiste could hardly have chosen a more symbolic candidate. Krivine's short career offers a kind of summary of the history of the young French far left over a period of what will soon be ten years. Although his culture, his eloquence, and even his physical appearance are typically those of a "left-wing intellectual" -- and although official television naturally chose to show a picture of him on Monday night most likely to alarm bourgeois viewers -- these qualities will certainly "come across well on TV" and hold the attention of voters more accustomed to the appearances of Monsieur Le Theule.*

* Le Theule is the French minister of information and as such rules the radio and television of the country with an iron hand. French broadcasting is noted for its tendentious and stuffy character. -- I.P.

Before giving headaches to ministers of education, and then ministers of the interior, the army, and to the Conseil Constitutionnel [Constitutional Council -- the highest judicial body for constitutional questions], Alain Krivine also caused the French Communist party apparatus some trouble. Joining the Jeunesses Communistes [Communist Youth] at seventeen -- where his four brothers had been active before him -- he expressed his disagreement with the party "line" in the Algerian business.

In 1962, as the secretary of the history section of the UEC [Union des Etudiants Communistes -- Union of Communist Students], he founded the Front Universitaire Antifasciste [Antifascist Student Front] which confronted the OAS groups [Organisation de l'Armée Secrète -- Secret Army Organization -- a right-wing terrorist organization opposing Algerian independence] in the Latin Quarter and elsewhere. As a result of this activity, the home of his father, a famous gastroenterologist, was bombed.

In 1963 a meeting in Paris with the Belgian Trotskyist leader Ernest Mandel brought him definitively under Trotskyist influence. Mandel is the intellectual leader of the tendency in the Fourth International which in France includes in particular the militants trained by Pierre Frank. But it was not until two years later that Krivine was expelled from the Communist party. After having "submerged" himself, along with his comrades, in the left wing of the UEC for two years and conducting a fight at the 1965 UEC congress for the "right of tendencies" and "real de-Stalinization of the French CP," he was expelled from the party in January 1966.

Among many other apparently more serious accusations, the Rue de Châteaubriand leadership attacked him especially for denouncing the support offered by the PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party] to Mitterrand's* candidacy. We have already come to a presidential election... But it would require an unusually subtle perception to see this as the first move in his present campaign.

From the JCR to the Santé Prison

Alain Krivine and the militants of the "Sorbonne-Liberal Arts" section then founded the JCR [Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire -- Revolutionary Communist Youth], which was to become the most extensive of the "splinter groups." This organization was to compete with the FER [Fédération des Etudiants Révolution-

* François Mitterrand, a liberal, ran against de Gaulle as a "united left" candidate in 1965. -- I.P.

naires -- Federation of Revolutionary Students], which originated from the so-called Lambertist faction,* for the right to represent the Trotskyist movement. The Lambert faction accuses Ernest Mandel of indulging in "modernism" and "economism."

The JCR devoted itself especially to the struggle against the Vietnam war. Alain Krivine -- whose brother Dr. Jean-Michel Krivine participated in two medical inquiry commissions in North Vietnam -- was one of the founders of the Comité Vietnam National [National Vietnam Committee], along with Laurent Schwartz. But he also developed ties with several revolutionary leaders in Europe -- with Rudi Dutschke in Germany and Tariq Ali in England.

Then came May 1968. We saw less of Krivine than Sauvageot,** Geismar,** or Cohn-Bendit. But the JCR, which had the most cadres, played an organizational and guiding role which students of the events consider to have been decisive. It was the JCR, for example, that provided UNEF with its monitors for the principal demonstrations. Whether at the time the barricades went up on the Rue Gay-Lussac, at the time of the attempt to link up the students and the workers on May 17, at the Renault plant, or at the Charléty meeting,**** we find Krivine, with his comrades, in the forefront, megaphone in hand.

On June 12 the JCR was banned along with the other revolutionary "splinter groups." Two weeks later, Alain Krivine denounced this "illegal" measure in a news

* Followers of Pierre Lambert, grouped at the time of the May events in the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste [Internationalist Communist Organization]. This grouping split from the Fourth International in 1963 and is presently connected with the sectarian Socialist Labour League of Britain. The May 17 Le Monde reported that the Lambertists have recently reconstituted themselves under the name "Trotskyist Organization (for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International)." -- I.P.

** The leader of UNEF [Union Nationale des Etudiants Français -- National Union of French Students]. -- I.P.

*** The leader of SNESup [Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Supérieur -- National University Teachers Union]. -- I.P.

**** A meeting of 50,000 persons in the Charléty Stadium on May 27. The meeting followed a demonstration of 100,000 which was condemned by the CP. It marked the high point of attempts to develop a political alternative to the left of the CP during the May-June upsurge. -- I.P.

conference. On July 16 he was arrested in a restaurant near Saint-Lazare in the company of his wife (who is the daughter of Gilles Martinet, the former assistant general secretary of the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié -- United Socialist party -- a left Social Democratic formation]). He was charged with "maintaining and reconstituting a banned organization." He denied the accusation, saying that he had not taken part in any attempt to shift to underground activity.

After five weeks of detention at the Santé prison, he was released at the urging of Edgar Faure,* who was trying to prepare a resumption of classes free from the aftermath of May. As soon as he was released, Krivine, a twenty-seven-year-old student with an academic deferment, was inducted into the army at Verdun. He was assigned to the clerical staff of the regiment and was not subjected to any discriminatory treatment.

A Special Furlough and 230 Signatures

In April 1969 Private Krivine participated with several other former JCR members in forming the Ligue Communiste. One of the first acts of this organization was to place his name in nomination before the voters "in order to dissipate the electoralist and parliamentary illusions of the CP" and after the PSU refused to make common cause with the Trotskyists.

There were two kinds of problems among those raised by the Krivine candidacy. Could a "revolutionary" and "anti-electoralist" candidate gather the 100 signatures of notables required by law? Was the candidate's military status an insurmountable obstacle? Krivine did not have to depend on government complicity to get his signatures and, so, did not

* The Gaullist minister of education.
-- I.P.

fulfill the prophesy ungenerously suggested by Georges Marchais.* The elected bodies include more nonconformists than was supposed and a good number of May militants were able to pressure a father who was a town councilor or an uncle who was a mayor into providing one of the precious signatures. In a word, the Krivine candidacy received more than double the required endorsements.

As for the military regulations, they provide that a candidate in the armed services is entitled to a special furlough, leave without pay, and freedom from military discipline in speaking and writing as soon as he leaves his base. Could Private Krivine be considered to have "met the requirements of the draft laws" upon rejoining his regiment? The minister of the army let it be known that he did not think so. Two appeals to the Conseil Constitutionnel and then to the interim president of the republic by Krivine's comrades made it possible to clear away the last obstacles.

With his special leave -- without pay -- and 230 signatures of notables, Alain Krivine inaugurated his "presidential" campaign Thursday -- it will culminate on May 28, with a mass meeting in the Palais des Sports. Here at least is a splinter group that has grown up.

* A member of the Political Bureau of the French CP who gained a certain notoriety in the period leading up to the May explosion by baiting Cohn-Bendit, in an article in the CP organ l'Humanité, as a "German anarchist" at a time when the student leader was under violent attack by the government and reactionary press. When Krivine's candidacy was announced, Marchais wrote that if the young revolutionist had any difficulty getting the required signatures, Marcellin, the red-baiting French minister of the interior who commands the country's police, would be happy to provide them.
-- I.P.

ALAIN KRIVINE ON TELEVISION

[The following is the text of Alain Krivine's first speech over France's national television network, given May 17. His appearance was part of the 100 minutes of television time he is entitled to as the presidential candidate of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League -- the French section of the Fourth International). The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

For the first time a revolutionary militant has an opportunity to present his ideas to you. This opportunity is not the result of any election. Nor is it a

result of the generosity of the government propaganda office which the ORTF [Office de la Radio et de la Télévision Française -- French Radio and Television Office] represents today. If I can speak to you, it is because of the extraordinary mobilization of ten million workers that developed in May 1968.

Recently Monsieur Marcellin, the minister of the interior, told you that power comes from the ballot. In fact, when we think how Monsieur Marcellin became the minister of the interior, how the Gaullist regime was established as the result of a military coup, we might ask Monsieur Mar-

cellin very simply whether he got his power from the ballot. We might ask him if he did not use force to become the minister of the interior.

It is clear to us that the socialist left can never look forward to taking power and imposing its solutions by means of elections or any kind of an electoral consultation. Experience in both France and other countries shows conclusively that one of two things can happen. If the left develops a right-wing program and then wins the votes of the right, it can, in fact, achieve a governmental majority.

Wilson did this in England and Guy Mollet and Mitterrand did it before him in France. But when the left develops a much more advanced program, a program which cannot win the approval of the bourgeoisie, then the capitalist class is prepared to violate its own legality and impose its solutions by military coups d'etat.

We are familiar with the example of Greece and the fascist regime that rules there today. We are familiar with the example of Indonesia. And we are familiar with the example of Republican Spain. In fact, we have absolutely no confidence in the ballot.

We think -- and May 1968 showed it -- that the workers have their own methods of struggle. In May 1968, through demonstrations, through occupying the factories, the workers achieved something that no vote had ever been able to accomplish. They forced the "strong state," which the Gaullist regime was then, to back down. In a few weeks, the Gaullist state gave concessions which it had refused to give throughout its ten years in power.

But for us, May 1968 will not be the anniversary of a historical battle which we will commemorate like old soldiers. Nor will we bury it, as all the official left parties are trying to do now. For us, May was a great promise, and what we will strive to do through this campaign -- which we want to make a revolutionary activist campaign above all -- is to explain what happened in those days. We want to draw all the lessons and show all the failings of the May movement in order to arm the students and workers for the coming struggles, which will not and cannot be, electoral ones.

The lessons are many. For years we were told that a working class no longer existed, that the capitalist, the neo-capitalist, system had resolved all its contradictions, that today the standard of living could be continually raised.

Now, what do we see? And the workers saw this in May 1968. There are hun-

dreds of thousands of unemployed. Today there are tens of thousands of young people without jobs. Or when they find jobs in factories the jobs usually don't measure up to their skills. Today, the production-line tempos are being speeded up in the factories in pace with the opportunities for increasing profits.

In May 1968 the workers by the millions realized that the problem was not to fight for some reform, for a 2 or 3 percent raise that the bosses would immediately take back. They learned that they had to win their broad demands, to transform society radically, and take the centers of production into their own hands.

This is what they started to do by the factory occupations and by starting up the factories in some areas without the bosses.

A period of real freedom reigned in France during May, in that month of May 1968. At that time we said that anything was possible. And we were called "ultra-leftists" and "wild men." But when you look at the situation closely, when you read all the books on this period that are coming out today, when you look at the panic that reigned in the government ministry offices -- which were mostly deserted -- when you consider how isolated the big bourgeoisie was, cut off from the students, from the intermediate strata, and the peasantry, you can understand that, in reality, if the workers parties had provided a real political alternative, a socialist alternative offering the perspective of a workers government and offering the workers the means to struggle for this goal, then everything would have been completely changed. If that had happened, we would not be deciding now in this election campaign whether we should have a Pompidou or a Poher as head of state.

Today, in the absence of workers' struggles, the bourgeoisie has been able to restabilize its system temporarily. It has even allowed itself the luxury of sending de Gaulle back to Colombey-les-Deux-Eglises. Clearly, de Gaulle made it possible to achieve a decisive change in the political institutions in May 1958...But after May 1968 the instability of his regime became apparent. De Gaulle suffered an enormous loss of prestige and, faced with the possibility and predictability of new struggles, the bourgeoisie recognized that it had to get rid of de Gaulle in order to look toward a regime capable of confronting the working class in the months to come.

We are offered two candidates -- Poher and Pompidou. There is a lot of difference between their programs, as you can judge for yourself. One is for progress with continuity; the other is for continuity with progress...That is the democ-

racy, that is the real choice that is being foisted on us today. And it is because of the official left that this can happen. Their candidates offer no alternative.

A number of candidates have thrown their hats in the ring. But we might ask them all the question, "Where were you in May, when there wasn't any hustling for votes going on, when the workers were struggling and on strike? Where was Mollet? Where was Defferre? Where was Mitterrand?" This question deserves an answer, but I think everyone can give it...The left was unable to lead the May battle.

Today the left assumes a stance of opposition to the Fourth Republic and a return to the ways that prevailed then. But tomorrow Defferre, Mitterrand, Mollet, and the others will come and tell us, "We must object. We are against the ways of the Fifth Republic." What we have to understand is how we could come to such a pass a year after May 1968. In fact, the left lives on two myths which paralyze it -- its belief in the ballot and in this celebrated Unity of the Left. As for us, and we say it clearly, we are against this Unity of the Left, because this expression has absolutely no meaning today.

If "left" means a location in the chambers of parliament, that is, the section to the left of the chairman, all right then, it's a geographical definition. But if it refers to political program, then we may venture to ask the question: "When Jules Moch* was minister of the interior and called out the cops to club the miners, was he further to the left than Marcellin? Was Guy Mollet a man of the left when he sent the paratroopers to Suez? Was Mitterrand a man of the left when he talked about "French Algeria"?"

* A right-wing Social Democratic politician most famous for his role in organizing the repressive forces to defend French capitalism from the postwar working-class radicalization. Among other things, he organized the CRS [Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité -- Republican Security Companies], the elite security troops which gained a reputation for extreme brutality in the May-June days.
-- I.P.

We don't see any "left"; what we see is a working class. We see organizations that support the demands of the working class, but we can't go any further than that.

The unity that is needed now to achieve a radical transformation of society is unity of all the workers, which can then provide a basis for an alliance of the workers -- united on a socialist program -- with the middle strata. As for us, we refuse to get entangled in this game of left politicians, no matter who they are.

May 1968 brought a new communist current to the fore in France, a current for which socialism is something totally different from the caricature that exists today in the Soviet Union. For us, concentration camps are not socialism, for us a regime like the one in the Soviet Union which puts its intellectuals in prison, which stifles all workers democracy, which does not hesitate to reestablish what it calls law and order in a sister country, as was done in Czechoslovakia, for us such a regime cannot be socialism.

This new communism, this new vanguard does not exist in France alone. It exists today in a whole series of countries in Europe, Latin America, and even in the United States.

This socialism is not represented today by Brezhnev or Kosygin. It is personified much more by Che Guevara. And we think that May 1968 put Che Guevara's famous phrase squarely on the order of the day: "The duty of every revolutionary is to make the revolution."

When we see how many opportunities were missed in 1936, in 1946-47, and just recently in 1968, we can see -- and it is clear today -- that you don't win the right to call yourself a communist by paying dues. This name is not the monopoly of one party. This name must be won by participating in the actions of the working class. This name must be earned in the class struggle.

As for us, we see this campaign as a means for presenting the balance sheet of the struggle that ten million workers waged in May and offering a means for continuing it.

REVOLT REPORTED IN HAITI

Haiti's dictator François Duvalier has reportedly sent troops to the north of the country to suppress a popular revolt. The May 25-26 Paris daily Le Monde said an "authoritative source" had revealed that high army officers had joined

the rebels, as well as political exiles who had returned to the country clandestinely. "According to this source, President Duvalier was said to have undertaken a violent repression against the opposition to his government."

DEPENDABLE JACQUES DUCLOS

The bureaucracy of the French Communist party could hardly have done better than it did when it decided to offer Jacques Duclos to the public as the party's "finest."

A vintage piece of the "popular front" days, renowned in his time as one of Stalin's most faithful hacks, the seventy-two-year-old former pastry cook is fighting with all he has to save French Stalinism from being outflanked on the left.

The veteran of many a sly deal and shady combination with the bourgeois political machines, Jacques Duclos knows the electoral game.

As the presidential candidate of the Communist party, he is not appealing to the revolutionary youth -- that is not his strong point -- but to the staid papas who feel that they have at least a little stake in the capitalist system.

At the same time, to keep up appearances among Communist-minded workers, he does touch on socialism -- to be sure not in a way to make the hair of conservative small shopkeepers stand on end.

A good example of his pitch is the following statement made at a press conference in Lyon May 20:

"If elected, I am convinced that the forces of the left would present a common program in the elections following the dissolution of parliament which I would proceed to invoke. We are not wreckers. We are not for the black flag [of the Anarchists]. Besides it was never anything but the emblem of hopeless mourning. We are builders; we will show this in the municipalities where we are in office. And we know that in the not too distant future we will be called on to play our part in conducting the affairs of the country. The truth is, it is not the so-called activist minorities who -- with Mr. Krivine's permission -- can impose their law. As for us, we represent a political, economic, and social potential



DUCLOS: No babbling about socialism.

which the country cannot do without, a force without which a genuinely democratic policy cannot be practiced."

At an election rally the same day in Lyon; Duclos inveighed against Alain Krivine, saying that his youthful opponent, who came to national prominence during the revolutionary crisis of May 1968, was "babbling about socialism."

Jacques Duclos does not engage in babbling about socialism. But it is highly dubious that the babbling he does engage in will save the French Communist party from being bypassed by the new generation of revolutionary socialists now coming to the fore in France.

WORKERS DEMOCRACY, DUCLOS STYLE

The French CP, fearful of the new revolutionary youth to its left, is doing its best to prevent Alain Krivine from speaking to workers at plants where the CP union is in control. On May 19 Krivine, with a delegation of some 300 young students and workers, appeared at the big Renault plant southwest of Paris. A hand-picked "reception committee" of roughly

the same size was lined up at the factory gate with banners reading, "Oppose the diversionary anti-Communist candidate!" "Vote for Jacques Duclos, the union candidate!" They hissed, whistled, booed, and sang the Internationale, trying to drown out the Trotskyist speaker. But Krivine made himself heard and again challenged Duclos to debate him on the issues.

DANIEL COHN-BENDIT -- FOR PRIME MINISTER OR PEOPLE'S COMMISSAR?

The announcement of the Communist League May 5 that it was running Alain Krivine for president had considerable impact among the circles that were most involved in the actions leading up to the revolutionary crisis in France a year ago. It became a central topic of discussion, the comment in general being favorable.

The current known as "spontané-ism," which is strongly influenced by the anarchist outlook, appeared to have somewhat mixed emotions about the campaign. Repelled by capitalist society, but also by communism (which they equate with Stalinism), the spontanéists are opposed to constructing a revolutionary combat party in the Leninist tradition. Decrying the role of leadership, they count on spontaneous action by the masses to overturn capitalism and do away with the exploitation of man by man.

The spontanéists, who were very prominent on the barricades in Paris last year, conduct themselves in the spirit of the old-time anarchists. They are especially good at scandalizing the bourgeoisie with irreverent exposures of the hypocrisies of capitalism.

They incline toward ultraleft actions, but it remains to be seen whether they will succeed in avoiding the path taken by leading anarchists in Spain during the revolutionary crisis of the thirties. These forerunners of the spontanéists, despite all their opposition to the state in general, accepted posts in a bourgeois government and thus helped save capitalism when it was on its last legs in Spain.

A typical gesture from this current toward the campaign of Alain Krivine came from Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the student leader of greatest international renown last year. On May 7 he sent a telegram to Alain Krivine, announcing his readiness to serve as prime minister in the event the candidate of the Communist League should win the election.

Krivine had not yet been granted the furlough from the army which he needed to campaign for the presidency and so he was absent at his first press conference. Three leaders of the Communist League spoke for him.

Mentioning the telegram, Charles Michaloux expressed astonishment at Daniel Cohn-Bendit's "bourgeois" concept of politics. He explained that if the candidate of the Communist League were to win, the post of prime minister would hardly be available in view of what could be expected to occur to the structure of the state as the Communist League carried out



COHN-BENDIT: Withdraw at very last moment!

the teachings of Marx and Engels on this point. He agreed, however, that Daniel Cohn-Bendit might well fill one of the posts of people's commissar that would be created.

On May 20 Radio Europe 1 featured Alain Krivine taking questions by telephone from listeners. Daniel Cohn-Bendit put in a call from Frankfurt.

The candidate of the Communist League, said Cohn-Bendit, was "the only one able to talk about the May movement from the inside." This was good.

But in order to make a demonstration that "electoralism doesn't get you

anywhere and you don't fight the class struggle by dropping paper ballots in a box," he suggested that Krivine withdraw at the very last moment.

Krivine agreed about continuing to oppose electoral politics but held that the revolutionary movement should not make it a principle to boycott elections. "I am well aware that the number of votes we may get will not correspond to our possible influence in the country, if only because tens upon tens of thousands of youth who were on the barricades and who participated in the May movement cannot vote. Besides which, tens of thousands of soldiers can't vote. But the elections can help to indicate our political influence somewhat. In counting up votes, we utilize the elections -- to use Lenin's expression -- something like a thermometer."

Cohn-Bendit raised some additional questions, among them the following: "The

workers or minority of workers who may agree with us on revolutionary perspectives or needs in France don't know the differences we have among ourselves -- and with good reason, because they don't give a damn. Wouldn't it be possible to have a debate with Duclos or one of the others?"

Krivine said he was not the candidate of the May movement as a whole but of a definite political organization, "the Communist League, which has a whole series of differences with you, as you know, and with other groups."

It would sow confusion to cover up these differences. "The meetings we are organizing throughout France will all be debates in this sense, and we always invite discussion.... Just the same, I am the candidate of a political organization and I think it is necessary to make this clear in order to avoid confusion."

MASSIVE PROTEST STRIKES HIT AUSTRALIA

Some 630,000 workers staged twenty-four-hour national strikes in Australia between May 16 and May 21 to protest the jailing of a union leader for refusing to comply with government restrictions on the right to strike.

The strike wave, described by Agence France-Presse as the most important in Australia in more than twenty years, was touched off by the May 15 jailing for contempt of court of Clarence O'Shea, the sixty-three-year-old secretary of the Victorian Tramway Men's Union. He had refused to pay an \$8,100 fine for having led an "illegal" strike. On the same day, twenty-seven unions in Victoria, representing 65 percent of the total union strength in the state, went out on a twenty-four-hour strike.

The London Times reported May 19 that though the workers in Victoria had gone back to work, their leaders had declared: "If O'Shea is not released by Monday afternoon, further industrial action will follow immediately."

The Australian Council of Trade Unions [ACTU] called a nationwide general strike for Monday, May 19. Unions in different states honored the call on different days.

On May 19 some 150,000 workers in Queensland in thirty-six unions struck, paralyzing the region. Public transport, power stations, the metal trades, building, waterfront, and food industries were all shut down.

Eighteen unions in New South Wales, with a membership of 150,000 workers, called a general strike for May 20.

In Sydney, maritime workers set their strike for May 21, promising to tie up all major Australian ports. The Federal Cabinet met in Canberra to discuss the situation.

The union actions won widespread support from the student movement. The London Times reported:

"For the first time in union demonstrations in Australia banners inscribed 'worker-student power' have been displayed as a result of university students being invited to take part."

The Paris daily Le Monde commented May 21: "The threat of a general strike which is presently pending in Australia draws attention to the importance of the penal clauses contained in the legislation defining the relations between the government in Canberra and the unions. This sort of crisis could be produced in England if equally severe penal clauses are inserted in the proposed antistrike bill of Mrs. Barbara Castle."

Australian Labour Minister L.H.E. Bury and Attorney General N.H. Bowen met with representatives of the ACTU in Sydney May 18. In a joint statement the next day, the two government representatives warned, according to the May 20 London Guardian, that "the situation might get worse."

Report from the Underground

THE STUDENT MOVEMENT IN BRAZIL

[The following two articles were taken from Informe Nacional (National Report), the clandestine bulletin of the Partido Operaria Comunista (Communist Workers party). They describe the problems of the revolutionary student movement in Brazil in face of the recent in-

tensified repression and propose a counterstrategy.

[The first article appeared in the March 25 issue of Informe Nacional; the second in the April 13 issue. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

Repression in the Universities

The beginning of the academic year* caught the student movement only partially prepared for the attacks of the hard-line faction in the government which won out with the adoption of Institutional Act No. 5.**

The student movement is prepared to confront the new attacks to the extent that it has a broad understanding of the character of this coup and the tactics the government will use to achieve its aims in the universities. The student movement is also generally agreed that new forms of organization are necessary in the present phase. But it does not know what organizational forms are needed, and, therefore, the development of these forms has lagged.

The primary element in government policy in this initial phase will be repression -- repression limited to the universities. The campaign will be selective, because it is aimed at the "leaders" among both the students and professors. The government will try to carry out this operation quietly. And if the dictatorship is not blocked by a student organization capable of systematically exposing it and rallying the scattered sectors of the movement to resist, it will have a free hand in its game.

The primary element is repression. However, we must not forget that while the objective of the government's attacks on the students is to destroy any movement of opposition to the regime, the firing of professors is aimed principally at clearing the way for the establishment of a new kind of university set up like a

* In Brazil, a Southern Hemisphere country, the academic year begins in March.

** Institutional Act No. 5 was the legal expression of the "coup d'etat within the coup d'etat" of December 13, 1968. This act outlawed all opposition, tightened the censorship, and eliminated any vestiges of constitutional rule still to be found under the military dictatorship.

capitalist enterprise and closely supervised by the dictatorship. These firings can, of course, have the additional aim of stamping out organized opposition to the dictatorship among the professors.

Whenever resistance movements are organized, this selective repression within the universities will be accompanied by full-scale repression. In this confrontation between the organized student movement and the military forces, the student movement is clearly qualitatively weaker. If the confrontation were strictly military, the student movement would lose. The students' opportunity lies in exploiting the enemy's weak points -- his extreme unpopularity, etc. The students' chance lies in wearing out the military by a series of actions serving not only to organize the students but to provide a stimulus to the working masses.

In order to do this, the student movement needs an organization capable of resisting the repression. In the first place, it must envision mass demonstrations that are not the outcome of democratic discussion at various levels but are generated by clandestine or semiclandestine organizations.

Secondly, it must be realized that "explosions" by the discontented masses will occur, even if the student leadership judges them "too dangerous." Closing our eyes to this general discontent and failing to organize the masses to direct the force of these explosions properly would mean ignoring the main political tasks of the student movement. But, however absurd it may seem, various sectors of the leadership think that they will not occur because they consider such mass demonstrations to be too dangerous and are not preparing for them.

Certain experiences this year show that even if the leadership holds back, demonstrations will develop. These experiences have shown that demonstrations will develop either without any preparation at all, and thus be doomed to defeat (thereby dissipating our strength), or that they

will have the wrong kind of leadership. The student movement must learn how to develop the organization needed.

New forms must be created. Small semiclandestine action groups must be organized which will devote themselves constantly to agitation and propaganda on the political problems of the student movement and which will carry on agitation and propaganda among the masses as well. These action groups must make it their permanent task to develop the organization and means of self-defense necessary to direct the mass "explosions." In demonstrations these groups will be the political and organizational guides of the masses, leading them toward clear objectives and defending the masses from repression while they teach them to defend themselves.

The previous, widely held theory that the masses understand "instinctively" how to defend themselves from repression must now be banished from the scene.

The political conditions today do not permit empiricism and irresponsibility. Groups trained in self-defense are needed.

But these groups must not act alone, defending the masses in a paternalistic way. Besides being politically incorrect, such an approach would lead to an easy victory for the repression. Only politically conscious masses can, with some instruction in street fighting, turn a struggle against the police into a political struggle. But for this the ground must have been prepared by agitation and propaganda focused on a clear political objective.

In the present phase, the tactical focus of such a campaign must be struggle against repression.

On the campuses the most important and immediate objective is to resist the government decree banning any demonstration by students, professors, or university employees. The chief slogan, therefore, must be "Resist the Decree!"

* * *

The Student Movement a Year After the Death of Edson Luiz

A year ago the country was convulsed by student demonstrations which contributed greatly to the political attrition of the dictatorship. Opening a breach for demonstrations of popular opposition, the students linked up with broad sections of the salaried petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat and stimulated further actions. They were so successful that the dictatorship was unable to celebrate the anniversary of its seizure of power openly last March 31.

This year the student movement planned demonstrations for the anniversary of the death of the young high-school student killed in last year's clashes. But the results were poor. In Bahia, displaying great combativity, the students succeeded in paralyzing academic activity on this day of protest against the death of the high-school student Edson Luiz.

However, the general tone was one of quasi-passivity. Paraná, which was in the forefront of the great struggles last year, exemplified this. This city has seen several students sentenced by military courts and has been unable to raise a simple protest. We are not among those who build their strategies on falsehoods and we cannot deceive ourselves. The truth is that the student struggle is going through a phase of decline.

Does this mean that the mass of students are shifting to the right or towards an apolitical attitude? No, that is not taking place. Anyone in contact with the masses of students and even with the

new sectors that are entering the universities must see that the students are still showing no signs of a "turn" to the right. Neither Operation Rondon nor the systematic repression has been sufficient to achieve this. You can feel the political tension even in the corridors of the schools and in every little problem. But it is clear that the situation more than ever before requires constant work by the revolutionary left to block the reactionary offensive.

If the student masses have not taken a turn to the right, there must be some other reason why they have not sustained the agitation that developed last year. The explanation is that they need new forms of struggle. They sense that they are facing a reinforced and relentless enemy.

Obviously such a situation cannot last for a very long time. If a mass remains inactive for a long period of time, it loses its awareness of the enemy. As it settles down and returns to normalcy, it loses its consciousness and morale, thus permitting new strata to adapt to a situation of passivity. For this reason, the student vanguard must develop new tactics to prevent the energy of the masses from falling dormant, to sharpen their political consciousness, to win them to the workers' struggle.

An important aspect of such action is unremitting agitation and propaganda, exposing all of the enemy's moves and clarifying the objectives of our struggle. Bulletins, papers, pamphlets, debates, and

all forms appropriate to every concrete situation must be constantly developed and broadened which can serve to ridicule the repression and bring communist arguments to the greatest number of people.

Another aspect is the kindling of limited economic struggles in order to inspire self-confidence in the masses and to undermine the norms imposed by the dictatorship. Belo Horizonte has just provided good examples of this form of struggle. The students seized the cafeterias of two schools in succession as a form of protesting price increases for food. These were rapid and brief actions, but actions whose psychological effect could in nowise be depreciated.

Finally there is an essential aspect to the problem. The readiness of broad sectors of students to go into action exceeds the present opportunities for struggle in the universities. The reason is obvious. The repression is now concentrated on the campuses, along with some working-class neighborhoods. This is why a direct confrontation in the schools has become a very difficult proposition.

STUDENT MILITANCY ON THE RISE IN CHILE

The erosion of the ruling Christian Democratic party in Chile, shown in the March 3 legislative elections, continues to develop at a quickening pace amid signs of increasing worker-student militancy. "Scarcely a day passes without a few demonstrations by revolutionary students, accompanied by the whiff of tear gas," New York Times correspondent Malcolm Browne reported May 22.

On May 17 university and high-school students demonstrated in the capital city of Santiago in protest against the imprisoning of sixteen workers accused of occupying and setting fire to their factory. More than 100 students were arrested in the violent fighting that accompanied the demonstration and considerable material damage was caused. After the protest, however, the workers were released on bail.

On May 21, after walking out of the national convention of the Christian Democrats, the left wing founded a new political party, MAPU (the United People's Action party). In its founding congress, the new organization called for the expropriation of U.S.-owned copper mines and an alliance with the Socialist and Communist parties. Juan Chonchol, a former agrarian reform official, was elected secretary general of the new organization. Agence France-Presse reported: "Chonchol declared after the

For precisely this reason, the student vanguard must project political work among the laboring masses as an objective of the student movement's struggle. This, obviously, must not lead to abandoning the work of political propaganda and agitation and of organization for struggle, for specific struggles, in the schools. To the contrary, it is possible to develop new leaderships emerging from the student masses.

Only by this combined approach can the compressed energy in the universities be utilized to arouse new forces, to create new hotbeds of agitation, and to continue the struggle.

Of course, activity by students among the workers involves many problems arising out of the students' inexperience, amateurism, and petty-bourgeois consciousness. But these problems are no reason to discount the students.

Revolutionary workers must demonstrate their capacity by learning how to organize and utilize those sections of the student rebels which are amenable to organization.

founding of MAPU that the revolutionary and socialist forces no longer had any business in the Christian Democratic party and that the fundamental problem for the Chilean left was to conquer power to 'put the government at the service of the workers.'"

The Christian Democratic party came to power in 1964. It ran on a left platform under the slogan "Revolution in Freedom." At the time, Fidel Castro challenged President Frei to produce on his revolutionary promises. On September 10, 1964, Castro said, "Let's see which country will advance the most, which experiment will go farthest, which will solve the main real problems of the people, and how long it takes to solve them." It has taken less than five years for Frei's demagogy to lose all credibility.

In contrast to the Christian Democrats, the Chilean Communist party has been holding its own in the electoral arena. The New York Times reported May 24 that the CP was expanding its propagandistic efforts: "El Siglo, the official newspaper of the Communist party, has begun publishing girlie magazines with expensive color photographs...[An] employee said '...we also have to stay in business, both to meet expenses and to give the Chilean public what it wants.'" It is not reported what other plans the CP has for expanding its influence.

PYOTR YAKIR'S INDICTMENT OF STALIN

[In the past year the Soviet bureaucracy has stepped up its repression of political dissidence in face of increasing pressures for a restoration of socialist democracy. The invasion of Czechoslovakia was the most blatant action in the Kremlin's campaign, but there have been an increasing number of arrests of oppositional communists in the Soviet Union itself, such as Pavel Litvinov, Larisa Daniel, Ivan Yakhimovich, and, most recently, former Major General Pyotr G. Grigorenko.

[Along with tightening the political straitjacket, the bureaucracy has pinched off the "de-Stalinization" instituted under mass pressure during the Khrushchev era. Several authoritative Soviet publications have begun "rehabilitating" Stalin. On March 5 Literaturnaya Gazeta, the weekly of the writers' union, devoted almost a full page to attacking Novy Mir, one of the less orthodox Soviet journals, for publishing a novel on hardships under Stalin. Pravda, the Communist party newspaper, followed suit on March 6.

[The most far-reaching attempt to refurbish the Soviet dictator appeared in the February issue of Kommunist, the official theoretical magazine of the Central Committee of the CPSU. In the name of a "balanced portrayal" of Stalin's role, the journal repudiated a number of specific charges made against Stalin by Nikita Khrushchev in his speech at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956 (the authors refrained from mentioning Khrushchev by name), although it claimed to uphold the "well-known resolution of the Central Committee" of June 30, 1956, "on overcoming the cult of the personality and its consequences." The article, signed by five Soviet historians, complained that some authors, "instead of real party criticism of mistakes and shortcomings connected with the cult of the personality, blacken the heroic history of our state and the Leninist party in the period of the building of socialism and depict those years as an uninterrupted chain of mistakes and failures."

[A review of recent memoirs of a number of Soviet marshals appeared in the same issue of Kommunist. The author, E. Boltin, sought to fix up Stalin's military record during World War II. He described Stalin as an "outstanding military leader" and concluded, "Not a stone remains of the irresponsible statements about his military incompetence, of his direction of the war 'on a globe,' of his supposedly absolute intolerance of other views, and of similar inventions grasped and spread by foreign falsifiers of history." These charges were all made by Khrushchev in his "secret speech" to the

Twentieth Congress.

[Following are major excerpts from an open letter to Kommunist written March 4 by the left-Communist Soviet historian Pyotr I. Yakir. Needless to say, Kommunist did not print this indictment of Stalin's crimes.

[Pyotr Yakir is the son of General Ion Yakir, who was shot, along with Tukhachevsky, in 1937 during the Great Purges. General Yakir joined the Bolsheviks in 1917 and was a member of the Stalin faction from the early twenties. At the Twenty-Second Congress in 1961, Khrushchev had this to say about him:

"I knew Comrade Yakir well. I also knew Comrade Tukhachevsky but not as well as Yakir. During a conference at Alma Ata this year, his son, who is working at Kazakhstan, came to see me. He asked me for news of his father. But what could I tell him? When we took these matters up in the presidium of the Central Committee, we were given the report that neither Tukhachevsky nor Yakir nor Uborevich ever committed any crime whatsoever against the party and the state...At his dying moment, Yakir cried out: 'Long live the party! Long live Stalin!'"

[Pyotr Yakir has taken an active part in the fight for socialist democracy in the Soviet Union that has developed in the last few years. Most recently, he was among fifty signers of a petition to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The petition, drafted May 20, declared that "recent arrests have compelled us to think that Soviet punitive organs have decided finally to bar the activity of people protesting against arbitrariness in our country."

[In his open letter to Kommunist, Yakir endeavors to prove, on the basis of present Soviet law, that Stalin should be posthumously tried, rather than eulogized for his military qualities. The text, somewhat abridged, was published in the March 16-17 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, which said it had deleted an opening section analyzing the articles in Kommunist before turning to the case against Stalin himself. Le Monde also supplied biographical sketches of a number of the personalities mentioned in the article. We have drawn on this material for a number of footnotes. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

The Soviet Penal Code contains articles calling for punishment of the activities mentioned in the decisions of the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist

party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

1. Abuse of power -- in general (Article 170 -- imprisonment up to eight years); also, exceeding authority or power (Article 171 -- imprisonment up to ten years).

2. During the mass repressions, people were illegally deprived of their freedom, which is punishable according to Article 126 and Article 17 by a sentence of up to three years imprisonment (Article 17 of the Penal Code of the USSR -- "accessories"). The article states: "Accessories to crimes, apart from those who commit them, are designated as organizers, instigators, and accomplices."

Since under the circumstances, as in a whole series of other cases, it is unknown whether Stalin personally carried out a particular misdeed, we refer to Article 17 of the Penal Code of the USSR, since Stalin's role as organizer is obvious.

3. It is known that it was Stalin's proposal in 1937 that brought about the decision to use physical methods to influence judicial inquiries. This resulted in beatings, deprivation of sleep up to seven days, and other tortures, which the author of these lines (arrested in 1937 at the age of fourteen, as a member of a family of "enemies of the people") personally witnessed. These acts are punishable under articles 113 and 17 by imprisonment for up to three years.

4. A large number of leading functionaries ended their lives by suicide, some of them out of horror from participating in the crimes which were being committed, as is evidenced by letters written before their deaths:

S. Ordjonikidze; * V. Kossior; F. Furer; Pogrebinsky, head of the NKVD in the Gorky region, founder of our rehabilitation communes; Litvin, head of the NKVD in Leningrad; Kozelsky, head of one of the branches of the NKVD in the Ukraine; Norin, head of special services of the NKVD in Georgia; and many others.

Many persecuted people killed themselves as a protest or from fear of torture:

I. Gamarnik, M. Tomsy, P. Liubchenko and his wife, V. Lominadze, A. Cherviakov, Rabichev, Adamovich, Lakoba,

Firin, and many others.*

Some who could not bear up under torture committed suicide in prison:

N. Gololed, I. Garkavy, Nosalevsky, Lapin, and many others. All of this falls within the provisions of Article 107 ("incitement to suicide") and carries penalties of imprisonment for up to five years.

5. The massive repressions were accompanied by slanders and insults against the victims, their friends and relatives. This took place in the press, on radio, at meetings and conferences. Activities of this kind fall within the provisions of Article 130 ("slander" -- sentence up to five years) and Article 131 ("offenses" -- correctional labor up to one year).

6. For failure to denounce and for having protected his accomplices (Yezhov, Frinovsky, Yagoda, Beria, Ulrich, Vyshinsky, and tens of thousands of others**)

* Ian Gamarnik: Head of the political administration of the army, killed himself in 1937. Mikhail Tomsy: Participated in the 1905 Revolution, was trade-union president from 1917 to 1929. In a bloc with Rykov, Bukharin and Stalin, he helped defeat the Trotskyist Left Opposition, then was accused by Stalin of plotting capitalist restoration. He was driven to suicide or killed in 1936 for alleged complicity in the Kirov assassination, later shown to have been engineered by Stalin himself. V. Lominadze: Organized the Canton insurrection in 1927 on Stalin's orders. He was expelled from the Central Committee in 1930 and committed suicide in 1934.

** Nikolai Yezhov: Became head of the NKVD in September 1936. Commanded police during the bloodiest period of the purges, known as the Yezhovshchina. Removed from his position in 1938, he disappeared shortly afterward. Genrikh Yagoda: Head of the secret police in 1934, he conducted the purge which followed the assassination of Kirov. He was himself purged in 1936 and executed the following year. Lavrenty Beria: Head of the secret police from 1938 until Stalin's death. He was executed in 1953. Ulrich: Head of the Supreme Court which sentenced Lenin's comrades to death. Andrei Vyshinsky: Former Menshevik who joined the Bolsheviks only in 1921. He was the chief prosecutor in the Moscow Trials and organized the preparation of phony confessions that were proved to be lies (see The Case of Leon Trotsky, "Report of Hearings on the Charges Made Against Him in the Moscow Trials by the Preliminary Commission of Inquiry" headed by John Dewey, Merit Publishers, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003, 603 pp. \$10. Also, Khrushchev's speech to the Twentieth Congress). Vyshinsky was Soviet representative to the United Nations at the time of his death in 1954.

* Gregory Ordjonikidze: Was a close friend of Stalin from his youth. He participated in suppressing internal democracy in the Communist party during Stalin's consolidation of power, but opposed the use of the death penalty against party leaders. He committed suicide in 1937.

Stalin is answerable under the provisions of articles 88-1 and 88-2 and subject to imprisonment for a period of from three to five years.

7. Many of the victims of repression were shot or otherwise killed, or died of injuries received during inquiries. Among these figure such eminent party personalities as Chubar, Kossior, Rudzutak, Postyshev, Eikhe, Voznesensky, Kuznetsov,* 110 members of the Central Committee of the CPSU out of the 139 who were elected at the Seventeenth Congress of the party, and hundreds of thousands of other honest men.

a. At Stalin's order, representatives of all opposition groups were arrested and in the majority of cases killed. Many of them have not been rehabilitated to this day despite the fact that the accusations against them were complete fabrications.**

* All those named were Stalinists. Vlas Chubar was a Politbureau member from 1923 to 1932 and again from 1937 to 1938. He became vice-president of the government in 1938 and disappeared the same year. S.V. Kossior: Politbureau member, chairman of the Soviet Control Commission, was shot during the purges. Yan Rudzutak: Former trade-union head. Politbureau member in 1927, arrested and executed in 1937. Pavel Postyshev: Politbureau alternate in 1934; party secretary in the Ukraine from 1932. Executed in 1940. R. Eikhe: Arrested in 1938 while minister of agriculture. Shot in 1940. Nikolai Voznesensky: Former head of the Planning Commission and member of the Politbureau. Disappeared in 1949. Aleksei Kuznetsov: Secretary of the Central Committee in 1949. Disappeared at the same time as Voznesensky.

** Yakir does not explicitly mention Leon Trotsky, who was the chief defendant in absentia in the Moscow frame-up trials. Nor does he discuss the actual role of the Left Opposition to Stalin, the members of which made up a much larger portion of Stalin's victims than this account would indicate. It may be that Yakir, in seeking publication for his rebuttal to Kommunist, chose to avoid referring too directly to these questions. Possession of Trotsky's writings, for example, is still a criminal offense in the Soviet Union punishable by a long term in prison. Yakir has indicated elsewhere, however, that he is not ignorant of Trotsky's role in Soviet history. In an open letter to literary and cultural figures in the USSR following the trial of four dissident youths in January 1968, Yakir -- along with Ilya Gabai, an editor, and Yuli Kim, a teacher -- wrote:

"The name of J.V. Stalin has been

b. Stalin had no compunction about annihilating foreign Communists who had fled to our country to avoid persecution by fascist, semifascist and monarchist dictatorships: the Germans, H. Remmele, Schubert, Heinz Neumann, Werner Hirsch; the Hungarians, Bela Kun, Mesan, Gidas, Gabor Farkas, and others; the Bulgarians, Stamoniakov, Tanev, and others; the Poles, Dombal, Leszczynski, Prochniak, and others; the Estonians, Kh. Pegelman and others; the Iranians, Sultan-Zade and others; the Yugoslavs, V. Copić, D. Serdić, and others; the Swiss, F. Platten (who had shielded V.I. Lenin with his body at the time of the first assassination attempt) and others.*

cited from the highest platforms in a wholly positive context...for some reason, there is not enough objectivity to permit telling the truth about the major political leaders of the first decade of Soviet power. It would, after all, be possible, without violating the proper bounds of party discussion, to say honestly of various persons that they did not organize terrorist actions, did not engage in espionage, and did not sprinkle broken glass into foodstuffs. It would, after all, be possible to relate also what they accomplished while in their high positions. But the great Civil War services of the People's Commissar for National Minorities J.V. Stalin remain with us to this day, alongside the unrelieved wrecking activities of the then People's Commissar for the Armed Forces and Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council, L.D. Trotsky."

* Hermann Remmele: Former member of the Political Bureau of the German CP and a Reichstag deputy. Represented his party in the Comintern. Arrested in 1937, he was executed along with all the members of his family. Hermann Schubert: Political Bureau member of the German CP. Member of the Secretariat of the Comintern for Central Europe. Was arrested after criticizing the campaign being waged in the West against Trotsky. Heinz Neumann: Political Bureau member of the German CP. Carried out Comintern assignments in China and Spain. Arrested in April 1937. His wife was turned over to the Germans in 1940.

Werner Hirsch: Former secretary to Thaelmann. Disappeared in the USSR. Bela Kun: Leader of the Hungarian revolution of 1919. Member of the Presidium of the Communist International. Arrested and assassinated in 1937. Dombal (Thomas Dabal): Settled in the Soviet Union in 1923 after imprisonment in Poland. Founded the Red Peasant International. Executed in the USSR.

Julian Leszczynski: General secretary of the Polish CP. Arrested and died in 1939. Edward Prochniak: Former pupil in the school conducted by Lenin at Longjumeau in 1911. Member of the Polish Political Bureau. Arrested with several members of his

c. It was with Stalin's knowledge that many heads of our intelligence service were annihilated: Berzin, Artuzov, Treliasser, Boky, Uritsky, Borovich, Spiegelglass, Ksenofontov, Peters, Latsis, Kedrov, and others. This seriously weakened our intelligence in the prewar period.

Since we do not have documentation of the crimes that Stalin committed personally, we are compelled to accuse him through the expedient of Article 17 and more precisely Article 102-17 ("premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances," punishable by up to fifteen years imprisonment or by sentence of death) and of Article 66-17 ("terrorist act" -- "murder of a social or state personage or of a representative of the power...with the intent to undermine or weaken the Soviet power," punishable by imprisonment for up to fifteen years or by sentence of death).

The Forced Deportation of Peoples in Our Country

8. Stalin was head of state in the period during and after the Great Patriotic War [World War II] when many peoples in our country (the Crimean Tatars, the Kalmuks, Chechens, Ingush, Balkars, Koreans, Greeks, Turks, Germans, and others) were victims of forced and illegal deportation from their native lands.

These crimes fall under provisions of Article 74 ("violation of the equality of nations and of races," punishable by up to five years imprisonment).

9. Together with the mass repressions, the majority of the leading scientific and technical cadres in all branches of our economy and agriculture were liquidated or imprisoned, which had a substantial effect on the economy of our country. Thus, for example, iron production in 1938 was down 10 percent from 1937, although the plan had forecast an increase. The rapid rotation of skilled cadres acted as a brake on production: in 1940, for example, out of 153 heads of shops in the metallurgy industry, 75 had held this position for less than a year. (Questions on the History of the CPSU, 1964, No. 2, pp. 73-74.)

The greatest engineer-inventors in the sphere of military technique were

family in 1937. Vlada Copic: Communist deputy in Yugoslavia. Commander of an international brigade in Spain. Recalled to Russia in 1938 and disappeared. Hans Pegelman: Participant in the founding congress of the Comintern in 1919 and a member of its executive committee. Arrested for "nationalist Estonian deviation." Executed in 1938.

physically liquidated: G. Langimak (creator of what subsequently became known as the "Katiusha"), Kurchevsky (creator of the best recoilless cannon), V. Bekauri (founder of the radio command system of firing explosives), V. Zaslavsky (tank designer), Smirnov (head of radar work), I. Kleimenov (head of the Scientific Institute for research on reaction engines), M. Leitenzon (founder of the Society of Interplanetary Travel of the Zhukovsky Academy, etc.; or imprisoned: A. Tupolev, S. Korolev, A. Berg, V. Gluchko, B. Vannikov (people's commissar of armaments) and a great many others.*

Very great scholars were annihilated: N. Vavilov, I. Krichevsky, Dogadkin, Tulaikov, Gerasimovich, Polag...

The listed activities can be characterized according to Article 69 ("sabotage" -- "action or inaction tending to undermine industry, transportation, agriculture...") and are punishable by imprisonment up to fifteen years.

10. Cases of profanation of tombs took place (which is punishable according to Article 22 by a prison sentence up to three years). The urn holding the ashes of S.S. Kamenev** was withdrawn from the Kremlin wall, the urn holding the ashes of I.A. Gamarnik was removed, the tomb of M. Tomsy was destroyed, the monument decorating the tomb of I. Yakir was overturned, etc.

11. As is known from the confidential letter of the CPSU Central Committee to the Twentieth Congress of the party, as well as from the recently published novel of Chakovsky, Stalin hid somewhere on the day the war began; for several hours, none of the state leaders could find the commander in chief. The episode in question is described by Article 247 ("desertion"), which carries a death sentence in wartime.

12. In 1939 a defense line in depth was built, which was well equipped with fortified regions (URs). After the return of the Baltic republics, western Byelorussia

* A. Tupolev: The designer of the planes which bear his name. Sergei Korolev: Designer of the first intercontinental rockets, the first sputniks and the Vostok-type space ships. Nothing was published about his burial at the time of his death in 1966. V. Gluchko: A rocket specialist.

** Sergei Kamenev: Not be to confused with the Bolshevik leader Leon Kamenev who was executed by Stalin. Sergei Kamenev was a former Czarist officer who went over to the Bolsheviks in 1919. He became commander in chief, died in 1936, and was given a state funeral.

sia, the western Ukraine, Bessarabia, and northern Bukovina, the frontier was displaced by 100 to 600 kilometers. It was decided to fortify this new frontier. But without waiting for construction to begin on the new fortified regions, and over the protests of the head of the general staff, B. Shaposhnikov, Stalin ordered all the old fortified regions dismantled and thus gave the fascist invaders an unobstructed entry into our territory. This seems to us criminal negligence, bordering on treason.

As for the annihilation of 80 percent of the upper officer corps and command, which decapitated the army, this constitutes a direct betrayal of the country (Article 64 -- sentence of death).

Moreover, the military leaders who had fought in the Spanish Civil War were arrested in the spring of 1941 and subsequently, in October, shot without trial: Smushkevich, twice a hero of the Soviet Union, for whom a monument was erected in this country on February 26 of this year; the heroes of the Soviet Union: P. Rychagov, Stern, Chernykh, Ptuknin, Gussev, Proskurov, Pumpur, Arzhenukhin, and others.

Partisan bases on our territory were liquidated; tank formations were dismembered; certain types of automatic arms indispensable to the army were not put into production; and there were numerous other measures.

The millions of victims during the first period of the Great Patriotic War are the result of a whole series of crimes committed by Stalin.

13. Apart from what has been stated above, medieval bestialities were committed in our country which do not directly fall under the Penal Code of the USSR but constitute crimes against humanity. These did not happen behind Stalin's back but upon his orders.

During the course of investigations, beatings and other methods drove arrested persons to madness and mentally healthy people were locked up in psychiatric hospitals.

14. The wives of slain personalities were arrested and frequently shot (the wives of Tukhachevsky, Uborevich, Postyshev, Kossior, Eikhe, Gamarnik, Kork, Chubar, Shelekhes, Agranov, Dybenko, Vareikis, and others were shot). Going on to complete madness, Stalin even had the wives of his disciples Kalinin, Molotov, and Poskrebyshev arrested.

15. The minor children of outstanding victims of repression were imprisoned or placed in camps: those of Postyshev, Kossior, Liubchenko, Medved, Kamenev,

Garkavy, Bauman, Kadatsky, Tomsky, Sosnovsky, Popov, and others. The older son of Postyshev, Valentin, the sons of Evdokimov* and of Lakoba were shot.

16. In certain camps hundreds of prisoners were shot without trial or inquest (the Garaninshchina on the Kolyma).

The Situation of Our Prisoners

17. On Stalin's order, our government refused to join the international Red Cross organization for aid to prisoners of war, because our military system equated capture with treason. This deprived prisoners of material assistance and of control over the conditions of their detention, thus contributing to the loss of a great number of good people (the majority were taken prisoner after being wounded, while unconscious or without ammunition).

We have not set as our task to present all the accusations against Stalin which he merits, but a ten-thousandth part of his crimes as set forth in the present statement is a sufficient body of offenses under articles 64, 68-17, 69, 74, 88-2, 102-17, 107, 113-17, 126-17, 130, 131, 170, 171, 229, and 247 of the Penal Code of the USSR. If we examine Article 38 of the Penal Code ("mitigating circumstances"), we find, so far as Stalin is concerned, no basis for reducing his sentence.

On the basis of Article 39 of the Penal Code ("aggravating circumstances"):

1. "Crimes committed by a person who has already committed another crime."

4. "Crimes having serious consequences."

5. "Crimes committed against a minor, an elderly person, or a defenseless person..."

7. "Crimes committed with particular and outrageous cruelty to the victim."

We have no doubts on the need to resort to Article 39 of the Penal Code against the accused J.V. Stalin.

It is equally necessary to proceed against Stalin under Article 36 ("deprivation of military and other grades, as well

* Grigory Evdokimov: Old worker-Bolshevik. Sailor from age fifteen. Joined the party in 1903, active in the Civil War, chairman of the Petrograd Council of Trade Unions in 1922. Secretary of the Central Committee in 1925-26. Official party speaker at Lenin's funeral. He was a follower of Zinoviev and a member of the Left Opposition bloc. He capitulated to Stalin at the Fifteenth Party Congress, was arrested in 1934, and shot in 1936.

as of decorations, medals and honorary titles"), since this measure is aimed at the punishment of serious crimes.

On what grounds do the authors of the articles mentioned and the editorial staff of the magazine rehabilitate the greatest criminal our country has known in all of its contemporary history?

I propose to the authors of the articles in question that they refute the facts which I have brought out here -- to refute them in the only admissible way in a society of honest people, namely, by publishing my statement and answering it.

If they do not, I can only conclude that the authors are in agreement with the facts brought out in my statement and with the conclusions which flow from these facts. This means that without waiting for an answer to this statement, I will consider myself justified in inviting my colleagues participating in this discussion, to jointly request the magistrates of the USSR to initiate a penal inquest against Stalin (Djugashvili), J.V., accused of the crimes set forth above. I am convinced that a posthumous condemnation is possible and legal, just as posthumous rehabilitations are possible and legal.

APPEAL FOR SOLIDARITY WITH ELIO PORTOCARRERO RIOS

Lima

been scheduled for the last week in May.

The Committee for the Defense of Human Rights [CODDEH] reports that Elio Portocarrero Ríos may soon be put on trial. A former law student at the Universidad Nacional de Trujillo and a leader of the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria, he is accused of having led a guerrilla movement in the north part of Peru in 1965.

The prosecution has demanded that he be sentenced to ten years in prison.

The police hunted him for three years and finally succeeded in capturing him last August 22 when they broke into his home without a search warrant.

At present Portocarrero is being held in Lambayeque prison. When he was first seized, the young revolutionist was subjected to torture. It was feared that he would "vanish" like other Peruvian rebels captured by the police in recent years. International protests saved his life. The authorities have nevertheless subjected him to abuse and arbitrary restrictions.

According to information emanating from the chairman of the Council of War of Zone I of the Police Judiciary, located in Chiclayo, Portocarrero's trial has

The defense committee is appealing for expressions of solidarity and material aid. The address is: CODDEH, Apartado 10149, Lima, Peru.

BOLIVIAN POLICE ON THE QUI VIVE

Lima

lice in Cochabamba and that he was being held in prison.

A case illustrating the dangers encountered by a young person in traveling in Bolivia has been reported to the Committee for the Defense of Human Rights [CODDEH].

No official reason has been given for the arrest. Perhaps the Bolivian police, mindful of the attention given the Andean country by Che Guevara, thought they had got their hands on another top Cuban leader in Bolivia for suspicious reasons.

A Peruvian student Raúl Castro Vera, on the way to Argentina for medical treatment, disappeared in April while in transit in Bolivia.

CODDEH has asked that messages be sent to the Bolivian government or its representatives, demanding the immediate release of Raúl Castro.

His frantic parents learned indirectly that he had been seized by the po-

YOU CAN SAY THAT AGAIN

"Mr. Nixon had adopted President Lyndon B. Johnson's strategy of maintain-

ing maximum battlefield pressure on the enemy." -- The New York Times, May 23.

Books

CATCHY NEW TITLE IN KREMLIN'S SPRING BOOK LIST

By George Saunders

"Trotskyism -- The Enemy of Leninism" [Trotskizm -- Vrag Leninizma, compiled by B.S. Vlasov, Moscow, 1968, 359 pp.] is a catchy new title on the spring book list of Politizdat, the Soviet state publishing house for political literature. It is getting a big promotional job, too -- not only in the Soviet Union.

The title is cited in the "New Books" list of the World Marxist Review for March of this year, after having been similarly listed in several Soviet publications (for example, Kommunist and Novy Mir). World Marxist Review is, of course, the Kremlin-sponsored monthly organ put out for the international pro-Moscow current; it appears in most major languages. The prominent display this book is getting in regular outlet stores for Soviet books is also indicative of the importance the bureaucracy attaches to such works. At least half a dozen such articles and books have appeared since 1965; two have been translated and rebutted in the pages of this publication. [See World Outlook (former name of Intercontinental Press), November 11, 1966, and March 22, 1968.]

Though Vlasov's contribution to the new anti-Trotskyist campaign is not now in English, it would not be surprising to find it translated for international purposes soon. At any rate, the polemical line it represents will surely be heard from more widely.

The book is a compilation of documents, both complete texts and excerpts, arranged chronologically. These consist of writings by Lenin criticizing or taking issue with Trotsky, plus a mass of party resolutions adopted after Lenin's death, attacking Trotsky and the Left Opposition, stopping at Trotsky's expulsion from the party in 1927. That is all, except for a short foreword and footnotes.

A blurb in the front of the book tells us that it is "intended for the wide circle of readers studying the history of the CPSU [Communist party of the Soviet Union] in the party educational system and in institutions of higher learning."

One of the significant facts about the compilation is that, for the period from February 1917 through Lenin's death in January 1924, Vlasov could dredge up no differences between the coleaders of the revolution other than the worn-out, long since resolved differences over

Brest-Litovsk in 1918 and the trade-union question in 1921, those standbys of every Stalinist critique of Trotsky.

Not surprisingly, there are no documents presenting Trotsky's own views and comments on the various disputes covered.

Non-Soviet readers can easily acquaint themselves with the historical contexts and the positions of Trotsky and the Left Opposition. (Isaac Deutscher's three-volume biography and Trotsky's autobiography, My Life, provide a starting point.)

But Soviet readers are not able to compare the other side in the disputes Vlasov's book touches on. If Politizdat were to put out a supplement containing such material, they might find it amazingly popular.

There is another curious gap in this collection of rare items. The "struggle of the CPSU against Trotskyism" -- as Vlasov titles the post-Lenin material -- is not documented after 1927.

But most of the material produced by the CPSU against Trotskyism appeared after 1927. In fact, it constituted one of the greatest literary floods in all history -- not only the speeches of Stalin, but voluminous court records produced by his secret political police in the notorious Moscow Trials; not to mention the commentaries, articles, resolutions, books, plays, movies, and poems depicting the "Trotskyites" as spies, saboteurs, assassins, agents of Hitler, the Mikado, British imperialism, U.S. imperialism, and the White Guards; and not to mention the sequel of the late forties and early fifties when Stalin framed up such East European "Trotskyites" as Tito, Slansky, and Rajk.

All this material would make quite a volume for the edification of the "wide circle of readers studying the history of the CPSU in the party educational system and in institutions of higher learning." The high-ranking editors in the offices of Politizdat might well consider putting Vlasov to work on Volume Two.

If Volume Three were projected, it would of course have to strike a different note. This would include the text of Khrushchev's admissions at the Twentieth Congress concerning the monstrous crimes of his former mentor, Stalin, committed in the name of "the struggle against Trotskyism" (and other "enemies of the peo-

ple"). An appendix might list the thousands of victims of the bloody purges who have been "rehabilitated" -- most of them posthumously. This one, too, might top the reading lists very quickly.

A final Volume Four could then explain why Khrushchev was so cautious in doling out "rehabilitation" to Stalin's victims. And why Khrushchev's heirs decided to stop altogether the restoration of the good name of revolutionists and loyal Soviet citizens who suffered or died at the hand of Stalin and his secret police butchers, most often on charges of "Trotskyism."

This kind of collection, bringing things around full circle, would prove most useful to students of the history of the CPSU, both "in the party educa-

tional system" and outside it. It might uncover the real reason why the decision has been made to revive the "struggle against Trotskyism" today, why the Kremlin functionaries are digging out and circulating once again the material used in the campaign of slander and intimidation of the twenties. By that campaign Stalin prepared the suppression of the Left Opposition, and of all political dissidence and freedom of expression in the Soviet Union. His successors in the seats of power wish to repeat that effort.

But in today's revolutionary world, unlike the era of defeats and downturn when Stalin rose, the Soviet people, who are beginning to find their voice, will not be so easily silenced. Works like Vlasov's compilation are liable to have the opposite effect from that which their producers intended.

Movies

"THE NEW TSARS' ANTI-CHINA ATROCITIES"

The April 25 issue of the Peking Review reported that a full-length documentary The New Tsars' Anti-China Atrocities has been showing throughout China since April 19.

Produced by the "Central Newsreel and Documentary Film Studio," the movie is evidently considered by the Mao regime to be of some importance. The report about the documentary was featured by Peking Review as its lead article.

The film, according to the Maoist weekly, "exposes with irrefutable facts the hideous features of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique which has taken over the mantle of tsarist Russian imperialism and is pushing its social-imperialist policy of aggression."

In opposition to the Khrushchevists, the film "fully reflects the iron will of the Chinese armymen and civilians who, armed with Mao Tsetung Thought and tempered in the great proletarian cultural revolution, are determined to defend their motherland's sacred territory at all costs."

The documentary goes back before 1860 to show the extent of Russian seizures of Chinese territory. "The film records the righteous statements by Marx, Engels and Lenin denouncing tsarist Russia's crime of aggression against China."

The film also cites the policy announced by the Soviet government on September 27, 1920, renouncing the seizures and returning the territories to China.

"The film reminds the audience of the fact that although there are boundary questions between China and the Soviet Union left over by history, nothing untoward happened along the boundary when the Soviet Union was still a socialist state." Those happy days make a bright spot: "Moving scenes on the screen reflect the friendly relations between the people of the two countries on the Wusuli and Heilung Rivers."

But after the "Soviet revisionist renegade clique...brought about an all-round restoration of capitalism at home and, externally, carried out frantic anti-China activities in collusion with the United States" things changed. Filled with "wild ambitions," the Soviet revisionist renegade clique set out "to seize still more land from China."

What happened then is shown in a "large number of on-the-spot shots in the film: Gunboats sent by the Soviet revisionists creating trouble on the Wusuli River, ramming Chinese fishing boats, seizing Chinese fishermen's nets, spurting water on Chinese fishermen with high-pressure hoses and even kidnapping Chinese fishermen. There are also shots of fully-armed troops sent by the Soviet revisionists to forcibly occupy China's territory Heih-siatzu Island and repeatedly intrude into Chinese territory Wupalao Island, Chilin Island and other islands, interfering with and undermining the productive work of Chinese inhabitants in the border area and even pushing some of them into the Heilung River. Armoured vehicles sent by the Soviet revisionists kill unarmed Chi-

nese fishermen by running over or ramming them. All this fully shows that, like the U.S. imperialists, the Soviet revisionist social-imperialists are a gang of out-and-out fascist pirates."

The film reports the incidents that occurred on Chenpao Island in the two years between "January 23, 1967 and March 2, 1969" on sixteen occasions, the final ones creating a worldwide sensation.

The documentary ends by showing scenes of "hundreds of millions of army-men and civilians in China, who have bitter hatred for the enemy, holding unprecedentedly powerful demonstrations and other activities to protest and angrily denounce Soviet revisionism's crimes of aggression."

According to the May 5 Peking Review, in the five days from April 19 to April 23 "nearly a million people in Peking saw the film." They were more than enthusiastic.

"The audiences turned the cinemas into meeting halls for denouncing the Soviet revisionist renegade clique. During the showing of the documentary, they again and again burst into angry shouts of 'Down with the new tsars!' 'Down with Soviet revisionist social-imperialism!' and 'Anti-China scoundrels will surely come to no good end!' Full of wrath after seeing the film, the revolutionary masses in many factories, government departments, schools and rural people's communes on the outskirts immediately held rallies to condemn the Soviet revisionists' anti-China fascist outrages. The commanders and fighters of the three services in Peking were even more deeply enraged; many activists in the living study and application of Mao Tsetung Thought, combat heroes and 'five-good' fighters angrily denounced the Soviet revisionist renegade clique in the cinemas where they saw the film and expressed their firm determination to defend the sacred territory of their motherland at all costs."

So powerful was the effect of the movie that not a single person of the entire million in Peking who saw it between April 19 to April 23 found anything to criticize in it:

"The masses of workers, peasants and soldiers unanimously pointed out: The documentary has, with iron-clad evidence, exposed the rapacious nature and hideous features of the Soviet revisionist new tsars who are pursuing the social-imperialist policy of aggression. It is a record of the criminal anti-China atrocities perpetrated by the Soviet revisionists and provides very good teaching material for opposing revisionism. It helps the revolutionary masses to understand more deeply the reactionary nature of the So-

viet revisionist renegade clique. It also vividly reflects the heroic spirit of the Chinese army-men and civilians along the frontier who dare to struggle and dare to win. It is a song of praise to the frontier army-men and civilians who are armed with Mao Tsetung Thought."

The audiences noted fact after fact showing that "the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is a gang of social-imperialist bandits obsessed by expansionist ambitions."

For example: "The poor and lower-middle peasants of the Wangszuying Commune on the outskirts of Peking pointed out that, in pursuing their wild expansionist ambitions, the new tsars are so low and shameless as to build a dam on the boundary river to channel the water to wash away the river bank on the Chinese side so as to nibble away at our territory."

Kuo Teh-hai, "a 53-year-old worker of the Peking Hoisting Machinery Plant," was quoted as saying: "The scene showing the Soviet revisionists on gunboats on the Wusuli River throwing their weight about reminds me of the atrocities committed by the U.S. imperialists on the Whangpoo River in Shanghai in old China. But China today is not like the China of old. The Chinese people rose to their feet long ago! The rabid provocations by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique against our country will all end in complete failure."

As for the impression made by the resistance to the Soviet revisionists on gunboats, this is indicated by the comments of the commanders and fighters in the General Logistics Department of the People's Liberation Army during their discussions after seeing the film: "Our heroic fishermen on the Wusuli showed great courage in the face of threats from the Soviet revisionists' gunboats and attacks by hoses. Filled with bitter hatred, they hacked off the hoses of the Soviet revisionists' gunboats with axes, thereby exposing the Soviet revisionist social-imperialists as paper tigers."

In the navy and air force, many commanders and fighters said: "The heroic Chinese frontier guards and civilians, driven beyond the limit of their forbearance, fought back in self-defence, meted out due punishment to the Soviet revisionist intruders who carried out provocations, and triumphantly defended the sacred territory of our motherland. Their heroic deeds show that the Chinese people armed with Mao Tsetung Thought are invincible."

The same issue of Peking Review carries three pages of photographs from the documentary. The captions indicate the spirit and tone of the Maoist production. Here is one of them:

"Waving the flag of 'socialism,'

the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is carrying out imperialist acts. Soviet hoodlum troops intruding into Chinese territory set their vicious dog on the Chinese fishermen fishing on the ice on the Chinese side of the central line of the main channel of the Wusuli River. What difference is there between the Soviet revisionist renegade clique's savagery and the atrocities of U.S. imperialism in south Vietnam!"

The Far Eastern Economic Review, a conservative bourgeois weekly published in Hong Kong, offered two reports on the film (May 15 issue).

John Gittings describes it as "a superb piece of cinematic propaganda, and it had packed audiences of Hongkong Chinese cheering in the aisles." Pravda, Gittings notes, had denounced the documentary as a "cinematic libel" which had put together still pictures in such a way as to gloss over the Chinese provocations while putting the defensive measures of the Soviet border guards in a bad light. "No doubt some skilful editing took place in Peking, but many of the sequences (which are largely movie footage, not stills) can hardly have been faked. Whatever the nature of the Chinese provocations, the film provides a compelling insight into Moscow's no-nonsense gunboat diplomacy."

Gittings describes a number of scenes, among them the following:

"On the island of Chiliching, only a few miles north of Chenpao, Soviet armoured cars break up a Chinese demonstration on the ice by playing 'chicken'. They charge the demonstrators at high speed, halting at the last moment, then force the Chinese to scatter by driving in circles through their ranks. (This is one of the most vivid scenes in the film.)

"The film," Gittings continues, "dramatises the 'wicked nature' of Soviet revisionism to an extent which no editorial in the People's Daily could ever rival, and there is little doubt that any Chinese who sees it will know where the real enemy is supposed to lie. It is impossible to recall a similar film being made in recent years in Peking with the 'American imperialists' as the target of such hatred and contempt. As a straightforward expression of outraged nationalist sentiment (the Thoughts of Mao are not very prominently emphasised), it will certainly find receptive audiences throughout China."

The unidentified author of the column "Traveller's Tales" made the following comments in the same issue of the Far Eastern Economic Review:

"Racialism may have nothing to do

with it. But the Russians certainly come out as big-nosed white bastards in the new Chinese film on the Sino-Soviet border dispute...To any Chinese watching the film, the comparisons will be irresistible. On the one side, diminutive unarmed Chinese fishermen, trying to defend their nets in the Ussuri river from Soviet patrol boats. On the other, those hulking, offensively handsome Russian sailors, prodding their victims with boat-hooks or hosing them down with high-pressure hoses. One shot shows a Russian sailor giving an offensive V-sign to the Chinese; another shows his colleagues sniggering at the soaked fishermen. Then there are those Soviet officers, dressed up in smart great-coats and peaked caps, while the Chinese border guards wear their shabby olive-green tunics.

"The audience last week at the Astor cinema in Kowloon had no doubts at all who the baddies were (and they didn't all seem to be 'dedicated communists' either). Shouts of applause greeted the Chinese fishermen when they hacked off the Russians' high-pressure hoses, or splashed a Red Army officer with water. There were resounding cheers at the sight of Chinese anti-aircraft guns raising their noses into the air. The whole film was an excellent piece of propaganda, and it used all the tricks of the trade. Cheerful pastoral music to show the happy days of Sino-Soviet friendship, when Chinese and Russian boats on the Ussuri greeted each other with hand-clapping and accordions. Cut to a frozen shot of Eisenhower and Khrushchev at Camp David. Sinister ground-base accompaniment as one was shown a menacing Soviet watchtower on the river bank. The whirr of helicopter blades, and the hissing of water-hoses.

"The most shattering sequence for most people was the one of Soviet tanks, on the frozen ice, charging full speed at a demonstration of Chinese fishermen. If this was faked, it is hard to see how it was done, and it seems quite possible that some Chinese were killed in the process.

"If only we could now see the Soviet film, shown in Moscow some weeks ago, which gave their side of the story...Apparently it showed fanatic Chinese waving their Little Red Books at the Soviet border guards. Perhaps it even showed them urinating in the direction of the Soviet Union, as they are alleged by Moscow to have done. But Red Books and unbuttoned trousers hardly seem to call for the kind of measures adopted in retaliation by the Russians."

Up to now, two important credit lines appear to have been overlooked by the reviewers of the film, both in Peking and Hong Kong.

One is the credit due the fishermen

for having the foresight to always include movie cameras in their tackle boxes along with lines, fishhooks, lures, and such items.

The other is the skill displayed by these fishermen in using their movie equipment. They got wonderful close-ups -- a snigger on the face of a Russian sailor, for instance. And not without risk to themselves and their cameras.

For example, they did not hesitate

to move right in as their comrades chopped high-pressure water hoses with axes.

Perhaps even firmer nerves were required to stand motionless, taking yards of film as Russian tanks charged down full speed to flatten them on the ice.

If any Oscars are to be given, it would seem in order to present these amateur cameramen with the biggest Mao badges of all.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Alain Krivine	521
Student Revolts Flare Throughout Argentina -- by Gerry Foley	522
DRAWING: Lt. Gen. Juan Carlos Ongania	522
Nationwide Protests in Venezuela Against Shooting of Students	523
Daniel Camejo, Other Political Prisoners, Sentenced in Mexico	524
DRAWING: Daniel Camejo Guancho	524
More Political Trials in Greece	525
DRAWING: Colonel George Papadopoulos	525
Iraq Makes Peace Offer After New Kurdish Offensive	526
DRAWING: General Mustafa al-Barzani	526
Dutch Police Attack Student Sit-In	526
PHOTO: May 18 Women's March in London	527
Women in Britain Demonstrate for Equal Pay -- by Sue Pascoe	527
Interview with Ricardo Ochoa:	
The Student Struggle in Mexico Today -- by Dick Roberts	528
Students Close Down Ivory Coast University	530
"Le Monde's" Assessment of Alain Krivine	531
Alain Krivine on Television	533
Revolt Reported in Haiti	535
Dependable Jacques Duclos	536
DRAWING: Jacques Duclos	536
Workers Democracy, Duclos Style	536
Daniel Cohn-Bendit -- For Prime Minister or People's Commissar?	537
DRAWING: Daniel Cohn-Bendit	537
Massive Protest Strikes Hit Australia	538
Report from the Underground:	
The Student Movement in Brazil	539
Student Militancy on the Rise in Chile	541
Pyotr Yakir's Indictment of Stalin	542
Appeal for Solidarity with Elio Portocarrero Ríos	547
Bolivian Police on the Qui Vive	547
You Can Say That Again	547
Books:	
Catchy New Title in Kremlin's Spring Book List -- by George Saunders	548
Movies:	
"The New Tsars' Anti-China Atrocities"	549

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen. CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack. MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans. 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 one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries. 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.