

## Moscow Parley Deepens Split with Peking

From Mexico:

### Political Prisoners Rebel Against Brutality

Greek Trotskyists  
Given Life Sentences

Alain Krivine's  
Election Platform



BREZHNEV: For "collective security" in Asia. See page 610.

The SLL Abstains on Krivine

Provisional Government Formed in Vietnam

MOSCOW CONFERENCE DEEPENS SPLIT WITH PEKING

Projected originally as early as 1962, the many-times postponed conference of Communist parties opened finally in Moscow June 5.

Representatives of seventy-five parties were reported to be attending. Among those absent were Albania, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Yugoslavia. The Cuban Communist party was represented by an observer.

The central task of the conference remained as first projected by Khrushchev -- to rally the forces of the world Communist movement against the leadership of the Chinese Communist party.

A secondary task was to place a stamp of approval on the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the doctrine issued by Moscow to justify it -- the alleged right of "socialist states" [the most powerful one, that is] to intervene in the internal affairs of "other socialist states."

One of the main reasons for the repeated deferment of the gathering was the reluctance of some of the pro-Moscow parties to support a resolution that would read the Chinese Communist party out of the movement. Such a resolution would compel them to break off fraternal relations with the Chinese, facilitating the Kremlin's aim of reestablishing stricter control over their internal affairs.

The Sino-Soviet conflict, by rupturing the old monolithism, was not without its advantages to the bureaucracies of certain pro-Moscow parties despite the way they have deplored it. The interbureaucratic conflict made it easier to assert their own national interests and to strike a posture of independence from the Kremlin.

The policy of these parties, as advanced in particular by the Italians and Rumanians, was to block Moscow from staging a showdown with Peking in the international Communist movement. Unable, finally, to further postpone the gathering, they sought to prevent any conclusive condemnation of Peking at the conference.

To get these parties to attend the conference, the Moscow bureaucrats appear to have promised them privately that no definitive action would be taken against the Chinese. Once assembled, however, the delegates discovered once again how little reliance can be placed in the assurances of the men who were handpicked by Stalin to head his bureaucratic machine and who became the treacherous dictator's heirs upon his death.

On the very first day, the first

speaker, C. Maciel of Paraguay, attacked the Chinese. This was an obvious opening move by the Kremlin strategists intended to set the pack off in full cry.

The Rumanian delegation was so incensed at this that instead of abiding by the regular order of speakers, they took the floor as soon as possible on a "point of order" to deliver a warning.

This was done by Nicolae Ceausescu, the president of Rumania and general secretary of the Rumanian Communist party. The Rumanians, he said, had come to the conference to help seek ways of surmounting "or at least attenuating" the "differences" among the Communist parties.

In the preparatory work for the conference, he continued, the delegates refused to condemn or censure other Communist parties. "We hail the fact that the draft resolution stated that the parties participating in the conference will support and develop cooperation with the parties that are not participating."

However, "to our great regret," the representative of the Paraguayan party leveled attacks against "a party that is not participating in this meeting."

Ceausescu appealed to the delegates not to attack other parties "whether they are present or not at this meeting." What the conference ought to do, he said, is provide a demonstration of the "unity and solidarity of the Communists in the struggle against imperialism, a demonstration of our decision to restore unity among the Communists."

The warning was intended to slow down the Kremlin's steamroller. This intent was progressive. It should not be overlooked, however, that it was also an expression of the national aims of the Rumanian bureaucracy. These are not at all revolutionary. In fact there is considerable evidence that this bureaucracy is particularly desirous of opening up channels to the West. That the road to handouts from Washington passes by way of support to Peking as against Moscow is perfectly understood, of course, by Ceausescu and his fellow graduates of the school of Stalinism. Their idea is to use Peking as a fulcrum in trying to pry themselves loose from the Kremlin so as to be free to move far to the right.

Even while the Rumanian delegation was drawing up the statement to be read by Ceausescu, the Kremlin had moved another piece. Wladyslaw Gomulka, first secretary of the Polish party, was on the floor attacking the Chinese.

"They have betrayed internationalism, have spoken from positions of anti-Soviet nationalism and have split the world system of socialist states," he said. "They have espoused political struggles in other fraternal parties and have created splinter groups.

"They have made unjust territorial claims and fomented border incidents."

Comment on the hypocrisy of this speech is hardly needed. It came from a leading participant in the plot to use the armies of the Warsaw Pact to crush the struggle for proletarian democracy in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Gomulka was followed by Waldeck Rochet, the general secretary of the French Communist party, who denounced "the leftism characterizing the groups adhering to either Maoism or Trotskyism."

Referring to the "resolutions and particularly the new statutes adopted at the conclusion of the recent congress of the Chinese Communist party," Rochet said

that the French CP viewed these as "a new grave accentuation of the anti-Leninist, anti-Soviet and divisive line of the Chinese leaders. This line, which they seek to impose on us by any means possible, is causing considerable damage to our struggle."

Others took up the same theme, laying down a heavy barrage in anticipation of the main assault. This came June 7 in a speech read by Leonid I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the Soviet party. Seven of the fifty-six pages of this document were devoted to the Chinese.

With the dexterity that comes from years of practice at the game, Brezhnev quickly disposed of the promise not to attack the Chinese at the conference. "Frankly speaking," he said, "just recently we had no intention at all of touching on this question at the meeting. However, the events of the recent period, particularly the nature of the decisions taken by the Ninth Congress of the Chinese party, have forced us to deal with it."

Because of the Ninth Congress, he averred, the conference faced a "new situation." He then repeated some of the standard charges leveled for years by Moscow such as the "messianic role" being "drummed into the heads of the Chinese workers and peasants" by Mao.

Brezhnev even rehashed the story which Khrushchev "leaked" to Western diplomats:

"Possibly, many of the comrades here remember Mao Tse-tung's speech in this hall during the 1957 meeting. With appalling airiness and cynicism he spoke of the possible destruction of half of mankind in the event of an atomic war. The facts indicate that Maoism is not calling for a struggle against war, but, on the contrary, for war, which it regards as a positive phenomenon in historical development."

Brezhnev's speech was so bellicose that the more sensational papers in the West raised the possibility of the border conflict with China developing into a war.

One paragraph in particular caught the attention of diplomats: "We are of the opinion that the course of events is putting on the agenda the task of creating a system of collective security in Asia."

In response to inquiries on this, Soviet officials referred to an article by Vikenty Matveyev published in the May 28 Izvestia. Matveyev wrote about the possibility of a "vacuum" being created if the British pulled out east of Suez and if the Americans withdrew from South Vietnam.

"Judging by what the Peking press says, Mao and his henchmen entertain quite definite designs on a number of countries



CEAUSESCU: Tries to stop steamroller.



of Soviet troops into that small, weak country, Brezhnev sought to substitute the hypothetical movement of Chinese troops into the powerful USSR.

On the question of the invasion of Czechoslovakia, a note of opposition was struck by Laurie Aarons, the general secretary of the Australian Communist party, in a speech June 6. He indicated that the Kremlin acted out of national interests while trying to justify the intervention as an act of "proletarian internationalism." He was quoted by Le Monde as declaring, "We have said, and we repeat it, that this intervention brought injury to our cause and that its consequences will not easily be overcome."

Enrico Berlinguer, deputy secretary general of the Italian CP, registered his party's disagreement with the Kremlin on both China and Czechoslovakia in a speech June 11 that received considerable publicity outside the Soviet Union.

Berlinguer said that it was necessary to speak frankly about the tragedy of Czechoslovakia, because when the independence of a country is violated, "a question of principle is posed, which concerns not only the interested parties, but our movement as a whole."

He rejected the idea of "a guide party or a guide state," a position maintained by the Italian Communist leaders in accordance with the concept of "polycentrism," or live and let live.

As for the Sino-Soviet conflict, Berlinguer considered this to be "not only very dangerous for the movement but a negative factor in the international situation that arouses grave preoccupation."

He said that the Italians had often criticized the Chinese and he regretted that the Chinese considered Mao Tsetung Thought as the only possible road.

Nevertheless steps ought to be taken to end "this political discord and reach a rapprochement....The policy of peaceful coexistence and the anti-imperialist struggle need the positive contribution of China."

He emphasized the readiness of the Italian CP to act as a go-between in order "to transcend the present situation and to diminish this tension."

It was an eloquent speech, perfectly tailored for the audience...in Italy. For ironic effect, the representative of the right-wing Italian CP bureaucracy was the indicated man to put up the strongest case at the conference for Peking.

BERLINGUER: Ready to serve as go-between.

in this part of the world," said Brezhnev.

Hence the advisability of these countries "pooling efforts" and establishing "collective security."

The article does not call on the British and American imperialists to stay in the area to prevent the formation of a "vacuum." That will not be necessary in view of the Kremlin's readiness to underwrite the efforts of the capitalists of India and similar countries to meet the threat of revolution allegedly emanating from Peking.

The article constitutes a brazen effort to provide justification for Moscow's policy of collaborating with the bourgeoisie in colonial countries and of shipping them arms to be used in putting down insurgent movements.

Moscow's deliberate magnification of the Sino-Soviet conflict, particularly the attempt to create a scare over the alleged threat of a war, also had an immediate purpose at the conference itself. It was calculated to help divert the attention of both the delegates and the press from the highly embarrassing scandal of Moscow's intervention in Czechoslovakia. In place of the real movement

PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT FORMED IN VIETNAM

On June 10, two days after Nixon announced a token withdrawal of 25,000 of the 540,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam, the Vietnamese freedom fighters announced the formation of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam. The move constituted a serious political blow to the Saigon dictatorship. The new revolutionary regime has appealed to all governments for diplomatic recognition as the only legal government of South Vietnam.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government represents a broad coalition opposed to the Thieu-Ky regime. Its major component, of course, is the National Liberation Front, which includes the most courageous opponents of the U.S. aggressors and their puppet supporters.

Of the other components the most important is the Alliance of National, Democratic and Peace Forces.

This formation was set up in February 1968 during the Tet offensive. It has maintained close ties with the National Liberation Front since then.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government was mandated by an All-South Vietnam Congress of People's Representatives which met in a liberated area near Saigon June 6-8.

The congress adopted a "Program of Action" which pledged the Provisional Revolutionary Government "to mobilize the South Vietnam armed forces and people in order to push forward the struggle against U.S. aggression, for national salvation, to total victory and to successfully accomplish the lofty tasks laid down" by the congress.

The program stated that the new government would enter into negotiations with other political forces in South Vietnam with the aim of "setting up a provisional coalition government on the principles of equality, democracy and mutual respect. The provisional coalition government will organize general elections in order to elect a constituent assembly, work out a democratic constitution fully reflecting the interests and aspirations of the entire people, and set up a coalition government reflecting national concord and a broad union of all social strata."

Huynh Tan Phat, fifty-six, was named chairman of the provisional government. Three deputy chairmen were named: Dr. Phung Van Cung, who is also minister of the interior; Prof. Nguyen Van Kiet, who is also minister of education and youth; and Nguyen Do. Madame Nguyen Thi

Binh was designated minister of foreign affairs and representative of the new regime to the Paris talks. Tran Buu Kiem, who had been heading the Paris delegation, is to be minister to the chairman's office. Tran Nam Trung was named minister of defense.

In addition to these posts, an advisory council was designated, headed by Nguyen Huu Tho, the chairman of the National Liberation Front. Members of this council include the well-known Buddhist monk Thich Don Hau of Hue, and Lam Van Tet, a rich Saigon surveyor who was a member of the Council of Notables set up in 1963 by the generals who overthrew Diem.

Besides the NLF and the Alliance of National, Democratic and Peace Forces, the congress that established the Provisional Revolutionary Government was attended by representatives of the Liberation Committees, some 2,000 of which are functioning in villages and cities throughout the country. The congress elected representatives to the advisory council from various national and religious minorities, including the Montagnards, Khmers, the United Buddhists of Vietnam, the Hoa Hao sect, and Catholic Patriots of South Vietnam.

By June 13, thirteen countries had given full recognition to the new government. Algeria, which was the first, was followed by North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba, Yugoslavia, Syria, the Congo, Rumania, Poland, East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union.

Washington and Saigon were quick to denounce the new regime and to deny any importance to the development. Robert J. McCloskey, speaking for the State Department June 11, called it "the same old wine in a new bottle." Thieu declared it was merely a "propaganda trick of the Hanoi Communists." The New York Times, however, commented June 12: "The allied dismissal of the latest move by the other side was not shared by some diplomats friendly to the United States. They saw it as the first step in a program to establish the equality of the new regime with President Thieu's Government."

In Paris, Tran Buu Kiem told reporters June 14 that the new revolutionary government "will create favorable conditions to broaden the solidarity of our people and push ahead our fight in our country. On the other hand, it will also step up our diplomatic activities in general and the Paris negotiations in particular."

INDIA'S "LEFT" AND "RIGHT" COMMUNIST PARTIES EXPLORE ACCOMMODATION

Top leaders of the Communist party of India [CPI -- the pro-Moscow CP] and the Communist party of India (Marxist) [CPI(M) -- the originally pro-Maoist CP] met in Calcutta May 24-26 for a "summit" meeting to explore the possibility of common action between the two parties. This was the first such meeting since the groups split in 1964.

The meeting was preceded by a three-day session of the CPI(M)'s Politburo, carried on simultaneously with informal discussions between secondary leaders of the CPI and the CPI(M) that began in Calcutta May 22.

CPI(M) leader E.M.S. Namboodiripad released a Politburo resolution to the press May 22 on the question of united action between the two parties. The resolution was in reply to an April 19 proposal by the National Council of the CPI that the parties (1) form joint national and local coordinating committees, (2) form a joint bloc in parliament and in state legislatures, and (3) coordinate their work in mass movements and organizations.

The CPI(M) rejected the first two proposals, on the grounds that the "revisionism" of the CPI precluded such close identification of the two parties. But Namboodiripad indicated that the third proposal would be seriously discussed at the "summit" meeting.

There has been friction between the two CPs in the CPI(M)-dominated United Front governments in Kerala and West Bengal -- particularly the former -- which Namboodiripad suggested was the most serious block to closer cooperation.

The Calcutta Hindusthan Standard reported May 23: "The Politburo resolution on Kerala said that the United Front and its Government in Kerala had been brought to 'the brink of a break-up' by the 'disruptive activities of the Right Communists and the Indian Socialist Party [ISP]'..."

"It bitterly attacked the CPI and the ISP for their role ever since the formation of the UF Ministry and charged them with 'functioning as Opposition parties in fact, although a part of the Government in form.'"

One issue that divided the CPs was how to increase food production and carry out industrialization in Kerala. CPI Minister T.V. Thomas had proposed that foreign capitalists be invited to invest in the state, particularly the giant Japanese monopoly Mitsubishi. The CPI(M) rejected schemes based on penetration of foreign capital, suggesting instead that

Rumania or other East European workers states be asked to help establish industries in Kerala.

On May 23 A.K. Gopalan, leader of the CPI(M) national parliamentary fraction, met with reporters in Calcutta to discuss rumors that the two parties were considering unification. The May 24 Calcutta Statesman reported: "Ruling out the possibility of immediate unity of the two parties, Mr Gopalan feels that only by gradual ideological training from below and a change of policies through mass struggles could the CPI come closer to the CPI(M)...He pointed out that the CPI still believed in a national democratic Government at the Centre consisting of the peasantry, the working class and a section of the national bourgeoisie, while the CPI(M) felt that this would be a collaboration of the toiling classes with the exploiting class."

It was difficult to judge how seriously the CPI(M) took this objection, inasmuch as capitalist parties such as the Bangla Congress have been welcomed into the United Front governments in both Kerala and West Bengal. Gopalan left the door open for further collaboration with the CPI in peasant organizations and trade unions, and on the electoral front.

"Stressing the need for unity," the Statesman said, "he regretted how during the last mid-term poll in Punjab, the refusal of the CPI to come to an understanding with his party led to a situation where both the parties suffered defeats."

One reason for the CPI(M)'s hesitancy in moving too close to the CPI was the latter's recent endorsement of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. An April 7 meeting of the CPI's National Council voted for the first time to back the Kremlin's intervention as "inevitable and justified." The party had been sharply divided between the old-line Stalinists led by party chairman S.A. Dange and a current that opposed the Soviet action led by Bhupesh Gupta. The April 8 Hindusthan Standard said the final vote in the National Council was unofficially reported at fifty-two against twenty-seven with some abstentions.

The resolution claimed that a "dangerous situation" had been developing inside Czechoslovakia "as a result of the activities of internal antisocialist and counter-revolutionary forces linked with West German revanchism and U.S. imperialism from outside."

The pro-Moscow leaders of the CPI, at the same meeting of their National Council, voted to make overtures to the CPI(M) for unified action. In their estimate the commitment of the CPI(M) leaders to the

"parliamentary road," and a bloc with the national bourgeoisie would ultimately outweigh any prejudice on the part of the "left" CP against "revisionism."

The May 24 Statesman claimed that "a section of the CPI leadership is keen on the merger of the two parties. According to them, the continuation in power of a few old leaders in the two parties stands in the way of such unity."

"Stressing the inhibiting role of the personalities rather than the ideological differences, the pro-unity section is even prepared to concede to the rival party by removing from the hierarchy Mr S.A. Dange. There are talks that Mr Dange might be offered the presidency of the world federation of trade unions, which would prevent him from interfering in his party's policies in India."

There is some evidence for the CPI's view that the political differences separating the "left" and right CPs are rather small. The Central Committee of the CPI(M) met May 10-13 in Calcutta, its first meeting since the United Front victory in West Bengal in February. This meeting endorsed the multiclass United Front coalitions as a model for the party on a national level. In the main political report to the plenum, CPI(M) leader Basavapunnaiah discussed the party's attitude toward a potential split in the ruling bourgeois Congress party. The Statesman paraphrased his report as follows:

"In the event of a cleavage, the CPI(M)'s attitude will be to find out its class basis. The party's task in that event will be to isolate the big business men and big landlords, who now control the Government at the Centre, and try to win over the non-big bourgeoisie to the anti-Congress democratic front."

There was evidently some opposition from within the Central Committee at this openly class-collaborationist perspective. The Statesman said: "Some members from the CPI(M)'s West Bengal unit at the Central Committee feel that the United Front should not be an element of bourgeois diplomacy or a hotch-potch coalition of opportunistic elements."

If the Central Committee meeting represented a move closer to the positions of the pro-Moscow CPI, there still remained the issue of the original split: Maoism. In fact the "true" Maoists or Naxalites [from the peasant rebellion in Naxalbari, West Bengal, in 1967] have split from the CPI(M). The party, nevertheless, has continued to describe itself as pro-Chinese.

The CPI(M) Politburo, in its session ending May 24, adopted a resolution

breaking definitively with Maoism. There is no need, the Politburo said, to lengthen the phrase "Marxism-Leninism" by adding "Mao Tsetung Thought" to it.

In discussing the recently concluded Ninth Congress of the Chinese CP, the CPI(M) Politburo said it was "highly objectionable" to name Mao as the lifetime leader of the CCP and to incorporate Lin Piao's title to the succession into the party constitution. "Such a course," the Politburo declared, "may benefit organizations and parties that are to be built on faith, but is forbidden for a Communist Party based on the science of Marxism and built on the principle of democratic centralism. Then the democratic principle of election of leaders will be replaced by the principle of succession." The Chinese method of deifying leaders, it said, was "really strange and monstrous."

Lin Piao's report to the Ninth Congress, the CPI(M) declared, "suffers from dangerous Left-opportunist and sectarian errors."

The Politburo accused the Maoists of adhering to the "theory of building socialism in each separate country," saying that such a concept "carries the danger of cutting itself loose from the Marxist-Leninist scientific concept of building world socialism and communism."

The CPI(M) demanded to know why the old party constitution had been junked in China without explanation. It described the documents of the Chinese congress as "totally disappointing" inasmuch as they contained "literally nothing" in the way of information on the experience of socialist construction in China since 1956. It also noted the absence of any explanation for the claimed emergence of a "bourgeois" tendency around Liu Shao-chi and other long-time party leaders. The CPI(M) leaders pointed to the lack of any concrete discussion of the world Communist movement and the presentation in its place of "a facile picture of everything going well except for the nuisance of a handful of capitalist-roaders at home and some tiny groups of renegades abroad in most of the Communist parties in the world."

After making these many telling criticisms of the Maoist bureaucrats, the CPI(M) leaders had nothing to propose, however, but a return to the documents adopted by the pro-Moscow Communist parties at their world conferences in 1957 and 1960 (which Peking had adhered to at the time). The timing of this public break with Mao, moreover, scarcely twenty-four hours before the "summit" meeting with the CPI, suggested that the two events had some connection.

The negotiations ended May 26 with a joint communiqué signed by leaders of both parties. The more notorious bureaucratic fossils, such as S.A. Dange for the CPI and

B.T. Ranadive for the CPI(M), did not take part in the meeting.

The May 27 Statesman summarized the results of the "summit":

"Both parties recognized that efforts to keep the United Fronts in Kerala and West Bengal should be given the highest priority. In this context, stress was laid on the need for greater under-

standing between the two Communist parties....

"Both parties also agreed that a broad unity in the working of such mass fronts as trade unions and kisan [peasant] organizations should be achieved by inter-party discussions at the State levels. The conference, for the time being, kept in abeyance the discussions on the possibility of the two Communist parties coming closer at the national level."

#### GREEK TROTSKYISTS GIVEN LIFE SENTENCES BY MILITARY TRIBUNAL

##### Athens

A group of Trotskyist militants were condemned to long prison terms by a military tribunal here following their "trial" May 19-20. The defendants, arrested in September 1968, were members of the Internationalist Communist Organization of Greece, which supports the Fourth International. The ICO publishes the monthly journal Spartacus and distributes leaflets opposing the dictatorship.

During the trial the defendants declared their opposition to the military regime, denounced the tortures they had been subjected to, and courageously upheld their political convictions against the dictatorship and the capitalist state. They called for a socialist revolution, as partisans of Trotsky and the Fourth International.

The tribunal handed down the following savage sentences against the accused:

Theodossis Thomadaxis, machinist, prison for life; Panayotis Doumas, waterworks employee, prison for life; Sofronis Papadopoulos, building worker, prison for life; and Hélène Doumas, printer, eighteen years in prison.

Three other defendants were also sentenced: Elie Corovessis, student, eight years in prison; Dimitri Frangoulanis, house painter, eight years; and Anna Karouta, printer, two years.

The prosecutor in his indictment during the trial described the defendants as "stateless persons" and "traitors to their country" in the service of...Moscow!

During the same week: Thirty-nine members of the Patriotic Front were put on trial in Salonika. In Athens, six intellectuals were tried for having set up a network for the centrist organization Democratic Defense (Papandreou's group).

Also in Athens, an independent left-wing group was tried for having set up a resistance network. The principal defendants were Theodore Nicas, sentenced to life in prison; Georges Tzortzorian, and Lambrini Iconomidou, who each received twenty years; and Dimitri Livieratos.

In Greece today there is no large, massive resistance movement. But there are always illegal activities against the dictatorship led by the vanguard political tendencies.

#### UNIVERSITIES CLOSED AS STUDENTS CLASH WITH POLICE IN TURKEY

Students throughout Turkey, protesting the government's failure to pass promised university reform legislation, occupied buildings and fought pitched battles with police during the first two weeks of June. Istanbul University, the largest school in the country, was closed June 10 after army troops were called in to oust radical students. The university will not reopen until September. Middle East Technical University in Ankara was also closed.

A crowd of more than 400 students in Ankara marched on the U.S. military

headquarters June 11 and threw fire bombs and stones at the building. American officials estimated the damage at \$10,000. Students in Ankara and Istanbul used Molotov cocktails and stones to defend themselves from large-scale police attacks. The police used concussion grenades and tear gas.

A top official of Turkey's largest trade-union confederation threatened to bring the workers into the streets to join the students unless the government agreed immediately to pass a pension bill which the unions have been fighting for.



MEXICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS REBEL AGAINST GUARDS' BRUTALITY

[The following account, based on information obtained from several political prisoners in Mexico City's Lecumberri Prison, has been compiled by the USLA Reporter, the newsletter of the United States Committee for Justice to Latin-American Political Prisoners.]

\* \* \*

On April 6 a common prisoner escaped prison by drugging one of the visitors, taking his identification tab and clothes, and walking out as one of the Sunday visitors. Thus the guards were more or less alert on Monday night.

At about 3:10 a.m. Tuesday morning, we suddenly awoke to the sounds of rifle and pistol fire and the shouts of guards. It was perfectly clear that the shots were close by -- being fired either in our own ward or right next to it. We could hear the guards running over the roofs of our cells. We got out of the way of the entrance to the cell and glanced out toward the tower in the center of the ward. There were three guards firing away with .38 caliber pistols toward Ward A.

At first we thought there might be an escape attempt by some of the political prisoners in that ward. There were shouts by the guards of "Bajanse!" ["Get down from there!"] and then more gun shots. Not only the three guards in the tower were shooting, but many others, along the big walls dividing wards A and E, were also firing with Mausers.

Before the shooting started, several prisoners heard the guards shouting, "Son politicos!" ["They are politicals"], then opening fire.

In a short time the guards cornered the two common prisoners, who were unarmed. They had not been trying to escape, but only to sneak into the workshop to pilfer a few things. We could clearly hear the beating they were getting. There was one solid blow which was particularly audible. Later we learned that one of the two had been hit by a bullet in the leg. As the beating continued, one of the inmates in Ward A, watching through a high cell window, yelled out, "That's enough, let them go, you cowards!" to the guards.

One of the officers ordered, "Count the windows! Figure out which cell that's coming from so we can give him a warming over, too," but they were unable to spot which window the voice came from.

One of the two men was taken to an unknown place. The other was taken to the Polygono, which is the central office.

There he was surrounded by the monos ["monkeys," the prisoners' name for the guards], who began beating him with their nightsticks. When he fell, they began to kick him terribly. All of this was witnessed by the political prisoners in Ward C, since they can see the Polygono from their ward.

The prisoners were not brought to the infirmary, for according to someone in the prison who knows, medical attention is never given to those caught trying to escape.

Later we learned that the two men had been thrown into a damp, dark isolation cell after they had been beaten.

The prisoners learned that night that what they have always suspected is true. The firing did not begin until someone yelled out that the two men were political prisoners. Later, when they were beating them, one of the guards, trying to get them to take it a little easier, shouted, "No hombre, son ratas de la A!" ["No, they are rats from Ward A!"]. In other words, not political prisoners, as they had originally thought.

Another revelation was that the guards in Ward N are armed, although as a rule, guards on duty at floor level carry only a nightstick. We are fully aware that the prison guards have been instructed that brutal beatings even of unarmed, captured prisoners, are fully sanctioned by the authorities; and that under the right circumstances, it is not too undesirable to shoot a political prisoner.

\* \* \*

On May 1 the political prisoners of wards M and N carried out a coordinated May Day celebration, prison style. For a few weeks there had been no guards posted inside the wards, although they came in at times and stayed in the tower\* for

---

\* Wards N and M are each constructed in the form of a circle. At the center is a fifty-foot-high control tower, usually manned by guards. Surrounding the tower is a circular inner hall, from which cells branch out like slices of a pie. The inner part of each cell, nearest the inner hall, is a "patio," with steel bars for a roof. The prisoners sleep in an enclosed part of the cell between the "patio" and the outer wall of the ward. In Ward N, for example, there are twenty cells, each holding a number of prisoners. An entrance hall with a steel gate at each end provides access to the circular ward.

brief periods.

On this day the ward and roof were clear, so we climbed to the roof of the control tower at the center of each of the wards and raised red flags. Revolutionary songs were sung, and we chanted slogans and cheered.

That same evening a second meeting was held. While the red flag was lowered, the "Internationale" was sung. Then, at ground level, assemblies commemorating the date were held in both wards, with speakers from all of the political tendencies. The common prisoners in nearby wards heard the speeches and they cheered and applauded after each one.

During the week that followed, there were scattered repressive incidents. Adrián Campos Díaz was struck by a guard while he was at the infirmary, and others were also molested. We wrote an open letter of protest to General Mario Cedillo Granados, who runs the prison, and managed to get it published in Sucesos.

On Wednesday, May 7, several prisoners were outside Ward N, waiting to be taken to the infirmary. Suddenly, as they looked through the second gate, also padlocked with a chain, they saw guards chasing prisoners and striking them. Rushing past their guards, the prisoners from Ward N ran to the second gate and saw that those being struck were compañeros from Ward M.

The guards at this second gate tried to hold back the prisoners from Ward N, but they resisted and yelled out to the guards in the main circulation hall to stop hitting the compañeros. While they stood there yelling, one of them ran back to the ward and called out, "They're beating our comrades from M!"

Within a minute almost all of the prisoners in Ward N were smashing at the gate. Although the lock didn't give, the latch did and they all ran out, past a group of five guards, to the second gate.

Some ran back for empty coke bottles, sticks, etc. Others managed to get the attention of one of the students being held at Ward M, Rafael Villalobos, nicknamed El Jarocho, who had been badly beaten. He lifted his bloody face and told the prisoners from Ward N that Sócrates Amado Campos Lemus, a student leader imprisoned in Ward M, had been suddenly taken out of the cell block and they didn't know where he was.

Since in the past another student leader, Cabeza de Vaca, had been taken out of Ward H, the newcomers' ward, and transported to Military Camp No. 1 where he had been beaten and where they had carried out a simulated firing squad ritual

to intimidate him, the compañeros of Ward M had decided to act.

While they were being taken to the steam baths, they had attempted to rush to the administration offices to conduct a lightning meeting to protest this action and to demand that Sócrates be returned immediately to his ward. However, they were assaulted by some of the guards and all hell had broken loose.

The Ward N prisoners managed to "neutralize" the five ward guards. The guards were outnumbered and the prisoners told them that it was foolish for them to risk getting hurt or killed for the measly 1,000-odd pesos per month they get paid [1,000 pesos = US\$80]. Then the prisoners threw bottles at the guards who were beating the compañeros in the main hall, to distract them from their task. Before long the padlock on the second gate was smashed.

The guards formed a human blockade to prevent the prisoners from getting through to their wounded comrades. But the prisoners broke through and went to the rescue of the others, like El Jarocho, who were now surrounded and being beaten by a whole gang of guards. The guards were finally neutralized without any violence and the prisoners of wards M and N advanced toward Ward C.

The compañeros in Ward C had already been alerted to what was happening. They also smashed the lock on their gate and neutralized their guards. But when they tried to rush toward the administration office around the corner, the big gate that cuts traffic on the main corridor was shut and locked. They began to climb over this twenty-foot-high gate at about the time the prisoners from wards N and M were arriving.

By sheer luck, painters were working with a scaffold on the outside wall of the small Sala de Defensores [Defense Counsels' Room] used for prisoners of wards M and N. One of the windows in this hall was within reach of the scaffolding, so the advancing prisoners climbed it, kicked in the wooden shutters and climbed down, thus avoiding having to climb the main gate.

Now we all advanced en masse -- the great majority of the political prisoners in Lecumberri -- toward the main administration office, the main Sala de Defensores, and...the main gate!

When we reached the Sala de Defensores, a meeting was quickly organized and the wounded compañeros were lifted up so that all of the visitors to the prison (Ward C plus all the common prisoner wards) could see them. Others proceeded to Wards I and H.

Florentino Jaimes Hernández was spotted in the Sala de Defensores. He is the prisoner who carried through a spectacular assault on an armored payroll truck. This compañero, even though he declared (published in Excélsior) that the robbery was carried out for political reasons -- to get funds to help fight against the system -- was sent to the common prisoners' Ward D instead of to one of the wards for political prisoners.

We call Jaimes to join us and he came forward, but the guard refused to unlock the gate. He was told to open it or the prisoners would smash it down, and it was opened. Jaimes rushed out to applause and cheers.

Meanwhile, the front contingent of prisoners had reached Ward I, where Sócrates had been taken. One of the prisoners had brought a sledgehammer and we began smashing the lock on the gate to Ward I. José Revueltas was there at the gate and he shook hands with some of the prisoners as they finished off the lock.

The guards were all grouped around the main gate which led to the main entrance gate, but the prisoners did not go toward that gate. As totally spontaneous as the action was, it was surprising how a major confrontation with the guards was avoided. Two compañeros addressed the guards, stopping them short when a lieutenant gave the order to charge the prisoners and disperse them.

With the lock on Ward I smashed, some prisoners went into the ward to convince Sócrates to come out and join them, to which he readily agreed. Now the mass turned toward Ward H, yelling "Danzos! Danzos!" calling to the peasant leader Ramón Danzos Palomino, recently jailed and being held arbitrarily in Ward H when he also should have been with the political prisoners.

The prisoners formed a cordon with locked arms so as not to allow the guards to interfere, and they smashed into Ward H. One guard tried to stop Danzos from leaving the ward, but was held back by another guard.

At the same time, others broke into the office of the assistant director, Major Bernardo Palacios Yáñez, located between wards I and H. Some of us held others back from going in and smashing the place up. No damage was done to the office. Neither the general nor Palacios showed up during the entire action.

Former deputy of the House of Representatives Estrada Villa was also rescued from Ward H, and the prisoners began to voluntarily move back toward their own

wards, trying to keep together to avoid being cut up into small groups. There were many clashes with the guards, but these were isolated incidents and the prisoners managed to effectively neutralize the guards verbally!

Danzos Palomino and Estrada Villa went to Ward C; Sócrates back to his own ward, M; and Jaimes was brought to Ward N. Later, Estrada Villa voluntarily returned to Ward H.

Back in Ward N, the prisoners expected the guards to counterattack at any time to get Jaimes back. They set up a twenty-four-hour watch schedule on the tower and near the entrance gate. The next day the guards came at 7 a.m. and said they wanted to count Jaimes. The prisoners discussed the matter and decided to have Jaimes come to the inside gate of Ward N, which they controlled, so that the guards could see him from outside the gate. This done, the guards left without comment.

Evidently the government has not yet decided what to do about this fait accompli. The prisoners have decided to continue to resist, depending on what happens. Meanwhile, prisoners who have left the ward to get their mail or go to the Sala de Defensores have not been bothered or provoked by the guards, and, of course, the common prisoners cheer them at every opportunity.

It can be surmised that the considerable publicity in Mexico on the conditions and demands of the political prisoners contributed heavily to the fact that an order must have been given not to shoot at the political prisoners.

On May 8 public meetings of protest were carried out at the Polytechnic Institute and at the University of Mexico.

An issue of El Día contained a news item that Silva Herzog, the historian, at a ceremony where he was being honored, said that instead of honoring him, the government ought to release the political prisoners. This issue of El Día was not allowed into the prison.

The successful actions have raised the morale of many of the political prisoners. Several, taken alone or together to court since then to sign papers, etc., have ripped up their files or defended themselves against insults and blows.

Pablo Alvarado Barrera was struck down by prison guards with clubs when he tried to rip up the court document on his sentence when the judge's envoy began reading it to him in the administration office.

SOVIET DISSIDENTS APPEAL TO MOSCOW CONFERENCE

[Oppositional Soviet communists, intensifying their activities in response to stepped-up repressions by the Kremlin bureaucracy, appealed in a statement dated June 1, 1969, to the conference of pro-Moscow Communist parties which opened in the Kremlin on June 5.

[The full text of this appeal, signed by ten of those who have been active in the Soviet civil-rights movement (several of them are members of the Soviet Communist party), has become available in Russian. The translation below is by Intercontinental Press.

[Among the signers is the wife of former Major General Pyotr Grigorenko. He himself was unable to sign, as he has been imprisoned since May 7 in Tashkent, where he was attempting to act as nonprofessional defense counsel for ten Crimean Tatar spokesmen facing trial in that city.

[The wife of Ilya Gabai, another prominent dissident, signed the appeal in his name; he, too, is in prison in Tashkent. Another signer was Irina Kosterina, presumably the widow of the late Aleksei Kosterin, a writer and a Bolshevik since 1916. All three men, Grigorenko, Gabai, and Kosterin, had signed a similar appeal in February 1968 addressed to the conference of Communist parties in Budapest.

[Most of the other signers had also participated in the May 20 appeal to the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Most prominent, besides the three already mentioned, is Pyotr Yakir, son of a Red Army general executed by Stalin in 1937. (Yakir's call for the posthumous trying of Joseph Stalin for his crimes appeared in Intercontinental Press, June 2, 1969.)

[On June 6 five young Crimean Tatars and Irina Yakir, twenty-year-old daughter of Pyotr Yakir, demonstrated in downtown Moscow near Red Square with placards calling for the right of the Tatars to return to their homeland, from which they were exiled en masse by Stalin in 1944. The demonstration was timed to coincide with the arrival of foreign delegates to the conference being held nearby.

[According to one report, a placard calling for the release of General Grigorenko was raised, and a crowd of several hundred curious onlookers soon gathered. Another report stated that some in the crowd "mauled" the demonstrators. It is certain that the six were arrested, and according to "unofficial sources" mentioned in a June 8 Reuters dispatch, they were released the next day after extensive questioning. The five Tatars were said to have been shipped back to their

home town.]

\* \* \*

We are appealing to the international conference of Communist and workers parties in regard to the revival of Stalinist methods in our country.

The Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses exposed and condemned Stalin and his serious crimes against the party and the people. Stalin's one-man dictatorship; the arbitrary practices of the security forces, which kept society in an atmosphere of fear and terror for decades; the concentration camps, in which millions of innocent people perished; the criminal nationalities' policy, under which entire nations were repressed; the impasse into which the national economy fell; the stagnation of culture and science; the low level at which wages and the production of consumer goods were kept; the catastrophic housing crisis; and the many other deformations of Stalin's dictatorship -- all these were condemned.

The party solemnly promised the Soviet people that the personality cult and its consequences would never be repeated in the life of our country. It was said that the Leninist norms of democracy would be restored.

Soviet society believed these announcements, and in fact a good deal was done toward revitalizing the life of our people.

A certain amount of anxiety was aroused by the slow and partial character of de-Stalinization. Togliatti wrote of this in his political testament.

Still greater anxiety was felt when, after the removal of Khrushchev, the democratization process began gradually and bit by bit to give way to the restoration of Stalinist methods.

At that time a movement for civil rights arose in the Soviet Union. The milestones of this movement are well known to the entire world. They are dated by the trials of Sinyavsky and Daniel; Ginzburg and Galanskov; Khaustov and Bukovsky; Litvinov and Larisa Daniel; the trials of the Crimean Tatar participants in a national movement for returning to the Crimea; the trials in the Ukraine; the trials of Marchenko and Belogorodskaya; and the recent arrests of Yakhimovich, General Grigorenko, and Gabai. This list could be expanded many times over.

In this connection it is neces-

sary to speak of illegal arrests and unjust sentences, the lack of publicity and the bias of the courts, numerous violations of procedural norms, searches of homes and shadowing of people; eavesdropping on phone conversations and opening of mail. Thus, free citizens of the USSR, who have been convicted of nothing, can be placed in the position of outcasts if they don't please the KGB [the secret-police organization] -- mail is not delivered to them; they cannot use the telephones freely; all who have dealings with them immediately come under KGB surveillance.

Citizens who dare to express criticism of any government position whatsoever (whether they are Communists or non-party people) are subjected to humiliations and persecution and unlawful dismissal from work. For the slightest attempt to criticize, Communists are subjected to immediate expulsion from the party (in violation of the party constitution). Recently, the commitment of completely normal people to mental hospitals has become more and more frequent.

We ask the representatives of the international Communist movement to help in the liquidation of such phenomena, which, like the distortions of Stalinism, constitute a shameful blemish on the entire international Communist movement. All of these judicial and extrajudicial repressions are aimed at suppressing independent beliefs. Again, as under Stalin, the alternative is silence. Again, as during that fearful time, we are being deprived of the opportunity to express our beliefs.

But despite persecution, people will not remain silent; they are protesting. After the fifty-year history of socialism in our country, Soviet people are not willing to equate socialism with Stalinism.

#### REPRESSION IN RUPUNUNI AREA OF GUYANA

The reactionary Forbes Burnham regime in Guyana is said to have taken savage reprisals in the Rupununi region of the country near the Brazilian and Venezuelan borders, where an abortive revolt by ranchers and Amerindian peasants took place in January. The Brazilian Helio Magalhães, writing in the Rio de Janeiro paper O Globo, recounted the atrocities. Part of his account was reprinted in the June 8 London Observer:

"In Lethem (capital of the Rupununi region) I saw houses destroyed by machine-gun fire without the occupiers having the slightest chance of escape. I saw

At the same time, recent years have seen the undertaking of more and more frequent attempts in literature and historical writing to restore to Stalin his former greatness and thereby to place in doubt the decision of the Twenty-Second Congress to remove Stalin from the mausoleum.

The growing influence of people who are striving to revive the Stalinist past has become more and more noticeable. Once again in the state and party apparatus old Stalinist cadres are setting the tone. How else can the introduction of Soviet troops into friendly Czechoslovakia be interpreted?

We ask the representatives of the Communist parties, whose ideal is the building of a totally just society:

Does it not alarm you that such an obvious restoration of Stalinism is occurring in our country, which is in the position of being the foremost Communist society? Is it really not possible to forestall the catastrophic consequences of this?

We appeal to you to examine the full seriousness of the situation and to do everything that your conscience and reason demand, everything in your power, to prevent the sinister shade of Stalin from darkening our future.

\* \* \*

G. Altunian, engineer, Communist (Kharkov); Z. Grigorenko, pensioner, Communist; Ilya Gabai, teacher -- from the KGB investigation prison in Tashkent, signed for him by Galina Gabai; R. Djemilev, worker (Krasnodar region); I. Kosterina, office worker; Krasnov-Levitin, writer on religious subjects; L. Petrovsky, historian, Communist; S. Pisarev, pensioner, Communist; L. Plyushch, mathematician (Kiev); P. Yakir, historian.

the Guyanese police cut down eight people, three adults and five children of seven and under. Another time they captured two girls, one of 14 and the other of 15. The two of them stayed tied up naked for three days without anything to eat. Afterwards they were raped by the police and immediately thrown on the ground and crushed by a lorry.

"I also saw police surround houses full of people in the middle of the night, throw petrol on the walls and set light to it, starting on the doors and windows, and the occupants inside screamed till they died."

HOW CHINA'S SCIENTISTS FARED IN THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION

"China's Scientists in the Cultural Revolution" is the title of an interesting article by Parris H. Chang in the May issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, the well-known journal sponsored by the late Albert Einstein among others. Chang is a Fellow of the Research Institute of Communist Affairs at Columbia University.

The general impression in the first phase of the Cultural Revolution, Chang writes, was that China's scientists were being shielded from the broad attack against intellectuals. The sixteen-point resolution passed by the Central Committee plenum in August 1966 seemed designed in fact to protect the work of scientific and technological personnel from disruption. The press even carried articles praising the scientists for such achievements as developing nuclear weapons and synthesizing insulin.

This situation changed around February 1967. China's scientists were attacked for pursuing a "bourgeois-revisionist line" in science and technology. A clamor was raised to purge the "capitalist roaders" in these fields.

"In early February 1967, a Red Guard newspaper carried a picture of Pei Li-sheng and Tu Jun-sheng, both vice-presidents of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), with revisionist placards round their necks. On April 10, 1967, a mass rally of 15,000 'revolutionary' scientists was held in Peking; the rally called for a purge of 'capitalist roaders' in the field of science and technology and stressed the necessity of 'thoroughly criticizing and repudiating the absurd demand of bourgeois scientists that Party control over science and technology be removed.'"

The July 26, 1968, issue of the Shanghai Wen Hue Pao criticized China's scientists for "relying too heavily on foreign textbooks" and "failing to break away from the straitjacket of foreign convention." The paper also said that "organizations in the scientific and technological field have turned into hotbeds of revisionist academic overlords divorced from politics and from the masses."

Chang cites an attack on Hua Lo-Keng, director of the Institute of Mathematics of the CAS, by a Red Guard newspaper as indicative of the issues raised by the Maoist leadership:

"1. As a student at Cambridge University, Hua was deeply poisoned by imperialist education and worshipped Western scientific culture.

"2. He negated the leadership of Mao Tse-tung's thought in science.

"3. He vehemently attacked the 'three red flags' -- 'general line,' 'great leap forward,' and 'people's commune.'

"4. He opposed the study of Mao Tse-tung's thought and held that scientists could not be forced to study Mao's works and that all they have to do is to engage in scientific research.

"5. As head of the Institute of Mathematics, he opposed putting 'politics first' as a condition for recruiting research students and turned away workers and peasants who are 'good politically' but without 'professional skills.'

"6. While teaching at the Peking University of Science and Technology he advocated the 'imperialist educational line,' thus gradually turning students into 'nobles in spirit.'

"7. During the Cultural Revolution, he suppressed the rebel activities of students and attacked Chiang Ching [Mao's wife] for being 'fanatic and insane.'

"8. He spread the notion everywhere that nuclear tests were the result of the 'hard work' of scientists and regarded the press claim of the victory of Mao Tse-tung's thought as 'vulgar.'"

The "intensive attack on the scientists during the Cultural Revolution," Chang believes, "might also have been caused by their attitude toward the Soviet Union." Possibly many top scientists "advocated rapprochement with the Soviet Union in order to benefit from her scientific knowledge and technical expertise." Several leading experts in the research and development of nuclear weapons were charged with having maintained ties with their Soviet colleagues.

Also, when China exploded her first nuclear bomb on June 17, 1967, some of the nuclear scientists may have disliked the way the event was utilized to further enhance the prestige of Mao and his faction. Chang notes that the June 18, 1967, issue of the Liberation Army Daily criticized "certain scientists who failed to see the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Cultural Revolution, hesitated and wavered in the face of certain difficulties in an attempt to delay the test." The paper called for struggles against "revisionists on the science and technology front."

In August 1967 a Conference of Criticism and Struggle Against Revisionism was called in Peking under the auspices of the National Defense Science and Technology Committee under the Party's Military Af-

fairs Commission. The conference condemned "the capitalist-roader plot of usurping the leadership in undertakings of national defense scientific research by means of penetration and sabotage" and demanded that "all prevalent poison in the system of national defense science research be thoroughly liquidated."

Thus in the two years since China's first successful explosion of a nuclear bomb a number of top officials in charge of science administration have been purged.

"Vice-Premier Nieh Jung-chen, who heads both the government's Commission on Science and Technology (CST) and the Party's National Defense Science and Technology Committee, was ruthlessly attacked by several 'revolutionary' organizations for, among other things, building up his 'independent kingdom.' Five vice-chairmen of the CST, Han Kuang, Chang Yu-hsuan, Wu Heng, Chang Ching-fu and Yu Kuang-yuan, were purged and arrested as top 'capitalist roaders' in the science front."

From the meager information, it is not easy to determine how extensive the purge has been among China's scientists. Some indications, however, can be gathered:

"Since December 1967 the CAS, China's topmost institution of academic and scientific studies, has been under military control. People's Daily (December 22, 1967) revealed that personnel of the CAS were in class studying the thought of Mao 'under the assistance of PLA units stationed there' and were engaging in 'self-education and self-examination.' According to disclosures of Science and Technology War Bulletin (July, 1968), Canton Red Flag Bulletin (June 1, 1968) and other sources, two vice-presidents of the CAS, Pei Li-sheng and Tu Jun-sheng, were arrested. These same sources also revealed that more than 15 of the top scientists in the CAS, several of them associated with the nuclear program, were under arrest or were subject to charges ranging from opposition to the Cultural Revolution to spying for the CIA and the Soviets. These victims include: Chien San-chiang, director of the Institute of Atomic Energy; Wang Kan-chang, Chien's deputy in the above institute, who is believed to be the head of China's nuclear program; Hua Lo-Keng, director of the Institute of Mathematics, who occupies an important post in the nuclear program; Kuo Yung-huai, deputy director of the Institute of Dynamics and a missile expert who was recently killed by an unspecified explosion; Wu Ju-Yang, director of the Institute of Automation; Liu Ta-Kang, director of the Institute of Electric Engineering; and Li Hsun, director of the Institute of Metallurgy."

In view of the fact that the Sino-Soviet conflict was precipitated by the refusal of Khrushchev to honor the agreement to help China build its own nuclear deterrents, it may appear surprising that Mao would not do his utmost to protect the scientists in charge of this work. In the blind factionalism of the Cultural Revolution, excesses occurred, however, and it would seem from the evidence cited by Chang that not even China's defensive capacity in the nuclear field was spared.

Related areas were also seriously affected:

"The State Council's Seventh Ministry of Machine Building, an agency having jurisdiction over industrial plants manufacturing airplanes, missiles, rockets and their accessories, was also hit hard by the Cultural Revolution. Its minister, Wang Ping-chang who was formerly a deputy commander of the Air Force, was ousted in the beginning of 1967 or earlier. The ministry was placed under military control to avoid the disruptions that would be engendered by the 'seizure of power' by the Maoist rebels. However, it was then plagued by endless infighting between two rival mass organizations from within, and for a long time the Maoist leadership was unable to persuade them to reconcile their differences. As a result of the political turmoil in the national defense industry and the scientific and research institutions, the production of military hardware has been adversely affected and China's overall military capability crippled."

In his conclusion, Chang notes that China's nuclear program is apparently behind schedule. "Undoubtedly, the research and development of the modern weaponry, and particularly nuclear weapons, have been retarded by the internal political events of the last two years."

Another H-bomb was exploded on December 27, 1968, but it was rated by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission as roughly the same as the previous explosion, and it was the first successful test in a year and a half. A test in December 1967 was "very likely" a failure.

China's missile program "has also been retarded by the Cultural Revolution." There have been unconfirmed reports of an attempt to fire an experimental ICBM into the Indian Ocean during the second half of 1968 which failed.

"The predictions made by some Western observers that China would be able to deploy long-range missiles before the end of 1968 have not been borne out," says Chang. "For what the Cultural Revolution has accomplished in the scientific community, the price is indeed costly."

Books

THE GREAT HOLDUP IN IRAN

By Javad Sadeeg

IRAN: The New Imperialism in Action, by Bahman Nirumand. Monthly Review Press, New York, N.Y. 192 pp. \$6.95. 1969.

This book presents, essentially, the message that the Iranian student movement has been trying to get across internationally: to expose the military dictatorship of the shah and the role the U.S. has played in keeping Iran politically suppressed and economically backward. The facts presented by Nirumand stand in stark contrast to the image of the "free world" and its relations with Iran presented in the bourgeois press.

The Iranian students started demonstrations against the shah's despotic regime in the late fifties and early sixties in Europe and the United States. Nirumand, one of the leaders of this movement, provides valuable background material for understanding this development. Going back to the early part of the century, he outlines the imperialist role in Iran, particularly in relation to oil. He tells about the intrigues of the British in Iran and how they obtained favorable oil concessions.

Especially good is Nirumand's account of the nationalization of the oil industry under Mossadegh in 1951, and how the imperialists reacted.

The "free world" immediately started to exercise its "freedom" to strangle the struggling nation.

Iranian oil was boycotted. Mossadegh tried hard to obtain aid or a loan from the U.S., but to no avail. The Soviet Union did not help. Mossadegh began jockeying for a "solution," at first directly with the British and then with U.S. participation as an "honest broker." Nirumand provides considerable detail on these dealings, using mainly Western sources. American capitalists and U.S. government envoys, including Averell Harriman, came and went, all promising Mossadegh something...but somehow nothing ever materialized.

Meanwhile, the British and the shah, and later the U.S. and the shah, plotted to overthrow Mossadegh's government.

After Mossadegh's government went down in August 1953 through a CIA-engineered coup d'etat, the oil problem was readily "settled," and the U.S. imperialists, who had held nothing in Ira-

nian oil previously, were awarded a 40 percent interest in the Consortium combine that was created.

The political persecution, the economic dependence, the national humiliation and cultural degeneration that occurred under the subsequent "Americanization" of Iran deeply affected the young Iranians and led to their radicalization. The author of the book reflects this mood.

In trying to explain why Mossadegh failed and the imperialist counter-revolution succeeded, Nirumand offers the following reasons: "If he had commenced the domestic struggle for emancipation at the same time as the foreign one, the Americans might not have found the necessary collaborators within Iran. The failure of the struggle for national liberation hardened the fronts of the struggle for social emancipation, thwarting the hopes of the Iranian people and rendering fruitless the heavy sacrifices they had made during the Mossadegh period."

Nirumand also mentions Mossadegh's failure to carry out a land-reform program. This alienated some very important sectors: "If he had had the masses resolutely backing him, he could never have been overthrown by a handful of officers and a bribed mob of riffraff." However, Nirumand does not examine this point further. He does not investigate the social reasons behind Mossadegh's course.

The book contains valuable material, as has been indicated, but it hardly measures up to its title of Iran: The New Imperialism in Action. It is clearly impossible to understand the actions of the imperialists in Iran without understanding what they faced; namely, the actions of the anti-imperialist forces, the character and leadership of these forces, and the revolutionary potential of the working class.

These questions are not taken up. The book does not go, concretely, into the mass demonstrations, strikes, and uprisings that shook Iran in the forties and early fifties, prevented the imperialists from stabilizing their control, and led to the nationalization of the oil industry and the expulsion of British imperialism from the country.

But these civil struggles were very important. In fact Mossadegh himself was brought to power through mass



actions, the decisive one being a general strike of oil workers. This strike, in April 1951, involved 60,000 participants, to the amazement of the ruling-class paper Ettela'at which admitted the existence of a strong feeling of unity among the workers (Ettela'at-i Haftagi, April 19, 1951).

The workers thus served notice on the rulers and the rulers took notice. Mossadegh, whose nationalist opposition faction constituted only a tiny minority in the Majles, a parliament dominated by reactionaries serving imperialism and feudalism, was suddenly appointed prime minister by the shah! The Majles approved the appointment at once (April 30, 1961).

Under Mossadegh, the feudal and bourgeois property relations were not touched. The masses fought hard to defend Mossadegh's government when it finally came under attack, yet the revolution did not advance beyond the nationalist stage. The socialist revolution did not materialize. This meant, to use Nirumand's words,

"thwarting the hopes of the Iranian people and rendering fruitless the heavy sacrifices they had made during the Mossadegh period."

The Tudeh party, which claimed to be the revolutionary working-class party, but which was heavily influenced by Stalinism, had no program for taking state power. In an earlier period, the leaders had concentrated on pressuring the government into granting oil concessions to the Soviet Union; thus they took a dim view of the movement to nationalize the oil industry. The bourgeois nationalist leadership took advantage of the default of the Tudeh party and won control of the movement.

The book does not take up these questions and thus fails to contribute to the development of a revolutionary anti-imperialist program for Iran.

However, those who have illusions about the shah and the role of U.S. imperialism will find the book instructive.

#### THE SLL ABSTAINS ON KRIVINE

By Joseph Hansen

The position of Gerry Healy's Socialist Labour League on the French elections is worth noting. Despite the claim of this British group and their French allies to stand on the program of Trotskyism, they found it impossible to offer even critical support to Alain Krivine, the presidential candidate of the Communist League (French section of the Fourth International).

As explained by Tom Kemp in the June 7 issue of The Newsletter, the reasons for taking this sectarian position were as follows:

The interests of the French working class would have been "best served by the presentation of a single united-front candidate supported by the workers' parties and trade unions."

Tom Kemp does not say so, but we assume that he would be willing to add that the interests of the French working class would have been best served if this single united-front candidate also stood on a program of revolutionary socialism.

Unfortunately the French Socialist party hastened to put its own candidate in the field, Gaston Defferre. The Communist party "followed suit with the wily but ageing Jacques Duclos."

That eliminated the possibility of a single united-front candidate support-

ed by the trade unions and mass working-class parties. But there still remained the candidacies of Michel Rocard of the United Socialist party and the Trotskyist Alain Krivine.

It was correct to refuse to support Rocard. His program was "left" Social Democratic. He had no mass following.

But what about Krivine? Kemp could not support him either. Krivine's platform was not revolutionary enough!

"For all its revolutionary phraseology, this current can be regarded as a petty-bourgeois centrist trend," said the ultraleft Kemp.

"Its main support comes from sections of the students and a kind of beatnik fringe. It has never carried out serious and sustained work in the working class in France.

"Its policy has been characterized by a complete lack of consistency and principle.

"Krivine's candidature can thus only contribute to further confusion and division."

Among the "proofs" of his contentions, Kemp cited the fact that the Communist League had to obtain at least 100 names of elected officials to get on the ballot.

"It is obvious," Kemp continued, "that since no Communist or Socialist representatives would sign up for Krivine, he had to secure the signatures of bourgeois politicians, many, no doubt, hoping that he would split the opposition vote."

This argument is hardly different from the one made by l'Humanité against Krivine. And Kemp, in fact, in the very next paragraph indicates his awareness of what the Stalinist daily was saying: "l'Humanité made the best of this and has published the names of two Gaullist deputies who signed Krivine's petition."

Kemp refrained from specifying the two names published by l'Humanité. It is unfortunate that the editor of The Newsletter did not call his attention to this oversight. Thoughtfulness in making it easier for others to check assertions based on Stalinist sources is always appreciated.

So far as I know, l'Humanité published the name of only one Gaullist deputy in trying to throw mud at the Krivine campaign.

Alain Krivine promptly answered this reversion to the old Stalinist practice of seeking to amalgamate Trotskyism with reaction. He wrote l'Humanité an open letter dated May 23, extracts of which were quoted in the May 24 issue of Le Monde. [See Intercontinental Press, June 9, p. 563.]

The Communist League did not solicit the signature of Jacques Moron. Krivine told the editors of l'Humanité that upon learning that Moron was a Gaullist deputy, they did not include his name in the nominating petition "because it seemed to offer an opportunity for provocations by political primitives."

Kemp does not report how the French Trotskyists exposed the Stalinist attempt at a smear job and turned it into a public scandal against its authors. Could it be that Tom Kemp finds it in the best interest of his sectarian line to make a united front with...Duclos?

Thus, in the absence of a "united front" candidate fitting their ideal, the SLL, echoing their French allies, could not even unite behind a Trotskyist candidate for the presidency.

In this way they proved that at least in the matter of supporting Trotskyist candidates they stand at a more primitive level politically than their allies in the U.S. The American Healyites, organized in the Workers League headed by Tim Wohlforth, supported the Trotskyist ticket in the U.S. in 1968 -- naturally very critically.



DUCLOS: Tried smear job on Alain Krivine.

Here is what the Political Committee of the Workers League said in a statement published in the July 22, 1968, issue of the Bulletin: "It is with this perspective [relentless struggle against those political tendencies which seek to turn the mass movement back into capitalist politics] that we welcome the electoral initiative of the Socialist Workers Party in running Fred Halstead and Paul Boutelle for president and vice president in 1968. This campaign poses a socialist alternative to the capitalist parties and thus offers to socialists and militant workers an opportunity to cast a ballot against our oppressors."

As for the SWP platform, Wohlforth was satisfied with a single plank: "The 1968 election platform of the Socialist Workers Party calls for the formation of a labor party in America and it is this position in particular which gives the campaign relevancy today."

It remains to be seen what stand Wohlforth will announce concerning the candidacy of Alain Krivine. After all, there is the unpleasant business of Healy's discipline to face. Besides, that's French territory. And fortunately the election is over.

ALAIN KRIVINE'S ELECTION PLATFORM

[The campaign of Alain Krivine, candidate of the Communist League (Ligue Communiste -- the French section of the Fourth International) for president of France, brought the ideas of revolutionary socialism to a wide audience.

[Many speeches were given over radio and television, including a number of nationwide hookups. Mass meetings and

rallies were held in Paris and throughout the provinces. Besides this, a great deal of literature was distributed.

[The key item, translated below, was Krivine's election platform. Some 30,000,000 copies of this platform were printed and distributed by the government in accordance with the provisions of French electoral law.]

\* \* \*

An Election Will Solve Nothing!

There Is Only One Solution -- Develop Direct Struggles

Where Are the Forces of May?

In May 1968, 10,000,000 workers were on strike. They had power within their grasp. They were the power. On May 24, when de Gaulle offered them the sop of a referendum, they answered at once -- "Power Is in the Street!" And there was no referendum...

The bosses were offering the velvet glove and an obliging face. The ministers were quietly packing their bags to abandon ship. The workers could have demanded much more than a precarious improvement in their lot. They could have demanded everything. They could have demanded the only thing that really will nail down their gains -- expropriation of the bourgeoisie and power to the workers.

And today the bosses are offering this force, which was so formidable in the May strikes, a choice between Pompidou and Poher. Who are they kidding?

However, Gaullism will not survive de Gaulle. The foundations of Gaullism are undermined. Threatened by an awakened working class, the French bourgeoisie is hastily taking refuge behind the skirts of American imperialism. The big bourgeoisie, lined up behind Pompidou, is making this retreat with resignation. But the middle bourgeoisie, which is ready and willing to bargain for a reprieve, is turning tail with enthusiasm. It has puffed up Poher in a few days, launching him like a new brand of soap.

Who could feel naturally enthusiastic over this colorless Fourth Republic functionary? Since he is totally devoid of personality, the press is trying to give him a comforting image of conciliatory mediocrity. And an entire left that was only "left" because it was anti-de Gaulle and pro-American is relieved to find a champion...

Poher accuses Pompidou of sliding

toward the center. Pompidou accuses Poher of stealing his program. What program? On the one side they talk about "continuity with progress," and on the other, "progress with continuity." Who can make anything out of this?

Certainly, the workers expected a new regime to follow from the fall of de Gaulle -- their own.

These elections are turning into a masquerade. They are an insult to the workers, coming one year after the May strikes. Since May, the workers have suffered one disillusionment after another. After the most formidable strike that the country ever experienced, the vote gave the Gaullists an unparalleled majority. Then de Gaulle's defeat in the referendum led to an election campaign where you can't tell the candidates apart.

But where are the forces of May, which yesterday were so powerful and today are so disarmed? By changing the field of battle, they lost all their best cards. By exchanging the red flag for the green curtain at the polls, the clamor of the street for the muted silence of the voting booths, they have lost all initiative.

Who Are the Utopians?

Before May the journalists and the sociologists all agreed that the workers no longer had only their chains to lose but their gains -- their TVs, their refrigerators, their cars, their paid vacations, and their credit...

Even some militants despaired of their class and talked mournfully about the softening and bourgeoisification of the working class.

However, the breadth of the May explosion itself could only be explained by a long accumulation of insults and humiliations -- a workweek still in ex-

cess of forty-five hours, the difficulty of finding a job matching your skills, dubious safety and health conditions, brutalizing production-line tempos. And this is to say nothing of dreadful conditions in transportation, the housing problem, etc....

Promoting the image of a submissive and bourgeoisified working class, the PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party] has projected a strategy for taking power suited to this image -- a strategy of taking power by legal and parliamentary means. The PCF prefers motions of censure to factory occupations.

This strategy offered a formidable weapon to strike down one-man rule -- the "common program."\* But what happened? De Gaulle has, indeed, fallen. But he fell precisely because there was no common program! The bourgeoisie was able, without any danger to itself, to use the workers' votes to rid itself of this old man who had become ineffective and was getting in the way.

According to this strategy of peaceful roads to socialism, a united left government should have succeeded de Gaulle. But de Gaulle's departure has scattered this left to the four winds. Did this left ever exist, moreover, except on the floor of parliament? Did it ever exist for any purpose but electoral bargaining? In all real struggles, it has been divided. When Jules Moch\*\* sent the CRS [Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité -- elite security troops] against the miners, was he further to the left than Marcellin? And when Guy Mollet\*\*\* sent paratroopers to Suez and voted credits for the Algerian war? And what about Mitterrand\*\*\*\* when he was minister of the interior?

The PCF in particular, since it spent all its time yapping about one-man rule, finds itself completely at a loss since the "strong state" has survived its Bonaparte.

---

\* Projection of a common electoral program by the Communist and Social Democratic parties. -- I.P.

\*\* A right-wing Social Democrat who commanded the police during the postwar upsurge in France. He established the CRS, which are intensely hated by broad layers of the French population for their record of brutality. -- I.P.

\*\*\* The Social Democratic premier during the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt in 1956. -- I.P.

\*\*\*\* A liberal. -- I.P.

Who are the utopians? Those who say that majorities are won in struggle and that you must demonstrate your will and determination in order to win over allies and show them that you are a serious contender for power? Or are the utopians the ones who wanted first to reassure potential allies by respecting bourgeois law and order, by trading off the May movement for an election?

Today the monopolist big bourgeoisie no longer rules through parliament. The bourgeoisie needs clear and quick decisions. The bourgeoisie with the best chances in the great capitalist competition is the one that most perceptively weighs the strength of the working class. As soon as a left majority is won or firmed up, the bourgeoisie does not hesitate to violate its own legality in order to intervene. The fate of Greece was decided this way, with the support of NATO.

The parliament has been put on the shelf. The bourgeoisie governs by means of special commissions operating behind the scenes in the state apparatus. Electoralism is more and more in an impasse. The workers' votes are lost in the electoral combinations. Only struggle on its own home ground, in the factories and the street, will enable the working class to count its contingents and measure its forces.

#### The Kind of Government We Want

The presidential elections will solve nothing. They will provide a successor to de Gaulle, reassuring all those who thought he was irreplaceable. But in doing this they will not solve the problems that were at the root of May. Today an electoral truce prevails. No one would risk offending the voters by daring to take measures that were too unpopular. But as soon as the formality is accomplished, the bourgeoisie will start making up for lost time. It has to overcome the losses for which it blames a combative working class.

Devaluation, deflation, a wage freeze, and austerity will be on the order of the day, the morning after June 15. The ones who put their hopes in the defeat of the referendum will only be more embittered. The example of May must teach us that the government we want is not a parliamentary reshuffling, another dosage of alliances in the National Assembly, or a redistribution of ministerial portfolios. The government we want cannot be delegated to any party or president. The government we want is the workers power that arose in the factories and the streets, the power we got a glimpse of in May.

In factories emptied of bosses,

the workers organized themselves. Often strike committees were elected and the life of the plants was reorganized on a different model.

For the first time, the workers went into their factories as if they owned them. Far from punching a time clock and submitting to the brutalization of work and the overcrowding of the public transportation system, they took their fate into their own hands.

Today the government talks about strikes as if they were an act of collective sabotage. But in May the sympathy of the population was with the workers in struggle.

All strata of society were shaken by the May earthquake. The professional soccer players occupied the headquarters of their association. The doctors even besieged the highly reactionary Conseil de l'Ordre [Council of the Order -- the French medical association]. And others did the same in the big stores, the hotels, and the restaurants.

So who was isolated then? The 10,000,000 workers supported by the overwhelming majority of the population? Or the bourgeoisie panicked by the movement which was forcing them out of their place in society?

May 1968 was not just a massive strike and a lot of demonstrations. It was above all an attempt, in face of a crumbling bourgeois state, to lay the first foundations of workers power.

The movement's real potential was shown by the resumption of operations in some plants by the workers themselves; the organization of transportation with the equipment available in the automotive industry; and the procurement of provisions in direct cooperation with the peasants, the farm cooperatives, and the merchants on a wholesale basis, eliminating the middlemen.

The bourgeoisie has wasted a lot of time and paper in drumming in the idea that you have to have specialists and bosses. Do you need specialists to buy eggs and chickens directly in the country? Do you need specialists to run the buses?

We might add, moreover, that many specialists, engineers, and technicians were on the side of the workers in May and sometimes helped them in very concrete ways. These specialists also found in the May movement their first means of freeing themselves from the narrow tasks they were chained to -- i.e., supervising a particularly tiny sector of the production process without knowing what comes before or after.

Here also only the workers could achieve an organization of work corresponding to the capacities of each person involved and not to the needs of the bosses and the state.

If these experiments had been consciously extended rather than held back, they would have quickly led to national coordination of the workers in struggle, coordination of strike committees, factory committees, and action committees.

The extension of these forms of power would have built a mighty force opposed to the bourgeoisie and capable of demonstrating that it could start the economy moving again for its own benefit.

The regime was an empty shell. De Gaulle and his ministers themselves realized it after May. State power was there to be taken; the workers would have taken it if they had been given a perspective.

All of de Gaulle's imprecations, threats, and speeches would have run up against this wall -- without us you can do nothing and you can bet that we are not going to do anything for you. The Gaullist bluff would have lasted like the ripples of a stone in a lake.

Today the experience of May is not just a memory. It inspires the workers in their daily struggle. It stimulates their initiative.

Thus, small numbers of workers are paralyzing whole factories by work stoppages at key points which foul up all the production lines. They are resisting plant closings and firings by occupying their shops. They are slowing down the pace of the production lines without trying to negotiate with the bosses but by presenting them with an accomplished fact and thus denying their norms and their authority.

The sole solution is by this road -- advancing the class struggle.

The Only Way Out --  
Advance the Class Struggle

The workers aspire to real changes, not illusory ones. They know that to transform their condition they must seize political power. This does not mean replacing one bourgeois governmental team with another. It means getting rid of the government of the bourgeoisie. This objective will never be attained by electoral and parliamentary roads. In any election all the dice are loaded. It is the governments that regulate elections. The division into electoral districts, the election rules, radio, television, and the newspapers are utilized for the benefit of their interests. The real bat-

ties are not waged in voting booths but at the point of production. The real victories are won in the factories and in the street. The power we want, workers power, will not grow from the ballot box but from the upsurge of mass struggles. It must be based on the organs of struggle the workers create for themselves -- plant and neighborhood committees supervising production as a preliminary to expropriating the bosses and managing a planned economy directly.

Such a power appeared in May 1968 through the factory occupations. It represented the basis of real workers democracy, a regime radically different from the sinister caricatures of socialism provided by the USSR and the people's democracies. This is the kind of power we are fighting for. This is the objective toward which the struggles must be directed.

### The Socialism We Are Fighting For

The Vietnamese revolutionists of the National Liberation Front have won the admiration of workers throughout the world by struggling against American imperialism arms in hand. They have shown the way to all the peoples of the world who are struggling for national and social emancipation.

The example of Che Guevara has inspired and heartened the revolutionists of Latin America and it is the symbol of the Cuban revolution, of socialist Cuba, which continues to inspire the struggles of the guerrillas in Latin America.

The resistance by the Palestinian masses to the domination of their country is winning increased solidarity throughout the world today.

The struggle of the workers in Czechoslovakia against the Stalinist bureaucracy of the USSR and against the capitulation of their own bureaucracy has shown that socialism is incompatible with invading tanks and soldiers.

The socialism for which the workers of France rose up in May 1968 cannot be a narrow "national" socialism.

The year 1968 showed that this earthquake occurred not only in France but internationally.

Germany, Brazil, Mexico, Uruguay, Lebanon, Egypt, Yugoslavia, Spain, Italy, and Pakistan experienced crises lesser in scope but similar to the one in France.

This year other countries throughout the world have seen revolutions germinating.

Nowhere is the power of the bour-

geoisie secure. Everywhere its power has already been undermined by the warning ripples of revolution.

### Workers, Students!

The socialism we want will be international. It will be built by the workers of the entire world and will put an end to the competition of their hypocritical bourgeoisies.

Facing a French bourgeoisie that is rallying its forces behind the shield offered by the USA and lavishing beaming looks -- which it calls Poher or Pompidou -- on the American imperialism of Nixon, facing this kind of a bourgeoisie, we must reinforce our solidarity with our comrades in struggle who will one day bring down this imperialism -- the resistance fighters of Vietnam, the guerrillas of Latin America, the Palestinian fighters, the black revolutionists in the American ghettos, and the advanced workers of the USA.

The socialism we want has nothing to do with a change in the ministerial lineup or in the presidency, even if the president or the ministers were "socialists."

Workers power is not the power of a party but exercise of power by the workers themselves organized in their own councils and factory and neighborhood committees.

No ballot will ever win this power.

The workers will seize it, in the struggle they themselves will organize today to win back what the bourgeoisie took away from them after May, and in the struggle they will organize tomorrow to conquer the state.

The elections will not settle anything. It makes no difference whether Pompidou, Poher, or Defferre wins; nothing will change unless we make it change.

De Gaulle has fallen, let us resume the offensive!

1. Demand the immediate restoration of the conquests of May and the rescinding of the measures the government and the bosses took following the June elections.

-- Immediate readjustment of wages, which have been eroded by constantly rising prices.

-- Immediate reinstatement of political activists and workers fired from

their jobs and of the ORTF personnel.\*

-- Restoration of scholarships and deferments to students deprived of them.

-- Lifting of the ban on the vanguard political groups.

-- Return of the expelled foreign nationals.

2. Raise again all the demands of May:

-- Immediate return to the forty-hour week.

-- A sliding scale of wages and hours.

-- Repeal of the laws cutting social security benefits.

3. Counter the economic and political measures of the bourgeoisie by organizing the workers in struggle.

-- The right of the workers to have a veto over production-line tempos, firings, and factory closings.

-- The creation of action and struggle committees to exercise this veto power.

4. Organize self-defense and vigilance.

-- Against the attacks of the CDR [Comités de Défense de la République -- Committees for the Defense of the Republic] and the SAC [Service d'Action Civique -- Civic Action Service] and other reactionary terror squads, we must create antifascist action and vigilance committees.

-- To prevent any putschist aspirations on the part of the reactionaries, we must demand the right for the ranks

\* For a brief time during the May-June period, the French official radio and television system ORTF [Office de la Radio et de la Télévision Française -- French Radio and Television Bureau] offered objective reporting. After the June elections, the Gaullist government moved to purge all radio and TV personalities who had revealed independent or critical views. -- I.P.

of the army to organize themselves politically and in unions.

-- Demand the dissolution of the CRS and the Gardes Mobiles [Mobile Guards -- riot police], the agents of repression in May.

5. De Gaulle is going, we must get rid of the Gaullist legislation.

-- Abrogation of the 1958 Constitution.

-- De Gaulle is going but his people remain; out with the Gaullist National Assembly elected in June.

6. We must not wait for any hypothetical concessions to be granted by the bourgeoisie. We must resume the fight now on our own ground, in the neighborhoods, the factories, and the universities. We must mobilize the people. To get rid of the Gaullist state along with de Gaulle, we must demand not reelection of the Chamber of Deputies but the convening of a Constituent Assembly for a workers government!

To break up the game of parliamentary wheeling and dealing, the Ligue Communiste (the French section of the Fourth International) has put up its own candidate, Alain Krivine.

While all the other candidates end their speeches with "Long Live the Republic," so that you can't tell them apart, we are running Alain Krivine's campaign under the banner of the world socialist revolution and workers power. In asking you to vote for Alain Krivine, the Ligue Communiste remains conscious of the fact that it is not competing for an office or for votes but that it is fighting for the only possible perspective -- for the advancement of the struggles which the workers of this country unleashed in May 1968.

In all its mass meetings and radio and television addresses, the Ligue will maintain the view that only a massive mobilization by the workers can force the bourgeoisie to retreat, can bring it down, thereby doing away with all its presidents.

Long live workers power!

Long live the world socialist revolution!

Alain Krivine

ALL THE NEWS THAT FITS...

"RIO DE JANEIRO, June 9 -- The military government of Brazil warned all newspapers and broadcasting stations today to divulge only favorable news about Governor Rockefeller's fact-finding trips

to Latin America....It is understood that the directors [of Brazil's newspapers and radio and television stations] have consented to the orders." -- New York Times, June 10, 1969.

MODZELEWSKI'S ANSWER TO HIS PROSECUTOR

[Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Kuron were sentenced to three-and-a-half years in prison by a Warsaw court on January 15, 1969. The two left-Communist student leaders, accused of having organized the demonstrations of March 1968, were not allowed to publicly defend their views.

[The fact that the pair were tried in secret became something of an embarrassment to Polish authorities. In April, the Warsaw daily Youth Standard devoted a quarter of a page to "refuting" the charge made by K.S. Karol in Le Nouvel Observateur that the trial had been held "behind closed doors" ("à huis clos").

[The May 26 issue of Le Nouvel Observateur replied to the Polish paper: It is true, said the editors, that the trial was not legally declared closed. However, it was held in a room in the Palace of Justice that seated only thirty to forty persons. The doors were closed. Only court officials, the secret police, and the parents of the defendants (by special written authorization of the court) were allowed to attend.

["This trial was so 'public,'" the Paris weekly said, "that it has taken

four months for Modzelewski's final declaration before the tribunal to arrive in France." We have translated below the extract from Modzelewski's statement as it appeared in Le Nouvel Observateur.]

\* \* \*

I would like to deal for a moment with the fact that I am "accused" of being of Jewish origin. What role does my mother's family name play in a trial? The prosecutor has underlined in the course of the proceedings that the Jewish ancestry of the defendants was "a sign that they have another nationality."

Permit me to say that neither I nor the other defendants here present have felt the need to confirm that we are of Polish nationality. Our national identity card is, in our eyes, much more important than any government functionary's service pass. This is why I refuse to accept the viewpoint of the prosecutor -- and he is an official personality, because he represents the state here -- concerning the Jewish origin of the accused as being the viewpoint of the Polish nation. I believe that to do so would be extremely harmful for our country.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Leonid I. Brezhnev .....	609
Moscow Conference Deepens Split with Peking .....	610
DRAWING: Nicolae Ceausescu .....	611
DRAWING: Enrico Berlinguer .....	612
Provisional Revolutionary Government Formed in Vietnam .....	613
India's "Left" and "Right" Communist Parties Explore Accommodation .....	614
Greek Trotskyists Given Life Sentences by Military Tribunal .....	616
Universities Closed as Students Clash with Police in Turkey .....	616
Mexican Political Prisoners Rebel Against Guards' Brutality .....	617
Repression in Rupununi Area of Guyana .....	621
How China's Scientists Fared in the Cultural Revolution .....	622
Books:	
The Great Holdup in Iran -- by Javad Sadeeg .....	624
The SLL Abstains on Krivine -- by Joseph Hansen .....	625
DRAWING: Jacques Duclos .....	626
All the News that Fits... ..	631
Modzelewski's Answer to His Prosecutor .....	632
Documents:	
Soviet Dissidents Appeal to Moscow Conference .....	620
Alain Krivine's Election Platform .....	627

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.