

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 7, No. 27

© 1969 Intercontinental Press

July 28, 1969

50c



Nixon's Real Game in Rumania

**Czech Students Resist
Order to Dissolve**

**Eyewitness Account:
The Demonstrations
in Cordoba**

**Uruguay Ripe
for Revolution**

Crisis in Italy

AGNEW: People's choice for landing on Mars. See page 745.

5,000 in Melbourne March Against Vietnam War

NOVEMBER 15 SET FOR MASS ACTION IN WASHINGTON AGAINST VIETNAM WAR

A national conference of more than 900 antiwar activists meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, July 4-5, laid plans for a fall offensive against the Vietnam war. The culminating action will be a massive march on Washington November 15 to demand the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam.

The broadly representative conference, while encompassing many different and often conflicting views on how best to oppose the war, was able to agree by an overwhelming majority on a series of concrete action proposals. These included the following:

- Support to a march on Nixon's summer White House in San Clemente, California, August 17.
- A demonstration in Washington in early September where the names of the U.S. soldiers killed in Vietnam will be read.
- Support to the Vietnam Moratorium Committee for an October 15 student strike ("moratorium") to demand the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam.
- Support for a September 27 demonstration in Chicago called by the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) to protest the war and show solidarity with the eight antiwar figures indicted after the Democratic party convention in August 1968 (their trial is slated to begin the day of the demonstration).

The central issue under discussion at the Cleveland conference was the efficacy of mass demonstrations. Harry Ring, writing from Cleveland in the July 18 issue of the revolutionary-socialist weekly The Militant, summed up the contending viewpoints:

"On the one side there were those who favor massive, militant demonstrations around the demand for the immediate withdrawal of forces from Vietnam, involving the broadest possible forces in the civilian population and within the armed forces.

"In counterposition to this was the view that such mass demonstrations are largely ineffectual and that more 'militant,' 'confrontation' action is needed, even if by significantly fewer people. To this concept some add the proviso that the demonstrations must center around 'more advanced' anti-imperialist slogans." The latter, "confrontationist" position was supported by a majority of the arbitrarily selected steering committee of the gathering, but the great majority of the delegates and observers strong-

ly supported the proposal for a mass mobilization in Washington. Both sides finally agreed on the Chicago and Washington actions, and this united thrust of the antiwar movement promises to make the Washington demonstration one of the largest and most important up to now.

Following the conference of the adult antiwar coalition, a national conference of the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam was held July 6 at Case-Western Reserve University in Cleveland. Some 500 student antiwar activists voted to build the fall offensive against the Vietnam war, and to call a national student strike for November 14 as a prelude to the Washington mobilization.

Representatives from more than 150 local and national student groups participated in the SMC gathering. These included such organizations as the Austin, Texas, Student Mobilization Committee; Seattle GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace; Buffalo Draft Resistance Union; Madison, Wisconsin, Committee to End the War in Vietnam; Berkeley SMC; Terre Haute, Indiana, Draft Project; Committee of Returned Volunteers; Minnesota Resistance; Boston GI-CAP; and the Young Socialist Alliance. GIs were on hand from about ten military bases.

A discussion took place at the conference with members of SDS who urged the SMC to adopt a strategy of "anti-imperialist" confrontation in place of mass antiwar actions. This position received little support.

The proposal finally adopted by the great majority of participants in the conference declared, in part:

"We have arrived at a situation never before experienced in the history of the United States. The overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to the war in Vietnam and are not fooled by the transparent maneuvers of the Nixon administration....We now have the potential of mobilizing masses of people against the war who have not been involved in the struggle up to now."

The conference made a special appeal for international solidarity actions to coincide with the fall demonstrations in the U.S., especially the November 15 march on Washington:

"The international character of the antiwar movement will be a dramatic aspect of the Fall Offensive. The struggle of the Japanese antiwar movement against the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and the use of Okinawa as a launching pad for U.S. aggression in Vietnam will culminate in massive demon-

strations in Japan this fall.

"The profound struggle on the part of the European antiwar movement for an end to the war and the NATO treaty will

erupt on that continent this fall.

"The SMC Fall Offensive will solidarize itself with these vanguard antiwar students all over the globe."

5,000 IN MELBOURNE MARCH AGAINST VIETNAM WAR

More than 5,000 persons took part in an "Independence Day" march and rally against the Vietnam war July 4 in Melbourne, Australia. Sponsored by the Vietnam Coordinating Committee and aimed at both American and Australian participation in the war of aggression against the Vietnamese people, the demonstration was one of the largest and most militant yet to be held in Australia.

The demonstration began with a peaceful rally in the Treasury Gardens at 5:30 p.m. From there the protesters marched to the U.S. consulate in Commercial Road, where they were met by a solid wall of police standing behind steel barricades. At this point there was a brief but sharp confrontation with the cops. Most papers blamed the demonstrators for the encounter, although the facts as reported in the July 5 Melbourne Age indicated that the police attacked the demonstrators.

"The momentum of the crowd," the Age said, "carried about 50 young people through the barricade. Hundreds more headed for the gap in police lines."

"The lead demonstrators covered only 20 yards before additional police behind the lines moved in to close the breach. They felled demonstrators who attempted to reach the consulate."

Alan Morison, writing in the July 5 Melbourne Herald, described the conduct of the police at the U.S. consulate:

"Chief Inspector Frank Holland commanded his 'troops' like an army general. He walked around behind the barricade, holding his gloves in one hand and slapping them into the palm of the other."

"About 7:30 p.m., when all the steam had gone out of the first assault, he yelled: 'Right, fellas, get on the other side of the barricade and move 'em out! Move 'em out!'"

"His men moved quickly. Demonstrators who objected were carted to the waiting divvy vans, arms and legs flailing in all directions."

Forty-five demonstrators were arrested. Most were charged with "indecent language, offensive behavior and resist-

ing arrest." They were later released on bail.

The worst police assault took place at the Southern Cross Hotel on Exhibition Street in Melbourne, where the police cornered a group of about 200 demonstrators near the Australian-American Club.

"When the protesters arrived from the legation demonstration," the Melbourne Sun reported July 5, "about 40 police formed ranks and charged."

"Striking out with batons, the police sent screaming protesters scurrying across the road. A police horse charged in and knocked down protesters....Students, theatre-goers, and hotel guests were flattened. Protesters fled up and down escalators and stairs."

"Police left three lying in the gutter in Bourke St. One protester crashed through a plate glass window. Several were hit by cars."

"La Trobe University students claimed 10 police had grabbed one of them and truncheoned him to the ground."

"'He was lying in the gutter bleeding,' student Ian Christey said. 'They picked him up and threw him in the wagon. They would not say where they were taking him. We were just walking away from the hotel when they descended on us and told us to move away.'"

Simultaneous demonstrations were held in Canberra, Sydney and Brisbane. Twenty-seven persons were arrested in Brisbane and arrests were also made in the other two cities.

The Australian press, while admitting that the demonstrators represented a wide cross-section of society, including many trade unionists, sought to blame the antiwar marchers for the violence unleashed by the police.

The headline in the Sun, for example, declared, "Big Mob Storms Barricades." The Age claimed, "Angry Mob Charges Police."

The organizers of the demonstration replied to these allegations in a July 6 statement to the press.

"The Vietnam Co-ordinating Commit-

tee congratulates all those who took part in the July 4 march to the U.S. consulate," the statement said. "The demonstrators expressed in a militant and determined manner their opposition to the aggressive policies of the Australian and U.S. governments, and maintained a commendable degree of unity and discipline in the face of baton-wielding police.

"Far from being an 'angry mob', as some sections of the press have claimed, the march was spirited but orderly. The police did not interfere with the march as it proceeded through the city and along St. Kilda Road, and as a result there were no 'incidents' during this part of the demonstration. The brief clash at the barricades in Commercial Road was certainly not an attempt to storm the consulate; if the five thousand marchers had really intended to do this, the police would have been unable to stop them.

"The police violence at the consulate was in keeping with the Australian government's general attitude towards effective opposition, either at home or overseas. Whether it be demonstrators in Prahran [the section of Melbourne where the U.S. consulate is located] or villagers in Vietnam, the Gorton government knows only one answer; it is this government which is the real source of violence in Australian politics.

"The size and militancy of the demonstration reflected the widespread feeling against the Vietnam war which has developed in Australia. It was the best possible answer to the intimidatory tactics... which the government has carried out since July 4 last year.

"The V.C.C. and its supporting organizations will continue their campaign until all foreign troops are withdrawn from Vietnam. Last Friday's demonstration was a very effective part of this campaign."

The Vietnam Coordinating Committee received wide support from various left and liberal organizations in replying to the police attack. The Australian Universities Liberal Federation, for example, issued a statement July 6, saying, "There is good evidence that police simply picked men (and women) out of the crowd, took them aside and clubbed them with their truncheons." The federation, which is not affiliated with the Liberal party, represents Liberal clubs at universities in all states. The statement added:

"This was clearly not something done by individual policemen in self protection. The object seems to have been to 'teach the bastards a lesson they will never forget.'

"This action is quite unjustifiable."

U.S. NERVE GAS RAISES TEMPERATURES IN OKINAWA

A new storm of protest against the U.S. occupation of Okinawa was precipitated by the Wall Street Journal's revelation July 18 that deadly nerve gas has been stored on the island and that twenty-five Americans were hospitalized July 8 after an "accident" in which some of the gas was apparently released.

The July 19 New York Times calmed few nerves when it added to the story that the "secret issuing of limited stocks of nerve gas munitions to forces deployed overseas has been standard United States policy since the nineteen-fifties...." The Times said that such weapons were believed to be stocked in West Germany as well as in Okinawa and South Korea. Nerve gas might also be stored in bases on mainland Japan, inasmuch as only nuclear weapons are barred under the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

The gas in question is believed to be VX, an "improved" version of Tabun, a poison gas developed by the Nazis during World War II. "Tabun," the Times said, "was a volatile substance that killed within seconds if inhaled in sufficient quantities but also dispersed quickly.

VX, on the other hand, is an oily substanceIt covers the ground, vegetation and buildings where it has been dispersed and can linger for months under certain climatic conditions. Death comes within seconds from a few inhaled milligrams. A slightly larger amount touching the skin is fatal within minutes unless antidotes are administered immediately."

Within twenty-four hours all major opposition parties in Japan had demanded an investigation and immediate removal of the gas if the report were confirmed. Not only the Communists and Socialists, but even the right-wing Komeito [Clean Government] party endorsed this action. Some members of the ruling pro-American Liberal-Democratic party also said they would support the opposition.

In Okinawa, Chief Executive Chobyō Yara told reporters: "If the report is true, this is a serious problem. The presence of horrible nerve gas weapons jeopardizes our lives and thus it is absolutely unforgivable." Yara said his government would demand the immediate withdrawal of such weapons.

Interview with Japanese Antiwar Leaders

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE U.S. OCCUPATION OF OKINAWA

[The following interview was granted by Shimpei Fujimaki and Ryoshin Nakayoshi to Jean Simon in Cleveland, Ohio, May 31, during a speaking tour which the two representatives of the Japanese antiwar movement made in the United States.

[Shimpei Fujimaki is secretary of the Foreign Policy Committee of the Japan Socialist party. Ryoshin Nakayoshi is managing director of the Okinawa Prefecture Council Against A- and H-Bombs. He is also chairman of the Government Employees Union of Okinawa and cochairman of Council of Joint Struggle to Save Human Lives in Okinawa.

[At the time of the interview, Fujimaki and Nakayoshi had met with American antiwar activists and spoken at meetings in Honolulu, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, and Atlanta. After the interview in Cleveland, their tour took them to Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Boston, New York, and Chicago.

[Ryoshin Nakayoshi replied to Jean Simon's questions in Japanese. His answers were translated by Shimpei Fujimaki.]

* * *

Question: What is the purpose of your visit?

Answer: The primary purpose of our mission is to inform the American public as much as possible of the actual situation in Okinawa in light of the growing importance of the negotiations over the reversion of Okinawa to mainland Japan and also the pending review of the present U.S.-Japan Security Treaty.

Secondly, we also want to invite as many Americans as possible to participate in the international conference to be held in August in Naha, capital city of Okinawa, as we did last year for the first time. Mr. Nakayoshi and I were sent by the Japan Congress Against A- and H-Bombs and its branch in Okinawa.

Q: When is the conference to be held?

A: It starts on August 2, and includes mass meetings in several parts of Japan, but the international part of the conference concerning Okinawa will be held on August 14 and 15.

Q: What will be the nature of the meetings you mentioned?

A: The mass meetings will be held

in Hiroshima on August 6 and in Nagasaki on August 9. Both dates mark the anniversary of the bombing of these two cities, so we are going to organize a preliminary national meeting in Tokyo to help build the two meetings. After the Hiroshima and Nagasaki meetings there will be the international conference on Okinawa.

Q: Why is the return of Okinawa to Japan such a burning question?

A: There are a number of reasons. First of all, it has been twenty-four years since Okinawa was placed under American occupation. The legal ground for this occupation was Article 3 of the peace treaty with Japan signed in San Francisco in 1951. According to this article, the U.S. government can continue its exclusive rule over Okinawa until such time as Washington asks the United Nations to make Okinawa a UN trusteeship, "with the United States as the sole administering authority."

But Japan became a member of the United Nations in 1956, and according to Article 78 of the UN Charter it is forbidden to place an area that is under the authority of one member nation under the trusteeship of another nation of the UN. Therefore we now regard this legal justification for the continued American occupation of Okinawa as null and void.

Secondly, what is now being done by the Americans with regard to the Japanese people in Okinawa is a sort of government by decree under the U.S. high commissioner -- who is a U.S. general, responsible only to the Defense Department in Washington. He intervenes directly in judiciary affairs, administration and legislation. We have an Okinawan legislature, but all the bills passed in that body can be amended or rescinded by decree by the U.S. high commissioner. This kind of almost colonial status of government is maintained by the Americans because they want to keep that island as the keystone to American strategy in the Far East.

Thirdly, the problems caused by the American presence and the American bases. Most important in this regard is the existence of the nuclear stockpile in Okinawa, and also the visits of the American nuclear submarines to Okinawa.

For example, due to the visits of nuclear submarines to the Naha Naval Base, the sea bottom of the Bay of Naha is contaminated by radioactivity -- cobalt 60.

Another problem is the existence of special units which are armed with chemi-

cal, bacteriological, and nuclear weapons. For example, near the area where these units are stationed 240 school children were burned by an unknown substance while swimming at the beach. Twenty-three children had to be hospitalized for two months. We also discovered a number of strange cases of nine-legged frogs instead of the normal four-legged frogs. These are cases that are directly affecting the lives, the daily lives, of the Okinawan people. They have forced us, just to save our lives, to oppose the virtual American occupation.

At the present time B-52 bombers take off every day for the bombing of Vietnam. Last November 19, very early in the morning at 4:15, one of the B-52s crashed immediately after takeoff. This crash occurred just within the fence of the airbase, but beyond that fence there is a much bigger area used for ammunition storage, including the nuclear stockpile. A split-second mistake would cause a tremendous explosion. As it was, all the bombs on board the B-52 exploded when it crashed. If this had taken place 115 meters further, it would have set off a chain reaction that might have wiped out as much as two-thirds of the entire main island of Okinawa.

After that plane crash we thought that our demands for the removal of American nuclear arms and the American presence and also against the stationing of B-52s are just simply a struggle to save our lives, just as American youths are struggling to save their lives. And so, after that plane crash we decided to organize a joint struggle of the Okinawan people to save our lives.

The greatest role in this movement is being played by the trade unions. There is no question about that. But in addition to the trade unions, there is an association of parents and teachers, and also an association of all the mayors of villages and towns, and other ordinary organizations -- all of them have joined in this joint-struggle organization.

In mainland Japan there are three major labor organizations. The largest is SOHYO [General Council of Trade Unions of Japan], the second largest is the Domei Kaigi [Japanese Confederation of Labor], and then Churitsu-Roren [Liaison Council of Independent Unions]. All three organizations support our struggle.

Q: What will be the role of youth and student groups in the conference, and how will it relate to the struggle against the war in Vietnam?

A: The youth delegates and student representatives will also participate in our international conference, as they did last year, and in addition to that we

think that our struggle in Okinawa can only succeed by strengthening international cooperation. If we were to succeed in the removal of the American bases from Okinawa, but the bases then merely moved from Okinawa to Micronesia, then we could not say that our struggle had succeeded completely. Therefore, also in this sense we try to strengthen our cooperation on an international scale.

Q: How strong is the support for the demand for reversion among the Okinawan people?

A: The demand for the reversion of Okinawa is the strongest demand of the Japanese people in Okinawa as well as in Japan. On the Japanese mainland virtually the whole people stand for the reversion of Okinawa. Even the Sato government cannot disregard this demand without risking its own downfall. Therefore, what the Sato government is now doing is to proceed to make a compromise between the pressure of the Nixon administration and the pressure of the Japanese people.

The government hopes that the ultimate reversion of Okinawa can be utilized to strengthen the armed forces in Japan so that it can pursue a policy of reviving Japanese militarism -- it is this policy to which we are adamantly opposed. Our struggle for the reversion of Okinawa is closely connected to our struggle against the reemergence of Japanese militarism, and we are determined to pursue that struggle in that direction.

Q: What are your impressions of the antiwar movement in the United States?

A: First of all, what the Americans are now doing in Okinawa is quite undemocratic. But what the Americans are now doing here in the peace movement in the United States is an expression of the history of the democracy in this country which was created and built by the American people themselves. Among the people now the peace movement certainly is spreading. But unfortunately it lacks a national center which organizes the entire peace movement on a national scale.

There is no political party or any organization which can organize all the peace movement throughout the continent on a national scale. This is, maybe, the weakness of the peace movement in this country.

Here in this country the youth is indeed very genuinely fighting. This is very important. But, while respecting their struggle, how can you spread this struggle on a nationwide scale and also throughout the whole people of the United States? To do that, to make the peace movement include the whole population, all kinds of people, it would be the duty of

the trade-union movement and also the leaders of the political parties to spread the strength of the youth in the peace movement throughout the nation.

In Japan the trade-union movement is united over the demand for the reversion of Okinawa. In addition to that, SOHYO, the largest labor federation, demands the abrogation of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, and also the withdrawal of American troops from mainland Japan as well as from Okinawa. SOHYO stands for the normalization of diplomatic relations with Communist China.

Q: Do all the political parties support the demand for the return of Okinawa to Japan?

A: As to the reversion of Okinawa to mainland Japan, all the political parties are agreed in general on that issue. The parties disagree as to the conditions of the reversion.

The Sato government is fully aware that unless it carries out the program of the reversion of Okinawa it will be toppled. But the government -- that is, the Liberal Democratic party -- is ready to accept some concessions to strengthen the U.S. strategy in the Far East to obtain the reversion, as a trade.

In Okinawa, all of the political parties, including the Liberal Democratic party, are against the Vietnam war. In mainland Japan the situation is rather different. The Liberal Democrats and the Sato government have officially supported the U.S. war effort in Vietnam. But the opposition parties are against it.

The Democratic Socialist party has a rather complicated position. They are against the Vietnam war and sometimes they are against the Vietcong.

Because the American bases in Okinawa are now being used as a base for the military operations against Vietnam, all

the parties are against the Vietnam war in the sense that they want the U.S. to get out of Okinawa. (This military operation also causes very serious damage and threatens the lives of the Okinawans.)

Q: Is it true that despite the fact that 60 percent of the economy of Okinawa is geared to the military operations, the Okinawans consider this secondary to the problems caused by the U.S. occupation?

A: The Japanese people in Okinawa feel that way indeed. At the same time we -- that is, the Japanese people in Okinawa -- are confident that with Okinawa returned to mainland Japan our economy could also be switched to peaceful production as an integrated part of the Japanese economy. In addition to that, it is also very clearly established by law that if Okinawa is returned to mainland Japan, the central government in Tokyo will have to spend, for example, \$90 million in addition to the present amount budgeted to raise the Okinawan economy. By law the central government will have to do that.

Q: What activities have you conducted besides preparations for the conference, and what actions do you project for the fall, after the conference?

A: We have already conducted a series of campaigns and also a struggle in the form of strikes and demonstrations against the American presence in Okinawa. These have included blocking the traffic on the military road near the American bases. We are planning to stage a general strike this coming November, which is the most powerful weapon in the hands of the trade unions. By using this weapon we will try to demonstrate our determination to get rid of the Americans from Okinawa.

We ask you for support in our struggle, you who are against the Vietnam war and against ABM. We want to keep our tie closer than ever.

FOR THE MAN WHO HAS HAD EVERYTHING

For as little as \$20,000 you can get a mausoleum in La Recoleta, the most exclusive cemetery in Buenos Aires.

That, of course, is for one of the more modest structures of the 5,200 in the 272 paved streets of the ten-acre burial ground.

An average mausoleum costs considerably more. Recently one went for more than \$80,000.

Besides the hard cash, approval of

your family tree and background is required to get into this upper-class final meeting place. It is like trying to join the most snobbish country club except that it costs more.

Is the waiting list bigger than the available space? Figures are not easily obtained. But around 80,000 persons are already buried there -- more than fifteen to a mausoleum. The cemetery is so packed in fact that the mausoleums go wall to wall and rise in many instances several stories high.

THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT IN WEST GERMANY

By Lothar Boepple

[The following article is from the May issue of the West German revolutionary-socialist newspaper Was Tun. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

The 1968 Vietnam congress in Berlin was unquestionably a milestone in the protest movement against the Vietnam war. It reflected a qualitative change in anti-imperialist actions. The "peace movement" led in the spirit of "peaceful coexistence" by the Stalinists and Khrushchevists was buried.

The Vietnam congress was, however, not only a milestone but a turning point. Since then the movement has retreated and seldom gone beyond a parochial level.

This decline in the movement of solidarity with Vietnam went hand in hand with a not inconsiderable radicalization and broadening of the anti-imperialist forces. The focusing on actions directed against our own West German capitalism as well as the fragmentation of the movement and concentration on "specific local conditions" has helped to reduce the support for the Vietnamese revolution.

Of course it is true that the best support for the revolution in the Third World is struggle against our own capitalism. Of course it is true that we must organize on a "grass roots" level in order to develop a base in the working class. But the "scissors" between anticapitalist activity and activity against U.S. imperialism also shows plainly the weaknesses and failings of today's left, shows where self-criticism is called for.

The revolutionary left has not yet been able to unite on a concrete anticapitalist program in the framework of concrete political internationalism. Spontaneous and ad hoc actions against essential (and not so essential) capitalist institutions are not without their value. But their significance is diminished when they are not integral components of an international strategy and practice.

Since the Vietnam congress virtually nothing more than verbal analyses have been contributed in this area. The reactions to international class struggles and international revolutionary mobilizations were sporadic rearguard actions, which were forgotten as quickly as they developed. We reacted when something hit us in the face; we reacted empirically.

The spontanéist and anarchistic tendencies -- which unquestionably broke

through countless taboos, and, in the ossified political life of the Federal Republic, helped to prepare the way for relatively greater mobilization, especially of the masses of youth -- no longer have a progressive character. Spontaneity is no substitute for political planning nor radicalism for organized revolutionary strategy.

The Vietnam negotiations in Paris seem also to have had an effect. At any rate, since the negotiations began the course of the Vietnamese revolutionary war has not been followed so attentively as before. This has been true not only of the liberals but also of the far left, who should have been the first to expose the U.S. imperialists' game by the proper reactions, i.e., actions.

The Nixon regime, in reality, is trying to win a military victory by an enormous escalation which exceeds everything done up to now. Since the end of the bombing of North Vietnam, the bombing in the south has increased at a growing rate. The "pacification" actions and saturation bombing have cost the South Vietnamese population a terrible number of victims. Nixon is determined to take an appreciably harder line in defending imperialist interests than his not exactly squeamish predecessors Johnson and Kennedy.

It is only natural, therefore, that the National Front for Liberation has appealed to all those who supported the Vietnam protest movement in the past to resume, continue, and step up the activity. So far, however, the NFL's magnificent counter-offensive has not gotten the proper response, has not gotten the support, for example, that last year's Tet offensive got.

A renewed and intensified struggle against American imperialism cannot mean, however, beginning again where the movement more or less stopped -- on the national level. Protest demonstrations which can unite on little more than the formula of "peace through negotiations" belong to the pacifist or Khrushchevist past of the protest movement.

But breaking windows in U.S. embassies and staging militant demonstrations in front of U.S. imperialist institutions also have hardly more than a symbolic character now. The real task before us today is political agitation among the GIs, the creation of a broad protest movement or the reinforcement of it where it is already present in its initial stages.

Our task is to create an antiwar movement in the army! It is not to organize a desertion campaign. That is, we must leave antiwar GIs in the American war machine as disruptive elements and not hide them individually in the civilian world as in the desertion campaign.

Such political work can no longer be done simply by isolated, more or less unconnected groups like scattered "GI grass roots committees." In Germany we must coordinate the activity concretely and on a permanent basis. Day-to-day, small-scale activities of individual groups are not sufficient either. In order to increase the effectiveness of the work among the GIs we need militant mass actions from time to time, but not like before in West German centers but where the GIs are concentrated.

Moreover, such necessary mass actions require coordination, require agreement on a unified concept by an active collective. Revolutionary activity among

the GIs, furthermore, represents a bridge to activity against NATO and the Bundeswehr.

Occupied West Germany is an excellent starting point for political, anti-militarist, and anticapitalist work aimed at appealing to the ranks of a whole series of capitalist armed forces. Here is a concrete target we can focus on to demonstrate our solidarity with the revolutionary struggles in other countries not only verbally but in practice. To cite only one example -- along with GI work, we can influence the French soldiers stationed in West Germany.

And this work requires coordination more than activity in the Bundeswehr ever did, and not only among the active German groups. This work can be carried out intelligently only with the support, advice, and help of foreign comrades. Real international revolutionary solidarity promotes real international collaboration.

AGNEW READY TO TAKE OFF FOR MARS -- IF HE CAN STAY IN VIETNAM

While waiting at Cape Kennedy for Apollo 11 to blast off for the moon July 16, Spiro T. Agnew (the vice-president of the United States) granted an interview in which he said: "It is my individual feeling that we should articulate a simple, ambitious, optimistic goal of a manned flight to Mars by the end of this century."

The public response was hearty. Why wait until the end of the century? Why not go ahead at once -- and include Agnew in the crew? The trip would only take a year.

At the Apollo 11 launching, a group headed by the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy protested spending such vast sums of money on space rocketry while hunger ravages the earth.

Agnew answered the demonstrators. "I regard the space budget as an investment," he said, "just as I do some of the monies we have been using to assist other nations. This comes back to us indirectly." He could have added that the investment "comes back" in a highly profitable way, what with somewhere between \$24 billion and \$33 billion (up to now) being spent for highly obsolescent objects.

Nixon's possible successor held that to refuse to carry on "may well turn out to be the most debilitating thing as far as curing the ills of society is concerned." Thinking again of the poor and the hungry, he added: "This may react to the benefit of the poor in ways that we can't even envisage at this moment."

Agnew was well briefed to handle the poverty angle. On July 1 he took up the subject at the Midwestern Governors' Conference in Wichita, Kansas. He told the governors that they could not expect any increases in federal aid for the people in their states as long as the Vietnam war continues.

No relief is in sight on that, he made clear. "Our resolution is firm. This Administration wants peace, but not at the price of abdication. This means we must stay long enough to secure the self-determination for the people of South Vietnam."

The main obstacle is the Americans who want to get out of Vietnam. It's a "myth," said Agnew, "that there is an easy way out of Vietnam through unilateral withdrawal."

He appealed for unity and patience. "The tragedy is that, in some cases, sincere opposition is undermining our negotiations for peace and prolonging the war. The Vietcong remains intransigent because of the slender hope that the voices of dissent at home will force us to alter -- perhaps even abdicate -- our policy of proving that confrontation with the United States is costly."

Stick tight in Vietnam and speed on to Mars -- that's how Agnew wants it. For their patience, the hungry may finally be rewarded. For it is well-known that Mars is made out of pie the way the moon is made out of cheese.

NIXON'S REAL GAME IN RUMANIA -- CHINESE CHECKERS?

Nixon's visit to Rumania has been generally interpreted in the U.S. press as aimed at encouraging the tendency of the Ceausescu regime to move away from Moscow and gravitate toward Washington. However, an additional and perhaps more important aim may be involved, if we are to believe Rowland Evans and Robert Novak.

The team of Washington correspondents claimed in their column of July 14 that the "principal and secret purpose of President Nixon's visit to Rumania is to signal Communist China that the U.S. has no present intention of joining Russia in anti-China alliance."

Evans and Novak point to the significant fact that of all the Warsaw Pact countries, Rumania is the only one that continues to maintain "cordial relations" with Peking. At the recent world conference of Communist parties held in Moscow, Rumania took the risk of seeking to soften Moscow's drive against Peking.

"Thus, by visiting Bucharest," the two columnists stated, "Nixon hopes to send this message to China: The U.S. can build a special friendship with a Communist country which occasionally thumbs its nose at Moscow, nurtures friendship with Peking, and runs a Stalinist inter-

nal regime."

According to Evans and Novak, the maneuver was the idea of Henry Kissinger and his National Security Council staff, the strategists in charge of this sector of administration policy. It is part of "secret planning inside the Administration to ease the 20-year freeze in U.S.-Chinese relations."

In a secret session with a group of senators, "Nixon speculated that the Russians were trying to line themselves up with the U.S. in an anti-China façade..." He also "made clear that his visit to Rumania was partly to dispel that possibility."

When a senator asked Nixon why he did not also visit Yugoslavia, the president "replied that would be too provocative to Moscow..."

In fact, however, the experts on Nixon's staff believe that a visit to Yugoslavia "would be considerably less provocative to Moscow" than the visit to Rumania. Besides it would "detract from his visit to Rumania with its special relationship with Peking."

Nixon also has a personal reason for visiting Rumania, according to Evans and Novak. In 1967 Poland barred him as a private citizen and Czech officials publicly insulted him by boycotting a Pakistan embassy reception which he attended. Ceausescu, in contrast, granted him a very cordial two-hour session.

"But desire to renew acquaintances with Ceausescu scarcely compares with the hope of a dramatic sign to China," Evans and Novak said in conclusion. "Some professional diplomats who regard both the President and Kissinger as amateurs feel they are miscalculating badly in that aim. Whether such skeptics are correct or not, however, the China ploy belies the liberal critics who claim that the President is risking giving offense to Moscow solely to pursue a Rumanian caprice."

Chinese checkers experts, although unwilling to be quoted, have professed amazement at Kissinger's opening move. He has doomed himself to defeat before he even gets started, in their opinion.

What Kissinger should have done, the masters of the game say, is have Nixon first withdraw American troops from Vietnam without any further delay, and next publicly repudiate the Chiang Kai-shek regime in Taiwan.

An opener like this might have made the game look at least interesting to Mao Tsetung, Lin Piao and Chou En-lai.



sepan

KISSINGER: Fascinated by Chinese checkers.

CHILEAN POLICE HUNT LUIS VITALE

Santiago, Chile

For more than a month the Chilean political police have been seeking Luis Vitale on charges of violating the State Internal Security Law. In addition the minister of the interior has stepped up pressure on the Supreme Court to turn down Vitale's appeal against the action of the Alessandri government six years ago revoking his Chilean citizenship.

Under the headline "Another Figure Sought," the June 26 La Tarde said: "Now the Argentine citizen Luis Vitale, a known revolutionist who was almost expelled from the country a few years ago, is being sought."

Under the headline "Other Searches," the Communist party daily El Siglo commented June 26: "Yesterday morning the police also visited the residence of the veteran Trotskyist Luis Vitale, an Argentine citizen who is now one of the ideologues of the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria -- Revolutionary Left Movement], to make an investigation. Vitale was not at home. His wife, Neomicia Lagos, was taken to investigations headquarters in an effort to get her to indicate the whereabouts of her husband."

The pro-Yankee daily Ilustrado wrote on its editorial page June 30: "Luis Vitale, a member of the MIR, born in Argentina and granted the privilege of Chilean citizenship, is reportedly the victim of a government action of the most odious kind, according to the evening Castroist paper [Ultima Hora]. According to the geniuses financed by Havana, he is an outstanding intellectual and the author of many historical works. Vitale was implicated as an accomplice of the MIR terrorists by one of the Miristas themselves, also a fugitive."

The daily La Segunda of June 25 said: "Before noon the third raid took place in the Villa suburb 'El Dorado,' where a search was made of the home of Luis Vitale Cometa, accused by the police of being an 'ideologue of the MIR.'"

"The police searched all the rooms systematically and held Vitale's wife, Neomicia Lagos, who had a long 'conversation' with the officials assigned to establishing Vitale's whereabouts. It was learned unofficially that Vitale was in Concepción and that a 'call' was sent out on the police wires ordering his arrest."

On July 1, Ultima Hora wrote: "The people of Villa Eldorado are experiencing the same climate of terror the inhabitants of Concepción are being subjected to. The political police are staging raids every night, and at any hour, searching for the writer and professor

Luis Vitale. This intellectual's house is the main target of the police siege. His wife, Dr. Neomicia Lagos, a psychiatric specialist whose work with children is justly famous, has been subjected to the procedures of the political police to force her to reveal where her husband is."

Under the heading "Pérez Zeta Calls on the Supreme Court to Rule Against Vitale," the daily El Clarín said June 26: "On a personal order from Minister of the Interior Edmundo Pérez, the Supreme Court 'renewed' the case in which the professor and writer Luis Vitale appealed against an illegal cancellation of his Chilean citizenship card..."

There has been an outstanding display of nationwide solidarity with Vitale. The Full Council of the University of Chile, which is composed of professors, students, employees, and workers, passed a resolution June 30 expressing solidarity with him.

The July 1 El Clarín reported that "the assembly of the Federación de Estudiantes de Concepción approved a resolution of solidarity with Professor Luis Vitale, who 'has made an important contribution to the national culture.' In Santiago, the police raided the professor's home searching for evidence of his alleged participation in the guerrilla encampment discovered in Guayacán. 'Despite their previous agreement to return to classes, the sociology students at Concepción will remain out in solidarity with Professor Vitale.'"

Both El Clarín and Ultima Hora devoted editorials calling on the workers and students to show solidarity with Vitale. The editorial in the July 3 El Clarín, written by Lord Callampa, said: "Vitale was active in the Central Unica de Trabajadores de Chile [United Workers Federation of Chile], where he was a national leader side by side with Clotario Blest. He has written books showing considerable learning and careful historical and sociological research. Among these I can point to his Esencia y Apariencia de la Democracia Cristiana [Essence and Appearance of Christian Democracy], Historia del Movimiento Obrero [History of the Workers Movement], and especially his Interpretación Marxista de la Historia de Chile [Marxist Interpretation of the History of Chile], the second of whose projected six volumes has just appeared. Now they want to cancel his Chilean citizenship papers for good. They must not deprive him of his citizenship and convert him into a stateless person. They must not hand him over to the Argentine 'gorillas,' in whose hands the life of this distinguished writer, this husband of a Chilean professional and father of a Chilean daughter, would not be worth a cent."

REPRESSION IN CHILE

By Roberto Icaza

Santiago, Chile

The Christian Democratic government of Eduardo Frei has unleashed a harsh repression against the student, peasant, and workers movement in the callampas [shanty towns] circling Chile's cities and towns.

After the massacre of Puerto Montt, in which ten shanty-town dwellers were killed,* Frei focused his repression in June against the Federación de Estudiantes de Concepción [Concepción Student Federation], the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria -- Revolutionary Left Movement], and the Partido Socialista [Socialist party].

On June 7, in the first violation of university autonomy in Chile in thirty years, the University of Concepción was raided. The president of the FEC, Nelson Gutiérrez (a member of MIR), and Vice-President Manuel Rodríguez (a member of the Socialist party) have been held incommunicado in prison for nearly a month. The move to repress the MIR was based on an accusation that this organization was involved in an assault on Hernán Osses. This venal journalist initiated a slander campaign against the MIR and the university reform movement in the daily Noticias de la Tarde of Talcahuano, a town in the province of Concepción.

The Christian Democratic government started two trials -- one with regard to the assault and the other for alleged violations of the State Internal Security Law.

The courts ordered a number of persons arrested, including Luciano Cruz, a former president of the FEC and a leader of the MIR; Miguel Enríquez, the general secretary of the MIR; Bautista Van Schowen, the Concepción regional secretary of the MIR; and ten other MIR leaders.

Luis Vitale, a well-known Trotskyist, was also ordered arrested.

So far, the political police have been unable to track down any of these leaders despite a number of raids.

The repression was extended to the Socialist party on the pretext that a small arsenal had been discovered in Puente Alto, a town near Santiago. The

government claimed that members of the Castroist tendency in the Socialist party were implicated in the case. Three members of the Socialist party were arrested and are still being held. A number of residences have been raided. These include the homes of Senator María E. Carrera de Corbalán, whose son is being held; the business manager of the magazine Punto Final; and the lawyer Alejandro Pérez.

Government forces attacked a student rally in Concepción June 23. Some eight students suffered brain concussions or fractured skulls. Many others were seriously injured.

The Frei government is seeking to halt the accelerating mass upsurge which has been apparent since the end of 1967.

Frei's demagogic "nationalistoid" project of "Chileanizing" Anaconda, the big American copper concern, touched off an anti-imperialist mobilization.

The Christian Democrats did not nationalize the Anaconda holdings but created a mixed company, buying 51 percent of the stock. The FRAP [Frente Revolucionario de Acción Popular -- Revolutionary Front of People's Action] proposed nationalization with compensation. The MIR raised the slogan of expropriating without compensation and placing under workers control not only Anaconda but all the copper companies and other American businesses.

The Chilean peasants have occupied land in many areas, including the holdings of big estates. In the first week of July, twenty-five estates were occupied in the Norte Chico region and others in the central region, in the Mapuche Indian district. Chile has not seen such intensive and militant occupation of estates in thirty years.

The peasants realize that the presidential term of the Christian Democratic government, which has carried out a certain agrarian reform, comes to an end next year and they want to force Frei to fulfill his promises in view of the possibility that he may be succeeded in 1970 by a conservative representative of the landlords and industrialists like Jorge Alessandri.

The dwellers in the callampas have launched massive occupations of land on which to build their shacks.

The hundreds of thousands of persons who enrolled in Operación Sitio [Operation Building Lot], which the govern-

* On March 10 police fired on a group of 1,000 squatters who were trying to set up homes on municipal property. See Intercontinental Press, March 24, p. 296.

ment promoted to build homes, will not long stand for the delaying tactics now being employed by a government that has broken so many promises.

For this sector, the MIR has advanced a program that includes "Homes for the Homeless," freezing the payments of CORVI [Corporación de la Vivienda -- Housing Corporation] and the Asociaciones de Ahorro y Préstamo [Savings and Loan Associations], combined with refusal to pay the readjustable rates. These readjustable rates constitute sheer robbery. The shantytown dwellers can never pay off their mortgages because the payments are readjusted and their homes revalued from year to year.

In addition to this, the factory and mine workers as well as the employees in the state sector are mobilizing to win midyear wage increases instead of waiting for the annual adjustment. The inflation in Chile is so bad that the buying power of raises given in January can be eroded away by June.

These struggles of the workers, peasants, and shantytown dwellers, plus the battles the students are waging now for university and high-school reform, taken in the context of the deteriorating economic situation and the intrabourgeois frictions that have arisen in connection with next year's presidential election, make it possible to predict with virtual certainty that Chile will enter a prerevolutionary stage in the coming months.

This stage can last only six months if the upsurge is canalized into the electoral process. It can be prolonged if a revolutionary Marxist leadership projects a new alternative. Even if the prerevolutionary ferment is canalized into electoralism, we can predict that the social context of the 1970 presidential struggle will be different from that of 1958 and 1964.

The present repression undertaken by the Frei government is aimed at intimidating the masses and paving the way for a right-wing bourgeois successor in the 1970 presidential elections.

THE CRISIS IN ITALY

By Guy Desolre

[The following article appeared in the July 12 issue of the Belgian revolutionary socialist weekly La Gauche. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

Italy has entered a governmental crisis which will probably be the most profound and prolonged since the establishment of the republic. The Rumor government presented its resignation after the Social Democratic ministers quit. These departures were the result of a split in the Socialist party which the right wing provoked last Friday [July 4] after a compromise proposal submitted by the party chairman and minister of foreign affairs, Pietro Nenni, was defeated in the Central Committee by a vote of sixty-seven to fifty-two.

The minority, led by Ferri, Tanassi, and Preti, formed the United Socialist party. Both parties claim to be supporters of Pietro Nenni. The majority affirm that they want to continue the "center-left" policy (collaboration between the Christian Democracy, the Socialists and the Republicans) which was inaugurated six years ago, and they accuse the splitters of wanting to shift "the axis of political life" in Italy to the right. The Tanassi-Preti-Ferri group, on the other hand, accuses the majority of wanting to collaborate with the Communist

party and of preparing underhanded maneuvers to introduce the Communist party gradually into government circles, first at the local level and then at the national level.

In other words, the new United Socialist party accuses the Italian Socialist party of wanting to move the "political axis" of the center-left to the left and is effusively avowing its faith in the Atlantic alliance and making anti-Communist declarations of a prehistoric type. The fact that the right-wingers have already announced that they can never participate in the same government with their former comrades is not calculated to help matters any.

The crisis of the Italian government is not the result of simple internal stresses in the parties (the Christian Democracy itself is divided into multiple currents). The crisis of the Italian Socialist party is the consequence of the mass struggle which developed in Italy in 1968 and throughout 1969 -- a struggle of the workers; the peasants; the youth, especially the university and high-school students; and -- showing the depth of the crisis in a classical way -- the middle classes. Functionaries, court clerks, in short a whole range of social layers, which in normal times are the staunchest defenders of order, have participated in the struggle. In the present period they

consider striking and even resorting to certain forms of violence as if it were the most natural thing in the world.

Recent months have been marked by powerful outbreaks of struggle -- the explosion in Battipaglia in April, the local insurrection in Naples, building-occupations in Palermo, and now the violent street battles of the semi-insurrectional demonstrations in Turin during the first week of July. For several months the government has been paralyzed by such developments. It was the struggle of the workers and the masses in general that threw the center-left into crisis, producing a fragmentation of the Christian Democracy and the split in the Socialist party.

Faced with the paralysis of the government and the impossibility of resorting to a military-type solution because of the consequences it would bring, some bourgeois circles have begun to raise the question of the Communist party entering the government. The Communist party, in fact, would have no fundamental or principled objections to collaborating in the government. This emerges very clearly from a reading of Unità since the onset of the crisis. From its support offered to the Socialist party, to its criticisms of the United Socialist party as the instrument of a reactionary maneuver, the Italian Communist party's daily organ strongly implies that Communist leaders would not say "no" if called on.

The problem, however, is that this question does not depend on the CP. The debate between the two wings of the bourgeoisie on what tactics to follow has been fought out in the Socialist party. The question, in fact, boils down to two possibilities. More than sixty years ago, Lenin entitled an article on revolutionary tactics "Two Tactics of the Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution." An analysis of the Socialist split might be entitled "Two Tactics of the Bourgeoisie Faced with the Danger of Socialist Revolution."

The first tactic, which corresponds fundamentally with classical Social Democratic reasoning, seeks to associate the "representatives of the workers" with the regime in order to emasculate any mass radicalization. Consistent with the logic of the Social Democracy, this position calls for helping the Communist party as much as possible to transform itself into a Social Democratic party, including the maneuver of handing it governmental responsibilities. In short, in order to better divide, deceive, and weaken the workers, this line of reasoning calls for bringing all the traditional parties of the workers movement into a governmental coalition.

On the other hand, the former Socialist party minority are of the opinion that the Communist party's entry into the government would not make it proof against mass pressure. Therefore, they refuse to accept this orientation, which they consider too dangerous because it could not definitively bar revolutionary developments.

At a time when the Italian Communists went to Moscow, refusing in advance to be bound by the decisions that would be made there, it is paradoxical and almost laughable that the right-wing of the Socialist party advocates holding with an iron discipline to the "decisions" of the Socialist International against collaboration with Communists.

In fact, hardly a year after the unification of the PSDI [Partito Socialista Democratico Italiano -- Italian Socialist Democratic party -- a pro-NATO faction that split from the Socialist party when the Cold War began] and the Socialist party, the old split has reappeared, although the men involved are not entirely the same. The splitters attracted some personalities from the old Nenni party but it is doubtful that their base will be as extensive as the one held by the old Social Democratic party.

In fact, after the unification, the Socialist party became an organization integrated into the system, in which the workers no longer had any opportunity to play an active role. The clashes in the Socialist party were clashes between men representing class interests other than those of the working class. Moreover, the leaderships of the Socialist federations were rarely homogeneous. The top bodies were usually made up of combinations of several tendencies. The Socialist party had become a confederation of currents.

The governmental crisis will stimulate the largely spontaneous mass movements. It will increase the pressure of these movements on the Communist party and put the CP in a tight squeeze. It will make its scheme of shunting the struggles onto the reformist track more difficult. It will reinforce the already favorable conditions for the development of revolutionary tendencies. But it will also increase the danger of a military coup d'etat. All of the forces will polarize.

The opportunity for revolutionists lies in the fact that in all parties in Italy (even the Christian Democrats) the ranks, the masses, are further to the left than the leaderships. But these leaderships are not going to be replaced just like that. In the weeks to come, the game will be intense.

From CzechoslovakiaSTUDENTS RESIST ORDER TO DISSOLVE UNIVERSITY UNION

[The following article was written by Czechoslovak revolutionists in Prague for the information of socialists in other countries. It was sent out of the country via clandestine channels. The language of the original is French. Some places in the article were badly blurred. Where we could not be sure of the spelling of a name we enclosed it in brackets. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

After the SVS [Svaz Vysokoškolského Studentstva -- University Students Union] decided in its first regular congress April 25-27, 1969, not to join the National Front,* the Czechoslovak student movement suffered grave dissension. The refusal to join the National Front automatically brought state economic sanctions against the SVS. The subsidy of 7,000,000 korun [7.2 korun = US\$1] was cut off, making it necessary to dismiss the employees of the SVS apparatus. Most of these functionary-leaders were leftovers from the old organization, the CSM [Svaz Československé Mladeže -- the Union of Czechoslovak Youth]. They had never held any other kind of a job.

Some of these officials, for example, the Ondrouch, Vilímek, and Kymlicka groups, tried to get the congress decision reversed. A certain section of the moderate wing, represented by the Dymáček and Brno groups -- the majority of whom were members of the old SVS Presidium -- also sought to overturn the decision. In the beginning of May, these two groupings united to form the "Coordinating Committee," that is, the leading organization of the schools that wanted to join the National Front. An attempt was made to form a Moravia-Silesia student union, encompassing the university centers of Olemouch, Ostrava, and Brno. At the culmination of this campaign, however, only the university center in Brno and two schools in Prague -- the schools

* The National Front (Národní Front) was originally set up as the political form corresponding to Stalin's "theory" of "People's Democracy," a form of government allegedly intermediate between capitalism and socialism. It included the so-called antifascist parties -- the Communist party, the Social Democratic party, and the People's party (a Catholic formation). When the Kremlin answered the Cold War by toppling capitalism in Czechoslovakia, the National Front was incorporated into the bureaucratic government machinery. -- I.P.

of medicine and law -- continued to adhere to the projected union.

When the SVS Presidium met on May 12, 1969, it took note of the formation of the Coordinating Committee. While reaffirming the right of tendencies to their own activities, the Presidium declared that the Coordinating Committee was preparing the way for the liquidation of the SVS. It should be mentioned that the leading party bodies waged a campaign against the SVS in the press and that the press supported the activities of the Coordinating Committee. On the other hand, the SVS Presidium totally lacked any effective means for publicizing its positions. It was able to disseminate its statements only by means of mimeographed leaflets.

As a result, the SVS got a much more limited hearing than the Coordinating Committee. The campaign waged in the press was designed to convince the public that a handful of extremist and irresponsible functionaries had usurped power in the SVS leadership and that the creation of the Coordinating Committee was the expression of the justified anger of the immense majority of honest students over the irresponsible policy of the SVS Presidium.

As the totalitarian regime in the Czechoslovak CP hardened with the May Central Committee plenum and other moves to the right, the leading party bodies sought to settle the situation in the SVS. The economic sanctions had not gotten the expected results. The Coordinating Committee's activities were unsatisfactory -- dissension reigned in this welter of different forces and tendencies.

By June 1969 the Coordinating Committee had virtually ceased to exist. The putsch which Strougal's* bureau had set up on behalf of the functionaries failed. It failed primarily because a putsch in a student organization staged by "youth" over thirty years old and half bald was a move completely lacking in finesse.

Faced with this situation the party leadership decided to dissolve the SVS. The Ministry of the Interior issued a decree banning the organization on June 20. The Presidium of the SVS responded with the following declaration: "On June 20, 1969, the SVS of Bohemia and Moravia received dispatch No. VS/3 -- 1422/69 from the Ministry of the Interior. In this communication the Ministry announced its decision

* The secretary of the Czech CP. -- I.P.

to dissolve the SVS of Bohemia and Moravia.

"The Presidium considers this decision an incorrect application of Law No. 126/1968, 5b, section 2, paragraph 1. The interpretation given to this provision of the law can only serve the interests of the bureaucratic power center which has temporarily usurped power.

"The Presidium of the SVS will appeal this ruling to the Ministry of the Interior within the allotted fifteen-day period and seeks to oppose this decision by all legal means.

"The Presidium of the SVS believes that the activity of student organizations cannot be suppressed by an administrative act or prevented by repression. For this reason, the Presidium addresses itself to all members of the organization, calling on them to respect the decisions of their elected bodies alone."

Immediately after the banning of the SVS, a so-called Preparatory Committee was formed. The committee's objective was to found a new Quisling student organization. The composition of the committee revealed its character very clearly: Jozef [Frenčáček], a twenty-nine-year-old second-year student at Charles University; Commanders Malák and Skvařil from the Military Political Academy; Petr Bilínek, a paid functionary in the SVS apparatus; Ješek from the Military Medical School at Hradec Králová; and Myslinger from Gottwaldov.

The appearance of this organization was immediately condemned by numerous schools. The resolution of the students in the School of Mathematics and Physics at Charles University, for exam-

ple, declared: "The activities of the Preparatory Committee...are in keeping with the activities since August 1968 of the party and state leadership -- who respect all sorts of 'realities' except the rights and will of the Czechoslovak people." Declarations of this type were very common.

However, the strike that took place June 24 in thirteen factories in Prague was a more important protest than all these declarations. The strike was organized to protest against the dissolution of the Human Rights Society, the SVS, the persecution of progressive journalists, the delay in implementing the law on socialist enterprises (which includes provisions for workers councils), and the general abandonment of the post-January 1968 democratization policy.

The strike was staged everywhere for only fifteen minutes. It was held in the following factories: the CKD [Českomoravská-Kolben-Daněk, Národní Podnik -- a state metals combine] Trakce, where there are about 2,500 workers; the CKD Lokomotivka, with about 4,000 workers; the CKD Kompresery; the CKD Dodavatelský; the CKD Zásobovatelský Závod; the CKD Dukla metals plants, both factories; the Cal. Automobilive Opravny; the Papírny Karlín paper plant; the NP Energetiky; the Research Institute of Industrial Automation; the Institute of Physics; the CKD [Polovodiče] electrotechnical plant.

About fifty factories were ready to strike. However, lack of organizational experience on the part of the strike organizers and the resistance of the union leading bodies and the plant administrations prevented the strike from having a more massive character.

A CASE OF TROTSKYIST "BORING FROM WITHIN"?

The antiwar movement in the American army appears to have aroused the interest of some Soviet journalists. The July 4-10 issue of the Soviet foreign news digest reprinted an article from U.S. News and World Report describing this development. The excited tone the conservative U.S. magazine adopted in reporting the GI movement may have attracted the Soviet journalists' attention.

The article begins this way: "More and more evidence is piling up that the so-called 'New Left' and other radical groups are carrying out a calculated attack on the morale and discipline of the armed forces of the USA. Military planning bodies are convinced that if this assault is successful our armed forces will be turned into an armed rabble." (Retrans-

lated from Za Rubezhom.)

The Soviet news digest also reprinted a picture from U.S. News showing some outstanding examples of literature and posters put out by antiwar soldiers and civilian sympathizers. The foreground of the picture is dominated by a New York City "Militant Labor Forum" leaflet announcing a lecture on the "GI's United," an organization composed mainly of black and Puerto-Rican soldiers.

The Militant Labor Forum is a weekly lecture series sponsored by the American Trotskyist weekly The Militant. One of the main leaders of GI's United is a twenty-year-old black Trotskyist, Joe Miles.

WHY AN AUTO COSTS TWICE AS MUCH IN LATIN AMERICA

Why does an automobile made in Mexico cost twice as much as the same model made in the United States where wages are eight times higher?

This question is answered in an illuminating way by Leo Fenster in an article, "Mexican Auto Swindle," in the June 2 issue of the liberal New York weekly The Nation. Leo Fenster, an auto worker by trade, has been an officer of the United Auto Workers for twenty-six years. For the past thirteen years he has made regular trips to Latin America.

The Mexican government, Fenster explains, issued a decree August 23, 1962, aimed at creating an auto industry as a key step toward constructing a modern industrial plant. Previously foreign auto producers had done little more than assemble cars in Mexico.

It was speculated that there would be opposition to the project. "But none was offered; the foreign producers entered into the game with spirit and capital."

"The country was soon to have a ring of plants in a vast ellipse around Mexico City," Fenster continues. "Added to the existing Ford, Chrysler and General Motors assembly plants in the city itself were GM, Chrysler and American Motors plants in Toluca; a Volkswagen plant near Puebla; a Ford plant at Cuautitlan; three Renault (American Diesel or Dina) plants at Sahagun; a Fiat plant near Cuernavaca; a Datsun plant at Morelos; an International Harvester truck plant and a bankrupt Borgward plant, resurrected from Germany, at Monterey. Fifteen gleaming plants spread over vast acres of space: on a map or an industrial plan sheet, this was an imposing complex. It must mean that Mexico was in the auto business, implicitly part of the technological 20th century as it reached toward the 21st."

The spotlight was placed on this Latin-American achievement at a meeting in January 1965 when Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, the president of Mexico, joined Frederic Donner, the president of General Motors, in dedicating the new GM plant in Toluca. The Mexican press was filled with glowing accounts of the event. A writer in Excelsior declared that "General Motors has plants in five continents and [this one] in Toluca is the most modern of all."

Fenster had a different impression. "As a guest of the management on the previous day," he writes, "I had made a careful tour of the plant. It was worse than archaic. Worse, because it was deliberately archaic, with the obsolescence carefully built in. The plant was beautiful,

laid out with great yardage of surplus space for comfortable operation and future expansion. The machinery was new and sparkling. It was also very peculiar -- it had been designed and built -- not to produce.

"After I had inspected the plant, I was invited in for a half hour of coffee and discussion with the manager. He had been a GM plant executive in the States. 'This is an overwhelmingly beautiful plant,' I said. 'Any manager back home would give all his eyeteeth to have such fantastic amounts of space. But what I can't understand is the equipment. Overall it would appear to have less than 10 per cent of our productivity potential back home.'"

"We were both auto workers, and on this point there was no way to dissemble. 'Well, you see,' he said, 'there is only so much steel in Mexico. The government has to dole it out in quotas. If we were to use the equipment you have back in the States we would have enough for only one hour's run or so a week.'"

Fenster says that in pursuing his inquiry he was to hear this answer many times. It never rang quite true although it did confirm the fact that the new Mexican plants were being equipped with "snail-paced" machinery.

A month later he toured a new GM plant in a suburb of Buenos Aires. There he watched some of the presswork on a minor part. (Major parts are still imported.) "The minor part I saw went through a series of presses for the consecutive operations -- low draw, trim, pierce, finish. Each press was manually activated. The standard, I was told, was 180 pieces an hour. And I judged that the complete operation required ten men, operators and helpers.

"In the United States the same operation is performed by one automated giant press. There is one operator and he activates the press by pushing a button after he has threaded the coil. Then he stands by and watches while the press produces 1,800 finished parts an hour. This therefore makes a man-hour ratio of 100 to 1."

The U.S. press, of course, costs a great deal more than the combined Argentine presses. But the difference in cost could be amortized in not too many months of operation. "The salient fact is that the presses in Buenos Aires, like the machines in Toluca, were not antiquated, broken-down wrecks. The machinery there was also newly built -- not to produce."

The name of a Cleveland-based machine-tool plant "which builds the most

sophisticated automated equipment for General Motors, Ford and Chrysler" was on a good deal of the new equipment in the Latin-American plants. Upon returning home, Fenster looked up an employee of that company who supervises the installation of new machinery.

"I asked about the operating standards of machinery constructed for American engine production. 'Our machinery is built so that a motor comes off the line every twenty-five seconds,' he told me. That meant 144 an hour. The maximum potential of the Toluca plant was twelve an hour. The ratio, then, was 12 to 1.

"I asked him about the Foote-Burt machinery I had seen in the Latin American plants. 'Oh,' he answered, 'that is our special low-production machinery.'

"I questioned him closely. 'It's all newly designed,' he told me, 'built to specification from blueprints.'

"'But why is this low-production machinery built?'

"'We don't ask those questions,' he laughed; 'we are happy enough to have work to do.'"

Within a year and a half after the dedication of "the most modern plant" in five continents, the enthusiasm in Mexico over the establishment of an indigenous auto industry was wearing off. An article in the October 15, 1966, issue of Sucesos complained that "a car proudly 'Made in Mexico' costs twice as much as the same model in the country of its origin."

Sucesos calculated that this cost the Mexican people \$180,000,000 in 1966 and that the cost will rise each year. By the end of the decade, the auto industry will have drained Mexico of at least \$1,000,000,000. Sucesos, however, was not at all sure of the reason for this state of affairs, or what the solution might be. "It is obvious," declares Fenster, "that the publication was unaware of the fact that Mexico's plants are deliberately equipped with low-production machinery. Nor does this seem known to anyone else with authority, inclination, opportunity or courage to speak out."

Fenster's explanation of the mystery is as follows:

First of all, neither Mexico nor any other Latin-American country has a machine-building plant of any consequence whatever. Since they lack such plants, these countries "are completely subservient to the desires and preferences of the industrially advanced nations. Latin America cannot say what kind of equipment shall be installed; it takes what it is given."

It might appear at first glance that the intense competition existing among the automobile corporations on an international scale would automatically ensure a struggle among those operating in the same field to reduce costs. However, among other things, there is the market to be considered.

Mexico has a sales potential of about 100,000 cars and trucks a year. "This is a ratio of one unit to every 450 people. In the industrialized world the ratio is 25 million units a year for 800 million of population, or about one unit to thirty-two people -- an incomparable difference."

In view of all the limitations, "why did all the major auto producers of the world swoop into Mexico like one joined flock of migrating birds?"

Because, in Fenster's opinion, they are one joined flock of birds. He finds a "cogent clue" in Alfred P. Sloan's memoirs, My Years With General Motors. In the chapter "The Corporation Overseas," Sloan tells of the high-echelon discussions that took place during the late 1920s, as GM "had to determine whether we wanted to be exporters or overseas producers." Sloan headed the group that rejected emphasis on export, "claiming instead that real profits were possible only when capital was sent abroad to build new plants." This has been General Motors policy ever since.

"What GM had learned and accomplished became the road for all major auto producers the world over. General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Volkswagen, Fiat, Renault, American Motors, Datsun, International and Borgward came to Mexico at about the same time. With the plant acreage they developed, these giants would have to produce more than 1 million units in order to operate both normally and profitably. But the demonstrable market was only a tiny 7 per cent of that. To operate normally therefore became impossible -- but to operate profitably is always indispensable.

"The companies came because they had money to invest and because none wanted to be frozen out of an enduringly profitable market. But could they set up their automatic plants and produce to capacity for the current microscopic market? That kind of competition would be seen as anarchy in today's industrial world.

"Who doubts what happened; what discussions took place? There had to be agreement on quotas; on the rate of production; on the cost of the product. None of these elements, given the unusual circumstances, could be expected to find their appropriate levels through normal processes.

"And it must be equally obvious that the world's auto producers are enjoying a

profitable market, despite the artificially limited productivity. The outlandish prices provide the beautiful margin of profit. The fact that Mexico and the other Latin American countries must impose a 100 per cent duty on new or used imported cars in order to prevent a disastrous outflow of capital permits General Motors and the rest to command prices almost 100 per cent above home country prices."

It might still be argued that despite the excessive cost, Mexico and the other Latin-American countries still end up with the foundation of a major auto industry.

This is "the greatest distortion of all," declares Fenster. He cites a statistical demonstration by Dr. Otto Feinstein, based on the economy of Venezuela, that the growth of a foreign sector in the economy of an underdeveloped country results in an actual decrease in the domestic sector. In Mexico, for instance, "domestic industrial growth is choked off because scarce capital is drained into this foreign sector....

"Thus each tortured inch of Latin American industrial advance is actually a giant step backward when measured against the seven-league jumps of the industrialized world."

Fenster is completely convinced of the ability of the Latin-American countries to develop a modern industrial base. He cites what Mexico accomplished after expropriating the oil industry. An indispensable ingredient, however, is a machine-building industry. "Whatever else happens, Mexico and Latin America must begin that difficult job. It will serve as their industrial declaration of independence."

As for the auto industry in Mexico, what the country needs "is not ten foreign owners with fifteen or more plants equipped with ludicrously low-paced machinery. It needs a single national plant with the most modern automated equipment. At present wage levels it could then produce a car for \$800 or less; mini's for about half the price. That would initiate a mass market, spill over to other industrial development, and open a way to substantial increases in real wages."

CLAIM PRO-MOSCOW FORCES FINGERED GUERRILLAS IN INDONESIA

In a "think piece" in the June 12 issue of the Far Eastern Economic Review, Jay B. Sorenson discusses the "fight" between Moscow and Peking in Indonesia. Much of the article is of dubious value. One item, however, is worth noting, pending confirmation; i.e., that either the Soviet diplomatic mission or pro-Moscow members of the PKI tipped off the Suharto regime on the construction of guerrilla bases in the eastern part of Java, leading to their destruction by the army.

One of the stakes in the Sino-Soviet conflict, Sorenson says, has been the Partai Komunis Indonesia (Indonesian Communist party). "Both Moscow and Peking are constantly bidding for its loyalty as the PKI has attempted to reorganise and make a comeback."

Until 1968, Peking was in the lead in this rivalry. "In the spring of 1967 it had become clear Peking was helping the remnants of the scattered and outlawed PKI to reorganise. Beginning in the spring of 1967 they began to regroup in Eastern Java and apparently were planning a Vietnam-type guerilla war. Peking at the time gave constant encouragement with frequent radio and news broadcasts, and called for 'revolutionary armed struggle' in Sumatra, Kalimantan and Java. Mid-1968 attempts to fan uprisings in rural areas were hailed in Peking as a 'victorious' application of Mao's strategy of struggle

in the countryside. Through the PKI campaign of insurgency China delineated a policy toward the Suharto regime; unlike Moscow, Peking did so in disregard of caution and of any improved relations with Djakarta it might have sought as an Asian power....

"Last summer the Indonesian army initiated a six-week campaign against the PKI. Acting on a tip some say came from pro-Moscow PKI elements and other reports from the Soviet diplomatic mission, the Army swept into newly prepared guerilla bases in the dusty Eastern Java hills around Blitar and destroyed them. What first appeared only a minor skirmish turned into a major political victory. Eight of a 10-man new politburo were killed. Oloan Autopea, the reputed successor to Aidit, was the chief victim. From 1,000 to 2,000 Communists were reported killed or captured. Information forced from captured Communists revealed a wide network of agents and sympathisers within the Government and Armed Forces, and since the Blitar campaign a purge has resulted in the arrest or dismissal of thousands."

According to Sorenson, little has been said by Peking about the PKI since the Blitar campaign. However, denunciations of Moscow in relation to the entire catastrophe suffered in Indonesia have been stepped up.

In July the Peking press ran an article scoring in particular the military supplies sent by both Moscow and Washington to Suharto's army.

Moscow, on the other hand, published articles last fall claiming that Peking was directly responsible for the "thousands" killed in East Java.

In Sorenson's view, Moscow's efforts to woo Suharto are not making much headway "despite a sharp deterioration of relations between China and Indonesia." Moscow "may be able to bring sufficient

pressure to bear by means of political protest, debt rescheduling, military hardware, and money to induce Suharto not to go too far over to the West, but it is difficult to see Moscow exerting much positive influence in Indonesia."

"Suharto," Sorenson concludes, "still sees communism as Indonesia's number one enemy, and he will take measures to contain it. The Soviet Union is therefore supporting a nationalist government determined to steer Indonesia away from communism, and Peking has been quick to point out the irony of Moscow's dilemma."

COLONIAL ECONOMY BURDENS PHILIPPINES

[The following article is from the June 25 issue of Laging Una, a Filipino newspaper published in Los Angeles, California.]

* * *

Although the economy of the Philippines has grown, its basic structure is changing very slowly and "it remains essentially a colonial economy based on agriculture and trade, in a society characterized by inequality, dependence, and foreign dominance."

This is the principal conclusion of the committee on economic affairs of the Philippine Senate contained in a 241-page report submitted in Manila last month after an exhaustive study of every aspect of the country's economy. The committee was headed by Sen. José W. Diokno.

The continuing backwardness of the economy, says the Diokno committee, is the reason why average family income remains low. It also explains the shocks suffered by the economy when sharp variations occur in the pattern of foreign trade.

In addition to proposals of a general character for enhancing the economy, the committee called for the assertion of Filipino control, but did not indicate how. The proposals include intensifica-

tion of agriculture, development of heavy industry, improvement of airport and seaport facilities and interisland shipping, construction of feeder roads.

Citing facts showing the continuance of a colonial-type economy, the committee pointed to pervasive foreign influence. It said the biggest corporate and individual taxpayers are foreigners, while vital industries such as oil refining, tire production and trade in construction materials are controlled by foreigners.

One of the consequences of sluggishness in economic growth, the Diokno report asserted, was great unemployment. In 1968, it said, 1,067,000 persons out of a labor force of 12,213,000 were jobless. This was 8.7 per cent of the total.

Regarding wage rates, the report said these had risen between 1955 and 1967 by 25.7 per cent for skilled labor and 37.6 for unskilled labor. During the same period, prices rose by 57.6 per cent, leaving workers worse off than before.

Emphasizing the urgent need for accelerated economic growth, the report cited forecasts that the population of the Philippines, now estimated at 35 million, will reach 76.6 million by 1990. Population growth in the Philippines is among the highest in the world.

SAIGON LEAVE-TAKING JUST A GIMMICK TO GI'S

It took a whole month to assemble the first 814 men of the 25,000 Nixon has agreed to withdraw from Vietnam. They found the leave-taking ceremonies rather obnoxious, according to the July 21 issue of Newsweek. Some were "chagrined by an order forbidding them to display the peace medallions they had worn openly in the Delta." Some took off the flowers bestowed on them by the South Vietnamese

and "dropped them to the ground." One group of blacks "threw a clenched-fist salute to a soul brother driving past in a truck. Other GI's wondered whether they had done the right thing fighting in Vietnam. 'I can truthfully say that I can't see any good reason for 36,000 Americans to have died here,' commented Sp/4 Gary Doss. 'And these ceremonies about going home -- it's just a gimmick.'"

URUGUAY RIPE FOR REVOLUTION

[The following article is from the June 23 issue of the Buenos Aires revolutionary-socialist weekly La Verdad. Like all socialist periodicals in Argentina, La Verdad must be published and circulated clandestinely. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

Imperialism, hand in hand with the bourgeoisies of Argentina and Uruguay, has managed to divide our two peoples. Still worse, the exploiters have succeeded in keeping the working classes of both countries almost totally ignorant of each other.

At the beginning of the century, the Uruguayan and Argentinian workers movements, led by the anarchists, succeeded in establishing friendly relations between the two working classes and in unifying their struggles. Later this unity was broken. The Argentinian workers movement backed the Peronists while the Uruguayans followed the old workers parties, the Socialists and Communists, who for an entire period were agents of the Yankee colonization of our countries. The leaderships of both workers movements, following the voice of their successive masters, moved away from the workers.

The situation has changed. Today the Uruguayan workers and students have taken the lead in the revolutionary struggles on this continent. Their old leaderships have been bypassed or are in the process of being bypassed. The Socialists are no longer a factor and the Uruguayan Stalinists are losing strength day by day. The Tupamaros and a new semianarchist, semispontanéist student and worker vanguard have begun to replace these traitorous leaderships. In the Argentinian student and worker vanguard a similar process is under way, although it is proceeding much more slowly. Everything is working in favor of the development of conditions permitting a new rapprochement between the two working peoples that would overcome the artificial divisions which our exploiters have erected over a century and a half.

Last year La Verdad gave an objective report of the struggles waged by the Uruguayan students and workers. These struggles resulted in three dead, many wounded and beaten, and a massive popular demonstration. All this was the consequence of the emergence on the campuses of a new leadership and a new revolutionary generation which bypassed the Communist party. They forced the CP, in order not to lose its leadership of the mass movement, to go into the streets also, in contradiction to its policy of negotia-



PACHECO: How long can he hold down lid?

tions and deals with sectors of the "progressive bourgeoisie."

In 1967 the Uruguayan student movement began to wage an intense struggle for minimum demands. Specifically the students of the national teachers college in Montevideo, the magisteriales as they are called, began a struggle to get a building adequate for their educational needs. This battle for a building gave rise to new organizational forms which soon spread during 1968 to a large part of the Uruguayan movement.

Instead of the classical student organizational centers, which like our FUA [Federación Universitaria Argentina -- Argentinian Student Federation] are run on the basis of annual elections, assemblies developed, and class and school delegates were elected or reelected on a weekly basis -- and sometimes, during periods of great activity, on a daily basis. These school delegates organized themselves in committees which reflected the opinion and aspirations of the students at the moment directly and almost instantaneously.

This was how it was possible to prevent the ponderous leading apparatus of the student movement, which was in the hands of the Stalinists, from exercising a brake on the mobilizations. The struggle for assemblies and school delegates was essential in achieving the proper organizational framework for mobilizing the students. The Stalinists were, to all intents and purposes, eliminated from the leadership of these mobilizations.

For three months the students were in control of the streets and neighborhoods of Montevideo, achieving a linkup with the workers movement on some occasions. Confronted with this situation, the leadership of the Uruguayan Communist party and of the trade-union federation, the CNT [Convención Nacional de Trabajadores -- National Workers Convention], found themselves forced to join the struggle in order better to control the movement of the workers and students.

When the great demonstration occurred at the funeral of Liber Arce, the Uruguayan workers and students in fact had power within their grasp. The only thing that was needed to take power was a revolutionary party with influence in the mass movement.

Unfortunately such a party was lacking, or, as in the case of the Tupamaros, failed to comprehend the situation. We say this because the Tupamaros are indisputably the only revolutionary organization with an enormous prestige in the mass movement.

The government responded with emergency measures, an indecisive state of siege. These emergency measures postponed, but did not eliminate or overcome, the revolutionary crisis.

The government of Pacheco Areco lifted its emergency measures in a tacit agreement with the Communist party, which apparently promised to divert all the struggles into peaceful and parliamentary channels. Another reason for the suspension of the emergency measures was the division of the Uruguayan bourgeoisie in face of the chronic economic crisis. The government has been boxed in by the financial and banking groups linked to Yankee capital.

This has provoked serious friction with the other sectors of the bourgeoisie who do not want to accept the consequences of the crisis. The bourgeois unity that permitted Pacheco Areco to enforce the emergency decrees no longer exists. A reflection of this is the fact that the parliament passed a motion of censure against Pereyne Facio, the agent of the banks and the strongman of the cabinet, and forced him to resign.

This crisis of the bourgeoisie has facilitated a new rise of the student and workers movement. Unlike last year, the center of the struggle has been the workers movement, especially the workers in the meat-packing industry. The Frigorífico Nacional workers have been on strike for two months. This strike detonated the present upsurge, with its wave of strikes stemming from the conflict in the meat-packing industry.

The student movement is playing a role of prime importance, but it has ceased to be the sole and undisputed vanguard. The student movement offers a continual example of extraparlimentary struggles and head-on confrontation with the regime. The students' street actions are beginning to be copied by the workers movement. For example, the high-school students have customarily used the technique of blocking off neighborhoods and collecting tolls from motorists, as well as attacking imperialist businesses, burning their cars, and breaking windows. And today, suddenly we find that the young university students and workers of the meat-packing district, the famous Cerro, have begun to do the same -- block off the district and prevent the entry of buses and police.

In fact, all this is creating a situation of dual power. During the hours the high-school students or the Cerro workers block off a district it is no longer controlled by the bourgeois government but by the students or workers. Unfortunately no one seems to realize the profound significance of this fact and no slogans are being raised for the creation of local and centralized organizations which could bring this rival authority to the workers in all the poor and modest neighborhoods of Montevideo and the other important Uruguayan cities.

By the tacit agreement, the government and the Communist party are letting the student and worker vanguard dissipate energy in a multitude of isolated actions.

The following is a normal day in Montevideo. The workers in the proletarian neighborhood of La Teja blockade the district and refuse to let the police come in. The night students of the IAVA, an institution similar to the National University of Buenos Aires, come out to demonstrate, clash with the police, burn automobiles, and build barricades. The students of various institutions in small groups, each in their own area, burn the cars of the Yankee and Argentinian businessmen and break windows in their stores and offices.

There is no coordination or centralization of these actions. Each group sets fire to, or occupies the buildings in its own area. At present there is almost a national mania in the students and workers

movement to have your own, separate, and independent "rumpus." This is exactly what the reactionaries want. They want the workers and students to exhaust themselves in these "rumpuses" which objectively achieve no victories and may end by exasperating the petty bourgeoisie.

However, the wave of workers strikes is shaking and rocking the Uruguayan bourgeois economy as a whole. Neither the government nor the Uruguayan bourgeoisie can permit this. As a result, the government and the bourgeoisie itself are being forced to change their tactics. If the wave of strikes is not defeated quickly, conditions will begin to emerge that again will raise the possibility of emergency measures or a "gorilla" coup to block the rise of the workers movement.

The Uruguayan vanguard, intoxicated by its enthusiasm and the immediate opportunity it has to carry on its own "rumpuses" day and night, does not real-

ize that it is sitting on top of a volcano and is threatened with an imminent calamity. Nor does it realize that it has an obligation to control the eruption of the volcano and prevent the calamity. It has no alternative but to begin to organize itself with iron discipline and centralize its actions.

To do this, it must also realize that what is necessary is not scattered "rumpuses" in the various neighborhoods but more advanced conditions for organizing "a great national rumpus." What is necessary is to organize a "nationwide rumpus" in Uruguay as a whole and along scientific socialist lines. What the Uruguayan vanguard must realize is that it can and must organize a workers revolution which will remove the government of Pacheco Areco and any possibility for any other bourgeois regime in order to install Latin America's second workers government. As the direct heirs of Artigas and Ramírez, the Uruguayan workers and students, can and must do it.

An Eyewitness Account

THE DEMONSTRATIONS IN THE CITY OF CORDOBA

[The following is an eyewitness account of the massive demonstrations that swept Córdoba, Argentina's third largest city, on May 29, developing into a general strike on May 30. An estimated thirty persons were killed and 500 arrested. This report is from the June 11 issue of El Combatiente, the weekly organ of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (Revolutionary Workers party -- the Argentinian section of the Fourth International). Like all socialist papers under the Onganía military dictatorship, El Combatiente must be published and distributed clandestinely. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

I arrived at the Córdoba terminal at 11 a.m. Thursday, May 29. At that moment, 3,500 workers at the Kaiser factory, as well as the workers in the other automotive plants, the foundries, the light and power plants, meat-packing and elsewhere, were downing tools to march in columns on the city.

The workers intended to hold demonstrations and rallies in solidarity with the protesters who had been killed in Corrientes and Rosario. They were heading toward the assembly areas set for the demonstrations by the workers and students Coordinating Committee which functioned within the framework of the CGT [Confederación General de Trabajadores -- General Workers Confederation]. Groups of students

from the various schools of the university were also marching toward the areas designated by the Coordinating Committee. The selection of sites for the demonstration was all the planning there was for the popular mobilization.

Then I began going through the streets of Córdoba. In various places in a five- to six-block radius of the center of the city, groups of students were beginning to hold their first rallies. In staging these demonstrations, the students profited from the experience of the Rosario students. They knew that in order to carry through their actions they would have to defend themselves against police assaults. For this purpose they began by using all the material at hand to build the first barricades. There was no lack of bonfires, shouts, applause, and speeches to attract the attention of the people in the neighboring areas and to swell the crowd. Already the population was showing the first signs of solidarity by helping the students.

At about 11:30 a.m. the Kaiser workers approached the bus terminal where they were to hold their rally. Here the police fired at them, using machine guns. Far from dispersing upon seeing Mena fall mortally wounded, the workers answered the police with stones and shouts. The shooting of Mena, who later died in the hospital, and the less grave wounds inflicted on many others were barely a starter for the day. The shooting, symbolizing the brutality of the repression, inflamed the

demonstrators, setting in motion a dynamic not anticipated in the Coordinating Committee's plans and which would go beyond simple demonstrations and rallies.

The hatred unleashed by the repression was shown in the attitude of a middle-aged worker who was walking beside Mena when the latter was mortally wounded. Blind with rage, he faced the police with his chest bared, defying them: "Kill me, you murderers, you killed my compañero." And he went into a fury, attacking a newsstand which he smashed by blows and kicks. This may have been the only act of destruction not directed against targets representing the government, its repressive forces, the big bourgeoisie, or foreign businesses.

I realized what that man would have done if he had had a machine gun or a rifle in his hands. He had no weapon. But the rage that exploded in him was like a break in the dike releasing a first rivulet which later spread and swept up the other automobile workers, and then all sectors of the population, in a torrent of fury.

A second tour of the city showed that the barricades which had stood five or six blocks from the center of the city had now spread to the outlying districts, reaching the furthest suburbs -- Clinicas, Alberdi, Sobremonte, Talleres, Nueva Córdoba...

While groups of students and workers continued to build barricades, the mechanism which permitted the great spread and extension of barricades was the following: In the face of the clashes and fracas with the police, the people of the neighborhoods, men, women, and children, came out of their houses, and clustered on the street corners. And when these groups got above ten or fifteen persons, they immediately imitated the groups on the nearby corners, beginning to build their own barricades. On the barricades, old men could be seen pouring bottles of kerosene on planks, trees, and old furniture. There were no spectators. No one waited for "orders."

From the San Martín district, I went to the center city area. Reaching a corner, I was surprised to see an orderly flow of traffic following the signals of a student formally posted on the traffic cop's platform. With the characteristic gestures and whistle blowing, the cars were detoured away from places where fires made passage dangerous. I got through the area with no difficulty on my motorbike. Nearby, an Impala with government plates was consumed in flames. A large number of new Citroëns had been taken out of the Acuña dealer's showrooms where they had been on display. They were used to build bonfires, and new barricades

were constructed with the burned-out remains.

The same thing happened to the company cars of a commercial firm known in the city for its dealings with high government officials. Also burned were the La Oriental cake shop, a meeting place of the Córdoba aristocracy; La Aduana; Gas del Estado [the state-owned gas company]; the Xerox company; Burroughs; the Forja manufacturing company; Fiat; various banks; and the air force officers' club. When groups of workers saw that the officers' club was guarded by only two cadets, they set it afire after ordering the cadets to go home.

Except in the case of a notorious commissioner of police, no private home was attacked.

It was impossible to list all the fires. But it was obvious that the demonstrators were venting their condemnation and outrage only on targets which were tangibly connected with the government, its repressive forces, or the monopolies. Almost all the windows in the downtown area were broken by stones or by police bullets but no demonstrators were to be seen looting merchandise.

By 3 p.m. 400 city blocks marked by bonfires and barricades had become a liberated zone in the hands of the population.

In the Nueva Córdoba suburb, 150 workers attempted to organize themselves in groups of ten, electing leaders for each group and setting up a central command which was able to organize control over several blocks. One group took charge of provisioning, passing out food from a common pot supplied by the people of the neighborhoods. Another group established a system of carrying messages between the various detachments. However, they did not achieve any kind of coordination with the other sections of the city. This embryonic organization broke down every time the police staged an assault, although the workers still managed to repel many attacks successfully.

This was perhaps the greatest attempt at organization. The workers were in permanent assembly where they discussed the political situation of the moment and its possible solutions. All agreed that no solution could be found through a mere change in bourgeois governments. Therefore, one of the slogans you could hear them chant was "Fight, Fight, Fight, and Never Stop Fighting for a Workers and People's Government." And another slogan which they shouted along with it was "The Police Have Just Two Roads Left, Join the People or Become Murderers!"

In one of the confrontations, two policemen were seen throwing off their

coats and waving their caps in the air to go over to the band of demonstrators. According to various versions of this story, the episode was repeated in other places. It fanned a flame of enthusiasm.

It was already 5 p.m. when I spoke with several demonstrators, clerks, who had joined the groups in the street on leaving work. Several tractors of a street-paving company were blazing around us and the flames were being whipped up by youths who had just arrived from the neighborhoods. The news coming in of the battles going on inspired people to commandeer the automobiles of passersby and come to the downtown area from the most distant places.

Each group that arrived compensated for the weariness of those already there. But above all the newcomers surpassed their predecessors in their understanding of the situation and their methods of struggle. I ran ahead to meet a group that continued feeding the bonfires in the street to warn them that the army was approaching. The answer I got was this: "Don't worry, buddy, they massacred the boys at Kaiser because they didn't have anything to defend themselves with but stones. When we got wind of the fracas, I swiped my old man's blunderbuss, and Skinny brought his .22."

In fact, the new demonstrators displayed some old guns, most of them small-caliber arms, obviously hurriedly dragged out of closets. Not all of them were prepared to use their guns effectively but they showed a consciousness of the situation higher than was present at the beginning of the struggle.

Rapidly an idea gained currency -- return to the neighborhoods and entrench there for resistance. Some, however, persisted in not giving an inch of ground and remained at strategic points to harass the army that was entering the city. The previous sporadic firing now became general. At 9 p.m., in the neighborhood of the new bus station under construction, I first heard a pitched gun battle between two directly opposing bands. I could distinguish clearly between those who were firing with .22s and those using FALs [Fusil Automático Liviano -- Light Automatic Rifle] and machine guns. Incidents like this occurred throughout the night in the neighborhoods of Clínicas, Nueva Córdoba, Talleres, Güemes, etc.

The relationship of forces from the military standpoint led the boldest and best-armed demonstrators to take up positions as snipers on the roofs and in the windows of the neighborhoods, where their knowledge and command of the terrain offered them a much more favorable field. The snipers, in fact, held off the army all night long.

At 9 p.m. a curfew was imposed. But the city waited, alert behind every door, beside every radio and television, behind every barrier. Reports from different caliber guns and murmurings stirred the air of the city, dimmed by blackouts.

These blackouts appeared by magic everywhere the struggle was the hottest. Some attributed this to complicity by the electric company workers with the snipers, others to blown-up generators. But the people of the neighborhoods took advantage of this night of darkness to shelter the fighters and maintain the resistance.

A higher degree of organization emerged owing to the need for armed resistance in the various neighborhoods. There workers, students, professionals, merchants, old people, women, and children, in one way or another, all played a role. Some built barricades and searched for guns, others collected food and cared for the wounded. The couriers never rested. In the Güemes neighborhood I saw a man who had been running fall at my feet. I thought he was wounded and started to help him. He was nothing of the sort. He was just exhausted.

"I'm from Talleres looking for people and guns. I came part of the way over the roofs, jumping from one to the other to avoid being spotted by the patrols..."

The resisters, already better organized and victorious in the neighborhoods, began to plan their first offensive moves. They attacked the police stations, setting fire to some of them, and tried to take others. Some participants still followed the Radical strategy of 1890. But reality quickly overcame old conceptions...Spontaneity had gone as far as it could. What was needed to counter a bourgeois professional army was another army. What would have happened if there had been even 300 men of the people, armed, disciplined, and with military training, fighting there as the advance guard of the Revolutionary Army?

With the first light of dawn on the following day the streets of the neighborhoods filled with people. It was the morning of Friday, May 30. On this day the population of the entire country gave a gigantic demonstration of solidarity with the resistance in Córdoba, paralyzing all activity in the country as had never been done before.

Along the Avenida Colón going through the Clínicas neighborhood, enthusiastic crowds testified to popular support for the resistance, filling the avenue from sidewalk to sidewalk for several blocks. The fear was gone. Army patrols fired repeatedly on groups forming to march downtown. The people dispersed, but not to leave the field of battle. They only scattered to avoid the bullets and to regroup later. The people of the neighborhood dis-

cussed the episodes of the previous night, hiding in their doorways from the bullets. But they did not retreat into their houses. They stayed in the street. At noon, a big demonstration started from Clinicas heading for the center of the city. The army managed to break it up only by a major effort.

In the afternoon, columns of military trucks carrying weapons of all kinds charged in the vicinity of Clinicas, clearing away the barricades and other obstacles. One of these obstacles gave testimony to the sentiment of the people, and they had to halt before it. An old man waving his arms in the air blocked their path and demanded that they go back.

The army, which had been impotent through the night and up till this time, only now succeeded in entering Clinicas. But already the boldest and most heroic snipers, realizing that it was impossible

to resist under these conditions, without organization, without leadership, without military training, had retreated... There was no defeat. There was a truce.

There was one determined idea floating in the air -- the brave fighters of Clinicas, with their store of experience and new and higher forms of organizing for struggle, would return to make Clinicas the Cholon of Córdoba.

These new forms were heralded in the afternoon and night of May 30 when the army was already beginning to get the situation under control. Detachments, hurriedly organized, rushed from various directions toward the Talleres neighborhood in an attempt to reconquer it from the occupying army. Despite an all-night battle, this proved impossible. But in their last effort these heroic fighters set the highest level of organization in the May days.

MANITOBA NDP VICTORY STUNS OLD PARTIES IN CANADA

Capitalist politicians in Canada are still weighing the setback they received with the spectacular electoral victory of the New Democratic party in Manitoba at the beginning of July. The NDP, Canada's labor party, won an absolute majority in the provincial legislature, defeating a long-lived Progressive-Conservative government and reducing the Liberals -- the ruling party in Ottawa -- to a rump of five members. The July 10 Christian Science Monitor, published in Boston, reported that the NDP victory had "staggered the national leaders of the two old-line parties in Ottawa."

On only one previous occasion has the NDP won a majority in a provincial legislature -- in Saskatchewan, also in Western Canada -- but the NDP government was short-lived.

In Manitoba the NDP vote went from 23 percent in the previous election to 39 percent. The Conservatives dropped from 39 percent to 35 percent. One leader of the Liberals went over to the NDP after the election, declaring, "the Liberal party is dead."

NDP leader Edward Schreyer will be the new premier in Manitoba.

The capitalist politicians are especially worried that the NDP upset may be repeated in British Columbia, where elections may be held later this year.

The Workers Vanguard, a revolutionary-socialist newspaper published in Toronto, said in a July 14 editorial:

"The Manitoba election is a victory for the principle of independent labor political action. With one stride thousands have entered the political arena, independent of the capitalist parties and under the banner of a party based on the organized labor movement. It is true that the program of victory was not one of fundamental change, not socialist but liberal-reformist. Thus this first step has a faltering character.

"But with victory, anticipations are high. With this breakthrough the whole motion is forward -- in the direction of socialism, the only way out for the workers of Canada and the entire world."

"To be sure," the paper added, "it is a victory for the liberal reformists in the party if only for the fact that they are in the leadership of the party. But they do not control the breaker that is beginning to surge forward. They are only riding on its surface.

"It is a victory for the socialists in the NDP, for the Socialist Causes, for the Workers Vanguard and for the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière. It is a victory for all those who have struggled to win the party to a class struggle policy and a socialist perspective....

"Now, with Manitoba and the promises of victory elsewhere, the socialists will be able to move out of the narrow discussion circles to which they have been limited and much closer to the broad arena of the class struggle."

THE NINTH CONGRESS OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

By Livio Maitan

As was to be expected, the Ninth Congress of the Chinese CP -- which was the culmination of the struggle begun in November 1965 -- essentially represented a reorganization and reaffirmation of the party as the primary instrument of leadership and command in all spheres of the country's life.

So far the documents have been published only in part. Among other things, we know nothing about the two speeches given by Mao Tsetung. While the report issued about the congress stressed the exceptional value of these speeches, it quoted only one sentence from them, the importance of which was purely propagandistic: "We hope that the present congress will be a congress of unity and a congress of victory and that, after its conclusion, still greater victories will be won throughout the country."

It is probable, in my opinion, that Mao's speeches were in the vein of all his contributions during the "cultural revolution," that is, characterized by statements of very general truths put in the form of moral maxims or exhortations. The real meaning can be determined only by reference to the concrete context in each instance.

We also know nothing of the real debates or even the speeches given by the most important representatives of the Mao tendency (the official report mentioned Chou En-lai, Chen Po-ta, Kang Sheng, Huang Yong-cheng, etc.).

In contrast to the 1956 congress, the Ninth Congress did not adopt a single resolution. The only document approved, aside from the new statutes, was Lin Piao's report. As for the communiqués, whose apologetic character was painfully obvious, all they indicated was that the orientations expounded during the "cultural revolution," and especially in its final stage, were unanimously confirmed.

Despite the criteria that determined the selection of delegates -- the April 1 communiqué reiterated that they were "unanimously chosen...through full democratic consultation" and not merely "elected" -- it is still very probable that there were rather lively discussions and that differences were expressed. The fragmentations and differentiations which occurred within the Maoist tendency itself during the "cultural revolution" were no doubt reflected in this congress also.

The official communiqués, for their part, mentioned that "the delegates

have made many good proposals for additions to and modifications of the report" of Lin Piao. They alluded to the fact that a great many proposals had been made in regard to the new statutes (since November 1967, the Central Committee had received "several thousand drafts").

Most of all on the composition of the new Central Committee, the discussion was prolonged.* Above and beyond the methods of selection, it is obvious that very delicate questions of balanced representation of factions arose. What relative weight was to be given to the different elements active in the "cultural revolution"? It is significant that the first communiqué, which discussed the delegations present at the congress; and the final communiqué, which among other things announced the election of the Central Committee, both carefully stressed the representation of all the various strata and sectors of Chinese Communists.

It goes without saying, in any case, that the play of democracy was fundamentally perverted from the start. The opposition had been expelled or shunted into the background before the congress. Thus the delegates could not hear the oppositionists' views and, in practice, could only ratify accomplished facts.

The political guidelines approved may be seen from the April 24 communiqué, which summarized the essential themes, especially of the final stage of the "cultural revolution"; and from Lin Piao's report.

Lin's report clearly proposed to draw the conclusions from a whole period of struggles, and it did not, essentially, include any new elements. It was a balance sheet of the "cultural revolution," with chapters on its antecedents, its genesis, and its development.

It is significant from the standpoint of the content as well as the methodology and style of this document that it is built around an exceptional number of quotations from Mao Tsetung (more than sixty!).

* The discussion on political policy lasted April 1-14; the discussion on the Central Committee from the April 15-24. In all, the length of the congress was not exceptional in comparison to the past, if it is remembered that the Eighth Congress lasted September 15-27, 1956, and the Seventh Congress April 23-June 11, 1945.

Thus Lin Piao went back over the inevitability of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for the entire stage of the transition from capitalism to socialism. He went back to explain the errors and crimes of Liu Shao-chi, mixing up together real differences, denunciations based on grotesque amalgams, and the purest Stalinist-style slanders.

He described the major events of the "cultural revolution," in his own fashion, of course, without stopping to consider the wave of strikes at the beginning of 1967. He recalled the internal struggle in the Maoist tendency and the polemics against all kinds of left and right deviations leading up to the reorganization which culminated in September 1968.

For his central themes, Lin stressed the necessity that the apparatuses not become detached from the masses. (Liu was accused of having prevented Mao from getting his directives to the broad masses.)

He stressed the primary role played by the army. The allusions to economic problems were very brief. He noted the favorable market conditions and the stability of prices, as well as the full payment of the public debt both domestic and foreign. The fundamental orientation was confirmed that calls for giving priority to agriculture.

As for the intellectuals and students, the report repeated what has been said many times, especially since July 1968. Particularly stressed was the necessity for the intellectuals and students to accept direct supervision by the workers and peasants (which in practice means supervision of the reorganized apparatus) and the duty of the vanguard youth to go into the countryside and the mountainous regions (which reflects the persistence of the problem of finding openings for them in the industrial economy and the urban economy in general).

There was nothing new regarding international questions, on which the report introduced no adequately developed analyses. The only new element in this area was the overture for negotiations with the USSR to eliminate the border conflicts.

I cannot go back over the criticisms here that revolutionary Marxists have raised in regard to the Maoist conceptions which were reaffirmed in the report approved by the Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist party.*

* On this subject, see above all the resolution and report on China approved by the Ninth World Congress of the Fourth

We believe that these conceptions are an improper basis for finding a real solution to the crucial problems of the stage of transition from capitalism to socialism or for overcoming the contradictions that have convulsed postrevolutionary Chinese society. While the Maoists reject, most often correctly, the answers to the problems of the transition given by the post-Stalinist and post-Khrushchevist Soviet bureaucracy as well as by other East European bureaucracies, they nonetheless end up with a fundamentally erroneous analysis of the social nature of conflicts in transitional society and of the present nature of the USSR. As for themselves, the Chinese have projected orientations which in part are not new and in reality repeat criteria and conceptions already tried without success (for example, the Great Leap Forward and the launching of the People's Communes in 1958-59), in part smack of a propagandistic and voluntarist conception, and in part can at most have only temporary legitimacy and bearing.

The adoption of the new statutes merits comment. In general, the Chinese CP seems always to have had an empirical conception of its party statutes, inasmuch as they have always in large measure been adapted to the specific political needs of the time they were enacted (this has been reflected most of all in their preambles). The result has been that every congress has found itself compelled to adopt new statutes or to make marked changes in the old ones. And this has been all the more true because after a certain point, the highest party body met at highly infrequent intervals...* The 1969 statutes are no exception. In fact, they were directly inspired by the needs of the "cultural revolution." The themes of the "cultural revolution" are briefly recapitulated in the first chapter, in a statement that differs from previous expositions only by its greater conciseness.

Regarding the content of the statutes, the fundamental principles remain the same as in the 1945 and 1956 bylaws. Especially in the case of the norms governing the right of criticism, the right of appeal to higher bodies, etc., the changes were much more a matter of language than substance. Also with respect to the frequency of congresses, the five-year interval was maintained, although with a modification that implied a limi-

International [published in the July 14 issue of Intercontinental Press].

* New statutes were adopted by the 1938 and 1945 congresses and in 1956 the statutes were rectified to a considerable extent.

tation of the powers of the congress.*

This point deserves emphasis. In the first place, the statutory rules on the frequency of congresses were never respected by the bureaucracy, although it itself pushed through the adoption of these provisos. No justification, for example, of the absence of congresses in the long and crucial period from 1945 to 1956 could be anything but mendacious and hypocritical. But in any case, these intervals would be excessively long and would permit an exercise of almost uncontrolled authority by the leading groups.

What the article on the frequency of congresses represents seems clear if we remember that the congress is considered "the highest leading body of the Party" (article No. 6) and that according to the Maoist principles which reject any kind of "polycentrism," the "organs of state power of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the People's Liberation Army, and the Communist Youth League and other revolutionary mass organizations, such as those of the workers, the poor and lower-middle peasants and the Red Guards, must all accept the leadership of the party." In this context, the article in question seems a reflection in statutory terms of the fundamentally bureaucratic nature of the regime, of its bureaucratic character which has subsisted in spite of all the storms and propagandistic bluster of the "cultural revolution."**

But the regime's bureaucratic nature is revealed still more clearly by the basic conception of the new statutes, the canonization of Mao's thought, which is enthroned as the highest criterion. This is shown not only in the reaffirmation, in much stronger terms, of the 1945 formulas that were criticized in 1956. It is reflected above all in the statutory proclamation of Mao as party chairman and of Lin Piao's right to succeed him.*** If

memory serves correctly, this statutory enthronement is, in fact, an innovation. To what extent it might be considered an original contribution to Marxism is another problem whose solution I will leave to the apologists of Maoism, especially those of the spontanéist variety...

The congress marked the end of the crisis which shook China from top to bottom since November 1965. Lin Piao did not hide the fact that the leading group wants to rehabilitate the old cadres as much as possible and even deal respectfully with the intellectuals who were termed "reactionary academic authorities." In general, he recommended an attitude of leniency toward adversaries. However, the Mao-Lin Piao group's control is not yet evenly consolidated and in certain areas the "purification" has not yet begun.*

But the conflicts will break out again, especially when it becomes necessary to make a real accounting of economic development and the political and social gains. The problems China has to confront remain enormous and will create very serious difficulties for quite a long period.

In the last analysis, these problems can only be solved in an international context; they can only be solved when the world revolution has won new victories in Asia and on the other continents and when, as a result of this, the construction of socialism in China itself is placed in a qualitatively different context.**

May 15, 1969

always "chairman." This also is very revealing as to the extent of the equalitarian conceptions held by the Chinese bureaucracy.

* See Chapter 4 of Lin Piao's report. In the same chapter he alludes to "places where the revolutionary great alliance has not yet been sufficiently consolidated" and to "units where the work of purifying the class ranks has not yet started or only just started."

** It is interesting that Lin Piao quoted this statement by Mao (made in October 1968): "We cannot speak of final victory. Not even for decades. We must not lose our vigilance. According to the Leninist viewpoint, the final victory of a socialist country not only requires the efforts of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people at home, but also depends on the victory of the world revolution and the abolition of the system of exploitation of man by man on the whole globe...." (Chapter 5.)

* The 1956 statutes provided for a congress every five years, but at the same time they introduced the principle -- never honored in practice -- of calling a session of the congress every year. The 1945 statutes provided for a new congress every three years.

** It goes without saying that the frequency of congresses is not in itself a decisive criterion.

*** The congress confirmed the fact that Maoism predominates over Marxism-Leninism in the ideology of the Chinese Communists (the portrait of Mao alone dominated the great hall of the congress...). One detail usually goes unnoted. During the 1956 congress, Mao was called "comrade"; now this title never reoccurs. Mao is

Message from Jose Revueltas to the World Congress of the Fourth International

[José Revueltas is one of the best-known writers of Latin America. His second novel *El Luto Humano* (Human Mourning) won the national prize for literature in Mexico in 1943. Long a member of the Communist party, he parted company with it in 1956. Recently he has devoted his attention primarily to studying the causes of the worldwide youth revolt. For this reason, the Díaz Ordaz government accused him of being the intellectual inspirer of the revolutionary struggle of the Mexican students which broke out following July 26, 1968. On October 2, 1968, he was arrested for "subversive activities." On April 5 José Revueltas sent the following message from his cell in the Mexico City preventive prison to the world congress of the Fourth International.

* * *

Comrades,

I greet the Third World Congress of the Fourth International After Reunification with enormous enthusiasm. This meeting will certainly result in the very near future in the creation of a revolutionary general staff uniting all the independent Marxist-Leninists throughout the world. And this general staff will lead the great mass struggles already in progress and constantly growing in power and immensity, struggles that will inevitably lead to the victory of the new world revolution before the end of this half of the twentieth century.

The years to come will be decisive not only for the destiny of socialism throughout the world but for the very existence of humanity. This can be understood when you take into account the new factors which appeared in contemporary history following the end of the second world war. These factors transformed the old components of reality and transmuted them into essentially new — and generally unforeseen — phenomena. These elements cannot be approached with the aid of certain *classical* Marxist concepts, which without losing their basic methodological correctness have nonetheless been superseded by this new reality.

The discovery of the technique of splitting the atom and its military use as a weapon of genocidal destruction is the direct dialectical opposite in the twentieth century of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth. Revolutionary Marxism was not able to comprehend the significance of this fact immediately. It had to master it gradually and at the cost of a certain number of surprises. The military use of atomic energy combined with factors of a historic context which seemed made to order for it as a medium in which to grow and develop to its utmost limits. Or, to put it the other way, this richly favorable medium made possible the direct emergence of man's splitting of the atom as a historically unprecedented destructive force instead of permitting the application of this discovery to an equally unprecedented development of the productive

forces. Strictly speaking, if shortly after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the Soviet Union was able to build its own atomic bomb, it is by no means a foolish or light-minded question to ask why the socialist states could not outstrip imperialist technology and develop nuclear fission for peaceful construction, which the capitalist modes of production had undermined throughout the world. Neither the question nor the answer are foolish or light-minded, although historically they have a different name. The most adequate description of the question is *utopian*; of the answer, brutally *objective*. With respect to the utopianism of the question — it was impossible to expect that after forty years of Stalinism Soviet socialism would respond as a proletarian, revolutionary, and internationalist power capable of becoming the decisive force in the struggle for the liberation of the working class and the peoples of the world. As for the objective character of the answer, the Soviet Union appeared in history as a *new type of state*, which was only a "proletarian" counterpart of the "pure" power alienation which developed among the nations after they got possession of atomic energy. The logical implications of this type of state have become steadily more clear and unmistakable. And they already do not exclude — or rather they specifically countenance — armed clashes between socialist states, that is, in plain words, war between "workers states."

Behind all this, of course, appears, like an inexorable specter, the ever more monstrous shadow of socialism in one country, swollen by new accretions. With or without Stalin, the theory and practice of *socialism in one country* could not help but widen and deepen the course of its distorting dialectic. Within this dialectic, the historic contradiction between socialism in one country and world revolution is resolved in an alienated form which does not overcome the contradiction but causes it to coexist in an inevitably counterrevolutionary and reactionary equilibrium of opposites. And this equilibrium of opposites is masked by a social appearance which gives specific and marked emphasis to the socialization of the means of production, as if this already constituted the entire historical desideratum. Thus, because it has not transcended itself through transformation into world revolution, *socialism in one country* becomes national and geopolitical socialism in a series of countries. Here, then, is another of the previously uncomprehended new factors in the contemporary context of the second half of the twentieth century. This explains why the countries which made their own revolution during and after the second world war and which sustained themselves essentially by their own resources, like China and Yugoslavia, were the first to break with this false "world system" of socialist countries. But in this break also there was and is a fundamental deformation and corruption. Both China and Yugoslavia (the latter perhaps less so but only because of its lesser spe-

cific weight) have assumed national positions completely alien to the real, historical interest of the world working class.

Revolutionary Marxism has already faced, and in the very near future will still face, a context of widening and deepening revolutionary convulsions. The logic of these convulsions implies first of all undermining the present state of socialist consciousness dominated and distorted by the Communist parties in most of the countries in the world. This means that the essential task is to create a proletarian, internationalist, Marxist revolutionary world party. And the Fourth International will doubtless devote its maximum effort to this end.

What, then, is the *key point*, the nerve center of the distortion and the confusion of worldwide socialist consciousness? This point is none other than the alienation of the *real* historic consciousness of the proletariat, transforming it into *atomic consciousness*. This takes the form of the regression of consciousness to the level of simple, immediate, sense perception. It is the mental reflex of possessing atomic energy as a *weapon* of war, which rests in a feeling of security and power for the country possessing it, in a feeling that it is a collective good and a sacrosanct common heritage. (We have already seen how in the period 1914-18 the "socialist" masses of Germany and France opted for the defense of their respective imperialist bourgeois fatherlands). This "atomic consciousness" affects equally the proletarian masses of the USSR and People's China, as, in another sense it explains the criminal blindness so far of the immense majority of the American working class.

The New World Revolution, whose presence can be discerned in the great mass struggles already shaping up on the horizon, cannot be separated from this world context, whose decisive characteristic is the possession of nuclear weapons by groups of states with different social systems—the USSR and China on the one hand and the imperialist powers on the other. This poses the problem of human alienation in categorical terms which supersede the old formula of *revolutionary war* as the conduct of class struggle by other means. Humanity must choose between two alternatives—atomic war or world revolution, it being understood of course that the latter must include the specific forms of revolution that are to be adopted in the socialist countries.

If the socialist powers had not abandoned proletarian internationalism in favor of geopolitical nationalism, the problem of averting and preventing an atomic war would have an unequivocal, revolutionary, and Leninist answer—*unilateral destruction* of their respective nuclear arsenals by the Soviet Union and China. Today, the only realistic outlook for preventing nuclear war is the perspective of international action by the proletariat and the popular masses of all countries under a leadership that represents *organized consciousness* on a world scale—that is the creation of a proletarian internationalist world party embracing, along with the old cadres of Trotskyist fighters, the new independent Marxist-Leninist currents. The task of any future revolution in any of the nuclear powers is to emancipate proletarian consciousness from its atomic alienation. Wherever it occurs, this new revolution can only be an *internationalist* revolution, which will renounce its own atomic power and will be prepared

to do so unilaterally. This *unilateral* renunciation would signify the shattering of the unity which, as an antihistorical whole, represents the military form of existence of atomic energy without regard to whether these weapons belong to socialist or imperialist countries.

In no case can atomic weapons be considered defensive, even in repelling an aggression of the same type. Atomic energy would make any war—whatever its causes—the most reactionary of all reactionary wars in human history. It is impossible to propose an atomic war for any revolutionary purpose, even the extermination of imperialism. Such a proposal would only be a kind of "spiritual effluvium" of an alienation of revolutionary consciousness in the realm of practice resulting from a reflex reaction against imperialist consciousness, a mirror reflection of imperialist consciousness. In this case, imperialist consciousness would have driven revolutionary consciousness—and it is doing so—to its own disrealization, to complete and utter irrationality in its own revolutionary terms. As long as this fact has not been sufficiently understood by free and unalienated Marxism to be subsumed in *praxis*, that is embodied in the inherent pattern of all revolutionary practice, this praxis will lack real historical meaning, however advanced and radical its external manifestations may seem. Revolutionary forms, deprived of this praxis, cannot but be—as they are now—only a futile testimony to a succession of chimerical actions and movements, no more than "shadow boxing" with nothingness.

The disruption of atomic monolithism by a country in which the revolution takes power—or where it has already taken power, as in the Soviet Union or People's China—would be a brake on nuclear war. The *compromising of the total character* of atomic power within the family of nuclear states would create an imbalance in the atomic condominium. This fact would have the greatest importance in rousing the proletariat and the people of all nations of the world to revolution. It would be the beginning of the end of the use of atomic energy as an instrument of war. This is the only way proletarian internationalism can be expressed within the atomic context of the contemporary world.

The New Revolution will have a dual character. It will be both anticapitalist and antidogmatic and will embrace at once the countries still dominated by the bourgeoisie, the socialist countries, and the countries of the so-called Third World. The New Revolution will be a qualitative leap with respect to the role played by the Communist parties over the last fifty years since the death of Lenin. Of course, it will be a *revisionist* revolution. It will *revise* the role the Communist parties have played and put freedom and democracy on the order of the day in conformity with the Marxist principles of struggle to end human alienation. It will transform the party from an instrument of state domination into an organ of collective consciousness, of the highest and most developed forms of consciousness. It will subvert the concept and the practice of converting the notion of the proletariat into an absolute, transforming the theory and practice of class struggle into an ever broader fusion of conscious society. The New Revolution cannot succeed without the dialectic development intrinsically represented by the proletariat which negates itself

as a social class. This New Revolution will broaden its sphere of action with respect to the relations between the working class and other social strata. It will supersede the old—though illustrious and combative—concept of "Workers of the World Unite" with that of "Let Us Pass from the Realm of Necessity to the Realm of Freedom."

Then the great masses of humanity will play the role of conscious creators in the historical process for the first time in human history.

Comrades: Again I greet you, with joy and confidence in the future from my present post of combat, a revolutionist's cell in the Mexico City preventive prison.

REDUCED SUMMER SCHEDULE

As mentioned in a previous issue, we are now on our reduced summer schedule. During July we published two issues, one of them a special 72-page number containing the major documents and reports of the world congress of the Fourth In-

ternational. During August, we will not publish anything unless something big happens -- like a revolution.

We will resume on a regular weekly basis at the beginning of September.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Spiro T. Agnew	737
November 15 Set for Mass Action in Washington Against Vietnam War	738
5,000 in Melbourne March Against Vietnam War	739
U.S. Nerve Gas Raises Temperatures in Okinawa	740
Interview with Japanese Antiwar Leaders:	
The Struggle Against the U.S. Occupation of Okinawa	741
For the Man Who Has Had Everything	743
The Antiwar Movement in West Germany -- by Lothar Boepfle	744
Agnew Ready to Take Off for Mars -- If He Can Stay in Vietnam	745
Nixon's Real Game in Rumania -- Chinese Checkers?	746
DRAWING: Henry Kissinger	746
Chilean Police Hunt Luis Vitale	747
Repression in Chile -- by Roberto Icaza	748
The Crisis in Italy -- by Guy Desolre	749
From Czechoslovakia:	
Students Resist Order to Dissolve University Union	751
A Case of Trotskyist "Boring from Within"?	752
Why an Auto Costs Twice as Much in Latin America	753
Claim Pro-Moscow Forces Fingered Guerrillas in Indonesia	755
Colonial Economy Burdens Philippines	756
Saigon Leave-Taking Just a Gimmick to GIs	756
Uruguay Ripe for Revolution	757
DRAWING: President Jorge Pacheco Areco	757
An Eyewitness Account:	
The Demonstrations in the City of Córdoba	759
Manitoba NDP Victory Stuns Old Parties in Canada	762
The Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party -- by Livio Maitan	763
Documents:	
Message from José Revueltas to the World Congress of the Fourth International ...	766

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.