

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 7, No. 42

© 1969 Intercontinental Press

December 15, 1969

50c



—From the Black Dwarf

## **Nixon, Wilson Assailed Over Vietnam Massacre**

Tariq Ali Barred from United States

The Strike Wave in Europe

Chicago Police Slay Hampton and Clark

# Lively Water

The December 3 *New York Times* reported an intriguing complaint from some of the residents of the world's richest city. Above 110th Street, in the black ghetto, an unusual liveliness has been noted in the drinking water since September 17.

"Mrs. Joan Coates turned on a faucet of the sink in her Harlem apartment," the *Times* reported, "then gasped in horror. The water she had drawn appeared to be swarming with tiny worms."

One black spokesman told reporters at a press conference: "People are drinking juice, milk—anything but water." Neighborhood women brought bottles of the worm-filled water to show reporters.

The wrigglers were identified as larvae of the chironomidae, a family of small, mosquito-like flies. They were traced to one of New York's three major reservoirs. A second reservoir is thought to act as a settling basin, removing the worms from water piped to predominantly white areas.

According to the Health Department, the larvae are "not dangerous." Officials have done no more than increase the chlorine, failing to clear the water.

Cornelius McDougald, a Harlem community leader, told Department of Water Resources director John Egan: "I'm not sure the efforts of your department have been what they would have been if the complaints had come from another part of Manhattan." [That is, where the whites live.]

Egan said that water from another system would be diverted to the affected area. "But this will stir up iron and other settled matter in the mains. . . . You'll get red water, and that may be more offensive than what you have now."

A sand filtration plant, he said, was the only sure way to eliminate the larvae, but it would take at least five years to put such a plant into operation. Meanwhile he hoped for a prolonged cold wave that might kill the unpalatable little organisms.

## In This Issue

		FEATURES
	1106	Lively Water
		VIETNAM WAR
Les Evans	1107	Worldwide Revulsion Over Songmy Massacre
	1116	Ky, Thieu Tell Different Stories
		CHINA
	1108	Peking Fears Nuclear Strike
		U. S. A.
	1109	Tariq Ali Barred from the United States
	1110	Mandel Ban Draws Wide Criticism
	1111	Alistair Cooke on the Mandel Case
	1112	"Daily World" Protest on Mandel Exclusion
	1113	Chicago Police Slay Hampton and Clark
Ray Follett	1114	Ultrarightists Raid SWP, YSA Headquarters
		ARGENTINA
	1112	Ongania Frees More Political Prisoners
		BOLIVIA
	1115	Free the Political Prisoners!
	1119	Ask Amnesty for Regis Debray
		MEXICO
	1115	Political Prisoners Threaten Hunger Strike
		AUSTRIA
	1116	Stalinists Gain Vienna CP
		GREAT BRITAIN
T. Philips	1117	Nixon, Wilson Assailed Over Vietnam Massacre
		CEYLON
	1118	Senanayake Fishes for N.M. Perera
		FRANCE
Gerry Foley	1119	Lambertists Knife Aid for Bolivian Victims
		PERU
	1128	Hugo Blanco on Land Reform in Peru
		DOCUMENTS
	1120	The Strike Wave in Europe
	1124	Balance Sheet of the Student Movement
		DRAWINGS
Copain	1116	Nguyen Cao Ky; 1116, Nguyen Van Thieu

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square 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 in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August.

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.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.

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 first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York 10010. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U.S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright © 1969 by Intercontinental Press.

## Worldwide Revulsion Over Songmy Massacre

By Les Evans

The revelation of the massacre of hundreds of Vietnamese civilians by American troops at Songmy (Mylai) in March 1968, has dealt a heavy blow to Nixon's plans to prolong the war indefinitely. It is too soon to gauge the full impact, but a first assessment was made by the *Washington Post* December 1. "The adverse effects," said staff writer Murrey Marder, "several officials suggest, may nullify the Administration's success in riding out the October and November anti-war demonstrations.

"At a maximum, another official trained in making Vietnamese war calculations said, Mylai could become the breaking point for the American tolerance level of the war. . . .

"By this assessment," Marder added, "if the shock effect of Mylai grows so great that a majority of Americans conclude the war is brutalizing the nation to the extent that the goals are not worth the cost, it will be impossible to pursue it."

In fact, Nixon's "success" in riding out the October and November antiwar actions is highly dubious. On the contrary, a recent Louis Harris poll shows a dramatic increase in opposition to the war tied directly to the protests, while the effects of the Songmy disclosures have yet to be measured.

The Harris survey, taken immediately after the November 15 march on Washington and San Francisco and released December 4, showed that 46 percent of those interviewed—a plurality—sympathized with "the goals of the people who are demonstrating, marching, and protesting against the war in Vietnam." Some 45 percent said they disagreed with the aims of the protests, while 9 percent were undecided. The sympathizers had increased by 7 percent from a similar poll taken in October.

The poll provided an even sharper refutation of Nixon's claim to speak for a "great silent majority." Some 52 percent of those polled said they agreed with the statement that "Demonstrators are right in believing [the

Vietnam] war is morally indefensible and [it] was a mistake for [the] U.S. to be there." Only 37 percent said they disagreed.

In face of this overwhelming rejection of its policy, the government has sought to minimize the exposures of American war crimes. But the press, under heavy pressure from the popular antiwar sentiment, has refused to play along.

*Newsweek's* Pentagon correspondent Lloyd Norman reported in the December 8 issue:

"The Army has hidden behind every possible legal bush to avoid adding any more drama to the story. When I asked Pentagon officials two weeks ago for the details of the charges [against Lieut. William L. Calley, the only man formally charged at this writing], I was rebuffed with the reminder that the Army could not prejudice the case by prematurely releasing evidence. It is obvious, in fact, that the military dragged their feet and their law books as long as they could."

The army even asked the United States Court of Military Appeals on December 1 to impose a ban on all further publication or broadcast of statements and photographs concerning the massacre until Calley is brought to trial at a still unspecified date. The court rejected this attempt to muzzle the press.

Various government figures have reminded the nation of Nixon's November 3 denunciation of the National Liberation Front's "massacre" at Hue during the 1968 Tet offensive. The claim is being made that the NLF is responsible for more civilian casualties than the United States. What is not mentioned is that those executed at Hue were not old men, women, and children, but officers, police, and officials who were underlings of the Thieu-Ky dictatorship.

One side in this "equation" is fighting to free its homeland from a foreign imperialist invader and its accomplices; the other side, the strongest military power in the world, is

seeking to impose a puppet dictatorship by force on an underdeveloped country, and is executing women and children in the process to terrorize the population into acquiescence.

As for the figures on civilian casualties, Senator Edward Kennedy gave some idea of the real scope of American atrocities in Vietnam. The December 3 *Washington Post* reported:

"Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) said yesterday that 300,000 civilians in South Vietnam had been killed in the last four years, most of them by U.S. and South Vietnamese fire power."

Kennedy, reporting for the Senate Refugee Committee, of which he is chairman, said that there have been more than 1,000,000 civilian casualties in Vietnam since 1965, primarily caused by American bombing and shelling. "The casualty figures," Kennedy added, "are really on the conservative side."

With the exception of Kennedy, most of the congressional "doves" seemed unwilling to initiate any new criticism of the war. Nixon was able on December 2 to push through the House of Representatives a resolution endorsing his efforts to negotiate a "just peace" in Vietnam. Administration spokesmen let it be known in advance that they regarded the measure as a blank check for Nixon's war policy. In a remarkable display of servility to the White House, 333 of the legislators endorsed Nixon's resolution while only fifty-five voted against.

There was a suggestion that the government may take a leaf from General Thieu's book and try to deny that the Songmy massacre took place. Captain Ernest L. Medina, company commander of the unit that carried out the killings, held a press conference December 4 in which he denied that he had seen or ordered any massacre. He claimed that only twenty-eight civilians had been killed, by artillery, helicopter miniguns, rockets, and small arms, while driving a guerrilla force out of the village.

Although several members of the

company have publicly testified either that Medina gave the order for the shooting of hundreds of civilians or was present and did not stop the killing, the army has not charged him and he does not face court-martial.

A devastating rebuttal to Medina appeared in the December 5 issue of *Life* magazine, including photographs of the victims of Songmy taken by army photographer Ronald Haeberle. The accompanying article included eyewitness accounts by a number of the participants in the massacre.

One of Medina's squad leaders, Sergeant Charles West, said the captain gave the order "to destroy Mylai and everything in it."

Haeberle described what he had seen:

"Off to the right a woman's form, a head, appeared from some brush. All the other GIs started firing at her, aiming at her, firing at her over and over again. She had slumped over into one of those things that stick out of the rice paddies so that her head was a propped-up target. There was no attempt to question her or anything. They just kept shooting at her. You could see the bones flying in the air chip by chip. . . .

"There was a little boy walking toward us in a daze. He'd been shot in the arm and leg. He wasn't crying or making any noise." Haeberle knelt down to photograph the boy. A soldier knelt down next to him. "The GI fired three shots into the child. The first shot knocked him back, the second shot lifted him into the air. The third shot put him down and the body fluids came out. The GI just simply got up and walked away."

Army reporter Jay Roberts testified:

"Just outside the village there was this big pile of bodies. This really tiny little kid—he only had a shirt on, nothing else—he came over to the pile and held the hand of one of the dead. One of the GIs behind me dropped into a kneeling position, 30 meters from this kid, and killed him with a single shot."

Specialist 5 John Kinch, who is presently on active duty in Vietnam, was the leader of the heavy weapons squad in Mylai that day. He told *Life*:

"We moved into Pinkville and found another stack of bodies in a ditch. It must have been six or seven feet deep and they were level with the top

of it. One body, an old man, had a 'C' carved on his chest." The unit that carried out the massacre was C Company of the First Battalion, 20th Infantry, 11th Infantry Brigade of the American Division. Kinch continued:

"Captain Medina was right in front of us. Colonel Barker, the task force commander, was overhead in his helicopter. . . . Colonel Barker called down for a body count and Medina got back on the horn [radio] and said, 'I have a body count of 310.'"

The reaction in Europe has sharpened in the weeks since the slaughter was first publicized. Foreign Minister Torsten Nelsson of Sweden said in a speech in Malmoe at the end of November: "World opinion cannot be silent about the American war crimes in Vietnam."

In Norway, the chairman and vice-chairman of the Liberal party, which is in the coalition government, joined the Labor party opposition in calling for the recognition of North Vietnam.

In the Netherlands, the Social Democratic *Het Vrije Volk* wrote: "The Americans have been killing the people they wanted to protect. This means the bankruptcy of United States Vietnam policy."

The Paris weekly *L'Express*, published by Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, compared Mylai to the German

massacre at Oradour-sur-Glane in central France in 1944, and to French atrocities in Indochina and Algeria.

The conservative London *Spectator* said American withdrawal from Vietnam is now "both a necessary act of state and a human imperative."

The November 29 London *Guardian* warned the Pentagon that its plan to court-martial only one or two low-ranking officers would only increase the disbelief in the army's claims that Songmy was an exception and not typical of the U. S. aggression in Vietnam.

"It will give the impression that platoon commanders and others of low rank, however criminal their acts, are being made the scapegoats for savage events over which more senior officers ought to share the blame. It will also tend to give the impression that what happened at Pinkville has probably happened in two dozen other places, but so far has been successfully hushed up."

But a wide investigation of Washington's genocidal course in Vietnam is something Nixon and the Pentagon want to avoid at all costs (unless they themselves do the "investigating"). As *Newsweek* put it December 8, there is the "possibility that the Song My incident could prove to be only the tip of a blood-soaked iceberg."

## Peking Fears Nuclear Strike

That Peking fears an unfavorable outcome to the talks with Moscow now proceeding behind tightly locked doors can be gathered from the feverish preparations for a possible nuclear attack.

"China's drive to strengthen its defenses against Soviet attack smacks of panic," L. F. Goodstadt writes in the December 4 issue of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*.

"The main Chinese concern," he continues, "seems to be with civil defence. In the capital itself, work on the underground railway has suddenly become a crash programme. Its stations and subways would provide protection for a considerable part of Peking's population in the event of a nuclear attack. In Shanghai, air raid shelters are under construction in every street. In Canton, a vast tunnel

complex has been dug, and air raid shelters linked to the tunnels are being built beneath the larger blocks of offices and flats. Ordinary households are being urged to dig their own air raid shelters."

In the same issue of the Hongkong magazine, the anonymous columnist who writes "Traveler's Tales" reports:

"Businessmen who have returned from Canton over the last month have reported on the extensive digging of air-raid shelters in that city.

"In Peking, visitors report that every house and compound is digging its air-raid shelter (usually L-shaped and about 10 feet deep). Military exercises are being ostentatiously carried out, and the zones around the Peking city walls and the Ming Tombs have been temporarily placed out of bounds."

## Tariq Ali Barred from the United States

The U.S. State Department barred the Pakistani-born antiwar leader Tariq Ali from the United States December 1. Ali, who is a well-known figure internationally, had been scheduled to give the keynote address at the convention of the Association of Arab American University Graduates [AAUG] in Detroit on December 5.

The ban on Tariq Ali's visit came a few days after the Belgian Marxist Ernest Mandel was denied a visa to participate in a seminar in New York organized by the Socialist Scholars Conference and the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. In Mandel's case the State Department authorized issuing a visa but was overruled by the Justice Department. Both Ali and Mandel are prominent Trotskyists.

According to the *New York Times* of December 3, "Officials explained that the two cases were not specifically related." The pretext given for refusing a visa to Tariq Ali, the *Times* reported, was an allegation that on November 23 he burned an American flag in front of the U.S. embassy in London during a demonstration against the war in Vietnam.

An article in the *Detroit Free Press* following the State Department's action gave a somewhat different version. The Detroit paper reported that William Dale, deputy administrator of security and consular affairs, said that Ali was refused a visa on the basis of the fact that "he was with a group of demonstrators who burned an American flag." Dale reportedly claimed that the State Department did not object to Ali's opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam but to the "anti-American nature" of the demonstration.

The demonstration the State Department spokesman referred to was a protest following the disclosures on the Songmy massacre. [See article on page 1117.]

Various political tendencies were represented in it, including Maoists as well as members of the International Marxist Group, the British section of the Fourth International, of which Tariq Ali is a leading spokesman.

It is not unlikely that the new Mc-

Carthyites of the Nixon administration view Tariq Ali as a walking arsenal of dangerous thoughts. He was one of the organizers of the October 27, 1968, antiwar march in London in which 100,000 people participated, along with a number of trade unions. He chaired the mass rally at the conclusion of the demonstration.

Tariq Ali testified in 1967 before the Bertrand Russell International War Crimes Tribunal investigating U.S. atrocities in Vietnam. He reported on American violations of Cambodian neutrality and the systematic and massive bombing of the civilian population of North Vietnam.

Tariq Ali is the editor of the *Black Dwarf*, a lively biweekly paper of the young British left, which has supported the antibureaucratic revolution in the Soviet bloc states as well as the student revolts in the industrialized countries and the anti-imperialist struggles in the colonial world.

His book *The New Revolutionaries*, which presents a sampling of the views of various representatives of the new generation of freedom fighters around the world, is well known in America. A review was featured in the *New York Times*.

Obviously, Tariq Ali's socialist outlook does not at all make him "anti-American." Nor does the allegation that he participated in a demonstration where an American flag was burned.

Since when are prospective visitors to the United States required to demonstrate allegiance to the Stars and Stripes?

Furthermore, millions of U.S. citizens have taken part in demonstrations against the Vietnam war in which some individuals or small participating groups have sought to dramatize their opposition to the genocidal policy followed by the White House in Vietnam by burning flags and draft cards.

The slightest respect for the feelings of a world outraged by the crimes in Vietnam ought to call for at least shamefaced silence over the lack of respect shown abroad to the nation-

al symbols of the U.S. that have been so deeply dishonored.

It is an exercise in "doublethink" for the American government to brand Tariq Ali guilty by association in the burning of an American flag while at the same time it denies responsibility by association or otherwise for the atrocities committed by its forces at Songmy and elsewhere in Vietnam. The truth is, of course, that the Nixon administration, like the Johnson administration before it, considers it patriotic Americanism to burn Vietnamese babies.

The Association of Arab American University Graduates issued an immediate and sharp protest against the State Department action. It expressed special anger because the officials had waited to act until a few days before Ali was scheduled to speak, despite the fact that they had been notified months in advance that he would be applying for a visa.

The press release issued by the organization said, in part: "The AAUG regards the arbitrary and discriminatory action of the State Department as both procedurally and constitutionally infirm. . . .

"The Conference which is being sponsored by the AAUG is an open, public meeting of many people of different persuasions. Both the individual members of the Association and members of the public at large have a right under the First Amendment to hear speeches and lectures, just as they have a right to read materials presenting controversial points of view. The Supreme Court of the United States has already decided in the *Lamont* case that the U.S. Postal Department may not censor or refuse delivery of printed matter expressing controversial social, political and economic points of view, even though that material be sent from Communist countries. May the State Department censor the points of view which American citizens may hear or be exposed to by denying entry visas to individuals who have been invited to present their point of view? The Association of Arab American University Graduates thinks not."

## Mandel Ban Draws Wide Criticism

"Mandel's ideas may clash with American beliefs, but there is something absurd in the whole McCarran Act notion that the U. S. must be protected from dangerous alien contamination by keeping out certain travelers."

That was the view of *Time* magazine (December 5) on the Justice Department's refusal to allow Ernest Mandel, the Belgian Marxist economist, to visit the United States for a speaking engagement.

The adverse decision split the highest echelons of the Nixon administration (the State Department had endorsed Mandel's visit), and has been taken by the press as further evidence of the (Joseph) McCarthyite mentality of Attorney General John N. Mitchell, the author of the ban.

Mandel has announced that he will take legal action against Mitchell in behalf of freedom of speech in the U. S. There are also reports that the State Department may press the case.

It was the State Department that announced the ban November 26, but officials made no attempt to justify the action, attributing to the Justice Department the refusal to grant a routine waiver from the now disused anti-Communist McCarran-Walter Act of 1952. Mandel visited the U. S. in 1962 and 1968 under such waivers.

*Newsweek* described the current interchange on the waiver question in its December 8 issue:

"Once more the State Department urged a waiver. No, came the reply from Mitchell's shop. 'Why should we be afraid of this man and his ideas?' Secretary William Rogers fumed to an aide, and outraged State officials didn't even bother to paper over the interagency rift."

According to a Reuters dispatch that appeared in the November 28 *Los Angeles Times*, one State Department official declared, "The last chapter has not been written on this one."

Mandel has retained Leonard Boudin, the noted constitutional authority, as his personal attorney to test the constitutionality of the McCarran-Walter Act. Boudin is well known for his success in defending Julian Bond, the

Georgia civil-rights activist, who was denied the seat he had won in the state legislature because of his antiwar views, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the antiwar leader, who was recently acquitted after a frame-up trial on charges of conspiring to sabotage the military draft.

The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation of America, one of the sponsors of Mandel's visit, sent a letter to the Belgian government in an effort to determine the responsibility for the denial. The Belgian Ministry of State replied in a letter that the action was wholly the responsibility of the American government and Belgium had no part in the exclusion. The ministry said that on the contrary it favored a cultural exchange between the two countries.

The ban was widely reported abroad. We are reprinting below the article by Alistair Cooke that appeared in the November 28 British *Guardian* as an example. French-speaking Canadians were told about the case in the November 28 *Montréal-Matin*, owned by the ruling Union Nationale party.

Several U. S. publications interviewed Mandel, who is a contributing editor of *Intercontinental Press*. The November 29 *New York Times* carried the following dispatch from Brussels:

"Dr. Ernest Mandel, the Belgian Marxist who was refused a visa for a United States speaking tour this week, said here today [November 28] the refusal was the result of a previous visit, in which he broke certain rules of which he was not aware.

"I was informed, though not officially, that visas granted me in 1962 and last year had been issued with a State Department waiver concerning the McCarran Act," he said.

"It seems that one of its provisions bans persons who expound the economic doctrines of communism. This provision is set aside only on condition that the visitor strictly limits himself to the purpose of his trip and sticks to his itinerary. At the time I was not informed of this. I have

now been told that I altered my itinerary and attended a meeting where money was being collected. This is true, but I did not know I was breaking any rule."

"Dr. Mandel, editor of the weekly journal *La Gauche*, added that since the State Department had approved his latest visa application while the Justice Department had turned it down, he still hoped to receive permission to visit the United States.

"He has a series of speaking engagements at universities, including Princeton, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Vassar.

"He had been scheduled to take part in a panel discussion tomorrow organized by the Socialist Scholars Conference and the Bertrand Russell Foundation in New York. Questions will now be put to him by telephone.

"I am surprised at the great interest this visa issue has aroused since I am not at all an international celebrity," Dr. Mandel said. "It shows that public opinion in the United States is very much alive to the dangers that threaten our basic freedom."

*Time* magazine also interviewed Mandel in its December 5 issue.

"A revolutionary Marxist' is the way Belgian Economist Ernest Mandel describes himself," the widely read newsweekly said. "In 1962 and again in 1968, Mandel toured the U. S., lecturing at a number of universities. But because of his openly announced political creed, Mandel had to receive special clearance by the Department of Justice to make the trip. . . .

"His two earlier visits were authorized because the Justice Department decided that the political climate had mellowed since the [McCarran-Walter] act was passed. Now, apparently, Attorney General John Mitchell thinks that it has changed for the worse once again."

*Time* described Mandel's economic work:

"Mandel, who lives in Brussels and edits the militantly leftist weekly *La Gauche* (circ. 5,000), has written a number of books. His most recent is a two-volume work titled *Marxist Economic Theory*. Critics both in the U. S. and abroad have praised the book's fresh, undogmatic approach to Marxism, and the *Economist* felt that 'no student can afford to ignore this very important work.' . . .

"Mandel was surprised that the Jus-

tice Department opposed his entry into the U. S., 'surprised that the American government is afraid of people who defend Marxist doctrine when many Marxist books are freely sold in the U. S.' But he feels he has made some capital out of his rejection. 'If I had gone to the U. S.,' he says, 'I would have addressed audiences of about 100 people.' As a result of his rejection, adds Mandel, 'I have been interviewed by television, and 40 million Americans will listen to my views.'"

Mitchell's action against Mandel was designed to win approval from the Neanderthal right, the favored constituency of the Nixon administration. But if the supporters of former Alabama Governor George Wallace were pleased by the revival of the witch-hunt, Mitchell's know-nothing posturings are fast making him the laughingstock of the more sophisticated wing of the ruling class.

Washington columnists Frank Man-kiewicz and Tom Braden on December 2 discussed the effect of the Mandel case on Mitchell's political future:

"Attorney General Mitchell, who came here as the tough 'can do' man of the Nixon administration, is rapidly destroying himself before the eyes of colleagues who began their Cabinet careers in his awe.

"The former campaign manager has been responsible for most of President Nixon's political mistakes, but that is a minor problem compared to the fact that he is now responsible for the President's personal embarrassment. The past, one senses here, is still prologue."

The columnists pointed out that it was Mitchell who hired Major General Carl Turner as chief U. S. marshal shortly before it was charged that Turner had covered up fraud by an extortion ring of American sergeants in Vietnam.

Mitchell was also the architect of the unsuccessful attempt to place the reactionary Judge Clement Haynsworth on the U. S. Supreme Court.

But it was Martha Mitchell, the Attorney General's wife, "who has given the President his first major political embarrassment.

"In an astonishing nationwide television interview, Mrs. Mitchell attacked what she called 'the liberal Communists' in Washington and confided that she and her husband had been afraid

to come to the capital because of their presence. She went on to quote her husband as advocating the exchange of liberal Communists for Russian Communists, presumably on a one-to-one basis. . . ."

Mitchell, in a slightly modified form, endorsed his wife's version of his views:

"The trouble compounded when Mitchell, in another interview, sought to clarify his wife's remarks. First, he misquoted her in a grossly self-serving manner. Then he said that if, for the word 'liberal' in her remarks, one 'transposed' the phrase 'violent-prone militant radicals,' she would be understood better. So she would.

"Then, as far as the 'take-a-Bolshevik-to-lunch' campaign went, Mitchell laid some ground rules. He would prefer, he said, 'academically inclined Marxist Communists' to 'violent-

prone militant radicals,' and he would exchange them gladly, two for one.

"The test came swiftly. This week, expressly overruling Secretary of State William Rogers, Mitchell turned down the visa application for U. S. travel of Dr. George [sic] Mandel, a Belgian philosophical Marxist who had been invited to repeat an earlier lecture tour at several American universities.

"Mandel, as it turns out, was a leading Marxist critic of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, but it took minimal research to find that out, and research—evidently—is not Mitchell's long suit.

"The Attorney General may ultimately be overruled by the courts in the Mandel case, as he was in the case of the Southern school districts. But a larger test of credibility and respect lies ahead. Mitchell—despite his enormous power—is rapidly becoming a Washington joke."

## Alistair Cooke on the Mandel Case

[Under the title "'McCarthy' law used to ban a Marxist," the following account of the Ernest Mandel case appeared in the London *Guardian* of November 28. It was written by Alistair Cooke under a New York date-line.]

\* \* \*

In a hasty retreat to the letter of a law passed by Congress at the height of the McCarthy era, the Attorney-General of the United States has overruled the express wish of the Secretary of State and refused admission to this country of a foreign Marxist.

Dr Ernest Mandel is a Belgian editor, an avowed Marxist and a stern critic of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last year. By the terms of the McCarran Act, passed by Congress in 1952, he is, like all other members of certain "proscribed" organisations of that time, legally ineligible for a State Department visa. But since the death of Senator Joseph McCarthy in 1957 and the abandonment of the Communist hunt he inspired, innumerable Marxists, anarchists, and other heathens have been allowed in through the technicality of a waiver issued by the Attorney-General. Dr Mandel himself, for instance, was let in by the Kennedy administra-

tion in 1962; and last year, on the nod of the Johnson administration, he visited 30 universities and colleges on a lecture tour.

He was to start a shorter lecture trip on Saturday with an appearance here, under the auspices of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, and take part in a conference on "Agencies of Social Change: Toward a Revolutionary Strategy for Advanced Industrial Countries." He was meant to go on to talk to the philosophy department at Princeton on Monday and thence to Amherst, Columbia, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Vassar, and the New School for Social Research.

Dr Mandel applied for a visa last month and was refused on some extra-political technicality. He was told he might apply again and this time the visa was granted and was accompanied by a letter from Secretary of State Rogers urging Attorney-General Mitchell to grant the usual waiver of the law "in the national interest." Mr Mitchell replied to the State Department, which alone can issue the actual visa, that he would not allow Dr Mandel in. The State Department then mentioned that it might try to change the Attorney-General's mind.

It is the first time that anyone can remember an Attorney-General pub-

licly repudiating the Secretary of State on such an issue. The "New York Times," in a leading article today, lamented the action as "an example of autocratic insensitivity . . . the triumph of police over diplomacy, fear over freedom, and of ideological rigidity over democratic commonsense."

However, a way has been found to bring the Professor's ideas, if not his body, to his awaiting audience here in New York. His speech will be played in a recording before the Saturday conference at Town Hall and in the following discussion he is expected to take part over a transatlantic telephone circuit. This stragem introduces a new threat to the *cordon sanitaire* of the McCarran Act. And if the Department of Justice is in earnest about its revived quarantine on inflammatory ideas, it undoubtedly should seek a law prohibiting the arrival in the United States, via the vocal chords, of all thought, arguments, and doctrines that run counter to the political views of the Administration. It would, after all, merely implement the contention of Vice-President Agnew that the television and radio networks, as also the American press, "must be made more responsive to the views of the American people."

## 'Daily World' Protest

[The following editorial, protesting the Justice Department's refusal to allow Ernest Mandel to speak in the United States, appeared in the November 29 issue of the *Daily World*, the newspaper of the Communist party U. S. A.]

Attorney General John Mitchell is again proving to be the spearhead in the Nixon Administration's drive to wreck the Bill of Rights. Latest Mitchell thrust is barring entry to the U. S. of Ernest Mandel, the Belgian Trotskyite, to address today's Socialist Scholar's Conference. Characteristically, Mitchell has invoked the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952.

Clearly, the conference has a constitutional right to decide on its speakers. By preventing entry of Mandel the Justice Department attacks not only the conference but also the First Amendment rights of all Americans, irrespective of views. The Mitchell diktat should be reversed.

## Argentina

# Ongania Frees More Political Prisoners

More than 100 political prisoners were reported released in Argentina on November 28. The head of the military government, General Juan Onganía, had announced previously that his regime would soon release all the political prisoners arrested since the violent clashes in Córdoba last May.

Hundreds of persons, including many top union leaders, were arrested and sentenced to long prison terms during a wave of demonstrations and strikes in May and June against the military dictatorship's brutal suppression of the student and workers movement. These protests reached their peak in a virtual insurrection in the provincial city of Córdoba May 29-30 in which an estimated thirty persons were killed and 400 arrested.

Another wave of mass arrests followed the assassination of Augusto Vandor on June 30. Vandor was the leader of the wing of the labor movement that sought to collaborate with the military dictatorship. The shooting served as a pretext for arresting an estimated 500 opponents of the regime.

Of those arrested as a result of the Vandor assassination, about sixty are still in prison, according to *Le Monde's* Buenos Aires correspondent Philippe Labreux.

Among the trade-union leaders released are the heads of the Córdoba electrical workers union and mechanics union, Tosco and Torres, who had been sentenced to eight and four years in prison respectively by a special military tribunal after the Córdoba explosion.

According to the latest reports, however, the principal union leader imprisoned by the government, Raimundo Ongaro, the leader of the wing of the trade-union movement generally considered most militant, remains in jail. It is not yet clear whether the dictatorship intends to apply its amnesty in a discriminatory way, keeping its more determined opponents imprisoned.

With the release of a number of political prisoners, government circles are intimating that economic conces-

sions will be made to the workers, whose buying power has been seriously reduced by inflation. Government sources have also suggested that the state of siege, which has been in effect for five months, will be lifted.

As a crowning touch to this series of conciliatory moves and promises, the Onganía government organized a national religious ceremony in Luján, a town about forty miles from the capital, where the Argentinian Republic was "dedicated to the immaculate heart of the Virgin Mary."

It had been anticipated by observers of the Argentinian developments that the Onganía regime would have to attempt a conciliatory turn. The sudden popular explosion in May and June had shown that the dictatorship was dangerously isolated. Even sectors of the army balked at the massive repression necessary to keep the regime in power.

It is too early to say how effective Onganía's concessions will be in reducing opposition to his government. It seems noteworthy, however, that both Catholic church officials and their followers showed little enthusiasm for the festival of national reconciliation at Luján.

Despite the fact that the government provided free transportation, only a few thousand Catholics attended. Most of the Argentinian bishops declined official invitations to attend.

*Criterio*, one of the most important Catholic publications, wrote: "It is clear that General Onganía is a pious man, but he did not have to resort to spectacular gestures to prove it. He must not mix his religious devotion, which concerns his private life, with his public functions, nor the role of chief of state with that of priest."

## Beatle Gives Medal Back to Queen

John Lennon, one of the Beatles, has returned his Order of the British Empire medal to Queen Elizabeth as a protest to Britain's support of the U. S. in Vietnam and "involvement in the Nigerian Biafra thing." The Beatles were awarded the medal in 1965 because sales of their records brought so much foreign currency into England.



### Police Slay Two More Black Panthers

With the killing of Fred Hampton and Mark Clark in Chicago December 4, the number of Black Panther members murdered by the police since January 1968 now stands at twenty-eight.

As reported by the police, a search warrant had been obtained on the basis of a tip from an "informant" that arms had been cached in an apartment occupied by the Black Panthers at 2337 West Monroe Street. Armed with shotguns, a submachine gun and revolvers, the police staged a predawn raid.

Sgt. Daniel Groth, according to the press, said he had knocked on the door and announced that he was a policeman with a warrant. "There was no response," he said. "We pushed in the front door. As we entered, a girl who was lying on a bed in the living room fired a blast from a shotgun at us."

According to Sgt. Groth, a "fierce" gunfight ensued. "There must have been six or seven of them firing. The firing must have gone on 10 or 12 minutes. If 200 shots were exchanged, that was nothing."

Two other detectives came in through the back door and began firing.

During the gunfight, Sgt. Groth said, he several times ordered a cease-fire, but a voice from the dark shouted: "Shoot it out."

Hampton, still according to the police, was "found" dead on his bed in a rear bedroom. Clark was likewise "found" dead behind a door. Four Panthers were "found" wounded from shotgun blasts. They were Ronald Satchel, 19; Blair Anderson, 18; Miss Vernlin Brewer, 17; and Miss Brenda Harris, 18.

In addition, three other persons were arrested in the apartment. They were Miss Deborah Johnson, 19; Louis Trueluck, 39; and Harold Bell, 23.

The police said that all seven would be charged with "attempted murder."

Despite the hail of bullets and shotgun blasts which they claimed to have faced for ten or twelve minutes, casualties among the police were miraculously light. One officer received a light wound in the leg from "a bullet"

and another one received a cut from broken glass. They were treated at the University of Illinois Hospital and released.

On the following day, the Black Panthers conducted tours of the apartment. In a special dispatch published in the December 6 *New York Times*, John Kifner described what he saw:

"Most of the rooms and walls appeared to be free of scars, pockmarks and bullet holes. There were clusters of bullet holes and gouges of shotgun blasts in the places where the Panthers said the two men had been killed and four others had been wounded."

In other words, there were no bullet holes marking the shots which the police claimed had been fired in *their* direction. But there was a concentration of bullet holes where Hampton and Clark had died.

"The apartment in which the raid occurred," continued Kifner, "consists of an entrance alcove, a living room, a narrow hallway, a dining area, a kitchen and two small bedrooms. The living room measures approximately 13 feet by 24 feet. The other rooms are much smaller.

"There were no bullet marks visible in the kitchen, the dining area or the front entrance door.

"There were no bullet marks in the area of the two doors through which the police said they entered.

"There were bullet holes on a wall at about a 45-degree angle from the door, over a dingy mattress that was lying atop a heap of disordered litter on the floor of the living room.

"There were more than 36 bullet holes, in a pattern of roughly two straight lines and a small cluster, about two feet up the wall, which was stained with blood.

"In the rear room, which was occupied by Mr. Hampton, there were a score of bullet holes. Many bullets appeared to have been fired through the wall into the room, just above the bed. There were two large holes with small clusters around them on the wall opposite the doorway. One of the two windows was broken."

A further telling bit of evidence was

the fact that Hampton was killed while lying in his bed. He received two shotgun blasts in his head at close range and three bullets in the heart.

Patrolman Renault Robinson, president of the Afro-American Patrolmen's League, said December 5 that his organization did not believe the official police version.

"We doubt what was said by the physical evidence," he told the *Times* correspondent in a telephone interview. "The powder burns from the bullets were on the outside of the door, meaning the shots were fired in. By the front door was a large pool of blood, meaning whoever opened the door to let them in got his then and there."

The Black Panthers told the press that Fred Hampton, their 21-year-old leader was "murdered in his bed" by the police on a "search and destroy mission."

Three Chicago aldermen, A. A. Rayner, and William Cousins, who are black, and Leon Despres, who is white, called for independent investigations of the shooting. Alderman Rayner termed it an "assassination" and said it was part of a "systematic extermination" of the leadership of the Black Panther party.

Jay A. Miller, executive director of the Illinois division of the American Civil Liberties Union, called for a "blue ribbon" investigation, possibly by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

"The Chicago raid and killings," he said, "seem part of a nationwide pattern of police action against the Panthers."

In contrast to such expressions of indignation and protest against the police ambush and execution of the Black Panther leaders, State's Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan had only praise for Democratic Mayor Daley's "finest":

"We wholeheartedly commend the police officers for their bravery, their remarkable restraint and their discipline in the face of this vicious Black Panther attack and we expect every decent citizen of our community to do likewise."

#### Tough Luck Department

"It's not an easy thing to wake up each morning to learn that some prominent man or some prominent institution has implied that you're a bigot or a racist or a fool."—Spiro T. Agnew, in his November 20 address to the Montgomery, Alabama, Chamber of Commerce.

## Ultrarightists Raid SWP, YSA Headquarters

By Ray Follett

Chicago

Right-wing extremist groups are continuing to harass the Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers party in a sustained effort to intimidate antiwar activists in this city.

Last November 1, twelve to fifteen masked men, who called themselves "Minutemen," invaded the headquarters and bookstore of the YSA and SWP. They attacked the four persons present, including two members of the Black Panther party, with a Mace-like chemical spray, and with clubs. Scalp injuries sustained by a high-school youth were serious enough to require a number of stitches.

The raiders made off with a cash-box, a drawer of filed material, and some tapes.

During the following week, the YSA received anonymous threatening telephone calls concerning the stolen property. On November 12, a group calling itself the "Legion of Justice," held a press conference to boast about the raid and the material it had stolen.

The spokesman for the Legion of Justice turned out to be an attorney, S. Thomas Sutton, notorious for his "Operation Crescent," a secret organization formed to prevent black migration into all-white neighborhoods and the busing of school children across ghetto boundaries. With him were two young men, one of whom was recognized as a pretended friend of the YSA.

Sutton displayed the stolen files and tapes and declared that the Legion of Justice was a "patriotic" organization dedicated to actions against antiwar groups. When reporters asked him about the legal aspects of the raid and seizure of property, he replied: "There is no law that can protect a traitor."

Carl Finamore, organizer of the Chicago Young Socialist Alliance, and Richard Hill, organizer of the Chicago Socialist Workers party local, were present at the press conference. James Campbell of the *Chicago Sun-Times* described how they intervened:

"Sutton was explaining the use of

tear gas by the group in disrupting meetings when his own meeting was disrupted.

"From the back row came a shout: 'We will not tolerate such attacks, whether it's from the Legion or any other paramilitary organization! And where's the money you stole?'

"Richard Hill, 26 organizer of the city chapter of the Socialist Workers Party, which shares the office of the Young Socialist Alliance, was on his feet.

"'You're out of order,' Sutton told Hill, and told the assembled newsmen that the groups were too embarrassed to file a complaint with the police.

"Hill contradicted Sutton. 'We did not know who did it until recently, and we have filed a complaint, charging assault and battery and theft,' Hill declared. He then addressed a puzzled group of reporters.

"'These tapes were stolen from our office and are being displayed here. They hit and run like cowards. There were 12 or 15 of them wearing masks and carrying clubs. They sprayed a blinding chemical on the four in the office and clubbed them.'

"The Black Panthers attacked the Legionnaires,' Sutton countered. 'The strike force only came for a visit and dialog — and liberated the records.'

"'Would you call robbing a bank, liberation of the funds?' Hill questioned Sutton, but there was no answer. 'I charge you with receiving stolen property, Mr. Sutton.'

The police did not trouble to come to the press conference although they had been informed that the stolen property would be displayed publicly. Only when they were called during the confrontation did they show up. They refused to act on Hill and Finamore's demand that they arrest Sutton and his group. Only as Sutton's helpers were removing the records, with Hill and Finamore loudly protesting, did the police decide to impound the evidence and take the Legion of Justice representatives into custody. The charge of possessing stolen property

was later dropped on grounds of "insufficient evidence."

On November 15, Mobilization Day, the Legion of Justice held a "film burning" rally at the Chicago Civic Center. Last summer the Legion raided the offices of an antiwar motion picture group and stole some films. At the public burning, Sutton did not admit this, but claimed that the film had been taken from the YSA headquarters. He said it displayed American prisoners of war paraded in the streets of Hanoi; but he did not permit newsmen to examine the film. The YSA denied Sutton's story, stating that no motion picture film was ever kept in its headquarters.

Other incidents have occurred since then, the most ominous coming on December 4 when police showed up at the headquarters. They said that they had been tipped off that arms had been cached in the headquarters. This was the same day the police conducted their ambush of Black Panther leaders Fred Hampton and Mark Clark on a similar pretext. While they were searching the SWP and YSA headquarters, newsmen showed up, apparently expecting a repetition of the shoot-out in a different part of the city earlier in the day. However, finding nothing, the police left.

Coincident with this, several unidentified persons placed long distance calls from Chicago to leaders of the SWP elsewhere in the country. Pretending to be Carl Finamore and Richard Hill, they said that the police had raided the headquarters, that of the nine persons present, all had been Mace'd and seven had been shot. Two of the seven, said the callers, were lying stretched out on the floor.

The false nature of the calls was soon determined; but it may well have been that the persons making them were the same ones who had "tipped off" the police about an "arms cache," and they fully expected Chicago's cops to go into the headquarters, guns blazing, as they had in the apartment of Fred Hampton.

## Free the Political Prisoners!

[After seizing power September 26, the Bolivian military junta headed by General Ovando Candia made a series of anti-imperialist gestures, going so far as to nationalize Gulf Oil, one of the greediest and most heavy-handed imperialist monopolies operating in the country.

[However, the anti-imperialist declarations of the Ovando government are contradicted by the fact that it has not ended the repression instituted by the previous governments that sold the country out to imperialism.

[Many members of the most militant anti-imperialist organizations are still in prison or forced into hiding. The principal victims of the repression have been the Ejército de Liberación Nacional (ELN—Army of National Liberation), initiated by Che Guevara; and the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR—Revolutionary Workers party), the Bolivian section of the Fourth International.

[The General Secretary of the POR,

Hugo González Moscoso is being hunted by the police and his family has been subjected to harassment.

[The Bolivian Trotskyists are trying to expose the demagogic nature of the Ovando regime and at the same time compel it to grant more concessions to the people. The following is our translation of a printed leaflet now being distributed by the POR.]

\* \* \*

*An Unconditional General Amnesty and Freedom for the Revolutionists Accused of Being Guerrillas.*

Despite the repeal of the State Security Law imposed by the imperialist counterrevolution, the freedom of more than thirty Bolivian patriots accused of being guerrillas is being denied and impeded.

Paradoxically, now when imperialism is threatening us with the Hickenlooper Amendment,\* the real anti-imperialist fighters are imprisoned and

being hunted while the counterrevolutionary lackeys are free to engage in their intrigues.

The POR demands the immediate release of all the prisoners tried as guerrillas. Carry out the amnesty implied in the repeal of the State Security Law!

Freedom for the Trotskyists José Moreno V., Felipe Vásquez, Víctor A. Córdova, and Tomás Chambi!

Freedom for the ELN leader Enrique Ortega!

Freedom for Jurgens Schut, Gonzalo Oroza, Dr. Walter Pareja, and all the imprisoned patriots!

Freedom for Loyola Guzmán, Tertu Tuliikki, and Geraldine de Coronado.

Stop the manhunt. Civil rights for the General Secretary of the POR Hugo González Moscoso.

Bolivia, November 1969.

Partido Obrero Revolucionario  
Freedom for Debray and Bustos!

\* The Hickenlooper Amendment requires the U.S. government to cut off aid to any country nationalizing the property of American citizens if "just compensation" has not been made within six months.—IP.

## In Lecumberri Prison

# Political Prisoners Threaten Hunger Strike

The great majority of the 120 political prisoners in Lecumberri jail in Mexico City have announced their intention to begin an unlimited hunger strike. This decision was reached after they learned that the initial phase of their trials had been closed without adequate evidence being presented or the required legal procedures being observed.

In the Mexican court system, the first phase of the trial is devoted to gathering evidence. In the second phase, another court hears arguments based on this evidence and then rules on the case.

The investigating judge, Ferrer MacGregor, declared the initial phase of the federal-law political cases closed November 22 without holding hearings, without allowing the prisoners or their attorneys to see the formal accusations presented by the govern-

ment or the evidence introduced to support them, and without the defense attorneys being able to examine prosecution witnesses, or question evidence.

Even in the cases of some political prisoners where hearings were held, all the witnesses were police agents. Defense attorneys were not allowed to cross-examine these witnesses nor given sufficient time to produce their own.

Most of the 120 persons being held in Lecumberri were arrested for minor "political crimes," such as handing out leaflets or attending meetings. Some are young people who were unfortunate enough to be in the area when some student action took place.

The appeal written by the spokesman for the prisoners, Luis González de Alba, ended with this declaration: "Since we received notice that

our trial had been closed without the defense being able to begin to present its case, we decided not to wait for the sentence before making a last attempt to obtain our release. For this reason we have decided to begin an indefinite hunger strike December 10 to demand that the charges against us be dropped. Although our sentencing is imminent, these charges have not been proved."

The pressure on the government to release the prisoners is becoming powerful in Mexico. However, it is essential that the hunger strikers receive the greatest international support, since December is traditionally a dead month in Mexican political life. Messages of support can be sent to Lic. Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, Presidente de México, Palacio Nacional, México 1, D. F.; or Lic. Luis Echeverría, Secretario de Gobernación, Av. Bucareli y Calle General Prim, México 1, D. F.

## Ky, Thieu Tell Different Stories

Somewhere between Saigon and Washington the strings seem to have gotten crossed up. When the first revelations about the Songmy massacre hit the headlines, the puppet Defense Ministry branded the reports as "totally false."

President Nguyen Van Thieu himself approved the statement of the Defense Ministry describing the civilian deaths in the village as a normal and unavoidable act of war for which the "Vietcong" were to be blamed. According to this version, Songmy was heavily fortified and there was heavy resistance as the Americans entered. One of Thieu's spokesmen said that so far as Saigon was concerned the case was "closed." That was on November 21.

As the evidence mounted and the international protests grew, Vice-president Nguyen Cao Ky decided, for unknown reasons, to take a different tack. On November 29 he told newsmen that he was not satisfied with the statement that the reports of the massacre were "totally false."

"We must investigate the whole matter so as to know what exactly has happened and how," he said. "We have instructed the Defense Ministry to reopen the investigation."

Ky's shift provided a good indication of the furor over the exposure of the massacre. Ky has not hesitated to proclaim Hitler, who was responsible for such horrors as the massacre at Lidice and the extermination of the Jews in Germany, as his greatest "hero."

But whoever pulled the strings on Ky, forgot to give a corresponding tug on Thieu's strings. On the same day that Ky said instructions had been given to the Defense Ministry to reopen the investigation, Thieu's director of the National Press Center, Nguyen Ngoc Huyen, reaffirmed that the case was closed.

He was supported by Thieu's press secretary, Hoang Duc Nha, who said: "I think Vice President Ky was only speaking in his own behalf. Mr. Ky only expressed his personal opinions. The case is definitely closed. There is

not the least indication that it would be reopened."

To confound the confusion, Dang Duc Khoi, an aide close to Ky, said that Ky had not ordered the Defense Minister, Gen. Nguyen Van Vy, to reopen the inquiry, but had only discussed the matter with him "informally."

But Ky was still marching to another set of drums. He reiterated that he was dissatisfied with the quick dismissal of the massacre reports. "If the press reports prove true, I will condemn the act. During the fight I accept accidents, the innocent civilians killed by accident. But after the fight, and the fight is finished and you will kill them, the innocent women and children, the civilians, in cold blood, no, I cannot accept that."

For those who are interested, it can be added that Marshal Ky was dressed in a cream-colored Nehru-style uniform, and that he had his usual thin smile on his lips.

## Stalinists Gain Vienna CP

The unreconstructed Stalinist wing of the Austrian Communist party appeared to have assumed full control of the Vienna party organization at the local conference November 29-30. Of thirty-six members of the steering committee, only thirteen were retained. Twenty-three members known for their anti-Stalinist or independent views refused to stand for reelection.

The Vienna organization includes nearly half the total CP membership, overshadowing the rest of the party.

Among the steering committee members who withdrew was City Councillman Josef Lauscher, head of the Vienna party since 1945. The CP organ *Volkstimme* reported that Lauscher was disappointed that a compromise could not be achieved permitting representation of all tendencies on the steering committee.

It is also reported that half of *Volkstimme's* staff has resigned. A new editor is to be appointed December 11.



KY: Investigation reopened.



THIEU: Case remains closed.

# Nixon, Wilson Assailed Over Vietnam Massacre

By T. Philips

London

More than 3,500 persons protested Nixon's war in Vietnam here November 23 as reports of the Mylai\* massacre made a powerful impact on British public opinion. The national press featured the massacre, with front-page headlines three days in a row.

In the midst of this exposure of U. S. atrocities in Vietnam, the Wilson government, always eager to please its benefactors in the U. S. State Department, once again demonstrated its role as apologist for U. S. imperialism.

In the House of Commons November 20, responding to questions from left-wing Labour MPs, Prime Minister Harold Wilson mouthed platitudes about "atrocities on both sides" and lined the cabinet up with Nixon's phony peace promises of November 3.

The following day, Wilson's right-hand man, deputy Labour party leader George Brown, put the Wilson position more crudely in a television interview. The Americans, he said, should "stop weeping and get on with winning the war." In justifying his position he made reference to past British operations in Malaysia, assuring people that the British army has a number of such atrocities to its record there and in other parts of the world.

Some Labour party MPs called for Brown's resignation and a full debate on government Vietnam policy before Wilson's scheduled January 27-28 trip to the White House.

Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart

\* The site of the March 16, 1968, shooting of hundreds of unarmed Vietnamese civilians by American troops is known by several different names. The Vietnamese call the village Truongan. The U. S. army calls it Songmy, the most common name used by the press. The killings actually took place about half a mile from Songmy at Mylai Hamlet No. 4. There are six hamlets named Mylai in the area. U. S. officials, as an anticommunist jibe, also call the area "Pinkville," a name that has appeared in some newspaper accounts. — IP.

hastened to soften the impact of Brown's TV outburst by giving a more "rounded" view. "When men are engaged in war," he said November 23, expressing squeamishness over the atrocity reports, "they are brutalized but you cannot say that because atrocities are committed on one side therefore the whole cause for which that side is struggling is wrong." (November 24 London *Daily Telegraph*.)

A Tory resolution tabled in the House, however, drew the thought out to its conclusion, congratulating Brown for reminding British citizens of "what is at stake in Vietnam, where her Majesty's Australian and New Zealand forces are engaged alongside American and other allies in resistance to a cruel communist enemy." (November 25 London *Times*.)

The 3,500 antiwar demonstrators from half a dozen cities who marched from Hyde Park to a rally in Trafalgar Square had another point of view. Placards carried by the demonstrators as they passed the U. S. embassy and 10 Downing Street read: "All U. S. Troops Out of Vietnam"; "End British Support for U. S. Imperialist War"; "Victory to the National Liberation Front"; and "Recognize the Provisional Revolutionary Government."

A rally, following the march, was addressed by representatives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. The crowd also heard former GI Allen Myers from the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which has headquarters in Washington and New York.

Madame Ngoc Dung, representing the PRG, stressed that the key to ending the war in Vietnam is the immediate withdrawal of all U. S. troops. She pointed out that more than a million Vietnamese had lost their lives in the war and said the Mylai revelations brought to light only a small part of the atrocities being commit-

ted by American imperialism in Vietnam.

The demonstrators, many of them students, loudly applauded Allen Myers when he referred to George Brown as Britain's Spiro Agnew who says what Wilson thinks. Myers reported on the massive November 15 Washington antiwar demonstration.

Police were very much in evidence, with more than 1,000 of them ringing Grosvenor Square near the U. S. embassy. Mounted police waited in the background.

Throughout the demonstration, there were spirited chants of "U. S. Out Out Out"; "Ho Ho Ho Chi Minh"; and "Victory to the NLF." Maoist groups shouted, "Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tsetung." The cops did not interfere and there were no incidents.

The demonstration was organized by the Vietnam Mobilisation Committee, an ad hoc coalition of individuals and groups, including the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, the International Marxist Group (the British section of the Fourth International), and the Young Communist League.

The Vietnam Mobilisation Committee distributed open letters to both Nixon and Wilson. The message to Nixon said in part:

"Today we join the millions around the world who have exposed your big lie on Vietnam. The atrocities perpetrated by your government on the Vietnamese people can no longer be hidden. The world knows that the My Lai massacre reflects your policy of genocide against the Vietnamese people. . . .

"Our campaign to force the British government to break with your criminal Vietnam policy has only just begun. In this we join with the people of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan and Western Europe who are struggling against the complicity of their own governments. Prime Minister Wilson is scheduled to visit your country on January 27th and 28th. Have no illusions—if he gives you continued support, he does so against

the wishes of the British people." The letter closed with the demand to withdraw all U. S. troops from Vietnam now.

The letter to Wilson declared:

"You cannot evade your complicity in U. S. aggression and the massacre of the villagers of My Lai. You talk about the 'horrible and tragic war' but have chosen to stand with the war criminals of the American state department headed by Nixon. Before this, you served your time as an apologist for war criminal Johnson. . . .

"On January 27th and 28th you intend to go to Washington for another cap-in-hand session. Your responsibility to the working people of Brit-

ain and the Vietnamese people is clear. When the Prime Minister of Japan made his pilgrimage to Washington the Japanese people, demonstrating against the Vietnam war and the renewal of the U. S.-Japan military ties, also made his responsibilities clear. *We intend to do the same!!*"

The committee demanded that Wilson, on behalf of the British government, call for the immediate withdrawal of U. S. troops from Vietnam; recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam; condemn Nixon's policy in Vietnam; stop all British material aid and research used in the Vietnam war; and provide government resources to aid the international antiwar movement.

## Ceylon

---

### Senanayake Fishes for N.M. Perera

It has been persistently rumored in Ceylon in recent months that Dr. N. M. Perera, the head of the Lanka Sama Samaja party [LSSP], has received overtures from Prime Minister Dudley Senanayake to break his alliance with the Sri Lanka Freedom party [SLFP] led by Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike and make a bloc with Senanayake's ruling United National party [UNP]. The bait, according to the rumors, is a post in the cabinet.

Apparently there was sufficient substance to the rumors to cause Perera to issue a public denial. At a regional conference of the LSSP youth in Bulathkohupitiya November 9, he said that "the LSSP which is the oldest political party in the country, dedicated to a workers and peasants socialist program cannot join a capitalist party like the UNP."

Perera's disclaimer is hardly likely to settle the speculation. Years ago, when he was a Trotskyist and the LSSP adhered to the principles of the Fourth International, similar statements were issued with regard to the SLFP. Eventually Perera labeled the SLFP a "petty-bourgeois" party and concluded that this made it permissible to form a coalition with this party which held power at the time. This dealt a devastating blow to the workers and peasants of Ceylon at a time

when prospects were bright for a revolutionary upsurge that might well have established a socialist regime on the island by now.

At the LSSP youth conference, Perera denounced the UNP as representing "the reactionary vested interests of this country backed by the imperialists." He said, "The LSSP has no intention whatsoever of betraying the peasants and workers whom it has represented all these years."

Despite this demagogy, it was evident that the LSSP leader had mulled over Senanayake's overtures. At one point, Perera seemed to be arguing with himself: "The UNP which criticised the SLFP for taking the Marxists into its ranks is reportedly inviting the LSSP now. This is absurd. Can the UNP go back on what it had claimed all these years?"

The UNP is in an impasse, he said. Now it is willing to forget the Marxist bogey which it never failed to raise all these years. It is a trick to fool the people but no one will fall for this.

Dr. Perera did not raise the possibility that Senanayake might view the main leader of the LSSP not as a "bogey" but rather as a sucker or perhaps a political operator who can be had for a price.

In a dispatch from Colombo, published in the November 27 issue of

the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, H. E. R. Abayasekara said: "Ideologies often go by the board in Asian politics when a party's survival is at stake—or its lust for power exceeds its principles. And in Colombo today, the word is the Trotskyist LSSP . . . is about to desert its more natural ally—the Opposition SLFP . . .—for the ruling UNP . . ."

Despite Perera's denials, Abayasekara said, ". . . with an election in the offing, LSSP movement across the floor to government benches has increased speculation." The situation is remindful of what happened five years ago when the SLFP was in trouble and turned to the LSSP for help. "That deal was worth three portfolios to the LSSP, Perera getting the job of finance minister."

"Premier Dudley Senanayaka," Abayasekara added, "has been holding out tempting bait of high office to several LSSP leaders. Already he has asked why the LSSP does not put its considerable political experience at the country's service [Senanayake's service, that is] rather than fritter away their resources on barren political controversy."

"Senanayake's biggest catch to date has been J. C. T. 'Jack' Kotelawala, his first cousin. Kotelawala has accepted the job of ambassador to Moscow. Although the LSSP sacked him, the departure from the party of this founding member has shaken it badly. Kotelawala insists that he remains a leftist but since his LSSP expulsion he has shown increasing sympathy toward Senanayake's government. Another big fish to come across is LSSP MP P. B. Wijesundera, and a so far undetermined number of small fry have either been, or are on the brink of being, netted by the prime minister."

Abayasekara ended his article by indicating another possibility:

"Some observers have been predicting that the LSSP, rather than join the ranks of government, more likely would crack up entirely. Even Senanayake has spoken of it as a 'vanishing party'. But Perera, after returning from a trip overseas, shored up a few of the cracks with his talk of the 'unbridgeable gap'. In jest he added that Senanayake was quite welcome to apply for LSSP membership—but in all seriousness Perera might just find the lure of a government portfolio too much to resist."

# Lambertists Knife Aid for Bolivian Victims

By Gerry Foley

An ultraleft grouping in France known as the "Lambertists" has reacted in a most bizarre way to an appeal issued early in November by the French section of the Fourth International, the Ligue Communiste [Communist League], for solidarity with the victims of the political repression in Bolivia.

In a special supplement to No. 37 of their weekly paper, *Rouge*, the Ligue Communiste described the police raids last July against several nuclei of the ELN [Ejército de Liberación Nacional—National Liberation Army], the guerrilla force initiated by Che Guevara.

The Bolivian section of the Fourth International, the Partido Obrero Revolucionario [POR — Revolutionary Workers party] supports the guerrilla movement in Bolivia, and a number of its members fell victim to the raids. The *Rouge* supplement listed the imprisoned Trotskyists and appealed for funds to aid them.

Shortly after this appeal was published, the weekly *Informations Ouvrières* printed a letter from a group led by a former POR leader, Guillermo Lora, denouncing the solidarity campaign as "an operation with all the signs of a fraud."

The letter made an even graver charge, if that is possible: "Serious suspicions exist today that Mr. González Moscoso [the leader of the POR] in person is working in the pay of the Bolivian government."

The truth is that Moscoso has been the object of a manhunt since the July raids, and the police have harassed and mistreated his family.

*Informations Ouvrières* is the organ of the Fédération des Comités d'Alliance Ouvrière [Federation of Workers Alliance Committees], a French ultraleft sectarian group headed by Pierre Lambert and allied with the Socialist Labour League of Great Britain. Lambert's followers, who claim to be Trotskyists, distinguished themselves by denouncing the battles that touched off the May-June upsurge in France as "adventurist."

*Informations Ouvrières* gave its full endorsement to the slander issued by the Lora group. The Lambertist paper called this group, which styles itself the POR, "the Trotskyist organization in Bolivia." It described the letter as a "correction by the secretariat of the POR regarding the material published by the Ligue Communiste calling for political and financial aid for Hugo González Moscoso, who was presented as the leader of the POR. As the correction indicates, this was a gross deception."

The Lambertists also published some political statements issued by the Lora group on the situation in Bolivia.

The present Lora grouping has developed rather recently. There was a long-standing division in the Bolivian Trotskyist movement between the tendency led by González Moscoso and that led by the brothers Guillermo and César Lora.

In May, 1965, as the army moved in to occupy the mines, César Lora, a popular leader of the miners, attempted to organize guerrilla resistance. He was captured in the northern part of the province of Potosí by the army on July 20, 1965, and executed on the spot.

On February 17, 1966, the two tendencies in the Bolivian Trotskyist movement united. Guillermo Lora, who is a well-known parliamentary figure, approved the unification although he was out of the country. When he returned, however, he refused to work in the united organization. He formed a personal grouping which eventually called itself by the same name as the organization it split from.

The declarations published by *Informations Ouvrières* indicate that Lora has adopted a sectarian line: "The Bolivian POR [Lora's "POR"] is not an advocate of guerrilla warfare of the Castroist type and considers this a typical adventure stemming from petty-bourgeois despair."

Differences are possible among revolutionists over the tactic of guerrilla

warfare; but no genuine revolutionist would fail to solidarize with guerrillas as victims of a repression. But Lora fails, as do his newly found French allies, to solidarize with such victims. Still more reprehensible, this bloc slanders the victims in the face of a full-scale anti-Cuban and antiguerrilla witch-hunt, and stabs them in the back by advancing the most poisonous kind of charges against a campaign to raise funds to help them.

Some of the Lora group's charges against the POR tend to echo the major themes of the government propaganda: "Today it is the political intervention and the writings of Castroism that this group of profiteers [the POR] is trying to exploit in order to carry on their shady dealings with the help of the revolutionists' money."

It seems strange that the Lambertists should give unreserved endorsement to such a dubious document from a faraway country, isolated not only by its geographical position but by a repression. Perhaps the Lambertists felt that this was an opportunity to show, for the first time since the Cuban revolution, that they have at least one contact in Latin America.

It is to be hoped that the nature of the relationship between the Lora group and the Lambertists will be clarified. Does this alliance rest on a principled agreement? Does Lora, like the Socialist Labour League and Lambert, believe that the Cuban revolution was not socialist, giving rise only to state capitalism? Does he hold with them that Fidel Castro is another "Batista"? Does he approve of the slanders that appeared in the Socialist Labour League press (before it became known that Che Guevara was in Bolivia) that Castro had liquidated his comrade in arms?

### Ask Amnesty for Regis Debray

Andre Malraux, Francois Mauriac, and Jean-Paul Sartre have appealed jointly to General Ovando to release Regis Debray, who was sentenced to thirty years in prison for visiting Che Guevara's guerrilla camp in Bolivia.

# The Strike Wave in Europe

[The following is an editorial scheduled for publication in a forthcoming issue of *Quatrième Internationale*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

The fall of 1969 has been marked by a powerful wave of strikes sweeping capitalist Europe. In turn, the principal imperialist countries on this continent — France, Italy, West Germany, and Great Britain — have been caught up in the tide. This strike wave has carried forward and broadened the upsurge in working-class militancy that was expressed in an objectively revolutionary way in France in May 1968.

Prerevolutionary tensions persist in France. A prerevolutionary situation has developed in Italy and may spread in the coming months to various other capitalist countries in Europe. The other driving forces of this process must be shown, its origins and distinctive dynamics explained, and its perspectives ascertained in order to better arm revolutionary activists and organizations for carrying on work within it for the international socialist revolution.

## 1. The Workers' Demands and the Economic Cycle

The fact that these explosions of workers struggle have occurred simultaneously must not lead us to forget that, at least in part, they are governed by immediate concerns, that they correspond to particular social and economic conditions in each country, and that therefore they come to focus, at least partially, on diverse material demands reflecting these specific preoccupations.

Thus, after the 1966-67 recession in West Germany and the 1964 recession in Italy, the bourgeoisies of these two countries succeeded to a considerable extent in blocking the rise of wages. This greatly increased the capitalist competitive capacity of these two countries and brought a substantial increase in profits.

The wildcat strikes in West Germany this fall and the widening strikes in Italy reflect the fundamental desire of the workers to "restore the balance" and to make up for the lag in wage increases over the past years. Added to this is a less conscious but no less real desire to retaliate in kind for the humiliations which the workers were subjected to by the bosses for a whole period.

In Italy, to the purely conjunctural motivations of the strike wave must be added a desire to overcome the most harmful effects on the workers of the present boom—that is, the increased cost of living, higher rents, the housing shortage, etc. In Germany the desire of the workers to eliminate wage inequities among regions and plants played a role in touching off the wildcat strikes.

On the other hand, in France the most immediate conjunctural impulse rousing the workers to struggle has been the attempt of the capitalists, through raising prices, public service fees, and taxes, to wipe out the gains they were forced to grant the workers in order to stop the May 1968 general strike.

In Great Britain it is rather the capitalist "rationalization" policy and the "Labour" deflation, as well as the threat to employment represented by the pressure of half a million jobless, that explain some of the most determined reactions by the workers, especially the actions of the steel workers in Port Talbot, the stevedores, and the miners.

The desire of the more badly paid strata to catch up with the average wage level accounts for the outbreak of strikes like that of the London dustmen [sanitation workers] and by the miners, who demanded substantial increases for surface workers, the worst-paid category.

Above and beyond these differences in the cyclical situation in each of the big capitalist countries in Europe, there is a more general immediate economic cause common to the wave of strikes in these countries.

Since 1966, the rate of growth of the European capitalist economy has

slowed, and interimperialist competition has become much fiercer. In this economic climate, the need felt by big business to defend profits inevitably takes precedence over the desire to defend "social peace" at any cost.

The bosses are no longer ready to drop much ballast in negotiations. They no longer give concessions except when constrained and forced to do so under the threat of much worse defeats, as at the time of the Grenelle Agreements in France in May-June 1968. And even in this case, the bosses hastily began an attempt to wipe out these concessions afterward, even though this course created a climate of agitation and social effervescence in the country.

In this tense situation, capitalist "rationalization" is imposing a continual speedup, that is, superexploitation of labor which the workers are rebelling against nearly everywhere in Europe. And this gives special importance to the demands for a shorter workweek.

## 2. The Prerevolutionary Social Climate and the Upsurge

However, as important as these immediate impulses of the workers struggles are in understanding the mechanism involved in setting off the strikes in each individual country, they are not sufficient to account for their general drive or their astonishing simultaneity over a large part of capitalist Europe. Other more profound and less immediately visible factors enter in here.

There is no doubt whatever that the thunderbolt of the revolutionary struggles of May 1968 in France changed something fundamental in the relationship of class forces throughout capitalist Europe.

Nearly everywhere in Europe, workers, even if they did not act immediately, or fully grasp the exemplary importance of the revolutionary struggle of the French workers and students, instinctively recognized that May 1968 had abruptly revealed the underlying weakness of the capitalist system, which had been declared "definitively stabilized" and capable of "resolving all its contradictions."

May 1968 restored the confidence of the European proletariat, its confidence in its own strength and for struggle up and down the line against capitalist society. The current strike



wave is, essentially, the result of this revelation.

The clearest case is that of Italy. In Italy it is difficult to depict the almost uninterrupted succession of workers struggles, which have been continually widening for a year, as a simple succession of "labor conflicts" over higher wages. The insurrectionary explosions in southern Italy, in Avola and Battipaglia, despite their sometimes ambiguous character, were already a harbinger.

The way in which the wildcat strikes have developed; the widening clashes between strike pickets and the guardians of bourgeois order in Turin, Milan, Bergamo, and elsewhere; the broadening of the struggles beyond the limits of the plants, drawing into the fight the working populations of the big proletarian cities; the powerful workers demonstrations in Milan, Turin, and Naples— all of this, occurring in a climate of intense politicalization and anti-imperialist and anticapitalist consciousness reaching into the broad masses, come into focus as a continually mounting prerevolutionary situation. The only positive outcome of this development in the near future would be the creation of organs of dual power and the opening of a struggle for political power.

Obviously, things have not yet reached this point in Great Britain, to say nothing of West Germany. In France, however, the overall political and social situation continues to be marked by very great instability and uncertainty on the part of the bourgeoisie and by a combativity as yet intact, on the side of the workers.

And this combativity has been expressed in a flareup of staggered strikes, in which the workers have not hesitated to take radical measures (e.g., a sit-in strike and seizure of the manager at Cholet, and the occupation of several other factories in the provinces). The growing resistance among the workers to the bureaucratic halter of purely token "pressure strikes" reflects this undiminished combativity.

In the case of Great Britain, it would be premature to speak of a prerevolutionary climate. It is, however, evident that the mechanisms and shock-absorbers by which the bourgeoisie has traditionally been able to keep

the class struggle in "tolerable" limits are fast wearing out. Now, after the Labour party bureaucracy, it is the turn of the trade-union bureaucracy to be outdistanced by certain categories of workers.

After the political strike of 150,000 workers against the proposed anti-strike law in October, there was the strike of 120,000 miners in direct opposition to the "left" bureaucracy of their union. The narrowing of the margin for maneuver (which an American recession might accelerate dramatically) in any case heralds increasingly severe tensions in the relations among the classes as well as extensive struggles by the workers.

The fact that an abrupt recovery of self-confidence by the proletariat of West Europe is the underlying reason for the present rise of strikes makes understandable the extremely important international repercussions of this upsurge, in which each major wildcat, or extensive, strike in one country spurs the militancy and readiness for combat of the most radicalized elements of the proletariat (above all, the working youth) in a neighboring country. The international transference of radical forms of struggle (militant demonstrations, factory occupations, etc.) is a contributing factor.

The change in the relationship of class forces in capitalist Europe is also shown in the acute crisis of political leadership that the bourgeoisie is suffering in several key European countries. The elimination of de Gaulle has left nothing in France but a bonapartist regime without a Bonaparte.

The ouster from power of the Christian Democrats in West Germany for the first time in twenty years; the profound crisis the Christian Democracy is undergoing in Italy; the obvious lack of enthusiasm for Heath's Tory team in Great Britain are all expressions of the same basic phenomenon.

The pronounced weakening of the Social Democracy in countries like France and Italy and the repercussions of the international crisis of Stalinism are reducing the possibilities for the bourgeoisie to channel the present upsurge into the classical avenues of reformism, although such possibilities obviously persist to some extent.

### 3. Demands that Challenge the Very Relations of Capitalist Production

It is only when we approach the current strike wave in Europe from the vantage point of the revolutionary upsurge, which began in May 1968 and which is still only in its initial phase, that we can understand why and how the new demands, going far beyond immediate economic questions, have arisen in struggles nearly everywhere in Europe. These demands amount in effect to an all-out embracing challenge to the very relations of capitalist production.

Thus, in response to a threat by the bosses to fire 3,000 workers, the shop stewards in the General Electric plants in Liverpool, backed up by the trades council of this large city, representing tens of thousands of workers, launched an appeal for the occupation of these factories, opening the books, and workers control.

So, too, in the much less politicalized and much more conformist climate of the West German working class, the slogan of opening the books emerged spontaneously in at least two plants in the course of wildcat strikes: the Howaldt shipyards in Kiel and a smaller factory in the Ruhr.

So in Italy, demands challenging the capitalist organization of work, the speedup, the system of job evaluation, and piecework appeared nearly everywhere.

The appearance of these demands shows the dovetailing of the propaganda of the "leftist" revolutionary vanguard with the experience of the more conscious and seasoned workers in the plants themselves.

In a phase of accelerated technological innovation and rapid economic growth, like the one extending from 1950 to 1965, everything involving the organization of work necessarily assumes greater importance for workers used to relatively full employment.

The whole climate of "antiauthoritarian confrontation" created by the revolutionary student movement has made the authority of the boss seem all the more odious as the level of education of the working class has progressively risen (especially as a result of the introduction of increasingly complicated machinery demand-

ing more and more skilled manpower).

Every change in the economic cycle, however moderate, every reappearance of unemployment, every increase in the arbitrariness of the bosses must, in these conditions, provoke a counterattack by the most combative workers against the very nature of capitalist relationships, that is, the right of capital to command men and machines.

Sensing instinctively that a broader test of strength with capital was looming up, the workers everywhere sought to achieve cohesion in their own ranks by advancing demands that would increase the unity of the worker masses.

For this reason a considerable importance must be attached to the slogan of "An Equal Wage Increase for All," (i.e., increases not distributed according to a hierarchy) which sprang up spontaneously in the wildcat strikes in West Germany, Italy, and France.

This demand constituted an entirely justified response on the part of the proletariat to fifteen years of maneuvers dividing and atomizing the workers in the plants by multiplying "wage categories," bonus systems, and techniques of job-classification pay differentials.

#### 4. Worker Militancy and the Traditional Bureaucracies

The "wildcat" character of the German and British strikes, the no less "wildcat" beginning of the fall strikes in Italy, and certain "wildcat" aspects in the recent strikes in France clearly indicate that a growing distrust and hostility toward the bureaucratic union apparatuses is playing an indisputable role in the present wave of worker indignation. However, this does not imply a rejection of unions as such.

These feelings are accounted for primarily by the fact that for a year these apparatuses have endeavored to stifle the militancy of the workers and divert it into the traditional paths of electoralism, parliamentary negotiations, and rotten compromises.

In Great Britain the number of strikes—most of which were wildcat strikes—went from an average of 780 semiannually in the period 1960-67 to 1,000 semiannually in 1968; 1,300 for the first half of 1969; and will

doubtless reach 1,500 in the second half of 1969.

These feelings of mistrust and resentment toward the union bureaucracies, however, express something more profound. The workers feel "alienated" from the mass organizations of their class (from the traditional Social Democratic and Stalinist parties still more than from the unions). They feel that they have lost all control over these organizations. The workers feel that from instruments for defending the interests of the mass of working people, these bodies have been transformed into instruments exclusively for the defense of the bureaucratic apparatuses themselves.

Their recent experiences could only strengthen this conviction in the minds of the vanguard workers. Let us mention only the most striking examples—the way the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor, the CP-dominated union] stifled the desire of the French working class in May 1968 for more far-reaching aims than mere ephemeral wage increases; the British Labour government's proposal of an antistrike law, from which it retreated only in exchange for a promise from the union apparatuses that they themselves would "police wildcat strikes"; the negotiation of a new wage contract for millions of West German metal workers by a handful of bureaucrats without any consultation of the ranks or any chance for the rank and file to express their views.

However, the bureaucratic union apparatuses cannot fail to be alert to this development which involves numerous dangers for them. The union bureaucrats are not servants of capitalism out of conviction or idealism. In order to defend their privileges and the positions they hold within the "democratic" bourgeois state, they must have leeway to blackmail the capitalists, which is the function of the power of their organizations and their ability to canalize their militancy of important working-class forces. When the union bureaucrats lose this power and ability, their usefulness in the eyes of the capitalists vanishes and concurrently their privileges are threatened.

Consequently, it was inevitable that the bureaucratic apparatuses themselves would be stirred to action by the flare-up of wildcat strikes. That

the ultimate goal of their response was to regain control of a movement which threatened to slip out of their hands is unquestionable.

But it is equally indisputable, after the Italian example, that the process of regaining control necessarily involves a phase in which the apparatuses no longer systematically strive to suppress or fragment all struggles but to the contrary adapt to the combative spirit of the workers.

In Italy we saw the bureaucratic apparatuses go so far as to co-opt the lists of demands that rank-and-file groups had drawn up independently of them and in opposition to them and make these demands the "official" union program in the metal workers' contract negotiations.

Thus, a new dialectical relation between a spontaneous or autonomous mass movement and the mass organizations under bureaucratic leadership is opening up. In its dynamics, this development is more favorable to the outbreak and widening of struggles than to the pure and simple bureaucratic suppression that prevailed before. This should, above all, enable the vanguard worker militants to drive *wedges of union democracy* into the bureaucratic phalanx.

The outcome of this new process depends primarily on the development of an alternative workers leadership, its building a mass base, and its capacity to unite broadening struggles around transitional demands that increasingly undermine the very foundations of the capitalist system.

#### 5. Independent Organization and the Struggle for Transitional Demands

One of the surest signs of the profoundly revolutionary significance of the current strike wave in Europe is the reappearance in the class struggle of forms of collective organization by the workers that have not been seen on any broad scale in Western Europe since 1923 (with the exception of certain cases in the Spanish revolution).

Of course, these are no more than first beginnings. But the appearance of these incipient organizational forms—which were so cruelly lacking in May 1968 in France—indicates that the mass movement is getting ready in the next stage to surpass the level

of maturity attained in the May 1968 general strike in France.

In a few big factories in West Germany where wildcat strikes have occurred (and, let us repeat, in spite of a politicalization and radicalization on the part of these strikers unquestionably lower than in the three other big imperialist countries of Europe), strike leaderships were democratically elected in mass assemblies of the strikers. In the Kloeckner ironworks in Bremen, an oppositionist factory council, elected counter to the trade-union bureaucracy in May 1969, played an analogous role.

In several big Italian factories, following the example set by FIAT, shop delegates have been elected. Regular general assemblies with full powers to establish the demands to be made to the bosses have been held, as at Montedison in Porto Maghera. Interunion committees functioning under the supervision of the mass of workers were set up.

A shopsteward action committee was established in the electrical construction industry in Liverpool. The wildcat strike of the British miners was conducted by local union committees.

All these facts, in themselves isolated, are indicative of the turn the movement might take in its next stage toward strikers organizing themselves through democratic general assemblies, through the election of strike committees, and the federation of these committees by industries and at a local, regional, and national level.

However, the thesis advocated by a certain number of revolutionary groups or tendencies in Europe, above all in Italy, that the independence of the mass movement is itself the best—if not the only—guarantee that it will not be reintegrated into bourgeois society must be rejected by revolutionary Marxists.

Any economic movement, even the most democratic, with the greatest rank-and-file initiative, the most independent of the traditional apparatuses, which limits itself to demanding only "higher wages and shorter hours," will ultimately be absorbed. As May 1968 showed once again, when their power is itself directly threatened, capitalists are ready to meet any immediate demand, knowing full well that they will be able to take back with one hand what they have given with the other, as long

as they retain control of their state and economic power.

Moreover, forms of independent organization in the plants are strictly dependent on the ups and downs of the mass mobilizations and are condemned to be reduced to bare bones or to disappear in a period of temporary retreat.

The only guarantee against the bourgeoisie being able to ride out the current wave of strikes, therefore, is represented by transitional demands, which, by nature, are inassimilable by the capitalist system. Such demands cannot be absorbed by capitalism because they prevent the "normal" functioning of the profit economy, because they challenge capitalist relations of production. From this standpoint, the demand for workers control more than ever assumes an exceptional importance. It is par excellence *the* transitional demand for the present phase.

A practical application of propaganda for workers control flows from the current phase of the strike struggle in Europe. Cases are multiplying in which bosses are responding to wildcat strikes or "guerrilla strikes" by lockouts or temporary layoffs. This has occurred, for example, at FIAT and Pirelli in Italy, at the Le Mans Renault plant in France, and at Vauxhall in Great Britain, etc. The struggle for *veto power by the workers over layoffs and plant shutdowns* thus assumes a special timeliness, which can rapidly make workers control operative. The lightning response of the Le Mans Renault workers to the management's lockout by occupying their plant and thus forcing the bosses to retreat is a step in that direction.

The struggle for workers control has, moreover, the secondary effect of serving as an excellent school of self-organization for the workers. What is still only sporadic in times of strikes becomes, by means of this struggle, a more and more systematic reflex on the part of the workers—collective organization right on the job. The struggle for workers control thus leads to transforming general assemblies and strike committees into real organs of dual power, opening up a revolutionary period in the country involved.

## 6. Building a New Revolutionary Leadership of the Proletariat

The emergence of a new young vanguard on a scale unseen in Europe

since 1923 was the main feature of the May 1968 revolutionary upsurge in France. This same characteristic is being repeated today in Italy, and, on a more modest scale in other countries in capitalist Europe.

In all these cases, groups of young students or revolutionary groupings have been able to break out of their isolation from the working class, to establish contacts with plants, to participate in forming revolutionary groups or cells in the factories, and to exert an influence in the wildcat strikes of this fall.

In these conditions the debate over Marcuse's theories about "the inevitable integration" of the working class into neocapitalism is definitively outmoded. But the debate over spontanéism, which dropped off sharply in France after the events of May 1968, has been revived.

The revolutionary Marxists neither wish to "tame" spontaneous struggles nor believe they could do so with a movement that represents both an instinctive revolt of the workers against bourgeois society and an attempt to free themselves from all bureaucratic encumbrances blocking their desire for emancipation.

The revolutionary Marxists participate in all the strikes and demonstrations of their class as activists whose main concern is guiding these struggles to victory. They never subordinate the general welfare of the movement to the petty interests of a group or sect.

But at the same time, the revolutionary Marxists are convinced that any inclination to want to limit the explosion of the workers' anger to a mere "festival" of self-expression would lead the present upsurge to certain defeat.

It is completely illusory to think that a class enemy, who has at his disposal a highly centralized state apparatus and a wealth of historical experience in maneuvering, will step aside at once or gradually withdraw without being beaten in a full-scale battle. Behind the pseudo revolutionary verbiage of some, we thus find the old reformist illusions about a gradual conquest of "the public power."

This all-out battle cannot be conceived solely as the culmination of coordinating and centralizing strikes. It is a revolutionary *political* battle.

Its objectives are to throw the enemy off balance, to dissipate his material, moral, and repressive resources, to mobilize all the exploited strata of the nation around the proletariat, to defeat the capitalists ideologically and morally before defeating them economically and politically. Its aim is to win the minds of the popular masses to the struggle for socialism.

All of these objectives are preconditions for a victorious revolutionary struggle to overthrow the bourgeois state. Without a strategic design of this sort and without its systematic, conscious, and organized application, no victory over capital in a highly industrialized country is possible. When we speak of building a revolutionary party around a revolutionary transitional program, it is such a stra-

tegic design that we have in mind.

Thus, far from being mutually contradictory, building a revolutionary party, increasing the autonomy and spontaneity of the mass movement, heightening working-class combativity, and raising the level of consciousness of the proletariat are mutually enriching and interlocking forms of struggle.

There is no alternative to combining these forms except faith in improvisation and the unconscious; that is, faith in miracles. The Trotskyist movement prefers to work at building the revolutionary party (of which the present sections of the Fourth International will be only one of the foundation stones) rather than abandon itself to such an irrational and illusory faith.

appointed continuers of this tradition—the students experience the crisis of bourgeois ideology very intensely.

3. As future "professionals," the students are haunted by the problems of employment. In those branches where the professional perspectives are precisely defined, to be a future specialist is frequently synonymous with future unemployment as a consequence of the imperatives of continual economic reorganization. In the liberal professions, long years of study often culminate in beginning a slow climb in the restricted hierarchies.

||

4. More specifically, the students find themselves in the center of a contradiction which they may strive to surmount but which they can never resolve because it involves the fundamental contradiction in the capitalist mode of production—the contradiction between developing the productive forces and maintaining the relations of production. This same contradiction bears on the universities which are compelled to respond simultaneously to two contradictory demands—(1) advancing the productive forces through a general increase in the level of skills at the price of an increase in the social costs of training; and (2) retaining the productive relationships through fragmentation of knowledge, discriminatory recruitment, and respecting the private profits of the capitalists as individuals. The bourgeoisie everywhere tries to deal with this contradiction by measures and reforms which themselves are hybrid and contradictory and which perpetuate the institutional crisis and instability of the university.

5. The increasing needs for skilled manpower are bringing about a diversification of university recruitment and its extension to the middle strata. These strata, attracted by the prospects of assimilation into the upper classes, do not bring rebellion into the universities with them. But everywhere they are an element of instability. Caught between an insecure family background and an uncertain professional future, the children of the petty bourgeoisie on occasion are ready to make the authorities pay for the insecurity and anguish which is their lot.

6. The student population, rooted

## Documents

# Balance Sheet of the Student Movement

[In our July 14 issue (page 723), we published a resolution entitled "Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International." This document opened a discussion on the subject in the Fourth International, the World Party of Socialist Revolution, founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938. The document below is a second contribution to the discussion. It is a condensation of *Cahiers Rouges*, No. 12, "Problèmes du mouvement étudiant," written by Daniel Bensaïd and C. Scalabrino. The condensation appeared in *Quatrième Internationale*, No. 38 (September 1969). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

1. The student movement in the 1960s was everywhere in the vanguard of the reviving revolutionary struggles. The particular political mobility of the student milieu arises from the accumulating superstructural contradictions of which it is the focus: the crisis of bourgeois ideology which affects the youth as a whole; the problems of employment, training, and professional careers which concern the

intellectual workers; and the institutional crisis of the university.

2. A component part of the youth in general, the students were the first to be affected by the crisis of bourgeois ideology, which they are called upon to glorify and perpetuate. The bourgeoisie of the period of imperialist decadence is not the creative bourgeoisie that rose to power to accomplish its historical tasks. The values, morals, and history of this bourgeoisie can inspire no enthusiasm. The cause of the crisis seems clear—the youth cannot identify its hopes with those of the bourgeoisie, or tie its fate to this moribund class. This is all the more true because the values so much preached by the schools, the academies, and the authorities are denied daily by the crimes imperialism commits in its death throes. Losing its morality and ideals, the bourgeoisie has replaced them with advertising slogans. It no longer seeks to inspire defense of the ideals of the rising bourgeoisie ("liberty" and "equality") but conformity to the robot image of the average consumer, the mediocre bourgeois of the period of decadence. No young generation can identify with this ideology. And more than any other young people—since they are the heir apparent and the

in the contradiction of the university, lacks both social and political homogeneity. Even if the time spent in school has been extended, even if the concentration of university complexes has reached immense proportions, even if the diversification of university recruitment and the professional careers open to students create stronger ties than ever between them and the rest of their generation in the high schools and factories, for all that the contradiction in the university system does not constitute an objective foundation for bringing the students as such over to the side of the proletariat and does not make the students natural allies of the workers. There are no homogeneous student interests to defend.

7. The student milieu has given birth to movements and political currents whose poles are outside the university, in the class confrontation between the bourgeoisie and the working class on the national and international scale. A part of the students have aligned themselves with the established order, whose benefits they are destined to share; another part have gone over to the proletariat. But there is nothing natural and spontaneous about this lineup, especially when the workers—deprived of revolutionary leadership—fumble and mark time.

8. This is why in the advanced capitalist countries the politicalization of the students has generally taken the path of anti-imperialist struggle. The students have not found the least perspective in the Social Democratic or Stalinist workers organizations in their own country, which have submitted to the status quo. As a result, the Vietnamese revolution provided a symbol and an example of the international struggle of the proletariat in which a part of the student population recognized what it was waiting for and which restored its hope.

9. Moreover, mobile, unstable, and continually renewed, the student milieu provides few openings for the working-class bureaucracies, above all at a time when the crisis of Stalinism and its ideology echoes that of the bourgeoisie. Thus the student movement represents the weakest link in the chain of political integration forged and maintained by the bourgeoisie and the Social Democratic and

Stalinist leaders to preserve the international status quo.

### III

10. Shaken by the interplay of contradictions all of which come to a focus on the campus, the university population produced a powerful student movement. Impelled by the crisis of bourgeois ideology and of the educational structures, and inspired by the example of the colonial revolution, this student movement escaped the control of the working-class bureaucracies. The extreme contradiction in the universities has given the student movement an energy which has enabled it, alone and in spite of its isolation, to wage vanguard struggles distinguished by a revival of violent forms of combat, of direct action, in defiance of the political rules of the game accepted by the working-class leaderships.

11. However, the student movement by itself cannot deal with the contradiction of the university, which rests on the very foundations of capitalism. It is incapable of political and programmatic independence from the working class.

12. As a result, the student movement is torn between its revolutionary vocation and the objective limits of the university community, between its mass character and its role as a substitute vanguard, at a time when, as the weakest link in the political system, it finds itself thrown into the vanguard of the struggles.

13. This is why the student movement cannot be analyzed as a distinct entity; one could only describe its fluctuations, often irrational and unpredictable. In order to understand it and give it political direction, it must be analyzed in connection with the variations of the coordinates that condition its existence and its development, for in itself the student movement has no history or memory. These coordinates are on the one hand the workers movement (the extent of its mobilization, the political forces which compose it) and on the other the development of the revolutionary vanguard, which is still in too embryonic form to really play a leadership role.

### IV

14. The evolution of the French stu-

dent movement illustrates the relationship between the student movement and the workers movement in a very complete way. After the Algerian war, in a period of relative quiescence in working-class struggles, the student movement became the guilty conscience of the workers movement. Against the spurious rationality of the bourgeoisie, it counterposed its own programmatic rationality—it relied on the power of reason and the word to unmask the contradictions of capitalism and demonstrate the validity of the socialist view without having to take into account a relationship of social forces caused by lack of mobilization of class.

15. In the period of reviving workers struggles, the student movement, inspired by revolutionary groups that had broken from the Social Democracy or the Stalinist movement, rediscovered the reality of the workers movement and the possibility of linking up with it. In this period, the student movement constituted itself either as pressure groups acting on the workers movement or as supporters of the workers movement. As a pressure group, the student movement acted through liaisons with the unions on common problems (training, employment); as a supporting force through populist movements inspired by Maoist groups. During this period, the developing student movement slipped into the preexisting structures of academic vocational associations where it found an ideological forum and a vaguely unionist rubric that legitimized its attempt at hybrid unionism.

16. The student movement could not remain forever on this tight leash, drawn behind a workers movement under Stalinist or Social Democratic domination. It had to either submit and return to the bosom of the "democratic" forces or rely on the resources of the student population and alone, or at the risk of isolating itself, take the initiative and try to upset the status quo in the class struggle. The student movement was driven to this choice. Economic struggles that were halted or diverted as they ran up against a state speaking in the name of the "national interest" seemed increasingly futile. Thus, the mobilizing structures taken over from the vocational interest-group associations seem too constrictive. The example of the March 22 Movement at its birth was typical.

Along with this movement, the vanguard groups took the initiative of combining the fragmented political activities of the student movement into an anti-imperialist, anticapitalist, and antibureaucratic movement. After this turn, the student movement ceased to follow its natural channels; it was organized by the vanguard groups which defined its role and its objectives, no longer in accordance with campus criteria but in accordance with the general relation of forces, an overall evaluation of the class struggle. In this altered form, the student movement acquired the means to play the role of a temporary substitute vanguard, of accelerator or detonator of the class struggle, more by its exemplary forms of struggle than by its programmatic content.

17. Once the workers movement began to struggle, the student movement could not continue to play its role of substitute vanguard by giving an example of determination and courage. The workers cannot limit themselves to moving through the tactical breaches opened up by the students. They need strategic perspectives and slogans which the student movement, incapable by itself of going beyond a certain level of political comprehension—that of petty-bourgeois radicalism—cannot provide. In the face of this problem, the student movement yields to the revolutionary vanguard.

## V

18. The temporary vanguard role played by the student movement is not a novelty requiring any revision of Marxism. Already Engels, Trotsky, Mao Tse-tung hailed the vanguard role played by the students in Austria in 1850, in China in 1919. This role merely testified to the fact that the bourgeoisie was no longer vigorous enough to make its revolution and the proletariat was not yet mature enough to lead its own. Today, the vanguard role of the student movement is no longer a sign of the insufficient objective maturity of the proletariat but of the bankruptcy of its Social Democratic or Stalinist leaderships.

19. It is no less true that the student movement can only play this role with the perspective of a linkup very shortly with the workers movement. Without this perspective, the student move-

ment is condemned to maintain an impossible balance between its revolutionary function and its mass character, continually pulled by reformism on the one side and ultraleftism on the other. This contradiction can be resolved only by constructing and developing a revolutionary organization capable of transcending the student "point of view" and offering a strategic design, an organization capable of playing a vanguard role in the workers movement as well as in the student movement.

20. Building such an organization demands qualities of doggedness, of perseverance, of firmness, which are far from inherent in the fickle, unstable, and unremembering student population.

This is why we see the flowering in the student movement of a gamut of ideologies that are just so many escape routes from the fundamental task of building the revolutionary organization.

21. An early variant of these ideological evasions consisted in the dynamics of a group, a phase of introspection in which the student movement searched for the reasons for its political impotence in its own lack of consciousness. A subvariant was populism by which the movement endeavored to efface itself by doing penance in the service of the masses—all under the theoretical aegis of Mao's thought. Introspection and populism are the infantile deliriums of the student movement.

22. Anarchism and spontanéism are its adolescent deliriums. Incapable of surmounting the contradiction in the student movement (between its revolutionary role and its mass character), the anarchists prefer to deny this movement outright. For them the student population is sociologically petty bourgeois; consequently there can be no revolutionary student movement, only anarchist militants intervening in the student milieu by direct action and propaganda of the deed. The objective is, by means of the question of violence, to radicalize this student petty bourgeoisie still tainted with a squeamish humanism. The objective is to draw the student masses into the wake of an activist minority. But since the "solidarity" of the mass of students is associated more with sentiment than political consciousness, it would be futile to try to give it an organizational form.

23. As incapable of resolving the contradiction as their anarchist cousins, the spontanéists dissolve the student movement in the cultural revolution. For them the students are a natural ally of the proletariat. The only obstacle in the way of revolution is the lingering fascination of decaying bourgeois ideology, the cop everyone carries in his head. Through a spiritual conversion, termed cultural revolution for the occasion, everyone must drive the cop out of his head. In this way he comes directly to the revolutionary movement (without class distinctions) and not to the student movement. In a word, between the student under the spell of bourgeois ideology and learning and the revolutionary militant there is no longer any place for an overly encumbering student movement. The problem is thus removed but not solved.

24. The common denominator of these student ideologies is an antiauthoritarianism which combines the student movement's awareness of the hoax of the strong state and its resentment of a hated father figure. The student movement blames the bourgeois society which has nourished it and educated it for betraying its own teachings and its own precepts and covering up this betrayal by an omnipresent and arbitrary state authority. To this betrayal the student movement reacts by seeking a new antiauthoritarian humanism into which it dissolves the class struggle. And since it does not have the means of carrying out a proletarian revolution by itself, it contents itself with a "cultural revolution." It attacks culture by preference because it began by sustaining itself from it. Mao-spontanéism is the most all-inclusive cocktail of student ideologies in which populism, spontanéism, and antiauthoritarianism blend. All these ideologies converge on one point and that is to reject the revolutionary organization which threatens them as their own negation.

## VI

25. In the period when new vanguards are emerging from the youth radicalization, these vanguards find a favorable environment for growth in the student milieu. Since they are too weak to confront the bourgeois regime directly or to compete with the recognized working-class leaderships, the student movement offers these organizations shelter and protection. B

its mass mobilization, the student movement compensates for the vanguard groups' weakness. During this period these new vanguards are primarily student groups regarding themselves as parricidal offspring of Stalinism or the Social Democracy. It is only through transforming themselves that they can link up with the Fourth International which is the bearer of the strategical acquisitions that constitute the alternative to Stalinism.

26. This transformation enables the incipient revolutionary organization to raise itself to the level of an overall strategic understanding, and to finish off the student group outlook that perpetuates the social and political characteristics of the student movement. The revolutionary organization must be virtually torn out of the student movement.

27. The student movement as such has neither memory nor history, it is absorbed in ephemeral actions, in acts of bearing witness, in spectacular demonstrations. In contrast, the intervention of the vanguard is not spectacular. By organizing and training militants it weaves the fabric of the political memory of the student movement. It is the mast that bears the sails of the student mobilization. It is vertical with respect to the horizontal dispersion of student agitation (anarcho-Maoist agitational focuses). Through the improvisations of the student movement it traces the coherence of its own revolutionary design. The balancing of the student movement between reformism and ultraleftism cannot be broken except by the hammering intervention of the revolutionary organization.

## VII

28. The development and reinforcement of the revolutionary organization does not mean the end of the student movement but a change in its function. In the early period, the student movement, because of specific conditions in the universities, was in the lead of the youth radicalization. The development of a revolutionary organization makes it possible to reconstitute the student movement, which is foundering in repetitious actions dictated by its contradiction, into a movement of the youth in general. This broadening is a precondition for increasing the mass movement's capac-

ity for struggle. It has been made possible by modifications in the relationship of forces between the vanguard and the state, between the vanguard and the bureaucratic working-class leaderships.

29. The basis for such a youth movement lies in the struggle against the regimentation of youth. This regimentation begins with vocational training in all its forms (high schools, universities, apprenticeship, technical education). It includes the housing, transportation, and working conditions imposed on youth; the organization of amusements, culture, competitive sports, all the repressive recreational structures offered to the youth (scouting, camps, athletic clubs); and sexual oppression. Finally this regimentation culminates in the army, the last stage of integration into bourgeois society.

30. The youth, not having gone through the great defeats of the working class, does not bear the burden of this dead past. It is a profoundly powerful element of political renewal and is shaking the bureaucratic yokes.

31. The mass youth movement we have to strive to develop must be distinguished, however, from the youth affiliate of a revolutionary organization. Such a youth affiliate assumes the existence of an already strong revolutionary organization.

## VIII

32. The attempts to define a strategy for the student movement as such have generally ended in failure. The strategists of the Critical and the Negative Universities, as these terms indicate, reduce the student struggle to an essentially ideological struggle against the bourgeois university. As soon as the student movement moves on "from the criticism of the university to the criticism of society," it is faced with problems of revolutionary strategy that only a vanguard can resolve.

33. In a parallel way, revolutionary trade unionism in the student milieu leads into reformism. You cannot restrict yourself to applying in limited areas an all-encompassing design which you have the means to carry through only in the universities. This way you end up with the slogans of student control, even student management, in the universities and high

schools, which, in isolation from the overall situation in the class struggle, are thoroughly reformist.

34. Any attempt at a student strategy is thus liable to a double trap. On the one hand, there is the danger of reformism, of patching up the system under the pretext of a partial transitional strategy applied to the university. On the other hand, there is confrontationism which is only a policy in bits and pieces.

35. The Red University is not a slogan. Like workers control, it is a general theme of struggle which should be filled out by concrete slogans in specific situations. The Red University is not an institution that can be counterposed to the bourgeois university; it is a movement of struggle by which the vanguard seeks to direct the student movement as a permanent striking force against the system. The Red University is not a line for the universities but the tactic of the vanguard in the universities, a subordinate part of its overall strategy.

36. The university slogans of the organization may attack the problems of professional training by demanding flexible training and a guarantee of employment at the level of skill acquired. But the implementation of these slogans requires the mobilization of the workers movement, in which the embryonic vanguard does not hold the initiative. That is why the slogans centering around the theme of workers control of education retain a propagandistic character.

37. Incapable of an overall strategic program, the student movement can meet the bourgeoisie's university policy only by organizational resistance (maintaining the independence of the movement and opposing participation in collaborationist structures) and tactical political initiatives laid out by the vanguard in accordance with its evaluation of the political conjuncture as a whole.

These initiatives revolve around three major axes—support of workers struggles, support of anti-imperialist struggles, and the struggle against regimentation. It is under this last heading that struggles for freedom of expression, political organization, and against the bourgeois educational policy fall.

38. A student trade union as a means of struggle is a scheme that could have reality only in a consciously defined framework of student self-management. The reformist workers organizations, anxious to humor their allies, have maintained this myth of the autonomy of student demands. The student trade-union structures fly into bits as soon as political struggles revive. Moreover, united mass political organizations of the student movement, such as the FUA and the March 22 Movement were in France, can have only a temporary existence. Based on specific tactical agreements, they must disappear or fossilize once strategic problems come to the fore. Caught between the slow attrition of the student-interest organizations and a nostalgia for united political organizations, the student movement runs the risk of fragmentation into fiefs (Italy) or atomization.

39. The most favorable organizational outlet for the student movement presupposes already quite powerful revolutionary organizations. In this case, a process of cartelization develops. The breakup of Zengakuren provided an example of this which will not prove an exception. The revolutionary organizations, which alone are capable of resolving certain strategic and practical problems (like demonstrations which at a certain threshold of confrontation require a degree of discipline and organization that does not come naturally to the student movement), will reorganize the mass movement around their own political initiatives.

## X

40. The student movement and the youth radicalization cannot be considered simply as a windfall for the vanguard, which can win the youth involved over to its program and recruit new elements among them. This youth radicalization, in which the student movement occupies a prime position, enables the vanguard to alter the relationship of forces between it and the bourgeois state and the working-class bureaucracies. The specific role of the student movement offers the still weak vanguard a margin for maneuver, an opening to get a foothold in the political arena, to carry

out its initial experiments without being under the double fire of the bourgeois and bureaucratic repression. In this sense, the student movement is playing a precise and specific historical role.

41. But this opportunity for the vanguard is also a test. It cannot be satisfied to profit from the student movement. In order to play its role, the vanguard must grapple with the student movement, organize it en masse, engage in a continual polemic against its spontaneously generated ideologies. Ceaselessly threatened by opportunism of the left and right, the vanguard must have enough theoretical firmness to resist the ideological pressure of the movement and enough political understanding of the conditions of struggle left by the breakup of Stalinism to get in step with the movement without dissolving itself in it. The road is difficult; no verbal schematicism can make it any easier. But it is by this route that the resurrection of the revolutionary vanguard will come.

42. If this phenomenon holds true

## Hugo Blanco on Land Reform in Peru

The Cuban news agency Prensa Latina carried a summary in its November 25 bulletin of an interview with the imprisoned Peruvian peasant leader Hugo Blanco published in the magazine *Universidad*, which is put out by the University of San Marcos.

Among other things, Prensa Latina reported that the Trotskyist leader had said the agrarian reform law decreed by the ruling junta of General Velasco had reduced tensions in the countryside and made the prospect of armed struggle more remote.

Blanco denounced the junta's land reform as a capitalist commercial operation. He said that the big landowners were trying to use the land-reform law to force peasants to pay them compensation for lands seized by the peasants in the struggles of the early sixties over which the landlords were unable to reassert ownership.

Prensa Latina pointed out that Blanco urged revolutionists not to limit themselves to dogmatically criticizing the agrarian reform law from the cities or campuses, but to go into the coun-

tryside and promote the progressive aspects of the law by helping the peasants to organize themselves to gain all possible benefits and push the land-reform process forward.

The interview reported by Prensa Latina presented arguments that appear to have been developed more fully in Hugo Blanco's article "The Mobilization of the Peasants," which appeared in the October 13 issue of *Intercontinental Press* (page 904) and the declaration issued by the FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario—Revolutionary Left Front], published in our September 22 issue (page 839).

Understanding the role and the limitations of the youth radicalization is one of the keys to advancing the sections of the Fourth International and developing the world movement itself from a propagandistic International to an International rooted in the masses and capable of responding to the new tasks of the period.

### Next Issue

For our next issue we have scheduled a review of 1969 plus our annual index. This will be the final issue for the year, since we do not publish during the last week in December or the first week in January.

To begin 1970 right, we are working on some special features which we hope will prove of unusual interest to our readers.