

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 8, No. 3

© 1970 Intercontinental Press

January 26, 1970

50c

Nigeria's Victory

How It Happened What It Means

Mexico

'Waiting for Us
with Knives and Pipes'

Czechoslovakia:

Husak Uncovers
a 'Trotskyite Plot'

Student Hunger Strikers
Seized by Police in Peru

Hector Bejar:

Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerrilla Experience



GENERAL YAKUBU GOWON

In Air We Breathe

In former times, it was common knowledge that you could easily commit suicide by lighting up the charcoal burner and closing the doors and windows. A colorless, odorless gas put you to sleep . . . permanently.

Nowadays we have an easily available variant, at least in the industrially advanced countries. In a small, locked garage, you start up the motor of your car and wait.

In both cases, the insidious gas, as everyone knows, is carbon monoxide, which today is one of the components of the air of our cities. Don't worry. In low proportions, carbon monoxide is relatively harmless. Of course, if you want to be a worrywart . . .

At a meeting January 12-14 of the New York Academy of Sciences, reported in the January 15 *New York Times*, Dr. John R. Goldsmith of California's Department of Public Health estimated that each day in New York City "automobile traffic alone dumps 8.3 million pounds of carbon monoxide in the air." In Los Angeles "the daily output is more than 20 million pounds."

In the opinion of Dr. Goldsmith, "In Los Angeles at times there is enough carbon monoxide in the air to reduce the blood's oxygen-carrying capacity by 20 per cent."

Alarming or not? There have been some new discoveries. A study showed that under actual road conditions, the displacement in the blood of oxygen by carbon monoxide in levels between 10 and 20 percent reduced the driver's ability to respond to changes in the velocity of the car in front of him and his ability to detect the brightness of the taillights.

Other studies showed that levels of 3 to 6 percent hamper visual functions.

Because of carbon monoxide in the air normally breathed by the mother, unborn babies could suffer abnormalities of development.

Severe hardening of the arteries at an early age may be due to low levels of carbon monoxide. And the carbon monoxide in cigarette smoke might account for the high incidence of sudden death from heart attacks among addicts.

In This Issue

FEATURES

- 50 Relatively Harmless in Air We Breathe
58 Meeting of International Executive Committee of Fourth International

NIGERIA

- Les Evans 51 Civil War Ends—British Imperialism Held Main Victor
I. B. Tabata 52 Biafra and the Right to Secede
55 Washington's Postwar "Reconstruction" Plans
Woki Woka 56 Total Ban on Strikes
56 Sartre, Others Condemn the Silence Over Biafra

HAITI

- 54 Another CIA Job?

PAKISTAN

- Javed Akhtar 57 An Uneasy Calm

U. S. A.

- 59 Stalinists Below Bourgeois Level in Objectivity
59 Healyite Hits Nail on Head

MEXICO

- 60 "Waiting for Us with Knives and Pipes"

PERU

- 61 Police Seize Student Hunger Strikers
63 Struggle in Defense of Freedom of Press
72 Two Lima Churches Occupied

AUSTRALIA

- 62 "Say Something Stupid, Spiro!"

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

- 64 Husak Uncovers a "Trotskyite Plot"

CANADA

- Ron Haywood 65 Rise and Decline of Maoism in Canada

BOOKS

- Hector Bejar 68 Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerrilla Experience

DRAWINGS

- Copain 49 General Yakubu Gowon; 51, General Odumegwu Ojukwu; 57, General Yahya Khan; 65, Gustav Husak.

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 old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright ©1970 by Intercontinental Press.

British Imperialism Held Main Victor

By Les Evans

The thirty-month Nigerian civil war ended January 12 when secessionist Biafra was finally overwhelmed by federal troops. The toll in human lives was at least 2,000,000 dead, more than have perished in the war in Vietnam.

"We are loyal Nigerian citizens," Biafra's last head of state, Lieutenant Colonel Philip Effiong, said in his declaration of surrender January 14. He said that former Biafrans would "accept the authority of the federal military Government of Nigeria."

General Odumegwu Ojukwu, who led the breakaway nation during its two-and-a-half-year existence, fled the country as the last defenses crumbled.

From the beginning, rival imperialist interests intervened in the Nigerian civil war, seeking to deepen their influence on the African continent. Both sides accepted and sought aid from the most reactionary sources, and each accused the other of making important concessions to imperialism to secure military backing.

The governments of the capitalist world did not regard either side as a revolutionary threat to their interests.

Britain, whose British Petroleum-Shell group alone had investments in Nigeria of nearly \$500,000,000, became a heavy supplier of arms to the federal government at Lagos.

France, Britain's old colonial rival, was Biafra's chief supporter, although it never gave the Ojukwu regime formal recognition and never provided the volume of aid the Wilson government gave to the other side.

Some of the most unsavory governments in Europe intervened, although not usually on the same side. Thus, Portugal aided Biafra, while Spain was reputedly running guns to Nigeria.

In Africa itself, only four regimes recognized secessionist Biafra: Gabon and the Ivory Coast, both former French colonies; and Zambia and Tanzania. But if recognition implied support from Tanzania, one of the most radical of the national bourgeois



GENERAL ODUMEGWU OJUKWU

regimes, the Ojukwu government also was aided by South Africa and Rhodesia, and employed white mercenaries who had fought in the Congo.

Washington maintained an ostentatious neutrality, but tacitly supported the Nigerian government, while providing some \$80,000,000 in food relief for Biafra—a "humanitarian" policy that was also designed to assure its influence there if the Biafrans should win their bid for independence.

Both Moscow and Peking intervened, too. Moscow joined British imperialism and Franco Spain in providing massive military aid to the neocolonialist government of General Yakubu Gowon in Lagos. Peking condemned the Soviet bureaucrats, expressing its own support, albeit critical, for the Biafrans' right to self-determination.

The civil conflict was further complicated by the mixing of tribal, class, and regional issues.* The country itself was an artificial creation of Brit-

* For a more extensive discussion of these questions, see "The War Between Nigeria and Biafra," *Intercontinental Press*, December 2, 1968, page 1076.

ish imperialism, bringing within arbitrary geographical boundaries people with no common culture or history. The federation united the semi-nomadic Hausas of the North, the Yorubas of the West, and the Ibos of the East, along with many smaller tribes.

With its 60,000,000 people, Nigeria is the most populous country of Africa. Biafra, with its Ibo majority, claimed 14,000,000 of this number when it seceded on May 30, 1967. An estimated 3,000,000 persons remained in the Biafran enclave at the final collapse.

The Ibos, who were once the favored instruments of British rule in Nigeria, became the principal victims of the artificial state after independence. Precisely because of the role they had played as civil servants and merchants, they were not chosen by the British to rule the independent nation. They were rapidly developing into a national bourgeoisie with interests of their own, in conflict with those of British imperialism. It was instead the backward North that was to control the "independent" Nigeria.

Without the protection of the British, the Ibos, hated for their role as colonial administrators, became easy targets for pogroms along tribal lines. In face of widespread fraud, the Ibos' political representatives boycotted the federal elections of 1964, which a northern-dominated alliance won by default.

In January 1966, Eastern army officers led by Major General J. T. U. Aguiyi-Ironsi, an Ibo, staged a coup, deposing the "elected" government. Ironsi was overthrown in a counter-coup in July 1966, which was followed by a pogrom in which as many as 50,000 Ibos were killed. This set the stage for secession.

Under the cover of tribal warfare, a bitter struggle was waged for supremacy between two emergent national bourgeoisies—within the same "nation." Each sought the patronage of imperialist protectors.

One reason for the reluctance of the

national bourgeois states of Africa to recognize Biafra was the fear of promoting movements in their own countries for self-determination along tribal lines for dozens of new "nations," a process of Balkanization that would hopelessly fragment the African continent and make it even easier prey for imperialist intervention.

It can still be debated whether Biafra constituted a nation, and as such has been denied its legitimate right

to self-determination. It may yet be seen that the Ibos were right in believing that they could never be secure in a Nigeria controlled by their traditional enemies.

But the factor that outweighed all others, in the absence of a working-class party or a revolutionary movement on either side, was the deepening influence of Western imperialism—in Nigeria and Biafra alike. The *New York Times* gave its estimate of the

outcome of the war in its January 13 issue.

Nigeria, the *Times* said, "has enough oil to put her among the top six or seven producers in the world and the population to sustain industrialization. . . . The end of the war will make it possible to reopen oil fields disrupted by the fighting, including tracts owned by French, Italian, British and Dutch interests. Overall, the British are the big winners, because they dominate the Nigerian economy."

Nigeria

Biafra and the Right to Secede

By I. B. Tabata

[The following article is from the March 1969 issue of *APDUSA*, a newsletter published by the African Peoples Democratic Union of Southern Africa. The author is a well-known leader of the struggle against South Africa's apartheid system.]

* * *

Civil war in Nigeria has raised the question of the right to secession in its acutest form. All progressive forces throughout the world are called upon to discuss this problem with the seriousness that it demands, for let it be understood, this is not the first time this problem has presented itself in Africa, nor will it be the last. The continent of Africa is going to be plagued with similar problems for some time to come.

In former times the right of secession, the right of national self-determination, arose for the most part in the context of developing capitalism accompanied by the growth of capitalist democracy.

In this period, the demand of the national bourgeoisie for self-determination, which implied equality of nationalities, was a reflection of the internal dynamics of the struggle. To the extent that the demand expressed the national aspirations of the rising bourgeoisie for the establishment of a bourgeois democracy, in opposition to purely tribal and feudal servitude, this was progressive.

Throughout this period, socialists al-

ways supported the right of self-determination. This, however, did not imply a support of the national bourgeoisie and all their policies but simply that part of the demand which was historically progressive.

There was another principle which on the face of it seemed opposed to the first, namely, the creation of a single unified national state within the same geographic confines. This was in conformity with the economic requirements of a developing capitalist system. This, too, marked progress over tribalism-feudalism, but this objective requirement did not and could not invalidate the right of nationalities to full equality, i.e., the right to self-determination, including secession. The bourgeoisie, then a progressive force, set itself the task of organizing society, put itself at the head of the struggle against medievalism and claimed to speak in the name of the dispossessed and rightless people.

Now, in the period of decaying capitalism — imperialism, when the bourgeoisie has no longer a progressive role to play, the "general democratic content" has been reduced to the minimum. Bourgeois nationalism has lost its independence and is almost completely subordinated to the requirements of finance capital.

When Tshombe makes a bid to wrench Katanga from the Congo, he may invoke the principle of the right to secession. But the truth of the matter is that his demand is devoid of any semblance of a progressive aspect.

There is nothing of the "general democratic content" in his demand. He acts not in the interests of the national bourgeoisie but at the behest of imperialism. The Congo without Katanga is like a body with the heart pulled out of it. In South Africa, the architects of the fascistic apartheid policy demarcate 13 percent of the land for settlement by four-fifths of the black population (Bantustans) and encourage their lackeys to demand these as separate states. The vast majority of the African oppressed dismiss this demand out of hand as a snare designed to rob them of all claim to the country of their birth. Bantustans are not and cannot be viable as states. They are designed to become reservoirs of cheap black labour and graveyards for the exhausted, disease-ridden, spent force that is no longer able to minister to the needs of the white master race.

Tomorrow and the day after, imperialism in its effort to atomize African states will find more stooges to appeal to the right of secession. It is not difficult to state in advance that British imperialism, in an attempt to bring Zambia to heel, will not hesitate to find someone to advocate the breakaway of Barotseland (now Barotse province) from Zambia or Ashante from Ghana when that country makes a bid to smash the shackles clamped on it after the imperialist-engineered coup. A related problem that will be used as a source of friction amongst African states is that

of the boundaries. It is not accidental, for instance, that Banda of Malawi has, out of the blue, made sweeping claims on the territories of Tanzania and Zambia. In this he has the backing of the South African racist regime and Portugal, which in turn has the support of the NATO powers. All this signifies that the incipient and national bourgeoisie in the underdeveloped countries no longer play an independent role but have become pawns in the hands of finance capital.

The Nigeria-Biafra conflict must be seen in its historic setting, for it carries within it all the sources of conflicts and contradictions so applicable to the continent of Africa as a whole. In it are to be found the relics of ancient social organisms existing side by side with the most modern social structures of an industrial age. We find the hoe alongside the tractor, the spear with the machine gun. The witch-doctor with his craft exists side by side with the nuclear physicist; in a word, a tribalist, a slave, a feudalist, a trader, an industrialist, and a worker live side by side. All these stages were represented in the British-created Nigerian state.

When Britain conquered that part of the world, she brought together under one administration, peoples of different cultural levels of development while at the same time carefully maintaining and nurturing the differences amongst them. The Fulanis and Hausas of the North lived under a despotic oriental medievalism, the Yorubas under feudalism, and the Ibos, through force of circumstance, developed a trading class. It was on these heterogeneous nationalities and numerous others that Britain imposed a single national state of Nigeria immediately before she granted political independence to it with a constitution that ensured that political power was fully in the hands of the most backward section of the North.

The point to remember is that the national state was not born as a result of the struggle of the national bourgeoisie, that is to say, it did not arise as a consequence of the inner dynamics of the natural development of progressive forces. It was an arbitrary imposition solely in the interests of foreign finance capital. Despite the constitution, the different groups, by and large, continued to identify

themselves according to their tribal affiliations. The notable exception was the Ibo section. Within this group had developed a merchant class whose interests demanded a unified national state. Its representatives spread all over Nigeria in pursuit of their trade. In this sense, the Ibos were the only group who regarded themselves as Nigerians. It was only within this group and its struggles for a unified nation that "a general democratic content which is directed against oppression" was to be found.

It was to be expected that soon after the overlordship of the British was withdrawn, the centrifugal forces within the society would come to the fore. The contradictions within were many and varied. There were the emirates of the North which sought to impose their political influence over the whole of Nigeria. In this they had the backing of Britain, for with their backward-looking social system, imperialism could ensure its continued economic domination. There were the kingdoms of the Yorubas, who were interested in entrenching their own hierarchical system, with all its privileges, over the minority groups and serfs. Then there was the Ibo merchant class, whose interest lay in the abolition of all medieval and feudal vestiges for the free development of capital. And, finally, there were the working class and poor peasantry.

In the welter of these irreconcilable forces at work, it was inevitable that an explosion would sooner or later occur. For a time the leaders of various groupings attempted to effect a reconciliation to stave off the coming holocaust, but the almost unbelievable corruption and other malpractices in the higher circles triggered the working class to take action in self-defense. Whoever engineered the first coup succeeded in forestalling an upheaval of no small magnitude from below. A revolt by the working class at that time would certainly have had the sympathy of the dispossessed semi-slaves in the North and the peasantry in the South, Midwest and the East. Such a movement had all the potentialities of a broad national movement that would cut across all tribal affiliations; sweep aside all vestiges of medievalism and forge a truly national state, thus performing a task that properly belongs to the bourgeoisie.

The military intervention succeeded

in hoodwinking the masses without being able to eliminate any of the social contradictions. Faced with the sharpening social crisis and mounting discontent, the rulers dissipated the energy of the masses into the launching of pogroms which had the effect of debasing the political struggle to a most primitive level. In this way, they quashed the nascent aspirations for nationhood while at the same time they whipped up fresh fires of racism-tribalism.

Ironsi, afraid of making radical changes in the British-imposed constitution which stood as a barrier to all progress, was consumed in the flames of the social crisis. Gowon, his successor, prolonged his life by plunging the country into a civil war and diverting the attention of the oppressed away from the real problems of the country. He, too, stood in awe before the basic structure set up by British imperialism and the power of the North. He merely tinkered with the delimitation of constituencies without in any way tackling the very foundations of the medieval social and economic setup of the emirate system.

When Gowon appeals to the principle of one national state, one Nigeria, he is in reality advocating the maintenance of a nation based largely upon oriental medievalism. The irony of the situation is that Gowon declares war upon the only people who were in truth Nigerians (the Ibos) and whose interests demanded a single national state, whether it was unitary or federal. Under these conditions it is difficult to find a single argument in support of Gowon's policies which are designed to appease the aristocracy of the South and the emirs of the North.

It does not follow from this that socialists should support Ojukwu and all his policies. But it has to be remembered that the right of equality of nationalities, including secession, is indisputable. The only questions to be asked are: what are the motives for such a demand? Would the satisfaction of such a demand help to bring nearer the achievement of proletarian democracy? Biafra is not only a viable state but a potentially rich one. It is also an indubitable fact that its base is capitalism pure and simple, with all the social and political relationships that go with it.

This does not of course mean that

all the relics of tribalism and other relationships of the past have been completely replaced by bourgeois democratic norms. But what it does mean is that the circumstances created by the present situation clear the field and create a terrain favorable for the struggle for socialism. It goes without saying that this is not the aim of the national bourgeoisie. Theirs is the creation and maintenance of a capitalist exploitative system. To achieve this end, the bourgeoisie as a class will not scruple to put their country in pawn to imperialism so long as they can be made junior partners in an exploiting joint-stock company Ltd.

The discovery of the rich oil deposits in the East is probably the chief motivating factor that influenced the Biafran bourgeoisie to break with Nigeria. It certainly held out a rich promise for a great future. The petty bourgeoisie saw visions of a new world, the coveted world of the European financiers. What national bourgeoisie would not grasp such an opportunity! War itself with all its horror was not too high a price to pay.

The same prospects of rich dividends galvanized the federal leaders to stake their claim to the spoils. Thus in the final analysis, the bourgeoisie on both sides impelled by the same motive—greed—plunged the country into a grim and bloody carnage. As would be expected, this situation sets the stage for intervention by rival imperialisms. The British step into the breach to save what is left of its own creation—the federation lorded over by its carefully nurtured compradors, and not incuriously supported by the Soviet Union which provides the hardware; while on the other side, French imperialism finds the moment opportune to dip its own finger in the pie and at the same time increase its influence in West Africa at the cost of its rivals.

The Biafran rulers want exclusive control of the minerals on their own soil. The federal bourgeoisie on their part are actuated by something more than greed for the immediate riches. They are, in addition, impelled by the knowledge that their own reactionary regime is strengthened and fostered by the enslavement of the Biafrans.

There is yet another motive for the federalist actions. By harnessing the people's energies into a holocaust, they have temporarily succeeded in

diverting their attention from the realities of their stark social conditions. Their proclaimed war aims, couched in sophisticated terms, are designed to win the sympathy of the outside world. Internally the propaganda is calculated to arouse a vicious xenophobia against the Ibos.

It is true that the policy of the Biafran bourgeoisie is in many respects condemnable. The despicable speech delivered the other day by one of the spokesmen calling upon American imperialism to save their country from communism reflects the opportunism and the basic reactionary nature of this class. *But this must not be allowed to cloud the issue—the principle of self-determination and concretely the right of the Biafrans to secede. There is no question but that in so far as the Biafrans are concerned theirs is a people's war for survival.*

It is pertinent at this juncture to quote from a journalist from a country that supports the federal government, Winston S. Churchill [grandson of Sir Winston Churchill].

"It is impossible to understand the Nigerian Civil war," he writes, "until one appreciates why it is that the Biafrans are fighting and what they are fighting for. Above all, this is a people's war. No other explanation fits the facts or accounts for their spirit and long-suffering. The Biafrans almost to a man—and indeed, as is often the case, the women are even more forceful on this point—believe that surrender or military defeat can only mean death." (The Times, March 5.)

On the federal side there is evidence of mounting discontent amongst the masses, fanned by increasing disillusionment with the war. The main burden for the prosecution of the war falls upon the masses who have nothing to gain from it. The conscription for the front, the heavy taxation of the poorest, the lack of the most elementary necessities of life and the large desertions of the conscripts, all combine to produce a sense of frustration giving rise to large-scale banditry and lawlessness. This is now turning into resistance against the war, with isolated revolts here and there. All this points to one conclusion, namely, that the stage has been set for a leap forward. The question

is no longer how to keep Nigeria as one economic unit.

It is fruitless to discuss what might have been. History has taken its own course which is a departure from that which was originally plotted by the politicians. The state of Biafra is a fact. This should be a point of departure for all discussion amongst democrats and socialists.

What is necessary is to point out to the workers and peasants in the federation that their interests are the same as those of their brothers oppressed and exploited in Biafra; that their liberation is indissolubly bound up with that of the Biafrans. *For this reason they themselves have to accord the Biafrans the freedom to secede. They themselves can never be free as long as they allow their own oppressors to subjugate other nationalities.*

Only in this way can the masses in the federation revolt against the war imposed on them by the federal bourgeoisie and stretch the hand of friendship and solidarity to the exploited and oppressed Biafrans. This is the road that can lead to peace in Nigeria.

Another CIA Job?

Graham Greene, the British novelist, accused the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency [CIA] January 12 of aiding Haitian dictator François "Papa Doc" Duvalier in the murder of eighty-five persons in the Port-au-Prince area.

Greene leveled his charges in a letter to the London Times, reported by the January 13 Washington Post. According to the Post's summary, "Duvalier's terrorist squads killed men, women and children last year in a massacre similar to the alleged Mylai 4 massacre by American soldiers in Vietnam." Greene was quoted as saying that "to make Haiti seem respectable again for American tourism, Papa Doc has turned to killing so-called Communists." He said the Port-au-Prince massacre was carried out by the Ton Ton Macoute, Duvalier's secret police. Greene said the dictator considered the killings "a success he believed to owe to the assistance of the CIA."

Washington's Postwar 'Reconstruction' Plans

[The following is a major excerpt from a paper entitled "The End of the Nigeria-Biafra War," released January 14 by the Africa Research Group, a radical study project in Cambridge, Massachusetts.]

* * *

With the secession ended, what course will the new Nigeria adopt? President Nixon has already pledged millions for relief and a major international effort is being organized. What he didn't reveal was that thinking on the postwar reconstruction plans for Nigeria has been going on for many months in the backrooms of American foundations, corporations and consulting firms. Almost a year ago, in March 1968, the Ford Foundation sponsored a major conference on reconstruction at Ibadan in Nigeria to discuss the plans.

Other U.S. agencies, the World Bank and Arthur D. Little [ADL], the Cambridge consulting group, had already made far-reaching decisions on reconstruction policy. ADL until recently served as the principal advisers to the federal government on investment promotion and industrial policy by virtue of successive multimillion-dollar AID contracts.

ADL's 1968 progress report to AID revealed that the firm's technical advisory group had been giving special consideration to reconstruction planning since *November, 1967*—that is, less than six months after the war had begun. Their eagerness to get on with reconstruction was the result of the opportunities and new possibilities they felt the war provided them.

Their own progress report points out that an ADL paper entitled "Nigeria's New Industrial Policy," prepared for a two-day meeting of government officials in March 1969, "indicated the urgent short term problems of economic reconstruction but stated that *reconstruction economic policies can often result in considerable improvement over previous economic situations.*" (Italics added.)

Reportedly, the recommendations

and the conclusions in this same paper were being adopted as the basis for the country's reconstruction policies. These included a "New Estate Policy" aimed at promoting plantation-based agro-industries. The Ministry of Agriculture was using ADL reports as the basis for agricultural planning and development for the next ten years.

This should not be surprising: ever since 1945 the disciples and international missionaries of U.S. pseudo-technocratic expertise have perfected a specialty of rebuilding war-torn economies so that they could be more easily penetrated by American companies. While the State Department brandishes its official neutrality, they continue to intervene daily in Nigerian affairs in order to expand the influence of imperialist institutions, all in the spirit of "reconstruction."

Nigeria is one of the few independent African countries favored by sizeable U.S. assistance programs, which, of course, means that Nigeria, with its 60,000,000 people, represents a major potential market for U.S. goods.

At the outbreak of the civil war, Nigeria was the tenth largest producer of oil in the world. American companies have been increasing their share of investments in Nigeria, with the Rockefeller interests—the Chase International Investment Company and Mobil Oil—playing a particularly important role.*

While British investment is still dominant in the Nigerian economy, the U.S.-controlled institutions—from the World Bank to the Ford Foundation—have played the major innovative role in structuring Nigerian development. U.S. foundations and government agencies have coordinated their efforts in this campaign. While Ford provided a team of experts to write Nigeria's first six-year economic plan,

* U.S. direct investments are close to \$200,000,000. The U.S. also has a stake in protecting British interests as part of its support for the British economy.

AID promised over \$200,000,000 for its financing.

Since 1959 AID has committed some \$189,600,000 in economic assistance. Of the "private" agencies, Ford alone has pumped over \$20,000,000 into its Nigeria projects. Together, these agencies are seeking to build and staff an educational *system* to train the new middle class. Simultaneously they are erecting the *institutions* to employ them and manage their lives.

The strategy of imperialist penetration in Nigeria is not being challenged either by the Soviet Union, which has used the war as an opportunity to expand its own influence in the country. If imperialism is to be challenged, the people themselves will have to do it.

During the war, political parties and agitation have been outlawed on both sides of the battleline. In Nigeria, the military has presided over a fragile coalition which includes such leaders as Chief Awolowo, once considered a man of the left. Yet this populist front in Lagos may represent nothing more than a façade for the reinforcement and expansion of middle-class influence so essential to corporate imperialist strategy. For some months now, the war provided the cohesive glue which kept Nigeria together; now that it has ended, the never-resolved conflict between elites may erupt again.

Arrest MIR Members in Chile

Twenty-four young members of the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria—Movement of the Revolutionary Left] were arrested in Chile January 4. The authorities claimed that the young people had firearms in their possession and were preparing to rob a bank, presumably to gain funds for waging guerrilla warfare.

Merit Changes Name to Pathfinder

The name of Merit Publishers, the chief American publishers of Trotsky's works, has been changed to Pathfinder Press, Inc. The address, however, remains the same: 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003.

Total Ban on Strikes

By Woki Woka

Lagos

The federal military government of Nigeria has placed a total ban on all strikes, threats of strikes, lockouts, and wage increases of any kind for the next twelve months. The decree was published here on December 13, 1969.

The military government said in a statement that it recognized that the workers and the majority of the country's trade-union leaders had shown a sense of responsibility and loyalty to the national cause throughout the current crisis. The ban on strikes, the government said, was necessary because of the disruptive activities of a few agitators, who, exploiting the hardships and sacrifices brought about by the war, caused industrial unrest in vital sectors of the economy

and thereby endangered the survival of this great nation.

The new decree prohibits the publication of threats to strike or the showing on mass communications media of disputes involving a threatened strike. Any publication likely to cause industrial unrest or disaffection is also forbidden.

The federal government has also decided on measures to control prices and freeze wages and dividends over the next twelve months. For this period the government will:

1. Exercise selective controls over basic prices in the economy during the period of national emergency and postwar reconstruction.

2. Stabilize the general price level, control profiteering, and contain inflationary pressures on the economy while avoiding artificial price levels

unrelated to economic forces, thereby minimizing black marketeering as much as possible.

3. Protect the interests of the low-income groups. The government promises to set up a price-control board consisting of members drawn from government officials, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the trade unions, and the public.

The board will have authority to fix, where and when necessary, the factory price of locally manufactured commodities, and the mark-up margins for different centers of distribution in the country, taking into account such factors as the cost of transportation. With respect to imported commodities, the board will fix the landed price and mark-up margins for different centers.

The government said in conclusion that it recognized that in view of the disruption caused by the war and other factors it will be necessary to carry out a general review of salaries and wages. It promised to appoint a commission to review salaries and wages after the end of the civil war.

January 1, 1970.

Sartre, Others Condemn the Silence Over Biafra

[Following the triumph of the Nigerian federal forces, a group of leading French radical intellectuals issued a statement, presenting their views on the civil war and its outcome. The signers were Simone de Beauvoir, Jean-Paul Sartre, A. Culioli, Laurent Schwartz, D. de Coppet, R. Jaulin, B. Kouchner, C. Lanzman, R. Marienstras, E. Marienstras, J. Pouillon, and P. Vidal-Naquet. Our translation of this statement follows:]

* * *

We know today of the passive complicity of the Allies in the genocide carried out by the Hitlerites. Still, the inaction of the democracies and of the Soviet Union—their refusal to bomb the railways leading to the concentration camps or to help the sub-human to rebel—had at least a shadow of an excuse. There was a world

war going on and it was a total war.

Today, nearly all the member nations of the UN, all of which are at peace and some of which are gorged with wealth, are accomplices not merely by omission but by deed in the agony that the Biafran people have suffered and must still suffer. These nations have deliberately rejected all procedures that would have made it possible to save ethnic groups which we fear may already have perished.

The nations of the world have permitted the enemies of these ethnic groups to conquer them slowly by famine and sickness. They have permitted a pseudolabor government in Great Britain and a pseudosocialist government in Russia to vie with each other in seeing which could provide the most efficient experts and the deadliest weapons so that the killers' work would be most facilitated.

Fire, ruin, pure and simple mur-

der, bombing hospitals and market places, an almost total blockade, nothing was spared. And this had the approval of almost all the African states, the Arab states, the countries of the "third world," the socialist, democratic, fascist, and other states, and of Secretary General U Thant who gave his murderous benediction to the great cause of uniting the oil fields in Nigeria.

For this ignominious conduct, no excuse was offered except worn-out principles that could not even mask the participation of these cold-blooded monsters in an unspeakable activity, an activity by virtue of which the Jews have already been converted into soap, the Sudanese blacks into hunted animals, by virtue of which the South American Indians have been slowly killed off, the Kurds in Iraq and the Indonesian Communists struck down; for the sake of which

the Vietnamese are being exterminated along with their flora and fauna, for the sake of which millions of citizens were deported to forced labor camps in the Soviet Union and tanks were sent into Czechoslovakia.

The Biafran affair epitomizes all this and marks the beginning of an entirely new age, in which any established nation can boast of committing any enormity in the name of any principle before any or all other nations. Let the murderers and the ideologists in their service rejoice. Their reign has encircled our globe.

In France and on the left, because that is where we stand, we must long remember the silences and the meager doling out of the news by the political and "objective" press, as well as the semantic pussyfooting of the left parties and unions, which prevented the Biafran question from being brought home to the conscience of the masses in political terms.

In the cesspool into which this failure has plunged us, we can state merely that everything this left says from now on can be received only with suspicion. Its phrasemongering and its concern for special causes are now revealed as hideous and murderous emptiness.

For Biafra, they are already trying to limit or prevent the possible massacres. We can be sure that they are doing this primarily to keep the word "genocide" from being brought up.

A term has yet to be invented to describe what has taken place — a whole generation of children lost, permanent crippling of millions of human beings, a terrifying number of refugees who cannot be fed immediately, and deaths by the hundreds of thousands. The victor will take charge of counting up the toll, with all the well-known objectivity of those who ride the whirlwind of history.

Let us hope that the help that is promised now — now! — will have some effect. A population already at the outermost limit of destitution cannot hold out for long.

The sequel to these events is predictable — a few massacres, as long as they can be perpetrated without witnesses and can pass for "acts of war." And then it will be revealed to us that the Nigerians are filled with love and kindness for the Bia-

frans, that their only thought is to feed them, and that those responsible for the holocaust are the Biafrans themselves. The press, of course, will publish the documents and evidence provided by the Nigerians.

Pakistan

An Uneasy Calm

By Javed Akhtar

Karachi

The regime of the new military dictator, General Yahya Khan, was supposed to calm the country down and make a few illusory concessions in order to restabilize the economic situation. However, the students of East Pakistan and the workers of West Pakistan have not allowed things to proceed calmly and the regime has been forced to make important concessions, the most crucial of which is the decision to stage the first general election ever held in Pakistan on the basis of anything but the most narrowly restricted franchise. The election has been scheduled for next October.

The newly elected members of parliament will then frame the country's constitution.

Political activity was resumed January 1, and public meetings and demonstrations have been allowed. But almost immediately afterwards, the Yahya government issued a new martial-law regulation declaring that these political activities must not in any way be opposed to the "ideology of Pakistan" — an obvious move against the left forces in the country.

While the left-wing and radical groupings are forced by statute to limit their political activities, their right-wing and neofascist opponents are in fact encouraged by the government to carry out a campaign of vilification and slander against progressives and particularly socialists.

All this propaganda did not succeed in defeating the candidacy of Raja Anwar, a prominent revolutionary student leader of Rawalpindi, for the presidency of the Gordon College Students' Union. The election campaign against Anwar united the neofascist

We should add that after the murder of the Biafran hopes, the ascendancy of political gangsterism has spread planetwide. We are a part of this planet. For the moment, outside of that, silence reigns.



GENERAL YAHYA KHAN

Jamaat-i-Islam and Mr. Bhutto's People's party. While the former denounced Anwar for being a "communist and an atheist," the latter accused him of being associated with that "well-known C. I. A. agent, Tariq Ali."*

Anwar combated both these campaigns and fought the election on a principled political basis, defeating his opponent by more than 200 votes.

A meeting was also organized to protest against the refusal of the United States government to give Tariq Ali a visa to address an Arab conference in Detroit.

Meanwhile the right-wing press con-

* Tariq Ali is the Pakistani-born British antiwar leader. He edits a London radical journal *Black Dwarf* and is a leader of the International Marxist Group, the British section of the Fourth International, the world Trotskyist organization. — IP

tinues its campaign of slanders in the best tradition of the Nazi press of the thirties. A well-established right-wing Urdu-language weekly, *Chatan*, published in Lahore, carried a two-page attack on Tariq Ali in its December 22 issue. It is necessary to quote from this to show the depth to which the neofascist journals have sunk.

The article is introduced by claiming that the anti-imperialist movement in Western Europe is in fact financed by the capitalist countries themselves in order to aid Zionism. Tariq Ali is accused of being in the pay of Zionism and a close associate of the "Jew Cohn-Bendit" and a follower of the "Jewish philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre."

The author, one Mohel Iqbal Sohail, writing from Beirut, quotes *Le Monde* as the alleged source of this information. The article continues:

"In Britain, Tariq Ali is associated with a radical socialist group which is full of young Jews. Ali's friendship with Cohn-Bendit is an old one. It is a well-known fact that Cohn-Bendit's family contains two beautiful young Jewish girls and with them Tariq Ali's relations were more than friendly. Both these girls played an important role in the troubles in France.

"At this stage it is worth mentioning that one of Tariq Ali's weaknesses is that he practices 'Sex Orgy' [these words appeared in English in the text] which is a common occurrence in Europe these days. Before the disturbances in France Tariq Ali and Cohn-Bendit met in Bonn at the house of a rich Jewish family and here forty Jewish girls were provided for them. Some specially chosen Jewish girls were also sent from Wall Street in New York..."

The article continues in a similar vein, but its importance lies in the fact that this leading right-wing weekly feels threatened by the ideas which people like Tariq Ali represent. It is bent on character assassination of this vile nature in order to discredit these ideas.

For the government of Yahya Khan the elections present a serious dilemma. If a government is elected which is even bourgeois-democratic in character, it will undoubtedly question the enormous financial resources diverted to military expenditure and thus threaten the independence of the army. To circumvent this, the army will be forced to reach a compromise solution

with the right-wing parties to maintain its financial hegemony.

The possibility also exists that if there is a mass upsurge similar in character to the November 1968 uprising the regime will immediately cancel the elections, which have been promised simply in order to calm down the undefeated mass movement.

The task of revolutionists in this election is clear: to participate in them to make revolutionary propaganda so that the voice of the people can be heard again. But it seems unlikely that this policy will be followed by any group.

The pro-Moscow National Awami party is preparing to fight for democracy and would participate in coalition governments with the reactionaries.

Maulani Bhashani's National Awami party is split into two factions, one of which is opposed to participation and the other of which is in favor of

participation in the same way as the pro-Moscow liberals.

The outcome that may be expected from the election—if it is ever held—seems to be quite clear: A coalition of right-wing parties which will come no nearer to solving the problems confronting the country, but which will undoubtedly create an atmosphere in which revolutionists will be able to organize themselves.

At the time of this writing, Pakistan is in the grip of a calm which will prove extremely deceptive. The morale and combativity of the masses is still there and the weakness of the military government has further encouraged their opposition to the present system.

In West Pakistan, however, there is still no revolutionary grouping which could exploit the situation, and in East Pakistan the elements who could provide revolutionary leadership have to unite themselves and accept a revolutionary Marxist program.

Fourth International

International Executive Committee Meets

The International Executive Committee of the Fourth International met at the end of December in its first plenary gathering since it was elected last April at a world congress of the Trotskyist organization.

The meeting, which was attended by twenty-one members and a number of observers from various parts of the world, discussed a report by Ernest Germain on the unfavorable economic situation now facing capitalism on an international scale, the perspectives of the Vietnamese revolution and the antiwar struggle, particularly in the United States, the strike wave in capitalist Europe, and the latest developments in the international crisis of Stalinism.

In the light of the report, the IEC considered the current activities of the Fourth International and the possibilities of expanding them in the coming period.

Livio Maitan reported on the working-class uprisings in Argentina, the permanent crisis of the military dictatorship in Bolivia, the repression

and witch-hunt unleashed against the revolutionary movement in that country, and other recent developments in the Latin-American revolution.

He outlined proposals for a broad international campaign calling for immediate release of the revolutionists imprisoned in Bolivia and Peru.

Pierre Frank reported on a conference held by the European sections of the Fourth International where it was decided to end the "entryist" orientation which has been followed by these sections for some years.

Fernand Charlier reported on a resolution drawing a balance sheet on the Algerian revolution from 1962 to 1969 which includes a section of self-criticism of the work of the Fourth International during the years when it was mobilizing material and political aid of the greatest importance to the development of the revolution.

The plenum was marked by a lively discussion and the free presentation of varying viewpoints on some of the subjects.

Stalinists Below Bourgeois Level in Objectivity

Two late roundups on the December 27-30 convention of the Young Socialist Alliance in Minneapolis, Minnesota, make an interesting contrast. One, by Austin C. Wehrwein, appeared in the January 9 issue of the *Boston Christian Science Monitor*. The other, by Ted Pearson, was published in the January 7 issue of the *Daily World*, the New York voice of the Communist party U. S. A.

While both reporters are hostile to the views of the Trotskyist youth organization, the two accounts show a marked disparity in objectivity.

Wehrwein accurately summarized the decisions taken by the convention. These included, he said:

● Campaigns to capture control of student councils, which SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] disdains as too 'Mickey Mouse,' as a step toward creating 'Red universities' which will be instruments for socialist revolutionary change.

● 'Mass action' to support the AFL-CIO boycott of General Electric Company against which 13 unions struck last October, by 'keeping scab GE recruiters off the campus' and forcing colleges and universities to join the boycott of GE products.

● An all-out campaign to defend the Black Panther Party, although the YSA has reservations about its armed tactics.

● Support for the 'women's liberation' movement, including sponsorship of teach-ins where demands such as courses in 'female history' (counterpart of black history) will be discussed.

● Continued united-front cooperation with the Student Mobilization Committee, one of a number of groups which coordinated the November march on Washington and in which YSA boasts an influential role."

The Communist party reporter, on the other hand, gave this summary:

"The main activities, it was announced, will include campaigns to 'expose' peace candidates, polemics against the Black Panther Party and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, and 'united fronts' for

the defense of the Panthers, vehicles for launching an all-black political party."

The *Daily World* reporter sought to red-bait an important sector of the antiwar movement by distorting the actual relationship between the YSA and the Student Mobilization Committee. He accused the convention of "acting almost as an executive committee for the SMC."

Both reporters described why the YSA decided to affirm its use of the slogan "Bring the Troops Home Now" in its antiwar work, rather than adopt the more militant sounding "Support the National Liberation Front." Wehrwein wrote:

"Indicative of the YSA pragmatic approach was the defeat of a resolution to add the slogan 'Support the Vietnamese revolution!' This happened not because the YSA does not support it but because it was felt that this position would lessen its appeal to nonsocialists."

According to Pearson, however, "The majority overwhelmingly defeated this proposal, noting that the NLF was led by 'Stalinists,' that they disagreed with its policies, that the Paris negotiations were part of the U.S.-USSR plot to sell out the Vietnamese revolution."

As Pearson knows, none of these criticisms—to say nothing of the distorted form in which he presents them—were given as reasons for accepting or rejecting the slogan "Victory to the NLF." The YSA gives unconditional support to the Vietnamese revolution against imperialism. The reporter for the *Christian Science Monitor* was able to report the convention's reasons for choosing the slogan "Bring the Troops Home Now" more accurately than the *Daily World* reporter. Despite all the bourgeois and religious prejudices of his newspaper, Wehrwein was permitted to come closer to the truth than Pearson, writing for a "Communist" newspaper. The *Daily World*, of course, is not really communist, it is *Stalinist*.

Pearson's argument seems even more peculiar in light of the fact that

it is only in the last few years that the Communist party has come to accept the demand for the immediate withdrawal of U. S. troops from Vietnam. Previously it supported such slogans as "Peace Now" and "Negotiate." It has certainly never advanced "Victory to the NLF" as its line, or main slogan, in the antiwar movement.

Even the number attending the gathering turned out to be a point on which the two reporters gave different accounts. Wehrwein said there were "about 600," a conservative estimate for some of the smaller sessions. He added, however, that "the total might have reached 1,000 but for heavy snow across much of the nation."

Pearson accurately cited the figure for registered participants, 821, but then he added mysteriously, "only 358 of whom were YSA members." He did not indicate where he got this figure, but Frank Boehm, who works in the YSA national office, suggested that this might have been announced as the number of *non*-YSAers in attendance. Many of these joined during the convention.

Healyite Hits Nail on Head

The *Bulletin*, organ of the Workers League, an American border guard of the Healyite Socialist Labour League in Britain, cited the article in the *Christian Science Monitor* quoted above as an authority in condemning the convention of the Young Socialist Alliance.

To fully appreciate the *Bulletin's* polemic, it is necessary to know that the issue of *Intercontinental Press* with Les Evans's report on press coverage of the YSA convention was off the press before the *Monitor* article was published.

"There is one press report Mr. Evans forgot to mention," said Lucy St. John in the January 19 *Bulletin*, referring to our roundup of press accounts of the YSA convention, "the report by the *Christian Science Monitor*. This paper headlined the convention with 'Young Socialists Gird — Pragmatic Trotskyite Youth Seek To Take Radical Rein from SDS.' The *Monitor* hits the nail on the head. . . ."

Monitor reporter Wehrwein confuses success with pragmatism, and Marxism with sectarianism. It appears that the *Bulletin* suffers from the same bourgeois confusion in questions of philosophy.

'Waiting for Us with Knives and Pipes'

[In our last issue we published a report from Mexico City on how the political prisoners, on a hunger strike in Lecumberri prison, were attacked. That account, based on the testimony of the wives of the prisoners, described how visitors, mainly women and children, were locked in a prison hallway and not permitted to go home. When the political prisoners heard their cries, they broke open the gates to their wards and went to aid their wives and children.]

[The prison authorities thereupon armed several hundred common prisoners with knives, sticks, and pipes, and turned them loose on the political prisoners.]

[The following eyewitness report was smuggled out of Lecumberri. It describes what happened in the cell-blocks after the visitors were finally released.]

* * *

Mexico City

January 1 — I have nothing, not even pen or paper, for these are borrowed. The room is so empty that the sound of my breath echoes. My headache reminds me of our defeat. A pipe — I think twice, but I do not remember. I had no time to take in all of what surrounded me.

The prison riot — common prisoners versus political prisoners — a spectacle, short-lived but as disastrous as planned. The prison subdirector gave the word to those from gallery S [common prisoners] and opened their gallery [ward] door. We had left our gallery sometime before, as our visitors were being held and not allowed to leave, and we could hear them calling us.

Those from gallery M had to force open two of the barred gates in order to open other gates to galleries C and N so their comrades could help. When we reached where the women were being held, the prisoners from S were waiting for us with knives and pipes.

After some argument, bottles and bricks were thrown and it really began. Guards on the roof began firing

while the guards below directed the common prisoners against us.

In the fight I saw the general [General Andrés Puentes Vargas], the director of the prison, no more than two feet away from me, standing as calmly as if he were at mass, or like an addict at the height of his trip. Nothing seemed to faze him and he had no reason to be fazed. Who else could have planned it? Several hundred common criminals were armed and sent against 115 political prisoners, eighty-five of whom had been on a hunger strike for more than twenty-three days. The general stood calmly among the common prisoners . . .

We were quickly beaten back to our galleries, many of us hurt. We had to decide how to defend ourselves when the common prisoners would come again.

* * *

January 2 — The night has passed. Everyone is tired; we are under siege. Surrounded by the common prisoners, who are armed with pipes, etc., no one is allowed to leave or enter. It was not the best of judgment that led us to gallery M, just a sort of protective instinct. Here we are in the worst position. Half of those who were here were cut off from us last night and went to galleries C and N. We are only about twenty and if something should arise we will not be able to defend ourselves. Even the guards, who were once sympathetic to our cause, are now against us.

Three of our comrades in the hospital are in bad shape. One was shot and the other two knifed. Another comrade is now having his fingers (smashed last night by a pipe) banded by a friend here in this room. The families of the political prisoners have been outside the jail protesting since morning and they continue to telephone and visit every important government official. No results, and the danger still exists that even a single common prisoner could touch off

the spark that would bring the mob back, perhaps to commit mass murder.

* * *

January 3 — Grenaderos armed with submachine guns are outside the prison and have been since Thursday. Visitors were allowed to see us for the first time since the attack. Blankets have been sent us from the outside. Everyone has protested in our behalf; that is, friends, families, and those students who know what happened. Conditions are really bad in [ward] C. You can look nowhere without seeing blood.

[Ward] N has not been entered, but we fear for them as they could be attacked at any time. But at least we know that they are well organized and able to put up one hell of a fight.

We need help in a big way as quickly as possible. This is the twenty-fifth day of the hunger strike and we have decided to continue.

* * *

Following is a list of the political prisoners injured and now in the hospital:

Shot: José Luis Nuñez Castillo; *knifed:* Rafael Jacobo García, Isaias Rojas Delgado; *severely beaten:* Fernando Granados Cortés, Saúl Alvarez Masqueda, Pablo Gómez Alvarez, Pedro Castillo Salgado, Rafael Villalobos Sauz, Romeo González Medrano, Adán Nieto Castillo, José Luis Becerra, Gilberto Balam Pereira, Antulio Fernández Maldonado, Prisciliano Pérez, and Ramón Danzós Palomiro.

And If They Get a 'Busy' Signal?

To a question propounded by the New York Academy of Sciences on what alteration of the human body would be most useful, Dr. Irving J. Selikoff, as reported in the January 5 *Newsweek*, suggested changing "the mucosal lining in man's respiratory tract to make it particularly sensitive to air pollutants. At the first whiff of dangerous concentrations . . . people could call their local air-pollution-control agency to protest the situation."

Police Seize Student Hunger Strikers

The so-called progressive military junta that rules Peru moved in the first week of 1970 to stamp out the resistance to its "pacification" of the universities.

On January 1, student hunger strikers were taken from the hospital rooms, where they had been kept under observation, to penal institutions. The seriously weakened protesters were charged with committing "a crime against health."

At 3:00 a.m. on January 7, a thousand special police, using dogs, tear gas, and flares invaded the campus of the Universidad Nacional de Ingeniería [UNI] in Lima, driving out the students who had been occupying the university and arresting 100 of them.

The Peruvian students reacted vigorously to the government's attacks. Following the transfer of the hunger strikers to police custody, groups of students from universities throughout the Lima area held protest demonstrations and distributed leaflets supporting their jailed comrades.

Sharp clashes between students and the police occurred on January 3 near the Hospital Obrero and at the corner of Puno and Huamanga streets. The San Fernando medical students built barricades in front of their school and interrupted traffic on the Avenida Grau for several minutes. Clashes recurred on January 5 when students again blocked Avenida Grau and held lightning demonstrations in the Colmena area. The police surrounded the San Fernando medical school and the Universidad Federico Villarreal.

Immediately after the police seizure of the UNI, the students of the University of Arequipa went into the streets and blocked traffic, protesting the reported death of the student Ramón Villavicencio in Lima.

Simultaneous with the battle of the UNI, conflicts broke out at the universities of Piura and Huancayo with the Consejo Nacional de la Universidad Peruana [National Council of Peruvian Universities] which regulates higher education.

Violent demonstrations in these cities denounced the junta's plan for reorganizing the universities and expressed

solidarity with the struggle of the UNI students. In Piura, the protesters occupied the city cathedral and held it.

Reacting to the police attacks of January 7, Peruvian student leaders proclaimed a national student strike, to be held at the end of the month, which is to be accompanied by a giant rally organized jointly by the students and the workers.

In a statement issued January 7 on the escalating confrontation between the students and the military junta, Rolando Breña, president of the Federación Universitaria de San Marcos [Student Federation of the University of San Marcos], explained that the student upheavals were not "isolated movements."

These actions, Breña said, "are being carried out because we students cannot let them intimidate us and we cannot continue to tolerate the manifold abuses and corruption in the universities."

Breña said that it would do the government no good to arrest the student leaders "thinking that they can suppress our demands that way."

"If we fall," the student leader continued, "others will take our place and they will have to put away all the students in the country to silence us."

Student unrest has been increasing in Peru since February 1969. At that time, four months after it had seized power, the junta issued its Decree Law 17437. The objective of this legislation was to reorganize the universities on the U.S. model, integrating them into the modern capitalist structure, and giving absolute powers to the school administrations.

However, Peru has a long history of violent and bitter struggles for democratic rights on the campus. The students resisted the generals' attempt to liquidate the gains of free education and academic democracy won by their predecessors at considerable cost.

Despite repeated invasions of the campuses by the repressive forces since February 1969, the regime has been unable to break the student resistance. Many universities have found it impos-

sible to function throughout this period.

The conflict heated up as the time came for the installation of the new "university assemblies" provided for in Decree Law 17437. These bodies, which were supposed to represent all sections of the campus community, were denounced by the students as a camouflage for arbitrary rule. The student leaders called for a boycott.

Some 99.6 percent of the students at the UNI did not vote in the elections held November 5. When the "university" council met November 11, the UNI rector, Santiago Agurto Calvo, ran into determined protests from the students.

Agurto responded to this opposition by ordering that the food prepared for meals be thrown out. He closed the student cafeteria, locked the dormitories, cut off medical, library, and thesis guidance services, and suspended classes.

The students counterattacked by occupying the campus and operating the school themselves. They began a campaign calling for Agurto's resignation and the reopening of the university.

On January 1, the Lima daily *La Prensa* described life in the occupied university: "More than 300 students are inside the UNI, among them several girl students charged with preparing meals in the school cafeteria.

"Various groups of students went to several markets in Greater Lima yesterday to appeal for food from the merchants. Carrying big baskets, they collected what the merchants gave them. They said that they would not change their course until Rector Agurto—who could not be located yesterday—resigned.

"Members of the police force kept close watch over the area around the university but did not attempt to enter the campus.

"In vehicles captured from the UNI, students moved around the large campus, in order, they said, to prevent the entry of strangers.

"Other groups, supported by students from the University of San Mar-

cos, the Agraria, the Catholic University, and Villarreal staged marches through the center of Lima, distributing leaflets and shouting criticisms of Rector Agurto Calvo."

La Prensa reported that it had learned from unofficial sources that Agurto Calvo had called for prosecution of the students involved in the occupation.

On January 5, the UNI administration issued a declaration preparing the way for the police invasion of the campus two days later. The statement sought to isolate the students: "Since the property of the Institution [UNI] is in unauthorized hands, and to avoid confusion in establishing legal responsibility for theft or damage, all members of the university staff must stay away from their offices. . . ."

The statement ended with a call for government intervention: "The University hopes that the authorities will act with the diligence the case demands to restore our buildings to us, which is essential for normalizing the University's functioning."

In the meantime, increasing numbers of students were joining the hunger strike begun December 11 to press the demand for Agurto's resignation. By the end of December, many of the strikers were showing signs of serious physical weakening. Despite this, they decided to step up their strike by refusing all liquids and medicines. Following this decision, the government stepped in and transferred the strikers to places where they could be isolated from their supporters and from the press.

Ten of the protesters being held at the Dos de Mayo hospital were hustled off to the infamous Lurigancho jail on January 1. The other eight, whose condition was apparently more serious, were transferred to the criminal ward of the hospital. Two of the latter group, Mauro Peña and Eulogio Malquí, were reported in especially grave condition.

Following the transfers, a statement issued by ACUNI [Asociación de Centros de la Universidad de Ingeniería—the UNI student association] reported that Peña had declared that he would continue his strike until death, if necessary.

All eighteen of these hunger strikers were shifted to the police infirmary January 5. The police announced that they were in good health but refused to allow anyone in to see them.

Another group of eighteen hunger strikers in the medical-student center of the University of San Marcos were taken into hiding before the police could seize them.

The government's move against the hunger strikers appeared to increase already growing public sympathy with the student protests.

The Lima daily *Ojo* wrote on January 4: "As we see, it would appear that Agurto is not resigning because he is welded to the rector's chair at the Universidad Nacional de Ingeniería.

"Meanwhile a group of students has been transferred to Lurigancho to be mixed in with detainees of all sorts. And the others have been taken to the San Camilo Ward—the Dos de Mayo's police ward. The latter place, among other advantages, has the highest concentration of tuberculosis bacilli in the world. To sum it up in few words, Peru has the high honor of being the only country in the world where sufferers from tuberculosis, venereal diseases, contagious illnesses, etc., share the same ward in happy comradeship. . . . Thanks to Señor Agurto, 'his' students, who are in a grave state of starvation, have ended up in the nicest little clinic!"

'Say Something Stupid, Spiro!'

Some 300 antiwar protesters "fought wildly with police and U.S. Secret Service men guarding U. S. Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew" in Canberra, Australia, January 14, according to the January 14 *Toronto Daily Star*.

"Observers said the clashes in front of Parliament were some of the ugliest ever seen in Canberra," the *Star* reported. "Police arrested at least 10 persons. A similar protest against Agnew yesterday also resulted in five arrests." Australian police claimed they had to rescue members of Agnew's bodyguard who were surrounded by the crowd. Demonstrators charged the police with a "Chicago-style" manhandling of protesters who were dragged from the area.

On January 13 demonstrators followed Agnew to the National War Memorial, carrying signs reading, "The Silent Majority Supported Hitler" and "Send Spiro to the Moon." When the vice-president emerged from the memorial, the protesters shouted, "Say something stupid, Spiro."

Ojo scornfully dismissed the statements of support for Agurto by some professors: "The professors (several of them appointed by Rector Agurto are by mere coincidence members of his old political party, which has now broken up into various forms of social opportunism) continue happily getting their checks, and as a result must have spent the Christmas and Passover holidays magnificently, while the students were going from grave illness to imprisonment."

The Lima paper expressed nothing but contempt for the UNI rector, who was known as a progressive before the current unrest: "It is already certain that Agurto cannot continue holding on to the post of rector at UNI, not only because he has lost the confidence of the students but because, as a result of his stubborn and rather tasteless attitude, he has lost the confidence of public opinion.

"What would happen and who would take direct responsibility if one of the students being held because of the strike died (which is becoming a more real possibility all the time)? Naturally the rector would have to resign, whether he wanted to or not. Is that the price Agurto expects for his resignation?"

In fact, Agnew made a statement to Prime Minister John G. Gorton, which the January 14 *New York Times* described as his "strongest outline of the reasons why the United States intends to stand by its commitments to its allies in the region." Agnew declared that it was "the destiny of our generation to come to grips with troubles and master them so that our children may have peace. For our part, American will never shrink from this destiny, this challenge—this opportunity."

"I know," Agnew added, "that Australia will continue to play a proud and honorable role in kindling the dawn of a new day."

The *Times* did not indicate whether the demonstrators felt their demand had been satisfied. In any case, Agnew himself refused to take the credit. He told reporters that his remarks were prepared with the help of the State Department and Nixon's staff of advisers on national security.

Struggle in Defense of Freedom of Press

The ruling junta in Peru unveiled its new press law January 1. It aroused almost universal resistance from the press. Even papers that had enthusiastically supported the "progressive junta" voiced dismay.

The new regulations under "Decree Law 18075" were described by the minister of education, Brigadier General Alfredo Arrisueño, as another step in the junta's program of reforms designed to break Peru's "ties of dependence." The junta's spokesmen characterized the law as guaranteeing freedom of the press.

Decree Law 18075 does contain some apparently anti-imperialist provisions. Article 10 specifies: "Only Peruvians by birth residing in Peru and in full possession of their civil rights can form or take part in companies whose objective is to publish periodicals. Juristic persons constituted in this country, domiciled in Peru, have the same right so long as their stockholders and the members of their governing boards are native-born Peruvians residing in Peru."

These provisions are, however, double-edged. They could be invoked to prevent imperialist interests from exercising direct control over organs of public opinion. They could also be used to silence publications whose editors or directors have been forced into exile or deprived of their civil rights by decree, a favorite device of arbitrary regimes in Latin America.

In any case, the main thrust of the new law was not against foreign influence on the Peruvian press. The prologue to the decree states its objectives as follows: "Whereas the press must orient public opinion correctly in order to contribute to the formation of a genuine national consciousness;

"Whereas it is indispensable to promulgate a Freedom of the Press Statute based on the concept of achieving the perfect exercise of the freedom of the individual to express his thought in harmony with the demands of the common good and social peace and solidarity;

"Whereas cases of slander have been occurring which must not go unpunished in the name and under the cov-

er of freedom of the press, because this freedom cannot and must not be used to damage the dignity and honor of individuals or violate the respect owed to the readers."

The following is an example of the infractions defined by the statute: "Publishing articles or reports in which phrases are employed that are offensive to the honor or reputation of a natural or juristic person or corporation. . . . It is an aggravating circumstance if the injured party is a public authority or entity. In this case the penalty will be not less than six months in prison and a fine of from 10,000 to 60,000 soles [38.7 soles equal US\$1].

The FPP [Federación de Periodistas de Perú—Journalists Federation of Peru] announced January 3 that it was beginning preparation for a nationwide general strike in defense of freedom of the press. The FPP's stand was seconded by the other major journalists union, the ANP [Asociación Nacional de Periodistas—National Association of Journalists].

The Central Sindical de Empleados Particulares [Federation of White-Collar Workers in Private Industry] joined in the protest and called on its locals throughout the country to support the journalists and broadcasters unions in defending freedom of the press.

The local journalists federations in Lambayeque, Arequipa, Tacna, Cuzco, Piura, Callao, Pisco, and Huanayo, as well as the Círculo de Periodistas Deportivos [Sports Writers Club], backed the national press unions.

The Sindicato Nacional de Profesores de Educación Secundaria del Perú [National Union of High-School Teachers of Peru] declared its "full support of the courageous protest of the nation's journalists and especially the valiant position assumed by the FPP."

The dean of the law school of the University of Cuzco said the new law violated constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of the press.

The Cámara Peruana de Radiodifusión [Peruvian Broadcasting Council], which represents eighteen television and 180 radio stations through-

out the country, declared that "far from guaranteeing freedom of the press, the so-called Freedom of the Press Statute tramples on it."

On January 4, the journalists unions initiated a suit to have the new press law declared unconstitutional. Their brief will be argued by the dean of the Lima bar, Dr. Luis Bramont Arias.

The Sociedad Peruana de Escritores [Peruvian Writers Society] protested against the new law as "offensive to the dignity of writers and restrictive of the free expression of thought."

The former dean of the law school of the Universidad Federico Villarreal said that "freedom of the press, one of the few guarantees that remained in force in this country, has been destroyed."

Three of the big Lima dailies—*La Prensa*, *Expreso*, and *El Comercio* came out against the new law.

La Prensa wrote on January 1: "In cryptic language, the Decree opens the door for silencing all independent opinion because of the vagueness of the 'crimes' it defines and the severe penalties it imposes, which can intimidate many and encourage 'prudence' in others."

El Comercio's comment was tinged with embarrassment, since this paper placed great hopes in the reformist program of the junta. "The national press," it wrote, "has in general maintained a cordial attitude toward the military regime. Its criticism of the government's actions has been careful; and the opposition of certain sectors, rational.

"No circumstances exist, then, which would lead anyone to believe that the country's security, sovereignty, or economic stability is being endangered by the press or by journalists."

The Peruvian Communist party, which, like Moscow, has supported the junta, also squirmed. The CP-controlled General Confederation of Labor, according to the Paris daily *Le Monde* (January 10), stated that while it supports most of the provisions of the new law, it does oppose the clause imposing penalties for publishing articles harmful to state security, national defense, and the financial and economic stability of the country.

Despite all this, the junta has shown no inclination to rescind the decree. Government spokesmen have declared that the opposition is motivated by "counterrevolutionary objectives."

Husak Uncovers a 'Trotskyite Plot'

The Czechoslovak government invoked the specter of a "Trotskyite plot" January 12 to justify widespread arrests of young opponents of the Kremlin-backed regime. The January 17 *New York Times* reported that more than 1,700 persons in many cities had been "investigated . . . in a crack-down on alleged lawbreakers and antisocial elements." An unknown number were held by the police.

The State Interior Ministry announced the "discovery" of an "illegal" organization "active in the spirit of Trotskyite ideas."

This was followed on January 16 with the announced arrest of an "espionage ring" in Slovakia.

The January 12 communiqué declared: "The Czech Ministry of the Interior has recently unmasked the activities of an illegal organization, hostile to the state, aimed at disturbing the process of consolidation and at creating political crises."

The statement, reprinted in the January 14 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, continued:

"The members of this organization, who utilized conspiratorial methods, distributed various publications hostile to the state, their aim being to overthrow the socialist regime and provoke resistance against the leadership of the Communist party and against the leaders of political life in Czechoslovakia. . . .

"The organization tried to create cells throughout Czechoslovakia. These cells were to work in conformity with the Trotskyist ideology. The organizers maintained permanent contacts abroad from whom they received instructions in carrying out activities hostile to the republic, and the Trotskyist literature they needed. The network of the Czech Ministry of the Interior has seized various leaflets put out by this organization, as well as the technical equipment used to produce them." The ministry gave no details on the arrests, but said a report would be made "shortly."

A further account was published simultaneously in *Rudé Pravo* of Prague and *Pravda* in Bratislava January 17. According to the January 18 *New*

York Times, the arrested youths were accused of calling for an "antibureaucratic revolution," not only in Czechoslovakia, but "in other socialist countries, in particular the Soviet Union." They were said to be members of "a 'revolutionary socialist party,' an underground group of students and young workers that had infiltrated institutes of higher learning and such labor organizations as the metal workers and printing industry unions."

The *Times* did not indicate whether the precise name of the proscribed organization was given. It is known that several left-Communist organizations, with various political views, had coalesced during the "Prague spring" and in the period following the Soviet invasion of August 1968.

"Many students and other young people are known to have been detained in connection with the 'Trotskyite' affair," the *Times* said, "but no statement has yet been made as to how many persons are in prison for questioning or under formal arrest.

"Today's article asserted that the plotters had been instrumental in 'strikes, acts of sabotage and fires of which there was an unusually large number in 1968 and 1969.'

"The plotters also circulated clandestine literature, the article said, and made preparations for 'armed struggle against the present regime.'"

The *Rudé Pravo* article sought to associate the arrested "plotters" with the revolutionary youth of the West, of whom the paper took a dim view:

"The members of the organization saw an example for themselves in certain extremist groups in the West, in anarchy, disorder, riots and chaos provoked by them.

"Many facts unequivocally prove connections with various Trotskyite organizations in the West." *Rudé Pravo* claimed that "functionaries of Trotskyite organizations in the West" had visited Czechoslovakia recently and taken part in clandestine student meetings.

The January 16 *Le Monde* suggested that a wide range of groups have been hit in the roundup. "It has been learned, in fact, from a good source, that between December 22 and Jan-

uary 1, thirty-five members of the Student Union of Bohemia-Moravia were arrested. They belonged mainly to the section in charge of contacts with the unions. Also arrested were a certain number of young Communists who have been meeting since March 1968 in a 'revisionist' organization, which was never legalized, known as the 'Revolutionary Youth Movement.'

"These youths tried mainly to distribute articles by Communist authors such as Roger Garaudy, Gramsci, and Luigi Longo."

The Husák regime is preparing a frame-up in the style of the notorious Moscow Trials of the thirties to silence its critics on the left. The men in the Kremlin who installed Husák by force of Soviet tanks are old hands at show trials. They learned the technique from Stalin himself. The procedure is simple. Representatives of all kinds of opposition tendencies are lumped together in an amalgam accusing them of participating in a common "plot." Fighters for proletarian democracy on the left may thus be accused of associating with the most reactionary forces in a projected crime against the state. To make it look more plausible, one or two real agents of imperialism may be included.

Evidence is mounting that this is what the Husák regime is cooking up. "Earlier this week," the January 18 *New York Times* reported, "a comment by the Czechoslovakia radio network alleged 'Chinese-Albanian' influences on the plotters.

"The broadcast depicted the conspirators as naive and 'petit bourgeois' radicals who confusedly were trying to combine the ideas of Trotsky with those of Chairman Mao Tse-tung of Communist China and the New Left in the West.

"The broadcast suggested that the movements that today professed to be inspired by Trotsky were in all likelihood being maneuvered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency."

Even a cursory examination of the documents that have become available in the West gives the lie to the charge that the left-Communist move-

ment in Czechoslovakia is procapitalist. In our March 10, 1969, issue, for example, we published a manifesto of the Czechoslovak Revolutionary Youth Movement.

"Living in a social system where the capitalist mode of production and capitalist productive relationships have been abolished," the manifesto said, "but where a democratic, socialist society has not begun to be built; and desiring to resist the abuse of Communist ideals as well as to uphold the principle that it is our right and duty to struggle actively against all who have dishonored and abused the ideals of Communism, we proclaim the formation of the Revolutionary Youth Movement.

"We are convinced that for the Czechoslovak people, as well as for the people of the USSR and the so-called people's democracies, socialism cannot be achieved without destroying the bureaucratic machine as a social stratum and establishing a system of self-management."

It is to silence critics like these of the bureaucracy that Husák and Brezhnev have concocted the current "plot." But the revolutionary youth of Czechoslovakia will not be silenced

easily. One organization, the Revolutionary Socialist party, declared in a statement which we published in our October 6, 1969, issue:



HUSAK: Stalinist frame-up artist.

"We no longer believe in a system where the leadership, even when it is as humane as Dubcek, decides for the workers without them, for only the workers themselves have the right to decide their own destiny.

"We do not believe in socialism in one country, or that the power of the bureaucracy can be broken in a small isolated country like Czechoslovakia, which would from then on have 'gone its own way,' had its own 'socialism with a human face,' for socialism is only one and its face is human, otherwise it is not socialism. . . .

"We do not believe in help from the UNO, we do not believe in 'peaceful coexistence' of imperialism and the Kremlin counterrevolutionaries.

"We believe only in ourselves, in our own reason, our own understanding and power. When we say ourselves, we are not thinking only of the workers, technicians, farmers, students and intellectuals in our country, but of all those who are in a similar social position anywhere in the world, for we have understood that our struggle and our organization must have an international character."

Albatross of Stalinism

Rise and Decline of Maoism in Canada

By Ron Haywood

[The following article is reprinted from the December 15 issue of *Workers Vanguard*, the biweekly paper of the Canadian Trotskyists published in Toronto.]

* * *

Several small Canadian groups are now vying for the nod of Chairman Mao Tsetung. Each claims to be the Canadian expression of the thoughts of Mao. And all seek a bureaucratic franchise from the Chinese workers' state.

A look at the recent decline of the Vancouver-based 'Progressive Workers Movement' [PWM] reveals some important lessons for today's radicalizing left in Canada. The history of the PWM also gives us a glimpse of how other, more recent Maoist groups can expect to fare.

In October, 1964, the PWM proclaimed: ". . . We will be heard—and will not retreat . . . We are here to fan the flames of discontent, and disdain to dissimulate or hide our intentions from any man—friend or foe." The PWM, in the same issue of its paper *Progressive Worker*, issued a statement of principles. It called for a "national confer-

ence in the near future for the purpose of organizing a Marxist-Leninist-Workers Party in Canada."

Nearly five years have elapsed since that bold statement . . . five years of revolutionary upsurge throughout the world. After a brief interlude of rapid growth, mostly through regroupment of older left-wing elements from the decaying B. C. [British Columbia] Communist party and from the CCF-NDP [Cooperative Commonwealth Federation-New Democratic party], the Progressive Workers Movement entered a period of attrition and decline that continues to this day.

The failure of the PWM is rooted in the neo-Stalinist heritage of its founders. The formative stages of the PWM program took place under the guidance of Jack Scott, the chairman of the group. He was expelled along with others from the Communist party in 1964 for dissenting pro-Peking "factional activity." He founded the PWM shortly after.

The PWM attacked the Communist party leadership for its liberal-reformist politics and its crass Canadian nation-

alist line. PWM attacked the CP record of supporting the wartime "no strike pledge" and its call for a "Liberal-labor coalition" in support of Mackenzie King in 1944. They blamed these class-collaborationist politics on the American Communist party leader of that period, Earl Browder.

Jack Scott charged that CPers now in the trade unions are mainly interested in getting elected to responsible positions and "are proud when they are good administrators." Many of these criticisms are valid — as far as they go.

However, the PWM attack on the Communist party stayed rigidly within the ambit of Peking's polemics with Moscow. It never broke with the Stalinist ideology and tactics inherited from the CP. PW's first public meeting in December, 1964, prominently displayed Stalin's portrait. Soviet revisionism, according to the PWM, started with Khrushchev.

The PWM failed to come to terms even with the postwar split in the Canadian Communist party led by Fergus McKean. That split produced the historic critique of the Communist parties, *Communism versus Opportunism*. In his book, McKean—once the top leader of the B. C. CP—recorded the policy of class collaboration and betrayals conducted by the Canadian and American CPs during the prewar and wartime period.

The PWM began its political activity with the albatross of Stalin and Stalinist policies around its neck. Ever since, it has displayed—through five years of remarkable opportunist and sectarian twists—a thoroughly ultraleftist stance on the major political issues of the day.

PW dismissed the New Democratic party as a capitalist party. Blinded by Stalin's theory of "social fascism" which equated the German Social Democrats and Nazis as political "twins," the PWM classified the NDP as a reactionary party. PWM withdrew its members from the NDP. It called upon all "genuine" socialists to leave the NDP and join PW. A few did, but they soon dropped away.

The central focus of working-class politics in Canada has become the NDP. Through it, organized labor broke with capitalist "Liberal-labor" politics and launched a labor party. The revolutionary-socialist tactic of supporting such developments and working within them has been defended many times over by Marxists. Lenin had occasion to analyze and defend this approach in his polemic against ultra-leftism entitled *Left Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder*.

Seemingly ignorant of this analysis, as of Marxism in general, PWM directed most of its fire at the Trotskyists of the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, attempting to "expose" the LSA/LSO's support of the NDP with the ready-made arsenal of epithets and charges provided by Stalin's school of falsification.

With this antilabor party policy, the PWM condemned itself to speedy isolation from the real world of working-class politics.

PWM's main political "capital" was the red banner of Mao's thought—the franchise to speak for Mao which they claimed to hold in Canada. The widespread interest in the Chinese Cultural Revolution, in the tremendous progress of the Chinese workers' state, and in the Chinese criticisms of the Soviet policies has been most pronounced among the youth and on the campuses. Despite this fertile interest in China and Maoism, the PWM failed utterly to win over significant youth forces.

This failure cannot alone be explained by its adulation of Stalin. The PWM failed to understand the importance of the youth radicalization and the strategic role open to the campus youth under neocapitalism. In fact, the PWM initially pulled its few youth off the campuses and sent them into the factories—to fight for Canadian unions!

PWM floated a youth group, the Youth Against War and Fascism. This group, also confined to Vancouver, didn't survive long, and was quietly buried. It left behind no program for youth—only a few memories of isolated demonstrations and militant displays of revolutionary fervor on workers' picket lines.

The Youth Against War and Fascism's birthmark was the PWM's chronic habit of combining a "minimum program" with ultraleft action.

This separation of minimum and maximum programs—a sectarian error soundly condemned by all great Marxists—most notably Luxemburg and Lenin, not to speak of Marx and Engels—dominated the PWM's one lapse into electoral activity.

Having denounced the New Democratic party as a capitalist party, the PWM decided to enter a candidate against the NDP in the 1965 federal election. It chose to run in Vancouver East, a traditional working-class stronghold. Jerry Le Bourdais, a prominent Vancouver unionist (then president of the Oil Workers union and a member of the Vancouver Labor Council executive) was put forward as PWM's candidate. PWM advanced its own program—a "minimum" program, no further to the left than that of the NDP. Some aspects of its "minimum" program were weaker than the NDP's—on social welfare issues, for example, where the PWM mustered enough fervor to call for "adequate medical, dental and hospital care coverage!"

The PWM "minimum" program echoed the NDP's program of reforms—with the addition of a strident Canadian nationalism. They called for the nationalization of American-owned monopolies—but carefully avoided aiming the same demand against Canadian-owned monopolies which, presumably, did not thwart Canadian independence.

The PWM showed in its 1965 electoral program its complete ignorance of the transitional program—a program which advances a series of class-struggle demands which can mobilize workers in struggle and advance their consciousness towards anticapitalist and socialist views. They zigzagged between their minimum reform demands on the one hand, and their exhortations to revolution on the other.

Their minimum program netted them some 300 votes, contrasted to many thousands for the NDP.

The common observation that ultraleftism and opportunism are but two sides of the same coin is borne out by PWM's record in the trade unions.

Just as they dismissed the NDP as a "capitalist" party, the PWM rejected the organized trade-union movement. Since this meant rejecting the international unions, which PWM labels "American," the main struggle before Canadian workers, according to PWM, was therefore for pure, all-Canadian trade unions. PWM tried to bypass the Canadian Labor Congress and the B. C. Federation of Labor with a series of trade-union adventures that virtually destroyed its original roots in the unions themselves.

The first escapade—in 1965—was the so-called General

Council of Workers. Just as the PWM would substitute for the NDP, this labor body would challenge the CLC. Needless to report, this Maoist front was short-lived.

After this disaster, the PWM poured even more steam into the campaign to "liberate" Canadian workers from the internationals. They allied themselves with any and all elements in the unions which sought Canadian unions at any cost. Any—or no—program would do. This brought them into collaboration with anti-NDP, pro-Liberal elements in the unions and led to the eventual formation of the Committee for Canadian Unions.

Thus, after attacking the CP for its crass nationalism, the PWM came full cycle back to the same position.

The program for Canadian unionism is a catchall which diverts rank-and-file struggles away from the key problems in the unions, such as bureaucracy and leadership careerism, and state intervention into union affairs. Bureaucracy in the unions is a social, not national feature. It is endemic to the workers' movement in all the advanced capitalist countries. In the fight against bureaucracy and for rank-and-file control, trusteeships and attacks by the brass may necessitate split situations. But PWM's policy made splitting with the internationals an obligatory principle and strategy without concern for what impact this would have on labor's overall strength against international capital.

PWM failed to understand that rank-and-file democracy and militant unionism depend upon raising *class* consciousness in the unions. Cultivated nationalist illusions and all-Canadian unions are no guarantee of rank-and-file democracy. Moreover, Canadian unionists should understand that the Canadian state—and the provincial governments—are just as viciously antilabor as the American and cannot be relied upon for assistance against "American domination."

The opportunism of PWM's Canadian unionism stance complemented its staggering infantilism in local union situations. Ultraleftism led to the isolation of some of its best trade unionists, most notably Jerry Le Bourdais. During his term as an executive member of the Vancouver Labor Council, Le Bourdais and the PWM had a caucus of almost a dozen VLC delegates. By following the PWM forays into the union movement, Le Bourdais was led into easy victimization and a defenseless situation in his own union, the Oil Workers local in Vancouver. His militant record was no substitute for a policy of winning the rank-and-file to a viable program of struggle.

When Le Bourdais was fired in 1966, he was rendered defenseless, thanks to the record of PWM's sectarian capers. PW substituted the issue of Maoism in place of the necessary and elementary defense of a trade unionist victimized by the boss.

Nothing now remains of the PWM presence in the unions, on the local level or at the VLC—not even the echo of their revolutionary rhetoric. PW has paid the price of substituting itself and its nationalist schema in place of a carefully worked out transitional program in the trade unions, a concerted struggle against the parasitic bureaucracy, and support of independent labor political action.

The most wretched aspect of PWM's neo-Stalinist outlook was its rabid sectarian attacks on other left-wing organizations. The operating principle of the PWM in other organizations and the unions was expose Trotskyists first

and CPers second. Once free reign could be secured for the PWM, action could proceed.

This strategy was most pronounced in the Canada-China Friendship Association. From its original function, that of promoting "better understanding between the people of Canada and China" and combating the capitalist press distortions about China, the association was converted by the Maoists into a propagandistic mouthpiece for the thought of Mao Tsetung. One had no business in the CCFA unless the thought of Mao was foremost in his mind and he supported the cultural revolution.

Similarly, the PWM pulled out of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and launched a factional tirade against the FPCC. They red-baited it as "Trotskyist." The countercommittee they formed folded shortly after it announced itself—coinciding with PWM's "discovery" that Cuba was a "bourgeois" state!

The February 1968 issue of *Progressive Worker*, PWM's journal, offered its readers a "systematic presentation of the PWM's position" on Cuba. Cuba, it said, is "essentially a bourgeois-democratic revolution masquerading as socialism," led by "petty-bourgeois leaders." According to this "systematic presentation," Castro "aims at no more than a patching of the capitalist system."

Castro's failing, of course, was that he did not prostrate the Cuban revolution and its revolutionary internationalism to the opportunism of Peking's foreign policy.

PWM failed the acid test—the defense of the Vietnamese revolution. Its record of capricious activity in "solidarity" with Vietnam substitutes for mass actions and support for the antiwar movement in North America. PWM characterized the actions of bringing thousands of Canadians into the streets to demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, an end to Canada's complicity, and self-determination for Vietnam, as "petty-bourgeois." The September 1967 issue of *PW* charged that the leadership of the antiwar movement was dominated by "counterrevolutionaries." Since then, PWM has not participated in building antiwar actions.

PWM's political method is at least consistent. The NDP is a capitalist party! International unions are CIA fronts! Cuba is a capitalist state! The antiwar movement is petty-bourgeois! Not a trace of class analysis goes into this confused and incorrect assessment; what does go into it is the preconceived, bureaucratic outlook of international Maoism. Worse, the method is crassly idealist; the class character of a state or a political party is determined here by the ideas of its leaders, not by its class foundations, roots, origins and developments it is undergoing.

These sectarian positions coupled with ultraleft confrontations on the picket line and a reformist policy in their election campaign spelled an early end to the PWM as a political force even in the Vancouver area.

Today, after a series of splits, expulsions, and resignations by disillusioned members, the PWM is a handful of sectarians outside the mainstream of political life.

The once-monthly magazine *Progressive Worker* has been supplanted by a mimeographed bulletin and a promised quarterly magazine. Their forums which once attracted many young radicals have been discontinued. Their policy of regroupment is academic. What have they left to regroup?

Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerrilla Experience

By Hector Bejar

Prologue

These pages give no final answers. They represent one moment in a man's continuing reflections, one stage in investigating deeds that have remained in darkness because the principal actors perished.

They were written from the standpoint of a conviction that the revolutionary guerrilla struggle in Latin America and Peru must be continued.

The reader will find few eulogies of the guerrillas. It is always easy to pile on the adjectives, and easiest of all for those not involved in the struggle. However, it seems preferable to me, if in fact you want to continue a task, to explain why your first attempts failed.

Total devotion to a cause does not preclude debate; rather such devotion makes it a duty to debate how to serve the cause best.

In the case of Peru, a careful and dispassionate analysis of the 1965 experience, about which so much has been written and so little is known, is still to be done. These pages are an attempt to open discussion, and will be revised and supplemented in the future.

The reader must understand that this book has been written in a prison, with all the limitations a prisoner's situation imposes. More than once, parts of the manuscript had to be rescued from the jailers and for that reason also, since the book was written in haste, it seems somewhat disorganized.

I have purposely omitted any reference to Lieutenant Francisco Vallejo's attempted uprising in Jauja in July 1962 and the aborted ELN guerrilla incursion in Madre de Dios in May 1963, which preceded the 1965 guerrilla insurrection and was historically linked to it. In the first case, I lack the necessary facts. In the second, there are a series of facts and circumstances that cannot yet be revealed.

Still, we have the satisfaction that the task has been begun—and the promise that it will be continued to the end.

Chapter I: Economic Sketch

The Stage

In the western region of South America, below the equator, like a kidney bathed by the Pacific Ocean, lies Peru. Its immense area of 1,250,000 square kilometers is divided into twenty-three departments.

The geographical setting is characterized by steep and difficult terrain. If you could look at the area from space, you would pick out the imposing Andean Cordillera that

transverses the country like a gigantic spinal column as its most notable natural phenomenon.

On its western slope, the Cordillera inclines almost to the sea, leaving a long narrow coastal strip at its base. To go from north to south, from Tacna, near Chile, to Tumbes, a post on the Ecuadorian frontier, a traveler would have to cover more than 2,200 kilometers. If it occurred to him to enter the country from the west, he could not go for more than forty kilometers or so—or about 200 in some extremely narrow belts—without having to mount the foothills of the Andes.

The *Costa* [coast] is a great levee that nature has placed in front of the ocean. Its moderate, monotonous weather, which never drops below freezing, is only slightly troubled by fogs and light drizzle. It is also an immense desert. However, paradoxically, the oases, which more than fifty small rivers have created around its ports and cities, include the country's most fertile and productive land, its export crops, a third of its population, and almost all its industry.

In contrast, the *Sierra* [mountains] is enmeshed in the Andean chain, and everything in it, men and villages, conforms to the twists and turns of the mountain range. There we find innumerable geographical variations, immense plateaus, deep canyons, precipitous inclines, and the most diverse climatic zones. Men live as high as 4,500 meters above sea level, devoting themselves to farming and animal husbandry. But the Andean peaks continue to climb, like spires hurled heavenward, up to 8,000 meters. Rainfall varies from year to year and droughts are frequent on the high plateau.

From the Andean summits, the rivers descend tumultuously to the *Selva* [the tropical jungle]. They begin as small brooks, swelling to powerful streams, and finally are transformed into slow serpents of water that feed into the Amazon basin.

The *Selva* is an enormous green mantle covering a large part of the northern and eastern frontiers. It occupies two-thirds of the national territory but supports only 11% of the population, which is clustered on the last foothills of the Andes, since the more low-lying regions and plains are inhospitable and difficult of access. This interminable, wet, and swampy woodland continues across the entire territory of Brazil and is barely broken by an occasional hill. There are almost no roads and the rivers are the only avenues of communication.

Deserts and hot tropical sun in the *Costa Norte* [northern coastal region] are moderated by the fogs produced by the Humboldt Current; biting cold in the *Cordillera* and the Andean plateaus; stifling humidity in the *Selva*: changing, variegated climate—that is the first impression given by this contradictory country.

If anything is typical of Peru, it is its contradictions. Its history was abruptly divided into two parts by the

Spanish conquerors who destroyed the old culture and waged a three-centuries-long genocide against the formerly dominant Quechuas. Its terrain is sundered violently by the Andean dorsal column. Not even the ethnic characteristics of its inhabitants are uniform, because you cannot speak of a melting pot when the traces of the far-off conquest still endure.

And what should we say about Peru's economy? Landlordism still lingers on languidly in the *Costa* and the *Sierra*, side by side with ancient peasant communal villages. And on this foundation, capitalism has imposed new relations of production and exchange, combining them in a shameful *mésalliance* with the feudalism of the Spanish colony. Finally, since the beginning of the century, imperialism has dominated the country, carrying on the previous systems in a deformed way.

American Domination

At the beginning of the century, American imperialism made its irruption into the country. Following the liberation and the first years of our turbulent republic, the English moneylenders pulled the strings in native politics and in the adjustments that followed the disastrous Pacific war. After the first world war, English domination gave way to American penetration.

Masters of our copper, a large part of our petroleum, and scientific agricultural production, the American monopolies hold in their hands the principal resources of our economy.

The American monopolies and foreign companies own 85% of our mineral production—copper, iron, silver, lead, zinc, and other metals—fourteen of the major groups in the fishing industry (Peru is the world's No. 1 producer of fish meal); six of the ten largest sugar plantations. The cotton, coffee, and wool trade is in their hands.

All the banks are tied into the international banking system. The *Banco de Crédito*, the most important bank in the country, apparently belongs to the Vatican through the intermediary of the Italian banking system. The *Continental* and *Internacional* are controlled by the Rockefeller family's Chase Manhattan Bank. Numerous branches of American, European, and Japanese banks operate without any restrictions at all. In general, there are almost no Peruvian banks not bound in one way or another to foreign capital.

The electricity consumed by the capital—where 70% of the country's manufacturing is located—is provided by the Lima Light & Power Company [English in the original] and a consortium linked to Italian finance. The telephones are in the hands of ITT.

Wholesale import trade is monopolized by foreign export concerns and American penetration reaches even into retail trade.

It was British companies that started off our traditional manufacturing industry—textiles, soap, etc. To this day, three-fourths of cotton textile production belong to the Grace and Duncan Fox companies which were started by British investors and are currently tightly tied to American interests.

In recent years American investment has created a consumer industry whose most notable characteristic is its tremendous vulnerability and dependence on foreign in-

dustry—48% of the product components must be imported from the United States and Europe.

Within the manufacturing industry lately, important changes have developed with the appearance of new producers of semimanufactured goods such as fertilizer, artificial fibers, caustic soda, explosives, sulfuric acid, pigments, etc. But all these are tied up with American capital or the American companies operating in the country. In toto, imperialist investment in the manufacturing industry mounts to 80% and groups of two or three companies monopolize between 90% and 100% of tire, paper, steel, dairy goods, and tobacco production, etc.

Agriculture

The total area of Peru comprises 128,500,000 hectares. In the present structure of rural ownership, 12,000,000 hectares are in natural pastures, woods, mountains, and uncultivated arable land, while another 455,000 hectares lie fallow. But only the tiny area of 2,800,000 hectares is in production.¹

Thus, at first glance, Peru seems to be a country of virgin and neglected land. A good part of this expanse could be brought into agriculture if sufficient means were put into the hands of the peasants. But the best part of this small amount of arable land is monopolized by the *latifundia*, which leave great expanses uncultivated.

The concentration of land in a few hands is enormous. About 1% of the farms and ranches occupy 75% of the total area in agriculture; 0.1% of the landowners hold 60.9% of the land under cultivation. Of the 17,000,000 hectares of arable land, 10,000,000 are included in 1,000 large estates and only 933,000 hectares are under the control of the peasant communities.²

Foreign capital is linked up with big landed property. The Gildmeister group of Hamburg is the biggest *latifundista* in the country, with more than 500,000 hectares under its control, followed by the Cerro de Pasco Copper Corp.³ with about 300,000 hectares, and the Le Tourneau group with around 400,000 hectares of jungle land. Grace, William & Lockett; and Anderson Clayton & Co. also figure among the foreign companies owning land devoted to the cultivation of cotton and sugar cane, stock raising, and logging.⁴

A direct consequence of this situation is the irremediable decline of agricultural production.

Let us look at some symptoms:

The agricultural sector, which contributed 25.7% of

1. Comité Interamericano de Desarrollo Agrícola (CIDA), *Tenencia de la Tierra y Desarrollo Socio-Económico del Sector Agrícola: Perú*, the Pan-American Union, Washington, 1966, page 300.

2. Instituto Nacional de Planificación, Dirección Nacional de Estadística y Censos. *Primer Censo Nacional Agropecuario*. Talleres Gráficos de la Dirección Nacional de Estadística y Censos, 1963.

3. Recently the Peruvian government announced the expropriation of eighteen estates belonging to Cerro de Pasco. These estates will be paid for with 21,000,000 soles in cash and 26,000,000 in agrarian reform bonds. In exchange for this transaction, Cerro de Pasco got new petroleum concessions in the north of the country.

4. CIDA, *Op. Cit.*, page 45.

the gross domestic product in 1950, represented only 19.6% of this aggregate in 1964. In 1940, 61.2% of the employed population was engaged in agriculture. In 1961 the percentage had dropped to 49.6%. In 1950 agricultural products exported represented 57.8% of the total value of exports; in 1965 they represented only 29.2% of this total.

The food shortage has had grave consequences in Peru's economic and social fabric. In 1950 we produced 8,431,638 tons of food products; in 1960 only 7,800,000. The quantity continues to drop while the population constantly rises. Moreover, this population is abandoning the countryside to cluster in the shantytowns around the cities. The food crisis is putting constantly growing pressure on the poor classes and on the balance of payments. For human consumption, the country imports 90% of its wheat, 40% of its meat, 40% of its milk, 40% of its fats, and 25% of its rice.

The decapitalization of the country is assuming alarming proportions. In the last five years, the imperialist cartels have taken \$347,000,000 out of the country after investing only \$58,000,000. The terms of trade grow more unfavorable every year. While the value of exports per ton in 1950 was \$105, in 1967 it was only \$58.50.

From this it can be easily deduced that the essential characteristic of Peru's economy is its subordination to American imperialism, which is draining the country of capital and aggravating its structural crisis.

Irregularities, Discontinuities, Contradictions

The tightening of imperialist domination results in a worsening of the contradictions within the country.

An immensely rich and prosperous oligarchy, intimately entangled with the imperialist cartels in a multitude of investments and transactions, stands at the apex of the system. At the base, the masses live in the most abysmal poverty.

Most of the political and economic power is concentrated in the hands of forty-five families associated with the American monopolies. Of this group, 56% are stockholders in banks and financial concerns; 53% own stock in insurance companies; 75% own companies in the building and real estate business in the cities; 56% have investments in commercial firms; and 64% are important stockholders in one or several petroleum companies. This group operates under the name of the *Sociedad Nacional Agraria*.⁵

According to official data, 24,000 privileged persons enjoy an annual income of 2,500,000 soles (about \$62,000) while 11,976,000 disinherited barely subsist on 6,310 soles (about \$157) a year. Of the income-earning population, 1.9%, about 61,300 coupon-clippers, receive a whopping 44% cut of the national income, while 44% of the income-earners—1,500,000 agricultural workers—get only 13%.⁶

The statistical averages, unfortunately, do not show the frequent case of families whose monthly income ex-

ceeds 1,000,000 soles (about \$50,000 at the 1965 exchange rate) while the men in the countryside get scarcely one sol a day, or no wage at all.

Parallel to these profound class differences, Peru exhibits irregularities from region to region. In 1961 the per capita income in the *Costa* was four times higher than it was in the *Sierra*. In 1965 it was already seven times greater.

There are also contradictions between city and country. Some twenty-three out of every hundred Peruvians live in Lima and the percentage is increasing at an accelerating rate with 75,000 people a year arriving from the provinces. Around 70% of the factories, half of the workers, and nearly two-thirds of the professionals are located in Lima.⁷ Almost half of the qualified voters live in Lima. As a result, the capital, in practice, determines the government of the country. Outside agriculture and mining, whose location is determined by the technical criterion of the position of arable land and mineral resources, all economic activity is in effect concentrated in the urban areas.

In the *Sierra*, 21% of the families in the urban areas consume less than 75% of the normal requirement in calories, while in the rural areas it is 61%. In this respect the mountain urban areas are almost on a level with the rural areas of the *Costa*, where 20% of the families consume less than the normal minimum requirement in calories. However, these areas lag far behind Lima, where scarcely 5% fall below the minimum intake in calories.

Looking specifically at the working population, we also find great disproportions among them. The difference between the average wage scales of the trades is excessive. The annual income of salaried employees and independent workers, that is, the petty bourgeoisie, is \$450, almost double that of the urban workers, which is \$260. And this, however little, is immensely higher than that of several million peasants—\$10 per year.⁸

The income differentials within the working class proper are also considerable. While gas and electrical workers earn 224 soles a week, miners 215, and construction workers 298, workers in the manufacturing industry earn only 193 and agricultural workers only 86.⁹

Economists, sociologists, and politicians have long laid stress on the "dualism" of our society. Recently its capitalist character (although deformed and distorted) has been pointed up. The debate is not yet concluded but the objective fact is that economically and socially Peru is far from having achieved an integrated organization. It was to this fact that the sociologist Matos Mar was referring when he wrote in a recent essay:

"... the regions are not developing and do not interrelate or complement each other. This is the case, for example, with the various productive sectors which seem disjointed, since every economic activity has its own

7. *Direccion Nacional de Estadistica y Censos. Primer Censo Nacional Economico.* Lima, 1963.

8. A study made by the Instituto Nacional de Planificacion on the basis of the data in the 1961 Censo Nacional de Poblacion.

9. *Direccion Nacional de Estadistica y Censos. VI Censo Nacional de Poblacion, Tomo IV, Caracteristicas Economicas.* Lima, 1961.

rhythm and rationale, almost without any connection to the others. Agriculture, thus, follows its own channel and the fishing industry its own; industry seems isolated. If relationships develop, they are only among powerful groups or partially in other sectors. Moreover, there is a great mixture of different types of economy in varying proportions, dominated moreover by regional habits caused by the cultural heterogeneity. In many cases, this mixture has clashing contrasts. Thus, the modern capitalist managerial sector uses colonial capitalist forms alongside the traditional indigenous cooperative methods."¹⁰

Mobility and Social Change

The Peruvian reality has ceased to be static. The social classes are developing an unprecedented mobility.

The population in general is growing rapidly. There are a little over 250,000 more of us every year. Today there are 12,000,000 of us; there will be 13,500,000 in 1970, and 18,000,000 in 1980. In twenty-five years our population will have doubled.

Parallel to this, the size of the working population is growing, and in this category the working class proper. Between 1950 and 1965, the income-earning population rose from 2,500,000 to 3,600,000; in this same period, the workers increased from 904,800 to 1,382,100, the salaried employees to 200,000 and the so-called independent workers to 300,000.

The structure of the working class has undergone changes.

Workers engaged in agriculture and fishing, which were the majority before, have dropped to 40%, and miners from 5.2% to 4.7%. The sector engaged in the manufacturing industry grew from 14% in 1950 to 18% in 1965.

Despite its growth, the working class continues to have a very low educational level. No agricultural day laborers are skilled workers; forty-seven out of every hundred workers are totally lacking in education and only forty-three in every hundred have a primary-school education.

The level of unemployment is very high. The economists calculate that at least 150,000 jobs have to be created annually in Peru, and, still more, if you take into account not only the population increase but the slow rate of incorporation of women into the work force. But industry creates only 10,000 jobs per year. As a result, in the big urban centers, underemployment and hidden unemployment, when not real and full unemployment, are spreading.

In this contradictory context, in which many social phenomena are ill-defined and the behavior of social classes does not assume the necessary clarity, the Marxist left has not yet been able to develop a unified and consistent tactic.

10. Matos Mar, Jose. "Dominacion, Desarrollos Sociales y Pluralismos en la Sociedad y Cultura Peruana." In *Peru Problema*, a collection of essays published by Francisco Moncloa Editores. Lima, 1968, page 38.

Peru, a Sick Nation

The causes and symptoms of the sickness appear more clearly in Peru than the workings of the sickness itself. The examination of a few figures, while not revealing the real dimensions of the tragedy, which the poorest and most exploited sectors are undergoing, gives an idea of the incurable sickness of the system.

Malnutrition is one of the marks of the Peruvian population. The consumption of calories and proteins drops every year. In a year, the average Peruvian consumes only about 17 kilos of meat, and this average includes millions who do not eat meat at all. The statistics show an average daily consumption of only 69 grams of meat, 6 grams of eggs, 20 grams of fish, and 108 grams of milk. But there are millions of Peruvians whose diet does not include either meat, milk, or eggs.¹¹ According to a study made in 1963 by students at the San Fernando Medical School, ninety-three out of every hundred children in Lima suffer from hunger and only two drink milk.

This explains why in Peru out of every thousand children only ninety [this figure seems to be a misprint for 900] live to be one year old and why every ten minutes a child under the age of one year dies of illnesses, most of which are curable.

In Peru there are more than 400,000 retarded children, and in most cases this is caused by alcoholism and poverty, since there are more than 250,000 alcoholics. Peru is the world's second largest consumer of coca leaf. It is estimated that 800,000 users chew around 8,000,000 kilos yearly. It is calculated that 137,000 kilos of cocaine go into the stomachs of our peasants every year.¹²

Around 7,000 children between the ages of six to nine work, including about 40% of this age group in the urban areas of Lima, Arequipa, and Cuzco. There are 73,000 children between the ages of ten and fourteen who work in the cities of the country, particularly Lima and Arequipa.¹³ Some 45% of Lima's 200,000 maids are under the age of twenty-one and many are still girls of ten to eleven.¹⁴

The poverty of the masses is indescribable. Half of the population of Lima lives in unhealthy one- or two-room hovels without potable water or toilet facilities.¹⁵ It is estimated that 3,000,000 Peruvians get no medical attention, that 1,500,000 go barefoot and that another 1,500,000 wear only "ojotas," crude sandals. From 1963 to January 1968, the cost of living in Lima jumped 77.93%.

In the meantime, crime has risen by 75% to 85% in the last five years. Every hour a robbery takes place in the capital and a minimum of two armed assaults

11. Instituto de Investigaciones Economicas de la Universidad Federico Villarreal, Lima, 1967.

12. Data of the Cuerpo Consultivo Interamericano sobre Fiscalizacion de Estupefacientes.

13. Statements by Dr. Benjamin Samame in the Primera Conferencia Sobre la Familia, la Infancia y la Juventud en el Desarrollo Nacional. Lima, 1967.

14. Censo Parroquial de Lima, 1967.

15. Data of the Oficina Nacional de Planeamiento y Urbanismo. Lima, 1967.

every twenty-four hours. No less than 12,000 women are engaged in prostitution and about seven women a day are drawn into this traffic. Lima ranks among the top cities in Latin America in the incidence of crime.

More than 2,000,000 people are officially listed as illiterate, not counting Peruvians over forty or under fifteen, these not being listed because they are outside the age limits on compulsory school attendance. And besides this there are 1,500,000 children who, while they can read and write, are unable to continue their studies for lack of school buildings. In total, going deeper into the apologetic official statistics, it is estimated that there are 5,000,000 illiterates in Peru.

In spite of the poverty that burdens the masses, the weight of most of the Peruvian state spending rests on them. The coupon-clippers and the big corporations contribute only one-third as much to the national budget as the people do through the indirect taxes they are forced to pay. And this relationship is tending to worsen, to the detriment of the neediest section of the population, because there are practically no taxes on the big exporters or the mining companies and the new manufacturing industries which are controlled in one way or another by the American monopolies. In the years from 1950 to 1965, indirect taxes increased 17.1 times, while the direct contributions of the corporations and coupon-clippers rose only seven times.

The tax exemption enjoyed by the powerful, confronts Peru with continual budget deficits. Between 1963 and 1967 these deficits mounted up to 10,638,000 soles (about \$394,000 at the 1967 exchange rate).

These deficits are covered with American loans, as are the costs of the public works which the state must undertake despite its slender budget. The abuse of foreign loans has increased the dependence of the Peruvian state and its policies on the United States, above all during the government of Belaúnde Terry.

As a result of this mendicant economic policy, the Peruvian state owes the following debts: \$234,000,000 to private lenders; \$94,000,000 to financial institutions; \$76,000,000 to the BID [Bank for International Development]; \$234,000,000 to the BIRD [Bank for International Reconstruction and Development]; \$122,000,000 to U.S. government agencies (AID [Agency for International Development] and EXIMBANK [Export-Import Bank]); \$42,000,000 to other states. At the end of 1968 the foreign debt came to \$742,100,000, according to the data of the *Banco Central de Reserva*.

The interest, amortization and service charges, which the state must pay its foreign creditors, have been putting increasing pressure on the balance of payments. In only the three years between the end of 1963 and the end of 1966, the country's foreign debts more than doubled.

To remedy this situation, successive oligarchic governments have sought foreign investments, offering conditions always advantageous for imperialism and always onerous for the Peruvian state.

The most extensive investment by the monopolies is directed toward the mining sector. Thus, between 1961 and 1964, a total investment in mining of \$400,000,000 was recorded, representing an annual direct investment of about \$300,000,000 [this figure apparently refers to

the total value of U.S. investments and not an annual average].

When included in the statistics, these investments have given Peru one of the highest GNP growth rates in Latin America, concealing the increased extent of the dependence, the crisis, and the distortion of the economic system as a whole. Above all, this GNP growth rate conceals the indisputable and dangerous fact that Peru is on the way to becoming an exclusively mining country.

Experts of the *Sociedad Nacional de Minería y Petróleo* have calculated that in the next seven years we can expect an annual investment of \$127,000,000, which would total \$900,000,000 for this period, a figure higher than all United States investment in Peru (\$518,000,000). If these investments are actually forthcoming, as seems to be happening, the oligarchic groups can save the critical financial situation and even offer the country a relative "stability" which will only further aggravate the system's contradictions and Peru's economic dependence.

It was within this context, characterized by (a) greater subordination to imperialism and (b) the worsening of the manifold social and economic contradictions of the system, that a nascent insurrectional left was to act in 1965. These were the objective conditions which gave rise to their struggle and which they tried to take advantage of to carry it forward. Let us see now how they did this and to what degree this country's irregularities, discontinuities, and paradoxes were reflected in this struggle itself and worked against it.

[To be continued]

Two Lima Churches Occupied

Some 200 workers were occupying two Lima churches at the end of the first week in January, protesting the Ministry of Labor's failure to defend them in disputes with their employers.

After spending the day of January 3 in fruitless appeals for action to the government agency, 138 workers from the Mayólica Nacional plant, including five pregnant women and ten children, occupied the San Sebastian church. The workers were locked out by the company December 31. Their claims for better vacation arrangements and a raise of 30 soles per day (38.7 soles equal US\$1) have been pending in the Ministry of Labor since last September.

The Mayólica Nacional workers announced January 5 that they would go on a hunger strike if they did not get satisfaction from the Ministry of Labor. The Lima daily *Ojo* reported January 6 that since there were no beds in the church, the occupiers were sleeping under the pews.

Sixty women from the Texoro candy factory have been sitting-in in the San Martín de Porres church since Christmas, resisting an attempt by the company to increase shifts from six and a half hours to eight and a half hours. Eight of the women, in advanced stages of pregnancy, lack medical attention. Many have their children with them. One child has bronchitis, two others are suffering from fever and intestinal disorders.