

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 8, No. 4

© 1970 Intercontinental Press

February 2, 1970

50c

Whitewash in Chicago

Mexico:

**Lecumberri Strike Ends;
Prisoners Tell Story**

France:

**Antiwar Soldiers
Seek Release**

Nigeria:

Oil and the War

Brazil:

Fine Art of Torture

Soviet Union:

More About Underground Publication



FRED HAMPTON, martyred Panther leader

Do It Now

The fact that Nixon felt compelled in his "State of the Union Message" to talk about the need to do something to save the environment, and to do it "now," is a good gauge of the rising concern among the American people over the problem of pollution.

The Republicans praised Nixon's words as masterly, impressive, historic, and uplifting. The Democrats regarded it as a skillful political speech, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, the heir of the Kennedy dynasty, praising it as a "well-constructed speech."

James Reston of the *New York Times* was more accurate in describing it as "a fairly artful if not artistic performance."

Nixon said he would propose a program calling for a \$10,000,000,000 outlay in the next five years to clean up the waters of the U. S. As for garbage disposal and pollution of the air, he spoke more vaguely: "It also requires that *to the extent possible* the price of goods should be made to include the costs of producing and disposing of them without damage to the environment." [Emphasis added.]

The press was quick to point out that even the \$10,000,000,000 proposal was phoney. Leaving aside the fact that the sum is utterly inadequate to clean up the waters of the U. S., Nixon's proposal, as explained by "informed officials" after the speech, is that the federal government assume only 40 percent of the cost, the balance to be assumed by the cities. Moreover, Nixon proposes to spend less than Congress has already authorized. And this is a Congress that belongs body and soul to capitalism!

Three proposals can be made to Nixon to test his sincerity:

1. Stop destroying the ecology of Vietnam. Do it *now* by getting the U. S. troops out of Vietnam *now*.

2. Stop the oil interests from their projected destruction of the ecological balance in Alaska. As a first step, fire Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel, a servile tool of the plunderers. Do it *now*.

3. Stop polluting the air waves with your rhetoric. Do it *now*.

In This Issue

		U. S. A.
	74	Message to Nixon
Les Evans	79	Jury Whitewashes Killing of Hampton, Clark
		MEXICO
Gerry Foley	75	Hunger Strike Comes to an End
	75	Statement by the Political Prisoners
	77	Eyewitness Accounts: New Year's Day in Lecumberri
		NIGERIA
	80	Oil and the War
		FRANCE
	81	Campaign to Free Antiwar Soldiers
Louis Couturier	84	Can You Be a Garaudyist Today?
		CEYLON
Allen Myers	82	What the Port Strike Is About
	90	Bala Tampoe Speaks in Paris
		BRAZIL
	83	Fine Art of Torture
		UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC
	85	Unexpected Costs of the Aswan Dam
		TUNISIA
	86	Student Demonstrators Granted Amnesty
		ISRAEL
	86	Decree Bans Jabra Nicola
		ETHIOPIA
	87	Feudal Emperor Faces Radicalizing Campus
		SOVIET UNION
George Saunders	88	More About Popular Underground Publication
	96	Yuli Daniel Case: "I Am Afraid for My Father"
		ARGENTINA
	95	PRT Calls for Help to Bolivian Prisoners
	95	"El Combatiente" Reports Death of Corvalan
		INDONESIA
	96	Students Stage Protest Marches
		DOCUMENTS
Hector Bejar	91	Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerrilla Experience Chapter II: The Social Context
	94	Vietnamese Appeal to American Soldiers
		DRAWINGS
Copain	73	Fred Hampton; 85, Gamal Abdel Nasser; 86, Habib Bourguiba; 87, Haile Selassie; 96, Larisa Daniel.

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 © 1969 by Intercontinental Press.

Hunger Strike Comes to an End

By Gerry Foley

The political prisoners in Mexico City's Lecumberri jail ended their hunger strike January 20, after forty days. Even the assault which the penal authorities organized January 1, inciting and leading the common convicts in a brutal attack on the political prisoners, could not break the strike.

The majority of the hunger strikers continued their action unfalteringly for nearly three weeks after the prison administration had resorted to the use of physical and psychological terror against them. The political prisoners ended their hunger strike only when they had reached the limit of their endurance and were assured that their principal political objectives had been achieved.

On January 18, the representatives of the political prisoners held a press conference in Lecumberri, announcing that they would end their strike at noon on January 20, exactly 1,000 hours after it began.

As reported by the Mexico City daily *Excelsior* (January 19), Federico Emery, one of the prisoners, summed up what had been achieved: "We did not win our release but we raised the consciousness of the people."

The spokesmen for the political prisoners listed a number of specific gains, according to the January 19 *El Día*. The main objective of the strike was won, these spokesmen said, when it succeeded in mobilizing the students and the people in general in support of the prisoners' release. The action publicized the irregularity of the political trials that have been pending since July 1968.

The strike brought pressure on the government to end its unconstitutional procedures. It won wide support for the campaign to release the political prisoners, including statements from General Zuno, General Lázaro Cárdenas, and Bishop Sergio Méndez Arceo, as well as from several committees in other countries.

Two days before the hunger strikers announced their decision to end their protest, tens of thousands of Mexican

students went on strike demanding the immediate and unconditional release of the political prisoners.

The January 1 attack on the political prisoners galvanized broad support behind their demands. On Jan-

Statement by the Political Prisoners

'We Accuse the Government'

[The international press has acknowledged that the communiqué issued by a committee of political prisoners offers the most complete and credible account of the January 1 incidents in Lecumberri prison. The *Montreal Star* wrote January 14: "The most detailed account of what allegedly took place Jan. 1 is in a four-page statement signed by four inmates and reportedly brought out by a sympathetic guard. It does not depart in substance from an account related by a fifth prisoner in a letter to a Catholic priest or from stories told by prisoners' wives who were present as visitors." Our translation of the political prisoners' statement follows:]

* * *

The government has just subjected the political prisoners to a new provocation with the aim of carrying out a new mass murder, a Tlatelolco in Lecumberri prison.

The following political prisoners were seriously wounded in an attack by hundreds of common convicts organized and led by the prison warden, Brigadier General Andrés Puentes Vargas: Compañero José Luis Núñez in Ward C was shot. Compañero Rafael Jacobo, also in Ward C, was stabbed repeatedly. Compañero Gilberto Balam, in Ward N, received a cerebral fracture and a cut on the head. In addition, dozens of

January 5, 300 prominent figures, representing a considerable part of the Mexican intellectual community, placed an advertisement in *El Día* calling on the public to express solidarity with the prisoners and to demand their release.

In a dispatch published January 17, the special correspondent of the Paris daily *Le Monde* described growing support for the political prisoners: "Alerted by the positions taken by leading personalities, public opinion has begun to be aroused by the dramatic plight of the political prisoners."

other compañeros were stabbed and clubbed.

This attempted massacre of the political prisoners was carefully organized and prepared in advance. It was executed systematically by the prison authorities according to orders from the government, as the following facts demonstrate.

On January 1, the prisoners' relatives—almost entirely women and children, because the men have to leave earlier—were held up by the prison authorities as they were leaving. The authorities prevented them from going back in, holding them virtually imprisoned in a corridor. At about 8:30 p.m., the political prisoners began hearing shouts in unison from the women and children. Our families were demanding to be let out.

When our representatives from wards M, N, and C tried to meet with the authorities to resolve this situation, they were not allowed to leave the wards and they got no answer from the warden or from his subordinates, who were keeping the visitors under lock and key.

Upset by this situation, we political prisoners left the three wards to demand a meeting with the warden so as to find out what was happening to our families, who kept shouting and shouting.

When we assembled in the central corridor of the prison, the so-called circle which the gates of all the wards

open onto, we found that the way was blocked—not by the guards, who made no moves of any kind at this point, but by hundreds of common prisoners. The gates to the common prisoners' wards had been opened by a group of prison administration stooges, the so-called *mayores* [trustees] and *commandos* [chiefs] of the common prisoners' wards, led by Brigadier General Andrés Puentes Vargas.

All of the common prisoners were armed with pipes, rods, knives, and machetes. The administration stooges who led them, mostly drug addicts or alcoholics, were completely out of their heads. According to eyewitnesses, the gate of Ward F was opened personally by the deputy warden of the prison, Major Bernardo Palacio Yáñez.

We saw the jailers open the gate of Ward E, in the presence of the warden and at his orders, and incite the prisoners to attack us. We also saw at the time that most of the prisoners refused to come out.

When the *compañeros* leading the group of political prisoners realized that it was a trap set up to massacre us, they immediately called for a retreat, shouting out that it was a deliberate criminal provocation.

In this situation, General Puentes Vargas, in person, refusing to listen to those political prisoners who tried to talk to him, pulled out his revolver and fired several times into the air to urge on the common prisoners who were following him; and he ordered them to attack us. All of the *compañeros* present heard his command.

The political prisoners retreated to their wards, trying to avoid a clash with the common prisoners, especially with the drugged and drunken agents of the administration who were leading them, oblivious to everything, including arguments. As we retreated, we were attacked with clubs and knives by the administration stooges leading the attack.

At the same time, the attack was supported by rifle and pistol fire from the tops of walls and roofs occupied by the jailers. This barrage was not directed toward containing the fighting but was aimed at the political prisoners to force them to retreat in disorder so that they could be picked off and murdered one by one. If there were not several deaths in this situa-

tion, it was only because the overwhelming majority of the political prisoners kept cool, realizing that it was a provocation, and retreated in an orderly way to their wards.

The three political prisoners' wards were immediately charged by dozens of common prisoners under the thumb of the administration—that is, by the select body of criminals which the prison administration organizes among the prisoners to keep the common convicts' wards terrorized and to protect its traffic in drugs and liquor as well as many other rackets.

These elements made their way into Ward M and beat up the *compañeros* who were there. They also attacked Ward C. When some *compañeros* tried to defend the door, they were fired on by the jailers on the walls and others were stabbed by the attackers. In this ward, *Compañero* José Luis Núñez was shot and *Compañero* Rafael Jacobo was stabbed. Both are in grave condition.

Once these wards were occupied, the administration opened the gates of the other common prisoners' wards and gave them the go-ahead to loot wards C and M. Both wards were systematically, coolly, and unhurriedly sacked by the common prisoners, who were backed up by the guards. Absolutely all the prisoners' belongings were taken—clothing, bed linen and blankets, radios, cots, pillows, cooking utensils, personal effects, absolutely everything. In addition, the common prisoners burned several hundred books.

These same elements tried to force their way into Ward N, where we and many *compañeros* from Wards C and M had locked ourselves in. The charge was supported once more by a heavy barrage of gunfire against the political prisoners in Ward N. From behind the door, we were able to repel the assault, although several *compañeros* were wounded by bottles, rocks, and clubs.

At this point, the attackers retreated to concentrate on looting wards C and M. A few minutes later, when the attackers had already withdrawn from the gate, the political prisoners in Ward N were subjected to a new attack by the jailers, who unleashed a third and more intense rain of bullets against the ward. The holes made by mauser and pistol bullets are still in the walls.

Later, the attacks stopped. The attention of the prison authorities, and the common prisoners they were leading, was concentrated on the systematic sacking of Wards M and C, which lasted approximately two hours. During this time, the attackers, under the noses of the jailers, were carrying off everything they could find.

As this press release is being written, gangs of armed convicts organized by the prison authorities are continually roaming through the corridors, threatening to renew their attack on the political prisoners' wards. The jailers are just watching the show, waiting for orders to resume their support of the attackers if the authorities order a new assault.

The Ward N political prisoners, along with a considerable number of *compañeros* from wards C and M who have taken refuge with us, have been threatened continually with a new onslaught by bands of convicts, directed by the authorities, attempting to take this ward as they did wards C and M. Our ward is besieged. The authorities have permitted no food to be sent in. No visitors have been allowed to enter, except one of our lawyers. In these conditions, we are maintaining the state of alert we organized from the first.

All the facts related above lead to the following inescapable conclusions: A criminal provocation was organized against the political prisoners with the intent of perpetrating a massacre and passing it off as an "incident" with the common prisoners. An action of this magnitude could not have been staged by the warden on his own authority, since it was a terrorist political act against the political prisoners, their families, the students, and the masses in general. This action was carried out by the government in resistance to the campaign for the release of all the political prisoners that is growing in this country and throughout the world. If the provocation did not result in a full-fledged massacre, it was because the great majority of the political prisoners acted with a coolheadedness that so far has prevented the authorities from achieving their criminal ends.

We political prisoners have already exposed the murderous attitude displayed by the government against us on several occasions. These exposures have been publicized by workers and

students organizations and by intellectuals throughout the world, and they have been verified down to the last detail.

The stage for the present provocation was set over a period of time with a campaign of allegations against the political prisoners, which was intensified as a result of the hunger strike which a large group of compañeros concentrated in wards C and M have been carrying on for three weeks.

Only two days ago, the daily *La Prensa* published a communiqué in the name of all the common prisoners but signed only by the ward "mayores," the prison administration stooges who led this attack under the command of Brigadier General Andrés Puentes Vargas. This communiqué attacked the political prisoners. It was the immediate preparation for this criminal provocation. It is one of the many pieces of evidence demonstrating the premeditation with which the attack was organized.

At no time during the attack did General Puentes Vargas or his subordinates lose control of the situation. Every move the common prisoners made was under their orders, from the assault to the looting and including the provocations of the last twenty-four hours.

The groundwork for this attack was also laid by a press campaign carried on by corrupt and servile journalists, like Ernesto Julio Teissier, who writes a filthy column in *Novedades* that is always filled with slander and threats against the political prisoners.

At this moment, the prison administration is in the hands of General Renato Vega Amador, the chief of the Federal District preventive police, who is keeping the armed bands of common prisoners circulating throughout the prison. The building is surrounded by *granaderos* [riot police] and other repressive forces.

We political prisoners do not ask for any protection from the government that perpetrated the massacre of Tlaltelolco, which every day represses the entire Mexican people by the most infamous methods, and which has continually threatened to murder us and our families by means of armed gangs like the so-called *Boinas Rojas de Netzahualcóyotl* [Red Berets of Netzahualcóyotl].

We ask no protection from a govern-

ment that has shown itself capable of relying on criminal bands of common convicts—which keep the majority of prisoners in this jail terrorized—to carry out its repression, that has shown itself capable of assigning a Mexican army general to command these gangs. We ask nothing and we expect nothing from a government that resorts to murder and looting to intimidate us and the people of Mexico.

This government must understand that it cannot frighten us, that we will continue our struggle. It must understand that it will be held accountable by the people of Mexico and the world for these crimes and these methods, which are the same methods by which it represses the masses of the country every day, beating and murdering people and looting the homes of the workers and peasants.

We political prisoners of Mexico address ourselves to the workers, the students, the peasants, the housewives, and the workers of the entire country and the entire world to denounce these criminal proceedings. We warn that this provocation was only a dress rehearsal and that new attacks are in the works. We warn that a carefully organized massacre and new repressive measures are being prepared against the political prisoners in Lecumberri.

We accuse the government, from the

president on down, of being the sole and exclusive organizer of these measures. We declare that this massacre is an extension of monstrous and fraudulent trials and sentences by virtue of which they are keeping us arbitrarily imprisoned.

We declare that since these trials and sentences have failed to intimidate the masses and the political prisoners themselves and since we have maintained our militant position, they are now preparing a mass murder as a means of terrorizing the entire Mexican people.

We call on all the organizations of the workers, students, farmers, and the people in Mexico and throughout the world to denounce these acts by every means. We call for a mobilization to defend the lives of the political prisoners in Mexico, to halt the constant attacks and provocations, and to demand the immediate and unconditional release of all the political prisoners as well as those jailed for trade-union and peasant organizing activities.

Signed by the members of the Committee of the Political Prisoners in Ward N:

Victor Rico Galán, Francisco Colmenares, Eduardo Fuentes de la Fuente, Fabio Barbosa, César Catalán.

Lecumberri Prison, January 2, 1970.

Eyewitness Accounts

New Year's Day in Lecumberri

[A number of eyewitness accounts by political prisoners, describing the assault on them in Lecumberri, have been published in the Mexican student and radical press. The following items supplement the report given in the political prisoners' press release above. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

After the strike was announced, the warden of the prison said that he had three separate plans for dealing with the consequences. He spoke only in these terms: "We will apply Plan 1, Plan 2, and Plan 3 as the situation requires."

Shortly before the strike began, he started to set the stage for the attack by the common prisoners. For this purpose, he began spreading the story among them that certain conveniences, such as going to the cafeteria, to the bathroom, to the exercise field, etc., were going to be affected by our strike. Finally, in the concluding days of the year, he began stirring them up with the story that visits were going to be suspended on our account.

On January 1, all the visitors who were late in leaving were held up for more than two hours. For about an hour and a half no one made any special protests and everyone accepted the absurd pretexts that were given;

for example, that the guards could not find the keys.

The first to begin getting restless were the children. And when the visitors tried to go back to talk to the authorities to explain the situation to them, they found themselves for all practical purposes imprisoned. They were caught between two locked gates. It was the children who began beating on the gate leading back into the prison and trying to force the lock. When at last they broke the lock, they managed to get to a place where their shouts could be heard from wards M and N.

All this, like many other things, was foreseen. At the outside gate of the prison there were *granaderos* and cops armed with machine guns. Moreover, the better part of the inside guards were also in the street.

Hearing the shouts of the women and children, everyone got very worried. However, their first thought was to talk to the authorities. But when they reached the door, there was not even a single guard there, although there are always at least five.

But Marcué [Manuel Marcué Pardiñas] was outside the ward and when he got a look at the situation he went to the authorities and was able to get as far as the deputy warden of the prison, Major Bernardo Palacios. When Marcué approached him, Palacios said that he had to leave in a hurry and that he would try to talk to the warden.

In the meantime, after waiting for so long, the *compañeros* lost their patience and got out by forcing the locks. At the same time, the *compañeros* in Ward N were also trying to get out. But for some time already, a growing number of common prisoners were gathering outside their cells ready for the attack.

Some *compañeros* from Ward M went to Ward C to let them know what was going on and the people from Ward C also came out.

Before the fight, [Fausto] Trejo tried to talk to the warden but the warden cursed him and made a move toward drawing his revolver. Meanwhile, Palacios, the deputy warden, was opening the gate of Ward E—where last year there were six murders in one week alone. As he did it, he said, "Now those sons of bitches are going to get it."

The warden himself gave the signal for unleashing the assault, firing two or three shots. At this point, all the common prisoners joined in the attack and a barrage of gunfire began.

When the fight began, they opened the exit gate for the visitors. But then the visitors did not want to leave without knowing what was going to happen to us. This was when the *granaderos* came in and took out the visitors one by one at gun point.

The authorities stated in the papers that they did not allow the visitors to leave until they had fully identified themselves. But the truth is that by that time nobody even bothered to collect their passes.

When they let out the common prisoners, we all had to retreat, since there were more than a thousand of them. The first ward they tried to take was Ward C. But this wasn't easy because the *compañeros* locked the door and began to put up resistance. After several unsuccessful attempts, the common prisoners were helped out by a rain of bullets, which forced our *compañeros* to abandon the gate. One bullet struck a common prisoner, costing him an eye. Another hit our comrade "Chanchas," a high-school boy.

In Ward C the guards themselves joined in the attack, alternately participating in the attacks and directing the attackers. All the serious casualties were in this ward. At least two-thirds of the political prisoners in this ward suffered wounds—stab wounds and head and face lacerations. They took Ward M easily because there were only sixteen of us hunger strikers there. Some of us were wounded—I was hit over the head with a bottle—but we still put up a fight.

The common prisoners were unable to take Ward N because the *compañeros* there, along with the majority of the political prisoners in wards C and M, took advantage of the breathing space they got to mount a defense that the attackers couldn't break through.

This is a sketch of what happened January 1. On the second and third, we were besieged by the common prisoners who think that we are an inexhaustible source of booty. There were moments of real danger.

But we have won a political victory because even going to these ex-

tremes the authorities haven't been able to break our strike. I was astounded at the strength we summoned up. I don't know where we got it from. Now we have nothing to worry about because we have absolutely nothing. We are back where we started from, but now we have a different perspective. People like Pepe, myself, and others did not waver for an instant because from the beginning we expected to die. Now the strike has achieved gains that not even the most optimistic hoped for. From now on everything is pure gain.

By Political Prisoner "Y"

All of this was no more and no less than a political plan to break our hunger strike, which the authorities feared not so much because of the strike itself but because of the repercussions it has had both nationally and internationally.

The student *compañeros* are mobilizing again, and democratic sectors from Méndez Arceo [a liberal bishop] to the intellectuals are declaring their support for our struggle and our release. Internationally, Bertrand Russell, Arthur Miller, and many other distinguished figures support us . . . But the government's plan failed. *We are holding firm and continuing our strike.*

By Political Prisoner "Z"

The attack we suffered at the hands of the common prisoners was planned in advance. It was foreshadowed when, following a statement in our favor by some common prisoners, a full-page advertisement, signed by the "*comandos*" [the head trustees of the wards], was placed in *La Prensa*. Besides denying the "story" that any common prisoners supported us, the ad came out against us.

A little later, we talked to some common prisoners and they told us that this document came down to them from above (the authorities) and that many of them were signed up arbitrarily and others signed because they had no other choice. The "*comandos*" signed because they are the stooges of the authorities.

The direct hand of the authorities in the attack is absolutely clear. From the start, on December 10, Vega Amador [chief of the Federal District preventive police] moved into Lecumberri and took over the prison.

Jury Whitewashes Killing of Hampton, Clark

By Les Evans

A special coroner's jury ruled January 21 that the killing of two Black Panther party leaders by the Chicago police was "justifiable." Fred Hampton, chairman of the Illinois chapter of the party, and Mark Clark, a Panther from Peoria, were shot to death in a predawn police raid on Hampton's apartment December 4. Four other occupants, two of them women, were wounded.

The police claim that the Panthers fired first, touching off a ten-minute "shoot-out." But only two police were wounded: one cut his hand while breaking a window; another said a cut he suffered was caused by a shotgun pellet. The police have been unable to find a single one of the bullets they claim were fired by the Panthers.

The Panthers state that the police came in shooting and murdered Fred Hampton while he was asleep in bed.

None of the seven Panthers who survived the raid testified at the inquest. They are all threatened with indictment on charges of attempting to murder the police and have said it would be prejudicial to their defense to tell their version of what happened before any pending trial.

The coroner's jury ruled that the police opened fire because they "reasonably believed it necessary to prevent death or great bodily harm."

"Solely on the evidence presented," the jury said in its verdict, the killing was "justifiable." When these words were read to the court, Mark Clark's mother rose to her feet. "It was not!" she said.

The verdict, a whitewash for the police, was no surprise to anyone. The prosecutor at the hearings was appointed by State's Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan, the same man who ordered the police raid in the first place. The coroner, Andrew J. Toman, is a well-known figure in the administration of Mayor Richard Daley. He appointed the director of the inquest, Martin Gerber.

This partisan setup was denounced even by conservative representatives of the black community. The Cook Coun-

ty Bar Association, for example, an organization of black attorneys in Chicago, declared: "The jury is not representative of the Black community, nor are the persons selected conducive to returning a 'fair and impartial verdict.'"

It is interesting to compare the successive stories handed out by the police. The December 5 *New York Times* gave the first account by Sergeant Daniel Groth, the man who led the fifteen cops in the raid:

"Sergeant Groth said that he knocked on the door and someone shouted 'Who's there?' He said he identified himself as a police officer and said that he had a search warrant. . . . Then, he said, he pushed the door open. Inside the apartment, he said, he saw a woman lying on a bed pointing a shotgun at the door. She opened fire on them, he said. . . .

"Several times during the gunfight, Sergeant Groth said, he ordered a cease-fire, but a voice from the dark shouted, 'Shoot it out.'

"'There must have been six or seven of them firing,' Sergeant Groth said. 'The firing must have gone on 10 or 12 minutes. If 200 shots were exchanged, that was nothing.'"

To bolster this story, and in violation of standard procedure for the handling of evidence, State's Attorney Hanrahan released police photographs of the apartment. These, reproduced in the *Chicago Tribune* of December 11, purported to show bullet holes made by guns fired by the Panthers. The December 12 *New York Times* reported:

"A comparison of the pictures with the apartment . . . showed that what the police described as bullet holes in a kitchen door were nail head[s]; that a bullet marked door described by the police as the outside of a bathroom door is the inside of a bedroom door; and that there are no marks on the walls where the police say a heavy deer hunting slug was fired through a door." When the pictures were properly identified, all marks finally identified as bullet holes

were shown to have been caused by police fire.

The police claimed to have found more than a dozen weapons in the apartment. Black spokesmen have in the past accused the police of bringing unregistered guns with them on raids and planting them to secure convictions. In this case the police have traced the ownership of only one of the seized weapons, a shotgun which belongs to the Chicago police department. They claim it was stolen by the Panthers. The police neglected to check the arsenal for fingerprints that might have proved they had been handled by the occupants of Fred Hampton's apartment.

The only "bullet hole" the police have yet been able to attribute to the Panthers is in the living room door behind which Mark Clark was killed. This conflicted, however, with Sergeant Groth's testimony that Brenda Harris had fired the shot. As the *New York Times* put it, "If the holes had been made by a slug fired by Miss Harris, it would have had to take a boomerang trajectory." On January 12 Groth changed his story, now claiming the "shot" was fired by Mark Clark.

Unfortunately for this theory, there is no bullet hole in the wall opposite the hole in the door. There is, however, a small hole in the door with jagged splinters projecting inwards, suggesting that the police bullet that killed Mark Clark was fired through the door from outside, before he had opened it. This is what the Panthers claim. The police deny that they fired into the apartment without first opening the door.

So far the police have found three shotgun casings matching weapons "found" in the apartment.

A police firearms expert told the coroner's jury January 20 that no slugs or pellets from these casings had been discovered. The *New York Times* added:

"Nor he said, were there any slugs or expended cartridges among the more than 100 recovered from the

apartment that matched any of the rest of the 17 weapons the police said they seized at the apartment."

James Montgomery, an attorney for the Panthers, summed up the inquest. It was, he said, a "well-rehearsed the-

atrical performance to justify these police officers in the killing and wounding of the Black Panthers."

Fred Hampton's mother was more blunt. "Rotten people," she said, "the whole bunch is rotten people."

Nigeria

Oil and the War

[The following discussion between Mr. Vaz Nunes, the director of Royal Dutch Shell, and Mr. van Meurs, the head of the Geological Institute in Utrecht, was broadcast by the Catholic service of Netherlands Radio, December 15, and reprinted in a "slightly revised, shorter version" in the January 16 issue of the London, *Peace News*. This pacifist weekly waged a vigorous campaign against British intervention in the Nigerian civil war.]

* * *

Van Meurs: Eight years ago, Shell made a contract to explore the offshore oil fields of Nigeria. Although it didn't have much success there, these fields are nevertheless potentially very rich. This is obvious from the fact that Mobil-Oil has already made eleven strikes there.

In a contract signed on November 30, 1969, half of the oil concessions had to be returned to the Federal Government. Is that right Mr Vaz Nunes?

Vaz Nunes: Yes.

Van Meurs: Shell has now returned these concessions—which was a very difficult business for her, since she had no chance to investigate them because of the war. However, these fields have an enormous potential. And because Gowon can give these concessions out again, he has an enormous hold on the oil companies. This means that the oil companies cannot allow themselves any vacillation in their support for Gowon. They even have to be more Nigerian than Gowon himself, if they want to get these fields back into their hands. Shell does everything to keep Gowon happy.

According to *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly* (December 8, 1969) they have even offered to build him a completely valueless refinery near Lagos. Near Port Harcourt there stands Nigeria's

only oil refinery—and it has produced all the oil products needed for Nigeria's internal use. Notwithstanding, Shell-BP [British Petroleum] has offered to build a Lagos refinery with a capacity of 50,000 barrels a day. What else has Shell done to please Gowon? Again, according to *Petroleum Intelligence Weekly*, she has plans to build a big fleet of tankers for the Nigerian government.

If we look at Shell's interests we find her in a very extraordinary situation. The war around the oil fields has now gone on for more than two years and the guerrillas are very active at this moment. So Shell is concerned that the war should stop as soon as possible. This could happen in one of two ways. First the Federal offensive could be allowed to wipe Biafra off the map. Second there could be negotiations. These are the only two possibilities. What is now the least expensive of the two ways? Wiping Biafra off the map has the disadvantage that there will always be guerrillas to harass the oil installations. But the disadvantage of negotiations is that Biafra will have a certain amount of self-government and that means she will want a say in oil matters.

Because Shell has aligned herself with Nigeria it's very hard for her to come to speaking terms with Biafra—this would cost Shell a lot of money. Nonetheless, there is this proposal made by Messrs Wierenga and Westerterp*—which I very much support—by which Gowon is forced to diminish the oil production and stop buying weapons, and to stop systematically destroying Biafra. . . There

* Two members of parliament, Wierenga and Westerterp, had urged their government to place an embargo on the export to Nigeria of new equipment by Royal Dutch Shell. —IP

is clearly a possibility (in this plan) that Shell will turn around, and even ask Gowon to negotiate. . . It is necessary in Shell's best interests, for her to solve this problem very soon. May I ask Mr Vaz Nunes to answer what I've said? (applause)

Vaz Nunes: Yes, I do want to say something. Mr van Meurs certainly knows a lot about his subject. But it's a great pity he loses himself in a sea of details, when such terrible Biafran suffering, with so many millions dying or dead, are involved. I thought we had gathered here to talk about the war and not whether concessions are given or taken back. . . If we had been able to influence things to shorten this war—and when I say *we* I mean Shell-BP (sharing half the government shares with the British government)—if we had been able to influence things in any way to shorten this war, we would have done so a long time ago.

The war has cost Shell-BP millions of pounds—not only for installations but there is also a great deal of waste—£79 million has been put into (Dutch) Shell in the last thirty years—we are not making any profit out of this £79 million. Moreover, oil which could have been used very well, must be replaced by other oil of the same quality, which is more expensive. So it's obvious that if we could have done anything to shorten this terrible conflict we would have done so a long time ago.

The unhappy truth is that we are as powerless as are governments and the United Nations. If we tried to put pressure on Lagos not only would we be thrown out, we would be accused of neo-colonialism and intervention in a nation's internal affairs. But unfortunately it wouldn't work anyway.

The oil earnings Nigeria gets from us are the same now more or less as they were at the beginning of the war—and this amounts to the cost of one month's warfare. I wish it were otherwise, but the nasty truth is that, even if the governments were to apply an embargo (presumably against oil imports and equipment—Eds. [of *Peace News*]) even if we were thus forced to stop completely, the war would still not be ended. So it is not an oil war.

Van Meurs: I would like to show Mr Vaz Nunes that this "one month's

cost of war" figure is quite unrealistic. It's very simple. The Nigerian budget comes to £150 million while the income from the oil industry (in which Shell-BP has an 80% interest) amounts to about £39 million per year (*Petroleum Press Service*, 1967). Therefore it is clear that the oil industry is able to finance a quarter of the war effort. (Per year — Eds. [*Peace News*])

Vaz Nunes: But may I reply with a set of figures I have here? The total income of the Nigerian government in 1966 was £N199 million; for 1967 it was £N163 million; for 1968 it was £N156 million; and the projected figure for 1969 is £N190 million. Of that £N190 million we estimate that the total oil industry brings in about £39 million a year to the Nigerian government.

Van Meurs: That is what I said — £39 million.

Vaz Nunes: As a percentage of £190 million, that is 15% — which is in any case the total oil industry figure — all of which is not Shell-BP.

Van Meurs: You come here with 15% and I have figures which come to 25%. But even accepting your 15%, that can pay for the war for six months — not the one month you've mentioned.

Vaz Nunes: All right it could — unless you cut off that oil income depriving the Federal government of 15% of its income. My submission was that unfortunately you cannot stop the war doing this — that there is still another 85% left.

Van Wennen (member of the Dutch Biafran Action Committee): But even one month means 100,000 dead. (great applause)

Vaz Nunes: I don't know what I can say to that. It would mean that everybody who does business with Nigeria is responsible for a part of the deaths. (applause) I thought we were talking about possibilities we could use to end this rotten war as soon as possible. I have said here that the ending of the oil production takes away 15% of the Nigerian government's income, and if you are going to divide those two million dead by this 15% — I don't think that is a very sensible remark, and I can't consider it a reflection on my industry.

Van Wennen: An economic boycott would certainly make this war impossible.

France

Campaign to Free Antiwar Soldiers

The jailing of four French soldiers for their antiwar views has been met by a nationwide campaign in defense of their rights. Such well-known figures as Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, and Daniel Guérin are among the sponsors.

Three of the prisoners, Serge Devaux, a former professor; Michel Trouilleux, an electrical worker; and Alain Hervé, a technician, have been held in the central prison at Rennes, in northwestern France, since October 20.

They are charged by the military authorities with "inciting disobedience among soldiers and hurting the morale of the troops."

The only specific accusation against them is that they possessed copies of the journal *Crosse en l'Air*, and of a petition on behalf of a draftee at Vannes who was struck by a non-commissioned officer, then put under orders not to protest this mistreatment.

The fourth prisoner, the soldier Divet, is being held at Landau, West Germany. A pamphlet was found in his possession entitled, "It's Only the Beginning, Continue the Struggle."

A National Committee for the Release of the Imprisoned Soldiers has been formed, with chapters throughout France. To date it has printed 50,000 posters and more than 200,000 leaflets explaining the case.

An appeal on behalf of Devaux, Trouilleux, Hervé, and Divet was announced January 15. The initial signers included Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Dr. Marcel-Francis Kahn, Dr. J.-M. Krivine, Marguerite Duras, Daniel Guérin, Aimé Césaire, Claude Bourdet, Pierre Frank, *Brochier* magazine, Alain Krivine, Jean-Pierre Vigier, Marguerite Bonnet, and Annie Le Brun.

"In rejecting the regimentation, the bullying, and the repression which reigns in the army," the appeal said, "Devaux and his comrades have expressed the opinion of tens of thousands of other soldiers.

"In struggling so that the soldiers in the ranks may enjoy the same rights as all other citizens, Devaux and his comrades are struggling for the thou-

sands of workers, peasants, and students who refuse to be transformed, for sixteen months of their lives, into docile sheep of a despotic hierarchy."

The signers demanded the immediate release of the prisoners, and called on others to sign the appeal.

The four soldiers are to be tried by military courts, and face up to two years in prison if convicted. The trial at Rennes is said to be scheduled for the beginning of February.

One demand by the Committee for the Release of the Imprisoned Soldiers is that the defendants be granted the status of political prisoners. Thus far the military has refused, but the three prisoners at Rennes have threatened to go on a hunger strike if their request is not granted.

According to the January 19 issue of the Paris revolutionary-socialist weekly *Rouge*, the army has established commissions of inquiry to pry into the political beliefs of other soldiers, with the threat of further prosecutions. More than twenty draftees have been interrogated in Rennes, Meaux, Tours, and Mutzig.

The Committee for the Release of the Imprisoned Soldiers has asked that statements of support be sent to Dr. Marcel-Francis Kahn, 15, rue Cler, Paris 7, France.

Was That the Candy's Retail Value?

Kept in New York penal institutions for thirty-four years for stealing \$5 worth of candy at the age of sixteen, Stephen Dennison has appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court for \$115,000 by way of restitution.

While on probation for the \$5 theft, he failed to report and was sent to a reformatory. There he was classified as a "low-grade moron" and "sent up." At the age of sixty, he was finally released through the efforts of his brother George.

Dennison's plea to the Supreme Court is that the maximum legal sentence in New York for stealing \$5 worth of candy is only ten years.

You Can Say That Again

"Enough is enough. Everybody with any sense agrees that a big war is not only unwinnable but suicidal. Yet we prepare for it with might, main and treasures. It is insanity." — Editorial in the January 10 *Detroit Free Press*.

What the Port Strike Is About

By Allen Myers

Colombo

This morning I observed an outdoor mass meeting of more than 5,000 workers striking the Colombo port. After listening to arguments pro and con by leaders of the seven unions involved in the strike, the workers, who had stood patiently in sweltering heat for nearly an hour and a half, voted virtually unanimously to continue the strike.

Now in its sixth week, the strike is centered on two major demands: a change from the present daily to a monthly wage scale, and a substantial increase in wages. The first demand is occasioned by the fact that there is often insufficient work available to occupy all the port workers. On such days, workers, who are thus in effect temporarily laid off, are given only "stand-by wages," which are considerably less than their regular wages. The workers are demanding a fixed monthly wage in order to protect themselves against this sort of concealed unemployment.

Even regular wages are pitifully small. I talked to one port worker at the edge of the crowd who told me that his normal pay for an eight-hour day is six rupees—about U. S. \$0.66.

On this tiny income, he has to support a wife, four children, and his parents. A pound of rice in Colombo currently costs Rs 1.50 and a single coconut Rs 0.45.

Seven different unions have formed a united front to conduct the strike. They are: the Port Corporation Branch of the Ceylon Mercantile Union, Ceylon Harbour Socialist Workers Union, All-Ceylon Harbour and Dock Workers Union, Independent Harbour Workers Union, and United Harbour and Launch Workers Union.

Two other unions, led by the Lanka Sama Samaja party and the United National party, have refused to honor the strike and have told members to continue work. (Some of the rank and file of these unions have ignored the treacherous advice of their lead-

ers and are also on strike.) In addition, the government has given a concrete illustration of why an underdeveloped country needs a military—it is using the army to unload ships in the harbor.

But even in the face of these strike-breaking attempts, the port is effectively all but closed. Yesterday I was taken on a tour of the harbor by Bala Tampoe, the president of the Ceylon Mercantile Union. (Approximately 3,500 of the 10,000 port workers on strike are members of the CMU.) We could count no fewer than fourteen ships inside and outside the harbor waiting to be unloaded. Some have already been waiting for weeks; in the last few days the newspapers have reported that one of the ships is now carrying a cargo of rotten onions.

The government has the added problem that it can't be sure that cargoes that are unloaded actually reach their intended destination. Since 95 percent of the port clerical workers are members of the CMU and on strike, there is no real check on what happens to goods; and many soldiers are taking advantage of the opportunity to supplement their own meager wages.

At a meeting with leaders of the united front on January 13, the Ceylonese prime minister granted the strikers' first demand and agreed to implement a monthly wage scale. But on the question of the size of this monthly wage, the government was less accommodating. The government refused even to make a specific offer, alleging that wages would have to be "worked out" as part of an overall pay scheme for all the government-run corporations, and this "working-out" might take weeks, even months.

Before today's mass meeting, leaders of the All-Ceylon Harbour and Dock Workers Union announced that their union would accept the government's offer and return to work. (The union is led by the Mahajana Eksath Peramuna—the "People's United

Front." The MEP is part of the government, and one of its leaders, Philip Gunewardena, is the Minister of Industries and Fisheries. The union leaders thus find themselves in the embarrassing position of conducting a strike against members of their own party.) But immediately after the vote was taken today, other members of the union's executive committee announced that they had not been consulted on the back-to-work decision and that the union would be meeting soon to reconsider the move made by the leadership.

Later in the day it was announced that the Harbour and Dock Workers Union is now officially once more on strike. The union's representative told the other members of the united front, "We go back together, or the government falls."

You can't help being struck by these workers' almost automatic solidarity with the antiwar struggle in the U. S. Immediately after the mass strike meeting, the CMU had a meeting at its hall.

Hundreds of workers, most of whom had just finished listening to an hour and a half of speeches, were crammed shoulder to shoulder listening to Bala Tampoe. He went on at some length, speaking, of course, in Sinhala. I assumed from the attentiveness of the audience that he was discussing some complicated point of strike strategy.

But when I asked someone what Tampoe was saying, I received the answer: "He's talking about your visit and the antiwar movement in the United States."

Not exactly the kind of thing one would expect from the leaders of an American trade union.

January 16.

Soviet Cops Alert to Contraband Ideas

On January 17 two young Italians, Teresa Marinuzzi and Valtenio Tacchi, chained themselves to the grating of a Moscow department store and distributed leaflets to passersby calling for the release of political prisoners, particularly Pyotr Grigorenko. It took the police about an hour to get them loose.

On January 18 a young Belgian, Victor Van Brantegen, chained himself to a balcony at the opera and sent similar leaflets showering on the spectators.

A young Norwegian, Gunnar Gjengseth, was arrested within five minutes January 22 when he began distributing leaflets of the same kind in Leningrad.

'Unequaled in the Whole History of Brazil'

Reports of widespread torture of political opponents of the dictatorship in Brazil are appearing with increasing frequency, despite a pledge in November by the country's new ruler, General Emílio Garrastazú Médici, to halt the "use of violent methods."

The January 19 issue of the Rio de Janeiro daily *Tribuna da Imprensa* carried a front-page editorial demanding an end to the tortures, and the freeing of the political prisoners. It is necessary, the paper said, "to empty the prisons, where some 90 percent of those detained are young people, under twenty-five years old, who don't know why they have been incarcerated." The editorial denounced "the barbaric tortures inflicted on certain prisoners of both sexes, mostly students, with a brutality unequaled in the whole history of Brazil."

The National Council of Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Brazil has compiled a report on the tortures including a number of case histories, with signed and sworn statements by the victims. According to Leonard Greenwood, writing from Rio de Janeiro in the January 18 *Los Angeles Times*, the church report also gives "the names of those alleged to have inflicted the torture, details of what they did, and when and where."

"At least 12 churchmen and one mother superior are known to be in prison, according to church records," Greenwood writes. The imprisoned mother superior is Maurina Borges of Ribeirao Preto, a city of about 150,000 north of Rio de Janeiro. The police have accused her of plotting to launch an armed revolutionary struggle. Soon after her arrest in November, according to Greenwood, "church sources said she had been tortured with electric shocks. Msgr. Da Cunha Vasconcellos, archbishop of Ribeirao Preto . . . excommunicated the city's two senior police officers and denounced brutality towards other prisoners."

The *Wall Street Journal* confirmed this report in its January 23 issue, adding that "clerics charged that the

police stripped the Mother Superior at the police station and humiliated her. . . .

"No less dismaying was the murder in May 1969 of the Rev. Henrique Pereira Neto, a young sociology professor and aide to Dom Helder [the archbishop of Recife, an outspoken critic of the military regime]. . . His throat was cut and his body riddled with bullets. Dom Helder charged that the assassins were right-wing fanatics acting with the acquiescence—if not the connivance—of the government, and he alleged that 32 clerics, including himself, were on a 'death list.'"

An open letter was sent to the pope December 16 by sixty-one prominent European Catholics who charged that dozens of people were killed or tortured in Brazil in 1969 because of their criticism of the dictatorship.

Last November 22 the banned Brazilian National Students' Union issued a statement accusing naval police of torturing political prisoners by electric shocks on the wrists and genitals and by sharp blows on the ears. In some cases, the students said, this had caused permanent deafness. Another torture is called the "telephone." Suction cups are placed over both ears then violently removed, causing damage to the eardrums.

According to a November 22 Reuters dispatch, "The students' union also charged that its jailed president, Jean Marc, was submerged in water and hung upside down and beaten during interrogation."

The *New York Times* on December 3 described a case where the victim did not survive the "interrogation":

"A young Brazilian former medical student, who had gone underground, apparently to join a guerrilla group late last year, was arrested as a terrorist recently. Four days later his body was returned to his family. . . . According to official records the former medical student, Chael Charles Schreier, died on Nov. 22 of internal bleeding, one day after his arrest here [Rio de Janeiro]."

The *Times* added that reports of

tortures were common, although they have been "reflected only indirectly in the unofficially censored Brazilian press. . . . Witnesses and victims have said that some interrogations involve beatings and electric shocks applied to naked prisoners hanging by their knees from bars or poles."

The December 31 *Wall Street Journal* suggested that such brutalities are even more widespread than the *Times* indicates. A "longtime resident" of Rio de Janeiro is quoted as saying, "almost everybody has at least a second-hand story of torture."

Novelist José Yglesias, in a report from Brazil in the December 7 *New York Times Magazine*, described the experience of some well-to-do liberals arrested by the military police. To protect them from reprisals he omits their names.

"The intellectual had been at the military police jail . . . and he recreated the scene for us: . . . A short corridor led to the room where a sadistic captain and a kind lieutenant conducted the questioning, with two soldiers with rifles at the ready and a third holding the electrical gimmick with which they administer shock treatment to the genitals.

"I spoke to two persons besides the Intellectual who were in and out of those rooms that month and their descriptions supported one another. All three remembered the gunshots at intervals outside the building, followed by an officer entering the room calling out to a colleague, 'Well, that's two more of them!' . . .

"All three were in the anteroom when they heard the agonized screams of a newspaperman and saw him led back to the anteroom, stumbling and shaking, by the lieutenant who played the kindly role."

No Women Need Apply at Vatican

A Vatican spokesman announced January 25 that a West German diplomat would not be accredited because she is a woman. Mrs. Elisabeth Muller, former head of Bonn's commercial delegation in Prague, must be replaced by a man.

Can You Be a Garaudyist Today?

By Louis Couturier

[Increasing interest in the dissident views of the leading French Communist intellectual spokesman, Roger Garaudy, has forced the CP leadership to debate with him in the columns of *l'Humanité*, the party's Paris daily. The unusual sight of a public dispute in the traditionally monolithic French Stalinist party is creating something of a stir, all the more so since it is taking place on the eve of the CP congress. We have translated the following comments from the January 12 issue of *Rouge*, the weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League), the French section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

It is probable that the "Garaudy Affair" will have considerable repercussions in the PCF [Parti Communiste Français — French Communist party] coming on the eve of its nineteenth congress. For the first time in quite a long while, a member of the Political Bureau is kicking over the traces on clearly political questions. His peers so far have not called him a police agent or an enemy infiltrator, but only a dissident and undisciplined comrade.

Rosa Luxemburg once said something to the effect: "When they accuse me of stealing the spoons in the dining room, you will know that I am in political disagreement." Garaudy has not incurred such charges (for the time being). It is true, however, that *l'Humanité's* tone has been escalating in sharpness at a carefully calculated pace. After respectfully apologizing for his "poor theoretical capacities," an obscure secretary of the Jura federation accused Garaudy of factional activities and of setting himself "above the party and in opposition to it."

It was known that Garaudy differed with the Political Bureau over the Czech question. As a result of his interview with *Politika* in Belgrade, he was censured (in an "understanding and fraternal" way, according to

the theoretician from the Jura mentioned above).

Marchais [the CP's chief hatchetman] did not launch his anathemas against the dissident philosopher until the publication of Garaudy's latest book, *Le Grand Tournant du Socialisme* [Socialism's Great Turning Point], which was intended as a sequel to *Pour un Modèle Français du Socialisme* [For a French Socialist Model].

As of this writing, Garaudy's book is not yet available in the bookstores, although it has gotten a noisy fanfare in the widest possible range of the mass media. Nonetheless, some observations can be made at this time.

Roger Garaudy was the man assigned all the intellectual dirty work during the period of triumphant Stalinism. It is important to keep this in mind in order to understand the personality that is being forged today. Garaudy was the protégé of Maurice Thorez, who wrote a flattering preface to his thesis on "liberty," which earned Garaudy the title of doctor of philosophical sciences from the University of Moscow in 1954.

Thorez also chaired the meeting in June 1962 at which Garaudy criticized "Stalin's philosophical errors" in front of the Communist philosophers. One suspects that with such patronage the criticism was not very penetrating.

Presentable Communist intellectuals being few, Garaudy was given the task of making overtures to the Catholics and trying to divert attention from the worst ideological excesses of Stalinism by writing platitudes about Kafka, St. John Perse, Teilhard de Chardin, etc. (A platitude does constitute a definite advance over slanderous falsehoods.)

Unfortunately for the party leadership, Garaudy was to get carried away by the game. In attempting to gain the ear of the reverend fathers and other liberals, Garaudy came at last to realize that the Stalinist reality of the PCF was a severe handicap.

The cleverest sophisms, which he had learned how to spout, did not weigh much in the balance against

the fate of Solzhenitsyn, the notoriety of Marchais, and Brezhnev's tanks.

Thus, taking his role seriously, Garaudy himself started to "confront" the established authorities. He did not question the basics, of course. He is in agreement with "the program, the policy, and the objectives of the party" (an article in *l'Humanité*, January 2).

This is one of the rare times we can believe him. What devastates him is that the party's correct policy has so little impact: "The opposition forces, which are in the majority, are without power in the country; and within this opposition, the strongest contingent, the French Communist party, is incapable of rallying these forces" (interview in *Kommunist*, September 4, 1969).

Attached by his entire past and all his training to the opportunism of the PCF, Garaudy is looking for gimmicks to make a rotten policy look appetizing. So we are witnessing feats of juggling which are astonishing even from him:

—"The Party's line is correct but the Party has not scientifically analyzed the changes introduced into class relationships by the great transformation of the productive forces."

—"The line is correct but the Party has not made clear what model of socialism we want to establish in France."

—And in more concentrated form: The program is excellent but its theoretical bases are "very weak" (for this reason he was unable to support the draft theses of the nineteenth party congress).

Our philosopher thus accepts the concept that a correct program can be built on a nonexistent theoretical foundation. The role of theory, then, is to justify the program after the fact in order to make it more palatable to finicky intellectuals. This in general is what Roger Garaudy presumed to criticize Stalin for in 1962—using theory to justify "incorrect practices."

Artfully justifying the PCF's line is not enough to attract the intellectuals and the youth, who show a very marked coolness. What is needed is to reestablish some degree of democratic life within the organization and to assert some independence from the USSR.

Garaudy's complaints about the way *l'Humanité* mutilates his writings and

the peculiar way party members are informed have the definite ring of truth. Unfortunately, and because of this, we can entirely sympathize with Garaudy's distress; it was not long ago (1967) that he grossly manipulated Trotsky's writings on the theory of the permanent revolution so as to make them fit in with Stalin's version of what Trotsky wrote. (See Roger Garaudy, *Le Problème Chinois*, Collection 10-18, pages 142-152.) But, in spite of everything, when he calls for the publication of opposition views, basing himself on Lenin, and when he calls out for Brezhnev to "Resign!" we can only applaud him.

It is more honorable, it should be added, to get yourself expelled from a Stalinist party than to expel others. We hope he will permit us to express some concern for his political future. We do not know if the "congress" (in other words, the apparatus meeting in plenary session) will decide to expel him. But it does seem to us that a process has been set in motion which must sooner or later lead to this.

Inasmuch as Garaudy supports the line, attacking only the methods of applying it, he constitutes an ideal oppositionist for the leadership. You just have to look at the zest with which those who inspire the column publishing contributions to the "discussion" point up the erring comrade's contradictions and duplicity.

Pierre Hervé also began by proclaiming his agreement with the party line when he published *La Révolution et les Fétiches* [Revolution and Fetishes] in 1956. He attacked only the party's ossified ideology and its methods, arming himself with quotations from Stalin. He did not suspect that the logic of his position would lead him far from home.

For historical reasons, the ties the PCF has developed with the USSR, the existence of a bureaucracy functioning in the Stalinist manner, and the omnipresence of ideology have prevented the party from integrating itself into bourgeois society as the Social Democratic parties have done, which often had less reformist programs.

Refusing all "lifelines," and hanging on with both hands to the party line, Roger Garaudy risks finding himself one day high and dry on a beach of bitter realism . . .

Ecologists Alarmed

Unexpected Costs of the Aswan Dam

The name of Gamal Abdel Nasser will no doubt be long remembered for at least one of his works—construction of the Aswan Dam. Built high up in the Nile, it provides water for year-round irrigation besides electricity.

However, even leaving aside the flooding of irreplaceable artistic treasures and sites of great archaeological importance, it appears that some of the costs of the dam were not given adequate consideration.

In the January issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Garrett Hardin lists four items that ought to have been considered before starting the huge project:

"First, the replacement of periodic flooding by controlled irrigation is depriving the flood plains of the annual fertilization it has depended on for 5,000 years. (The fertile silt is now deposited behind the dam, which will eventually have to be abandoned.) Consequently, artificial fertilizers will soon have to be imported into the Nile valley.

"Second, controlled irrigation without periodic flushing salinates the soil, bit by bit. There are methods for correcting this, but they cost money. This problem has not yet been faced in Egypt.

"Third, the sardine catch in the eastern Mediterranean has diminished from 18,000 tons a year to 500 tons, a 97 per cent loss, because the sea is now deprived of flood-borne nutrients. No one has reimbursed the fishermen for their losses.

"Fourth, schistosomiasis (a fearfully debilitating disease) has greatly increased among Egyptians. The disease organism depends on snails, which depend on a steady supply of water, which constant irrigation furnishes but annual flooding does not. Of course, medical control of the disease is possible—but that, too, costs money."

Besides this, Garrett Hardin points out, one of the first effects of the Aswan Dam was to bring about an expansion of the population, "of whom a greater proportion than before are



NASSER: Puts snail above the sardine

chronically ill." This can lead to unforeseeable "political effects."

"Before the Aswan Dam was ever started, there should have been a thorough study of the costs and benefits to be expected. There was a study of a sort, of course, but it was myopic on the cost end: All it included was the cost of building a concrete dam, implicitly assuming that it is possible to do just one thing. There was no mention of the costs of a new fertilizer industry, of a far-flung medical program, of a soil reclamation program or of developing a new occupation for displaced fishermen; and nothing at all about controlling pathological processes in the body politic."

In Hardin's opinion, "What was missing in the preliminary cost-benefit analysis was the ecologic view. The analysis was merely economic, in the narrowest sense."

From the data indicated by Hardin, it is quite clear that the decision of

the government of the United Arab Republic to build the Aswan Dam involved the ecology of the entire Mediterranean. To have reached a proper "cost-benefit analysis" would have required a common effort by all the countries bordering the Mediterranean. In fact, some of the ultimate effects of the Aswan Dam are clearly of concern to some degree to all of mankind and their interests should have been taken into consideration.

But how is any such comprehensive, scientific planning possible under the capitalist system which puts

the economic interests, "in the narrowest sense," of each national capitalist class above everything else?

Hardin does not even raise this question, still less answer it. Nevertheless, it would seem rather germane to ecology in the broadest sense.

However, perhaps those "pathological processes in the body politic," touched off by construction of the Aswan Dam among other things, will eventually rectify things, including granting the sardine fishermen of the Mediterranean a guaranteed annual wage.

Tunisia

Student Demonstrators Granted Amnesty

Bahi Ladgham, first minister to President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia, announced January 14 that some forty imprisoned student leaders would soon be released.

The political prisoners were sentenced to terms of up to fourteen years in two trials in September 1968 and February 1969 for participating in demonstrations at the University of Tunis in March 1968.

According to the January 16 Paris daily *Le Monde*, the prisoners include "progressives, Communists, Trotskyists, and sympathizers of the Baath party."

The students are to be released in small groups on three national holidays. The first group was scheduled to be freed January 18, the anniversary of the opening of the struggle for independence in 1952. The rest are to be released March 20 and June 1.

The trials were part of a government crackdown on the deepening student radicalization. One participant in the June 1967 demonstrations against Israel's surprise attack on the Arab countries was sentenced to twenty years in prison. The March 15, 1968, demonstrations were called to protest this harsh punishment.

Two groups were prosecuted in the September 1968 trial: supporters of the magazine *Perspectives*, which the prosecution labeled "pro-Chinese," but which included other tendencies; and the Communist party group around the magazine *Espoir* [Hope].



BOURGUIBA: Decides it's time to give his regime a bit of face-lifting.

When the sentences were handed down, the September 18, 1968, *Le Monde* said, ". . . the greatest doubt remains as to the validity of the charges against the defendants. Unless the distribution of literature, publishing opposition papers, and holding unauthorized meetings is called a 'plot' and criticism and propaganda are considered a violation of state security."

The Bourguiba regime was accused of having tortured the prisoners prior to their trial. This accusation was

made by a number of attorneys and was upheld by the International Human Rights Federation. Tunisian lawyers who agreed to defend the victims were disbarred, and two French lawyers were deported and not permitted to take part in the trial. The defendants were not allowed to confront their accusers or to call witnesses in their behalf.

The second trial, in February 1969, involved a group of pan-Arab nationalists. They were reportedly given similar treatment.

Bourguiba has in the past demonstratively released small groups of imprisoned students in response to pressure from world public opinion. It remains to be seen whether those scheduled to be freed will receive the amnesty they have been promised and whether there are other political prisoners not covered by the amnesty.

Israel

Decree Bans Nicola

Haifa

Jabra Nicola, a leader of the Israeli Socialist Organization [ISO], was placed under a ban in a decree issued by General David Elieser, December 15. Nicola cannot go outside the city limits of Haifa without the personal permission of the general. Such a decree smacks of the totalitarian practices of South Africa.

Censorship of the ISO publication *Matzpen* [Compass] has been made much more severe. Virtually half of the last issue was ordered deleted. This is the first time that the Israeli authorities have gone this far in muzzling a legally published Hebrew journal. Until recently, only publications in Arabic were subjected to such measures.

Not long ago, some high-school students in Tel Aviv brought out a newspaper critical of Israel's policies toward the neighboring Arab countries. The police grilled them about their "association" with the *Matzpen* group.

Up until then, the students had never heard of the ISO. They courageously defended their democratic right to freedom of speech, and after being released looked up the ISO. Truth makes its way, sometimes in strange ways.

Intercontinental Press

Feudal Emperor Faces Radicalizing Campus

About twenty-seven students are said to have been killed by government troops in Ethiopia during demonstrations protesting the December 28 assassination of Telehun Gizew, a student leader at Haile Selassie University in Addis Ababa.

The university, which was closed an estimated 40 percent of the last school year because of student demonstrations, has not reopened as scheduled after the Christmas holidays. According to Frederic Hunter, writing from the Ethiopian capital in the January 22 issue of the *Boston Christian Science Monitor*, this decision was taken by the Haile Selassie regime to avoid a confrontation with angry students who blamed the government for the murder.

"Official government spokesmen," Hunter said, "suggest there is strong suspicion that Mr. Telehun's murder resulted from internecine struggles among radical student groups."

This version is not accepted by the students:

"Most students believe orders for his assassination came from the imperial palace and were executed by the military. In their eyes, the fact that the student leader was personally related to the imperial family lends credence to this view."

University and secondary-school students gathered on the Haile Selassie campus the day after the shooting. The government called out security forces. Hunter described what happened:

"Following prolonged and fruitless negotiations over possession of the body and details of a procession, and after considerable student taunting, security forces opened fire on the demonstrators, say sources sympathetic to them. Later they are said to have used tear gas to disperse the crowd and to have bullied both professors and students from university classrooms and lounges.

"According to government sources, the incident caused three fatalities; students set the figure at 27 or more. Security forces are also said to have beaten students at an Addis Ababa secondary school."



SELASSIE: Target of protest over murder of student leader Telehun Gizew.

In Harar, near the Somalia border, police dispersed a symbolic funeral for Telehun Gizew at a secondary school. "According to education circle sources," Hunter said, "police bayoneted the assistant provincial education officer, roughed up 10 teachers and administered beatings not only to students but to parents as well, claiming the latter had not taught their children discipline."

Some 1,800 secondary-school students staged a march in Makelle, the capital of Tigre province. Other demonstrations took place in Adowa and Axum. This is reportedly the first time there have been widespread student actions outside Addis Ababa, and the first time that students have openly condemned the despotic regime rather than demanding mere educational reforms.

A prime focus for student protest

is the deep involvement of American imperialism in Ethiopia. Hunter writes:

"Students see American aid and advisers as propping up a regime which, without that support, would topple.

"According to them, evidence exists that active American support of the Emperor played an important role in thwarting the 1960 coup. They point out that aid funds and equipment strengthen and enrich a recipient government and say that American military aid has killed more Ethiopians, such as those at the recent university demonstration, than external enemies of the country."

Only about 10 percent of school-age youth attend educational institutions. Until recently, even these were largely confined to the capital. Now third-year university students are going to the countryside to teach at rural secondary schools. In the process they are beginning to broaden the base of their movement.

The reporter for the conservative *Boston Daily Comments*:

"Observers doubt that student discontent will soon lead to significant change. Still, rural junior high-school students are beginning to talk of dying for their freedom. Some have started to speak openly despite the fact that government informers infiltrate classes."

All Deliberate Speed

WASHINGTON, Jan. 3 (UPI)—The Government reported today that 61 per cent of the nation's Negro students and 65.6 per cent of whites still attended largely segregated schools, 14 years after the Supreme Court's desegregation decision.

"The figures, compiled and made public by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, were for the fall of 1968. But Leon E. Pannetta, director of the department's Office of Civil Rights, said they 'present what can be considered the basic nationwide picture today.'"

Birds Die in Irish Sea

Since September at least 17,500 birds have died in the Irish Sea from a still unidentified pollutant. Prime suspect is PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl), a toxic waste from the plastics industry.

More About Popular Underground Publication

By George Saunders

A dramatic new index of the extent of the current Soviet opposition movement is a bimonthly publication entitled *The Year of Human Rights in the Soviet Union—A Chronicle of Current Events*, which has been published there secretly every two months through 1968 and 1969. The existence and character of this publication was reported in *Intercontinental Press*, January 12, 1970, page 11. Further information about the journal and what it reflects about the Soviet opposition movement has now become available.

In content, the *Chronicle* consists of factual accounts, often quite detailed and with a deliberate effort not to editorialize, of the many political arrests, investigations, trials, incarcerations in prisonlike mental institutions, and other acts of repression, such as expulsions from the party, from universities, discharge from employment, and secret police visits.

Also reported in the *Chronicle* are protest statements (which are summarized rather than reprinted), demonstrations, and other oppositional activities. This material deals not only with the many prominent political cases that have received much publicity in the world press, but hundreds of lesser incidents that have received little notice abroad. For example, demonstrating workers at a Kiev hydroelectric plant, striking over job conditions, recently raised a banner with the slogan "All Power to the Soviets."

News comes from all parts of the Soviet Union—not only Moscow and Leningrad, but the Ukraine, the Baltic republics, small Russian cities, the Caucasus, and Soviet Asia. Seemingly highly restricted information—the prison addresses of prominent political victims and their conditions of imprisonment—is also passed along.

One of the most interesting regular features of the *Chronicle* is the review of the latest *samizdat*, the material which is privately reproduced and circulated hand to hand. (The *Chronicle* itself is one of the most outstanding examples of *samizdat*.) Circulating widely in 1969 have been reproduc-

tions of *Czechoslovakian* documents and statements, including the *Two Thousand Words* declaration; an article by Milan Kundera; and a speech by a Czech oppositionist denouncing Husák. These are described by the *Chronicle*.

Other *samizdat* materials it describes are political books (a three-volume one on Stalin's life, for example; another, a Marxist discussion *The State and Socialism* by Gorky University students), open letters, collections of documents, trial records, and, needless to say, the works of Solzhenitsyn. It also describes other information sheets similar to itself which are also circulating.

The *Chronicle* editors point out the difference between their own publication and one or two other, similar *samizdat* newsletters. The others, they say, make editorial comments on the events they report. The *Chronicle* welcomes the existence of the others, but its own approach is as much as possible just to list the bare facts. The editors are quite scrupulous in their reporting, correcting earlier statements when more reliable information is received. This approach is obviously geared to reaching a broader public with information that the official press does not provide, and convincing the public that it is true.

The existence of such a publication for such a long time, despite the obvious threat it entails for the bureaucracy (which requires control of all information) is a striking comment on the erosion of the repressive apparatus.

An interesting verification of the *Chronicle's* authenticity, and perhaps even of its influence, was the fact that an incident it reported in late 1968 was later described (though of course not in quite the same way) in the official press in November 1969. A comparison of these two accounts may be of interest.

In issue No. 5 of the *Chronicle* dated December 31, 1968 (and which became available to us in September 1969), we read the following items 137 and 138 in the section listing

"Acts of Extrajudicial Repression in 1968":

"137. Yevgeny Goronkov, candidate in the physical and mathematical sciences, Urals Polytechnic Institute, one of the leaders of the Song Club. In May, the Song Club invited Yuli Kim*

* Yuli Kim, born 1936, is one of the prominent Moscow dissidents who have come to notice since the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial. A secondary-school teacher of literature by trade, he is better known as a composer and performer of protest songs, which circulate widely by private tape recordings. He has made some commercial recordings and is sometimes allowed to make public appearances.

Kim was one of 170 signers of a petition of January 1968, addressed to Brezhnev, Kosygin, and Podgorny, calling for a public reexamination of the Ginzburg-Galanskov trial. He was also one of the twelve who appealed to the Preliminary Conference of Communist parties held in Budapest in February 1968 calling for an end to the trampling of human rights in the Soviet Union. Other signers included Pavel Litvinov, Larisa Daniel, Pyotr Grigorenko, Pyotr Yakir, and Ilya Gabai.

Even more interesting, Kim was cosigner, together with Pyotr Yakir and Ilya Gabai, of a January 1968 statement protesting the rebirth of Stalinism. It included the following paragraph:

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

More recently, Kim was one of the fifty-eight signers of an appeal to the UN Human Rights Commission made in May 1969. Though he was not listed as one of the fifteen members of the "Initiative Group on Human Rights in the USSR" who drafted that appeal, most of whom have since been arrested, there is no doubt he is one of the leading activists of the new Soviet opposition. — IP

to give a performance in Sverdlovsk. When Kim arrived at the station, he was met by *druzhinniki* [volunteer youth, usually careerist Komsomols, who assist the regular police] who demanded that he go back the way he had come. The public performance was canceled; nevertheless, Kim sang his songs—at the apartment of one of those who had invited him. Two weeks later the KGB [secret police] arrested the owner of the apartment, confronted him with false charges of murder and frightened him into surrendering all the tape recordings of the songs, as well as the written texts, and into giving useful testimony as well.

"The leadership of the Song Club was removed, and Yevgeny Goronkov was, first, called back from a work assignment in Poland, while still on his way there, then discharged from his job.

"138. Boris Feldman, a student at the Urals Polytechnic Institute, was expelled for his *samizdat* activities."

The same incident was described a year later in the November 18, 1969, issue of *Sovietskaia Rossiia*, a Moscow daily that calls itself "the newspaper of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

We reprint below the bulk of the text of the *Sovietskaia Rossiia* article, which was entitled "A Man Like a Suitcase with a Double Bottom." We have summarized the omissions, plac-

ing these in brackets. The incident involving Yuli Kim is described substantially as the *Chronicle* reported it, though some details are different. There is nothing about KGB arrests and threats, not surprisingly. Also, nothing about reprisals against Goronkov.

On the other hand, the reprisals against Boris Feldman—and the pressures on his family, as well as the atmosphere of surveillance and informing—are brought out quite strongly. Why did the Central Committee run this article? As the final paragraph indicates, they are concerned about the rebellious moods among the youth—who make Sinyavsky and Daniel into heroes. By telling what happened to Feldman, they are putting pressure on the youth to conform. But the article is also a warning to university administrations not to be too lax or liberal about keeping student rebels in line. After all, the Kremlin is aware of the worldwide youth radicalization and of how the students have "acted up" in Poland and Yugoslavia, not to mention their catalytic role in setting off the Czech democratization.

One question we would especially like to know, though the *Chronicle* might tell us before the editors of *Sovietskaia Rossiia*: Who were the "political renegades" whose pictures Boris Feldman, with his top marks in party history, kept on his bureau?

couraged by his older brother's approving glances, rushed to the defense of the touring entertainer from the big city.

And thus, in the apartment with which we are familiar, Yuli Kim sings.

Arkady, the older brother, who had known Kim in the big city, whispers to his latest "girl friend": "Yep, that's him. He's been in two movies: 'Number One Newton Street' and 'Seven Notes in the Silence.'" The fiasco of the unsuccessful attempt to appear at the city's biggest meeting hall, the one at the institute, apparently spurred the "bard" on to new heights. He made up some impromptu lyrics to a popular melody, producing a filthy lampoon on the lovely city of Sverdlovsk. Then, strumming his guitar, he sang an irreverent song about the Tomb of the Unknown Soviet Soldier.

And no one stopped this vulgar character as he mocked the most sacred things in our life . . . [Ellipsis in original. — G. S.]

The personal case of Komsomol member Boris Feldman was soon taken up at a meeting of the bureau of the local Komsomol committee. The student, in his last year of a five-year course at the UPI—who, one might say, was just short of becoming an engineer, had to answer to his comrades.

At first, one might suppose that Boris fell into the matter involving Kim accidentally. Say he had had a drop too many and acted on the spur of the moment. Who doesn't have such experiences? It was with this kind of feigned naïveté that he explained his subsequent actions as well: he had recorded the foul-smelling performance of the modish bard exclusively as a collector, and had given Kim a build-up simply because the "guys like songs."

"The general impression these songs gave," recalled one of those who attended the gathering, the student S. Zorin, "was extremely distasteful. As though someone had poured filth into your soul."

And how did B. Feldman evaluate them? "I'm no critic. I only listened."

That is not true. Boris knew very well what was what. He liked both Kim—"a friend of my brother, a person of great sincerity and integrity"—and Kim's so-called muse.

Here we must look back—to the days when our hero, having come of

Man Like a Suitcase with a Double Bottom

The affair that evening was a great success. Even as late as that afternoon no one could have predicted that it would all turn out so well. Young people gathered in the bachelors' quarters of the Feldman brothers, whose father, Ilya Markovich, commercial director of one of the local plants, had paid for this place for his grown-up sons to live in.

Those who attended were members of the "Song Club" at the Urals Polytechnic Institute, headed by its director, Assistant Professor E. S. Goronkov, and other friends and acquaintances. At the table, set with bottles and tidbits, the guests vied with one another in praising the hospitality of the hosts. They drank a toast to the Feldman brothers. And what a good fellow that

Arkady was! He had even managed to bring home . . . Yuli Kim! A toast was raised for Boris too, who had invited this representative company to meet the renowned minstrel.

Boris straightaway turned out to be the hero of the day's events. Many of those present had witnessed the stormy scene played out that afternoon at the entrance to the polytechnic institute. Having arrived in Sverdlovsk, Yuli Kim had wished to hold a public appearance for a student audience in the institute's assembly hall itself.

But the Komsomols, the best students, those who knew his repertory and were disturbed by the banality and cynicism of many of his songs, refused to permit the projected concert.

At that point, Boris Feldman, en-

age, chose his path in life. The natural sciences never greatly interested Boris, but in 1963 he nevertheless matriculated in the chemistry department at the Urals State University. There was less competition there.

Even during his first year he began to fear being called up for the draft, and he transferred from the university to the polytechnic institute, although the future profession of engineer did not appeal to him at all. Torturous years of study went by. Boris did not distinguish himself by any special zeal in his studies, and in his later years cooled off entirely: "I'll get my diploma in any case!" Life at the university was in full swing, but only our student could find no place in it. "He had nothing in common with his classmates, took on no Komsomol duties, and did not live in the dormitory, but in an apartment with his brother." Thus reads one of the statements on his character.

Invited to the hearing on this personal case, I. M. Feldman [the father] declared to the Komsomol bureau members: "As a father I committed two serious errors: I helped Boris avoid military service although by legal means and I arranged for him to live together with his older brother, even though I knew of the latter's unhealthy moods."

Expelled from a teachers institute for "unworthy conduct and irresponsible remarks," Arkady—this unsuccessful teacher—eagerly went to work on the "education" of his younger brother. In the evenings they would sit together hour after hour at the radio trying to pick up foreign stations. The announcers talked endlessly of the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial. "Here we got only a brief account," said Arkady, who managed to get hold of their "last words" at their trial and to duplicate this material on his typewriter. And thus in the eyes of the Feldman brothers these two scum were transformed virtually into heroes.

"It's hard to argue with Arkady," says Boris in self-justification. "He knows Polish, Serbian, and other languages and thus is much more fully informed. In the end one can only agree . . ."

[The article goes on to tell that Boris was expelled from the Komsomol and from the institute for two years. He was given a chance to rehabilitate himself by working in a chemical

plant at Gubakh, with the opportunity to complete his courses at the institute later.]

[He then allegedly forged a good recommendation from the factory director and got back into the Komsomol, but was traced and expelled again. We are lectured about his constant wrongdoing: taking courses he was not interested in, avoiding service, leading a double life, telling his teachers one thing and thinking another.]

Testimony to this latter fault was the fact that he received excellent marks in the required course in party history, while having photographs of political renegades at home on his bureau.

The history of the fall of Boris Feldman is quite instructive. In many ways it illustrates the truth that the slightest relaxation of the influence of our ideology means intensification of the influence of bourgeois ideology. At Ural Polytechnic, we must say frankly, this case was overlooked. It is no accident that the revelations made in the personal investigation of B. Feldman did not come as a complete surprise to many.

How did the leadership of the insti-

tute react? They tried to avoid giving the case a lot of publicity. The party members discussed the case only in their cells and at the bureau meeting of the institute committee of the Komsomol. Feldman did not have to appear in front of the Komsomol organization, nor the student body; even the rector, F. P. Zaoostrovsky, failed to have a meeting with him.

But this is a matter that involves more than just Feldman. His case offers serious proof of the need for an impassioned discussion with the youth about the duty and honor of the student, and his responsibility to society, to the people. The fact that no such discussion has taken place—is a very serious oversight, first of all on the part of the institute's party organization. Not to give a public reproof to the followers of these dubious songsters and the prophets of even more dubious ways of life is to weaken ideological-educational work at the institute. It is to weaken the Marxist, the party influence on the student youth.

B. Baidakov, spec. corr. of Sov. Rossiya (Nov. 18). Sverdlovsk-Gubakh.

Bala Tampoe Speaks in Paris

Paris

P. Bala Tampoe, general secretary of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary), the Ceylon section of the Fourth International, spoke here January 3 at a meeting sponsored by the Ligue Communiste. He told about the current struggle of the workers in Ceylon and the background to the upsurge.

The strike struggle that began December 12 is important to the workers of Ceylon for a number of reasons. The key demands include adequate monthly pay rates and maintenance of a full work force.

The Trotskyists of the LSSP (R) are playing an important role in the strike actions. Bala Tampoe, for instance, is secretary general of the Ceylon Mercantile Union [CMU], a key union.

The Ceylon bourgeois press has done its best to undermine the morale of the strikers. A typical instance was the December 28 editorial in the *Ceylon Daily News*. It recognized the right to strike but demanded "responsibility"; i.e., that the workers should restrain

themselves, not seek international support. It invoked the "national interest" against the strikes. It played up the two unions that broke ranks under the leadership of the former Trotskyists of the centrist Lanka Sama Samaja party and the bourgeois United National party. It even accused Tampoe of using the solidarity of the unions in India for factional ends in a struggle for leadership.

Bala Tampoe said that "guerrilla war is completely unrealistic in Ceylon," but that the strike in the port shows the high revolutionary potential of the masses.

Not a Typographical Error Either

The *New York Times* reported the gist of Nixon's January 22 speech as follows:

"In his first State of the Union Message, the 37th President placed 'first priority' on world peace and a 'just' settlement of the war in Vietnam. But his major preoccupation was the state of the union, not the state of the world, and his central message was an appeal to match the resources of the 1970's to the vision of the 1770's."

Intercontinental Press

Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerrilla Experience

By Hector Bejar

[This is the second installment of a translation by Gerry Foley of the essay by Héctor Béjar that won the 1969 prize of the Casa de las Américas. The first installment appeared in our January 26 issue.]

Chapter II: The Social Context

The Emergence of the Peasantry

Beginning in 1956, almost unnoticed by the left political leaderships and by the country as a whole, a new social force emerged with its own specific characteristics—the peasantry.

Unionization started up slowly in the areas where the peasantry was strongest economically and lived closest to the centers of communication. The valleys of La Convención and Lares in Cuzco, Cerro de Pasco in the central part of the country, and the valleys of the north were inhabited by an awakened peasantry that was selling its products on the market and beginning to struggle against the vestiges of feudalism.

Traditionally, the peasantry had existed outside the life of the nation. While it is true that the debate over the Indian question dates back to the end of the last century, the peasants took no part in it. Now they were beginning to formulate their own problems and develop their own actions.

In Peru the agricultural workers of the *Costa* have a long tradition of struggle. In the 1930s, the sugarcane and cotton plantations were the scene of deep-going social struggles. The message of the petty-bourgeois caudillos had an impact on these struggles. But this was not true for the peasants of the *Sierra*, who were forgotten by these caudillos.

But in 1959 and 1960, the agrarian agitation easily reached a number of isolated corners of the country. It began in the *Costa*, certainly, but it was not limited to that region.

A strike occurred in Casagrande, the country's biggest enterprise in the sugar industry, owned by the Gildemeister family. The police intervened. Four workers were killed and twenty-six wounded, three of them seriously.¹⁶ In Paramonga, a similar enterprise owned by Grace, a clash between strikers and troops left three dead and sixteen wounded. In Rancas, a confrontation between the police, who were defending the Cerro de Pasco Copper Corp., and the villagers, who were demanding title to their lands on the basis of legal arguments, caused three deaths. Shortly before, other villagers had tried to recover the land held by the Paria *hacienda*, also owned by Cerro.

16. Bourricaud, Francois. *Poder y sociedad en el Peru contemporaneo*. Editorial SUR, Buenos Aires, 1967, page 124.

On the Torreblanca *hacienda* in the Chancay valley, the *guardias civiles* [members of the Civil Guard] broke up a union meeting, killing and wounding several peasants.

These facts showed that the government and the big landowners were trying to halt the process of unionization by arbitrary use of force. But their bloody methods did not achieve the desired objective.

In 1961 and 1962, the Lima papers began to talk about Hugo Blanco, demanding repression of the unions in La Convención and Lares.

The land recoveries, provocatively labeled "invasions" by the oligarchic right, were proceeding peacefully in these valleys, mobilizing large numbers of peasants whom economic development and migration had divided up into a complex social structure.¹⁷

As Craig points out,¹⁸ the *arrendires* [sharecroppers] and *allegados* [relatives of the semiserfs, particularly women, who are likewise obliged to labor under feudal-like conditions] had been submitting systematic demands to the *Ministerio de Trabajo* [Ministry of Labor] in Cuzco for ten years, and in 1958 eight organizations had formed a provincial federation. The stimulus to presenting the first protests and forming the first unions seems to have been the textile workers strike that took place in the south in 1956.

Almost all the union leaders in La Convención and Lares were former artisans or former railroad workers who had migrated to the valley, spoke Spanish, and had acquired some elementary education. Many were fundamentalist Protestants and "had seen in the labor movement an opportunity for achieving the goal of 'social justice' which they inferred from the holy scriptures. As one leader expressed it succinctly: 'The Bible teaches that the humble will inherit the earth—and we are the humble.'"¹⁹

Through the intermediary of the Cuzco lawyers, the peasants established ties with the *Federación de Trabajadores del Cuzco*, which was almost totally dominated by the Communist party. The first strike took place in the months of June and July 1960, when Hugo Blanco had not yet reached the valley.

Hugo Blanco's entry into the union-organizing activity

17. As Craig notes, "less than a third of the peasants living in La Convención in 1965 were born in that province. Two-thirds were from the mountainous provinces of Urubamba, Calca, Anta, Acomayo, and Apurímac, which border on La Convención." The social structure was more or less like this—*hacendados* [landlords], the *yanacunas*, who work for the landlords in conditions of serfdom; the *arrendires*, who serve the *yanacunas* under similar conditions; and, finally, the *allegados* and even *suballegados*.

Craig, Wesley W., *El movimiento campesino en La Convención, Peru. La dinámica de una organización campesina*, pages 9, 12. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima, 1968.

18. *Ibid.*, page 13.

19. *Ibid.*, page 15.

raised the level of the struggle. The years 1961 and 1962 can be designated as the high points of the wave of union organizing.

But Blanco's revolutionary ideology aroused the jealousy of the old leaders of the *Federación Provincial* and his Trotskyism the suspicion of the Communist leaders of the *Federación de Trabajadores del Cuzco*. When he was elected general secretary of the former organization in 1962, the election was challenged by some members. Meanwhile, the government in Lima ordered his arrest.

Then came the violent period of the manhunt that ended in his capture in May 1963. The government had gotten rid of Blanco but it had been unable to prevent the liberation of thousands of peasants, the breaking of the power of the big landowners, and the alteration of the preexisting social structure. It was the first defeat of such proportions that the landlord system had suffered. A de facto land reform had been achieved.

The general picture of the peasant movement in those years shows a struggle for three fundamental objectives: (a) union recognition and higher wages in the *Costa Norte*; (b) the recovery of the land by the peasant villages in the central part of the country; and (c) the abolition of conditions of serfdom in the *Cuzco Selva Alta* [high jungle].

At the same time, the most prominent focal points of the movement were concentrated in areas where, because they had a greater economic capacity, more connections with political parties, or a higher educational level, the peasants had organized to defend their rights.

But the mobilization was not total. On the contrary, the centers of agitation overshadowed the protracted and slow-moving struggle in other areas where the exploitation of the peasants is greater and more tragic. The *Costa Norte*, Cerro de Pasco, and La Convención are probably areas where the peasants have a relatively high standard of living. However, at the same time there are places like the high-altitude provinces in Cuzco, the mountains of the so-called *mancha india* [Indian strip]²⁰ and the Puna high plateau where destitution reaches the dimensions of a national tragedy.

The case of Lauramarca can be cited as an example of this situation. In a study done on this *hacienda* (in the Quispicanchis province in the Department of Cuzco), Gustavo Alencastre describes the incredible working conditions that prevail there. From the age of seven, men, women, and children work at various jobs. The wages, when they are paid—the ranch always tries to avoid meeting this obligation under various pretexts—are thirty *centavos* a day. Anyone who misses a day has to pay fifty *centavos* compensation, that is, a sum greater than his wages. To go to work on the ranch, the tenants have

20. "The region commonly called the '*mancha india*' is made up of the departments of Ancash, Apurímac, Ayacucho, Cuzco, Huancavelica, and Puno. In 1961, this region included 29% of the country's total population. Of this segment, 87% of those over five years of age spoke an Indian language. The occupational structure of the region was distinguished by the fact that 69% of the work force was engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry, while the average for the rest of the country in these occupations was 42%."

Cotler, Julio. *La mecánica de la dominación interna y del cambio social en el Perú*. Special issue of *América Latina*. Centro Latinoamericano de Investigaciones en Ciencias Sociales. Rio de Janeiro, 1968, Vol. 11, No. 1, page 78.

to leave their houses around 4:00 or 5:00 in the morning and walk ten to twenty-five kilometers to their job sites. The herdsmen have to tend the stock in the coldest and most desolate places, because if a lamb is lost or dies they have to pay eight, ten, and even twelve alpacas in compensation, which represents an economic disaster for them. "*Pongaje*," or unpaid domestic service in the house of the landlord, foreman, or *guardia civil* is prevalent despite the fact that it is forbidden by Peruvian law. The struggle of the peasants against this system is mute and silent:

"It has been confirmed also that many tenants avoid obeying the orders and instructions of the supervisory personnel. Some rebel openly. Others surreptitiously occupy sheep pens and break down wire fences . . . a small group of natives who willingly serve the landlords enjoy privileges consisting of more land, more pasture, exemption from paying grazing charges, and so on. This group is held in very poor regard by the others and considered traitors to the native cause."²¹

In May 1957 the Lauramarca peasant union was organized. It was affiliated to the *Federación de Trabajadores del Cuzco* and to the *Confederación de Campesinos de Perú* [Peasant Confederation of Peru]. The formation of the union resulted in its leaders being subjected to constant pressure and persecution. They found themselves forced to stay in hiding to avoid danger. In a very short time the first work stoppage occurred. Several tenants were beaten by the supervisors, many were jailed, and not a few were gunned down in their homes.

But the collective power of the union was able to assert itself and transformed the peasants and their customs:

"In remote times there was a Council of Elders which had great influence, authority, and standing. But that is a thing of the past. Today, when important matters have to be discussed, a general assembly meets where representatives are chosen by voice vote. These assemblies demonstrate a clear understanding of democratic debate and respect for the opinions of others, besides correct instincts and reasoning which are perfectly focused on the desired end."²²

Several million Peruvian peasants still live in conditions similar to, or worse than, those on the Lauramarca *hacienda*, but they have lacked the economic capacity of those in La Convención or those living near the centers of communication, which distinguishes Pasco and the central region of the country.

When the most combative areas in the countryside are suppressed by punitive expeditions launched by the successive governments, the discontent of the peasant masses persists and spreads, waiting for the first opportunity to erupt. But the explosions remain isolated. This isolation is favored by the rivalry among the political parties and left tendencies, the lack of connection between the regions, and the existence of several peasant federations which express different interests and diverse conceptions of struggle.

21. Alencastre Montufar, Gustavo. *Informe sobre la situación económica social en Lauramarca*. Lima, 1957. Typed copies, page 63.

22. *Ibid.*, page 70.

The following peasant organizations exist in Peru:

(a) The *Federación de Campesinos de Perú* (FENCAP), which is linked to APRA [*Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana*—American People's Revolutionary Alliance, an old anti-imperialist party turned reactionary], and has influence in the agricultural areas of the *Costa Norte*.

(b) The *Confederación de Campesinos del Perú*, oriented by various tendencies of the Marxist left, which has influence over the peasants in Cuzco, Ayacucho, and Lima.

(c) The *Federación de Comunidades del Centro* [Federation of Villages of the Central Region], which represents the peasant villages in the Mantaro valley (*Sierra Central*).

(d) *Frente Sindical Departamental de Puno* [the Puno Departmental Union Front], directed by the Cáceras brothers, local merchants with political ambitions.²³

All of these organizations have a certain tradition, since peasant unionism is not a new thing in Peru. There are some unions that were organized in the 1930s, such as those in the Chancay valley and the big coastal *haciendas*.

What is new in this decade is the spread of the union movement to the mountainous regions, the land occupations, the violence of the clashes with the repressive forces, and the impact that all this has had in the capital, thanks to the modern news media.

The Ring of *Barriadas*

The phenomenon of *barriadas* [shantytowns] circling the cities is another characteristic of the social context in recent decades, although it is not peculiar to Peru.

In 1955 there were thirty-nine *barriadas* in Greater Lima, with a population of 119,140 persons, or 10% of the total population of the metropolitan area. Ten years later there were 500,000 persons, or a quarter of the population of the capital, living in these *barriadas*.

The reasons for this gigantic migration have been rehashed many times—the attraction Lima has for the rest of the country as a result of being the most developed urban center; the false but very widespread belief that work is to be had in Lima; and the generally more difficult living conditions in the interior.

So far, the *barriada* population has been distinguished by the hopes it places in the present social order and by its attempt to better its conditions through bourgeois politicians. At the same time, the communal spirit of the countryside persists in this stratum, enabling it to face the adverse conditions of its life. The penetration of the Marxist left has been very limited if not totally lacking.

All told, the mere presence of this growing marginal and underemployed population surrounding the capital like a belt of destitution has appeared throughout these years as an explosive social factor. And the land occupations in the outskirts of Lima have been compared with the frequent reports of peasant land "invasions." These two phenomena created the feeling in the most politically aware sectors of the middle strata that violent social changes were brewing. The revolution seemed to be on the way. . .

23. Matos Mar, Jose et al. *Proyecto de estudio de: "Los movimientos campesinos en el Peru desde fines del siglo XVIII hasta nuestros dias."* Instituto de Estudios Peruanos. Lima, 1967, pages 34, 35.

Radicalization of the Petty Bourgeoisie

Another factor can be added to the preceding, one that is decisive for the political history of recent years and for the history of the revolution in Peru—the growth of the petty bourgeoisie.

When we first look at twentieth century Peru, we see a powerful oligarchy concentrating control in its hands, in association with the foreign companies, at the apex of society. At the base of the social pyramid, the majority of the population is composed of an illiterate and destitute peasantry deprived of any power of decision, together with an exploited agricultural proletariat, all of whose rights have been curtailed. Between these two extremes lies a proletariat of factory and mine workers, the artisans, and a rich social gamut of educated intermediate strata.

In reality, as we have seen previously, this last sector of society stands far above the factory workers and artisans in income, standard of living, educational level, and technical capacity. Its highest strata rub elbows with the ruling class. Entry into these strata comes through the exercise of a profession, through politics, or through personal and family connections.

This phenomenon is not peculiar to our country, but it is more prominent here than in other places because of the existence of large sectors which are outside the national life. An abyss separates the "middle class" from the peasantry and the agricultural proletariat, making the middle layers in fact a privileged sector.

Since 1930, this privileged sector has been struggling for power and raising radical slogans in order to win the support of the disadvantaged strata. But it has not hesitated to betray them when it has been able to make profitable deals with the ruling class.

Today, since 1956, we see that as a result of urbanization and the great social mobility of recent years the growth of the middle class has matched that of the proletariat.

Although Peruvian statistics do not permit a precise study of the class structure of society, the "occupational position" of workers registered by the 1961 census can serve as an index. The census reports classify 50.8% of the work force as independent workers and salaried employees, 32% as workers, 5.7% as domestics, 1.9% as employers, and 9.3% as unpaid family helpers.²⁴

This high figure—1,548,469 in an income-earning population of a little more than 3,000,000 persons—gives us an idea of the numerical importance of the petty bourgeoisie in Peru, above all if we take into account that students are not considered part of the work force.

In addition to its growth in recent years, the petty bourgeoisie shows great social mobility. A great number of "newcomers" from the provinces as well as the sons of workers, artisans, and peasants find their way into it. The avenue of access is always education, as it is supposed to be for the higher social strata. For this reason, as the petty bourgeoisie grows, the universities become more democratic, and the social level of the students dips lower every year. And since this process is

24. Censo Nacional de Poblacion de 1961.

occurring in the midst of struggles, conflicts, and social clashes, a sector of the students is radicalizing and becoming a culture medium for Marxist ideas.

At the same time, the office workers and bank clerks have succeeded in building strong union organizations, which for several years have been in the vanguard of social struggles in the capital.

The Students

In the *Plan Sectorial de Educación* [Plan for Education], we read: "Since 1955 the Peruvian educational system has experienced the most rapid period of growth in its history. The total number of educational institutions has risen from 12,875 in 1955 to 18,722 in 1964, an overall increase of 45.4%. In primary schools, high schools, and institutions of higher learning, this increase was respectively 41.0%, 140.6%, and 273.3%."²⁵

In this same period, the school population rose from 1,262,765 in 1955 to 2,491,571 in 1964, a total increase of 97.3%.

The growth was still more striking in the universities. From 34 teachers colleges and 9 universities in 1960, the number rose to 86 teachers colleges and 24 universities in 1964. And this rate of growth in education has continued in the subsequent years. In 1968 the school population at all levels of education reached 3,235,700, a quarter of the total population. There are 96,000 university students. In 1970, 111,000 high-school graduates will be knocking at the doors of the universities.

Guided by traditional notions and prestige considerations, students tend to prefer the liberal professions, which are those that offer the least opportunities in a country flooded with intellectuals. On graduation, few can get

25. Instituto Nacional de Planificación. *Plan Sectorial de Educación*. Lima, 1967, pages 2-11.

well-paid jobs and a good percentage have to work outside their specialty.

And this is not all. Before getting to the universities, they have had to pass through a strict weeding-out process in which the poorest applicants are eliminated. An increasingly high percentage of those who succeed in finishing high school are excluded from higher education because the universities cannot accommodate so many applicants.

The list of applicants increased from 12,305 in 1960 to 26,374 in 1964. Of these, 4,479 were declared "qualified for matriculation" in 1960 and 7,968 in 1964. In 1967, 40,000 applicants could not matriculate. It is estimated that in 1970, 71,000 applicants will be rejected.²⁶

"Almost half of the high-school students drop out before graduating . . . of those that finish high school only half succeed in entering institutions of higher learning."²⁷

The students have suffered a reversal in their situation. In the early years of this century, the sons of "good families" with university educations had an assured future in politics, the liberal professions, and business. In recent decades, to the contrary, a feeling of insecurity has been pressing on the poor students, impelling them toward more and more radical and violent actions.

There is very little that the sons of poor clerks or workers can hope for from the system. While it is true that a minority can get ahead, the majority is always rebuffed and ready to listen to revolutionary appeals.

Thus, this accelerated radicalization from 1956 on brought the Marxist left into the leadership of the student movement. Since that time, the leadership of the better part of the student organizations in Peru has gone to the groups in the left that use the most inflammatory language.

[To be continued]

26. Proyecciones de la Oficina Nacional Interuniversitaria de Planificación.

27. *Plan Sectorial de Educación*, pages 2-52.

Documents

Vietnamese Appeal to American Soldiers

[The following appeal was issued December 23 by the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam. It is taken from the January 12 issue of *Vietnam Information Bulletin* published in Rangoon, Burma, by the consulate general of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.]

* * *

Officers and men of the United States and other countries in the U. S. camp,

The war which the U. S. govern-

ment is conducting in South Vietnam is an aggressive, unjust, illegal and immoral war. It tramples on the sacred sovereignty of the Vietnamese nation and causes a massacre of the Vietnamese people, the most brutal ever seen in human history. It has also caused the senseless death of tens of thousands of young Americans in South Vietnam, brought bereavement and suffering to tens of thousands of American families, dislocation to the American economy, difficulties to the life of the American people, and blemish to the honour of the United States,

so proud of its traditional love of peace, justice and freedom. For the independence and freedom of their fatherland, the Vietnamese people have courageously waged an extremely courageous war of resistance against U. S. aggression, for national salvation, and have recorded very glorious successes. Broad sections of the American people and peace-and justice-loving people in the world have been strongly condemning this criminal aggressive war of the U. S. Many army men in the U. S. expeditionary corps in South Vietnam have also

courageously taken stands against this war.

The policy of war and aggression pursued by the Johnson administration and continued by [the] Nixon administration has met with ever heavier failure and ever greater alienation. However, the Nixon administration remains very obstinate and perfidious.

In an attempt to appease and deceive public opinion in the United States and the world, Nixon is playing the peace fraud, talking glibly of peace while effecting a troop withdrawal by dribbles which is in reality aimed at dragging out the war, continuing to force the American youths to a useless death in South Vietnam and pushing America into tighter straits and greater stalemate.

In face of such [a] situation, for the sake of justice and morality and for the friendship among nations and world peace, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam appeals to the U. S. officers and men on the South Vietnam battlefield to rise up and together with the progressive people in the United States, to use every appropriate form of struggle to demand that the Nixon administration end immediately the war of aggression, and bring home forthwith all the troops of the U.S. and the other countries in the U.S. camp so that the South Vietnamese people may settle their own internal affairs by themselves, free of foreign interference.

Motivated by its humanitarian policy, the P. R. G. of the R. S. V. N. welcomes and supports all anti-war acts, collective or individual, by American officers and will create every facility for them to withdraw promptly and safely from South Vietnam. The P. R. G. of the R. S. V. N. calls upon them:

1. To resolutely refuse to take part in terror raids, refrain from bombing, shelling, firing or any other acts of repression and massacre against the Vietnamese people, to let the Vietnamese people move about freely to earn their livelihood, to struggle against the U. S. war-mongers and their puppet and refrain from all hostile acts against the Vietnam people's liberation armed forces; to use every form of struggle to resist being forced to take part in terror operations, and if compelled to go to battle, to stay

put and refrain from all acts of terror.

2. To struggle courageously for repatriation without delay.

3. To seek every appropriate means to contact the local people, revolutionary power or liberation armed forces and inform them of your anti-war attitude and actions so that the latter may refrain from attacking you or may provide you assistance when necessary.

4. Those of you who want to escape the war of aggression in Vietnam and return to their country or proceed to any other country in the world by crossing over to the side of the Vietnamese revolution will enjoy humanitarian treatment from the revolutionary government and the people's liberation armed forces who will ensure them safety and afford them every facility.

5. The officers and men of the other

countries in the U. S. camp who take anti-war actions will also enjoy the same treatment as mentioned above.

Officers and men of the U. S. and other countries in the U. S. camp,

For the sake of peace and independence of the nations, for the honour of your country and the happiness of your families and your own life, rise up to demand that the Nixon administration immediately comply with the common aspiration of the American people and of yourselves, viz., peace in Vietnam and immediate withdrawal of all U. S. expeditionary troops.

The just struggle of the Vietnamese people and the progressive people in the United States against the Nixon administration's stubborn policy of dragging out the war of aggression will certainly win complete victory!

PRT Calls for Help to Bolivian Prisoners

BUENOS AIRES, Argentina. December 15 (PRENSA LATINA) — The newspaper *El Combatiente*, organ of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT) [Revolutionary Party of the Workers], has called for a campaign of solidarity with the Bolivian revolutionary prisoners, tortured and persecuted by the military regime of that country.

The newspaper, whose orientation is Trotskyist, says that among the prisoners are guerrillas who were members of the Ejército de Liberación Nacional [National Liberation Army]

commanded by Guido "Inti" Peredo. The paper adds that among those held in prison are many Trotskyist militants belonging to the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR) [Revolutionary Workers party] led by Humberto [Hugo] González Moscoso. The appeal of the PRT ends by saying that all revolutionary organizations should support the campaign "to put an end to the repression being carried out by the regime ruling in Bolivia, through petitions to Bolivian embassies, through press campaigns and other means."

'El Combatiente' Reports Death of Corvalán

BUENOS AIRES, Argentina. December 15 (PRENSA LATINA) — The bi-weekly *El Combatiente*, organ of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT), published details about the death of Oscar Corvalán, a Trotskyist militant, who committed suicide in the prison at Tucumán. Corvalán, according to the Trotskyist newspaper, was arrested during raids conducted by the Tucumán police against members of the PRT.

He said he "preferred" to take his own life in the prison before under-

going "questioning" by the police.

The publication described Corvalán as a "hero and martyr of the party," but indicated that it disagreed with his decision to end his life.

In addition, sources close to the PRT stated that the Tucumán police were holding Roberto Samtucho, an active leader of the organization. According to *El Combatiente*, he was named in a police report recently in connection with a search for an allegedly armed group in the province of Jujuy.

'I Am Afraid for My Father'



LARISA BOGORAZ-DANIEL

Alexander Daniel, the eighteen-year-old son of imprisoned Soviet writer Yuli Daniel, has sent an open letter to the British novelist Graham Greene appealing for aid in publicizing his father's case. Yuli Daniel was sentenced to five years at hard labor in 1966 when his writings were declared "anti-Soviet" by the Kremlin bureaucrats.

Alexander Daniel's letter was reported by the January 17 London *Daily Telegraph* and summarized by the January 18-19 Paris daily *Le Monde*. He confirmed reports that reached the West last September that his father was transferred from the labor camp at Potma to Vladimir prison, just east of Moscow. *Le Monde* quoted from the letter:

"I am afraid for my father. What could be the aim of such a change just when he is so near to having completed his sentence? Why do the authorities need to isolate him so completely? It is certainly easier to prolong a sentence in prison than in a camp! In a camp everybody knows the decisions of the administration right away, but in a prison six months can pass before the news could get out."

Yuli Daniel has received particularly

harsh treatment during his imprisonment. One of his fellow prisoners, Anatoly T. Marchenko, in his book *My Testimony*, written in 1967, said Daniel, who suffered from ear trouble, was made almost totally deaf by camp authorities, who forced him to work in a machine shop where the noise level damaged his hearing.

In a letter smuggled out of the Potma camp and reported in the June 2, 1969, *New York Times*, Yuli Daniel and five other prisoners testified that they worked twelve to fourteen hours

a day on a diet of only 2,413 calories. The barracks was inadequately heated, with temperatures inside most of the year ranging from 32 to 50 degrees Fahrenheit.

Alexander Daniel's mother, Larisa Bogoraz-Daniel, is also a victim of the Stalinist rulers of the USSR. She was sentenced in October 1968 to four years' exile in Siberia for taking part in a demonstration protesting the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Despite her poor health, she was assigned to heavy labor at a lumber mill near Taishet in eastern Siberia.

After six months of lifting boards weighing 100 pounds and more, doctors finally permitted her to take a supervisory job in a timber-drying operation. She is a linguist by profession.

Indonesia

Students Stage Protest Marches

An estimated 2,000 to 3,000 students held a march in Djakarta January 23 protesting recent government-ordered increases in the price of gasoline and kerosene. The demonstrations, which began a week earlier, also spread to Jogjakarta in Central Java, where high-school students marched against the price rise and to protest corruption in the government.

General Suharto, Indonesia's military dictator, has threatened to use troops to crush the demonstrations.

The price of gasoline was increased by 50 percent; the price of kerosene was doubled. Both are used as fuel for cooking and lighting. The increases came just after the exposure in the Indonesian press of corruption and mismanagement in the state-owned Pertamina oil enterprise.

"Oil earnings have always been the mainstay of Indonesia's exports," the *New York Times* commented January 23, "accounting even in underplayed official figures, for over \$240-million last year. Yet it has always been firmly believed in Indonesia that much of the money is used secretly for the Indonesian armed forces and some of the generals."

Suharto declared that there will be no reconsideration of the price in-

creases. He urged his ministers to "explain" the reasons for the new policy, in hope that this will satisfy the students.

The military command in Djakarta has announced that action will be taken against the protest, "in all its forms and manifestations."

No Surprise

The Ovando government announced January 23 that it had uncovered a downtown office in La Paz run by the CIA. The place contained equipment for bugging telephones and for transmitting by radio.

Colonel Juan Ayoroa, who made the discovery public, said that any employee in his Ministry of the Interior found to be involved with the CIA would be dismissed and hauled into court.

Perhaps Colonel Ayoroa ought to start higher up in the government. It has long been public knowledge that the CIA, working hand in glove with the military junta, including Ovando himself, played a decisive role in Bolivia in capturing and murdering Che Guevara and putting down the guerrilla forces initiated by the revolutionary leader.

No Preventive Medicine?

An estimated 14,000 infants in south and east India become blind each year because of malnutrition, according to Dr. Kagan Gachi, an adviser to the Indian Ministry of Health. From 50,000 to 60,000 others undergo physical or mental deficiencies from the same cause.