

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 8, No. 21

© 1970 Intercontinental Press

June 1, 1970

50c

Withdrawal from Cambodia?

'Silly Argument of Silly People'



Antiwar Sentiment
Continues to Spread

Unionists Speak Out
Against the War

GIs Oppose Nixon's War

Ernest Mandel Barred
from Australia

Ky Said So, That's Who

Polls Give Labour Promising Lead Over Tories

Authorities Worried

Military authorities have begun issuing regulations intended to stop the growth of the antiwar movement among U. S. marines stationed in Japan.

In doing so, they have violated not only the U. S. constitution, but even the regulations of the Defense Department.

A regulation now in force at the Marine Corps Air Station in Iwakuni, Japan, states that "No person . . . shall participate, off station, in Japan, or any other foreign country, in demonstrations, protest marches, sit-ins, political speeches or rallies, the distribution of printed materials. . . ."

Another paragraph of the regulation reads: "All material or literature which is not distributed through official outlets, . . . has not been printed by a government agency, has not been prepared with the use of nonappropriated government funds, and which is not advertising for Station sanctioned clubs and organizations, must be submitted to the Commanding Officer for approval prior to its dissemination."

This regulation clearly contradicts a Defense Department directive issued last September which says that "publication of 'underground newspapers' by military personnel off-post, on their own time and with their own money and equipment, is not prohibited. . . ."

The regulation is aimed at *Semper Fi*, an antiwar newspaper founded by marines at Iwakuni several months ago. The paper has been popular with GIs, and in April sponsored two peace rallies attended by several hundred marines.

\$2.9 Billion for 'Intelligence'

U. S. Assistant Defense Secretary Robert F. Froehlke, in testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee made public May 19, revealed that Nixon's budget for military "intelligence" in 1970 runs to \$2,900,000,000.

This astronomical figure covers only the spy agencies of the army, navy, and air force—not counting what they spend in Vietnam for this purpose! Not included are the budgets of the Central Intelligence Agency, the "intelligence activities" of the State Department, or the domestic political police, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Some 136,114 persons are employed by the military spy networks.

In This Issue

		ANTIWAR
	506	Marines Going Antiwar?
	507	Antiwar Sentiment Continues to Spread in the U. S.
	510	Bay Area Unionists Speak Out Against the War
	510	3,000 in Vienna Antiwar Demonstration
	511	Cologne Students Protest Nixon's War
	513	GIs Display Rising Opposition
	518	Rhetorical Pearls for Your Next Speech
	522	The Great Scramble for Roosts in the Dovecote
	523	Greek Junta Stand Up for Nixon
	525	Yevtushenko's Poem to Allison Krause U. S. A.
	508	Georgia March Ends in Rally of 10,000
Allen Myers	520	Chicago Cops Shot Hampton and Clark in Cold Blood MEXICO
	509	Largest Demonstration Since 1968
	519	Action on Mexico's Political Prisoners Called For SOUTH AFRICA
	511	Hundreds of Students Jailed in Demonstration AUSTRALIA
	512	Ernest Mandel Barred from Speaking in Australia PERU
	514	Why Peruvian CP Supports the Military Junta SWITZERLAND
	515	Hubert Krivine Released on Bail ARGENTINA
	516	Police Announce Arrest of Guerrillas PHILIPPINES
	519	Women Picket Beauty Contest
	521	Philippine Newsmen Face Death in Taiwan GUATEMALA
	523	Yon Sosa Reported Killed in Mexico GREAT BRITAIN
Joseph Hansen	524	Wilson Sets Elections for June 18 GREECE
	528	Voices Cry Out in Anguish from Korydallos Prison CHINA
Les Evans	534	A New Convert to the Theory of "State Capitalism" DOCUMENTS
	509	Hitler's Excuses . . . and Nixon's
	526	Black Power in Trinidad and Guyana
	529	Ceylon Mercantile Union May Day Resolution
	530	Varga's Secret Testament Condemning Stalinism DRAWINGS
Copain	505	Nguyen Cao Ky; 521, Fred Hampton; 522, Frank Church; 523, Panayiotis Pipinelis; 524, Harold Wilson; 525, Yevgenii Yevtushenko

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square Station, N. Y. 10010.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan,

Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.

TRANSLATIONS: Gerry Foley, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion,

unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism.

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

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

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

Copyright © 1970 by Intercontinental Press.

Antiwar Sentiment Continues to Spread in the U.S.

At his May 8 press conference, when asked whether Saigon's troops would pull out of Cambodia at the same time as the U.S. forces, Nixon replied: "I would expect that the South Vietnamese would come out approximately at the same time that we do, because when we come out our logistical support and air support will also come out with them."

Anthony Lewis, writing from London in the May 23 *New York Times*, quoted Marshal Ky as calling this "a silly argument of silly people." Ky's remark is evidently closer to the truth than Nixon's.

According to the same issue of the *Times*, the United States "was reported today [May 22] to be prepared to continue air cover, if needed, for South Vietnamese forces that are considered almost certain to remain in Cambodia after the American withdrawal deadline, July 1."

The number of Saigon troops operating in Cambodia doubled in the third week of May to a total of 40,000 men commanded by U.S. advisers. United States B-52 bombers are ravaging the Fishhook region. Some 12,000 American combat troops are engaged in ground fighting.

* * *

In the United States, sporadic strikes and antiwar demonstrations are continuing on campuses throughout the country in the aftermath of the first general student strike in American history.

Whole new layers of the campus population, including many faculty members, have been propelled into action, and are now discussing the lessons of the strike and the future of the antiwar movement.

At hundreds of colleges and universities, political meetings and "classes" have supplemented or supplanted the regular course of study.

From this campus base, important gains have already been made in winning Black and labor support for the protest movement. Since the shooting of six Black men by police in Augusta, Georgia, May 11, and the killing of

two Black students at Jackson State College in Mississippi May 15, many Black colleges have joined the strike.

Howard University in Washington, D. C., one of the leading Black universities in the country, was struck May 18. Students at Howard are emulating the pattern of the "antiwar university" by taking over the school for protest activity. The May 19 *Washington Post* reported:

"Under an arrangement worked out with James E. Cheek, university president, last week, all normal course work was suspended for the rest of the spring semester and classes will focus on the problems of black people."

In New York, students demanded and won the official closing of all public schools May 22 in honor of the dead in Jackson and Augusta.

On the West Coast, some 451 trade-union officials, executive board members, and shop stewards representing dozens of unions took out full-page advertisements in the May 18 *San Francisco Chronicle* and *Examiner*.

"We want out of Vietnam—Now!" the unionists declared, in the most significant break to date from the prowar diatribes of AFL-CIO President George Meany. (See page 510.)

In New York the growing polarization over the war openly split the labor bureaucracy. Leaders of the right-wing building-trades unions sponsored the first sizable prowar demonstration called by any organization since the war began, under the slogan "Love of country and love and respect for our country's flag."

The *New York Times* estimated that from 60,000 to 150,000 turned out for the May 21 march to city hall. The high figure, the *Times* said, was given by the police, who openly marched in the parade. In fact the actual number was somewhat below the minimum estimate given by the *Times*.

The following day, thirteen unions sponsored a "Stop the War" rally in the name of the Labor-Student Coalition for Peace. Some 25,000 turned out in the first mass demonstration against

the Vietnam war ever called by the union movement. The sponsors included the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; United Auto Workers; Drug and Hospital; Electrical; Bakery and Confectionery; Hotel and Restaurant; Furniture; State, County and Municipal Employees; Jewelry; Store Workers; Teamsters; Distributive; and Motion Picture Operators unions.

Various factors contributed to the differing size of the two demonstrations — with the prowar action approximately twice the size of the antiwar rally. Neither demonstration was composed entirely of workers. In the right-wing action, large numbers of businessmen, clerks, and secretaries joined the march in the Wall Street area. Confetti and ticker tape were tossed to the marchers from the offices of big Wall Street brokerage houses.

The rally was also joined by all the professional right-wing groups and veterans organizations, carrying such signs as "One Hippie in the Hospital Is Worth Four in the Street" and "We Love Our Police, Flag and Country — We Hate Our Commie Mayor."

In part the protest was aimed at discrediting New York's liberal Republican Mayor Lindsay, who has been critical of the war. The right wing of the Democratic party machine, which includes the construction-trade bureaucrats, saw the rally as an opportunity to strike a blow at a political opponent. Some marchers carried signs such as "Lindsay Eats Here," with a picture of a toilet.

The building trades are a particularly privileged section of the working class, and in New York the unions in this industry are run by a case-hardened reactionary leadership. Only a handful of Blacks have penetrated these lily-white job trusts despite years of protests by the Black community at being excluded from apprenticeship programs. The average weekly pay is some \$229, well above levels in many other trades.

But the union bureaucrats did not rely solely on the undeniable right-wing sentiment among sectors of the ranks. A deal was reportedly worked out with the construction bosses to

pay workers for attending the rally. The May 21 *New York Post* reported:

"Black workers who participated in the construction workers' rally indicated that they showed up because economic pressure had been put on them to attend. . . .

"One of them, William Roberts, stood on the sidelines as Local 206 assembled on Warren St. 'The union said we'd have to come here to sign in, otherwise we wouldn't get paid,' he said. 'I signed in, but I'm not part of the protest, that's for sure. The only place I'm marching is home.'"

The antiwar rally the next day was organized on short notice, without such monetary inducements for participants. Its organizers did not mobilize the membership of their unions as they might have done. The "student" sector of the march was entrusted to an individual previously unknown to the student movement, and little was done to organize support in this area. Under the circumstances, the labor turnout was impressive and constitutes an important precedent for the antiwar movement.

The political ferment on the campuses is turning toward organized channels for expression. While the liberal press is seeking to divert students into lobbying in Congress and ringing doorbells for capitalist "peace" candidates, such organizations as the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam are working to keep the movement in the streets, independent of the capitalist parties.

The SMC and other antiwar groups have moved ahead with plans for May 30 demonstrations in a number of cities. A May 19 Associated Press dispatch reported:

"A student antiwar group said yesterday that massive demonstrations are planned for Memorial Day, May 30, in at least eight cities.

"The Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam listed them as: Atlanta, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Phoenix, Seattle, San Francisco, New York and Gainesville, Fla. In addition, it said, calls for demonstrations in Chicago and Philadelphia have begun.

"The national SMC office said the demonstrations are the beginnings of a developing coalition between students, labor and the black community against the war and its extension at home.

"It said the theme of the demonstration will be: 'Stop the killing. No more

Vietnams, Cambodias, Kents, Augustas or Jacksons. Bring all the troops home from Southeast Asia now.'"

The main efforts of procapitalist liberals and reformists of all varieties—including the Communist party—are directed toward involving the radicalizing youth in support of congressional "peace" candidates. It is symptomatic of the backwardness of American politics—the absence of a mass working-class party—that to some degree they will succeed.

Nevertheless, it must be counted as an advance for thousands of youth to renounce apathy in favor of antiwar activity, even if they enter the political arena through reformist channels.

As long as such organizations as the SMC continue to pose an independent alternative to the liberal politicians, the reformists have little chance of holding the new radicals for long. Even such activities as congressional lobbying have proved embarrassing when the antiwar youth found they had nothing in common with their "leaders."

On May 21, for example, an unofficial committee of Democratic and Republican members of the House of Representatives met with what they thought were "moderate" students in Washington. The May 22 *Washington Post* described the interchange.

Lon Williams, twenty-three, son of a conservative Republican real-estate broker from Arlington, Texas, told

the congressmen what he thought of the war.

"As a child," the *Post* reported, "he recalled, he was constantly reminded of the evils of Nazi Germany and the failure of its people to put their own convictions above 'loyalty and pride in the Fatherland.'"

"All I can say is that we learned our lesson well," said Williams, who is president of Southern Methodist University's student association. "We have been programmed entirely too thoroughly to be silent . . . (and) disregard human lives."

The congressmen refused to believe reports on the depth of the opposition to the government in even out-of-the-way, hitherto conservative schools. Jack Berger, a junior at tiny Principia College in Elsah, Illinois, "said that a poll of 250 of the school's 750 students—all that could be queried on short notice—showed that 65 per cent consider President Nixon 'unresponsive' and nearly 50 per cent think the divisions in American society could result in revolution.

"With a trace of annoyance, [Representative Vernon W.] Thompson asked whether Principia had a chapter of the radical Students for a Democratic Society skulking about the campus.

"No sir," Berger said.

"Berger later explained that all the students at Principia are Christian Scientists."

Georgia March Ends in Rally of 10,000

A five-day March Against Repression ended with a rally of 10,000 persons in Atlanta, Georgia, May 23. The predominantly Black demonstration was called to protest police and national guard killings of Blacks and whites in Augusta, Georgia; in Jackson, Mississippi; and at Kent State University in Ohio. The marchers also protested Nixon's war in Indochina.

The march began May 19 in Perry, Georgia, 110 miles from Atlanta. When they reached Atlanta, the marchers filed past the tomb of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., past the State Capitol to Morehouse College in the Black ghetto area, where the rally was held. Speakers included the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference [SCLC]; Coretta Scott King; and Senator George McGovern of South Dakota.

Mrs. King addressed a message to whites: "America," she said, "we are not

your enemy. Your enemy are those forces of repression in the nation that will silence all dissent in this nation by any means possible."

Abernathy read a list of the "ten most unwanted politicians." The list included Nixon and Vice-president Agnew.

McGovern said, "There will be no end to the violence of hunger and division in America until we end the violence that is devouring our blood and resources in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam."

The rallies on the way to Atlanta were also spirited. On May 22 in Barnesville, SCLC vice-president Hosea Williams told a cheering audience, "I am Black and I am proud. . . . Me being Black and beautiful does not make white folks ugly just because they are white. Now there are some ugly white folks. I think Lester Maddox [Georgia governor] is a very ugly man. I think the United States Attorney General Mitchell is a very ugly man and in fact, Richard Nixon is ugly, too."

Mexican Student Movement Returns to the Streets

"About 7,000 chanting students burned an American flag last night and threatened street demonstrations similar to those bloodily repressed by troops prior to the 1968 Olympic games here," a Reuters dispatch from Mexico City reported May 15.

The Mexican students were protesting the American aggression in Cambodia as well as the repression in their own country. One of their demands was for the release of the political prisoners jailed in the suppression of the 1968 student movement.

The marchers cheered as a portrait of President Nixon was burned.

The demonstration was also timed to coincide with official preparations for the World Soccer Cup matches. The Mexican press is sensitive to any developments that might affect the tourist trade.

The May 14 march was apparently one of the largest in Mexico city since the student movement was driven underground after October 2, 1968. On that date the army and police attacked a peaceful rally in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas, slaughtering hundreds of participants and bystanders. Despite the significance of the demonstration, however, there were few reports of it in the international press.

Facing the murderous repression of the Mexican regime, students have naturally been reluctant to go into the streets again. The success of the march, however, encouraged many to join in: "A protest march which swelled from 2,000 timid marchers to 7,000 slogan screaming youths by the time they reached the statue of the Mexican Liberator Benito Juarez in the center of the City," is how the May 15 Reuters dispatch described the progress of the demonstration.

Some of the participants seem to have been encouraged to look forward to a revival of the mass demonstrations of 1968.

"'This is just the beginning. We will be on the streets again this month and in larger numbers,' the protesters shouted to passing pedestrians," according to Reuters.

Many of the students carried signs attacking Luis Echeverria Alvarez,

who, as the dispatch put it, is "expected to win the next Mexican presidential election." Echeverria is the candidate of the PRI (Partido Institucional Revolucionario — Institutional Revolutionary party), the government party in what is in fact a one-party state.

The PRI candidate was the minister

'I Hesitate to Draw Parallels'

Hitler's Excuses . . . and Nixon's

[The following letter was printed in the May 14 issue of the *Washington Post*. The author is historian and journalist William L. Shirer, who has written several books about Nazi Germany, among them "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich."]

* * *

I hesitate to draw parallels between what one saw in Nazi Germany and what we now see here. The Third Reich, after all, was a totalitarian dictatorship. We are a democracy. Nevertheless . . .

When Hitler invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, the official communiqué of the German High Command called it a "counter-attack." The official communiqué of the American High Command in Saigon called our moves into Cambodia "counter-attacks."

When Hitler invaded Denmark and Norway on April 9, 1940, the official German communiqué said this was "to protect their freedom and independence." We have been hearing similar language from Washington to justify sending our armed forces into Cambodia.

Press dispatches from Washington indicate that the President is gambling on "victory," and that if the gamble succeeds he believes the American people will forget everything else. "What really matters as far as the people are concerned," the President said at the Pentagon, "is that it comes out all right. If it comes out all right, that

of the interior at the time of the massacre in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas. However, he has taken a somewhat more ambiguous tone toward the students than the incumbent administration, encouraging hopes that he will relax the repression after he is elected president.

is what really counts." Senator Aiken seemed to sense this when he said: "If his strategy is successful . . . then we will have to call him a hero."

This somehow reminds me of the secret speech Hitler made to his generals on the eve of the German aggression against Poland.

"I shall give a propagandist reason for starting the war — never mind whether it is plausible or not. The victor will not be asked afterward whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war it is not right that matters but victory."

I do not for one moment compare President Nixon with Hitler. But the shabby propaganda out of Washington since our going into Cambodia is bound to remind one of the Nazi propaganda used to justify the Germans going into Poland, Denmark and Norway.

Tehran Reply on Parsanejad

In their own way, the Tehran police have answered the demand of the Iranian Students Association for information on Dr. Syavosh Parsanejad, held incommunicado in the shah's prisons since March 19.

According to the May 20 *Le Monde*, the police claim that Parsanejad turned himself in to the authorities and begged for pardon from the shah after entering Iran on a secret mission and finding that he had been misled "on the real economic and social situation in Iran."

The police made no comment on the charge that Parsanejad had been subjected to torture and threatened with death.

Bay Area Unionists Speak Out Against the War

[The advertisement reprinted below appeared in both the *San Francisco Chronicle* and *The Examiner* on May 18. It was signed by 451 union officers.

[The *New York Times* article on the advertisement noted that "the signatures to such a document of the names of many leaders of conservative unions constitutes a departure from national labor policy" as represented by the official position of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

[The *Times* says that one of the first signers was Einar Mohn of the Western Conference of Teamsters, "who surprised the advertisement's authors with the vehemence of his response."

[Another of the signers is a long-time activist in the fight against war, Warren K. Billings, who together with Tom Mooney was framed on a charge of bombing the San Francisco Preparedness Day parade in 1917.

[Following the ad is a representative selection from the list of 451 signers.]

* * *

We've had it!

We the undersigned Bay Area trade union officers, executive board members and shop stewards have sent the following message to President Richard M. Nixon with a copy to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright:

Dear Mr. President:

American working people and their families are deeply disturbed at your expansion of the war into Cambodia. Those men being killed are our sons — new casualty lists to add to the 40,000 already dead and 300,000 wounded in Vietnam.

On April 20 you announced that 150,000 men would be removed within the course of a year. Although we felt that even that pace was too slow, we hoped this was a turn toward peace, an end to the killing.

Now you have further divided this country by a number of blatant reversals in the course of a few days. First there were arms to Cambodia. Then

there were American "advisors." Now an invasion in force!

This took place without even the pretext of a request from Cambodia, which international law considers a neutral nation.

This is a direct break with the US Constitution. Only Congress can declare war. Furthermore, you did not even consult the Senate Foreign Relations Committee — the committee mainly responsible to advise and consent. Your own Secretary of State William P. Rogers testified he told Congress that the United States would not escalate the war into Cambodia. Little wonder there are members of your own party who have said you have "broken faith with Congress."

You have created a credibility gap of incredible proportions.

You have pledged to the American people that we will be out of Cambodia by June 30.

In the light of this record, all we can say is — we don't believe you!

The economy of our country is steadily being eroded; your promises to stabilize the economy and control

inflation have become meaningless. Our paychecks buy less for our families; our standard of living has been assaulted. We are suffering increased inflation and unemployment.

Now Cambodia! What next?

There must be an end to these military adventures.

We want a cease-fire — Now!

We want out of Cambodia — Now!

We want out of Vietnam — Now!

We've had it!

Most important, this nation of ours must turn from war to peace. Any other course leads to disaster.

Matt L. Ayon, vice-president, Teamsters local 9; James Ballard, president, American Federation of Teachers local 61; Edward Barlow, secretary-treasurer, Teamsters local 9; Harry Bigarani, secretary, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers district council; Warren K. Billings, executive board, Watchmakers Union local 101; Loren Blasingame, president, Communications Workers local 9415; Harry Bridges, president, International Longshoremens and Warehouse-

3,000 in Vienna Antiwar Demonstration

A united front, ranging from socialists to Catholics, staged a demonstration of more than 3,000 people in Vienna to protest the American invasion of Cambodia and the resumption of bombing of North Vietnam.*

The march from the university to the government office of the chancellor was peaceful in spite of attempts by right-wingers to provoke a fight. At one point a right-winger fired a tear-gas pistol into the crowd, injuring one demonstrator.

While the demonstrators sat in the street outside, the chancellor, Dr. Kreisky, received a delegation of twelve protesters. They informed him of the

demands of the demonstration: diplomatic recognition of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam; breaking of relations with the Lon Nol regime and the recognition of the Sihanouk government; and the condemnation of the American intervention in Indochina.

The reply of the chancellor consisted of platitudes: "I am opposed to every military intervention. . . . It will be our [the government's] task to strive for a peaceful development within the framework of the United Nations."

The large demonstration did move the chancellor to action on one point, however. The president of the university had ordered the school to be closed to prevent a teach-in which the students had planned. After a phone call from the chancellor, the president agreed that the teach-in could be held.

* We believe that the date of the demonstration was May 14, but we are not certain inasmuch as our Vienna correspondent unfortunately overlooked identifying and dating the newspaper clippings he sent us. — IP

men's Union; Albert Brown, secretary-treasurer, Milk Drivers local 302; Cleophas Brown, International Union of Laborers local 329.

Also, Jim Calvarese, secretary-treasurer, Bartenders local 595; Tony Cannata, president, Contra Costa Labor Council; Avery Carter, business agent, Hospital Workers local 250; Samuel C. Churchwell, business representative, Plasterers and Cement Masons local 224; Edward Collins, assistant secretary, Alameda County Labor Council; Russell Crowell, president, Cleaners and Dye Workers; Barbara Davis, executive board, Office and Professional Employees local 29; Daniel Del Carlo, chairman, San Francisco Building Trades Council; Emilio Della Rosa, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers local 107; Joseph Diviny, first vice-president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; George Duncan, international representative, Typographical Union; Frank M. Farro, secretary-treasurer, Teamsters local 853.

Also, Fred L. Feci, vice-president, Santa Clara Labor Council; William Ferguson, financial secretary, Machinists and Aerospace Workers local 68; A.A. Figone, Carpenters and Joiners district council; Ken Finis, president, City Employees local 400; Maurice Fitzgerald, secretary-treasurer, Cemetery Workers local 265; Fred D. Fletcher, executive secretary, San Francisco-Oakland Newspaper Guild; Morris Goldman, second vice-president, Typographical Union local 21; Louis M. Gray, president, Social Workers local 535; Richard Groulx, executive secretary, Alameda County Labor Council; Errol Hendra, Lithographers and Photoengravers local 17L; Walter R. Howes, Butchers Union local 506.

Also, Mattie Joyce Jackson, business agent, United Garment Workers; Jake Jacobs, business agent, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers local 1-5; Claude H. Jinkerson, secretary-treasurer, Retail Clerks local 648; William Kilpatrick, secretary, Cooks local 44; Ernie King, secretary-treasurer, Boilermakers local 513; Richard Krause, president, Service Employees local 390; Vince Licari, secretary-treasurer, Culinary local 822; H.M. Martinson, president, United Electrical Workers local 1412; Thomas McGuire, sub-regional director, United Steelworkers; Einar O. Mohn, international director, Western

Conference of Teamsters; Vanustiano Olquin, organizer, United Farmworkers.

Also, Marge Pagan, president Bottle Blowers local 141; C.D. Parker, secretary, Iron Workers local 1088; Wendell J. Phillips, secretary, Bakery Wagon Drivers local 484; Miriam San Julo, State, County, and Municipal Employees local 377; Paul Schrade, regional director, United Auto Workers Region 6; Stanley Smith, field rep-

Germany

Cologne Students Protest Nixon's War

Three thousand students fought police in the streets of Cologne on the evening of May 12 after the cops used clubs against peaceful demonstrators protesting the war in Vietnam and the invasion of Cambodia. At least eight people, two of them policemen, were injured.

In the afternoon, while students were conducting a teach-in, police put up a double row of fences around America House, the target of the demonstration.

The marchers were militant but peaceful. Banners carried read: "For the Victory of the Revolution in Indochina," and "Nixon Murderer," with the "x" in Nixon's name replaced by a swastika.

Violence flared when police attempted to drive demonstrators back from the fences with blows from their clubs. According to the Cologne newspaper *Stadt-Anzeiger*, the students responded by throwing bags of paint, Molotov cocktails, and stones. They also turned fire extinguishers on police who ventured outside the fences to attack the demonstration.

What happened next was reported as follows by the *Stadt-Anzeiger*: "The situation seemed to become quiet for a time. Then suddenly . . . mounted police appeared. And that was the beginning of the escalation which finally produced casualties."

The police rode their horses into the crowd of demonstrators, who tore up the fences intended to protect America House and placed them across the street to stop the mounted charges.

The police then went on a rampage. This finally ended after the demonstrators were dispersed by tear gas. One man was injured when kicked by

representative, Glaziers local 718; Walter J. Stack, executive board, Hodcarriers local 36; John Sroka, president, Barbers local 917; Lawrence Swain, second vice-president, Postal Clerks local 2; Raoul Tailhet, president, California Federation of Teachers; Cornelius C. Wall, International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Floyd Weseman, Jr., secretary, Mailhandlers local 121; Dave Williams, vice-president, Piledrivers local 34.

a horse. Most of the other injuries occurred when a policeman on horseback pushed a group of people, including some passersby, through a store window.

South African Student Action

Some 357 white students were arrested in Johannesburg May 18 for defying a ban on a march in support of twenty-two Africans who have been held for a year without trial. The demonstration was the first major act of civil disobedience against the South African government's apartheid policy in years.

The students, from the English-speaking University of Witwatersrand, had asked the Johannesburg City Council to approve the march. The council agreed a week beforehand.

On the morning of the demonstration a magistrate ruled in favor of a police request to prohibit the action. Some 2,000 students gathered on the campus to discuss the ban. Those willing to be arrested marched to Vorster Square, where police headquarters is located, carrying banners reading "Charge or release" and "The erosion of law." They sang "We Shall Overcome."

As police approached to arrest the crowd, several students sat down. They were dragged along the pavement.

All were released the same night, but face charges of riotous assembly, which carry penalties of up to five years in prison. As they emerged from jail after being fingerprinted, a high-ranking police officer, Brigadier C. I. Buys, told reporters he thought the government would treat the students leniently "at this stage." According to the May 19 *Washington Post*, "he warned that any further protests would bring a swift crackdown. 'We can't let this go on. In three or four years it would be like the United States,' Buys said."

Ernest Mandel Barred from Speaking in Australia

The Australian government has refused to issue a visa to the internationally known Belgian Marxist economist Ernest Mandel, who was to have been a keynote speaker at a Socialist Scholars Conference in Sydney May 21-24. The Gorton regime has refused to give any explanation for the ban, despite sharp questioning from Labor members of parliament and protests from organizers of the conference.

The government did not even announce the ban publicly or inform the sponsors of Mandel's visit. The May 13 *Sydney Morning Herald* reported:

"Mr Philip Sandford, a member of the planning committee of the Socialist Scholars' Conference, announced in Sydney that the visa had been refused. . . .

"Mr Sandford said that he had telephoned Dr Mandel in Brussels yesterday afternoon on a matter concerning the conference and Dr Mandel had told him that someone claiming to be from the Australian Embassy in Belgium had telephoned him and said he would not be given a visitor's visa to Australia.

"When he had asked why, he had been told that it was not policy to explain the reason for such a decision."

The conference planning committee has issued a statement pointing out that the Australian government was following in the footsteps of the Nixon administration, which refused to allow Ernest Mandel to visit the United States to fulfill speaking engagements in October and November 1969.

Mandel, the statement pointed out, had spoken "before 5,000 assembled militants in Paris, May 1968, at the height of the massive worker-student uprising. . . . His address was the high point of the gathering and has been reproduced in numerous Left-wing magazines."

Philip Sandford told reporters that the Socialist Scholars Conference had already gone to considerable expense to arrange to bring Mandel to Australia.

"Dr Mandel has traveled throughout Europe, the United States and Asia," he added. "In view of this it is incon-

ceivable that the Australian Government should suddenly discover that he is an unfit person to visit this country.

"It should be noted that he was one of the most outspoken critics of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia."

In addition to speaking at the conference, Mandel was to have given public lectures in Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide.

One state legislator accused the government of being subservient to Washington. "The Labor MLA for Kembla, New South Wales, Mr G. Peterson," the May 13 *Australian* reported, "who said he would be attending the conference, claimed the Australian Government appeared to have followed an American Government decision in banning Dr Mandel as it had done in many other matters."

The *Australian* reviewed Mandel's experiences with the Nixon administration:

"Dr Mandel made an extensive lecture tour of America in 1968, but became the centre of a controversy between the State Department and the Justice Department when he was refused a U. S. visa for a similar tour in 1969.

"At that time the Justice Department took the unusual step of dissociating itself from the State Department's decision not to grant Dr Mandel a visa."*

The procedure used by the Gorton regime almost directly paralleled that used by Washington in barring Gisela Mandel from visiting the United States to address an antiwar demonstration in New York April 15. In that case also, notification of the denial was made only a few days in advance, likewise by telephone rather than in writing, and the reason for the ban was not stated. In the case of the U. S. ban of Mandel's wife, reference was made to a section of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality

* In fact it was the State Department which recommended that Mandel be permitted entry and the Justice Department which imposed the ban; thus State can be regarded as having dissociated itself from Justice's decision not to grant a visa.—IP

Act of 1952, passed at the height of the McCarthy period, but no specific violations of the provisions of the act were cited. The Australian government did not bother to give any reason at all for the exclusion of Ernest Mandel.

One Labor senator demanded an explanation in parliament. The May 13 *Melbourne Age* reported from the capital at Canberra:

"The only interpretation which could be placed on the refusal to grant a visa to a noted Belgian author to enter Australia was that the Government was afraid of free dissemination of ideas, a Labor senator said last night.

"Senator J. M. Wheeldon (Labor WA) said Dr. E. Mandel had been refused a visa to enter Australia for a socialist scholars' conference in Sydney.

"Senator Wheeldon, who was speaking in the Senate, said Dr. Mandel travelled extensively in Britain, France, India, Italy, Ceylon and America delivering lectures."

The following day one of the top leaders of the Labor party pressed the inquiry in parliament, forcing the minister for immigration of the ruling Liberal-Country party coalition to make a statement on the case.

"The Minister for Immigration (Mr. Lynch) yesterday refused to say why the Federal Government had refused a visitor's visa for a Belgian economist," the *Melbourne Age* said May 14. "It is understood the visa was refused on the advice of the Australian Security Intelligence Organization [ASIO].

"Mr. Lynch would only say that the facts behind the Government's refusal could not be given 'in the national interest.'

"Mr. Lynch was questioned by Labor's 'shadow' Treasurer Mr. Crean (Vic.) over reports that the Government had refused a visa to Dr. Ernest Mandel, a Belgian scholar and newspaper editor who had been invited to attend a socialist scholars' conference in Sydney this month.

"Mr. Crean asked on what grounds Dr. Mandel, 'a well known Belgian scholar,' had been refused entry to Australia.

"Mr. Crean said Dr. Mandel was a reputable historian and expert on Marxian economics who had travelled throughout Europe.

"The refusal made Australia look ridiculous."

The reply of the minister of immigration was evasive. "From the wide publicity given to some socialists who have been allowed to visit Australia," he said, "— and the word socialist is a somewhat imprecise euphemism in such circumstances—it will be perfectly evident that the Australian Government's attitude to the entry of such people is essentially flexible although careful attention must always be paid to questions of national security."

Why, then, was Mandel barred under this "essentially flexible" policy?

"Sometimes the national interest demands that the facts not be stated, although they have been established," Lynch said. "This is true in the case of Dr. Mandel.

"The decision was taken only after the most careful, complete and comprehensive consideration of all the factors by all the Ministers concerned."

The *Melbourne Age* shed a little more light at least on who was involved in this decision taken at the highest levels of the Australian government:

"It is understood that Mr. Lynch refused a visa to Dr. Mandel after consultation with both the Attorney-General (Mr. Hughes) and the Minister for External Affairs (Mr. McMahon).

"It is believed that Mr. Hughes was advised by ASIO that Dr. Mandel was a well-known communist in Europe.

"He had allegedly been involved in the French students' uprising two years ago."

According to the May 14 *Australian*, the one reason Lynch would give for not stating the reason for the ban was that visa applications were confidential between the applicant and the Department of Immigration.

In this case, evidently, they were so "confidential" that even the applicant was not told.

Who is this man who is so dangerous that even to reveal the reasons for keeping him out of the country would endanger "the national interest"? The May 13 *Sydney Morning Herald* explained:

"Dr Mandel is the author of the well-known two volume work on the Marxist economic theory. His latest book

is being translated under the title of 'Europe Versus America?'

"He edits the Belgian weekly, 'La Gauche' ('The Left'). . . .

"Dr Mandel was to have addressed the conference on 'The Crisis of the Capitalist Relations of Production' and to have addressed a public meeting

on 'The New Wave of Workers' Struggles in Europe.'"

Academic circles have been mobilized to protest Mandel's exclusion and a deputation is scheduled to visit Lynch to request a reversal. A poster campaign to publicize the case is also underway.

The May 16 Demonstrations

GIs Display Rising Opposition to War

At the headquarters of the U.S. Fourth Infantry Division at An Khe a few days after Nixon announced the invasion of Cambodia, one GI protested the decision by conducting a sit-in in the middle of a busy highway until military police arrested him.

The GI's action was an individual expression of a widespread phenomenon: a growing and deepening opposition to the American aggression within the ranks of the military.

The clearest expression of that opposition was not the one-man sit-in, nor even the refusal of six soldiers to go into combat in Cambodia—both of which incidents were reported in the New York weekly *Newsweek*—but antiwar demonstrations conducted at bases all over the United States on May 16.

May 16 is Armed Forces Day, traditionally a day on which bases are opened to the public for patriotic speeches and displays of military hardware. But this year, for the first time, the GIs themselves changed it into something different.

Antiwar groups at many bases—most often organized around one of the fifty or sixty GI antiwar papers—began planning Armed Forces Day actions several months ago, but the demonstrations appear to have been given a greater importance in the eyes of the GIs by the escalation of the war into Cambodia. At most bases, actions were far larger than any previously held, and for many May 16 was the first public demonstration.

In an attempt to conceal GI antiwar sentiment from the public, military authorities canceled Armed Forces Day programs at a number of major posts, including Fort Polk, Louisiana; Fort Dix and Fort Mon-

mouth, New Jersey; Fort Jackson, South Carolina; Fort Meade and Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland; Fort Benning, Georgia; Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana; Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina; Quantico Marine Corp Base, Virginia; Great Lakes Naval Training Center in Chicago, Illinois; and the Marine Training Center in San Diego, California.

In most instances the demonstrating GIs were joined by civilian antiwar demonstrators. Several thousand civilians joined 1,500 GIs in a rally just outside Fort Bragg. Near Camp Pendleton in California, a Marine Corps base, hundreds of marines marched with 6,000 civilians. In Wrightstown, New Jersey, 3,000 civilians demonstrated outside Fort Dix, but authorities kept GIs confined to the base.

Joint GI-civilian actions also took place in El Paso (where 400 GIs participated), in Anniston, Alabama; at Fort Carson, Colorado; and near Fort Devens, Massachusetts.

In Killeen, Texas, which adjoins Fort Hood, 500 soldiers marched through the streets in an exclusively GI demonstration, while several hundred more lining the way expressed their sympathies with the marchers.

And in Columbus, Georgia, more than 100 soldiers from Fort Benning conducted a war crimes tribunal which found the Nixon administration, the U.S. government, and the Army of officialdom guilty of war crimes.

The scope of the May 16 actions thus gave convincing proof that American GIs have not been fooled by Nixon's claims that the Cambodian invasion is intended to protect their lives. The growth of the antiwar movement in the civilian population is finding its reflection among GIs.

Why Peruvian CP Supports the Military Junta

Jorge del Prado, general secretary of the Communist party of Peru, in an interview that appeared in the May 12 London *Morning Star* explained, as the headline put it, "Why Communists support Peru's military Government." The interview was granted to Colin Williams, the Moscow correspondent of the British CP organ.

"The military Government of Peru headed by Gen. Velasco Alvarado," Del Prado said, "contrary to the views abroad that it had carried out a preventative coup d'etat against the Left, has in fact introduced a number of important radical measures with far-reaching consequences.

"A year ago it nationalised the Rockefeller-owned International Petroleum Company—the most odious symbol of imperialist exploitation in Peru. It then instituted an agrarian reform, under which it expropriated the big landowners and handed the land back to the peasants and to co-operatives.

"It later followed this with a trade law which gave it control over the exports of minerals and fish-meal and a decisive say in the development of the mining of mineral resources.

"In addition the Government has announced that it will nationalise the main means of production.

"In face of the opposition of internal reaction and the threats of economic sanctions from the US that these measures evoked, the Government established relations with the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries.

"It also proclaimed a law on the freedom of the Press, under which it handed two of the largest mouthpieces of Big Business—the newspapers *Expresso* and *Extra*—to co-operatives to run."

All of this, Prado sums up, "explains why today the overwhelming majority of the people of Peru, including Communists, give militant support to the Alvarado Government."

This explanation by the head of the Peruvian Communist party of why these "Communists" have joined the entourage of the military junta makes interesting reading. There is nothing in the list of General Velasco's accomplishments, even as told by Jorge

del Prado, that suggests the military regime is anything more than a bourgeois government taking certain anti-imperialist measures to win a certain independence from American domination. It is one thing to give critical support to and demand the full implementation of these measures, as the Peruvian Trotskyists have done. It is something else again to pledge "militant support to the Alvarado Government."

Today Peru's jails remain filled with revolutionists, ranging from the Trotskyist peasant leader Hugo Blanco to such well-known figures as Héctor Béjar and Ricardo Gadea. At the same time, Del Prado's pro-Moscow Communist party has the benevolent protection of the dictatorship. Jorge del Prado gives this explanation:

"As the conflict between the Government and imperialism and native reaction becomes deeper, so the points of view of the Government and [Communist] Party draw closer.

"The Party's position for these reasons has improved considerably compared with its position under the former constitutional Government, when, though it was legal, it was constantly subjected to attacks."

Inasmuch as the repression continues against revolutionists, the question arises whether the CP's "improved" position has resulted from the government moving to the left, or the CP moving to the right.

Let's examine Velasco's "accomplishments" a little more closely. The new agrarian reform, according to Del Prado, "expropriated the big landowners," and "handed" the land back to the peasants. A very different picture of this law appeared in a report from Peru by Hugo Blanco last October (See *Intercontinental Press*, October 13, 1969, page 904). Blanco, as the only left-wing leader to organize a successful mass peasant movement for land seizures, speaks with some authority on this question.

"Now this reformist junta has decreed a new law," Blanco wrote, "a law more advanced than the preceding one but which in essence is still a law involving buying and selling land.

"It is possible that an attempt will actually be made to enforce this law because it is aimed not just at taking the steam out of the peasant movement. Reflecting the interests of the development-oriented bourgeois sectors, both national and foreign, this law seeks to create an internal market of small landowners, who would be consumers of industrial products, and likewise raise funds for capitalist industrial development. . . .

"This law which treats the land as a commodity to be bought and sold and which is turned over to the bureaucrats for enforcement is not what the FIR [Frente de la Izquierda Revolucionaria—Revolutionary Left Front—the Peruvian Trotskyist organization] proposes. The Trotskyists have advocated and continue to advocate 'Land Yes, Payment No!'"

Blanco stressed that the Trotskyists would aid peasants seeking to win gains through the new law, while encouraging them to build their own organizations to win a real land reform:

"If there are sectors of the peasantry that want to apply this bourgeois law, we will fight shoulder to shoulder with them for its enforcement, watching out to see that all the positive provisions are implemented, combating the negative aspects, and always stressing that only by mobilizing can the peasants guarantee enforcement of even this limited bourgeois law."

He also indicated how the new law cheated the peasants:

"Great expanses of land throughout Peru have been illegally seized from the peasant communities, even by bourgeois standards. The boss ranchers are trying to use the Agrarian Reform Law to avoid restoring these lands to their rightful owners. They are trying to get these lands 'expropriated' so that they can collect 'compensation' for them. In these cases, we must fight for pure and simple return of these lands."

As for the government's "decisive say" in the development of mining and mineral resources and the announcement that it "will" nationalize the main

means of production, the record shows otherwise. Hugo Blanco indicated what the military junta's real industrial policy is in an article that appeared in the March 30 issue of *Intercontinental Press* (page 278).

"A clear proof that the government is not nationalist," he said, "is that it has not proceeded to nationalize the other enterprises in imperialist hands, such as Toquepala, Cerro de Pasco, Marcona, etc. On the contrary, the government not only gave assurances that the measure taken in the case of La Brea-Pariñas [the International Petroleum Company oil fields] was exceptional, but has continued the tradition of past Peruvian governments of selling the national resources, handing over the Cuajone oil fields to the imperialists.

"In the disputes between the imperialist companies and the workers movement, the government's position has been unquestionably proimperialist. We saw this in the strike of the Cerro de Pasco workers. We saw this at the time of the Toquepala strike against Southern Peru Copper Corporation (when the Peruvian workers were fighting heroically against this imperialist concern, the 'nationalist' government was turning over Cuajone to the same company)."

As for recognition of the Soviet Union and the "Socialist" countries, while undoubtedly a progressive measure and one with special significance for the pro-Moscow CP, it is hardly proof that the regime is anti-imperialist. The USSR maintains diplomatic and cultural relations with such countries as Greece, Indonesia, West Germany, Iran, and the United States, none of which, we hope, would qualify as "anti-imperialist" even by the Peruvian CP's standards.

The so-called Freedom of the Press Statute, it is true, has been used thus far to silence right-wing critics of the government. But in legalizing government intervention against the press, the right-wing papers will not be the last victims. Too many times before we have seen authoritarian measures instituted by bourgeois regimes ostensibly to curb political dissent on the right, only to find their chief application at a later date in curbing the workers movement.

While Jorge del Prado speaks of the CP's "own independent work as a political party," the only example he

gives shows the exact opposite. He describes how his party used its influence in the trade unions to call off a workers' march and turn it into a progovernment demonstration at the request of General Velasco:

"The General Confederation of Labour of Peru, in which the Communists play an important role, had by now become a very powerful force . . .

"The confederation called a big march and meeting to support the Government's general policy, but also to demand an end to the anti-labour policy of the Ministry of Labour.

"Despite opposition from certain Government quarters, which said that another meeting was being prepared by the Government, the confederation said that the march and meeting had to go on.

"As the march was due to end in a meeting in the square of the Presidential palace, the President indicated that in this case he would have to make an appearance, *which he wasn't prepared to do*, though he respected the demonstration that had been called.

"A compromise solution resulted in the march being waived and the meeting being transferred to another square.

"Thus on March 9, this year, the first organised mass demonstration of the Government took place with over 60,000 taking part." (Emphasis added.)

And what did the CP "win" in return for calling out the workers for a demonstration "of the Government," obligingly keeping them away from the presidential palace so that the "anti-imperialist" president-general would not be compromised? Del Prado reports:

Hubert Krivine Released on Bail

Hubert Krivine was released on bail May 15, along with two members of the Ligue Marxiste Revolutionnaire (Revolutionary Marxist League) of Lausanne arrested at the same time, the Paris daily *Le Monde* reported May 17.

Hubert is a member of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League, the French section of the Fourth International) and the brother of Alain Krivine, the Ligue's candidate for president of France in the 1968 elections. He was arrested, along with Bernard Bachelard and Olivier Parriaux of the Ligue Marxiste Revolution-

"Following the demonstration, the President received a delegation representing the miners and resolved the strike [in favor of the imperialist owners of the Cerro de Pasco copper company—*IP*]. He decided then to reorganise the Ministry of Labour, and the Government is presently *considering* a law on the protection of miners' working conditions." (Emphasis added.)

The attitude of the Peruvian Trotskyists toward the junta is very different from the obsequious prostration by the CP. Hugo Blanco outlined the Trotskyist position in his article in our March 30 issue:

"The FIR fights for a workers and peasants government, for a socialist government. It fights for nationalizing the banks, foreign trade, and all foreign enterprises. It fights for putting the industries into the hands of the working class and the land into the hands of the peasants.

"We know that we can achieve this only through a revolution, that the exploiters will not readily surrender power into the hands of the workers.

"But we also know that the Peruvian people are still not ready to struggle for power.

"The various popular sectors are struggling for their immediate, most deeply felt, and fundamentally economic needs.

"We are accompanying our people in this struggle, realizing that all aspects of it, if they are conducted effectively, lead toward the revolution.

"The masses learn in struggle, and this apprenticeship is not wasted when it is guided by a revolutionary party, when this party incorporates the best fighters in the mass struggle, when the party continues to learn from this struggle."

naire, on April 18 near the town of Baden in the canton of Argovie.

Various versions of the charges against Krivine and the other two young revolutionists appeared in Swiss and French papers but the authorities seemed finally to settle on the accusation of "robbery and spying."

There appears to be some doubt now that the Swiss government intends to bring Krivine to trial since at the same time as releasing him on bail it expelled him from the country.

Argentine Police Announce Arrest of Guerrillas

"Colonel Jorge Diotti, the director of federal coordination, announced Thursday [May 7] the arrest of seventeen members of an extreme left movement," Agence France-Presse reported May 9. The Argentinian official claimed that those arrested were "members of a clandestine organization whose purpose was to start an armed insurrection against the government."

The group was charged with participating in assaults on police stations as well as the seizure of 41,500,000 pesos [350 pesos=US\$1] and a quantity of arms.

The organizer of the raids, according to the director of federal coordination, was the PRT (Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores—Revolutionary Workers party, the Argentinian section of the Fourth International).

The May 15 issue of *Bohemia* reported additional facts about the case. The Cuban weekly magazine viewed the arrests as an expression of the military dictatorship's fear that urban commandos would develop in Argentina on the model of the Tupumaros in Uruguay. Owing to this fear, the Onganía regime is strengthening its repressive apparatus.

Bohemia pointed out that civil-service prosecutors have recently been replaced by executive appointees in order to facilitate political trials. At the same time, the power of indictment has been handed over to the police.

The top army commander, General Alejandro Lanusse, has declared that the armed forces will command all the police and intelligence agencies in a coordinated campaign against "subversion."

In this context, *Bohemia* wrote: "The government has played up the arrest of a cell of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores, an organization of Trotskyist origin which has now adhered to the tactic of armed struggle.

"The repressive forces succeeded in arresting sixteen members of the PRT, on top of a similar number arrested last year in the province of Tucumán.

"The sixteen arrested are now being held in the city of Rosario, where they were active and, it is said, have been

barbarically tortured by the police.

"According to the police version, the persons arrested constituted four cells of the *El Combatiente* sector of the PRT, which is distinguished from the other sector of the organization called *La Verdad*. These names come from the papers published by the two groups.

"*El Combatiente* was the most active. It is believed that the arrest of the two groups, the one in Tucumán last year and the one in Rosario this year, have dealt this organization a heavy blow.

"So far as is known, the PRT was not involved in the two direct-action organizations which have proved most active recently—the Frente Armado de Liberación (FAL) [Armed Liberation Front], and the Fuerzas Armadas Peronistas (FAP) [Peronista Armed Forces]."

Shortly before the announcement of the arrest of the Rosario group, the Buenos Aires daily *La Nación* [April 23] reported that the sixteen arrested in Tucumán last year had been sentenced to "preventive imprisonment." Under this system, detainees can, in effect, be held an indefinite period before their cases are settled. A plea of habeas corpus on behalf of two of the defendants was denied by Federal Judge Eduardo Lucio Vallejo.

La Nación noted that the Tucumán revolutionists were arrested in October 1969 in connection with violent labor disputes in that province. The first of the group arrested, according to the paper, was Tirso Luis Yañez, who was reportedly caught placing a bomb in an interurban bus. The police claim that Yañez's arrest led to the capture of the other fifteen.

The judge's ruling claimed that another member of the group, Juan Antonio Moya, who escaped, "set bombs in the plaza and the railroad yard, as well as a park in Ciudad Alberdi. In the same period he set fire to a bus in that city and blew up a section of the railway tracks near Villa Hileret. He also planted a bomb in the dormitories of the Massalin y Celasco firm in La Cocha."

The Tucumán group were described in the judge's ruling as adherents of an organization "designed to subvert the institutional order of the nation, which indoctrinated its members in the principles of international Communism and gave instruction to qualify them for urban and rural guerrilla warfare."

The Argentine press listed the following persons, in addition to Yañez, as members of the group in Tucumán: Raúl Eduardo Aguilar, Juan Carlos Díaz, Hugo Froilán Choque Arroyo, Miguel Angel Fuensalida, Eduardo Arturo González, Ramón Rosa Jiménez, Juan Santiago Mangini, Miguel Antonio Quinteros, Mario Roberto Santucho, René Rolando Torres, Juan Andrés Molina, Juan José Rearte, J. Antonio Moya,¹ Carlos Luis Garay, and Alberto Jiménez.

The first arrests in Rosario were reported in the Argentine press April 29. *La Nación* carried the headline "A Vast Terrorist Network is Being Investigated." Eight persons were jailed. The police alleged that they had carried out the raid on Police Station 20a in Rosario. As a result of these arrests, *La Nación* reported, the police had established responsibility for a series of other commando attacks, including the seizure of 41,500,000 pesos from a Mitre line train held up between the Ludueña and Barrio Vila stations. The train was carrying funds from the Rosario branch of the Banco de la Nación Argentina to the Venado Tuerto branch.

In a house on 4608 Salta Street in Rosario, *La Nación* reported, the police captured 13,000,000 to 15,000,000 pesos of the money taken from the Mitre line train, as well as empty bottles for making bombs, a Winchester rifle, a shotgun, knapsacks, and a large quantity of bullets. One member of the group was reportedly captured at the house.

"Although secrecy about the police operations is total," the Buenos Aires paper wrote, "we were able to learn

1. Moya is listed as arrested with the other fifteen in *La Nación's* account. The judge's ruling refers to him as a "fugitive."

that the local authorities and intelligence services of the army, the Gendarmería Nacional [special police], and the Federal Police met in the local police headquarters and interrogated the captured terrorists at length."

The interrogation supposedly revealed that the group had planned to "assassinate" the commander of the Second Army Corps, General Roberto Aníbal Fonseca; the director of the USIA, Cortez Keable; and the police inspector of the Robos y Hurtos sector, Telémaco Ojeda. The arrested revolutionists had planned to blow these officials up, *La Nación* claimed.

Moreover, one of the alleged guerrilla cells was supposed to be specially training for kidnappings.

The names of those alleged to have attacked the Mitre line train were given April 29 as Emilio Delfino, Elvira Alba Antesano,² Manuel Alberto Navarro, Emilio Rodríguez Caravante, Raúl Della Santa, Jorge Alberto Isaías, and Antonio Cufre—all between the ages of twenty-five and thirty.

"The police have information about a connection between this group and terrorists and leftist extremists in the federal capital [Buenos Aires], Santa Fe, and Tucumán," *La Nación* wrote. Calls were said to have gone out for the arrest of persons involved in the guerrilla network in these areas.

"Also under arrest," the paper continued, "is a woman named Caravalli, a twenty-five-year-old lawyer supposedly the girl friend of one of the accused." Two other guerrillas reportedly escaped, Coco Sánchez "Hula," the head of the Che Guevara commando group; and N. Martínez, an engraver.

Elvira Alba Antesana was accused of driving the getaway car in the attack on the train.

New arrests in Rosario were reported April 30: "Despite the veil of secrecy under which the police are working," *La Nación* wrote, "it was learned that new arrests were made. Among the persons arrested were Doctor Margarita Araceli Díaz, the girl friend of Manuel A. Navarro, and the owner of the Citroen automobile driven by Elvira Alba Antesana, the secretary of the Chilean consul. Also arrested were Miguel Indalecio Suárez,

an employee of the Rosario branch of the Banco de la Nación Argentina . . .

"The bank employee confessed that he was the inside 'informant' for the train robbery. Another one of those jailed is Gerardo Britos, an Argentinian student employed in the provincial courts. Britos was known under the alias of 'Comandante Brazzano' and it is known that he took an active part in the events that occurred recently in Tucumán, Córdoba, and this city [Rosario].³ He has admitted responsibility for the crimes with which he is charged."

The proceeds from the assault on the train were divided as follows, the Buenos Aires paper said: "15,000,000 pesos were sent to Tucumán and 10,000,000 to Córdoba, according to the books in which the terrorist cell kept its accounts. And they kept very strict accounts indeed, noting even minor expenses, such as 290 pesos for a taxi, 250 for a meal, and 90 pesos for three coffees, which shows the meticulous bookkeeping of the group."

Two of those arrested with the first group in Rosario were reported released for lack of evidence April 30—Jorge Isaías, twenty-three years old; and Antonio Cufre, twenty-four years old. Added to the list of those imprisoned were Pedro Oscar Yáñez, a doctor; Manuel Suárez; and Oscar Rubén Suárez.

It was reported April 29 that nine persons charged with attacking Police Station 20a had been flown to Buenos Aires the day before.

A more detailed report of the arrest of PRT members in Rosario appeared in the May 8 issue of *La Nación* along with a discussion of rumors of guerrilla activity in various parts of the country. At the head of the article was a picture of Director of Federal Coordination Dotti (not "Diotti" as Agence France-Presse reported) pointing to a chart allegedly depicting the PRT's organizational structure.

The chart showed a pyramid topped by the Central Committee of the PRT and leading down to the Executive Committee, the military apparatus, regional military organizations for Buenos Aires (this name was not clear on the chart), Salta, Rosario, Tucumán, and Córdoba, and finally the

commando units in Rosario—the Che Guevara Commando Group, the White Commando Group, the Green Commando Group, and the October 8 Commando Group.

Accompanying Dotti at the news conference were the chief of the Intelligence Bureau, Colonel Ricardo Campoamor; chief of the Federal Crimes Division, Inspector Urricelqui; chief of the Antidemocratic Activities Investigation Division, Inspector Carrino y Castro.

The aim of the guerrillas had been, according to Dotti, "to use all forms of violence—terrorism, attacks on individuals, armed robbery, establishment of guerrilla units, etc., to win power and establish a dictatorship."

Captured documents showed, *La Nación* reported, that "one of the aims of the group was to replace the courts, which they consider corrupt, by so-called people's justice, which was to be administered by their own bodies. They had planned on kidnapping the managers of companies with labor troubles and dealing out justice to 'traitorous' elements, as well as stealing food and distributing it among striking workers where conflicts were prolonged."

Dotti admitted that the purpose of the robberies allegedly carried out by the PRT group was to acquire the means for waging an armed struggle against the brutal military regime that rules Argentina. However, he stressed that the arrested guerrillas would be tried as common criminals despite the intent of their actions.

At his May 7 news conference, Dotti accused the arrested revolutionists of a series of new crimes. They began their operations in 1969, he said, by stealing cars to use in their work. On August 8, 1969, they supposedly raided a gun store on the Calle Felipe Moré in Rosario and assaulted a policeman. Two similar alleged attacks were carried out in October of the same year, but without success. In March 1970 the arrested revolutionists were said to have attacked Police Station No. 8 in Rosario and the Gendarmería Nacional detachment at the corner of Vera Mujica and Virasoro streets.

Dotti was asked if the Rosario PRT members had any connection with the FAL guerrilla group. He replied that he could not answer the question be-

2. This name appears later on in the same article as Artesana, and in articles in the April 30 and May 8 issues of *La Nación* as Dentesano.

3. This apparently refers to the escalating protests and violent strikes that developed in most of the country's provincial cities in the spring of 1969.

cause that matter was still under investigation.

The full list, supposedly, of those arrested in connection with the Rosario events was published in the May 8 issue of *La Nación*. The paper stated that the list contained the names of sixteen persons (not seventeen as reported by Agence France-Presse). In fact, only fifteen names were listed. We have shown those names made public here for the first time in italics:

"Emilio Caravantes, alias Sergio, Spanish nationality, twenty-four years old, married, teacher; Elvira Dentesano, alias Veca, twenty-six years old, single, clerk; *Manuel Justa Gaggero*, thirty years old, married, a lawyer; *Francisco René Santucho*, alias El Negro, forty-five years old, a merchant; Pedro Oscar Yáñez, thirty-two years old, single, a doctor; Mario Emilio Delfino, alias Cacho Fuentes, twenty-eight years old, mechanical technician; Manuel Alberto Navarro, alias Felipe, twenty-nine years old, bank clerk; Eden Gerardo Britos, alias Federico, twenty-seven years old, single, a clerk; Rubén Oscar Suárez, alias Mario, twenty-three years old, married, a metallurgical worker; *Maria del Huerdo Figura de Caravantes*, twenty-three years old, married, philosophy student; Araceli Margarita Díaz, alias Silvina, twenty-six years old, single, a lawyer; *Emilia Susana Gaggero de Pujals*, twenty-seven years old, married, a psychologist; *José Mauricio Navarro*, alias Chinchino, twenty-six years old, bank clerk; *Omar Osvaldo Electo Valderrama*, twenty-five years old, teacher; and Beatriz Pederana."

The last eight arrested, the paper stated, were not picked up in Rosario but in various places throughout the country. There was no clarification as to which eight were arrested in Rosario, but all sixteen were said to belong to the same group.

Seven alleged guerrillas were reported arrested in that city April 29, of whom two were later released. Six more persons were reported arrested in Rosario the next day, making a total of eleven held by the police.

The woman "Caravalli" (Caravantes?) was not mentioned again. Margarita Araceli Díaz, whose arrest was reported April 30, was also described as the "girl friend" of one of the PRT members whose arrest was reported April 29. Is she the mysterious "Caravalli"?

The following persons reported arrested prior to Dotti's May 7 news conference were not included in the final list: Raúl della Santa, Miguel Indalecio Suárez, and Manuel Suárez. The absence of the bank clerk Miguel Indalecio Suárez stands out particularly, since he was supposed to have been the "inside man" in the train robbery.

Many questions remain to be answered. Some of those who appear on the May 7 list seem to be relatives of persons previously arrested. Are the police victimizing the families of the alleged guerrillas? Where are the missing "commandos"? Were the earlier press reports inaccurate or are some PRT members being held incommunicado? Or have they been quietly murdered? There were already incidents

Memo from the White House

Rhetorical Pearls for Your Next Speech

"President Nixon's policy — deliberate, firm, confident — is working."

Or at least that's what it says in one of eight suggested speech segments sent out by George Creel, director of public affairs for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), for lower officials in the department to insert into their public speeches.

The deliberate, firm, confident policy referred to is not, as one might expect, the administration's position on housing and urban development, but Nixon's policy in Vietnam — which, since the passage was written, has grown so deliberate, firm and confident that Nixon decided to repeat it in Cambodia.

The eight suggested speech segments were accompanied by a one-paragraph memorandum signed by Creel. According to a *Washington Post* dispatch printed in the April 27 *Los Angeles Times*, the memo said: "I have been asked to forward the enclosed material together with a White House request that favorable references to the President's recent Vietnam statement be included in public speeches delivered in the immediate future."

The concrete examples were presumably included for the benefit of officials who could not find anything favor-

able to say. They include rhetorical pearls fully matching the one already quoted.

In a press conference in Rosario the same day as Dotti's revelations, General Lanusse declared, in effect, that the army and police were at war with the population of the country: "We are facing enemies who are not of the traditional kind, since they presently arise from the population of the country itself. Therefore, all forces must be integrated in a common struggle. I am not convinced that we are living in a time of peace. We must change our way of analyzing problems. Although it has been said that peace followed the second world war, I do not share that opinion because I think we are at war."

orable to say. They include rhetorical pearls fully matching the one already quoted.

For example, a suggested opening is "I hope that the leaders in Hanoi were listening Monday night when President Nixon made his speech on Vietnam." Perhaps this indicates a plan by HUD to have Nixon's speeches translated into Vietnamese and broadcast to Hanoi via earth satellite.

Another gem reads: "Hanoi should not miss the nuances . . . our training and equipping of the South Vietnamese military is going better than expected . . . pacification is working. This means the enemy is losing the countryside . . . Listen, Hanoi."

One wonders why it is necessary to tell Hanoi that it is losing the countryside, or why, if Hanoi is really that ignorant of its own fortunes, the Department of Housing and Urban Development should want to disclose such valuable military information to the enemy.

Slavery Still Found in 40 Countries

The British Anti-Slavery Society estimates that slavery still exists in forty countries and that there are still about 2,000,000 chattel slaves. Slavery is still legal in the British-dominated sultanate of Muscat and Oman.

Action on Mexico's Political Prisoners Called For

[The first item below is a letter that appeared in the June 4 issue of the widely read *New York Review of Books*. The author of the letter, Paul Goodman, is a novelist, poet, critic, and essayist.

[The second item accompanied Paul Goodman's letter. It is an open letter signed by a number of Americans expressing solidarity with the political prisoners in Mexico.

[The two letters also appeared in Nat Hentoff's column in the May 14 issue of the *Village Voice*, a weekly published in the Greenwich Village area of New York City.]

On a recent visit to Mexico, I was astounded and chilled to learn that the 'massacre of students' of 1968 was indeed a massacre. A sober and unimpeachable source told me that he could certify at least a hundred shot dead; angry radical students said there were 500, many of the bodies having been made to vanish in a crematorium. (This rumored detail was denied by my more sober authority.) Because of this event, Mexican students express an irreconcilable bitterness that is quite unlike the tone of our American militants — though it may exist among some blacks — and it seems to be a terrible warning to us.

It is essential that the whole incident be aired and fully reported by those who have information about it. It is blacked out of the Mexican press, and at present Mexicans cannot protest without serious sanctions. The following statement was prepared by Americans who may or may not risk unpleasant consequences because of it. The thirty-four signers include professors and students, a truck driver, priests, ministers, and missionaries, a member of the American Friends Service Committee, a college president, a former Regent of one of our states, etc. (I and the *New York Review* have the names.) The American Bernard Ames is singled out not for special consideration, but because he has been a means of information.

Paul Goodman

* * *

The undersigned U.S. citizens, all recent visitors to Mexico, protest the

continued unconstitutional imprisonment and inhumane treatment of more than 100 prisoners in Mexico City's Lecumberri federal prison. Most of these prisoners are Mexican students, still held without trial, public hearing, or even formal charges for over a year and a half, in violation of Mexican law. Most of them were arrested during student strikes and protests during 1968, climaxed by the massacre of hundreds of students by military and police forces at a rally in Mexico City's Tlatelolco Plaza on October 2 of that year.

The Mexican government vigorously denies retention of any "political prisoners." Recent visitors from abroad have been deported simply for stating intentions to visit them. The prisoners are charged with constitutional violations, not with political dissent. Nonetheless, they are segregated in dormitories M, N, O, and C of the Lecumberri prison, as some of us can testify from prison visits and from conferences with defense attorneys. When two U.S. clergymen visited students in the penitentiary on March 28, the guard was instructed, "Search them carefully! They are visiting *presos politicos*." We have established beyond reasonable doubt that the student prisoners have been cruelly harassed, given extended solitary confinement, beaten, tortured, and robbed by other prisoners with encouragement by prison officials. Powerless, their only recourse has been a 40-day hunger strike (reported in the *New York Times* on January 19).

One of the youths still incarcerated is a young American Marine deserter from the war in Vietnam, Bernard Phillip Ames, from Vernon, New York. Some of us have visited and befriended Ames in prison. We encourage similar attentions to him from sympathetic Americans (registered mail only). Yet Ames can expect no special treatment, little help from the U.S. Embassy, and a legal fate not unlike that of his Mexican colleagues.

Defense attorneys for the prisoners are preparing a petition for amnesty from Mexico's new president after forthcoming elections in July and in-

auguration in December, in accordance with provisions of the Mexican constitution. They hope for at least a million signatures from Mexicans, plus prestigious signatories from other nations. They suggest letters, telegrams, and petitions to the PRI candidate and inevitable next president, Luis Echeverria. However, they strongly advise against more dramatic actions now, either in Mexico or abroad (a summer student/tourist boycott of Mexico had been suggested) until inauguration of the next president. They believe that such further actions would be counter-productive in Mexico's political situation and might even lead to a hastening of sentences by the courts. Their best hope, they say, is to stall such sentencing until the new administration takes over.

As foreign visitors to Mexico, we were prevented by Mexican law from any political activity on behalf of the imprisoned students. Yet our common conscience compels us to make this appeal to citizens of our own country for continued concern and appropriate action of their own.

Women Picket Beauty Contest

Some forty women students picketed the Miss Philippines 1970 beauty contest in Quezon City on April 18. The picketers were members of Malayang Kilusan ng Bagaong Kababaihan (MAKIBAKA), a women's liberation group organized on a number of campuses at the end of last year.

A report in the April 9 *Philippine Herald* said that five jeep loads of police harassed the demonstrators and tried to snatch their banners as the peaceful protest was concluding.

A leaflet distributed by the women denounced the "commercialization of sex" inherent in beauty contests, which are "concrete manifestations of the unjust exploitation of the Filipina." The leaflet also pointed out: "The function of women in our society has been mostly as a source of sexual gratification and domestic servitude . . . It is time that the women of the Philippines assert their rights to equal dignity as human beings."

MAKIBAKA is conducting a lecture series on the role of women in society and plans to publish a magazine.

Chicago Cops Shot Hampton and Clark in Cold Blood

By Allen Myers

On January 21 a coroner's jury in Chicago ruled that the killing of Black Panthers Fred Hampton and Mark Clark last December 4 by police was "justifiable."

In an article in the February 2 issue of *Intercontinental Press*, Les Evans described that verdict as a "whitewash for the police," and pointed out the numerous contradictions in the testimony of police that had been reported in the press. The evidence indicated that the Chicago police had carried out an unprovoked attack upon the Panthers in the apartment and then deliberately falsified their testimony to make it appear that the Panthers had initiated a "shoot out."

Now, nearly four months later, a federal grand jury in Chicago has released a report that substantiates this view in every important respect—yet the jury declined to bring indictments against any of the police involved!

The grand jury's report was released on May 15. Exactly one week earlier all criminal charges against the seven Panthers who survived the raid had been dropped. They had been charged with attempted murder and unlawful use of weapons.

In dropping the charges, State's Attorney Edward Hanrahan explained that "the methods used to recover and identify evidence seized by our police in the apartment may prevent our satisfying judicial standards of proof."

In the May 20 *Washington Post*, Nicholas von Hoffman gave a less euphemistic account:

"What happened after the killings is as indicative of how the officials in Chicago regard black men as the deed itself. Men with any kind of reverence for human life would have immediately known that a terrible thing had transpired, regardless of who may have been at fault, and they would have made every effort to document what had happened and how.

"Nothing of the sort took place. What the report [of the grand jury] shows is that these policemen went in, did their killing and wounding, collected

the dead and surviving, the booty of guns, slammed it all in trucks and just drove off. No fingerprints were taken, no systematic photographing of the apartment, no labeling of evidence."

What Von Hoffman failed to understand, and what Hanrahan attempted to conceal, is that this was more than a case of careless police work. The police did not want reliable evidence because it would have revealed what has finally been made clear to the public by the grand jury report: that the police had deliberately shot their way into the apartment without any justification whatsoever.

Hanrahan even went so far as to tell the press that "there is other evidence that the occupant[s] fired at the police." There is in fact no such evidence at all, as the grand jury report proves. But this does not prevent the State's Attorney from making wild charges in an attempt to mislead the public.

Excerpts from the grand jury report were printed in the May 16 issue of the *New York Times*. Nearly one-half of the quoted material is critical of—the Panthers! This, presumably, is to demonstrate the "impartiality" of the *Times* and the jury itself.

Nevertheless, a clear picture of the killings emerges from the report:

"At an absolute minimum the participating officers say that they were fired at from three to six times with shot guns, six times with pistols, and from one to three times by unidentified weapons—a total range of ten to fifteen shots. Only one bullet hole, one shell and one projectile—all associated with the blast through the living room door—can be identified ballistically as having been fired by the occupants."

The claim that this one shot was fired by Panthers, it should be noted, gives credence to the police version. Brenda Harris was originally accused of firing the shot. When it became clear that it would have been impossible for her to do this from her po-

sition in the apartment, the police changed their story and claimed that Mark Clark had fired the shot from behind the door, where he was killed. But as Les Evans noted last February:

"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 ballistic evidence does not prove that the Panthers fired even one shot. It shows only that one of the shots came from a weapon which the police say belonged to the Panthers, and the State's Attorney has admitted that he cannot prove such possession.

The grand jury report goes on to discuss the shooting done by the police:

"By contrast, the officers also testified to the shots which they fired in the apartment. This testimony, together with the physical evidence recovered, indicates that they fired from 82 to 99 total shots. Of these, the grand jury has received in evidence 55 projectiles and has accounted for 82 expended shells positively identified as having been fired in police weapons. Moreover, there are numerous bullet holes, marks and fragments in the walls and furniture that are consistent with this testimony." According to the *Washington Post*, at least some of these 82 to 99 shots were fired from a submachine gun.

The Chicago police laboratory, said the grand jury, had repeatedly made serious "errors" in its investigation, such as leaving behind at the scene 80 bullets and casings, and attributing to the Panthers shots which had actually been fired by the police.

And the internal investigation by the police department "was so seriously deficient that it suggests purposeful malfeasance." The report, according to the *Times*, said "policemen were

coached in advance the questions that would be put to them . . ."

But perhaps the most telling item in the report is the following revelation of who was behind the raid on the apartment:

". . . the initial information that the Black Panthers were thought to be stockpiling weapons in Chicago had come to the Chicago officials from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This disclosure was the first official substantiation of charges by black leaders that Federal officials had played a part in the investigation that led to a raid on the apartment and the fatal shooting. According to the grand jury, the two F. B. I. tips were routine transmittals of information from a 'confidential source.'"

The grand jury thus confirms the position of the Panthers that the raid was not an isolated incident, but part of a federally directed campaign which has resulted in the murder of twenty-eight Panthers in the last two years.

In brief, the grand jury report and the admissions of State's Attorney Hanrahan reveal the following sequence of events:

1. The FBI initiated the raid by giving Chicago police a report that the Panthers were stockpiling illegal weapons.

2. Chicago police without warning shot their way into the apartment, killing two Panthers and wounding four.

3. The police laboratory produced a report which gave a completely false picture of what had happened.

4. The police department investigation into the killings was conducted in a manner which indicated "purposeful malfeasance."

5. Hanrahan admitted that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate any of the charges against the Panthers, including the charge of illegal weapons which was the alleged reason for the raid.

The grand jury report, however, concludes on a still more incredible note. The jury refused to bring indictments against any of the officers responsible for the murders! The sole action taken has been the demotion of three officials responsible for the falsification of reports.

The jury "justified" its inaction on the grounds that the Panthers had refused to testify and therefore "no one has appeared before the grand



FRED HAMPTON

jury with a specific allegation of wrongdoing" by police.

The seven survivors of the attack, who could still be indicted by a state

grand jury, refused to testify on the grounds that the jury, which consisted of twenty-two whites and one black, was not a jury of their peers.

But the grand jury did not require "specific allegations" from the Panthers in order to bring indictments; the jury's report demonstrates quite clearly that Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were murdered in cold blood. If the police had succeeded in killing all the Panthers in the apartment, would the jury have refused to return indictments because there were no survivors to bring "specific allegations"?

It would be hard to imagine a more clear-cut case of murder, a case in which the evidence is less disputable. The inaction of the federal jury is thus a declaration to police everywhere that it is perfectly safe for them to shoot down black militants. That message has already been received and duly noted.

As Nicholas von Hoffman wrote after the news of the killings at Augusta and Jackson State: "The police in two Southern cities have emulated the Northern police; they've gotten the word the lid is off, and it's okay to shoot black people like they do up in Illinois."

Philippine Newsmen Face Death in Taiwan

The International Press Institute meeting in Hong Kong condemned the government of President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines May 18 for its "flagrant and high-handed action" in deporting two Philippine-born Chinese newsmen to Taiwan for criticizing the Philippine regime.

The brothers Quintin and Rizal Yuyitung, the publisher and editor respectively of the Manila daily *Chinese Commercial News*, were arrested on March 23. Secretary of Defense Juan Ponce Enrile charged them with "the commission of acts inimical to the government of the Republic of the Philippines." They were accused of acting as spokesmen for the Maoist regime in Peking and fomenting "armed revolution."

In the course of their trial it became clear that their real "crime" was expressing sympathy for the radical student movement.

In addition they were opposed by pro-Chiang Kai-shek elements in the Chinese community for advocating in their paper that Philippine-born Chinese integrate into Filipino society rather than remain an isolated community with its roots in Taiwan. A high official of the Taipei regime was sent to Manila to testify against them in their trial.

In their defense the Yuyitung brothers challenged the court's English translation of articles that had appeared in their paper. They denied any political agreement with Maoism.

On April 24, when it became clear that deportation to Taiwan was a real threat, Rizal Yuyitung renounced his Taiwanese citizenship. Quintin Yuyitung followed suit the next day, declaring in a statement to the press: "Under the circumstances, I'd rather be stateless than render allegiance to a government that would even go out of its way to fabricate charges to destroy me and my family. I therefore am letting it be known to all that I renounce my citizenship and allegiance to the Taipei government of the Republic of China."

Their case was still on appeal when they were seized by police early in the morning of May 5 and forcibly put on a plane to Taipei. They were arrested immediately on arrival in Taipei and face a possible death sentence. They are being held without bail on charges of "treason."

Said Ernesto O. Granada in the May 7 *Manila Chronicle*:

"What the Philippine government committed in the Yuyitung case was nothing less than premeditated and deliberate murder. . . .

"For whatever they did, in short, the Yuyitung brothers were condemned, apparently with President Marcos's approval to death. And for this, the Philippine government under President Marcos deserves the condemnation of the entire civilized world."

The Great Scramble for Roosts in the Dovecote

The outburst of public, particularly student, opposition to the invasion of Cambodia touched off quite a display of fireworks in the U.S. Congress.

The congressional criticism of the invasion has various causes. The most obvious was also the immediate one—the massive student strikes, the resulting furor in the communications media, and the deluge of mail from voters protesting escalation of the war. With elections coming up in the fall, congressmen had no choice but to show some kind of response.

Congress was caught in a most embarrassing position. Nixon took the plunge without even informing, let alone consulting, this august body.

When he testified at a session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee two days before the invasion, Secretary of State William Rogers made no mention of the administration's plans. A sharper demonstration could hardly have been asked for of the fact that the White House has usurped the war-making powers of Congress.

The commotion in Congress also reflected the split in the American ruling class over tactics in suppressing the Indochinese revolution and how much can be afforded in terms of domestic unrest in order to carry out that suppression.

Congressional opposition to the invasion of Cambodia has been expressed almost exclusively as support for one or both of two amendments to the Foreign Military Sales Act now before the Senate.

The amendment proposed by Republican John Sherman Cooper and Democrat Frank Church, which has the better chance of passage, would prohibit the president from using any funds after June 30 to "retain" American forces in Cambodia or to supply "advisers" or air support to the Cambodian military.

The Cooper-Church amendment does not prohibit Nixon from supplying air support for ground combat operations in Cambodia mounted by troops of the Saigon regime. In fact, it puts fewer restrictions on the president than Nixon has placed on himself in his public statements.

As a *New York Times* editorial put



CHURCH: Joint author of face-saving amendment now pending in Congress.

it, in arguing in favor of the Cooper-Church amendment: "The measure does not interfere with the military operations now under way. Nor does it bar any important actions in the future that the President himself has not already foreclosed. It does not prohibit limited arms aid to the Cambodian forces nor air interdiction of Communist supply lines through Cambodia to South Vietnam. Nor—despite some Congressional misgivings on this point—does it rule out future American air and logistical support to South Vietnamese units in Cambodia, although Mr. Nixon has pledged himself to halt the current support operations by June 30."

The Cooper-Church amendment thus amounts to a declaration that it is perfectly okay for Nixon to continue the assault on Cambodia until June 30, but that if he wants to do it again thereafter, he should tell Congress of his plans a little in advance.

The other amendment, offered by Democrat George McGovern and Republican Mark Hatfield, is in some respects even more innocuous than the Cooper-Church amendment. It would not cut off funds for Cambodian operations until thirty days after its passage—and there is a good chance that it will not even be considered by the Senate until Nixon's June 30 deadline has passed.

The remainder of the McGovern-Hatfield proposal, which is misleadingly labeled "The Amendment to End the War," is supposed to require the withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam and Laos by June 30, 1971.

The sponsors of the amendment have offered no reason why the Vietnamese, Laotian, and American people should undergo another year of the slaughter. But the fact of the matter is that even if it is passed, the "Amendment to End the War" will provide no guarantee of withdrawal by the specified date. As noted in the revolutionary-socialist weekly *The Militant*, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment has an escape clause which permits Congress to extend the time limit.

McGovern described the escape clause in these words on May 7: "A joint and specific declaration by the President and Congress can demonstrate the need for a specific, publicly recorded reason for an extension of time."

There is no need to go into the logic of how a congressional declaration can "demonstrate the need" for a "recorded reason." The point is that "The Amendment to End the War" is in reality an attempt to guarantee that the war can continue for at least one more year without widespread dissent being manifested outside of "safe" channels.

Senators like McGovern and Hatfield are clearly speaking for a section of the ruling class that believes the antiwar movement can be defused by a verbal concession. Even if the amendment fails to pass, the "doves" hope to achieve the same result by drawing the movement out of the streets and into lobbying for the amendment.

McGovern's suggestion to the anti-war movement is that instead of "throwing bricks, or blocking traffic, or cursing the system," it should "take a piece of paper and ask your fellow citizens to sign it in your neighborhood, at your club, in your office, at your school or college, in your church or labor hall, or elsewhere, pledging their support for the amendment to end the war and their willingness to urge their representatives and senators to vote for it."

This tactic is part of the larger strategy of drawing radicalizing sections of society, particularly the students, into the capitalist two-party system through the congressional election campaigns this fall.

The speechmaking and parliamentary maneuvering have another prime purpose. Confidence in the government has been badly shaken among millions of Americans. After getting rid of Johnson, they found themselves saddled with the Nixon replica of Johnson.

The disrepute of the White House will not easily be overcome by anything that Nixon will likely do.

But Congress shares in this low estimate inasmuch as it voted for the Tonkin resolution that legalized Johnson's escalation of the war in 1965, and it has supplied the funds to keep the war going. This body had come to resemble a rubber stamp, to be used as pleased by the president.

In the opinion of some, Congress could be more aptly compared to a doormat for the convenience of the White House.

The decline in confidence in both Congress and the White House is politically dangerous in the view of influential figures in the ruling class. Hence the need to do something.

The moves by certain congressional leaders to assert the constitutional powers of Congress against the White House aim at repairing the damage.

Of course individual ambitions of some of the congressmen are also involved. Looking ahead to 1972 and the fulfillment of Nixon's forecast that he may be only a one-term president, they are grooming themselves as aspirants for the succession.

This requires a dove image and considerable flapping of wings and ruffling of feathers as a "peace" candidate.

Greek Junta Stand Up for Nixon

Say Cambodia Invasion Was 'Simple Logic'

One of the few governments to be counted openly defending Nixon in his "hour of need," following his decision to escalate the war in Indochina, was the Greek military junta.

This, of course, is hardly surprising inasmuch as the Papadopoulos dictatorship would not last long without the backing of the White House. Just the same, the Greek colonels took their time about clicking heels and saluting. The invasion of Cambodia was announced April 30. They did not come to their boss's aid until ten days later.

Foreign Minister Panayiotis Pipinelis was given the unappetizing assignment, which he carried out at a press conference in Athens May 10.

Nixon's decision to invade Cambodia, he told the correspondents, is of "historic import." On top of this, it is "simple logic."

Moreover, the Americans were merely resorting to their right to pursue the enemy.

In defense of Nixon, Pipinelis criticized the European leaders who had opposed the move made by Washington in Indochina. These Europeans, said Pipinelis were motivated by low political considerations and interests.

The high-minded spokesman of the military junta then went on to speak of relations with Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania. Trade with Bulgaria had increased from 50 to 100 percent since 1964. It was hoped that "tourism" could now be stepped up.



PIPINELIS: Nixon's the one for him.

Pipinelis mentioned the "sincere sympathy" felt by his government toward Yugoslavia.

As for Albania, while official relations had not improved, some straws in the wind were worth noting. A high-jacked Greek plane had been returned last year; the Albanian press had stopped criticizing the Greek government; and some fugitives, who had managed to slip across the border secretly, had been delivered to the Greek police.

Yon Sosa, MR-13 Leader, Reported Slain

According to an unconfirmed report from an unnamed Mexican army spokesman, Marco Antonio Yon Sosa was killed May 18 in a battle with Mexican troops just north of the Guatemala-Mexico border. The army spokesman said that the battle erupted when Guatemalan guerrillas fired on a Mexican patrol.

Yon Sosa is commander in chief of the Guatemalan guerrilla organization Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre (MR-13). He has held that position since the founding of the MR-13 in December 1962.

A split in MR-13 occurred in 1965. One of the MR-13 leaders, Luis Turcios Lima,

formed the Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes (FAR—Rebel Armed Forces). He was killed in an automobile accident in 1966.

The two guerrilla organizations have sought to reunite their forces but negotiations proved inconclusive.

The MR-13 has insisted on the need for a socialist revolution in Guatemala. The FAR has emphasized the nationalist and anti-imperialist aspects of the struggle. In spite of their political differences, the two groups have cooperated in the military struggle against the dictatorship.

The MR-13 has not yet issued a statement confirming or denying the report of Yon Sosa's death.

Polls Give Labour Promising Lead Over Tories

By Joseph Hansen

In a television broadcast May 18, Harold Wilson explained why he thought the polls had recently registered a dramatic turn in favor of the Labour party after showing the Conservatives in the lead for the past three years.

"A large number of people are now feeling proud that Britain is strong and standing on her own feet," said the prime minister. He went on to boast that the country now has "one of the strongest balances of payments in the world."

A more likely reason for the shift in opinion was the Labour government's recent relaxation of its opposition to wage increases, a course designed to improve Wilson's public image.

This was part of Wilson's calculation that his chances would be better to gain another five years in office if he were to call an election sometime this year rather than next, when it would have automatically been required by law.

The Harris Poll, published April 22, gave Labour 46 percent of the votes, and the Conservatives 44.

The Gallup Poll on the same day still showed the Conservatives ahead, 47 percent to 42.5.

That a new trend had developed was confirmed by the Gallup Poll May 13 which gave Labour a clear lead of 7.5 percent.

Wilson based his decision to set the election for June 18, not on his record in office but on this shift in sentiment. The new mood, which may be only temporary, enables him to campaign for reelection without having to put up much of a defense of that record. "Britain's consummate politician," said the *New York Times*. (May 20.)

Since he took office in 1964, Wilson has served the British capitalist class as a most faithful labor lieutenant. He held down wages, increased unemployment, battled for new restrictive legislation, cut down social services, and backed up both Johnson and Nixon in their imperialist aggression in Indochina.

It was such crimes against the working class and against the professed so-



WILSON: Gambles on polls staying up.

cialist aims of the Labour party that led to the precipitous decline in popularity of Wilson's government. The fear that workers might abstain in the next election and permit the Conservatives to stage a comeback had a real basis in fact.

One of the consequences of Wilson's gross betrayal of the mandate given him by the British workers in 1964 was a strengthening of ultraleftism in the British left, especially among radicalizing students. As it became apparent that Wilson was preparing to call an election, debate broke out on whether it would not be a mistake to offer even critical support to the Labour party as against the Conservatives. The punitive cry, "Let them bleed," echoed this posture.

In the April 15 issue of *The Red Mole*, for instance, Robin Blackburn sought to establish a theoretical underpinning for this political opinion and convert it into a principle. He argued that the Labour party is a bourgeois party like the Democratic

party in the United States. This brought him, as consistency required, to advocate active opposition to both Labour and the Conservatives in the current election. "A plague o' both your houses!" Or as Blackburn put it in modern English: "We should disrupt the campaigns of the bourgeois parties and their leading spokesmen using all the imaginative and direct methods which the last few years have taught us."

From the Leninist point of view, this is a gross political error inasmuch as the revolutionary left in Britain has no alternative to the Labour party and its candidates to offer the workers at the present time either in the electoral or extraparliamentary arenas.

So long as the majority of British workers are affected by strong electoral illusions, revolutionists have no choice but to engage in battle in this field; i.e., to advance alternatives that can help shatter the illusions or eventually transcend them. The primary political challenge still remains within the Labour party itself—organization of an effective struggle against the dictatorial control exercised by the right wing.

Unfortunately, successive generations of British revolutionists have defaulted in this. The main sins, often seen in combination, have been sectarianism and the fantasy that the Labour party can be bypassed.

A more limited problem is mixed up in this—recruiting from radicalizing layers temporarily affected by ultraleftism. These layers find it repugnant to call on the workers to vote for the Labour party in view of Wilson's record.

But this is a subjective reaction. It can be overcome more quickly by stating this and by explaining why it is politically correct to condemn Wilson's record yet to campaign to keep Labour in power.

A Conservative victory would signify a setback for the working class and by that token for the cause of revolutionary socialism.

Yevtushenko's Poem to Allison Krause

[In the early 1960s, the Russian poet Yevgenii Yevtushenko expressed the enthusiasm of many of the new generation of Soviet youth for the authentic revolutionary spirit and freedom of the new Cuba. He expressed also the hatred of the young people in the Soviet Union for the lies and hypocrisy of Stalinism.]

[Yevtushenko has not been heard from much since the Soviet bureaucracy tightened the screws, abandoning its brief experiment in "liberalization." In fact, at the time the first Sino-Soviet border clashes were reported, this young poet sunk to the level of making apparently racist slurs against the Chinese people, comparing them to the Mongol conquerors of Russia.]

[But the outrage of the best of the young generation throughout the world against the new American aggression in Indochina appears to have revived Yevtushenko's better side—or at least induced the Kremlin to let him express it.]

[The following poem, addressed to one of the murdered Kent State students, was published in *Pravda* May 18. A partial translation appeared in the *New York Times* May 19. It is apparent from a comparison of the full poem with the excerpts printed in the *Times*, that this capitalist newspaper (which opposes the Vietnam war as "unwise") transformed a fervently revolutionary poem into a purely pacifist one by selective cutting.]

[In addition some of the *Times*'s translations are somewhat peculiar. The word "vstan'" ("arise"), which is the first word of the Russian version of the "Internationale," is translated "get up."]

[We are reprinting the *Times*'s version below, with some corrections of the translation, and have added the missing verses, placing these in italics.]

* * *

Anyone who loves flowers
is naturally not liked by bullets.
Bullets are jealous ladies
Can one expect kindness!
Nineteen-year-old Allison Krause,
You were killed because
You loved flowers
It was —
An expression of purest hopes
In the split second
when defenseless as the thin
pulse of conscience
You placed a flower
in the barrel of the guards-
man's rifle
And said:
"Flowers are better than
bullets."
Don't give a gift of flowers to a
state where truth is punished
The response of such a state is
cynical and cruel,
And that's what the response was
to you, Allison Krause
Bullets,

Pushing out the flower . . .
*Let all the apple trees of the world
no longer wear white
but a black mourning cloak*
O, how fragrant the lilacs are
But their fragrance cannot move you.
As the President said about you,
You are a "bum."
Every dead person is a bum,
But this is not his fault.
*You lie in the grass,
A caramel pressed behind your lips
You will wear no more new dresses
Buy no more new books.*
You were a student.
*You were studying the fine arts.
But there is another kind of art —
a bloody, gruesome genre
That hangman's art also, no doubt
has its geniuses.*
Who was Hitler?
*A cubist designer of avant garde
gas chambers*
*In the name of all the flowers
I curse your creations
architects of lies
maestros of murder
The mothers of the world whisper:
"O God, o, God . . ."*
*And the prophets fear
to scan the future
With a rock 'n roll rhythm in his bones
Death is dancing today in Vietnam,
Cambodia,*
*And what stage
will he find tomorrow!*
Rise up, girls of Tokyo,
Boys of Rome,
Gather flowers
against the evil enemy of all,
Blow together on all the dande-
lions of the world —
Oh what a great storm there will
be!
Flowers, gather for war!
Punish the oppressors
One tulip after another
Carnations in ranks
Burst forth in anger
From tidy gardens,
Stuff with earthy roots
the throats of all hypocrites,
You, the jasmine, clog
The propellers of minelayers,
You, the nettles, stick firmly to
the lenses covering up the gun-
sights
Arise lilies of the Ganges
And the Lotus of the Nile —
And block the props of airplanes
Pregnant with death of children.
*Roses, don't get puffed up, if we sell you
more dearly!*
*Touch softly the tender cheeks of girls —
but grow more serious, sharper thorns
to prick the bombardiers*
*Bullets, it is true, are harder than flowers
You cannot rise up against them with
flowers alone*
*Stamens are too delicate,
Petals, poor armor*



YEVTUSHENKO

*But Vietnamese girls — Allison's age —
taking up machine guns
That is the anger of the people
Armed flowers!
If even flowers rise up in rebellion,
It won't do to play hide and seek with
history
Young America
Tie up the hands of the killers
Mount
Mount
escalation of truth,
against the escalation of lies
trampling out the lives of men!
Close ranks, flowers, to war!
Defend the beautiful!
Flood the streets and country roads
with the tramp of a terrible army
marching in columns of humanity
and flowers
Allison murdered Allison Krause
Like the immortelle* of our era —
the protest of a well-armed flower!*

* The immortelle, which means "immortal girl," is a tropical flowering tree with great red blossoms. It is also called the "flame tree." — IP

Illiteracy Found High in U. S.

More than half the adults in the world's richest country may be functionally illiterate, a recent Harvard study indicates. The government estimate is 8.3 percent. But it is based only on the percentage of the U. S. population who finished fourth grade, without regard to whether fourth-grade reading skill was achieved or maintained. A study of disadvantaged adults in Chicago in 1967 showed that about half with a sixth-grade education or more were in effect illiterate, the *New York Times* reported May 20.

Black Power in Trinidad and Guyana

[The following article, entitled "Power to the People," is taken from the April issue of *Ratoon*, a left-wing Guyanese monthly. *Ratoon* is one of a number of new militant publications that have appeared in the Caribbean area in the past two years. It is critical of both the Burnham regime in Guyana and of the Cheddi Jagan opposition.]

* * *

A new generation is taking over Trinidad. Just as fifteen years ago it became clear there that the older generation of colonial politicians were giving way to the new 'doctors' (Williams and Capildeo) so recent events have revealed that another shift is taking place. What it will finally accomplish when the full power will pass, we cannot say—but the process has begun: and it is irreversible.

We are not saying that the 'generation shift' is the decisive or central factor; mere years are never basically significant! But every now and then the torch is taken up by a new generation *and it is carried in a different way along different roads*—and history is made.

This is what is happening in Trinidad. It is usually preceded by a few path-seekers who begin to search for the outlines of the new order before the bones of the old begin to whiten in the sun . . . in the case of the PNM [People's National Movement] by C. L. R. James, and Williams himself. This time there has been an added intensity to the process because *for the first time in the history of the West Indies* the intellectuals have had an institutional base—the University of the West Indies. They have not had to emigrate, and offer their challenging views of society from outside. And so added to the age old harbingers of history—the deprived and dispossessed masses—we now have a new catalyst, the students and some of the teachers of the University.

And, as Jamaica with the Walter Rodney affair and Trinidad with the present events have shown, it is an

explosive and dynamic combination. The Rodney protest died down quickly, although its ripples have helped to radicalise a whole generation of West Indians; but the Trinidad revolt has only begun. Here we have the crucible of the future. Let us take a closer look.

One of the first things that strike us is that the revolt has not been the child of any one man or group. There is, instead, a number of groups operating and organising in different areas of protest. The need for coordination has been partly satisfied by the National Joint Action Committee, one inclusive organisation. The old style political parties are conspicuous by their absence. The lines of the new politics become clearer. No more overnight party machine led by a local 'hero'. Instead, a blurring of lines and an overlapping of political, social and cultural activity and protest: a blending of different centres of activity on the field of protest leading to . . . what . . . a peoples assembly? . . . the creation of an area of social organisation, of power in the deepest sense, which the government cannot destroy or control? We in Guyana can only wait and see. We can also attempt to apply what we see to Guyanese reality. There are many things one can learn. . .

For instance, superficial observers have expressed surprise that a government which only a short while ago seemed very much in control of the old political game ('when will Eric call the next election?') should become, overnight, the indecisive and cautious object of popular wrath. Clearly, if the chain of West Indian oppression is as strong as its weakest link there is much to be done in a shorter time than we think, or events will overtake those who have themselves helped to bring them about.

Another interesting element is the remarkably instructive response of the governing elite. The old politicians, who hold power on the strength of the support of different racial groups, have united in a common attempt to maintain racial hostility and suspicion

at all costs in order to remain in power! At a time when the protest was clearly aimed at the presence of *white* economic power in Trinidad, the desperate attempts of Williams, Maraj and others to emphasise peripheral "destruction of *Indian* property" and whip up *Indian* suspicions and fears should be a lesson to us.

It is the old leaders who desperately try to drive the wedge of hostility between Africans and Indians deeper when their power is threatened, and it is the young movement that counteracts their efforts by extending the hand of brotherhood to the Indian workers, and demonstrates its sincerity by a long and moving march of solidarity. Proof once and for all that the old politicians, like their colonial predecessors, *are dependent for their very existence on the racial division of the people.*

In Guyana, this dependence is usually represented by the Burnham-Jagan syndrome. If the Africans were not afraid of the Jagan monolith, where would Burnham be? When the corruption of the new ruling elite and the effects of deepening American penetration and control, of widening inequality and deepening poverty and deprivation, when all of these lead to inevitable dissatisfaction amongst the groups most affected, where would the sleek, well-fed boys be—without Jagan to scare the senses out of their people? And *vice versa*. Where would Jagan hide his political bankruptcy and impotence were it not for the existence of a Burnham?

Like two well-heeled professional wrestlers, both know the rules of the game inside out. The excruciating howls of 'foul', the snarls of rage, the postures of despair or triumph, each has confidence in the other's ability to fake a good 'fight' to fleece the suckers who pay to see the show. Even the spectators are in on the game: most of them know perfectly well that it's all a sham—but after all, it's the only show in town . . . up to now.

In a way this interdependence of the racial leadership of both groups is only a reflection of a greater truth—the interdependence of the groups themselves. For whether developments in one group reach fruition depends on developments in the other. We can now see that in Trinidad, the success of the black revolt will depend to a

large extent on the response of the Indian workers. This is why the old parasites, the Marajs and the rest, play for all they are worth on the insecurity and suspicion of 'their' community ("they coming to take your jobs from you").

This is why the process of development and self-examination must take place in *both* groups . . . here as well as elsewhere. In Guyana, as all over the region there is a great groundswell of African self-examination and re-appraisal. The creation of a black consciousness and the rediscovery of black dignity. There is also the need for re-appraisal and self-examination among our Indo-Guyanese citizens for, whilst it is true that his greater cultural residue (indentureship did not destroy as much as slavery), and his links with the land help to give the Indian a greater sense of security, that is only the half of a complex truth.

For part of that same sense of security is culturally rooted in colonial values, in a sense of greater proximity, in certain ways, to the European value system, in the Aryan and caste-ridden prejudices of a conservative religion. There are already signs that this re-appraisal is beginning, and it is crucial that it should or we will once again reach a stage in the work of reconstruction and reform when the work of many years will come crashing down around us.

However it must take place in an atmosphere free from cant and double-talk. The events in Trinidad and the response of Guyanese to them have exposed the fact that much of what passes for 'black power' in Guyana is a mere excuse for the political supremacy of a new elite. Black dignity and black power, if they are to mean anything, cannot be achieved by rigged elections and shouts of 'we pon top'. One cannot achieve personal freedom by oppressing others. If Afro-Guyanese are serious about black power then the truth must be faced—other groups are just as entitled to a fair share. If "coalition of equality or partition" was a valid slogan when Jagan was in office, what makes it treason now?

Those who pretend that the Indian community does not exist or worse, that Burnham represents them as well! are not in favour of black power, but of black self-deception and black dis-

unity. But then they travel a vicious circle, for once they accept that 'black' includes both African and Indian, they have to pretend that the government represents both races, or look elsewhere for a solution. But to maintain this travesty of the truth they must attempt to commit an entire generation of African youth to evasion and double-think—a generation which, more than any other, rejects the hypocrisy of its elders. An impossible task!

One of the reasons that the movement in Trinidad is more advanced is that history has been kinder to them in this respect. They have to a large extent avoided the tragic series of developments which have deepened racial hostility and division in Guyana. They have not had to make the life-or-death choices that so many have had to make here or take positions so fraught with self-compromise and conflict.

The bitter harvest of the last ten years in Guyana, the actual *physical* separation of the racial groups has totally destroyed the possibility, if it ever existed, of playing it by ear, of the spontaneous invention of solutions to the tactical and strategic problems that are bound to arise.

One gets the impression that in Trinidad and Tobago the possibilities for inventiveness, for spontaneous response still exist: it is easier to recover from mistakes (for instance, the original intention to cut cane alongside the Indian workers, distorted by their enemies into an attempt to take work away from them, changed successfully to a march of solidarity). Let us not pretend that the path is as easy here.

The more the need, therefore, to define Black Power in such a way—in terms of programme and action—as to make it impossible for its real enemies to embrace it to death. Clearly attempts are already being made in Trinidad and Tobago to do precisely this. Williams' broadcast, the Archbishop's statements, and now Robinson's resignation all fall into this pattern: embrace the slogan and subtly try to rob it of revolutionary content. *Everyone* is now in favour of Black Power—provided it is 'reasonable' i.e. it only tinkers with the cultural, economic and social system.

In Guyana the slogan has already, to some extent, become the plaything

of the new elite. It is therefore the duty of those who believe that black power means more than merely putting a Tshombe or a Williams, a Duvalier, a Bird or a Gairy, a Shearer or a Burnham in office, to define Black Power with boldness and precision. It is their duty to attempt clearly and without evasiveness to outline the future pattern of relationships between Indians and Africans in the fields of politics, economic endeavour and cultural expression, on the basis of not accepting less for our fellow citizens than we demand for ourselves. The violent geographic separation of the major groups in many parts of the country makes this absolutely essential.

We might even find that such separation as there is can be turned to ultimate advantage. Too much nonsense is spoken about 'one nation, one people' and 'racial unity' without considering whether a theory based on indiscriminate mixing (an African live here, a Chinese next door, an Indian two doors down and a red man in between—a truly *Guyanese* neighbourhood, eh!) is not based on false pseudo-'modern' values. In any case, the time for such superficial doodling passed in 1962.

How to provide for radical change in a society which, in the pursuit of many of its serious functions (not dancing at the Pegasus or lining up for 'national honours') is already partitioned. The supporters of Black Power, Ascria and the left in the University have all seen one essential—you have to accept and provide for the need of each group to achieve its own cultural and economic dignity. The old 'melting pot' is not enough. The task is now to move on that assumption and define black power in terms of institutional change and social co-operation.

The programme must show *from the beginning* that it provides a new opportunity for economic and cultural emancipation for *every group*. This means you have to deal with sugar as well as bauxite, with the problem of land-holding in the countryside at the same time as that of property-holding in the city. And control by the *people who have poured their sweat and tears into bauxite and sugar*, not by a bureaucratic elite in Georgetown.

In other words, the government must

take a chance on national survival by giving the people of each group a positive role in the areas in which they have sacrificed themselves for generations. *Power to the people*, not to the ruling elite. This means local government—local government of a depth, breadth and power that we have never seen before. It means the extension of co-operatives into fields that the present ruling elite would shiver to contemplate! It means national control of all our major financial institutions, not one bank struggling to compete with the imperial giants (note that the move is made by Williams as well).

More than this, it means creating an entirely new political game, in which

the old parliamentary game of winner take all is thrown out the window, and a few extra heads (real or imaginary) don't give you the right to lord it over everyone else.

Above all, we can learn from both 1970 (Trinidad) and 1953 (Guyana) that one must simultaneously attack in areas where both the major race groups have an interest—in the cities and on the estates. In other words, a situation in which developments take place in one group or area while the other remains aloof and quiescent is a sure recipe for disaster. It gives the powers that be time to play one group against the other . . . and have no fear, they will have no compunction in playing on Indian fears to

corner their own revolting 'supporters.'

This is why the Williams-Capildeo and Burnham-Jagan syndrome must be seen for what they are, two branches of the same tree, to be dealt with together by going for the roots. This is what our brothers in Trinidad have begun to do. Will their wave subside before it rises again, or will it sweep everything before it? *We* cannot say from here. All we can do is pledge our absolute and unshakable solidarity with our brothers, learn from them as we place the benefit of our tragic experiences in their hands, and work with renewed vigour and hope to break *this* link in the chain that runs throughout the region.

Greece

Voices Cry Out in Anguish from Korydallos Prison

[We have translated the following appeal from the April issue of *Ergatike Pale* (Workers Struggle), the organ of the Kommounistiko Diethnistiko Komma tes Ellados—Internationalist Communist party of Greece, the Greek section of the Fourth International). Like all socialist journals in Greece, *Ergatike Pale* must be published and distributed clandestinely.]

* * *

Brother and Sister Workers,

We speak to you from behind prison bars and the barbed wire of concentration camps, from the dark dungeons of the secret police. We speak to you to tell you the truth, to appeal for your class solidarity.

Three years have passed since the junta, the tool of the imperialist monopolies and the native plutocracy, chained the working class of our country, dissolved the workers and popular organizations and parties, banned the workers' press, abolished all conception of trade-union or political freedom.

For three whole years the workers, the poor farmers, and the small working artisans have experienced the most savage exploitation. The thousands of unemployed and underemployed are multiplying every day. Every day the buying power of wages and sal-

aries declines. On-the-job accidents have exceeded all previous records. Safety standards are threatened with obliteration. The prices of agricultural products are getting more and more exorbitant. The taxes on the popular masses are increasingly heavy while the plutocrats are raking in their profits. Terror, arrests, tortures, trials, and severe sentences of worker and popular fighters are continually increasing. That, in brief, is the "true democracy" that the military dictators imposed on the Greek people with tanks.

We speak to you from the jails and the concentration camps to expose the lies and the deception of the militarist scribbler "theoreticians" of the dictatorship. We have been imprisoned for three years because we raised our voices against the tanks, against the barbarous oppression by the monopolies and the military dictators. Because we supported the democratic and trade-union rights of the working masses. Because we fought to overthrow the military tyranny and to restore trade-union and political liberties. Because we fought for the abolition of all antiworker and anti-popular laws, both new and old, for freedom of action by all the workers parties, organizations, unions, and farmers and students associations. For free circulation of the workers' press. For turning over the funds of insur-

ance plans to those insured. For increasing wages and salaries to a level that would meet the needs of the people.

We fought for limiting and finally eliminating all exploitation and oppression, for dismantling the capitalist system, which in the epoch of its death agony brings only unemployment, hunger, military dictatorships, and wars.

Among the thousands exiled and the hundreds imprisoned are the vanguard worker militants, the members and cadres of the unions dissolved by the junta. They are being tortured inhumanly. Their hands and feet are broken. Their finger nails are torn out. They have been given the severest sentences.

Thousands of union cadres have been persecuted and hunted, moreover, since the first day of the military coup, or are dragged every day into the police stations and beaten. The military dictators are dealing savage blows to all the unions (more than 1,000 of them) that are not under the control of the various "business union" cliques which, since the war, have held the credentials of the GSEE [Genike Synomospondia Ergaton Ellados—General Federation of Workers of Greece] and the major workers' federations and confederations in the country. The junta is striking out

against all the unions not openly and exclusively supported by the industrialists and the police and state apparatus.

The central aim of the junta can only be to attack and break up the organized workers movement. That was the purpose of the new constitution and the innumerable antiworker and antipopular laws the colonels have formulated. Only in this way can they now, and they hope in the future, provide willing labor power to the various Tom Pappases, Onassises, and Niarchoses.

The so-called Panergatiko Synedrio [All-Worker Congress], which the organs of the junta are preparing for April 8, 1970, has exactly the same aim.

The junta's promised "restoration of the health of the unions" is a sweet-sounding slogan designed to cover up their attempt to refurbish the capitalist "business union" apparatus. In place of the old and well-known arch "merchants of labor" (Markes, Theodorou, etc.), who have infested the workers organizations since 1947, the colonels are trying to set up less notorious figures more devoted to their police-state apparatus.

All the "gentlemen" who gather in April in Delphos and elsewhere have nothing in common with the working class and their problems. They are open enemies of the workers. Any "differences" among these opportunists can be nothing more than squabbles among various cliques over the juiciest positions.

We denounce this council of the hired stooges of the capitalist class to the workers of the entire world. Real working-class unionism in Greece has been driven deeply underground and is being savagely persecuted by the military dictators. Those of its cadres not confined in prisons and on desert islands are struggling clandestinely and organizing the working class against the military tyranny and the imperialist monopolies.

Brother and sister workers, young vanguard fighters of the entire world: We appeal to you to extend us your fraternal, class assistance. Despite all its illustrious struggles, the workers movement of our country is passing through difficult times. The opportunist policy of its traitor leadership has disoriented and fragmented the workers movement. For three years now under the military tyranny, the unor-

ganized working class has suffered heavy blows.

In these difficult conditions the heroic workers vanguard is fighting to open up the road forward, fighting to forge a new revolutionary leadership. This struggle cannot be victorious without your fraternal class solidarity, without a mobilization of the world, and especially the European proletariat, against the military tyranny, against capitalist exploitation and oppression.

We call on all workers and all the exploited and oppressed people of the world to display their hatred of the military dictators in every way, to struggle shoulder to shoulder with us,

Ceylon

CMU May Day Resolution

[The resolution printed below was adopted at the May Day rally of the Ceylon Mercantile Union in Colombo. It was submitted to the rally by Bala Tampoe, General Secretary of the union and Secretary of the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary), the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

1. This May Day meeting of the Ceylon Mercantile Union extends fraternal greetings to all workers' organizations and other organizations of the peoples of the world, who are struggling against capitalist and other forms of exploitation and oppression, or who are striving for the establishment of socialist democracies in those countries where capitalist rule has been overthrown.

This May Day meeting at the same time salutes the glorious memory of Comrade V. I. Lenin on this May Day, which falls soon after his birth centenary, and endorses the revolutionary principles he advocated and applied.

2. This May Day meeting of the Ceylon Mercantile Union salutes and declares its complete solidarity with all sections of the Vietnamese people who are continuing their heroic struggle against the armed forces of American imperialism and its allies in Vietnam, and denounces the continuing occupation of that country and the cynical destruction of human life as well as animal and plant life in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia by the American imperialists, in their efforts to subjugate the peoples of Asia completely to imperialist exploitation.

3. This May Day meeting of the Ceylon Mercantile Union condemns the Government of Ceylon for its repeated and continuing attacks on mass living standards and democratic rights and, in particular,

with strikes and demonstrations, to overthrow the dictatorship in Greece, for full exercise of the abolished democratic and trade-union freedoms, to defeat the imperialist plans to transform Greece and the entire world into one vast concentration camp. Victory will be ours. The imperialist monster will be destroyed.

Long live the world working class!

Long live the international class solidarity of the workers of the entire world!

Long Live Socialism!

Signed: A Group of Unionists.

April 2.

Korydallos Prison, Piraeus.

(i) for its deliberate failure to take any action up to now to reinstate the interdicted and dismissed union leaders and activists in the Ceylon Fisheries Corporation and in the Ceylon Broadcasting Corporation and to restore the democratic rights of the unionized workers in the two Corporations despite the written representations made to the Prime Minister in that behalf nearly two months ago,

(ii) for its deliberate connivance in the dismissal of employees in the Ceylon Fisheries Corporation and the Ceylon Broadcasting Corporation, the Overseas Telecommunication Service and at Lanka Sala Sala Ltd., merely because of their exercise of their trade union rights during their periods of probation,

(iii) for its deliberate failure to introduce any legislation for the protection of workers against unjustified dismissals and arbitrary suspensions or victimization in various ways for their trade union activities, and its preparations instead to introduce completely reactionary changes in the existing laws pertaining to trade unions and industrial disputes, to shackle the trade union movement in accordance with the insistent demands of foreign and local capitalist vested interests,

and calls upon all working class and other mass organizations to unite their forces to defend the living standards and democratic rights of all sections of the people in the coming period and to resist the reactionary attacks that are already taking place.

Poisonous Tar in Seafood

The small saury fish eats shellfish that eat bacteria growing on lumps of oil tar polluting the Atlantic Ocean. Larger fish eat the saury. Biologists assume poisonous tar is now pervading the marine chain of life.

Varga's Secret Testament Condemning Stalinism

[When the Soviet economist Evgenii Varga died in October 1964, he left behind a political testament which has reportedly been circulating clandestinely in the USSR. In March 1970 this testament was published by the Viennese monthly *Wiener Tagebuch*. Since the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, this magazine, which is controlled by intellectuals in and around the Austrian Communist party, has become a forum for dissident CPers critical of the Kremlin.

[The *Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* (1951) gives the following facts about Varga. He was appointed People's Commissar of Finance in revolutionary Hungary in 1919, later becoming chairman of the Hungarian Supreme Soviet of the National Economy. When the revolutionary government was overthrown, he fled to the Soviet Union.

[Varga wrote a book called *Problems of Economic Policy Under the Proletarian Dictatorship* that was attacked by Lenin. From 1925 to 1947 he was director of the Institute of World Economics and World Politics attached to the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

["In his work *Novye Iavleniia v Ekonomicheskom Kri-sise* (New Phenomena in the Economic Crisis) published in 1934," the *Entsiklopediia* wrote, "V. gave an analysis of the development of the crisis of 1928-33, basing himself on the historical positions of J.V. Stalin's report to the Seventeenth Congress of the VKP(b)."]*

[Following the war, Varga ran afoul of the party line, however. The *Entsiklopediia* writes: "In many of V.'s works, especially after the second world war (on how the war affected the capitalist economy, etc.) serious mistakes were made of a bourgeois reformist type." In 1949 Varga made the appropriate self-criticism, the *Entsiklopediia* points out.

[In its introduction to the testament *Wiener Tagebuch* notes only that "in the interwar period, Evgenii Varga was the most important economist of the Communist International." The text of the testament translated below indicates that Varga shared many of the viewpoints of the bureaucracy represented by Stalin. However, unlike the later generations of bureaucrats, he appears to have retained a certain scientific and political honesty.]

* * *

Where are the deeper causes to be found for the fact that in the years after Lenin's death the Russian working masses—which had been swept along by the Communist party onto a special path of transition to socialism unforeseen by Marxism—were so rapidly subjected to the unlimited power of the bureaucratic party tops? Where should we seek the causes of the fact that the organizational principle of our society, the democratic centralism provided for in the rules of the RKP(b) [Rossiiskaia Kom-

munisticheskaia Partiiia (bolshevikov)—Russian Communist party (Bolsheviks)], was not carried forward?

Why did the centralism of the party leadership swallow up democracy and retain only its external, purely formal, appearance? The roots of this development lie "in the Russian road of transition to socialism," which arose from the revolutionary situation of 1917.

A gigantic, economically backward country, the overwhelming majority of whose population were peasants and petty-bourgeois layers, overthrew its old ruler because of his degeneration and incompetence which had brought on a state of economic ruin. In the ensuing development, this country faced incredible difficulties. In order to rapidly reconstruct the economy and build it up, in order to overcome the resistance of the reactionary village bourgeoisie, in order to hold out alone, surrounded by strong and threatening capitalist countries, a gigantic centralized and organized exertion was necessary, as well as enormous material resources.

The short intervals of time in which economic development had to be realized, in which the nation, confronted with an extraordinary heightening of international tensions, had to save itself from collapse, required an organization so centralized that it wholly excluded a long process of educating for socialist democracy, as well as "a gradual 'growing over' of the Kulaks into socialism." In this respect Stalin was right when he revised Lenin's and Bukharin's plans and rapidly did away with NEP. But precisely this course favored rapid emergence of a party and state hierarchy, which in all its measures was very harsh and cruel.

This was, however, only the unavoidable system of the levers of centralized, administrative leadership. Yet it was necessary not only to lead but also to build up the economy of the country. The reconstruction of industry, the creation of an army, an apparatus, and the rest required very great resources. Still greater resources were required for the transformation of agriculture and the creation of a great many new branches of industry and new economic institutions.

Since it was impossible to get loans from abroad, these resources had to be squeezed out of the labor of the population, and not only through domestic loans but, above all, by direct exploitation of the labor of the workers, peasants, and white-collar workers.

If the development of capitalism required a phase of "primitive accumulation," then in the development of socialism in a devastated backward country there was a corresponding phase. Here the law of the appropriation of surplus value by the state operated directly in industry.

In his pamphlet, *The Economic Bases of Communism*, Stalin was wrong in asserting that under the conditions of communism the category of value ceases to exist. By "value" he understood "exchange value" realized on the market. In reality, in whatever form it is manifested, the value of a product is always measured by the amount of labor power required to produce it. Value represents

* Vsesoiuznaia Kommunisticheskaia Partiiia (bol'shevikov) — All-Union Communist party (Bolsheviks).

an absolutely objective relationship between labor and its material product.

Hence value can never disappear. All productive labor creates a product whose value exceeds the costs necessary to compensate the worker for the reproduction of his labor power. The entire problem lies in the question of who retains the surplus value, the big private entrepreneurs, or the socialist state.

The centralized party-bureaucratic state realizes the value of products through its state trading. It appropriates the surplus value created by the labor of the working people and uses it to meet its needs—that is, essentially for building up and developing the nationalized economy and thus for increasing the privileges of the bureaucratic party tops.

In state trading the highest possible prices are established, often representing many times the state's real outlay to cover the labor performed in producing the commodity. The workers receive the lowest possible wage that under existing costs will enable them just barely to make ends meet. This degrades the workers morally and causes them often to seek supplementary means of making a living by taking extra jobs or even violating the law.

In contrast to this insecurity or bare security of the broadest masses stands the excessive remuneration of certain layers—the highest party and state bureaucrats, including military officers as well as the successful fraction of scientists and artists.

In agriculture things are still worse. In principle the agricultural collectives are supposed to have full sovereignty over their productive forces, the land, the stores, machinery, and draft animals, and thus over all the products of their labor, which they sell to the state on the basis of free agreement and mutual advantage. They are also supposed to be free to govern themselves, electing their leaders and organizers.

In reality, from the first steps in organizing the kolkhozes, the Stalinist leadership subjected them to arbitrary control from above. The collective farms rotated crops according to plans "promulgated" by the agricultural departments of the executive committee; they were led by chairmen named by the *raion* committees. And the collective farms were forced to deliver produce to the state in the quantities it needed and at the prices that suited it. Often the required deliveries were so great that they exceeded the possibilities of the collective farm. As a result the remuneration of labor was very small, often quite miniscule.

Both in industry and in agriculture, conditions stood in crying contradiction to the ideal of communism and to the party program. And very quickly the bureaucratic tops resorted to concealing the real situation and the economic processes that were developing in the country from the population, from the workers in the towns and on the land. Too a still higher degree the economy of the USSR was kept secret from world public opinion and opponents in bourgeois circles, but also from sympathetic observers among the workers in the advanced countries.

Since, however, economics is one of the essential elements of Marxism, it was impossible not to talk and write about it. Thus we very quickly became accustomed to viewing economy as the development of the productive forces of the country. Economy was called construction, the opening of new mines, enterprises, factories, electrical stations, railroads, etc.; plus the work in them. Economy in the

real sense of the word was a "book sealed with seven seals."

The denial of information on the economy to the great mass of the population, and the irresponsibility and uncontrolled nature of all the economic measures of the regime resulting from this, were the essential basis and starting point for the rapid bureaucratization of the state itself, its transformation into a party-bureaucratic hierarchy, isolated from the masses and raised above them. It was precisely this concealment of the economic facts that created the sharp contrast between the extreme poverty of the workers and the extreme prosperity of the bureaucratic party tops, permitting all kinds of abuses in this area.

.. the theoretical basis of socialism, "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work," had therefore long been distorted in practice. The work of ordinary workers was valued too low, even if they developed outstanding capacities and did their jobs well. The labor of the men on the "list of appointments," however, was valued too high, indeed often outrageously high, even if they demonstrated no special abilities and even if they harmed the progress of the work by their arrogance and bureaucratic procedure. All this unquestionably represents inner contradictions in the life of our society.

Are these contradictions based on the exploitation of the broad masses of the workers by the ruling strata of the society? Of course, the functionaries on the "list" and their families live extremely well since by means of secret decrees they appropriate a certain portion of the value of the national product produced by the labor of the ordinary workers, collective farmers, and white-collar workers. And if these poor people come in contact with facts that reveal the extreme prosperity of the ruling strata, they naturally feel envy, hatred, and contempt, which are characteristic of class divisions.

The party bureaucrat has long been a well-developed type—with a well-fed look, manners crudely calculated to impress, and despotic, intimidating habits. It does not follow from all this by any means that all leading party workers are like this. There are not a few among them who exploit their privileges in moderation and if possible with discretion. But unfortunately there are all too many party "potentates" and satraps.

.. the further they are from Moscow, especially heading in a southeast direction, the more unbridled their lust for power. They have forgotten even the thought of Lenin's simplicity and democratic manner, and the reminders of these in anniversary articles and speeches do not make the slightest impression on them.

But the particularly dangerous aspect in the activity of the bureaucratic party tops is not their inclination to personal abuses of power but their universal incapacity to administer the state properly. Precisely because of their bureaucratic nature, the party circles demonstrate ever increasing sluggishness and conservatism in their work, a striving to hold on to the established forms of life, a fear of any decisive change in the existing social relations and the principles of leadership.

The overwhelming majority of the "Soviet" bureaucrats would rather follow the letter of the law, the accustomed methods and processes of preparing and deciding measures, than proceed from the standpoint of the interests

of efficiency, consideration for the public welfare and the benefit of the state, or the welfare of the working masses.

The party bureaucrats occupy themselves with building paper empires, oppose all organizational innovation, block the most valuable technological advances, and impede an international exchange of scientific experience. They often even support the proponents of outworn theories and pillory progressive scientists, as was the case for years in the field of biology.

The society, the state, and the entire population of the country have often paid very dearly for all of this. These bureaucratic procedures have very frequently damaged the international reputation of the USSR. The clearest example of this bureaucratic muddling was the criminal carelessness of the Stalin leadership's preparations for the war, which inflicted fearful losses on the country and in the first year of the war brought defeats. And there are no forces which could eliminate this disastrous sluggishness and conservatism on the part of the ruling circles.

But what expression does this social structure of Soviet society find in political relationships, in intellectual and moral life? The dictatorship of the proletariat, for which Marx and Lenin provided the theoretical basis, was very quickly transformed into a dictatorship of the bureaucratic party tops.

The party bureaucracy with its "list of appointments hierarchy" rules the country not through the soviets but through the party institutions—the Central Committee, the Obkoms (Oblast' committees), district committees, raion committees, and their departments. All these state institutions are called "Soviet" and are considered such.

However, the power these bodies exercise is "Soviet power" only because the persons who head them, the representatives of the bureaucratic party tops, are simultaneously deputies to the soviets, which were elected by the entire population in "direct, secret, uniform" elections. All of these persons, however, were not in fact chosen by the people, not by the social organizations of the people, not by the public opinion of the workers. They were appointed to these posts behind closed doors through party bureaucratic channels.

However, not only members of the party bureaucracy come into the soviets. Other deputies are also placed here by the leadership of the party bureaucracy because of some contribution they have made to society or as a result of their talent for blind obedience to the regime.

There are such deputies in the various departments of the executive committee and they participate in the discussion of some problems. But these problems have often been raised beforehand in the departments of the Ispolkom [Executive Committee] by the leadership of the party bureaucracy, often even by the highest circles of the leadership, and have already been decided.

Neither on their own initiative, nor on the basis of the considerations of others, can the ordinary deputies do anything here. Their essential function lies in maintaining contact with the population, in receiving requests and complaints, primarily of a personal nature, and in supporting these petitions against bureaucratic power. In this they are not always successful.

The same must be said of the deputies who are elected to the Supreme Soviet and take part in its sessions. They attend the sessions and often give reports on problems which have already been taken up and decided by party

circles. Their job is still only to "support" the regime and to adapt the language of its decisions to the needs of its territorial or professional areas. As a result the election of deputies becomes only an empty form robbed of all content, a parody of Soviet democracy. The people elect persons who have already been chosen by the party; they elect candidates confined to a single slate. The people understand this. But although they perceive this fact they still participate dutifully in elections, in order to fulfill their civic duty, without the slightest interest in the results.

"Soviet power" exists in our country then in the sense that the party tops rule in the name of soviets whose members are chosen arbitrarily. Not only all nonparty citizens but, at bottom, also ordinary party members have no political rights. Political differences of opinion and, above all, political struggle are considered inadmissible and suppressed by the harshest and crudest repressive measures. As the writer A. Yashin correctly said, all party members have long since been converted into political "levers."

It does not, however, follow from this that there is no struggle involved in political decision-making. Such struggle does take place but it proceeds in secret inside the party and state organizations. The working masses are entirely left out of it. They learn of its outcome from the publication of decisions already made or from rumors which may turn out to be false or be deliberately spread by one or another circle, often enemy circles. In other words, there is no democracy in the political life of the country. Like the operation of the economy, if not more so, political affairs are secret.

The system of party-bureaucratic centralism, on which the life of the Soviet society is based, has necessarily had its ideological reflection. The ideology of a prevailing order is always created to justify the society by idealizing its positive side and covering up its negative side. In the Soviet state, ideology is produced and propagated only by tops of the party bureaucracy, who rule the country with dictatorial methods on the basis of concealing the economic and political relations. They also spread this ideology among the people.

Ideological centralism is dominant in the country. Only one ideology prevails, which excludes or suppresses all others. The entire press and censorship system are strictly subordinated to the party and are in the hands of the state. Freedom of assembly and expression belong only to the party and state and are regulated only from above; in the society there is not even a trace of freedom of opinion.

As a result, the dominant ideology lacks the elements of study and criticism. Only individual facts and personalities are to be criticized, and even then they do not occupy high positions. It is forbidden under threat of heavy penalties to criticize the foundations of the existing social order, the principles of its political organization, and the leadership of the society. Since there is no free discussion in the society, there is also none in the party. The times of political debate in the twenties seem absolutely fantastic.

This dogmatized ideology is presented day in and out to the masses in the press and in the public statements of the leadership and to the youth in the universities and in the system of party education. Very politically naïve and inexperienced people naturally have blind faith in this

ideology, and the ideology itself promotes the development of such naïveté and inexperience. Many people, moreover, primarily party members, try to convince themselves of it in order to remain faithful to their duty to the party and their work.

In many persons, however, all this ideological propaganda inevitably produces indifference, intellectual emptiness, and often even leads to cynicism. For a long time now all genuine social ideas have been disappearing in the country, offering a fertile ground for all kinds of foreign influences and fads that are often completely absurd. All this not only fails to increase the inner strength of the existing society but diminishes it.

The new materialistic morality is not being developed theoretically; it is not being justified either from the philosophic or historic standpoint. It flows from the proclamation of abstract dogmatic slogans which are incapable of making any strong or profound impression on men's thinking. Furthermore, the material relationships in Soviet society often promote immoral episodes and dealings.

Moreover, the excessive material welfare of the tops of the party bureaucracy produces not only self-satisfaction and arrogance in those "on the list" and especially in their families but very often leads to demoralization. This excessive gratification impels these elements, in order to reach a still higher level of enjoyment, to appropriate and squander state property; it encourages them to seek gratification of their passions, which often drives them to crime.

The representatives of this youth, accustomed to exceptional prosperity, have even gotten the name in the press of "toadstools." They are often the subject of comment in the press, often sentenced to jail terms, but this does not change the situation.

On the other hand, the inadequate satisfaction of the needs of the workers in the cities and the countryside often drives them to raise their standard of living through theft and to moral degeneration, which is expressed in drunkenness, mistreatment of women and children, in domestic gossip, shirking work, rowdiness, and often in senseless crimes.

In a better position, it might seem, are the middle layers of the Soviet population, which do not exactly have a very high living standard but which still earn enough to lead for them and their families to a normal life. But it is precisely in the moral consciousness of these middle strata that a negative aspect of Soviet life reveals itself clearly and distinctly, that is, the lack of real democratic content and the active civic interest this would create. The lack of such concern results in members of Soviet society seeking satisfaction in personal, private family life, and in a petty-bourgeois existence.

Aside from his professional affairs, the ordinary Soviet citizen thinks mainly about acquiring personal property, a good apartment, a dacha with a garden, a television set, clothing, etc. For this purpose he saves money and boasts about it in front of his relatives and neighbors. These types are in the true sense of the word representatives of the Soviet petty bourgeoisie.

Soviet citizens in general have absolutely no notion of real socialist democracy and the collective moral relationships arising from it.

This is the negative side of the social life of a people that was the first to begin the transition to socialism in

the Russian way and is still continuing on this road after half a century.

All these negative features arose in the period of Stalin's leadership, which lasted about thirty years. Stalin died in 1953 and after his death seemingly impressive changes occurred in Soviet society. Legality was restored, completely innocent persons ceased to be declared "enemies of the people," arrested, tried in secret, executed, exiled, and confined in concentration camps.

However, did this change the structure of our society? The reply must be "no." Now as before the power is in the hands of the tops of the party bureaucracy. Now as before the political relationships are concealed from the working masses. Neither the unions nor any other organizations have any part in administering production. Now as before the workers mechanically vote in elections for deputies to the soviets already chosen in advance. And now as before ministers and chairmen of executive and plant committees named by the Central Committee and regional party committees rule in the name of the soviets.

Now as before there is a stark contrast between the excessive material well-being of the ruling tops and the extremely low wages of the majority of the workers, clerks, and collective farmers. Now as before this leads to many crimes.

Now as before the consciousness of society is dominated by the ideology grafted on from above and essentially unexamined. And all this is still producing social immorality. Soviet citizens still enjoy no real democratic education. The docile submit to the instructions of the highest authority and live their petty private lives as workers or clerks.

This failure to change the principles of governing our country has its domestic and foreign causes. The first lie essentially in the fact that the tops of the party bureaucracy, installed and trained by Stalin, consider it impossible to renounce their unlimited, uncontrolled, and irresponsible personal power, or the concealment of their political and economic measures, or their legal and material privileges. They have become accustomed to all that and so do not understand, or pretend not to understand, that all that is in fundamental contradiction to real socialist democracy.

Characteristic in this regard is the fact that Khrushchev's attempts to at least partially limit the affluence of his collaborators on the "list" led to no substantial results. They simply did not permit him to do it.

An external cause for the maintenance of these principles of government is the appearance of a new, mighty, and very aggressive power in the forefront of the capitalist world, the USA. That has forced the government of the USSR to make enormous expenditures for defense and to maintain its harsh political regime in the country, economic and political secrecy, and its unlimited power.

In order to change the existing situation, a radical turn is necessary at the top. It is impossible to wait for any initiative from below. The working masses are so used to obedience that they are incapable of compelling the ruling circles to take up the tasks which Lenin posed for Soviet society in the last years of his life.

Communism means not only the growth of the productive forces, the productivity of labor, and material culture. Communism is above all the total triumph of

socialist democracy and free civic activity of the masses, resting on the self-government of the workers in all areas of life. As long as the task is not begun of gradually and consciously eliminating the serious distortions of socialist

democracy that are an essential feature of the present order in the USSR, it will not be possible to achieve communism in this country, not in twenty and not in a hundred years.

Latest in Mao Tsetung Thought

A New Convert to the Theory of 'State Capitalism'

By Les Evans

While Nixon escalated the Vietnam war, relations between China and the Soviet Union took another turn for the worse. The latest interchange was initiated by Peking in a lengthy article "Leninism or Social-Imperialism?" published April 22 on the centenary of Lenin's birth. It was billed as a joint production of the editorial departments of the Peking *People's Daily*; *Red Flag*, the organ of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist party; and the *Liberation Army Daily*. The article attacked Soviet party chief Leonid Brezhnev as a "new Hitler" and accused the Kremlin of "working against time . . . to plot wars of aggression."

Three days later on April 25 the Soviet radio broadcast a statement in Chinese accusing Mao Tsetung of complicity in the deaths of his first wife and his son, and of having had "an open love affair with an actress in front of his [second] wife."

"Leninism or Social-Imperialism?" was published in English in the April 22 Hsinhua Daily News Release; was issued as a special supplement to the weekly *Hsinhua Selected News Items*; was the feature article in the April 24 issue of *Peking Review*; and, according to an April 27 Hsinhua dispatch, has already been issued as a book.

The Chinese document accuses the Kremlin of "plotting to unleash a blitzkrieg of the Hitler type" and of having "taken over Khrushchev's military strategic principle of nuclear blackmail . . ."

The Soviet reply, in its crude personal attacks on Mao and its refusal to even deny any of the specific charges leveled by Peking, lends credence to the Maoist case.

But "Leninism or Social-Imperialism?" is more than a reaction to the immediate conjuncture. It is the most serious attempt to date by the Maoist ideologues to codify their "line" on the nature of the Kremlin regime and to adduce plausible arguments for their claim that capitalism has been restored in the Soviet Union. For the first time the Maoists publicly state when, by whom, and by what means capitalism was allegedly restored to power in the Soviet Union:

"Being the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviet Union lacked experience in consolidating this dictatorship and preventing the restoration of capitalism. In these circumstances and after Stalin's death, Khrushchov, a capitalist roader in power hiding in the Soviet Communist Party, came out with a surprise attack in his 'secret report' viciously slandering Stalin and by every kind of treacherous manoeuvre usurped Party and government power in the Soviet Union. This was a counter-revolutionary coup d'etat which turned the dictatorship

of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and which overthrew socialism and restored capitalism."

This is a remarkable thesis indeed. Khrushchev was able to carry out a counterrevolutionary restoration of capitalism thirty-nine years after the October revolution — by making a speech! The overturn was accomplished without a shot being fired, without a piece of property changing hands, without even a change in government personnel. The only armed struggle, in fact, that broke out in the Soviet bloc in 1956 was the attempted Hungarian political revolution in October, eight months after Khrushchev's "coup."

But Mao had evidently not yet learned in 1956 how to tell one social class from another, because when the "capitalist" Soviet Union sent troops to crush the Hungarian workers' uprising, Peking stood solidly on the side of "capitalist roader" Khrushchev.

The new Maoist theses also attempt to answer the objection that the label "capitalist," first publicly applied to the Soviet Union in 1967, fails to explain the fact that there is no Russian capitalist class — all basic industry remains nationalized and the state monopoly of foreign trade remains in force.

"Since the Soviet revisionist renegade clique usurped Party and government power in the Soviet Union," the editorial explains, "the Soviet bourgeois privileged stratum has greatly expanded its political and economic power and has occupied the ruling position in the Party, the government, and the army as well as in the economic and cultural fields. And from this stratum there has emerged a *bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class*, namely, a *new type* of big bourgeoisie which dominates the whole state machine and controls all the social wealth. [Emphasis added.]

"Utilizing the state power under its control, this new-type bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class has turned socialist ownership into ownership by capitalist roaders and turned the socialist economy into a capitalist economy and a state monopoly capitalist economy."

This phrase "bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class" is a new addition to the Maoist lexicon. Since 1967 they have been content to describe the Soviet bureaucracy as "fascists," "new Czars," etc., with no pretense of an explanation.

But if the idea that "state capitalism" has been established in the Soviet Union is new in Peking, it is no stranger to radical politics in the West. There is no need to repeat here all the arguments against this "theory." The most elementary point to be made is that this so-called state capitalism is said to rest on precisely the

same economic foundations as a workers state: nationalized property administered through a planned economy. The bureaucrats can neither buy, sell, nor inherit state property, the source of their privileges. If political democracy is to be the only criterion in deciding the sociological character of such a state, we should be forced to say that China is also an example of "state capitalism," inasmuch as there is no more proletarian democracy under Mao than there is under Brezhnev.

The Maoists correctly point to the growth of a "privileged stratum" as the source of the Soviet bureaucracy, but the victory of the bureaucracy—which did not represent a restoration of capitalism—does not date from 1956, as Mao well knows, but from the late twenties. In whitewashing Stalin and covering up his crimes, the Maoists are forced to rewrite history as crudely as Stalin did. As they tell it, it was Stalin who struggled against bureaucratism.

"Stalin cleared out quite a gang of counter-revolutionary representatives of the bourgeoisie," says the Maoist editorial, "who had wormed their way into the Party—Trotzky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, Rykov and the like. This showed that sharp class struggle was going on all the time and that there was always the danger of capitalist restoration."

The Maoist editors do not mention that the men who were "cleared out" constituted the majority of Lenin's Central Committee which made the October Revolution. Nor do they mention that they were "cleared out" not by defeating their political ideas but by shooting them after the infamous Moscow Trials—with the exception of Trotsky who was assassinated by a GPU agent in Mexico.

The editorial condemns the present political repression in the Soviet Union, accurately describing the harsh treatment of all dissidents:

"In the Soviet Union of today, special agents and spies run amuck and reactionary laws and decrees multiply. Revolution is a crime, and people are everywhere being jailed on false charges; counter-revolution is a merit, and renegades congratulate each other on their promotion. Large numbers of revolutionaries and innocent people have been thrown into concentration camps and 'mental hospitals.'"

This expression of sympathy for the victims of the Kremlin bureaucracy would be more convincing if Mao and his colleagues had not applauded the Stalinist terror and if they did not continue to laud it to this day. The present Soviet rulers were, after all, handpicked and trained by Stalin himself and are only repeating what they have done for forty years, if on a somewhat diminished scale. It is no trivial point either that the one act by Khrushchev that Mao has singled out as so heretical as to constitute a counterrevolutionary coup was his speech criticizing, albeit halfheartedly, Stalin's crimes.

Peking even attributed to Brezhnev specific crimes that are well known to have been committed by Stalin:

"Now the Soviet revisionist new tsars have restored the old tsars' policy of national oppression, adopted such cruel measures as discrimination, forced migration, splitting and imprisonment to oppress and persecute the minority nationalities and turned the Soviet Union back into the 'prison of nations.'" [Emphasis in original.]

The only forced migrations of minority nationalities

were carried out on Stalin's direct orders during World War II when seven nations were deported en masse to Siberia and Central Asia—the Volga Germans, the Crimean Tatars, the Kalmyks, and four smaller Caucasian nationalities, the Chechens, Ingushi, Karachai, and Balkars. The total number exceeded 1,000,000 persons. The present regime has refused to allow these persecuted peoples to return to their homes. The Crimean Tatars, who have been most outspoken in defense of their rights, have had a number of their leaders imprisoned.

Aside from the historical distortions and convenient lapses of memory, the Maoist theoretical argument that a "new class" now rules in the Soviet Union might be taken more seriously if Peking's "theory" of the character of the Soviet state had not shifted so often in the past, following the ups and downs of China's diplomatic relations with the Kremlin.

The Sino-Soviet dispute began in 1956 but did not become public until 1959-60. It reached split proportions only in 1963—seven years after the USSR supposedly restored capitalism!

The precedent for declaring the Soviet Union capitalist was Peking's characterizing Yugoslavia as such in 1963. Now that Albania, Mao's only governmental ally, is seeking to reestablish political relations with Tito, it remains to be seen how long it will be before the Yugoslavs have a "socialist restoration."

It should be pointed out that Peking did not reject Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in 1956. The Maoists themselves went some way down the road of de-Stalinization with the "Let a Hundred Flowers Bloom" turn in 1957. But the outburst of mass criticism that greeted this relaxation of the bureaucratic censorship led Mao to clamp the lid on tight and to preserve at all costs the Stalin cult. Was not the myth of Stalin the "great revolutionary" the cornerstone of the even more idolatrous cult of Mao?

Peking, however, said that Khrushchev had gone too far in criticizing Stalin, rejected his explanation of the "cult of the personality," and posed instead the thesis that *social contradictions*, continuing after the overthrow of capitalism, constitute a source of friction until the final establishment of a communist society in the distant future.

It was not until 1964 that the Maoists first referred to a "privileged social stratum" in Soviet society. This was in a joint editorial by the *People's Daily* and *Red Flag* of July 13, 1964, entitled "On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World." The editorial declared:

"The members of this privileged stratum have converted the function of serving the masses into the privilege of dominating them. They are abusing their powers over the means of production and of livelihood for the private benefits of their small clique."

The editorial, while stopping short of asserting that capitalism had been restored, attributed the growth of the privileged stratum to the development of social inequality in the party and government:

"The system of high salaries for a small number of people should never be applied. The gap between the incomes of the working personnel of the Party, the government, the enterprises and the people's communes on the one hand, and the income of the mass of the people on

the other hand, should be rationally and gradually narrowed and not widened. All working personnel must be prevented from abusing their power and enjoying special privileges."

But when did these "special privileges" originate in the Soviet Union? It was Stalin—portrayed in the current polemic as a fighter against "bourgeois" tendencies in the party—who abolished the legal maximum placed on salaries of party functionaries in the government in 1930. Social inequality was not only covertly encouraged but was enthroned as an official dogma, while the Bolshevik practice of wage leveling was denounced as "petty-bourgeois equalitarianism."

It was Stalin who reintroduced piecework in Soviet factories, driving down the standard of living of the Soviet masses, while a new labor aristocracy, the Stakhanovites, pocketed wages up to twenty times as great as their fellows. Even this was nothing compared to the take of the bureaucracy proper which in wages alone often was paid as much as 100 times the minimum wage of an average factory worker—to say nothing of the "fringe benefits" in housing, vacations, transportation, etc.

But if the Maoists were unable to discern any social inequalities under Stalin it should also be noted that they are not looking as hard at the Soviet Union today as they were even in 1964. The current editorial discreetly treats the question of the privileges of the Soviet bureaucracy on an abstract level and does not repeat its specific criticisms of 1964.

As late as 1966, more than a year after the ouster of Khrushchev, the Chinese said they considered the Kremlin's "deviation" a question of political line, not a matter of a capitalist counterrevolution. The February 10, 1966, issue of *Red Flag* said: "We will never take any united action with the new leaders of the Soviet party so long as they do not abandon the Khrushchev revisionist line, do not change their line of Soviet-U.S.-Indian-Japanese alliance."

It is this sectarian refusal to seek a united front in defense of Vietnam that has driven the Maoists to "revise" the nature of the Soviet Union by way of justification. Lenin's tactic of the united front was designed *precisely* to bring communists and revisionists together in action in defense of the working class against the common enemy. It was only by "discovering" that the Kremlin was "capitalist" or even "fascist" that Peking could justify its sectarian abstention from joint aid to the Vietnamese revolution.

But Peking hesitated to take the decisive step of reading Moscow out of the workers movement altogether. The Chinese sent fraternal delegates to both the Twentieth and

Twenty-second congresses of the CPSU. It was only in 1966 that they boycotted the Twenty-third party congress in Moscow. How was it, we might ask today, that for so many years Mao sent fraternal delegates to the congresses of a "fascist" party?

The open letter to the leadership of the CPSU dated March 22, 1966, still proclaimed the unconditional commitment of the Peking regime to defense of the Soviet Union in the event of imperialist attack:

"... once the Soviet Union meets with imperialist aggression and puts up resolute resistance, China will definitely stand side by side with the Soviet Union and fight against the common enemy."

It was only in January 1967, when the "cultural revolution" was in full swing, that the Soviet Union was branded "fascist." Chinese students were being recalled from all over the world to take part in the intrabureaucratic struggle in China. On their way home several groups carried out demonstrative protests at Soviet diplomatic installations, which resulted in clashes with Soviet police or embassy guards. The most serious incident took place in Moscow's Red Square when a group of Chinese students were allegedly beaten while trying to place wreaths on the tombs of Lenin and Stalin. A January 27, 1967, *People's Daily* editorial took up the case under the title: "Hit back hard at the violent provocations of the filthy Soviet revisionist swine!"

"How closely your atrocious, bloody suppression of the Chinese students resembles the atrocities committed by the Czar, by Hitler and by the Ku Klux Klan!" the editorial said. "This clearly shows that what you are practising in the Soviet Union is in fact the most reactionary and the most savage fascist dictatorship."

Thus at each worsening of the diplomatic relations between the two bureaucracies, there was an escalation of abuse, and the "theory" was changed to fit the needs of the moment, reaching a factional frenzy in Peking during the "cultural revolution."

The current document pushes back to 1956 a breach in relations that only reached its present depth in 1967. The "state capitalism" business is only an attempt at resolving the ludicrous contradiction the Maoists fell into in terming "fascism" a "revision" of Marxism.

Still Available

Our special April 27 issue containing M. Basmanov's "Role of Trotskyism in the Modern World," along with a Trotskyist reply: "The Role of Basmanov in the New School of Stalinist Falsification" by George Saunders. We have noted special interest in this debate, particularly in George Saunders's extensive references on the sources cited by the Kremlin "authority." If you missed this issue, or would like an extra, drop us a note with fifty cents.

to: Intercontinental Press
P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station
New York, N.Y., 10010

from:

Name

Street

City State Zip

Country

- \$15 enclosed for a one-year subscription.
- \$7.50 enclosed for a six-month subscription.
- Send information about first-class and airmail rates.