

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 9, No. 7

©1971 Intercontinental Press

February 22, 1971

50c

China Issues Grave Warning



BELFAST, FEBRUARY 3. Women have played leading role in defending nationalist ghettos of Northern Ireland from repressive forces. On Kashmir Road

(above) women of all ages spearhead confrontation with British troops and Royal Ulster Constabulary. Brutal military raid provoked week of fighting.

○ New Pogrom in Northern Ireland

Women Win Vote

Switzerland has finally decided to allow the majority of its population to vote in national elections. On February 7, by a nearly two-to-one margin, a referendum approved a women's suffrage amendment to the federal constitution.

The amendment applies only to federal elections. In eight of the twenty-five cantons, women are still denied the vote in local elections.

One factor in the approval of women's suffrage appears to have been the discomfort felt by a growing number of Swiss men as to the company they were keeping. The only other countries in the world that still bar women from voting are semifeudal monarchies: Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen. (Liechtenstein, which borders Switzerland and is practically a Swiss canton, is planning to extend the vote to women.)

But if Swiss federal voting laws have now been modified to accommodate the twentieth century, other laws restricting the rights of women are still based on the early-nineteenth-century Code Napoléon.

Upon marriage, a Swiss woman's money automatically becomes the property of her husband. She cannot buy property or contract debts unless her husband is a cosigner. In the case of a divorce, the woman is given an allowance for herself and any dependent children, but a family business is given exclusively to the husband.

In most of the German-speaking cantons, a woman needs her husband's permission to open a checking account or to apply for a passport. □

Please Note

Our New Address

It's easy to remember: *Intercontinental Press*, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

No, we haven't moved out of Manhattan; just to a more convenient location. We don't know why it's called a "village."

In This Issue

		SWITZERLAND	
	146	Women Win Vote	
		INDOCHINA WAR	
Allen Myers	147	Nixon Follows Path Blazed by MacArthur in Korea	
	167	Continued Cover-up in Mylai Case U.S.A.	
Frank Lovell	149	Unemployed Millions in U.S., Canada Grow Restive	
		IRELAND	
Gerry Foley	151	British Troops Drop Mask of "Keeping Peace"	
		CZECHOSLOVAKIA	
	155	Opening of "Trotskyite" Trial Postponed	
		PERU	
Hugo Blanco	156	Land Reform in the Coming Socialist Revolution	
		GREAT BRITAIN	
Allen Myers	160	Sun Sets on the Rolls-Royce Empire	
		VENEZUELA	
	161	Pumping Profits from Oil	
		POLAND	
	162	Gdynia Workers Demand Probe of Mass Murder	
		ITALY	
	163	700 Students Back Polish, Czech Victims	
		YUGOSLAVIA	
	163	Tito Seeks U.S. Investments	
		GUINEA	
Paul Doyen	164	Behind the Wave of Terror	
		SOVIET UNION	
	165	Ten Scientists Ask Release of Pimenov	
		SOUTH AFRICA	
	166	Polaroid's "Experiment" in Apologizing for Apartheid	
		CANADA	
	167	Over 6 Percent Jobless	
		JAPAN	
Tatsuo Tomochika	168	Capitalists Look to China for More Trade	
		NIGERIA	
	168	Support for Angela Davis	
		PHOTOS	
	145	Belfast women confront British troops;	
		157, Hugo Blanco	
		DRAWINGS	
Copain	149	Walter Reuther; 162, Mieczyslaw Moczar;	
		164, Sekou Toure	

Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan,

Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, Allen Myers, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein, Steven Warshell, Jack Wood.

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, Black, and women's 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 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. 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 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. 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 © 1971 by Intercontinental Press.

Nixon Follows Path Blazed by MacArthur in Korea

By Allen Myers

The invasion of Laos, launched by U.S. and Saigon troops under President Nixon's command, has raised a new possibility—China's responding with an armed defense against the mounting military threat to her borders.

As in the case of Korea two decades ago, Peking issued a warning. In carefully measured, even restrained words, the Chinese government pointed out February 8 that "Laos and China are close neighbors" and that the invasion is a "grave provocation not only against the three Indochinese peoples but also against the Chinese peoples."

That at least part of the American ruling class realizes the Chinese warning must be taken seriously was indicated by a February 13 *New York Times* editorial, which pointed out the parallel:

"... by abandoning even the inadequate restraints imposed by his predecessors, President Nixon is moving along the path followed by General MacArthur in Korea when he pushed north to the Yalu, *inviting war with China.*" (Emphasis added.)

That Nixon had launched a major escalation on China's doorstep was abundantly clear in spite of the unofficial censorship that filled the American press with contradictory rumors and outright distortions once the official "embargo" was lifted February 4.

The invasion force, for example, was variously reported at 3,000; 4,000; 10,000; 13,000; or 14,000. Similarly, in the first hours of the attack February 8, six U.S. helicopters were reported shot down. The figure was reduced to two in later press accounts. On February 12, the American command in Saigon admitted that seven helicopters had been lost in the first four days of the invasion, while the *New York Times* of the same date reported ten in only two days.

In part, the lack of information was due to a concerted effort to keep news-

men away from the scene. Alvin Shuster described the procedure in the February 14 *New York Times*:

"The American military command, which is trying to minimize the massive United States support effort, is leaving the details of the action to Saigon spokesmen and refusing to fly American correspondents into Laos even though United States helicopters carried them into Cambodia last spring. The South Vietnamese military spokesmen are somewhat distrustful of the American press anyway, and they have learned well from the American military that it is better to err on the side of evasion."

Terence Smith wrote in the same issue:

"Cambodia came all at once, with a terrible shock that caught everyone—Congress and public alike—unprepared. News of the Laos invasion, by contrast, dribbled out bit by bit.

"Speculation was rampant for 10 days. . . . On Sunday night [February 7], when the invasion was finally announced, the news came more as an anticlimax than a shock.

"A nagging question remained after the announcement. Had the press been used? Was the embargo more news management than security?"

Smith's "nagging question" admitted of only one answer. The American press had not only been "used" to manage the news, but had willingly cooperated. A great deal of information printed abroad somehow never found its way into U.S. papers.

The self-imposed censorship included information on reaction to the invasion within South Vietnam. The February 11 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde* printed an Agence France-Presse dispatch indicating a revival of militant Buddhist opposition to the war.

Nhat Thuong, secretary general of the An-Quang pagoda, denounced the U.S. government for having turned his people into "a nation of mercen-

aries in the pay of an expeditionary corps."

Le Monde quoted some further comments of the priest:

"Never has the drama of the war been more tragic than now. The invasion of Laos has become part of President Nixon's general strategy, and experience has shown us that President Thieu docilely obeys the American government in carrying out the policy decided on by Washington."

While American papers were dutifully printing Washington's denials that any U.S. ground forces were involved in Laos—statements later partially retracted—the West German weekly *Der Spiegel* pointed out in its February 8 issue:

"For years, South Vietnamese and American soldiers have crossed the border into Laos at will—the Americans often in shoes camouflaged to leave the impression of Vietnamese sandals."

One of the most interesting instances of self-censorship involved the public statements of Saigon's vice-president Nguyen Cao Ky. Alvin Shuster wrote in the February 11 *New York Times*:

"He [Ky] suggested that it might be necessary to *bomb North Vietnam.* He said that the Communist troops were close to their home bases and to insure success 'we have to strike not only those bases in Laos but also their rear bases in North Vietnam.'" (Emphasis added.)

But Jean-Claude Pomonti pointed out in the February 11 *Le Monde* that Ky's plans included more than the bombing of North Vietnam, as serious as that would be. The French reporter asked if destroying "rear bases" meant invading North Vietnam.

"The general," Pomonti wrote, "did not hide the fact that he would be favorable to such a course if it was felt necessary. In that case, 'we could even launch ground attacks against North Vietnam. The North Vietnamese do that in our country. Why can't

we do it in theirs?"

(In a February 13 editorial, the *New York Times* included one sentence that acknowledged Ky had spoken of an invasion of North Vietnam.)

Shuster and Pomonti agreed that Ky had promised a repeat performance of the Laos invasion "at the next dry season."

The greater amount of information available in the foreign press was an indication that even Nixon's allies are seriously alarmed by the latest escalation of the war in Indochina. They have every reason to doubt that the U. S. and Saigon troops can accomplish their aims in Laos while at the same time propping up the tottering Cambodian regime of Lon Nol. In the February 3 issue of *Le Monde's* weekly English-language edition, Pomonti wrote:

"The Communists' sudden assault on Phnom Penh on January 22, and continuing guerrilla raids since, have forced the United States to unleash the heaviest bombing operations of the war in both Cambodia and Laos.

"President Nguyen Van Thieu's regime meanwhile is planning to send a light division—about 8,000 men—to Cambodia this month to help buttress the defences of Phnom Penh. Suddenly no one is talking about destroying the Vietcong and North Vietnamese 'sanctuaries' any more. Washington and its allies are concentrating on saving General Lon Nol's 'sanctuary'—his capital."

Another article in the same issue warned of a Laos invasion:

"South Vietnamese troops may be able to occupy a few positions in the region for a time. But to achieve the obvious aim of the offensive—cutting the Ho Chi Minh Trail—would require the permanent presence of several divisions."

Le Monde, in short, is afraid that Thieu is overextending his forces, a fear shared by such mouthpieces for one wing of the American ruling class as the *New York Times*. No one was reassured by Thieu's promise that the invasion would be "limited in time and in space," a description that can be applied to any phenomenon, including both world wars, the Roman Empire, capitalism, and Thieu himself.

For the *New York Times*, Thieu's words called to mind a precedent:

"Last spring, when President Nixon ordered an allied attack against Communist sanctuaries inside the Cambodian border, he denied he was enlarging the war and indicated the 'incursions' would be limited in time and space.

"Yet today South Vietnamese troops are back in Cambodia in strength, operating at times well beyond border areas in direct support of the threatened government of ailing Premier Lon Nol. American aircraft are giving direct support to the South Vietnamese and Cambodian Government forces."

In a telephone poll conducted the day after the invasion began, the National Broadcasting Company found that only 14 percent of those questioned believed the administration's assertions that the operation would shorten the war. But 46 percent said they believed that American ground troops had entered Laos. That percentage is likely to increase since the opinion is correct.

Despite the censorship, a few facts about the involvement of U. S. troops did creep into the press. The *New York Times* reported February 12:

"Reports broadcast by the American Broadcasting Company and the Columbia Broadcasting System yesterday said that American ground troops were taking part in the South Vietnamese incursion into southern Laos, some in South Vietnamese uniforms.

"A. B. C. said the body of an American soldier in a South Vietnamese uniform had been flown out of Laos with the bodies of four helicopter crewmen who had been shot down.

"C. B. S. said United States helicopters flying South Vietnamese troops into Laos sometimes carried American Special Forces officers, some in South Vietnamese uniforms."

These reports followed a United Press International dispatch which quoted American GIs at Khe Sanh as saying that "100 or more" U. S. troops had fought in Laos during the first three days of the invasion. This was denied by government officials, but the press agency noted:

"United States spokesmen in Saigon, in issuing the denial, said there was

considerable latitude on steps that might be taken to rescue downed American helicopter crews."

It was thus clear that the Nixon administration was merely playing its old game of putting a different name on combat troops. This was confirmed the next day, February 11, by an Associated Press dispatch from Saigon:

"Official sources said today that United States reconnaissance teams were operating inside Laos—but only in an intelligence-gathering role—and that there were no American ground combat troops in that country. . . .

"The sources said the reconnaissance teams had been operating in Laos for years and they were continuing their work."

As part of its self-censorship, the U. S. press did its best to play down the reaction in the United States. Most papers made much of the fact that demonstrations protesting the Laos invasion were smaller than the mammoth student strike that swept the country following the attack on Cambodia last spring.

But despite the lack of information and often inhospitable weather, significant demonstrations did occur around the country on February 10, only two days after the invasion began. The New York office of the Student Mobilization Committee [SMC] said it had received from protest organizers reports of 10,000 demonstrators in Boston; 2,000 in Washington, D. C.; 500 in Minneapolis; a strike at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, with daily strike meetings of 1,500-2,000; 100 in Cleveland during a blizzard; 3,000 in New York; 2,000 in Berkeley, California; and 2,000 in Seattle.

Accounts in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* also reported protests in Palo Alto, California; Chicago; Baltimore; New Haven, Connecticut; Albany, New York; Milwaukee; Pittsburgh; Columbus, Ohio; Philadelphia; Detroit; and Ann Arbor, Michigan.

In the February 12 *Christian Science Monitor*, Joanne Leedom quoted a prediction made by Mike Arne, an SMC spokesman:

"I would characterize the reaction now as a slow burn which will, with-

out question, grow."

That "slow burn" can be expected to rise in temperature as more information becomes available about the extent of the continuing escalation. Before the invasion of the Laotian panhandle was a week old, U. S. air force

planes were reported flying combat support for the mercenary troops of right-wing General Vang Pao around the Plaine des Jarres. Nixon is clearly pushing the escalation as fast as he can in hope of inflicting a decisive defeat on the liberation forces before

the opposition at home makes him pull back.

The demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco April 24, called by the National Peace Action Coalition, must be built into a massive "NO" to Nixon's plans. □

Nixon Pundit Forecasts Economic Miracle

Unemployed Millions in U.S., Canada Grow Restive

By Frank Lovell

The number of registered unemployed in the United States reached 5.4 million in January, the highest in ten years. However, the report on January unemployment, released February 5 by the Labor Department, claims a slight dip. In December 6.2 percent of the labor force was unemployed. According to the latest figures, after adjusting for the normal seasonal rise in unemployment following the usual Christmas holiday business spurt, unemployment now stands at 6 percent.

Government spokesmen sought to make out a "trend" in these latest statistics which they hope will eventually overcome unemployment. Labor Secretary Hodgson reportedly said, "The signs are encouraging."

The statistics show:

- The duration of unemployment for those now on the rolls has increased, up from an average of 9.7 weeks in December to 10.4 weeks in January.

- More adult males have been hired, unemployment for this category declining slightly from 4.6 to 4.3 percent.

- Unemployment among adult women remained at 5.7 percent.

- The average rate of unemployment among teen-agers is still unchanged, 17.6 percent.

The most significant new facts are the overall increase in the number of unemployed and the constantly increasing length of time the average unemployed worker has been off the job. This is what every worker knows. More of his friends and relatives are out of work. Few are being rehired.



REUTHER: Had a plan (not yet tried) to convert guns into butter, and end unemployment without hurting bosses' profits.

Unemployment benefits are coming to an end for many.

Nothing in the overall economic picture—contrary to optimistic predictions—indicates a reversal of the present downward trend. In 1970 the real gross national product—the total value of the country's output of goods and services—slipped \$2.8 billion. In the last three months of 1970 the real output fell at an annual rate of 3.3 percent. Consumer spending, business investment, and housing

starts were all down.

Paul W. McCracken, Nixon's economic advisor, told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress on January 5 that he expects a 9 percent annual growth of the economy. The only basis for such an extraordinary reversal of the production trend is a probable increase in war-related industries resulting from the present expansion of the war in Indochina and the prospect of wars in other parts of the world, not mentioned by McCracken in his forecast.

The most startling increases have occurred in the Consumer Price Index. Over the past ten years, prices have gone up 38 percent and are still rising. Sidney Margolius, writing in the January issue of the *AFL-CIO's Federationist*, says, "The average worker in manufacturing industries actually is even worse off than in 1964, with \$84.43 (weekly) in spendable dollars now, compared to \$85.27 then." The greatest price increases—well above average—have been in food, housing, transportation, and medical costs.

If the employed worker finds his standard of living reduced by rising prices, the unemployed face impoverishment.

This pincers of rising prices and increasing unemployment has steadily and relentlessly squeezed down the living standard of the working class, and has forced the union movement to seek ways to relieve the pressure. The organized workers, shielded by their unions, have suffered less than the majority, who are unorganized.

During the past year the unions

have fought tenaciously to hold existing real wages, and have tried to insure them by demanding cost-of-living adjustments to keep wages abreast of rising prices.

But little has been done to combat the devastating effects of unemployment. The unions, as a national policy, have been content to seek higher unemployment benefit payments from state legislatures. The January 23 *AFL-CIO News* reports that "AFL-CIO Social Security Director Bert Seidman sees 'an excellent opportunity' to achieve long-sought improvements."

According to the account, "He urged AFL-CIO state central bodies and affiliated unions to press for passage this year of higher unemployment benefit ceilings—equal to at least two-thirds of the state's average weekly wage."

The United Auto Workers [UAW] has a contract provision for supplementary unemployment benefits [SUB] to be paid by the employers. This boosts the income of an unemployed auto worker to nearly 95 percent of his regular after-tax pay. But only those workers with at least one year seniority are eligible, and SUB is of limited duration.

Similar, but less effective, unemployment benefit schemes have been negotiated by a few other unions, all predicated on the assumption that unemployment is temporary.

The International Typographical Union in New York, Local 6, has a contract provision to protect its members against structural unemployment in the newspaper industry resulting specifically from the use of teletype tapes to activate and operate typesetting machines.

This process eliminates workers, and the exact number can be determined by the amount of lines of copy set from the use of tapes. The employers are required to make payments accordingly.

The ITU contract specifies that "payments made for outside tape shall be adjusted up or down upon the percent variations that have or shall occur in the number of lines printed each year in comparison to the number of lines used in the studies of 1963."

These payments go into a fund that may be used for supplementary un-

employment benefits, but that has never yet been used for this purpose.

This is a timid and tentative attempt by the union to restrict and control technological changes in the industry which will otherwise result in widespread unemployment of printers, a big problem in the printing trades now.

The present growing unemployment has a permanent, not temporary, look to many workers.

Recently some local unions have begun to talk about ways to solve "the unemployment problem." A UAW local near Philadelphia, which three years ago represented 7,000 workers at Boeing Company's Vertol Division, now has more than 4,000 members out of work. This division of Boeing manufactures helicopters for the army, previously employed 13,000 men and women, and expects to have a work force of less than 3,000 this year.

John Taylor, president of Boeing UAW local 1069, has attempted to persuade the Boeing Company to convert for peacetime production. According to an article in the January 11 *Nation*, Taylor has had little success. He says: "My argument is that there are thousands and thousands of unused square feet of production space at the Vertol division that could be used to produce low-cost housing and transportation on a production line basis. Or rapid transit equipment. Mass transportation in our country stinks. With the proper effort, Boeing could easily produce rail cars, buses and other sorely needed equipment. All sorts of things could be done—medical equipment, such as kidney machines; devices for air and water pollution control. All that is needed is some imagination and some initiative."

The reaction of one company official—"But think how many units of housing we'd have to sell to make as much money as we do on a single helicopter."

This idea of reconversion was advanced as a cure for unemployment by the late Walter Reuther at the close of World War II.

The plan was revised, enlarged and refined by Reuther shortly before his death last year, and submitted to Congress in a form suited to his anticipa-

tion of a post-Vietnam war economic and social dislocation. Similar plans for industrial conversion to peacetime needs are becoming increasingly popular among some union officials today.

Plans for a conference on "peace and conversion" in the San Francisco Bay area have been projected by the leader of the AFL-CIO Contra Costa County Central Council, Art Carter.

In the Seattle area, where unemployment is estimated by some to run as high as 20 percent, the Central Labor Council has done little more than urge an extension of unemployment benefits. Washington governor Dan Evans has extended the thirty-week benefits an additional nine weeks, but such stopgap measures are puny compared to the mass of unemployed. Some union officials in that area have suggested unemployment rallies and marches to force higher benefit payments and more funds from the state and federal governments, but have not gone beyond the talking stage.

The entire Pacific Northwest is hard hit by unemployment, affecting Canadian workers even more severely than those on the U. S. side of the border.

On January 21 more than 2,000 demonstrators marched through the streets of Victoria, British Columbia, when the provincial legislature opened its session there, shouting: "We want jobs! We want jobs!"

The demonstration was organized by the British Columbia Federation of Labor, which brought unemployed workers from Vancouver and other cities.

The February 1 Canadian publication *Labor Challenge* reported that "BCFL's [president] Johnson promised further actions and emphasized the federation's policy of including unorganized unemployed in the movement."

The report says that the unions there are demanding "a moratorium on all debts, construction of public works—schools, hospitals and public housing—and an end to the sellout of resources and the export of thousands of jobs."

Some of the most powerful local unions in the U. S. and Canada have in times of mounting unemployment demanded a thirty-hour workweek

with no loss in pay. The United Steelworkers of America is now demanding the four-day week — thirty-two hours — when the present contract in the steel industry expires July 31.

Such demands are designed to put more workers on the job and pass along some of the benefits of labor-saving machinery to the workers. It is safe to predict that this will become a standard demand of the union movement as unemployment increases and it becomes generally recognized that unemployment is a permanent, built-in feature of capitalist economy.

The periods of full employment in this country are exceptional, occurring only when the youth contingent of the vast army of unemployed is put into uniform and shipped overseas to die in wars of benefit to big business.

The idea that men and women should work long hours while millions of others are deprived of jobs is irrational. And some unions are powerful enough to force the employers to reduce the workweek, as has happened in sections of the building industry.

But to guarantee full employment, as is quite feasible from the great tech-

nological advances already made, the present forty-hour-week law needs to be amended.

The present wages and hours laws must be altered so as to force all industry to reduce the hours of work proportionately to the rate of unemployment so that unemployment at all times remains at zero.

In cases where there are temporary dislocations and some few, including apprentices, are locked out for any reason, they should be paid the full scale of wages during the period of unemployment. □

New Pogrom in Northern Ireland

British Troops Drop Mask of 'Keeping Peace'

By Gerry Foley

The long-simmering crisis in Northern Ireland reached a new stage February 3-9 as bloody battles flared in Belfast, Derry, and at other points in the British imperialist enclave. The confrontation between the nationalist population and the repressive forces was the most widespread and violent since the virtual civil war of August 1969. But the crucial new development was a political one. All of the imperialist and proimperialist contingents seem to have closed ranks for a concerted attack on the nationalist minority.

The fighting was touched off Wednesday, February 3, when British troops, working together with the infamous Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), raided a number of houses in the Lower Falls-Springfield Road Catholic ghetto in Belfast. This is an area where the nationalist population suffered especially heavy losses in the August 1969 pogrom led by the RUC and the B Special counterrevolutionary militia.

"The searching of the Kashmir road [a side street off the Springfield Road] was most unfortunate," *Irish Times* correspondents Henry Kelly and Denis Coughlan wrote in the February 4 issue of the Dublin daily. "This street runs perilously close to the peaceline between the Catholic Falls and Prot-

estant Shankill areas and is bounded at one end by Bombay street where about 40 Catholic homes were razed to the ground in August 1969."

At the time the fighting began, Patrick Kennedy, the representative of Central Belfast in the Belfast parliament and a member of the moderate nationalist Republican Labour party, was touring the area. In a debate in the Northern Irish House of Commons, February 4, according to the *Irish Times*, he gave this description of how the outbreak began:

"The people of the area had become incensed at the insults of the troops and had thrown stones. The troops then roared into the area in Land Rovers at speeds of up to 70 m.p.h. and one jeep hit a middle-aged woman and carried her for 70 yards. When the driver was asked how he had hit her, he replied: 'I mowed her down.'"

The specific communal hatreds fostered by imperialism in Northern Ireland are alien to most British soldiers. But many of them, especially the officers, seem to have adopted the colonial upper caste's contempt for the nationalist, Catholic population. For example, after clashes with youths from the Ballymurphy ghetto in Belfast in mid-January, according to a cable from John M. Lee in the January 24 issue of the *New York Times*,

a British officer expressed the following attitude toward the oppressed community: "With those large families, they get so much family allowance and jobless pay, they can fight all night and sleep all day."

Following the search of houses on Kashmir Street, according to Kelly and Coughlan, "... troops and crowds of young people fought running battles in the side streets off the Falls road and Springfield road . . .

"Stones, bottles, sticks and other missiles were thrown at the troops who replied with many rounds of rubber bullets and on several occasions water cannon, brought in to put out fires in the barricades, doused the rioters as well.

"Barricades went up and came down with almost incredible speed. Kashmir road was the first street barricaded and this was done at two points, one with a large crane and the other with an articulated lorry. Massive Army earth-movers swept both barricades out of the way into side streets, but rioters pulled them back almost as quickly."

The behavior of the British military forces seemed calculated to spread the conflict. "The tension which was built up on the Springfield road by the raids in the early part of the day was

further increased by military jeeps full of troops in riot gear speeding up and down the Falls road when the military themselves said everything was quiet," the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association said in a statement issued after the night of fighting.

As the nationalist population learned that the troops were attacking the people on Kashmir Street, the temperature rose in the other ghettos. Displays of military power by the British forces fanned the flames.

"All over the Lower Falls area, thousands of people came on the streets as word was passed during the afternoon," Kelly and Coughlan wrote.

"Then just about 5 o'clock, as people were streaming home from work, roads leading into the Falls were blocked off by troops with barbed wire barricades. Massive traffic jams built up in the city, the bus services to the Upper Springfield and Falls Road areas were suspended and the crowds on the street grew larger."

The organizations within the ghetto tried to restrain the population. "Local members of the Central Citizens Defence Committee and Republicans from the area were on the streets trying to calm the situation through the afternoon," Kelly and Coughlan reported. "And though some of the rioters efforts were successful in the short term the evidence seemed to suggest that the barricades were thrown up spontaneously and whatever organisation there was on the spot was done simply by men and youths enraged by the searches."

Deadly weapons were used against the British army first in the Springfield Road area and later in Ardoyne, Ballymurphy, and the New Lodge Road. Information on how the armed confrontations started was scanty. But it seemed that in one area, at least, the British army was the initiator. "The incidents in Ardoyne were sparked off when a soldier fired a shot into a crowd which he thought was going to attack him on the Crumlin road," according to Kelly and Coughlan.

As a result of the clashes, which lasted into the early morning hours, five British soldiers suffered gunshot wounds. Four were only slightly injured, but one was struck in the head

by "machine-gun" fire, press reports said. Another British soldier was hurt by a homemade gelignite bomb.

In general, the ghetto self-defense forces have only machine pistols which cannot penetrate the soldiers' battle armor. The fact that the one British soldier seriously wounded in these clashes was shot in the head suggests that the nationalists defending their neighborhoods had only light-caliber weapons.

The results of the raids on Catholic homes indicated that the objective of the British high command was to terrorize the population and not to remove any specific threat to military security.

"A police spokesman said that following the morning and afternoon searches for arms one shotgun had been found," Kelly and Coughlan wrote. "The searchers also discovered a quantity of picks and pick handles and shovels and some leaflets which an R. U. C. spokesman said were 'of a political nature.'"

The number of civilian casualties in the clashes was unknown. But the two *Irish Times* correspondents reported: "Some civilians were injured while being arrested and one girl was knocked down by an Army Land Rover."

The reaction to the fighting by the Protestant population clearly revealed the nature of the "religious hatred" in Northern Ireland, which has been the subject of so much resigned philosophizing by bourgeois liberal commentators. This colonial upper caste was created and fostered as a bulwark of British rule in Northern Ireland; its arrogance is based on the confidence that British power stands behind its privileges.

"Shortly after lunchtime," Kelly and Coughlan wrote, "Protestant factory workers from the James Mackie Textile Machinists on the Springfield threw bolts and rivets at a Catholic group of people on the far side of the road. The Protestants jeered, shouting: 'They are searching your houses' in chants."

On the floor of the Belfast parliament February 4, Patrick Kennedy said that "one of the most dangerous aspects of the present situation was that crowds on the Protestant side of

the peace line built up. They heard explosions and machine-gun fire and they became agitated. The city tonight was on the verge of sectarian war . . .

The Protestants, it would seem, recognized that the British troops had reverted to their traditional role of keeping the nationalists down and were prepared to follow them in a general pogrom against the oppressed population, as they had followed the RUC and B Specials in August 1969.

Sporadic incidents occurred in various nationalist areas February 4, as the military continued its searches. Some 600 more troops were rushed in from Great Britain to reinforce the imperialist garrison.

In his press conference February 4, British Chief of Land Operations General Tony Farrar-Hockley abandoned all pretense that the mission of the imperialist forces was to keep the peace between the two communities in Northern Ireland. For the first time since the military intervention, a representative of the British high command singled out as the main enemy an organization of the Catholic, nationalist ghetto dwellers whom the troops had ostensibly been sent in to protect from a proimperialist pogrom.

"Battle has been joined with the Provisional I. R. A.," Farrar-Hockleysaid. "It is not war, but it is definitely battle." He named five men as officers of the Provisional IRA and dared them to deny it, in a move apparently preparatory to arrests of suspected leaders and sympathizers of the nationalist movement.

At the same time, Farrar-Hockley admitted that the real reason for the searches was to intimidate the nationalist population. According to Henry Kelly, writing in the February 5 issue of the *Irish Times*, the British general "said that people had been going about in the Clonard area [where Kashmir street is located] with a great show of braggadocio persistently for some months, including a whispering campaign which had deliberately been brought to the attention of the military that the R. U. C. and the military dared not come into the Clonard to search.

"The Army did not want to take up challenges but that was the information which was being passed to the

troops on the ground and if they needed to go into the area they would go to search, 'in order to see that law and order is maintained.'

In the Belfast parliament the same day, Northern Irish Prime Minister Chichester-Clark revealed the army's objective with the brutal frankness typical of the British settler aristocracy. "The Army were splendidly self-disciplined. They were firm, but kept their tempers. When the guns came out, as we anticipated they would, the Army took very firm action indeed."

In other words, the leader of the Unionist party, whose sole program for fifty years has been suppression of the nationalist population and maintenance of the historic position of the Protestant caste, conspired with the command of the British army to stage a *provocation*.

Chichester-Clark also made it clear that the attack was directed against the nationalist people as a whole. In reply to the moderate Kennedy, he said: "You and your friends opposite [apparently the anti-Unionist opposition] are responsible for the disorders—and you can tell your Republican friends that too."

In a speech in Armagh the same day, the Unionist leader emphasized the humiliation of the Catholic population by British troops: "I hope it is now clearly understood that the Army will go where they like, when they like in the interests of our country and they are not going to be stopped by anyone—least of all a rabble of terrorists and their sympathisers."

With the British attack on the nationalist ghettos, unity seemed to be restored in the ranks of the Unionists. The Shankill Unionist Association, which is based in an area where the ultraright is strong, issued a statement February 4 calling on its followers to back the troops:

"It is worth noting that the security forces at long last place the blame for these riots where it belongs—at the feet of Republican extremist elements, and it is for this reason that we utterly condemn some sections of the press for reporting that a Protestant and R.C. [Roman Catholic] confrontation was in some way responsible for these outbreaks. . . .

"We wish to state that we are behind the security forces in whatever method and whatever measures they take to restore this country to the state it was in when we had an armed police force and Special Constabulary successfully keeping the peace for 48 years.

"Finally, we wish to recognise the great sense of responsibility shown by the Rev. Ian Paisley, M. P., in calling off his proposed marches and rally, and we call upon all Loyalists to close the ranks and stand together in this, Ulster's time of crisis."

Two days before the British army's assault on the nationalist ghettos in Belfast, Northern Irish Home Affairs Minister John Taylor revealed that a reconciliation between the ultraright and "moderate" wing of the Unionists was in progress. In a speech February 1, Taylor said, according to the *Irish Times*, that it was now apparent that "those few Unionist M. P.s who criticised the Government differed very little with Government policy. This was underlined during the recent Stormont [Belfast parliament] debate about law and order, when the main critics expressed no policies which were different from those of the Government."

Those M. P.s who criticized the government presumably included Captain Robert Mitchell, Unionist representative for North Armagh, who, according to the *Irish Times* of February 8, "favours, among other riot control weapons, live bullets instead of rubber ones, firing squads, military courts, dyed water in water cannon and deportation to Canada," and "wishes for internment as a solution to the present crisis."

Once the British government stopped balancing between the moderates in the Catholic community and the Dublin government on one side, and the Unionist establishment on the other, the reason for the division in the pro-imperialist ranks disappeared.

Before this, under British pressure, the economically and politically dominant section of the Protestant ruling class had promised concessions aimed at conciliating the Catholic bourgeoisie North and South and removing the features of the North Irish system most embarrassing to the Lon-

don government. The prospect of reform created insecurity among large sections of the fanaticized Unionist population, backward elements of the Protestant bourgeoisie, and members of the huge proimperialist patronage and repressive machine.

As a token of open support for Protestant supremacy, the London government sent a member of the royal family along with the military reinforcements—the Duke of Kent, eleventh in line for the British throne, who is a major in a Scottish regiment.

The presence of royalty in Northern Ireland at this time cannot be accidental. The Protestant caste ideology is heavily monarchist. The symbol of the crown and the Bible is everywhere in Unionist neighborhoods.

Catholic moderates both North and South seemed to realize that they had been abandoned. Even the Belfast Central Citizens Defense Committee, dominated by the Catholic hierarchy, denounced the searches as being essentially a pogrom. And this body's protests were backed by an editorial in the February 5 issue of the *Irish Times*, historically a Protestant ascendancy paper which cannot be suspected of sympathies for the IRA.

The editorial said: "Mr. Tom Conaty is no one's idea of an I. R. A. man or subversive. He is a Belfast businessman who serves as chairman of the Central Citizens Defence Committee, the body which a few months ago took a full-page advertisement in *The Irish News* to warn against violence in the streets and to appeal for participation in building a decent society in the North. . . .

"Yet Mr. Conaty, speaking on R. T. E. [Radio-Telefís Éireann—the state broadcasting network] yesterday, made a strong case against the British Army searches which, he alleged, were on a discriminatory basis and were in themselves the main source of Belfast's recent upsurge.

"To get Mr. Conaty's remarks into perspective, the outsider might cast his mind back to August 1969, to the week in which many Catholics in Belfast had reason to believe that they were about to be swamped in a mass pogrom. . . .

"The raiding for guns, largely among one section of the people,

seems to raise this spectre again; and the fact that on Wednesday [February 3] the search brought to light only one shotgun has been used to justify a charge of bias and, more, may suggest to the area raided—and to any potential aggressors on the Unionist lunatic fringe—that once again, a target is being set up."

The Catholic neighborhoods of Belfast found themselves almost defenseless when they were attacked in August 1969 by heavily armed Unionist gangs led by RUC men and B Special Constabulary. With the support of elements of local government, big business, and the British army, the proimperialist vigilantes have never had difficulty in obtaining weapons. Even the capitulationist Dublin Prime Minister Jack Lynch pointed out in his February 6 statement on the Northern fighting that members of the formally disbanded B Specials have recently been allowed to form "rifle clubs."

The statement issued by the CCDC following the outbreak of fighting in Belfast ended on a pathetic note: "He [General Erskine Crum, the new British commander] must bear in mind that every day the actions of his troops are increasing the number of people without hope, and people without hope soon become extremist. Those of us who have tried to be a moderating influence are left with less and less to offer."

The British and American press seemed to fall in line with the general offensive of the imperialist bloc in Northern Ireland. Feature articles appeared in capitalist papers supporting witch-hunt propaganda against the organizations of the nationalist population. A prime example was an article by Roy Hodson of the London *Financial Times* which was published in the February 9 issue of the *Washington Post*. In the columns of one of the most authoritative American capitalist papers, this British journalist told a tale of IRA control of the Catholic ghettos reminiscent of the "Viet Cong Terror" stories published by the American big press in the early days of the U.S. intervention in Vietnam.

"They [the IRA]. . . have the power

to send mobs of youths, women, and lately children too, into the streets to harass and attack the British troops, and so a pattern has developed.

"During the day, disturbances are of a 'soft' character. They include women chanting and banging bin lids, children throwing stones at soldiers, buses and vans being hijacked. After dark the 'hard' fighting starts, and army patrols find themselves exchanging fire with shadowy figures."

Hodson makes the passive resistance of the ghettos sound so diabolically formidable that one almost feels sympathy for the poor British army that has only 7,000 heavily armed soldiers, tanks, helicopters, gas, and barbed wire to maintain order.

In Belfast, which has a history of savage anti-Catholic pogroms dating back well over a hundred years, the IRA has served largely as a ghetto self-defense organization. The tactic of having women bang garbage-can lids to rouse their neighbors against the repressive forces goes back at least to the 1930s. At that time it was used to combat the "Murder Gang," a proimperialist terror organization composed of B Specials and ex-British servicemen that raided Catholic areas, murdering at random.

Regardless of what measures the organizations in the ghettos took, the commanders of the repressive forces could be certain that their actions in the morning and afternoon of February 3 would touch off a general outbreak. The temper of the people was unmistakable already six months ago when this writer was in Belfast.

I watched the British Army search a housing project in the Lower Falls Road area in early August. Crowds gathered on the streets throughout the neighborhood, seething with bitterness. The adults complained of living under unbearable tension, never knowing when the army would come in and drive them out of their homes with gas, break into their houses and destroy their few belongings, or seize and beat their male relatives. Everyone believed that it was standard operating procedure for the troops to beat their prisoners senseless before turning them over to the courts for automatic six-month sentences. Stories circulated of young boys beaten so

badly that it took up to sixty-five stitches to close their wounds.

The young men I saw standing on the street corners at that time were by no means roughnecks looking for a fight. They seemed thoroughly decent young fellows, obviously choking down a rage almost too great to bear. Night after night they had to watch a foreign military force terrorize their families and occupy their neighborhoods, and they could not do anything about it. They had no means of fighting armed soldiers. They just had to stand and watch, with their hands in their pockets, as terrified refugees streamed away from the building the soldiers were "searching" and elderly women sobbed in doorways along the poor streets.

There were tanks and armored cars everywhere, armed military outposts and constant patrols. Sitting in the living rooms of ghetto houses, I saw continual patrols go by, most often small armored cars, but sometimes tanks and armed foot-patrols that looked like something out of the Vietnam war.

This overwhelming military occupation is particularly disruptive of life in the Belfast ghettos. Although these areas are being transformed by "urban renewal" into modern slums, a large part of the inhabitants still live in very tight-knit, densely populated neighborhoods. These are mazes of small, quiet streets where there are almost no cars, and infants play in the middle of the road without fear. There is no place else for them to play. The tiny houses have no yards.

Into these areas have come swarms of high-powered military vehicles. The most commonly used armored car is, to say the least, not designed with pedestrian safety in mind. The driver sits about four feet off the ground, his view obstructed by steel projections on all sides. He is directed by a rifleman standing above him, whose attention is focused on potential attackers and not on the road ahead.

Even in the Protestant Shankhill district, mothers are terrified of the army vehicles. As I was watching children play on a street in the Shankhill on a sunny afternoon, I saw a jeep turn a corner about a block and

a half away. Suddenly, almost hysterical with fright, women dashed out of the houses and carried their children inside.

In order to blame the natural and inevitable resistance of the ghetto dwellers to military occupation on "shadowy figures," imperialist spokesmen have attributed incredible powers of manipulation to the IRA. A small Catholic girl was killed by a combat vehicle February 8, touching off new attacks on British troops and equipment. Army public relations claimed, according to a summary of dispatches in the February 9 issue of the *Washington Post*, that "the girl, aged five, jumped under the wheels of the scout car as it was moving at about five miles an hour through the New Lodge Road area."

The article said "the incident underlined British concern over the involvement of children in clashes between Irish republican gunmen and troops."

The reason why the British command chose to blame the outbreak specifically on the Provisional IRA seems clear. This organization, which according to press reports has been dwindling, is essentially a right-wing splitoff from the republican movement. To combat the left-wing leadership of the official IRA, the Provisionals have talked an ultramilitant line with a lot of boastful talk about attacking British forces, thereby handing the imperialist commanders a cover for their provocation.

The scope of the British provocations, and especially the sudden closing of ranks by the Unionist factions and the army high command, made it absolutely clear that the repressive operation was aimed at the nationalist community as a whole and not any one part of it.

As fighting spread in the Catholic ghettos, in reaction to the hard line taken by the Belfast government and the British commanders, the repressive offensive gathered steam.

In five days of clashes, troops and police arrested almost 200 persons, to be crammed into already overflowing prisons.

Finally, on February 8, Home Affairs Minister Taylor made explicit the threat which General Farrar-Hockley

had implied in publicly naming the alleged leaders of the Provisional IRA. "We do not want to introduce internment but if I.R.A. activities become more widespread we would have to take specific measures to deal with people who used undemocratic means and physical force."

The Belfast regime has resorted be-

Czechoslovakia

Opening of 'Trotskyite' Trial Postponed

The trial of nineteen youths charged with "Trotskyism," scheduled to open in Prague February 8, has been postponed until February 20, according to an Agence France-Presse dispatch that appeared in the February 10 Paris daily *Le Monde*. AFP attributed the news to "a reliable source."

The young people—first reports put their number at twenty-five—have been imprisoned by the Husak regime since December 1969.

Eric Bourne, writing from Vienna in the February 12 *Christian Science Monitor*, published in Boston, gave a similar account:

"According to information from Prague, the trial due to start Monday [February 8] was of some 19 'Trotskyist' minded youngsters, boy and girl students and workers, who have been detained since early last year after being accused of 'plotting' against the 'socialist order.'"

In Bourne's opinion, the decision to put off the trial "suggests that, for all the harsh words still being published about those 'responsible' for the 1968 crisis, 'consolidation' is deemed to have reached the point where the Husak regime feels confident and ready to look to the future and a new start."

Agence France-Presse suggested a less praiseworthy reason for the Czechoslovak government's action:

"The postponement was said to have been decided on to avoid having the trial begin during the tenth congress of the International Union of Students being held at Bratislava."

The French news agency added:

fore to internment, or mass imprisonment without trial, of suspected nationalist militants. During the second world war large numbers of political prisoners were interned on a prison ship, including some who had drawn suspicion on themselves, for example, by showing too great an interest in Irish literature. □

"Among the accused, many of whom are students, are two foreigners: a young man born in France of Spanish émigré parents and a young girl from West Berlin. The latter was said to have been accused in particular of having acted as a liaison between the members of the clandestine organization and former leaders of the Fourth International in Germany. □

Somebody Has to Pay

From a total revenue of \$65,000,000 in 1970, the Liberian government had to spend \$20,000,000 as repayment and interest on debts. Foreign firms, which have invested some \$1,000,000,000 in the country, are guaranteed low taxation and security against expropriation.

MEMO to:

Intercontinental Press
P. O. Box 116
Village Post Office Station
New York, N. Y. 10014

from:

Name _____
Street _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____
Country _____

- [] \$15 enclosed for one year.
- [] \$7.50 enclosed for six months.
- [] Send information on first-class and airmail rates.

Land Reform in Peru's Coming Socialist Revolution

By Hugo Blanco

[In its January 18-28 issue, the Lima mass-circulation magazine *Caretas* published an interview with the Peruvian revolutionary leader Hugo Blanco, who was released from prison December 22.

[*Caretas* ran the three-page interview under the headline, "The Famous Hugo Blanco." The introductory note read: "This is an unprecedented dialogue in which Blanco talks intensely about his ideology—Trotskyist in essence, with reminiscences of the old anarchist Peter Kropotkin. In a Spanish with the rhythm of Quechua he shows us that seven years in prison have done nothing to tame this fierce labor agitator."

[The editors explained that Blanco had agreed to grant the interview in order to make a plea for the release of Eduardo Creus and eight peasant leaders still held in jail despite the junta's proclamation of a general amnesty for political and social prisoners. Creus was released January 20 and deported to his native Argentina. Many political prisoners remain in jail, however, in Lima and in the provinces.

[Our translation of Hugo Blanco's interview with *Caretas* follows.]

* * *

Question. What does it feel like when you come out of prison after seven years?

Answer. You have many strange feelings. It hits you very strongly. There is a feeling of being maladjusted to the outside world. Unfortunately, another journalist misinterpreted me when I explained this; he thought that I was bewildered by the national political situation. That was not what I wanted to say. It is one thing to feel disoriented, not to be able to cross the street through traffic or find the bus lines I last used ten years ago. Changing my opinions or feeling confused about the character of the government is quite a different thing.

Q. What is your view of the character of the government?

A. You don't have to be on the spot in the Plaza San Martín to get an idea of what the government is like.

Q. Do you think it is a revolutionary government?

A. I think it is a *desarrollista* [pro-industrial development] bourgeois government. I don't think it is even anti-imperialist. I do believe that transformations have occurred, based on the interests of the *desarrollista* sector of the bourgeoisie, not on the interests of the workers.

Q. How do you explain the fact then that there has been a very definite withdrawal of investment?

A. The government represents the general interests of the bourgeoisie. This doesn't keep individuals or sectors in the bourgeoisie from feeling insecure or distrustful about this process of change. The frictions between the government and the industrialists arise precisely from this. The government safeguards and defends the historic interests of the bourgeoisie, while the capitalists take care of their immediate individual interests on their own.

Q. Leaving the bourgeoisie out of it, can we still talk about an oligarchy in Peru?

A. That depends on what meaning you give the word. If we equate the oligarchy with the big landowners, we could say that this sector has been displaced from its old position.

It has not been crushed, but it has been displaced, moving its capital partly voluntarily and partly under compulsion into the industrial sector. While before, these magnates were slowly changing over to the industrial form of exploitation, now the agrarian reform law is forcing them

to do this. They have not been crushed as an exploiting class. They retain this character. But they have been forced to change their methods.

Q. Doesn't the term "oligarchy" imply power?

A. Power, yes. But basically the bourgeoisie as a whole, including the imperialists, continues to hold power. We must understand that within the imperialist camp, there are also contradictions. There are component bourgeois sectors with differing interests. Some elements have an interest in maintaining the old system of exploitation.

But the sectors that favor new methods are constantly gaining in strength. They understand clearly that if the old forms are maintained, the conditions will ripen for a socialist revolution. But this is not the only reason for their orientation. They are on the side of new methods because they have an economic interest in seeing changes that fit in with the new forms of exploitation.

The machinery-producing sectors of the U.S. imperialist bourgeoisie are steadily increasing in importance as exporters, surpassing producers of manufactured goods. It is this wing of the U.S. bourgeoisie that is pushing industrialization in the underdeveloped countries out of a need to sell its machinery. It is a matter of indifference to them whether these factories are American-owned, Peruvian-owned, or owned by the government itself. What they are concerned about is unloading their goods.

Q. Are you saying that the industrialized countries have a stake in the economic development of the third world?

A. Yes, in the industrialization of the third world and, in a certain sense, in its economic development. But they want to keep the third world dependent and develop its economy only as it suits imperialist interests. And cre-



HUGO BLANCO

ating layers of small agricultural proprietors also fits in with this objective.

Because of the absence of world wars in the latest period, there has been no massive destruction of factories. The second world war gave a certain respite to world capitalism. By destroying the installations in Ger-

many, Italy, and all of Europe, the war opened up a field for development and for the sale not only of manufactured products but machinery.

But now this process has ended, and what they call a crisis of overproduction is occurring. They have to sell to someone. Since there are no areas of the earth left to conquer, they have to develop sectors already won in the colonial and semicolonial areas, and create petty-bourgeois strata, small agricultural proprietors, that can absorb the products of industry.

Q. In other words, are you also saying that this neocapitalism has a stake not only in industrializing the third world but also in processes of social reform?

A. That follows logically. The imperialists have an interest in seeing an agrarian reform carried out, but on their own model and in accordance with their own interests. There must be no doubt left that this is not calculated to serve the interests of the peasants. The best evidence of this, I think, is the case of the Huando ranch. In Huando there was no reform based on giving the land to the peasants who worked it.

The land was parceled out privately among the relatives and friends of the landlord. This gave rise to a layer of small proprietors, which is what the imperialists and the industrial bourgeoisie in general want. They do not want to give the land to those who work it.

Q. In Puno, for instance, can you carry out an agrarian reform based only on giving the existing cultivated land to the peasants who work it? In other words, is minifundism a sensible solution in terms of the welfare of the peasants themselves?

A. In terms of the economic well-being of the peasants, minifundism is not a correct solution in any sense. We socialists are aiming for socialist ownership and a socialist method of cultivating the land, of operating industry. If in some cases we proceed by parceling out the land—not in a private way, as is being done, but through a division carried out by the peasants themselves in a democratic way—it is precisely because we believe that agrarian reform and all

reforms must be carried out by the people themselves.

It may happen that backward sectors of the people, like the peasants in Cuzco, will insist on dividing up the land. I can talk best about Cuzco because that is where I am from, and I worked in the countryside there. In that region the peasants live in a stage of development that has important feudal characteristics. The products of La Convención, for example—which was my area—are destined for export. It forms part of the world market and the capitalist world. From that point of view you cannot say that it is a feudal region. But the serf system, which is a feudal feature, survives in the mountains. There you see a combined form of development. It has semifeudal, precapitalist, and capitalist aspects.

We as revolutionists, who base ourselves on the interests of the workers and on mobilizing the workers, must understand that some sections of the peasantry have capitalist-type aspirations. That is, they want to own the piece of land that they are working. For centuries the peasants have worked these plots of land to maintain themselves, but they had to pay for using them by going to work free for the landowner. Today these peasants' greatest aspiration is to own the land they are working and not to have to do unpaid labor for the landlord, to be able to devote their full time to getting the maximum production out of their plots.

We cannot go against this desire of the peasants, even though they have a bourgeois aspiration in relation to their semifeudal environment. They must, because they want to, pass through this capitalist stage. We think that collective ownership would be much more positive, and we will tell the peasants that. But revolutionists are basically democrats and we must accept the will of the majority, because it is the peasants who are going to carry out the agrarian reform.

If in carrying out this reform, the peasants take bourgeois-type measures in some areas, they will quickly learn better. Before long they will see that collectivism is in their interest, if we show them that other sectors where work is being done collectively are reaping more benefits. They will see cooperativism is in their interest, that socialism is in their interest. And then by their own will and as a result of

the vanguard's work in propagating socialist ideas, they will agree to join in cooperatives and to collectivize.

Q. It is being said now that the ratio between the population and the amount of arable land is such that if the agrarian reform law were applied over all the national territory, an appreciable percentage of the peasants would be left without land. This reality is supposed to override the question of whether the form of landholding is private or collective. The claim is that the problem is bound up with the reasonable minimum amount of land a family needs for making an adequate living and with the need to eradicate minifundism. How would you deal with this dilemma?

A. I think that the great solution for all these problems is to have the peasants themselves decide what measures are to be taken. The peasants may agree, precisely for reasons like those you mention, to work collectively, and that way they would produce more than working individually. Moreover, the peasants are going to try to bring new land under cultivation. They will also learn that there is no reason to let land lie fallow as is now being done on a grand scale. With techniques like crop rotation, fertilization, and so forth, they can raise agriculture to much higher levels.

Q. Do you mean intensifying agriculture?

A. Exactly.

Q. Isn't that, after all, an economic problem, a matter of huge investments and of education?

A. This problem can be largely overcome by mobilizing the peasants. If the peasants understand that they are working for themselves and if they know they can play an active role, they will overcome all these problems. The problem of education is misunderstood. It is not only that the peasants must know how to read and write. Above all, the peasants must realize that they have to use certain techniques. But if it is the enemy that is trying to force them to do this, the peasants may distrust these methods.

Q. Can you cite me a case where a socialist agrarian reform has been car-

ried out without great problems with the peasants and without imposing the principle of hierarchical authority?

A. There is a very bad interpretation of the character of our revolution . . .

Q. What do you mean by "our"?

A. What?

Q. What do you mean by "our"?

A. Our revolution, the revolution of those . . .

Q. Those who what?

A. Those who struggle for a revolution of the workers and the peasants. Let us say, the leftists . . .

Q. Do you mean the Trotskyists?

A. The leftists. There are some who think that our revolution must be a bourgeois one. Many leftists even support this government, thinking that it is making a bourgeois revolution, the type of revolution that corresponds to the stage the country is going through. "Our," then, refers to all of the left, including the opportunist sectors.

Another sector of the left thinks that our revolution must be purely socialist. We think that the reality of the country is primarily capitalist but with many precapitalist features characteristic of our underdevelopment. That is, we think that the situation of the country is one of combined development. From this flows the character of our revolution, which must be socialist fundamentally, but also must carry out a number of bourgeois-democratic tasks along the way. These are tasks the bourgeoisie should have completed but has not. This is precisely what distinguishes the agrarian reform we advocate. We do not push an agrarian reform that would be socialist at the outset because that would get a strong negative reaction from the peasants. We base ourselves fundamentally on peasant democracy, in letting the peasants decide . . .

Q. Would every valley decide what kind of landholding system, what kind of system of subdividing the land, and how large the plots should be?

A. Every valley, every communal village, every ranch union.

Q. Wouldn't this consolidate minifundism in the vast areas where it exists?

A. It might, it might consolidate minifundism. And this would lead these *compañeros* in a few years to realize that they were mistaken, because the socialist revolutionists would definitely be on the spot explaining the disadvantages of this system and carrying out a propaganda campaign for the adoption of collectivist-type systems. When we socialists are in power, we will educate but we will not force any section of the peasants to collectivize.

Forced collectivization is counter-productive. You can run up against a boycott by the peasants that way. For example, although a cooperative would be much more productive from the technical standpoint than private plots, it would have negative results if the peasants were opposed. It is much better to let the *compañeros* go through their experience and for us to go through it with them. But at the same time we have to carry out a systematic propaganda campaign in favor of collectivism, until we reach a point where the majority of the *compañeros* agree to collectivize. Our revolution is a profoundly democratic one, not in the electoralist sense, but because the people themselves, the masses themselves will decide by majority vote what measures are to be taken.

Q. If the vote were given to illiterates, would you still think that a process involving force was inevitable? Or would you come to believe in the electoral road?

A. Giving an electoral voice to the illiterates would be a great step forward, but I do not think the dominant forces, the ruling and possessing classes, will ever surrender power willingly. History has shown that no class gives up power on its own, that it uses force against the underclasses which the latter must repel. I think that the workers of Peru are going to have to meet violence with violence.

Q. Won't the idea of applying a system of direct democracy in the valleys, ranches, etc., lead in most cases

to solutions that are reactionary from a technical standpoint? Take a valley, for example, where 1,000 peasants possess minifundia of three-fourths of a hectare [1 hectare equals 2.47 acres] and a hundred families have more reasonable-sized holdings of three to four hectares. Wouldn't such a system result in the viable farms being swept away for the sake of giving a little extra land to the smallest plots, which would still be minifundia?

The mentality you say prevails in Huando is not, after all, characteristic of the rest of the country. Moreover, wouldn't it be very difficult to administer an agrarian reform process whose forms varied from valley to valley, from ranch to ranch, and from communal village to communal village?

A. In the first place, the peasants' attitude to the country's situation is antifeudal and anticapitalist in combined form . . .

Q. But with a sense of private property . . .

A. With a sense of private property. But let's look at each case closely. Let's consider the case of Chaupimayo and how the peasants there carried out the agrarian reform. In the first place, they got rid of the obligation of work on the land belonging exclusively to the landlord. This established every peasant as the de facto owner of the plot he had been assigned, since he no longer had to do labor to pay for the use of it. Then, the land that had been worked for the benefit of the landlord was collectivized. On one ranch and in one union the two aspects of the Peruvian revolution, its socialist and bourgeois-democratic aspects, were combined.

In various parts of the highlands and the lower slopes of the Andes, and also along the coast, there are great extensions of uncultivated land that could be brought into agriculture. They are being left uncultivated because they are being monopolized by landgrabbers.

Q. Do you really think that that sort of thing is going on?

A. I think that it is going on virtually throughout the Ceja de Montaña [the mountain-forest belt along the middle slopes of the Andes] and

in large sections of the highlands. I think also that if this land were divided among the peasants as was done in Chaupimayo, it would be intensively cultivated.

Q. Don't you think that in view of the provisions of the present agrarian reform law that systems of unproductive land-hoarding are at least condemned to die out in a short time?

A. The fact is that the law is not being carried out.

Q. You have to understand that the law has only been on the books for a year and a half . . .

A. You also have to understand the internal contradictions of the governing sector. The law was decreed with the intention that at least its main features would be carried out. In fact, the landgrabbers have maintained great influence, including in the bureaucratic machinery entrusted with carrying out this law.

And since the peasants are not allowed to mobilize, despite the fact that they are the only force that can effectively counterbalance this bureaucracy and these landgrabbers, in reality the government, in spite of itself, is permitting many reforms to remain a dead letter.

Q. If Hugo Blanco were running the government, do you think things could have gone much more quickly?

A. All right. I would never have been running the government. I would have been governed by the workers and peasants movement. We do not advocate government by one man or a team of persons. We call for a government representing the workers directly through workers' delegates subject to recall at any time. The workers must determine the direction of our entire economy, the branches of industry that need to be stimulated, the manner of the agrarian reform.

Q. Can you tell me any place where a system works that way?

A. Well, Russia at the beginning and, logically, before the bureaucratic degeneration. I cannot cite another example.

We started to do it in La Convención. There it was the peasants who

decided things. The bourgeois press and people said, some with good and others with bad intentions: "Hugo Blanco did this and Hugo Blanco did that. Hugo Blanco divided the land." It was not Hugo Blanco that did it. It was done democratically by the mobilized peasants. I might have been opposed to some of the attitudes they took, but they made their decisions in a democratic way and I had to accept the rules of peasant democracy.

Q. According to your own definition, the imperialists seem to be basing their domination today on maintaining a technological type of dependence in the third world. Do you think that your system of direct democracy is consonant with the demands of production that must be an increasingly complex and specialized process? Take for example running an advanced industrial enterprise which requires very precise decisions.

A. In reality our revolution is only part of the world socialist revolution, as Mariátegui¹ said. In that regard we still agree with El Amauta.²

We do not believe in a socialist revolution in one country. We are absolutely opposed to this absurd and anti-Marxist concept. This is a fairy tale invented by the bureaucracy for the express purpose of sabotaging the world revolution and subordinating the international revolutionary movement to the layers that usurped power from the Russian working class.

What is required is a revolution on a world scale. The Peruvian revolution is only part of this revolution. That is why we are organized as an international party, the Fourth International. We do not believe that Peru is going to solve its problems alone. We think that if Peru faces hostile pressure, a blockade, that it cannot find a solution through deals with imperialism or even capitulation to the Soviet bureaucracy, but only in an extension of the world revolution.

Q. Is the Soviet Union part of this

1. Jose Carlos Mariátegui (1891-1930), essayist who founded the revolutionary Marxist movement in Peru. — IP

2. "Amauta" is an old Quechua term for "philosopher." Mariátegui was very much interested in the status of the Indians in Peru. — IP

world socialist revolution?

A. The Soviet Union, yes. But the Soviet bureaucracy is against world revolution. Therefore . . .

Q. *Czechoslovakia? . . .*

A. The Czechoslovaks wanted a real socialist revolution and they wanted socialist democracy. That is why the Soviet tanks crushed them. It was the Soviet bureaucrats' fear that this spirit would spread to the workers in their own country and inspire them to revive the traditions of the revolution led by Lenin.

Q. *How do you explain the growing concentration of American investment in Europe and Japan, and its consequent withdrawal from the third world, which is presumed to be the area of imperialist exploitation?*

A. In fact, imperialism is being unified on a world scale. The big trusts that exist now are multinational. There is also another phenomenon. Big Japanese and European exports to the United States are capturing the market from many companies based in that country. Logically, the Yankee capitalists invest where it is most profitable, and if it is more profitable to invest in Europe or Japan, they invest there.

Q. *How can this be reconciled with the idea of imperialism exploiting the third world, if it is now more profitable to invest in the developed countries. Present-day capitalism . . .*

A. Does that stop them from exploiting us?

Q. *Let us say that it would seem that this exploitation has less importance for these countries, in terms of their own welfare or survival.*

A. World imperialism wants to continue dominating all sectors of the world. The fact that the imperialists are investing more in Europe does not mean that they are abandoning Latin America, Asia, or Africa. Otherwise, they would have gotten out of Vietnam some time ago.

The imperialists' stubbornness in Vietnam indicates not only that they want to make people think they are invincible. It also testifies to the eco-

omic interests they have in this entire region as well as in Latin America.

The fact that the American imperialists want to dominate the other industrialized countries does not mean that they do not want to dominate ours, dominate not only our production but our consumption. This is one of capitalism's great contradictions. Capitalism seeks to exploit the workers. But on the other hand it needs buyers, it needs workers getting higher wages in order to buy goods. The fact that it has one kind of interest in Europe and another in Latin America is only another indication of the contradictory character of capitalism.

Q. *Do you think it would suit the United States to see Peru today in a position like France, for example?*

A. As long as Peru can be industrialized in dependency and not in an independent form like France. Development in a dependent and semicolonial country cannot be mechanically compared with this process in highly developed countries, which industrialized along almost totally independent paths.

Q. *The claim is made that Peru's immediate development is tied to a natural necessity of exploiting the min-*

eral wealth of the country. Cuba in the same way, despite the political and social changes, has remained tied to sugar production. Exploiting our mineral resources requires a lot of investment. What would you recommend if the socialist world did not offer the kind of help necessary?

A. We do not say that we couldn't gain technical advantages from dealing with the capitalist world. We are prepared, even when the government is socialist, to trade with every country in the world, to do business with the Yankees themselves. Castro has made this point clear, and we agree completely with him.

There is no difficulty about doing business with the United States, as long as they don't attach political strings. If natural conditions so dictate, then it is all right for Peru to promote mining. Precisely because we don't believe in socialism in one country, we don't think that Peru has to do everything. Peru is part of the world economy. There is no country in the world that can supply all its own needs. This was one of capitalism's great contributions to humanity, unifying the world economy. Socialism is not going to do away with this economic unity but to the contrary take advantage of it, advance it, and intensify it. □

No More Profitable Losses

Sun Sets on the Rolls-Royce Empire

By Allen Myers

As materialists, we tend to look askance at such methods of foretelling the future as astrology and divination. Nevertheless, it would be difficult to blame an English capitalist if he saw an omen in the death of Charles Stewart Rolls.

On July 11, 1910, Rolls achieved the unfortunate distinction of being the first Englishman to die in an airplane accident. On February 4 of this year, the company he cofounded—Rolls-Royce, Ltd.—also crashed. Again, the cause was an airplane. Rolls-Royce should have kept its wheels on the ground.

The company was driven into bankruptcy by a contract to produce jet engines for Lockheed Aircraft, a U. S. corporation that is having its own financial difficulties. This was a rude blow considering the original expectations.

In March 1968, when it was announced that Rolls-Royce had won the contract to produce 540 RB-211 engines for the Lockheed Tristar jet, the Labour government of Harold Wilson hailed it as a great triumph for British exports. The *London Daily Express* declared: "The triumph of Rolls-Royce is a marvelous tribute to

our outstanding British design and manufacture . . ." The engineer who sewed up the order, David Huddie, was knighted.

We trust that the queen will not ask Sir David to turn in his title. The decline and fall of Rolls-Royce is not really his fault. Most observers seem to agree with the "informed commentator" quoted by Anthony Lewis in the February 5 *New York Times*:

"The reason for the collapse is simple. It was a series of gross errors by the management of Rolls-Royce, in this fatal contract with Lockheed."

Perhaps we lesser mortals who occasionally find our expenditures exceeding our income can take some consolation from the fact that the titans of industry and finance face the same sort of problem, although on a much vaster scale.

When Rolls-Royce signed the contract with Lockheed, development costs of the RB-211 were estimated at \$168,000,000. Since the reputation of British design and manufacture was at stake, it was only natural that Harold Wilson agreed to provide \$113,000,000 of this sum from the public till. Who could object to such an expenditure in defense of the national honor?

But as anyone who keeps an eye on such phenomena as food prices realizes, we live in a period of considerable inflation—caused, of course, by the unreasonable demands of workers. By last November, "greedy workers" had driven the cost of developing the RB-211 to an estimated \$324,000,000, and the representatives of Britain's reputation once again knocked at the treasury door in search for help in bearing their sacrifice.

Prime Minister Edward Heath, who had in the meantime replaced Wilson as chief guardian of the nation's welfare, persuaded several London banks to lend Rolls-Royce \$48,000,000. The public, he promised, would kick in an additional \$101,000,000 since the honor of England was involved. All he asked in exchange was that the company permit an independent auditing of its books.

How rueful the Rolls-Royce management must have looked when the auditors pointed out their error! The contract with Lockheed could not pro-

vide this pillar of British design and manufacture with the indispensable pillar of capitalism—a profit.

In fact, Rolls-Royce was committed to provide 540 engines at a price of \$840,000 each. The cost to Rolls-Royce, however, was \$1,104,000 per engine. It didn't take Heath's economic experts very long to figure out that Britain's reputation was going to lose \$264,000 in hard cash on every engine sold.

The Rolls-Royce management might have interjected that there was little danger of this since actual production of the RB-211 was highly questionable. Although Rolls-Royce had promised delivery of the entire order by November 1971, it had not yet put together even one engine that met specifications.

Unfortunately, an indefinite delay in production didn't offer a way out: A clause in the Lockheed contract provided financial penalties for late delivery. These could have amounted to as much as \$700,000,000.

Meanwhile, development costs had risen to \$408,000,000.

In a way, it seems unfair that the Rolls-Royce directors should be criticized so severely for their little miscalculations. Certainly they had every right to expect that in a matter of national honor, Heath would be no less generous than Richard Nixon, who recently rescued Lockheed from bankruptcy with \$781,000,000 in public funds.

But British imperialism lacks the resources of its senior partner, and Rolls-Royce was forced into bankruptcy.

Heath, who has been busy handing over to private enterprise some profitable sectors of nationalized industry, announced that the company's operations—except for the RB-211—would be nationalized.

This in turn pushed Lockheed once again to the brink of bankruptcy, since it will now either have to find someone else to make engines for the Tristar or pay considerably more for the RB-211. The banks to which Lockheed owes \$350,000,000 responded sympathetically to the dilemma by suspending plans to lend the company an additional \$50,000,000.

The Labour party, meanwhile, insisted that the government must con-

tinue with production of the RB-211. It was not immediately clear whether this position was a demonstration of Wilson's international solidarity with Lockheed's owners, or merely the result of his unfamiliarity with the gamblers' adage about not throwing good money after bad.

While the terms of the nationalization have not been announced, it was clear that the prestigious—and profitable—Rolls-Royce automobile would continue to be produced. Those who have a taste for elegance—and \$24,000 to \$35,000 to spend—will still be able to travel in a style befitting their station.

This was the one bright spot in the whole affair. We would hate to think that the frugal captains of industry would be denied the small luxuries they have earned by their skillful and farsighted management of the economy. □

Pumping Profits from Oil

When the Venezuelan government increased its share of oil profits from 52 to 60 percent last year, the oil companies were not really hurt as badly as their screams of outrage indicated.

The division between the government and the oil monopolies is calculated on the basis of "dockside" prices—that is, a largely arbitrary value set for oil before it is shipped. The dockside price in Venezuela is now around \$1.75 a barrel. The same oil when it reaches New York is worth \$4 a barrel. Transportation costs, even by the companies' figures, are only 75 cents a barrel.

The dockside price of Middle East oil is about one-half the cost in Venezuela.

The price regulation is maintained by monopoly control. In Venezuela, one company—a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey—controls one-half of the country's petroleum output.

Venezuela's known oil reserves have decreased 20 percent in the last five years. At the current rate of production, the present reserves will be exhausted in thirteen years.

Australian Commission Confused

The Australian Broadcasting Commission recently declared Margaret Court, the woman tennis champion, "Sportsman of the Year."

Premier Takes Care of His Own

During the five years he has been in office, the family of Premier Suleyman Demirel has become the second richest in Turkey, according to a Turkish paper quoted in the German weekly *Der Spiegel*.

Gdynia Workers Demand Probe of Mass Murder

[The following statement by the workers of the Polish port city Gdynia was published in the *New York Times* of January 28 and in the February 1 issue of the West German weekly magazine *Der Spiegel*. The two versions were apparently different abridgements of the same document. We have combined the variants, trying to get a version as complete as possible of the text.]

* * *

To All Countries of the World:

The workers of the Paris Commune shipyard in Gdynia, the dockers, and the blue- and white-collar workers of all enterprises on the Baltic coast urge condemnation of the mass murders committed against the innocent population of this area by the Polish NKVD. The murderers were Moczar's¹ torturers trained in special schools in Slupsk, Pila, and other Polish cities.

We ask that this letter be spread abroad by all the mass media. We demand punishment of those responsible for ordering the brutal murder of women and children, pregnant women, mothers, fathers, and sons, on December 17. On that date the victims were shot down as, in response to Kociolek's² appeal, they were returning to work in the shipyard, the docks, and the enterprises located in the area of Polska and Marchlewski streets, and on the Oksywie.

On December 16, 1970, between 8:00 and 9:00 p.m., Kociolek made a radio appeal for a return to work.

1. General Mieczyslaw Moczar, the head of the "Partisan," or Polish national Stalinist faction of the party. Responsible for the riot police at the time of the December clashes, he was promoted to full Politburo membership by the Gierak leadership. He is now in charge of "national security."
— IP

2. Stanislaw Kociolek was secretary of the Gdansk region of the party until July 1970. He was believed to be popular with the workers in the coast region and was sent in when the trouble rose to the danger point. He is in charge of economic matters in the Gierak leadership. — IP



MOCZAR: Workers charge him with murder.

In obedience to this appeal, in good faith and suspecting nothing, the workers of these enterprises were going back to their jobs.

On the way to the shipyard, the docks, and the other enterprises, you have to cross a railway bridge that links Czerwonych-Kosynierow Street and Polska Street.

The first to start down the steps of the railway bridge was a pregnant woman. About twelve paces behind her followed four workers, who were probably from the shipyard. At that instant without warning, bursts of machine-gun fire rang out. The woman cried, "Jesus! Mary!" and rolled down the steps. There was another series of machine-gun bursts. A worker slumped against the railing; three others tumbled down the stairs. An indescribable panic and horror seized the people. Shouts of "murder" were heard and blood flowed.

It was at that moment that two electric trains bringing workers from Gdansk and Wejherowo arrived at the Gdynia shipyard station. When the people getting off the train saw what

was happening they began to jump onto the rails and tried to escape along the tracks to Czerwonych-Kosynierow Street.

Two people fell onto the rails, probably shot by snipers because Moczar's men could not get at them as they were on the other side of the train. A large crowd gathered at Czerwonych-Kosynierow Street shouting: "Murderers! Gestapo!"

There was a general commotion, and feelings rose high against the so-called people's government which had given the order for this massacre. This state of affairs continued until it became light. Then helicopters went into action, dropping tear gas and strafing the crowd with machine guns. Many people were killed or wounded. The crowd ran for cover.

Paying no attention to the bullets, youths tore a door off its hinges and raised the body of a boy on it. He had been shot down on his way to school. The youths dipped a Polish flag in his blood and started marching toward the city. At least 2,000 persons joined the procession. They intended to go to the town hall to demand an explanation.

As they reached Swietojanska Street, Moczar's disciples were already waiting for them. A horrible massacre and bloodbath followed. You could hear only the screams and weeping of mothers, as defenseless people were slaughtered before their eyes.

We do not know why the authorities decreed a death sentence against the inhabitants of Gdynia. No one in this city had even broken a single windowpane. No one had damaged anything. So, we ask — Why?

The press reported that 21 people were killed; they should have added at least a zero.

The wounded were treated in inhuman fashion. The police said bandits should die like dogs and there was no need to take them to the hospital. From this it follows that in the eyes of the so-called people's government, workers are bandits. Eternal shame to a people's state that murders its own citizens and its own people!

Gdynia will never forgive Moczar

and Cyrankiewicz, who signed the death sentence against its people as well as the inhabitants of Gdansk, Elblag, Sztum, Slupsk and Szczecin, for the innocent blood they have shed.

We call on the United Nations to demand that the Polish authorities give an exact account of the number of people killed in the Baltic coast cities, and to demand that the bodies of the dead be returned to their families.

Teach-in at University of Rome

700 Students Back Polish, Czech Victims

Rome

More than 700 students packed the University of Rome auditorium January 26 for a teach-in in solidarity with the victims of bureaucratic repression in Poland and Czechoslovakia. The organization initiating the meeting was the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari (Revolutionary Communist Groups, the Italian section of the Fourth International).

Lucio Colletti, a prominent Marxist historian, pointed out that the repression in Czechoslovakia was only one episode in a long series of such campaigns that dated back to the Moscow trials.

The recent events in Eastern Europe, Colletti said, had once again raised the question of the nature of the bureaucratic workers states. For long years this question had been discussed only by small groups but now it is the subject of universal debate.

As an example of the reemergence of this question despite continuing bureaucratic terror, Colletti cited the case of two young Polish students, Jacek Kuron and Karol Modzelewski. These two recent victims of Stalinist repression authored the first Marxist critique of the bureaucratic system written in a degenerated or deformed workers state since the physical annihilation of the Left Opposition in the 1930s.

Livio Maitan, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, outlined the development of Poland since the second world war. He stressed that the December 1970 events marked the beginning of a new

They were taken away and buried in unknown graves.

This was another Piasnica.³

Signed: The Paris Commune shipyard workers, the dock workers, and the workers of the other enterprises.

3. Piasnica Wielka is a village near Gdansk, where 10,000 to 12,000 Poles were slaughtered by the Germans in 1939. — IP

stage in the Polish workers' struggle against the bureaucracy.

Luigi Pintor, a former Communist deputy purged by the party for his opposition to its bureaucratic policies, also spoke in solidarity with the victims of bureaucratic repression in

Yugoslavia

Tito Seeks U.S. Investments

A committee of the Yugoslav Federal Assembly has announced measures to make investment in the country still more attractive to foreign capitalists.

The Commission on Currency Reform on January 26 proposed amendments to the present investment law that will remove the obligation to reinvest a portion of profits and will give a formal guarantee of the "right" to withdraw all initial capital.

The amendments will go into effect when passed by the parliament.

Yugoslav law now encourages foreign capitalists to invest in enterprises jointly with the state. Since 1967, a total of \$60,000,000 has been committed by twenty-seven firms, primarily West German and Italian. The Italian corporation Fiat has put \$32,000,000 into the Crvena Zastava automobile factory.

The new regulations will make it easier for U.S. capitalists to invest in Yugoslavia. Alfred Friendly Jr. observed in the January 28 *New York Times*:

Eastern Europe. Pintor was one of the signers of the open letter which a number of well-known figures in the European left addressed to the Czech government demanding the release of youths charged with "Trotskyist activities." [See "Demand Release of Socialists Held in Prague Prison," *Intercontinental Press*, January 18, page 24.]

Pintor, who is a member of the *Il Manifesto* group, maintained that a process of capitalist restoration is in progress in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Soviet Union.

At the end of the meeting, Livio Maitan expressed the support of the Italian section of the Fourth International for street demonstrations in solidarity with the East European workers.

The axis of these demonstrations should be defense of the victims of repression, Maitan said. But at the same time the antibureaucratic slogans raised by the workers of the embattled Polish cities should be supported. □

... economic experts believe the new provisions will encourage American investors who have been hanging back. During his visit here [Belgrade] at the end of October, President Nixon restated his intention of extending United States Government investment guarantee provisions to Yugoslavia. As soon as Parliament actually promulgates the amended law, diplomats believe America will be able to honor its pledge." □

Less Glitter for Sierra Leone

More than two-thirds of the value of Sierra Leone's exports consists of diamonds. The country had a trade deficit in 1970 because the recession in the United States reduced the demand for diamonds.

New Use for Holy Water

An Anglican church in Queensland, Australia, is manufacturing and selling a window cleaner. The formula was developed by a parish priest, and the product was blessed in the church. It is being sold under the name "St. Andrew's Halo Window Shine."

Behind the Wave of Terror in Guinea

By Paul Doyen

[We have translated the following article from the January 29 issue of the Belgian revolutionary-socialist weekly *La Gauche*.]

* * *

"To put a stop to speculation and hoarding, the Enragés [the far left] demanded that terror be introduced, that hoarders be punished by death, that the guillotine be set up permanently in the public squares . . ." (Daniel Guérin, *La lutte de classes en France sous la Première République* [Class Struggles in France Under the First Republic].)

In the November 27, 1970, issue of *La Gauche*, a few days after the abortive invasion attempt, we wrote: "In 1958, along with Algeria, Guinea took the lead of the independence struggle. Ten years later this country may become the symbol of the second wind of the African revolution."

And we added: "The advocates of neocolonialism, the advocates of a course on the Houphouët-Boigny pattern, are still numerous. The only way to put an end to their plotting and sabotage is to place all power in the hands of the people."

In fact, as the news from Conakry confirms, the formidable popular mobilization, which, after a few uncertain hours, inflicted a new Playa Girón on imperialism, created the conditions for a deepening socialist revolution. In particular, it produced a situation in which the first practical measures could be taken to eradicate neocolonialism.

Despite its revolutionary verbiage, and its real struggle against a *certain kind* of imperialism, the government that rules in Conakry remains fundamentally tied to American imperialism. Moreover, these interests are gaining a firm footing in the coun-



SEKOU TOURE

try through their bauxite mining in Boké. American capitalists are carrying on these operations under the cover of a mixed company in which the Guinean state is associated with the international trusts.

The class that holds power in these circumstances is a bourgeoisie being formed in the bureaucracy. By means of the levers it commands in the state apparatus, the government, and the party, and by basing itself on the support of American imperialism, this stratum has succeeded in capturing political power to the detriment of the popular masses.

The arming and mobilization of the people dangerously weakened the power of this bourgeoisie, which lacks capital and which has derived its strength solely from the support of foreign capitalism. Under the cover of mixed national companies, this ruling class has permitted foreign capitalist penetration of the country.

Ismael Touré, Sékou Touré's half brother, is notorious in Guinea as the No. 1 ally of the United States. Therefore it is, to say the least, paradoxical that he has set himself up as the great accuser of the counter-revolutionaries and the incarnation of revolutionary virtue.

No honest militant in Guinea, no worker, no poor villager has ever taken Ismael Touré's words for good coin. Everybody knows that for a few dollars this practiced *griot* [a kind of African family bard, or professional eulogist] will strike up the purest Maoist, socialist, or African exceptionalist tune, depending on who pays the piper.

Therefore, those who have set in motion a Jacobin terror machine in Conakry bear an immense responsibility before history. By erecting gallows in the public squares, they are trying to divert the people's anger toward scapegoats.

The fact is you can't promise the people the stars for ten years—while you take all the gravy, and engage in financial manipulation (currency deals), hoarding, graft, and speculation on a grand scale—without somebody having to pay a price.

A look at the figures who show up on the list of persons sentenced to death or hard labor shows what is happening. The Sékou Touré government has exploited the people's hatred of the Portuguese mercenaries and their African puppets to settle accounts with several rival factions of the Guinean bourgeoisie. (Although we might better describe the latter as elements who aspire to form such a class, since one did not exist, or existed only in a very embryonic form, at the time of independence.)

On this list we find Lebanese, the perpetual fall guys, always mere front men for the big Guinean merchants. There are also West German citizens,

who make good trophies for those anxious to regain their anti-imperialist reputations. There are Touré's old rivals from the colonial period, representing a faction of the traditional chiefs (Ibrahim Barry, the so-called Barry III).

Finally the list includes some former members of the government who were *too* greedy in picking up quick personal fortunes (e.g., Camara Balla, former minister of foreign trade; and Seydou Conte, former minister of national education).

As regards the last category, it is significant that there has been no public discussion of their "large-scale activities to undermine the national economy, in particular by currency speculation." Probing into these gears might expose the whole mechanism that makes the system run. Therefore, the authorities prefer to use the amalgam technique, dumping all the persons accused into the same sack.

The whole process of cultural revolution initiated in 1967 was supposed to lead to challenging the power of imperialism (including in Boké), of neocolonialism, and of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie.

Today the whole population has mobilized in one great surge against the mercenaries and the invaders. But from the Parti Démocratique de Guinée [Guinean Democratic party] organ *Horoya* and from the language of Radio Conakry, it seems that all propaganda for the Socialist Cultural Revolution has been put under wraps. Even the word "socialism" is again being carefully expunged from official statements.

So the Guinean Democratic party left wing has capitulated completely to the right, which favors an alliance with Washington. The left wing has missed a unique opportunity. The popular mobilization gave it the chance to strike substantial, decisive blows against the real causes of the country's stagnating in the web of neocapitalism, and against the bureaucratic bourgeoisie that is maintaining itself in power through an alliance with American imperialism.

As a result of this failure, we are seeing a repeat performance in Guinea of the sinister scenario of the terror

that France experienced under the First Republic, and whose mechanisms Daniel Guérin admirably illuminated in the light of the theory of permanent revolution.

A process similar to what occurred in the French revolution has started in Guinea. The extremely low level of the productive forces in the African country gives rise to particularly difficult objective conditions for beginning socialist construction. It is possible to begin building socialism in Guinea, but success would depend on unselfish aid from the most advanced workers states. However, the seizure of political power in these workers states by a bureaucratic caste means that only a trickle of aid is forthcoming and even that is dependent on diplomatic considerations. Thus isolated in a neocolonial Africa, Guinea has remained desperately alone. This fact helps to explain why the Guinean people let power slip from their grasp.

Those who grabbed power in Guinea for their own profit think that they can hang on to it with the help of the gallows. But before long they will swing by their own rope. The people

will ultimately turn their anger against their most dangerous enemies.

The acolytes of imperialism, the hypocritical defenders of Western "civilization," are trying to take advantage of the terror unfolding in Guinea to discredit the revolution. They were less quick to protest when the allies of French imperialism, momentarily in power in the Cameroons, shot Ernest Ouandié and his companions. These men's only crime was to fight arms in hand against a corrupt and exploitive regime.

But these hypocrites would do well to stop and think before they weep their crocodile tears. Their friends, the American imperialists, who have just given a colossal gift of blood money to the very people setting up the gallows, will soon be totally unmasked. The truth, always revolutionary, will convict them.

The people really responsible for the Jacobin terror raging in Guinea are not the supporters of the socialist revolution. To the contrary, the promoters of the terror are those who see this as the only means for staving off a socialist revolution. □

Soviet Union

Ten Scientists Ask Release of Pimenov

[The sentencing of Soviet physicist Revolt I. Pimenov in October to five years' exile provoked renewed protest among other scientists who had denounced his arrest last July. (See *Intercontinental Press*, November 2, page 924.) Pimenov, the author of the study *Kinematic Spaces*—an extension of Einstein's special theory of relativity — was charged under the catchall law against "slandering the Soviet state and social system."

[The declaration printed below, which was sent to the chairman of the Supreme Court of the Russian Republic shortly after Pimenov was sentenced, recently became available in the West. One of the signers, nuclear physicist Andrei D. Sakharov, was reported to have been present during the trial.

[The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

By the verdict of the Kaluga regional court, our esteemed colleague, R. Pimenov, and his friend, the artist V. Vail, have been sentenced to five years' exile for "disseminating" among close associates several type-written texts which the court pronounced slanderous to Soviet society and the state.

In recent years such cases have evoked protests from many citizens. Every new trial of this type is all the more disturbing to the public because, despite repeated urging, legislators have not given a precise interpretation of Article 190-1 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Republic [prohibiting "slander against the Soviet state" — *IP*]. And, furthermore, violations of the

principle of public trial have become commonplace in these proceedings.

For their interest in critical articles on social themes, for their part in socially necessary exchanges of information, two men will be cut off from their work and from normal

life in their familiar surroundings for five years.

We call upon the Supreme Court to consider our concern over the harshness of the sentence and over prosecution for an act which in a demo-

cratic society must be considered a civil right.

Academician A. Sakharov, Academician M. Leontovich, V. Turchin, V. Chalidze, A. Tverdokhlebov, S. Kovalev, Yu. Shikhanovich, G. Podypolsky, I. Kristi, A. Lavut.

South Africa

Polaroid's 'Experiment' in Apologizing for Apartheid

[The following article was released February 1 by the Africa Research Group in Cambridge, Massachusetts.]

* * *

Polaroid cameras will remain on sale in South Africa.

The multimillion-dollar Cambridge-based corporation announced last week that it will reject the demands of the Black revolutionary workers movement to disengage from South Africa. Instead, as the company announced in full-page advertisements in newspapers throughout the country [the Polaroid Corporation's advertisement appeared in the January 13 issue of the *New York Times*], Polaroid will continue selling in that country and use a portion of its profits to encourage Black education.

The Polaroid Workers Revolutionary Movement [PWRM] promptly denounced the scheme as a farce. They announced plans to extend a boycott of all Polaroid products. The workers have been pressing demands that Polaroid withdraw from South Africa and contribute the profits it has made in that country since 1938 to recognized African liberation movements [see *Intercontinental Press*, December 14, 1970, page 1083].

After months of demonstrations and boycotts, the company sent a four-man, biracial team to South Africa to "study the problem." A full month after their return, the company announced its decision to stay put. Playing on the lack of popular knowledge about actual conditions in that country, Polaroid announced an "experiment" in Black education for South Africa. The program involved upgrading status and training for non-white employees who they admit were

underpaid. It also included provisions for scholarships for about 500 African students at various levels. The total package would cost the company an estimated \$100,000 per year. Polaroid's advertising offensive on the issue cost just about as much.

Polaroid also admitted that about 20 percent of all the pictures taken for the passbooks that all Africans are forced to carry in South Africa were taken on Polaroid equipment. The company announced that it would stop all sales to official agencies of the Pretoria government. The corporation acknowledged selling its instant photo identification system—the type used by many drivers' license programs and police departments—to the South African military.

In defense of their position, Polaroid, which presents itself as a liberal corporation, said that the Africans it spoke to during a ten-day visit to the country wanted them to stay. Moreover, Polaroid cited the contention of some experts who believe that apartheid in South Africa will be eased when more Blacks achieve mobility in the work force.

Knowledgeable Black South Africans dismiss both points as nonsense. By law it is a treasonable offense in South Africa, carrying the death penalty, to support any campaign for economic withdrawal of foreign firms or for the imposition of sanctions. What South African would have been foolish enough to suggest economic withdrawal to Polaroid's visiting team? Moreover, the major South African liberation movements all support a policy of withdrawal of Western capital from South Africa as the only realistic way to bring pressure on a government whose racism has been universally condemned.

South African labor legislation also makes it illegal for any Black to occupy a position senior to any white in a company. If equal opportunity employment is a farce in the United States, it is completely out of the question in South Africa. When Polaroid headquarters in Cambridge announced that Frank and Hirsch, the firm's South African distributor, was also an equal opportunity employer, the South African company had to deny it. "I don't know what they were talking about," Frank and Hirsch director Berman told the *Johannesburg Star*. "We are governed by the laws of the country. Would they allow the existence of such a policy? It is not possible."

Polaroid's liberal contention that "education" is the key to change in South Africa is a false alternative. Government controlled "Bantu" education specifically and openly trains Blacks for inferior positions. The government itself says: "There is no place for him (the Black) in the European (white) community above the level of certain forms of labor." This is education for servitude, not the key to change. Only revolutionary warfare can transform South Africa, say the liberation movements which represent the disfranchised African people.

Polaroid's decision to remain in South Africa is not really surprising. In the business community, the employee-initiated campaign was considered a test. As *Business Week* comments: "Even if there is a complete ban, the effect on Polaroid would hardly be noticed. Sales in South Africa amount to less than \$1.5 million a year out of a worldwide sale of about \$500 million." But Polaroid is not operating in a vacuum. There are over 300 other U.S. corporations

which reap sizable profits in South Africa. For these corporations, *Business Week* continues, "there could well be repercussions if such anti-apartheid protest spreads."

One of these corporations is General Motors. GM controls 18 percent of the auto sales in South Africa. And James Killian, chairman of the MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology] corporation and director at Polaroid, sits as well on the board of directors at GM. Killian certainly has good reason to see to it that Polaroid remains in South Africa.

Polaroid is integrated into an international business community which wants to stay in South Africa. For example, Polaroid deals with two banks—Morgan Trust and the Chemical Bank. Morgan was one of the primary financial supporters of South Africa after the Sharpeville massacre of 1960. Its loans helped South Africa to pull through the crisis after the massacre and become "stable."

The Chemical Bank has extensive interests in South Africa and was the target of a UN resolution because of proapartheid advertising. These are the banking institutions to which Polaroid must look for its next extension of credit.

Polaroid has spent the last ten weeks of "soul searching" investigation to determine the best method of legitimizing their stated policy on apartheid. Polaroid's experiment in numbing public concern about U.S. corporations doing business in South Africa is of interest to these other corporations, which may be following Polaroid's lead if its public relations ploy proves successful.

Thus, when Edwin Land, the brain behind Polaroid and chairman of its board of directors, says that he doesn't want to be pushed around by a group like the Polaroid Workers Revolutionary Movement, he speaks for a whole community of corporate and financial interests. "I know one thing," said Land, "if we at this moment, cut off all our business in South Africa, then the newspapers will be full of the vast Polaroid Revolutionary Movement. . . . We would have a series of new demands, and there is no doubt that the management would not meet them. . . . The world is watching us right now. Other companies are saying that 'if Polaroid can't make the grade, none of us can.'" □

Charges Against General Dismissed

Continued Cover-up in Mylai Case

As we predicted [*Intercontinental Press*, January 18, page 30], Major General Samuel W. Koster will not be court-martialed for his role in concealing the Mylai massacre.

That decision was announced January 29 by Lieutenant General Jonathan Seaman, commander of the U.S. First Army. Seaman dropped all criminal charges against Koster, he said, "in the interest of justice."

Last March 17, Koster was accused of failure to obey lawful regulations and dereliction of duty for not investigating evidence of the massacre at Mylai, which was carried out by troops of the Americal Division, at that time under Koster's command. Thirteen other officers were similarly accused.

The charges came as the result of an army investigation by a panel headed by Lieutenant General William R. Peers.

Since the Peers panel made its report, the army has dismissed all charges against twelve of the fourteen officers. Only two still face the—remote—possibility of trial.

(In regard to those accused of actually carrying out the massacre, the record is similar. Of twelve originally charged, seven have been released without trial. No decision has yet been made as to whether Captains Ernest Medina and Eugene Katouc will be court-martialed. Two enlisted men were tried and acquitted. The trial of the twelfth defendant, Lieutenant William Calley, will resume February 16 after a recess to permit a psychiatric examination.)

A statement released by the Pentagon acknowledged that Seaman had found "some evidence" that Koster knew of civilian deaths at Mylai and nevertheless did not investigate. Seaman concluded, however, that this failure was not an "intentional abrogation of responsibilities." The statement thus confirms that the "responsibilities" of U.S. officers in Vietnam do not include preventing the slaughter of civilians.

"General Koster's knowledge," the Pentagon said, "was limited to credible information about 20 civilians killed as an unfortunate incident in a con-

tested combat action with the enemy." A mere twenty dead civilians are beneath the notice of a general.

The assertion that Koster knew of only twenty deaths and that he thought a battle with armed Vietnamese liberation forces had occurred in Mylai has been contradicted by testimony at the Calley trial, which indicated that Koster observed at least part of the events from a helicopter. [See *Intercontinental Press*, January 25, page 54.]

In deciding to drop the charges, the Pentagon statement continued, Seaman took into account "the long and honorable career of General Koster."

The February 7 *New York Times* commented:

" . . . the dropping, without trial, of even those charges against General Koster arising out of admitted failure to report the killing of Vietnamese civilians creates the impression that the [Peers] panel's chief value in the eyes of the military was as a deflection device to take the edge off public anger."

The chief beneficiary of Seaman's action, however, is not the military, but Richard Nixon, who will now be spared the embarrassment of a public trial that would draw more attention to the kind of war he is waging in Indochina at the very moment he is enlarging it. □

Over 6% Jobless in Canada

Although the rate of inflation in Canada is slowing, it still remains significant. At the same time, measures intended to check inflation have produced rising unemployment. Edward Cowan reported in the January 25 *New York Times*:

"Canada produced nearly \$84-billion of goods and services in 1970, an increase of roughly 6 3/4 per cent from 1969. Nearly 4 per cent of the rise was caused by inflation, leaving real business expansion at a sluggish 3 per cent or less."

Unemployment grew considerably in 1970. The jobless rate in 1969 was 4.7 percent. The average for all of last year was 5.9 percent, and for the month of December it was 6.6 percent. In Quebec, 8.4 percent of the labor force was out of work.

Japanese Capitalists Look to China for More Trade

By Tatsuo Tomochika

Japanese industrialists are seriously concerned over Canada and Italy's diplomatic recognition of China.

Their worry stems from the fact that the explosive growth of Japanese production has already flooded the domestic market and nearly exhausted its possibilities for sales in the international market.

Since the autumn of 1969 the quarterly index of crude steel production of the Nippon Steel Company is reported to have exceeded that of the U. S. Steel Company, the biggest capitalist steel producer in the world. (*Oriental Economist*, Tokyo, August 1970, page 18.) The Japanese shipbuilding industry produces the greatest tonnage of ships in the entire world.

Spared the expensive missile competition that hampers the United States and the USSR, Japan has a tremendous productive power that no other country can easily challenge. Businessmen therefore understand the necessity of improving economic relations between China and Japan if the latter is to find outlets beyond the limited ones provided by the world capitalist market.

Canada's interest in the Chinese market alarms Japanese businessmen, who had hoped to monopolize Chinese trade and gain an advantage over their American and West European competitors. They recognize that behind the Canadian tie with China stands the power of U. S. business. This is so because of the large amount of American investment in Canada.

"... the Canadian export drive," says the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, "will have the important backing of US resources behind it. Reports are current in Tokyo that Canadian subsidiaries of US industrial giants, such as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and Du Pont, are already making preparations to enter into trade with China." (October 31, 1970, page 48.)

This puts the Japanese bourgeoisie face-to-face with its deepest contradiction since the end of World War II.

The irreversible tide of the colonial revolution in Asia on the one hand and the decline of American influence on the other require the ruling class to take a stronger anticommunist, counterrevolutionary position. At the same time, however, the rapidly expanding Japanese industry needs an opening to the markets of the workers states, particularly China and the USSR.

These markets are necessary if Japanese industry is to remain profitable enough to compete successfully with the U. S. and European capital that is entering the country under the liberalized capital import regulations. This dilemma is compounded by the high tariffs on Asian agricultural products.

The Japanese bourgeoisie has found only one weapon against the threat of overproduction that allows it to maintain prices. This is the deliberate limitation of production.

There is discussion of the fact that West German steelworkers gained an extension of their Christmas holidays with full pay. In that country, 3,000,000 tons of rolled steel are lying idle in dealers' stocks or customers' yards. In response to this circumstance, German steel companies decided to cut output by 20 percent in the final quarter of 1970. Output reduction on a smaller scale was also expected in France, Italy, and the Netherlands. (*The Economist*, London, November 7, 1970, pages 74-75.)

This restriction of output allowed the companies to maintain prices and to avoid laying off workers, which would have created labor unrest.

Japanese industrialists must have already learned this lesson. But the curtailment of production does not benefit the workers, even if they receive full pay. The measure is only a temporary solution.

To defend their own interests, the Japanese workers will have to fight for a program that includes: immediate diplomatic recognition of all work-

ers states; opening of trade negotiations with them; and the abolition of the unreasonable tariffs on agricultural imports from Asia. □

Nigerians Support Angela Davis

The Nigerian Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization has launched a fund to aid in the defense of Angela Davis. At a January 29 news conference, the group announced its support for Davis, who faces a possible death sentence in a clearly political trial [see the January 18 issue of *Intercontinental Press*].

According to a Reuters dispatch printed in the January 30 *Washington Post*, the organization plans a public appeal for funds throughout Nigeria. It also urged the Nigerian government to contribute to the defense fund.

A spokesman at the news conference said the group regards Davis as "a victim of blatant American political oppression and repression." □

Sign of Underdevelopment?

"There are profitable opportunities all through French-speaking Africa. As part of a banking network that's been in these countries since their beginnings, Societe Generale and its local affiliates can pinpoint productive potentials for you. . . .

"The 'how' of approaching authorities in French-speaking Africa is quite important. Consult Societe Generale . . . the bank with long, deep experience in gaining official cooperation."—From an advertisement in the January 29 *New York Times*.

The ad revealed one apparent difference between underdeveloped and developed capitalist societies. In the U. S., where politicians often become millionaires, the "how" of approaching officials is not nearly as important as the "how much."

Indian Ministers Doing All Right

Government ministers in India are paid more than forty-five times the average per capita income. They also receive free housing.