

# Intercontinental Press

*Africa*

*Asia*

*Europe*

*Oceania*

*the Americas*

Vol. 10, No. 14

©1972 Intercontinental Press

April 10, 1972

50c

## **ALL OUT APRIL 22!**



### **Hanoi Launches 'Protective Reaction' Ground Strike**

# Charges Against Feliciano Dropped

All major counts in the arson-bombing trial of Puerto Rican nationalist Carlos Feliciano, who has been held in prison since May 16, 1970, were dropped March 23. The action came as a result of a deal offered by District Attorney Burton Roberts according to which Feliciano would plead guilty to the relatively minor charge of "reckless endangerment."

Originally, Feliciano had been charged with bombing or burning forty-one buildings. A two-year campaign to free him has been waged by both civil libertarians and militants in the Puerto Rican freedom struggle.

The district attorney's offer took place during a court battle over a hearing that would have exposed the illegal manner in which Feliciano's home and car were searched while the state was collecting "evidence" against him.

Assistant District Attorney Kenneth O'Malley had been arguing strenuously against holding the hearing, which, according to Feliciano's attorney William Kunstler, would have resulted in the state's case being crushed.

Bronx Supreme Court Judge Sidney Asch conceded that Kunstler had a "good point," and asked for a delay so he could check his law books. At that point Roberts appeared in the courtroom and offered the deal.

A press release issued by the Committee to Defend Carlos Feliciano states, "After conferring with movement leaders, his family, and members of his committee, Carlos decided that this deal, wiping out the threat of a conspiracy charge levelled against the whole movement (because of the nature of the bombing allegations), was a good one. According to the Committee to Defend Carlos Feliciano, in the minds of many militants in the Puerto Rican movement, Judge Asch has the reputation of being 'a decent and honest man,' the most likely of all New York judges to mete out a fair sentence.

"For the Committee to Defend Carlos Feliciano and the Puerto Rican people, the only fair sentence is for Carlos Feliciano to walk out of the court a free man."

Sentencing is scheduled for April 10. □

## In This Issue

<b>FEATURES</b>		The Fourth International—by Pierre Frank
	394	Chapter 6: 1948 to 1968
<b>U. S. A.</b>	378	Charges Against Feliciano Dropped
	380	Iranian Student Fights Deportation —by Mike Kelly
	391	Found: Carload of Mail Missing Since '70
	397	Nixon Tightens Film Blockade
	398	Press Lifts Lid Higher on Corruption in Washington
	400	Jury Finds Soledad Brothers "Not Guilty"
<b>INDOCHINA WAR</b>	379	Hanoi Launches "Protective Reaction" Ground Strike—by Allen Myers
<b>WEST GERMANY</b>	380	1,200 in Frankfurt Hear Mandel Speech
<b>IRELAND</b>	381	Internment Remains the Crucial Issue
<b>CANADA</b>	381	Public Employees Walk Out in Quebec
<b>TURKEY</b>	382	Government Dooms Kidnapped Technicians
<b>ARGENTINA</b>	383	Lanusse Decides to Sacrifice Kidnapped Executive
	385	Witch-Hunt in Argentina
<b>SOVIET UNION</b>	386	Kremlin Troubled by "Flash Points" of Dissent —by George Saunders
	388	KGB Carries Out Mass Arrests in Ukraine —by Ted Harding
<b>SWITZERLAND</b>	387	Call for Antiwar Demonstrations April 22
<b>ALBANIA</b>	389	Hoxha Cool to Nixon-Mao Detente
<b>GREECE</b>	390	Fourteen Prisoners Sentenced by Military Courts
<b>CYPRUS</b>	390	Athens in New Attack on Makarios —by Jon Rothschild
<b>BAHREIN</b>	391	British Officers Crushed Strike
<b>BANGLADESH</b>	392	Rahman Promises Trials of War Criminals
<b>CEYLON</b>	392	Tamil Party Raises Autonomy Demand
	393	Trotskyist Youth League Members Jailed
<b>ITALY</b>	393	NATO Finds a Staunch Defender
<b>CHINA</b>	400	"Maoist Document" Reveals More Secrets About Taipei Than About Peking
<b>REVIEWS</b>	401	Trotsky's "1905"—The Unity of History and Politics—by George Novack
<b>DOCUMENTS</b>	405	Ukrainian Journal Evaluates Soviet Dissidents
	406	Soviet Intellectuals Write to London "Times"
	407	Czechoslovak Appeal Against Political Repression
	408	Relatives Report Torture of JVP Leader
<b>PHOTOS</b>	377	Antiwar demonstrators in San Francisco on April 24, 1971 — by Ron Payne
<b>DRAWINGS</b>	379	Vo Nguyen Giap; 384, Alejandro Lanusse; 399, Richard Kleindienst—by Copain

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: Allen Myers.

COPY EDITOR: Ruth Schein.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders, David Thorstad.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Lawrence Rand.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; 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, 10 Impasse Guemeene, Paris 4, 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 © 1972 by Intercontinental Press.

# Hanoi Launches 'Protective Reaction' Ground Strike

By Allen Myers

APRIL 3—One week after Nixon's cancellation of the Paris peace talks, the Vietnamese liberation forces responded to the continued escalation of the air war with "protective reaction" strikes—to use a favorite term of the Pentagon—at Saigon troops and their U.S. "advisers" in Quangtri province.

The "protective reaction" began March 30 with artillery and infantry attacks on the string of bases across South Vietnam's northernmost province. By April 3, it was reported that the only base in the province remaining in the hands of the puppet forces was at Quangtri City, the provincial capital.

"The North Vietnamese," Craig R. Whitney wrote in the April 3 *New York Times*, "have been able to advance openly, in large units, with tanks and artillery strung along the roads and fields where peasants farmed."

In abandoning one camp, Saigon troops were in such a hurry that they left behind four long-range artillery pieces.

"Heavy fighting was also reported," Whitney added, "Saturday and yesterday [April 1-2] near the Cambodian border northwest of Saigon, in Tayninh Province. North Vietnamese troops moved into South Vietnam and briefly overran Fire Base Pace, just east of the border on Route 122.

"An American observation helicopter was reported shot down there Saturday afternoon, and two crewmen killed. . . ."

Although heavy clouds prevented U.S. planes from providing close air support to the puppet troops and their U.S. "advisers," B-52 bombers dropped tons of bombs over Quangtri province in an effort to slow the rout.

The North Vietnamese radio reported that waves of U.S. planes had also bombed the city of Vinhlinh April 1, and that three of the planes had been shot down. The U.S. command admitted four "protective reaction" raids on North Vietnam April 2. In Quangtri province, at least three U.S. helicopters and one observation plane

were shot down.

The number of planes involved in the "protective reaction" raids was not disclosed, in keeping with a policy recently adopted to conceal the extent of the air war.

"The U.S. military command's latest clampdown on the flow of war news from Vietnam," Daniel Southerland wrote in the March 30 *Christian Science Monitor*, "was a direct result of White House pressure to keep the war off the front pages in this elec-



GIAP: "United States imperialists . . . are in a fix."

tion year, according to well-informed sources in Saigon."

Southerland quoted the reaction of one reporter to this suppression of news: "Since the war hasn't faded away, they're hoping for second best. They're hoping the press will fade away."

Nixon responded to the Vietnamese "protective reaction" strikes by preparing the largest air armada in three years for massive air raids against North Vietnam as soon as weather permitted. The propaganda justifica-

tion for the coming raids was given in an April 2 claim by Washington that the North Vietnamese had violated the 1968 "understanding" that Lyndon Johnson said was the price of the bombing "halt."

(The existence of such an understanding has been denied, not only by the Vietnamese, but also by former officials of the Johnson administration.)

Hanoi's "protective reaction" moves seemed to have doomed Nixon's hopes of keeping the war "off the front pages." It made clear once again that the most massive bombing campaign in history has not succeeded in defeating or intimidating the Vietnamese people.

General Vo Nguyen Giap, North Vietnamese minister of defense, was reported in an April 2 North Vietnamese radio broadcast to have called on "the Vietnam people's armed forces" to continue the struggle until "complete victory."

In a speech to North Vietnamese army personnel, Giap said that "the United States imperialists who have sustained heavy defeats are facing innumerable difficulties and are in a fix."

In an apparent reference to the current battles, he added: "The Vietnamese people have gained tremendous successes and the situation is developing to their advantage. . . . Bringing into full play their position of offensive, our armed forces and people are dealing heavy blows at the enemy."

The current fighting will deal a powerful blow to the illusions that have been created in the United States by Nixon's propaganda about "winding down the war" and the Nixon-Mao détente. With the war back on the front pages, the antiwar movement has an opportunity to mobilize the war-weary American people in the streets to demand the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops, planes, and matériel from Indochina.

The April 22 demonstrations in New York and Los Angeles should be a massive demand of "Out Now!" □

## Iranian Student Fights Deportation

By Mike Kelly

Seattle

Babak Zahraie, Iranian foreign student leader at the University of Washington, was ordered deported from the United States by the U.S. Immigration Service on March 14. According to Dan Smith, Zahraie's American Civil Liberties Union attorney, this decision is being appealed to the Immigration Board of Appeals in Washington, D.C. If the Board of Appeals refuses to overturn the deportation order, Zahraie will appeal the ruling to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. There is an automatic stay of execution of the deportation pending appeals.

Zahraie, twenty-one, is president of the University of Washington Foreign Student Council. The Immigration and Naturalization Department initiated deportation proceedings against him on February 9. At that time Zahraie was coordinator of the Council of Student Delegates to Roll Back Tuition, a coalition fighting a tuition increase at the university.

Immigration officials claimed that Zahraie's role as a leader of the campus struggle was "a disgrace to this nation." The Committee to Defend Babak Zahraie—whose sponsors include MECHA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán—Chicano Student Movement of Aztlán), Graduate Professional Student Senate, Young Democrats, Foreign Student Council, the Iranian Student Association, and the Student Mobilization Committee—launched demonstrations in support of Zahraie on February 22, 25, and 28, when hearings were held before local authorities.

In the March 14 decision, the Immigration Department hearing officer, John W. Keane, ruled that Zahraie did not have proper papers when he made a short trip to Canada in November 1971. Keane declared he had no jurisdiction to consider the fact that Zahraie was unable to comply with the Immigration Department regulations because the department was holding his passport. Immigration authorities had earlier dropped other

charges, including one of "subversion," in the face of public protest.

Bahram Atai, secretary of the Committee to Defend Babak Zahraie, announced that the committee plans to

## Continued Protest Against Ban

### 1,200 in Frankfurt Hear Mandel Speech

Student action against the West German ban on Ernest Mandel continues to mount. Next to the 2,000-strong protest at the West Berlin Free University February 28, the largest rally was the March 22 meeting in Frankfurt. There, some 1,200 young students, workers, and intellectuals met to protest the ban on Mandel, as well as all other repressive measures taken in the last months against the German left.

The Frankfurt action was organized by the Voltaire Club, a leftist cultural group. The rally took the form of a wide united front of all leftist tendencies in the German workers' movement.

Among the speakers were Wolfgang Lefèvre, a former leader of the West Berlin SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund—German Socialist Student Federation); Georg Fülberth, a Communist party sympathizer; Jürgen Seifert, former SDS president, and Sibylle Plogstedt, representing the Gruppe Internationale Marxisten (International Marxist Group), German section of the Fourth International.

The high point of the evening was a speech by Mandel himself, played from a tape recorder. Mandel analyzed the objective roots of the current intensification of repression throughout Western Europe. He stressed the necessity for a united front of all tendencies in the workers' movement, aimed at rolling back the slightest restriction on civil liberties.

The principal objective of the bour-

step up its activities and has launched a petition campaign on the University of Washington campus. Atai said that the committee is still in need of funds to press the appeal. Donations should be sent to the Committee to Defend Babak Zahraie, c/o University of Washington "Hub," Seattle, Washington 98105.

If the U.S. government succeeds in deporting Babak Zahraie to Iran, he could face imprisonment, torture, and death, as has happened to other Iranian student activists. □

geoisie, Mandel said, was not to weaken the far-left groups, but to limit the right to strike, to crush strikes, whether they be wildcat or protracted, and to reverse the relationship of forces between labor and capital.

The bourgeoisie goes after the revolutionary groups because it knows that they will never collaborate in the regime's effort to justify the antiworking-class repression, nor will they passively accept it. The revolutionary groups will instead organize vigorous resistance to the repression, and this resistance has the potential to mobilize masses of people.

The day after the Frankfurt rally, meetings were planned for several other cities, notably Leverkusen and Heidelberg. Teach-ins have already taken place in, among other places, Cologne, Bremen, Stuttgart, Tübingen, and Constance. At many of these rallies Mandel, thanks to the tape recorder, was able to address the participants.

The response of the left has shown that the Social Democratic government's ban on Mandel's entering West German territory is not only disgraceful but downright ridiculous. Its practical effect has been to increase the size of the audience for Mandel's revolutionary and "subversive" views. □

#### Pandering to Profits

U.S. toy manufacturers are predicting a boom in panda sales in the wake of Nixon's China trip. "Remember," noted one profit-conscious observer, "you don't have to pay royalties to pandas."

## As Britain Takes Over in Northern Ireland

### Internment Remains the Crucial Issue

"What we want now is an end to the shooting and the fighting and the bombing and the warfare—we're all tired of it," said Joseph Breen in a Bogside pub in Derry in the wake of the British decision to impose direct rule of Northern Ireland. "You might say that we are all thirsting for peace. So are all the boys in the internment camps. The IRA wants them out, so do I, but we have the government's promise that they'll be let out gradual if the fighting stops. I'm for letting them prove it."

The statement was a reflection of the fact that the Catholic community will be watching closely to see if the British move actually results in any bettering of the situation for them.

"Now that we are to be ruled from London," another Bogside resident, Daniel Ryan, told *New York Times* correspondent Michael Stern on March 27, "we'll all be treated the same—Catholics and Protestants alike—and maybe we can get on to doing something about unemployment. . . . The next government has to make sure that the jobs are open to everybody. The discrimination against Catholics is what started us all down this road."

But Prime Minister Edward Heath's decision to impose direct rule does nothing to eliminate the underlying grievances of the minority in Northern Ireland regarding discrimination.

"The crucial issue in the Catholic community remains internment," wrote *New York Times* correspondent Bernard Weinraub from Belfast March 26. "If the policy continues, or if only a handful of the 900 men held without trial are released, then the Catholic neighborhoods will probably turn with renewed anger against the British soldiers here."

In the Irish Republic, the Provisional republicans denied reports on March 27 that they were split over how to respond to direct rule or that their Derry branch had declared a truce. Chief of staff Sean Mac Stiofain described reports of differences as "wild speculation."

The same day, according to a report in the *New York Times*, the head of the Official Sinn Féin, Tomás Mac

Giolla, was cleared in Dublin of charges of being a member of an illegal organization, attempting to raise a military force without constitutional authority, and possessing incriminating documents.

"The prosecution had submitted as evidence what it said were motions made at an IRA convention two years ago for a military build-up, a take-over of the republic, and extension of the power to impose the death penalty. Mr. Mac Giolla and three persons accused with him denied any knowledge of the documents."

One of the others, Sean O'Cionnaith, the U. S. organizer for Sinn Féin, was fined \$26 for possessing incriminating documents. Charges against the other two were dropped.

Work stoppages and demonstrations occurred throughout Northern Ireland on March 27-28 in response to a call by the right-wing Protestant Ulster Vanguard. "William Blease of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions, which opposed the strike, said that up to 180,000 of Ulster's 470,000 workers were out," reported Weinraub on March 27, "but he noted that many had been forced to go home because of the power cuts." The Ulster Vanguard said that 300,000 had taken part.

At a rally that day in Belfast, estimated by Weinraub at 25,000, the

leader of the Ulster Vanguard, William Craig, called on Protestants to "turn our backs" on the administration of the new secretary of state for Northern Ireland, William Whitelaw.

The following day, former Prime Minister Brian Faulkner addressed a rally of an estimated 50,000 persons. Although he called for noncooperation with the Whitelaw administration, two days later he was saying the opposite, pledging to cooperate with Whitelaw and not to be "truculent or unreasonable."

The appearance of Faulkner at a rally sponsored by his political enemy William Craig caused some confusion among Unionists, according to Weinraub. "Faulkner has quite clearly decided that if he is to remain a figure of power he has got to get under the umbrella of Craig and the Vanguard Protestants," he was told by a close associate of the former prime minister.

Such an association, Weinraub wrote in the March 30 *New York Times*, "would split the Unionist party and result in numerous defections to the moderate Alliance party, a two-year-old group with a steadily growing Protestant and Catholic membership, largely middle-class."

Craig said that his organization intends to "continue to mobilize the country to defeat the British initiative. There will be a campaign of civil disobedience. There will be a boycott against all those associated with the struggle against Ulster. There will be lightning strikes of industry." □

### Public Employees Walk Out in Quebec

Most of Québec's 210,000 public service employees did not show up for work March 28 in the largest single strike in the history of the Canadian labor movement. The one-day solidarity action was called by a united front of three union organizations: the Confederation of National Trade Unions, the Québec Labor Federation, and the Québec Teachers Corporation.

The strike was called to back up contract demands now being negotiated with the government and involved teachers outside the Montréal

area, Liquor Board employees, highway maintenance workers, government office workers, health and welfare department employees, school maintenance workers, and nonmedical workers in many hospitals.

The government obtained injunctions that prevented strikes at some hospitals and at the Québec Hydroelectric Commission.

Yvon Charbonneau, president of the Teachers Corporation and spokesman for the united front, said the strike had shown the solidarity of all government workers. □

# Turkish Government Dooms Kidnapped Technicians

Turkish police, under the personal direction of Minister of the Interior Ferit Kubat, stormed a house in the small mountain village of Kizildere on March 30 and killed ten alleged members of the Turkish People's Liberation Army (TPLA). The attack was the climax of a four-day search for three NATO technicians (two Britons and one Canadian), who were kidnapped from their base in the coastal town of Unye on the night of March 26.

The Turkish government, which does not always tell the truth, claimed that the three hostages had been executed before the police attack. This contention was not the only dubious one in the whole affair.

On March 27, Musa Eran, governor of Ordu province (where the NATO installation is located), said that five "urban guerrillas" had entered an apartment building in Unye, tied and blindfolded ten NATO employees, and taken three of them away in a Land Rover.

According to a March 27 Associated Press dispatch from Unye, "informed sources" reported that the kidnapers had left a note demanding that three alleged TPLA members who have been condemned to death be released in exchange for the freeing of the NATO hostages. Governor Eran and the district attorney both denied the existence of any such note, but the story continued to circulate and acquired something of an official status.

Whether or not the kidnapers intended to exchange the hostages for political prisoners, the kidnapping was coincidental with the last "legal" procedures before the execution of three Turkish leftists. On March 23 President Cevdet Sunay signed death sentences for Deniz Gezmiş, Yusuf Aslan, and Hüseyin İnan, who were convicted last October 9 of having kidnapped four U.S. airmen and of having committed other acts of violence. Since the sentences had already been approved by the parliament, execution was thought to be imminent.

But there was considerable opposition to the president's decision, both

inside and outside Turkey. In France, the Committee to Support Victims of Repression in Turkey, which includes among others Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Maxime Rodinson, and several professors and lawyers, appealed to Sunay not to sign the order. André Malraux, while not a member of the committee, signed its appeal. The Union of Turkish Students in France issued a similar plea, and the Norwegian and Austrian ambassadors to Turkey urged clemency.

In Turkey itself pressure has been steadily mounting, despite a massive government repression of all dissent, to end capital punishment for political offenses and establish some semblance of civil liberties.

The present regime was installed on March 25, 1971, after the army forced the preceding government to resign. Just one month and one day after taking power, Premier Nihat Erim declared martial law in eleven provinces. The terms of the so-called state of siege give the state the right "to search without warrant, ban any meeting, suspend the activities of any organization, impose curfews, and set up military tribunals to try cases involving crimes against state security."

The emergency decree, put into effect to smash a growing wave of student and Kurdish radicalism, was followed by the arrest of hundreds, the suppression of all opposition papers in the country, the occupation of the universities by police, the sentencing of leading journalists to long prison terms (well over 100 years in some cases), and the banning of a number of organizations, including Dev Genç (Revolutionary Youth) and the TPLA.

But there has been some resistance on the part of the bourgeois Republican People's party, led by İsmet İnönü, to the army's attempt to resolve Turkish social problems with armed force. The RPP has opposed reforms in the constitution that have been proposed by Premier Erim. Recently, İnönü introduced a bill into the parliament that would have barred capital punishment for political offenses.

Erim's determination to go ahead with the execution of the three sentenced TPLA members was seen as a central issue in the conflict between the two wings of parliament over tactics to be used in crushing the left.

From the beginning, Erim made it clear that there would be no negotiations with the kidnapers. The government, he said, was "determined not to give in to blackmail." Interior Minister Kubat declared that "as many troops as necessary" would be employed to find the kidnapers, and that "all of Turkey is included in the search zone."

"These are the final convulsions of the street bandits," Erim said, "for they are being caught one by one."

On March 29, the Turkish National Security Council issued an appeal to the country's political leaders urging them to end their "sterile squabbling" and support the regime's "law and order" campaign. The council requested new powers for the executive in order to "eliminate all possibility of new crises and internal troubles."

In Istanbul, on the night of the kidnapping, twenty-five persons were arrested and charged with belonging to illegal leftist groups. Martial law was extended for another two months.

In its haste to use the kidnapping as an excuse for still another crackdown on civil liberties, the regime fell into a series of contradictions in its reports on the kidnapping.

First, there was the question of the elusive ransom note. Second, the official press agency published a number of lists of those allegedly involved. The first included the name of Omer Ayna, who escaped from a military prison last November. Then a new list came out, minus Ayna's name. But when the house in Kizildere was taken, Ayna's name reappeared as

### When You Move...

Don't count on the post office forwarding your Intercontinental Press! It's against their rules.

Send us your new address. And in plenty of time, please.

one of the dead "terrorists."

The circumstances of the police assault are still unclear. First government reports said all the kidnapers had been killed in an explosion. Later, a government spokesman said the police had taken the house in an assault with tear gas, and that the kidnapers had been shot. The confusion, the spokesman said, arose from the fact that the kidnapers had thrown hand grenades at the police.

The government never explained what evidence led it to the conclusion that the kidnapers had killed the hostages before the police assault. What was clear, however, was that the regime was dead serious in its decision not to bargain with the kidnapers, regardless of the fate of the NATO technicians. After the house was surrounded, according to a March 30 Associated Press dispatch, the kidnap-

pers offered to release the hostages in exchange for a guarantee of safe conduct out of Turkey. If there were any other ransom demands, they were dropped at that time. For such an offer to have been made, the hostages must have been alive. But Interior Minister Kubat, present on the scene, rejected the deal and ordered the police assault.

British Foreign Secretary Alec Douglas-Home took a rather philosophical view of the Turkish government's willingness to sacrifice the lives of British personnel: "This senseless violence against innocent people is a terrible feature of the times in which we live."

It is unlikely that the Turkish government, which is not known for great independence of action, would have acted as it did without first consulting the Heath government. It would

thus appear that an international understanding has been reached, at least between Britain and Turkey, that kidnapers are not to be bargained with, and that if hostages are killed, it is just a "terrible feature of the times in which we live."

How wide the latest witch-hunt in Turkey will become remains to be seen. Premier Erim spent March 18 to 23 in Washington and obtained Nixon's pledge to help "modernize" Turkey's armed forces. The premier, who actually called his country an "outpost of Western civilization," considers himself to be up against a far-flung web of subversive intrigue.

He told the National Press Club that he faced a "very well organized plot," manned by urban guerrillas trained in Palestine and Berlin, allied with Kurdish separatists with headquarters in Stockholm. □

## ERP Twice Postpones Deadline

# Lanusse Decides to Sacrifice Kidnapped Executive

APRIL 2— Outside of Argentina, the sensation created by the kidnapping of Oberdan Sallustro has died down. Very little is now to be found in the press about it. Since our report in last week's issue of *Intercontinental Press*, however, further developments have occurred, and from clippings sent us from Buenos Aires, we have been able to ascertain additional details about the first days of the case.

The ransom demands issued Friday, March 24, by the commandos of the ERP [Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—Revolutionary Army of the People] were as follows:

### *On the government:*

1. Fifty imprisoned guerrillas to be released, given valid passports, and flown to Algeria.

2. An unspecified number of imprisoned union activists and leaders to be released.

### *On Fiat:*

1. Reinstatement of all workers fired since October 1971 (some 500 in all).

2. Withdrawal of police guards stationed in Fiat plants for the past six months.

3. Distribution of \$1,000,000 in school supplies together with a message from the ERP.

4. "Indemnification" of the ERP by Fiat. No amount was specified, this being left open to negotiation.

### *On the Buenos Aires press:*

1. Publication in full and without censorship of all communiqués issued by the ERP.

The ERP communiqué stated that a "death sentence" had been pronounced on Sallustro, and that he was to be "executed by firing squad" unless the ransom demands were met by Sunday noon, March 26, in which case the sentence would be "commuted."

The Lanusse government rejected the demand for the release of fifty imprisoned guerrillas and stated that it would not negotiate with "common criminals."

The management of Fiat, on the other hand, began preparations to meet all the demands laid against the company and urged the government to do the same.

In the evening, the Italian ambassador to Argentina, accompanied by Aurelio Peccei, a high official of Fiat who flew to Buenos Aires immediately after the kidnapping, visited President Lanusse to urge that the government comply with the demands of the guerrillas.

Lanusse rejected the plea of the two Italians.

On Saturday, March 25, the police announced that a widespread house-to-house search for the hideout was under way and that "bloodhounds" were being used.

Fiat appealed to the guerrillas, stating that it was willing to do anything "within its power" to win the release of Sallustro. It agreed to rehire the 500 workers who were fired, to get rid of the police guards, to pay ERP an unspecified sum to be fixed in negotiations, and to buy \$1,000,000 worth of school supplies and distribute them.

Giovanni Leone, the president of Italy, cabled Lanusse asking him to ensure the safe release of Sallustro.

In reply to President Leone, Lanusse rejected the appeal, stating that the kidnapping involves "internal security that is an exclusive matter of the Argentine state."

On Sunday, March 26, after the deadline for acceptance of the ransom demands had passed, the ERP issued a communiqué extending the deadline for thirty-six hours, that is, to Monday midnight.

The communiqué, reported to be

three pages long, repeated the original demands, but said that the ERP is "conscious of the great value to the people" of Fiat's announcement that it would do everything within its power to meet the demands.

The communiqué spelled out some details on the \$1,000,000 to be paid in school supplies. Nearly 900 schools, involving 100,000 school-children, were listed. The kits to be made up were to include pencils, pens, erasers, paper, shoes, school uniforms, notebooks, etc. In addition a message was to be included entitled "From ERP to the Children." The text, as reported by the press, included such statements as: "These supplies are not a gift. They belong to you because they are part of the wealth which your parents, and the parents of all poor children, produce with their work and which is stolen from them by the exploiters."

The government cut across Fiat's efforts to meet the demands of the guerrillas. Minister of the Interior Arturo Mor Roig announced that the government opposed dealing with the kidnapers in any way that would aid "criminal activity."

A publicity campaign against the guerrillas, mounted by the government, gained considerable momentum. Denunciations of the kidnapping came from business organizations, from Italian cultural associations, and similar sources. Prayers were offered in churches for Sallustro. Ida Sallustro, the wife of the auto executive, and two sons made emotional appeals on radio and television.

By Monday, March 27, thousands of soldiers and police continued their house-by-house search in Buenos Aires and in Córdoba.

After an "all-night" meeting with military officers, Lanusse held a press conference. Reading from a statement, he said among other things: "The saving of a life cannot imply, under any concept, jeopardizing of the social order or exposure of the country unprotected to the agents of chaos."

The government urged the news media not to publish further communiqués from the ERP.

Juan Perón made a statement from his exile in Spain decrying the kidnapping.

The ERP announced in a communiqué that the deadline had been extended for another twenty-four hours to midnight Tuesday.

On Tuesday, March 28, in still another communiqué, the ERP warned that if Fiat did not meet the demands placed against the company, "the finger of the company will join that of the government in pulling the trigger against Oberdan Sallustro."

Millions of Argentinians were re-



LANUSSE: Military dictator turns thumbs down on saving Fiat executive, refusing to let company meet demands of guerrillas.

ported to be following the events on television and radio.

Ida Sallustro called "on those who can save my husband" to meet the demands.

Carlos Aramburu, the acting archbishop of Buenos Aires, read a message from Pope Paul VI.

General Lanusse himself joined in these efforts to whip up sentiment against the ERP guerrillas. He read portions of "Communiqué No. 7," which had been intercepted by the police, holding the government responsible for Fiat's inability to meet the ransom demands and win clemency for Sallustro.

At 11:00 p.m., an hour before the deadline, Fiat announced that the ERP demands were "beyond its reach."

Just before midnight, Lanusse's press secretary Edgardo Sajon said the decision "not to negotiate with common criminals is irreversible."

On Wednesday, March 29, the ERP announced in a communiqué that Sallustro was still alive but that he would

be executed "at an opportune moment."

The police announced that three persons in Córdoba had been arrested in connection with the case. No names were given.

The police also announced that another three persons had been arrested on suspicion in La Plata. Their names were given as Juan Manuel Carrizo, public accountant, Roberto Eduardo Coppo, student of architecture, Jorge Benito Urtega, student of law.

According to a UPI dispatch carried in the March 31 issue of the New York daily *El Diario-La Prensa*, the two most important corps of the army — the one in charge of the federal district and province of Buenos Aires, and the one in charge of the province of Córdoba — were mobilized.

"Camouflaged troops, supported by three helicopters, combed the northern suburbs of Buenos Aires [yesterday] searching for Sallustro. Other contingents of soldiers were stationed at checkpoints on the highways. In Córdoba, the Army employed armored cars to transport troops brought into the hunt for extremists and the search for the victim of the kidnapping."

The dispatch added: "General Tomás A. Sanchez de Bustamante, Commander of the First Corps of the Army, warned that he was going to "gradually accentuate the volume and intensity" of the security operations. □

## Protocol Problems

In preparation for Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union in May, Washington Sovietologists are working overtime to think of appropriate gifts for him to present to Soviet leaders.

"Mr. Nixon," Bernard Gwertzman reported in the March 31 *New York Times*, "is known to pay close attention to this aspect of his travels, but he usually likes to have some suggestions from the State Department's protocol office, which has on its staff a specialist . . . who is the Government's 'present man.'"

The gifts are traditionally supposed to be of American origin.

"Among the suggestions," Gwertzman wrote, "have been an Accutron clock mounted in California redwood; a Corvette sports car (Mr. Brezhnev has expressed a love for cars, and received a Renault and a Citroen while in Paris last fall); a hunting rifle or shotgun for Mr. Brezhnev's bear-hunting weekends; a stereo set, and a home movie-making outfit."

They'd better forget about the clock mounted in redwood: Brezhnev is likely to remember that Mao got a whole tree. □



# Witch-Hunt in Argentina

The newspapers in Argentina verify that leftists and their families are being harassed, tortured, and murdered by police, and often arrested and put on trial on the basis of the flimsiest of evidence.

The Buenos Aires daily *La Razón* on February 7 reported charges of torture by police in Tucumán. Edmundo Diego Villarreal, the father of Ana Villarreal de Santucho, wife of Mario Roberto Santucho, said to be a leader of the ERP (Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—Revolutionary Army of the People), charged that his daughter was arrested and "handcuffed, undressed, blindfolded, and subjected to all kinds of tortures and taunts of a physical, moral, and psychological nature in the central police headquarters."

The same issue of *La Razón* told of an incident in Córdoba in which police murdered 23-year-old Alfredo Costa in cold blood and arrested his family early in the morning of February 3. The family was visiting Costa's brother in Córdoba and planning to return to their home in San Juan that very day. They were awakened by loud banging at the door and windows of the house. As soon as the door was opened, the police started firing. In the process, Costa was killed. The dead youth's father charged that he was "brutally murdered and the rest of the family handcuffed and taken without any consideration to a police station where everyone was held incommunicado in a prison cell." They were released without any explanation.

The father said his sons were Peronists, but that they belonged to no political organizations. The police carried out their violent assault despite the fact that at no time was there gunfire or the threat of gunfire from the occupants of the house.

On February 14, the Córdoba police carried out what *La Nación* said began as a "pretty much routine operation" and ended with one "extremist" and one policeman dead. The "extremist" was identified as Ramón Alberto Leguizamón, alleged to be a member of the ERP. He was killed

as police raided a house that they claimed was being used to shelter members of an "extremist cell."

This incident was followed by several other raids in which thirteen persons were arrested, according to *La Razón* (February 18). All were suspected of having connections with the ERP, though no evidence was offered. They were: Humberto Tumini; Luis Viale and his wife, Marta Ferreyra de Viale; Belisario Roque; Guillermo Araujo; Roberto Varas and his wife, Cristina Canavosio de Varas; Oscar Cárdenas; Carlos Albarracín; Benjamín Nieto; Héctor Chapur; and Gustavo Quiroga. Another woman was arrested, but her name was not given.

On February 18, *La Nación* reported the following day, six persons carried out a "daring attack" on a police station in Salta and escaped after a skirmish with police.

Early in the morning of the same day, an ERP commando made off with a milk truck containing close to 3,000 liters of milk. "One of the extremists took over the vehicle," according to *La Nación*, "while the others stood on the running boards of the truck. After the truck went a certain distance, four other extremists got into it. They had pulled stockings over their face so that they would not be recognized."

Upon reaching Lules, about 25 kilometers south of San Miguel del Tucumán, "they woke up the families in the area by honking the horn, and then distributed the milk. Before fleeing, they spray-painted slogans on the vehicle with black paint referring to 'Che' Guevara and the extremist group to which they belonged."

The same day, in Mendoza, four persons who were leaving prison (after receiving a suspended sentence for theft of explosives) were again arrested by federal police.

February 18 was also the opening day in the Buenos Aires trial of six persons alleged to be members of the ERP and accused of planning to burn the presidential viewing box last July.

On July 9, Alejandro Lanusse, the president of Argentina, and Jorge Pacheco Areco, the president of Uruguay, were to review a military parade from the box.

The six are Mario Vicente Rodríguez, Pedro Luis Cazes Camarero, Miguel Streger, Martín Richard Marcó, Alicia Sanguinetti, and María Elena Mauceri.

According to one report, the prosecutor accused them of being linked not to the ERP but to the Communist party.

They are being charged on forty-two counts, among them car theft, attacking and robbing policemen, stealing a Mauser rifle with a telescopic sight, forging documents, possession of explosives, and illegal association with communism. Police said they were discovered in a bar planning the attack on the presidential parade box.

One of the defendants, Martín Richard Marcó, charged on the witness stand that he had been tortured while in the hands of the DIPA (División de Investigaciones Policiales Antidemocráticas—Division of Police Investigations into Antidemocratic Activities).

The caliber of prosecution witnesses was evident from the testimony of Alejandro Rubén Elías, a taxidriver. He explained, according to *La Razón* February 22, that the police had asked him to participate in the raid on the home of defendant Alicia Sanguinetti. "Elías gave a detailed description of the various incriminating materials that were discovered there, such as a Mauser, Communist and Trotskyist books, weapons, wigs (which he asserted belonged to the accused, although he had previously indicated that he did not know her), the weapons, and even the uniform of a ship's captain in the Uruguayan navy. When cross-examined by the defense, the witness (who is 19 years old) vacillated markedly and ended up by admitting that his knowledge of leftist books was limited and that he had no idea whatsoever of what a Mauser looked like."

On February 23, the trial began in Tucumán for two more alleged members of the ERP, Clarisa Rosa Lea Place, a law student, and Jorge Wenceslao Paul. They are accused of attacking a radio station and of stripping a policeman of his weapon and his uniform. □

## Kremlin Troubled by 'Flash Points' of Dissent

By George Saunders

In late December and early January, the Soviet leadership opened a sweeping campaign against all visible forms of dissent. The tone was set for this campaign by the one-day, drumhead trial of Vladimir Bukovsky, with its harsh twelve-year sentence.

Widespread arrests and searches of dissidents' homes came in the weeks after the Bukovsky trial—in the Ukraine, in Moscow and Leningrad, in the Baltic republics, and probably in other parts of the Soviet Union from which reports have not yet been heard.

The direct use of the police and courts was supplemented by a press campaign on the theme that all forms of dissidence are part of an intensifying ideological struggle between imperialism and "socialism." Prominent individual dissidents have been branded in the Soviet press as open collaborators with the imperialist campaign of "anti-Soviet slander." Bukovsky himself was treated to such a "news story" after his trial, and both the Soviet novelist Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and physicist Valery Chalidze, a leader of the nonofficial Human Rights Committee, have come in for the same kind of special journalistic coverage.

Along with the press campaign, there has been a more private campaign for the "information" of party cadres. Top officials have been giving confidential reports at special conferences, apparently to solidify the bureaucratic ranks, to whip them up for a concerted drive against dissent, and to generally "heighten the ideological level." Attacks on Trotskyism, like the one by Central Committee Secretary Boris Ponomarev in the last issue for 1971 of the "theoretical" magazine *Kommunist* and the one by Professor Fedoseyev, head of the Marxism-Leninism Institute, in the December 5, 1971, *Pravda* (part of an updated diatribe against Maoism), are a significant part of this "ideological" buttressing work.

The special targets of this drive—

a drive that appears not to have been resoundingly successful so far—were those organized or incipiently organized forms that have crystallized out of the general "democratic movement" of the late 1960s.

The drive aims particularly at the two unofficial human-rights groups: the moderate Human Rights Committee, based on a relatively highly placed sector of the technical and cultural intelligentsia; and the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in the USSR, a loosely knit group of more plebeian, more radical intellectuals, the leading figure of which is Pyotr Yakir, son of a general who was framed and executed in Stalin's 1937 purge of the Red Army high command. Yakir was subjected to a prolonged police search in mid-January. A great mass of his private papers and effects was confiscated, and he is reportedly being kept under close police surveillance.

Ominous word on Yakir's possible fate appeared in a recent protest statement by five Soviet dissidents, a translation of which appeared in the *London Times* on March 9: ". . . from the interrogation rooms of the Lefortovo prison, where another dozen candidates for martyrdom are being summoned, the persistent and terrifying warning is already seeping out, that Pyotr Yakir . . . will 'meet a bad end.'" (The full text appears on p. 406 of this issue.) Pressure on Yakir must be understood as pressure on the Initiative Group, which responded to the sentencing of Bukovsky with another open appeal to the United Nations signed by some fifty persons. In the same way, press attacks on Chalidze, pressure on Academician Sakharov, and reprisals against Human Rights Committee member Aleksandr Galich are not aimed at the individuals alone, but at the committee. The Kremlin wants to eradicate all "flash points"—as the five in the *London Times* expressed it—all "sources of likely troubles."

Other "flash points" are the periodical journals that have more and

more cropped up in *samizdat* (privately circulating, uncensored material, usually in manuscript form). One of the more recent regularly appearing information bulletins of this kind is *Ukrainsky Visnyk* [Ukrainian Herald], the first three issues of which were dated April throughout October 1970. The extensive arrests in the Ukraine in January, including prominent literary critics and other leading oppositionists, are clearly meant to snuff out this organizing voice of the Ukrainian nationalist, antibureaucratic, and democratic opposition, the dominant current of which is Marxist.

The best-known "flash point" in the Soviet Union generally is, of course, the Russian-language *Chronicle of Current Events*. It has appeared approximately every two months since April 1968.

One of the most important confidential steps taken by the Kremlin in its current "ideological" campaign, a measure not publicized in the official press but reported by dissident sources, was an order sent down by the Central Committee of the bureaucratized ruling party on December 30 specifically naming the *Chronicle* and decreeing that it should be rooted out.

The March 6 *London Times* reported that "the KGB (security police) are continuing to interrogate people suspected of having links with the clandestine political journal *Chronicle of Current Events*. Criminal prosecutions of certain people are being prepared—including Mr. Kronid Lyubarski [sic] an astronomer, who was arrested in January."

According to the *New York Times* of January 19, the homes of eight persons in Moscow, in addition to Yakir, had been raided. Of those, Lyubarsky, who was employed at the Chornogolovka Institute of Solid State Physics, and Yuri Shikhanovich, a mathematician, were later called in for questioning and detained. These are the kinds of "candidates for martyrdom" who have been summoned to the interrogation rooms of Lefortovo prison.

Some additional details about the Kremlin's drive to snuff out journals that act as "flash points" were reported by Charlotte Saikowski in the February 5 *Christian Science Monitor*.

"According to usually reliable sources," she wrote, "the party Central Committee on Dec. 30 adopted a resolution stating that no more issues of the subrosa bimonthly [the *Chronicle*] are to appear and that the clandestine operation is *to be stopped at all costs*."

"The sources say," Saikowski continued, "that *hundreds of people connected with the Chronicle* now have been put under surveillance.

"They also report that three persons were called in for individual questioning by the KGB (secret police) here on Feb. 2, and that all were asked about it. Among them was the wife of Vladimir Osipov, editor of *Veche*, another underground publication in which the KGB has taken an interest. [Lyubarsky and Shikhanovich are, presumably, the other two. — G. S.]

"Two full colonels are said to have taken part in the interrogations, which also touched on the *Ukrainsky Visnyk*, an underground bulletin that has been appearing in the Soviet Ukraine since 1970.

". . . Dissidents see the [Central Committee] move as posing a major confrontation and *a test of their ability to survive*." (Emphasis added throughout.)

The *New York Times* also reported that the Kremlin drive was aimed at *Ukrainsky Visnyk* and *Veche* as well as at the *Chronicle*. An article by Hedrick Smith on February 4 explained that "at least five issues of *Ukrainsky Visnyk*, a journal reporting on Ukrainian nationalist activities and official efforts to suppress them, have appeared since January 1970."

Smith also gave some background information on *Veche*: "Only two issues of *Veche*, which calls itself a 'Russian patriotic journal,' and claims intellectual descent from the 19th-century Russian nationalist movement, are known to have circulated since it appeared about a year ago."

Since then a third issue of *Veche* has been reported. In it, Osipov included a statement urging that—if he were arrested—other "Russian patriots" should continue to put out the journal. He expressed his loyalty to the Soviet state and social system and

the hope that among the Soviet leadership there would be those "to whom Great Russia is not a matter of indifference" and who care about the "prestige of the Motherland."

A curious figure, Osipov was a leading participant in poetry readings at the statue of Mayakovsky in Moscow in the years 1958-61. He was the chief defendant in a 1961-62 trial of "a broad circle of people" who had participated in those unofficial gatherings of young people. Having served a seven-year sentence as a result of that trial, he apparently resumed his literary activities along Slavophile lines.

The editors of *Ukrainsky Visnyk*, many of whom have, in all likelihood, become victims of the January round-ups in the Ukraine, recently gave an evaluation of the state of the dissident movement among Soviet Russians. (It appeared in issue No. 5, probably published in mid-1971.) Interestingly, they dealt with the two human-rights groups and the *Chroni-*

*cle* and *Veche* in some detail. The *Ukrainsky Visnyk* editors' views, then, are those of one of the Kremlin's main targets commenting on all the other key targets.

A translation of this editorial appeared in abridged form in the Russian-language *Chronicle* No. 22, dated November 10, 1971, which has only recently become available to us. (A translation of the *Chronicle* abridgement appears on p. 405 of this issue.)

Since then, *Chronicle* No. 23 has also become available. It appeared on January 10 and included, among other materials, a *samizdat* transcript of Bukovsky's January 5 trial. The widespread searches and arrests and the intensified surveillance date from then, although the Central Committee decree was passed earlier. In spite of that decree, as Charlotte Saikowski put it, "No. 23 of the *Chronicle* came out on time . . . a fact the dissident community views as something of a victory." □

## Switzerland

### Call for Antiwar Demonstrations April 22

The "Action Committee for April 22" has called for a nationwide demonstration in Zurich against the Indochina war.

"The American National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC)," the committee's call says, "is organizing a campaign in the United States for that date and has asked international support from all progressive organizations. Throughout Western Europe this support is now being built, and on April 22 there will be a series of demonstrations in response to NPAC's appeal."

The Zurich call notes that the war is not being wound down. "On the contrary, U.S. imperialism's policy of aggression is spreading throughout all of Indochina. Its aim is to crush the self-determination struggle of the Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian peoples, and thus to intimidate all of the world's oppressed peoples."

The committee, which was formed March 11, seeks to develop an ongoing antiwar movement:

"The task of all those in Switzerland who consider themselves pro-

gressives, communists, socialists, or revolutionists is to respond to the expectations of the Indochinese workers and peasants. For two years our support to the Indochinese liberation movements has been only sporadic, and for a reason that is not necessarily negative: the beginning of the rise of struggle in Switzerland itself. But this cannot make us forget that the successful outcome of the heroic struggle in Indochina will considerably weaken capitalist reaction in Western Europe.

"The new campaign of solidarity with Indochina must begin right now. Although the decisive struggle will be waged on the military level, all forces at all levels are important in its development—even the modest support that can be mobilized here in Switzerland.

"It would be unconscionable if such crucial unity of all progressive forces were blocked for sectarian or opportunist reasons. This unity is necessary so that the support campaign can have the greatest effect and the greatest force possible." □

## KGB Carries Out Mass Arrests in Ukraine

By Ted Harding

Oxford

An intense struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy is being waged by a new generation of Ukrainian Marxists who have emerged out of the disintegration of Stalinism. The fact that the bureaucracy recently resorted to mass arrests in the Ukraine is an indication of the numerical strength of the active opposition.

According to recent reports, well over 100 Ukrainians were arrested during the mid-January KGB (Soviet secret police) raids. (*Ukrainske Slovo*, Paris, February 20.) The earlier figure of nineteen arrested quoted by Western journalists consisted only of the most prominent dissenters. The mass arrests were carried out in all parts of the Ukraine and involved primarily youth and intellectuals.

The arrests came in the wake of an announcement by Pyotr Shelest, the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist party, that "the means of ideological influence on the masses have been insufficiently used." Shelest warned the party of its failures on the ideological front and demanded increased struggle "against all kinds of revisionism." (*Radyans'ka Ukraina*, November 11, 1971.)

Protest in the Ukraine against the new wave of terror has been widespread, according to the newspaper accounts. *Samvidav*<sup>1</sup> letters and articles, petitions to government bodies signed by collective farm labourers, workers, students and schoolteachers have been widely circulated.

Of the hundred or so arrested, five—among them the journalist Ivan Dzyuba, author of *Internationalism or Russification?*,<sup>2</sup> a forceful Marxist analysis of the nationalities question—have been released on the grounds

of insufficient evidence, according to a report in *Die Welt*, February 1.

Only a few of the arrested have been identified. They are: Vyacheslav Chornovil, television journalist, member of the Komsomol since 1952 and author of an underground account of secret police methods used in rounding up Ukrainian dissenters arrested in 1965-66, *The Chornovil Papers*;<sup>3</sup> Iryna Staciv, poet, Ivan Svitlichny, literary critic; Evheny Sverstiuk, literary critic; and Stefania Chabatura, artist.

In addition to the charge of "slandering" the Soviet state (which carries a maximum sentence of three years imprisonment), Chornovil, Sverstiuk, Svitlichny, and unnamed others, have been accused of conspiring with a Belgian tourist, Y. Dobosh, for purposes of "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation," according to a short announcement in the Soviet press. (*Radians'ka Ukraina*, February 11.)

Dobosh, arrested roughly at the same time as the others, is charged as an agent of an *émigré* nationalist organization. The law prohibiting "anti-Soviet propaganda" carries stiff sentences, and the new development with Dobosh is undoubtedly a frame-up designed to discredit the most prominent voices of opposition as "bourgeois nationalists" and silence them for a long period of time. Chornovil, arrested once before in 1967, is threatened with a fourteen-year sentence, the others with seven- to ten-year terms.

Soviet propaganda has labelled those arrested as "bourgeois nationalists," a euphemism for anyone opposing Great Russian chauvinism. The Western bourgeois press has parroted this fabrication. Chornovil, Dzyuba, and the others have repeatedly denied this slander in their writings. As Marxists they want a reestablishment not of the bourgeoisie, but of socialist democracy. Chornovil, in

the closing statement at his trial in 1967, said:

"When the Revolution triumphed and the construction of a new type of state began, V. I. Lenin constantly insisted that as many citizens as possible should take part in the governing of the state and society; in this he saw the only guarantee of the successful development of socialism. His famous phrase that a cook should be able to govern should obviously not be interpreted in the vulgar sense . . . these words should be understood to mean that under socialism each ordinary citizen should be able to think in statesmenlike terms, formulate his point of view even in the most complicated case, and not wait until someone writes the next program into him . . . I tried to act according to these Leninist precepts, and you will now inform me of the result of this attempt." (*Ferment in the Ukraine*, ed. M. Browne. New York: Praeger, 1971, \$15.)

The mass arrests testify to the fact of growing militant opposition to the bureaucracy in the Ukraine. Although the Ukrainian population is only 17 percent of the Soviet total, Masyutko, a political prisoner, estimates that 60 to 70 percent of the inmates in Soviet camps for political prisoners are Ukrainian. The bureaucracy's reactionary social-economic policy in the Ukraine has always included, as an essential feature, a policy of suppressing the Ukrainian language and culture, which is the language and culture of the bulk of the working class and peasantry. Dzyuba, in *Internationalism or Russification?*, writes, "It is wrong to oppose social problems to national problems . . . National problems are always social problems as well, problems of *political class strategy*." It is clear that the national and social grievances in the Ukraine are becoming fused into a powerful revolutionary dynamic.

The dissenting movement in the Ukraine is particularly threatening to the bureaucracy because it was among the first to learn the organizational tasks facing the opposition. In the late fifties and early sixties numerous underground political organizations appeared. These groups were especially significant in that substantial numbers of workers were involved. The "United Party for the Liberation of the Ukraine" and the "Ukrainian National Committee" were two organi-

1. *Samvidav*—the Ukrainian equivalent of the Russian word *samizdat*; i.e., uncensored writings that circulate clandestinely in typescript.

2. Published in English in London in 1968 and in New York (Humanities Press, \$8.95) in 1969.

3. Published in English in New York (McGraw-Hill, \$6.95) in 1968.

zations composed mostly of industrial workers. Both were in the Lviv region.

The bureaucracy reacted savagely to such working-class initiative. Bohdan Hrytsyna and Ivan Koval, two young workers in the "Ukrainian National Committee," were shot. Other members of the two groups, whose combined membership was close to sixty, had their death sentences commuted—all were sentenced to long terms of detention.

One of the few detailed political programmes of such clandestine groups to reach the West was that of the "Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union." Author of the programme and founding member of the union was L. Lukyanenko, a former Communist party ideological worker. He had sent protest letters to government officials in behalf of the arrested workers who belonged to the above-mentioned two groups. Lukyanenko wrote: "As a result of studying Soviet reality, in 1960 I came to revise the earlier conclusions embodied in the draft programme and began to think that it was not the independence of the Ukrainian SSR that was essential for the improvement in the life of the people, but the *liquidation of bureaucratism*."

The union did not abandon its call for an independent socialist Ukraine, but their programme included a call to end the "curtailment of the rights of the trade unions, whose leaders had become the best tools of the managers in violating socialist legality," liquidation of "bureaucratic methods of administering the national economy," "full democratization of the soviets of workers' deputies," and a radical improvement in the lot of the peasantry.

The bureaucracy's attitude toward this political perspective was aptly expressed by Lukyanenko's interrogator, the KGB officer Denisov, who said, "Even if you had succeeded in organizing demonstrations in Kiev, Lviv, and other large cities of the Ukraine, and even if those demonstrations had been joined by masses of people carrying banners, placards and slogans demanding the secession of the Ukraine from the Union, do you really think that the Government would not have used the troops to crush the demonstrations? What are they stationed in the cities for?"

Lukyanenko was sentenced to death.

After much protest, the death penalty was commuted to fifteen years imprisonment. Other participants in the group received: Kandyba, fifteen years; Virun, eleven; Libovych, ten; Borovnytsky, seven; Kipysh, seven.

The Soviet working class, terrorized into passivity by Stalin, is slowly recovering its strength. The 1962 price increases for meat and dairy products, for example, were greeted everywhere by demonstrative anger. Sit-down strikes, mass protest at factories, street demonstrations, and here and there riots involving bloodshed occurred throughout the USSR. The Ukrainian cities Donetsk and Zhdanov figured prominently in the disturbances. Yet another example of renewed working-class organized opposition is the case of the residents of Vyshhorod, the working-class district of Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, who in June 1969 protested to the Central Committee of the CPSU about bureaucratic malpractices in the workers' settlement. They also sharply condemned the arrests of Ivan Hryshchuk, a retired major, who was sent to Moscow by the workers of the Kremenchug Hydroelectric Power Station as their representative to air grievances. The KGB arrested Hryshchuk while he was in Moscow petitioning the bureaucracy.

The national and antibureaucratic struggle of the Ukrainian people has expressed itself in a rebirth of Marx-

ist theory. Domestically, the bureaucracy does everything possible to strangle revolutionary thought, and over forty years of "socialism in one country" has deprived the Ukrainian oppositionists of knowledge of the world revolutionary experience. But the bureaucracy, says Lukyanenko, "cannot padlock the numerous channels of various outside (and inside) information which bring new ideas. And each new stream of new information carries with it new and fresh gusts to demolish the old foundations of the chauvinist edifice. They will be strong enough to stifle the prisoners, but the spirit of our time, which constantly gives birth to thousands like us, cannot be imprisoned." Dzyuba writes, "Witness the Soviet reader's growing interest in, and acquaintance with, living world communist theory, the theoretical works and ideas of Marxists-Leninists from all over the world—works and ideas which turn out to be much more profound, humane, and attractive than the stuff that our present newspapers keep chewing over."

As the opposition in the Ukraine develops, repression against it will become more savage. The recent wave of arrests is but a rehearsal of what can be expected in the future. The bureaucracy can arrest hundreds, but it cannot alter the conditions that force ever growing numbers into the dissenting ranks without undermining the foundations of its power. □

## Hoxha Cool to Nixon-Mao Detente

The subtleties of Mao Tsetung's "revolutionary diplomatic line"—as it is called in Peking—seem to have perplexed one of the chief enthusiasts of Mao Tsetung Thought. Albanian President Enver Hoxha has given indications of dissatisfaction with the détente between Mao and Nixon.

The Albanian government "clamped a complete news blackout" on Nixon's visit to Peking, Edith Lenart reported in the March 11 *Far Eastern Economic Review*. There were additional signs of disagreement:

"When Nixon was in Peking, the Albanians really rubbed their disapproval home: the Albanian journalist in Peking excused himself from attending the official banquets in con-

nection with the Nixon visit. The only other party to refuse similar invitations was the Vietcong's Gia Phong news agency."

Lenart noted that signs of a rift between Mao and Hoxha were visible as far back as last November, when the Albanian Communist party held its Sixth Congress. The event did not receive the usual editorials in the Chinese press, and no Chinese delegation attended.

Prime Minister Mehmet Shehu, in an evident allusion to the Nixon-Mao détente, told the Albanian party congress, "We have never carried and we will never carry several flags. We will never enter the same camp as the wolves, and our policy is never tied to any axis." □

### 14 Prisoners Sentenced by Military Courts

Eleven members of the Panhellenic Liberation Movement (PAK—Panelenia Apeleutherotike Kinysis) were convicted of sabotage March 21 by a military tribunal in Athens. Four codefendants were acquitted. The fifteen were accused of having sabotaged a bridge, a power station, and a ship belonging to the U. S. Sixth Fleet.

The PAK is led by supporters of former premier Andreas Papandreou, and the trial created some stir in Greece. Three members of the pre-junta regime testified on behalf of the defendants.

The heaviest sentence (eight years in prison) fell on Ioannis Koroneos, a lawyer. Andreas Frangias received a four-and-one-half-year term.

Several of the accused charged that they had been tortured, and Frangias presented a medical certificate stating he had suffered wounds on his head and abdomen.

In another sample of justice, junta-style, three persons were sentenced March 22 for the crime of having dis-

tributed propaganda materials of the Patriotic Front. The official charge was "attempting to overthrow the established social order."

Loizos Danos, a journalist, was sentenced to fifteen months in jail; George Christodoulou, a fifty-six-year-old construction worker, and Ch. Zarbanis, an accountant, each got two-and-one-half-year prison terms.

Marie Kravariotou and Constantin Papaioannou, both journalists, were acquitted.

The latest two trials were only a small part of the campaign against civil liberties waged by the ruling colonels in Athens. The International Conference for the Abolition of the Greek Dictatorship, which met in Paris March 17-19, published a list of 429 political prisoners currently being held in Greece. The conference decided to intensify its worldwide campaign for general amnesty for the political prisoners, and asked for international coordination to organize the sending of legal observers to all political trials. □

### CP Wants to Play by Church Rules

---

### Athens in New Attack on Makarios

By Jon Rothschild

The Greek military junta and its allies in the Cypriot church hierarchy have dropped the facade and admitted their aim of overthrowing the Cypriot regime of President and Archbishop Makarios.

The latest round in the Cyprus crisis began last February, when the junta demanded that Makarios relinquish a clandestinely imported shipment of Czechoslovak arms. The junta's ultimatum was followed by a demand by the three bishops who constitute (along with Makarios) the holy synod of the Cypriot church. They asked that Makarios resign his post as pres-

ident on the ground that it is a violation of holy canon for a churchman to hold secular office.

Makarios conceded to the junta on the arms question and effectively ignored the bishops' "request." The clash then entered a new phase.

On March 28, the bishops released a statement reiterating their demand for Makarios's resignation. But this time there was not a word about church law. "For twelve years," the seven-page letter said, "we have been witnessing a nationally disorienting policy, which, instead of bringing Cyprus nearer to the realization of her

national aspirations, contributed to severing Hellenic Cyprus from the national body."

The national body is, of course, Greece. And the entire statement, written in the form of an indictment, closely followed the formulations of the junta. Makarios, according to the bishops, has abandoned the ideal of union between Greece and Cyprus, tolerated the growth of communism in every phase of public life, allowed the rise of anti-Greek attitudes, and engendered the spread of nihilism and atheism.

The statement, to which Makarios is not expected to reply before April 9 (Easter in the Orthodox calendar), was issued from Limassol, Cyprus's second largest city. Limassol is the headquarters of Bishop Anthimos of Kitium, one of the signers of the letter. The other two bishops are virtually refugees in the city. Yennadios of Paphos was chased out of his hometown by popular wrath and has not returned there since the synod first asked Makarios to resign.

Police in Limassol are on a state of alert following seven explosions of undetermined origin that ripped through the city March 24.

The bishops, nearly all observers now admit, are merely carrying out orders from Athens. The junta itself again took the offensive during the third week of March. Greece's Cyprus expert, Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs Constantine Panayotakos, delivered a new message to Makarios. There was no mention of foreign arms this time. Instead, the archbishop was told to form a new cabinet of "mutual confidence" immediately.

It was "reliably reported," the *New York Times* wrote, that the junta had offered Makarios a deal: Greece would call off the bishops and drop its campaign to oust Makarios if the archbishop would comply with the request to form a new regime. Cypriot sources considered the junta's offer to be less than sincere.

On March 30 an "authoritative" Greek government source said that unless Makarios submitted to Athens, the junta would seek a "solution" to the Cyprus problem without consulting the Cypriot government. "We do

not recognize Archbishop Makarios or his right to judge alone about what is in the national interest," the official said. "We do not want to have recourse to force. We leave the initiative to Makarios. If he does what we are suggesting, everything will be all right. If he does not, we will act without consulting."

The official was asked by reporters whether this would not amount to brushing aside the elected government of Cyprus. Immaterial, said the junta's representative. "Elections in Cyprus are not as in other free countries. Cyprus has a government of one person."

The Athenian Hellenic center, on the other hand, had its last elections, free or otherwise, in 1964. George Papadopoulos, whose government accuses Makarios of running a one-man show, is regent and minister of foreign affairs, defense, and government policy.

But Greek statements about Cyprus's lack of democracy are not the most Kafkaesque element in the current situation. For that distinction we must turn to Ezekias Papaioannou, secretary general of the Cypriot Communist party. (Its official name is the Progress party of Working People.)

"I believe there is nobody here who could unite the broad masses of people like President Makarios," the sixty-two-year-old Stalinist told *New York Times* correspondent Henry Kamm during an interview at party headquarters.

The CP, it should be noted, unites a few broad masses of its own. In a country with a total population of only 650,000, the Stalinist party has an official membership of 12,000. Also, it controls the Cypriot Federation of Labor, whose 40,000 members constitute about half the organized workers in Cyprus. In the last elections (1970), the party won all nine seats it contested. It deliberately refrained from running enough candidates to win a majority in the thirty-five-member body. Few doubt the party could have achieved this. But, as Papaioannou says, "This stage of our struggle is national liberation. All forces are necessary in Parliament."

Papaioannou strenuously objects to

the current anti-Makarios machinations of the Cypriot bishops. Because they represent the Greek junta and U.S. imperialism? No, because they are violating church rules: "The bishops themselves are putting themselves outside church rules and regulations. Archbishop Makarios pointed out in his letter to them that the way they voted against him was against church rules. Now they are meeting in Limassol to make their plans, again contrary to rules. They should have

asked the Archbishop to call a meeting of the Holy Synod."

The Progress party of Working People has not yet requested representation on the synod. In the meantime, Makarios continues his balancing act, granting some points to the junta and resisting on others. But the junta remains adamant on the central point of the make-up of the Cypriot government. The next ultimatum may be backed up by more than interviews with unnamed officials. □

## British Officers Crushed Bahrein Strike

MANAMA, BAHREIN, MARCH 15 — For four days a general strike has paralyzed industry and business in Bahrein. The strike started at the airport and very quickly spread to include an overwhelming majority of the working class.

Oilfields, construction sites, electrical plants, schools, and the port were empty on Monday, March 13. The streets and squares of Manama were the scenes of tragic battles between an angry people, armed with stones accumulated from deserted construction sites, and soldiers of Omani, Yemeni, and Saudi origin, commanded by British officers and armed with tear gas, shields, helmets, clubs, machine guns, and armored cars.

Today the streets of Manama are quiet. Every major intersection is guarded by at least two armored cars and a dozen soldiers with machine guns. One can sense the fear and anger of the people in every square inch of the city.

The desperation of the strikers was characterized by an exchange between the minister of health and striking hospital workers who were demonstrating outside his office.

"If you don't come back to work," the minister said, "who will feed all these sick children?"

A demonstrator replied: "They are our children. They would starve anyway—if not in your hospital, then in our homes." □

## Found: Carload of Mail Missing Since '70

A railroad car loaded with parcel-post packages that had been missing for more than two years was finally located by U.S. postal inspectors, according to a March 14 Associated Press dispatch.

The mail was on its way to the Birmingham post office, for distribution to Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana, but it disappeared between Philadelphia and Washington.

"Our inspectors made a two-year, car-by-car search all over the Washington area," said LeRoy Greene, a postal official. "They finally found it on an obscure, seldom-used siding in Perryville, Maryland."

The car contained 319 sacks of mail, including 207 sacks of parcel-post packages and 112 sacks of third-class mail. The 1,874 parcel-post packages had been mailed February 4, 1970.

According to Greene, the post office was not responsible for the mishap: "The Penn

Central Railroad had and has to date no explanation of the matter. It will be fined a substantial sum by the Postal Service transportation system."

An official of the Penn Central disagreed. He said that the company had not been told about the missing boxcar. Moreover, it was not found by postal inspectors but by Penn Central employees.

The climax to the saga of the missing vehicle was provided by *Newsweek* (March 27):

"The U.S. Postal Service and the Penn Central railroad bickered briefly over how the car got detached from its train, whether the railroad had ever been notified of the loss and who actually located the missing car. But in the end, it was the Postal Service that backed down. After an initial announcement that the Penn Central would be fined a 'substantial sum,' the service conceded that its own employees were to blame."

# Rahman Promises Trials of War Criminals

Bangladesh Prime Minister Mujibur Rahman celebrated the first anniversary of the country's formal declaration of independence with announcements of two concessions to the Bengali people: more than 1,000 Pakistani prisoners of war will be tried for war crimes; jute, sugar, and textile mills will be nationalized.

Lieutenant General A. A. K. Niazi, who was Pakistan's military commander during the occupation of Bangladesh, and second-in-command Major General Rao Farman Ali Khan will be the two major defendants in the trials, which are expected to begin by the end of the year.

"Major war criminals," according to the government announcement, will be tried by a special court of leading Bengali and international jurists. Others will go before an all-Bengali court.

That the decision to proceed with trials is a reluctantly made concession on Rahman's part is indicated by the effect such trials will have on diplomatic relations in the subcontinent. Pakistani President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto maintains that the prisoners of war are solely the concern of India and Pakistan. If India turns any of them over to Bangladesh to be tried, he has said, "then I am afraid we [India and Pakistan] would be reaching the point of no return." Bhutto claims to be "quite prepared" to recognize Bangladesh, but only if the Pakistani prisoners are first released by India.

India and Bangladesh have both maintained that recognition must precede release of the POWs.

War crimes trials will thus be an obstacle to reestablishing diplomatic stability on the subcontinent, a goal shared by Gandhi, Rahman, and Bhutto.

Rahman's announcement of the nationalization of some industries in Bangladesh came as no surprise. The sugar, jute, and textile mills were almost wholly owned by Pakistanis who either fled or were taken prisoner when the occupation army surrendered. The industries are presently being administered by state-appointed bureaucrats, many of whom have aspirations of becoming a new bourgeoisie.

Banks and insurance companies were also nationalized, but foreign corporations were specifically exempted. There was no mention of the tea plantations or the petroleum industries, both of which are almost totally foreign-owned.

In a radio broadcast on the subject of the economy, Rahman said the nationalizations were a "revolu-

tionary" part of his program of establishing a "scientific socialistic economy."

*New York Times* correspondent Sydney Schanberg aptly commented: "Despite the radical language, which many observers believed is aimed at keeping Sheik Mujib's reformist credentials credible in a public growing increasingly restive over the economic crisis, the program appears to be the moderate brand of socialism practiced by Bangladesh's closest ally, India. Sheik Mujib has said frequently, for example, that he welcomes foreign investment." □

## Ceylon

# Tamil Party Raises Autonomy Demand

"At this moment in the country's history," read a resolution adopted at the January special convention of the Federal party of Ceylon, "when a republican constitution is to be inaugurated, all reasonable demands of the Tamil people have been completely rejected, and the actions of the government are inexorably driving the Tamil nation into separation."

The bourgeois Federal party, the largest Tamil party in Ceylon, may be presumed to have included more than a little bluster in its resolution, but the "United Front" government led by Sirimavo Bandaranaike nevertheless indicated its concern by censoring the document to prevent its becoming known outside the country, according to a report by Urmila Phadnis in the March 25 *Far Eastern Economic Review*.

The government has reason to fear the growth of nationalist sentiment among the Tamils, whose second-class status is being formally written into the country's new constitution. Among other things, the constitution expressly preserves the 1948 law that deprived nearly half the Tamils of citizenship.

(Tamils comprise roughly 22 percent of Ceylon's population. About half of them are known as "Ceylon Tamils." Descendants of plantation workers brought in by the British in the nine-

teenth century are called "Indian Tamils" and 90 percent of them were deprived of citizenship in 1948.)

Last June, the thirteen Federal party delegates walked out of the Constituent Assembly to protest the refusal of the United Front to accord the Tamil language equal status with Sinhala. The party has boycotted the assembly ever since.

Phadnis reported that in February S. J. V. Chelvanayagam, the founder and leader of the Federal party, held a press conference in Madras, capital of the Indian state of Tamil Nadu. Chelvanayagam said he wanted to mobilize "outside sympathy, if not assistance" for an autonomous Tamil province in Ceylon.

The Tamils of Ceylon are not likely to gain much sympathy from the Indira Gandhi government, in view of the fact that the success of the Bangladesh independence struggle has inspired the raising of demands for autonomy in the four Tamil states of India.

The Federal party has already begun comparing itself to the Bangladesh Awami League, but Phadnis considers the comparison inappropriate, pointing out that the party lacks the sort of overwhelming support that the Awami League won in the December 1970 elections in East Pakistan. The Federal party has a fairly strong rival



in the Tamil Congress, which has three seats in parliament and which supports the United Front coalition government. The United Front par-

ties are also reported to have made some gains in Tamil areas, primarily from "the Tamil elite which has a big economic stake in Colombo." □

H. A. D. Piyadasa, port worker and committee member of the union branch.

Sirisena, worker at Wellawatte Spinning and Weaving Mills.

E. R. Devadasan, militant worker fired from Walkers Limited last year for allegedly attacking a strikebreaker.

It has been learned that police officers at certain stations have been told by their superior officers that the group arrested in the raid had been "detailed" to "attack Colombo." It remains to be seen whether the government will attempt to make such a farcical charge publicly or will simply try to hold the prisoners without trial under the emergency regulations. □

## Trotskyist Youth League Members Jailed

Colombo

Ceylon police raided a private home in Colombo March 19 and arrested approximately fifteen persons attending a meeting of the youth league of the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary) [LSSP(R)], Ceylon section of the Fourth International.

Beginning in mid-March, the government seemed to have set out to create a climate that would serve to justify arbitrary arrests and indiscriminate attacks on the people once again. The army was put on full alert, barricades were set up in and around key offices, check-points for searching vehicles were reestablished, and leave was cancelled for all government employees. There were several instances of assaults on innocent civilians by the police, and a number of persons who had been released were rearrested.

Rumours were afloat to the effect that the government was expecting another insurrection. The object seems to be to intimidate those sections of the working class who are preparing to fight back against the government's attacks on living standards and to provide the "United Front" coalition with a pretext for maintaining emergency rule. Despite the economic burdens imposed on the working class by the last budget, the government has not been able to resolve the deep economic crisis. The next budget is expected to be even more savage.

The youth league meeting raided by the police was held at the home of Prins Rajasooriya, the assistant secretary of the LSSP(R). All the participants in the meeting were arrested and taken to the Wellawatte police station in Colombo.

After questioning by police, Rajasooriya was asked to sign a statement drawn up by the police specifying his replies. He refused to do this when he discovered that the statement contained "answers" that he had not made.

He was then detained along with the others. All those arrested are being held incommunicado and it has so far been impossible even to discover the names of all the prisoners.

It seems clear that one of the reasons for the government's actions is the fact that Rajasooriya is one of the counsels in the habeas corpus trial of P. C. Gunasekera, the brother of Prins Gunasekera, the Sri Lanka Freedom party member of parliament who broke with the governing coalition because of its suppression of civil liberties. (P. C. Gunasekera has been twice arrested without cause, the second time on the same day that the Ceylon Supreme Court ordered him released.) The trial has so far received a great deal of publicity and has obviously embarrassed the government.

It is known that the following persons were among those arrested in the raid on Rajasooriya's home:

Dudley Ball, member of the LSSP(R) youth league committee and a full-time employee of the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU).

G. C. Fernando, assistant secretary of the Bank Employees Union branch at National and Grindlays Bank, member of the LSSP(R).

W. P. Hendrick, committee member of the CMU branch at Wellawatte Spinning and Weaving Mills and secretary of the Wellawatte LSSP(R) youth league.

N. E. D. Wijegoonewardene, vice president of the CMU branch at Mackwoods Limited, member of the CMU General Council, member of the LSSP(R) youth league committee.

N. Salih, president of the CMU branch at Colombo Commercial Company, member of the LSSP(R).

Percy Biyagama, leading militant in the Government Clerical Service Union, member of the LSSP(R) youth league committee.

A. I. F. de Silva, committee member of the CMU branch at Walkers Limited.

## NATO Finds a Staunch Defender

The head of NATO's fleet in the Mediterranean, Admiral Gino Birindelli, has resigned his post in order to run for office in the May 7 parliamentary elections in Italy as the candidate of the neofascist party, the MSI (Movimento Sociale Italiano - Italian Social Movement). According to an Agence France-Presse dispatch, Birindelli told a Rome news conference that he had decided to become the neofascist candidate in order to "continue my fight for NATO."

"The Communist-Socialist alliance in the last presidential elections in December clearly showed that NATO is in danger," he said.

Lars Herluf Jensen reported in the March 15 Danish daily *Politiken* that Birindelli "became famous during the second world war for a series of daring frogman expeditions against the Allies in the Mediterranean, and he was, among other things, the leader of the fanatic attack on the British base at Gibraltar in 1940."

The sixty-year-old nobleman's decision to join the neofascists is viewed as an "important catch" for the MSI, said Jensen, "because with his standing he will be able to give the party the respectability that its leader, Giorgio Almirante, has long sought to create for it." He said Birindelli enjoys "enormous popularity in the Italian army."

# The Fourth International

By Pierre Frank

[This is the fifth installment of our translation of Pierre Frank's *The Fourth International: A Contribution to the History of the Trotskyist Movement*.

[This English translation appears through the courtesy of the Paris publishing house of François Maspero. Copyright © 1969 by François Maspero.]

\* \* \*

## Chapter 6: From 1948 to 1968

### I. From 2nd World Congress to the Split in the International Trotskyist Movement

At the Second World Congress, held in April-May 1948, several sections, especially in Europe, found themselves replenished and strengthened by new forces acquired in the aftermath of the war. In some cases, these sections began to be a factor in the political life of their countries. Thus, despite the growth of the old parties (especially the Communist parties) during that period, the perspective of a further development of the Fourth International's sections was adopted by the congress, which raised the slogan, "Forward to building mass Trotskyist parties!"

But the situation was in the process of developing in a totally unexpected direction. The few signs pointing to this development were still too weak at the time of the congress to permit of a correct evaluation—too weak even to give us an inkling of where it was headed. The postwar revolutionary wave in Western Europe seemed to be momentarily halted, but actually it had begun to subside. The "cold war" had only just started. The Soviet blockade of West Berlin would start several weeks later. The "Prague coup," i.e., the seizure of power by the Czechoslovak Communist party, was only a few weeks old. The social changes within the so-called people's democracies were only beginning to take shape. There was no way to foresee the break that was to take place two months later between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union.

Important events and totally unexpected developments occurred immediately after the Second Congress and for some years thereafter. Their results were unpredictable; the world was assuming a shape that had never been envisaged or even imagined by the most eminent, the most perspicacious, the most farsighted Marxists. These upheavals raised extremely complicated theoretical and political problems. Moreover, we were confronted, not with a single event that could have been judged per se, but with numerous events spread out over several years and not necessarily connected with each other. These events finally, after several years, resulted in a world picture totally different from what had previously been seen, even since the first world war and the October Revolution.

Certain Marxist tenets seemed to be placed in doubt by some aspects of the situation. As a result, a multiplicity of assessments and theories proclaiming the bankruptcy of Marxism appeared. Marxists could not answer these arguments with a pure and simple repetition of basic tenets, treating the latter as eternal truths independent of time and space. Such an approach would not have been worthy of Marxists. The primary task of the Fourth International was to place the basic teachings of revolutionary Marxism in juxtaposition with the new world picture, to redefine the situation, to reevaluate perspectives and tasks. Neglecting such a task would have meant leaving the field free both for the apologists of the Communist parties and for the innumerable revisionists on the left and on the right.

For the sake of clarity, this exposition will not treat events in chronological order but will first point out the major changes that took place as a whole—in order to arrive at the overall picture that emerged at the end of a few years. In this way, theoretical problems that were raised and difficulties that had to be resolved will stand out. The actions of the Fourth International can thus be set forth in context, making it possible to judge them on an objective basis.

### Postwar Upheavals

Let us first review the main events and the basic changes that occurred from 1947-48 to about 1960.

The "cold war" began in 1947. Soon—after the breach in the American monopoly on atomic energy in 1949—the development of nuclear weapons and the atomic arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union would begin. The problem of world war was thenceforth posed in new terms, not new on the social level, but new because of the availability of vast powers of destruction, so huge that they were in a completely different dimension from so-called conventional weapons.

In 1947 the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform) was created. At the same time, the "cold war" led the Soviet Union (in order to protect its buffer states) to effect a social change—by military-bureaucratic means—in the East European countries its armies had entered during the war. Despite a few measures aimed at those members of the propertied classes who had collaborated with the Germans, the army had left the bourgeois social structures of these countries intact. The "cold war" forced the Kremlin to liquidate the bases of capitalism in those countries and to transform them into workers states.

In June of 1948 the first great crisis of Stalinism erupted, in the shape of the Soviet-Yugoslav split. The Yugoslav Communist party was expelled from the Cominform on charges reminiscent of the prewar Moscow trials—

the Yugoslavs were fascists, spies, etc. But, for the first time, the Kremlin's hegemony over the workers states and the Communist parties as a whole was challenged—challenged by a party that had led the armed struggle during the war and had, against Stalin's advice, pursued that struggle until it had established a workers state. Stalin extended his repression in the East European workers states in order to prevent any spreading of the Yugoslav split. But the Yugoslav affair was his first big setback, at the very moment that the Soviet Union was at the peak of the glory reaped from its resistance during the war and its victory over Hitler's armies.

October 1949 saw the victory of the Chinese revolution, that too despite the advice Stalin gave the Chinese Communist party's leadership, namely, to make a deal with Chiang Kai-shek. The collapsing Kuomintang regime took refuge on the island of Taiwan (Formosa), where it would thenceforth survive only by grace of U.S. military aid. The victory of the Chinese revolution had immense repercussions, which have developed through the years and which we shall summarize as follows:

1. A huge shift in the overall relationship of forces on an international scale, to the advantage of socialism.

2. A tremendous impetus to the colonial revolution, which thenceforth would spread from one colonized continent to another; outbreak of the Korean war in 1960; continuation of the Vietnamese revolution, first against French imperialism, later against American imperialism; extension of the colonial revolution to Latin America and victory of the socialist revolution in Cuba in 1959; extension of the colonial revolution to the Middle East, to North Africa in the 1950s, then to Black Africa from 1960 on.

3. Extension of the crisis of Stalinism.

In the course of the postwar period, enormous upheavals also occurred in the economically developed capitalist countries, in the capitalist countries based on a colonial structure, and in the workers states. Let us review them.

In a great many colonial countries, we witnessed a quasi withdrawal by the imperialist nations (principally Britain; others, to a lesser extent), in which these colonies acquired formal political independence while at the same time an economic hold on them was maintained. These new—and indirect—forms of domination constitute what has been called *neocolonialism*. In several cases, American imperialism has supplanted the colonizing imperialism in its function of economic hegemony. Indigenous bourgeois leaderships of a special type appeared (Peronism, Nasserism, Sukarnoism, etc.). Sometimes they played along with mass movements—a dangerous game. In the case of Cuba, the revolution won victory under a leadership which, although it did not originate in the working-class movement—and certainly not in the official Communist movement—made the revolution a socialist one. Finally, in the colonial movements there are a number of leaderships that either try to seesaw between West and East, or gravitate for a time around the workers states without, however, effecting their countries' social transformation into workers states.

The growth and development of colonial revolutionary movements persisted. But—with the exception of Cuba in Latin America—receiving neither sufficient solidarity from the working-class movements in the imperialist centers nor a correct political line from the workers states, it

was difficult for them to find a political orientation that would permit them to resolve, in the least costly way, the problems posed by the economic and social backwardness of their countries.

The Soviet Union's isolation, unbroken since 1917, had come to an end—in the West (the "people's democracies" of Eastern Europe) as well as in the East (China and the Democratic Republics of Vietnam and Korea). Then, on the American continent, socialist Cuba was born.

To the Soviet Union were added workers states which, with the exception of Czechoslovakia and East Germany, were less developed economically than the first workers state. Following a rocky period of postwar reconstruction in which Stalinism, faithful to its concept of "socialism in one country," shamelessly pillaged the neighboring countries, the Soviet Union's progress was so tremendous that it became the world's second greatest economic power. In the new workers states of Eastern Europe, the new forms of property ownership also, generally speaking, brought about great economic progress. This, however, did not serve to improve the living standard of the masses to any considerable extent. In their initial period, these states had the same internal regime that the Soviet Union had experienced under Stalin. But the growth of the new relationships of production did not entail the growth of Stalinism. The latter proved incompatible with the former. The crisis of Stalinism thus began to become evident under the impact of various factors—the police state's ever greater brake on the Soviet Union's economic progress; the contradiction between the needs of the other workers states and the Kremlin's policies; the rising revolutionary tide throughout the world. The Communist parties were no longer inevitably and automatically aligning themselves with Moscow. China was to play a very special role in the crisis of Stalinism.

In Western Europe, the Communist parties, which had generally increased in size at the war's end, did not succeed (with exceptions such as France, Italy, etc.) in becoming rooted in the working class. The Social Democratic parties remained, or again became, the majority working-class parties.

As noted above, the crisis of Stalinism began with the Yugoslav events in 1948. This crisis, for all practical purposes, has never since stopped growing (onset of "de-Stalinization" after Stalin's death in 1953; East Berlin events in June 1953; Twentieth Congress [of the CPSU] and events in Poland and Hungary in 1956; Sino-Soviet conflict; Czechoslovak crisis; etc.).

The absence of a revolutionary victory in the economically developed countries was not without influence, for a time, on the "de-Stalinization" process. Among other things, it determined the protracted nature of this process and the fact that it was largely kept under control by the Kremlin bureaucracy. For the most part, the "socialist camp" remained under Moscow's hegemony. China's break with Moscow shook the Kremlin's authority in the Communist world to a tremendous extent, without contributing to any decisive advance for revolutionary Marxism.

In the highly developed capitalist countries, some very surprising phenomena occurred. There was general agreement among economists—both bourgeois economists and those in the labor movement, Marxist or not—that fol-

lowing a postwar period of reactivation and reconstruction, a serious economic crisis would occur. Marxists, basing themselves more particularly on Lenin's concepts of imperialism, believed that the loss of the colonies would contribute to the disintegration of the imperialist centers. Yet, far from disintegrating, for about fifteen years the capitalist world experienced boom, an unprecedented economic prosperity interrupted not by crises but only by "recessions" of varying but always limited size and duration. This led to what was called the "consumer society" or "neocapitalism," which on the surface seemed no longer to correspond with the capitalism that Marx had analyzed. In this unparalleled prosperity, the European workers' movement, the oldest organized movement with the oldest Marxist tradition, experienced stagnation and even a pronounced political decline. The Social Democratic parties tended, even formally, to renounce socialism in order to become "people's parties"; the Communist parties "social-democratized" themselves; the left social-democratic tendencies dissolved; the revolutionary vanguard steadily dwindled. The socialist movement, born in Europe more than a century ago, raised in the perspective that a socialist revolution in Europe would precede the economic, political, and social development of other areas of the world, no longer corresponded to this image of yesteryear.

In the course of the first world war and in the early years of the October Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky had foreseen the possibility of victorious socialist revolutions in the colonial countries, paralleling those in Europe. But from 1948 onward, revolution was in full swing on capitalism's periphery, while in the imperialist centers the workers' movement was, or appeared to be, at a lower ebb than ever before in its entire history. And finally, in the countries where capitalism had been overthrown, the bureaucracy seemed to be entrenched, with the working class passively submitting to its domination.

A capitalism deprived of its colonies yet flourishing more than ever, with a working class shorn of political aspirations and almost exclusively preoccupied with its standard of living; in the workers states an extension of the new relationships of production, with bureaucratic domination maintained and without any workers' mobilizations; in the colonial countries a revolutionary upsurge, based essentially on the peasantry — all this largely explains the proliferation of theories denying, in one way or another, the historical mission of the proletariat as formulated by Marx, whether in classically capitalist countries, colonial countries, or workers states (the class nature of the last-named also gave rise to a multiplicity of theories). It was not possible to grasp the totality of the process immediately. In the midst of the tremendous pressures brought to bear on the entire world, and inevitably on the Trotskyist movement, delay was unavoidable.

## The Crises in the Trotskyist Movement

It was impossible to deny these contradictory events and to cite, in lieu of explanation, all the great classics of revolutionary Marxism on the revolutionary mission of the proletariat, etc. In order to answer the profusion of theories successfully and to be able to act, it was necessary to proceed to an examination of the situation with

the help of revolutionary Marxism, to seek therein the key that would permit an explanation of this new situation, to see what adjustments, rectifications, and enrichment had to be brought to revolutionary Marxism. This was possible only while participating in the class struggle at the same time, testing the evaluations of the new situation in the fire of battle. And this is what the Fourth International tried to do, in a situation rendered all the more difficult by the fact that it was operating in a political scene such as no revolutionary tendency had ever before encountered. In addition to the enormously complex picture of the world that has been sketched here, the International was faced with the obstacle of two old, organized workers' movements, which came to life only when fighting revolutionary currents. The "workers state" factor, which, from 1917 on, had given a new dimension to working-class politics and which, in the form of Stalinism, had for so many years influenced the working-class movement, introduced — together with the existence of several workers states in the underdeveloped areas of the world — increasingly complex effects.

In order to understand the problems and tasks with which the Fourth International was faced, in order to understand the positions it took during the years in which these changes occurred, in order to judge its activity as objectively as possible — it is quite necessary to grasp the size and scope of the changes produced in the aftermath of the second world war. It is quite necessary to grasp this state of affairs in order to have a Marxist explanation of the internal difficulties the Fourth International experienced, especially its crises and its splits.

A detailed history of the Fourth International will not fail to examine each of the crises and splits, to study their various stages, the primary and secondary positions defended by this or that current or faction, the role of individuals, etc. But such a historical study can have value only if it is written from a Marxist view of the total picture, with a correct appreciation of the general causes at the root of these crises and splits, and of the main orientations which, aside from any specific position, conflicted with each other. It is this philosophy of crises, as it might be termed, that we will indicate here as an indispensable prerequisite. A number of our adversaries, incapable of doing this, find themselves reduced to mumbo-jumbo in describing this period of crises and splits, embellishing their account with more or less inane bits of gossip.

Let us start with a point that is not without significance. A big to-do has been made, and is still being made, about the crises the Trotskyist movement has gone through. "What, another crisis! Another split!" invariably exclaimed those who were often more content to fight the Fourth International on that basis rather than be obliged to discuss its ideas. We have no need to deny the oftentimes painful nature of the crises in our movement. Nevertheless, this characteristic, which for a long time seemed peculiar to the Trotskyist movement and which could be looked down on with cynical amusement from the lofty seats of the big organizations, is today prevalent in all kinds of movement organizations, big and small. Actually, what was really abnormal in the working-class movement was monolithism — that "unity" achieved by smothering all independent political thought within organizations laying claim to Marxism, the most critical school

of thought in the world. The history of the working-class movement proves that, more often than not, it has been racked by struggles between divergent theoretical and political tendencies and currents. This was normal, because without continually testing theories, positions, and orientations, by measuring them against reality, no progress in revolutionary thought and action can be envisaged. There was all the more reason for the movement to undergo such struggles, faced as it was with a world in constant upheaval, in which "something new" appeared, as it still does, each day. Although differences are a perfectly normal phenomenon, it does not follow that discussing them must necessarily and frequently end in splitting the movement. It is therefore necessary to look into the objective or subjective reasons that contributed to this state of affairs. In the history of the Trotskyist movement, both objective and subjective factors played their role.

Objectively, the splits were caused in large measure by the fact that differences on analyses or on the orientations to follow in order to build the revolutionary party were rendered all the more acute because the organization was numerically weak, with very weak roots in the masses. Most often the differences boiled down to opposition on the tactics to adopt to overcome that precise situation. The entire world is more than ever subject to the pressure of colossal forces that tear up not only tiny vanguards, but bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groups, workers' mass organizations, etc., as well. (It would be easy to draw up an impressive list.) The international Trotskyist movement's theoretical base is an invaluable instrument for resisting the divisions that antagonistic forces tend to produce. But a theoretical base, no matter how powerful, is not without limits, especially in face of material forces that can at certain times assume considerable size in a few countries or groups of countries. As we shall see, in every crisis and split it is easy enough to uncover which factor (in the given circumstances) assumed undue proportions for a group of members—to the point where they left the International.

Subjectively, the situation was aggravated in numerous cases by the fact that since the organization was tiny, it was viewed by some as a secondary factor, to which too much importance should not be attached. Cutting it in half did not seem to matter much, numerically speaking, especially for those who believed they had found the orientation that would permit of rapid growth. These feelings were rendered all the stronger in view of the disproportion between the objectively revolutionary character of the situation—the important tasks this set—and the clearly inadequate forces and means at our disposal, a disproportion that continually weighed (and still does) on our movement. Such feelings are the exact opposite of those that prevail in mass organizations where the members, responsible to large masses and aware of the role of the organization per se, are loath to initiate splits—even when serious differences arise within these organizations.

We are not saying that crises and splits can be explained solely by the above-mentioned factors. Factors of a personal nature, for example, also played a role. But in order to have a clear understanding of history, the most general elements have to be placed in the forefront; with-

out them the actions of other factors could not acquire significant weight. Within a period of about fifteen years, the most important changes in history took place; changes embodying the transition from capitalism to socialism while the major revolutionary forces were still under reformist or Stalinist leadership; changes, moreover, affecting essentially the most backward, not the most economically advanced, countries in the world. This situation favored the rise of multitudinous theories denying the validity of Marxism. It also gave rise to tendencies and currents in the Trotskyist movement that to a certain degree held a distorted view of the situation; believed they could bank essentially on one or another aspect of the situation; and did not believe they had to consider the Fourth International, as constituted, a political force. As is always the case, those who broke away were not aware of the process they were part of—nor where it would lead them.

It is also worth noting that, with rare exceptions, those who broke with the Fourth International and did not take part in the 1963 reunification soon found themselves—if not politically nonexistent—with reduced forces, despite any expectations they might have had or the forces at their disposal when they left. Nor should we view this as an accidental result. Rather must we examine the causes of this phenomenon—not causes of a personal nature because there was no lack of determination or capability on the part of the individuals involved. This situation must be attributed to:

1. The fact that they embarked on a politically incorrect course.

2. Their separation from the international movement, which, by its very international nature, was best able to resist the colossal forces at work in the world and to correct its own errors when they occurred.

The International is not a fetish; it does not generate miracles. But, despite its numerical weakness, the very nature of the organization, centralized and democratic at the same time, makes it a force that can best prevent any national distortion and resist the pressures exerted throughout the world by all kinds of forces (state powers, mass movements with all kinds of leaderships, etc.).

[To be continued]

## **Nixon Tightens Film Blockade**

The New York Museum of Modern Art has capitulated to pressure from the U.S. Treasury Department and canceled its plans to show six Cuban films.

After first barring four Cuban directors from coming to the United States to view the screening of their own works, the Nixon administration moved to confiscate twenty-three films that had been brought to the United States via Canada. Michael Myerson of American Documentary Films (ADF) says he imported the films in his automobile and is prepared to distribute them for U.S. showings. Although the Treasury Department has obtained a warrant to search ADF's offices for the contraband celluloid, the G-men have not yet been able to find the films.

The department's Foreign Assets Control Division claims the ADF has violated the "Trading With the Enemy Act."

On March 25, the second day of what was to have been a ten-day Cuban film festival at New York's Olympia Theater, federal agents seized one of the films. Museum Director of Administration Richard H. Koch thereupon telephoned the Treasury Department to inquire whether the films were illegal. He was told they had been illegally imported. The museum then decided to cancel its scheduled showings. □

# Press Lifts Lid Higher on Corruption in Washington

When columnist Jack Anderson published the memorandum of an International Telephone and Telegraph (ITT) lobbyist indicating that the company had purchased a favorable settlement of an antitrust suit by promising a \$400,000 contribution to the Republican party convention, he exposed only a tiny portion of the corrupt relations between government officials and American corporations.

The attitude of the federal agencies involved was characterized by an incident concerning the memorandum published by Anderson. This document was denounced as a "forgery" by its alleged author, Dita Beard, who has not yet explained, however, why she waited until three weeks after its publication before making her denunciation.

Anderson had turned the memorandum over to the Senate Judiciary Committee, which is investigating the affair, and the committee in turn gave it to the FBI for testing.

The committee's action was in itself questionable, since the FBI is a division of the Justice Department, which is implicated in the memorandum. FBI investigators nevertheless reported that the memo appeared to have been written around June 25, 1971, the date that appears on it.

On March 24, however, ITT announced that "experts" it had hired had determined that the document was actually written much later, probably in January of this year.

Aside from the question of the impartiality of the ITT "experts," this announcement naturally raised another question: Why had the FBI turned over the disputed memo to ITT? It is hardly usual practice for the government to hand over evidence to potential defendants even before a grand jury has had the opportunity to examine it. One can imagine the outcry that would have come from defenders of "law and order" if, for example, Philip Berrigan and the other defendants in the alleged conspiracy to kidnap Henry Kissinger had been given a similar opportunity to rule on the authenticity of the letters they were accused of writing.

But while the Senate committee was continuing its hearings, the March 24 issue of *Life* magazine documented still another example of the double standard of "justice" that prevails in Washington. Written by Denny Walsh and Tom Flaherty, the *Life* article described certain legal favors that the Nixon administration had provided to C. Arnholt Smith, a San Diego, California, multimillionaire and longtime supporter of Richard Nixon. Smith is reported to have raised as much as \$1,000,000 for Nixon's 1968 campaign.

According to Walsh and Flaherty, a federal investigation of organized crime in southern California turned up evidence that Smith was involved in a scheme to funnel illegal contributions from corporations into Nixon's 1968 campaign fund. (It is illegal for corporations to contribute to political candidates.)

The investigators found, for example, that the San Diego Yellow Cab Company reported payment in September 1968 of \$2,068 to Barnes-Champ Advertising Agency, a company controlled by Smith. The sum was listed as payment for a "wage and hour survey." But in February 1970 the president and vice president of Barnes-Champ told a federal grand jury that there had been no survey. The payment was actually a cover for a contribution to the Nixon campaign.

"According to the testimony before the grand jury," Walsh and Flaherty wrote, "the man responsible for billing Yellow Cab for the \$2,068 was C. Arnholt Smith's top lieutenant in political matters, Frank A. Thornton. Thornton, who had been chairman of the 1968 Nixon campaign in San Diego, was vice-president of Barnes-Champ."

The grand jury had Thornton subpoenaed, but the subpoena was never served. According to the *Life* article, the subpoena was stopped by Harry Steward, the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of California. Steward had worked with Thornton as a fund-raiser for the Republican party and had been appointed U.S. attor-

ney on the recommendation of C. Arnholt Smith.

"Meanwhile," Walsh and Flaherty wrote, "Internal Revenue Service [IRS] agents had collected evidence indicating that Yellow Cab's payment to Barnes-Champ was part of a much larger scheme to illegally funnel thousands of dollars into political campaigns. They examined records which indicated that funds from several of Smith's companies, as well as from other firms, had gone into a Barnes-Champ account used for political purposes. Much of the money from that account went into the 1968 Nixon campaign. . . ."

"An extremely strong charge. But it was to go no farther. Once again U.S. Attorney Harry Steward stepped in and ordered Stutz [David Stutz, the IRS special agent in charge of the investigation] to lay off Barnes-Champ. He, Steward, had assured Barnes-Champ that it did not have to produce certain documents Stutz had requested."

Then, in September 1970, Charles Pratt, the president of San Diego Yellow Cab, decided to tell all to the investigators. Pratt confirmed that the \$2,068 paid for a "wage and hour survey" had actually been a campaign contribution, and that it had been arranged by Smith and Thornton. He also said that he and Thornton had been kept informed (illegally) of the grand jury proceedings by Harry Steward.

"A week after Pratt started to talk to the investigators, Thornton said [to Pratt] he wanted to return the Nixon contribution. Thornton said that to protect Smith he had lied in a sworn statement to IRS, and he urged that Pratt's story conform to his. Thornton and Smith, through their contacts in the Nixon administration, would see to it that Pratt, if convicted, was granted probation.

". . . Armed with the Pratt interviews, Stutz forwarded a recommendation that the government pursue Smith, Thornton and Pratt for conspiring to: (1) make an illegal campaign contribution, (2) illegally deduct the contribution, and (3) prepare a false

corporate tax return. He also recommended pursuit of Thornton for perjury and for attempting to persuade Pratt to commit perjury. Stutz's recommendations were approved by the head of IRS intelligence in Los Angeles. That is the last that was heard of them."

Because of his role in the case, the FBI launched an investigation of Steward for possible charges of obstructing justice. In February 1971, however, Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst—a "law and order" type now nominated by Nixon to become attorney general, and an official whose name has appeared frequently in the ITT scandal—announced publicly: "I have evaluated the matter and determined there has been no wrongdoing."

The investigation of Yellow Cab also turned up information that resulted in San Diego Mayor Frank Curran and seven other officials being indicted on charges of accepting bribes from Yellow Cab to permit a fare increase. IRS agent Stutz was prepared to testify that Curran had admitted accepting money from the company, but the IRS commissioner in Washington refused to allow Stutz to testify. Curran was acquitted. The next morning, Richard Nixon personally telephoned the mayor to congratulate him.

In only one instance was the Nixon administration unable to provide complete protection for its San Diego supporters. This was in the case of John Alessio, a director and stockholder of a Smith-controlled conglomerate, Westgate-California Corporation. Alessio ran a bookmaking operation that was based in Mexico but drew most of its bettors in the U. S. He personally contributed \$26,000 to Nixon's campaign in 1968 and raised thousands more from other contributors.

The IRS uncovered evidence that Alessio had illegally evaded taxes on income from his Mexican gambling operation. In March 1970, the case was ready to be presented to the grand jury. Walsh and Flaherty charged that Smith then flew to Washington to ask Nixon to intercede for Alessio. Smith denies the charge. The White House has so far refused to comment on it.

At any rate, a few days after Smith's alleged trip, an assistant U.S. attorney general who has since become IRS commissioner reportedly ordered that presentation to the grand jury be

held up for "further consideration" of the case.

From Alessio's standpoint, "further consideration" was highly desirable, since the statute of limitations on a major portion of the charges was due to expire on April 15, 1970. Only after individual agents in the Justice Department began leaking information to the press was Alessio indicted—along with his son and three brothers—on April 7.

When the case came to trial, Alessio and his brother Angelo changed their pleas to guilty one day after the pros-



KLEINDIENST: "No wrongdoing."

ecution began presenting its evidence. Walsh and Flaherty indicated that their imprisonment worked no great hardship on the Alessios:

"Angelo Alessio was paroled after serving five and a half months of a one-year term.

"John Alessio is serving a three-year term in a federal prison. Until recently he was an inmate at a minimum-security honor camp at Lompoc, Calif. He and his brother were regularly allowed to make unauthorized overnight trips away from the camp, usually to conduct personal business or to meet women friends at a Lompoc motel. On one occasion while still a prisoner, Angelo Alessio and a guard actually went deer-hunting together. During this period the administrator of the honor camp and his family were

entertained by Alessio's son on C. Arnholt Smith's yacht and at the Kona Kai Club [controlled by Smith and Alessio], where Alessio's son paid the administrator's bill of \$355.15. A senior officer at the camp leased a custom-built horse trailer on favorable terms from an Alessio company. Another officer bought a pick-up truck at a discount from an Alessio firm. An investigation by the FBI and the U. S. Bureau of Prisons has led to the suspension of two of these prison officials. John Alessio has been moved to another, presumably less hospitable prison. Next week he becomes eligible for parole."

The accusations of corruption against the Nixon administration are unusual only in the fact that such charges are rarely so well documented. They tend to come up particularly during election years, when the "opposition" party hopes that revelations of the incumbent party's corruption will enable it to get its own snout back into the trough.

The ITT case has provided an illustration of the bipartisan nature of corruption in Washington. In an interview, Susan Lichtman, a former secretary to ITT lobbyist Dita Beard, told Robert M. Smith of the *New York Times* that ITT maintains a section called "Congressional Liaison," the function of which is to do favors for members of Congress.

"The thing that shocked me," Lichtman said, "and very little in Washington would shock me, was that members of Congress would call Congressional Liaison and sometimes Mrs. Beard for favors on a big scale."

Lichtman told Smith that members of Congress received such favors as the use of company airplanes. She mentioned specifically Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana, who recently withdrew as a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. Hartke, she said, requested a plane but had to be refused because all the firm's planes were in use. Another Congressman asked to have two camper vehicles waiting for him when he and his family arrived in France for a vacation.

Smith wrote that "she said the requests were so numerous that Mrs. Beard was moved at one point to say something like 'All these people want planes all the time. Don't they know the company has to use these planes, too?'" □

## Verdict Expected to Aid Angela Davis Defense

### Jury Finds Soledad Brothers 'Not Guilty'

The twenty-six-month ordeal of the two surviving Soledad Brothers ended March 27, when a San Francisco jury found them not guilty of murdering a white prison guard at the Soledad prison in January 1970. Fleeta Drumgo and John Cluchette, who had been brutally mistreated and whose defense had become an international issue for the Black liberation struggle, had been charged with killing guard John Mills in retaliation for the gunning down of four Black inmates at the prison.

The third and most well known Soledad Brother was George Jackson, who was killed by guards at San Quentin prison last August 21. The acquittal of Drumgo and Cluchette provides further evidence that Jackson was in fact murdered.

Prison authorities claimed that Jackson had been trying to escape when he was killed. Aside from the wholly preposterous police version of the supposed escape, it was pointed out at the time that Jackson, who fully expected to prove his innocence in court, had no reason to try to break out of the nearly escape-proof San Quentin fortress.

The Soledad jury began deliberations March 24. On March 26 it reported a nine-to-three deadlock. But Judge S. Lee Vavuris instructed the jurors to continue discussions, and one day later the unanimous "not guilty" verdict was returned.

At the moment the Soledad verdict came in, state prosecutor Albert W. Harris Jr. was delivering his opening remarks in the San Jose trial of Angela Davis, whose case is closely linked to that of the Soledad Brothers.

On August 7, 1970, George Jackson's seventeen-year-old brother Jonathan entered the Marin County Courthouse and handed weapons to three prisoners. Together the group took five persons hostage, one of them a judge.

According to some witnesses, Jackson demanded that the Soledad Brothers be freed before he would release the hostages. Police opened fire, and Jackson, two of his accomplices, and the judge were killed in the shoot-out.

Eight days later, the county pros-

ecutor announced that the four weapons used by Jonathan Jackson belonged to Angela Davis and that Davis had been instrumental in organizing the kidnapping attempt. She was then indicted for murder.

The state of California had previously tried to engender a racist hysteria against Davis, a Black member of the Communist party. She had just been fired, over the strenuous objections of students and faculty, from her teaching job at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Because of the witch-hunt atmosphere prevailing in the area when she was indicted, Davis fled California. She was captured in New York City on October 13, 1970. In December she was returned to California and on January 5, 1971, was formally arraigned.

The massive international campaign to defend Angela Davis, which has already exposed the frame-up nature of the charges against her, has apparently had some effect on the tactics the state will use in trying the

case. In his opening statement, Harris was careful to stress that Davis's motives in "organizing" the August 1970 courtroom action were not political but personal!

Davis, the state prosecutor said, acted out of "a passion [for George Jackson] that knew no bounds, had no limits, and no respect for life . . . not even the life of George Jackson's younger brother."

Harris's idiotic attempt to eliminate politics from what is obviously a political trial was answered by Davis when she delivered the opening statement in her own defense March 29:

"This is utterly fantastic, utterly absurd. The prosecution would like to take advantage of the fact that I am a woman, for in this society women are supposed to act only at the dictates of their passion. Clearly, this is evidence of the male chauvinism that pervades this society."

In her two-hour statement, Davis told the jury that "at no time will you hear evidence that a gun was bought by me for any criminal intent or purpose."

She reiterated that she had been active in the defense of the Soledad Brothers, whose innocence is now a matter of legal record. She wanted them to be freed, but through the court system, not through violence. □

### 'Maoist Document' Reveals More Secrets About Taipei Than About Peking

Of all the commentaries on Nixon's trip to Peking, some of the most amusing were those inspired by Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan. The February 27 issue of *Free China Weekly*, published in Taipei, carried a notable example.

Not content with commenting from afar, the paper quoted from a "Maoist secret document," which it said had been "captured on the mainland by Chinese government [Chiang's] intelligence agents." As secret documents go, the captured material was not very sensational, being limited to predictions that Nixon would be forced by "domestic and diplomatic needs" to make compromises.

*Free China Weekly* in fact overlooked the most significant aspect of the document, which was the fact that it referred to "Nixon's visit to Peiping."

It will be recalled that the name of Peiping (which means "northern peace") was changed to Peking ("northern capital") when Mao moved his government there in 1949. Chiang and his supporters, who

believe that the capital of China lies under Chiang's hat, have insisted on continuing to call the city Peiping.

Now a "Maoist secret document" is captured in which Peking is called Peiping. What can this mean except that officials of the Communist party—perhaps very high officials—are secret supporters of Chiang and are eagerly awaiting the day when he will be "unleashed" by Washington?

One can only marvel at the failure of the *Free China Weekly* editors to notice the real meaning of the secret document. Certainly other guardians on the ramparts of the "free world" would never be so careless. We suggest that Nixon immediately dispatch to Taipei a team of technical advisers to instruct the paper's editors in the proper interpretation of captured secret documents. Perhaps he could send a few of the specialists who decode the similar documents that are regularly captured in Vietnam whenever Washington wants to prove how well the war is going. □



# REVIEWS

## Trotsky's '1905' — The Unity of History and Politics

By George Novack

*1905* by Leon Trotsky. Translated by Anya Bostock. Random House, New York. 488 pp. \$15. In paperback, Vintage Books, New York. \$2.95. 1972.

Trotsky's *1905* is an eyewitness account of the first Russian revolution by one of its leading figures, the acting head and chief spokesman of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies. He analyzes the social forces that came to grips during that upheaval, which unsettled the decaying czarist regime but failed to overthrow it. That was done twelve years later.

Trotsky's interpretation of the "great rehearsal" for 1917 displays the same acumen that characterizes his subsequent masterful companion work, *The History of the Russian Revolution*. Whoever wants to understand the significance of the 1905 events will find ample enlightenment in its pages.

Trotsky here expounds the theory of permanent revolution that he first formulated in 1905-06 and, in several appendices, defends his views against the criticisms of other tendencies within the Russian social democracy. His polemics over the nature of the Russian revolution formed part of a continuing controversy over the prospects of its development that involved the whole spectrum of oppositional opinion after 1905, from the Kadets (Constitutional Democrats) to the divergent political groupings among the Marxists.

This work can be viewed in a context even broader than that of the clash of political ideas in Russia between 1905 and 1917. It can also illuminate some of the major theoretical problems concerned with the interpretation of history.

Historians and philosophers have asked: Can we have real knowledge of the past? Do historical events have any intrinsic meaning; if so, how are they to be explained? Can history-writing be objective, and is political partisanship compatible with objectivity? Is there causation in the historical process? Is the future predictable?

In recent years a host of anti-Marxists, from professors Popper to Acton, have severely criticized the affirmative positions of historical materialism on these and related questions. They have sought to disqualify the scientific character of the Marxist method and relegate its conclusions to the never-never land of utopia. They do so at a heavy cost since, by denying lawfulness in history, they deprive historiography of any scientific validity and verifiability.

The first translation into English of Trotsky's *1905* provides a good occasion to counterpose the positions of the contending schools of historical interpretation on these theoretical issues, to see which stands up best under the test of the actual events. Trotsky is generally acknowledged (outside the Soviet bloc and China) to be as pre-

eminent in writing history in the Marxist manner as he was in making it. As a representative product of the school of historical materialism, this work is well suited to serve as a standard for assaying the worth of the Marxist conception of history.

Trotsky's book, composed of materials written in 1905 and essays published in 1908-09 in Polish and German periodicals, was issued in an interlude between the crushing of the first Russian revolution and the outbreak of the second. It looked back upon past struggles the better to move forward upon their resurgence.

The author's appraisal of the character and motive forces of Russia's development was one among many theories and forecasts put forward by the journalists, statesmen, politicians, and historians around that time. His views differed not only from those of the spokesmen for the upper classes, from the defenders of czarist autocracy to the ideologues of the bourgeois constitutionalists, but also from all the other left tendencies, including the Social Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks, and even Lenin's Bolsheviks. (See the Appendix: "Three Concepts of the Russian Revolution" in *Stalin*, pp. 422-34, for Trotsky's final review of the various outlooks.)

His distinctive contribution was the affirmation that a victorious revolution could come about only as the result of the conquest of power by the working class, backed by the insurgent peasantry, and that the new revolutionary power would have to break through the limitations of bourgeois democracy, establish a dictatorship of the proletariat, and take measures that would abolish capitalism.

This conception of the dynamics of the revolutionary process in Russia and prognosis of the next stage was subjected to verification by the events of 1917, emerging fully vindicated. This much is admitted by most serious scholars, some of whom attribute the accuracy of the forecast to Trotsky's intellectual brilliance.

The keenness of his insight and foresight was not solely a product of his exceptional personal gifts. His writings testify still more to the value and validity of the Marxist ideas, which were confirmed in action by the October revolution. The theoretical anticipation and the subsequent practical verification, linked together, can help clarify a series of problems connected with what used to be called "the philosophy of history."

Diverse schools of thought, from the existentialists to some positivists, contend that history in itself has no rhyme or reason. In their view, its processes are not governed by law and its course and causes cannot be made intelligible. History is essentially irrational and only a hopeless Hegelian idealist or Marxist dogmatist would talk about "the logic of history." By dint of investigation we might find out to some extent what really hap-

pened in history (though some skeptics question whether even so meager a portion of knowledge is obtainable). But we cannot discover or explain why things happened as they did and not otherwise.

Marxism takes exception to this skeptical or agnostic point of view. It teaches that although the laws of human development differ qualitatively from those belonging to physical or biological phenomena, they exist and can be deciphered. These are best formulated in the principles of historical materialism. According to this theory, the main factor governing the development of civilized society is the class struggle, which in the twentieth century has culminated in the mortal combat on a global scale between the procapitalist and the anticapitalist forces headed by the proletariat.

Trotsky used the ideas of the materialist interpretation of history as his guidelines in analyzing the contradictions of Russian society. He pointed out that the exceptional peculiarities of Russia's past had produced a national structure that was very different in type from the older capitalisms of Western Europe. Through a true knowledge and accurate estimate of the special correlation of social forces at work, he asserted it was possible to perceive and predict a new road for the Russian revolution.

On account of the very different relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the belated Russian revolution could not and would not duplicate the earlier democratic revolutions. The struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism, which up to that point had been separated, were inextricably intertwined. Since the weak and cowardly bourgeoisie could not shoulder or solve the tasks of the democratic revolution, these demands of national progress would be taken over by the working class, which had its own socialist interests to realize in the process.

Trotsky was first of all able to arrive at this bold and innovative deduction, which was not shared by some of the staunchest revolutionists of his generation, because of his insight into the past. He grasped before others the momentous consequences of the peculiar path of Russia's development compared with the more advanced countries. The fact that his conclusions turned out to be well founded demonstrated, among other things, that with a sound scientific method it was possible to acquire true knowledge of the past.

The skeptics do not merely argue that the past is opaque and incomprehensible. They further contend that the present is too elusive, ambiguous, and undetermined, too torn by multiple conflicting trends, for anyone to identify the principal strategic forces at work with any accuracy or ascertain whither these are tending. The existing situation, they say, contains all sorts of possibilities in suspension, so that no specific lines of development can be singled out as more determinative of the future than others. The totally open-ended character of the present precludes the possibility of telling what the future will bring; it is utterly unpredictable.

The purpose of scientific inquiry is to penetrate the chaotic and confusing appearances of the given in order to uncover the essential structural relations that generate them and the driving forces that will change them. That is what Trotsky sought to do in his work. He did not take the present as fixed and final nor the future as inscrutable. According to his analysis, the special align-

ment of social forces in Russia held out only two fundamental variants of political development in the event of another revolution. Either the reaction would triumph and reconsolidate its grip, if the revolution was again defeated; or the proletariat would come to power at the head of the insurgent masses, as it came close to doing in 1905. His assertions were quite categorical. There was no third option available to the country under the historically created circumstances of the class struggle.

The representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie disputed this prognosis and declared that a constitutional regime on the English or German model was the next predestined and desirable step in political progress. The SR's and Mensheviks argued that a democratic republic with the bourgeoisie in the driver's seat was the proximate goal. Even the Bolsheviks, who looked forward to a "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry," felt that Trotsky was going too far and too fast in skipping over the democratic stage and leaping to the socialist one.

The unfolding of the events in 1917 proved that the polar lines of development projected by Trotsky were the only real choices. After other variants were tried and cast aside, the alternatives came down to either the military dictatorship of Kornilov as a stage toward monarchical restoration or the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat based on the Soviet power headed by the Bolsheviks.

The period in which Trotsky completed *1905* did not have its full significance blazoned on its surface for anyone to read. It was a time of deep reaction, of recession of the revolution, and repression of all oppositionists. It required a prodigious effort of the intellectual imagination to make a rounded estimate of its manifold aspects and from these deduce the shape of things to come.

Trotsky did not treat either the 1905 revolution or its counterrevolutionary sequel as independent and self-sufficient wholes but as distinct, interlinked stages in a single process of struggle against the old order. A pure empiricist would have held that the failure of the 1905 uprising spelled doom for the revolutionary cause, and indeed most of its participants drew this despairing conclusion so long as the period of reaction lasted.

Trotsky's opposite view that victory would come was based on an all-sided examination of the existing state of affairs. He saw the ebb of the revolution as a more or less protracted interval between two flood tides of the mass movement. Therefore the principal theoretical task was to explain the organic connections between the past, the present, and the future in order to clear the way for the next advance of the class struggle. Its subsequent revival and reascent to the peak of revolution showed that this dialectical approach to the given situation was rational and realistic.

Positivists argue that however much the historian can learn about the past, such knowledge and its lessons are of little or no help in ascertaining what lies ahead. The future is in principle unpredictable and its outlines unforeseeable. Those who claim that the future is determinable to any significant degree are, they say, guilty of "historicism," or, still worse, are reverting to the theodicy of the providential or purposive schemes of history.

Trotsky, the Marxist, proceeded from entirely different premises in respect to Russian history. Though it ended in defeat, the 1905 experience cast considerable light on

what was ahead, he wrote. It disclosed the vulnerability of czarism, the political feebleness of the bourgeoisie, the latent insurgency of the land-hungry peasants combined with their incapacity to take the center of the political stage, and, above all, the leading and decisive role of the working class. He predicted that the roles of the contending forces displayed during 1905 would be reenacted on a higher level at the climactic phases of the next revolutionary upsurge.

This extrapolation from the past to the future was borne out in 1917. It could be objected that the correspondence between Trotsky's prevision and the later course of events was not owed to any really scientific understanding of historic processes but was a lucky strike—while he happened this one time to hit the center of the target, there was no assurance that he would not go amiss on other occasions.

Trotsky replied to this argument against the scientific objectivism of the Marxist method in the introduction to volumes two and three of *The History of the Russian Revolution*. "When a mining engineer finds magnetic ore in an uninvestigated region by drilling, it is always possible to assume that this was a happy accident; the construction of a mine is hardly to be recommended. But when the same engineer, on the basis, let us say, of the deviation of a magnetic needle, comes to the conclusion that a vein of ore lies concealed in the earth, and subsequently strikes ore at various different points in the region, then the most cavilling sceptic will not venture to talk about accidents. What convinces is the system which unites the general with the particular."

Trotsky's prescience was not confined to the class dynamics of the revolution but extended to the agencies that were to carry it out. He saw that the soviets, which had first sprung up in 1905 as a spontaneous creation of the workers, were destined to be the central organ of their struggle against the possessing classes and in laying the framework and foundation of a new state power. His participation in the affairs of the Petersburg Soviet, which he headed, certainly reinforced this conviction.

Predictability is based upon the persistence of regularities in the historic process. If we credit the empiricists and existentialists, necessity and lawfulness do not characterize the course of human affairs—history is like a roulette wheel; what comes up next is pure chance.

Nonetheless the operators of gambling casinos are well aware that even random occurrences are subject to the statistical laws of probability, and they profit thereby. Some empiricists will admit that probabilities exist so that one outcome may be more likely to happen than another. But they stubbornly insist that necessities are ruled out. These are metaphysical entities that have no place in social science, as Professor Popper, the foe of historical determinism of any kind, declares. It is not the causal connections of historical facts in their development that decide the course of events and give meaning to history but only our individual decisions, he says. On this hypothesis there could have been no necessity for the proletariat to have come out on top in 1917. That was a sheer accident.

Trotsky thought otherwise. He would have conceded that the particular outcome was not foreordained. If all the conditions for the victory of the proletariat—from the war-weariness of the people to the intervention of Lenin—had

not come together at that juncture, 1917 might have ended as disastrously as 1905. All the same it is true that whatever fortuitous factors contributed to that result, the proletariat did take power in 1917. Nothing can erase this fact from twentieth century history, and that is what makes that year so meaningful. It started a new era in world development.

As Trotsky explained at length and in detail in the three volumes of *The History of the Russian Revolution*, the objective necessities responsible for this result were lodged in the whole of Russia's past, crystallized in its peculiar alignment of social forces that gave birth to a proletarian revolution mightily reinforced by an irrepressible peasant uprising. The general direction of these necessities could be discerned in advance and knowledge of them consciously used to steer the class struggle toward victory, as the Bolshevik leadership did in 1917.

Academic historians incline to divorce theory from practice, past history from contemporary politics. In their eyes the two belong in separate compartments. History may be open to dispassionate scientific investigation, but politics has no scientific basis and is not the proper business of the historian.

Such an arbitrary disjunction between the struggles of the past and the present is unwarranted and even impossible to maintain since the ideological and political outlook of the scholar does affect the nature and results of his inquiries. It is foreign to the integrated procedure of historical materialism. For Marxists the purpose of studying history is to find out the meaning of the present in connection with the past in order to shape the future. History would be worthless if we learned nothing from it.

Trotsky was not a mere journalistic commentator on the passing show nor a professor detached from public affairs and indifferent to them in pursuit of his specialty. He was a full-time revolutionist. He undertook his analysis of 1905 and used its conclusions to orient the cadres of the Marxist movement in the unfolding struggle. His theoretical work was inseparable from his political activity. From 1906 to 1917 the views he set forth in the theory of permanent revolution, the "Trotskyism" of that era, were restricted to a small circle even in the socialist movement. However, they were adopted in substance by the Bolsheviks after April 1917 and the perspectives of that theory guided them to the October insurrection.

The triumph of the October revolution under Lenin's and Trotsky's leadership is linked with two factors in the biographies of these individuals. In the *April Theses* that rearmed his party, Lenin took over the strategic conclusions of Trotsky's conception that the proletariat was obliged to seize power in order to realize both the democratic and the socialist program of the Russian revolution. Several months later, when his Interdistrict Organization merged with the Bolsheviks, Trotsky was irrevocably won over to Lenin's conception of party organization. If Lenin became "Trotskyist," as Kamenev charged at the time, Trotsky in turn became "Leninist." These two developments on the personal and ideological levels entered as essential preconditions for the successful conquest of power.

Here we can see how the decisions of individuals and their ideas form part of the process of historical determination in association with the more fundamental and weightier forces of the classes in motion. As Trotsky writes in 1905: "The logic of the class struggle does not exempt

us from the necessity of using our own logic. Whoever is unable to admit initiative, talent, energy, and heroism into the framework of historical necessity, has not grasped the philosophical secret of Marxism. But, conversely, if we want to grasp a political process—in this case, the revolution—as a whole, we must be capable of seeing, behind the motley of parties and programs, behind the perfidy and greed of some and the courage and idealism of others, the proper outlines of the social classes whose roots lie deep within the relations of production and whose flowers blossom in the highest spheres of ideology."

Instead of disjoining historical theorizing from political practice and party affiliation, Trotsky fused these aspects of revolutionary work in an unbreakable unity. The Marxist system knits together the study of history with current politics, giving it practical value and preventing it from becoming a devitalized enterprise.

History is concerned with processes of social change—and revolutions are the supreme accelerators of change in human relations. If the academicians can study the upheavals of the past with a certain degree of objectivity and equanimity (though their biases often warp their judgments and the inadequacy of their methods dull their insight), they have extreme difficulty in linking up the struggles of the past with the dynamics of the class conflicts in the world around them.

The eclectics and skeptics who feed on uncertainty and confusion are repelled by the clear-cut principles, revolutionary class standpoint, and firm conclusions of Marxism. In denying that past or present history lends itself to scientific analysis, they nowadays chiefly aim at discrediting the foundations of historical materialism, the consummate expression of scientific knowledge about the development of society. The analytical and predictive power exhibited in Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution, ratified by 1917, was a specific refutation of such critics through the higher criticism of the historical process itself. He wrote, he acted, he—together with the Russian workers and peasants—conquered.

\* \* \*

This is not to say that the Marxist method of historical interpretation gives infallible results. Though such a claim may be made by the idolizers of the genius of Stalin, Mao, and Kim Il Sung, it is as out of place in authentic socialism as in any other branch of scientific endeavor.

Even the most precise machine that stamps out uniform parts now and then produces scrap—and the application of the ideas of historical materialism is not in the least a mechanical procedure. Marxism offers the most profound, comprehensive, flexible, and reliable instrument of analysis available to investigators of historical processes. Like all tools, material or conceptual, it is susceptible of improvement and its results open to criticism in the light of new and better data. Even within its own precincts, the method can be applied with very unequal effectiveness to the problems at hand by different craftsmen.

This disparity is illustrated in the debate between Trotsky and the noted Soviet historian Pokrovsky on the subject of the special features of Russia's development that took place following the publication in 1922 of a revised edition of *1905*. Without entering into the substantive is-

sues, which can be gathered from Trotsky's remarks, their disagreements did indicate, as Trotsky pointed out, "what a complicated business it is trying to apply the methods of historical materialism to living human history, to what clichés even extremely well-informed people like Comrade Pokrovsky are sometimes liable to reduce history."

Students of history in the universities are looking for models to imitate and teachers to learn from—in most cases in vain. In Trotsky they will find a superb teacher in the employment of the scientific method of comprehending historical processes. He combined expertness in the field of theory and literary artistry with a career of devoted service to the emancipation struggle of the oppressed.

The youth often ask: Is it possible for scientific inquiry and historical learning to be meshed with activity in a revolutionary organization? Trotsky, among others, showed that however difficult it may be to keep them in tandem, the one can go along with the other. To be sure, the demands of theoretical work can sometimes conflict with the exigencies of participation in the ongoing struggle. Which is to take priority in that event?

Lenin gave an excellent answer to this dilemma in the afterword to his work *The State and Revolution*. He, too, was concentrating upon setting down the lessons of the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917 when the political crisis of the October overturn supervened and prevented him from completing that book. "Such a hindrance," he wrote, "can only be welcomed. It is more pleasant and useful to live through the experience of a revolution than to write about it."

However, revolutionary showdowns are not always on the agenda. Marxists spend most of their days preparing and organizing for them, not fighting them. This alternation of tasks makes it all the more important, as both Lenin and Trotsky recognized, to study the experiences of the past in order to make its processes intelligible and be most adequately equipped to deal with new problems of the struggle as they arise. □

Subscribe now  
Read

**Intercontinental Press**

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

[ ] \$7.50 for 26 issues.  
[ ] \$15 for one year.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

## Ukrainian Journal Evaluates Soviet Dissidents

[The following editorial from *Ukrainsky Visnyk* (Ukrainian Herald), the leading privately circulated oppositional journal in the Soviet Ukraine, was reprinted in abridged form in the *Chronicle of Current Events*, issue No. 22, dated November 10, 1971. The *Chronicle* is the best-known Russian-language journal of the democratic movement in the Soviet Union.

[The *Ukrainsky Visnyk* editorial is of special interest at this time inasmuch as it gives an evaluation, by Ukrainian dissidents, of civil-rights groupings and *samizdat* publications that have recently come under attack by the Soviet authorities. *Ukrainsky Visnyk* itself, and the circles that produce it, have of course come under attack as well.

[The translation of the *Chronicle's* abridgement is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

That section of Ukrainian public opinion that is familiar with Russian *samizdat* has taken an interest in the attitude held by the Russian oppositional forces, which have been visibly active since the second half of the 1960s, toward the national question in general and the Ukrainian question in particular.

In late 1970, Academician Sakharov and the physicists Tvyordokhlevov and Chalidze founded the Human Rights Committee in Moscow—a moderate opposition group the aim of which is to defend the constitutional rights of Soviet citizens. The committee has not defined its attitude in any way toward the national question in the USSR, nor toward the question of the rights of the non-Russian nations, nor toward the guarantees of those rights. There are only some broad generalities.

In the first appeal to the CPSU Central Committee by Academician Sakharov and scientists [V.] Turchin and R. Medvedev, there is a statement to the effect that a gradual democratiza-

tion of life in the USSR is necessary because that would diminish the threat of nationalism. In the same appeal there is a proposal that, instead of one's nationality, the words "citizen of the USSR" be stamped on everyone's passport. (Similar proposals were made even under Khrushchev and were viewed in the Union Republics as attempts at further encroachment upon their sovereignty.)

In May 1969 the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in the USSR was founded in Moscow; it sent a petition to the United Nations at that time, protesting the persecution of people in the USSR for their opinions and for communicating their opinions. Among other things, the appeal mentioned repression against people who supported national equality. No further statement of position on this question has been made by the Initiative Group. The majority of its members were soon arrested.

The periodical *Chronicle of Current Events* is guided by the same principles of struggle for freedom of speech and opinion as held by the Initiative Group. . . . Without listing any articles of program other than freedom of speech and information, the periodical tries to shed an impartial light on acts of political persecution throughout the Soviet Union and to briefly characterize new works of Russian *samizdat* (and sometimes, those of one or another nationality). From time to time the *Chronicle* also provides material on the Ukraine, with no loss in objectivity. The brevity of the accounts and the isolated inaccuracies are, apparently, caused simply by the lack of more detailed information.

For example, in issue No. 17 the *Chronicle* reports on the trial of V. Moroz, gives the most detailed account known so far on the case of the Ukrainian National Front (we are reprinting this information), and in its supplement on victims of repression of 1969-70, it lists those victimized in the Ukraine.

The Ukrainian reader has welcomed

the appearance of the *Chronicle*. It is notable for its objectivity, extensive coverage, and relative accuracy of information, providing a rounded picture of the political trials unknown to the majority of people in the USSR.

However, some have raised their voices to point out, without denying the importance of the *Chronicle*, that it has rather unilaterally and pretentiously assumed the stance of a supranational or all-union journal, when in fact it is the product of Russian (and possibly, in part, Jewish) circles. It has also been noted that the sparse informational reports from the republics are worked in as though they were supplementary to the quite extensive description of events in Russia, mostly in Moscow—this in and of itself creating a false impression of the situation in the USSR.

It is very hard to obtain information on the attitude toward the national question held by the various underground groups, organizations, and "parties" that have arisen in recent years in Russia (Leningrad, the Baltic fleet, the Volga region, etc.). The existence of these organizations has become known only after their being broken up by the KGB; likewise, their programmatic demands are known only in the broadest outline. From what is known, the conclusion can be drawn that none of these organizations had worked out a program for solving the national question in the USSR and none had stated its position on national demands and on the national movements in the USSR. The impression obtained is that the participants in these groups, while aiming at very radical changes in many spheres of social life, wished—to one degree or another—to preserve the *status quo* on the national question.

Along with organizations and groups that raise the question of democratic transformations in the USSR, others have appeared that criticize the government and the "liberals" from reactionary, openly chauvinist positions, seeking even a formal liquidation of the USSR and the creation of

a military-democratic unitary state "of all the Russians" [nedelimoi Rossii]. Let us quote the brief description of one such document of Russian *samizdat* given by the *Chronicle* in its issue No. 17, "Message to the Nation" [Slovo Natsii]. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Further on, the *Chronicle* No. 17 gave a similar brief summary of a *samizdat* reply to these patriots by V. Gusarov. . . .<sup>2</sup> Judging by this summary, Gusarov's own position on the national question does not seem to be a constructive one outside of his assertion that "the national type" has not been preserved anywhere (consequently, there is no reason to try to preserve national types; let them all be leveled away). It is unclear what the author thinks the future of the non-Russian Soviet nationalities will be or what he would like it to be. The only thing that concerns him is that there be full public airing of issues [glasnost] and that there not be "the whip and the birch."<sup>3</sup>

1. The following is the text of the description of "Message to the Nation" that appeared in *Chronicle* No. 17. The translation is by Amnesty International, which has published *Chronicles* 16 through 21 as separate booklets.

"Signed: 'Russian patriots'. This document, a sort of declaration, is a manifesto of Russian nationalists. The authors vehemently take issue with Russian (and all) liberals, accusing them of having aims and views which are unsubstantiated, impotent and objectively harmful. The 'Russian patriots' campaign for the purity of the white race, which is being tainted by 'random hybridisation', and for the rebirth of Russia ('great, united and indivisible') and of the national religion."—IP

2. The following is the summary of V. Gusarov's "A Message on Liberty," which appeared in *Chronicle* No. 17, in the Amnesty International translation:

"An essay. A democrat's rejoinder to the 'Russian patriots' ('Message to the Nation').

"The author concentrates his attention of the great-power and racist views of the 'patriots', without touching on the economic programme or other aspects of the pamphlet 'Message to the Nation'. 'The universal degeneration must be halted not by means of the whip and the birch, but by means of openness and publicity [glasnost].' Operative executive power must be under public control.

"The hopes set on the 'voice of the blood' are particularly dubious—the history of Russia gives no grounds for supposing that a national type has been preserved anywhere in a pure form."—IP

3. Two additional replies to "Message to

The *Chronicle*, giving an assessment of the typewritten journal of Russian nationalists, *Veche*, states that *Veche* differs from the above-mentioned manifesto *Slovo Natsii* in its attitude of greater restraint and patience regarding the other nationalities. However, the *Chronicle* notes: "Judophobia [anti-Semitism] and Stalinist sympathies are characteristic of some of the contributors to *Veche*. . . ." As far as can be gathered from this assessment, *Veche* is published as a supposedly legal journal, and its editor Osipov is a real person.<sup>4</sup> □

the Nation" appeared in *samizdat*. They were described as follows in the Amnesty International translation of *Chronicle* No. 19:

"A. Krasnov: 'The living word.' A reply to 'Message to the Nation'. The author argues against the 'Russian patriots' ('Message to the Nation' is signed thus) from the stand-point of a Christian and a democrat. That which divides people and engenders hostility among them the author calls the *dead word*. 'The living word is the word of the struggle for liberty, equality, fraternity and justice among people.' Thus the essay ends."

"Sergei Severny: 'To the authors of "Message to the Nation"'. This essay is devoted to exposing the unsound logic and lack of scientific integrity of the 'Message to the Nation'."—IP

4. The assessment referred to appeared in *Chronicle* No. 18 (Amnesty International's translation) as follows:

"*Veche*, 1971, No. 1 (January). The first issue of the typewritten journal *Veche* has appeared. The editors of the journal define its orientation and aims as follows: '. . . to turn our faces towards the Motherland . . . to resurrect and preserve the national culture, the moral and intellectual

heritage of our ancestors . . . to perpetuate the guiding line of the Slavophiles and Dostoyevsky'. 'We are embarking on the publication of a *Russian patriotic journal*', the editors announce.

"A comparison of the journal *Veche* with the manifesto 'Message to the Nation', which appeared over the signature of 'Russian patriots', reveals an essential difference. 'Message to the Nation' is a political declaration preaching racism, state despotism and great-power attitudes; whereas the nationalism of *Veche* takes the form not of a political ideology but only of a particular attitude to Russian history, culture and Orthodoxy.

"Judophobia and Stalinist sympathies are characteristic of some of the contributors to *Veche*, but by no means all of them. The editor of the journal, V. Osipov, writes: 'It must be regretted that the Russian nation is judged not by Khomyakov and Kireyevsky but by Dubrovin and Menshikov.'

"We do not think it necessary to annotate or comment on individual issues of *Veche*, since its concerns are not connected with the question of human rights in our country. We introduce this journal to the reader only because it is an example of the uncensored press.

"On 1 March 1971 V. Osipov, on behalf of the editors of the journal *Veche*, circulated a statement stressing that *Veche* is a legal journal, that political problems are outside its field, and that the journal does not aim at belittling the dignity of other nations."

*Chronicle* No. 20 gives a description of the contents of *Veche* No. 2, dated May 19, 1971. From it one may gather a continued effort by Osipov and his collaborators to stress a purely cultural, apolitical concern with the Russian national heritage. "The editors reject the description of the journal as 'extremely chauvinist.'"

*Veche* No. 2 expounds the views of the early Slavophile Khomyakov, whom it describes as "a conservative, not a reactionary," waxes patriotic about Russian literature "nourished by our thousand-year-old culture," and reports on *samizdat* activities by, and official reprisals against, those with Slavophile sympathies.—IP

## Soviet Intellectuals Write to 'Times'

[The following letter was published in the London *Times* on March 9. The *Times* provided the following description of the signers:

[Mr Yuri Glazov is an Orientalist, specializing in Indian languages, who was expelled from the Academy of Sciences and Moscow University after signing a political protest in 1968.

[Mr Yuri Stein is a former producer of documentary films, who lost his job after protesting against the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

[Mr Yuri Titov is a painter, some of whose works have been exhibited in Western Europe.

[Mr Aleksandr Volpin is a mathemati-

cian, and is the son of the late Sergei Yesenin, the poet.

[Mr Vladimir Gershovich is also a mathematician who was in trouble for protesting over Czechoslovakia.]

[All five of the signers are reported to have applied for visas to emigrate to Israel.]

\* \* \*

It is possible that each of us, having received his visa in his hand, will soon climb the steps of the aircraft and leave the confines of Russia. On the eve of such a change in our lives, it is our inner duty to express our attitude to what is

happening.

On the Russian sea, with its recent public agitation, a calm is just about to descend. The flood tide of the last leap year, with its storms and tragedies, is being succeeded in the present leap year by an ebb tide, which brings with it apathy, exhaustion and the need for re-thinking. People crowned with glory—Andrei Sinyavsky, Yuli Daniel, Larisa Bogoraz, Konstantin Babitsky, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Natalia Gorbanevskaja—are returning from their incarceration, and may not be able to understand straight away what is happening in that society on whose altar they so many times offered up their sacred gifts.

Returning some people to society, the authorities implacably attack others, all "flash points"—sources of likely troubles—are stamped out. A new campaign against Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn is being fuelled. Academician Andrei Sakharov is no longer graciously permitted to attend court cases. All regalias have been hurriedly ripped from Aleksandr Galich, who

is now chained to his bed by a new heart attack, which seriously threatens his life. Deep disgrace threatens that most talented author, Vladimir Maksimov.

And at the same time, in the Chernyakhovsk psychiatric hospital, General Pyotr Grigorenko is dying, literally dying. The noble Anatoly Levitin-Krasnov is knocking together boxes in a labour camp for criminals at Smolensk. Andrei Amalrik is freezing somewhere beyond Magadan. Ilya Gabai and Pavel Litvinov are counting the days until their release to "freedom". Vladimir Bukovsky's mother has been promised a meeting in Vladimir jail with her son, sentenced once more, a living reproach to us all. And from the interrogation rooms of the Lefortovo prison, where another dozen candidates for martyrdom are being summoned, the persistent and terrifying warning is already seeping out, that Pyotr Yakir—the person who was shown on the world screen as the one who refused to be ground down by the former Stalinist reprisals—will "meet a bad end".

Educated people, who in common parlance are counted among the intelligentsia, are carefully keeping silent, hoping in the depths of their souls that the danger will pass them by. And this at a time when some people are being imprisoned, others are being dishonoured and pacified, and yet others are actually being shown the door from this country. At a time when orders have come from on high to close down the "Chronicle of Current Events"—the impassive recorder of the illegal acts of the last four years. May God grant that the silence of the intelligentsia, whose reasons are perfectly understandable, shall not be turned against it in the future.

Moved by moral considerations, we express our solidarity with the victims of the recent repressions, and our most profound concern at the turn which the internal political wheel may take. We leave here, with our friends, a part of our hearts.

*Yuri Glazov, Yuri Stein, Yuri Titov,  
Aleksandr Volpin, Vladimir Gershovich.*

## Czechoslovak Appeal Against Political Repression

[The following appeal, signed "Socialist Movement of Czechoslovak Citizens," has been distributed in Prague, Czechoslovakia. We have translated the text from the March 18 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

Citizens:

Since the elections, the regime, which claims not to want political trials and promises that no one will be bothered because of his or her political opinions, has abandoned all restraint and taken the road of the most frenzied repression against those who do not wish to submit.

In November, even before the elections, some political leaders and renowned scientists were arrested—for example, Jaroslav Sabata, Jan Tesar, Rudolf Batek, and Ladislav Hejdanek, the student Jiri Müller, and a dozen others. They were accused of having distributed manifestos during the pre-election period. Even if this were true, the fact remains that they have been persecuted for having wanted to remind the Czechoslovak citizens of certain provisions in the electoral law dealing with the rights of the electorate—provisions that the press deliberately ignored. When should citizens be allowed to express their political ideas if not during elections?

At the beginning of January the following were arrested: Milan Huebl, former member of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist party and rector of the CP college; Alfred Cerny, secretary of the regional organization of the party in Brno; the journalist Karel Kyncl; and Jan Sling, son of the Communist leader executed during the 1950s.

During the first week of February, while the persecution was not intensified, it took new forms. This time the police did not catch the usual thieves and prostitutes in their dragnet, but rather Marxist intellectuals.

In Prague alone, about 100 citizens were arrested, interrogated, and had their homes searched. The following, among others, had to spend several days in the Ruzyn prison: Rudolf Slansky, son of the Czechoslovak CP general secretary executed in 1952; the wife of the imprisoned Jan Sling (whose mother, a party functionary since before the war, was arrested at the same time in Bratislava); a number of scholars and professors, like Karel Kosik, Jaroslav Klofac, Karel Kaplan, Robert Kalivoda, Lubos Sochor, Frantisek Samalic; the historians Karel Bartosek and Josef Belda; the journalists Jiri Hochman, Jiri Dienstbier, Cestmir Suchy, Vladimir Nepras; the political officials, ex-members of the Prague regional commit-

tee of the party, Jaroslav Littera and Adolf Dorn; the former director of the information section of the Central Committee, Jan Kaspar; two professors at the CP college; the painter Jindrich Heger.

As the police dragnet did not have the expected practical success, most of the people arrested had to be released. Nevertheless, they find themselves constantly under threat of new arrest and interrogation.

Among others, Karel Kaplan, J. Littera, Karel Bartosek, and J. Hochman are still in jail.

. . . The police claim to be engaged in the investigation of "criminal activities." In reality, these interrogations of hundreds of citizens show that they are looking for something else—the chance to avenge themselves for 1968. Several investigators have not hidden their intention to arrest J. Smrkovsky, nor their hatred of Dubcek. The police dragnets are reinforced by the speeches of the most reactionary elements, who demand a new purge.

This process, as we well know, has its own logic. As in the allegory of old, once the mill is started, it ends by crushing the very persons who set it in motion.

The circle closes not only around those who openly express their disagreement with the regime, but is ready to snare any citizen who

might be accidentally involved—not as the result of engaging in any organized opposition—even including those who ally themselves with the regime in the hope of gaining security for themselves and their families.

We know that in these conditions open opposition would be futile and would only bring about new losses. Nevertheless, humbly submitting to the repression would be tantamount to a confession of guilt. It would also mean that later on someone could claim that we share responsibility for what is going on today.

Each of us has a number of possibilities, more or less limited, to oppose the persecution of our friends and acquaintances, our coworkers and neighbors.

We express here our solidarity with the victims of the persecution; we will assist their families; we demand respect for the law; we refuse to grant the police more power than they lawfully command; we will not permit the persecuted to be fired from their jobs.

We can also help in other ways: refrain from unnecessary talk about things that would interest the secret police; do not hold on to clandestine leaflets or journals, but circulate them in the most rapid and safe way possible. During interrogations, we must declare that we know nothing, that we remember nothing, even when it seems the police already know everything, and even when they really do know something.

Confessions would be useless; they would only furnish the inquisitors with testimony to use against ourselves and others later on.

*We draw the attention of the international communist movement, of communists, socialists, democrats, friends of Czechoslovakia, and all their organizations to the dangerous developments taking place in our country.*

The present regime is destroying the last remaining rights and liberties of our citizens. It presents itself as socialist even while it destroys everything that represents the socialist ideals of our citizens.

In a situation where the Czechoslovak people are reduced to silence, the voices of the above organizations can contribute to curtailing the persecutions and can ensure that the destiny of Czechoslovakia and its people will not be forgotten during the upcoming Conference on European Security. □

## Relatives Report Torture of JVP Leader

[We reprint below two documents describing the treatment of Rohan Wijeweera in Ceylon's Jaffna Prison. Wijeweera is the leader of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP—People's Liberation Front), whose arrest last March helped spark the youth rebellion against the government of Sirimavo Bandaranaike.

[The first document, dated November 24, is signed by Wijeweera's brother, Ananda Wijeweera. The second, dated December 17, is by his mother, Masinona.

[Both documents have only recently become available outside Ceylon. They were addressed to a legal adviser inside the country.]

\* \* \*

On receipt of a letter from Jaffna Prison, I went there to see my brother Rohan Wijeweera on November 22. As required by him, I met you in your office on the twenty-third at about 11:00 a.m. and briefed you on the following facts, which you wanted me to write in, and I do so as required.

He was arrested at Amparai on March 13, 1971, before the declaration of the emergency. Subsequently, we wrote several times to the Defence Ministry and the Prime Minister, requesting permission to see him, but every time we were informed that "permission cannot be given to see him".

Thereafter, on July 11, and for the first time since his arrest, we were given permission to see him. Although all members of our family went to see him, we were informed that only one person would be allowed to meet him, and I saw him. At this meeting he told me that in May several CID officers questioned him at the point of a revolver placed against his chest.

Then I again met him on August 12. At this meeting he told me that certain CID officers (he named some of them) came along with Crown Counsel Ian Wickremanayake and that he was removed to a lonely house and there was tortured and thrashed for seven days and threatened with death and was forced to make a statement, which was tape recorded by them. Subsequently, I saw him again on September 10, October 14, and November 22.

On every occasion I met him, he

complained regarding the food supplied to him. He told me that the food supplied to him was insufficient and that whatever was supplied was unfit for consumption and lacked any nutritious value. As a result he has developed aches and pains in his limbs and joints and blisters on his tongue.

Further, he stated that he has been denied facilities for reading or writing as allowed to other suspects and also the facilities for obtaining food and drugs from outside.

He told me that the prison officers are treating him shabbily and that they call him a leader of a communal and racist organisation. He requests transfer to another prison, if that is possible.

He said that he has now been kept in confinement for about eight months without charges or trial, and requests that he be brought to trial without delay, if he has charges to face.

Therefore, if you can possibly do anything regarding the above injustices, it is my expectation that you will do so without reserve.

\* \* \*

When I visited my son Rohan Wijeweera, who is in Jaffna Prison, on December 15, 1971, he told me that about five days before my visit he was down with fever, vomiting, and tonsillitis, and for about two days he was lying on vomit and that no remedial measures were taken nor was he moved to a hospital.

The treatment given was six aspirins a day for four days, and now as a result he has got a headache.

He was not pleased with the manner in which some prison officials act in respect of him. He told that especially the prison superintendent is enforcing special regulations only in respect of him.

While expressing displeasure about the food given to him, he also questioned why is it that the right of getting food from home, a right enjoyed by others, is denied to him. In this respect he also told me that he wishes to know whether the superintendent is acting on his whims, on a communal basis, or whether he is carrying out instructions from above.

I expect that you would do everything possible in this connection, please. □