

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 10, No. 34

© 1972 Intercontinental Press September 25, 1972

50c

'Newsweek' Tries to Link Trotskyism With 'Terrorist International'



Leon Trotsky

Trelew Survivors Tell What Happened
Studies Find High Morale in North Vietnam

How Healyites Revise Marxist Philosophy

'No Dumping' Sign

The Society for the Study, Protection, and Utilization of Nature in the Southeast (of France) has protested to the French government against renewed dumping of radioactive wastes in the Bay of Biscay.

The protest, according to the July 30 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, was submitted along with 300 supporting letters and 11,000 signatures. Among the signers were more than 1,000 schoolteachers and 100 cultivators of oyster beds.

The nonprofit organization, which has 1,800 members, stated that "at the end of June or beginning of July, 4,000 tons of radioactive wastes were dumped in the Bay of Biscay in a trench 5,000 meters deep located 1,000 kilometers from the coast."

The containers of concrete and steel will disintegrate in ten to twenty years, according to the complaint, releasing wastes that will remain radioactive for several centuries.

The deadly wastes came from seven different European countries — Belgium, Holland, Great Britain, Switzerland, West Germany, Spain, and Italy.

The European Agency for Nuclear Energy recently published a long study on the disposal of radioactive wastes in the high seas. According to this source, in the years 1967, 1969, and 1971, a total of 67,000 containers of such wastes were dumped into the Atlantic at depths of around 5,000 meters.

The report claimed that this quantity would endanger neither the marine environment nor human beings even if the containers gave way to corrosion, permitting the contents to leak out.

"We note, nonetheless," *Le Monde* commented, "that this disposal method now has fewer partisans than in the past. What is held against it is not the danger but the fact that it costs more than storing it on land." □

No Surprise

A Washington, D. C., panel of scientists has found that lung cancer is twice as common in city dwellers who breathe polluted air as among country dwellers.

In This Issue

FEATURES	1003	"Newsweek" and the Real "Terrorist International" —by Jon Rothschild
	1020	Healyite Revisionism in the Field of Philosophy —by George Novack
ECOLOGY	1002	"No Dumping" Sign
MIDDLE EAST	1004	Israel Invades Southern Lebanon —by Jon Rothschild
	1005	3,117 Political Prisoners in Israel
INDOCHINA WAR	1006	Why the North Vietnamese "Keep Going" —by David Thorstad
	1009	General Lavelle Rebels Over Scapegoat Role
	1012	Blockade Aims at Vietnam's Food Supplies
U. S. A.	1007	U. S. Senate Approves SALT Agreement
	1013	Death Agony of the U. S. Postal System
	1017	Attica Prison Revolt Was "Spontaneous"
ARGENTINA	1008	Three Trelew Survivors Tell What Really Happened
	1008	"Tracherous and Premeditated Murder"
VENEZUELA	1010	Working-Class Front Formed —by Miguel Fuente
	1011	Election Stand of Venezuelan Trotskyists
IRAN	1012	Mehdi Rezai Executed
SRI LANKA	1014	Hunger Strike Set for October 18
	1015	Star Witness Flounders in Sri Lanka Trial —by Fred Feldman
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	1016	On the Trials in Czechoslovakia —by Sibylle Plogstedt
SOVIET UNION	1018	"Successes" for Political Police in Ukraine
	1018	Ukrainians Denounce Stalinist Practices
	1019	Soviet Dissidents Assess Yakir's Arrest
	1019	Amalrik Transferred to Lefortovo Prison
REVIEWS	1024	The Awakening of the Brazilian Revolution —by Gerry Foley
	1029	Behind the Prison Revolts
DOCUMENTS	1030	Why Lanusse Murdered the Sixteen Prisoners
	1031	French Far-Left Stand on Munich Events
	1032	Letter Smuggled From a Yugoslav Prison
PHOTOGRAPHS	1001	Leon Trotsky
	1014	Sri Lanka rally held in spring of 1971
	1019	Pyotr Yakir

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

COPY EDITOR: Lawrence Rand.

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

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein.

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 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 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.

'Newsweek' and the Real 'Terrorist International'

By Jon Rothschild

The entire back page of the September 12 *New York Times* was taken up by an advertisement for the September 18 issue of *Newsweek*. Part of the ad, in huge type, blared, "European experts are convinced, says *Newsweek*, that Black September is no bunch of loners, but rather a super-secret arm of Al Fatah. As part of its cover story, *Newsweek* explores the links between the major—and minor—young revolutionary groups throughout the world, their motives and heroes (would you believe Leon Trotsky?), and the civilized world's chances of stopping them in an age of instant communications and jet travel."

The publishers of *Newsweek* spent more than \$10,000 for this single announcement of its big scoop on the implications of the Munich events.

For one and a half pages the unsigned "expose" pieces together the alleged exploits of Black September and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. In addition it weaves in the Japanese United Red Army, the West German Baader-Meinhof group, and the Turkish Dev Genç (Revolutionary Youth).

The article notes that in the past year terrorist actions have been "disastrous" for the terrorists, but it claims that "the avant-garde in international terrorist organizations no longer cares much whether others approve of its tactics."

Then comes the point: "Its models are less likely to be Mao Tse-tung with his emphasis on national guerrilla movements, than the figure of Leon Trotsky—the Russian revolutionary who sought to spread communism throughout the world. 'His gigantic portrait, complete with fuzzy hair and pince-nez,' wrote British New Left specialist Peter Paterson, 'can dominate a hall full of British teenagers on a sunny Sunday afternoon like some political version of that sanctified teen-age star, the late James Dean.' Trotskyites see themselves as the catalysts provoking governments into ever harsher repressive measures.

This, they believe, will encourage Fascism and, in turn, produce more radical fanatics and more cracks in established society.

"According to some European specialists, the founding of the Fourth International in Brussels two years ago represented the most ambitious current effort to set terrorism firmly into a multinational frame. Its leading theoretician, Prof. Ernest Mandel of the University of Brussels, urges 'active participation of our comrades in armed insurrections designed to destroy the established order, whether in Ireland or in Latin America.' The Fourth International seems to have especially close ties with Latin American terrorists—and, in fact, was instrumental in convincing the Latin Leftists to switch from rural to urban guerrilla warfare. Its philosophy dovetails nicely with that of Brazil's Carlos Marighella, who first expounded the principle that 'the urban guerrilla's only reason for existence . . . is to shoot.' Marighella himself was killed in a police ambush in 1969."

It could be argued that Leon Trotsky's hair was somewhat fuzzy. It is true that he sometimes wore pince-nez and that, as a revolutionary Marxist, he believed in the socialist future of humanity. As for the rest, *Newsweek's* research was less than thorough.

The Fourth International, as anyone even casually acquainted with radical politics must know, was not founded two years ago. The fuzzy-haired, pince-nezed Leon Trotsky, as *Newsweek's* wordsmiths might put it, called for its formation in 1933, just two years after the birth of the late James Dean. And the Fourth International was founded in 1938. *Newsweek's* date is off by thirty-two years.

Ernest Mandel is neither a professor nor a member of the University of Brussels faculty. He is indeed one of the leading theoreticians of the Fourth International and the author of the widely acclaimed *Marxist Economic Theory*, which does not espouse

terrorism, urban or rural, and which is most likely beyond the understanding of *Newsweek's* editorial staff.

The quote attributed to Mandel by *Newsweek's* anonymous author does not exist in any of Mandel's published works. Since *Newsweek* obviously did not discuss this matter with Mandel, we must assume that the quotation was concocted by a staff editor or by a police agent who listened to some lecture by Mandel and wrote down some garbled nonsense that he thought would please his superiors.

The claim that "Trotskyites see themselves as the catalysts provoking governments into ever harsher repressive measures" designed to bring about fascism, which they believe will "produce more radical fanatics and more cracks in established society" sounds like a belated echo of the charges invented by Stalin during the infamous Moscow trials of the 1930s.

Those who want to know the truth may turn to Trotsky's own writings on fascism. They will find that, far from believing that the onset of fascism and repression brings nearer the day of revolution, Trotsky held just the opposite. He saw from its inception the gravity of the threat fascism represented to the very existence of the working-class movement.

In fact, the call for the formation of the Fourth International, which flowed from Trotsky's recognition that the Stalinized Third International had become a counterrevolutionary instrument that could not be rejuvenated from within, was prompted by the failure of the German Communist party effectively to fight Hitlerism and by the Comintern's complacent attitude toward the Nazi seizure of power.

The Fourth International does indeed have close ties with some forces among Latin America's guerrilla fighters. It has supported them and other guerrillas against brutal military dictatorships, above all through worldwide activities in defense of political prisoners arrested and often tortured by these military dictatorships that, somehow, escape the label "ter-

rorist" and are included by *Newsweek's* editors as belonging to the "civilized world."

The Fourth International was a key component in the international campaign that won the release from prison of the Peruvian revolutionist Hugo Blanco, a proclaimed Trotskyist and the most popular socialist fighter in the country, where the oppressed peasantry recognizes the regime, and not the opponents of it, as the real terrorists.

More recently, the Fourth International has engaged energetically in the effort to win freedom for the political prisoners in Argentina, a country in which political dissidents are assassinated by government forces at frequent intervals.

It is also true that some forces in the Latin American revolutionary movement have in recent years moved closer to the political positions of Trotskyism, and that Trotskyists may be found among their ranks. But it is not true that the Fourth International "was instrumental in convincing" Latin American revolutionists "to switch from rural to urban guerrilla warfare." That turn was first made by the Tupamaros in Uruguay; and they are not Trotskyists. The aim of *Newsweek's* assertion is transparent.

To throw in the name of Carlos Marighella—who was not a Trotskyist either—is also transparent, as is the quotation attributed to him. Marighella broke with the Brazilian Communist party because of its reformist political line. It is slanderous to suggest that his only conceived purpose was "to shoot," particularly in view of the record of the Brazilian government in shooting—or otherwise dispensing with—political dissidents or critics.

The concoctions in *Newsweek's* "Terrorist International" are obviously part of an effort to organize a more ominous sort of "international." The capitalist rulers and their media are lumping together various scattered guerrilla or terrorist actions by small groups and seeking to use that amalgam as propaganda in a witch-hunt of worldwide proportions.

Ernest Mandel has been forbidden to travel to France, the United States, Switzerland, and West Germany. Earlier this year, the Social Democratic regime in Bonn explained its refusal to allow Mandel to enter West Germany by referring to the alleged, and

completely fictional, terrorist actions of the Fourth International.

The rhetoric used by the Brandt government in banning Mandel set the stage for a possible decision to declare the Fourth International itself illegal in Germany.

French members of the Fourth International have been arrested in Spain for the "crime" of bringing anti-Franco literature into the country.

In the United States, as *Intercontinental Press* reported September 18, a special new committee composed of members of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the CIA, and the FBI has been formed to investigate "terrorism."

UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim has called for a special General Assembly discussion of "terrorist activities" in order to coordinate an international witch-hunt against dissident political movements.

Newsweek's story is a crass attempt to amalgamate "terrorism" with the international Trotskyist movement—with the dual purpose of making rel-

atively insignificant guerrilla actions appear more important than they actually are and of using those incidents to repress adherents of the Fourth International.

The selection of the world Trotskyist movement as a target has a certain logic from the viewpoint of the capitalist class. As a tendency that has shown considerable potential for growth in recent years, the Trotskyist movement may soon become a significant force in the political life of a number of countries. The ruling class has good reason to be concerned about this.

At the same time, the parties and groups adhering to the Fourth International are not yet of mass size. They are thus less able to defend themselves than is, for example, the organized trade-union movement. Pressed by a worsening political and economic crisis, the capitalist class, in attacking the Trotskyist movement, is aiming ultimately at the entire working-class movement. □

Part of 'Continuing War' Against Arabs

Israel Invades Southern Lebanon

By Jon Rothschild

Some of the Israeli armed units that poured across the Lebanese border on September 16 in massive terror raids against the civilian population almost did not make it home in time for Yom Kippur, the day of atonement for sins of the past year. For the first time ever, the Lebanese army had the effrontery to defend itself—a fact that brought forth both denials and indignation from Israeli military leaders.

The September 16 invasion was described by Lieutenant General David Elazar, who had promised further attacks after the massive September 8 air raids on Syria and Lebanon, as part of "our continuing war against the terrorists."

And he promised more: "The operation itself will not end the war, but it was a major battle."

An unidentified senior officer of the Israeli General Staff called the assault "a combing and purging operation." Those familiar with Israeli terminol-

ogy know what this means: bombing civilians, blowing up houses, destroying roads and bridges.

At dawn—5:45 a.m.—three columns of Israeli infantry, armor, and artillery, supported by helicopters, breached the Lebanese border in what was to be the largest Israeli ground operation since the June 1967 war. Simultaneously, twenty-five Israeli jet fighter-bombers struck at Nabatiye, population 20,000, and Tyre, population 35,000. Both towns are sites of Palestinian refugee camps.

The ground forces penetrated some sixteen miles into Lebanon, seizing a total area of more than 130 square miles. At least sixteen Arab villages were occupied in the sweep and Israeli military spokesmen reported that more than 150 homes were destroyed—allegedly because commandos had been known to have stayed in them. At least sixty "fedayeen" were reported killed, twenty taken prisoner. The real toll is doubtless much higher. First

reports of the September 8 air raids listed forty dead and twenty wounded; later, the figure was expanded to 200 killed or wounded. The Israeli command reported three Israeli soldiers killed and six wounded.

The attacking troops were forced to stay longer than they had planned. One armored unit came under heavy fire during its withdrawal and had to take up defensive positions over night. "We were unwilling to move our tanks and other heavy armored vehicles out after dark," a senior officer told the press.

The officer seemed surprised at the combativity demonstrated by the Lebanese army: "Evidently the Lebanese Army decided it had to put up some sort of a show. They fired on us, so we had to fire back.

"It was not our purpose to take ground and hold it. There are between 300 and 400 terrorists in the central area and our aim was to capture as many as we could and destroy as much of their equipment as possible."

Chaim Herzog, a military commentator and former chief of army intelligence, threw his hat in the ring for the chutzpah of the month award by explaining to Israeli citizenry that it was now "up to the Lebanese Government and the Lebanese people" whether there would be further, even deeper raids in the future.

The resistance of the Lebanese army, which hitherto has been thoroughly passive in face of Israeli invasions, was described by Terence Smith in the September 18 *New York Times*:

"Although military authorities here [Jerusalem] were unwilling to admit it, it was evident that unexpectedly heavy resistance, particularly from the Lebanese Army, had slowed the Israelis and forced a change in their plans. . . .

"Two American reporters who served as a pool for the foreign press said in Tel Aviv this afternoon [September 17] that the unit they accompanied had been attacked and ambushed repeatedly."

The correspondents said the Israeli unit had to "fight its way out" of the village of Jouya, which was defended by both commandos and regular Lebanese troops.

The official explanation for the invasion given by government leaders may be discounted as nonsense. Be-

fore September 1970, when the fedayeen had at least 15,000 combatants under arms and were conducting regular raids on Israeli border patrols, inflicting an uncomfortably high rate of casualties for a country with a population of only about 3,000,000, the Zionist government insisted that the fedayeen were an insignificant military clique, an isolated band of maniac extremists constituting no more than a nuisance to the Israeli state.

Today, after a series of severe defeats for the Palestinians, at a time when even the Israeli general staff admits that only 300 to 400 fedayeen were located in the invaded sector, open war is declared by the Zionist leaders against the Palestinian commandos, who are suddenly discovered to be a threat to the holy land.

The Israeli regime's rhetoric about reprisals for "terrorist" operations is a transparently spurious pretext. The fact is that as long as the Zionist state exists, in the absence of a comprehensive "peace" settlement imposed at the expense of the Palestinian people and guaranteed by the "great powers" and strong, repressive Arab regimes, Israeli military assaults on neighboring Arab states designed to terrorize the civilian population and humiliate the Arab world will continue.

The target country, in this case Lebanon, is selected according to the correlation of forces in the region, Israeli public opinion, and Zionist diplomatic activity. Since negotiations with the Jordanian regime are under way, the opportunity of discussions with Egypt has opened up, and Soviet troops have been removed from Egypt—which is thus militarily weaker and also has an excuse for standing idly by while other Arab states are attacked—the logical target is Lebanon, the country least able to defend itself.

Paradoxically, the modest but significant resistance offered by the Lebanese army may increase Israeli determination to attack again, perhaps this time permanently occupying a slice of southern Lebanon on grounds of military security.

There has been, so far, no comment from the U. S. government on the September 16 invasion. After the September 8 air raids, however, influential sectors of the U. S. press (the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *New York Post*, which while

not a newspaper of national stature is significant in this situation because of its mostly Jewish readership) cautioned Israeli leaders not to upset the imminent peace negotiations and forfeit the sympathy accruing to them in the wake of the Munich events.

But in an election year, particularly with George McGovern strenuously trying to outbid Nixon in appealing for the Jewish vote, the U. S. government is scarcely likely to impose restraint on Tel Aviv.

More and perhaps increasingly severe Israeli attacks, probably against Lebanon and perhaps against Syria as well, can thus be expected.

These attacks will be accompanied by increased repression inside Israel and conceivably by Israeli government-organized terror attacks on Arabs in Western Europe. On September 13, an Israeli military court sentenced a Palestinian commando to death. Mahmoud Ahmed Mansur was convicted of planting a bomb in the spare tire of a Tel Aviv bus in November 1971. Two persons were wounded when the device exploded. The prosecutor in the trial had asked only life imprisonment, but the court's sentence was death.

This decision is a clear portent and is virtually unprecedented in Israel. Kozo Okamoto, convicted of the mass shooting at Lydda airport May 30, got only life imprisonment. Only two guerrillas have ever been sentenced to death in Israel before—and their sentences were commuted to life imprisonment.

On September 12, in a speech to a special session of parliament called to discuss the Munich events, Premier Golda Meir vowed a fight against commandos on a "far-flung front line." The September 13 *New York Times* commented: "Government sources declined to amplify this point, which some newsmen interpreted as a threat that Israeli security agents might begin to hunt down Arab terrorists in Europe and elsewhere." □

3,117 Political Prisoners in Israel

The total number of Palestinians being held for political reasons in about a dozen prisons in Israel is 3,117, according to the August 11 *Le Monde*. They are charged with, or are suspected of, being members or sympathizers of fedayeen organizations.

Among them, 1,949 have been sentenced by military tribunals, 331 have been interned for "administrative reasons," and 837 are awaiting trial.

Why the North Vietnamese 'Keep Going'

By David Thorstad

The heavy bombing of North Vietnam has failed to meaningfully slow the flow of men and materiel into the South, and in spite of the bombing the North will be able to sustain fighting "at the present rate" for the next two years. This is the conclusion reached at the end of August in separate but concurring reports by the two top U. S. intelligence agencies, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency. The "substance" of the reports, which were prepared for the National Security Council, was leaked to the *New York Times* on September 12 by persons its correspondent Tad Szulc described as "highly placed intelligence officials."

"They [the North Vietnamese] have not been hit fatally," one told Szulc, "but they are slowly bleeding to death—even if it takes two more years."

The main findings of the reports were said to be the following:

- Some 20,000 "fresh" North Vietnamese troops have made their way into the South in the past six weeks.

- The number of regular troops in the Mekong Delta is the highest since the war began—20,000 to 30,000 compared with 3,000 a year ago. The intelligence officials felt that the delta region is now "our biggest problem."

- Since Nixon mined Haiphong harbor in May, a third petroleum pipeline has been begun and completed between Hanoi and the Chinese frontier railroad terminal of Pingsiang.

- An unspecified number of additional pipelines have been built southward from Hanoi to supply forces in the South.

"Intelligence officials, discussing the reports of the two agencies, said that it was virtually impossible for air strikes to cut the pipelines, which are four inches in diameter," wrote Szulc. "Two officials said that whenever a pipeline was hit, North Vietnamese technicians turned it off at pumping stations while rapid repairs were made."

The officials said the effects of the bombing of railways running from China have been "to a large extent neutralized" through the marshaling

of "all available rolling stock and manpower."

Bombing of supply routes has been circumvented by what the officials called "ant tactics." This involves "moving supplies by rail up to a bombed-out bridge or a severed highway. The supplies are then reportedly moved by river barges, truck, bicycle or back pack to railroad cars waiting beyond a damaged section of track or a destroyed bridge, and reloaded. At the same time, it was noted, labor units repair the tracks and bridges."

The officials, said Szulc, also predicted "new enemy offensives" in September and October. The prediction was allegedly based on "the deployment of troops southward, the 'preparation of battlefields' by demolition men and other technical units, captured documents and information from defectors and prisoners of war."

The "leaking" of this and other similar information by unnamed intelligence and government officials during recent week—such as the prediction of "unending war" by U. S. officials in Saigon at the end of August (see *Intercontinental Press*, September 11, p. 940)—comes as the American presidential campaign swings into high gear. Those responsible for the leaks may have believed that the information would provide useful ammunition to Democratic candidate George McGovern, who has been seeking to capitalize on the deep-going antiwar sentiment of the American people.

Some cynical Washington observers believe, however, that Nixon may be behind the leaks. Their argument is that the polls of public opinion put Nixon so far ahead that even if he slips somewhat between now and election day he is still certain to win. Consequently he is now maneuvering to present his projected victory as a mandate to keep up the war.

Nixon has not denied the reports about the war continuing after the election. In fact he has admitted to the press that this is likely to happen.

Whatever the truth may be as to the political objectives of the leaks, the main purpose of the heavy bombing has not been to destroy supply routes or "military" targets. The essential goal was to terrorize the population and destroy morale.

The November 1971 findings of the Cornell University Air War Study Group, for instance, showed that more than 90 percent of fixed-wing air activity in South Vietnam was used for "interdiction," a concept that goes far beyond attacking supply routes, to include harassment, reprisal, and in areas where the NLF is predominant, bombing "to influence the population: to cause them to move into areas under government control, or to make them stop supporting the insurgency."

The study noted that in a guerrilla war, the adversary "may live intermingled with the population or may actually *be* the population. . . . To interdict such an enemy means to blanket all possible areas with firepower. . . . Seen in this light, generalized interdiction in Vietnam takes on the character of *strategic* warfare. The targets are not well enough defined to qualify as tactical objectives. Rather, the attacks are directed against the over-all reserves of the insurgents, which are in the population itself, and against the will to continue to fight."

That such a policy of terrorizing the civilian population and disrupting the existing social fabric is likewise being applied in the bombing in the North is clear from the overwhelming evidence of deliberate bombing of civilian targets such as dikes, hospitals, churches, and residential areas.

Repeated studies by U. S. agencies have indicated that this policy does not produce the desired result and that North Vietnamese morale is not sagging, but remains very high. "This is the conclusion of four confidential studies made for the Defense Dept. by the Rand Corporation in 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1970," revealed syndicated columnist Jack Anderson September 6. "The latest battlefield reports indicate that Communist morale is still high as ever."

Rand is a "brain factory" that does strategic studies for the Pentagon. The 1970 study, written by a Konrad Kellen, is based on twenty-two "in-depth" interviews with North Vietnamese prisoners and, according to Anderson,

is "corroborated by many other interviews over the years."

"If what these 22 men have said," wrote Kellen, ". . . corresponds to what large numbers of soldiers, or perhaps even the majority of Vietnam's 30 million people similarly feel, then the chances of rooting out (the Communist) revolution by military force or political devices is dim indeed, and emerges as an undertaking questionable in more ways than one."

Kellen was especially impressed with the morale of the North Vietnamese troops: "To anyone experienced in interviewing soldiers in war, the results are . . . extraordinary. Enemy morale appears high indeed, particularly in view of the enormous disproportion in power and resources of the two contenders. . . ."

He also noted that "the enemy soldier who, lacking all the important modern engines of war, cannot be broken in his morale and motivation, seems anomalous, because probably few enemy armies could have carried on the war under comparable circumstances."

"At the very least, others would resent fighting an enemy who had B-52s, sensors and napalm, which they lacked. But it is precisely that resentment—a powerful corrosive agent to morale—that seems entirely absent in the enemy forces. . . ."

The captured soldiers were all prepared to continue their struggle well beyond the two years the CIA and DIA studies still give the North. "Of those interviewed . . .," the Rand study stated, "all said that the sacrifices had been worthwhile, and all said that in one way or another the war would have to continue through future generations if they themselves should be unable to achieve their aims."

"I would rather die in the struggle for independence than live under the domination of foreigners," a prisoner named Ha Tam told the researchers. "We will still have to fight even if the war is prolonged for five more years, ten more years or twenty more years. If fathers cannot achieve victories, sons will succeed them."

In a special dispatch from Hanoi in the September 7 *Christian Science Monitor*, Agence France-Presse correspondent Jean Thoraval reported that the heavy bombings "apparently have not considerably diminished the mil-

itary potential of North Vietnam." He quoted a "very authoritative" official as having told him in an "off-the-record chat": "We can say that our supplies have not dried up, and we have what is necessary to continue the war for a long time still."

"Experience has taught us that, even when we are assured of continuous supplies, we should stock reserves. This is what we have done."

Thoraval said that "over the past three months, in trips over thousands of kilometers, I have been struck, like my colleagues, by the endless convoys of trucks of all sizes, built in China or the Soviet Union or some other country of the Communist camp. Many of them are so new you can still smell the paint on them, and their tires are in good condition. . . ."

"Under my windows, in central Hanoi, I have often seen oxen slowly pulling the carts filled to the brim with munitions or supplies. One does not know where they came from. One does not know where they are going, except that they are going south."

Motorbikes, he said, "are more numerous in the streets than they were in 1968, and gas rationing is less strict than that imposed when the former Johnson administration decided to bomb the North."

The Vietnamese appear to be coping with the mining of the harbors with the same ingenuity they have exhibited in the past: "Old and traditional junks, insensible to magnetic mines, still have their utility, just as they had

during the war against the French.

"Evidently, the use of the junks is slower than the direct entry of a big freighter into Haiphong Port. But people here shrug their shoulders and say that time is of little importance."

"We know this well," they say, "because the war has lasted 30 years already, and nothing indicates that it is over."

An official explained this ability to cope with the heaping up of difficulties: "So when the bombings increased and the ports and coasts were mined, we had to find other solutions to meet the situation."

"To prove his point," Thoraval went on, "the official invited me to eat a delicious French soup, a 'bouillabaisse,' full of lobster and other shellfish. With a slight smile, he said, 'So much for the blockade.'"

In background sessions with newsmen in Saigon and Washington, high administration officials have recently been admitting that the blockade and the bombing are not accomplishing their publicly stated objectives, according to *New York Times* correspondent Craig Whitney. Writing from Saigon August 31, he quoted one intelligence specialist as having voiced the opinion, "I can't imagine why the other side would feel ready to give up at this point. Our faithful sources say the word is to continue, and even under the bombing they can get enough supplies to keep going for a long, long time, even at the current relatively high level of battlefield activity." □

U.S. Senate Approves SALT Agreement

By a vote of eighty-eight to two September 14, the U.S. Senate approved the Strategic Arms Limitation [SALT] agreement, which was signed by Nixon and Brezhnev in Moscow May 26.

The senators also passed the Jackson-Scott amendment, which calls for the United States to seek numerical "equality" with the USSR in all weapons systems, and "vigorous research and development" of nuclear arms. The administration-endorsed amendment won by fifty-six to thirty-five.

Since the House of Representatives had voted in favor of the pact without amendments, a Senate-House conference will now take up the issue.

On the day of the Senate vote, the House approved and sent on to the Senate a "defense" budget of \$74,500,000,000. While somewhat less than Nixon had

asked for, this is the biggest appropriation for armaments since World War II.

In the last days of the SALT pact debate, Democratic Senator Alan Cranston of California took a pessimistic view of the "arms control" agreement. His comments appear in the August 14 *Congressional Record* (S 14873):

". . . in 1963, Moscow and Washington signed the nuclear test-ban treaty. Far from stunting the arms race, however, the test-ban treaty had the unfortunate effect of accelerating underground testing and speeding up the development of new weapons of destruction to offset the supposed concession represented by the treaty itself.

"Now we face a parallel danger—that SALT may mean more weapons, not fewer weapons."

"Thus far, that has been the consequence of SALT." □

Three Trelew Survivors Tell What Really Happened

[The following article by *Le Monde's* Argentine correspondent Philippe Labreuveux was published in the September 13 issue of the authoritative Paris daily. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Buenos Aires — It happened on August 22. "That night," Alberto Camps related, "Captain Sosa and Lieutenant Bravo woke us up around 3:00 a. m., ordering us to fold up our mattresses and blankets and stand inside our cells. Then we went out into the corridor, where we were lined up in a double file.

One of the guards in the passageway said: "Now you're going to see what repression is, you murderers, you sons of bitches . . ."

"The first burst of machine-gun fire followed immediately," Camps continued. "I thought they were firing blanks but I saw a bullet hit a comrade. My cellmate and I threw ourselves back into our cell. I heard two or three more volleys, and then single shots.

"Lieutenant Bravo entered and told us to stand up and put our hands back of our heads. He asked me if I intended to talk. I said no. He fired, hitting me in the stomach."

Ricardo Haidar, who was in a neighboring cell, reported: "At the end of the corridor, there were two or three noncoms armed with machine guns. Bravo and Sosa strode down the corridor between the two lines of prisoners hurling insults and threats; then they turned on their heels. Without the least incident or movement from us, the machine guns started to clatter. We went back into our cell and rolled under the bed.

"Bravo came in and told us to get up. 'Are you going to talk, yes or no?' He left. But another officer appeared immediately. Without saying a word, he raised his gun to the level of my head. Instinctively, I dodged to the left. The bullet, which hit me in my right collarbone, threw me into the air. I heard my cellmate scream in pain. Then there was a long si-

lence, and I heard Bravo explaining to someone: "They tried to escape."

María Berger was closer still to the guards stationed at the end of the corridor: A fat noncom began shooting at us, and then all the officers and noncoms joined in. I was hit four times, twice in the arm, once in the buttocks, and again in the stomach.

"I played dead. An officer came up, looked at the head of my cellmate, fired, and then turned his gun on me. He left without even seeing if he had done his work well."

These are the testimonies of the three survivors of the massacre at the Trelew naval air base, in which sixteen guerrillas died. It was primarily to keep their stories from getting out that the government decreed a law on August 22, forbidding "the reproduction of any statement attributed or attributable to illegal organizations, groups, or persons implicated in subversive or terrorist activities." No Argentine

publication has yet divulged these eyewitness accounts.

In any case, the official version claiming that most of the nineteen guerrillas being held prisoner on the base were slaughtered as the result of an escape attempt has convinced no one. It does seem rather unlikely that these clear-headed and disciplined young people would have considered escaping from a military base that had a garrison of 900 men and which, on top of that, was completely isolated in a semidesert. The group knew that any sign of resistance would bring reprisals.

Who gave the order for the slaughter? The government and the navy command, who covered up for those directly responsible, seem above suspicion. The political consequences of the massacre run too contrary to the aims of the military regime. On the other hand, it is no more reasonable to think that the officers involved took it on themselves to commit such an act. □

Interview With Argentine Guerrillas

'Tracherous and Premeditated Murder'

[The Chilean magazine *Mayoria*, in its August 30 issue, published the following interview with the Argentine guerrillas who escaped from Rawson prison on August 15. They were interviewed shortly after the Trelew massacre on August 22. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Mayoria. Were you expecting reprisals to be taken against those who were left in Trelew and Rawson?

Quieto. Yes, but not on this scale or of such brutality. So much did we expect it that we had reached prior agreement among ourselves on the mechanics of surrendering, which they used in the airport and in the prison.

Mayoria. Did you foresee the possibility that the plan would not be carried out exactly?

Vaca Narvaja. When you plan an operation, you always take into consideration various alternatives and anticipate difficulties.

Quieto. We thought that the intervention of the courts and the press and the fact that part of the population knew about the situation would safeguard the lives of the compañeros who were unable to escape.

Osatinsky. It is obvious that our foresight was not enough and that the regime preferred to pick out and physically eliminate a group of revolutionary fighters—even at the cost

of a reaction among the people, which, indeed, we have already witnessed.

This also shows how desperate the military dictatorship is and how it fears the capacities and the quality of the fighters belonging to the armed organizations. If any of those who were wounded manage to be saved it will be because of the massive and immediate mobilization of our people.

Mayoría. It is totally impossible that they tried to escape?

Quieto. Totally impossible. As the press itself has pointed out, it is absurd to even think this of a group of fighters who a week earlier had at their disposal a large quantity of weapons, who were holding hostages—

Mena. And with the confusion there was then!

Quieto. — sixty hostages, and with the military security network damaged, and still they did not even attempt an escape of a desperate nature, as one by car would have been.

Vaca Narvaja. It would have been desperate, but in no way senseless like the story the dictatorship wants people to believe.

Quieto. So it would have been difficult to attempt to escape while they were imprisoned on a military base, under strict guard, with reinforcements brought in subsequently, totally isolated, and with no kind of vehicle to use for an escape. Even granting the absurd version of an attempted escape, it will not stand up to the slightest analysis.

Santucho. According to the dictatorship's version, Compañero Pujadas seized an officer's gun. Absurd! Absurd! First of all, it is impossible that all the compañeros—men and women—would be kept together following a first escape. In any country in the world, following an event of this nature the prisoners are kept strictly separated and isolated from one another. Especially in Argentina, where this is a normal practice, even in lesser cases. Second, if only one person seized the weapon, why massacre all of them? Third, why was the officer not also massacred, or at least wounded?

Osatinsky. It was mass murder! To kill sixteen of nineteen compañeros, several machine guns must have been fired simultaneously.

Vaca Narvaja. Moreover, a very important point is that our attitude, which the organizations want to be the prevailing attitude, is to always proceed, whatever the circumstances, in such a mature way that no desperate escapes will be attempted. In the written instructions themselves that were distributed to the combatants inside and outside of the prison (he displays them), it is explicitly stated: "Weapons: use of weapons is pro-

hibited, except under orders from an officer or out of absolute necessity for self-defense. . . ."

Quieto. As you can imagine, the compañeros who were left behind knew that they would have to "reorganize" themselves in order to attempt a new escape. But under no circumstances would they attempt a desperate escape.

Osatinsky. Only one conclusion is possible: It was treacherous and premeditated murder, the responsibility for which lies above all with the military regime headed by Lanusse. □

Gen. Lavelle Rebels Over Scapegoat Role

General John D. Lavelle told the Senate Armed Services Committee September 12 that Admiral Thomas Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General Creighton Abrams, former commander of the U. S. forces in Vietnam, had approved his "unauthorized" bombing of North Vietnam. Lavelle was demoted and retired when his bombings and falsified reports were made public.

According to the September 13 *New York Times*, "an aide to Admiral Moorer confirmed that the Admiral was in Saigon on Nov. 8, the day of the first raid, and also acknowledged that he had been briefed by General Lavelle."

Lavelle said that an aide of Admiral John McCain, Jr., commander of all Pacific forces, told him after one "unauthorized" air strike that "he had been called from Washington and Washington didn't believe that we had done a good job on hitting that airfield."

Both Abrams and Moorer have denied all responsibility for the bombings. Abrams testified "that, of course, he knew of the raids but did not know they were being conducted outside the rules of engagement."

However, in other testimony summarized in the September 18 *Times*, ". . . General Abrams acknowledged that in early January he had approved one of General Lavelle's strikes against a radar site in North Vietnam. The attack was subsequently declared to be a violation of the rules of engagement by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General Abrams testified that he had given orders not to stage such raids again."

The *Times* reported that the early November raids were officially described as a "'warning' to Hanoi forces not to become more active in the air." The contradiction between such "warnings" and "protective reaction" by planes supposedly under "attack" was noted by one senator.

Further light was shed by Sgt. Lonnie Franks, the twenty-three-year-old intelligence officer who first exposed Lavelle's actions. In an interview in the September 7 *New York Times*, he charged that there were seventy-five such bombing raids—not twenty as Lavelle has claimed.

"Both the advance planning and the actual results were reported orally and in secret cablegrams to a high-ranking general stationed at General Lavelle's Seventh Air Force Headquarters in Saigon, Sergeant Franks said."

Why did Lavelle, who had previously gone along with the Pentagon story, decide to spill the beans?

His change of heart was explained by a "civilian source close to" General Lavelle:

"I think General Lavelle had some bad advice at the outset of this thing.

"It looks to me that the Air Force is trying to make a patsy out of him on these things."

Lavelle's testimony raises questions about the role of Nixon as well as the Pentagon tops. Were Lavelle's assaults on North Vietnam an act of insubordination as the official version implies? Or were they part of Nixon's step by step escalation of the air war?

Working-Class Front Formed in Venezuela

By Miguel Fuente

Caracas

For the first time, an electoral front along working-class lines is being formed in Venezuela. Its aim is to intervene in the presidential elections scheduled for December 1973. The campaign is being launched by the MAS (Movimiento al Socialismo—Movement Toward Socialism) around the candidacy of the independent Marxist José Vicente Rangel, who is being presented as the socialist candidate for president.

The MAS is a centrist formation that grew out of a split in the PCV (Partido Comunista Venezolano—Venezuelan Communist party), and includes most of what was then the PCV youth [see *Intercontinental Press*, April 12, 1971, p. 335].

José Vicente Rangel has an excellent reputation throughout the entire left for his untiring and audacious efforts in denouncing the tortures and murders committed by the repressive forces and for his defense of political prisoners. His book *Expediente Negro* documenting the assassination of Alberto Llorera, a PCV leader, by the Acción Democrática [Democratic Action] government of Rómulo Betancourt was widely read.

The two major bourgeois parties, Acción Democrática and COPEI (Comité Organizado por Elecciones Independientes—Committee for Independent Political Action, the Christian Democratic party), have selected their candidates—Secretary General Carlos Andrés Pérez and ex-Minister of the Interior Lorenzo Fernández respectively—and launched their campaigns.

Two other bourgeois parties, the MEP (Movimiento Electoral del Pueblo—People's Electoral Movement, an Acción Democrática split-off that occurred during the 1968 election campaign) and the URD (Unión Republicana Democrática—Democratic Republican Union), have joined with the PCV to launch a popular front under the designation "Nueva Fuerza" (New Force).

The Stalinist leadership of the PCV has publicly supported bourgeois can-

didates in the past, but this is the first time that a formal, open "alliance" of this kind has been put together here.

At a recent national conference of the three participating parties, MEP leader José Paz Galarraga was chosen as the Nueva Fuerza candidate.

The formation of this popular front was, of course, clearly inspired by the Unidad Popular victory in Chile. The liberal opportunist politicians of the MEP and the URD assumed leftist poses and are mouthing "socialist" slogans. The PCV, in keeping with its class-collaborationist policy, eagerly merged with these "progressive" bourgeois parties. For all its leftist verbiage, the program of the Nueva Fuerza is nothing but a rehash of old reformist formulas.

The crucial difference between the candidacy of José Vicente Rangel and the popular front campaign hinges on the question of independent working-class action versus class collaboration. This is the first time that this basic question relating to Marxist principles is being posed in a national context in Venezuela.

It must be pointed out, however, that neither the MAS, nor José Vicente Rangel, nor various other groups that have publicly endorsed his campaign, have explicitly stated that they are opposed to making electoral alliances with bourgeois formations. Nevertheless, in practice Rangel has been adamant about maintaining alliances only with forces standing on this side of the barricades.

The MIR (Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria—Movement of the Revolutionary Left), badly weakened as a result of the past period of guerrilla armed struggle, has evolved into a centrist group like the MAS, although with different traits. Unlike the MAS, the MIR contains a clearly discernible left tendency reaching into the leadership. True to its centrist nature, the MIR has not as a group stated its position on the elections and the working-class candidacy of Rangel.

A tendency in the MIR appears to favor supporting Nueva Fuerza.

The forces that still identify with the strategy of guerrilla warfare as the road to socialist revolution in Venezuela—the FALN (Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional—Armed Forces of National Liberation) and Bandera Roja—have failed to appreciate the opening presented to the revolutionary forces by the present political situation. They have called for a "front of all those struggling arms in hand." Except for a Maoist formation, which has come out in support of the Nueva Fuerza candidate, these groups have announced no position on supporting candidates or participating in the elections.

In a statement published in the August-September issue of *Voz Marxista*, the GTV (Grupo Trotskista Venezolano—Venezuelan Trotskyist Group) explains its position on the election campaign.

The statement begins by placing the Venezuelan situation in the present international context. Following a brief analysis of the country's economy and where it stands, the statement praises the class struggle and the continuing political forces.

The final section of the statement explains why the GTV decided to give critical support to Rangel's campaign as long as he makes no alliances with bourgeois organizations and maintains his present independent programmatic platform. The document also calls for the construction of a "frente revolucionario socialista" (revolutionary socialist front) as an outcome of the campaign.

If Rangel remains firm in his independent working-class stance, and runs a militant campaign by forming a united front with other revolutionary and proletarian groups, the working-class and revolutionary vanguard could take significant strides forward. This would create very favorable conditions for the construction of a revolutionary workers' party and would have positive repercussions in the class struggle on a continental scale. □

What Recession?

Giorgio Lena, who holds two doctorates and speaks five languages, applied for teaching posts at 1,300 U.S. and Canadian colleges. He got no response and now works as a janitor.

Election Stand of Venezuelan Trotskyists

[The following statement by the Grupo Trotskista Venezolano (Venezuelan Trotskyist Group) on the elections scheduled for December 1973 is the concluding portion of a lengthy document published in the August-September issue of *Voz Marxista*. The translation of the statement, which is dated August 11, 1972, is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

We did not adopt our position on the elections by referring to some immutable principle as a guide but by basing our approach on a concrete assessment of the Venezuelan situation. There is deep discontent among the people here, who realize that their living conditions are getting worse and worse. Today, more so than in the three previous elections, there is a mistaken and illusory collective desire to seek a way out in the electoral arena. We sincerely believe that to call for casting a blank ballot would only be observed in limited student circles. And it would be insane to call for a boycott when the forces necessary to organize it do not exist, considering the fact that the only way to implement it is to resort to armed violence as would be the case in a prerevolutionary situation.

Our task, like that of all the revolutionists, consists of showing the discontented masses that the change they desire can only be brought about through mobilizing their own forces for action. This change will never be brought about by elections but by the violent emergence of the exploited people onto the stage of history. The projected election provides us with a favorable opportunity because people become interested in political discussion. So let's go to the masses. To one degree or another, they are indicating their dissatisfaction. But there is a sector of the masses that has arrived at an approach to the election campaign that is similar, though not identical, to that of the Trotskyists. This is the sector that we want to address first of all, and thereby begin to extend our influence to in-

creasingly greater numbers of the population.

A solid movement of disinherited masses who are challenging the existing regime has rallied to the candidacy of José Vicente Rangel. This is a movement that has picked up the banner of socialism and heeded Rangel's call to struggle now and after 1973. It is a movement that in many ways objectively goes way beyond the centrist positions of the MAS [Movimiento al Socialismo—Movement Toward Socialism]. It is a movement composed mainly of young workers and students, and we know that the Venezuelan revolution will be above all the work of the youth; they must be spoken to clearly so that they can begin to prepare themselves.

We have decided to associate ourselves with this movement and, as a result, to support the candidacy of José Vicente Rangel for the presidency of the republic. Ours is critical support, and it is not irreversible. What do we mean by this? Simply that we are supporting this candidacy on the following condition: that it resolutely refuse to form electoral alliances with the parties of the bourgeoisie or those that have compromised with the system—the URD [Unión Republicana Democrática—Democratic Republican Union], the FDP [Fuerza Democrática Popular—Popular Democratic Force], the MEP [Movimiento Electoral del Pueblo—People's Electoral Movement], the movement of Pérez Jiménez, etc. It is impossible to advance a revolutionary program and carry out revolutionary agitation as long as ties, pacts, or agreements are maintained with the groups or parties that in one way or another have served or are serving the capitalist system.

We are announcing our support on the basis of conclusions that follow from the analysis developed in this document. These conclusions can be summed up in the following points:

1. *For a revolutionary socialist front!* Once a line of demarcation is drawn with the bourgeoisie and its parties, or the inchoate mixture of parties that claim to represent several classes, the Trotskyists call on

all parties, groups, and individuals of the socialist and revolutionary left who stand for the class struggle to unite around a minimal program for struggle and jointly back the socialist candidate; so that this candidacy may serve as a rallying point and voice for the Venezuelan revolutionary organizations and as a stepping-stone to a revolutionary socialist front, whose goal is nothing less than the revolution.

2. *Toward the building of the revolutionary workers' party!* The social class whose labor sustains the entire structure of capitalism and without whose leadership any socialist perspective is illusory must break politically with the bourgeoisie and form its own party. All the revolutionary tendencies must use the electoral process toward this end. José Vicente Rangel, who has made no deal with any bourgeois party, will be the candidate of the working class.

3. *For a plan of action to mobilize the proletariat, the students, the poverty-stricken layers in the towns and the countryside, and for a revolutionary governmental program!* Propagandistic speeches and articles are not enough. It is true that television, the radio, and the press are in the hands of the bourgeoisie; but we revolutionists have our own methods for bringing our ideas to the masses. The main one is through correct revolutionary action.

The socialist candidate and the movement that supports him must participate directly in the daily struggles in the factories, neighborhoods, schools, etc. The MIR's *Plan of Action* is a good point of departure. The slogans intended to mobilize the working class must be posed in progression, starting from the struggle for a minimum wage level up to the arming of the proletariat (in the event we enter a prerevolutionary period), a direct struggle for power, and the installation of a workers and peasants' government. All of this taken together means that it is necessary to link up the mobilization of the masses with a revolutionary governmental program that projects, fundamentally, the expropriation *without indemnification* of the imperialists and the indigenous bourgeoisie, as well as the nationalization of their holdings.

We are aware that this program will not be realized via the electoral road,

no matter what the results of an election. But the opportunities for propaganda offered by the electoral process can be utilized in a most effective way to popularize socialist ideas and the *form* in which our revolutionary aims can be won.

4. *For proletarian internationalism!* The working class in its struggle for socialism requires a worldwide organization and strategy. Against capitalism, which recognizes no frontiers, the workers construct their own internationalism. This principle is converted in practice into unconditional support to the Vietnamese revolution, to the Chilean workers, and to the proletariat of the entire world. The application of this internationalism during the electoral campaign and after is not a consequence of any noble altruistic sentiment. It derives from the fact that no country in the world can achieve socialism solely through its own efforts, inasmuch as the international division of labor bars this. Consequently our consistent support of the revolutionary process developing in other countries follows from

understanding that Venezuela can achieve socialism only within the framework of the Socialist United States of Latin America as a part of the world socialist revolution.

José Vicente Rangel and we who support him must call for international proletarian solidarity. Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Trotsky understood socialism as a united effort of the proletariat cutting through national frontiers.

The Venezuelan Trotskyist Group is interested only in achieving revolutionary objectives. We reject running as members of the bourgeois slates. Campaigning in the election and calling for votes for the socialist candidate will help measure the political level of the Venezuelan people and will contribute to the ideological, revolutionary, and socialist education of the masses.

For proletarian unity around the candidacy of José Vicente Rangel!

For a revolutionary socialist front!

For the construction of a revolutionary workers party!

Long live the socialist revolution! □

Part of "Secret Peace Plan"?

Blockade Aims at Vietnam's Food Supplies

When Nixon announced the mining of North Vietnam's harbors, he said that his goal was "to keep the weapons of war out of the hands of the international outlaws of North Vietnam."

Anthony Lewis, in the September 11 issue of the *New York Times*, cites evidence showing that Nixon's main objective is to starve the Vietnamese people into submission.

An example is a September 3 Associated Press dispatch reporting the Seventh Fleet's seizure of "two and a half tons of rice that it said the Chinese had tried to float ashore from a freighter [off North Vietnam]. . . ."

"The announced seizure of those bags of rice," Lewis argues, "raises the question of whether the American blockade is in fact limited to military supplies."

A "Pentagon expert" was asked about this. The initial response was evasive. Finally, after checking with "higher authority," the official stated that the U. S. Navy was under orders to stop food and anything else discovered

anywhere off North Vietnam.

Lewis quotes the official as saying, "The policy is to interdict all supplies going into North Vietnam by sea."

The *Times* columnist points to some of the implications this policy has for the Vietnamese people:

"In short, the United States is carrying out a total naval blockade of North Vietnam, not one limited to military supplies. What makes that highly important is the fact, not widely understood, that only a tiny proportion of North Vietnam's imports by sea is of a military character.

"An analysis of North Vietnamese imports was made in the opening weeks of the Nixon Administration. It appears in National Security Study Memorandum No. 1, known as NSSM-1.

"About 85 percent of the aid from her Communist allies reached North Vietnam by sea, NSSM-1 said. And that was almost entirely food and other 'economic' aid rather than military. 'The military equipment provid-

ed by the Soviets and Chinese' came mainly by rail through China, it said.

"During the first nine months of 1968, NSSM-1 estimated, the seaborne cargo broke down as follows: 'Foodstuffs [chiefly rice and wheat] 38 percent of total volume, general cargo 33, petroleum 20, fertilizer 8, timber 1.' The memorandum added:

"The importance of food imports can hardly be overstated; even with them, North Vietnam has been forced to strictly ration foodstuffs. . . ."

"The hawkish Economist of London estimated recently that in 1971 only about a quarter of North Vietnam's imports were 'military-related, much of the rest being raw materials and food.'"

Lewis concludes that "the American blockade, to the extent that it is effective, must have one of its principal impacts on the food supply. And those who made the policy well understood that when they instituted the blockade."

The *Times* columnist is deeply disturbed by this new development in the imperialists' genocidal war.

"One of the Nazis condemned to death at Nuremburg," he recalls, "was the wartime governor of Holland who caused a civilian famine by ordering the dikes destroyed."

Lewis does not expect moral or humane considerations to stay the hands of Nixon, Kissinger, or their Pentagon advisers. "But the rest of us," he remarks, "might have a feeling in the pit of our stomach the next time Mr. Nixon tells the heart-rending story of little Tanya, the 12-year-old Russian girl who saw her family die one by one in the famine during the German siege of Leningrad." □

Mehdi Rezai Executed

Mehdi Rezai, a nineteen-year-old student and political opponent of the shah's regime, was executed by a firing squad September 7. Rezai was arrested in August of last year, according to the Teheran daily *Ettelaat*, on charges of being a member of a subversive organization, of attempting to subvert the state, and of committing murder.

He was sentenced on August 28 after a two-day trial before a military court. Rezai appealed the sentence, but the conviction was upheld by the military, and the shah signed the death sentence. □

Death Agony of the U.S. Postal System

In the September issue of *The Carpenter*, the journal of the Carpenters union, whose headquarters are in Washington, D. C., the editors pay high tribute to the Pony Express:

"In its time the Pony Express was considered a monumental achievement. In a little more than a week, it delivered a letter posted in Sacramento, California, to St. Joe, Missouri.

"The day seems to be approaching when the Pony Express will once again be looked upon as a model of efficiency. The post office system has become so inefficient, so disorganized, and so riddled by bureaucracy that the Pony Express looks good by comparison."

Officials of the Carpenters union are little inclined to criticize the U. S. government, or any sector thereof. But the facts began to pile up. And as Lenin once said, "Facts are stubborn things."

"One time last year," the editors recall, "it took five days to deliver a letter from a Congressman's office to our headquarters building, despite the fact the buildings are not more than three-quarters of a mile apart.

"Three-day service from Baltimore to Washington is not uncommon, although the two cities are barely 40 miles apart; this despite the fact that the Post Office Department was reorganized two years ago and turned into a quasi-government corporation to step up efficiency."

The younger generation may think the U. S. postal system was always the way it is today. Senior citizens—who are prominently represented in the upper echelons of the Carpenters union—know better:

"Only those who remember the Post Office service before World War II can appreciate how low the service has fallen. Before 1941 there were two home mail deliveries a day in the cities. A first class letter needed a 3¢ stamp. The Post Office Department maintained a savings bank service. Parcel post was a cheap and relatively fast way to send packages.

"Since that time home delivery service has been cut to once a day. The cost of first class mail has gone up

from 3¢ to 8¢, the savings bank feature has been eliminated completely, and parcel post service has become increasingly inefficient even as it has become more costly.

"What efficiency the new semiprivate post office administration has shown has been limited to the area of increasing postal rates. There it has been efficiency itself.

"The Service is inaugurating a schedule by which the cost of sending second class matter will be increased 750% in 10 years. Labor publications generally come under the second class mailing category. Many of them will be forced to discontinue publication if the scheduled increases are adhered to."

It is otherwise with the originators of junk mail, who do not bear a "fair share" of the cost. "More and more the Post Office Service is becoming a cheap delivery system for detergent manufacturers, razor blade promoters, and producers of 'occupant' mail."

What to do about it? Part of the answer lies in reminding the citizenry of the intentions of the republic's founding fathers:

"The founding fathers who set up the postal service never visualized it as a tool for enriching manufacturers and promoters of various kinds. The original objective of the Post Office Department was to make possible rapid exchange of correspondence and information at reasonable cost. That objective seems to have gotten lost in the shuffle."

Another possibility is action by the postal workers. *The Carpenter* explains that these workers are at present under heavy pressure from management. "Like managers in many other walks of life, the people operating the U. S. Postal Service are endeavoring to get the Service out of red ink by taking it out of the hides of the postal workers. They have promulgated a freeze on hiring, and they are exerting subtle pressures on old-timers to get them to retire. Efforts to institute speed-ups are common."

While they have not yet won legal recognition of their right to strike, the

postal workers have compelled recognition of their right to bargain collectively.

"Perhaps, in the long run," say the editors of *The Carpenter*, "the postal workers, through their unions, will eventually get the service back on the track. It appears that little can be expected from the current management which is profit-oriented rather than service-oriented."

It is excellent that the editors recall the attitude of the founding fathers. They forget, however, that the founding fathers were revolutionists—the representatives of progress in their day.

They forget, too, that the development of an efficient, low-cost postal system was tied in with the needs of capitalism when it was a rising system.

Today capitalism is in decline—in fact it has reached the stage of its death agony. What has been happening to the U. S. postal system is only one of the signs of the deep decay. Both the Republicans and Democrats are much more concerned about putting down revolutions—as in Vietnam—than in keeping up the domestic mail service. Instead of hiring more postal workers, they spend the money for bombs, for napalm, and nuclear weapons.

It is dubious that any fundamental improvement in the U. S. postal system will be seen until after the coming socialist revolution, which will straighten out many things wrong with America today. Nevertheless, the editors of *The Carpenter*, despite their conservative outlook, do have the germ of a promising idea on what could be done right now; that is, turn operation of the postal system over to the postal workers.

This could be formulated in a demand: "Let the postal workers manage the postal system."

To draw the public's attention to this proposed solution in a dramatic way, the entire labor movement ought to pick up the cry, "Not smart bombs—smart mailbags!" □

Papal Bull?

"Behind sexual permissiveness there loom narcotics," Pope Paul VI warned the world September 13. The chief sky pilot did not elaborate, except to assert that sexual pleasure conflicts with "the lyrical and generous giving of self." We wonder how he knows.

Sri Lanka Hunger Strike Set for October 18



One of the many rallies of Ceylonese workers, peasants, and students held in spring of 1971 be-

fore mass repression. Speaker is JVP leader Rohana Wijeweera, now on trial for his life.

Colombo

More than 1,000,000 persons are expected to participate in a hunger strike that has been set for October 18 to protest the continuing repression in this country.

The action is sponsored by the Human and Democratic Rights Organisation, the Ceylon Mercantile Union, the Ceylon Tea Estates Staff Union, the Central Council of the Ceylon Trade Union, the Ceylon Workers Congress, and the Joint Front of Trade Unions in the Ceylon Electricity Board.

Many other individuals and organizations have also pledged to take part. Several public meetings have been scheduled, specifically at places where the April 1971 youth revolt occurred and where actual mass repression was

carried out. Some of the sites being considered for public rallies are Colombo, Kandy, Galle, Matara, Hambantota, Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa, Kurunegala, Kegalle, Badulla, Hatton, Nuwara, Eliya, and Jaffna. It is not yet certain whether the government will attempt to prevent the rallies from occurring.

The hunger strike is being organized for the following reasons:

The regime has indicated no intention to end the state of emergency that was proclaimed March 16, 1971, under which 11,000 persons are still being held in prisons and concentration camps.

The suppression of democratic rights and civil liberties under the emergency has been accompanied by a series of financial measures result-

ing in increased economic hardships for the people.

The government is expanding the police and the armed forces, supplying them all types of arms and equipment, as well as accepting military aid from imperialist powers.

The Bandaranaike regime has made strikes illegal under the emergency, thus seriously handicapping trade unions in bargaining with the employers on matters affecting the workers' wages and conditions of employment.

The cost of living has continued to rise.

The enactment of the Criminal Justice Commissions Act has given the government powers to keep thousands of persons in custody indefinitely without trial, even should the state of

emergency be ended.

The government has proposed totalitarian measures to suppress freedom of the press.

The form of protest scheduled for October 18 is one that can be implemented on a nationwide basis under present conditions. It can help to ini-

tiate a serious political discussion of and movement against the repressive measures taken by the regime.

The Ceylon Solidarity Committee in Great Britain has decided to organize some sort of solidarity action on October 18. Supporting actions may take place in other countries as well. □

Star Witness Flounders in Sri Lanka Trial

By Fred Feldman

The trial of forty-one of Sri Lanka's 11,000 political prisoners is now in its fourth month. Sobitha Thera, a young Buddhist monk who claims to have participated in the activities of the JVP (Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna — People's Liberation Front, the radical youth group accused of fomenting the April 1971 revolt), has emerged as a key witness for the government.

He has been pardoned by Attorney-General Victor Tennekoon because of his willingness to aid the prosecution.

His knowledge of the insurrection has proved to be rather scanty, since he claims that he broke off contact with the JVP and went into hiding on March 24 (or March 25), almost two weeks before the outbreak.

Under cross-examination by defense counsel Bala Tampoe, Sobitha shed some light on his reasons for "cooperating" with the police. The September 8 Colombo *Sun* summarized his testimony up to that date as follows:

"He was arrested on May 2 [1971] and taken to what was called a dreadful place in the fourth floor.

"He was somewhat frightened but he had no fear of the fourth floor as being a dreadful place. He was apprehensive after the very thing he feared had taken place.

"He had heard stories of what happened to persons taken to the fourth floor, before he actually went there.

"He was not terrified but he had some fear. Before he was taken there he had an opportunity of seeing a priest with burns caused by cigarette butts, at the fourth floor.

"This was at the meeting on February 21. He had admitted that the reason for the dreadful treatment meted out to the priest was for only

pasting posters announcing that meeting. He himself had pasted posters and he thought that he might be caused physical harm by the police. He knew he could not escape from the police. He did not think it was safer to assist the CID [Criminal Investigation Department] in its investigations. He thought it best to save himself. . . .

"He believed that several persons of the Bhikkhu Peramuna [a group of radical Buddhist monks] had laid down their lives, and sacrificed themselves and that several had been killed by police after being taken into custody."

At the September 5 session, according to the September 14 *Ceylon News*, Sobitha "denied . . . that he claimed to be a member of the JVP because he was thrashed at the CID headquarters."

Under questioning by Bala Tampoe, he further "denied he fell at the feet of Bhareti Thera of Kaduganawa at the CID headquarters."

Sobitha's involvement in the JVP consisted, according to his own admissions, of little more than attending meetings, Marxist study classes, and group discussions of the JVP's perspectives, and engaging in private conversations with JVP leaders. He has tried to give these completely legal political activities an aura of conspiracy and subversiveness.

Sobitha further discredited himself as a witness when he admitted falsifying the date of an alleged conversation with Rohana Wijeweera, a leader of the JVP and one of the defendants in the trial. He now asserts that this discussion—in which Wijeweera supposedly confided his plans for assaults on police stations—took place

in February 1970, more than a year before the revolt, and not in July 1970 as he had previously claimed.

Sobitha said he had lied in order to "help" Wijeweera, an explanation that strained the credulity of H. N. G. Fernando, chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission.

The poor performance of the government's star witness has been reported in detail in the bourgeois press. The daily *Sun* opened its front-page coverage (September 9) of the trial with these comments:

"Bhikkhu [monk] Sobitha admitted he was a coward and a traitor to the insurgent movement. He said he expected the April uprising to succeed and Wijeweera to take over the leadership of the country and give him an important position for the work he had done for the party even though he had run away. He changed the dates which Wijeweera suggested for starting the attacks on police stations from February 1970 to July 1970, thinking it would help Wijeweera. He did not think of the gravity of his deed then, but he did realize it now."

Sobitha's admissions about police brutality hardly amount to a revelation in Sri Lanka. Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandarnaike has felt compelled to note what is common knowledge among the people and to criticize the police while minimizing their brutality.

She told a gathering of recruits at a police training school, as paraphrased by the September 14 *Ceylon News*, that "there was unfortunately an impression that the moment a person went to the Police station he was open to physical harm, or all sorts of threats and intimidation."

The *Ceylon News* quoted her as saying, "I do not say that all policemen belong to this group—there is only a minority of such officers."

In practice, however, the government's witch-hunt has continued. The prisons and detention camps are still jammed, and arrests continue to be made for alleged participation in the April 1971 events.

The same issue of the *Ceylon News* reported the arrest of Merrennege Agiris de Costa of Piliyandala. The police described him "as the leader of the gang [of] terrorists who are alleged to have attacked the Kahatuduwa Police Station in April last year . . ."

The "Acting magistrate remanded the suspect to protective custody under the Emergency Regulations." □

On the Trials in Czechoslovakia

By Sibylle Plogstedt

Just a month before the fourth anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Husak regime staged a number of political trials. This marks, so far, the highest level of the repression.

In Prague and Brno there were nine legal proceedings against forty-six defendants. The most prominent defendants were Milan Hubl, former member of the Communist party Central Committee and director of a party cadre school; Jaroslav Sabata, former Central Committee member; Jiri Litera, former secretary of the Prague Communist party committee; the journalists and scientists Kyncl, Bartosek, Tesar, Battek, and Hajdanek; and the former student leader Jiri Muller. Sentences ran up to six and a half years in prison. Just nine months after the November 1971 elections, these people were sacrificed on the altar of the fourth anniversary festivities.

The defendants were accused of anti-state and antisocialist activities under section 98 of the Czechoslovak criminal code. Their offenses against the legal code involved, among other things, intending to emigrate to the West, drafting leaflets, calling for a boycott of the elections. All the alleged crimes were committed after 1969 and thus were treated as criminal, not political, prosecutions.

This game of false accusations has gone on since 1969, when the first arrests were made. Many persons have been imprisoned. Among them are V. Skutina, former radio commentator, who was sentenced to four and a half years in jail; General Prchlik, head of the army's political administration, who got twenty-two months; Petr Uhl, who was condemned to four years in jail as the alleged founder of the "Revolutionary Socialist party" (fifteen other alleged members were sentenced along with him*); the journalist J. Lederer, who was sentenced to two years in prison for collaborating with Polish emigrants.

These first trials and the current wave of prosecutions seem to resemble each other both in the type of accusa-

tions involved and in the way the investigations were pursued. Just as the members of the "Revolutionary Socialist party" attributed their confessions to pressure and extortion by the political police and to provocations fomented within the organization; just as they traced back the origin of the charges of "antisocialist" activity to direct provocations organized by police spies, the defendants in the new trials recognized the proceedings against them as political repression. Milan Hubl described the charges as made up out of whole cloth.

Against this, the official Communist party newspaper *Rude Pravo* claims the counts of the indictments to be "irrefutably proven," because the defendants demonstrated their antisocialist behavior in the courtroom. Does this refer to the defendants who refused to cooperate with these frame-up trials by confessing? Does it refer to Jan Tesar, who walked into the courtroom with fist raised singing the "Internationale"?

For *Rude Pravo*, evidence of the defendants' guilt is provided by the fact that the sentences were handed down by the socialist judicial system, which is run by "independent" judges.

But what kind of socialist legality is it when the courts do not allow the trials to take place publicly, do not allow free choice of defense attorneys, do not allow the defendants to present counterevidence against incriminating material? Where is socialist legality

* Sibylle Plogstedt was herself one of those arrested in January 1970 and charged with "Trotskyist" and "antisocialist" activities in connection with the "Revolutionary Socialist party." She was sentenced to two and a half years in prison. After serving seventeen months of her sentence, she was released on the basis of a law providing for early release of foreigners. (Plogstedt is a West German citizen and had been studying at Charles University in Prague.) She was deported from Czechoslovakia to East Germany in May 1971, and then was conducted to the West Berlin border. For an account of her experiences see "My Seventeen Months in a Czechoslovak Prison," *Intercontinental Press*, June 28, 1971, p. 600. — IP

when the courts regard refusal to give false testimony or withdrawal of false confessions as grounds for increasing jail sentences?

In a country where any political dissenter is in danger of losing his job and not being able to find another, it is not difficult to obtain incriminating statements against every defendant. And the "independent" judges are also subject to repression. After Justice Minister Jan Nemecek's declaration in July 1970, 145 Czechoslovak judges—that is, 13 percent of all judges—were discharged in a process of consolidation. Since then there have been more dismissals—thirty-four judges during July 1972. Under the new course, judges are obliged to make their contribution to "normalization."

Legality in Czechoslovakia is legality only in appearance, even if things have not yet come to Slansky-type show trials. The judiciary operates under political discipline, carefully separating leaders from followers, long-standing oppositionists from newly converted adherents. The latest, widely present opposition must be prevented from taking to action and illegal struggle. But will the trials stay within these bounds much longer?

One lesson has been clearly learned since 1956: Everything will be done to prevent the revival of resistance—by pressing for trials of former party leaders, thus isolating the active core of the resistance within the general passivity of the population. In Hungary this process took two years. Then the executions started. During those two years, Nagy was guaranteed immunity from prosecution. On November 26, 1956, Kadar declared, "We promised that we would initiate no criminal proceedings against him, even if he proclaimed his own guilt. We have kept our promise." Only in 1958 did the regime admit that it had begun executions.

Today, when Husak says there will be no political trials in Czechoslovakia, this can be explained as a repetition of what happened in 1958—the Czechoslovak bureaucracy is deferring before the Soviet bureaucracy.

The form of repression applied seems to correspond to the Soviet bureaucracy's interests. In 1968 Czechoslovakia had become a model of restructurization. In 1969 it was to become a model of consolidation, because potential resistance exists in

other countries as well. The experiences of Czechoslovakia's struggle can be utilized by all the workers states. So on the fourth anniversary of the invasion, all those who had been arrested during the first year of repression were interrogated again, but were immediately released.

The bureaucracy examined them to see how their opinions had changed during the past three years, to test the success of the "normalization" policies, to detect and opportunely isolate any new germs of resistance.

The repression in Czechoslovakia has been given this sweeping character in order to destroy systematically the beginnings of any organization. The concept of localizing the potential resistance corresponds to Husak's concept of localized, limited repression.

But inasmuch as the bureaucracy is unable to stage limited trials, it will push toward complete subjugation of the population. This was clearly seen in its complete acceptance of the "fraternal aid" of 1968. One recent commentary on the invasion stated, "On this day we remember the crisis that the party, society, and the state and all its organs faced four years ago. We appreciate the international aid the Soviet Union and allied countries furnished in August 1968 against the counterrevolutionary forces. We still have much to think about on this score."

Is there really a danger that in the coming period the limited repression will escalate into monster trials? Up to now the bureaucracy has not resorted to this. Yet none of the accusations against Dubcek have been dropped.

They involve high treason, treason against the nation, encouragement of foreign powers, antisocialist acts, etc. Nearly all these crimes carry a death penalty. Nevertheless, up to now, no proceedings against Dubcek have been opened, even though investigations of all the policies of his era are going on.

Instead, the party gives itself, despite the gravity of the accusations against Dubcek, an appearance of liberalism, within which is contained the threat of broader prosecutions. So long as this threat serves its purpose—guaranteeing quiet, order, productivity, and more privileges for the bureaucracy—show trials on the pattern of those of the 1930s and 1950s can be passed

up. If the bureaucratic experts at staying in power can systematically extinguish the smallest spark of mass resistance, they will try to avoid creating martyrs. That would fan the flames of resistance.

"Normalization" has a disadvantage in areas where the regime prefers to proceed with the carrot rather than the stick. It cannot overcome the passive resistance of the workers and employees. In spite of the increased supply of consumer goods over 1968-69, the increase in industrial production (7.3 percent) is mostly a result of repression at the factory level.

Higher production quotas, stricter rules and norms of labor, are the basis of the increased output. Just recently, *Rude Pravo* announced a new campaign against factory absenteeism (allegedly due to illness) and vigorously complained that there were workers who prevented their colleagues from bidding for unoccupied positions; or that there were workers who prevented others from submitting suggestions for renovations and improvements in the plants; or that there were workers who acted unfriendly toward those whose attitudes were known to be cooperative. The basic crisis of the states that call themselves socialist — the widespread political and moral indifference to the further development of the system—will not be solved through repression.

How can the Czechoslovak political

trials be fought? As the number of frame-ups grows, so does the wave of international protest against them. But most importantly, the Communist parties have been forced to act. They either joined in the protest or played down the repression. The French Communist party and the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor, the CP-dominated trade-union formation in France] protested against the turn to police methods instead of political persuasion; the British, Australian, Italian, and Spanish Communist parties not only disassociated themselves from the methods of the trials, but lined up behind the defendants and pointed out that socialism must at all times prove its historic superiority to any form of capitalist democracy.

Insofar as this discussion can be carried to the public, be publicly conducted, there is some hope that more extensive trials can be blocked. After the worldwide wave of protest, charges against ten defendants were dropped. In spite of August 21, no further prosecutions have been reported. For us, every trial that does not take place is a victory. But we should direct our efforts toward the verdicts already handed down.

Every time a prisoner is released before his term is up, it is a success. We must concentrate our work on this and force the Communist parties constantly to be confronted by this campaign. □

Attica Prison Revolt Was 'Spontaneous'

"Rather than being revolutionary conspirators bent only on destruction, the Attica rebels were part of a new breed of younger, more aware inmates, largely black, who came to prison full of deep feelings of alienation and hostility against the established institutions of law and government, and with an enhanced self-esteem, racial pride and political awareness, and an unwillingness to accept the petty humiliations and racism that characterize prison life."

The above is an excerpt from a 518-page report issued September 12 by the New York State Special Commission to investigate the Attica prison rebellion, which was drowned in blood a year ago by New York State police.

The commission, appointed after the rebellion by Governor Nelson Rockefeller, was chaired by Robert B. McKay, dean of the New York University Law School.

After interviewing more than 3,000 inmates, prison guards, state troopers, national guardsmen, and others concerned, the commission concluded that the revolt was spontaneous, a "product of frustrated hopes," that the prisoners' organization was not planned in advance but evolved during the events, that media coverage of the rebellion tended to create an "air of unreality," and that there had been no effort to prevent the reprisals against prisoners that occurred after the revolt.

The report, whose conclusions were accepted unanimously by the commission's nine members, criticized Rockefeller for refusing to go to the prison at the time, since he "realized that the prison system had long been neglected and was in need of major reform."

Rockefeller expressed "appreciation" of the commission's work, but a spokesman for the governor said there would be no further comment.

'Successes' for Political Police in Ukraine

[The following report appeared in the August issue of the monthly newsletter published in New York by the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners.]

* * *

Although an official blanket of secrecy covers the investigations in the cases of Ivan Dzyuba, Vyacheslav Chornovil, Ivan Svitlychny, Nadia Svitlychna, Mykhaylo Osadchy, Iryna Stasiv, Ivan Hel', Stefania Hulyk, Zenoviy Antonyuk, Mykola Plakhotnyuk, Hanna Kotsurova, Leonid Plyushch, and others arrested in the winter and spring of this year in Ukraine, there have been certain indications of what the KGB is attempting to achieve.

A definite attempt is being made to terrorize and compromise the entire dissident movement. Several additional leading dissidents have been arrested since the initial roundup in January 1972. Where trials have been held, the sentences have been harsh, often invoking the maximum penalty under the law. (Article 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR—"anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation"—carries with it a sentence of "deprivation of freedom for a term of six months to seven years, with or without additional exile for a term of two to five years, or by exile for a term of two to five years.") But what is even more significant is the KGB's willingness to resort to such time-tested Stalinist measures as linking the dissident movement with foreign nationalist centers, as in the case of Belgian subject Yaroslav Dobosh, and obtaining "confessions" and "recantations" from prisoners in an attempt to weaken the effect of the adamant stands of such men as twice convicted historian Valentyn Moroz, whose contemptuous closing statement at his trial in November 1970 is circulating in *samizdat* form.

The KGB has been successful in obtaining three such recantations. The first and perhaps most effective of these was that of Zenoviya Franko, the granddaughter of the outstanding

19th century writer Ivan Franko. Arrested in January, she was released immediately upon writing an open letter to *Radyans'ka Ukraina* on March 2, in which she acknowledged her "anti-Soviet activity," admitted to having had contacts and dealings with émigré Ukrainian centers whom she accused of having exploited her name, and appealed to her fellow dissidents to abandon their "shameful position of internal émigrés." Her letter was followed by an interview over Kiev radio, later published in *News From Ukraine* (May 1972), a Kiev based newspaper available only abroad. In her interview Z. Franko stressed that "the letter was written by me and on my own initiative," seemingly in order to dispel any suspicion that force or coercion had been applied against her.

Meeting with resistance from other leading dissidents, the KGB was forced to use what it could get as a follow-up to Z. Franko's disavowal. What it got was statements from Leonid Seleznenko, a candidate of chemical sciences of whom few people had heard before his arrest in January for what he describes as his "connection with the case of Yaroslav Dobosh," being "an accomplice of V. Stus, I. Svitlychny, and D. Shumuk," and "dissemination of literature of hostile and slanderous

Ukrainians Denounce Stalinist Practices

[Issue No. 25 (May 20) of the *Chronicle of Current Events*, which is circulated clandestinely in the Soviet Union, carried excerpts from a letter dated May 1972 and addressed to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, the Russian newspaper *Izvestia* and the Ukrainian newspaper *Literaturna Ukraina*. The letter, signed "Group of Soviet Citizens, May 1972, the Ukraine," appears below. The Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners has provided the translation.]

The decades of Stalinist arbitrary rule, later modestly called the "per-

nature," and from Mykola Kholodny, a poet whose works had appeared in Ukrainian émigré publications, but who since 1970 has shown definite signs of schizophrenia demonstrated in simultaneously attacking and defending *samizdat* and his colleagues in the *Ukrainian Herald*, appealing to Soviet authorities, recanting his "mistakes," and even approaching the KGB. The two letters appeared within a day of each other: Kholodny's in *Literaturna Ukraina*, dated July 4 and published July 7, and Seleznenko's in *Robitnycha Hazeta* on July 8.

According to usually reliable sources, the KGB actually failed to implement its original plan to obtain many more and more effective recantations, primarily from people with names in both the dissident movement and the Ukrainian cultural milieu in general.

Whatever the effect of the recantations that the KGB managed to obtain, there are indications that the initial paralysis of public opinion that followed the January wave of arrests in Ukraine is now giving way to a growing realization among more and more people, and particularly among the intelligentsia, that a revival of Stalinism is taking place. Anxiety on this account is already engendering the first signs of reaction, as for instance the letter written in May by a group of Soviet Ukrainian citizens to the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and Ukraine, which draws a parallel between the present and the 1930s. □

sonality cult," are a phenomenon that has as yet been little studied. This was much more complex than the cult of personality of any other individual, and in its consequences comparable to the devastation brought to the USSR by the world war. This was a terrible social plague, giving birth to terror, suspicion, denunciations, a whole country of concentration camps for millions of innocent people. It led to profound corruption, psychological shock, which tormented the people like a serious spiritual illness. In the 1930s this illness began with the extraordinary growth of the role of state security organs, which exceeded their authority and were no longer under

the control of the government. The NKVD became "a state within a state"; it created an entire industry of killing and in principle could discredit and destroy any person in the country. . . .

The change in climate in public life in the USSR in this direction is an extremely dangerous symptom. A number of events—the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet forces, a secret veto passed against the exposure of Stalinist arbitrary rule and even against revealing the materials of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the hounding of Aleksander Solzhenitsyn, endless reminders to intensify the ideological struggle—all these evoke profound anxiety, for they indicate a tendency which is capable of leading to a new 1937 . . . The suppression of national consciousness, multiple arrests of leading representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, threats, blackmail, persecution, and countless mass searches serve as a dangerous reminder of the fact that the year 1937 began in 1933; it began with repressions against national cultural activists. Herein the reason for our warning . . .

In particular we wish to explain the circumstance that forced us to sign ourselves simply as the Committee for Human Rights in the USSR. . . . We guarantee the authenticity of the information reported in this appeal. Anonymity sickens us. But the situation is such that the organs of the KGB respond to every display of social activity with immediate repressions. At the present time we, therefore, do not consider it advisable to have anything to do with the faceless and irresponsible Committee for State Security [the KGB—Trans.], which is steadily becoming a real threat to society. We would be prepared to openly sign our names and take part in a public discussion of the essence of our letter, if there were the slightest hope that it would be published in full. □

Normalized Radio

"The daily newspaper . . . *Rude Pravo* today sharply criticized the Nazi elements who disrupted the Olympic peace."—Radio Prague, German-language broadcast, September 5, 10:05.

"The daily newspaper . . . *Rude Pravo* today sharply criticized the Maoist elements who disrupted the Olympic peace."—Radio Prague, Czech-language broadcast, September 5, 11:15.

September 25, 1972

'Preserve the Democratic Movement'

Soviet Dissidents Assess Yakir's Arrest

[The following excerpts from an open letter assessing the significance of the arrest of Pyotr Yakir appeared in issue No. 26 of the *samizdat* journal *Chronicle of Current Events*. The letter was dated "July 1972" and signed "a Group of Soviet Citizens." The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Pyotr Yakir has been jailed.

The authorities have decided to add a new, somber page to the tragic fate of one of the most remarkable of our contemporaries, a man with a rare quality of civic concern, great force of character, inexhaustible energy, and courage that shies at nothing.

This opens up one more stage—possibly the culminating one—in the tactics of a creeping, but systematic, repression which the regime has been pursuing for several years now in an attempt to stifle the democratic movement.

We can and we must protest against this action. It is more important, however, to understand the essence of the new situation and to seriously, deliberately, but without hysteria (whether it be the hysteria of flinging oneself at the oppressor's bayonets or the hysteria of totally capitulating) adjust the life and struggle of every democrat—and that means the entire movement as well—to the present reality.

The arrest of Yakir, a man who consciously placed himself at the point of sharpest conflict, does not mean that "all is lost," that the policy of the authorities has resulted in victory for them. . . .

The arrest of Yakir is neither the beginning nor the end, but an important landmark. . . .

To keep our people safe and to keep *samizdat* going, to preserve and strengthen the democratic movement—that is the main goal of today. That is the best response to the arrest of Yakir. . . . □



PYOTR YAKIR

Amalrik Transferred to Lefortovo Prison

Ailing Soviet writer Andrei Amalrik has been transferred from a Siberian labor camp to Moscow's Lefortovo prison, according to a September 15 Associated Press dispatch. Arrested in May 1970 and charged with alleged "defamation" of the Soviet state and social system, Amalrik was sentenced in November of that year to three years imprisonment.

The charges were based on Amalrik's books, his interviews with a U.S. television correspondent, and a letter criticizing author Anatoly Kuznetsov for collaborating with the KGB and then defecting to the West.

Amalrik is the author of *Can the USSR Survive Until 1984?*, an uneven account of the new Soviet opposition that predicts a disastrous war with China. He also wrote *Involuntary Journey to Siberia*, an account of his 1965-66 exile to Siberia, where he worked on a state farm.

Amalrik, who suffers from heart disease, was denied adequate medical care in Siberia. He has now been assigned "invalid" status by prison authorities. □

Healyite Revisionism in the Field of Philosophy

[The July 3 issue of *Intercontinental Press* published an article by George Novack, "A Malignant Case of Sectarianism in Philosophy," dealing with the abuses of dialectical materialism committed by Gerry Healy and Cliff Slaughter of the Socialist Labour League in Britain and their disciples of the Workers League in the United States.

[A reader wrote in to raise some further questions. His letter and Novack's reply follow.]

Have They Turned Marxism Upside Down?

Editor:

I read George Novack's piece on sectarianism in philosophy; and while I liked everything he said, I was disappointed that he didn't say more. It is true that the way the Healyites relate dialectical materialism to revolutionary politics is wrong. But it seems to me that there is also something wrong with their brand of dialectical materialism. It would have been interesting and worthwhile to take up the content of their "philosophy."

Am I mistaken in concluding that in their all-out war on "empiricism" they have gone overboard and now stand for a type of "dialectics" so far divorced from empirical data, i.e., from material reality, that it can only be called a speculative, that is, idealist philosophy?

The materialist, as against the speculative concept of totality, which is of course basic to materialist dialectics, cannot be the mere result of intuition. It requires a prior full and all-sided study of empirical data. That, at least, is the way Marx and Engels always presented their method. Haven't the Healyites implicitly, if not explicitly, reversed the sequence of phases in the process of knowledge by doing away completely with the first phase? Haven't they reduced the process from three phases to two phases? Is it possible to produce abstract categories otherwise than from a study of the concrete?

Novack's comments on these questions would be of considerable interest.

A Reader

How Healyites Depart From Marxist Method

My article focused on the relation of Gerry Healy and Cliff Slaughter's philosophy to revolutionary politics because this side of the matter most concerns revolutionists who run into these sectarians in discussions. However, I agree that much more could and should be said about their method.

I stressed their disregard for the facts. Mendacious distortions of the views of others is one expression of this. They will blithely accuse opponents of holding the opposite of their real positions. There is a method in this consistent misrepresentation. It is a manifestation of their departure from materialist objectivity.

Genuine empiricism at least has the merit of giving an accurate, if not the most comprehensive and deep-

going, report of the facts. The Healyites do not even comply with that elementary criterion of empirical knowledge. They not only twist facts but cook them up to suit their factional needs.

Here is a fresh illustration. A front-page editorial in Wohlforth's *Bulletin* of August 28 entitled "McGovern, the Communist Party and Marxist Philosophy" polemicizes, in a matrix of pseudophilosophizing, against the support offered by the Stalinists to the Democratic candidate. It is a fact that the American Communist party, in its customary devious fashion, supports McGovern.

To smear the Socialist Workers party with the same brush, the author then goes on to assert that I, as well as the Stalinists, "create an identity between materialism and empiricism." This is a gross falsification as anyone who will turn to my book *Empiricism and Its Evolution* can readily verify.

This work expounds the thesis that the empirical philosophy in its heyday was closely associated with materialism in the struggle against medievalism and idealism but in its subsequent development shed more and more of its materialist ties and aspects until "the two schools of thought now stand arrayed against each other in fields extending from method in natural science to sociology and politics." (p.138.)

This historical appraisal concurs with that given by Engels in his introduction to *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*. In describing the British origin of modern materialism, he wrote: "Bacon, Hobbes and Locke are the fathers of that brilliant school of French materialists which make the eighteenth century, in spite of all battles on land and sea won over Frenchmen by Germans and Englishmen, a preeminently French century."

The most qualified Marxist thinkers have not made empiricism into the absolute antithesis of materialism as the Healyites (and many empiricists themselves) do. In the philosophical classics of Marxism that place is allotted to idealism.

Empiricism occupied an intermediate position in the spectrum of philosophic schools and methods. It was a composite, a hybrid, of semimaterialist and semimetaphysical ideas in proportions that varied greatly from one thinker to another and from one stage of its evolution to another.

As Engels pointed out, the empirical theory of cognition, in opposition to idealism, shared with materialism the cardinal proposition that all human knowledge was derived from sensation. Materialism alone, however, applied this sensationalist principle in a consistent way, ridding philosophy of all religious prejudices and metaphysical errors.

To say that the two philosophies had or have certain elements in common does not mean that they are essentially the same. If I say that Hegel and Marx were both dialectical logicians, that does not entail the view that

their philosophies were identical. To conclude otherwise would be to fall into the simple logical fallacy that stands out in Wohlforth's amalgam.

The Healyite approach to empiricism as a historical reality deviates in fundamental respects from that of dialectical materialism. Ernest Mandel correctly writes in the introduction to *Marxist Economic Theory* that the Marxist method "must . . . be genetical-evolutionary, critical, materialistic and dialectical." (p. 18.)

In philosophy as in politics the Healy-Wohlforth school ignores all these requirements. They do not view empiricism as a trend of thought that, like capitalism itself, has passed through various stages of growth and decadence from the age of bourgeois revolution to the age of socialist revolution and evolved, under pressure of its inner contradictions and the growing gap between its conceptions and the world around it, into something quite different from its original expression. As a result of the colossal socio-economic, scientific, and philosophical advances from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, empiricism has become transformed from a vigorous, innovative, fruitful mode of thought and set of ideas into an increasingly stale, skeptical, feeble, and sterile one. As its essential characteristics and contradictory nature have been defined and disclosed, the relations of empiricism with materialism have switched from ally to adversary. This has been the dialectic of its development.

The Healyites take a static, nondialectical, rather than a dynamic, approach to this philosophy. They do not grasp or set forth the inner contradictions that provide the driving forces of its specific course of development and account for its logic of motion. They do not correctly appraise the changing and complex connections it has had with rival schools of thought, including materialism itself in its progress from mechanical to dialectical materialism. They do not explain the reasons for the conversion of empiricism from a revolutionizing to a retrogressive mode of thought. They fix their gaze exclusively upon the end product, the final phase, of its evolution and palm it off for the whole.

This sort of rigid, narrow, unhistorical thinking that disregards the stages, transitions, and mediations characterizing the development of philosophic tendencies, like all other processes, is proper to a metaphysical outlook and method, not to dialectical materialism. Reality is variegated and multicolored but these color-blind sectarians see everything as either pure white or coal black.

Their polemics against "empiricism" are actually a shamefaced way of contesting Marxist materialism and its theory of knowledge. In disparaging the priority and importance of empirical data, Healy and his disciple Tim Wohlforth not only break with dialectical materialism but with scientific method in general. Consideration of the objective facts as given in experience is the elementary condition of any scientific inquiry or branch of knowledge.

They are disdainful of the history of scientific thought and the first principle of scientific practice. The practice of medicine, for example, first acquired a scientific character with the Hippocratic school of Ionia, which combined acute observation of the "empirical data" with reflective analysis in a harmonious synthesis of empiricism and rationalism. Whereas a quack or a witch doctor proceeds from arbitrary and a priori assumptions, a

skilled physician bases his diagnosis on observable symptoms that indicate the probable type and cause of the disease and suggest its cure.

Scientific socialism and its method of knowledge likewise rest upon the primacy of empirical data. The objects encountered in the world are what thought reflects and concepts denote. The given facts are the basis for the origin, content, evolution, and verification of all ideas.

Epistemologists have set forth two opposing lines of explanation of the origin of ideas. One holds that ideas come from some inner source through intuition or revelation ultimately leading to divine inspiration; the other that they are derived from external reality mediated by sense-experience. The first conception has been upheld by idealists through the ages. Ready examples are the British neo-Platonists and Leibniz in Locke's time. The second is the materialistic view which was defended by Locke in his devastating criticism of innate ideas.

The origin of ideas in sensation and perception, refined by reflection, was the common premise of both the materialist and the classical empirical thinkers who were closely allied during the rise of bourgeois civilization and the formation of its culture (viz., Bacon, Hobbes, and Locke). Marxism adheres to this position. Where do ideas come from if not from the testimony of the senses reacting to natural and social conditions?

Anyone who in any way gives existential priority to concepts and abstractions over empirical data, as Healy, Slaughter, and Wohlforth do, is making impermissible concessions to the primacy of the subjective over the objective elements in the process of acquiring knowledge.

The essential content of all our thoughts, however complex or fantastic, is likewise ultimately derived from the features of the external world in its historical development.

This is confirmed by the observable fact that ideas have changed and evolved throughout history in accord with objective changes in economic activities and social relations that have given rise to expanded and deepened insight into the world around us.

True ideas are discriminated from false ones through their correspondence—or lack of it—with the empirical facts as these are disclosed and tested in practice, by experiment, or by industry.

Thus all aspects of intellectual activity and its results are shaped and controlled by objective factors.

The primacy of the objective over the subjective, of things over consciousness and concepts, is exhibited in the process of learning about the world. Three fundamental factors are at work in the process of knowledge: sensory perception of the phenomena in the environment, increasing penetration into the essence of things by means of theoretical thought, and the verification in practice of the correspondence of our conceptions with the objective regularities of the world.

Empiricism emphasized the first phase of this process and slighted the second; rationalism concentrated upon the role of the second to the detriment of the first. Dialectical materialism overcame the one-sidedness of these earlier philosophical schools by seeing the organic coordination of all three of these phases in the process of cognition.

Where do Healy, Slaughter, and their pupils stand in

the light of these principles of dialectical materialism?

They invert materialism and approach idealism by converting facts into abstractions and abstractions into realities under cover of exposing empiricism. The priests of their cult perform this act of transubstantiation as zealously as the Catholic priesthood converts the wafer and wine into the body and blood of Christ. Theirs is a real revision of Marxism.

For example, Dennis O'Casey in his fraudulent *The Fraud of Neo-Capitalism* objects to Ernest Mandel's including the "empirical grasping of facts" in his definition of Marxist method. He informs us on page 5 what a fact is as he sees it. It is simply and solely an appearance.

For materialists a genuine fact is something manifestly real. To say it is nothing but an appearance is to deprive fact of its objective material content. In fact, as Hegel knew, though O'Casey does not, every appearance is a manifestation of its essence. There are no real essences apart from their factual embodiments.

O'Casey tries to cover up his abandonment of the materialist position by bringing in Marx's notion of the "imaginary concrete" from the introduction to the *Critique of Political Economy*. He misuses this formulation by exalting the adjective and obliterating the noun. Marx did not at all intend to deny the objectivity of the concrete (indeed, he writes that "it is the real starting point . . . of both observation and conception"). Marx's point was that the phenomenal manifestation of the given facts lacks adequate definition and is only the beginning and not the conclusion of scientific analysis in political economy. Every fact or factor must be viewed in the wealth of its connections, in its contradictory historical development, in the sequence of its specific determinations.

O'Casey would have us believe that Marx is asserting that the concrete is, in and of itself, "imaginary"—not fact but fiction.

Similarly, Alex Steiner tells us (*Bulletin*, March 27, 1972) that "Marx noted that in this whole cognition process it is necessary to proceed from the concrete appearance, which is actually an extremely complex number of abstractions called 'facts,' to simple essential abstractions." Steiner matches O'Casey in clarity. Facts to him are really sets of abstractions, not bits of objective reality.

These wizards next transmogrify abstractions into realities. O'Casey writes in his pamphlet: ". . . abstractions are, as Lenin points out in the *Philosophic Notebooks*, more real than the so-called facts." (p. 6.) Further, theoretical abstractions in men's minds are "in fact, more real and express reality in a more fundamental way than any factual statement however quantitatively precise about surface, concrete, phenomena." (p. 10.)

In the passage Steiner cites, Lenin was discussing degrees of truth and not the essential difference between facts and ideas. He contrasted scientific generalizations and laws to observations and impressions that rest on the phenomenological surface of reality and do not penetrate to the essential connections and driving forces of things (e.g., the fluctuation of prices versus their regulation by the law of value). He was not saying that abstractions drawn from the facts have more reality than the facts themselves. That was what the medieval Realists maintained. Even the Nominalists, the forerunners of the materialists and the empiricists, knew better than that!

O'Casey's misinterpretation of the nature of value illustrates his mode of thought. He announces that "In point of fact, however, value is an abstraction." (p. 10.) To be sure, the *concept* of value and the *theory* of surplus value are (scientific) abstractions. But value is more than its conceptual expression as a category. Value is first of all a social property that is the product of the expenditure of labor power and the application of socially necessary labor of a definite magnitude. If value is nothing but an abstraction, then so is surplus value and its subdivisions—profits, rents, and interest. It follows from this point of view that capitalists exploit their workers and fight among themselves over these "abstractions." An odd propensity for so pragmatic a class!

The nonmaterialist bent of Healyite thinking is also exemplified in their conception of what a law is. In defense of Slaughter against me, Steiner writes: "But the law of uneven and combined development is not an empirical generalization from which we can project certain trends developing in the future as they have in the past." What is it? "Rather, it expressed a fundamental property of dialectical development as applied to sociology. The discovery of this law is dependent on the development of dialectical materialism emerging as the culmination of all previous philosophy." (*Bulletin*, March 20, 1972.)

We understand the law as a formulation of certain fundamental and universal features of social and historical development discovered by Trotsky through his dialectical insight into the objective facts. The Healyites construe it as simply a product of autonomous advances in dialectical thinking about social phenomena, leaving out the factual basis that makes the law true, relevant, and fruitful.

Marx's own procedure is the best refutation of the disparagement and disqualification of empirical observation by O'Casey and his cothinkers. How does *Capital* in fact begin? It opens with an empirical statement of fact about the capitalist system as it immediately presents itself to an acute observer. "The wealth of societies in which the capitalist method of production prevails, takes the form of 'an immense accumulation of commodities,' wherein individual commodities are the elementary units." This is an empirical observation, is it not? Ricardo's *Principles of Political Economy*, on the other hand, begins on a different footing with a definition or explanation of what value consists of or depends on.

However, Marx is not a vulgar empiricist and he does not proceed in an empirical manner. He is a more scientific thinker equipped with the superior dialectical method. In the course of his work he moves from the phenomenal forms to the essential connections and inner laws of the mode of production under examination.

Dialectical materialism does not ignore or deny what is valid in the empirical approach—such as the collection, observation, and comparison of data—and its respect for facts provided by experience and tested by experiment. Bacon, the pioneer of the empirical method of studying reality, ushered in a new era in scientific and philosophic thought by insisting that correct conclusions can be arrived at only on the basis of facts that have been collected and critically studied.

Marxists part company with the empiricists by considering facts, not as isolated, fixed, and self-sustained

entities, but as changing historical products that appear in concrete contexts and special forms and that have to be taken in their interconnections and interactions.

The empirical *fact* that the products of labor necessarily acquire the commodity form under capitalist conditions was what Marx felt called upon to explain and what he took so many pages to clarify in all its ramifications and results. O'Casey's approach would expunge the reference to the empirical facts that underlies the entire course of Marx's exposition. O'Casey scoffs at Ernest Mandel's efforts in his two-volume *Marxist Economic Theory* to present empirical verification of the laws of scientific political economy. This is consistent with Steiner's denial that the law of uneven and combined development is rooted in the facts of history, reflects them, and is validated by them. Laws of political economy and history that could not be empirically verified would have neither validity nor use value.

As one would expect, these sectarians have a one-sided view of the process of negation. Dialectical negation not only breaks up and breaks with the preceding stage and form of being out of which it emanates but preserves in a superior synthesis the positive, viable, enduring elements in it. "Not empty negation," wrote Lenin, "not futile negation, not *sceptical* negation, vacillation and doubt is characteristic and essential in dialectics . . . but negation as a moment of connection, as a moment of development, retaining the positive, i.e., without any vacillations, without any eclecticism." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 226.)

The Healyites apply "empty negation" to intellectual and political phenomena and processes, admitting the destruction and discontinuity but not the continuity in successive phases of dialectical development. There would be no progress from lower to higher unless something was transmitted as well as transmuted and transcended.

To prove I am a liberal lamb masquerading in Marxist costume, Alex Steiner argues in his three-part series *The Liberal Philosophy of George Novack* as though there could be no elements of continuity whatsoever between bourgeois and proletarian democracy. What, then, makes them two successive forms of the same political type? We know they are irreconcilable because they have essentially antagonistic class foundations. But at the same time whatever rights of the people have been wrested from the propertied classes by struggle are to be preserved, protected, extended, and perfected under workers' rule.

In the eyes of this absolutist, not only formal democracy but formal logic is "completely reactionary." ". . . while formal logic was a progressive mode of thought in Ancient Greece," he says, "it is today completely reactionary. . . . To compromise with formal logic is to compromise with the bourgeoisie." (*Bulletin*, March 6, 1972.)

Admittedly, formal logic is inferior to and more limited than dialectical thinking. But Steiner aims to convey the idea that it is currently useless, utterly outmoded and inapplicable. How can a form of logic that everyone uses all the time be "completely reactionary"? Formal logic is no more reactionary in itself that Newton's laws of motion; and its fruitfulness is far from exhausted even today.

One of the foremost innovations in contemporary technology, the computer, is based upon binary numbers which are an expression of formal logical categories.

Two mutually exclusive entities—0 and 1—operate in its system. There are no third values in ordinary computer logic.

Moreover, Steiner himself cannot avoid using formal logic. Here are the steps in his argument from major premise to conclusion: (a) To compromise with formal logic is to compromise with the bourgeoisie. (b) Novack compromises with formal logic. (c) Therefore Novack compromises with the bourgeoisie.

But Steiner's own tail is easily caught in this kind of fallacious reasoning. Because, if he has compromised with formal logic by using it, he himself is guilty of compromising with the bourgeoisie.

In rejecting empiricism in toto, the Healyites are equally unhistorical and undialectical. Dialectical materialism does not deny or discard everything in the empirical tradition. It has incorporated into its own doctrines whatever was innovative, true, and enduring in the contributions of empiricism to the progress of human thought, above all its insistence on the observation and ordering of the empirical data in the acquisition of genuine knowledge about the real world.

Though the Healyite habit of inventing facts and substituting them for realities is alien to Marxism, it can be found among religious folk in the form of miracle-making. What their desires crave and imagination projects becomes more real to them than the mundane facts. Such is the semireligious feature of the egocentric outlook and subjective method of this sect.

George Novack

How to Build a Sect

The Third Healyite Circus

In 1966, the Socialist Labour League—which had refused to participate in the reunification of the world Trotskyist movement three years earlier—sponsored a "Third Conference" of its "International Committee" under the guidance of SLL National Secretary Gerry Healy.

At the gathering, James Robertson, who had been seeking to unify his own group with Healy's International Committee, was thrown out. Because of illness, he had missed a session without authorization, which was, of course, a petty-bourgeois deviation from "implicit Leninist norms."

Representatives of the *Voix Ouvriere* group were likewise thrown out. Their deviation was to abstain on the question of throwing out Robertson.

Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International is the record of this memorable conference as reconstructed from internal documents circulated by the participants.

The pamphlet includes an introduction by Joseph Hansen explaining what the circus was all about.

For a copy send 35 cents to the Socialist Workers Party, 14 Charles Lane, New York, N. Y. 10014.

The Awakening of the Brazilian Revolution

Un grano de mostaza: El despertar de la revolución brasileña ("A Grain of Mustard Seed: The Awakening of the Brazilian Revolution") by Marcio Moriera Alves. Casa de las Américas, Havana, Cuba. 284 pp. 1972. (Chosen as the best memoirs of the year by the Cuban state publishing house.)

"Time passes much more quickly on the human scale than on the historical one. We are always anxious to see the final realization of our dreams. But we must take up a task that has barely been begun, a job that may take more time than we are willing to sacrifice, a job that cannot be rushed. If we refuse to follow its rhythm, if we try to speed up the pace too much, we will risk interfering with the progress of the work and even spoiling the chances for ever finishing it.

"The struggle for liberation is like 'a grain of mustard seed . . . which, indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.'

The symbolism of Marcio Moriera Alves's book seems to reflect the contradictions not only of his own political development but of a whole generation of young revolutionists in Brazil, who progressed from a moral rejection of the capitalist system to revolutionary Marxism in the space of a few years. He uses the Biblical parable of the mustard seed not to explain the virtues of religion but to defend the concept of building a "mass revolutionary party."

The first revolutionary organization he came in contact with and the one which was the dominant group in the formative period of the Brazilian far left was the AP [Ação Popular—People's Action], a radical populist formation that traveled a road from social Catholicism to Debrayism to Maoism.

Moriera Alves himself, the scion of a prominent Brazilian political family, was pushed into actively opposing the military dictatorship by a sense of moral courage and a romantic love of the oppressed people of Brazil. He was the protagonist of perhaps the greatest moral test of the Brazilian bourgeoisie since the military dictatorship was installed in 1964.

The tame congress that continued to exist for four years after the military coup was dissolved by the generals for refusing to lift Moriera Alves's parliamentary immunity. The government was anxious to get at him for "insulting the armed forces."

"The brief period when my life converged with the political life of Brazil ended at 3:00 in the afternoon of December 12, 1968," the author writes, "when 300 deputies applauded their own daring act that culminated their long years of humiliation at the hands of the military. Men hardened by many years of political maneuvers, with their consciences softened by undeviating service to the

regime, burst into tears and embraced one another. The few women sitting in the eminently masculine house had long dark rivulets running down their heavily made-up cheeks. Even some journalists, for whom a loss of composure would have been a reproach to their profession, had tears in their eyes.

"The president announced the final result: 'One hundred and forty-one for, two hundred and sixteen against. Two abstentions. The motion is defeated.' His voice faded away. Someone in the balcony began to sing the national anthem. The bell sounded violently, demanding silence, but the anthem continued, swelled by other voices, gaining strength on every note, on every word. It drowned out the bell and swept the entire building, forcing even the president and the other members at the presiding table to rise."

This outburst of conscience, of course, did not change anything fundamental. The Brazilian bourgeois political world did not suddenly turn patriotic and democratic. Most of the hopelessly corrupt representatives of the colonial ruling class quickly made their peace with the military regime and continued to collect the dividends of selling their country to imperialism. But the dramatic incident of December 1968 illustrated the moral crisis of a society where even the most hardened defenders of the system apparently felt they had to make a desperate and dangerous gesture to show they had at least some self-respect left.

What had the young middle-class idealist done to provoke such political drama? As a journalist for virtually the only unbought and unintimidated paper in the country, the Rio de Janeiro daily *Correio da Manhã*, he had helped to expose the brutal torture in the prisons of the dictatorship. As a deputy he continued this work. He was the most outspoken defender of civil liberties in parliament when the military decided it could no longer afford the luxury of democratic trappings. Moreover, he had wounded the honor of the military on a very sensitive point. The offending passages were in a speech for the anniversary of Brazilian independence:

"My iconoclastic address not only spoiled the magic day, it also suggested an Operation Lysistrata—that is, a boycott by the wives and sweethearts of officers who by their silence were accomplices in the atrocities of their colleagues. The armed forces considered Operation Lysistrata the final insult. Now this spoiled rich boy who—despite the fact he was the heir of a long line of politicians that had always served the ruling classes faithfully—had somehow gotten Communist ideas was not just calling them torturers. He had dared to deal them a low blow in their masculine vanity. . . .

"A few months before this, the students at the war college, who are representative to a large degree of the thinking of the young officers, began to offer nationalist opposition to the government's shameless concessions to

Washington. It was quite correctly supposed that their democratic inclinations were nil. But the group had to be distracted with the prospect of a new coup d'etat. Otherwise, they might have been tempted to oust the generals and run the country themselves.

"The blow against the masculinity of the officer caste in my speech offered a perfect opportunity to distract the minds of the young militarists. My speech was a kick in the balls that anyone could understand. . . . While they were fuming against me, against the congress, and against all the combined decadence of all the supposed homosexual institutions that they thought made such an attack possible, while they were imagining ways of castrating me, or other exemplary styles of retribution, they were not annoying anyone with long-drawn-out conspiratorial maneuvers. And what was still more important, they would probably approve, and in fact did approve, any action against the offending branch of government."

As a reporter, Moriera Alves had already learned how dangerous it was to impugn the virility of the military: "A few days before my investigation, a young reporter from the *Jornal do Brasil* had been arrested and beaten up in Recife. His crime was that he had written that an officer had been moved to tears by the marriage on a military base of Miguel Arraes's oldest daughter. This statement was considered derogatory to the masculine pride of the armed forces and the reporter was severely punished. He himself told me the story while he was recuperating in Rio, and warned me about the hostility of the torturers toward the press."

Despite the violence of Brazilian politics, however, where parliamentary disputes often turn into open gun fights, bourgeois politicians have developed ways of surviving through the most turbulent periods. Moriera Alves describes how he weathered the April 1, 1964, coup:

"The day after my article [condemning the establishment of the dictatorship], my father called me in Brasilia to suggest that I disappear for a while. Citing his political experience and his memory of previous coups, he said that the first days of a new government are the most dangerous. No responsible authority has yet been established and the rules of the game are clouded. . . .

"An underground railroad was already functioning to aid in the getaway of those who had to leave Brasilia. A deputy who, although he supported the military coup, was trying to save the skins of some defeated colleagues had explained to me the previous evening how the 'freedom train' worked."

The extended family structure of Brazilian bourgeois society provides an important buffer against the violence of political life.

"In Brazil, family relationships are stronger than the ties of any political or religious affiliation. The strength of this bond survives even in ideological struggles. When a 'gorilla' colonel wrote his daughter, who had been imprisoned and tortured for her revolutionary activities, that he didn't consider a 'subversive' part of his family, he drew a flood of criticism from widely differing sectors of society whose most intimate defenses had been assaulted by his attitude.

"Moreover, even the most ferocious 'gorilla' will show a certain understanding for reactionary families that defend their persecuted members and allow themselves to be influenced politically by them. In 1964, General Taurino

de Rezende, the chairman of the National Investigating Commission, which had powers equal to those of a Grand Inquisitor in the Spain of the sixteenth century, resigned and publicly denounced the repressive methods of his colleagues when his son Sergio, a professor at the University of Pernambuco, was arrested and beaten up as a 'subversive.'"

This tendency to uphold the built-in defenses in Latin American society brings to mind the argument of the Tupamaros, when they assassinated the police "advisor" Dan Mitrione, that it is U. S. technical aid that is responsible for the cruelest methods of torture. It is true that the ruthlessness of the organizers of mass murder in Vietnam is hard to match.

Moreira Alves evokes the patriarchal and piratical bourgeois society of Brazil with a picaresque wit, starting with the origins of his own family in a half-abandoned old gold-rush town in the interior:

"It was to an already diminished Paracatu that João de Melo Franco came, a Portuguese father of the holy church. His interests were: first, gold; second, women; and then the salvation of his flock. In short order, he made a small fortune, founded a family, and took over command of the local militia. With a sword strapped over his cassock, he patrolled the city and organized dances in the patio of his house, where his numerous progeny were multiplying.

"Major Jefferson and I were descendants of this bellicose servant of the church. Like all the old Brazilian families, we had only to go back two or three generations to find unsavory types showing up among our forefathers — murderers, slave traders, criminals, women not always jealous of their honor."

Moreira Alves offers some other portraits:

"The chief of the Alves clan was a sister-in-law of my uncle, Dona Tiburtina. I saw her only once before she died. She was a thin, little old lady floating in a wide black dress. Her white hair was rolled up in a knot at the back of her head, and she had one solitary tooth in the middle of her mouth. Her voice didn't rise above a whisper. She spoke only in baby talk . . .

"Dona Tiburtina's greatest adventure came in 1930, during the political campaign that preceded the fraudulent presidential elections and the seizure of power by the defeated candidate, Getulio Vargas. The Prates [the rivals of the Alveses] were supporting the federal government, and the Alveses were with Vargas and the opposition. The dispute in Montes Claros became one of the hottest in the country. The city, its prosperity shown by its innumerable whorehouses and gambling dens, was the key to all the Northern badlands . . .

"Therefore, Montes Claros was important enough to merit the visit of the vice president of the republic, a Minas Gerais politician. He arrived in all the pomp of power — with a special train and a uniformed band. Greeted by his political supporters, the Prates, he took the lead of a parade that set out marching to the main square in the midst of a tremendous barrage of rockets and fireworks. Tiburtina's house was full of relatives and *jagunços* [gunmen].

"As the cortege neared the Alves home, the rockets exploded more loudly than ever, humiliating the enemy with their triumphal din. A rocket exploded at the feet of Tiburtina, who was watching the spectacle from a window.

A man came into the garden limping and his wife thought he was wounded. Tiburtina gave the order to fire. The volley, which left two people dead and several lying wounded on the ground, resounded throughout Brazil. It was the first blow of the coming revolution. The vice president was wounded in the neck by a splinter of bone and fled as fast as he could get his train in the station to go in reverse, a demoralizing procedure that cost him considerable prestige among his followers."

It was to "Major Jefferson," the head of the branch of the family that remained in the primitive interior country that Moreira Alves went to seek refuge from the military dictatorship. (His relative was called "Major," the author explains, because since the period of civil wars all ranchers and businessmen in the interior are given military titles.) The rustic strong man offered his protection to a distant relative he had never seen without a moment's questioning. "Major" Jefferson's four sons, always heavily armed, murmured but did not dare protest openly. The women of the family giggled and whispered behind closed doors.

Moreira Alves's book gives a vivid picture of a violent, colorful, and contradictory country with enormous frustrated potential. In the tropical wildernesses and deserts of Brazil, the characteristics of the old American West seem magnified almost to mythical proportions. The back country of Brazil is made wilder, culturally more complex, and more tragic by the shallow and abortive development of the area. One wave of adventurers after another swept over the country without transforming it in a thorough or lasting way. As one French journalist put it, the history of Brazil, more than any other country, is a history of booms and busts, of febrile economic adventures.

But the importance of Moreira Alves's book is much greater than the witty but somewhat superficial tableaux of the first chapters would suggest. *Un Grano de Mostaza* is not just a portrait of Brazilian society but a history of the development of a whole revolutionary generation in the weightiest country of Latin America.

Like most of the young rebels who formed the first revolutionary organizations to fight the military dictatorship, Moreira Alves was motivated by intellectual vision and personal honesty. Also like many of this generation, he combined a sense of guilt about his privileged status with a romantic sympathy for the people:

"I did not come to revolutionary positions through suffering or the bitter humiliations that so often go with such a choice for workers and peasants. To the contrary, political radicalization gave my life a purpose, a gift for which I could never be grateful enough. It gave me the opportunity of waging a fight in the press and in congress based on relatively firm principles. My situation involved few risks and many attractions, so many in fact that I had to learn to see myself from the outside in order to retain a critical sense and avoid mistakes that could have led me back into becoming part of the system."

Moreira Alves's critical sense, his gift of irony, gave him an insight into the standard operating procedures bourgeois politicians almost automatically fall into:

"Seeing ourselves as others see us is an excellent exercise in humility. Almost always I found myself ridiculous, above all when I fell into rhetorical pirouettes in lecturing, giving a speech, or trying the steps of the ritual dances of political seduction. At times, I had the feeling that I was manipulating others in such an obvious way

that it was impossible for them not to notice. But they did not."

The developing young radical felt the need to guard himself carefully against carrying over bourgeois light-mindedness and superficiality into his revolutionary ideas:

"My ideas on urban guerrilla warfare had more to do with medieval jousts than the sordid reality the fighters must face."

It would be easy to smile at Moreira Alves's middle-class romanticism and moralism, if you forget that many political cadres of revolutionary parties have come from enlightened petty-bourgeois families like the "Alves clan," families with children whose intellectual training and moral sense lead them beyond the narrow boundaries of the class mentality into which they were born.

Very few of these petty-bourgeois rebels, however, come all the way over from romanticism and moralism to scientific socialism and revolutionary professionalism. Along the way are many roads leading nowhere. The Brazilian rebels of the 1960s were perhaps particularly unfortunate. But they had little or no valid example to follow.

Although the Communist party was the best organized and most experienced radical party in Brazil, it had little attraction for radicalizing youth. Its opportunism repelled even those who did not understand the source of the CP's degeneration. Moreira Alves himself seems to have developed a general grasp of what was wrong with the Communist party:

"Almost all the forces committed to transforming the social structure in Brazil have felt the need for a revolutionary theory profoundly rooted in our reality. The lack of such a theory has brought decades of defeats.

"The Communist party could not produce such theory. Its evolution reveals a strange adaptation to the objectives of Soviet foreign policy, which has made it lose many opportunities and advance a zig-zag line.

"In 1935, when the USSR was an outcast encircled by the capitalist world and had little responsibility for maintaining world peace and little place in the organization of international life, the Brazilian CP attempted a putsch that was completely out of line with the real strength of the party. Influenced by the militaristic view then held by its general secretary Luis Carlos Prestes—who had commanded a column of 3,000 men in 1924 fighting all the way in a march of 10,000 kilometers, one of the longest in history—the CP sought a shortcut to revolution. The uprisings in Rio de Janeiro and Recife gave Getulio Vargas a pretext for consolidating his dictatorship. The price of this adventure was ten years of murderous repression. Prestes himself was imprisoned and so badly mistreated that his lawyer defended him by invoking the law against cruelty to animals.

"In a period when reaction was triumphant throughout the world, the Communist party seemed to be the only effective opposition to fascism. It grew and accumulated forces. Its antifascist ideals attracted students and intellectuals. Its defense of the interests of the proletariat and the opportunity it offered workers to participate in decisions attracted people from the working class. . . .

"When Prestes was released in 1945, as a result of the Allied victory in Europe, the situation of the Soviet Union in the world had changed drastically, and with it the line of the Brazilian Communist party. The newly emerged great power was preoccupied with establishing states that

could serve as a buffer against possible attacks from the capitalist countries, especially Germany. And it had to be cautious because of the American nuclear monopoly. It could not dissipate its strength by extending its lines to areas not immediately essential to its survival.

"The process of decolonization starting in Asia and Africa did not change the character of the U.S. sphere of influence in Latin America. To the contrary, U.S. domination was reinforced and the nuclear monopoly prevented any challenging of it. In view of this, Prestes led the party in search of a national bourgeoisie that would put itself at the head of a bourgeois national revolution. The idea was that with the modernization of the capitalist structure, not only would the emerging Brazilian economic interests clash with those of the imperialist companies, but the internal contradictions would sharpen until they finally created a favorable field for revolution.

"The plan provided for nonviolent methods and a tactical alliance with the progressive sectors of the bourgeoisie. It was followed even in 1948 when the party again came under persecution with the sharpening of the cold war. It was adhered to with minor modifications during the 1950s and reinforced by the de-Stalinization process initiated by Khrushchev's speech at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU. In the early 1960s the CP was turned into a political monstrosity when the greed, opportunism, and pursuit of sinecures promoted by João Goulart profoundly rotted the party's structure."

Even the 1964 coup could not turn the CP leadership from its reformist path. In fact, the conclusion that the leadership drew from the ignominious collapse of the "progressive" and "nationalist" regime, Alves explains, was that the party had been too energetic in its criticisms of Goulart. They expelled all the radical elements that wanted to organize a militant struggle against the dictatorship.

Most of the sincere young cadres grouped around expelled leaders like Carlos Marighella in São Paulo, leaving the Communist party a hollow shell. But Marighella also failed to build an effective revolutionary organization. Although he was a courageous and dedicated leader, he seems fundamentally to have still been influenced by the opportunist pattern of the Communist party. He was not prepared for the slow painful work of developing programmatic clarity and an organization of trained political activists rooted in all sectors of the mass movement. He sought to win a quick breakthrough by daring coups. In the process, he became trapped in the logic of elitist armed action.

"The defeats suffered by the urban guerrillas were the result of errors in political analysis. When Marighella began to operate, he had no intention of creating an original revolutionary model or taking power with a handful of determined men. He was not a putschist but a revolutionist whose patience had been worn out by being entangled in a deadening bureaucracy. He had too long experience in the Communist party not to understand that the guerrillas could not get very far without the masses.

"What he tried to do was bypass a paralyzing internal discussion and show that the dictatorship was not invulnerable, that it could and must be attacked. By demon-

strating this, he hoped to split the party and thus win sufficient political authority to set up a revolutionary front that would attract activists from various origins. In such a front, urban guerrilla warfare would have been like the visible tip of an iceberg. The majority of activists would dedicate themselves to the indispensable work of supporting the struggle from firmer bases. Tactical errors, an underestimation of the repressive forces, and the premature death of Marighella (November 4, 1969) wrecked this plan."

Moreira Alves seems, however, to be a little inconsistent in evaluating Marighella's course. In an earlier passage, he indicates that the Brazilian revolutionist's program of urban guerrilla warfare was not just a strategem to clear the way for building a mass revolutionary movement, but resulted from a hybrid concept of revolutionary strategy.

"His [Marighella's] ideas, as they were summed up by Conrado Detrez, a former member of the ALN [Ação Libertadora Nacional—Action for National Liberation, the guerrilla group headed by Marighella], who was the last journalist to interview him, were as follows:

"'Thesis: the priority of political over military work, stressing the working class, a strategy of alliances with the so-called "nationalist or progressive bourgeoisie" under the leadership of the orthodox CP (until 1960);

"'Antithesis: the priority of military over political work, the discovery of the peasantry whose poverty would force them to participate in the struggle (spontaneism), a strategy based on the guerrilla "foco" as developed by Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, and made into a systematic theory by Régis Debray (until 1970).

"'Synthesis: Unity from the start of military and political work, simultaneous interaction between the guerrilla vanguard and the mass movement, and tactical unity between the urban proletariat and the peasantry for the purpose of starting up revolutionary war.'

"Detrez commented that 'by organizing with this perspective the ALN sought to rise above Castroism without denying it and thus avoid being caught up in its temporary decline. Instead of unconditionally adopting Maoism, Carlos Marighella proposed to combine mass work of the classical Communist type—which was not to be underrated—with forms of armed struggle in both urban and rural areas.'

Moreira Alves's own comment is as follows:

"The reliance on a single weapon—urban guerrilla warfare—in combating a many-sided and powerful enemy was to cost the Brazilian revolution many defeats and lead to the death of Marighella himself, but in those days for a martyred generation it was a sweet siren song. Marighella denied the accusation that he was a militarist or had adopted some of the concepts of revolutionary elitism expounded by Régis Debray in this theory of the foco. In practice, however, he adopted Debray's thesis that in Brazil, as in other countries of Latin America, the political conditions already existed for revolution and all that was needed to get started was for the spark of military action to spread through the masses. . . .

"Immediate revolution is always attractive for young people, who grow impatient with the slow organizing work of the classical Leninist models. Although Marighella rejected the idea of forming a foco in a sparsely populated area where the enemy could concentrate his fire, he never

reached the point of carrying out or even explaining in detail the tactical alternative of the mobile military column.

"What Marighella did was to organize an intercommunicating structure of urban focos. These small armed groups had no intention of overthrowing the government or of achieving national power. Their aim was to achieve what Debray called the effect of armed propaganda by rural guerrillas. Their audacious blows were to test the enemy's capacity for resistance. This would presumably facilitate the task of recruiting fighters, broaden the social base of the guerrillas, help to establish hostile forces in the cities near the country's centers of decision, and give rearguard support to the activities of the liberation army in the countryside."

Despite a number of spectacular operations by the urban commandos, Moriera Alves writes, the balance sheet of urban guerrilla warfare is a negative one:

"After three years of constant armed struggle, in 1971 the Brazilian revolutionary movements reached the bottom. The urban guerrillas failed to weaken the power of the dictatorship. Their contingents were divided, shrunken, and impotent. They failed to mobilize the masses; they could not even take advantage of the sympathy aroused by some of their actions. They did not form structures capable of developing independently. The repression completely terrorized the middle classes and dried up the aid that some sectors were giving to the guerrillas. The counterpropaganda of the dictatorship and the lack of any serious political training in the commando organizations turned public opinion against the revolutionists.

"The price paid for this experience cannot be measured solely in the time the dictatorship was given to prepare its defenses. Many of the best revolutionary leaders were murdered and thousands of activists were jailed or forced into exile."

The guerrilla warfare orientation of the Brazilian revolutionists even had the side effect of reducing the cost of U.S. military aid to the Brazilian regime: "The U.S. program of military assistance to Brazil is the biggest in Latin America, totaling \$221,000,000 during the period 1950-1970. Starting in 1960, this 'aid' took the form of counterinsurgency materiel relatively cheap in comparison with the prestige weapons—tanks, bombers, aircraft carriers—that were preferred by the military chiefs of the underdeveloped countries in the past."

Aside from the various urban guerrilla groups, the AP was the most prominent organization of the revolutionary left in Brazil. It too had a flirtation with "foquismo." It turned away from this, however, only to become entrapped in another of the pitfalls in the path of radicalizing youth.

"The chance for making the AP the starting point for a broad revolutionary front was wrecked by the absurd sectarianism of its leaders as well as by their shifting political positions. Shortly after the coup, some of the most influential cadres of the movement took a 'foquista' position and helped to organize guerrilla bases in the forests near Rio, São Paulo, and Belo Horizonte. When one of these bases fell without firing a shot and the others disintegrated on their own, these activists became disillusioned in what they called the 'Cuban model.'

"The search for new ideas led them to Mao Tse-tung. In his work they found a general explanation of revolutionary activity in underdeveloped countries. His all-em-

bracing outlook corresponded well to the need felt by this group of formerly fervent Catholics for intellectual certainty and a closed-in world free from doubt. They embraced the new creed with all the ardor of fresh converts."

Instead of using their education and opportunities for study to help organize and enlighten the masses and to unify and politicize their struggles, the activists of the AP became preoccupied with morally purifying themselves, with sharing the deprivations and feelings of the masses, with idealizing the forms of their spontaneous consciousness.

"Cadres who refused to become unskilled workers or peasants were accused of rightist deviations and immediately expelled. No alternative work was offered for those who decided to remain in their own social stratum. Thus, the AP was rapidly reduced to a nucleus of missionaries who were doubtless very dedicated and heroic but whose political impact on the national life, if it is felt at all, will be perceptible only in the long run."

In the absence of any effective revolutionary organization, Moreira Alves seems to cast a longing glance in the direction of the Catholic Church.

"The church has an enormous independent communications network. It has dozens of radio stations, hundreds of papers, magazines, bulletins, publishing houses, bookstores. It has a devoted audience of almost 10,000,000 persons. It owns thousands of buildings—parish halls, palaces, skyscrapers, high schools, convents, missions, orphanages—all of which can serve as hideouts or contact points. It controls 14,000 disciplined men and 40,000 obedient women working full time for very limited wages. But, above all, it still has a lot of influence on the urban middle class, the origin of most of its activists, and it keeps the masses in reverent awe in a way no other institution can approach. And this entire force has always been on the side of the ruling class, helping to maintain Brazil's social equilibrium. If its position shifts, the entire structure will be more easily upset."

In another place, Moriera Alves writes:

"The Brazilian revolution can only develop if it enormously broadens its political and social base. For a start we must convince the majority of the activists of the orthodox Communist party—still the best organized sector of the socialist forces in the country—of the necessity of following the only road that the regime has left open: armed struggle. It is equally important to incorporate into the struggle young Catholic activists, with their habits of discipline, their logistical support, and their contacts with the masses."

The political positions Moreira Alves expresses are by no means fully formed and they suffer from many contradictions. He seems still to be, as he has apparently been in the past, more of a mirror of the thinking of the broad layer of Brazilian radicals than a political leader or theoretician. He is a good journalist, a polished and brilliant writer as well as far more thoughtful and critical than the typical left-leaning petty-bourgeois commentators, who tend only to extol the mood of the moment among the young left, or judge it by a few banal bourgeois formulas.

"The majority of the revolutionary organizations have seen and analyzed their errors. Some have reduced their activity in order to reformulate their strategy, to think

over new tactics, to seek seriously to establish a revolutionary front of organizations that could be the nucleus of a broader liberation front.

"Others, although they observe the formalities of internal discussion and self-criticism are refusing to recognize their errors. They escalate their rhetoric and keep on with the same methods. Some of their leaders think that if they change the direction of their activity, they will be betraying the *compañeros* who fell for the revolutionary cause. They do not see that the worst betrayal is failing in the struggle, failing to achieve victory. Organizations that blind themselves to reality are irrevocably condemned; at most they will be a bloody footnote at the bottom of a page in Brazilian history.

"Quotations are excellent defenses behind which to hide our inability to reason correctly. Some activists try to explain the many defeats that have been suffered by saying that they are making progress politically by going 'two steps forward and one step backwards' or that 'we are at the stage of accumulating forces.' But if we do not establish a correct strategy all of our steps will be backwards and we will never accumulate sufficient forces to attack the enemy.

"It is obvious that the guerrilla groups will continue to exist as long as the dictatorship survives. They represent the immediate, precipitous response of the radicalized youth to a situation of intolerable oppression. But no matter how spectacular their actions, they are not going to change the relationship of forces in society.

"To the contrary, if these groups do not unite with more numerous popular forces through helping to mobilize them, they can even bring about the reverse of what they want by reinforcing the power of the representatives of the most irrational groups within the military. The consequence could be to limit political life to a battle between little groups of armed revolutionists and big groups of much better armed counterrevolutionists. The people would be spectators in the struggle, without any possibility of intervening or influencing the outcome."

Despite his rejection of the guerrilla strategies of the 1960s, it seems clear that Moreira Alves is not looking for a peaceful or reformist road to revolution in Brazil: "The Chilean model—if it becomes a model—is absolutely out of the question in Brazil. Not only are the institutions and the political tradition different in our country, but Brazil is too important to the United States for Washington to permit our country to leave its sphere of influence without a violent intervention.

"On the other hand, it is also illusory to think that the revolutionary organizations can skip over stages and get a depoliticized people to enter immediately into a prolonged war without adapting their slogans to the needs of the masses. The idea that a revolutionary vanguard composed of highly political supermen can make the revolution for the people and not with the people is elitist stupidity that leads to suicide."

Moreira Alves denounces the Brazilian Communist party for failing to learn from its past reformist mistakes and for trying to find a "national sector" of the army to ally with. He calls for a long, difficult process of winning the Communist party activists and young Catholic radicals to a revolutionary perspective and then drawing the broad masses into the struggle against the regime: "And all this effort must be directed toward forming a mass revo-

lutionary party that will take charge of leading the armed phase of the struggle.

"The revolutionists must have flexible tactics and political positions that seem reasonable to people in order to form a political front. They need to learn to detect and take advantage of the most acutely felt contradictions between the regime and the people. Plans must be adapted to the people's level of political understanding—which can only be perfected gradually by the people themselves through the experience of new struggles. . . .

"The revolutionary front must have room for a variety of approaches, whose adherents would have the right to express themselves and influence the discussion and the adoption of the general political line. The process of decision-making must be democratic but centralized, so that all phases of the struggle can be correctly led. Democratic consultation of the rank-and-file bodies must not be reduced to a formal exercise as so often happens in bureaucratized parties. The opinion of the activists must really be taken into consideration. . . ."

Although Moreira Alves's book suffers from some inconsistencies and superficiality, the Latin American left should find it enlightening and thought-provoking. Moreover, it makes some analyses and raises some questions that are likely to be controversial in Cuba itself. It is to the credit of the Cuban state publishing house that it singled out such a book for special attention, recommending it to a wide readership by awarding it the prize for its class, and printing and distributing numerous copies. It is to be hoped that an English translation will soon be published.

The unscientific methods that have led to an unnecessarily high cost in lives of dedicated young revolutionists throughout Latin America and that stand in the way of reaching the masses can only be overcome by a free and frank discussion such as Moreira Alves proposes.

—Gerry Foley

Behind the Prison Revolts

The Prison Revolt by Joe Johnson. Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y. 22 pp. \$.35. 1972.

On an average day, almost 1,500,000 people are in U.S. jails and prisons. The overwhelming majority are poor, and a big percentage are Black, Chicano, or Puerto Rican. Their oppression, and the rebellions it has inspired, are the subject of Joe Johnson's pamphlet.

Johnson has first-hand familiarity with conditions in U.S. prisons, having served two years in the federal penitentiary at Springfield, Missouri.

He describes the systematic violation of human rights that occurs at every stage of the administration of "justice"—arrest, trial, sentencing, and imprisonment.

The Prison Revolt tells how thousands of prisoners have joined in struggles for simple democratic rights such as an end to political persecution, racial persecution, and the oppression of homosexuals; control of big prisons by the Black and Chicano communities; the right to receive political newspapers and books.

This concise pamphlet is especially timely as the prisoners' revolt spreads to France, Britain, and other countries. □

Why Lanusse Murdered the Sixteen Prisoners

[The following statement on the August 16 Trelew massacre was drafted by the six guerrillas who escaped from Rawson prison, and who together with four other guerrillas hijacked a plane to Chile. It is jointly signed by them in the name of the three organizations to which they belong—the ERP (Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—Revolutionary Army of the People), the FAR (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias—Revolutionary Armed Forces), and the Montoneros.]

[The text of the statement was published in the August 30 issue of the Chilean journal *Mayoria*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Once again the armed forces in Argentina have clearly demonstrated their role as occupation forces in the service of imperialism and its domestic allies, their counterrevolutionary role, their role as exploiters of our people, and their role as savage murderers and torturers of militants fighting in behalf of the people.

The deliberate murder today of sixteen prisoner-of-war compañeros belonging to our organizations, the ERP, the FAR, and the Montoneros, marks a new stage in the long road of revolutionary war upon which our people have embarked. The evolution of any revolutionary war urged on by the masses takes on particular characteristics suited to each area, the political experiences of the people, the situation faced by the enemy, and the enemy's concrete actions against the revolutionary forces—these are some of the features that characterize revolutionary war in different countries. The savage act of August 22, 1972, in Trelew, marks the beginning of an engagement that will reflect higher levels of confrontation in the war. The armed forces have already amply demonstrated their true role as gendarmes for imperialism.

We already know how the gorilla troops, Lanusse's soldiers, react. We already know this and we are preparing our army, the army of the op-

pressed people, accordingly. The general was not mistaken when he told the journalist wounded by his jittery troops in Trelew that it was a risk he ran in his profession, that in Vietnam various journalists have been killed and wounded. This officer was not mistaken when he stated this, for the murder of our compañeros clearly reveals the bloody claws that imperialism employs against every revolutionary struggle, its thirst for blood, the impunity with which it carries out its acts, and its morality when it comes to maintaining a system in which man exploits man; the claws of imperialism are the same throughout the world, in Vietnam as in Argentina, although its face or its uniform may vary. About this, the representative of the military was not mistaken.

In Argentina, imperialism's claws are disguised, protected by our own flag, by uniforms decorated with national emblems, by an army that calls itself Argentine but that has nothing Argentine about it, by an army that calls itself the inheritor of San Martín although it has inherited nothing from him. This is an army of occupation and oppression, in the service of the ruling classes. The other was an army of liberation that represented the people's interests; it was created by the people themselves. They undertook to destroy it. They undertook to lock up and tie down the flag of our country in the barracks of oppression where the assassins and torturers of our people are trained and where the support and power of the ruling classes, and their privileges, are centered. They are a disgrace to our people. It is they who stain our flag with their bloody hands, with their murders and tortures. It is they who are responsible for forcibly maintaining a regime of exploitation by silencing popular demonstrations and suppressing the voice of the people. They are our enemies.

They took our compañeros to one of the many barracks of oppression—one of the many barracks in which their strength is concentrated. They

imprisoned them just as they have imprisoned our flag. But this was not their goal. Their goal was to offset their defeat, to quench their thirst, and to make up for their impotency in the face of the revolutionary morale of our fighters. Their conscious goal was to eliminate these sixteen compañeros. They knew their quality as political-military cadres and the revolutionary potential of each of them. They thought it through and picked them out. Their fear of them, their fear of this revolutionary force which had again defeated them in their own territory, in one of their strongholds, their function as defenders of privileges, and their class role led them once again to show who they really are and what they are made of, by murdering our fighters in the most despicable and bloody way, as they have also done to our people on other occasions. They believed, and continue to believe, that by murdering the people's fighters and by hunting down and torturing popular militants they will be able to maintain their regime of exploitation and to succeed in halting or silencing this revolutionary force. History will show the opposite to be true.

We can offer proof of this in the innumerable concrete facts emerging from the struggles of our people in their revolutionary advance. The slaughter at Trelew today is one of the most important landmarks in our revolutionary process. It strengthens our struggle, our fighting spirit, and our revolutionary morale. It brings us even closer to building the people's army. Our forces are increasing. The lives laid down by our compañeros, by the fighters of our revolutionary organizations, once more show the path to follow. It indicates the responsibility that we have assumed together with and before our people, and the need for unity among the revolutionary forces in our country that are today struggling through revolutionary war for mutual goals, for a society without exploitation and privilege, for a socialist homeland.

In this act, in this sacrifice, lie all

the strength and content of the unity that is being projected and is beginning to take shape more clearly. This constitutes a great victory for our fallen compañeros. This constitutes a great defeat for our common enemy. The enemy wanted to destroy them, to isolate and separate them, to halt this irresistibly advancing revolutionary force. The enemy was not able to do so.

They cannot be destroyed because today they are stronger than ever, more present than ever in the mobilizations of the people that have taken place in Córdoba, Tucumán, Comodoro, and Buenos Aires. They cannot be isolated or silenced because today their names and their ideals are on the lips of thousands of compañeros who are joining the struggle and who are expressing their outrage.

They could not be separated and this revolutionary force could not be halted because they are today our fighting pledge to build the people's army. Without any doubt, their sacrifice and the blood they shed express most deeply the confluence of the revolutionary forces toward the people's army, which is one of the most overriding necessities of the revolutionary process. This is the legacy of our compañeros; this is what the revolutionary militants who fell in the course of the struggle demand of us; this is what the people point to as a necessity in their mass struggle; this is what today obliges us to respond consciously aware of our goals, aware of our responsibility, and aware as revolutionists of our subordination and complete devotion to the revolution. This is what is demanded of us by the fallen revolutionary militants who were members of our organizations, and by the mobilizations of the people. We must respond to this demand as revolutionists.

Without any doubt, this response involves traveling a certain distance in order to overcome our political and ideological differences; it involves finding the form and the most correct method for overcoming and resolving them; and it involves deepening our points of agreement and the goals that unite us and that today make it possible for us to embark on this path.

A full understanding of this path will doubtless also be achieved in

working out this correct solution; and this understanding will be converted into concrete revolutionary practice, into a concrete tool for attaining our goals. We know that this will not be easy; nor will it happen right away. We know that we have important differences in politics and ideology. We know that the path we have embarked upon will be hard and that we will undoubtedly commit errors. But we also know that our subordination to the revolution, which today can only be called socialist, unites us, and that our sinking roots in the masses, whom we listen to and from whom we learn by fighting with them, is the best guarantee that we will overcome our differences. Our revolutionary practice as revolutionary organizations leads us to set out on this path with the determination and the elements necessary for the building of this people's army and for the triumph of our revolution.

It is on the basis of these considerations that we must find the proper forms and responses. This is what our enemy is most afraid of at this time, because he is perfectly aware of

the forces with which he is defending the interests of the ruling classes. Concrete facts have demonstrated it, and it is because of it that he continues little by little to lose ground to the revolutionary advance in spite of the slaughters, the persecution, the torture, the suppression of popular opposition, and in spite of all his unsparing efforts.

It is within this framework that the sacrifice of our compañeros who so generously shed their blood in Trelew belongs; this is the framework in which they were vindicated by the mobilizations and struggles of the people in response to this deed. This is the historic significance the Trelew massacre acquires for revolutionary war in Argentina.

This is our response to the deceit and lies of the exploiting classes as currently expressed in the GAN [Gran Acuerdo Nacional—Great National Agreement]. This is our response to all those sectors of the political and trade-union bureaucracy who have joined in this deceit. This is the response of our people, who are sick and tired of deceit, of lies, of poverty, and of injustice. □

French Far-Left Stand on Munich Events

[The following communiqué was issued on September 6, before the Israeli "retaliatory" raids against Arab villages. It appeared in the September 9 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

The undersigned organizations, which have joined together in protest of the Olympic Games, denounce the international holy alliance directed against the action of the Black September commandos in Munich. The murderers of the Indochinese people, the fabricators of the Stalinist trials in Czechoslovakia—as well as [Avery] Brundage [president of the International Olympic Committee], who in his day has been known to support real "barbarism," namely Nazism—have reached a new level of hypocrisy. The superpowers, all the big states of the world, have never

worried about the Palestinian people unless it was to repress them in blood. The superpowers shed tears over what just happened, but their grief was not so conspicuous at the time of the massacres in Palestine in 1947, or in Jordan in 1970.

In the spirit of proletarian internationalism and in opposition to the hysterical campaign in the press, the undersigned organizations affirm their solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people, who are resisting the Zionist state and the Arab regimes and are combating the "racial persecution of three million Palestinians, as well as of the Oriental Jews." (Black September communiqué, Sept. 5, 1972.)

After orchestrating an extraordinary outburst of phony humanism, the German and Israeli bourgeoisies did not hesitate to commit premeditated murder. They are the ones who are really responsible.

The hypocritical veil of the Olympic Games, which tried to mask exploitation, oppression, and wars of aggres-

sion, has been completely torn away. The masquerade had to end. The governments are shedding tears over its demise.

Sept. 6, 1972
Alliance Marxiste Révolutionnaire [Marxist Revolutionary Alliance];
Gauche Marxiste [Marxist Left]; Ligue

Letter Smuggled From a Yugoslav Prison

[We publish below the text of a letter written by Milan Nikolic which was smuggled out of a Yugoslav prison. Nikolic, a student in Belgrade, was sentenced in August to two years in prison on charges of having engaged in a "Trotskyist plot" to "reconstruct the Fourth International in Yugoslavia." Also sentenced after a trial that was held in August, while most students and many workers were on vacation, were P. Imsirovic (two years) and Jelka Kljajic (one and a half years).

[None of the allegedly subversive materials produced by the defendants have been published in Yugoslavia. The following letter is the first statement by the defendants received in the West since the trial. We have translated it from the September 9 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

Milan Nikolic and P. Imsirovic have been in prison since January 7, 1972, and Jelka Kljajic since January 21, 1972, all convicted of having "during 1970 organized a group, with which they worked both in Yugoslavia and abroad until their arrest in January 1972, with the objective of converting it into an enemy party aimed at overthrowing, by violent and anticonstitutional means, the regime of the working people and their legally elected representatives and executive political organs. To this end they acted publicly, wrote, produced, and distributed material of an enemy character in the form of an information program, communiqués, and tracts, all giving a malevolent and mendacious picture of the reality in the country and calling for an unconstitutional overturn by force. . . ." (Extract from the indictment.)

Communiste (SFQI) [Communist League (French Section of the Fourth International)]; Organisation Communiste Libertaire [Libertarian Communist Organization]; Organisation Révolutionnaire Anarchiste [Revolutionary Anarchist Organization]; Révolution!

The public prosecutor accused us of "associating with the enemy," of having carried on "counterrevolutionary activities," and of having spread "enemy propaganda." He claimed that in getting together and distributing leaflets, the three of us wanted "to overthrow the regime of the working people and their legal representatives."

To try to justify this assertion he invented a mythical "enemy group" having relations with "foreign organizations that are enemies of Yugoslavia." The various pamphlets we put out were said to be "tracts containing proposals harmful to the country," and our regular activity in the Union of Students, and especially in the school of philosophy's free "Red Horse" forum, was denounced as "enemy activity" and "propagation of ideas hostile to the country."

Those who accuse us think that the more absurd a lie is the more credible it will be, the more useful it can be when combined with a huge clamor from the press. During all this time, we could do nothing to counteract the lies being spread against us. We have been locked up for four months now [four at the time the letter was written; by now six months]. Our hands are tied and our mouths are gagged. Those who accuse us are well aware that if they let us speak freely all their accusations would burst like so many soap bubbles. That is why they seize our letters, will not let us prepare our defense outside prison—no doubt to prevent us from again committing the crime that we never committed in the first place—and that is why they forbid the press to publish our denials and explanations.

In reality, we were tried for the crime of heretical thinking, because we proclaimed: There can be no socialism and no truly human relationships among people under a market econ-

omy subject to the savage play of competition. Socialist democracy and self-management cannot be built while the political and economic role of the state continuously expands; workers' self-management cannot be said to have been achieved when the workers are not making the most important social decisions and when even in the only existing party the role and number of workers is less and less significant.

We were tried because we are convinced that it is possible, even indispensable, to undertake henceforth to create a totally integrated self-managing system—from the factory level up through the federal level—in which it would be possible for the largest number of workers and other citizens to take charge of society's destiny and to eliminate the professional politicians. We were tried because we are convinced that it is possible to create an extremely profitable and balanced economy with full employment of all workers based on a scientific analysis of society's needs and of its available resources, allocated under a democratically decided plan.

We were hauled before the court because we thought critically, because we freely expressed our opinions, which are contrary to the official conception of socialism. We will not be the last to be tried for this offense.

My friends and I believe that humane and democratic socialism and workers' self-management can be built only by releasing all the creative energies of the people. And this presupposes complete freedom of scientific investigation, the expansion of scientific knowledge, and the right to express freely differing opinions and varying conceptions of the road to progressive development of society.

Any other course is objectively in basic opposition to socialism, because it would smother development. That is exactly what we consider the measures taken against my friends and me to be—police intrigues against freedom of thought and expression. □

Torture in Uruguay

In a report published September 16, the World Council of Churches charged the Uruguayan government with torturing prisoners. The victims have been mostly Tupamaros, but the use of torture has also been extended "for political reasons" to "broad sectors of the population." Thousands of citizens have been held incommunicado without being brought to trial, the council charged.