

80,000 March in Paris



Rising Stench of Watergate Bugging Scandal Envelops Nixon Staff

The War Goes On: U.S. Keeps Thousands of 'Advisers' in Vietnam

Local Interviews

IMMEDIATE OPENINGS
IN VIETNAM FOR
AIRCRAFT
MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL

Applicants must have minimum of 4 years experience and have own hand tools. Must be United States citizen. Benefits include travel pay, per diem, insurance and vacation.

Crew Chiefs — Jet Fighter Aircraft

- GENERAL AIRCRAFT MECHANICS
- SHEET METAL MECHANICS
- ELECTRONIC TECHNICIANS
- ELECTRONIC TECHNICIANS (Doppler & Sensors)
- AIRCRAFT GROUND EQUIPMENT
- RECIP ENGINE MECHANICS
- JET ENGINE MECHANICS
- HELICOPTER MECHANICS
- HELICOPTER POWER TRAIN MECHANICS
- EX-AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE CHIEFS
- JET ENGINE SUPERVISORS

Chile Generals Leave Cabinet

Chisso 'Compensates' Its Victims

On March 20 a district court on the island of Kyushu, Japan, after four years of litigation, ordered the Chisso Corporation, one of Japan's major chemical firms, to pay \$3.6 million to 138 relatives of victims of mercury poisoning caused by Chisso's pollution of ocean water.

The illness, known to the Japanese as Minamata disease, has killed 68 persons and crippled more than 300 others since it appeared twenty years ago in Minimata, a fishing village on Yatsushiro Bay on Kyushu's southwest coast.

The disease first attacked the fish in Yatsushiro Bay, and then began killing pigs, dogs, cats, and crows that fed on the fish. In 1953, the townspeople began to fall victim to the malady, which destroys control over arms and legs, causes blindness and deafness, and often ends in death. Babies born with the ailment were deformed and mentally retarded.

Investigators traced the outbreak to Chisso's practice of dumping mercury wastes from its Minimata plant into the nearby bay. Despite these findings, the company adamantly refused to accept responsibility for poisoning Minimata's waters. The families, forced to care for the victims, sought redress from the courts in 1969. Their claims won wide support in Japan.

Chisso's owners did not hesitate to use violence to keep their crimes from becoming too widely known. When W. Eugene Smith, a well-known American photographer moved into the village and began photographing victims of the disease, he was attacked by a gang of company employees who brutally beat him and smashed his camera.

Although Chisso has now been ordered to pay minimal compensation, many of its victims are well aware that no amount of money can make up for the suffering they experience. Shinobu Sakamoto, a 16-year-old girl, told newsmen on January 19: "I hate Chisso. Money will not cure the disease. I want them to restore my body."

Another victim stated: "We want no money. To hell with compensation. We want Chisso's management to drink the waste from their own factory and to know the same agony." □

In This Issue

FEATURES	406	The Lambertists and the Vargaites Fall Out —by Pierre Frank
ECOLOGY	386	Chisso "Compensates" Its Victims
FRANCE	387	80,000 Students Demonstrate in Paris Streets —by Jon Rothschild
INDOCHINA WAR	390	Nixon Renews Bombing Threat—by Allen Myers
	391	Was Mylai Massacre an Army-CIA Plan?
U. S. A.	393	Watergate Stench Envelops Nixon Staff —by Fred Feldman
	408	Babak Zahraie Defeats Deportation Effort
	408	Set Antiwar Actions in 20 U. S. Cities
CHILE	396	The Generals Leave Allende's Cabinet —by Joseph Hansen
SWITZERLAND	397	Geneva SP Against Mandel Ban
ARGENTINA	397	Campana Acceptable to State Department
	401	Fourteen Sentenced in Sallustro Case
	404	ERP Kidnaps Industrialist
	405	ERP Raids Atomic Reactor
SOVIET UNION	398	Dzyuba Sentenced to Five Years in Prison —by Marilyn Vogt
	399	Kremlin Joins the Copyright Agreement
DENMARK	400	Workers in Denmark Go Out on Strike
PAKISTAN	402	U.S., Iran Keep Watch on Pakistan "Crisis" —by Allen Myers
GREAT BRITAIN	403	Women Discuss "Sexism and Capitalism"
NEW ZEALAND	404	Support Builds for Abortion March —by Kay Goodger
ISRAEL	405	Nixon Promises Meir New U. S. Arms
REVIEWS	409	Trotsky's Program for Revolution —by David Burton
	410	Australian CP's Weekly Reviews Losey Film
	410	Behind the Vietnam Cease-Fire Agreement
DOCUMENTS	411	Free All Political Prisoners in Argentina!
	413	Prisoner Writes on National Oppression in Ukraine
	415	Final Returns in Buenos Aires
	415	Platform of the Committees Against the Debre Law in France
	416	French CP Lies About Student Movement
	416	Ceylon Mercantile Union's "Demands in Defence of the People"
DRAWINGS	385	Nixon; 390, Spiro Agnew; 396, Salvador Allende; 402, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto; 405, Moshe Dayan—by Copain
	408	Babak Zahraie—by Ivan

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Mai-tan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

COPY EDITOR: Lawrence Rand.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Candida Barberena, 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 Gueme-nee, 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 © 1973 by Intercontinental Press.

80,000 Students Demonstrate in Paris Streets

By Jon Rothschild

In Paris, the demonstration had been banned by the police. On the evening of March 21, the day before it was scheduled to take place, the police department issued a communiqué that was widely disseminated by the press. "For more than a week," the cops complained, "agitation stirred up by far-left revolutionary movements has been developing among high-school students in Paris.

"To avoid any incident with the young demonstrators, the police department has, up to now, tolerated street parades, while placing limits on the inconvenience to the population."

The police went on to explain that the organizers of the March 22 demonstration against the so-called Debré law—a reform in the country's military service system that abolished deferments that had allowed high-school students to enter universities and complete a course of study before serving their mandatory year in the army—had unaccountably refused to accept a reasonable route of march. The police did not bother to mention that the organizers had presented several possible routes, but rejected the police insistence that the march run through out-of-the-way areas where it would not be noticed.

The police communiqué concluded: "Consequently, the demonstration that is planned for Thursday, March 22, is banned.

"The police department warns high-school students and their parents against any participation in this illegal demonstration. They would in that case bear full responsibility for any disorders and accidents that might result, as well as for their consequences."

But, not for the first time since the Debré law became a mass issue in the French educational system, the high-school students (and their parents?) ignored the regime's threats and pressure.

"A human sea despite the ban" was the Paris daily *Le Monde's* headline for the story on the March 22 demon-

stration. "A sea of young demonstrators—students from the high-schools, vocational schools, and private institutions of Paris and its suburbs, students from universities that are on strike, as well as many young instructors—poured into the streets of Paris's thirteenth and fourteenth arrondissements . . . Thursday [March 22] afternoon," *Le Monde* reported in its March 24 issue.

"It is very difficult to estimate how many people there were. . . . Probably it was about 80,000. According to the police it was 25,000 to 30,000. But by way of comparison, remember that the police estimate of the size of the funeral procession for the militant Marxist René-Pierre Overney [March 4, 1972] was 18,000, while in the view of many observers, there were more than 100,000."

Whether one accepts *Le Monde's* 80,000 estimate or the organizers' estimate of more than 100,000, one thing is certain. The March 22 day of national actions against the Debré law represented the largest outpouring of high-school youth since the mass revolutionary explosion of May 1968.

Considering that the demonstration was banned, the massive turnout alone would have been a victory for the students. But beyond that, the political seriousness and organizational expertise of the leaders of the action and of the rank-and-file participants clearly surprised the government. *Le Monde* explained the tactical maneuvering necessary to bring off the march:

"The ban on the demonstration obligated the organizers to pass the word late in the morning that there would be five assembly points . . . to form contingents that would converge on the Place Denfert-Rochereau. The few thousand isolated students who had not received their orders soon found the spot; it was ringed by significant police forces who tried to dissuade the youngest—girls and boys sometimes only twelve to fifteen years old—but let the older ones pass through.

"Nevertheless, people did slip through, beginning early in the afternoon. From 1:00 p.m. on, the subway trains were filled with youth converging on the meeting points. Sometimes, there was an air of mystery, people whispering on the platforms and at the interchanges; elsewhere, it was an explosion, people already singing and shouting slogans."

Once the demonstrators had evaded the police and assembled at the five jumping-off points, the cops adopted a new tactic: barring the contingents from getting to Place Denfert-Rochereau. It was in these situations that small clashes with the police occurred.

"The same scenario took place in various areas," *Le Monde* wrote. "The march would stop in front of a force of police; then there would be 'negotiations' with the officers in charge, who were almost always ill at ease standing before such a crowd of very young people for whom they had responsibility and against whom they might have to charge, driving back the contingent. The demonstrators' defense guard, youth in crash helmets, maintained a remarkable calm in every case, keeping the most energetic high-schoolers from breaking out of the line and trying to keep any panic among the pupils to a minimum."

But the general police policy clearly was to try to provoke incidents, hoping then to blame them on the allegedly unruly students who had come out to an illegal action. In at least one case, the cops charged the demonstrators and used tear gas against them. But for the most part, the defense guard was able to maintain order and prevent any mass attacks on the marchers. The demonstrators had outmaneuvered the police, who apparently decided that against tens of thousands of people, discretion was the better part of copdom.

In the provinces, the March 22 actions were legal—and frequently were

the largest political demonstrations to have taken place in years. Some of the figures:

In Toulouse 30,000; in Lyon 12,000; in Grenoble 10,000; in Lille 4,000, with 80 percent of the high-school students observing a strike and with a total of 50,000 people demonstrating in various cities in the area; at Amiens, 4,000; in Strasbourg, 7,000 (17,000 in all the cities of Alsace); in Limoges, 3,000-4000; in Dijon, 8,000; in Bordeaux, 4,000-5000; in Aix-en-Provence, 4,000.

Well more than 50 percent of the high-school students in most areas stayed away from school on March 22. In many places, strikes were 80-100 percent effective. *Le Monde* reported that hardly any significant clashes with the police occurred: "the demonstrators' defense guards proved to be extremely efficient."

There was one more notable feature of the March 22 actions. Up to one day before the national day of protest, which had been called March 14 by a national conference of the Committees of Struggle Against the Debré law (CSADL)—broad action committees which the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International, has played a major role in initiating and leading—the Communist party had refused to endorse the action. The Stalinists denounced the local struggle committees and proclaimed their own high-school group, the Union Nationale des Comités d'Action Lycéens (UNCAL—National Union of High-School Action Committees), to be the authoritative leader of the high-school movement.

The CP even called a demonstration for March 21, a clear attempt to undermine the struggle committees. But the CP was forced to come into the demonstrations. On March 21, the CP newspaper *l'Humanité* suddenly switched its line and urged CP supporters to march in the demonstrations. But the bureaucrats combined their turn with the usual pack of lies, even suggesting that the March 21 action had been called before the March 22 demonstrations (see "French CP Lies About High-School Movement," page 416 of this issue).

"Once again the division between the politicians and the youth seems complete," wrote Frédéric Gaussen in the March 24 *Le Monde*. "Once again the [Gaullist parliamentary] majority is



Part of a demonstration that took place in Paris before March 22 national action day.

completely out of a controversy raised by the youth. Once again the left parties [i.e., the Communist and Socialist parties], despite the efforts of some of their members, find themselves at cross purposes and put in an uncomfortable situation, having to support a movement that developed outside them and that they do not control."

The high-schoolers wasted no time demonstrating that their chant "This is only the beginning" was meant literally. On March 24 the CSADLs held a meeting in Paris at which two new target dates were decided. March 28 was set as a national "day of explanation" designed to reach adults—notably the working class—with the message of the anti-Debré-law struggle.

Another day of national action against the law was set for April 2, the date the newly elected parliament convenes and also the day a large quota of youth are to be inducted into the armed forces.

The CP's high-school outfit, UNCAL, held a separate meeting on March 24 and called its own "day of explanation" for March 27, thus proving that the Stalinists' efforts to take charge of the movement by circumventing the democratically selected bodies that have been leading the struggle had not been abandoned. But the UNCAL meeting agreed to April 2 as the next focus for national demonstrations.

The Universities Plunge In

The high-school students were the first in France to take to the streets after the electoral campaign. But they were not the only ones. Another Gaullist-inspired "reform," separate from but related to the Debré law, began to provoke mass resistance from university students just as the high-school demonstrations were building toward March 22.

This reform deals with education. Like the Debré law, it answers a bourgeois political and economic need, and like the Debré law, it was slipped into effect by the regime just before the elections—in fact, on the very eve of the elections, March 3.

Known as the Fontanet law (after Joseph Fontanet, minister of national education), it is actually a series of seven decrees. Its terms are complex and will take effect over several years, but its main provision, which goes into effect next term, is the creation of the DEUG—Diplôme d'Etudes Universitaires Générales (General University Studies Diploma).

The DEUG is intended to replace two existing degrees (in letters and sciences) for the first cycle of French university education. (The first cycle corresponds roughly to undergraduate study in U.S. colleges and universities.) It will be conferred after two years of study.

The regime has heralded the DEUG as a landmark advance in egalitarian and liberal education. Its real intent is rather more down to earth. The March 4-5 *Le Monde*, in explaining the Fontanet decrees, noted: "The first-cycle reform is a response to two facts; first, too many students quit the university without getting any degree; second, the degrees conferred correspond poorly to employment possibilities."

And further: "The minister's intentions are thus clear: He is concerned with increasing the proportion of students leaving the university after two years of study by making sure they can get a diploma with a recognized value."

A recognized economic value is more specific. "The aim is twofold," wrote the March 23 issue of the *Ligue Communiste's* weekly newspaper, *Rouge*: "To provide the employers with the semieducated labor they need for subordinate technical and administrative tasks; to tie up the students in a web of training full of restrictions under the continuous control of their superiors, under a discipline only slightly different from that of high school; in a word, to get hold of the students so as to ward off the threat of a new May 1968."

"It is thus obvious that the creation of the DEUG is intended as a complement to the Debré law on abolishing deferments: It involves

compulsory intensive study and an intensification of study material, and it limits students' rights to repeat courses. The Debré law and the Fontanet decrees will thus have a common result, and that is to reinforce social selection. The youth coming from modest financial origins will take up their studies after their year in the army; then, DEUG in hand, they will head directly into the labor market, where they will constitute for the employers a raw labor force, malleable and willing to work for a pittance, prepared to undergo further on-the-job training under the pretext of continuing education or professional advancement."

The university struggle against the Fontanet decrees began somewhat more slowly than the high-school movement against the Debré law. In part, this can be accounted for by the fact that the high-schoolers, denied the right to vote, were less affected by the electoral doldrums than were their university counterparts. But by the last week in March, university strikes were beginning to take root throughout the country.

The March 24-25 *Le Monde* reported universities on strike in Toulouse, Marseille, Saint-Etienne, Nantes, Rennes, Brest, and Paris.

By March 27, according to the influential bourgeois daily, "the majority of Parisian universities were partly or completely affected by strike movements by students acting against the reform of first-cycle higher education . . . and against the almost complete abolition of deferments."

In the provinces university strikes were also on the rise. New actions had broken out in Montpellier, Bordeaux, Marseille, Tours, Besançon, Poitiers, and Caen. In some universities the strikes were accompanied by occupations of administrative offices.

With the elections out of the way, and with both movements growing fast, the high-school and university actions are tending to become more and more closely tied. The DEUG and the Debré law are increasingly seen as complementary aspects of the same process of militarization and discipline of youth. The April 2 target date has become a day of demonstrations against both laws, and the movement has gotten large enough to draw significant support from the working class. □

A New Wave of Youth Revolt

"What is now going on in France, this extraordinary mobilization of youth, is part of a deeper and broader wave on a European scale," wrote Daniel Bensaïd in the March 23 *Rouge*. The French student upsurge was immediately preceded by a similar high-school revolt in Belgium, also around questions of militarization of youth. In Italy, West Germany, Great Britain, and even Spain and Greece, the student movement has experienced a new height of activity during past months.

But the present student revolt is occurring under conditions that are quite different from those of 1968-69, the time of the last major upsurge. The youth revolt today coincides more closely with a corresponding rise of working-class struggles. In some respects, the educational and military reforms proposed in France (and in Belgium) relate directly to the bourgeoisie's economic and social requirements under the new situation created by the persistent monetary crisis and the intensified interimperialist competition. Laws like the Debré reform or the Fontanet decrees are but an aspect of the West European bourgeoisie's twofold and complementary aims of rationalizing their economies and regimenting their youth so as to beat back the youth radicalization and harden labor discipline.

In this context, the youth upsurge takes on a profoundly radical character. The fight against what appear to be technical changes in the military service system and in the educational system becomes in reality a fundamental clash with the class needs of the bourgeoisie.

When this content is combined with the forms the youth struggle has taken (general assemblies of students to make decisions, organization of broad action committees to direct struggles, democratic decision-making, and so on), the high-school and university upsurge becomes much more threatening, not only to the ruling class, but to the trade-union bureaucracy (especially the Stalinists) as well.

When the Paris high-school students dispersed after their March 22 demonstration, one of the things they chanted was "Hot, hot, springtime will be hot!" And well it might. Not only for the Gaullist "majority," but for the Stalinist bureaucrats as well. □

Nixon Renews Bombing Threat

By Allen Myers

Writing from Saigon in the April 1 *New York Times*, Sylvan Fox quoted the remark of a journalist on the night of March 29, immediately after all U.S. military personnel had supposedly been withdrawn:

"What I'd like to know is whether this is the last week of the Second Indochina War or the first week of the Third. Or both."

The answer to the journalist's question is neither. Despite the January 27 cease-fire agreement, neither the "Second Indochina War" nor the U.S. involvement in it has come to an end.

This is most immediately evident in Cambodia, where U.S. B-52s continue daily raids in an effort to prop up the tottering dictatorship of the puppet regime. But it is equally true of Laos and Vietnam, as has been made clear by press reports and the words of Richard Nixon himself.

In a March 29 televised speech supposedly marking the achievement of "peace with honor" in Vietnam, Nixon for the second time in two weeks accused the Vietnamese liberation forces of violating the cease-fire and threatened to renew the bombing of Vietnam:

"There are still some problem areas: the provision of the agreement requiring an accounting for all missing in action in Indochina; the provision with regard to Laos; the provision prohibiting infiltration from North Vietnam into South Vietnam have not been complied with.

"We have and will continue to comply with the agreement.

"We shall insist that North Vietnam comply with the agreement and the leaders of North Vietnam should have no doubt as to the consequences if they fail to comply with the agreement."

"The warning," John Herbers wrote in the *New York Times* the next day, "was somewhat stronger than that in his March 15 news conference. . . ."

There were basically two objects in Nixon's remarks. One, of course, was to intimidate the Vietnamese liberation fighters. The second was to create a

justification for the bombing of Cambodia and for renewed bombing of Vietnam that would seem reasonable to U.S. public opinion.

Prior to January 27, Nixon had attempted to justify the genocidal air raids over Indochina as necessary "to protect American forces when they are engaged in military actions." With the



AGNEW: "Impressed" by prompt response of puppets in Saigon.

agreement to withdraw U.S. troops, it became necessary to find another rationale. For the obliteration of Cambodian villages, Nixon has so far come up with no pretext more convincing than a "request" from Lon Nol. For any renewed bombing in Vietnam, it appears, the rationale will be "violations" of the cease-fire by the liberation forces.

There are, of course, continual violations of the cease-fire, but they are being committed by Nixon and his puppets in Saigon—a fact so obvious that it has even begun to find its way into the U.S. capitalist press. When Nixon speaks of "violations" by the liberation forces, he means resistance

to the armed attacks of Thieu's U.S.-armed, U.S.-financed, U.S.-directed army.

"Both sides have been guilty of cease-fire violations," Daniel Southerland wrote from Saigon in the March 30 *Christian Science Monitor*.

"But this reporter's own impression after traveling extensively in three provinces has been that the Saigon government has been guilty in by far the greatest number of cases of launching offensive operations into territory held by the other side. Quite a few Saigon troop casualties seem to be attributable to Saigon attempts to build outposts in zones which have been recognized for years as National Liberation Front base areas. The Thieu government also seems to feel that it has the right, despite the cease-fire, to take back territory which it lost during last year's big Communist offensive.

"In one case, this reporter was interviewing NLF fighters in a village which had long been held by the liberation front and where the people clearly supported the front when heavily armed Saigon troops launched an operation into the village. The outnumbered front soldiers did not fight back."

In the March 29 *Washington Post*, H. D. S. Greenway provided additional information on Saigon's violations of the cease-fire in the days immediately after it was signed:

"The days immediately preceding the cease-fire in January were as bloody as any period during the war," one American official said. About 350 hamlets were seized by the Communists and it took the government about three weeks to get them back and a few more as well.

"Therefore the fighting between Jan. 28 and Feb. 18 was very heavy. On Feb. 18, Sahuynh, the only Communist-controlled town on the South China Sea capable of becoming a deep water port, fell to South Vietnamese forces. Since then the level of violence has fallen. 'We got most of what we could safely get by the end of February,' one South Vietnamese source said."

Even the statistics put out by the Thieu regime indicate which side is violating the cease-fire. According to Saigon, in the sixty days after the cease-fire agreement, 15,149 members of the liberation forces were killed.

Thieu's army put its dead at about one-fifth that number — 3,126.

At a March 31 press conference, Major General Le Quang Hoa, the chief North Vietnamese delegate to the four-party joint Military Commission, and Colonel Vo Dong Giang, a Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) spokesman, charged Nixon and Thieu with "sabotaging" the cease-fire.

"General Hoa," Sylvan Fox reported in the April 1 *New York Times*, "said that while the United States has ended its overt military involvement in South Vietnam, it 'continues its military involvement' by turning its military personnel 'into disguised civilian personnel to assist the Saigon army.'"

Colonel Giang accused the Thieu regime of 19,700 "serious" violations of the agreement. "He said that if Saigon continued its 'land grabbing,' the Vietcong would strike back. 'We have restrained ourselves,' he said, 'but there is a limit to our restraint.'"

Giang also charged that Nixon had kept 17,000 military personnel disguised as civilians in South Vietnam. (It has already been reported in the U. S. press that the Pentagon plans to employ 20,000 or more "civilian advisers"—many of them abruptly discharged from the military in order to become civilians—in South Vietnam. See *Intercontinental Press*, April 2, p. 355.)

The U. S. State Department has so far admitted that there are still "about 8,500" U. S. citizens in South Vietnam. In the March 29 *New York Times*, Bernard Gwertzman described some of the functions of these "civilians":

"About 5,000 are so-called 'contract' employes hired by private American companies working for the South Vietnamese Government. These include a large number of Americans involved in the upkeep and maintenance of advanced military equipment such as jet planes and high-speed communications equipment given to Saigon just before the cease-fire agreement.

"About 1,200 civilians will be attached to the 80-man military attaché's office in the embassy, supervising the continuing military aid that is permitted on a one-for-one replacement rate. There will continue to be large economic aid missions as well as a bolstered embassy staff."

Clearly, the U. S. embassy in Sai-

gon is the largest in the history of international diplomacy. No doubt Nixon will insist that the liberation forces respect the diplomatic immunity of this embassy staff as it travels around South Vietnam replacing the weaponry that Thieu's army is expending against them.

Vice President Spiro Agnew recently let slip some additional information about U. S. plans for the future of South Vietnam. Not surprisingly, he revealed that the country will continue to be made safe for imperialist investment.

Agnew was interviewed by reporters after his return from a visit to Saigon. Godfrey Sperling Jr. quoted some of his remarks in the March 27 *Christian Science Monitor*:

"We had a joint meeting between [U. S. 'advisers'] and the young Vietnamese, most of whom were trained either in this country or in Great Britain—to discuss what is needed for Vietnam as we move from a condition

of actual warfare into a peacetime economy.

"There is great realism about the fact there are going to be skirmishes and incidents but a knowledge that Vietnam has to revise its economy and has to become attractive to investment and has to move people into peacetime pursuits.

"And the thing that impressed me there was that all the Vietnamese advisers were in key with what our advisers recommended. . . ."

Nixon's administration has thus given us a fairly precise definition of the meaning of "peace with honor" in Vietnam. A puppet regime is to be permanently maintained in Saigon and its army, under the direction of U. S. "advisers," is to have complete freedom to attack the liberated areas. Serious resistance by the liberation forces will be met by bombs.

Whether one calls it the second or the third Indochina war, the war goes on. □

New Evidence Uncovered

Was Mylai Massacre an Army-CIA Plan?

Five years after the massacre of hundreds of South Vietnamese civilians by U. S. troops at Mylai, those persons responsible for the atrocity remain unpunished and even to a large extent unidentified. The administration headed by the biggest war criminal of them all has maintained that the slaughter was an "aberration" rather than an inseparable part of U. S. policy, and has so far prevented any investigation that could bring to light all those higher-ups who played a role in the massacre.

Now a U. S. newspaper has uncovered new evidence indicating that the destruction of Mylai was *deliberately planned* by the army and the CIA as a means of terrorizing the population in the region.

The March 25 issue of the *Oklahoma City Daily Oklahoman* carries an article by Jack Taylor based on interviews with five Pentagon officers who have had access to secret data on the massacre, two of whom say they were personally involved in planning the attack.

All five of his sources, Taylor in-

dicated, "believe the Army and the Defense Department are perpetuating a cover-up about the more serious aspects of the massacre and even more serious and numerous atrocities committed by American troops. One of the sources said other incidents 'make My Lai look like a Sunday school picnic.'

"All of the sources agreed to talk after being guaranteed anonymity. 'I can't blow the whistle,' one said, 'because they'll crucify me.'"

Taylor's informants indicated that the Mylai assault was connected with the notorious Operation Phoenix, the CIA's program of assassination of suspected members of the "Vietcong infrastructure."

Even before the Tet offensive of February 1968, many U. S. officials had begun to feel that individual assassinations were not terrorizing the population sufficiently and needed to be supplemented by larger operations. This was later indicated by a 1969 National Security Study Memorandum:

"Most easy targets have already

been hit and there are indications that some of the intelligence agencies involved are already beginning to exhaust their data bases. . . .

"As easy targets disappear, reliance upon large-scale cordon and search operations and less on rifle-shot efforts based on detailed intelligence; cordon and search operations may get VC supporters and guerrillas, but rarely members of the infrastructure. . . .

"We have no systematic or continuing evidence on the 'side effects' of the Phoenix program. There are those who feel that the Phoenix-Phung Hoang program, in particular the operation of the PRUs [Provincial Reconnaissance Units, the CIA-directed striking arm of Phoenix] may be counter-productive as it alienates the non-committed population more than it hurts the VCI [Vietcong infrastructure]."

Much the same idea was expressed in less bureaucratic language by James A. May, the senior U.S. "adviser" for the "pacification" program in Quang Ngai province (in which Mylai is located) at the time of the massacre. In 1967 May told author Jonathan Schell:

"In a few areas, the villages have been destroyed. This is a necessary side effect if you're going to fight hard. . . . The VC use villages as protection, the way a gangster uses a hostage.

"So in the process of getting at Charlie [the liberation forces] it's inevitable that the village gets it. . . . To me, it's just like the Second World War in places in France and Italy where the villages were wiped out as far as you could see.

"You just can't get at the enemy unless you get at them where they're at. There isn't any way to get them but *level the villages they're located in*. . . . So I expect to see a lot more destruction" (emphasis added).

When May later testified at one of the Mylai courts-martial, portions of his testimony were kept secret from the public.

There exists documentary evidence that the army was ordered by the Defense Department to cooperate with the CIA in Phoenix-type operations, particularly when these operations were on a large scale. For example, National Security Action Memorandum No. 162, dated June 19, 1962, states:

"More Special Forces personnel will

be assigned to support CIA covert paramilitary operations where acute insurgency situations exist. The Department of Defense has taken steps to expedite these assignments. In addition the Department of Defense will increase its capacity to fund, support, and conduct wholly or partly covert paramilitary operations. . . .

"Where such an operation is to be wholly covert or disavowable, it may be assigned to CIA, provided that it is within the normal capabilities of the agency. Any large paramilitary operation wholly or partly covert which requires significant numbers of militarily trained personnel, amounts of military equipment which exceed normal CIA-controlled stocks and/or military experience of a kind and level peculiar to the Armed Forces is properly the primary responsibility of the Department of Defense with the CIA in a supporting role."

"It was in such a setting," Taylor wrote, that "the planning for the destruction of My Lai took place, the sources say. One who was there and in on the planning talked about it for the first time.

"Barker [Lieutenant Colonel Frank Barker, who was killed in a helicopter crash several months after the massacre], the task force commander, worked in close coordination with CIA agents headquartered in Quang Ngai City, and CIA agents involved in the Phoenix program met with Barker in his headquarters to 'set up' the operation, the source, now at the Pentagon, said.

"The same source said: 'Prior to the operation of going into My Lai there was a previous operation where they went down there and blew hell out of a lot of people—a real shoot-'em-up, and they had the boys from Quang Ngai [CIA agents] with them on that event.'"

The same officer said that orders for the complete destruction of the village were given by Barker to Captain Ernest Medina, who was later tried but acquitted on charges of murder.

"He sat right there and told Medina, and Medina came out and said, 'This is it, boys,' and that's why Medina got in the jam that he got in, because Medina—based on what Barker told him—set the deal up, and then everybody backed out on it and ran from Medina. Nobody would back Medina up."

According to Taylor, "Medina told an original investigator that Barker claimed to have been given permission to burn My Lai because, according to Barker, 'It is the last time we are going into that place and we want it cleaned out.' . . .

"One Pentagon source said . . . that Barker even wanted B52 strikes on the village and 15-ton plows to plow it under after the operation."

The contention that the army and CIA planned the Mylai massacre receives circumstantial support from the way in which the government handled the Mylai courts-martial.

"Throughout the My Lai proceedings," Taylor noted, "issues over military intelligence, CIA operations and the Phoenix program were met with apprehension—and secrecy—whenever they arose.

"Whenever such issues cropped up in courts-martial, the Army promptly shied away. When subpoenas of CIA operatives were threatened, charges were dismissed."

Of twenty-five persons originally charged with crimes at Mylai, only six were brought to trial and only one—Lieutenant William Calley—convicted. Taylor quoted the words of one defense attorney who was able to subpoena three CIA agents:

"We got those subpoenas ordered. They [CIA agents] came down and briefed us. Within a week the Army dropped the charges. The subpoenas were what did it." □

Six in South Africa Charged With 'Terrorism'

Six persons were scheduled to go on trial in Pretoria March 19 under the notorious Terrorism Act. According to the March 17 issue of the Johannesburg weekly *Star*, the six are:

"Mr Alexandre Moumbaris (34), an Australian born in Egypt of French parentage, Mr John William Hosey (23), of Northern Ireland, Mr Tloi Theophilus Cholo (45) and Mr Gardener Sandi Sijaka (30), both of the Transkei, and Mr Maquina Justice Mpanza (34) and Mr Petrus Aron Mtambu (37), both of Natal."

The defendants are charged in a total of nineteen counts. They are accused of conspiring with the banned African National Congress to "encourage violent revolution," bringing arms and explosives into the country, having sought "military and political training in Russia and in African states north of the Zambezi," and distributing pamphlets containing "hostile propaganda." □

Watergate Stench Envelops Nixon Staff

By Fred Feldman

At the March 23 sentencing of the seven men convicted of raiding the Watergate Hotel offices of the Democratic party in Washington last June, Judge John J. Sirica had a surprise for all but one of them. "I have a preliminary matter which will be considered before arguments on the motion and sentencing," he announced.

Sirica then read a letter from James W. McCord Jr., a 54-year-old former CIA and FBI bureaucrat who was security coordinator for the Committee to Re-elect the President [CREEP] when he and his companions were arrested while trying to bug the Democratic party headquarters.

While the other prisoners and McCord's own attorneys stared in amazement, the judge read the letter. It said that "there was political pressure applied to the defendants to plead guilty and remain silent" at their January trials. (Five defendants—E. Howard Hunt, Bernard L. Barker, Frank Sturgis, Virgilio Gonzalez, and Eugenio Martinez—entered guilty pleas, while McCord and G. Gordon Liddy pleaded innocent.)

McCord charged that "perjury occurred during the trial in matters highly material to . . . the government's case."

One passage of the letter was certain to evoke feelings of insecurity in high Republican circles: "Others involved in the Watergate operations were not identified during the trial, when they could have been by those testifying."

"Members of my family," McCord wrote, "have expressed fear for my life if I disclose knowledge of the facts in this matter. . . . I do believe that retaliatory measures will be taken against me, my family, and my friends should I disclose such facts."

McCord offered to meet Sirica in secret session to tell the whole story. He declined to speak to the FBI or to the Justice Department. He said his decision to talk was influenced by fear that Sirica would deal harshly with conspirators who kept silent. His fear was well-founded. Sirica pro-

ceeded to sentence G. Gordon Liddy, formerly CREEP's financial counsel, to six to twenty years in prison. The other five defendants received "provisional" sentences of thirty-five and forty years. Sirica indicated he would reconsider the sentences if the five followed McCord's example.

Since the Watergate arrests last June, selective leaks from FBI files have indicated that the raid was part of a large-scale espionage and sabotage campaign against the Democrats organized by CREEP with the knowledge of members of Nixon's vast personal entourage.

A leak is only a leak. But McCord's letter threatened to blow the whole thing. That being the case, observers in Washington wondered whether the other defendants, silent so far, might try to save their own skins by following McCord's lead.

The convicted snoopers have not received the support they apparently had expected from higher-ups, and they are becoming bitter as they face the prospect of long prison terms. For example, Hunt, a former consultant to the Nixon administration who played a leading role in the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion, reportedly told friends, "I thought I stood up and took my medicine like a good little man, but then I find out that a stand-up guy is one who stands up and tells what he knows."

Before a private meeting between Sirica and McCord could be set up, McCord appeared before a Senate subcommittee investigating the ramifications of Watergate. That session was secret, of course, but according to a summary of his testimony leaked to the press, McCord implicated a bevy of Nixon's closest friends and advisers in the Watergate escapade.

The March 30 *New York Times* reported some of the substance of McCord's remarks: "John N. Mitchell, who left his post as Attorney General to serve as Mr. Nixon's campaign director, approved the espionage activity and served as 'overall boss' of the team that mounted it.



GRAY: So trusting of Nixon that even Senators found it hard to believe.

"John W. Dean 3d, counsel to the President, sat in on a planning meeting with two men ultimately convicted as conspirators, heard their plans and later reported that the operation had been approved. McCord apparently did not say who had given the approval.

"H.R. Haldeman, the White House chief of staff, 'knew what was going on' at the Committee for the Re-election of the President. . . .

"Robert C. Mardian, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Internal Security Division, had been in contact with McCord, who invoked the Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination when asked the circumstances.

"Charles W. Colson, former special counsel to the President, was thought by McCord to have received a detailed plan for the Watergate operation from E. Howard Hunt Jr., who pleaded guilty to the conspiracy."

Another Nixon aide reported to have been implicated by McCord was

Jeb Stuart Magruder, described as second in command in the CREEP.

If that summary is accurate, McCord has fingered many of the leading lights of Nixon's personal staff. It is possible that these public servants were involved in a complex intrigue without the boss's knowledge; however, Nixon has a reputation for attention to organizational detail and is reportedly a hard man to put one over on.

To obviate hasty conclusions as to Presidential guilt, it is only fair to report that before McCord testified, Nixon gave Republican Senator Hugh Scott a categorical denial of any presidential involvement: "Hugh, I have

nothing to hide. I have nothing to hide. I repeat that I have nothing to hide, and you are authorized to make that statement in my name."

Perhaps not. But McCord's bombshell was not the only Watergate blow the regime suffered. Administration efforts to keep the investigation and the flow of information about the case under tight control came to light during hearings begun in early March by the Senate Judiciary Committee on the nomination of L. Patrick Gray, a Nixon crony who succeeded J. Edgar Hoover as head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Gray's testimony revealed that presidential counsel John W. Dean III had closely supervised the FBI's inquiries into the

case. When the Watergate scandal broke last June, Nixon asked Dean to "investigate" the incident. With remarkable speed, Dean announced that no one "presently employed" by the administration had been involved. (In fact, it now appears that almost everyone "presently employed" by the administration was involved.)

Under questioning by the Senate, Gray admitted that Dean had not always been truthful with the FBI investigators assigned to the Watergate case. In one instance Dean told the FBI (on June 22) that he would have to "check" whether Watergate raider E. Howard Hunt had a White House office.

As it turns out, Dean knew very well that Hunt had such an office. In fact, he had entered it three days earlier and had broken into the safe and carried off the contents. One week later, most (not all) of the material was turned over to the FBI.

Gray was untroubled by the fact that Dean had withheld evidence from the FBI. "The president's got a rather substantial interest as to what might be in those papers," said Gray. "I see nothing irregular about it."

Gray's testimony revealed the great effort he had made to keep Dean abreast of the latest developments in the case. Dean was permitted to sit in on FBI interviews with White House personnel; he was given eighty-two FBI files on the Watergate raid. Outraged by suggestions that this could result in administration reprisals against people who had given information to the FBI, Gray said, "I don't think John Dean would do that. He's the counsel to the president."

Gray insisted that he would continue to give Dean FBI files. "That man is counsel to the president of the United States," said the awestruck Gray, adding, "I'm going to cooperate. That is my duty."

Gray's statements led to demands that Dean be called to testify before the Senate. Nixon reacted by barring his personal aides from testifying before any Congressional committee on the grounds of "executive privilege." After the McCord revelations, however, Nixon began to back off from this position, and aides indicated that he might be amenable to letting staff members testify in secret sessions.



James McCord, the man who sang for his freedom.

Despite Gray's expressions of reverence for Nixon and his corps of clean young men, the administration seems to have been disturbed by the FBI director's loquacity before the Senate committee.

On March 20 Gray told the senators that he had been ordered by Attorney General Kleindienst not to answer any more questions about Watergate. Somewhat crestfallen, Gray appealed to the Senate to stop asking questions and "vote up or down" on his nomination.

Noting that Gray's rejection by the Judiciary Committee was all but certain, Senator Birch Bayh, an Indiana Democrat, charged that Nixon had "decided to throw Gray to the wolves."

But McCord's decision to blow the whistle on his superiors in the spy ring made it likely that someone more important than Gray would have to be tossed to the wolves. The April 2 issue of *Newsweek* speculated, "The handicapping kept coming back to [former Attorney General John] Mitchell, who, having already left the employ of the President, might be available for sacrifice. 'That would be logical, wouldn't it?' said one insider. 'It doesn't hurt anybody.'"

One person who remains unimpressed with the power of this logic is Martha Mitchell, wife of the scapegoat-elect. On March 27 she telephoned the *New York Times* and said, "I fear for my husband. I'm really scared. I have a definite reason. I can't tell you why. But they're not going to pin anything on him. I won't let them and I don't give a damn who gets hurt. I can name names."

"If you hear that I'm sick," she warned, "or can't talk, please, please, get your reporters out to find me. Somebody might try to shut me up."

Some politicians who are on the outs with Nixon or his army of retainers are also unwilling to let matters rest with Mitchell as scapegoat. Senator Lowell P. Weicker, a Connecticut Republican who has carried out his own investigation, challenged McCord's claim that Mitchell was the "overall boss." Weicker charged that the head of the espionage and sabotage campaign is still on the White House staff.

On April 1, Weicker stated that Nixon's most powerful assistant, H. R. Haldeman, had "probable knowledge" of a plan in which Mc-



DEAN: The clean-cut young man who emptied Hunt's safe.

Cord was to oversee spying activities against leading Democratic senators and representatives.

The Democrats believe that the exposure of the police-state methods used by Nixon's cronies against the "loyal opposition" has given them a ready-made issue for the 1974 congressional campaigns. "They're making our campaign for us," one exultant Democrat told *Newsweek*.

Some Republicans agree and are asking Nixon to change course, sacrifice a staff member or two, and make a "clean breast" of it to the public.

Administration officials defend a policy of holding tough by pointing to surveys that show widespread public indifference to the scandal. Indeed, the American people have grown used to lies and corruption among politicians of both parties and so far have tended to view the Watergate business as a falling out among crooks, of no special concern to them.

To reap a harvest of votes, the Democrats will have to turn up some real dirt to convince the citizenry that their president is a scoundrel unworthy of the office. And therein lies the Democrats' dilemma. For adopting this course would mean undermining the sanctified institutions of American bourgeois democracy: the two party system, "free" elections, the cabinet, and most of all, the presidency itself.

Respect for these institutions, as opposed to the individuals who may occupy them, is a major pillar of American political stability. The leadership of the Democratic party recognizes that its party interests are indissolubly linked to the sacrosanctness of these institutions. The last thing the loyal opposition wants is a no-holds-barred mudslinging match from which both parties might emerge discredited. After all, if the Republicans are tagged with the Watergate mess, what could they reveal about the Democrats?

Nor is it in the interests of the Democrats to escalate the inquiry until the really important question is posed: If this is how capitalist politicians treat each other when the stakes are merely high elective office, what kind of espionage and sabotage campaigns are waged against the working class and its allies? And to what lengths will the politicians of both parties go as the class struggle intensifies?

One thing is certain: Whatever Watergate revelations leak out through Democratic-Republican alley fighting, they will be but a fraction of the criminal activities that have become part of the day-to-day game of capitalist politics in the United States. That is, unless another Daniel Ellsberg with a healthy measure of courage and an unlimited access to a Xerox machine turns up. In that case, the possibilities are immense. Here is a little tidbit that exemplifies what might be turned up.

Jack Anderson, the nationally syndicated columnist whose ability to uncover administration secrets has made him a persistent thorn in Nixon's side, wrote in his March 29 column: "Our sources say the President ordered an espionage-sabotage effort in 1971 after Maine's Sen. Ed Muskie, then the Democratic front runner, began to pass him in the presidential polls. . . . Another early objective was to push Alabama's Gov. George Wallace and South Dakota's George McGovern, who the President believed would be the easiest Democrats for him to beat."

And: "A former member of the Nixon Cabinet told us about watching the President go through the pantomime of plunging an imaginary knife into an opponent. 'After you get the knife in,' said the President gleefully, 'you twist it.' And he twisted his wrist to demonstrate." □

The Generals Leave Allende's Cabinet

By Joseph Hansen

President Salvador Allende's announcement March 27 of the composition of his new cabinet caused some surprise internationally. He said that he had accepted the resignation of the three generals, who had become a more and more prominent feature of his regime, and had named three civilians to their posts.

Army Commander in Chief General Carlos González Prats, the minister of the interior, Air Force General Claudio Sepulveda, the minister of mining, and Rear Admiral Daniel Arellano, the minister of public works, were replaced by Gerardo Espinoza, a Socialist, Sergio Bitar, a left Christian Democrat, and Humberto Martones, a Radical.

The departure of the generals did not seem compatible at first sight with the widely held view that they were moving toward taking power in view of the sharpening class tensions in Chile and the increasing polarization in the political arena. Does the shift in makeup of Allende's cabinet show that the danger of a military takeover has been overcome?

It is true that Allende did better in the March 4 legislative elections than the ultrarightists expected. They were counting on a two-thirds vote for the bourgeois opposition, which they thought would be proof positive of the erosion of popular support for Allende's Unidad Popular (Popular Unity) coalition, thereby justifying an immediate military coup and eliminating the need to wait for the 1976 elections for a change in regime.

The vote for the UP candidates, however, was 43.4%, which was an impressive gain over the 36.6% that won office for Allende in the presidential elections of 1970. Instead of 66% or better, as they had hoped, the combined bourgeois opposition candidates received only 54.7%.

Despite this relatively favorable electoral showing, Allende continues to face the perspective of an intensifying class struggle in which long survival for his regime is hardly in the cards. Chilean capitalism is not viable in

face of the pressure from U.S. imperialism on the one hand and the demands of the masses on the other. Inflation alone continually goads the masses into action.

Chilean democracy itself, for all the boasts of its protagonists, cannot be maintained for a prolonged period un-



SALVADOR ALLENDE

der such circumstances. The Chilean capitalists, in fact, have already been debating whether it is not beyond their economic means. Hence the appearance of ultrarightist and fascistlike bands. Concomitant to this, the uneasiness of the working class and its allies and the formation of various types of committees on the rank-and-file level in both cities and countryside—concerned at present mostly about defending their standard of living, about decent housing, distribution of the land, prices, etc.—constitute signs of the rising level of political consciousness in Chile.

Last October, the mounting tensions flared into a widespread bourgeois "strike" that shook the Allende regime. The workers began to counter this

"strike" with defensive actions of their own.

The rapidly increasing polarization of political forces led Allende on November 2, 1972, to bring the three top generals into his cabinet.

His action was highly revealing as to the class nature of the Popular Unity. Besides the Socialist and Communist parties and some bourgeois splinters, the army-party (as some have dubbed the military in Latin America) was included in the coalition. In the cabinet, General Carlos Prats stood next to Allende. This showed in a decisive way what influence the most powerful bourgeois party in Chile actually wielded in the regime set up by the Popular Unity. This proof that the Popular Unity is class collaborationist to the core could hardly be more convincing.

Allende called in the generals—if only temporarily—to strengthen his regime against the ultrarightists and those among the bourgeoisie who, out of fear and impatience, were provoking the masses, possibly goading them into actions that once started could end by bringing down the entire capitalist structure in Chile in short order.

Although the generals blocked with Allende against the right from November till March, thereby seemingly supporting the left, their real role was to dampen the class struggle. The generals, especially General Prats, played the role of "savior" when the country appeared to be on the verge of civil war.

But the mere inclusion of the generals in the cabinet raised apprehensions in the far left in Chile—the left wing of the Socialist party, the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (MIR), the Trotskyists, and similar formations. They feared a coup d'état by the "gorillas," an outcome that was clearly inherent in the political role assumed by the generals in the Allende regime.

This fear became a new element in the polarization. Warnings about the danger of a take-over became more insistent and more widely heard. The issue began to give a keener cutting edge to the propaganda of the far left concerning the bourgeois nature of Allende's government, the need to end with capitalism once and for all, the need to carry out the socialist

revolution, to prepare for a test of arms, and so on.

The continued presence of the generals was beginning to compromise Allende politically.

At the same time, the vote in the March 4 elections showed that Allende's standing with the working class and masses of the people was still strong. The emergency aid rushed to his regime last November (with its implication of a further emergency operation by the military if required) could now be withdrawn.

These appear to be the main political reasons why the powers that be in Chile decided to shift the generals from center stage back to the wings. On the surface it appeared to be a concession to the left. Actually it was intended to allay the growing fears about a coup, induce the masses to relax, and help block the organizing efforts of those who insist that the danger is very real. From this point of view, the "withdrawal" of the generals was only a tactical maneuver.

General Prats, it should be noted, is not without guile. He owes his post as commander in chief of the army in part, no doubt, to his capacities as a military politician. He remained constantly in public attention, evoking the image of an incorruptible patriot and statesman, as he upheld the regime against the frenzied layers that sought to bring it down before Allende's work was done and the masses had become demoralized. The image-makers likened him to the late Mexican President Cárdenas, who became heralded as the elder statesman of Latin America, mostly because of his role in diverting the Mexican masses from taking the road opened by the Cuban revolution.

Thus the Chilean general became widely known as a strong person able to deal blows to right and left, an upright figure on whom the entire country can depend in a crisis, a potential Bonaparte. He withdrew to the sidelines before this image had time to become tarnished.

Reporting from Santiago, Chile, in the March 28 *New York Times*, Jonathan Kandell sized up the experience with the general as follows:

"He has described himself as a 'simple soldier' with no political ambitions and has always indicated that his con-

tinued participation in the Cabinet was entirely in President Allende's hands.

"But his political stature has risen spectacularly in recent months and he has occasionally been considered a possible presidential candidate in

Switzerland

Geneva SP Against Mandel Ban

The Parti Socialiste Genevois (PSG — Geneva Socialist party), the Geneva cantonal branch of the Swiss Socialist party, has issued a statement condemning the decision to ban Ernest Mandel from Switzerland. On February 7, the Federal Council of Switzerland had rejected the final appeal by Mandel against the government ruling banning him from Swiss territory (see *Intercontinental Press*, March 19, p. 304).

In its statement, published in its organ, *Tribune Socialiste*, the PSG indicated that it views the decision as "an attack on freedom of information and on the democratic rights of Swiss citizens to receive, meet, listen to, and, if necessary, refute whoever they want, on their own soil."

After noting that the Federal Council attempted to justify its move by referring to Mandel's revolutionary ideas, the statement continued:

1976, when Dr. Allende's term expires."

This general bears watching. It can safely be predicted that he will be heard from again, and probably much sooner than 1976. □

"The party feels that it ill becomes a state that was formed through subversion of the established authorities (the Grutli oath), and an armed struggle that began with a political assassination (Gessler) and continued with a rural guerrilla war (Morgarten), a state that owes its present constitution to a civil war (1848), to deny entry into its national territory to a man under the pretext that he 'calls on his audiences to create conditions that will favor a future revolution.'

"The party takes note of the fact that, by its measure, the Federal Council is associating itself with governments that, because of their inability to oppose revolutionary movements on the level of ideas or politics, are attempting to oppose them through administrative measures." It called on the Council to reconsider its decision and to grant Mandel freedom of speech in Switzerland. □

Pressures Will Not 'Reach Critical Point'

Campora Acceptable to State Department

Wall Street does not appear to be nervous about the prospective installation of a Peronist government in Argentina next May. Financial circles in the United States expect that some "anti-imperialist" measures will be enacted but they have already discounted their extent.

These conclusions were to be drawn from a State Department "briefing" to the press March 29. Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs John H. Crimmins, in discussing the election of Dr. Héctor J. Campora as president of Argentina, said

among other things:

"From the standpoint of the United States preference for democratic systems, the holding of elections by the Argentine military government was a very big plus.

"Our own anticipation is that with respect to other interests, there will be manifestations of increased nationalism under the Campora government. We believe there will be some pressures on United States business interests in Argentina, but we do not believe these issues will reach the critical point." □

Dzyuba Sentenced to Five Years in Prison

By Marilyn Vogt

Ivan Dzyuba, prominent Ukrainian Marxist, was sentenced to five years imprisonment at a trial held during mid-March 1973 in Kiev, according to a press release issued by the New York-based Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners. He has been an outspoken opponent of the Stalinist policy on nationalities.

A respected literary critic, the forty-two-year-old Dzyuba is best known for his book *Internationalism or Russification?*, a Leninist critique of the Russification policy currently being carried out by the Kremlin in the Ukraine and in the other non-Russian Soviet republics. Originally written in 1965 as a memorandum to P. Yu. Shelest, first secretary of the Communist party of the Ukraine, the book circulated in *samvydav* [Ukrainian term for samizdat] and later was published in West Germany, Great Britain, and Canada.

In *Internationalism or Russification?* Dzyuba describes the Ukrainization process the Bolsheviks instituted in the early 1920s to encourage the development of Ukrainian language, literature, and culture and to foster the control by Ukrainians of their social, political, and economic life. He counterposes this program to those instituted by Stalin in the late 1920s and after: massive repression, purges, and arrests with imprisonment or execution of Ukrainian literary, political, and academic figures; he denounces Stalin's labeling of the achievements of the Bolshevik Ukrainization program as bourgeois nationalism.

Dzyuba cites abundant data and quotes party leaders to support his charge that the policy and practices of the Kremlin rulers today are a continuation of the policies of Stalin. The current Soviet policy has nothing in common with the internationalism of Lenin, Dzyuba states. It is rather Russification—a return to the Great Russian chauvinism that Lenin and the Bolsheviks fought so hard against.

Dzyuba states that the restoration of the Leninist policy on nationalities is imperative "for the cause of build-



IVAN DZYUBA

ing communism, for the future communist society, and for the fate of the world communist movement."

In 1969, after Dzyuba's book appeared in the West, the Soviet authorities published in both Ukrainian and English an official refutation: *What I. Dzyuba Stands For and How He Does It*. It was sold abroad but never released in the Ukraine.

Dzyuba has been a target of Kremlin harassment for years because of his literary and political activities. Since 1950 he has held a series of editorial posts with publishing houses and periodicals and has also published numerous articles on literary criticism. Although his views brought him respect and popularity with the younger generation of writers, in 1963 he was threatened with expulsion from the Ukrainian Writers' Union for allegedly presenting a distorted view of Ukrainian literature.

On September 4, 1965, Dzyuba staged with Vyacheslav Chornovil and I. Stus a protest in a Kievan movie theater against the massive wave of arrests that was then being conducted against Ukrainian students, workers, and intellectuals.

In a speech delivered on September 29, 1966, at Babyn Yar [site of the September 29, 1941, mass execution of Kievan Jews by the Nazis], Dzyuba stressed that the histories of the Ukrainian and Jewish peoples are similar in their tragic features. "In the times of Stalin there were clear and obvious attempts to play on the mutual prejudices of Ukrainians and Jews— attempts to destroy the Jewish culture under the pretext of combating Jewish bourgeois nationalism, Zionism, and so on; attempts to destroy the Ukrainian national culture and language under the pretext of combating Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism."

He stated that such attempts continue today. "It seems that Lenin's directives on the struggle against anti-Semitism are being forgotten, like the Leninist directives on the national development of Ukraine."

Dzyuba has made numerous public protests against the repression of Soviet dissidents, particularly those who are resisting the forces of Russification. With V. Chornovil and B. D. Antonenko-Davidovich, Dzyuba refused to testify when summoned as a witness in the trial of Valentin Moroz in November 1970 because of the numerous illegalities of the case. His statement on this incident is circulating in *samvydav*.

Dzyuba was among the more than a hundred persons arrested in January 1972 in the Ukraine as the Kremlin launched its campaign against the opposition movement. He was released in February but kept under house arrest until he was re-arrested on April 18. His apartment was searched by the KGB three times during that period. Part of the "incriminating" evidence confiscated during a search at the end of January was the complete works of Lenin, in which Dzyuba had made marginal notes.

He was expelled from the Ukrainian Writers' Union by a unanimous vote of the union's Presidium March 2, 1972. The reason given for his expulsion was his "gross violation of the principles and requirements of the constitution of the Writers' Union and for the preparation and circulation of materials of an anti-Soviet, anti-communist nature, which expressed nationalist views and cast libelous aspersions on the Soviet system and

on the nationalities policy of the party and the Soviet government."

Dzyuba has been jailed since April 1972, and until his sentence became known there had been no word of his fate. Possession of Dzyuba's writings had been used as "incriminating" evidence for the conviction of other Ukrainian dissidents tried as a result of the KGB raids in 1972.

A five-year sentence is especially severe in Dzyuba's case: He suffers from cirrhosis of the liver and from an advanced case of tuberculosis.

Defense campaigns to secure Dzyuba's release have been conducted in North America and Western Europe. The Toronto-based Committee to Defend Ivan Dzyuba is circulating a petition demanding that Dzyuba be freed. The first International Conference to

Defend Soviet Political Prisoners, held in New York City March 2-4, 1973, with representatives from Canada, Great Britain, and the United States, resolved to build an international defense campaign to free Dzyuba as a main focus of its work in the coming months.

In the prefatory letter to Shelest that accompanied the manuscript of his book Dzyuba stated: "I am firmly convinced that today a Ukrainian who is devoted to the cause of building communism has every reason to be worried about the fate of his nation, and if that is so, nobody in the world has the power to prevent him from speaking out about it."

A vigorous international defense campaign on Dzyuba's behalf is necessary to guarantee this claim. □

A Weapon to Be Used Against Dissenters

Kremlin Joins the Copyright Agreement

The Kremlin bureaucrats have undertaken to suppress the flow of samizdat writings to the West by resorting to the legal institutions of international capitalism.

On February 27 the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) headquarters announced that the Soviet Union intends to adhere to the Universal Copyright Agreement (UCA). The announcement resulted from a letter from Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to Director General René Maheu of UNESCO. Soviet membership in the Agreement becomes effective May 27, 1973.

The Universal Copyright Agreement, which emerged from the 1952 Geneva Copyright Convention, established mechanisms for the protection and compensation of writers and artists in the capitalist countries. The Soviet Union and most of the other workers states have not previously been among the sixty-three members of the Agreement.

The only motive initially offered by the Kremlin for this decision to adhere to the UCA was that the move was "in keeping with the current trend toward international relaxation of tensions." But any illusions that the decision represented a loosening up in

the Kremlin disappeared when the amendments to the Soviet copyright laws adopted by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet on February 21 and published in the February 28 *Vedomosti* (the Presidium's bulletin) became available.

The new amendments—Decree 133—to the 1961 Soviet copyright laws in combination with Soviet membership in the UCA provide a two-pronged mechanism with which the Soviet bureaucrats hope to curb publication in the West of literature by Soviet dissidents and prosecute Soviet dissident writers whose works are published abroad.

One provision states that "copyrights apply to unpublished as well as published works." A second provides for the "compulsory purchase" by the Soviet state of a copyright from an author or an author's heirs. Thus, the bureaucracy can declare itself the copyright holder of any published or unpublished manuscript by a Soviet writer, and it can also determine when and if this manuscript can be published anywhere.

Since the bureaucracy can declare itself the legal owner of a manuscript, if a work is smuggled to the West for publication with a Soviet author's name on it, officials will hold that

the author has violated Soviet copyright laws; the author can then be prosecuted. If the author claims he or she did not authorize publication of the manuscript abroad, the Soviet authorities will take action against the foreign publisher under the terms of the Universal Copyright Agreement in an effort to block the manuscript's publication.

This recent move is a direct threat to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. His only book to be officially published and circulated in the Soviet Union is *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. Like *First Circle* and *Cancer Ward*, which won him a Nobel Prize for Literature, his most recent work, *August 1914*, was refused publication in the Soviet Union on the grounds that it was "anti-Soviet," and was published in the United States by Farrar, Straus, Anderson & Giroux. A sequel to *August 1914* has been expected sometime this year.

Solzhenitsyn has been slandered in the Soviet press and considerably harassed by the authorities. However, while most of the dissident writers whose works have been published in the West have been arrested and prosecuted under Articles 70 or 190 of the Russian Criminal Code or its equivalent in the non-Russian republics ("anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" or "defamation of the Soviet Union"), Solzhenitsyn's international reputation has so far prevented the Kremlin from prosecuting him.

Some possible long-term effects of Decree 133 and Soviet membership in the Universal Copyright Convention are already being suggested.

Alan Schwartz, a lawyer and a contributing editor to *Publishers Weekly* (a U.S. publishing-industry trade journal) wrote in the *New York Times* March 10: "The Soviets will attempt to appeal to the profit motive of the [foreign] publishers . . . to persuade certain publishers . . . to forgo the publication of banned Soviet works in exchange for preferential publishing arrangements with Soviet publishers, thereby punishing economically those [foreign] publishers who continue to supply Western readers with works of banned Soviet writers. Of course the [Kremlin rulers] believe in, and in fact depend upon, our frequent inability to allow matters of principle to obstruct the path of commercial enterprise. Will they be right?"

Anthony Astrachan, writing in the

March 23 *Washington Post*, provided an answer to Schwartz's question. While Roger Straus Jr., Solzhenitsyn's U. S. publisher, stated that "he would continue to publish the Nobel prize-winner's works no matter what Soviet law might say—unless it put Solzhenitsyn's life, liberty or family in danger," other U. S. publishers that Astrachan contacted took a somewhat different position. "Publishers who have made deals with Soviet state publishing houses said they would be in a real dilemma if confronted with a choice between those deals and a samizdat. They obviously leaned toward the state deals," Astrachan reported.

Straus can perhaps afford to be noble, since Solzhenitsyn's writings mean profits for Farrar, Straus, Anderson & Giroux. Works by other Soviet dissidents, like Vladimir Maximov and Aleksandr Galich—who have as yet won no Nobel Prize and whose books published in the West have not become best-sellers—may not evoke

such a "principled" stand from Western publishers.

The extent to which the Kremlin can succeed in exporting censorship may come to depend on the support for the publishing of samizdat shown by small, independent publishers, authors' groups, and civil liberties organizations. The left-wing publishers will have a more important role than ever to play.

Within the Soviet Union, the Kremlin's new "copyright" regulations mean a still greater intensification of the drive against samizdat, which has been under way since December 1971, with the Central Committee decree to suppress the *Chronicle of Current Events* and *Ukrainsky Visnyk*. If the democratic opposition movement is to survive the attempt to silence it by silencing samizdat, it must find a way to mobilize broad sections of the population—workers, students, intellectuals—in a mass struggle for the most elementary rights of free speech and freedom of the press. □

throughout the country have been making demands of their own: a minimum equal wage of 18 kroner an hour; a thirty-six-hour workweek; a vacation allowance of 12.5 percent; a cost-of-living installment of 60 ore; minimum weekly wage for apprentices of 375 kroner.

These demands can in no way be met by the mediator's compromise proposal, which would not even make it possible to keep up with skyrocketing prices. His proposal eliminates any shortening of the workweek for hundreds of thousands of workers. It does not meet the minimum wage demand. The cost-of-living adjustment



JOERGENSEN: Gets a warning not to play political games.

Biggest Labor Conflict in 37 Years

Workers in Denmark Go Out on Strike

Copenhagen

On March 21, some 258,000 Danish workers went out on strike or were locked out in the biggest industrial and labor conflict here since 1936.

In Denmark wage contracts for the entire work force are renegotiated every two years. The current contract expired on March 1, and negotiations for a new one had been going on since mid-October.

After more than five months of rejecting the workers' demands for a new contract, the employers have provoked the current conflict in order to increase their economic and political power, to consolidate the benefits they alone stand to gain from Denmark's membership in the Common Market, and, with the help of the bourgeois parties, to force the workers' movement to retreat.

The official mediator in the negotiations, Sigurd Wechseltmann, had presented a compromise proposal that Premier Anker Joergensen, a Social Democrat and former leader of the country's largest union, had gotten the negotiators for the Trade Union

Confederation to accept, but the Danish Employers Federation rejected it. Briefly, it provided for the following: an hourly increase of one krone [US\$1 equals approximately 16 kroner] for women in the standard wage bracket and an hourly increase of 70 ore [100 ore equals 1 krone] for those in the minimum wage bracket; wage increases for both men and women of 40 ore per hour both on March 1 and September 1 this year, and 45 ore on March 1 and September 1 next year; a 10-ore raise in the hourly cost-of-living installment [pegged to the consumer price index], from 30 ore to 40 ore; an increase in the vacation allowance from the present 9.5 percent to 10.5 percent; reduction in the current forty-hour workweek by one hour for the third shift and a half hour for the second shift, to be received in the form of entire days off work in conjunction with holidays.

But the labor negotiators did not succeed in getting the workers they represent to go along with this compromise. For quite some time workers

amounts to chicken feed and the equal pay provision remains unsettled. The vacation allowance is much lower than what is being demanded.

The compromise proposal, therefore, does not provide a basis for agreement on a new contract. Nor is it the basis on which the struggle is now being waged. Rather, the struggle is being fought on the basis of the demands that have been raised in the trade-union movement.

"The conflict that the employers have provoked for political reasons must be carried through to victory," said 300 shop stewards in a statement to the workers of Copenhagen. "Now that a full-fledged conflict has broken out, we regard the negotiated compromise proposal as having no validity; henceforward, it is on the basis of the de-

mands that have been raised that negotiations will have to be carried out.

"We call upon the Copenhagen workers to ensure the effectiveness of the struggle so that the employers can be quickly forced to sign a new contract that meets our demands. The conflict has already shown how essential the workers are to production.

"We do not want to sit and wait for the employers, but, if necessary, to force to the negotiating table those who happen to enjoy the privilege of managing and allocating the labor supply."

At a rally of 10,000 workers in Aalborg, Premier Joergensen and the Employers Federation were warned not to play political games, and the Social Democratic government was warned against giving in to the bourgeois parties by intervening in the conflict. Thousands of workers marched through town as the Aalborg shipyard band played the "Socialist March," the "Internationale," and many other songs of the labor movement.

After discussing the demands of the workers, union president Niels Klitgaard told the rally: "No one today can doubt the fact that the intentions of the bosses are related to the po-

sition of the bourgeois parties in debates at Christiansborg [seat of the Danish Folketing, or parliament]. Their aim is not only to hold the workers back through bourgeois contracts, but also through cutbacks in social legislation. Therefore, we welcome the move to extend the struggle and make it more effective by involving workers in the power industry." (The Metalworkers union has decided to extend the strike on April 3 to include airplane mechanics, seven power plants, and mechanics on private railways.)

Klitgaard told the representatives of the bosses to call a halt to their power play. "We will not go on being pawns in your political game," he said. "We have the strength, the means, and the courage through our organizations to make you see the light. You know our demands. We will not be bought off by the mediator's proposal."

To loud applause, he concluded: "We and our comrades throughout the entire country must now raise a storm of opposition to the schemes the leadership of the Employers Federation is attempting to involve us in. The bosses have sown the wind; let them reap the whirlwind." □

nilla Lacasa, Jaime L. Smart, and César Black. The defendants were not present in the courtroom for the reading of the verdict, which took more than three hours, but had to listen to it over loudspeakers.

As the trial proceedings drew to a close on March 8, the defense criticized the prosecution for having ignored the fact that the defendants had been subjected to torture and that this barbaric treatment had been verified by medical doctors. One, Marta Abrego, testified, for example, that she was four months pregnant when she was arrested and that as a result of beatings she underwent at the hands of the secret police, she had a miscarriage.

"The defense lawyers made mincemeat out of the prosecution," wrote the March 15 issue of *Avanzada Socialista*, the weekly organ of the Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST — Socialist Workers party). "They pointed out the innumerable contradictions in the indictment, which was based on little imagination and many 'spontaneous confessions' elicited through electric torture."

As a result of testimony during the trial, the prosecutor himself felt obliged to withdraw his request for life sentences against five of the defendants. Initially, this sentence was sought against all fourteen.

Among the discrepancies that riddled the prosecution's case, reported *Avanzada Socialista*, was the role that the journalist Alsina Bea was alleged to have played in the Sallustro plot. His lawyer showed that "Alsina Bea is accused of having driven the station wagon that intercepted Sallustro's car and of having subsequently taken the victim to the other vehicle, whereupon he burned the station wagon. But it just so happens that Alsina Bea does not know how to drive automobiles and has never had a license."

In the closing session of the trial, reported *La Opinión* March 11, "defendant Urdampilleta asked for a minute of silence on behalf of those who died at Trelew, an action that the tribunal attempted to prevent. The courtroom audience rose to its feet, as did the fourteen defense lawyers, at the request of the defendants. The three judges left the hall after announcing that the verdict will be handed down next Friday."

The real defendant in the Sallustro

Three Given Life Imprisonment

Fourteen Sentenced in Sallustro Case

Fourteen persons were sentenced in Buenos Aires March 16 in connection with the case of Oberdan Sallustro. The head of Fiat Concord Argentina, Sallustro was kidnapped by members of the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP—Revolutionary Army of the People) on March 21, 1972, and executed during a raid on the guerrillas' hideout on April 10.

Of the fourteen defendants, three were sentenced to life imprisonment. They are Angel Fausto Averame, Carlos Tomás Ponce de León, and José Luis Da Silva Perreira. Three others—Giomar Schmidt de Klachko, Mirta Emilce Sgró de Menajovsky, and Marta Alicia Abrego—were acquitted. The remainder received the following sentences: Mirta Adriana Mitidiero de Da Silva and Osvaldo Sigfrido De Be-

nedetti—twelve years each; Elena María Da Silva Perreira—ten years; Silvia Inés Urdampilleta and José Beristain—nine years; Eduardo Adrián Menajovsky—seven years; Andrés Alsina Bea—six years; and Liliana Olga Montanaro—eighteen months, sentence suspended.

According to the March 17 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión*, the sentences against Alsina Bea, Montanaro, and Urdampilleta "are based on the charge of unlawful association, since they were held to be members of the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP), although they did not take part in the crimes that are being sentenced."

The sentences were handed down by the Supreme Criminal Court, consisting of three judges: Eduardo Mu-

trial, noted *Avanzada Socialista*, "was the monstrous repressive regime, the system of institutionalized torture and savagery." It called for building a

struggle to win a general amnesty law, to abolish the Supreme Criminal Court, and to end all repressive legislation. □

The Stakes in Bhutto's Fight With NAP

U.S., Iran Keep Watch on Pakistan 'Crisis'

By Allen Myers

"To knowledgeable Pakistanis as well as Western political analysts," Bernard Weinraub wrote from Rawalpindi in a March 28 dispatch to the *New York Times*, "the crisis here is the most critical since Mr. Bhutto's take-over after Pakistan's crushing defeat in the two-week 1971 war with India. . . ."

Weinraub was referring to the crisis created by President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's attempts to crush the bourgeois opposition parties in the wake of the seizure of a large supply of arms from the Iraqi embassy (see *Intercontinental Press*, March 26, p. 330).

There are several elements involved in the clash between Bhutto's Pakistan People's party (PPP) and the opposition National Awami party (NAP) and Jamaat-ul-Ulema-e-Islam (JUI).

The National Assembly, in which the PPP holds an overwhelming majority, is presently engaged in drafting a new constitution, and Bhutto has made it evident that he would like to take the opportunity to ensure his personal rule for the foreseeable future. The PPP has proposed, for example, that the prime minister be able to dissolve parliament at any time and that a two-thirds majority be required to pass a motion of no-confidence in the government.

For its part, the NAP-JUI coalition has been seizing on any and every issue with a desperation that indicates its terror before the prospect of years without a real chance to claim the spoils of office. The supposedly secular NAP is backing the theocratic JUI's demands that courts be allowed to overturn laws on religious grounds and that legislative bodies be required to obey the directives of Islamic religious leaders. (Bhutto has agreed to making Islam the state religion, but has no intention of yielding his pre-



BHUTTO: Planning to join hands with the shah?

rogatives to anyone.) The NAP, which not long ago advocated diplomatic recognition of Bangladesh, has taken to accusing PPP officials of insufficient hostility toward the Bengalis.

This jockeying for the spoils of office would be of no more interest than any other dogfight were it not for the explosiveness and international ramifications of the issue of provincial autonomy. Here the squabbles of the bourgeois parties become intertwined with questions of national oppression of the Pathan and Baluchi minorities in the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) and Baluchistan.

Bhutto's PPP is based in the provinces of Punjab—which has sixty percent of Pakistan's population—and Sind. The NAP draws nearly all its support from the NWFP and Baluchistan, both of which provinces it ruled

until Bhutto replaced their governors February 15.

The dumping of the NAP governors exacerbated the already simmering dispute over the amount of provincial autonomy to be permitted by the new constitution. For its own reasons, Bhutto's bourgeois opposition now finds it useful to pose as the champion of the oppressed nationalities and even to threaten a repetition of the Bangladesh rebellion two years ago. After Bhutto sent troops into Baluchistan March 2, NAP leader Wali Khan was quoted as saying, "The army action will destroy the unity of what remains of Pakistan forever."

While such remarks from NAP leaders consist almost entirely of bluster, it is still a fact that the Pakistani state is based only on the shaky pillars of religion and the privileged position of Punjabi capitalists. Even some of Bhutto's well-wishers have begun to fear that he may be provoking a confrontation that could quickly escape control.

"Clearly," Adam Werner wrote in the March 19 issue of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, "Wali Khan and his followers had played into the hands of their opponents by talking of different nationalities and preaching a kind of provincial chauvinism in a country which has yet to recover from the loss of its eastern wing. Nonetheless, Bhutto appears to be repeating the mistakes of his predecessors in trying to establish a centralized one-party system which can only widen the differences between the different parts of the country. The Iraqi Embassy raid demonstrated that the greatest threat to Pakistan's stability comes not from external sources but from its own politicians."

There are others besides Punjabi capitalists who have an interest in "Pakistan's stability." Not the least concerned is the shah of Iran, who might find a Baluchi national movement on his borders a considerable embarrassment. Such a movement would inevitably exercise an attraction for the Baluchi minority in Iran.

With the aid of \$2,000 million in arms recently purchased from the United States, the shah is making a determined effort to replace the British as chief guardian of reaction in the Arab-Persian Gulf and points east. The latest step in this effort is a proposal for "joint control" with the Sultanate of Oman over all shipping in-

to and out of the gulf, which must pass through the twenty-six-mile-wide Strait of Hormuz.

"The shah," David B. Ottaway observed in the March 23 *Washington Post*, "has made clear in many speeches his desire to make Iran the major military power in the gulf and its principal protector against the penetration of radical outside influences. . . ."

"Iranian officials make clear that control of the straits is an integral, indeed vital, part of the government's defense strategy for the gulf and explain Iran's seizure from the Arab sheikdoms of three small islands just inside the gulf's entrance in December 1971 as part of this strategy.

"The plan to control ship traffic through the straits is, according to one expert in gulf affairs, 'another step in Iran's clear desire to become the paramount power in the area, not only in the gulf but in the waters leading away from it.'"

The stakes involved are considerable. *Two-thirds* of world oil imports originate from gulf ports, and 75 percent of world oil reserves are thought to be located in the gulf and the countries that border it. Iranian control of the Strait of Hormuz would thus give the shah and his U.S. patrons a virtual stranglehold on a major share of the world's oil resources.

One of the governments most alarmed by the shah's ambitions is that of Iraq. The Iraqis have been pushing the idea of a "Greater Baluchistan" as a means of cutting the shah down to size.

In this situation, there is naturally speculation about possible involvement of the shah in the dispute between Bhutto and his opposition, as Werner indicated in his *Far Eastern Economic Review* article:

"For Bhutto, who started to reorientate Pakistan's foreign policy towards West Asia immediately after the birth of Bangladesh, it would seem logical to join hands with the ambitious Shah, who has always been responsive to Pakistan's friendly gestures. But the Iranian monarch never relished the idea of sensitive Baluchistan being ruled by a party whose leaders were thought to be very close to Moscow.*

*This is a reference to the fact that the pro-Moscow Communist party has long felt that it has found a home in the thoroughly bourgeois NAP.

Small wonder, then, that diplomatic circles in Islamabad are now wondering whether the Shah did not use his visit to Bhutto's home town of Larkhana in January to urge the President to bring Baluchistan under firm control."

Great Britain

Women Discuss 'Sexism and Capitalism'

Nottingham

Some 300 members of the women's liberation movement attended a two-day conference on "Sexism and Capitalism" organised by the Birmingham Women's Theory group March 17-18. The conference was attended by women from the International Marxist Group, International Socialists, Communist party, Labour party, Young Socialists, Workers' Fight, and Maoist tendencies, as well as radical feminists and nonaligned women.

This was the first time that women from socialist groups and nonaligned women had come together specifically to discuss the theoretical basis of women's oppression and problems of strategy. The Birmingham theory group said that the aims of the conference were to intensify theoretical work and debate, to consider how the women's liberation movement could be transformed into a politically effective movement, and to discuss the role of socialist women in the movement.

The first session, on "Theoretical Questions of Women's Oppression," started with a short theoretical paper by the Birmingham women. The conference then broke up into workshops on sexism, the family, and discussion and critiques of the ideas of Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James (*The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*, Falling Wall Press, Bristol).

The afternoon session started with workshops on the same themes, the best-attended being a workshop on Engels's contribution to the theory of women's oppression. Women then reported from all the workshops to a plenary session.

The morning session March 18 was an open discussion on the relationship between the women's movement and revolutionary socialism. Women from

Whether or not Bhutto actually required such a broad hint from the shah, it is clear that U.S. imperialism and its puppets will continue to follow developments in Pakistan with considerably more than academic interest. □

the different groups present made contributions and answered questions about their group's attitude towards the movement. This session, like the conference as a whole, was notable for its lack of sectarianism and for a general willingness to listen to opposing arguments.

The last session concentrated on a discussion of how the movement should tackle the question of the family in strategic terms. The conference decided to continue the discussions that had been started, to print the papers written for the conference, and to hold another conference in London in early autumn. □

New Zealanders Demand: Free Argentine Prisoners

Wellington

Actions took place across New Zealand March 9 as part of the international campaign of protests against political repression in Argentina. Labour MPs and trade union and student leaders were among those who sponsored an Auckland rally. Michael Moore, MP, and Russell Bartlett, president of the Auckland Students Association, were among those who spoke out at the meeting protesting the persecution of Argentine political dissidents.

In Christchurch, the city's mayor was among those who supported a picket in the city square. Wellington picketers presented a protest statement to the Argentine consulate pointing out that the March 11 elections in that country could only be a farce while the Lanusse government's opposition continued to be jailed and murdered.

The March 9 actions follow up New Zealand protests in November 1972, when the president of the New Zealand Students Association presented a petition to the Argentine consul signed by more than sixty prominent New Zealanders, including A.J. Faulkner, the Minister of Defence in the new Labour government. □

Support Builds for Abortion March

By Kay Goodger

Wellington

A national march for women's right to abortion, called by the Women's Abortion Action Committee (WAAC) in Wellington, will take place on April 13. The demonstration will be the third in the growing campaign to repeal the abortion laws in this country.

Last year, the abortion issue was brought clearly into public focus when hundreds of women marched in the main cities on May 5 and July 28, demanding women's right to choose whether or not to continue a pregnancy. The actions sparked a lot of interest among women, and helped to make abortion one of the issues taken up during the election period.

The coming action on April 13 has been building well since it was announced during International Women's Day activities March 8. Women's Abortion Action Committees in Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch are seeking endorsement for the march from a wide number of organizations, and so far the response has been very encouraging.

At a national meeting of the Abortion Law Reform Association (ALRANZ), which was attended by about 100 persons, a motion to give "whole-hearted support to the abortion marches on April 13" was passed unanimously and with much enthusiasm. (Among the many prominent figures who are now vice-presidents or Advisory Committee members of ALRANZ are Auckland's mayor, Sir Dove-Myer Robinson, Sir Edmund Hillary, and three Labour members of parliament, including the minister of justice, Dr. Finlay.)

Other Auckland endorsers of the march include the Princes Street and Epsom branches of the Labour party, a Values party candidate in last year's election, and the University Women's Liberation Group, which is canvassing lecturers for their sponsorship. An article is to appear in the national law students magazine giving the facts on abortion laws and the movement for repeal. Another article on the WAAC and its aims is being dis-

tributed to all medical students by a lecturer.

In Wellington, endorsers so far include David Shand (Wellington Central Labour candidate in 1972), the Teachers College executive, Victoria University Students Association executive, University Feminists, and the Wellington branch of ALRANZ.

The Christchurch WAAC picketed outside a civic welcome meeting for Prime Minister Norman Kirk March 22. They presented Mayor Pickering with a copy of an open letter to Kirk from WAAC and the Canterbury Uni-

Argentina

ERP Kidnaps Industrialist

The United Press International issued the following dispatch March 24 from Buenos Aires:

A wealthy metallurgical industrialist was kidnapped and held for a week, presumably by an extremist group, being liberated last night after paying a ransom of 600 million old pesos (\$600,000), according to an account given by the victim to the press.

After revealing that he had been kidnapped and then freed, Alberto Lloveras, assistant general manager of the metallurgical company TENSA (Talleres Electrometalúrgicos Norte S.A.), agreed to discuss the details of his captivity.

Lloveras said that on Friday, March 16, approximately at 7:30 a.m., he left in his automobile from his luxurious residence in the aristocratic district of Beccar, thirteen miles to the north of the capital, in order to go to the plant located in the neighboring district of Florida, four miles from his home.

Two blocks away, his automobile was intercepted by a station wagon that crossed in front, and almost simultaneously another vehicle closed

iversity Feminists demanding repeal of the abortion laws.

In view of the possibility of the abortion issue being raised in parliament in the near future, it is essential that the abortion rights movement make clear what it wants the government to do. Associated with the marches and other public actions, there must be an educational campaign to show why abortion laws must be repealed, not just reformed, and that abortion is a woman's right to choose.

To bring the greatest pressure on the government, all those persons and organizations that agree that abortion laws are unjust must be united in a common effort to ensure that women win their right to abortion. Judging from the wide support the April 13 action is receiving, especially in Auckland, it will prove a valuable step in this direction. □

in behind, blocking him from escaping.

Two persons got out of the station wagon and came resolutely toward Lloveras.

"They said they were from the 'Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo' (ERP)," the industrialist stated. "They covered me with machine guns, and after telling me not to try to resist, they pulled me out of my automobile and took me to the other one."

Two other persons joined the first two, and a little later the automobile drove off at high speed.

In his account, Lloveras said that after traveling for about an hour, he was taken to a house, and placed in a small basement.

He indicated that the negotiations over the ransom were conducted through the board of directors of his firm, who moved into the executive's residence.

The local police were not informed of what had happened in order not to put the kidnappers on the alert; but top officials of federal security were brought in directly, and their experts—through a special telephone connection—followed the dealings be-

tween the kidnapers and the officials of Lloveras's company step by step.

However, the captors acted in ac-

cordance with a perfectly organized plan and succeeded in gaining their objectives without being intercepted. □

Israel to Step Up Military Production

Nixon Promises Meir New U.S. Arms

During Golda Meir's visit to Washington at the beginning of March, the Nixon administration agreed to sell Israel four more squadrons of combat jet aircraft and to help the Zionist state set up production of a jet fighter of its own design, according to a report in the March 14 *New York Times*.

The tentative plans for the sales are said to involve some twenty-four F-4 Phantom fighter-bombers and some twenty-four A-4 Skyhawks. Delivery will begin in January 1974 and will extend over two years.

The new deal will provide Tel Aviv with a constant flow of planes through at least the end of 1975. In December 1971 Nixon promised to sell Israel 42 F-4s and about 80 A-4s. Deliveries of those Phantoms will be completed in December 1973, one month before the new deliveries begin; deliveries of the 1971 Skyhawks will begin in June 1973.

By the end of 1973, the Israeli air force will have a total of about 120 F-4s, and by the middle of 1974 about 200 A-4s. These totals exclude the planes that will be provided by the arrangements made during Meir's latest visit.

The production plans for the Israeli-designed plane are part of a more general program of industrialization through arms spending that had been initiated by Tel Aviv. The new plane, called the Supermirage, is based on the design for the French Mirage jet fighter. It will be powered by General Electric's J-79 jet engine, which is also used in the F-4.

Other weapons slated to go into production in Israel include an automatic rifle said to be superior to the American M-16 and the Soviet AK-47, an air-to-air missile, a surface-to-surface missile, a ship-to-ship missile, a missile boat, a new tank, and a modified barrage rocket.

The burgeoning arms industry does



DAYAN: His boys let some stuff slip through their fingers.

yeoman service for the Zionist state. Its most obvious function is to strengthen Tel Aviv's military might relative to the Arab states. In Israel it is generally claimed that the new arms production will reduce dependence on the United States for wea-

pons, which is scarcely true, since the Israeli-made arms need Western parts and supplies.

But the arms industry does have a "nonmilitary" benefit for the Zionist rulers: It allows for both an expansion of employment and investment (with the consequent general economic growth) and for increased regimentation of the workers (who can be disciplined more strictly because of the "sensitive" nature of their jobs).

In any case, producing the Supermirage will certainly turn a better profit than making the desert bloom. The same can be said for the possible harvest that a good supply of arms can generate in other ways—primarily theft.

On March 22 and 23, the Israeli press disclosed the contents of a report prepared by the Israeli state Controller, who investigated what happened to all that equipment captured from Egypt in the Sinai peninsula during the 1967 war.

It seems that millions of dollars worth of Egyptian property unaccountably vanished in the wake of the Israeli occupation. The press reports indicate that heavy machinery and industrial equipment was carried away by civilian entrepreneurs, contractors engaged in activities like road-building and other good works.

Details on how items like drilling and mining rigs, heavy electrical equipment, and industrial supplies could disappear without a trace under the watchful eye of the Israeli army, noted for its efficiency, were not disclosed. The procedure was explained in a secret session of the Knesset (parliament) finance committee, which insists that it will eventually publish a full report on the theft. □

ERP Raids Atomic Reactor in Argentina

The March 26 New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa* reported that guerrillas of the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP—Revolutionary Army of the People) had attacked the Atucha atomic reactor plant in Lima, eighty miles north-east of Buenos Aires.

According to the report, the heavily armed guerrillas appeared at the entrance of the plant, and without saying a word threw some hand grenades that caused considerable damage to

the building upon exploding.

After subduing the guards and taking their arms, the guerrillas hauled down the Argentine flag in front of the building and hoisted the flag of the ERP, a five-pointed star.

The guerrillas then fled in two station wagons, but about 300 yards from the plant they ran into a small group of police. After a brief but intense exchange of shots, the guerrillas made a getaway, leaving two policemen wounded. □

The Lambertists and the Vargaites Fall Out

By Pierre Frank

What a tedious chore it is to have to follow the "international life" of the Lambertists, their friends, and their ex-friends! You have to force yourself to read *Correspondence Internationale*, a "discussion bulletin" filled with virtually unreadable articles devoid of all interest. But nevertheless it must be done, in order to keep track of what is happening to those who, for a good twenty years, have claimed to be reconstructing the Fourth International.

It will be remembered that in 1971 there was a break between Lambert's OCI-AJS [Organisation Communiste Internationaliste-Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme—Internationalist Communist Organization-Alliance of Youth for Socialism] and the British SLL [Socialist Labour League] led by Gerry Healy. The former wanted to "reconstruct" the Fourth International, while the latter wanted to "construct" it. Each side accused the other of "Pabloism."¹ The result is that there are now two rival "International Committees."

In July 1972 an "international pre-conference" was held by the committee set up by Lambert and those who lined up with him after the split with Healy. A general political resolution was voted on at this conference. The vote on this resolution was taken only after separating out certain sections of it, with the following result: The section on Latin America was not voted on by the Latin Americans, and the section on Palestine was not voted on by the Israelis.²

From the first issue [of *Correspondence Internationale*] after the conference we learn that the members from the Eastern European countries had

1. See *Quatrieme Internationale*, No. 2, April 1972, "La scission entre Lambert et Healy." [Available in English in *Intercontinental Press*, March 6, 1972, p. 242, "'Construct' or 'Reconstruct' the Fourth International?"]

2. See *Correspondence Internationale*, No. 6 (October 1972).

not wanted to press their differences on the political level. Further on we see that this committee [Lambert's "International Committee"] is bound only—still—by decisions that are arrived at unanimously.

In issue No. 6 of *Correspondence Internationale*, which reported the votes taken at this preconference, we find a particularly virulent article by Stephan Just [a leading OCI member] against the Ligue des Révolutionnaires Socialistes Hongrois [LRSH—League of Hungarian Revolutionary Socialists] and the Comité d'Organisation des Communistes d'Europe de l'Est [CO—Committee for the Organization of East European Communists]. In issue No. 7 of this bulletin, which has just come out, we read:

"The political positions developed by Varga and the CO of East Europe, like their practice, represent an open capitulation to Stalinism, a complete break with the program and principles of the Fourth International. . . . [The OCI] takes responsibility for breaking all political relations with the LRSH and the CO of East Europe" (page 2).

The issue contains two articles—one by Just, "A Political Passport," which vehemently denounces the aforementioned groups and especially their spokesman, Varga, who is also a member of the OCI's Central Committee and Political Bureau; another by Varga, entitled "For the Maintenance of the International Committee."³

Renaming a Phony Committee

The Healy-Lambert polemic dealt with certain political differences (over the workers' united front, electoral candidacies, Lora's policy in Bolivia), plus a little philosophical spice added in by Healy. On the other hand, in

3. For the sake of simplicity, we will refer from now on to Varga when talking about the CO of East Europe and the LRSH.

the Just-Varga polemic, it is literally impossible to find the slightest expression of differences, whether on the international political and economic situation as a whole, or on some particular aspect of it, or on the policy that either group recommends following.

The outside world does not exist for these people. These articles deal only with the mutual relations among members of the committee, with its functioning, and with the "Pabloist" disease allegedly ravaging it. (We shall speak about this further on.) The discussion turns on the fact that the preconference decided to replace the "International Committee," which had convoked it, with an "Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International," composed of the same elements (minus Varga, after the split). Varga, on the other hand, declared for retaining the "International Committee." The many pages that the two sides devote to this point allow us to see, in an indistinct manner, that Varga advocates a smaller committee than does Just. But that's all.

In any case, yesterday Lambert and Healy broke over the question of whether the Fourth International had to be "constructed" or "reconstructed." Today, Just and Varga are breaking over the question of whether the "International Committee" must be preserved or renamed. Byzantine spats of sectarians coiling around each other! What is this "International Committee" that the fight is all about? Read what Just himself has to say:

". . . it [the International Committee] never functioned as and never was organized as the Fourth International must be. . . . At best it functioned as a federation; it had no congress, no executive, no budget. In principle, discipline was limited to the application of unanimous decisions, which were nevertheless not always respected. . . . It must be told like it is: The IC was never a central leadership, a centralized and centralizing interna-

tional leadership. . . . After the SWP [the U.S. Socialist Workers party] joined the International Secretariat in 1963 and formed the United Secretariat with it, the SLL progressively moved away; it hampered the IC's functioning and wound up by perpetrating a split, taking with it half the IC's organizations. . . ." (page 21).

Who could better demonstrate than Just does in these lines that whatever its name or goal (construction, reconstruction, or re-reconstruction of the Fourth International), this committee was nothing but, and its successors will be nothing but, phony committees?

The 'Pabloism' Psychosis

We will not go into the mutual organizational accusations, which cannot be verified from the outside. And we will pass over the extremely numerous insults exchanged. One central thread runs through the whole discussion: once again, "Pabloism." As Lambert and Healy did less than a year ago, Just and Varga accuse each other of "Pabloism."

". . . the forming of an East European superparty of political revolution. This is nothing but throwing up Pablo's vomit under another form" (Just, *Correspondence Internationale*, No. 7, p. 10).

". . . the OCI remains contaminated by this Pabloite past of the Fourth International. . . ." (Varga, *Correspondence Internationale*, No. 7, p. 54).

Each describes a "Pabloism" (without Pablo, who has become a phantom) that supposedly first destroyed the Fourth International as a united, centralized organization in 1952, and then allegedly continued its foul deeds obsessively within the International Committee that was created to combat it and continue the existence and the work of the Fourth International. "Pabloism" is said to have led first to the departure of the SWP, then to Healy's break, and finally to Varga's. Will this "Pabloism" never stop?

To these people Pabloism is a perseveration, an obsession. Their discussions—and this is what makes their articles unreadable—are nothing but a sort of perpetual effort to define it:

"Reformism, Stalinism, Pabloism are only particularized forms of the 'pres-

sure' of imperialism (of the bourgeoisie) on the proletariat. . . . The Kremlin bureaucracy is a special social layer, but it is organically tied to the world bourgeoisie. . . it embodies the unfinished bourgeois counterrevolution inside the workers state. . . . The epicenter theory of revolution so dear to the Pabloites. . . ." (Just, p. 11-12).

"We cannot accept that the roots of Pabloism are a 'conception,' a subjectivist-objectivist attitude toward history. . . . Pabloism is conceivable only in relation to the historic and worldwide battle between Bolshevism and Stalinism. . . . It is thus the agent of Stalinism, since it is the natural product of Stalinism's destructive work against Bolshevism. . . . The OCI's document winds up saying that 'Pabloism is not worth very much as a political force.' This is false, for it is the agent of Stalinism, to which its life is tied, and Stalinism is not yet dead" (Varga, pp. 41 and 43).

And so it goes for whole pages. For them, Pabloism is a demon. Reality has been lost sight of, and their detached "thought" revolves around itself. The Justs and the Vargas who want to reconstruct the "Fourth International" have become prisoners of a mythical "Pabloism" that they use to continually discover in each other's ponderous pronouncements a means by which they can split apart every time disagreement appears in their ranks. Is this still politics? Are we not entitled to view it as a manifestation of a paranoid psychosis?

Each to His Place in History

The disease—for a disease it is—also shows itself in each one's tendency to believe himself the center

of the universe. For Varga, the "International Committee" did not begin to become really Trotskyist until the SWP left it and the Varga group joined up:

"This period was concluded by a qualitative change in the IC between 1962 and 1963. It was marked by two important events. The first was the break of the SWP, which in 1962 rejoined the Pabloites to form the 'United Secretariat' after a 'reunification' congress. On the other side, parallel with this clarification and its conclusion, in 1963 the LRSH joined the IC. The change was very important. There was a deeper understanding of Pabloism and, on this basis, an alteration in the international struggle. . . . A qualitative change occurred" (Varga, p. 48).

For Just, the truth can only be otherwise:

"History has given the OCI a special place in the reconstruction of the Fourth International" (p. 29).

Still worse, Varga was supposedly never a Trotskyist; he supposedly only "camped . . . inside the OCI," where he never worked openly.

"The OCI and the IC had to be used; they had to be placed at the service of this elite that came from 'the countries that have expropriated capital.' As hard as it may be, we have to look reality in the face: For them at bottom, the OCI was a chicken to be plucked. It was natural that one day or another they would break with the OCI, which now becomes their declared enemy after having been the milk cow they utilized" (pp. 28-29).

The chicken for the plucking was a milk cow! Thus we end with the only moment of joy Just has provided us in all his work to "reconstruct the Fourth International."

March 20, 1973

Argentine People's Front to Back Peronists

The Alianza Popular Revolucionaria (APR—Revolutionary People's Alliance), which ran Oscar Alende and Horacio Sueldo in the Argentine presidential election March 11, has decided to throw its support in the runoff election to the candidates of the Peronist coalition, the FREJULI (Frente Justicialista de Liberación—Justicialist Liberation Front).

The runoff will elect senators, governors, and lieutenant governors. There will be no presidential runoff because the

Peronist ticket of Hector Campora and Vicente Solano was declared the winner.

In a statement made public March 16, the APR explained that it views the strong Peronist vote as a "verdict of the people," according to a report in the March 18 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinion*. "We have points of agreement with positions taken by the victorious presidential candidate," it noted.

The Alende-Sueldo ticket ran with the backing of the Communist party. □

Babak Zahraie Defeats Deportation Effort

MARCH 30—It was learned today that the U. S. government has dropped its attempts to deport Babak Zahraie, the former president of the Iranian Students Association at the University



BABAK ZAHRAIE

of Washington in Seattle. Representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) called Zahraie's attorney to report that his application for permanent residence status had been approved.

The decision marks an important victory for all Iranian students in the United States, others of whom are similarly threatened with deportation to Iran, where they face the threat of prison, torture, or death for their opposition to the shah's regime.

The INS began its attempts to deport Zahraie in February 1972, accusing him of being "subversive" because of his activity in the antiwar movement and in defense of Iranian political prisoners. When a committee was formed to defend him, the government dropped this charge but continued the deportation proceedings on a technical detail related to a visit he made to Canada in November 1971.

The INS also began deportation proceedings against Zahraie's broth-

er, Siamak Zahraie, and against Bahram Atai, the secretary of the defense committee. The INS was forced to abandon its attempts to deport Bahram Atai on February 6 (see *Intercontinental Press*, March 5, p. 249).

Both Babak and Siamak Zahraie had applied for permanent residence visas. Both are married to U. S. citizens. Normally, marriage to a U. S. citizen makes the granting of such a visa a routine matter.

The INS has not yet announced a ruling on Siamak Zahraie's application, but a refusal would be even more difficult to justify now than be-

fore his brother's victory.

The Committee to Defend Babak Zahraie has conducted extensive publicity about the cases and has received the endorsement of student and faculty groups, civil libertarians, and several members of Congress. At the time of the latest INS decision, Babak Zahraie was on a national speaking tour to publicize the facts about the U. S. government's harrassment of Iranian and other foreign students who hold political views not approved by Richard Nixon.

The INS is still trying, for example, to deport forty-one Iranian students for the crime of demonstrating outside the Iranian consulate in San Francisco in June 1970. The Iranian Students Association has announced a nationwide campaign in defense of the forty-one. □

To Protest Thieu Visit

Set Antiwar Actions in 20 U.S. Cities

The U. S. antiwar movement is planning to protest in the streets against the April 1-6 visit to the United States of Saigon dictator Nguyen Van Thieu.

At a March 22 news conference in New York, the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) announced plans for demonstrations in twenty cities during the Thieu visit. NPAC national coordinator Katherine Sojourner charged that the purpose of the visit was to try to "legitimize this dictator in the eyes of the American people in order to justify continued massive U. S. economic and military support to the Saigon regime."

Mike Shur of the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC), which is supporting the NPAC actions, called on "all students to unite in an all-out campaign of campus protest activities during Thieu's stay—to organize rallies, picket lines, forums, and teach-ins aimed at exposing the U. S. government's lasting commitment to Thieu and the threatening implications of continued U. S. intervention in Southeast Asia."

"Any U. S. intervention in Southeast Asia," NPAC declared, "is a violation of the right of the peoples of Indochina to determine their own affairs without outside interference. Through

years of savage warfare and bombing, the U. S. has wrenched concessions from the people of Vietnam—concessions the U. S. had absolutely no right to demand—and the Nixon administration is now trying to lull the American public to sleep with its rhetoric of an 'honorable peace.' Our action and vigilance is more necessary now than ever before." □

U.S. Public Backs Indians

Indian protesters who have occupied the South Dakota town of Wounded Knee on the Pine Ridge Reservation for more than a month have won the sympathy of a majority of Americans, according to a public opinion survey reported by pollster Louis Harris on April 2.

The study found that 51% of those polled said they were more in sympathy with the Indian demonstrators than with the U. S. government, which has surrounded Wounded Knee with FBI agents armed with M-16 rifles. Only 28% expressed hostility to the Indian protest, while the remainder were undecided.

According to Harris, sympathy was widespread among residents in the East, among youth, suburbanites, persons with incomes above \$15,000 a year, and among college-educated Blacks. He asserted his surveyors had found widespread feelings of guilt about the mistreatment Indians have received. □

Trotsky's Program for Revolution

If there is a single document that more than any other distinguishes the method of revolutionary Marxism from that of both reformism and ultra-leftism, it would be Leon Trotsky's *Transitional Program*.

Written in 1938, it was adopted the same year by the Fourth International as its founding programmatic document under the title *The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International*; yet the *Transitional Program* retains all its initial validity as a guide to action for revolutionists.

As Joseph Hansen notes in one of the three introductory articles included in this new edition, the problem of the contradiction between the subjective consciousness of the masses and the objective possibilities of the proletarian movement is one that has been around longer than the Marxist movement itself. In the late nineteenth century, this contradiction was reflected in the division of the programs of the European Social Democratic parties into a "minimum" program of reforms under capitalism and a "maximum" program of socialism at some indefinite, constantly receding point in the future. This division helped to conceal the reformist degeneration of the Second International until the imperialist contradictions exploded into the first world war.

In the carnage of 1914-18, only the Bolsheviks were able to demonstrate how to unite the "minimum" and "maximum" programs in a struggle for power. The October Revolution showed how a revolutionary party could advance demands that would bridge the gap between the consciousness of the masses and the objective possibility of overturning capitalism.

But with the Stalinist degeneration of the Communist International, hundreds of thousands of militants around the world were all but totally deprived of the opportunity to learn the real lessons of the Bolshevik Revolution. As the Communist parties alternated between kowtowing to "their" bourgeoisies and engaging in ultra-

left adventures, potential revolutionists were taught that their highest duty was unquestioning obedience to the omniscient leader in Moscow.

Moreover, many of those who even-

The Transitional Program for Socialist Revolution by Leon Trotsky. With introductory essays by Joseph Hansen and George Novack. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1973. 223 pp. \$2.45, £1.05.

tually were disillusioned by the Stalinist betrayals turned not to revolutionary Marxism, but to one or another variety of reformism or ultra-leftism.

While the reformists in effect elevated the old Social Democratic "minimum" program into the ultimate goal, the ultra-leftists and sectarians erred similarly but oppositely by putting exclusive emphasis on the "maximum" program. Impatient for the revolution that they saw was objectively possible, and confusing their own ideas with the consciousness of the masses, they isolated themselves from the mass movements by attempting to impose ultimatic demands rather than leading the proletariat forward in its daily struggles.

In preparing the founding document of the new international, Trotsky drew on the entire history of the socialist movement, both its positive and negative experiences. He not only drew the lessons of this history, particularly of the Russian revolution, but also generalized them for the era of imperialist decay.

What the Bolsheviks had accomplished in practice in 1917 Trotsky explained theoretically for the revolutionists who were to carry on their tradition:

"The strategical task of the Fourth International lies not in reforming capitalism but in its overthrow. Its political aim is the conquest of power by the proletariat for the purpose of expropriating the bourgeoisie. How-

ever, the achievement of this strategic task is unthinkable without the most considered attention to all, even small and partial questions of tactics. All sections of the proletariat, all its layers, occupations and groups should be drawn into the revolutionary movement. The present epoch is distinguished not for the fact that it frees the revolutionary party from day-to-day work but because it permits this work to be carried on indissolubly with the actual tasks of the revolution."

The foundation of the bridge between "day-to-day work" and the "actual tasks of the revolution" is the concept of transitional demands, that is, demands based on the present consciousness of the proletariat but directed against the bases of the bourgeois regime and therefore designed to direct that consciousness toward the struggle for power.

Because it deals with the real world, the *Transitional Program* is, as George Novack observes in his essay, "not a uniform and static set of demands, fixed once and for all, which is to be swallowed whole and mechanically imposed in a stereotyped manner on any and all situations regardless of time, place, and circumstance. Marxist logic teaches that 'the truth is concrete.' This rule has to be applied to the use of the *Transitional Program*. . . . The relevant parts of the program have to be brought forward in accord with an intelligent and informed appraisal of the actual conditions and adapted to the specific state of the ongoing class struggle."

This book contains a lengthy section indicating how Trotsky himself applied the transitional method to the concrete situation facing the young parties of the Fourth International. This is the stenographic record of a series of conversations in 1938 between Trotsky and leaders of the Socialist Workers party (SWP) of the United States. These conversations are an invaluable supplement for anyone seriously interested in studying the transitional method.

In addition, the book provides two illustrations of how the Fourth International and the parties in political solidarity with it continue to adapt the *Transitional Program* to changing conditions. These are *The Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International* (a 1969

resolution of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International) and *A Transitional Program for Black Lib-*

eration (adopted by the 1969 national convention of the SWP).

—David Burton

Australian CP's Weekly Reviews Losey Film

[The following review by Denis Freney of Joseph Losey's film *The Assassination of Trotsky* appeared in the January 23-29 issue of *Tribune*, a newspaper reflecting the views of the Australian Communist party, published in Sydney.]

* * *

This must be one of the most disappointing films I've seen for a long time.

The idea of making a film about Trotsky's assassination is indeed a daunting one. The attempt to capture the character of a revolutionary of such recent times and of such stature and yet still of such power in the world is almost an impossibility. To capture the complexity of the motives of a man such as Jason (Ramón Mercader his real name), who killed Trotsky on Stalin's orders, is almost as daunting.

The only conclusion one can reach from this film is that Losey and his scriptwriter Nicholas Mosley (son of British fascist leader Sir Oswald) gave up in despair and attempted to make up for the shallow characterisation with some nice color photography.

Losey and Mosley have drawn heavily on the books by [Isaac Don] Levine and the Mexican police chief Salazar which showed quite conclusively Stalin's guilt at a time when Stalin and his followers denied responsibility for the crime, while Mercader claimed he was a "disillusioned Trotskyist."

Those two books had their place in establishing the truth of those guilty of the assassination. But today, with Mercader living in Moscow after his release from the Mexican jail in the 'sixties and following Castro's refusal to allow him to stay in Cuba, there are very few who would deny Stalin's guilt.

The two books therefore are useless in making such a film today.

Burton's Trotsky emerges as a kindly old man who tends his rabbits and garden behind the high walls of

exile. Occasionally he is given to making political pronouncements that are embarrassingly declamatory and at times distortions of Trotsky's views. Only when he composes his testament (and this is given in full, word for word) is there a glimmer of the real revolutionary Trotsky. Burton's Trotsky is all one-dimensional cardboard.

Alain Delon as Mercader is just as

bad. He really hams it up and his motives are completely hidden.

To conclude: it would have been a service to everyone if Losey had not touched the topic with a 10-foot pole. For it could only be attempted successfully if it was tackled as a political film, not a psychological melodrama.

That would have meant a commitment to revolutionary socialism, but as well an understanding of the complexity of men and women in their individual solitude, reflecting, particularly in political persons, the diversity of social and personal experiences and forces upon them. □

Behind the Vietnam Cease-Fire Agreement

The Meaning of the Vietnam Accords by Barry Sheppard and Dick Roberts. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1973. 15 pp. \$0.25, £0.10.

This pamphlet contains three articles reprinted from *The Militant*, a revolutionary-socialist weekly newspaper published in New York. Their subject—the Vietnam cease-fire agreement and the prospects for the Vietnamese revolution—is one that will retain its importance for some time to come, as press reports from Vietnam already indicate.

In the first of his two articles, Barry Sheppard places the cease-fire agreement in the context of Nixon's world strategy for containing, and eventually rolling back, the process of world revolution. Nixon's hopes for the policy of "Vietnamization" of the war, Sheppard points out, were rudely shattered by the failure of the February 1971 invasion of Laos and by the spring 1972 offensive of the liberation forces.

"The [1972] offensive," he writes, "again demonstrated that Vietnamization was not enough to preserve the Saigon regime. Political pressure had to be mounted to secure an agreement that would guarantee to Washington's satisfaction that Hanoi's troops could not attack the Saigon army."

In exchange for the promise of political and trade concessions, the bureaucracies in Peking and Moscow allowed Nixon to escalate his attacks on North Vietnam to an unprecedented level. It was this totally unrestrained

assault that eventually forced the liberation forces to agree to a cease-fire that left Thieu in power in Siagon.

In his second article, Sheppard takes up the overly optimistic view of the accords presented by some left groups, particularly the Stalinists. The agreement, he shows, has not settled any of the crucial questions:

"The heart of the issue remains what it always has been in South Vietnam: which class will rule? The course of the class struggle itself will determine which of the two class forces, represented by the two armies and two regimes in South Vietnam, will eventually predominate."

In the concluding article, Dick Roberts analyzes the role of Moscow and Peking in Vietnam during the years 1971-72. He provides figures showing that less than one-tenth of Soviet military aid to foreign countries in 1971 went to North Vietnam. In terms of its value, aid to Hanoi was surpassed by aid to Egypt, Iraq, and India. Moreover, the weapons supplied to North Vietnam were obsolete compared, for example, to the advanced anti-aircraft missiles sent to Egypt.

Roberts quotes from the *Pentagon Papers* to show that it was fear of a Soviet or Chinese response that prevented U.S. imperialism from mining North Vietnamese waters in 1968. Four years later, the Kremlin welcomed Nixon to Moscow only days after the mining of Haiphong harbor, Peking's reception of Nixon two months earlier was the other sign giving U.S. imperialism a green light. □

Free All the Political Prisoners in Argentina!

[The following is a translation by *Intercontinental Press* of an article that appeared in the March 15 issue of the Buenos Aires *Avanzada Socialista*, the weekly newspaper of the Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores.]

* * *

Journalist: Is it true that one of your first measures will be to proclaim a broad amnesty law for political crimes?

Cámpora: Without doubt; in fact we're doing our utmost to contribute to pacifying [the country]. I think that the Argentine parliament . . . will be anxious to contribute to this pacification and to this Argentine coexistence, providing on the parliamentary level a broad amnesty for all those who have been unjustly deprived of their freedom. (La Nación, March 13.)

* * *

We appeal on this occasion to the *compañeros* who in one way or another have been struggling or who want to struggle to free the prisoners. We appeal especially to the *compañeros* of the Juventud Peronista [Peronist Youth] and to the militant sector of the Peronist movement, who have been campaigning on the fundamental slogan "Cámpora for president, freedom for the fighters." It was a satisfaction perhaps when you learned about the declarations of the president-elect reported above.

As a matter of principle, it likewise appeared positive to us for Dr. Cámpora to indicate that he favors a broad amnesty.

Nevertheless, *compañeros*, we feel obliged to say that there's a long way to go before these declarations become converted into the reality of an Argentina without a single political prisoner after next May [when Cámpora is scheduled to take office]. The fact is that the president-elect's words were ambiguous.

In his declaration Dr. Cámpora said, "I think that the Argentine parliament . . . will be anxious . . ." We wonder. And if parliament is not "anxious"?

Why didn't Dr. Cámpora, in order to dispel any doubts, simply say: "My first act in government will be to send a bill to parliament; and the FREJULI [Frente Justicialista de Liberación—Liberation Front for Social Justice, the Peronist coalition] legislators—who constitute the majority—will immediately approve it." Millions of citizens are awaiting a promise like that—clear and emphatic.

Another point to be disturbed about, because it lends itself to a double interpretation, is the statement that the "broad amnesty" will be "for all those who have been unjustly deprived of their freedom." And we say that it lends itself to misinterpretation because it can very well be concluded that if there are political prisoners who

are "unjustly" held in jail, then there are others who are quite justly being held in jail. And this interpretation is not a fanciful one. We know—Mor Roig [minister of the interior] himself hinted at this just hours before the polls opened—that the military, in order to alleviate pressures, is prepared to allow a discriminating or selective amnesty; that is, to release a handful of prisoners for minor so-called crimes, letting the rest rot in jail. By no means do we say that Dr. Cámpora's intentions merit such an interpretation. But it is necessary to clarify the point.

ALL the political prisoners, including ALL the guerrillas, must be freed. Who is going to determine which have been "justly" or "unjustly" imprisoned? Perhaps the same judges who convicted them on the basis of "spontaneous confessions" obtained through torture? And on the basis of what norm are they to be liberated or left in jail? Perhaps on the basis of ideological discrimination?

Absolutely ALL the political prisoners and guerrillas must be freed, because *the guilt for all the violence in these past years falls solely on the military regime*. It was the dictatorship that began repressing the popular protest in blood and fire. It was on this basis that the guerrilla actions arose and developed.

Compañeros of the Juventud Peronista and the militant sector of the Peronist movement: You, better than anyone else, know the conditions that the armed forces want to impose on the incoming government. And you also know that one of the main points among these conditions concerns the political prisoners.

Dr. Cámpora's declaration thus fails to answer the main question: how to counteract the formidable pressure that will be mounted by the military to block a genuinely broad and full amnesty? There is only one means: All of us who want to finish with the reign of the jail and torture must mobilize in a united way!! And with a precise objective: *to solicit from the elected deputies and senators, especially those belonging to the FREJULI, a public promise that the first law to be passed by Congress will be a broad amnesty, the abolition of all the repressive legislation and of the Supreme Criminal Court, and an investigation of the torture, murders, and kidnappings committed under the military dictatorship*. For this investigation we must demand the formation of an Investigating Commission, with a labor majority, made up of legislators representing the trade-union organizations, political parties, and the families of those who were murdered.

To accomplish this, we appeal in the first place to the *compañeros* of the Juventud Peronista and of the militant sector of the Peronist movement. You bear an enormous responsibility. You carried the FREJULI campaign, and you raised as one of the main slogans of that campaign: "Cámpora for president; freedom for the fighters." There is no point in discussing whether the FREJULI legislators intend to carry out their electoral promise without

vacillating. *It is not a matter of intentions in the main, but of the strength available to neutralize the formidable pressure of the military.* For that, compañeros of the Juventud Peronista and of the militant sector of the Peronist movement, your interest and feeling of urgency must be higher than that of anyone else in advancing this broad mobilization for the prisoners.

We likewise call on *the young Radicals*. You claim the tradition of the UCR [Unión Cívica Radical] on the question of civil liberties, having been the first to demand from your legislators the promise to free the prisoners and to repeal the repressive laws.

We likewise call on *all the tendencies that claim to be in the left*. Enough of sectarianism!! Let's unite in the struggle for an amnesty!! Whoever, on whatever pretext, holds back the broadest unity of action in demanding that parliament grant an amnesty facilitates our compañeros' being held prisoner until they rot.

Finally, *we appeal to the families of those detained*. We suggest that they take the initiative in convoking a public mass meeting to which all the legislators are invited, there to be asked to sign a promise to vote for a general amnesty. Demand that the Peronists, the Radicals, and members of any other party take a position on this point.

Let's initiate a massive campaign for a general amnesty!!

Spanish Text

Periodista: Es cierto que una de sus primeras medidas será dictar una amplia ley de amnistía para delitos políticos?

Cámpora: Indudablemente, si estamos haciendo todo lo indecible para contribuir a la pacificación, yo pienso que el Parlamento argentino . . . tendrá la inquietud de contribuir a esa pacificación y a esa convivencia argentina, estableciendo a nivel parlamentario una amplia amnistía para todos los que están injustamente privados de su libertad. (La Nación, 13 de marzo.)

* * *

Desde esta página nos dirigimos a los compañeros que de una manera u otra vienen luchando o quieren luchar por la libertad de los presos. En especial a los compañeros de la Juventud Peronista y del peronismo combativo, que hicieron la campaña teniendo como un lema fundamental: "Cámpora presidente, libertad a los combatientes." Ustedes quizás se habrán sentido satisfechos al conocer las declaraciones del presidente electo y que transcribimos arriba.

A nosotros también nos parece, en principio, positivo que el Dr. Cámpora propicie una amplia amnistía.

Sin embargo, compañeros, no podemos dejar de señalarles que desde esas declaraciones hay un largo trecho hasta lograr que en la Argentina no quede un solo preso político a partir de mayo de este año. Es que hay cosas que quedan imprecisas en las palabras del Presidente electo.

De acuerdo a su declaración el Dr. Cámpora "piensa que el Parlamento . . . tendrá la inquietud . . ." Nos pre-

guntamos: Y si el Parlamento no tiene esa "inquietud"?

Por qué el Dr. Cámpora, para aventar dudas, no dice sencillamente: "Mi primer acto de gobierno será enviar un proyecto de ley de amplia amnistía al Parlamento; y los legisladores del FREJULI—que son mayoría—lo aprobarán de inmediato." Millones de ciudadanos esperan un compromiso así: claro y tajante.

Otro punto que inquieta, porque se presta a dobles interpretaciones, es el que establece que la "amplia amnistía" será "para todos los que están injustamente privados de su libertad." Y decimos que se presta a malas interpretaciones porque podría muy bien pensarse que si hay presos políticos que están "injustamente" en la cárcel, en cambio hay otros que lo están con toda justicia. Y esta interpretación no es caprichosa. Sabemos,—el propio Mor Roig lo insinuó horas antes del comicio—que los militares están dispuestos a admitir, para aliviar presiones, una amnistía discriminada o selectiva; es decir, soltar a un puñado de presos por los llamados "delitos" menores, para dejar que el resto se pudra en la cárcel. De ninguna manera afirmamos que en el ánimo del Dr. Cámpora pese esta interpretación. Pero sería necesario aclarar.

TODOS los presos políticos, incluidos TODOS los guerrilleros, deben ser liberados, Quién va a determinar cuáles están "justa" o "injustamente" presos? Acaso los mismos jueces que los condenaron en base a "confesiones espontáneas" obtenidas por torturas? Y en base a qué norma se los va liberar o dejar en la cárcel? Acaso se los discriminará ideológicamente?

Absolutamente TODOS los presos políticos y guerrilleros deben ser liberados, porque *el único culpable de toda la violencia en estos últimos años es el régimen militar*. Fue la dictadura la que comenzó reprimiendo a sangre y fuego la protesta popular. Fue sobre esa base que surgieron y se desarrollaron las acciones guerrilleras.

Compañeros de la Juventud Peronista y del peronismo combativo: ustedes, mejor que nadie, saben el carácter condicionado que las Fuerzas Armadas piensan imponer al próximo gobierno. Y también saben que uno de los puntos principales de condicionamiento es el referente a los presos políticos.

A la declaración del Dr. Cámpora le falta entonces lo principal: Cómo contrarrestar las formidables presiones que harán los militares para impedir una amnistía verdaderamente amplia y total? Hay un solo medio: Todos los que queremos terminar con el reinado de la cárcel y la tortura debemos movilizarnos unidos!! Y con un objetivo preciso: *solicitar a los diputados y senadores electos, en especial del FREJULI, un compromiso público que la primera ley que vote el Congreso será una amplia amnistía, la abolición de toda la legislación represiva y de la Cámara Federal, y la investigación de las torturas, asesinatos y secuestros cometidos durante la dictadura militar*. Para esto último, exigir la formación de una Comisión Investigadora, con mayoría obrera, formada por legisladores, representantes de las organizaciones sindicales, partidos políticos y familiares de asesinados.

Nos dirigimos para esto, en primer lugar, *a los compañeros de la Juventud Peronista y del peronismo combativo*. Sobre ustedes pesa una enorme responsabilidad. Ustedes fueron el nervio de la campaña del FREJULI, y en ella levantaron, como una de las consignas principales: "Cámpora presidente, libertad a los combatientes."

No cabe discutir si los legisladores del FREJULI tienen la intención de cumplir sin vacilar con esa promesa electoral. *Es que no se trata principalmente de intenciones, sino de la fuerza con que habrá que neutralizar la formidable presión de los militares.* Por eso, compañeros de la Juventud Peronista y del peronismo combativo, ustedes deben tener más interés y urgencia que nadie en impulsar esa amplia movilización por los presos.

Llamamos igualmente a los jóvenes radicales: ustedes reivindican la tradición de la UCR en materia de libertades públicas: sean los primeros en exigir a sus legisladores el compromiso de libertar a los presos y derogar las leyes represivas.

Llamamos también a todas las tendencias que se re-

claman de izquierda: Basta de sectarismo!! Unámonos para luchar por la amnistía!! Quién ponga trabas, con cualquier pretexto, a la más amplia unidad de acción para exigir al parlamento una amnistía, está contribuyendo a que los compañeros presos se pudran en la cárcel.

Finalmente, *nos dirigimos a los familiares de los detenidos:* les sugerimos que tomen la iniciativa de convocar un gran acto público donde inviten a todos los legisladores, pidiéndoles que allí suscriban el compromiso de votar la amnistía general. Exijan que peronistas, radicales o de cualquier otro partido se pronuncien sobre este punto.

Iniciemos una campaña masiva por la amnistía general!!!

Prisoner Writes on National Oppression in Ukraine

[A little more than a year ago, in late December 1971, a confidential order was issued by the top leadership of the Soviet bureaucracy, the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. The order to the KGB (political police) was for an all-out campaign to suppress *samizdat*, the uncensored, privately reproduced and circulated material that has become such a widespread phenomenon in recent years in the Soviet Union.

[The Ukrainian version of this literature is called *samvydav*, and the magazine *Ukrainsky Visnyk* (Ukrainian Herald) has since 1970 been the most coherent and regular expression of the (prosocialist) national opposition in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

[In spite of the police drive to suppress *Ukrainsky Visnyk*, which took the form of the arrest of hundreds of known oppositionists in many cities of the Ukraine beginning in mid-January 1972, the sixth issue of the *samvydav* magazine began to circulate in March 1972. Since that time, no issue of the *Visnyk* is known to have appeared, but this does not mean that the police have definitively suppressed it.

[Recently copies of the sixth issue of *Ukrainsky Visnyk* became available outside the Soviet Union. The following document was one of a number included in that issue dealing with the case of Valentyn Moroz, a leading Ukrainian dissident.

[Although the Moroz document dates from May 1968 (at which time Moroz was confined in a KGB prison in Kiev), it has never before appeared

in the West or in English. It is of special interest to Marxists in its comments on the interrelation between the national and socialist struggles, and particularly in its assessment of Lenin's revolutionary grasp of the national question. Moroz's observations on this point are of real value, despite his somewhat unusual "biological" formulations. The translation from the Ukrainian original is by the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners.]

* * *

Statement to the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, from political prisoner Valentyn Moroz

Any social force that wants to remain viable and not fall beneath the wheels of history must abide by a fundamental political wisdom. There is a perpetual problem: the need to discard ballast, to rid oneself of tendencies that drag one under, to be able to infuse new tendencies required by life into one's organism.

This is a biological rather than a political wisdom. An organism expels waste products—anything that reduces its chances in its struggle for survival, anything that diminishes its prospects for the future. Dinosaurs become extinct because they were unable to discard their biological heredity, which became ballast and dragged them to the bottom. Mammals survived because they managed to fulfill this task.

It is a matter of life or death for a political organism to free itself of the forces of the past, which do everything in their power to appear the friends and defenders of the existing order. For in reality they are a time bomb; sooner or later this bomb will destroy him who has not thrown it out of his house.

The KGB is preparing a new reprisal. Once again we will hear the false words: "In the name of the Ukrainian SSR . . ." This is a lie. The interests of the political organism that is called the Ukrainian SSR do not require a new act of lawlessness. The "Report From the Beria Reservation" contains not one word against either the Soviet regime or communist ideology. This document is directed against the violation of law. It cites *facts* about crimes. Nevertheless, this document has been proclaimed not only "anti-Soviet," but also "subversive." At last we understand: the trial was not for anti-Soviet activity. On the contrary: the violators of the law were punishing those who expose their crimes.

The document clearly states that it is directed against those who discredit (and therefore subvert) the social order, and yet the document was declared subversive. The victim was declared the criminal.

The forces that inspired this reprisal are the forces whose time has passed. They are those who would immortalize Stalinism. They can no longer destroy me physically as not too long ago they destroyed millions of Ukrainians. Half their teeth are gone. And without doubt the inexorable

march of history will crush the remainder. But for the time being they snap their teeth and pretend to defend the interests of socialism. That is the main thing. Unfortunately, for the time being they are able to cover their deeds under the name of socialism, while in fact these deeds *undermine the very positions of socialism.*

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine is faced with an age-old problem: the need to develop the ability to recognize whom it covers with its flag. It is always a good idea to read any document you are about to sign very carefully. They say that one official signed a document (without reading it beforehand) stating that he was promoting himself to a higher position.

There is nothing strange in the fact that chauvinists accuse us of anti-Soviet activity. Proclaiming your opponent an enemy of the existing regime, the ruling ideology, is an old tactic. Even Thomas Aquinas (the father of Christian theology and a proclaimed saint) was accused of atheism by his opponents. . . . Russian chauvinism has always attributed to Ukrainian patriots a hostile attitude toward the reigning doctrines. At one time they were labeled socialists (at that time socialism was considered dangerous); today they are labeled opponents of socialism.

Anyone who regards a document directed against chauvinism, Stalinism, and lawlessness as anti-Soviet equates Soviet rule with chauvinism, Stalinism, and lawlessness. Anyone who persecutes a man who exposes a crime defends the criminal. *Could the most inveterate anticommunist conjecture a more effective method of subverting communism in the ideological struggle with the West?*

Intensifying the *ideological* struggle against an enemy does not mean waving a club in front of his nose with greater intensity. *Ideological* battles are won only through the use of ideological weapons. Sentencings will not help in this matter; on the contrary, they will only do harm. Anyone who uses his fists to defend his position in a discussion only proves that he has lost. "To rebuff" an opponent's ideological attacks is not in the vocabulary of the doomed. Anyone who produces a club against an idea, only hammers the last nail into his own coffin and ties a rock around his

neck. A political power that wants to have a future has to learn to recognize such rocks, for from above they sometimes resemble laurel wreaths.

Throughout northern Europe monarchies have survived, but they have disappeared in the south. Is it perhaps that northern Europe is more backward? On the contrary. Why then? The answer is that northern European monarchies found within themselves the strength to rid themselves of the forces and tendencies that were pulling them to the bottom; they managed to link their destinies in time with new tendencies and movements, ignoring the cries of those for whom change meant death. They knew how to throw the lethal ballast overboard and in its place raise new sails. The monarchies of southern Europe acted in a different manner: they placed their hopes on those who advised them to "hold on and not let go," on those who advised them to strangle all opposition. Who proved stronger? Not he who closed his eyes and ignored the realistic situation and screamed about his "invincibility" (this method only helps to drown one's own fears).

It is impossible "not to allow" a new tendency; it will triumph regardless, but by donning new clothes, as a weapon in the hands of the opponent. Not to allow a spring stream into one's own channel is to divert it onto another's mill. Not to forge one's own weapons out of a new tendency is to turn over this tendency to the hands of the enemy.

At the center of the ideological struggle between East and West stands the problem of freedom, the problem of human rights. To try a man for expressing ideas under these circumstances (and at a time when the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights guarantee freedom of speech) is to cut the branch from under oneself. In the ideological struggle the victor is not he who invents the greatest number of semi-obscene words, but he who opens his sluices to those forces that have prospects rather than those that are dying.

Life today has posed Ukrainian communists with the same problem that Lenin faced fifty years ago: national rebirth. Then, as now, there was no lack of the various Artems and Piatakovs who shouted that

"Ukrainization" had died along with Petlura. Lenin realized that to accept this view meant to direct this mighty stream (the national factor) onto his opponents' mill.

Will contemporary Ukrainian communists finally be able to reinstate Lenin's Ukrainization policy and declare a resolute war against Russian chauvinism in Ukraine? Herein lies the determining factor of success in the ideological struggle with the West. One may swear as much as one pleases that Leninist national norms have been fully restored in Ukraine, but as long as people are tried for protesting chauvinism, all these phrases will fail to convince. There is a more current example. The communists of Czechoslovakia are showing communists throughout the world how that which has become ballast should be thrown overboard and how to open sluices to forces that guarantee a future. Will the communists of Ukraine (in their own interest) be capable of learning this lesson?

National rebirth is the mightiest factor in our contemporary world and it is ridiculous to hide from it behind a piece of paper called a sentence. This wave will have to subside of itself, but only

*When into the gaping grave will fall
The last chauvinist on earth.*

(Vasyl Symonenko)

The new opens doors without knocking. There is no question of whether "to admit" or "not to admit" national rebirth (or any new tendency). The question, however, is this: he who realizes and takes notice of this will survive, and he who does not, will fall under the hoofs of history.

The KGB is preparing a new reprisal. Once again elementary human rights will be trampled — at a time when humanity is celebrating International Human Rights Year! Once again the West will receive a potent argument in the ideological struggle with communism.

Who profits by this?

Is it possible that this time too the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine will fail to stop those who weaken the positions of communism with their deeds?

Is it possible that persons who regard political wisdom as their profession fail to understand an elementary truism — the truism of self-preservation?

Final Returns in Buenos Aires

The final official returns for the federal district of Buenos Aires in the March 11 presidential elections were as follows, according to the March 26 issue of *La Nación*:

For President and Vice-President

FREJULI	663,567
Unión Cívica Radical	426,413
Alianza Popular Federalista	331,633
Alianza Popular Revolucionaria	258,647
Nueva Fuerza	45,108
Socialista Democrático	25,231
Alianza Republicana Federal	21,611
Socialista de los Trabajadores	16,253
Frente de Izquierda Popular	5,425
Blank votes	17,680
Voided	10,713

For Senators

FREJULI	645,776
Unión Cívica Radical	385,292
Alianza Popular Revolucionaria	244,343
Alianza Popular Federalista	178,454
Demócrata Progresista	96,011
Nueva Fuerza	93,912
Socialista Democrático	76,958
Socialista de los Trabajadores	31,030
Federalista Popular	12,308
Frente de Izquierda Popular	10,531
Cruzada Cívica Combatiente	7,855
Laborista	6,114
Blank votes	21,525
Voided	10,133

For Deputies

FREJULI	643,023
Unión Cívica Radical	368,545
Alianza Popular Revolucionaria	241,411
Nueva Fuerza	108,900
Renovador Federal	96,971
Demócrata Progresista	92,601
Socialista Democrático	90,830
Unión Popular	71,980
Socialista de los Trabajadores	36,151
Federalista Popular	12,231
Frente de Izquierda Popular	9,687
Laborista	8,943
Cruzada Cívica Combatiente	8,055
Blank votes	22,611
Voided	9,560

For Representatives

FREJULI	644,881
Unión Cívica Radical	380,397
Unión Popular	160,810
Nueva Fuerza	103,484
Renovador Popular	98,764
Socialista Democrático	98,452
Socialista de los Trabajadores	37,673
Federalista Popular	12,749
Cruzada Cívica Combatiente	8,584
Blank votes	170,050
Voided	8,202
Appealed	1,240
Challenged	766

Platform of the Committees Against the Debré Law in France

[The following is the text of the platform adopted March 14 by the national conference of the Committees of Struggle Against the Debré Law in France. It appeared in the March 23 issue of *Rouge*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

We are struggling to demand the repeal of the Debré law:

- because this law increases social stratification (how many youth from modest financial backgrounds will be able to take up their studies again after a year of systematic bludgeoning and brutalization, while at the same time they find themselves confronted with practically insoluble financial problems?);

- because this law is a beautiful example of covering up youth unemployment, and it transforms us into bargain-rate laborers (for young workers who come out of the CES [Collège d'Enseignement Secondaire—Institution of Secondary Instruction] at age sixteen, the choice is simple: either starve to death with a poorly paid job because they haven't yet fulfilled their military service, or else anticipate the call and enlist);

- because this law accelerates the militarization of youth. It's a matter of taking us in [to the army] earlier in order better to be able to indoctrinate and brutalize us;

- because this law intensifies the normalization in the universities (it's a means of eliminating the extra students, like the DEUG [Diplôme

d'Etudes Universitaires Générales—General University Studies Diploma, part of an educational reform sponsored by the regime]);

- because this law strengthens the normalization in the high-schools/barracks and the blackmail of labor (It is no longer permissible to repeat a year of study, to waver, or to change a course of study);

- because this law is a new encroachment of the military caste on the youth.

We do not demand the mere return of the old system of deferments based on class privilege.

We demand the repeal of the Debré law, the reestablishment of the deferments and their extension, and the freedom of choice about the time of induction for all youth.

French CP Lies About Student Movement

[The following article appeared in the March 23 issue of *Rouge*, newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

In a March 3 communiqué UNCAL [Union Nationale des Comités d'Action Lycéens—National Union of High-School Action Committees], which is led by the Communist party youth, stated that it regarded the demonstrations for the reestablishment of draft deferments "inopportune." The communiqué added: "Today, each high-schooler, academic or vocational, must be aware that it is possible to change things . . . through the victory of the Common Program. The regime is prepared to do anything to prevent this victory. Even to use the high-school students in a mass provocative maneuver."

That was before the elections.

On March 19, *l'Humanité* [the leading CP newspaper] acknowledged the existence of "tens of thousands of high-school students in struggle." Plenty of provocateurs looming on the horizon, but still, a struggle "against an ill-conceived and unjust law."

That was after the elections.

On March 21 *l'Humanité* published an UNCAL communiqué warning high-school students against:

"The attempts to take over their movement by ultraleftist groups and the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié—United Socialist party], who—after the democratic and youth organizations, with the support of the teachers, had announced a national day of action—called for a demonstration on March 22, a decision that was accorded extraordinary publicity on the airwaves."

Disgusting! Not only do the Communist party and UNCAL divide the movement, they also tell brazen lies.

The high-school students know perfectly well that the central demonstration on March 22 was called and prepared a week in advance by their strike committees, their united committees of struggle against the Debré law. They know perfectly well that the "day of action" called for March 21 was announced in *l'Humanité* on the morn-

ing of March 20, without even the knowledge of most CP or Young Communist high-schoolers.

The crass lies are aimed—and this makes them all the more vile—mainly at the workers, to make them believe that the Communist party initiated the

Ceylon Mercantile Union's 'Demands in Defence of the People'

[The following statement of demands was distributed at the annual membership meeting of the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU) held in Colombo and attended by more than 5,000 persons. Although the authorities banned a march that was proposed by the CMU leadership, the meeting participants held a very impressive walk, in long file along the sidewalk.]

* * *

The following 5 demands have been approved by the General Council of the Union, after consultation with other mass organisations, for the submission to the Prime Minister, with the signatures of all people in Ceylon who endorse these demands in the defence of the human and democratic rights and the living standards of the people:

1. Stop the import of arms, and cut the expenditure of a million rupees a day on the police and the armed services, instead of extracting more and more money from the people by increasing the prices of essential commodities.

Provide the second measure of rice on the ration, as well as sugar, flour and other essential commodities, at prices that the masses of the people can afford to pay, and restore the free measure of rice to all wage earners who have been deprived of it.

2. End the Emergency. Restore all democratic rights and civil liberties that have been suppressed or subjected to arbitrary control under the Emergency regulations.

Repeal all laws for the suppression or restriction of the human and democratic rights of the people, such as the Public Security Ordinance and the Criminal Justice Commissions Act, as

high-school mobilizations and that ultraleftist grouplets are splitters. This recalls the first days of May 1968, the time when Marchais [CP leader] called Cohn-Bendit a German Jew!

Splitters, liars, falsifiers, and scoundrels! In a word, Stalinists, for it will unfortunately be necessary for many high-schoolers to learn to call a spade a spade!

well as the new law to curb the freedom of the press.

3. Stop arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, and prevent torture of arrested persons on the "fourth floor" (C. I. D. [Criminal Investigation Department] headquarters) or anywhere else.

Release the thousands of political prisoners still being held arbitrarily in custody, and stop police harassment and re-arrests of those released.

4. Compensate all persons who have suffered injury or loss of property at the hands of the police or the military, and the dependants of those who have been killed by those forces.

5. Restore the fundamental right of workers to strike. Reinstate all persons who have been deprived of their employment by reason of "essential service" orders or other Emergency regulations.

Members are requested to obtain the signatures of members of their families, and of relatives and friends, in support of the demands. Those members in each branch or workplace who decide to participate actively in the signature campaign are requested to form a People's Defence Committee composed of such members, for this purpose. Similar Committees may be set up on a village or area basis.

Please contact the Union Headquarters for the lists on which signatures are to be obtained.

Long live the CMU!
Victory to the people!

Red Stars?

Fifty-five leading Cambodian astrologers have been arrested for predicting that Lon Nol will not survive in power until the end of April.