

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 15, No. 15

© 1977 by Intercontinental Press

April 25, 1977

75¢

Zaire Dictator Bolstered by Troop Airlift



CARTER: Masterminds campaign by imperialist powers.

Tariq Ali Banned From U.S.

Demands Public Amends for Vilification of Hansen, Novack

Fourth International Denounces Healyite Frame-up Campaign

Americans Denied Right to Hear Tariq Ali

By Judy White

Tariq Ali, an expert on Pakistani and Indian affairs, has been barred from entering the United States by the Carter administration. Ali had been invited to speak at several American universities on "Crisis in India and Pakistan Today" in mid-April. He is author of *Pakistan: Military Dictatorship or People's Rule?*

American embassy officials in London gave no reason for refusing his request for a visa. Perhaps it had something to do with the fact that he is one of the leaders of the International Marxist Group, the British section of the Fourth International.

At virtually the same time Ali was banned, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance announced that three Soviet labor officials—Georgi Oleshkevich, Ivan Sysoyev, and Yevgeny Butarev—were being refused entry to the United States. They had been invited to attend the national convention of the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

In another attack on the right of free travel, the Justice Department refused April 14 to grant a visa to Peruvian author Hugo Blanco. The Immigration and Naturalization Service based its action on the claim that the "evidence submitted to date does not establish the pre-eminence of the

beneficiary in a particular field, whether literary, political, sociological or philosophical. . . ."

Blanco's book, *Land or Death*, recounting the history and political lessons of the massive Peruvian peasant movement he led in the early 1960s, has been translated into several languages and read by tens of thousands of persons throughout the world.

Furthermore, the State Department maintains in full force the ban against allowing Belgian Marxist economist Ernest Mandel to enter the United States, where he has had numerous offers of speaking engagements at some of the country's most prominent universities.

The latest moves by Washington to deprive U.S. citizens of the right to hear the points of view of opponents of capitalism from other countries expose the fraud of Carter's March 17 speech at the United Nations, where he said that he was "moving now to liberalize almost completely travel opportunities to America."

Moreover, the bans on Ali, the Soviet labor officials, Blanco, and Mandel are transparent violations of the Helsinki accords, which Carter piously claims to uphold. □

ported from Washington April 12 that the White House was moving cautiously because "any deeper American involvement, with memories of Vietnam and the abortive 1975 intervention in Angola still fresh, would provoke a strong reaction from Congress and the country."

At the same time, however, the White House has taken action through some of Africa's former colonial masters, particularly the regimes in Belgium and France. Citing the same government officials, Hovey reported that "there is a strong feeling that Zaïre is getting all the heavy military equipment it needs from Belgium and France and thus there was no need for the United States to grant any."

Despite the State Department's denials that it is coordinating its involvement in Zaïre with these European powers, the editors of the *New York Times* noted April 13 that Carter's actions imply "a desire nonetheless to orchestrate the interventions and to fill in the aid gaps."

The most serious imperialist intervention in Zaïre so far is that being carried out by Paris. President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing revealed April 12 that the French airlift of Moroccan troops was under consideration April 2, when he met with U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance to discuss the situation in Africa. But he denied that he had mentioned to Vance the plans for the airlift. The first French planes flew to Morocco April 7, he said, and then to Zaïre the following day. The airlift was not publicly announced until April 10.

Giscard claimed that the airlift was launched in response to requests by the Moroccan and Zaïrian regimes. But correspondent Robin Wright said in the April 14 *Washington Post* that Moroccan King Hassan II was "reportedly urged by French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing to grant military assistance" to Mobutu.

The first Moroccan contingent airlifted to Zaïre numbered 1,500 troops, led by two colonels who fought in Zaïre, then called the Congo, in the early 1960s as part of an American-backed United Nations force. A second contingent of 1,500 troops has been placed on standby in Morocco, ready to fly to Zaïre if needed.

Like Carter, Giscard has also tried to minimize the extent of French intervention. In an April 12 television broadcast, he said, "France has no intention of sending its combat troops to Africa for a Vietnam-type war."

However, the Paris daily *France-Soir* published a photo of three French soldiers on the front page of its April 12 issue over the caption: "This is the first photo of the French military advisers in Kolwezi, in the Zaïrian province of Shaba (ex-Katanga)." A communiqué issued by the French Foreign Ministry April 11 admitted that French military instructors were stationed in Zaïre, but denied that they would take

Washington Steps Up Intervention in Zaïre

By Ernest Harsch

Claiming that it hoped to prevent "an escalation of the fighting" in Zaïre, the Carter administration announced April 12 that it was rushing an additional \$13 million worth of "nonlethal" military aid to help prop up dictator Mobutu Sese Seko.

Combined with the French airlift of 1,500 Moroccan troops and the dispatching of French and Belgian "advisers" to Zaïre, the new shipments of American military assistance mark the growing escalation of imperialist intervention in that central African country.

The stepped-up involvement of Washington, Paris, Brussels, and other powers followed the outbreak of fighting in Zaïre's mineral-rich Shaba Province (formerly Katanga). Antigovernment Katangan troops reportedly entered Shaba from their bases in northern Angola March 8 and are now thought to hold about one-third of the province.

Although the State Department said

that it had rejected Mobutu's request for even more "emergency assistance," the \$13 million worth of supplies—including a C-130 transport plane, spare parts, fuel, and communications equipment—nevertheless represent a significant increase in U.S. aid. A previous shipment, which was sent March 15, was valued at only \$2 million.

State Department representative Hodding Carter III termed the new shipment a "carefully considered response" to Mobutu's requests. He claimed that no American technicians would be sent to Zaïre to operate the equipment and said that no American military advisers were stationed there.

The Carter administration's step-by-step approach and its efforts to minimize the extent of American intervention are intended to avoid triggering a strong antiwar response within the United States. Citing government officials, *New York Times* correspondent Graham Hovey re-

part in any military operations. A presidential spokesman said that they were there only to instruct Zaïrian forces in how to use French military equipment.

Reports from Zaïre, however, indicate that the French forces are playing a direct role in helping the Zaïrian army prepare its operations against the Katangans.

A correspondent for the Brussels daily *La Libre Belgique* reported from Kolwezi that "the French have aided General Singa and Colonel Sassa to reorganize their troops. . . ." *Le Figaro* reporter J.-J. Leblond quoted Col. Michel France-schi, the commander of the French detachment in Kolwezi, as saying, "We are here to organize Kolwezi's defense system and to ensure the arrival of the Moroccans." (Quoted in the April 13 *Le Monde*.)

Even more ominous was a report in the April 14 *Le Monde* that fifteen officers and noncommissioned officers of the 11th Parachute Division had recently arrived in Zaïre. Stationed in southern France, the division is part of Paris's mobile strike force, known as the "force d'intervention," which has carried out military actions in several African countries since the early 1960s.

The French imperialists received valuable backing from the Stalinist regime in Peking, which supports Mobutu. An April 11 New China News Agency dispatch said that Paris had "responded positively" to Mobutu's "just struggle" against "foreign subversion."

Besides Paris and Washington, other imperialist powers have also rushed in. The Belgian regime—the former colonial ruler of Zaïre—sent thirty planeloads of light weapons. On April 12, Belgian Prime Minister Leo Tindemans admitted that there were eighty Belgian military "advisers" in Zaïre.

The West German government announced April 14 that it would fly \$2.1 million worth of "humanitarian and medical aid" to the Mobutu regime.

Citing "highly reliable sources," Robin Wright reported in the April 9 *Washington Post* that Mobutu had negotiated with a top official of the South African Bureau of State Security a week earlier for the provision of emergency aid, mainly fuel and money, from the racist regime in Pretoria.

After meeting with Carter and other U.S. officials in Washington in early April, Egyptian President Anwar el-Sadat charged that Moscow was aiding the Katangan forces in Shaba. On April 9 he said, "I hope we shall be doing something to help President Mobutu."

The Khartoum daily *El Ayam* reported April 11 that Sudanese President Gaafar al-Nimeiry has offered aid to the Zaïrian regime and sent an envoy to Kinshasa to discuss the assistance.

According to a report in the April 14 *Washington Post*, Zaïrian officials have said that the shah of Iran has also pledged to send support to Mobutu. □

In This Issue

Closing News Date: April 18, 1977

CZECHOSLOVAKIA	446	London Meeting Supports Charter 77
	446	An Appeal From Workers in Czechoslovakia
PAKISTAN	447	Protests Mount Against Bhutto Regime
SPAIN	448	Basques Mobilize for Amnesty —by Marcos Urrutia
	449	Trotskyist Youth Group Formed
SOUTH AFRICA	450	Pretoria's Partners—From London to Tokyo—by Ernest Harsch
	455	Students Protest Deaths of Political Prisoners—by Ernest Harsch
BRITAIN	458	Reed's Tour a Great Success —by J. O'Brien
SOVIET UNION	464	The Case of Aleksandr Serhienko —by Marilyn Vogt
NEWS ANALYSIS	442	Americans Denied Right to Hear Tariq Ali—by Judy White
	442	Washington Steps Up Intervention in Zaïre—by Ernest Harsch
DOCUMENTS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL	444	Fourth International Denounces Healyite Frame-up Campaign
BOOKS	456	Namibia's Political Prisoners —reviewed by Ernest Harsch
	456	Some Points of Difference With Tim Wohlforth
	457	Tim Wohlforth Replies
AROUND THE WORLD	459	
CAPITALISM		
FOULS THINGS UP	460	Thousands of New Yorkers Rally Against Concorde
DOCUMENTS	462	A Ukrainian Worker's Open Letter to Brezhnev
	463	Japanese Trotskyists Declare Solidarity With South Korean Dissidents
DRAWINGS	441	Jimmy Carter; 455, James T. Kruger —by Copain

Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Varick Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Published in New York each Monday except the first in January and the third and fourth in August.

Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at New York, N.Y.

Editor: Joseph Hansen.

Contributing Editors: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

Editorial Staff: Michael Baumann, Gerry Foley, Ernest Harsch, Susan Wald, Steve Wattenmaker, Judy White.

Business Manager: Pat Galligan.

Copy Editors: Jon Britton, Fred Murphy, Sally Rhett.

Technical Staff: Paul Deveze, Ellen Fischer, Larry Ingram, Arthur Lobman, James M. Morgan.

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 stands on the program of the Fourth International.

Paris Office: Pierre Frank, 10 Impasse Guéménée, 75004, Paris, France.

To Subscribe: For one year send \$24 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Varick Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Write for rates on first class and airmail.

For airmail subscriptions in Europe: Write to Pathfinder Press, 47 The Cut, London SE1 8LL. In Australia: Write to Pathfinder Press, P.O. Box 151, Glebe 2037. In New Zealand: Write to Socialist Books, P.O. Box 1663, Wellington.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Varick Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

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.

Intercontinental Press is published by the 408 Printing and Publishing Corporation, 408 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Offices at 408 West Street, New York, N.Y.

Copyright © 1977 by Intercontinental Press.

Fourth International Denounces Healyite Frame-up Campaign

[The following letter, dated March 26, 1977, is by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. It was written in reply to a letter from C. Slaughter of the "International Committee of the Fourth International," the text of which appears on the opposite page.]

* * *

To: "International Committee of the Fourth International"

Dear Comrade Slaughter,

Your letter of February 7, 1977, to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International has puzzled us because of its contradictory nature.

First as to the facts. The purpose of the January 14 meeting, to which you refer, was to defend workers democracy against the use of frame-ups and slanders; and in particular to denounce the campaign being waged by leaders of the Workers Revolutionary Party charging Joseph Hansen and George Novack with being "accomplices of the GPU" and other leaders of the Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International with helping them in "covering up for the GPU."

In face of the facts, you state: "On January 14 last you called a meeting in London with the declared purpose of answering the demand of the International Committee for a commission of inquiry into the security questions surrounding Trotsky's assassination and GPU penetration of the Trotskyist movement."

Your statement is obviously intended to help create the impression that by participating in the January 14 meeting we responded in some way to your demand to help set up a commission to "investigate" Hansen, Novack, and anyone else the central leadership of the WRP might decide to smear for factional reasons. That appears to be why you refer to previous letters you have written on this subject and why you leave out any reference to the public articles written during this same period by Hansen and Novack exposing the frame-up methods used against them.

Thus you pave the way for the assertion: "What took place at the London meeting has had the positive result of broadening considerably the interest in the workers' movement on these questions."

Does this praise from you for the results obtained by the protest meeting mark the beginning of a change in attitude toward us and our efforts to call to account the perpetrators of the frame-up campaign against Hansen and Novack? We would welcome such a change.

However, if a change in line is involved, your letter stands in glaring contradiction to the line being followed by the *News Line*, which in advance of the meeting condemned the participants and pictured the scheduled protest rally as a "Platform of Shame." After the event, the *News Line* escalated the epithet to "A Night of Slander."

In accordance with this way of picturing things, your cothinkers in the United States published an article in the February 25 *Bulletin* under the pen name "Frank Williams," describing the January 14 rally in defense of workers democracy and against the use of frame-ups and slanders as a meeting "in which revisionist leaders participated in a Platform of Shame to whitewash the GPU and its accomplices, Hansen and Novack."

It appears to us that you are caught in a considerable contradiction. The *News Line* and the *Bulletin* smear us with the false charge that we participated in a public meeting "to whitewash the GPU"; at the same time you send us a friendly letter commending our role at the meeting.

Perhaps you disagree with the *News Line* and the *Bulletin*. In that case, as a Trotskyist you are duty bound to open a vigorous struggle against the frame-up they use. But if you agree with the stance of the *Bulletin* and the *News Line*, you place yourself as a Trotskyist (which you claim to be) in the unprincipled position of addressing "accomplices of the GPU" and offering to join with them in setting up a parity committee to inquire into the crimes of the GPU. Did Trotsky address "dear comrades Yezhov and Vyshinsky" with the aim of peacefully discussing with them the crimes of the GPU that lay behind the Moscow Trials?

Whatever explanation may be offered for the contradictory nature of your letter, we want to stress our stand: We hold that the use of physical violence, of slanders and lies against opponents, has the effect of a deadly cancer in the labor movement which must [be] eradicated at all costs.

The Stalinists bear the prime responsibility for using such methods in the labor movement. But others share the guilt. Social Democrats, reformists, Peronists, and other trade-union bureaucrats and labor fakers have sinned in this respect again and again. Even petty sects have shown that they are not immune to committing such abominations.

We will fight against such methods mercilessly, wherever we encounter them. They are poison for the working class. They disrupt the normal functioning of workers democracy within working-class

organizations. They block clarification of political issues for the working class. They stand in the way of development of class consciousness. They discredit the labor movement and give aid and comfort to the class enemy. They are obstacles to the proletarian class struggle, obstacles to unity of action of the proletariat against the class enemy, obstacles to building genuinely revolutionary parties, obstacles to the socialist revolution. That is how we see them. That is why we fight them.

They can serve no proletarian or revolutionary-socialist purpose, regardless of the justifications advanced by practitioners of such methods: "security," "the need for secrecy," "in the class war all means are justified," and similar threadbare bits of sophistry. Since its foundation, the Fourth International has waged war against these variations of the lie. We shall win that war against the Stalinists as well as against the reformists and all their petty imitators.

Why did an organization like yours, which is of Trotskyist origin, and which in its first years was educated in a spirit of irreconcilable hostility to all methods that violate proletarian democracy, degenerate to such a point that it now employs the methods of bureaucratic gangsterism against its political opponents?

We believe that the origin of your course can be traced back to your refusal to participate in the principled reunification of 1963 which brought together the overwhelming majority of the world Trotskyist movement inside the Fourth International. You made a sectarian attempt to justify an isolationist course: first, by distorting the positions of the reunited movement; secondly, by exaggerating the real political differences that still separated your current from the bulk of the world Trotskyist movement.

Besides that you banked on organizational successes that would be achieved by

Copies Missing?

Keep your files of Intercontinental Press complete and up-to-date. Missing issues for the current year may be ordered by sending 75¢ per copy. Write for information about previous years.

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

your grouping and on organizational disasters that would shatter all others who proclaimed they stood for Trotskyism.

The reality turned out to be different from the schema you projected. Following 1968, the Fourth International expanded, so that despite some setbacks it now includes parties and groups in sixty countries. In contrast, the rump "International Committee," which you set up in 1963, ended in dismal failure and a series of irreparable splits.

In accordance with the dialectics of sectarian self-justification and dead-end factionalism, you escalated your efforts to seal off your members from the political influence of the Fourth International. The objective was to block any real political debate inside your own organization over your isolationist course, your factional reasons for remaining outside the mainstream of world Trotskyism, your withdrawal into an insular shell, and your discreditment among the British workers.

It is the dialectic of dead-end factionalism, over which you seem to have lost all control, that brought you to include the use of physical violence against your opponents. We have repeatedly pointed to the case of Comrade Ernest Tate. He had to be punished for the "criminal provocation" of selling a pamphlet outside one of your public meetings in 1966.

A similar case occurred on October 17, 1976, in Sydney, Australia. David Deutschmann of the Socialist Workers Party and Keith Olerhead of the Spartacist League were badly beaten by your cothinkers of the Socialist Labour League. Deutschmann was guilty of the "criminal provocation" of distributing literature near the entrance of an SLL meeting. Olerhead was guilty of the "criminal provocation" of carrying a camera.

In the same pattern, you slandered Comrade Bala Tampoe, the respected revolutionary workers leader of Sri Lanka, as an "associate of the CIA."

Ernest Mandel, who has been banned from five imperialist countries for his revolutionary Marxist political views, is another of your targets. The latest slander is that he abandoned his responsibilities in the leadership of the Fourth International to become a "Cambridge professor." There is not a word of truth in these assertions.

In the case of Comrades Hansen and Novack, the very grossness of the slander directed at them—"accomplices of the GPU"—helps reveal its purpose. What means could more strongly prejudice members of the WRP from considering the political views of two internationally known Trotskyists who have spent a lifetime defending the program of Trotskyism and building the revolutionary movement in a principled struggle against imperialism and Stalinism?

All these slanders and lies have but one purpose; to prevent your members from

Letter From Cliff Slaughter

February 7th 1977

To United Secretariat
And J. Barnes SWP

Dear Comrades,

On January 14th last you called a meeting in London with the declared purpose of answering the demand of the International Committee for a commission of inquiry into the security questions surrounding Trotsky's assassination and GPU penetration of the Trotskyist movement. This meeting took place exactly one year and nine months after our first letter to you (May 29, 1975) raising these questions and proposing a parity commission jointly to investigate them. This proposal has been repeated on several occasions subsequently. What took place at the London meeting has had the positive result of broadening considerably the interest in the workers' movement on these questions. You will have noted that Pablo's message to your meeting included the proposal for a commission of inquiry in order to clear up the historical questions which have been raised.

Our purpose in writing to you now is to propose the immediate setting up of a parity committee representing equally the International Committee and the United Secretariat in order to select and arrange for the preparation and convening of a Commission of Inquiry acceptable to both sides. The Commission would be charged with considering

all the evidence already established as well as the new facts which are now coming to the fore. The presence in the USSR of Ramon Mercader, decorated for his assassin's role, working with the same team of GPU agents (some in Moscow, some now in the Italian Communist Party) who organised the murders of Sedov, Andres Nin, the anarchists Tresca and Berneri and many, many others, is only one of these facts. It would be criminal to leave these matters where they stand, on the eve of great revolutionary struggles, for example in Spain, where these Stalinist butchers will renew their counter-revolutionary violence against Trotskyists and against others like Nin and Tresca who opposed Stalinism in the workers' movement.

We make this call with the aim of drawing your attention to the historical responsibility involved in these great questions. It cannot be allowed to continue without any method of resolving and learning the lessons for the whole world movement. Your political differences on the question of security are not with the International Committee of the Fourth International but with history itself. We appeal to you to put all considerations of a factional and sectarian character to one side, and to begin with us immediately the preparations for a parity committee.

Yours fraternally,

Cliff Slaughter. For the International Committee of the Fourth International.

asking a simple question: how is it possible that in the four imperialist countries where there is currently a revolutionary upsurge of the working class, which have witnessed years of rising, lively and sometimes explosive class struggle against capitalism, that is, France, Spain, Italy and Portugal, the self-styled "orthodox Trotskyists of the International Committee" have gained no organized force of any significance, have built no party worthy of the name, play no role in the class struggle, have no roots in the working class, are indeed ignored by the proletariat? Whereas the alleged "liquidators" and "revisionist" Trotskyists of the Fourth International, which you say refuse to build independent revolutionary parties, have won thousands of people to the Trotskyist program, have built strong Trotskyist organizations (including a daily paper in France, which has a bigger press run than *News Line*), have started to play a real role in the class struggle, and are beginning to successfully challenge the treacherous Stalinist and social-democratic misleaders of the proletariat?

You ought to take an objective view of the breakup of the "International Committee." It represented an insular concept—that through the success of a group of Trotskyists on a largely national scale an international can be constructed. But this concept is a political, theoretical and organizational absurdity. In the long run it leads to degeneration of the group adhering to it. A living example has been provided by the evolution of the WRP. It is high time to end the insular course you have been following and to reorient towards the Fourth International.

We will watch with interest for evidence that you have decided to give up your present campaign of slanders and lies against Comrades Hansen, Novack, and other leaders of the world Trotskyist movement, and to make public amends for vilifying them. Until we see such evidence, however, we have nothing further to discuss or to negotiate with you.

Comradely yours, for the United Secretariat of the Fourth International,

Charles Michaloux

London Meeting Supports Charter 77

LONDON—More than 150 persons gathered at the railway workers union's Unity House here March 23 to declare their solidarity with the Charter 77 signers and all others struggling for democratic rights in Czechoslovakia.

Initiated by the Committee to Defend Czechoslovak Socialists (CDCzS), the event had a broad sponsorship, including the Labour party National Executive Committee, the National Union of Railwaymen, the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, the editorial board of *Listy* (the publication of the Czechoslovak Socialist Opposition), the Socialist Workers party (the new name adopted by the International Socialists), and the International Marxist Group (British section of the Fourth International).

Among the wide range of speakers was Prof. A.J. Liehm, former editor of *Literarni Listy* (the journal of the Czechoslovak Union of Writers), who is now exiled in Britain. He explained the importance of workers in the West coming to the support of those in the East.

"Why did human rights become so important?" Liehm asked. "The European working class doesn't see why they should have to choose between capitalism and bureaucracy. By helping the Czech oppositionists, the Western socialists are helping themselves."

He described Charter 77 as an attempt "to get out of the situation where the police is the only partner with whom people who don't share the official views can discuss their opinions, their situation, their rights."

Another speaker was Edmund Baluka, a leader in the December 1970 shipyard workers' strikes in Poland. He recalled that the shipyard workers were unanimous in condemning the participation of Polish troops in the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. "We will be transporting Charter 77 to Poland," he said. "We are fighting for the same aims—the abolition of Stalinist bureaucracy—with workers in the bourgeois world."

A resolution expressing solidarity with the Charter 77 signers was introduced by Lawrence Daly, general secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers and chairman of the CDCzS. It passed overwhelmingly.

Among others who spoke at the meeting were Jiri Pelikan, exiled former official of the Dubcek government, now editor of *Listy*; Ian Midardo, representing the Labour party NEC; and Robin Blackburn from the IMG.

The Communist party declined an invitation to provide a speaker but sent a

message in support of the Charter 77 signers, which was read to the audience. (A favorable article on the meeting appeared two days later in *Morning Star*, the CP daily newspaper.) Messages from the Communist parties of Australia and Belgium, and from Noam Chomsky, Artur London, and Leonid Plyushch were also announced.

The irony of the CP's decision not to attend the meeting was underscored by a report that the well-known oppositionist Jiri Müller had been beaten up in Prague with three copies of *Morning Star* under his arm. There were also reports that on the streets of Prague, notices announced that "the following issues of *l'Unità* [the Italian CP daily], *l'Humanité* [the French CP daily], and *Morning Star* are not available. *All complaints are useless.*" Thus, regular subscribers were denied access to news of the support of the French, Italian, and British Communist parties for Charter 77.

The attempts of the bureaucrats have backfired inside the country, Jan Kavan, a former leader of the Czechoslovak student movement, reported at a news conference the next day. To back up its claims that workers do not support the charter, the bureaucracy has called large meetings in the factories to denounce it. "However," Kavan explained, "when they are asked to vote against it, the workers have demand-

ed the right to read it first—a problem for the bureaucrats. Most of the workers just left these meetings, leaving only a handful of the faithful to vote."

At the news conference, Pelikan, Liehm, and Kavan announced the publication of detailed information on the Charter 77 movement in Czechoslovakia and the Husak regime's brutal campaign to destroy it. Palach Press, which called the news conference, is making available all eight official documents issued by the Charter 77 movement, along with the regular monthly situation reports written by the movement's leaders. It also publishes a bulletin that provides up-to-date reports on newsworthy events and trends in Czechoslovakia and Poland from sources within those countries.*

On March 26 another meeting was held here, to discuss setting up "a solidarity campaign covering the Soviet Union and the East European countries." In attendance were members of many of the organisations that had sponsored the March 23 public meeting. Following an introduction by Edmund Baluka and discussion, an ad hoc committee against repression in East Europe was set up. A motion passed specifying that "we should organise the broadest possible support in the labour movement in defense of those struggling for basic democratic and working-class rights. These people should include everyone, not just socialists." Another meeting to discuss future solidarity activity was agreed upon. □

*For information on materials available, write to Palach Press Ltd., 145 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8UB.—IP

An Appeal From Workers in Czechoslovakia

'Defense of Human Rights Concerns Everyone'

[The following statement, signed "A Group of Workers," was issued in Plzen, Czechoslovakia, in January. We have taken the text from the March 30-April 6 issue of the French Trotskyist weekly *Informations Ouvrières*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

We have followed the events surrounding Charter 77 with great interest. We are convinced that this action is very fruitful, justified, and correct, and that it could bring a solution to many of our country's urgent problems.

The defense of human rights is not only a matter for intellectuals; it concerns everyone who expects more from life than mere material comfort. Nearly every citi-

zen who tries to achieve anything other than such bare material comfort has to face often insurmountable obstacles. The labor laws now in force give us no chance to develop our abilities. The unions do not defend our interests. And we cannot have the slightest hope that in turning to them we would find any understanding or help in solving our problems. Many gifted children of working-class parents do not get an opportunity to attend the University or other institutions of higher learning because first consideration is given to the children of the apparatchiks, even when they have lower grades.

Our factories, enterprises, schools, offices, and research institutions are managed and controlled by people with few, if any, qualifications. Corruption and dishonesty

are the rule nearly everywhere. The production plans are drawn up without our participation. The international accords on freedom of movement are not respected; many of us have been prohibited from going abroad, either as tourists or to visit our close relatives.

We find it hard to accept a situation where the mass media in our country present false and distorted news, and in order to find out what is going on, our citizens must listen to foreign radio broadcasts. This prevents us from reaching correct conclusions about our pressing economic, social, and cultural problems. Our mass media paint a rosy picture of our society's problems, presenting these in a completely unrealistic way. Much of what is published as news is nothing but falsifications. For instance, it should be possible to institute legal proceedings against the authors of the article in *Rude Pravo* entitled "Characters Who Have Outlived Their Usefulness and Self-Proclaimed Leaders," as well as against the authors of other lying and slanderous commentaries on Charter 77. It is both shameful and scandalous to see the police persecuting people who have openly stood up in defense of human rights—which are guaranteed by law, as well as by Decree No. 120/76, published in the October 1976 *Compendium of Laws* and available in bookstores and on newspaper stands.

Workers, come out of your state of hibernation! Follow current events, seek out news about what is happening, and pass it on to your friends! We cannot abandon the most courageous among us! Protest against the imprisonment of Jiri Lederer, the journalist; Vaclav Havel, the writer and spokesman for Charter 77; Frantisek Pavlicek, the writer; and the producer Ota Ornest! Protest against the police victimizations and acts of discrimination! Demand that the decisions about which young people are going to be admitted to institutions of secondary and higher education be made solely on the basis of ability! Fight for your own human rights and for your own demands! Do not allow yourselves to be misled into protesting against something that you have not read! Demand that all the statements of Charter 77 be published. If you agree with this charter, add your signatures to it, indicating your occupations and addresses.

The voices of all decent Czechs and Slovaks must be heard in Belgrade, where in June 1977 compliance with the Helsinki accords will be reviewed. □

Documents discussed at 1974 Tenth World Congress of Fourth International. 128 pages. 8½ x 11, \$2.50

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

Pakistani Women Join in

Protests Mount Against Bhutto Regime

Antigovernment protests have continued to rock Pakistan. Since the March 7 elections, it is estimated that about 200 demonstrators in Karachi, Lahore, Hyderabad, and other cities have been killed by police.

The protests were launched by the opposition Pakistan National Alliance (PNA), a rightist coalition of nine parties, to back their demands for the resignation of Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. The PNA has charged that Bhutto's Pakistan People's party (PPP) won the elections through massive vote fraud. The PNA has called for new elections, to be supervised by the military and judiciary.

On April 9, demonstrations were held in Punjab Province to protest the opening of Punjab's provincial assembly. Dozens of demonstrators were reported killed.

By April 11, the protests had spread to four more cities. According to a report in the April 16 London *Economist*, "Karachi was strike-bound for the fourth time since the elections, and opposition mobs roamed the streets, starting fires, smashing traffic signals and erecting roadblocks." A rally of 15,000 demonstrators in Lahore was attacked by police.

On April 15, while Bhutto was consulting with top advisers and cabinet ministers in his official residence in Lahore, several thousand demonstrators shouting "Bhutto dirty dog!" tried to march to the residence. They were halted by armed police.

As the protests have continued to gain momentum, women have begun to participate in them, a significant development in Pakistan, which is strongly influenced by orthodox Islam.

According to a report in the April 9 *Washington Post*, "In Karachi, protesting women attacked police who tried to break up their 12,000-strong anti-government protest yesterday. They stripped one of his uniform and drenched another with water."

On April 5, thousands of women reportedly stormed a police station in Hyderabad and freed twenty-eight political prisoners. Women have also marched in Lahore and Rawalpindi.

The protests have been carried out in face of severe repression. In addition to those shot down by police, the PNA has charged that about 24,000 persons have been arrested since the protests began.

The protests have been fueled by widespread dissatisfaction with the Bhutto regime. Since they began, a wide range of demands have been raised by the demonstrators, going beyond the PNA's focus on the issue of election rigging. Among the targets of the demonstrations have been

corruption, inflation, and the regime's growing authoritarianism. Thousands of persons have chanted "Bring back democracy" during marches and rallies.

On April 6, Chaudry Rehmatullah Aslam, the head of the Socialist party, endorsed the call for new elections. According to the April 7 *Ceylon Daily News*, "It was the first statement from a leftist party in Pakistan in support of the nine-party opposition National Alliance (PNA), which is predominantly rightist in outlook."

The mass opposition to Bhutto's rule has caused some cracks within the regime and the PPP. On April 8, four leaders of the PPP split to form a new party, called the Pakistan Awami Jamhoori party, (Pakistan People's Democratic party). A few days later Abdul Hafeez Dardar, a prominent member of the PPP, resigned his seat in the Punjab provincial assembly and dissociated himself from the PPP.

Two military figures who helped bring Bhutto to power in 1971 have resigned their posts as ambassadors. Lieut. Gen. Gul Hassan Khan, who resigned as ambassador to Greece April 14, said that Bhutto had "no credibility" and had lost the confidence of the military.

Air Marshal Abdur Rahim Khan, the Pakistani ambassador to Spain, had resigned the day before. In a telegram to Bhutto, he said, "I cannot sit idly by and see the country being dragged into another civil war by power-hungry men."

"I am therefore resigning in protest against your oppressive and dictatorial regime."

In an interview, the air marshal predicted, "If things go worse, he [Bhutto] may have to call in the army and declare martial law. . . ."

In an effort to defuse the protests, Bhutto has made a few conciliatory gestures to the PNA. In an April 17 news conference in Lahore, he offered to call new provincial elections and, if the PNA won a majority, to call new elections for the National Assembly. He conceded that there may have been some "malpractices" in the March 7 elections to the National Assembly and promised that any new elections would be "absolutely fair."

Bhutto also offered to enact into law some of the orthodox Islamic customs demanded by the PNA's religious leaders, such as the prohibition of alcoholic beverages, stricter censorship regulations "in conformity with the moral standards of Islam," and a closer adherence to the civil and criminal codes of the Koran.

An earlier offer by Bhutto for new provincial elections had been dismissed by the PNA as "not worthy of any consideration." □

Amnesty Struggle Unites Workers, Women, Youth

By Marcos Urrutia

BILBAO—A new campaign demanding total amnesty for all political prisoners and the return of all those exiled was conducted throughout the Basque country during the week of February 26-March 5. According to reports in the daily *El País* of March 1, and in the magazine *Punto y Hora de Euzkalerria*, "Last weekend more than 10,000 persons took part in numerous proamnesty services in churches and municipal buildings in Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa. . . . As the services ended on Sunday, many demonstrations took place; in all of them—which together numbered some 50,000 demonstrators—rallies were called and the statements prepared in the assemblies were read; all of these put the goal of amnesty in a broader context, focusing on the basic theme of the campaign: 'Amnesty is not being gained through negotiations. The people are winning it.' . . ."¹

Two weeks after these actions, the second government under the monarchy issued a decree permitting the release of more political prisoners.

The Basque people in fact have many good reasons to believe that amnesty is not something that can be won through negotiations, and that they are the ones who are winning it. Organized in amnesty committees throughout all the neighborhoods and towns of Euzkadi, thousands and thousands of workers, youth, and women have participated in the fight to win the release of all the political prisoners. And they have been able to see perfectly well that the government has found itself compelled to give ground time and time again. Each concession has been a new stimulus to press ahead with the mobilizations.

Let's look at this more concretely.

The Campaigns for Amnesty

With the coronation of Juan Carlos in November 1975, a decree was issued freeing the prisoners held "for political motives." But the reality was that very few compañeros got out of jail. So the work of organizing a powerful amnesty movement began from that moment.

The bases for it had been laid: There was a very favorable attitude among the working class and the youth toward making the fight for amnesty a top

An Appeal to All Basque People

[In December, the Amnesty Steering Committee in Euzkadi issued an appeal to all Basque people, from which the following has been excerpted.]

* * *

The struggle for amnesty continues, and will continue, no matter what promises are made, which we already know will not be carried out, or what warnings are issued, which we already know will not break us. We shall neither be distracted nor frightened.

Neither repression nor promises, neither the democracy of bullets and clubbings, nor bullets and clubbings without the disguise of democracy, can quiet the voice of Euzkadi. It continues and will continue to demand with all its strength: Release the prisoners; let the exiles return; give the fired workers back their jobs; recognize Euzkadi's right to govern itself and to decide its own fate; give us real liberties—justice so that no one can be persecuted for defending the inalienable liberties of peoples and of persons.

We won't negotiate over the release of the prisoners—we demand amnesty. Amnesty means our right to be free from all oppression, free to decide for ourselves; free also to erase from the lawbooks the legal insult represented by those statutes that make it a "crime" for women to exercise the most basic personal right, the right to control their own bodies, and which prevent them by force from exercising this right.

Amnesty means accepting the fact that the political prisoners did not commit any crime, and that their actions only reflected the violence to which we were subjected, and were the response of a people that does not want to die. Amnesty for all the political prisoners involves much more than their coming home (although this is fundamental for us). It means no one will again be persecuted, ever, for refusing to accept humiliation, nor the humiliation of their people; for refusing to be silent in the face of their persecution or the persecution of their people. . . .

priority; at the same time, all the workers parties and the radical nationalist organizations agreed on the need to press this issue.

A few months later the campaigns began. In the first week of July, two million persons participated in struggles for amnesty all across Spain. The biggest mobilization took place in Bilbao on July 8, as some 200,000 persons demonstrated, chanting slogans such as "Amnesty, liberty," "Give the fired workers back their jobs," "No more murders," "Workers unions," "Dissolve the repressive bodies," and others. The next day, July 9, in Santurce in Vizcaya Province, a forty-six-year-old woman worker and mother of three children, Normi Mentxaka, was killed by shots fired at an amnesty demonstration. The next week, the government, meeting in Madrid, approved a decree authorizing the release of political prisoners. But this was not exactly total amnesty; the decree wasn't fully satisfactory. Nevertheless it was a partial victory, an important gain. Many young prisoners were freed to return to their homes, and a

lot of exiles recovered their passports. But the people weren't satisfied with this. The fight had to go on. Two hundred political prisoners were still in the jails.

And so the struggle continued to be on the upswing. All during July and August, in the festivals in the small towns, especially in the recitals of the Basque songs and in similar gatherings, amnesty slogans were chanted over and over. In September, in Fuenterrabía in Guipúzcoa Province, the Civil Guard broke up an amnesty demonstration with machine guns, riddling Josu Zabala with bullets. He was a worker active in the Workers Commissions.

Zabala's murder aroused a powerful response—several days of strikes and workers demonstrations throughout Euzkadi. Two weeks later on September 27, a Day of Struggle for amnesty was held, in answer to a united call by all the left parties and the radical nationalists.² The

1. Emphasis added by *Punto y Hora de Euzkalerria*.

2. The call was supported by the Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE—Spanish Socialist Workers party, the main social demo-

press gave the figure of 600,000 workers on strike in the four Basque provinces. The day was a great success. Later, the COS³ called for actions throughout the Spanish state on November 11 against the economic plans of the government. The slogan of "general amnesty" was included among the demands. Two million workers responded to this call.

In December another campaign was initiated in Euzkadi around the theme "Gabonetarako denok etxera" (Everyone home for Christmas). This mobilization was the broadest yet. It was impossible to count the enormous number of amnesty meetings, demonstrations, and work stoppages carried out all over our Basque country. And finally, the February 26-March 5 week of protest was held, around the theme "Amnesty is not being gained by negotiation. The people are winning it." We already know the result. The government had to concede. At the end of March, massive receptions were held in all the towns to welcome the youths who were coming out of the jails.

The Amnesty Movement

The fight for liberation of all the prisoners has served to unify the popular mobilization. During these months of struggle a broad alliance has been forged among the working class, youth, and women of the Basque country. "Amnesty" was never raised for the political prisoners alone. "Amnesty for labor" has been spoken of constantly, and recently, amnesty for women accused of crimes that are a consequence of the "feminine condition" (prostitution, abortion, adultery, and so on). In this way, incorporating the objectives of various sectors, the movement has assumed a massive and united character.

In addition, the working people have all come to understand that amnesty not only means getting the prisoners out of the jails, but abolishing the repressive Francoist legislation, which has served to fill the prisons with young people, workers, and

cratic party), the Partido Comunista de Euzkadi (PCE—Euzkadi Communist party), the Movimiento Comunista de Euzkadi (Euzkadi Communist Movement), the Organización Revolucionaria de Trabajadores (Revolutionary Workers Organization), the Partido del Trabajo (Party of Labor), the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria and the Liga Comunista (Revolutionary Communist League and the Communist League, sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International), by six other left political organizations, and by the Comisiones Obreras (Workers Commissions), the Unión General de Trabajadores (UGT—General Workers Union), and the Confederación Nacional de Trabajadores (National Confederation of Workers).

3. Coordinadora de Organizaciones Sindicales (Coordinating Committee of Trade-Union Organizations), encompasses the Workers Commissions, the Unión Sindical Obrero (Workers Trade Union), and the UGT.

women. (Note that, for example, in 1975, in only one year, the "Tribunal de Public Order" sentenced more than 18,000 persons for political "crimes.") In this sense, the call for amnesty included the demand for establishing full political and trade-union liberties, as well as for recognizing the right of the Basque people and the other oppressed nationalities to self-determination. Democratic demands have therefore played an important role in the mobilizations.

Two lines have been counterposed throughout these months. One was the position that placed negotiations with the government above popular mobilization. This was the line of the bourgeois parties, such as the PNV,⁴ supported frequently by the PSOE and the PCE (who supported the

bourgeois politician Jauregui being in the "negotiating commission" dealing with the government).

The other was the line put forward by the entire revolutionary left—a line based on the need for constant mobilization as the only means of achieving freedom for our imprisoned comrades. This second line has clearly taken hold in the minds of the masses. This has been a great lesson for everyone and a great step forward. The proof of it is the slogan itself that was adopted in the recent week of struggle for amnesty.

April 1, 1977

4. Partido Nacionalista Vasco (Basque Nationalist party).

100 Delegates Attend Founding Congress of FJCR

Trotskyist Youth Group Formed in Spain

More than 100 delegates attended the founding congress of the Federación de Juventudes Comunistas Revolucionarias (FJCR—Federation of Revolutionary Communist Youth) March 19 and 20 in Madrid.

The delegates came from all nationalities and regions of Spain and spoke for the organization's 2,000 members, the April issue of the FJCR's newspaper, *Joven Revolucionario*, reported.

Delegates ranged in age from fifteen to twenty-two, the average being nineteen. Fourteen percent of the delegates were women. Fifty-one percent were workers, 37% students, and 12% unemployed. Forty percent of the delegates were from the Basque Country (Euzkadi) and 17% from Galicia.

Joven Revolucionario described the formation of the FJCR:

About a year ago, a handful of young activists in the LCR [Liga Comunista Revolucionaria—Revolutionary Communist League, a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International in Spain] met in Catalonia. They saw the need to begin ongoing, centralized work among the youth.

This work would be oriented toward struggling against all forms of oppression youth are subjected to in this capitalist society. It would aim at channeling the immense revolutionary outpouring that occurs in every struggle, in every sign of rebellion by the youth, into the fight being waged by the working class and the people as a whole, into one all-encompassing struggle against the monarchy and for socialism.

To achieve that, a plan was formulated—to create a revolutionary youth organization that would be the firmest bearer of these principles, to move toward building the Federación de Juventudes Comunistas Revolucionarias.

These activists then began to issue a

monthly newspaper, *Joven Revolucionario*, to publicize a platform of demands on the youth question adopted at the August 1976 LCR convention, and to win young people to the task of forming a youth organization that could fight around these demands.

In a statement issued in the form of a poster early this year they explained:

As youth in capitalist society we are deprived of all rights and subjected to a strict discipline by society to make us into docile tools for the exploitation that will be imposed on us later. Our situation in the family, school, and army is the inevitable result of the "bombardment" we undergo from infancy to make us insecure, dependent, guilt-ridden, and receptive to capitalist ideology.

As revolutionary youth, we raise the banner of the liberation of youth against that, and we work for a society where we will be able to develop as free individuals.

The statement also outlined some of the basic demands a revolutionary-communist youth group would fight for:

For young workers:

- Equal pay for equal work. No discrimination because of age or sex.
- Four hours of study and four of work paid the same as a workday of eight hours.

For rural youth:

- Compulsory education for rural youth until they reach eighteen years of age.
- Recreation centers financed by the state and under the control of the youth, with no interference from the OJE [youth organization of the Francoist regime] or the church.

For students:

- Obligatory, free, secular, rounded education by the state until students reach eighteen years of age.
- Elimination of all entrance requirements.
- Bilingual education at all levels for the

oppressed nationalities.

Youth and the family:

- Legal majority for both sexes at sixteen years of age.

- Abolition of the current laws on the family.

Youth and sexuality:

- Establishment of centers for information and sex education for all youth.

- Free, accessible contraception and abortion.

Against the repression of homosexuality.

Youth and the army:

- Reduction of military service to the time needed to learn the use of arms.

- Free choice as to the date and place of military service.

- Against military service outside our region or nationality.

- Democratic, trade-union rights for soldiers.

Youth and free time:

- Abolition of all censorship.

- Creation of youth associations and clubs financed by the state.

The fight for the liberation of the young woman:

- Against discrimination on the job and at the university against young women.

- Against "specifically" female courses—home economics, female jobs, etc.

- Division of domestic tasks.

- Free control over her own body.

Full liberation for youth cannot be realized in capitalist society and under the Francoist monarchy in particular, the statement said. It called on young people to join the fight for a socialist future, and to win the right of self-determination for the oppressed nationalities of Spain. □

Accomplices in Apartheid

Pretoria's Partners—From London to Tokyo

By Ernest Harsch

[Third of four parts]

Since the 1960s, Britain's traditionally paramount position among foreign investors in South Africa has been eroded to a certain degree by the increasing influence of its major competitors, the United States, West Germany, France, and Japan. But despite the growing role of other countries in South Africa, Britain still remains Pretoria's most important economic partner by a wide margin.

As of 1974, British investments accounted for about 60 percent of all foreign investments in South Africa, totaling £2 billion (\$4.9 billion). Reflecting the importance that its former colony still holds in British imperialism's worldwide interests, South Africa takes about 10 percent of all British overseas investments. Britain also remains South Africa's leading trade partner, in 1975 taking 23 percent of South Africa's exports and supplying 20 percent of its imports. Out of South Africa's top 100 companies, twelve are direct subsidiaries of British companies and another twenty-five are partially owned by British interests. In all, more than 500 British subsidiaries or associates are directly involved in South Africa. They include many of the leading names of British capitalism, such as the Imperial Chemical Industries, Unilever, British Steel, Slater and Walker Securities, Lonrho, Leyland Motors, Rio Tinto Zinc, Courtaulds, Cadbury Schweppes, and Barclays Bank.

Although British imperialism first established its foothold in South Africa through the gold mines, it has now come to rely more and more on the burgeoning manufacturing industries. The shift from indirect investments in mining shares to direct investments, mostly in manufacturing, closely paralleled South Africa's industrial development. By 1969, about 78 percent of all sterling area investments, overwhelmingly of British origin, were direct, while indirect investments accounted for only 22 percent.

The rate of return for British investors in South Africa is not as high as for their American counterparts, but it is still about 50 percent higher than for British investments in the rest of the world. Mining investment returns are estimated at 25 percent or more and manufacturing returns average about 10 percent. In a pamphlet on British involvement in South Africa, Jim Atkinson pointed out, "The high profit rates prevailing in South Africa are especially attractive for British capitalism, which is plagued by falling profitability at home: the real post-tax rate of return in British industry fell from between 7 and 9 percent in the early 1960s to 3-4 percent in 1973 and 1974."³²

For some British companies, the profits earned from their South African subsidiaries were decisive. For instance, while the Imperial Chemical Industry group's overall profits dropped 19.5 percent in 1970, the profits of ICI South Africa rose by 13 percent. Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation, one of the most successful mining and mining-finance houses in the world, has only 7.7 percent of its assets in South Africa. Yet in 1970 about 42 percent of the group's profits came from its Phalaborwa copper mine in the Transvaal.³³

South African financial institutions have been heavily dominated by the big British banks for more than fifty years. The subsidiaries of Barclays and Standard control 60 percent of all South African bank deposits and 70 percent of all banking outlets. Between 1970 and 1972, the after-tax profits of the South Africa Barclays Group increased by 30 percent. In 1972, then chairman of Barclay's parent company in Britain, Sir John Thomson, justified Barclay's operations in South Africa by claiming, "We are serving Africans in South Africa." He later indicated that it was more a question of the British stockholders serving themselves: "Obviously, one has to think a great deal about involvement in South Africa. We unanimously believe it is the right thing to be in South Africa. We think the vast majority of our stockholders approve of our being in South Africa, and our doing all we can to have good conditions in South Africa."³⁴

Like the American petroleum interests, British oil companies also play a vital role in South Africa's economy. Besides their involvement in exploration and refining, they have begun to expand into other sectors of the economy in recent years. British Petroleum and Shell Oil (which is jointly owned by British and Dutch capital) have begun to export coal. According to a report in the January 1977 issue of the London monthly *Africa*, both companies "have recently announced plans to invest over £200m in mining. Shell is now considering building a £200m slurry pipeline, carrying a suspension of pulverised coal in water, from Rand mines to the new harbour at Richard's Bay." Shell began building a £43 million polypropylene plant near Durban and BP holds a 20 percent stake in Sentrachem, South Africa's largest chemical firm. In announcing plans to invest about £250 million in South Africa over the next five years, BP Southern Africa Chairman W. Templar said in 1976 that the company "continues to have faith in the long-term stability of South Africa" and "we are laying down hard cash to prove it."

32. Jim Atkinson, *How the Labour Government Supports Apartheid*, (London: International Marxist Group, undated), p. 8.

33. First, Steele, and Gurney, *The South African Connection*, pp. 162-3, 172.

34. Counter Information Service, *Business as Usual*, pp. 10, 11.

Like other foreign companies in South Africa, British firms benefit greatly from low Black wages. In March 1974, a British Parliamentary committee found that of 141 British companies investigated, sixty-three were paying Africans minimum wages below the PDL starvation level. British companies are also strongly opposed to the recognition of African trade unions. British Leyland, which employs 4,500 persons in South Africa, announced in 1976 that it would not recognize the Metal and Allied Workers Union, stating that if it did its business could be damaged.

British firms in South Africa have long enjoyed the support of the British government, whether it happened to be run by the Conservative or the Labour Party. Traditionally, the Conservatives have been the most open in their encouragement for greater British investments there. The Conservative cabinet installed by Edward Heath in 1970 included no fewer than eight ministers who sat on the boards of companies with South African subsidiaries before they were required to temporarily resign in order to take up their government posts.³⁵

Although the Labour Party makes frequent public declarations against the evils of apartheid, its record in office is a sorry one. The contract between Britain's Atomic Energy Authority and Rio Tinto Zinc for the supply of Namibian uranium to Britain was first approved by Anthony Wedgwood Benn, the minister of technology in the Labour government that preceded Heath and today part of the Labour Party's "left wing." In 1968, Anthony Crosland, the president of the Board of Trade in the same Labour government, wrote that in the previous year

we sent goods worth nearly 260 million pounds to South Africa, or 5 per cent of our total exports. It is now one of our biggest markets after the United States. . . . We estimate that about one-tenth of UK overseas direct investment is in South Africa. We are also very conscious of the importance attached by South Africa to her exports to the UK; these continue to represent about one-third of South Africa's total exports. We have firmly resisted political pressure to terminate the preferential access enjoyed by South African products.

Our concern to see this valuable trade develop and to avoid any economic confrontation with South Africa has been repeatedly made clear in Parliament and the UN.³⁶

The next Labour government, which came to power in 1974, continued these policies. Three of the companies involved in South Africa that announced massive expansion programs in 1976—British Steel, British Leyland, and British Petroleum—are all government controlled. According to an October 20, 1976, Agence France-Presse dispatch from London, "Britain will take no steps to curtail investment in South Africa, and normal trading investment should carry on in the British national interest, Edward Rowlands, Foreign Office Minister of State, told the House of Commons today. Mr. Rowlands turned down a request by Labour M.P. Stanley Thorne for steps to curtail state and private investment in South Africa."

Attracting German Industry

German imperialism's interests in southern Africa date back to the end of the nineteenth century, when it ruled South-West Africa (Namibia) as a direct colony. Its economic interest in South Africa itself picked up shortly after the end of World War II. A West German-South African Association for Imports and Exports was set up even before the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1949. In 1956 Economics Minister (later Chancellor) Ludwig Erhard visited South Africa and declared that "if there should be any country which would be attractive to German enterprise initiative this would certainly be South Africa."³⁷

35. First, Steele, and Gurney, *The South African Connection*, p. 213.

36. *Ibid.*, pp. 214-215.

37. Jurgen Ostrowski, "Bonn-Pretoria Alliance Lives On," in *Sechaba*, First Quarter 1977, pp. 47-48.



G.M. Cookson/Red Weekly

LONDON, March 6: Part of march of 3,000 protesting British government's complicity with South African regime.

The attraction proved to be a strong one. By 1974, West Germany had become the third largest investor in South Africa—after Britain and the United States—with a total direct investment of more than 3.5 billion deutschmarks (about US\$1.4 billion). About 300 German companies have subsidiaries in South Africa, and another 5,000 are involved indirectly. They include such internationally known firms as Benz, Lufthansa, Bayer, Krupp, Siemens, and Volkswagen.

West German companies are particularly important in the manufacturing sector. Volkswagen, for instance, surpassed General Motors and Ford in 1973 to become the largest producer of passenger cars in South Africa. In late 1976 it announced that it would further expand its operations in South Africa, investing another \$35 million. South Africa is the fifth largest outlet for Siemens, the West German electrical equipment manufacturer. In an advertisement placed in a South African government publication, it pointed out,

Siemens, as a vital part of the South African industrial complex, with factories in Isand, Koedoespoort and the Rosslyn border area, continuously strives to meet the demands for the manufacture and supply of high precision electronic and electrical equipment.

. . . Siemens in South Africa has assets exceeding R60 million and is still expanding. A high percentage of the investment is by South African shareholders—Industrial Development Corporation, Federale Volksbeleggings and the Old Mutual—[which] have played and will play an important part in Siemens' past and future development.

Backed by International know-how and a sound knowledge of South African conditions, Siemens are prepared to meet the challenge of the nation's growth patterns.³⁸

To back up this pledge, Siemens announced in 1976 that it planned to invest another R30 million in South Africa over the next five years.

Many West German firms, including Allgemeine Elektrizitäts

38. *Homelands: The Role of the Corporations*, (Johannesburg: Chris van Rensburg Publications, undated), p. 4.

Gesellschaft, Demag, Hoechst, Krupp, Siemens, and Volkswagen, employ Black workers at wages far below the PDL. For the companies, it pays. According to a report in the June 28, 1976, issue of the German weekly *Der Spiegel*, the profit rate on all West German investments in South Africa averages about 18 percent.

West German banks have been prominent in the Euromarket loans to South Africa, particularly to Pretoria's state-controlled corporations. Either through the Euromarket, individually, or in consortia, such banks as the Deutsche Bank, Dresdner Bank and Berliner Handelsgesellschaft-Frankfurter Bank have lent South Africa hundreds of millions of dollars. In 1976 alone, two West German banks arranged a \$500 million loan for Pretoria's Richard's Bay project. It is estimated that about half of South Africa's foreign credits originate in West Germany.

Trade is another important cornerstone of the West German-South African partnership. West German exports to South Africa in 1974 were valued at DM3.6 billion, making it Pretoria's second largest supplier after Britain. In the same year, West Germany took DM2 billion worth of South Africa's exports. Pretoria's pattern of trade with West Germany is similar to that with its other major trade partners. In return for minerals, South Africa receives many of its sophisticated industrial imports from West Germany, which is now South Africa's major supplier of machinery, electrical equipment, aircraft, and ships. One graphic example of the symbiotic relationship between the two countries is in the nuclear energy field. West German companies (including some controlled by the government) have shared their nuclear technology with Pretoria in exchange for uranium.

Paris Broadens Its Ties

Since the early 1960s, the closest area of French-South African cooperation has been in the military sphere, with Paris selling Pretoria large numbers of planes, helicopters, tanks, armored cars, submarines, missiles, and other types of military equipment. In fact, France became the major source of arms for Pretoria's burgeoning military and police forces.

Since the early 1970s, however, the conventional economic ties between the two countries have also become increasingly important to the South African rulers. By 1976, French firms had invested about \$900 million in South Africa, twice the figure of 1970 and four times that of 1965. About seventy French companies were directly involved in South Africa, particularly in heavy industry, transportation, luxury goods, textiles, electronics, machinery, and petroleum. French companies account for about 6 percent of all foreign investment in Africa.

Total French trade with South Africa was valued at about \$700 million in 1975, a 280 percent increase over the previous seven years. French firms exported \$420 million worth of goods to South Africa, making France Pretoria's fifth largest supplier.

The partnership between French concerns and Pretoria's state corporations is especially close in the energy field. In Pretoria's grand scheme to lessen the economy's dependence on imported oil, the French companies have taken an active and central part. The biggest project to date in this growing alliance is the construction of Pretoria's first commercial nuclear power plant at Melkbosstrand, about 20 miles north of Cape Town. The \$1.1 billion contract to build the two 950 megawatt nuclear reactors for the Koeberg plant was awarded to a consortium of three French companies—Framatome, Spie Batignolles, and Alsthom—on May 28, 1976, despite other bids by American, Swiss, and West German companies. (Since Westinghouse owns 15 percent of Framatome, American capital still has a slice of the deal.) In addition, 85 percent of the financing for the project has been guaranteed by a consortium of French banks.

In 1976, two French companies, Air Liquide and Spie Batignolles, won contracts worth more than \$300 million to help in the construction of the Sasol II plant in the Transvaal, which will convert coal into oil. Jeumont-Schneider and Alsthom are also involved in Sasol II. Another French company has contracted to build a \$207 million hydroelectric plant in Natal. In addition, the

French-controlled oil company Total went into partnership with South African state capital and the National Iranian Oil Company to set up the Natref oil refinery in 1971.

In recognition of the growing French alliance, France was the only country besides Portugal and Spain that Vorster visited during his first trip to Europe in 1970. While there, he met with French Prime Minister Jacques Chaban-Delmas.

Japanese Imperialism Surges In

Officially, Japan does not have any direct investments in South Africa. But that has not prevented Tokyo from rapidly becoming one of Pretoria's major economic partners. During the 1960s, trade between the two countries increased 500 percent. By 1975, Japan was importing \$564 million worth of South African goods, or about one-eighth of all South African exports, outstripping the United States as Pretoria's second largest customer. All of Japan's leading *sogo shosha*, the giant conglomerates that dominate the Japanese economy, had established branch offices in South Africa by 1971.

In an August 1973 press conference, South African Economics minister Louwrens Muller declared, "South Africa is willing to expand and develop economic relations with all countries. In particular, Japan is considered as one of the best markets for South Africa's resources. South Africa is ready to guarantee a long-term and stable supply of her resources to Japan."³⁹

In 1973, Japan got 54 percent of its chrome, 44 percent of its manganese, and 33 percent of its asbestos from South Africa. Some of these minerals, however, are thought to have actually come from Zimbabwe, having been channeled secretly through South Africa in order to bypass the United Nations sanctions against trade with the Rhodesian white minority regime. Another important trade item between the two countries is uranium. Like South Africa, Japan is heavily dependent on imported oil supplies and has launched a massive nuclear energy program in an effort to reduce that dependence. By 1973, Japan's power companies had signed long-term contracts providing for the supply of 43 percent of its imported uranium needs from South Africa. In addition, South Africa is Japan's main source of ferrous alloys and pig-iron, its second largest supplier of maize, and its third largest supplier of sugar and wool.

For Pretoria, the Japanese market was the decisive factor in the economic viability of some of its major industrial expansion projects. Of the 15 million tons of iron ore Pretoria plans to export from the Sishen-Saldanha Bay project each year, about two-thirds is earmarked for Japan. A 1971 agreement by seven Japanese steel mills and cokeworks to buy 27 million tons of coal, worth \$364 million, from the Transvaal Coal Owners Association was a major economic spur to the development of the giant Richard's Bay project. The Japanese trading companies, such as Mitsubishi, Mitsui, Nissho-Iwai, and Marubeni, likewise aided Pretoria's expansion projects by supplying steel mills and other plants.

In an effort to minimize the importance of Tokyo's economic ties with South Africa, a Japanese delegate to the United Nations, G. Akatani, stated in October 1969 that Japan "has no capital invested either in Namibia or South Africa, or in any part of Southern Africa for that matter." In practice, however, Japanese companies have made rapid advances in South Africa. By 1975, more than seventy of them had set up franchised (not direct) subsidiaries in South Africa's auto, electrical appliance, electronics, rubber, and other industries. In her survey of Tokyo's economic relations with South Africa, Yoko Kitazawa wrote that

while the direct investment of Japanese yen is not allowed, Japanese expertise and technology in the shape of patents, blueprints, management skills, personnel training, direct advice from Japanese business partners, new methods for improving plant production, all are available and

39. Yoko Kitazawa, *From Tokyo to Johannesburg*, (New York and Geneva: Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility of the National Council of Churches of Christ and Program to Combat Racism of the World Council of Churches, 1975), p. 12.

contributed. The Japanese contribution to South Africa's economy is as real as the contribution from direct investment. . . .

In most cases Japanese companies have found ways to give their franchise to assembly plants and ensured that parts will have to be exported from Japan. These assembly plants . . . have frequently been financed out of accumulated retail profits, made by a South African company benefitting from Japanese businesses' aggressive sales techniques. . . .

In addition, some Japanese concerns invest in South Africa through European and U.S. outlets.⁴⁰

Toyota Motor Company, Japan's largest automobile manufacturer, began operating in South Africa in 1962. Its factory near Durban is now the corporation's biggest overseas assembly plant. Like other Japanese manufacturing concerns, it is run by South Africans under a franchise. Nissan Motors, which produces Datsun cars, has been in South Africa since 1964. Although its subsidiary is wholly South African-owned, Nissan contributed \$17 million toward the financing of a new engine plant through its American subsidiary. The major Japanese motorcycle manufacturers, Honda, Suzuki, and Yamaha, are also involved in South Africa. In 1973, both Toyota and Nissan paid their Black workers well below the PDL level. However, after a week-long strike by 2,000 Black workers paralyzed Toyota's assembly plant in Durban in February 1974, the management promised to raise Black wages.

Also under the guise of "trade," Japanese banks have made substantial loans to the South African government and its state corporations, as well as to the franchised Japanese subsidiaries. From 1972 to 1974, the Japan International Bank alone loaned \$24 million to South Africa.

In acknowledgement of the aid rendered by Japanese imperialism, Pretoria has granted Japanese businessmen in South Africa the status of "honorary whites."

Friends in Tel Aviv

John Vorster's April 1976 visit to Israel marked a new stage in the alliance between Pretoria and Tel Aviv. Like South Africa, Israel is a colonial-settler state based upon the suppression of the original inhabitants of the area, the Palestinians. The Zionist state also has a system of discriminatory laws against Arabs similar to Pretoria's racist apartheid policies. Both regimes, moreover, have been confronted with repeated challenges to their oppressive rule. Under the circumstances, the mutually beneficial ties between Pretoria and Tel Aviv have grown and have taken on a special significance to both regimes.

The strongest economic links between Israel and South Africa are in trade. In the ten years from 1965 to 1974, the value of total trade between the two countries (excluding diamonds) expanded more than ten times (see table). In 1971, when Israel was still trying to win diplomatic support from the Black-ruled regimes in Africa, South Africa was already its largest trading partner on the continent. Pretoria took one-fourth of Israel's exports to Africa, while supplying one-third of its imports from there. Israel, moreover, is one of the few countries in the world with which South Africa maintains a favorable balance of trade.

The Israeli exports to South Africa include chemicals, rubber products, textiles, pharmaceuticals, electronic equipment, and machinery. In April 1975, the Israeli regime designated South Africa a "preferred export target." To help lubricate this trade, a number of organizations have been set up in Israel, including the Israel-South Africa Friendship League, the Israel-South Africa Trade Association, and the Israel-South Africa Chamber of Commerce.

South Africa's exports to Israel include steel, cement, timber, and sugar. Reflecting the growing importance of Israel as a market for South African industry, Pretoria sold 60 percent of all its 1975 steel exports there. After Vorster's visit to Israel, it was reported that the Israelis had signed a ten-year contract to buy

40. Ibid., p. 25.

Israel's trade with South Africa

(in millions of U.S. dollars)

	Exports to South Africa	Imports from South Africa
1965	2.7	4.3
1966	2.3	4.5
1967	4.0	3.4
1968	5.7	5.2
1969	8.2	5.8
1970	10.7	10.2
1971	9.4	8.1
1972	8.8	11.6
1973	12.0	34.3
1974	28.7	43.1

SOURCE: "Relations Between Israel and South Africa," UN Special Committee against Apartheid, page 17. Based on Israeli government statistics.

coal from South Africa. Pretoria's largest export item to Israel is raw diamonds, although it is not included in the overall trade statistics. Noting that Israel is the world's second largest exporter of polished diamonds after Belgium, the Madison Area Committee on Southern Africa reported in a 1971 study, "While these diamonds are obtained by Israel in uncut form through various sources, it is purchases from the South African dominated Central Selling Organization which loom particularly large in the import column. In 1968, Israel obtained 52% of its supply from the Central Selling Organization, a figure which is representative of the range for the decade (40-60%). Total diamond imports in 1969 were worth \$219 million."⁴¹

Israeli investments in South Africa are modest compared with Pretoria's other imperialist allies. But they are on the rise. Koor Industries joined with a South African company in June 1974 to build a R2.5 million agricultural chemicals plant near the Transkei. Assia Chemical Laboratories has set up a South African subsidiary and Tadiran, Israel's leading manufacturer of advanced electronic equipment, has announced plans to build a R1.7 million plant near Pretoria. According to a United Nations report, Israeli banks have also taken part: "Japhet Bank and Bank Leumi established offices in South Africa in 1971 and 1973, respectively. The United States subsidiary of Bank Leumi was involved in a secret loan to the South African Finance Ministry in 1972, with a share of \$2 million. Bank Leumi recently sent one of its top executives to South Africa to explore further investment possibilities."⁴²

In June 1976 it was announced that Pretoria and Tel Aviv had signed a research agreement providing for the exchange of scientists and the holding of joint symposiums. Dr. Meiring Naudé, a scientific adviser to Vorster, said that Pretoria expected to gain tremendous scientific advantages from closer collaboration with Israeli technicians and scientists.

Allies Around the World

As of 1975, Swiss banks and industries had about R480 million (more than \$550 million) invested in South Africa, according to the October 22, 1976, *South African Digest*. Swiss exports to South Africa totaled R200 million in the same year and imports from South Africa to Switzerland were valued at R28 million. One of

41. Madison Area Committee on Southern Africa, *South Africa and Israel*, (Madison, Wisconsin, 1971), p. 7.

42. Special Committee Against Apartheid, *Relations Between Israel and South Africa*, (New York: United Nations, 1976), p. 21.

the Swiss projects undertaken in South Africa is an aluminum smelter jointly run by Alussuisse and Pretoria's Industrial Development Corporation. In addition to the direct involvement of Swiss banks in South Africa, three of them, the Swiss Bank Corporation, the Swiss Credit Bank, and the Union Bank of Switzerland, set up a consortium in 1968 that now markets most of South Africa's gold. "In March [1976] the South African Reserve Bank made a gold swap deal with a group of Swiss banks. This effectively represented a loan of some \$500m," according to a report in the July 1976 *Africa*.

Italy was the fifth largest exporter to South Africa in the late 1960s (although it was later overtaken by France). At that time, Italian companies held 35 percent of the South African market for small and medium appliances and supplied most of South Africa's shoe and typewriter imports. The big Italian typewriter manufacturer, Olivetti, set up a subsidiary in South Africa. About 44 percent of South Africa's cotton imports were from Italy. Other significant Italian exports to South Africa included telecommunications equipment, specialized machinery, motorcycles, automobiles, electronic components, and aircraft. The Atlas Aircraft Corporation of Johannesburg produces Impala airplanes under a license from the Italian company Aermacchi.⁴³

As part of Pretoria's massive Saldanha Bay project, Iscor has negotiated to build a semi-processed steel plant in collaboration with the Austrian state-controlled steel corporation Vereinigte Oesterreichische Eisen-und-Stahlwerke AG (Voest). Voest agreed to finance the R600 million to R700 million plant and to take an equity participation of at least 26 percent.

Although the Canadian government has expressed its official "revulsion" at the "cancer of Apartheid," Ottawa has not stood in the way of Canadian companies taking a share of South Africa's superprofits. In 1973, the latest year for which figures are available, Canadian companies had at least \$105 million invested in South Africa, or 84 percent of all Canadian investments in Africa. But a 1973 study of Canadian involvement in South Africa noted that these figures were based only on the known Canadian investment, adding, "The full extent of Canadian investment, however, can only be guessed at. . . and the total amount of Canadian asset holdings is obviously much above the direct investment figures. . . ."⁴⁴

Benefiting from low labor costs, Alcan Aluminum, which produces a wide range of semifabricated and finished aluminum products in South Africa, grossed almost \$5 million in profits in 1972. Massey-Ferguson, the giant agricultural equipment producer, did even better, raking in more than \$8 million in the same year; its average annual profit rate for the previous five years was 21.5 percent. Like their American counterparts, Canadian companies in South Africa sometimes coupled their exploitation of Black labor with open support for the country's racist system. A report by Howard Brown in the August 6, 1973, issue of the Toronto socialist fortnightly *Labor Challenge* quoted an official of Garfield Weston Ltd., a large Canadian food processing and distributing company in South Africa, as stating, "It's ridiculous to give the black man the vote, because his morals are not ours and his Christian ethics are completely absent."

Despite Ottawa's public stance against apartheid, it has a direct hand in promoting Canadian imperialism's interests in South Africa. According to a study by Dick Fidler,

the Canadian government actively encourages investment in South Africa, even to the point of granting the apartheid regime favored status in trade relations.

A decade and a half after South Africa left the Commonwealth, Ottawa continues to extend special trade rights under the Commonwealth Preference Tariff Agreement. This gives South African goods virtually unrestricted access to the Canadian market; in return, South Africa opens its doors wide to Canadian capitalists' goods and investments.⁴⁵

43. *Rapporto sulle Relazioni Commerciali tra Italia e Sudafrica*, (Milan: Movimento "Liberazione e Sviluppo," 1972), pp. 1-12.

44. *Investment in Oppression*, (Toronto: Young Women's Christian Association of Canada, 1973), pp. 3-4.

The Australian government also encourages its companies to invest in and trade with South Africa. In particular, the Department of Trade and Industry has urged Australian firms to set up industries near the impoverished African reserves, the Bantustans, because of "relatively untapped sources of black labour."

An estimated 200 Australian companies sell their products in South Africa, which is Australia's fourth largest overseas market. In 1971, about one-half of all exported Australian automobiles were shipped to South Africa.⁴⁶ About 75 percent of Australia's exports to Africa went to South Africa in 1973-74, while 69 percent of its imports from the continent came from South Africa.

Henry Jones Ltd., one of Australia's largest food processors, has profited from the especially low wages paid to Black farmworkers in South Africa, although it does not employ them directly. On the white-owned farms contracted by Henry Jones to supply its fruit and vegetables "wages of five rands a week are standard and eight rands considered good money. Women, employed for the fruit picking season, earn between 60 and 80 South African cents a day and children, who are herded into the fields to help, earn less. The labourers work 14 hours a day," according to a report in the April 23-28, 1973, *National Times* of Australia.

In an effort to encourage more Australian investment in South Africa, a South African trade official visiting Australia in 1972 pointed out that production costs in South Africa were the "lowest."

[Next: American Dollars to Pretoria's Rescue]

45. Dick Fidler, *Canada: Accomplice in Apartheid*, (Toronto: Vanguard Publications, 1977), p. 10.

46. Brian Noone, *Australian Economic Ties with South Africa*, (Victoria: Australian Union of Students, 1973), pp. 22, 31.

Quote of the Week

In an April 6 obituary of former Cuban President Carlos Prío Socarrás, who died in Miami Beach the previous day, the *New York Times* reported:

"Dr. Prío's presidency was characterized by respect for civil liberties, but he was strongly criticized for allowing groups of armed thugs to roam the streets of Havana. . . ."

Subscribe now
Read

Intercontinental Press

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

- \$12 for six months.
 \$24 for one year.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Country _____

South African Students Protest Deaths of Political Prisoners

By Ernest Harsch

Several hundred students marched through the Black city of Soweto March 6 to protest the death in detention of Samuel Malinga and other Black political prisoners.

The demonstration began after Malinga's funeral. The students marched two miles to Malinga's home, waving placards and shouting slogans. At one point during the march, riot police intercepted the students, taking away their placards and attempting to disperse the march with tear gas and gunfire.

Malinga had been arrested in Soweto in January under the draconian Terrorism Act. Security police claimed that he died February 22, allegedly of heart disease, after being transferred to a prison in Pietermaritzburg for questioning. But coming after the recent deaths of many other political prisoners, suspicions were raised that Malinga may have been killed by Vorster's jailers.

Since 1963, forty-three political prisoners are known to have died in police custody without having been brought to trial. Twenty of them, all of whom were Black, have died since the massive Black protests against the apartheid regime began in June 1976. The authorities have claimed that of those who died since the Soweto uprisings, six committed suicide by hanging themselves, six died of "natural causes," and three were killed by falls, either down stairs or out of windows. No cause of death was announced for the rest.

In response to the furor caused by the deaths, Minister of Justice, Police, and Prisons James T. Kruger acknowledged at a news conference February 23 that sixteen prisoners had died, but he denied that the deaths had resulted from police brutality. He claimed, "It is reasonable to assume that most of the suicides are by hard-core Marxists who are taking their own lives rather than talk."

In a television interview in early March, Gen. H.J. van den Bergh, the head of the Bureau of State Security, the powerful secret police body, claimed that a prisoner might commit suicide as a result of police "conveying to him such a full and detailed knowledge of his misdeeds or involvements in the conspiracy that it unnerved him that he was capable of doing just about anything."

At the same time, the regime has refused to allow an independent inquiry into the deaths. Demands for an inquiry have been raised by the South African Institute of Race Relations, the Progressive Reform party, the Johannesburg *Rand Daily Mail*,



KRUGER: Explains recent rash of prison deaths as "suicides."

and Sonny Leon, the leader of the Coloured Labour party, among others.

The authorities have also sought to obstruct independent autopsies of the victims. Mapetla Mohapi, a former member of the Black People's Convention and the South African Students Organisation (SASO), allegedly hanged himself in August while being held under the Terrorism Act. Two Black physicians who examined his body were arrested before they were able to testify at an inquest.

Master Tembeni, the chairman of the Zimele Trust Fund, which provides aid to former political prisoners and their families, called for an investigation into Mohapi's death. "Like all Black people," he said, "we in Zimele are highly suspicious of the frequent alleged suicide incidents among people detained under Section 6 of the Terrorism Act."

Before a post-mortem could be carried out on Nabaoth Ntshuntsha, who was said to have hanged himself January 8, two incisions were made in the body. According to the March issue of the London monthly *Anti-Apartheid News*, "they were performed in such a way as to make it impossible to ascertain the precise cause of death." A doctor commissioned by Ntshuntsha's family said that because of the incisions, "Any conclusions I might have drawn would have been based on features which may have been masked."

William Tshwane, who was detained along with other Soweto students June 25, 1976, was reported to have died on the day of his arrest. However, his parents were not informed until October 14, when they were told they could not have the body, since it had already been buried.

Despite Pretoria's attempts at a cover-up, enough details have been disclosed about some of the cases to confirm the use of physical assault and torture.

Joseph Masobiya Mdluli, the last political prisoner known to have died in detention before the Soweto uprisings, was arrested under the Terrorism Act on March 18, 1976. His death was announced the next day, the police claiming that he died after falling against a chair.

Four policemen were brought to court on charges of culpable homicide in connection with Mdluli's death. During the trial, one government pathologist described Mdluli's injuries, which included bruises, abrasions, extensive hemorrhaging, three fractured ribs, and a fractured Adam's apple. He initially concluded that Mdluli was strangled to death. Two other government pathologists said that he died by "the application of force to the neck." One said his injuries resembled those made by karate blows. Despite this evidence, the four policemen were acquitted.

Luke Mazwembe, a member of SASO, died September 2, 1976, two hours after being thrown into a cell in the police headquarters in Cape Town. Again, the police claimed he committed suicide. But during an inquest into his death in January, Dr. G.J. Knobel testified that Mazwembe may have been killed and then hanged to fake a suicide.

In light of what was previously known about the general treatment of political prisoners in South Africa, it can be assumed that most, if not all, of those who died were the victims of police brutality.

In 1973, the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid concluded after an investigation that "cruelty against opponents of *apartheid* is the application of a deliberate and centrally directed policy, and that torture by the Security police is condoned, if not actually encouraged, by the Government."

A report issued by the Christian Institute of Southern Africa in September 1976 listed torture methods employed by the security police. They included hanging prisoners from rafters by ropes around their necks, submerging their heads under water, depriving them of sleep, beating them, and applying electric shocks. □

Namibia's Political Prisoners

Reviewed by Ernest Harsch



Torture of political prisoners in Namibia "is employed almost on a routine basis," according to a report released by Amnesty International in April.

In a brief examination of the repression in Namibia, the international human rights organization also describes the prison conditions, legal procedures, and draconian laws that are directed against the Namibian freedom fighters.

Since World War I, Namibia has been ruled as a direct colony by the racist regime in South Africa. Over the past decade, however, the white rulers have faced a growing struggle in Namibia for Black majority rule and an end to South African domination. Their attempts to crush this struggle have been brutal.

According to the report, "South African military forces operating in northern

Amnesty International Briefing on Namibia. New York: Amnesty International Publications, April 1977. 14 pp.

Namibia reportedly use torture on an extensive scale in order to gather information about the movements of nationalist guerrillas and generally to intimidate the local civilian population on whom the guerrillas depend."

A former South African soldier revealed in August 1976 that his battalion had tortured about 200 Black civilians during just one sweep through Ovamboland two months earlier.

Before being brought to trial in 1968, Namibian nationalist leader Toivo Hermann ja Toivo and thirty-six other political prisoners were reportedly beaten and given electric shocks by South African security police in Pretoria. Other prisoners have testified in court that they were tortured.

The methods used include sleep deprivation, burning with cigarettes, the application of electric shocks, severe beating, hanging by wrists and ankles for long periods, and immersion under water. Severe floggings have also been administered, particularly in Ovamboland, where much of the Namibian population lives.

Political prisoners are also subjected to harsh conditions of confinement. Most male political prisoners are held on

Robben Island, near Cape Town. Women are held in Kroonstad Prison in South Africa's Orange Free State. Because of the long distances—more than 1,500 kilometers between Ovamboland and either Robben Island or Kroonstad—relatives of most prisoners cannot afford more than one visit a year. The prisoners are allowed to send and receive only one censored letter a month and are given meals consisting largely of maize-meal porridge, with small amounts of meat, fish, fruit, or vegetables. Because of the poor diet, the cold climate at Robben Island, and the compulsory prison labor, most prisoners are chronically ill.

Many of the repressive laws used against Namibians are the same ones employed against the Black masses of South Africa itself. One used particularly often is the notorious Terrorism Act, which defines "terrorism" as any activity likely "to endanger the maintenance of law and order." This broad definition has been used to cover such "terrorist acts" as

giving speeches, writing leaflets, or organizing strikes or demonstrations.

Amnesty International reports, "Section 6 of the Act provides for the detention without charge for an indefinite period of any person suspected of terrorism, as defined, or of possessing information relating to terrorism. Detainees are held incommunicado until they have 'satisfactorily' answered all questions put to them by their interrogators. No court of law may pronounce upon the validity of any detention or order the release of any detainee."

Most of the political prisoners in Namibia are members or supporters of the South West Africa People's Organisation, although members of the South West Africa National Union, the Namibia National Convention, and other groups have also been jailed in the past. At the end of 1976, forty-four Namibians were known to be serving sentences for political reasons. Hundreds of others have been detained without charge since 1972. □

Some Points of Difference With Tim Wohlforth

[The following comments were sent to *Intercontinental Press* by Robert Black, the author of *Fascism in Germany: How Hitler Destroyed the World's Most Powerful Labour Movement*, which was reviewed by Tim Wohlforth in the January 24 issue of *Intercontinental Press*, p. 46.]

* * *

There is very little in Comrade Wohlforth's thorough review of *Fascism in Germany* that I would disagree with. One point of difference, however, that does need to be further probed is that of the role played by Stalin's foreign policy in helping to shape the events leading up to the victory of the Nazis and the consolidation of the Hitler regime. Only here do I find myself seriously at variance with the positions developed by Tim in the course of his criticism of my own analysis and conclusions as they appear in various sections of the book.

I know that quotations, especially when regurgitated at great length, can be te-

dious, but in this instance, there is no other way of tackling the problem, since what is in dispute is, first, how Trotsky evaluated Stalin's foreign policy in the period leading up to the Nazi victory, and, secondly, whether in fact that evaluation accorded with reality.

Tim, quite justifiably, uses a citation from a discussion between Trotsky and C.L.R. James on this very problem, in passing making the observation that the latter "maintained a position close to Black's." I think that in fairness, Tim should have said two other things as well. One, that I too cite from the passages quoted by Tim, and two, that I also reproduce several other excerpts from the writings of Trotsky which strongly suggest, if not definitively prove, that the whole of his position on Stalin's Germany policy is not reflected accurately in his discussion with James.

Tim will recall that my appendix to Chapter 25 ("Trotsky on Stalin's Diplomacy") begins by examining this very

quotation. I then go on to counterpose to it (or rather supplement it with) several other statements by Trotsky on the same problem. I feel Tim was duty bound to do the same, given the obvious importance both he and I attach to this question. I would be grateful if Tim could give his own judgement as to which of these statements reflects most accurately Trotsky's position on Stalin's Germany policy.

Before Tim does, I would like him to take into consideration one more that I passed over when assembling material for this section of the book. Tim thinks I give too much weight to Stalin's economic motives for blocking the revolution in Germany through his ultraleft line of rejecting a united front with the SPD [Social Democratic party of Germany] against the Nazis, and favouring a rightist-nationalist government oriented towards an alliance with the Kremlin against the West. Bearing this objection in mind, I cite from the article by Trotsky, "The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union," dated June 16, 1934:

This policy [i.e., that of seeking an alliance with imperialist France against Nazi Germany—R.B.], now aimed chiefly against Germany, is an inevitable consequence of the dastardly betrayal of the German workers and semiproletarian masses by the German Communist Party under the direct command of Stalin. At first the German revolution was sabotaged in the interest of peace and credits. Now, with the threat of Hitler before their eyes, Stalin and Co. veer towards imperialist France in order to stay Hitler's hand. . . . [Writings of Leon Trotsky, 1934-35, p. 19, my emphasis.]

I would submit that this lends yet more weight to the thesis that I advance in my book, and which Tim rejects; that overall, Trotsky thought that considerations of foreign policy played a considerable part in shaping Stalin's Germany policy, a policy that necessarily, given its objectives, involved orienting toward the ultranationalist wing of German imperialism.

Tim will also recall that I cited, in support of this thesis, the important document of the Fourth International "The Evolution of the Comintern" (*Documents of the Fourth International*) wherein it is stated categorically that the Stalin-imposed policy of characterising social democracy as "social fascism," the bloc with the Nazis in the Prussian "Red Referendum," the chauvinist KPD [Communist party of Germany] programme of "national and social liberation," etc., "found its support in Soviet foreign policy which was solely governed by day-to-day considerations. This foreign policy saw as its task keeping alive German-French antagonism in order thus to exclude an intervention from the west" (ibid, p. 125).

Now, Tim may well find that in going over once again all these—and other—citations from Trotsky on the problem, Trotsky was mistaken on every occasion except one, that being his exchange with James; which, it should be remembered, was not an article, but a transcript of what

at times was quite a heated discussion, in the course of which, I suggested in my book, Trotsky "in order to 'straighten out' the formulations contained in [James's] book . . . bent the stick, in true Leninist fashion, a little the other way." All I have tried to do is complete the straightening-out job, with the aid of not only other quotations from Trotsky (which solves nothing) but a considerable amount of evidence.

Still on the same problem, though a different aspect of it, I must say Tim doesn't do justice to what I still think is a balanced assessment of the origins of the "third period" in the Comintern, and especially, the KPD. Tim says that "the factors involved in Stalin's ultraleft course were far more complex than Black pictures them." Had I in fact depicted the third period as simply a mechanical and automatic projection either of the internal policy of the CPSU (as some formalists have indeed done) or Stalin's foreign policy, then Tim's criticism would indeed be fully justified. But I think that the reader will see this is not the case. Tim goes on:

It [i.e., Stalin's ultraleft course] was a defense against the charges of opportunism in the earlier period emanating from the Left Opposition. It was a cover for Stalin's domestic superleftist course. It was also a gesture, a pressure upon world imperialism, reflecting the isolated international position Stalin found himself in at that time.

All these points are in fact made—and several times over—in the book. In the chapter "United Front From Below" the dialectical inter-relationship between the left-right zigzags of the Comintern between 1923 and the close of the third period are analysed in some detail (vol. 1, pp. 512-516). There I say:

It has almost become a truism today to say that the line of the CI was after Lenin's death determined by the policies being pursued by the dominant faction in the Soviet bureaucracy. . . . we have also to consider the CI as a force in its own right. . . . Indeed, not only the leading bodies of the CI, but those of its national sections, had to be purged repeatedly before Stalin could trust the International to function as a servile tool of Kremlin diplomacy.

In this same section, I also enumerate the various stages through which this left-right zigzag course of the CI passed—from the Brandler right course in Germany in mid- and late-1923, over to the Zinoviev leftism of 1924, then back to the Bukharin-Stalin rightist course of 1925-27. Each false turn consisted in part of recoiling from the errors and "excesses" of its predecessor. I concluded:

While the basic and decisive impetus for the ultra-left turn towards the "united front from below" and the theory of "social fascism" came from the dramatic turn in the Soviet Union at the beginning of 1928 [the grain crisis, and Stalin's panic measures against it—R.B.] it was without doubt at least anticipated, supplemented

and augmented by the dialectical relationship between the manifold stages and phases of the degeneration of the CI that began with the German defeat of 1923. [P. 517.]

Tim makes the entirely valid point that the pressure of Left Opposition criticism during the period of the Stalin-Bukharin right course (1925-27) was a factor in shaping Stalin's policies in the turn that came in 1928. I agree, and said just this in my book:

Nor, finally, should we for one moment underestimate the importance of the theoretical, programmatic and agitational activity of the Left Opposition . . . with each reverse suffered by the Stalin faction, the pressure increased within it to execute a manoeuvre towards the left . . . to cut ground from under the feet of the Left Opposition, and to disarm at least some of their criticisms by paying lip service to the need for a firm proletarian and internationalist line. [Ibid, p. 517.]

And more:

Unless we take these secondary, but by no means insignificant factors into account, we are in danger of arriving at a view of the CI which might appear to be formally correct, and in accordance with "orthodox" Trotskyism, but which in practice tends toward schematicism.

In other words, the tendency exhibited by C.L.R. James!

I think Tim will agree, on reconsideration, that there are no differences between us on this question, as a re-reading of the passages I quoted from should show. Where I think the exchange can proceed fruitfully is on the problem of Stalin's foreign policy. I would be grateful if Tim (or anyone else for that matter) would take up the debate where I have left it.

Tim Wohlforth Replies—

I feel the point that Trotsky was making in his discussion with C.L.R. James is not inconsistent with his other writings on the question, nor has Black as yet discovered enough new evidence to cause me to change this position.

As I stated in my review, the issue is not whether Stalin's foreign policy considerations had a bearing upon his policy in Germany and thus upon the policy of the German Communist party (KPD), but how much weight we should give to this factor. It is even quite probable that Stalin would have looked kindly upon a right-nationalist government in Germany as a balance against France, England, and the United States. This was not the issue in the Trotsky-James discussion.

It is quite another matter to conclude that Stalin was deliberately working for a Nazi victory. Clearly he underestimated from the beginning the fascist danger. It is doubtful that he felt such a victory was really a possibility right up to the last weeks.

Trotsky says in his discussion with James that Stalin "hoped" that the KPD

might win. What Trotsky writes elsewhere on this matter does not contradict this wish on Stalin's part. It only suggests that Stalin had the illusion that perhaps the KPD could win in a parliamentary fashion in time, and that he had no perspective for the KPD winning through a *revolutionary* strategy.

Certainly it is doubtful Stalin wished his most powerful party in the Western world to be totally destroyed by Hitler—even for a diplomatic advantage. The point is that his *policies*, regardless of his *wishes* and *intentions* and *consciousness*, led to this outcome.

Whatever he thought of the man, Trotsky always sought to understand Stalin's development objectively. He recognized that Stalin evolved in such a way that at the end he was quite different from what he had been at the start. Thus it is doubtful that Stalin in beginning his faction fight against Trotsky after Lenin's death thought it would lead him to purge and murder all the old Bolsheviks. Yet

each step led to the next and Stalin himself was as much the product of the process as he was its initiator.

Thus while not wanting a Nazi victory, his policies produced such a victory. This *reality* then led to new changes, a deeper degeneration in Stalin as well as in the bureaucracy he led and in the Communist International. This is why Trotsky chose the objective fact of Hitler's victory, and the lack of any major repercussions in the Communist International to it, as the basis for launching a new international.

It was not my feeling that the author holds the same schematic view of these events as C.L.R. James. I felt, to use Comrade Black's own word, that he *bent* a bit in the direction of interpreting the results of Stalin's course as being calculated, rather than emphasizing that Stalin as well as the German working class were victims of objective consequences of false policies narrowly conceived from a bureaucratic base.

Extensive Coverage in Television, Radio, and Press

Reed's Tour of Britain a Great Success

By J. O'Brien

LONDON—Evelyn Reed, a Marxist anthropologist and leading member of the American Socialist Workers party, completed a highly successful two-and-a-half-week tour of Britain March 19.

For the first time British feminists and students of anthropology had the opportunity to discuss with Reed her ideas on the history of women. Indicative of the great interest shown around the country by women's liberation groups, academic institutions, and the mass media was the fact that Reed was able to accept only about half the invitations extended to her, despite speaking twice a day most days of her tour. Reed's tour covered nine cities, stretching from London to Edinburgh.

On March 8, International Women's Day, about 450 persons attended a symposium here on "Why Are Women Oppressed?" with Reed as the main speaker. The other panelists were Hermione Harris, a lecturer in anthropology and member of the women's movement, and Irene Brennan, a leader of the British Communist party.

Other meetings for Reed were organized by women's liberation groups in Bristol, Nottingham, Leeds, Edinburgh, and Newcastle, with an average attendance of 150 persons.

"Feminism and Socialism" was her topic at a meeting in London sponsored by the

International Marxist Group, British section of the Fourth International, which attracted about 100 persons. Here she answered some of the sectarian criticism of feminism that comes from a number of the left organisations in Britain.

Reed also spoke at six meetings organised in five academic institutions around the country, including Oxford and Warwick universities. At the North East Polytechnic, she addressed 150 students in the sociology department, who brought up questions on the matriarchy, the transition to class society, and the relationship between feminism and socialism. The speech was videotaped for future use by the department. At Durham University, she encountered a group of professional anthropologists who were not sympathetic to her ideas. Having had much experience dealing with hostile academics, Reed welcomed the opportunity to debate them face to face.

Reed's tour received extensive news coverage. The press conference held on her arrival in the country was attended by reporters from fifteen newspapers and magazines. On International Women's Day, the national daily *Guardian* featured an interview.

In addition, Reed was interviewed on "Nationwide," one of the foremost current-affairs programmes on British television.



G.M. Cookson/Red Weekly
Evelyn Reed at London press conference
March 4.

The male interviewer challenged Reed's ideas on the history of women but prominently mentioned her book, *Woman's Evolution: From Matriarchal Clan to Patriarchal Family*.*

Reed was interviewed twice on the BBC national radio network.

As she travelled around the country, the local media expressed equal interest in Reed's tour. For example, a forty-five minute phone-in programme was organised by Radio Trent in Nottingham, and there was such a response that it went over its allotted time.

On the final day of her tour, Reed gave an extended interview to the feminist journal *Spare Rib*, which has a wide circulation in Britain.

The interest in Evelyn Reed's unique contribution to the struggle of women was also shown by the high sales of her books and pamphlets, especially *Woman's Evolution*.

It was a rare opportunity to meet someone who has done so much to dispel the old myths about the history of women, and audiences showed their appreciation of her work wherever she went. □

*This and other titles by Evelyn Reed can be ordered from Pathfinder Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014, or 47 The Cut, London SE1 8LL.—IP

AROUND THE WORLD



Libel Actions by Union Bureaucrats Threaten 'Socialist Worker'

A series of libel actions brought by trade-union bureaucrats is threatening to silence the British weekly *Socialist Worker*, according to a statement issued March 28. *Socialist Worker* presents the views of Britain's Socialist Workers party (formerly International Socialists).

In the first of the four libel actions taken against it early this year, the newspaper was fined \$17,000—the equivalent of a year's wages for the entire *Socialist Worker* staff. The offending article was a satirical attack on a union leadership for encouraging its members to take cheap vacations in General Franco's Spain.

The London *Times* reprinted parts of the same article and was also approached by the union's attorneys. Its refusal to settle was not taken any further, however.

Other libel actions coming up deal with articles on the firing of a woman worker who had just had an abortion, on discrimination against hiring Black workers, and with an ad for a pamphlet that attacked the undemocratic character of another big union.

The total damages against the newspaper may run as high as \$40,000 to \$50,000, easily enough to close it down.

Supporters of *Socialist Worker's* right to publish—including Philip Agee, Noam Chomsky, William Kunstler, and other well known figures—warned that the aim of financially breaking a socialist group is a threat to civil liberties everywhere. They urge that donations to help cover legal expenses be sent to: North American SW Defense Appeal, 635 Sixth Avenue, 2nd Floor, New York, N.Y. 10011.

Vietnam to Shift Millions From City to Countryside

An article published by the official Vietnam press agency April 12 revealed plans to shift as many as six million city dwellers to the countryside. The article was written by Nguyen Khac Vien, editor of the monthly *Vietnam Courier* magazine.

More than 80 percent of the Saigon population provided no useful work for the state, the article said. Vien estimated that only 35 percent of the people in southern Vietnam live outside the cities. This, he said, must be increased to 70 percent.

The article admitted that the new government has been unsuccessful in

persuading people that working the land is the best life.

"In the south, there are several million people more used to doing business than to working with their hands," Vien wrote.

"Several hundred thousand shop keepers, coffee house and restaurant owners and hawkers still spend their time trading, trafficking, speculating, making prices waltz and pocketing substantial incomes."

Government figures state that one million persons, or about one-half the wartime population, have moved out of Saigon since the Thieu regime collapsed in April 1975.

UAW Contributes \$10,000 to Defense of Polish Workers

The International Executive Board of the United Auto Workers Union has authorized a contribution of \$10,000 to the internationally organized Committee for the Defense of Polish Workers, UAW President Leonard Woodcock announced in Detroit March 6.

The funds are to be used to help feed the families of Polish workers who were dismissed from their jobs for participating in the June 1976 demonstrations against stiff price increases in basic necessities.

Student Election in Sri Lanka Won by JVP Candidate

A candidate of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP—People's Liberation Front) was elected president of the Students Council of the Peradeniya campus of the University of Sri Lanka, according to a report in the April 9 *Ceylon Daily News*.

K.A. Chandrapala won with a large majority over his nearest rival, who was a member of the bourgeois United National party. The pro-Moscow Communist party, which had dominated the Students Council for years, was badly defeated.

Chandrapala's election reflects the JVP's continued support among radical youths in Sri Lanka, despite the fierce repression against it. In 1971 the Bandaranaike regime banned the JVP and killed thousands of its members and supporters when it led an antigovernment uprising. About 18,000 youths were arrested during the counterinsurgency operations. After the lifting of the state of emergency in February, however, the JVP announced that it would resume political activities

and run candidates in the forthcoming elections.

The Peradeniya campus had been the scene of mass student protests in November 1976. After a student demonstrator was killed by police, student actions and labor strikes swept the country.

New Documents Reveal Nixon Promised to Recognize Peking

Former President Nixon told Chinese leaders in 1972 that he would recognize China if he were reelected that November, according to top-secret documents recently made public by Carter administration officials.

The Nixon promise, unknown publicly until now, was not carried out largely because of the Watergate scandal. Nixon evidently wanted to avoid alienating conservative members of Congress, whose support he was counting on to prevent impeachment proceedings.

According to a report in the April 11 *New York Times*, Carter officials obtained the documents from Nixon's attorneys. The aim was to check the accuracy of a recent column by Joseph Kraft in which he asserted that "Nixon and Kissinger virtually assured Peking that they would scrap the Taiwan [defense] agreement in a couple of years."

Senate Abolishes Witch-Hunt Panel

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which conducted anticommunist witch-hunt "investigations," was quietly disbanded March 31. Its counterpart, the House Internal Security Committee, was abolished in 1975.

Sen. James Eastland, chairman of the parent Senate Judiciary Committee, said the subcommittee's responsibilities and part of its staff would be transferred to the full committee.

In recent years the Senate subcommittee had shifted its focus away from uncovering "subversive infiltration" of government agencies to exposing "terrorist" activities. In July 1975 the panel held hearings that sought to smear the world Trotskyist movement as the "Trotskyite Terrorist International." Their sole witness was Herbert Romerstein, head of an organization known as "Friends of the FBI."

Capitalism Fouls Things Up



Thousands of New Yorkers Rally Against Concorde

"My country's workers should be put to better use than in building these dirty and energy-consuming planes that only benefit a small group of privileged people." That is what French environmentalist Catherine de Couan told a gathering of more than a thousand persons in Howard Beach, New York, on April 12. De Couan is active in Amis de la Terre (Friends of the Earth). She was one of a number of British and French opponents of the noisy, environmentally destructive Concorde who were special guests at two rallies organized to demand a permanent ban on the use of New York's Kennedy airport by the supersonic transport jet.

Between one and three thousand persons took part in the Howard Beach rally, and an even greater number were present at another rally held the same night in Cedarhurst, New York. Cedarhurst is one of five towns located directly southeast of Kennedy airport. Howard Beach is just west of the field. Residents of both areas suffer constantly from noise pollution created by jet aircraft, and the communities are thus hotbeds of opposition to the Concorde.

The New York SST opponents recognize that they have allies on the other side of the Atlantic. This was clear from the warm

response accorded de Couan and the other foreign guest speakers, most of whom live and work near the Paris or London airports and thus spoke from direct experience as Concorde victims. International solidarity also was evident in signs at the rallies bearing slogans such as "England get out of Ireland and stay out of Kennedy," and "Liberté, oui; fraternité, oui; Concorde, non."

The Howard Beach rally was sponsored by the SST Concorde Alert Program. This group is also organizing a motorcade for Sunday, April 17, with the goal of tying up all vehicular traffic at Kennedy (see *Intercontinental Press*, April 18, p. 436). The Emergency Coalition to Stop the SST was responsible for the rally in Cedarhurst. Leaders of this organization have indicated that they are opposed to traffic tie-ups at the airport at this time, although they say they will participate in such direct actions if Concorde landings are in fact approved by airport authorities. "We don't want to disrupt things unless we have to," said coalition leader Carol Burman.

But the Howard Beach group is going ahead. "We feel we have to put pressure on the Port Authority . . . to counter the pressure from the Concorde side," said Bryan Levinson, head of the alert program. "I don't see how they can stop citizens from getting in their cars and taking their families . . . to spend a pleasant afternoon at the airport. . . ."

Opposition in the communities near Kennedy shows no signs of dying down but is growing more militant and massive. This poses serious difficulties for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which administers the airport. The authority met April 14, two days after the rallies, and again decided to postpone a final decision on the Concorde. Meanwhile the lawsuit filed against the Port Authority by Air France and British Airways goes to court for final arguments on April 28.

At present, the Port Authority is studying noise-modification proposals made by British and French technical experts. The U.S. Federal Aviation Administration approved these changes April 14. But they won't do much to reassure the Concorde's potential victims in Queens: Among other

things they call for 45 percent of the plane's takeoffs to pass directly over Howard Beach.

Farmers Continue Struggle Against Tokyo Airport

Three thousand persons demonstrated March 27 outside the \$750 million Tokyo international airport nearing completion in Narita, Japan. The action was the latest in a struggle begun by the farmers of the Sanrizuka area in 1966 against the land seizures and environmental damage brought about by construction of the airport.

Heavy police repression and other forms of government intimidation and pressure enabled construction of the airport to proceed, although completion was originally scheduled for 1971. The Fukuda government has now said opening the airport by November will be a top priority.

But some big obstacles to the government's plans remain. Opponents of the airport have erected two steel towers 100 and 200 feet high near the end of a runway to block the approach of planes. The towers are constantly guarded by the farmers and their allies. Demolishing them will require a major confrontation.

Getting aviation fuel to the field won't be easy, either. A planned pipeline was blocked by a lawsuit filed by 10,000 citizens of Chiba City, who cited the possibility of explosions or fires caused by earthquakes. When the pipeline was scrapped in favor of rail transportation, the Chiba chapter of the National Railways Engineers' Union vowed to strike in solidarity with the farmers' struggle.

Transportation to the airport from Tokyo (a distance of 38 miles) is so inadequate that passengers will be forced to travel to Narita the day before their flight and stay overnight in one of the new luxury hotels there. Prime Minister Fukuda owns an interest in one of these hotels.

The antipollution movement in Japan sees the struggle against the airport as a central issue. The government is anticipating more land struggles, especially around the sites for nuclear power plants. A leader of the movement against atomic power says "Sanrizuka has become our struggle.



"Wow! Only 2 hours to cross the Atlantic . . . and three days to find a place to land!"

If the peasants are defeated, we shall be the next victim."

Thousands in France Protest Nuclear Plants

Four thousand persons demonstrated March 10 at Flamanville, the proposed site of a nuclear power station on the northern coast of France, according to a report in the April 12 issue of the French Trotskyist daily *Rouge*.

The day before, about 1,000 persons attended a teach-in in Cherbourg organized by the Regional Committee for Antinuclear Information and Action. Speakers included Brice Lalonde, head of the French environmentalist organization Paris-Ecologie, and a representative of the French Democratic Confederation of Labor.

Several speakers referred to the international scope of the antinuclear movement, and pointed to the recent U.S. decision to limit the use of plutonium as a victory.

A demonstration was held the same weekend at the Creys-Malville construction site of the Superphénix breeder reactor in southeastern France, *Rouge* reports.

Another teach-in, in May, is planned for western France.

Scots Move Fast to Head Off Nuclear Waste Dump

Residents of the Galloway area in southwest Scotland have already begun to organize against the possible siting of a nuclear waste dump there.

At present, the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority is only considering making some geological test drillings at Mullwharther hill near Loch Doon. Nevertheless, the Campaign Opposing Nuclear Dumping has been organized in the town of Dalmellington, the Scottish Nationalist party has issued a pamphlet entitled *Scotland: A Nuclear Dustbin?*, and 15,000 signatures have been collected on petitions.

The *Times* of London comments: "The protests over Loch Doon may just be another sign that the honeymoon period for nuclear development in the United Kingdom has ended and that in future the proponents of nuclear energy will find it increasingly difficult to convince the public that the benefits of nuclear power outweigh the dangers."

Divers Go After Chemical 'Time Bomb' in Adriatic

Operations to recover 250 tons of tetraethyl lead lost in the southern Adriatic Sea almost four years ago began April 4.

The lead compound bears many similarities to the mercuric poisons responsible for "Minimata disease" in Japan. More than 900 steel barrels of it were scattered on the sea bottom near Otranto, Italy, in July



Denver Post

1974 when the Yugoslav cargo ship *Cavtat* collided with another vessel and sank.

An Italian scientist, Giuseppe Signorelli, examined one barrel that was recovered in January. He said then, "If all the other barrels are in the same condition, in two or three months I would not swim peacefully in the sea of Otranto. . . ." And Jacques-Yves Cousteau, the French underwater explorer, has warned that "the *Cavtat* is a poisonous bomb, and its barrels are full of death, momentarily asleep."

Italian authorities at first sought to play down the dangers involved, since the wreck is near a major seaside resort. But warnings that the entire Adriatic could become a dead sea if the tetraethyl lead entered the food chain finally convinced Rome to put up \$11 million for a salvage operation.

During April and May divers will assemble the lethal barrels in lots of ten inside watertight containers. These will be lifted onto salvage ships by crane. The Italian authorities hope to recover some of the rescue costs by selling the tetraethyl lead that is brought up.

Mirex Is Back

We reported in our March 14 issue (p. 275) on plans by the state of Mississippi to produce and market Mirex, a pesticide that has been shown to produce cancer in laboratory animals and that decays into the notorious poison Kepone.

Six and a half million acres of land in five southern states will be sprayed with Mirex this spring, according to a March 30 UPI dispatch. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is cooperating in the program, which is aimed at controlling the fire ant, an insect pest.

Poison Peanuts?

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has evidence that some peanut products contain a cancer-causing poison called aflatoxin. The substance grows on peanuts if they're not properly dried and stored after harvesting. Although this is preventable by manufacturers, the FDA admits that 3 percent of all peanut products and up to 11 percent of some peanut butter are contaminated.

The agency has said that an outright ban on peanut products would be "unrealistic." (*Washington Post*, April 5, 1977.)

Maybe It Was Something He Ate

Twenty years ago, Paul Cooper and 1,103 other soldiers in the U.S. Army participated in "Exercise Smokey." The purpose of the exercise was to test soldiers' reactions to a nuclear explosion.

Paul Cooper's company of 250 men were marched to a protective trench 3,000 yards south of the nuclear blast site. Then a wind shift caused Cooper and the others to be moved to a hillside 3,000 yards west of the imminent explosion. There was no trench there.

"The heat was quite intense and almost unbearable for 10 to 20 seconds," Cooper said. "We were told to turn around. We did, and watched the fireball rise into the sky." The company was then marched to within 100 to 200 yards of where the blast had occurred.

Today Paul Cooper is dying of leukemia. But the Veterans Administration has turned down his request for \$820 a month in disability pay. It says his disease was not caused by radiation from the blast.

A Ukranian Worker's Open Letter to Brezhnev

[We have taken the text of the following document from the March 31 issue of *Inprecor*, a fortnightly news bulletin published by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. The introduction is by *Inprecor*.]

* * *

It is rare in the West to hear the authentic voice of a Soviet worker. It is even more rare to read first hand about the demands of the Soviet working class. The document below is therefore of special importance.

It was written by L.M. Siryj, a Soviet Ukrainian worker from Odessa, and addressed as an open letter to Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. The circumstances under which the document was written are exceptional. Siryj wants to emigrate from the Soviet Union because his material condition is abysmal and no amount of protest to trade union and other officials has improved it. He feels he has no other choice.

But what is remarkable about the letter is that Siryj details his "disagreement with the policies of the party and the government." His list of complaints is long, and many of his demands could form part of a program for political revolution.

* * *

We are asking you to hasten our emigration from the Soviet Union as soon as possible to any of the following countries: Canada, the United States, or Australia.

On February 16, 1976, we wrote a letter addressed to the Twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union in which we outlined in great detail our living conditions and declared our unwillingness to continue living under them. We also wrote that it was impossible to survive on the 50 rubles per person established as the norm, which is supposed to meet minimal living requirements. But I don't have even that. There are eight of us—myself, my wife, and our six children. Our combined income is 195, plus a 36 ruble supplement for three children under the age of eight, and 13 rubles from SOTBEZ (social welfare) for the infants. After deductions for taxes, trade-union dues, and accommodation, only 180-190 rubles remain.

In general, I do not want to repeat myself. But on numerous occasions I have written to the trade unions, to newspapers, the Supreme Soviet and the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, but you have not helped and

do not consider it necessary to reply. Regardless, I will pose certain issues again. As a non-party citizen, worker, and trade-union member since 1952, I officially declare my disagreement with the policies of the party and the government on the following questions:

1. (a) Wage increases are very small and limited. As they say in our pay office, you won't get more than 140 (rubles a month).

(b) Piece rates and tariffs are often revised. Consequently, one barely makes 5-6 rubles a day, almost the standard tariff. However, there is no improvement in working conditions. The technology is always the same, and there is always a lack of equipment. I have to bring my own tools to work. It seems that more sweat and blood is being squeezed out of the workers, but they are being paid less.

2. (a) Since 1961 prices have risen sharply in our country: in the state stores by 30-40% for groceries such as meat, eggs, lard, butter, and other high calorie products. Prices on the collective farm market have also risen—1½-2 times for vegetables, fruit, lard, honey, and other products.

(b) The amount that can be purchased in stores is rationed in the following way: 2 kilos of bread, 1 kilo of flour and macaroni products, 1 kilo of sugar, 0.5 kilos of fats, butter, etc.

(c) Meat, butter, potatoes, carrots, cabbage and many other items are often not available.

(d) Many grocery stores have been closed down, while on almost every corner 'Vodka-Beer' stores have opened. Our children are being raised on alcohol.

3. (a) With regard to relief for large families, unfortunately there is none. While lining up we show our booklets displaying our "motherhood medals." This won't even get you milk in the store. They tell us, "Show me where in your booklet it is written that you have the right to get groceries without waiting your turn, and more than the restricted amount." All we can do is shrug our shoulders. It's true. Where are there rights for large families? There simply are none. Maybe we should pin the medals on our chest and let the children look at them instead of eating. What's the use of having them? Housing for large families is not given in good faith, according to the law. If it is given, it is through bribes, or on the basis of "I'll give you something no one else will take." As a rule, these families are badly treated at school, at work, and in daily life.

(b) Poor medical service, "ambulances" don't respond to calls, and the doctors

have an indifferent attitude. (Poor service, poor medical treatment, poor food in hospitals.) It's like the story "Grand Inquisitor": if the patient behaves, he will cure himself.

(c) There is no financial assistance for medicine and prescriptions—you can't live on advice alone.

4. I do not agree with restrictions of individual liberties and civil rights.

(a) We have freedom for atheistic propaganda, but no freedom for religion. There are no religious publications, books, journals, newspapers, or radio and television programs. Churches and monasteries are closed down on any pretext and building new ones is simply unheard of.

(b) Our trade unions have been merged into one organization subordinated to the party and the government, even though there are longshoremen's, fishermen's, sailors', metallurgists' etc., unions. Each has its own interests and problems. The trade unions should defend the rights of workers before the party and government. They should have the right of collective protest and to demand wage increases, as well as better working conditions and vacations. The leading bodies of trade unions should be elected-by, designated by, the workers themselves and not by the Politburo. The trade unions and the party should be independent of one another. This is especially obvious in the local city trade-union committees where, for example, lists of acceptable candidates (lackeys, drinking buddies) are prepared by the party and given to the local trade union; then the illusion is created that they were chosen by the trade-union meeting.

(c) These types of elections without elections are held both here, locally, and in higher bodies. Somewhere, at a party gathering, a friend of the bosses or a lackey will stand up and nominate his chief. He praises him and they place him on the ballot. There is only one candidate on the ballot, so there isn't anybody to choose from. And even if a decent deputy [to the Soviet—*Inprecor*] should arise, they give him few rights and little opportunity to help the people.

(d) Our citizens are denied the right to demonstrate, strike, and protest in other ways. Complaints do not help.

(e) Citizens who disagree are persecuted by the militia, the KGB, and at work by the bosses. This happened to me. For my demands to raise the standard of living and wages so that we and our children would not have to go hungry or walk barefoot or go without clothes, so that it would be possible to pay for school and

other necessities, I was persecuted. They don't allow me to work my way into the fifth skill group. They don't hire my wife to clean offices at the dry-docks. They don't give me a visa to board a ship for abroad. Either jokingly or seriously they call me an "enemy of the people" and an anti-soviet element. And who says this? The bosses.

(f) Restore and expand the rights of the national republics, in particular Ukraine. Education—schools, universities—should be in Ukrainian. State institutions should also conduct their business in Ukrainian. The republics should have their own national cadres at all levels.

(g) Stop the campaign of persecution and slander of various intellectuals, writers, and poets: Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, Tverdokhlebov, Bukovsky, Valentyn Moroz, N. Strokata, Dzyuba, and Karavansky. Give them the right to appear at meetings

and let the people decide if they are right or wrong. Free all political prisoners in the Soviet Union. Down with censorship of mail and publications.

5. (a) Work out a constitution which will guarantee the rights of the citizen to be free and which will put an end to the activities of the KGB. Let the KGB chase after foreign espionage services rather than hunt after their fellow citizens-dissidents.

(b) Work out concrete laws concerning freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, and strikes.

(c) Establish a law concerning freedom to emigrate.

Only in such a democratic and flourishing country will we agree to live and raise our children.

L.M. Siryj

Odessa, November 14, 1976

Japanese Trotskyists Declare Solidarity With South Korean Dissidents

[The following editorial appeared in the March 28 issue of *Sekai Kakumei* (World Revolution), weekly newspaper of the Japan Revolutionary Communist League, Japanese section of the Fourth International. The translation and footnotes are by Hideo Yamamoto.]

* * *

On Tuesday, March 22, Carter and Fukuda were busy in Washington conferring behind closed doors and making occasional public statements about "Japan-U.S. cooperation in the world." At the same time in Seoul, the Supreme Court pronounced its "verdict" against eighteen defendants in connection with the Declaration of Democratic National Salvation.¹

It was an unusual full session of the Supreme Court, attended by all sixteen justices, including Chief Justice Min Bok Ki, that condemned Kim Dae Jung and the other defendants to remain in prison. That verdict symbolized the determination of the Park Chung Hee regime to hold out against Carter's "moral diplomacy." In his customary role as a judicial rubber stamp for the dictatorship, Min Bok Ki ruled that "the contents of both the declaration itself

and the sermon given on March 1 prove the defendants guilty of spreading distorted information." He rejected the appeal of the eighteen, letting stand their convictions by a lower court.

Kim Dae Jung and the other defendants who appeared in court reportedly showed signs of exhaustion after nearly a year of arbitrary detention, but their fighting spirit was undiminished as they stood motionless watching Min Bok Ki read the verdict. The feelings of the eighteen were perhaps best expressed by Kim Dae Jung's wife, Lee Hee Ho, who spoke out immediately after the decision. Facing reporters' microphones, she noted that the outcome of the trial had been exactly as predicted, and declared that it was not the verdict of a court of justice, but an act of vengeance. Nevertheless, she emphasized, the truth will surely win out in the end. The defendants, as they were being escorted away, shouted from inside the police vans, "It was we who won!" People who had gathered outside the Supreme Court building then set off in a demonstration, parading through downtown Seoul. At the head of the demonstration marched Yun Po Sun, Ham Suk Hun, and Chung Il Hyung, three of the defendants whose sentences had been suspended due to old age, together with Lee Tai Yong and Lee Woo Jung, the two women defendants whose sentences had also been suspended.

South Korea is now entering a situation in which it will be possible for political actions like the march near the Supreme Court building to attract and mobilize a majority of the people. The proclamation of a "Charter of Democratic National

Salvation" in response to the Supreme Court decision is another clear example of how the repressive policies of the Park regime today serve only to promote and strengthen the unity of the struggling dissidents.

Signers of the Charter of Democratic National Salvation included Jung Koo Young, former chairman of the Democratic Republican party² and up to 1974 an advisor to President Park; Yoon Hyong Joong, a Catholic priest; Yang Il Tong, leader of the Democratic Reunification party³; Catholic Bishop Jee Hak Jung; Park Hyung Kyu, pastor of the First Church of Seoul; and Cho Wha Soon of the Capital Industrial Zone Urban Missionary Church. Yun Po Sun, Ham Suk Jun and Chung Il Hyung, who had been convicted earlier the same day, also added their signatures. This new charter indicates the firm solidarity among the forces around Kim Dae Jung who issued their declaration last year, the signers of the Second Declaration of Democratic National Salvation issued this year in Wonju,⁴ and the authors of the March 10 Declaration of Workers Rights.⁵ And not only that. These steps toward unity of the struggling South Korean people have begun to create political divisions among forces that used to be central backers of the dictatorship. The fact that Jung Koo Young and Yang Il Tong signed the charter was a bitter blow to the Park regime.

The Charter of Democratic National Salvation spells out six key demands for rapid implementation, as follows:

1. Lift the state of emergency, declare the Yushin Constitution⁶ and all the emergency decrees null and void.
2. Release and restore full human rights to all political prisoners. Abolish all undemocratic institutions and laws.
3. End all torture, interrogation, and

2. The Democratic Republican party (DRP) was the main bourgeois party in South Korea prior to the issuing of the emergency decrees under which President Park has ruled since 1975. Park ran as a candidate of the DRP in the 1971 presidential election, narrowly defeating Kim Dae Jung, the candidate of the New Democratic party.

3. A relatively small bourgeois opposition party.

4. The Second Declaration was issued in the provincial city of Wonju after the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA) detained many activists in Seoul and confiscated the text of the document they planned to read on March 1, 1977, in Myong Dong Cathedral.

5. A statement issued by a grouping of religious leaders who condemned the starvation wages paid to South Korean workers as well as the Park regime's manipulation of the official "trade-union" apparatus.

6. The Yushin Constitution, adopted in 1972, gives President Park the power to declare a state of emergency and rule by decree for an unlimited period.

other forms of political repression and spying against the population.

4. Guarantee freedom of speech and of religion, university autonomy, and the independence of the judiciary.

5. Guarantee the right of all workers, farmers, and fishermen to a decent living.

6. Eliminate all corrupt, unjust, and secret diplomacy. Establish a good-neighbor foreign policy.

These six points will become a program of action for all the South Korean people in their struggle for "democratic national autonomy and national reunification." This six-point program of action will be a guiding light, unifying the South Korean people's struggles against the Park regime and against Japanese imperialism in the days ahead. The coming sharp struggles will surpass the ones led by the People's Council for Restoration of Democracy in 1974, which forced Park to set the repressive apparatus in motion with his Emergency Decree No. 1.

The Park dictatorship has chosen to hand down its vengeance verdict just at the time when public attention was focused on the opening of Japan-United States summit talks, just as "Japan-U.S. cooperation in the world" (including an updated version of the South Korea Clause⁷) was being worked out. Coming on the heels of the South Korean bribery scandals in the U.S. and Japan, this vengeance verdict exposes Carter's "moral diplomacy" for the lie that it is. It will probably exacerbate the already strained relations between Washington and Seoul.

This state of affairs—which is a direct consequence of the Kim Dae Jung abduction incident⁸—will in turn pose an even sharper dilemma for the Fukuda government, Park's most consistent defender. But above all, the situation calls for the people of Japan to struggle in solidarity with the fight for democracy in South Korea. Follow the example of the South Korean people!

March 23, 1977

7. The "South Korea Clause" in the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty stipulates that "the stability of South Korea is vital to the security of Japan," and by implication pledges U.S. military intervention whenever necessary to back up the Seoul regime. This clause provides a legal pretext for extensive Japanese collaboration with the U.S. military establishment in and around Korea, in spite of the Japanese constitution, which supposedly prohibits the maintenance of military forces.

8. Kim Dae Jung was kidnapped from a Tokyo hotel by KCIA agents in August 1973. The incident outraged public opinion in Japan, but the Japanese government refused to demand Kim's release, and instead negotiated with the Park regime for a "political settlement," which amounted to nothing more than a public denial of the KCIA's role and the Japanese government's complicity in the affair.

Mother of Ukrainian Dissident Appeals to Brezhnev

The Case of Oleksandr Serhienko

By Marilyn Vogt

An appeal to Leonid Brezhnev from the mother of Ukrainian dissident Oleksandr Serhienko has recently reached the West. Serhienko received a ten-year sentence—seven years in a strict regiment labor camp and three years of internal exile—in 1972 for "anti-Soviet agitation."

The prosecution charged that he had made statements about the right of the Ukraine to self-determination, criticized the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and proofread thirty-three pages of Ivan Dzyuba's *Internationalism or Russification?*, a Marxist critique of the Russification policy practiced by Stalin and his heirs toward non-Russian peoples in the USSR.*

Serhienko was arrested as part of the massive wave of repression Stalin's heirs carried out in the Ukraine in 1972 and 1973 to try to crush the opposition developing there among young Ukrainians like Dzyuba. Many of these dissident intellectuals, workers, and students recognized that in championing Ukrainian cultural and linguistic rights against Russian domination, they were upholding the ideals of the October revolution and the policies of the Bolshevik party under Lenin, which had been abandoned by the Stalinist leadership in favor of the Great Russian chauvinism characteristic of tsarist times.

After his sentencing, Serhienko began to serve the seven-year prison camp term in December 1972. In March 1973 he was given a maximum term in a special camp punishment cell, and in December 1973 he was sent to serve a three-year term in Vladimir prison, notorious for its harsh treatment of political prisoners.

Serhienko suffers from chronic tuberculosis, which has seriously worsened under conditions of confinement. In March 1976 he was again placed in a special punishment cell, where the cold and damp air and starvation diet further undermined his health.

Serhienko's mother, Oksana Meshko, who spent ten years in Stalin's camps, has made repeated appeals to authorities for her son's release. The most recent of these was her letter to Soviet Communist party leader Leonid Brezhnev dated September 29, 1976.

In the letter Meshko describes the

*Available for \$2.95 from Pathfinder Press, Inc., 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014.

appearance of her son during a visit she made in June 1976:

... he was no more than skin and bones. He lacked even the strength to move his lips; I could hardly hear what he wanted to say. He could not take a few steps without supporting himself with his hands on the wall.

Yet prison officials claimed that Serhienko's tuberculosis had been cured and that he was "in perfect health." "His name has been struck from the dispensary register," she said, "depriving him of even the few advantages he had as someone seriously ill."

Ironically, Oksana Meshko was one of those victims of Stalin's crimes who was saluted at the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses of the Soviet Communist party and rehabilitated.

Meshko tells Brezhnev that her son "has committed no crime against the people just as I had not." She continued:

Perhaps it is a crime when a youth, inexperienced in life, believes the pronouncements of party congresses that condemn Stalinism? Perhaps it is a criminal act when the constitution is taken literally, and not allegorically, as is customarily done in certain state institutions?

Soon, you—Leonid Illich—and I will leave this earth, leaving here our children and grandchildren. And with us departs the generation which Stalin trained to read one thing but understand another. Our children are not skilled at this. How can a young person's conversation about the secession of the Ukraine from the Soviet Union be declared a criminal act when such a secession is declared to be an inviolable right of the Ukrainian people in the Fundamental Law of the State?

Meshko charges that the same principle guided the signing of the Helsinki accords: "Read one thing but understand another."

An appeal for her son's immediate release is included in Meshko's letter:

When I was presented with the document on my total rehabilitation, the state had no way of compensating me for the wrong it had done. Today there is a way: Let the prison and camp term I served count for my son. . . .

She ends her letter by appealing to whatever concern Brezhnev might have about his future place in history:

... I have no doubt the decision of the Twentieth Congress will sooner or later be implemented. In Moscow, at last, a great monument will be erected to the victims of arbitrary state rule.

"Is it possible that it makes no difference to you, Leonid Illich, what words will be etched in its stone?" □