

24-Hour Strike Shakes Colombia



El Tiempo

BOGOTA: Troops patrol streets in effort to crush massive popular uprising set off by twenty-four-hour general strike September 14. In clashes with protes-

ters, military units and police gunned down at least fifty persons, wounded hundreds more, and arrested 4,000. See news article, p. 1036.

Steve Biko—Killed by Vorster's Police?

The Gathering Gloom on Wall Street

Claudio Tavarez Held in Santo Domingo

Schleyer Kidnapping in West Germany —Pretext for Offensive Against Left

By Gerry Foley

On September 5, an urban guerrilla group kidnapped Hanns-Martin Schleyer, chairman of the West German Confederation of Employer Associations.

According to wire service reports, five terrorists in a small yellow bus attacked Schleyer's car and other automobiles escorting it at a crossroads in Cologne during rush hour, spraying them with machine-gun fire. The driver, two policemen, and a security guard were killed instantly.

The Cologne kidnapping was the third terrorist operation in West Germany this year that resulted in loss of life. On April 7, the federal chief prosecutor, Siegfried Buback, was assassinated. On July 30, Jürgen Ponto, chairman of the Dresdner Bank, was also killed by an urban commando group.

Following the attack in Cologne, the kidnapers sent the authorities a picture of Schleyer, posed in front of the symbol of the Red Army Faction.

The terrorists informed the authorities that unless their demands were met, Schleyer would be executed. They ordered the regime to release eleven persons being held in prison on charges of participating in commando activity.

The following persons were on the list the kidnapers sent: Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ennslin, and Jan-Karl Raspe, the surviving members of the original Red Army Faction; Karl-Heinz Dellwo, Hanna Krabbe, and Bernd Rösner, who were arrested when Swedish police broke an armed occupation of the West German embassy in Stockholm in April 1975; Günter Sonnenberg and Verena Becker, held on suspicion of involvement in the Buback assassination; and Ingrid Schubert, Irmgard Moeller, and Werner Hoppe, held respectively on charges of robbery, suspicion of murder, and attempted murder.

Next Week . . .

"Debate Over Tactics in Scandinavian Antinuclear Movement—Why Danish, Swedish Trotskyists Marched With Masses."

Revolutionary socialists explain why they declined an invitation to march in a separate "Red" contingent in Sweden's largest antinuclear demonstration.

The police refused to make public all the demands of the terrorists. Some reports indicated that this was because negotiations were continuing. However, the urban guerrillas were said to be asking that the eleven prisoners be brought to an airport and given about \$43,000 each. Then they were to be put on a plane out of the country, and their departure was to be televised.

The terrorists may have hoped that the kidnapping of Schleyer would arouse sympathy from West German workers, since he is a notorious strikebreaker and was an active collaborator of the Nazis, having joined the fascist youth movement two years before Hitler came to power. He subsequently served as an SS officer and played a role in the body set up in occupied Prague to direct the economic "integration" of Czechoslovakia into "Greater Germany."

However, the public reacted to Schleyer's kidnapping in a way that made absolutely clear that West German workers do not see any connection between this act and their struggle. The West German population evidently responded with shock and apprehension to yet another spectacular display of violence, in what seems to most of them to be a war between a small group of heavily armed desperadoes and the police.

This episode, like the previous ones, is being played up by the capitalist politicians and media in a campaign to convince the masses that the safety of ordinary citizens is in peril, and that the main preoccupation of the state has to be to restore "order" at any price.

For example, the premier of the state of Baden-Württemberg, Hans Filbinger, used his funeral oration for one of the slain policemen to say that such acts were the result of "trendiness, cowardice, and lack of responsibility" that had helped to create a climate of excessive tolerance. The ceremony was televised. Following the funeral, 6,000 persons marched through the streets of Stuttgart, the capital of Baden-Württemberg.

Such a reactionary scare campaign is all the more dangerous because of the psychological scars left by the violent turmoil and the great historical disasters that the German people have experienced since World War I.

The period of relative stability and

prosperity since the early 1950s has offered Germans the first security they have known in more than a half century. Thus, the campaign of the media around the theme that this security is threatened by shadowy groups of fanatics trying to create chaos can have considerable impact.

In an article on the Cologne kidnapping in its September 15 issue, *Was Tun*, the weekly paper of the German Trotskyists, pointed out that a poll sponsored by the mass-circulation *Welt am Sonntag* shows that 42 percent of the West German people now feel more threatened by terrorism.

The West German capitalist press is particularly well suited for waging a hysteria campaign. It is one of the most venal and sensationalist on the continent.

Even the weekly magazine *Der Spiegel* did not shrink from publishing a lurid cover on its September 12 issue, with the headline "Killers War Against the State."

Was Tun pointed out that the furor over the Schleyer kidnapping came at a good time for the Bonn government, which has been coming under heavier fire for its austerity policies and its failure to do anything to reduce serious unemployment, especially among the youth.

In fact, *Der Spiegel's* cover the week before stressed the regime's disarray. Its headline said that the government was "At the End of Its Wits."

But after the Cologne kidnapping, the attention of the country was diverted to the war between the police and a handful of terrorists. *Was Tun* wrote:

The kidnapping of Schleyer has given the government a theme it feels comfortable with. Now it does not have to talk about a "program for the recession," or try to talk around the question of why the upturn is not creating jobs, as it is supposed to according to the dogma of market economics. Now it does not have to wage a sham battle over whether or not there is a need for "a pause for reflection" about the program of building atomic reactors.

The government has reverted to its favorite theme, the need for greater "internal security." Violent actions by small groups with no support in society have provided it with a plausible pretext for building up a massive repressive apparatus and an atmosphere of political intimidation.

Such a large-scale campaign is not necessary for dealing with small and isolated groups. *Was Tun* explained what the real target is:

We [the revolutionary socialists] are the ones the bourgeois propaganda machine is trying to isolate, to keep in isolation today after we have just begun to find a way of gaining a hearing.

The concept of "internal security" is aimed directly at the mass movements we want to strengthen. Today it is aimed at those who are disturbed at the destruction of democratic freedoms. Tomorrow, it will be aimed at those who oppose nuclear pollution.

Finally, this notion of "internal security" is aimed at those who are fighting in the factories

and unions for a shorter workweek, against wage cuts, and for an anticapitalist program for the labor movement.

The postwar stability in West Germany is ending as a result of the contradictions inherent in capitalism itself. But the government wants to put the blame on the very elements that offer a solution to the recurring crises of capitalism. For this reason it finds terrorists who claim to speak in the name of socialism useful.

In fact, the government has acted as if it is deliberately seeking to drive the urban guerrillas to desperation and frenzy. Those imprisoned on terrorist charges are being held in perpetual solitary confinement in conditions that amount to a form of torture and lead to increasingly serious nervous disorders.

Such conditions drove one prisoner, Holger Meins, to starve himself to an agonizing death. Reports in *Der Spiegel* at the time made it clear that the authorities deliberately let him die. The pictures of his corpse showed a body wasted away to nothing but skin and bones, resembling a victim of the Nazi concentration camps.

The war dances of the West German capitalist press and politicians are hardly likely to help save Schleyer's life. The cries for a mandatory death penalty for "terrorism" and condemnations of the "tolerance" of what is already one of the most repressive regimes in Western Europe can only convince the kidnappers that they have to take even more desperate measures.

The aim is to create the conditions for a return, if necessary, to the kinds of "legal" mass violence their system has practiced before, methods that they partially gave up in face of the horror of the German people at the crimes of Nazism.

The leaders of German capitalism want once again to be able to hold the mass of citizens in fear of bullying police and arbitrary "justice." And to achieve this, obviously, they have no qualms about sacrificing Schleyer's life.

Contrary to the illusions of the terrorists, Schleyer is an entirely dispensable representative of his system. The German bourgeoisie has no lack of figures of his "qualities."

The leaders of West German capitalism want to smear all those beginning to fight their system in any arena as political accomplices of the terrorists. But it is precisely these forces that are those most concerned about human life and most determined to eliminate the violence endemic in capitalist society, the violence that has led to the brutalizing show being staged around the Schleyer kidnapping.

In its September 15 issue, *Was Tun* wrote:

"Our 'program against terrorism' is one of mass action against unemployment and atomic pollution, of united defense of democratic rights." □

In This Issue

Closing News Date: September 19, 1977

FEATURES	1047	The Gathering Gloom on Wall Street—1 —by Jon Britton
COLOMBIA	1036	Twenty-Four-Hour General Strike Shakes Country—by Eduardo Medrano
SPAIN	1038	Demonstrations Say: Grant Demands of Oppressed Nationalities —by Gerry Foley
SOUTH AFRICA	1041	Protests Across Country Over Death of Steve Biko—by Ernest Harsch
USA	1042	1,685 Attend SWP Convention —by Fred Murphy
ZIMBABWE	1044	The Superexploitation of African Labor —by Jim Atkinson
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	1046	Claudio Tavárez Arrested in Santo Domingo—by Judy White
BRAZIL	1048	Student Protests Resume as Campuses Reopen—by Fred Murphy
ARGENTINA	1050	Sudden Turn for the Worse in Political Prisons
IRAQ	1050	More Death Sentences Handed Down
SWEDEN	1051	15,000 Protest Barsebäck Nuclear Power Plant
FRANCE	1052	Trotskyist Position on Nuclear Power Plants
NEWS ANALYSIS	1034	Schleyer Kidnapping in West Germany— Pretext for Offensive Against Left —by Gerry Foley
AROUND THE WORLD	1054	Italian Communist Banned . . . From the Soviet Union
SELECTIONS		
FROM THE LEFT	1056	
DOCUMENTS	1058	Unexpurgated Text of Castro-Walters Interview—3
CAPITALISM		
FOULS THINGS UP	1064	Manhattan Commuters Showered With Asbestos

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.

Second-class postage paid 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, Matilde Zimmermann.

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 Guéméné, 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.

24-Hour General Strike Shakes Colombia

By Eduardo Medrano

[The following article is scheduled to appear in the September 26 issue of *Perspectiva Mundial*, a Spanish-language newsmagazine published fortnightly in New York. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Armored units of the army and police clashed violently with workers and students in Bogotá and other Colombian cities on September 14.

The progovernment Bogotá newspapers *El Tiempo* and *El Espectador* reported on September 15 that ten deaths, an "indeterminate" number of civilian injuries, twenty-five police injuries, and an "incalculable amount of damage to automobiles, buildings, and commercial establishments" in Bogotá had occurred.

Other sources said that there were at least fifty deaths, hundreds of injuries, and that 4,000 persons have been detained. To prevent word from getting out on the real number of deaths, the army replaced the judicial police deputies, who are ordinarily in charge of removing corpses, by "judges" belonging to the military.

The incidents occurred as the government sought to crush a twenty-four-hour general strike called by the four trade-union federations¹ and the country's largest independent unions.²

1. Unión de Trabajadores de Colombia (UTC—Union of Colombian Workers), the country's largest trade-union federation, with around 800,000 members in twenty federations. Its leaders follow the line of the Conservative Party.

Confederación Sindical de Trabajadores de Colombia (CSTC—General Trade-Union Federation of Colombian Workers), the second largest trade-union federation. It has around 400,000 members grouped in ten federations, and is led by the Communist Party.

Confederación de Trabajadores de Colombia (CTC—Confederation of Colombian Workers) has around 300,000 members in seventeen federations. Its leaders are tied to the Liberal Party.

Confederación General del Trabajo (CGT—General Confederation of Labor) orients to the Christian Democrats and has 120,000 members grouped in five federations.

2. This designation refers to the unions or federations not affiliated to any of the major trade-union federations. They include around 200,000 members, and their largest components are the Federación Colombiana de Educadores (FECODE—Colombian Teachers Federation), the Unión Sindical Obrera (USO—Workers Trade-Union Alliance), the Federación de Traba-

In the first few hours, barricades were set up in the working-class neighborhoods of the south, west, and northwest. Dispatches from Bogotá reported sustained rock-throwing, train derailments, and looting of stores and factories. Even though the capitalist dailies described the upsurge as "acts of vandalism . . . committed by adolescents . . . between twelve and fifteen years old," the brutal unleashing of the repressive forces against these "adolescents" indicated that what was involved was a genuine mass uprising.

El Tiempo, for example, admitted in its September 15 issue that "800 men from the Baraya and Bogotá battalions converged" on a glazed-tile factory that was being "looted."

In the El Encanto district, *El Tiempo* continued, the skirmishes were so intense that "the disturbances continued for more than three hours. Neither the police nor the army dared enter the main street. Toward noon, a police action succeeded in reestablishing relative calm."

The "police action" could not have been anything other than the cowardly machine-gunning of the demonstrators in cold blood by the combined forces of the army and police. All the hospital reports indicate that the civilians killed and injured had received bullet wounds. While there were no indications in the press that the workers were armed, it is obvious in any case that the military detachments were ready to kill.

The mobilization was so effective in the working-class neighborhoods that one of the two newspapers mentioned advanced the theory that "the obvious objective of the insurrectionists was to choke off the capital, working from the periphery toward the center."

In the south of Bogotá, in order to retake only one of the access routes to the center, "various army trucks and armored police units" sent out "lightning squads," *El Tiempo* reported. In many cases, the troops, who were armed to the teeth, vented their rage on unarmed students. According to *El Tiempo*, an army patrol had to make use of "all its military strategy" to occupy a small hill and dislodge a

jadores del Petróleo (FEDEPETROL—Federation of Petroleum Workers), the unions and federations of bank workers, and the Federación de Trabajadores de las Empresas Públicas (FENASINTRAP—Federation of Workers in Public Enterprises).

"genuine 'nest' of rebels" who were holding a small fortress . . . with stones.

El Espectador on September 15 referred to mob attacks on three police headquarters, adding that the official sources did not give "details on the way in which such a thing could have happened."

The visible eagerness of government representatives to play down the bloody character of their response could only increase the suspicion that the work stoppage was a fact throughout the country, and that it was accompanied by a healthy dose of working-class and popular radicalization. In Bogotá, the main area of working-class concentration, public and private transportation ground to a halt in the first few hours. The largest skirmishes occurred precisely in the working-class neighborhoods and the areas where the major factories in Bogotá are located.

The center of the city was also paralyzed. The bosses' dailies said that very early on the day of the strike, it looked like New Year's Day in the city, and that by two o'clock in the afternoon, the offices were empty. Even those factories that did not strike in the morning did so by three or four o'clock in the afternoon.

That evening, President Alfonso López Michelsen went on television. He lamented the fact that "no fewer than eight commercial establishments have been looted; there have been some deaths, attempted arson, train derailments . . . all of which proves unequivocally that we have gone beyond the stage of a labor issue, and that what is involved is a matter of public order."

On the following day, the newspapers brazenly ran headlines announcing that "the strike has failed." However, the president's sudden television appearance and the measures that were announced proved just the opposite. A curfew was declared in Bogotá and Barrancabermeja, between 8:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m., "while the situation that I have just described lasts."

The absurdity of such an "analysis of the results of the general strike" was shown the next day, when it was revealed that the television broadcast had not been taped that evening, but rather some time in the afternoon, just when the general work stoppage was at its peak.

The disturbances continued. A UPI dispatch published in the September 16 *New York Times* said that the clashes had continued on September 15, with six more persons killed that day while "thousands of troops in battle gear patrolled the city in jeeps and armored cars."

The *New York* daily *El Diario* reported September 16 that according to union sources, there were "at least 2,000 prisoners" and that none of the leaders of the strike had been detained.

Background of the General Strike

The present upsurge is the most important event in the last thirty years of

Colombian history. In 1948, a semi-insurrection broke out, still remembered as the "Bogotazo." It was the prelude to fifteen years of undeclared civil war directed against the working masses in the cities and in the countryside.

In contrast to the 1948 uprising, the political events of mid-September were not spontaneous. While the former was set off by the assassination of a liberal figure, Jorge Eliécer Gaitán, the latter resulted from the workers' decision to fight to win their own demands.

At a large meeting held August 20 in Bogotá by the planning committee for a citizens' national general strike—which included delegates from the CSTC, the CGT, independent unions, and political groups on the left—representatives of the UTC and CTC declared their willingness to participate in the twenty-four-hour general strike that the CSTC and CGT federations had been planning since the end of May.

Inaction on the part of the government and the bosses in face of the rapid decline of real wages owing to inflation, which is already up to 41 percent for the past year, was the major reason for organizing the movement. Other issues raised by its organizers were the government's indifference to poverty, hoarding, and uncontrolled speculation in basic necessities; its disregard for the high unemployment rate; its failure to correct the disorganization of the health-care system, public services, and education; and its continuation of the state of siege.

The mood of the working class could be seen in August when four key strikes broke out—by cement workers, the agricultural workers at INDUPALMA,³ FECODE, and the ECOPETROL workers.⁴

However, the scope of the struggle encompassed far more than these sectors. It reached as far as the UTC and CTC bastions, the trade-union federations in the iron grip of bureaucracies tied to the clergy and the Liberal and Conservative parties, which among them hold the allegiance of 60 percent of the unionized workers in the country.

The stance taken by the leaders of these trade-union federations, who were under constant pressure from their ranks to support the general strike, was undoubtedly another key element in advancing the preparations for a citizens' national general strike.

The ranks were what made it possible at the national membership meetings of the

UTC (July 22-23) and CTC (July 29-30) to pass motions for "a national protest in view of the fact that the government has given a totally negative response to the workers' demands," as Tulio Cuevas Romero, a top leader of the UTC, told the weekly magazine *Alternativa* on August 17.

Thus, the highest bodies of the UTC and CTC decided to send President López a twelve-point memorandum outlining the workers' demands. López, arrogant and preoccupied by the crisis corroding his administration, rejected the petitions outright. Such a response had "a negative effect on the labor movement, which did not hesitate to characterize it as an act of 'defiance,'" the conservative weekly *Guión* reported in its August 22 issue. "The UTC and CTC responded in a matter of hours," *Guión* continued, "reaffirming their positions and their decision to go ahead with the twenty-four-hour general strike."

However, these bureaucracies, who were only using the threat of a strike to improve their bargaining position vis-à-vis López and whose real intention was to reach a compromise with him, got ready for a second round of "negotiations." Between August 29 and August 31, they met again with Minister of Labor Oscar Montoya at the same time that Minister of Government Rafael Pardo Buelvas was condemning the general strike as a subversive movement and threatening to put its organizers in prison.

This second round was a resounding failure. The government's main offer was to convene the National Council on Wages and the National Council on Labor for September 10—that is, after the political situation had quieted down. These bodies are a type of window dressing in which the bosses, the government, and a few trade-union leaders sit down to make a "study" of how wage increases are the "most immediate" cause of inflation. In face of the demand of the UTC and CTC that the government permit wage increases or put into practice law 187 of 1959 that establishes a sliding scale of wages, the government dug its heels in.

Troops in the Streets

Then, on September 1, the bureaucrats had to go along with breaking off negotiations and launching a general strike. While the government was "negotiating" in this fashion, the police and the army were "negotiating" in their own way in the streets. They had begun to attack strike pickets at Diamond Cement in Bogotá, Bucaramanga, Rafael Reyes, and Ibagué, and to step up military harassment of the petroleum workers in Barrancabermeja, El Centro, and Tibú.

In face of this, on September 1, a national steering committee for the general strike was set up, consisting of the presidents of the four trade-union federations: Tulio Cuevas for the UTC, Gustavo Díaz

for the CTC, Pastor Pérez for the CSTC, and Víctor Baena for the CGT. It was called the Colombian Trade-Union Council, and was constituted to determine what steps to take toward a general strike.

The same day it was learned that the four trade-union federations had issued a statement proclaiming their solidarity with the workers in struggle and condemning the repression. A decree imposing prison penalties on anyone "promoting, agitating for, or leading citizens' general strikes or illegal work stoppages" had recently been issued by the government.

The government, faced with the prospect of losing control over the situation, issued a new decree on the night of September 2, prohibiting radio and television transmission of any kind of "news, statements, communiqués, or commentaries pertaining to work stoppages or illegal or general strikes."

By this time word had already begun to spread about numerous dismissals at ECOPETROL, the detention of USO leaders and activists, and sharp clashes in Barrancabermeja between ECOPETROL strikers and strikebreakers hired by the company, who tried to go in to work under protection by troops.

In Tibú, one of the centers of the petroleum industry, the public expressed solidarity with the workers and went on a local citizens' general strike. In Barrancabermeja, another citizens' general strike began to develop under the "demand that high government officials finish a series of uncompleted public works," the bourgeois daily *El Tiempo* reported on August 30. A few days earlier, in Florencia and Pasto, successful local citizens' general strikes had broken out.

Such was the situation in the labor movement leading up to the September 14 general strike.

The demands put forward by the mobilization—the only exception being that the UTC and CTC leaders were not in favor of the call for ending the state of siege—can be judged from the following statement published in the August 15 issue of *Alternativa*:

On August 2, 1977, the CSTC and CGT sent a memorandum to President López, in which, while supporting the decision to go ahead with the preparations for the citizens' national general strike, they made the following demands on the government:

1. A minimum increase of 50 percent in wages and salaries.
2. A price freeze on basic necessities and on public service rates.
3. An end to the state of siege and reestablishment of political and trade-union rights.
4. Abrogation of the Educational Statute; the reopening and demilitarization of the universities, which are to be provided with adequate budgets.
5. Abolition of provisions of the Administrative Reform that deprive government workers of the rights of association, collective bargaining, and the right to strike.
6. Immediate return to the peasants of the

3. Industria Agraria La Palma S.A. (La Palma Agricultural Industry, Inc.), an agricultural complex with 6,000 hectares of cultivated land and more than 1,800 workers.

4. Colombian Petroleum Enterprise, a semigovernmental body that controls the extraction and refining of crude oil in the nationalized sector.

estates taken over by INCORA.⁵

7. An eight-hour working day and minimum wage for transportation workers, and a price freeze on the costs of maintaining buses, trucks, taxis, etc.⁶

8. Abolition of the decrees reorganizing the ICSS,⁷ which violate the interests of tenant farmers and the rights and gains of Social Security workers.

Call for a Witch-hunt

The bourgeois press—with the exception of the conservative daily *La República*, which is fiercely opposed to López—spared no efforts in trying to revive old feuds between the trade-union federations, so far

5. Instituto Colombiano de Reforma Agraria—Colombian Institute for Agrarian Reform.

6. In Colombia about half of such vehicles are individually owned.

7. Instituto Colombiano de Seguros Sociales—Colombian Institute of Social Security.

without success. They did this to distract, confuse, and intimidate public opinion with regard to the general strike.

El Tiempo, the most important mouthpiece of the ruling class, devoted its editorial on September 3 to accusing the trade unions of not listening to the president's arguments because "they don't want to hear," and to calling for a witch-hunt:

It remains to be seen who is pulling the hidden strings of this movement. However, it is logical to assume that working behind the scene—for such has been their time-honored tactic—are those who are trying to upset the stability of the "system," in their pseudorevolutionary jargon. In other words, those who aspire to destroy our institutional equilibrium, on the naïve assumption that they are dealing with a weak government and a conformist or apathetic country, which they have the audacity to think they can take by surprise or deception.

El Espectador, another part of the think tank of liberalism, devoted three editorials—August 22, September 2, and September 3—to warnings about the general strike, which it characterized as an

"adventure" that would bring nothing but "painful and unforeseeable consequences to the entire country. . . ."

At 3:00 p.m. in the afternoon of September 14, the leaders of the strike issued a victory message from underground. "Today's events are the trumpet call of tomorrow," they said.

"We will not bow to threats," López said in his speech. Encouraging the bosses to take reprisals against trade-union leaders, he explained:

I hope that all those who were victims of this outrage, to whom the government will, of course, lend a helping hand, will extend themselves to repair the damage that has been done, keeping fully in mind who were the instigators, propagandists, and spokesmen responsible for the damage, injuries, and distress they have suffered.

As is evident, the threat of subversion does not come from the trade unions or from the groups on the left. The main subversive agent resides in the San Carlos palace. □

Huge Demonstrations Shout, 'Yes!'

Should Spain Grant Demands of Oppressed Nationalities?

By Gerry Foley

At the same time that the Spanish press is predicting a new and still greater wave of strikes this fall, it has become clear that even with the help of the bourgeois and probourgeois forces in the nationalist movements of the oppressed peoples of Spain, Premier Adolfo Suárez has been unable to moderate the explosiveness of the national question.

The regime faces different problems in the Basque country and Catalonia, which are in fact two sides of the same coin. In Euzkadi, the probourgeois Basque Nationalist Party was able to gain a substantial electoral mandate. But this has not made it proof against the threat of being outflanked in action by the left and militant nationalist forces, even though most of these groups did not run an effective campaign in the elections.

In Catalonia, the bourgeois and probourgeois nationalists were routed by the workers parties. The Communist and Socialist parties received respectively 20 percent and 30 percent of the vote. Suárez has tried to get around this problem by making a deal with Josep Taradellas, the head of a government in exile that claims to represent the old Catalan autonomous authority.

This maneuver offers certain possibilities for Madrid, since Taradellas has some

power as a symbol, and his influence was increased by the opportunism and demagoguery of the Maoists and the big workers parties. Even now, when Taradellas's role has become clear, most of the working-class parties are not disputing his claim to authority in a very energetic or consistent way.

Nonetheless, in making a deal with Taradellas over the heads of the parties supported by a majority of the Catalan voters, Suárez is placing himself in open opposition to the principle of popular sovereignty and the parliamentary aspirations of the Communist and Socialist parties.

Such a bonapartist attempt to override popular sovereignty and trample on the electoralist ambitions of the big reformist workers parties can lead to opening up the way for mass mobilizations against the government. The example of Portugal in 1975 shows that. The Portuguese bourgeoisie was eventually able to turn such a situation to its advantage. In Catalonia, that would be far more difficult.

In its September 10 issue, *Le Monde* ran the headline: "Madrid Worried by the Influence of the Separatists in the Basque Country." Correspondent Charles Vanhecke wrote:

Over the last two months [since the June

elections], the radical far left, which advocates not autonomy but independence, has regained the initiative in Guipúzcoa and Viscaya [Basque provinces]. Despite its failure in the elections, it has once again mobilized the population by a series of marches and parades. The moderate formations woke up belatedly, and decided to take the lead of Thursday's demonstration in San Sebastián. In fact, despite their electoral victory, they are not in control of the situation. They left the field open too long to the separatists.

Writing in the September 17 issue of the Madrid weekly magazine *Cuadernos para el Diálogo*, which is close to the Socialist Party, Mayte Santibañez described the unsuccessful attempt of the parliamentarians to take the lead in the San Sebastián demonstration:

What was really at stake in the demonstration for amnesty and autonomy sponsored by the parliamentarians was "who controls the street?" or more euphemistically, "on whose side are the people?" The presence of forcibly exiled former Basque prisoners [who returned illegally to the country] set people shouting once again: ETA—*herria zurekin* [ETA, the people are with you] and "independence!" The ex-prisoners monopolized the head of the demonstration, leaving the parliamentarians trailing forty meters behind. For the first time since the elections, the parliamentarians and the advocates of mass mobilization above all else found themselves together in the same demonstration.

The following day . . . the returned prisoners said that they "considered that the expressions of support and solidarity that greeted them as they passed were not offered to them personally but through them to all those who died or have been imprisoned in the past and today for Euzkadi." But the parliamentarians, and not they alone, think that the continued appearances in reality favor certain parties. A representative of the Socialist Party told this magazine: "The people voted massively for us at the polls. So, who are the legitimate representatives of the people?"

Santibañez commented:

Nonetheless, it is also true that the representatives of Euzkadi in parliament have been too slow in picking up the banner of amnesty and have only mobilized for this demand when the extraparliamentary groups have outflanked them.

The attempts of the Stalinists, the Social Democrats, and the probourgeois Basque Nationalist Party to demobilize the mass movement for amnesty and self-government proved totally ineffective. Hundreds of demonstrations held in practically all the cities, towns, and villages of the Basque country throughout June and August culminated in some of the largest mobilizations yet seen in Euzkadi.

On September 2, a quarter of a million persons rallied in Bilbao, a city with a population of less than half a million. On September 3, 150,000 persons marched in San Sebastián, a city of about a quarter of a million inhabitants. On the same day, 35,000 marched in the town of Vitoria.

Rouge's special correspondent G. Bengochea wrote in the September 5 issue of the French Trotskyist daily that the San Sebastián demonstration was the largest ever in Guipúzcoa. He noted that the three rallies over September 2-3 brought out one-fifth of the entire population of the Basque country.

The Basque Nationalist Party opposed the September 2 demonstration in Bilbao up to the last minute, when it was finally forced to drop its opposition.

The San Sebastián demonstration, Bengochea reported, was organized by a united-front committee of the smaller left organizations. The three big parties—the SP, the CP, and the Basque Nationalist Party—did not participate.

Bengochea reported that the slogan of "Independence!" raised by the contingents of the revolutionary nationalist organizations, the EIA [Euzkal Iraultzalderi—Basque Revolutionary Party], the Euzko Herria Alderdi Sozialista [EHAS—Socialist Party of the Basque People], and the ETA, was taken up massively in the demonstrations.

In the September 17 *Cuadernos para el Diálogo*, Santibañez pointed out that the Assembly of Basque Members of Parliament has not functioned, having failed to hold a single meeting since it was set up. Unable to unite on a program for autonomy, the three largest parliamentary

parties have proposed three conflicting plans.

The biggest stumbling block for the parliamentary parties is the problem of Navarra, the most heterogeneous of the Basque provinces. In the province as a whole, the right is strong. In fact, the Basque character of Navarra is disputed. In the referendum for the autonomous Basque government set up under the republic in the 1930s, a majority of voters in Navarra cast their ballots against the province being included in the self-governing area. The north of the province is very similar to the rest of the Basque country, but in the south there is reportedly little identification with the Basque nation.

The results of the June elections for Navarra as a whole differed substantially from those in the other Basque provinces. Suárez's Center Party gained an edge in the popular vote and a disproportionately large majority of the parliamentary seats. His party favors separating Navarra from the rest of the Basque country under a different statute of "autonomy."

Faced with the need to come up with a concrete proposal for self-government, the Basque Nationalist Party has begun to reveal its common class interest with the centralist bourgeoisie of the Spanish state and its consequent inability to fight for the national aspirations of the Basque people. Its plan calls for a transitional government based on an assembly of ten representatives for each "historic territory." Each province would have one vote, and all decisions would have to be made unanimously. Thus, Suárez's party would have an absolute veto.

Even the Socialist Party is apparently unhappy about the Basque Nationalist Party's proposal. Santibañez wrote:

Obviously this proposal offers the Center deputies a much more attractive basis for negotiation than the Socialist Party plan. It means that now the future of a transitional Basque regime is in the hands of the Center and the Basque Nationalist Party. There has been no lack of comment saying "The Basque Nationalist Party is lining up where it belongs, with the right."

The Socialist Party proposed a confederation of the provincial councils of the four Basque provinces in which representation would go according to the vote cast for the various parties in this past June's elections. The Center opposes this on the ground that in such a body Navarra and, of course, the Center itself, would be in a minority.

Obviously, the specific formula raised for allowing the Basque people to exercise self-determination is particularly important because of the small size of the nationality and the impact of a centuries-long campaign by the Spanish central governments to destroy the Basque communities.

In Catalonia, problems also may arise

over what territories should be included in an autonomous Catalan state. However, at the moment the political struggle in Catalonia is focused on what kind of autonomous government is to be established, rather than what territory should be included under its jurisdiction.

According to Rafael Pradas, writing in the September 17 *Cuadernos para el Diálogo*, leaks to the press indicate that the restored Generalitat, as the autonomous Catalan government is called, will consist of a president and an Executive Council. The council can consist of up to twelve members plus the heads of the four provincial councils. The president will be named by the central government; the four provincial council heads are also government appointees. In addition, the government is to have the power to rescind any decision of the Generalitat.

Pradas pointed out that the government's proposal runs directly counter to the vital interests of the Communist and Socialist parties that got a majority of the vote in the June elections.

By means of a pact, the left wants to introduce parliamentary control over presidential decisions. . . . The Suárez government is absolutely opposed to letting the Assemblies of Members of Parliament, and not just the Catalan one, become centers of power.

However, a presidentialist Generalitat, headed by a government appointee, will tie Catalan autonomy directly to the governmental palace in Madrid, or to the offices of the Center Party. This tie will be strengthened, moreover, by the inclusion in the council of the heads of the provincial councils, a provision that many members of parliament consider unacceptable.

As Pradas points out, the Suárez government, which rules fundamentally by royal "prerogative" and not on the basis of an electoral majority, wants to hold back the development of assemblies of deputies that could claim a popular mandate.

However, in Catalonia, the Assembly of Members of Parliament has a majority of representatives of the working-class parties and actually has a potential for becoming a "center of power," unlike the Basque assembly, which is hopelessly divided between the workers parties and bourgeois and probourgeois parties.

The Suárez government's decision to negotiate the question of Catalan autonomy with Taradellas behind the backs of the elected representatives of the Catalan people also struck directly at the vital interests of the parliamentary parties. A negotiating committee was set up that included members of parliament, but they found themselves playing a subordinate role to the head of the exile Generalitat, who was elected by no one. (He was chosen in 1954 by survivors of the republican government.)

One of the members of the negotiating committee, Senator Josep Benet, who received more than 1,300,000 votes on a unity ticket including both the CP and the

SP, was forced to protest Taradellas's dominating the negotiations. Benet found himself excluded from the negotiating body.

In its September 10 issue, *Cuadernos para el Diálogo* reported that Taradellas told a journalist that Benet's ouster was "an order that has been issued, and that's it."

Benet protested that he owed it to those who elected him to inform them at least in general about the progress of the negotiations. But the Communist and Socialist parties failed to do more than grumble.

In the September 11 issue of *Rouge*, Luisa Vermeil and Michel Rovère reported:

When Taradellas excluded a senator [Benet], the workers parties in general humbly swallowed the affront and accepted the fait accompli with which they were presented by the new Catalan bonaparte. . . . Taradellas is trying to reduce the role of the workers parties in the negotiating committee and later in the Executive Council of the provisional Generalitat. He proposes to give them three seats (two for the SP and one for the CP), while the Provincial Council heads designated by Franco will have four seats.

The capitulation of the SP and the CP to Taradellas's diktat was only the logical continuation of their continual retreat from their previous commitments to the masses that elected them:

The "positive agreement" Taradellas has reached with Suárez's representatives is far less than the minimum proposed by the reformist parties. Their demands . . . are being reduced day by day. The SP and CP have agreed to accept a provisional Generalitat presided over by Taradellas that "would reflect the election results in a framework of national unity." That is, the majority workers parties refuse to assume their responsibilities and take up themselves the mandate they were given in the June elections.

On September 9, the Assembly of Members of Parliament . . . made it known that it would accept a provisional Executive Council without even any guarantee that the Communist and Socialist parties would be represented in it.

The approach of the Catalan National Day on September 11 offered the big workers parties an opportunity to answer Taradellas's challenge in the most effective way, by mobilizing hundreds of thousands of people in the street to demand the right to determine who will represent them. That, however, was the last thing they wanted.

And, in fact, in Catalonia most groups that claim to stand to the left of the CP also took a capitulationist position. Vermeil and Rovère wrote:

The constant capitulation of the workers parties was clear throughout the preparations for the Catalan National Day. . . . In the preparatory committee, two blocs opposed each other. On the one hand, the bourgeois parties and groups, supported by the SP and CP, wanted to celebrate the day as a national festival . . . without any clear focus for mobilization. On the other hand, some revolutionary organizations, the Communist League, the Revolutionary Communist League, the Socialist Party of National

Liberation, and the Red Flag group called for a national day of struggle for the following definite demands:

Full democratic rights and legalization of all working-class and mass organizations.

Full amnesty and national rights.

Satisfaction of the economic and social demands of the workers.

Vermeil and Rovère continued:

The "national festival" proposal got a majority. And what should be noted is that revolutionary organizations that only yesterday stood with us in the struggles, such as the Communist Movement of Catalonia, the Partido de Trabajo [PT—Labor Party, a Maoist group], the Organización Revolucionaria de los Trabajadores [Revolutionary Workers Organization, a Maoist group] and the Organización de la Izquierda Comunista [OIC—Organization of the Communist Left, a sovietist group] lined up unconditionally with the majority.

Despite the capitulation, the massive outpouring on September 11 created a certain momentum by its very size and composition.

The article on the demonstration in the September 17 *Cuadernos para el Diálogo* commented:

The question that remains posed is for what and for whom "this" Generalitat is going to be used. On Sunday [September 11], in upper Barcelona, where the right got its best vote, there were almost no Catalan banners on the balconies. But the ordinary Catalan, who may have been born in Andalusia or Extremadura [that is, might be an immigrant worker from a non-

Catalan part of the Spanish state] shouted himself or herself hoarse for a Generalitat that will advance the cause of democracy, justice, and freedom in genuine solidarity with the other peoples of Spain.

The magazine noted:

Insofar as is known, there were very few shouts for Taradellas, and reports in the local press show that in many of the rallies in other places, he was not even mentioned.

In the September 13 *Rouge*, Luisa Vermeil reported that the only contingent where pictures of Taradellas were generally carried was the Maoist PT. This contingent also was the only one that tried to shout down the LCR slogan of "No Puppets, Down With Taradellas!" The two Trotskyist contingents, the LCR and the LC, both raised the slogan of "Elections for a Catalan parliament, the people must make the decisions."

Vermeil also noted: "There was an immense banner in the march, followed by a sizable number of people, that said, 'Independence for the Catalan Lands!'"

She added: "The great lesson of September 11 is that the Catalan people want to decide their own future. The lesson, too, is that the relationship of forces between the Catalan bourgeoisie and the central government on the one hand and the workers parties on the other is overwhelmingly in favor of the workers organizations. □

Moscow Issues Turchin a One-Way Ticket

Valentyn Turchin, chairman of the Amnesty International chapter in the USSR, has been given permission to emigrate. Turchin, a doctor of physical-mathematical sciences, was offered a post teaching a mathematics course at Columbia University in New York City. However, when he applied for a visa to visit the United States to teach the course, he was told that he could only receive a visa to leave permanently.

A prominent figure in the dissident movement in Moscow, Turchin has been without work since 1974. He was first demoted, then dismissed from his academic post after defending Andrei Sakharov, who was under official attack in September 1973.

In September 1974, Turchin became a founding member of the Amnesty International group in the Soviet Union. The Kremlin's security police carried out an intense campaign of harassment against the members of the group, cutting off their telephones, confiscating their mail, and searching their apartments.

In late 1974, two members of the group were arrested, Andrei Tverdokhlebov and Sergei Kovalev. Tverdokhlebov was sentenced to a term of five years internal exile on charges of "anti-Soviet" slander. Ko-

valev received a sentence of seven years in a labor camp and three years exile on charges of "anti-Soviet" activity.

Despite the police pressure, Turchin maintained the Amnesty International group, defending Tverdokhlebov and Kovalev as well as numerous other political prisoners in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In March 1976 the Soviet branch of Amnesty International with Turchin at its head issued an appeal to the Uruguayan government signed by forty Soviet dissidents, condemning the torture of Uruguayan political prisoners.

After the Helsinki monitoring groups were formed in the USSR in May 1976, Turchin collaborated with them in collecting documentation of the Soviet government's violations of the accords' humanitarian provisions and defended group members persistently under attack from the authorities.

In January 1977, Turchin issued a statement of support and solidarity with the signers of the Charter 77 human rights manifesto in Czechoslovakia.

He has repeatedly been harassed by the police, taken in for questioning, subjected to searches and confiscation of material in his apartment, and attacked in the official press. □

Protests Across South Africa Over Death of Steve Biko

By Ernest Harsch

Steve Biko, one of the most influential young Black leaders in South Africa, died in police custody September 12, according to a government announcement the following day. The racist Vorster regime claimed that Biko, who was only thirty years old, had died after a one-week hunger strike.

As a founder and central figure of the militant Black Consciousness movement, Biko helped inspire an entire generation of young Blacks to stand up and oppose South Africa's racist system of apartheid. The news of his death came as a shock to Blacks throughout the country and led to a new wave of protest against the white minority regime.

Within hours of the announcement, about 400 Blacks and whites gathered at an impromptu memorial service in Johannesburg. Speakers condemned the regime's repressive laws, such as the one under which Biko had been held, that provide for indefinite detention without trial. As the service ended, Blacks in the audience shouted "Amandla!" (power).

The Black People's Convention (BPC), of which Biko was honorary president, issued a statement calling South Africa "a violent police state." And in response to the regime's explanation of Biko's death, it declared, "Death in detention can never be . . . explained in natural terms." On September 15, Moki Ceikisani, the president of the BPC, was arrested by security police.

The same day, the entire student body rallied at the all-Black University of Fort Hare, which Biko had once attended, to commemorate his death. The 1,500 mourners were dressed in black and sang Black freedom songs. Armed riot police rushed to the campus with attack dogs. Declaring the rally illegal, they arrested more than 1,200 participants.

By September 16, the protests and memorial meetings had spread to university campuses in every major city in the country. A mass funeral march has been scheduled for September 25 in Biko's home city, Kingwilliamstown. Soweto student leaders announced that a memorial demonstration would be held in Soweto as well.

One factor fueling the unrest over Biko's death has been Pretoria's contradictory claims and its refusal to allow an independent inquiry.

In the regime's initial version of Biko's death, Justice Minister James T. Kruger claimed that Biko began a hunger strike on September 5 while in prison in Port Elizabeth. Although Biko had been in good health at the time of his arrest August 18,



STEVE BIKO

Kruger claimed that he "appeared to be unwell" on September 11 and was taken to a hospital in Pretoria, where he died the next day.

On September 17, however, Kruger admitted for the first time that there may have been "irregularities" in the police handling of the case. With the apparent aim of setting up some scapegoats, he said that "heads may roll" in the police force after an investigation of Biko's death.

A teacher in Soweto with close ties to the Black student leaders there was quoted in the September 15 *New York Times* as saying, "I haven't met anybody who believes for one moment that he [Biko] would starve himself to death."

In light of the Vorster regime's known brutality against Black political prisoners and the death in detention of more than twenty Black activists over the past year, prominent Black figures charge that Biko may have died as a result of torture inflicted by the security police.

These charges were reinforced September 18 when Donald Woods, the editor of the East London *Daily Dispatch*, revealed that he had seen injuries on Biko's body that could have been caused by a beating.

In an interview published in the September 17 *New York Times*, Prime Minister John Vorster tried to play down Biko's importance, stating that "this matter has been blown up out of all proportion." But the very fact that the regime has felt compelled to engage in elaborate explanations is itself testimony to Biko's prominent role as a leader of the Black freedom struggle.

A former student at the Natal University Medical Faculty and the University of Fort Hare, Biko played a key role in the founding in late 1968 of the militant South African Students Organisation, of which he was elected its first president. As a leader of the Black student movement, he helped formulate the ideas of the nationalist current known as Black Consciousness, which stresses Black dignity and self-reliance and opposition to all forms of white oppression. It was these ideas that helped inspire the students in Soweto to launch mass protests against the apartheid regime last year.

In 1972, Biko helped establish the Black People's Convention, which is now one of the most important Black political organizations in the country. The following year he was banned (a form of house arrest). Although this prevented him from carrying out open political activities, he was named honorary president of the BPC.

After the beginning of the mass Black upsurge in Soweto in June 1976, Biko was arrested under the notorious Terrorism Act, which provides for indefinite detention without trial or access to a lawyer.

Following his arrest, correspondent John Burns published a report in the September 19, 1976, *New York Times* based on an interview with him. Biko criticized the talks going on at the time between Vorster and Secretary of State Kissinger and demanded that Washington ban any further American investments in South Africa and force the more than 300 U.S. companies now operating there to pull out.

"He made it clear," Burns wrote, "that a government formed around the black-consciousness groups would follow a policy of black socialism, placing severe restraints on private enterprise and sharply cutting, if not eliminating, foreign investment."

Biko was released from prison after more than three months but was detained again August 18. According to Kruger, he was arrested under the Terrorism Act for the "compilation and distribution of written material propagating violence and arson."

The real reason was that his ideas represented a danger to the continued maintenance of white supremacy and all the injustices that accompany it. But his death cannot stop the spread of those ideas. Nor will it lessen the determination of South Africa's twenty-one million Blacks to rid their country of the barbaric system of apartheid. □

1,685 Attend SWP Convention

By Fred Murphy

"A world offensive on three fronts has been launched or accelerated by the Carter administration," Jack Barnes, national secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, told the 1,685 members and guests assembled for the SWP's twenty-ninth national convention.

The gathering, held in Ohio August 6-13, was the largest convention in the party's history. The reports and discussion reflected the deepening of the process begun at the SWP's 1975 convention of centering the party's activities on new political openings in the trade unions, the women's liberation movement, and in the organizations and communities of the oppressed nationalities.

Jack Barnes's report, "The U.S. Ruling-Class Offensive Abroad and at Home," analyzed Carter's three-pronged offensive—against U.S. imperialism's capitalist competitors, against the colonial and semicolonial world, and against the Soviet Union.

The American ruling class has used the leverage obtained in the relative strengthening of the U.S. economy since 1975 to improve its position in trade relations with Western Europe and Japan, and to force these imperialist allies to bear a greater share of the cost of policing the world. In the semicolonial countries, acting behind the facade of his declarations on "human rights," Carter has continued the government's policy of backing brutal military dictators.

"The U.S. offensive against the Soviet Union has been the most publicized," Barnes said. "Carter began by proposing an arms budget bigger than Ford's. That was one of his first acts in office. But even more important than increasing the size of the war budget was a series of decisions Carter made on a set of weapons."

Barnes explained how Carter's backing for the cruise missile, the neutron bomb, and the MX mobile missile represents a "massive new escalation in death-dealing arms." Behind this escalation lies U.S. imperialism's continued drive to open the Soviet Union to penetration by American capital. This, Barnes said, is "the imperialists' real economic aim underlying détente. . . ."

In discussing Barnes's report and four other reports, the 272 convention delegates assessed the impact of the ruling-class offensive on the working class, on the oppressed nationalities, and on women in the United States.

Working people have been "stunned" by

the capitalists' attacks on their wages and living standards, and the trade-union bureaucracy has put forward no strategy for countering this offensive, Joel Britton said in his report on the SWP's tasks and perspectives in the labor movement. But he noted the important and encouraging developments among workers exemplified by the Steelworkers Fight Back campaign, in which Ed Sadlowski challenged the bureaucratic leadership of the United Steelworkers of America for the presidency of the union. "The Sadlowski campaign represented a big step forward in the union movement," Britton said, "a break with many aspects of the class-collaborationist approach of the top union officials."

The Socialist Workers Party "actively backed Sadlowski," whose campaign represented "the most important new development in the class struggle, and our biggest experience in the labor movement, since we met here in convention last August."

Britton went on to note that developments similar to Steelworkers Fight Back could be expected in other industries and unions, and that the SWP had to continue the effort it began in 1975 to increase its membership and activity among industrial workers.

He emphasized that "the Carter administration is preparing to move against the coal miners if they should dare to strike when their national contract expires in December." To help lead the developing response among miners to the government's offensive, the SWP will be establishing a branch in Morgantown, West Virginia, where 130 persons, mostly coal miners, recently subscribed to the party's newspaper, the *Militant*.

Willie Mae Reid, in her report, "The Struggle for Women's Liberation," described the effort of the ruling class to roll back all the social gains American women have made in recent years.

"The attack on women's right to choose abortion is the clearest example of the ruling-class offensive against women," Reid said. She called special attention to the attacks on women of the oppressed nationalities and the crucial role these women will play in future struggles.

The battle to defend women's rights is centered at present in the National Organization for Women, the largest women's liberation group in the United States. The central leadership of NOW has failed to mount an adequate response to the ruling-class attacks, but growing numbers of

NOW members are considering or reconsidering the perspective for a militant feminist approach outlined by the Defending Women's Rights caucus in NOW at the organization's convention in April. SWP members have helped to lead that caucus.

The ruling-class offensive at home also confronts the oppressed nationalities. Malik Miah's report, "The SWP and the Struggle for Black Liberation," noted that "a decade after the passage of important legislation that gave Blacks legal equality, nothing much has really changed for the masses of Black people."

Miah explained that "no national response to the government offensive has occurred" because "the leadership of the Black community is completely in the hands of the liberal, procapitalist currents of the movement."

The SWP will continue to deepen its involvement in the fight for Black rights, helping to build the new leadership that will break the Black community from the Democratic and Republican parties.

Resistance to the government's offensive against the Chicano community is centered in the fight against deportations of immigrant Mexican workers. Olga Rodriguez reported on "the initiatives taken by the leaders of the Texas Raza Unida Party . . . to build a national response to the government's attacks."

The Texas RUP leaders have joined with a number of other Chicano activists in the Southwest to call a national antideportation conference for San Antonio, October 28-30. "This conference can be an important first step in the direction of building a badly needed multinational, united-front campaign demanding an end to deportations," Rodriguez said.

Leaders of the Texas and New Mexico RUPs were guests at the convention and brought greetings from their organizations.

Three developments favoring the growth and strengthening of the world Trotskyist movement received special attention at the convention.

The first of these was the fusion of the Revolutionary Marxist Committee with the SWP. After a year of political discussion and several months of joint activity with the SWP, the RMC found itself in political agreement with the SWP's perspectives for the American revolution. Convention delegates voted unanimously to approve Larry Seigle's report proposing the fusion. Three former RMC members were elected to the SWP's National Committee.

"The fusion, and the discussion it will generate, will cause some people to take a new look at our party, and to consider for the first time that maybe the SWP is the place for them to be," Seigle said.

Representatives of the newly formed Canadian Trotskyist organization, the Revolutionary Workers League/Ligue Ouvrière Révolutionnaire, reported on the reunification of Fourth Internationalists in



Lou Howort/Militant

Part of audience at rally for "Militant," held August 12 during SWP convention in Ohio.

Canada that made possible the formation of the new group.

The fusion of the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, the Groupe Marxiste Révolutionnaire, and the Revolutionary Marxist Group, just prior to the SWP convention, brought to a close a four-year split among Canadian Trotskyists. Divisions among the three groups along the lines of debate between the two major groupings inside the Fourth International—the International Majority Tendency and the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction—had narrowed under the impact of recent events in the class struggle in Canada and around the world.

The fusion in Canada has great significance for the entire Fourth International, Barry Sheppard told the convention in his report on the world Trotskyist movement. He noted that the convergence of the two currents in the international on several important issues now makes it possible to carry out a discussion in which agreements or disagreements will not simply repeat the old alignments. The delegates voted to approve Sheppard's proposal that the convention call upon the LTF and the IMT to dissolve.

Charles Duret, representing the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, brought greetings to the convention. Speaking also as a representative of the IMT, Duret welcomed the proposal for dissolution of the factions, while noting that his view of the political differences was not the same as Sheppard's.

Among the more than 150 guests from abroad at the convention were representatives of two Trotskyist currents not inside the Fourth International—the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International, and the current affiliated with the French organization Lutte Ouvrière.

Two special international guests were the veteran British Trotskyist Harry Wicks and Irish revolutionist Bernadette Devlin McAliskey.

Wicks was a student at the Communist International's "Lenin School" in Moscow

in 1929. He told the convention of the excitement aroused there by the arrival of the first issue of the American Left Opposition's newspaper, the *Militant*. Wicks hailed the SWP's role in exposing the Moscow Trials: "Nothing was more important than your fight to defend Leon Trotsky."

Devlin McAliskey was the final speaker at a rally held to launch a \$50,000 fund drive for the *Militant*. She told of the setbacks suffered by the civil-rights movement in Northern Ireland in recent years; but she also said that a number of groups and individuals in Northern Ireland—including herself—are moving toward the Fourth International. She was repeatedly interrupted by applause as she said:

This time, in the reawakening and remobilization of the mass movement, things are going to be different. And the reason they are going to be different has a great deal to do with the Socialist Workers Party; has a great deal to do with the *Militant*; a great deal to do with *Intercontinental Press*; and a great deal to do with the Fourth International. Because we came the long, hard road—making every mistake in the book, learning every lesson that people in this party may have taken for granted, because they know where to look for the lessons. We learned the lessons by making the mistakes. . . .

I remember my first meeting with Gerry Foley was through the *Intercontinental Press*, at a time when the Officials [the "Official" wing of the Irish Republican Army] were literally trying to physically shoot our organization off the face of the earth. And I came upon a copy of the *Intercontinental Press* and discovered this guy Gerry Foley had it all worked out. . . .

That was the first time I saw *Intercontinental Press*—I then took out a subscription. My education has been broadened markedly ever since.

When we look here and see the Socialist Workers Party, and then look back at Ireland again, and say, if we had had in 1969 and '70, and '71, and '72—if we had had in Ireland a Socialist Workers Party at that time, we would by now have so drastically changed the course of Irish history that we would have changed the course of history of the world.

Devlin McAliskey concluded by telling the rally how John McAnulty, general secretary of People's Democracy, had been imprisoned under frame-up charges by the

British authorities. (People's Democracy is discussing the possibility of fusion with the Movement for a Socialist Republic, Irish section of the Fourth International.) The delegates voted to send a message of solidarity to McAnulty.

The convention reflected the growth and expansion of the Socialist Workers Party achieved since the party's 1975 convention. In her organization report, Mary-Alice Waters summed up the membership growth, geographic expansion, leadership development, and broadening political activity that has characterized the SWP during the past two years. Since August 1975, the party's membership has increased by 59 percent, with an increasing percentage of new members coming from the oppressed nationalities. Almost half of the new members are women.

The party has doubled the number of cities in which it has established units, and has greatly stepped up its involvement in the trade-union movement.

The convention discussed the beginning of the party's involvement in the movement against nuclear power that has arisen on a national scale in the United States during the past year. This movement, Jack Barnes said, is "challenging the right of the capitalist government to make decisions on nuclear energy that can affect human beings for millions of years to come."

Barnes outlined the SWP's position on nuclear power: "We propose a complete shutdown of the nuclear industry in this country. Nationalization under workers' control of the entire energy sector. Open the books of the corporations to get rid of the fake and the fraud about the energy crisis."

The convention elected a new National Committee to lead the party during the coming year. This body was expanded from sixty-two to eighty-three, reflecting the growth of the party and the broadening of its leadership. Twenty-seven members of the new National Committee are from the oppressed nationalities, as against twenty on the outgoing National Committee. □

The Superexploitation of African Labor

By Jim Atkinson

[Third of a series]

"We cannot exist for five minutes without the native today. He is absolutely essential to our wage structure, if nothing else. . . if we went on a purely European basis with the present conditions of living and pay . . . the country would be sub-economic and down and out in five minutes." Godfrey Huggins, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, November 30, 1944.¹⁷

To exploit the mineral and agricultural wealth of Zimbabwe, the white conquerors employed a battery of methods to coerce Africans into working for white employers. In 1903, the British South Africa Company (BSAC), then administering the country under a royal charter granted in 1889, set up a Native Labour Supply Bureau to recruit labor from both inside and outside Zimbabwe.

One of the methods used by the colonists to induce a labor supply was to tax the Africans. This forced Africans to leave their villages in search of paid work so that they could pay the tax collectors. To this end, the BSAC government levied a tax of ten shillings per hut on the African population in 1894, just one year after the subjugation of the Ndebele. If Africans could not pay their taxes, the regime seized cattle and goats. In 1904, the hut tax was replaced by a poll tax—a £1 tax on each African male plus ten shillings for each wife after the first.

The colonial regime also sanctioned the use of forced labor, the 1926 Native Juveniles Employment Act providing for the compulsory indenturing of Africans found "loafing" in urban areas.

The regime was keen to recruit labor from outside Zimbabwe. The taxes levied by the British colonial authorities in Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) and Nyasaland (Malawi) forced Africans in those countries to search for work and many made their way south to find employment in Zimbabwe.

They were insecure and especially vulnerable to the hazards entailed if they lost their jobs, so the employers could savagely exploit them. In 1946, 203,000 out of the total of 363,000 Africans

employed in the country were immigrant workers.¹⁸ As late as 1972, 36 percent of agricultural workers were migrants.¹⁹

One of the principal ways in which the regime—to this day—has guaranteed a flow of African labor for the capitalist interests has been by curtailing and damaging African farming. After the British conquest, vast tracts of African farmlands were stolen by the settlers; tens of thousands of Africans were evicted from "white land"; and the African peasantry was crowded into "Native Reserves," since renamed Tribal Trust Lands (TTLs). Today, some four million Africans depend for their livelihood on about half of the country's farming land, while just 6,000 white-owned capitalist farms monopolize the other half. The Tribal Trust Lands are grossly overcrowded, so soil erosion, poverty, and malnutrition are widespread. As such, the Tribal Trust Lands, unable to support their population adequately, act as labor reservoirs for capitalist factories, farms and mines.

In addition, in 1951, the settler regime tried to step up the flow of African labor by decreeing the end of the traditional communal land tenure system in the TTLs. Though it was later abandoned in the early 1960s owing to the strength of African opposition, the 1951 Native Land Husbandry Act was designed to force large numbers of Africans into permanent dependence on wage employment by removing their customary rights to use land in the TTLs.

Today, there is a growing mass of job-hungry unemployed. According to the Whitsun Foundation, a Salisbury institute sponsored by big-business interests, the labor force grew by 485,000 between 1965 and 1975, while wage employment expanded by only 209,000. In 1976, according to government figures, total wage employment actually fell by 7,000, while the population continued to increase by 3.6 percent a year.²⁰

The large reserve army of labor in both the TTLs and the cities, combined with government repression of African political and

17. Quoted in Martin Loney, *Rhodesia: White Racism and Imperial Response*, p. 64.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 63.

19. ATUC Education Services, *Workers Education Programme*, p. 160.

20. *Economic Survey of Rhodesia, 1976*.

Table 2

GROSS OPERATING PROFITS AND TOTAL WAGES AND SALARIES PAID BY SECTOR
(Figures for 1972 in R\$m)

	Gross Operating Profits	Total African Wages	Total Wages
European agriculture	81.1	43.4	54.2
Mining and Quarrying	37.8	19.5	37.5
Manufacturing	150.6	59.3	147.7
Construction	15.3	28.7	61.3
Electricity and Water	24.1	2.2	10.1

trade-union activity, has ensured a steady supply of cheap, disciplined labor for the capitalist monopolies, making massive superprofits possible. Built into the system is the assumption that sub-Poverty Datum Line wages paid by firms can be subsidized by workers' relatives in the subsistence sector in the Tribal Trust Lands. As the African Trades Union Congress (ATUC) explains:

As far as employer groups are concerned, a maintenance of the "tradition of a single subsistence wage" has numerous attractions. It enables them to avoid the costs of providing for the consumption needs of an employee's dependents, and of providing for the employee in his retirement. The system ensures a continuation of the dependency of the black urban workers on rural supports. . . . The "premium" that employers have to pay to achieve this dependency alignment is not the full cost of supporting the dependents of urban workers, but rather the costs enabling partial proletarianisation. Industrial workers are not "migrants" in the classic sense of the word, but their particular style of migrancy does enable producers to avoid paying the full premium for permanent proletarianisation.²¹

The cheap labor system is buttressed by the regime's tough antilabor laws—as well as its more general repressive legislation, which, though directed principally against the Black nationalist movements, can also be employed to detain union organizers and break strikes.

The most draconian of the antilabor laws is the Masters and Servants legislation, first enacted in 1901, which still applies today to agricultural workers and domestic servants. (In 1976, there were 356,000 agricultural workers and 126,000 domestic servants.²²) This legislation carries a whole series of penalties for workers who fail to perform to the satisfaction of their white "masters." It allows workers to be fired at a moment's notice with no right of appeal; and it specifically outlaws trade unionism in both the agricultural and domestic service sectors. Strikes are also illegal under the legislation.

Trade-union action by African workers forced the government to recognize trade unions in other sectors of the economy. However, under the 1959 Industrial Conciliation Act, the regime is able to severely curtail trade-union rights. Under this law, unions that give funds to political parties are denied recognition. The act helps to keep down wages by forcing workers to go through compulsory and long drawn-out arbitration procedures; and it is virtually impossible to hold a legal strike under the act. Strikes are illegal in essential services, where employees are bound by an unexpired contract, where arbitration procedures have not been exhausted, or if the president deems a strike to be against the "public interest."

An example of the repressive stance taken by the government against trade-union activists was its heavy-handed action against members of the Transport Operating Industry Workers Union who went on strike in December 1976 in Salisbury to demand a Christmas bonus. Armed police were sent in to break the strike and hundreds of bus workers spent Christmas in jail.

The large army of unemployed, the labor reservoirs in the impoverished Tribal Trust Lands, and the repressive antilabor laws all combine to produce very low wages—African workers earning on average only R\$517 (or just under R\$10 a week) in 1976. That year, gross earnings of Africans totaled R\$478.6m while the capitalists notched up gross operating profits of R\$771.4m²³ (Tables 2 and 3, which compare African wages with profits and show the proportion of the value of output represented by wages, given an idea of how the system allows the big capitalist monopolies to rake in superprofits from the cheap labor supply guaranteed by the racist regime.)

The BSAC, in the first years of colonial occupation, set its underpaid and wretchedly housed workers to work in the gold mines; and, though Rhodes's gold bonanza never materialized,

21. ATUC Education Services, *Workers Education Programme*, pp. 156-157.

22. *Economic Survey of Rhodesia, 1976*.

23. *Ibid.*

Table 3

WAGES AS % OF GROSS OUTPUT, 1968-72

	African Wage Payments as Percentage of Gross Output	Total Wage Payments as Percentage of Gross Output
Manufacturing	7.73	18.92
Construction	16.31	36.14
Electricity & Water	4.68	20.17

Source for tables: African Trades Union Congress Education Services, *Workers' Education Programme*, Bulawayo, undated, p. 222.

gold mining did play an important part in the economy. Gold production rose from 55,000 ounces in 1900 to 854,000 ounces in 1914; and, in 1943, it was estimated that 50 percent of national income was derived from gold. In addition, the capitalist mining sector expanded after the discovery of a large coal deposit at Wankie and the later discovery of deposits of lead, chrome, tungsten, and asbestos.²⁴ The gross value of mining output rose from £7.7m in 1938 to £25.8m in 1957.²⁵

Meanwhile, with cheap supplies of mainly migrant labor, capitalist agriculture boomed, the value of farming output soaring from £3.8m in 1938 to £41.8m in 1957.²⁶ Much of this expansion was concentrated in the tobacco industry. Up until UDI in 1965, when the settler regime stopped publication of trade statistics, tobacco was the country's major export, the crop totaling 246m pounds in 1965. Many of the country's huge farms, plantations and ranches are owned by big, international monopolies.

The greatest expansion, however, has been in manufacturing, with the value of output in this sector rising from £5.1m in 1938 to £105.1m in 1957, ahead of both mining and agriculture.²⁷

Typical of the giant monopolies straddling the manufacturing sector is Barlow Rand, a South African-based company with total assets of R324.2m²⁸ in 1973. Barlow Rand has interests in scores of Rhodesian manufacturing industries, ranging from Rhodesian Breweries to paint companies and five furniture factories.²⁹

In the mining sector, the giant is the South African monopoly Anglo American Corporation, whose Rhodesian interests are handled by Anglo American Rhodesia (Amrho). In 1966, Anglo American's chairman, Harry Oppenheimer, told his Annual General Meeting that, having taken over the assets of the BSAC the previous year, Amrho was following the example of the connection between Rhodes and De Beers. Today, Amrho wholly or partly owns scores of Rhodesian companies, including Wankie Colliery, the Rhodesian Nickel Corporation, Trojan Nickel Mines, Bindura Smelting and Refining, Industrial Metal Products, Hippo Valley Estates, Mazoe Citrus Estates, and Madziwa Mines. Amrho's profits in 1971-2 totaled R\$2.56m.³⁰

Hulett, a new diversified South African-based sugar giant, is a typical example of a Rhodesian agribusiness monopoly, with 100 percent ownership of three sugar estates (Triangle, Lewveld, and

24. Loney, *Rhodesia: White Racism and Imperial Response*, pp. 67-68.

25. L. Tow, *The Manufacturing Economy of Southern Rhodesia* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, 1960), p. 4.

26. *Ibid.*

27. *Ibid.*

28. One South African rand is equivalent to US \$1.15.

29. ATUC, *Education Services, Workers Education Programme*, p. 214.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213.

Syringa) and majority shareholdings in two others (Mtilikwe and Tokwe). In his 1973 report, Huletts' chairman disclosed that of the group's R11.39m profits that year, that "attributable to Rhodesia amounted to R4.42m."³¹

Mention should also be made of the banks. The two largest banking groups in the country are Standard and Barclays, both subsidiaries of British banks. Standard is the largest financial institution in the country, with assets of R\$160m in 1972 (up

31. Ibid, pp. 213-214.

R\$50m since the settler regime's unilateral declaration of independence in 1965).³²

It is evident from this pattern of economic domination of Zimbabwe by a handful of giant imperialist corporations that full national liberation will require not only the achievement of political rights and freedoms by the Black majority, but also the expropriation of the imperialist-owned banks, factories, mines, and farms.

[Next: Land Hunger]

32. Ibid, p. 214.

Police Confiscate Copies of 'Perspectiva Mundial'

Claudio Tavárez Arrested in Santo Domingo

By Judy White

Claudio Tavárez, a Dominican teacher prominent in activities to defend democratic rights in his country, was arrested in the Santo Domingo airport September 9 and detained for five days. The secret police held him on charges of possession of "Communist literature."

On September 12 District Attorney Anaiboni Guerrero asked the Second Penal Court to set bail of 200,000 pesos (US\$200,000) for Tavárez, who was formally charged with violating three Dominican anti-Communist statutes—Laws 6, 70, and 71. The "Communist literature" that provided the pretext for the charges was *Perspectiva Mundial*, a Spanish-language fortnightly magazine published in New York. Tavárez was carrying two bundles of the magazine at the time he was detained.

The September 13 issue of the Santo Domingo daily *La Noticia* reported:

The material, designated as subversive by the police, was to be distributed throughout the country with the aim of "introducing a far-reaching plan of agitation, mobilizing the masses of the communist parties, and encouraging the youth to commit disorderly acts directed against public and private property."

In court, Tavárez's attorney, Conrado Cedeño, denounced the charges as a "monstrous piece of judicial nonsense" and demanded that the bail be lowered. One Dominican lawyer said she believed a 200,000-peso bail would be the highest in the country's history.

Judge Sergio Rodríguez Pimentel rejected Guerrero's petition and set bail for Tavárez at 50,000 pesos, which was subsequently obtained to secure his temporary release.

Tavárez is well known as a defender of human rights. Formerly a leading member of the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA), he is also a member of Amnesty International,

and has participated in the work of other civil liberties groups in the United States and the Dominican Republic.

As part of his work with USLA, he headed the task force that helped win the release of Francisco Antonio Santos, Eugenio Pérez Cepeda, Julio de Peña Valdez, and Juan Vargas—four Dominican trade-union leaders—in 1975.

As reported in the Spring 1976 issue of the *USLA Reporter*, the committee's newsletter:

USLA initiated the defense campaign in response to an appeal from the Dominican CGT [Central General de Trabajadores—General Workers Federation] when its central leadership was thrown in prison last summer on charges of "conspiring to overthrow the government." Broad support was won within the U.S. labor movement, with powerful unions like the United Auto Workers and United Mine Workers joining USLA in the campaign. Major unions abroad responded to the CGT's appeal as well.

Tavárez was also instrumental in organizing a fact-finding commission of U.S. and Canadian clergy and civil libertarians to Santo Domingo in September 1975, to investigate the status of human rights on the island. The commission's findings of "widespread repression" received broad coverage in the Dominican press, helping increase pressure for the release of the trade unionists.

The following month Tavárez was invited to the First Conference for Trade-Union Freedom in Santo Domingo, to report on activities in the United States in defense of Dominican political prisoners.

Enrique de León and José Díaz, the official distributors of *Perspectiva Mundial* in the Dominican Republic, described the arrest of Tavárez as a "serious violation" of the law of freedom of expression.

Police have threatened "to detain all persons who have in their possession,

distribute, or read the magazine *Perspectiva Mundial*," Tavárez told *Perspectiva Mundial* in a telephone interview following his release on bail.

But we will continue to sell the magazine. We will deliver it to the subscribers, and we plan to continue moving forward in increasing sales of the magazine. . . .

We have and will continue to exercise our right [to sell *Perspectiva Mundial*] as we have been for the last nine months.

Since it began publication January 24, 1977, *Perspectiva Mundial* has been distributed in thirty countries and in no case has it been ruled "subversive."

Tavárez faces trial in October, and it is feared that other frame-up charges may be introduced at that time. The September 10 issue of *La Noticia*, for example, reported that he had been "studying in a socialist country and returned yesterday to Santo Domingo."

They added, "It has been impossible to establish what socialist country the prisoner was studying in." Perhaps this is because Tavárez pursued his university studies in New York, hardly part of a "socialist country."

In the interview with *Perspectiva*, Tavárez asked that "all those who defend democratic rights and freedom of expression send telegrams to the attorney general and to the president of the republic* protesting my imprisonment and demanding that *Perspectiva Mundial* be declared legal."

He asked that copies of all messages be sent to Enrique de León and José Díaz, Calle Respaldo Proyecto 39, El Portal, Santo Domingo, República Dominicana. □

*Anaiboni Guerrero, Fiscal del Distrito Nacional, Palacio de la Justicia de Ciudad Nueva, Santo Domingo, República Dominicana; Presidente Joaquín Balaguer, Palacio Nacional, Santo Domingo, República Dominicana.

The Gathering Gloom on Wall Street—1

By Jon Britton

[This is the first of three articles on the debate in the public press over economic prospects in the capitalist world.]

* * *

Fears of a new world economic crisis sent the U.S. stock market plunging to a 21-month low September 19. Warnings of an economic "pause," a new recession, or even a major depression are proliferating. A number of politicians and government representatives around the world have broken with carefully contrived official "optimism" to sound the alarm.

Falling stock prices are a weighty warning of trouble to come. "The market's record for predictions is excellent," *Business Week* points out in its August 29 issue. "In fact, the National Bureau of Economic Research ranks it as the best of the government's leading indicators."

This should not be surprising. The banks and other "insiders," by virtue of their special access to information, are in the best position to judge underlying economic trends and then act on them. When business prospects turn sour, they sell stocks and shift a portion of their funds into corporate or government bonds and increase their cash reserves, well in advance of the actual downturn. It appears that big investors have been shifting away from stocks for well over a year.

For most of that period, professional economists and the hacks writing in the financial press have been generally optimistic. But now a few are changing their tune:

"A significant deterioration is taking place in the tone of economic forecasts for the final months of 1977 and for 1978," *Business Week* states in its September 5 issue. "Few economists, if any, are forecasting an outright recession in the next 15 months," the magazine continues, "but the voice of the bear can nevertheless be heard in the land." (A "bear" in Wall Street parlance is one who thinks the stock market or economy is headed lower.)

"Wall Street isn't yet in a panic, but it's in a state of extreme unhappiness," feeding off the "combined fears of a recession and rising interest rates," Bud Simon, director of research of Weeden & Co., said August 25.

In an "economic analysis" published in the August 30 *New York Times*, Clyde H. Farnsworth states flatly that "the world's economic recovery is faltering, uneasily shifting toward a phase some analysts are

calling a growth recession."

And John Palmer writes in the September 4 *Manchester Guardian Weekly* that "a new international economic recession in 1978—and not merely continued stagnation—is now feared by many governments in Europe. . . .

"Officials in the Benelux and some in France and West Germany," he continues, "fear the US will not be able to sustain its modest economic expansion and are sceptical about the prospects of faster growth in Japan."

Recriminations among capitalist "statesmen" have begun. British Prime Minister James Callaghan told a press luncheon in Glasgow, Scotland, September 2 that last May's conference of the seven top imperialist powers in London "has not succeeded" and suggested that the United States and West Germany must bear much of the blame, according to R.W. Apple, Jr., writing in the September 3 *New York Times*.

At a subsequent press conference Callaghan elaborated on this point, complaining that "some of the member countries, such as the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, have not been able to get the degree of expansion in their economies that they put their hands to."

One of the most dramatic forecasts of doom was made by New York's Sen. Jacob Javits at a Senate Banking Committee hearing in Washington August 29. According to the *New York Times*, he warned of "a worldwide depression in two or three years" unless steps are taken now to shore up the international economic system.

"Such a depression," he added, "could last as long as the last depression of the 1930's and possibly even longer because, obviously, in this age of atomic warfare, we cannot expect to have the war-led recovery that occurred then."

In face of this wringing of hands, the Carter administration maintains an air of cheerful optimism, forecasting continued economic growth, if at a slightly slower pace, for the rest of this year and for 1978.

"I think Wall Street is just being irrational," *Wall Street Journal* reporter Richard J. Levine quotes one government economic forecaster as saying.

However, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in their column appearing in the August 25 *Washington Post* claim that a "key Carter economic policymaker" told them privately that "the economy for the rest of the year is tenuous at best." The

columnists continue: "What it may be at worst, he hinted, is a declining economy—in harsh words, a recession."

Still, Wall Street pundits can be found who say they see no recession or depression in the offing. *New York Post* reporter Charles Strand talked to several of them.

One was Manny Korman, vice-president and assistant director of research at Bache Halsey Stuart Shields. Strand writes in the August 26 issue: "While acknowledging that no observer can state categorically that a recession will not develop, Korman said, 'we think it unlikely.'"

Bernard Schoenfeld and Anne Parker Mills, business seers at the Bankers Trust Company, are quoted by Strand as saying, "Real economic growth in the second half of 1977 will be less rapid than in the first half, but it nonetheless still will be respectable."

At first glance, the more optimistic forecasters would seem to have a good case. After all, corporate profits in the United States hit an all-time record high of \$104 billion in the second quarter, for a 12% year-to-year gain, the largest increase in nearly two years.

Also, stock dividends reached a record \$40.3 billion in the second quarter, up from \$35 billion in the same period last year, a 15% increase.

Housing starts jumped 8% in the month of July alone to score a 46% gain over the July 1976 level. This put construction of new housing in July at an annual rate of 2,064,000 units. While far short of people's needs, this pace exceeded the Carter administration's own projection earlier in the year of 1.7 million units, and also the 1.86 million estimate made by the National Association of Homebuilders.

In addition, consumers—those with steady incomes—seem to be in a free-spending mood. August car sales set a record, topping the 1976 level by 13.6%. And U.S. retail chain stores posted double-digit sales gains in August over the corresponding month a year ago, with Sears, Roebuck & Company, the nation's largest retailer, chalking up a 15.3% increase.

It is true that U.S. unemployment jumped back to an officially acknowledged 7.1% in August, with Black workers bearing the entire increase. And in Europe, where unemployment has risen to levels unprecedented in the last quarter of a century, figures show 5.6 million persons, 5.4% of the labor force, out of work in the Common Market countries, up 12% in one year.

However, even this cloud has a silver lining for the employers: it helps them further boost profits by holding wages down and facilitating the drive to raise labor productivity through speedup and automation.

But a closer look at the U.S. and world economies makes clear what is behind the gathering gloom on Wall Street. That will be the subject of subsequent articles. □

Brazil—Student Protests Resume as Campuses Reopen

By Fred Murphy

The wave of protests by Brazilian students that was sparked by the April 28 arrest of eight persons leafletting for a May Day action continued through the months of July and August.

The student actions in May and June succeeded in winning the release, by the end of July, of seven of the imprisoned activists; Celso Brambilla, a twenty-six-year-old metalworker, remained in jail. Thousands of students took to the streets in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Brasília, and other cities in those protests, which also demanded restoration of democratic liberties and a full amnesty for the hundreds of political prisoners held by the military dictatorship.

The student upsurge in turn has sparked protest actions and expressions of discontent among various professional and middle-class sectors, such as attorneys, scientists, filmmakers, and even businessmen.*

The most recent student actions focused on a struggle against repression at the University of Brasília (UnB).

On May 31, 5,000 students at the UnB voted to go on strike indefinitely to demand the reinstatement of nineteen student leaders suspended for their role in earlier protests. The suspensions were ordered by the university's rector, José Carlos Azevedo.

The government responded by ordering 2,000 police onto the campus on June 7. But on June 21, a student assembly voted to continue the strike. The next day, Azevedo ordered the school closed for one month.

Classes were to resume July 25. On that day, military police units were on the campus in force, at the request of Azevedo.

The progovernment paper *O Globo* reported:

At 8:30 a.m., as classes were beginning in some departments of the university, about 1,000 students tried to hold a march to protest the presence of police on campus. Classes were interrupted as police officers went into action against the demonstrators, detaining about 150 persons, among them students, journalists, and professors.

Some of those arrested were sons and daughters of federal authorities or members of Con-

gress. By the evening, all had been released. . . .

All those detained were taken to the Security and Detention Headquarters of the Federal District, and released after being identified and photographed.

The secretary of public security said that the students were disturbing order "and for that they will be dealt with in conformance with the law." In the march that was held, before the police intervention and the arrests, the students sang the National Anthem and the Hymn of Independence and shouted slogans such as "down with repression" and "a greve continua, Põe o capitão na rua" [the strike continues, put the rector in the street].

Azevedo claimed to have based his request for military-police intervention on a federal court order. Judge José Alves de Lima had received a petition on July 24—ostensibly from a group of UnB students—to guarantee the right to attend classes. So the judge gave Azevedo twenty-four hours to see that this was done, and the rector asked for the cops. However, Alves de Lima declared after the arrests, "I granted the preliminary injunction only to guarantee . . . the right to pass freely through the interior of the University of Brasília to attend classes. I did not grant any measure that would imply prejudice against the students who declared themselves on strike."

In addition, Rector Azevedo claimed that hundreds of students had been involved in the request for a court order. But Alves de Lima said that the petition had only about fifteen signatures. On July 26, two of the alleged signers denied having participated.

During the rest of the first week of classes, the pattern of the first day was repeated. Students would attempt to hold a march or a meeting, be surrounded by cops, and a number of arrests would be made, with the students being released later in the day.

Jailings and Expulsions

However, on July 28, thirteen UnB students and one journalist were picked up, and were held incommunicado for ten days, and jailed for thirty, as provided under Article 59 of the National Security Law for persons charged with "crimes against national security."

Also on July 28, Azevedo announced the expulsion or suspension of sixty-four students, although throughout the strike he had been blaming the protests on the presence of "subversives" and "outsiders." Newton Rodrigues took up Azevedo's ar-

guments in the July 27 issue of the daily *Folha de São Paulo*:

It seems clear that the rector of the University of Brasília has objectives in view that go beyond the simple educational context. There is no need to examine in detail the various arguments that have been raised against the students, which are only variations on the single theme that forms the defense of authoritarian methods—insistence on speaking of foreign elements as responsible for the events at the university. This is quite simply ridiculous, aside from the obvious fact that nonstudents, including ex-students and parents of students, might try to go onto the campus during this time of difficulties. To seek in their possible presence the motor cause of university dissent shows the level to which the present administration of the UnB has stooped, after ten years of identical episodes, aggravated by scenes of vandalism by the repressive forces that still have not stopped. . . .

One of the official themes is that the university movement, besides its specific demands, follows political slogans and is infiltrated by radical organizations. It happens that the campuses are not located among the stars and that students, citizens just like everyone else, confront the same general problems. It happens also that, in Brazil, such problems arise with intensity precisely as a result of the education laws and administrative methods, an edifying example of which is provided by Rector José Carlos Azevedo.

By the first week in August, Azevedo's arbitrary actions and the police repression in Brasília had begun to evoke a response from students in other cities, as the campuses reopened after vacations.

The University of São Paulo had been in the vanguard of the earlier protests in May and June. On August 3, a meeting of 1,500 students was held there that included representatives from a number of other campuses in the area. A spokeswoman for the "Mother's Committee for Human Rights" told the gathering that her group was trying to "gather a large number of mothers for the defense of the just demands of our children. . . . We have confidence in you and we are with you."

The next day, 1,500 USP students marched in solidarity with the struggle at the University of Brasília. The march culminated in a mock burial of Rector Azevedo. A "funeral manifesto" read by the students was described in the August 5 *Folha de São Paulo*:

. . . the students referred to the arrests and tortures that they said are being suffered by those who fight against the precarious situation in which the majority of the Brazilian people live. And they criticized those, who, "in order to safeguard their interests, propagate a false ideology, a false morality, transforming liberty into

* See "Brazil Swept by Student Demonstrations," *Intercontinental Press*, June 13, p. 660; "Student Demonstrations Continue Throughout Brazil," *IP*, July 4, p. 756; and "Uproar in Brazil Over Muzzling of Scientists," *IP*, July 18, p. 830.

the freedom to agree, democracy into the power of the few over the many, and exploitation of labor into the Brazilian miracle.

This protest by the USP students was held without government interference, despite the presence of Colonel Erasmo Diaz, the secretary of public security, and 500 military police mobilized for the occasion. Diaz told reporters he was only visiting the USP Police Academy. "I always come here," he said.

An unusual point should be noted about the coverage of the day's events in *Folha de São Paulo*: The newspaper reported the description and license number of each of the police vehicles observed by its reporters.

As the march and mock burial were taking place in São Paulo, 1,000 students and parents of students gathered in a church in Brasília to observe a religious mass. "We know that the students can no longer meet at the University of Brasília," said one of the priests in opening the ceremony, "but the church opens its arms and fraternally welcomes all persons."

The mass was held at the request of a number of parents of students arrested or expelled from the UnB. It was authorized by the archbishop of Brasília, José Newton.

A "Manifesto to the Nation" issued by the striking UnB students was read, and an appeal to President Geisel demanding an amnesty for the arrested students and the withdrawal of the police from the campus was made available for signing.

National Day of Struggle

The biggest show of solidarity with the Brasília students came on August 23, which had been declared a National Day of Struggle. The more than 15,000 cops mobilized in São Paulo that day had their hands full as thousands of students filled the downtown streets throughout the afternoon. *Folha de São Paulo* reported:

... diverse groups of students, some comprised of several hundred, carried out rapid protest marches, carrying banners and shouting slogans against the repression, for democratic rights, and in solidarity with imprisoned students in Brasília, São Paulo, Rio, and elsewhere.

In São Paulo . . . the police dispersed many of these demonstrations with quite a lot of violence. According to many students, it was the most violent repressive action of the year. The police used vehicles, cavalry, dogs, concussion grenades, tear gas, smoke bombs, and clubs. There were dozens of arrests. . . .

The São Paulo protests were marked by expressions of support by workers in office buildings on the downtown streets where the students were attacked. *Folha de São Paulo* described the scene in the Largo Paçandu in central São Paulo:

As students began to arrive from various points around 4:30 p.m., a contingent of military police removed bystanders crowded into the entryway of the Grandes Galerias building. . . .

The students began to gather in small groups at the corner of rua D. José de Barros and av. S. João. The cavalry at first tried to disperse them, but then limited themselves to surrounding the group. It was 5:10 p.m. . . .

Five minutes later, to shouts of "Down with



Pedro Pérez/El Sol de Mexico

GEISEL: Answers student protests with cavalry, concussion grenades, and clubs.

the dictatorship!" a group of about 100 ran up the rua D. José de Barros in the direction of the rua 24 de Maio. People leaning out of the windows of buildings on the rua D. José threw tickertape. . . .

Another incident on the av. 24 de Maio was reported:

The animosity between the people and the police grew greater still when a brave youth passed along the police troop on a bicycle and was clubbed. The youth stopped in front of the group of police, raising a protest. The lieutenant in charge of the platoon arrived, and, before the youth could say another word, sprayed a jet of tear gas into his eyes. The youth went on a few meters and got off his bicycle as a group of citizens formed a ring around him. The police attacked the group, provoking a reaction from people in the windows of the office buildings.

Students continued to gather for short, rapid marches in various streets and squares of central São Paulo throughout the early evening, regrouping again and again as the police tried to disperse them and applause and tickertape showered down from office building windows.

Large actions also occurred on the National Day of Struggle in other Brazilian cities. In Recife, 1,500 students rallied and approved a statement calling for direct elections and amnesty for political prisoners. This was the first such action in that city in ten years, according to *Jornal do Brasil*.

Two thousand students marched through downtown Salvador, in Bahia state, carrying coffins to symbolize UnB

Rector Azevedo and the National Security Law. The eight-kilometer march was not attacked by the police.

Strikes, rallies, and marches also took place on campuses in Sorocaba, São Carlos, Rio de Janeiro, Belo Horizonte, and Piracicaba.

In Porto Alegre, a march of 1,500 students was dispersed by 500 cops using fire hoses, tear gas, and clubs. One journalist was arrested there.

In Brasília, where a police presence remained in place on the campus, students again attended a religious service. A strike manifesto and an "open letter to the soldiers" were distributed at that gathering.

'Succession' or Free Elections?

The Geisel regime has not only responded to the student protests and the rising discontent with its rule through direct military repression, but has also taken other measures to close off avenues of free expression and tighten its grip on the government structure.

In April, Geisel issued decrees dissolving Congress for fifteen days and altering the political system to make it virtually impossible for the bourgeois opposition party, the Brazilian Democratic Movement (MDB), to gain a majority in Congress or block the passage of legislation.

In response to these moves, four MDB leaders went on television and radio for an hour on June 27 to call for a "return to democratic normality." Alençar Furtado, leader of the MDB in the Chamber of Deputies, called for a constitutional convention, restoration of the right to habeas corpus, and an end to "arbitrary arrests, unfair punishment and the disappearance of citizens."

An estimated 25 million Brazilians heard this broadcast, which had been allowed under a law that provided two hours of television and radio time each year to the MDB and to ARENA, the government party. The authorities had approved the program without ascertaining its content.

Geisel retaliated on July 1 by suspending Furtado's political rights for ten years and dismissing him from the Chamber of Deputies. On July 26 he decreed the suspension of the law that had allowed the broadcast to take place.

Geisel acted under the provisions of Institutional Act No. 5, decreed by the dictatorship in 1968, which grants the president power to modify, rescind, or decree any law "in defense of the revolution," superseding the constitution itself.

But the discontent has not been stemmed, neither among the students nor other sectors of society. David Vidal reported from Rio de Janeiro to the August 13 *New York Times*:

... what was once a whisper is a growing voice. Even past supporters of the Government say the military leadership has run out of steam,

that it desperately needs new inspiration to keep from losing its hold on the mind of this nation of 110 million. . . .

Maneuvering has begun among top military officers and a few civilian bourgeois politicians over who is to succeed General Geisel as president. His term expires in 1979. Presidents are formally chosen by an electoral college dominated by civilian leaders of the ARENA party. In past "elections," this body has chosen four-star generals. But a symptom of the impact the growing unrest is having on the big bourgeoisie itself is the declared candidacy of Senator José Magalhães Pinto. He is president of the Senate, the owner of the fourth largest bank in the country, and a former

foreign minister in the military government.

At the time of the 1964 coup, Magalhães Pinto was governor of the state of Minas Gerais and a key civilian supporter of the military takeover. The editors of the Brazilian socialist monthly *Independência Operária* explained his objectives in their August issue: "to force the government to seek a candidate of ruling-class consensus, in order to stave off even deeper divisions and preserve a unified succession."

Independência Operária proposed an alternative to the "succession" of a general or a banker:

We must say "enough" to the dictatorship that has oppressed us for thirteen years. We must say

to the military that we are quite tired of the tutelage they have imposed on the people through their regime of oppression. We want and we have the right to elect our own government in free and direct elections. We want and we have the right to put forward our own candidates, organize our own parties, and elect freely whom-ever we choose.

"Only the mass movement," the editorial concluded, "will be able, on the basis of the ripening objective conditions (the economic crisis, pressures of imperialism, divisions among the bourgeoisie), to cast the dictatorship to the ground. Despite the government's offensive and the repression, the conditions for doing this are present. All that is lacking is unity in action. That is what we are working for." □

Appeal for Worldwide Protests

Sudden Turn for the Worse in Argentine Political Prisons

[The following statement was issued in Buenos Aires, August 11, by the Political Bureau of the Grupo Obrero Revolucionario (GOR—Revolutionary Workers Group), sympathizing organization of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Since July, the situation of political detainees in the Unidad 9 prison in La Plata, in the province of Buenos Aires, has taken a marked turn for the worse.

Months ago it was revealed that a large group of prisoners had been separated from the rest and brought together in the "Death House"; that is to say, they were virtually condemned to death. The international outcry against this grave danger succeeded temporarily in checking the bloodlust of the military dictatorship.

Now, without any kind of prior warning, the conditions under which *all* the detainees in U-9 are being held have worsened to an unprecedented extent.

They are being physically punished without any reason. On the word of a prison guard a prisoner can be subjected to beating, given cold-water showers, forced to do knee bends, etc.

It is common to send these comrades to a punishment cell, called the "pig."

The "pig" is a very small cell, where the sunlight never gets in. It is very dark and damp. Down there, they give a prisoner a pair of summer trousers, a summer shirt without any buttons, and a pair of light slippers with no laces—this in the winter with temperatures below zero. Prisoners get half rations (half of what is already an inadequate diet).

They may be kept down there for ten days or more. They are beaten, which can cause more problems. If prisoners have heart trouble, they are hit in the chest; if they have kidney ailments, they are beaten around the waist; if they pass out, the guards kick them with their boots in various parts of the body.

In addition to this "initial treatment," whenever the guards come into a cell they beat the prisoners again and pour cold water on them. It is common to beat the prisoner in the testicles with a slipper until they are swollen and terribly sore. The guards are also fond of seizing prisoners by the neck and strangling them until they faint, in a make-believe hanging.

As this procedure is not something that is done with real safeguards, it sometimes happens that these guards get carried away. This is what happened with a very young comrade from the province of Mendoza, named Ibañez, from cellblock 9.

He was subjected to this horrible torture and was asphyxiated. In order to prevent his dying after mouth-to-mouth resuscitation had failed to revive him, a tracheotomy was performed. This saved his life, but at a high cost. He is still in a coma with apparently irreparable brain damage.

The official version is that he tried to hang himself with pieces of his shirt.

This example is only one of the atrocities that make up the daily life of political prisoners in Argentina. The prison regime itself and the censorship keep word of other cases from leaking out.

We appeal for publicity to be focused on every one of these cases of murder and torture. We appeal for the demand to be raised as widely as possible for the dictatorship to give an accounting of all those who are missing and to free all the political prisoners who have survived the prisons, military camps, and secret concentration camps. □

More Death Sentences Handed Down in Iraq

The Iraqi regime has sentenced to death 102 political prisoners, according to information recently received in Vienna.

Among those sentenced are Marxists and Kurdish nationalists. The following persons are known to have been sentenced: Ahmad Hama Karim, Mahmoud Taib, Maulud Hamza, Muhammad Zangana, Kamal Muhammed Salih, Abdulla Tamsik, Ahmad Khidir, Ali Mars Sharif, Ali Jundi, Faik Amin, Abdul Kudir Hikmet,

Kadir Ali Kadir, and Khalid Hussein.

Fifty-two of the prisoners are being held in Mossul prison, and fifty in Abu Greb.

In the last few weeks, three persons were reported to have been tortured to death. They are Anwar Abdul Rahman, Abdul Kadir, and Schamzin Karim Schamzini.

In July, four persons were shot by police during a strike in Basra prison. Most of those killed were members of the Iraqi Communist Party (Central Leadership).



Ingvar Andersson/Dagens Nyheter

Antinuclear demonstration September 10. Banner reads, "The North [Scandinavia] Against Barsebäck."

Feminists Play Key Role in Demonstration

15,000 in Sweden Protest Barsebäck Nuclear Power Plant

About 15,000 persons marched more than two miles through driving wind and rain on September 10 to protest against the nuclear power plants in Barsebäck, on the southwestern coast of Sweden.

The site of these reactors is only about twelve miles from Copenhagen and about the same distance from the major Swedish city of Malmö. The biggest single concentration of population in Scandinavia is in this region.

In the September 11 issue of the Stockholm daily *Dagens Nyheter*, Sweden's most prestigious newspaper, Claes Sturm reported:

"The wind ripped and tore through the great banners. It swelled a giant Viking sail, making the slogan written on it stand out more clearly: 'Scandinavia opposes Barsebäck.' Behind this banner came row upon row of marchers, in the biggest antinuclear demonstration our country has yet seen."

Two nuclear reactors are functioning in Barsebäck. Fueling of the first reactor began October 1, 1974. The first demonstration against the project was held the following day by sixty university students.

Reviewing the history of the Barsebäck movement, *Dagens Nyheter* noted in its September 9 issue:

"In Denmark, it was the very active women's movement that led the first opposition to Barsebäck. . . .

"In the summer of 1974, women from eight cities and towns in north Sjöland [the island on which Copenhagen is located] formed a group to take up the Barsebäck question."

About 6,000 persons marched in the first all-Scandinavian demonstration against Barsebäck on August 7, 1976.

On November 25, 1976, the second Barsebäck reactor began to be fueled, and it went into full commercial operation on March 21, 1977. The OK for operating this

reactor was given by Swedish Premier Thorbjörn Fälldin within a few weeks after he took office. His coalition of bourgeois parties had defeated the Social Democrats in the September 20, 1976, elections.

Nuclear power had been a major issue in the electoral campaign, and Fälldin's Centerparti had expressed opposition to developing nuclear plants. Press reports at the time indicated that many voters believed that they could effectively oppose the building of such plants by casting their ballots for the bourgeois coalition.

Fälldin's betrayal of these hopes gave a new spur to mass protests on both sides of the Oresund strait. The effect was indicated by Gunilla Oberg, an organizer of a special women's contingent in the September 10 march and the only Danish speaker at the rally. In a dispatch from Copenhagen in the September 10 *Dagens Nyheter*, Birgitta Nyblom wrote:

"The growing women's movement in

Scandinavia has organized its own contingent in . . . the march to Barsebäck. The initiative for this was taken by the Norwegian and Danish feminist environmental activists.

"It was the day after Thorbjörn Fälldin's betrayal that I became active," said Gunilla Oberg, a lecturer at the University of Copenhagen. She works with the OOA [Organisation til Oplysning om Atomkraft—Organization for Education on Atomic Energy] and is also a member of the women's group in the OOA organized this June 1. . . .

"The women point out that in Sweden and Denmark in 1976, only half as many women support nuclear power as men.

"In Denmark, 62% of women and 53% of men oppose nuclear power. It is supported by 11% and 22% respectively.

"In Sweden, 47% of women and 37% of men oppose nuclear power. It is supported there by 15% and 30% respectively."

Also quoted in this article was a Social Democratic member of the Swedish parliament, Birte Weiss, who supported the demonstration:

"We have been able to avoid having any nuclear power plants inside the Danish borders because the people were quicker with their protests than the politicians with their decisions. The protests dissuaded the government from bringing such proposals to the floor of parliament."

Siegfried Christensen, a Danish leader of the OOA, noted that while two-thirds of the Social Democratic members of the Swedish parliament favor nuclear power, the majority of Social Democratic voters oppose it.

Nyblom reported that the membership of the OOA has grown to 400,000, with 150 contact groups and a loosely coordinated network of other small groups throughout Denmark.

The Danish contingents stressed that the politicians who approved building the nuclear plants in Barsebäck violated the democratic rights of the people throughout the Oresund region, since they exposed this population to grave danger without even allowing it to have a say in the decision.

In his statements to *Dagens Nyheter*, Christensen pointed out the connection between the antinuclear movement and the strong Scandinavian peace movement. He said:

"The reason for this is, in part, that weapons can be made from the by-products of nuclear power plants; and, in part, that these plants bring a concentration of political power."

According to Sturm, more than half the demonstrators at Barsebäck were Danes. And groups came from many other countries—from Britain, and from Finland, where the environmental movement is just beginning.

There was also a West German contingent. Sturm wrote:

"On one banner was written 'Kampf dem Atomkraft Bau Glückstadt' [Fight the Glückstadt Nuclear Plant Project]. German—were these the Germans everybody was afraid of?"

The capitalist press in Germany, France, and other countries has tried to identify the West German antinuclear movement with violence, suggesting that the aim of many or most of the organizers and participants is paramilitary confrontation with the police.

Dagens Nyheter reporter Bo B. Melander interviewed one of the young German marchers. The youth said:

"This is a march for freedom. Nuclear power has become the symbol of the threat to freedom in an ever more vulnerable society."

Sturm was struck by the peacefulness of the large march, in which, he said, the average age of the participants was about twenty.

"In contrast to those in Germany and France, this was a quiet and nonviolent

march, and perhaps it was far more impressive precisely because of that."

The march did not lack enthusiasm, however:

"Although it was a cold day, this September 10 was the beginning of a hot fall for nuclear power in Scandinavia. . . . The warmth and the fervor was among the demonstrators."

The rally adopted a resolution calling for shutting down Barsebäck as a "step toward a nonnuclear society." It said:

"In place of a nuclear-power society, with its waste of natural resources, we want a society that conserves natural resources."

In her speech concluding the rally, Gunilla Oberg said:

"Our world has seen new focuses of struggle emerge in Brokdorf, Wyhl, and Malville [where demonstrations have taken place against nuclear power plants]. Today, we have written the name Barsebäck forever into the history of the peoples of the North." □

Unsafe No Matter What the Profits

French Trotskyist Stand on Nuclear Power Plants

[The following resolution was adopted August 29 by the Central Committee of the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Communist League), French section of the Fourth International. We have taken the text from the September 1 issue of *Rouge*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Halt French Electronuclear Program Immediately!

1. The governments of most of the advanced capitalist countries have undertaken the development of electronuclear programs. The French program is among those that have developed the fastest. The construction of six nuclear plants a year between now and 1985, and the building of the Superphénix breeder reactor, represent the drive toward an all-nuclear society.

This choice has not been made for overriding scientific or technological reasons. It is dictated by the needs of capitalist development, which sees in the industrial application of nuclear technology a new sector for capital accumulation. The government's declared intention to guarantee national energy independence means that the French bourgeoisie wants to improve its competitive position relative to other capitalist countries, and

intends to make use of French imperialism's sphere of influence in Africa to exploit the uranium deposits there.

A Dangerous Method of Production

2. Under present conditions, the nuclear energy industry presents very serious risks to those who work in it and to residents of areas where nuclear plants are located.

Capitalist production is carried out according to the laws of profit, which do not take into account the social cost involved in applying technology. For centuries, this led to disregarding the evils of industrial pollution stemming from the capitalist mode of production.

In addition, the dangers arising from the production of nuclear energy cannot be controlled by the existing level of knowledge of science and technology.

Furthermore, in the context of capitalist society, the expansion of nuclear energy production means stepping up the process of policing the workers. In the name of secrecy and security, working conditions are militarized on the model of Framatome, and nuclear facilities are turned into virtual military zones.

These facts justify rejecting the industrial use of nuclear energy for the present.

As for the problem posed by the use of nuclear energy in a society in transition to

socialism, a public discussion should be opened by the LCR.

All of the considerations regarding constraints on the use of nuclear energy in view of the state of scientific knowledge will of course be taken into account by a society that will weigh the overall social cost in making its choice.

Only by developing the productive forces to a high level will a communist society be able to liberate humanity from famine and subjection to labor. As scientific knowledge expands, the variety of its technical applications increases, so that socialist society will not be limited to simply reproducing the techniques now applied by capitalism. In particular, choices will be made on the basis of evaluating the social costs of the techniques employed, the amount of labor necessary to apply them, and the extent of social control that they permit.

Malville: A Turning Point, Our Weaknesses

3. Broad opposition movements are developing in response to the launching of electronuclear programs in the advanced capitalist countries. An international coordination of these movements is beginning to take shape.

For several years now, numerous mobilizations have taken place around opposition to the government's electronuclear program.

The July 30-31 demonstration at Creys-Malville* was a turning point in the history of struggles against the government's electronuclear program: the debate has now spread nationwide.

In July, while the government was reiterating its statements in favor of the development of its electronuclear program, the CP and SP placed the question of nuclear energy at the center of their discussions around updating the Common Program.

The CP, while objecting to the governmental options in favor of an all-nuclear society, accepts the industrial use of nuclear energy under the current safety conditions provided by capitalism. Squarely opposed to the mobilizations in progress, it proposed a parliamentary debate, as though the workers could make themselves heard by a debate in this discredited national assembly.

The SP took a superficially more open position because of its electoralist concerns. The SP proposal to organize a referendum on the question dodges the needs of the real struggle against the government's electronuclear program. The referendum proposed by François Mitterrand aims to deflect the public's legitimate desire to have a say over the building of

* See "30,000 in France Protest Nuclear Power Plant," *Intercontinental Press*, August 29, p. 938.

nuclear plants and coopt it in the direction of a plebiscite. The democratic conditions for a real choice are not spelled out by the Socialist Party.

Whatever their tactical detours, the essence of the CP and SP positions lies in their acceptance of the industrial use of nuclear energy under present conditions. Their choice is determined by their acceptance of the laws of the market economy and the forms of growth practiced by capitalism.

This situation gave the Malville demonstration an importance that was linked to the bourgeoisie's determination to defend its electronuclear program, and to the CP's and SP's declared willingness to accommodate to it.

The LCR, for its part, because of a late start in thinking it through, underestimated the political importance that the mobilizations against the electronuclear program would take on. In particular, it underestimated the impact of the Malville demonstration. The very scope of the political test of forces that took place at Malville confronted the Malville Coordinating Committee with responsibilities that it was in no way prepared for. The defection of the SP and the French Democratic Confederation of Labor during the month of July added to the disorganization. Because of our inadequate participation in the committees planning the march and our failure to fully think through the perspectives for the struggle, we could not really contribute to putting forward objectives that could have made the slogans raised by the Malville Coordinating Committee more concrete.

Although it was correct to point out that the goal of the Malville demonstration was to concretize the breadth of the mass movement against nuclear plants, we did not arm ourselves politically to get this orientation adopted.

So, while the working-class organizations were pulling out of the Malville demonstration, and while the CP was keeping shamefully quiet about the murderous repression that swooped down on Malville, the vagueness of the objectives put forward by the Malville Coordinating Committee enabled the leaderships of these committees to justify their abandoning the field before broad layers of militants.

Halt the Government's Program

4. Because of the breadth of the national debate touched off by the struggles against nuclear plants, the task of the moment is to broaden the ongoing struggles. The movement needs a national focus that corresponds to what is at stake in the electronuclear program being developed by the government for the benefit of the French bourgeoisie. We must demand an immediate halt to the electronuclear program. We must fight for a moratorium on the government's electronuclear program,

by launching a national campaign, which will include commissions of inquiry initiated by workers in the nuclear industry, the population concerned, antinuclear organizations, workers organizations, and scientists, as well as mass actions. They will also have to demand the right to be heard in the press, radio, and television.

Faced with a hypocritical government, which announces the formation of an electronuclear information council whereas its decisions have long been settled, we must demand that workers have the right and the opportunities to understand the dangers of this industrial technology. Abolishing the secrecy that surrounds the development of the electronuclear program, and an immediate halt to a program whose risks are covered up, are the preliminary conditions for this. In face of the concerted policy of the European governments, the international coordination of the struggles is one of the objective needs of the movement.

5. This national focus requires deepening the mobilizations already in progress. In the areas where nuclear plants are scheduled to be built, many committees have existed for some time. Rooting these committees among the workers and small farmers—already well under way in some areas—is of decisive importance. The right of residents to veto a plant is a demand that the entire workers movement must fight for.

In many cities, mass action and information committees against nuclear plants have initiated activities. Contributing to the development of these committees is the task of LCR members, who will put forward objectives and methods of struggle that can lead to successful national mobilizations against the government's electronuclear program.

6. Faced with the development of the government's electronuclear program, the leaderships of the workers organizations are turning their backs on the mobilizations now under way. Although many people, in the course of these mobilizations, come to realize the need to struggle against the government, the absence of workers organizations from these struggles does not necessarily lead to a political distrust of the leaderships' orientation, but may instead induce real confusion in these social layers.

The battle to involve significant sectors of the workers movement and its organizations is of decisive importance for the political future of the movement against the government's electronuclear program.

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

AROUND THE WORLD



Italian Communist Banned From Soviet Union

Vittorio Strada, a Venice University specialist in Russian and Soviet literature and a thirty-year member of the Italian Communist Party, has been denied a visitor's visa to the Soviet Union.

A *New York Times* report from Rome September 3 said that "it is believed here that he was barred because Moscow suspects him of maintaining or seeking contacts with Soviet dissident writers."

Strada had been planning to attend the Moscow International Book Fair in his capacity as a consultant to publisher Giulio Einaudi. Einaudi was granted a visa but cancelled his trip and accused the Kremlin of hampering cultural exchanges. Strada said the move was "proof of obtuse bureaucratic arrogance."

The Italian CP daily *L'Unità* said: "We don't understand and we don't endorse the decision of the Soviet authorities."

Videla's New Friends

"I wish each member of Congress could come here and see the truth," Texas Congressman Eligio de la Garza told the Buenos Aires newspaper *La Razon*. De la Garza was one of twelve U.S. legislators and officials who were guests of the Argentine military junta in August.

Karen de Young reported on their visit in the August 30 *Washington Post*:

"The Argentine 'truth' was presented to the legislators in interviews with President Videla, [Foreign Minister Oscar] Montes and the country's economy and defense ministers.

"All the visitors were given ample chance, through guided tours, to enjoy the Paris-like delights of Buenos Aires. . . ."

Senator Ernest Hollings of South Carolina, a Democrat, was especially impressed. "The people in the United States are going to hear a lot about the Argentine from old Hollings," he told businessmen at a meeting of the American Chamber of Commerce in Buenos Aires.

"They're going to hear about [Argentina's] free government," Hollings complained that the Carter administration has done "too much moralizing, and I think they're making a mistake applying it to the Argentine."

Carter's top State Department aide for Latin America, Terence Todman, was also in Buenos Aires in August. He held a news conference to say that Washington is trying to maintain a "direct contact with [Argentine] reality," and that "the human-

rights situation . . . seemed improved."

De Young noted that "the treatment given the House and Senate delegations was somewhat different from that given other official U.S. visitors—including Rep. Robert Drinan (D-Mass.), whose trip here last fall as a member of an Amnesty International team . . . was marked by frequent official intimidation, including surveillance of Drinan and the arrest and interrogation of some of his Argentine contacts."

Marcos Honored With Shrines

For his sixtieth birthday on September 11, President Ferdinand E. Marcos's wife, Imelda Romualdez Marcos, had all of the Philippines dictator's former homes converted into shrines and museums.

The old home of the Marcos family in Batac was converted into a luxurious residence, complete with a fully equipped gymnasium. A museum next door contains exhibits tracing the events of Marcos's life, with Marcos represented by life-size effigies.

Jorge Ramos, architect of the residence, said he and all the contractors furnished materials and labor free of charge.

In conversations with reporters, Mrs. Marcos termed her husband "one of the great revolutionaries" of the nation, and said, "A leader is always strengthened by the love of his people and vice versa."

Japan CP Rejects Kremlin's Charges

The Japanese Communist Party has responded to a June 12 editorial in the Soviet CP newspaper *Pravda* that accused it of "adapting . . . to chauvinistic, nationalistic attitudes and fostering . . . hostile feelings toward the Soviet Union."

On July 5, the JCP made public a document entitled "On the Kurile Question and Justice of Socialism," defending its endorsement of the Japanese government's claim to the Kurile Islands, which are currently held by the Soviet Union.

The document was described in the July 7 *Mainichi Daily News*:

. . . the thesis read that Stalin's demand for handing the Kurile Islands over to the Soviet Union was a demand of superpowerism, which was completely against the principle of non-expansion of territory honored by the Allied Powers. . . .

The *Pravda* commentary had also criticized

that the JCP was currying favor with the "reactionary forces" of Japan. On this point the JCP explained the difference between the policy of the Liberal-Democratic party (LDP) and the JCP as follows:

The LDP and the reactionary forces of Japan maintain that Etorofu and Kunashiri Islands are not included in the Kurile Islands, to which Japan renounced her rights and claims in the San Francisco Peace Treaty, without any legal ground.

But the JCP maintains that it would insist on the inheritance to Japan of all the Kurile Islands after declaring the abrogation of an article of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, which stipulates that Japan has renounced her territorial rights over the Kuriles, and scrapping the Japan-U.S. military alliance.

The JCP's thesis reiterated that the *Pravda* commentary represents superpowerism of the Soviet Union which was evidenced in the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Turkish Government Orders Austerity

Sharp increases ranging from 10 to 100 percent in gasoline, fuel oil, and electricity prices are part of a drastic austerity program announced September 9 by the Turkish government.

Charges for first-class postal service and local telephone calls have nearly tripled, while prices for cement and newsprint have also skyrocketed. These increases come on top of an inflation rate of nearly 30 percent.

The announcement of the austerity measures was timed to coincide with the visit to Ankara of a delegation from the International Monetary Fund. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the government's request for a \$200 million loan.

Kidnappings Protested in Argentina

Since early 1977, groups of women have gathered every Thursday afternoon across from the government house in Buenos Aires to protest the disappearance of their relatives, who were kidnapped by armed squads:

"According to human rights organizations here," Associated Press reported September 10, "at least 760 people have disappeared since March 1976. Most of the victims are described as political liberals or moderates. Among them are more than 30 journalists, about 100 labor leaders and hundreds of students.

"Security officials claim the abductions are the work of right-wing squads retaliating against left-wing terrorist operations.

But many human rights leaders, moderates, leftists and liberals say security agents themselves are involved."

The Videla government has admitted that its "security groups" have carried out kidnappings. But it claims that they acted "on their own," and denies any complicity with such actions, the dispatch said.

"The women say one of their representatives once met with Gen. Jorge Rafael Videla, the Argentine President, who reportedly told her he could not do anything.

"This is the one and only reason why we decided to meet at the plaza," said another woman. "To make our problem known to passersby and journalists so that someone does something, we will continue to meet here until we know what happened to our relatives."

Latinos Win Apology

Officials in Moline, Illinois, have apologized to the city's Latino community, and agreed to pay \$2,000 in compensation for a series of illegal police raids in September 1975.

On the pretext of searching for "illegal aliens," police raided businesses and questioned hundreds of Spanish-surnamed residents about their citizenship.

The agreement to pay damages was part of an out-of-court settlement announced September 9 in a \$130,000 suit filed by the Illinois Migrant Council.

"The court and the lawyers for the city have now acknowledged that the conduct [of the police] was unlawful," an attorney for the migrant council announced at a news conference.

A Year Behind Bars for Refusing to Inform

Jackie Bosman, arts editor of the *Financial Mail*, and Ilona Kleinschmidt, wife of an exiled antiapartheid activist, were sentenced September 7 to one year in prison by a South African court.

The two women were convicted for refusing to furnish information about a visit they allegedly made to Winnie Mandela, a Black activist who was banished in May to a remote area and put under house arrest.

Bosman and Kleinschmidt were released on bail pending their appeal.

Swiss Human Rights Group Confirms Israeli Torture of Arabs

A report issued September 12 by the Swiss League for Human Rights charges that Israel has "commonly and systematically" used torture against Palestinians living on the Israeli-occupied West Bank of the Jordan River.

The twenty-four-page report, prepared by a four-member team that spent a week on the West Bank in June, also says that Israeli authorities conduct "expropria-

tions, confiscations and destruction" of Arab property in an effort to force Palestinians to leave.

These new charges come on top of the revelations of torture of Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails contained in two recent articles in the London *Sunday Times* (see *Intercontinental Press*, July 4, 1977, p. 762, and August 8, 1977, p. 901).

In the past, the U.S. State Department has defended Israel against such allegations, denying that Israeli officials use torture during interrogations.

However, in view of the growing body of evidence that such practices are routine, the Carter administration has been obliged to make a show of concern.

On September 13, the day after the Swiss report was released, Hodding Carter III, a top State Department spokesman, said that "sufficient independent evidence does not exist on which to make the judgment that there is consistent and officially sanctioned practice of torture."

However, he admitted that he "wouldn't perhaps rule out isolated incidents."

The subject of torture has been raised "directly and at the highest level" with the Israeli government, Carter said.

Smith's Party Routs White Opposition

In elections held August 31, Prime Minister Ian Smith's ruling Rhodesian Front won all of the fifty seats in Parliament reserved for whites.

Incomplete returns reported in the September 1 *New York Times* by correspondent John F. Burns showed Smith's party with 83% of the white votes. The Rhodesian Action Party, an ultraright splinter from the Rhodesian Front, received only 9%. The National Unifying Force, a "liberal" group that had expressed support for efforts by London and Washington to negotiate a compromise between the white-settler regime and Black nationalist groups, was credited with 6% of white votes.

No results were reported in elections to fill eight of the sixteen seats set aside for Blacks in the settler state's Parliament. (The other eight Black seats are filled by tribal electoral colleges.)

The vast majority of the country's 6.3 million Blacks are disenfranchised by property-ownership and education restrictions—only 7,500 are eligible to vote.

In turning back the challenge of the Rhodesian Action Party, Smith regained the votes in Parliament that he may need to push through constitutional amendments aimed at granting a few cosmetic concessions to the Black majority.

"The major question now," Burns said, "is whether any of the major black groups will agree to discuss an 'internal' accord. Already, two black leaders, Bishop Abel Muzorewa and the Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, have indicated that they will refuse to join the 'broader-based' cabinet, including blacks, that Mr. Smith has proposed as a first step toward a settlement."

Sketches by Copain

A sampling of sketches by Copain. Published in 1974 to help celebrate the tenth anniversary of *Intercontinental Press*.

The reproductions, of various sizes, include portraits of Hugo Blanco, Malcolm X, Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, James P. Cannon, Che Guevara, Leon Trotsky, and others, some of them suitable for framing.

An 8.5" x 11" soft-cover book at the original price of only \$5.



Capitalism fouls things up. The opinion of an endangered species.

Intercontinental Press

P.O. Box 116

New York, N.Y. 10014

Selections From the Left

rotfront

"Red Front," the monthly newspaper of the Revolutionary Marxist Group, Austrian section of the Fourth International.

The boundary settlement following World War II left a sizable Slovene minority in the Austrian province of Carinthia. This community was guaranteed cultural and linguistic rights in the peace treaty.

However, the Vienna government and the Austrian bourgeois forces have been bringing increasing pressures to bear to break up the Slovene community and force the Sloves to assimilate into the German-speaking majority.

A resistance movement has developed against the Germanization campaign, supported also by principled defenders of democratic rights in the majority community, in particular the Austrian Trotskyists.

In the September issue, the lead story sums up developments in the fight to defend the rights of the Slovene minority:

The hopes of the Socialist Party, the People's Party [the main bourgeois party], and the Liberal Party to somehow get rid of the Slovene problem are still unfulfilled. The November 14 minorities referendum [designed to establish that Slovene-speakers were too small a minority to merit recognition] ended in a total disaster. The Slovenes refused to let themselves be "counted." In Vienna alone, more people [mostly sympathizers of the minority] voted Slovene than in Carinthia.

The Slovenes also failed to take the bait offered in the National Groups Law. The few token bilingual road signs put up after January 1, 1977, were not enough to get the Slovenes to accept a continued denial of their rights. The token signs served more as a focus for massive protest actions, which took place in St. Jakob/Sentjakob on July 7, in St. Kanzian/Skocjar on August 14, and in Bleiburg/Pliberk on August 26 and following days.

On some occasions, after rallies and demonstrations, bilingual signs were put on private grounds. The Executive, however, removed these.

In Bleiburg, the sign was cemented in, and a guard was mounted over it. Some persons chained themselves to the sign. The Executive moved in once again and made several arrests. Some demonstrators are to be charged with "resisting the state authorities."

What could not be achieved by the "normal" antiminority policy is supposed to be accomplished by a campaign of presenting the resisters as criminals.

On July 19 the trial began in Vienna of four young Slovenes, who made a special protest against the reactionary "nationalities referendum." In Zell Pfarre/Sele Fara, they took a ballot box from the polling place and burned its contents.

On October 17-21 in Salzburg, there is to be a trial against the Slovene leader Filip Warasch. The only witness for the prosecution is a notorious reactionary who claims that Warasch

intended to carry out bombings.

These trials, which it is said will not be the only ones, have one sole political purpose. They are designed to break the Slovenes' will to resist by "legal" persecution.

The trials offer the Slovene movement an excellent opportunity to expose the real character of the policy of the three parliamentary parties before a broad public. We must utilize this opportunity to the fullest.

Down with the oppression of the Slovene minority!

Release the four defendants!

End the legal proceedings against Filip Warasch!

Down with the National Groups Law!

Bilingual signs in all places throughout the entire area where both languages are spoken!

Equality for the Slovene language in government, the courts, and the schools!

Full rights for the Slovenes!

rouge

"Red," revolutionary communist daily, published in Paris.

An article in the September 6 issue calls for the release of eighteen students arrested during the October 6, 1976, military coup in Thailand. The eighteen went on trial in Bangkok on September 5. They are accused of "communist activities" and "incitement to riot" and face a possible death sentence. The article continues:

The eighteen militants whose trial is now under way restated their innocence before the military court, and denounced the emergency measures applied to them. In October 1976, at the time of the events with which they are now charged, they were, in fact, "under the protection of the 1974 constitution (later suspended by the military) guaranteeing freedom of expression." The eighteen are scapegoats selected by the ruling junta to back up their phony assertions about a far-left "conspiracy," cooked up by the right wing to justify the 1976 coup.

Their fate largely depends on waging an international campaign to save them. Previous campaigns have shown that the Thai government is not immune to them. The trial was scheduled to open on June 17, with 110 militants still under indictment. It was supposed to be held in the greatest possible secrecy. However, faced with the protest actions held in many countries, the Thai government was compelled to postpone the trial, order the release of several dozen prisoners, and allow observers to attend the court sessions.

DIRECT ACTION

Socialist weekly published in Sydney, Australia. Presents the views of the Socialist Workers Party.

In the September 1 issue, Sol Salby reports that 7,000 public employees attended a rally in Melbourne on August 25

to protest the Fraser government's plans to implement new antistrike legislation.

The militant mood was evident throughout the two-hour meeting. Speaker after speaker was cheered when they attacked the Commonwealth Employees (Employment Provisions) Act 1977. . . .

The workers also cheered enthusiastically their own union leader, Paul Munro, the then president of the Council of Australian Government Organisations, who denounced the Act in detail. . . .

Munro pointed out that the Act—designed basically to give the minister for employment and industrial relations unprecedented power of sackings and stand-downs—had virtually no limits.

Under the Act *anything* can be perceived as constituting a serious disruption to the normal work of public servants. Even the most minor strike in the public transport arena. . . .

In an accompanying article, Jim McIlroy reports from Sydney on a protest rally attended by 3,000 public employees on August 26.

Government workers marched from Chifley Square and from the Redfern mail Exchange through the city to the Sydney rally.

The meeting voted unanimously to call on the Federal government to repeal the Commonwealth Employees (Employment Provisions) Act 1977, and CAGEO Federal president Ken Turett later said that a "national effort" involving all the peak union councils . . . would be launched if the government made any effort to sack public servants under the legislation.

INFORMATIONS OUVRIERES

"Workers News," open forum for the class struggle. Published weekly in Paris.

An article in the September 7-14 issue reports that Josef Szymanski, a worker at the Adolf Warski shipyards in Szczecin, Poland, and a member of the January 1971 strike committee, has been released from prison after three months. The article continues:

Several other former members of this same strike committee were arrested shortly after Szymanski, but were released after a few weeks, although they are being subjected to constant harassment by the police. Obviously, the campaign to free them, which was launched in May—the numerous signatures on petitions, the telegrams and delegations to the consulates and the Polish embassy in France—played a large role in this. This seems clear since following the release of the members of the Committee to Defend the Workers, apparently all the workers in Radom, Ursus, and Szczecin who were jailed by the bureaucracy have all been set free.

The article goes on to note that the release of these dissidents left the bureaucracy's hands free for what it obviously hoped would be a profitable diplomatic

maneuver.

The government of Edward Gierek could thus turn its attention to other tasks—in particular, to welcoming those eminently progressive figures, “our illustrious guests, the shah-in-shah [king of kings] Mohammed Reza Pahlavi and the empress of Iran, to whom Warsaw residents gave a warm welcome on their first official visit to our country . . .” as it was put in a three-column headline on the front page of the August 24 issue of *Zycie Warszawy*, one of the main Warsaw dailies and one which had been particularly noted for its vicious and slanderous attacks against members of the Committee to Defend the Workers.

la brèche

Twice-monthly French-language organ of the Revolutionary Marxist League, published in Lausanne, Switzerland.

The August 27 issue reports on the Twenty-Seventh Congress of the Federation of Free Italian Colonies, in the past the main organization representing the interests of the Italian immigrant workers in Switzerland. The article points out that this organization has reached a crossroads:

The federation had to redefine its role in a situation that has changed profoundly in the course of recent years.

The economic crisis has left a great impact. Of the 240,000 immigrant workers fired and forced to leave the country with their families, a good half were Italians, including many members of the federation itself. Of the immigrants who remain, the composition has markedly changed.

Three-fourths are now established residents or have been here a long time on annually renewed work permits.

About 345,000 foreign workers, that is, 34 percent of the total, are under twenty years of age. These are second-generation immigrants.

Not only had the composition of the Italian immigrant population changed, *La Brèche* says, but the formation of other organizations such as regional groups and affiliates of the political parties in Italy had weakened the position of the federation as the representative of the entire Italian community. On the other hand, these other organizations had proved very lethargic in their defense of the Italian workers, especially the Communist Party and the groups influenced by it. The Italian CP is anxious to demonstrate its responsibility to the ultrareactionary Swiss authorities.

The attitude of the Italian CP is demonstrated by its refusal to participate actively in the campaign for a forty-hour week, as well as by its almost unconditional support for the leadership of the Swiss Union Federation, including this leadership's scandalous position on the new law limiting the rights of foreign workers.

The Communist Party also remains the dominant force in the Federation of Free Italian Colonies.

La Brèche reports that the federation congress did reach an understanding of

the need to organize youth and to defeat the new law restricting the rights of immigrants. It points out, however, that the federation will remain in its impasse so long as it fails to challenge the attitude of the Italian CP and the Swiss Union Federation toward the interests of the immigrant workers.

HNH

“Nedeljne Informativne Novine” (*The Week's News*), published in Belgrade by “Politika” enterprise.

The report on Tito's visit to North Korea in the September 4 issue stressed how impressive a reception the Yugoslav Stalinist chief received. The headline is “More than Hospitality.” The author, Dragoslav Rancic, notes:

“Every detail of Tito's public presence among the people was endowed with abundant symbolic meaning and warmth.”

Above the article were big pictures. One showed giant portraits of Tito and Kim Il Sung on the field of a huge stadium. In the bleachers, the crowd was organized in such a way that by what they wore or carried big contingents spelled out “Welcome” in Serbo-Croat in a dark color against a uniformly gray background.

The other picture showed ranks of young women dressed in flowing white gowns and carrying flowers.

The article notes:

“This is the first time Tito has had a chorus of 50,000 young people in a faraway country sing at the top of their lungs, in Serbo-Croat, the song he knows so well: ‘Not Hell Itself Can Make Us Flinch from the Side of Marshal Tito, Heroic Son of the People.’

“One can imagine how many rehearsals were necessary to get so many people to learn not only the melody but the words in a language so difficult for them to pronounce.”

Ny Tid

“New Times,” socialist weekly published in Oslo, Norway. Reflects the views of the Socialist Left Party.

The August 4 issue includes an interview with Ivar Utsi, chairman of the Lapp organization Samüd Saer'vi, in the northernmost part of Norway. The interviewer, John Gustavsen, begins:

Question. Section leader Alf Isak Keskitalo has raised the idea of a Lapp delegation in parliament. What comment do you have on that?

Answer. My immediate reaction is to be for it, assuming that the two representatives who would sit in the Storting [parliament] are able to speak for the Lapp cause.

Q. But Lapps have sat in the Storting before, and today, for example, a Lapp, Per A. Utsi, sits

as a representative of Finnmark [northern Norway]. He was elected on the Labor Party slate.

A. Our experience in general is that Lapps who join Norwegian parties are bound hand and foot, and this is no less true in the Labor Party. The best defenders of the Lapps in parliament have been non-Lapps.

Q. On what basis should the Lapp representatives be chosen?

A. On the basis of the Lapp organizations, that is, the Norwegian Lapp Reindeer Herders Association, the Norwegian Lapps National League, and Samiid Saer'vit.

Q. From what groups should the representatives be chosen?

A. I think three groups stand out. Those who have the most need to be heard are the southern Lapps. They have long been in a particularly difficult situation. The same goes for the sea Lapps and the reindeer-herding Lapps, who are the backbone of the Lapp population and who perhaps have been demanding attention the longest.

Q. A member of the Finnish parliament has suggested that perhaps a separate Lapp state should be organized. What do you think about that?

A. I think that should be the last alternative. But one thing is certain: The reindeer-herding Lapps must secure their rights to pasture, to seasonal migration, and to access to the calving grounds. [Lapp reindeer herders traditionally migrate through the European subarctic area divided by four national boundaries.] Reindeer herding is an activity that cannot survive the kind of impact machine society now threatens to make. If the energy development plans are not stopped here in the north, the Lapps either have to take drastic action or be wiped out.

Q. What do you include under the heading of drastic action?

A. We have to set limits on development projects and raise demands for national rights that can assure our livelihood. . . .

Q. In Finnmark, it has aroused a lot of attention that Lapps are being used as comedy figures in theatrical performances. . . .

A. I have not seen those shows, only read the parts published in the papers and seen interviews with those responsible. It's funny that those who act and sing in these things are of Lapp stock.

Q. Is that demoralizing for you, since you work for the Lapps?

A. We Lapps have been hardened to everything. I consider this a result of a brutal Norwegianization policy, and that those behind it do not dare to be Lapps. It is really tragic. The youth have reacted more sharply than I, who am beginning to get along in years.

Q. It has taken seventeen years to finish drafting the new reindeer law. Many Lapps think it is a scandal that this law has not been translated into Lapp. What do you think?

A. This is another example showing that the Lapps are not being taken seriously by the authorities. It should be a self-evident democratic right for us to be able to read this law in our own language.

Unexpurgated Text of Castro-Walters Interview—3

[Third of four parts]

[More than once in her attempts to slip a knife to Castro, journalist Barbara Walters found herself nailed to the wall. She ascribes this to Castro's being a "terrific" lawyer. The truth is that she was betrayed by her own commitment to defend capitalism, which she did on the most shallow level.

[Thus on the question of Africa going socialist, Castro easily scores some telling points.

[Nonetheless, from the standpoint of revolutionary socialism, it must be said that Castro does not stand on Leninist grounds. While he maintains that socialism is advancing irresistibly in Africa, he holds that it can take various roads. "Some countries will do it under the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Others will do it under the principles of Islam; and, who knows, maybe there'll be a few that do it under the principles of Christian humanism."

[Castro leaves out the Leninist position on the necessity to build a combat party committed to the principles of scientific socialism. Still worse, instead of viewing antisocialist religious cults as obstacles standing in the way, he visualizes them playing a leading role in advancing the revolutionary process.

[One of the logical consequences is that Castro can say such things as "... look, take the case of Algeria: it's developing socialism and has a solid base. Libya is working for socialism; Ethiopia is working for socialism; Mozambique is working for socialism; Angola is working for socialism; Dahomey is working for socialism; Guinea-Bissau. . . ."

[Another possibility—which Castro leaves out of account—is that the bourgeois state in these countries fosters the development of capitalism instead of socialist relations. The outcome of Nasser's "socialism" in Egypt is an instructive example.

[Discussion of the fate of Ben Bella, whose workers and peasants government was overthrown in 1965, could provide illumination on the counterrevolutionary nature of the Islamic ideology and bourgeois Islamic leadership in the Algerian revolution.

[Of interest in relation to the speculation on the sending of Cuban troops to Angola is Castro's insistence that it did not occur in response to a request from Moscow. "There's no need to make up anything," Castro said. "You want to know if the Soviet Union asked us to go there? The Soviet Union did not ask us to go there. It never said a single word to that effect. It was Cuba's own decision."

[In the exchange between Walters and Castro on revolutionary figures there is a striking omission. Mao, Stalin, Lenin, and Castro are all assessed by the Cuban leader. Not once does he even hint at the existence of Lenin's comrade-in-arms Leon Trotsky, still less offer an opinion on his role in history or his murder by Stalin. And Barbara Walters, of course, graciously remains silent. Trotsky is still too hot to handle—even for ABC television.]

* * *

Journalist. Can we talk about Africa? Our State Department estimates that there are between 10 and 15,000 troops and civilians in Angola. I believe you say there are 5,000 civilian.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Me? Where did I say that?

Journalist. That was the information I had.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No, I've never said that.

Journalist. Can you tell us how many troops or advisors you have now in Angola?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No. I can't tell you that; I'm not going to say. I am not going to tell you that.

However, I can tell you this much: the figures the State Department has given out have been very imprecise. In Ford's and Kissinger's time, they gave specific figures. They said there were 12,000—and, in fact, at one time there were more than 12,000. The CIA might know—I don't underestimate the CIA. The fact that we've struggled against them by fair means and scored some successes doesn't mean that we underestimate the enemy.

I think they knew the figure—but, because of the electoral campaign and for reasons of prestige, they kept quiet.

Another thing I can tell you is that, when the war ended, we—in agreement with the Government of Angola—immediately began to withdraw Cuban military personnel, programmed according to the wishes of the Angolan Government.

Everything was programmed: we reduced our military personnel and increased our civilian personnel—doctors, engineers, technicians in all kinds of field—to help in Angola's reconstruction. We now have several thousand civilian technicians there.

We reduced our military personnel from the end of the war up to last April. In April, when France and Morocco intervened in the internal affairs of Zaire—that constituted a threat for Angola—we stopped reducing our military personnel, and we have been watching to see how events developed ever since.

Journalist. Do you think that, one day, all of Africa will be communist?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Yes, I do; what do you think of that? Communist? Let's not say communist. It depends on what you mean by communist. I wouldn't say that all of Africa is going to be Marxist-Leninist, because there are African countries that have a strong Islamic religious influence, that determines their political philosophy.

That is, if you're asking me if all of Africa is going to be socialist someday, I say yes, I am convinced that, one day, all of Africa will be socialist. Moreover, a part of Africa is already working, is carrying forward a socialist process—and this is taking place in large parts of Africa. Some countries will do it under the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Others will do it under the principles of Islam; and, who knows, maybe there'll be a few that do it under the principles of Christian humanism. But, in the economic and social domain, I'm sure all of Africa will be socialist, because it has no alternative; there's no alternative: it would be illusory to think it could continue along the capitalist path.

A group of European countries was able to travel that path; the process began in England, continued in France, was then taken up in the United States and later developed in Japan—so that those countries achieved great development in the field of production, with advanced technology, and amassed great riches. While there were still no other industrial areas in the world, they managed to attain development through capitalism, but the countries of Africa cannot do this.

Africa is terribly backward; sanitary conditions are horrendous; there are countries that have only one doctor for every 100,000 people. Many countries have no universities or very few students;

there are no technicians. The state of education and sanitation is terrible.

Those countries can't allow themselves the luxury of thinking about anarchic development, capitalist style, what we call the path of neocolonialism—that is the method whereby foreign investors take over the natural resources of a country.

I'm not denying the possibility that there could be agreements between foreign companies and those countries; but basic control of their natural resources should remain in the hands of those countries; their economic development should be planned; their resources must not be wasted; and corruption must not be allowed. They have to use every last cent they have correctly, and the economy has to be planned. If they don't take the socialist path, they will never solve their present problems. Thus, this isn't just a matter of what I want, of my ideas; rather, it's a matter of necessity, since there's no other way.

This is why I say that I'm sure that, one day, all Africa will be socialist and that neocolonialism will fail there.

What colonialism has left behind already is really impressive. Colonialism was born of capitalism. One has to see for himself what capitalism and colonialism left in their wake. It would be a good thing for U.S. citizens to learn what is going on in those countries. They would come to the same conclusion if—without prejudice—they mulled over what I'm saying.

Those countries can't follow the way of life of France, of Paris, of London, of New York or the United States. You have created a certain way of life and a society of great wealth—badly distributed, of course; very badly distributed!—but you do possess great wealth.

Do you think that the "American way of life" is the model for Africa, for India, for China? Just imagine what the situation would be like if every Chinese had a car; if every Indian had a car; and if, within 20 years, every African had a car? How many years would the world's oil reserves last? How long?

You have created a society that may be very good for you—if that's what you think is good—but it is not the answer and cannot be the model for the underdeveloped countries of the world, of Latin America, Asia and Africa. That is the reality.

Journalist. Do you think Africa will be socialist within the next 20, 25 years?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. It's possible. In fact, I would venture to say yes; because, look, take the case of Algeria: it's developing socialism and has a solid base. Libya is working for socialism; Ethiopia is working for socialism; Mozambique is working for socialism; Angola is working for socialism; Dahomey is working for socialism; Guinea-Bissau. . . .

Journalist. And you are helping them.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. All we can. Unfortunately, we don't have much.

But, now, I wonder; next year, you will spend 112,000 million dollars on building warplanes, warships, atom bombs, lasers, systems of mass destruction. Think what could be done with just half that money! With half that money, in ten years, all the problems of development could be solved; that is, with half that money over ten years. . . .

Journalist. Do you tell that to the Soviets as well?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. I'm going to finish my idea, if you'll permit me. In ten years the problems of the 100 poorest countries in the world could be solved—of course, that's not including India; I couldn't say how much money is needed to solve India's problems. What is all that money spent on?

[Referring to the journalist's last question] Me? I'd be delighted to talk to the Soviet Union about it. They and we think alike.

Journalist. Will you remove your troops from Angola?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. They aren't going to be there indefinitely. That has never been our intention—but not because of any commitment with anybody. That will only be done when it's in the interests of Angola and her government. I want to say that we can discuss this problem only with the Angolans and the Government of Angola. We cannot and are never going to discuss this problem with the United States.

What sense would there be in keeping that military personnel in Angola indefinitely? Its mission is to support Angola against any foreign aggression while the Angolan army is being organized, equipped and trained. The Angolan army is now being organized and trained, and the day will come when it won't need our support to defend itself against South Africa or any imperialist plan.

That is the only reason. What interest could we possibly have in maintaining that military personnel there in Angola? It would be pointless. It's expensive for us; it involves efforts and sacrifices.

Journalist. Why are you in Angola in the first place? And did the Soviets ask you to come in?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Let me tell you something. If you knew the Soviet people, if you knew them well, it wouldn't occur to you to think they would ever ask Cuba to send a single man to Angola. Such a thing would go completely against their relations with Cuba and their own conduct. Such a decision could only be taken by our Party and government, on our own initiative, in response to a request from the Angolan Government.

This is the way it's always been. There's no need to make up anything. You want to know if the Soviet Union asked us to go there? The Soviet Union did not ask us to go there. It never said a single word to that effect. It was Cuba's own decision.

Even the CIA, that finds out things once in a while, has written some things to this effect. I think it agrees with what I'm saying.

Journalist. Will you send troops to other countries of Africa?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. That will depend on the circumstances.

Journalist. What do you see Cuba's role as in Africa?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Look, Cuba's role in Africa is mainly of a civilian nature, not military.

We have been helping a growing number of countries for a long time, sending them technical assistance, civilian assistance—especially doctors. We have doctors in many countries in Africa. That is, above all, our support to the African countries is civilian support—as much as we can give. At times, we have been asked to send military advisers to help organize the armed forces—a small group of military advisers or a few or several dozen—and we've sent them. When asked to do so by the governments concerned.

Angola was the first country to which we sent military units. I don't want to go into the whole story again, unless you want me to.

We've always had contact with the MPLA, ever since it began the struggle for independence, and we helped it. When it was on the point of winning independence, an attempt was made to deprive the Angolan people of their independence. That's what happened. The CIA was involved—that is, not the CIA: the Government of the United States invested tens of millions of dollars in organizing a movement it directed in Zaire—the famous FNLA—in agreement with your friend Mobutu—not your friend: a friend of the United States. The Portuguese organized another counterrevolutionary movement before pulling out: UNITA. South Africa was determined to prevent the triumph of the MPLA. We had been helping it for a long time, sending it arms and some military instructors.

There's a historical truth that nobody can deny: we sent the first military unit after the regular troops of South Africa invaded Angola, on October 23, 1975, with tanks and artillery: a blitzkrieg-

style, Nazi-style, apartheid-style attack—that's the only way to describe it. They sent their regular army. We had to make a decision; either we would stand by with our arms crossed, and South Africa would take over Angola, or we would make an effort to help. That was the moment, on November 5, when we made the decision to send the first military unit to Angola to fight against the South African troops. That is the reason we made that decision. If we hadn't made that effort, South Africa would most probably have taken over Angola; then it wouldn't be just South Africa and Namibia, but Angola would also be in the hands of the South African racists.

I don't know what has been published in the United States about this, but I'm sure the blacks there know what discrimination means and know what apartheid means. The blacks in the United States would be the first to understand what the effort we made in Africa signified; all aware people in the United States, whites and blacks, who understand what apartheid and racial discrimination are and all those who do not understand this yet because they do not have accurate information will, someday, approve of our having made the effort we did to save a black African people from South African occupation.

Journalist. Would you send troops. . . ?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. I'm going to tell you something more. I'm absolutely positive that the South Africans didn't begin that invasion without first consulting with the Government of the United States. I'm absolutely positive about that. They would never have set forth on that adventure without Kissinger's and Ford's approval.

You can ask Ford about that if you ever interview him. Ask him if he knew anything about this. Let's see if he tells you the truth.

Journalist. Would you send troops into Rhodesia?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Look, our criterion about this is that the attainment of independence is a task for each people, a task for each people. That is, independence cannot be brought in from outside. This isn't the case of Angola; it isn't the case of Angola, that had already won its independence and had formed a government when it was invaded.

In Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa, it is the people that have to win their independence. We can give them political and other support, but it goes without saying that we could not send troops to attain the liberation of Rhodesia and Namibia. That's basically a task for their own peoples.

Journalist. Would you send troops into South Africa?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. That's the same question. It must be the people of South Africa. It's the people of South Africa that have to. . . .

Journalist. You would not send troops to Rhodesia or to South Africa?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Of course, we don't want to make any promises to anybody—not to the South African racists, not to those of Namibia and not to those of Rhodesia. This shouldn't be taken as a promise. It's simply an expression of our ideas and criteria on these problems: that liberation has to be a fundamental task of every people rather than a task to be carried out by military units sent by other peoples. Do you understand?

I'm going to ask you something.

Would you have approved if Lafayette and his French troops had helped you, the people of the United States, against the English starting in 1777?

Journalist. Do I think they should have? Is that what you're asking?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. What I mean is was it or was it not correct for Lafayette and the French to have helped Washington and the other U.S. patriots in the struggle against English colonialism?

Journalist. Are you trying to make a comparison between that and Cuba's sending troops to South Africa?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No, no, I simply want to make a review of history. You have statues of Lafayette, and you thank the French every year because they helped you in your war, yet now I see you're very worried over the possibility of another country's helping patriots in other parts of the world who are struggling against colonialism. Why is this so?

Journalist. It is not the same situation, because we are talking about Africa.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. What's the difference?

Journalist. The difference is that what we called Americans at that time were striving to free themselves from a foreign government. In South Africa they are not striving to free themselves from a foreign government but to solve what might be a civil war. We did not have foreign troops fighting in our Civil War. What I'm asking you is if you would send troops.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No, first I asked you if that was a good thing or not. You gave me an answer.

Now, what is there in Rhodesia? And in Namibia? I tell you, I don't see why you're so worried. I've already told you my position. What do I think? That the basic task of liberation should be carried out by the people in each country; but, when U.S. citizens get all worked up about the possibility that others may be helping those liberation movements, they forget their own history. That's all I wanted to point out.

What do you want to discuss about South Africa? What's your opinion about South Africa?

Journalist. I just want to say in passing that I can see why you were a terrific lawyer.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. What do you mean by that? That I'm a sophist? That I'm using arguments just to argue with you?

Journalist. No, I don't think a lawyer is a sophist. I just think you are very prepared. . . .

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Yes, I know. It's just that being a "terrible" lawyer here means being a bad one, a very bad one. I agree with you in the case of a bad lawyer.

Journalist. No, terrific, terrific, good. A good lawyer, a good lawyer. (She laughs.)

Are you now sending military advisers into Ethiopia?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. We have sent diplomatic personnel to Ethiopia. All of our personnel in Ethiopia is accredited as diplomatic personnel. That is, there are no military advisers as such in Ethiopia.

Journalist. What do your diplomatic advisers do?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. They are diplomatic advisers who have a lot of experience in revolutionary matters and even have some experience in military questions—I don't deny it. But we do not have military advisers as such accredited by the Ethiopian Government. We are going to send them civilian aid. We are going to see how many doctors we can send them, to help

the civilian population, because Ethiopia—with over 30 million inhabitants—has only 125 doctors. Any county in the United States has more doctors than Ethiopia has. Of course, we consider that we have a right to send military advisers to Ethiopia if the government needs them and if it is in our power to do so. That is, we do not renounce our prerogative, if need be, to send military advisers to Ethiopia. We're simply stating the truth.

Journalist. Do these diplomatic advisers assist in training troops?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No, they are not helping to train troops, but—I repeat—if necessary, if the Government of Ethiopia should request it and we could do it, we would exercise our prerogative to send those troop instructors.

Journalist. Can you tell us approximately how many advisers you have? We hear that there are 20 there now and 200 more expected.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Where?

Journalist. In Ethiopia.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. I can assure you that, no, that information is not correct.

Now I am going to ask you, Barbara, why you are asking me so many detailed questions about these matters? I can't work for free for the CIA. It would be better for them to have to do the work. I'm telling you that, if I'm not going to work for them if I'm paid, even less will I do so for free.

Journalist. Look, there is a difference between sending 20 and sending 200, and what I am trying to accomplish for the Americans is to understand how deep is your involvement.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Right.

But we'd be killing two birds with one stone: to be informing. . . .

I'm ready to do just about anything for U.S. public opinion and for ABC viewers, but I'm not about to do anything for the CIA. My conscience would bother me if I were to say anything that would help it.

But I will tell you one thing: don't worry about it. Look, there isn't so much difference between 20 and 200 because Ethiopia is a country that has more than 30 million inhabitants; it is a country that is making a thoroughgoing revolution that has enormous support from the masses, the peasants and the workers—who have just left the age of feudalism behind.

You can see what your friend Haile Selassie did—your friend, whose government you supported for so long. When he died, there were just 125 doctors in the country. Is that what the friends of the United States can hope for? Is that the collaboration the United States gives to Third World countries—125 doctors for 35 million inhabitants?

I'll tell you something: in just a few weeks, we could send more than 125 doctors there, because we are already graduating 1,000 doctors per year, and we have a doctor for every 950 inhabitants.

And then, Ethiopia can mobilize its people, its masses, so 200 instructors is nothing; it's nothing at all. That is, this isn't so important.

We don't have any military instructors in Ethiopia, but we do not renounce our prerogative to send them if the government asks us to do so and we are able to. Let this be well understood. I have answered your question by telling you the truth, but the truth does not imply any promise that we are not ready to send the instructors.

Up until just a few days ago, there were U.S. instructors in Ethiopia. Why are you so worried about the possibility of there

being Cuban instructors there now?

What's more, we know how to handle U.S. tanks and weapons.

Journalist. Did Cuban advisers train troops to fight in Zaire?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No. Absolutely not.

Look, I want to tell you this: during the war, citizens from Zaire, from the province of Katanga, were together with the MPLA; during the war, there was contact with them. Since the war ended, over a year ago, we have had no other contact with those people from Zaire.

Why is this so? Because we thought that what Angola needed was peace; and, even though we know that the Government of Zaire is one of the most corrupt, most repressive, most reactionary and bloodthirsty in Africa, Angola needed to better its relations with its neighbors; it needed peace for its reconstruction. This is why we have shunned any kind of contact with elements from Zaire—contact that could have hampered this policy. We have upheld this criterion throughout.

Therefore, there have been no contacts, no training, no arms. What's more, we didn't even know that those events were going to take place, because those people lived east of Angola, thousands of kilometers away, in areas that are practically cut off from the rest of the world.

Now, the CIA knows, the Government of the United States knows, the Government of France knows and everybody knows that we Cubans have not trained or armed the patriots in Zaire, that we don't have anything to do with this problem in Zaire, that it is an entirely domestic matter. Everybody knows this. Everything else is a lie to justify the intervention by France, Morocco and Egypt, with the blessing of the United States—with the blessing of the United States! Troops were sent from Morocco and Egypt, from those countries, with French logistical support, to Zaire.

This is why we have halted our program of evacuating the Cuban military personnel from Angola: because we have more than enough reason to think that there may be a subsequent plan of aggression against Angola behind all this.

Journalist. Why did you personally make that trip to Africa?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Don't I have a right to travel?

Journalist. Yes, but I wonder why you did and at that time.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Look, we have a lot of friends in Africa, who invited us to visit their countries. We had promised many of them that we would do so. We have many technicians working in a lot of countries. My visit was made to further our relations with those governments, in response to the invitations that had been issued to me; to visit the Cuban technicians; and to get a direct, personal understanding of Africa's problems.

And I'm not sorry I went. I'm very glad that I made that trip.

Journalist. If there were forces in Puerto Rico who wanted to change the political conditions and become socialist, would you send advisers, diplomatic or otherwise?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. If Puerto Rico were to become an independent state and asked us to send advisers, we would be perfectly justified in sending them—if they wanted to receive them. We have sent advisers to countries with legally constituted governments. This is not the case with Puerto Rico, for it isn't a sovereign, independent state.

Journalist. Are you trying to help them achieve their independence?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Look, in the case of Puerto Rico, as in that of the others, the attainment of independence is, above all, the business of its own people.

However, now that you've brought up the subject of Puerto Rico, I would like to state that—there's always some pretext or another being made up to keep up the hostility toward Cuba—there have always been ties between Puerto Rico and Cuba, dating from even before our independence. The Cuban Revolutionary Party, the party of independence founded by Martí, fought both on Cuba's and Puerto Rico's behalf.

With the U.S. intervention and the Spanish-American War, at the end of the last century, the United States seized Puerto Rico and turned it into a colony.

Historically, Cuba has always given Puerto Rico political and moral support—always. I remember that, when I was a university student, I was a member of the Committee for the Independence of Puerto Rico.

Moreover, one day in front of the U.S. consulate, in the old section of Havana, the police beat me up because I was taking part in a demonstration in support of Puerto Rico's independence. This was at the time of the uprising led by Albizu Campos, who was the leader of the Puerto Rican patriots.

I would like to point out that Cuban university students have always given Puerto Ricans moral and political support in their struggle for independence. Political and moral support. Nobody can accuse Cuba of having fomented violence; nobody can accuse Cuba of having taken part in violent actions in Puerto Rico or fomenting violence in Puerto Rico. We give the Puerto Ricans political and moral support. We'd be fakers if we didn't.

There are some U.S. citizens who say that the majority of Puerto Ricans don't want independence.

There were many people in the United States who, 20 or 30 years before independence, didn't want the United States to become independent.

Journalist. You're going to make me regret we ever had that Revolution.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No, of course not. We're very happy with your independence, and we're admirers of Washington and Lincoln.

Now then, it may very well be that most Puerto Ricans are not yet fully aware of the problem, but there's no doubt that Puerto Rico has been a colony of the United States and has been politically, economically and culturally dominated by the United States.

We have never practiced or promoted violence against the United States.

Our support for the Puerto Rican patriots is political and moral, and one thing I can tell you in this respect is that as long as there is a single Puerto Rican—a single Puerto Rican!—who aspires to the independence of his country, we have the moral and political duty of supporting him. If a day comes when there's none, then our duty toward Puerto Rico ceases to exist.

Journalist. How are you right now supporting, politically or morally, the independence of Puerto Rico?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Well, we hold solidarity rallies, international meetings, and we give them support in the United Nations.

Journalist. Do you have any advisers there?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. There? No, of course not.

Journalist. I want to just go back to Africa for a while. If you

have the right to be there, do you feel that we have the right to be there?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No, we don't have the right. It's the governments that have the right to request us to be there, not us.

I would like to make it clear, too, that we don't have a single bank, a single mine, a single hectare of land, a single oil well, a single factory, absolutely nothing over there.

And I would also like to tell you that the civilian aid we give Africa and the military advisers are all taken care of at our expense.

Journalist. Do you consider China a friend or an enemy of Cuba?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. I consider China to be a good ally of the United States.

Journalist. Does that make her an enemy of Cuba?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Well, to the same extent that the United States is Cuba's enemy. You've done a fine diplomatic job with China; you've got them on your side now on every fundamental issue. They support NATO; they support Mobutu just like you do; they support Pinochet just like you do; they support every reactionary government in the world just like you do. Such is life!

Journalist. No, no, no; they do not vote the way the United States votes in the United Nations.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. All right, but what does it matter if you have differences at the UN as long as you agree on everything else?

You know that as well as I do and, besides, you're very happy about it. Are you or aren't you? Are you or aren't you happy with China?

Journalist. We are pleased that we have new relations with China, and in the same way that we would be pleased to have relations with you.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Yes, of course—but we wouldn't act like the Chinese do.

If I promised the United States that, if the blockade were lifted and relations were established, we would do the same as the Chinese and become the allies of the United States, that would be a tremendous lie, a terrible act of deceit. I cannot say such a thing.

We will go on being socialists; we will go on being Communists; we will go on being internationalists; and we will go on being friends of the Soviet Union.

Journalist. China as well.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No; China is socialist, but it isn't internationalist.

Journalist. We are far less involved with China than you are with the Soviet Union. China does not consider herself our ally.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. What's that? Come again? You say we're involved?

Journalist. I find your thinking of our relationship with China surprising and almost naive. China does not consider herself our ally; we're just beginning to normalize relations. We do not even have diplomatic relations; we disagree about Taiwan; we have totally different systems of government.

We certainly don't in any sense have the relationship with

China that you have with the Soviet Union.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. No, no, of course not.

We have internationalist relations with the Soviet Union, while China has reactionary relations with the United States.

There's a problem: you created Pinochet, and China supports Pinochet; you created the FNLA and Holden Roberto, and China supports the FNLA and Holden Roberto; you created Mobutu, and China supports Mobutu. You created NATO. . . . Didn't you?

Journalist. China does not support NATO.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. China supports NATO. China supports the Conservative Party of England and welcomes its members as visitors; China supports the reactionary forces of the FRG. I'm saying some serious things. The Chinese secret services meet with the secret services of France, the FRG, England and the United States in Paris. China opposes the evacuation of the Guantánamo naval base. China uses the same arguments as the United States does to attack Cuba. I don't know whether some of these Chinese leaders will be expelled, charged with forming part of the Band of Four. There are some things about China that I don't understand. Mao Tse-tung's widow and three others are blamed for everything that went wrong in China, but these things have been going on for more than ten years. What kind of a genius, what kind of a god and what kind of a revolutionary was Mao Tse-tung if his wife and a group of associates could do these things that the present Chinese leadership is fighting? My opinion is that China is one of your best allies.

Journalist. Are you saying that China is in the pocket of the United States?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. I can't say that China is in the pocket of the United States, because China is too big to fit in a pocket. It may be that Pinochet, Somoza and the heir of Chiang Kai-shek fit in the United States' pocket, but China is very big and won't fit in a pocket. I'm not saying that. I'm saying that China is one of the best allies the United States has at present.

Journalist. Do you not feel that Mao Tse-tung was a true revolutionary?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Yes, I do. I sincerely think that he was a great revolutionary leader; I think he made a great revolution; I think that, at certain times in his life, his thinking was brilliant. He came to power; the personality cult was developed; he was made a god; and, at the end, he made so many mistakes that they constitute a blot on his life.

There was a true revolution in China, a profound revolution. The Chinese people are an extraordinary people—heroic, self-sacrificing, hard-working. They have tremendous virtues, but I think that, for a long time, Mao Tse-tung destroyed with his feet what he had made with his head. I'm convinced of this. Someday, the Chinese people themselves and the Communist Party of China will have to recognize this. It's just a matter of time.

That is my humble opinion on this matter.

Journalist. Do you not feel that China now is a true socialist country?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. Yes, I think that China is a socialist country, because there aren't any large landowners or capitalists there. The paradox of China is that, while having a revolutionary domestic policy, it is carrying out a foreign policy of treason to the international revolutionary movement; but, as that does not have an internal basis, since it is, let's say, a deformation of the process, I'm fully convinced that it can't last very long.

Journalist. What do you think Mao did to destroy this? What were his mistakes?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. First of all, I think that the personality cult practically destroyed the Communist Party of China. He unleashed a witch-hunt to the detriment of the best Party cadres, allowed himself to be turned into a god and betrayed the revolutionary solidarity of the peoples. That, I believe, was Mao's great crime. What I don't attribute to him. . . . I think that he was an extraordinary man, with great ability, who transformed China.

What happened? Men who take part in these processes, the men who found revolutions, acquire great power and may abuse it later on.

We've already discussed this topic. You asked me if I could become that kind of a man, and I am pleased—and, more than pleased, proud—because I know that I have not become and that I could never become that kind of man. The men who make revolutions acquire great personal power. I, too, acquired great personal power, but I never abused it, and I didn't keep it in my own hands: I distributed it; I turned it over to the revolutionary institutions.

Journalist. What about Stalin? What about Lenin? That was a personality cult. Didn't that make them become heroes, a legend?

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. You can't compare Lenin with Stalin. Lenin was an extraordinary man in all regards, and there isn't a single blot on his life in my opinion.

Stalin also had great merits, extraordinary merits, without a doubt, in the field of the industrialization of the USSR, in the leadership of the Soviet state, in the difficult times of the Nazi attack. Those merits should be recognized, because they are real. However, it is also true that a personality cult was developed in the Stalin era and that there were abuses of power.

Journalist. The United States supports Taiwan; China does not. The United States supports Israel; China does not. The United States in the United Nations voted against the Zionism as racism statement; China voted for it. We do not have at all the same aims or votes.

Commander in Chief Fidel Castro. All right, there are some tactical discrepancies between China and the United States, but only tactical ones. Strategically, you agree. One vote for or against what the United States wants can be a rhetorical question. China still tries to maintain a certain image, but, on the fundamental question, on the struggle against the Soviet Union, the United States and China are great allies. Thus, there is no telling today who's fighting harder against the Soviet Union—China or the United States.

For us, the revolutionaries, the USSR is the main bulwark of the revolutionary progressive movement in the world. It has won this distinction by virtue of having been the first socialist state; through its role in the struggle against fascism and the sacrifice of 20 million lives in World War II, in the fight against fascism; and through the support it has given the world revolutionary movement, including Cuba—in very difficult times caused by the blockade and in times of threatened aggression—and to the revolutionary movement in Africa and Asia. Without the Revolution in the Soviet Union, the Chinese Revolution could not have been possible.

Today, the essential strategic question is that the United States and China are allies in the struggle against the Soviet Union.

For example, I believe that Carter is dangerously verging on cold war by upping the military budget and encouraging NATO, urging NATO on to an arms program. I believe that that is one of the basic problems in the world today. The risks involved in this policy are very serious, and China is in favor of this policy. Thus, there may be tactical discrepancies between China and the United States, but you agree on basic matters.

[To be continued]

Capitalism Fouls Things Up



Manhattan Commuters Showered With Asbestos

Thousands of persons in New York City were showered with sand and asbestos debris August 30 when a Consolidated Edison Company steam pipe exploded at 60th Street and Lexington Avenue during the morning rush hour. Asbestos fibers are among the most potent carcinogens known (see *Intercontinental Press*, September 19, p. 1020).

"We don't want to scare the hell out of people about this," said a representative of the city's Department of Air Resources, describing the accident as "certainly nothing compared to what we used to have floating around in city air."

"But still," he told the *New York Daily News*, "people should be aware if they were exposed (of the need to) wash themselves and their clothes thoroughly and give their apartments a good cleaning if dust got in."

According to the *Daily News*, Con Edison "could not say how much of its pipe system was wrapped in this way. And no one seemed very sure that such an explosion had not happened before, or could not happen again."

... and Try to Refrain From Breathing

A tank at the Stauffer Chemical Company in Morrisville, Pennsylvania, discharged a large white cloud on September 14. News reports described it as "a potentially dangerous chlorine gas compound."

Police in Morrisville and in Trenton, New Jersey, across the Delaware River, drove through the streets warning residents by loudspeaker to remain in their homes.

Ten Thousand Pounds an Hour

Ten thousand pounds of sulfur dioxide, mercury, arsenic, and other toxic chemicals billow every hour from the smokestack of an iron ore processing plant jut outside Atikokan, Ontario. They ride the prevailing winds thirty-five miles to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in northern Minnesota—the largest U.S. government-protected wilderness area east of the Rocky Mountains.

Now the Ontario Hydro power company is planning to build an 800-megawatt coal-fired generating plant in Atikokan. The plant will have no sulfur pollution con-

trols, and could thus triple the amount of airborne chemicals falling on the pine forests and myriad lakes and streams in the Boundary Waters Area.

Pollution from Atikokan also falls on Quetico Provincial Park, a Canadian wilderness area eleven miles away.

Pressure from environmentalists has forced the U.S. State Department to open talks with the Ontario provincial government seeking a relocation of the power plant or stricter controls, Robert Ostmann Jr. reports in the September 10 *Washington Post*. "But most observers say privately the chances are slim that the United States will be able to effect any major change in the Canadian plans. . . ."

"Hydro has never been cited, sued or coerced in any way by the province to clean up pollution from its power plants."

Coffee, Tea, or DDT?

Out of nineteen samples of imported coffee beans tested by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration between 1974 and May 1977, nine were contaminated with pesticides. Seven billion pounds of coffee were imported during that period.

Senator Gaylord Nelson said September 1 that the FDA would be stepping up its efforts to detect such contamination. Ten samples were to be analyzed during the month of September.

Ontario Farmers Fight Nuclear Dump

"A little-noticed recent event may turn out to be the Achilles' heel of the nuclear power program in Canada," Robert Paehlke reports in the August/September issue of *Environment* magazine.

In January, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) announced that test drilling for a possible nuclear waste disposal site was to be conducted at Mount Moriah, just north of the small farming community of Madoc, Ontario. This was one of several locations in central Ontario with the hard granite rock formations the AECL considers suitable for burial of spent fuel rods from Canadian reactors.

The weekly newspaper in Madoc announced the AECL's plans on January 12. "Within a week or so, hundreds of people were turning out for meetings, and a local group called Citizens Opposing Rad-

ioactive Pollution (C.O.R.P.) was formed. . . . Many local citizens became very actively involved—including leading local businessmen, at least one of whom earlier had had difficulties with arsenic pollution affecting his sports fishing establishment. By January 20, the Hastings County Federation of Agriculture unanimously passed a resolution which concluded with the following sentence: 'Therefore be it resolved that A.E.C.L. find some other place to dump its radioactive waste or keep it where it is produced.' Equally strong resolutions were passed by the local Conservation Authority and by the Hastings County Labour Council."

In March, 1,200 residents of the Mount Moriah area attended an "information exchange" organized by the local member of Parliament. All of them, Paehlke says, "were fiercely opposed to the facility at Mount Moriah."

Paehlke does not report whether the Madoc community's fight to avoid becoming an atomic dump has yet succeeded. But he sums up the determination with which it is being waged:

"The farmers knew roughly how poisonous plutonium is, they knew they themselves did not use the power from the atomic plants, they knew there had been a minor earthquake in the area back in the 1930s, and they knew their farms were downstream from Mount Moriah. They did not feel they needed any more information."

'Peaceful Atoms' for Panama?

Article XII of the proposed new Panama Canal treaty deals with the possibility that a sea-level canal might be constructed at some future time. Section 5 reads as follows: "In the construction of the aforesaid works, the United States of America shall not use nuclear excavation techniques without the previous consent of the Republic of Panama."

What the imperialists may have in mind was indicated by Barbara Rehm, writing in the *New York Daily News* September 8:

"Using nuclear explosives (an untried method), the U.S. could blast out a ditch in five years for a little more than \$1 billion. With conventional canal-building methods, experts say, it would take 14 years and a cost of \$3.5 billion."