

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 15, No. 37

© 1977 by Intercontinental Press

October 10, 1977

75¢

Huge Antinuclear Rally at Kalkar



At the Kalkar demonstration. Contingents turned out from all over Europe in a single coordinated rally.

Harassment by the West German police failed to dampen the antinuclear protest. See page 1116.

**Fourth International Calls on U.S.
to Turn Canal Over to Panama Now**

Claudio Tavárez Wins Swift Victory

Blanco Granted Visa to United States

France: Split in Union of the Left

Spain: Trotskyists Win Legal Status

USSR: More Arrests of Dissidents

**Israel Shahak, Gerry Foley Debate
Inconsistencies of Soviet Dissidents**

Peng Appraises Mao's Political Life

Shah Changes His Prime Minister

The Rise of Zimbabwean Nationalism

Gandhi's Successors Stall for Time

Show in Outer Space Free of Sex

Tavárez Wins Swift Victory

By Joseph Hansen

On September 30 Judge Sergio Rodríguez Pimentel declared Claudio Tavárez not guilty of the charge of "subversion" brought against him by the police of Santo Domingo. The verdict marked an important victory for democratic rights in the Dominican Republic.

Tavárez was arrested upon his arrival from New York at the airport on September 9. As part of his baggage, he had brought two packages containing various issues of *Perspectiva Mundial*, a journal published in New York.* They were intended for newsstands that had not received these issues because of mishandling by the Postal Service. This material was cited by the police as the basis for their charge of "subversion." It is difficult to understand the excitement in police circles over *Perspectiva Mundial*. The August 29 issue, the latest one carried by Tavárez, was centered like previous issues on defending the Panamanian people against American imperialism. It bore the headline: "¡Fuera Yankis de Panamá!" (Yankees Get Out of Panama).

Other articles dealt with the struggle of women in Puerto Rico for liberation; the defense of Chicanos against illegal deportation from the United States; and current events in Mexico, Colombia, El Salvador, and Spain. As a special feature, the issue included a Spanish translation of an article dealing with Trotsky's views on party building.

Perhaps it was the latter item that caught the attention of the police. The September 10 issue of the Santo Domingo daily *La Noticia* reported that Tavárez had been "studying in a socialist country and returned yesterday to Santo Domingo." It was not reported what "socialist" country offers favorable studies in Trotskyism.

Tavárez, it appeared, had been selected for special victimization. The press played up his arrest with screaming headlines.

The prosecution demanded 200,000 pesos bail, the equivalent of \$200,000. The court decided on 50,000 pesos. Friends managed to raise the exorbitant amount, and Tavárez was released after five days in jail.

The effort to railroad Tavárez into prison ran into an unexpected difficulty—an intensive campaign in his defense. This was facilitated by the fact that Tavárez is a well-known activist in civil-rights strug-

gles. He is a member of Amnesty International and a former leading member of the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA).

The arbitrary seizure of *Perspectiva Mundial* likewise facilitated the campaign, for it was a flagrant violation of freedom of the press.

Protests began to pour in. The September 18 issue of the Dominican daily *¡Despertar!* condemned the arrest and charges as "one more blow against the precarious freedoms enjoyed by the Dominican people."

El Caribe, in editorials in the September 21 and 22 issues, condemned Police Chief Niet Rafael Nivar Seijas's action in bringing charges and urged him to withdraw the indictment.

The Dominican Press Association went into action immediately, making its offices

Hugo Blanco Granted Visa to Enter United States

By José G. Pérez

[We are reproducing the following article, which has been scheduled to appear in the October 14 issue of the *Militant*.]

* * *

The fight to win a U.S. visa for Peruvian revolutionist and peasant leader Hugo Blanco has been won.

On September 30, Ralph Kramer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) central office told the *Militant* in response to a telephone call, "Mr. Blanco will be admitted directly." That was after the INS had concurred with a State Department recommendation that Blanco be let in.

This brings to a successful conclusion a two-year fight. It represents a major victory for the right of the American people to hear all points of view.

In June 1975 Blanco applied for a visa to conduct a three-month speaking tour sponsored by the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA).

The State Department stalled, then alleged—under a 1952 thoughtcontrol law—that Blanco was unfit to enter the United States. The State Department later

available to those organizing the defense effort.

In New York, USLA, the Puerto Rican Association for Community Affairs, and the Dominican human-rights group Derechos Humanos all went into action.

In face of the mounting pressure, Police Chief Nivar Seijas offered to return the two packages of *Perspectiva Mundial* to its official distributors on the island, Enrique de León and José Díaz.

At the opening court session on September 27, Prosecuting Attorney Reynaldo Pared Díaz departed completely from the script written by the police. He asked that all the charges be dropped inasmuch as Tavárez had committed no crime.

The judge thought it over until September 30, then rendered his verdict, which was a wise one: "Not guilty."

The case thus came to a satisfactory conclusion exactly three weeks after its inauspicious opening.

The outcome shows what can be accomplished by speedy action in a defense case. The victory, of course, could not have been achieved without a favorable response from the public. That response was not only favorable, it was remarkably swift. The Dominican people are sensitive to infringements of freedom of the press! □

considered a waiver of his inadmissibility, but decided no.

USLA responded by organizing a campaign of protest messages and meetings demanding that Henry Kissinger, who was then in office, reverse the decision. Scores of prominent individuals joined the protests, and Kissinger felt it best to bow to the pressure by formally reversing the decision.

However, the Immigration and Naturalization Service vetoed Kissinger. Despite continuing protests, Blanco was barred.

In March 1977 efforts to get Blanco a visa were renewed. Pathfinder Press, Inc., formally requested that the INS classify Blanco as "an alien of distinguished merit and ability" so he could conduct a speaking tour organized by Viewpoint Speakers Bureau, a division of Pathfinder, and by USLA.

Blanco is one of the best-known Trotskyists in the world. He led a land-reform movement among Peru's Quechua-speaking peasants in the early 1960s. He was arrested and framed up on murder charges for this activity, and it took an international defense campaign to save his life and finally win him amnesty in 1970.

Pathfinder submitted with the March 1977 application laudatory reviews of

*A one-year subscription can be obtained by sending \$10 to *Perspectiva Mundial*, P.O. Box 314, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

Blanco's *Land or Death: The Peasant Struggle in Peru*. They also submitted personal testimonials on Blanco, ranging from Ché Guevara's 1963 comment, "Hugo Blanco has set an example, a good example," to a *Boston Globe* editorial that called him "a recognized spokesman for freedom and dissent."

A month after this material was submitted, the INS sent it back with a form letter saying, "evidence submitted to date does not establish the preeminence of the beneficiary in a particular field. . . ." They asked for more evidence.

Pathfinder responded by sending back the petition, documentation and a letter of protest. Other protests from prominent intellectuals and civil libertarians soon followed. On June 15, the INS found that "additional documentation" had convinced them.

Blanco's visa application was then before the State Department. As in 1975, the department branded him "ineligible" and stalled, claiming it was considering a waiver.

On September 9—the day Blanco was to have arrived—there was still no decision from the State Department. USLA and Viewpoint Speakers Bureau then called for protest messages and publicity around the case. Three weeks later all government objections to Blanco's visa had been overcome.

Neither Kramer of the INS nor State Department representative Lloyd Dewitt would explain to the *Militant* why the long-standing ban on Blanco had been lifted. "That I couldn't tell you," was Dewitt's answer. Kramer said, "I'm not in a position to say anything about that."

However, before the State Department had given its OK, the *Nation*, a liberal weekly published in New York, reported: "The Department spokesman has said that political considerations will weigh heavily in the Blanco matter. . . ."

Several "political considerations" may have been involved.

- Shortly after taking office President Carter promised to relax rules on travel to the United States, noting Washington's ideological travel ban was in violation of the 1975 Helsinki Agreement.

- Last August, Carter signed into law a State Department appropriation that carried a rider. The rider specified that persons who had been previously barred from the country because of their ties to communist, socialist, or anarchist groups should now be admitted.

- A negative decision could have embarrassed INS Director Leonel Castillo. In 1975, while still comptroller of the city of Houston, Castillo had gone on record as favoring a visa for Blanco.

For these reasons, Carter's appointees found it untenable to maintain the Ford administration's ban on Blanco. It would have further exposed the fraudulent nature of Carter's human rights rhetoric. □

In This Issue

Closing News Date: October 3, 1977

FEATURES	1114	Bankers Fear Defaults by Semicolonial Countries—by Jon Britton
	1118	Debate on Inconsistencies of Soviet Dissidents—by Israel Shahak and Gerry Foley
	1125	Show in Outer Space Free of Sex
PANAMA	1100	Pentagon Reassures Senate on Canal Pact—by Fred Murphy
FRANCE	1102	The Split in the Union of the Left —by Gerry Foley
IRAN	1105	The Shah Puts a New Prime Minister in Charge—by Ali Golestan
CHINA	1107	An Appraisal of the Political Life of Mao Tse-tung
ZIMBABWE	1111	The Rise of Zimbabwe Nationalism —by Jim Atkinson
HAITI	1113	Oppositionists Recount Horrors Under Duvalier Dictatorship
WEST GERMANY	1116	Massive Antinuclear Turnout at Kalkar —by Susan Wald
THAILAND	1116	Appeal for Solidarity With Students on Trial
USA	1117	The Smell of Watergate —by Steve Wattenmaker
BRITAIN	1117	The Poor Pay More
SPAIN	1121	An Open Letter to Santiago Carrillo
	1121	LCR Wins Legal Status
INDIA	1124	Gandhi's Successors Stall for Time —by Sharad Jhaveri
SOVIET UNION	1127	Kremlin Crackdown on Dissidents Continues—by Marilyn Vogt
CUBA	1127	Castro Forecasts Slow Progress in Détente Efforts
NEWS ANALYSIS	1098	Tavárez Wins Swift Victory —by Joseph Hansen
	1098	Hugo Blanco Granted Visa to Enter United States—by José G. Pérez
DOCUMENTS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL SELECTIONS	1100	Turn the Canal Over to Panama Now!
FROM THE LEFT	1122	
AROUND THE WORLD CAPITALISM	1126	1,000 Students Arrested in São Paulo
FOULS THINGS UP	1128	Shell Knew in 1954—Workers Find Out in 1977
DRAWINGS	1101	Omar Torrijos; 1106, Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi; 1117, Bert Lance; 1124, Morarji Desai —by Copain

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

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.

Turn the Canal Over to Panama Now!

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following statement on September 15. A similar statement was adopted jointly by the American Socialist Workers Party and the Revolutionary Socialist League (LSR) of Panama. In addition, a joint statement was adopted by nine Central American revolutionary Marxist organizations which appeared in *Inprecor*, No. 7 new series, May 26, 1977.]

* * *

Ever since it stole the Canal Zone of Panama over seventy years ago, Washington has been determined to maintain its grip on it. The Panama Canal is a vital transportation link for U.S. imperialism and the exploiters throughout the world. The United States maintains key military bases in Panama and utilizes the Zone as a staging area for counterinsurgency activities in the Caribbean and throughout Latin America. The original treaty which imperialism imposed on the Panamanian people gave the U.S. control over the canal "in perpetuity." In face of continued resistance to the U.S. occupation over the years, Yankee troops have intervened twenty-one times to maintain Washington's domination.

The negotiations which have led to the new treaty were themselves forced upon Washington by the struggles of the Panamanian people. Prior to 1964 the United States refused all calls to negotiate a new treaty. But after the mobilization of the Panamanian people on January 9-10, 1964, which was brutally suppressed, the imperialists decided they had to adopt a new stance and agreed to negotiate a new treaty. Washington's hypocrisy is evident in the delay in even carrying out these negotiations. In fact, Washington has no right to negotiate anything in Panama—it should get out immediately and unconditionally.

Now a new treaty has been negotiated in secret between Carter and General Omar Torrijos. Washington's aims are to present a facade of reasonableness in dealing with the people of Latin America, while at the same time maintaining its essential interests. The new treaty contains certain partial gains for Panama on questions of territory, administration, tolls, mail, and so forth. The Panamanian government is presenting the new treaty as a victory. But in supporting this treaty Torrijos makes unwarranted concessions to imperialism. The new treaty is not a genuine abrogation of the old accord. On the contrary, it legalizes the U.S. military presence and provides for joint defense "through a

parallel neutrality pact that gives the United States the right to intervene forever to guarantee the canal's security."

Moreover, Panama will not even assert formal sovereignty over the canal until around the year 2000. There is no guarantee that Washington will honor this promise even then. The negotiations themselves were carried out under the guns of the imperialists. While they were going on, 9,000 U.S. troops were stationed at fourteen bases in the Canal Zone. Genuine negotiations are impossible under such conditions.

The Panamanian government of General Torrijos was a party to the secret talks that produced this pact. Torrijos says he will submit the agreement to a plebiscite for approval by the masses. The real attitude of the Torrijos regime is expressed in the fact that it has sent into exile anti-imperialist fighters who have demanded that the U.S. get out of Panama immediately and unconditionally. There can be no genuine debate among the Panamanian people as long as the anti-imperialist foes of the pact are in forced exile and access to the mass media is denied to the different mass organizations in Panama.

A joint statement issued September 1 by the Liga Socialista Revolucionaria (LSR—Revolutionary Socialist League) of Panama and the Socialist Workers Party of the United States says, "... this treaty does not satisfy the historic aspirations of the

Panamanian people for total sovereignty over their national territory and for the expulsion of Yankee soldiers from Panama once and for all. It is designed only to cover up continued U.S. domination of the canal, to retard the struggle of the Panamanian people, and to deny their self-determination."*

Certain reactionary politicians in the United States oppose the new treaty because, they claim, it gives up U.S. "rights" to Panama. This has tended to shift the axis of the debate onto which imperialist-imposed treaty should be supported, the old one that codified the imperialist take-over of the canal or the new one that maintains imperialist control, but in a form better suited to disguise and justify that domination. Against both the proponents of the new treaty as well as those of the old, the Fourth International says that the U.S. has no right to be in Panama at all, and no right to impose any treaty on the Panamanian people.

We call on the working people and oppressed peoples of the world to raise their voices alongside the anti-imperialist fighters in Panama and the United States in demanding:

Full and immediate sovereignty for Panama.

U.S. troops out of Panama.

Dismantle all U.S. military bases in the Canal Zone.

Turn the canal over to Panama now.

U.S. hands off the canal and Panama. □

*For full text see "Joint Statement by Panamanian and American Trotskyists" in *Intercontinental Press*, September 19, 1977, p. 1006.

Pentagon Reassures Senate on Canal Pact

By Fred Murphy

Jimmy Carter's efforts to secure approval for the Panama Canal treaty,¹ in the view of his top aide Hamilton Jordan, "are in deep trouble in Congress," the *New York Daily News* reported September 29. A few days earlier, Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd told reporters that "to bring [the treaty] up this fall would insure its rejection."

The new accord, signed by Carter and Panamanian chief of state Omar Torrijos on September 7, provide a facelift for American control of the Panama Canal.

1. The accord actually consists of three treaties, one on the turnover of the canal itself, scheduled to take place December 31, 1999; one guaranteeing the canal's "neutrality"; and a protocol to the "neutrality" pact that other governments will be asked to sign. For an account of the provisions of the treaties, see *Intercontinental Press*, August 29, p. 922.

Before it can go into effect it must be ratified by a two-thirds vote in the U.S. Senate and by a plebiscite in Panama set for October 23.

Carter and Torrijos each face difficulties in putting the accord across.

The U.S. president's problems stem from the campaign being waged against the treaty by right-wing jingoists headed by former California governor and erstwhile presidential aspirant Ronald Reagan. In seeking an issue around which to galvanize a new conservative movement in American politics, these forces have charged that a treasonous "giveaway" of the canal is in the works. Their drive picked up steam September 30 when the national committee of the Republican Party voted by a sizable majority to oppose ratification of the treaty.

The right-wing opposition is useful to Carter up to a point. He can tell General

Torrijos how lucky Panama is to be dealing with a "champion of human rights" such as himself, rather than with Ronald Reagan.

Torrijos explains his concessions to the imperialists in just this way. Upon returning to Panama September 9, he said that "Panama was not heard . . . until the moral figure of President Carter emerged." And he cautioned in an earlier speech that "if the U.S. Senate does not ratify the treaty, we must find an answer that is not violent," since violence would only "provide arguments for Carter's enemies."

While the stance of a "moral figure" serves Carter well in Panama and internationally, he must still secure sixty-seven votes in the Senate to get the treaty ratified. Thus he must provide assurance that nothing of substance is being given up, that imperialist domination of Panama will remain intact.

The administration's effort to do this began with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on September 26. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance testified that "there is no limit under the treaty on the freedom of the United States to assure permanently the canal's neutrality."

Vance was followed on September 27 by Defense Secretary Harold Brown and a string of top military officers. Brown "said the Pentagon had examined the treaties' provisions for protecting the canal in terms of 'practical world realities' and had concluded that they 'fully serve, and greatly promote, our national security interests,'" the *Washington Post* reported September 28.

He was seconded in his arguments by Air Force Gen. George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff [the highest U.S. military post]; Adm. Robert L. J. Long, vice Chief of Naval Operations; and Lt. Gen. D. P. McAuliffe, commander of U.S. military forces in the Canal Zone. . . .

[Gen. Brown] and the others noted that the Pentagon had worked closely with the State Department in negotiating the treaties ("to ensure that U.S. defense requirements were protected.") The military's main concern, they said, had been for inclusion of the provision allowing U.S. intervention to safeguard the canal's neutrality. That requirement had been satisfied, they added.

Such talk should prove useful to Carter in taking some wind out of the jingoists' sails. But it also adds to Torrijos's difficulties in selling the treaty to the Panamanian people. Under the headline "Treaties Are Attacked in Panama," Alan Riding reported to the *New York Times* in a September 26 dispatch from Panama City:

Dissatisfaction here centers on Panama's acceptance of the United States' right to defend the canal after the new treaties expire at the end of 1999. . . .

The strongest criticism has been for the so-called "neutrality treaty," which grants the United States residual defense rights after 2000 but which nationalists say is merely a disguised form of the "perpetual" American control en-

shrined in the 1903 treaty.

But five small militant leftist groups are also protesting the clause that permits United States troops to remain here until the year 2000.

The Torrijos regime has been stung by the exposure of the real nature of the accord by the Trotskyists of the Liga Socialista Revolucionaria² and by several other radical organizations. Riding reports that the nationalists who are speaking out "have been variously denounced as 'trai-



TORRIJOS: Bugged by Panamanian leftists.

tors' and 'bad Panamanians' and, even though many are strident leftists, have been linked in official propaganda to conservative opponents of the treaty in the United States."

The possibility of any real democratic discussion of the treaty by the Panamanian people has been undercut by Torrijos's rush to hold a referendum on October 23. In addition, many of the best-known nationalist opponents of the treaty, including the revolutionary socialist Miguel Antonio Bernal, have been in exile since being expelled by the regime early in 1976. (Torrijos sent a number of right-wing politicians and businessmen packing at the same time, but most of these were allowed to return to Panama last May.)

While leftist critics of the treaty are slandered and prevented from speaking out, the Panamanian government is whipping up a campaign in support of the accord. When Torrijos returned from the

2. See "Panamanian Trotskyists Demand Immediate Return of Canal," *Intercontinental Press*, September 5, p. 952.

signing ceremonies on September 9, a crowd of 200,000 was on hand to greet him. "Many in the crowd were government employees, who were told to sign in at gathering points all over town," the *Washington Post* reported September 10. "According to a high-school teacher, those not showing would lose a day's salary. Offices and factories received instructions to close at 2 p.m. to enable employees to attend."

Riding reported in his September 26 dispatch:

Almost daily, different organizations announce their support for the treaties, and several political parties, officially outlawed since 1968, have been allowed to meet to consider them. The Panamanian Association of Business Executives was among the first to endorse the treaties, but the Moscow-line Panamanian Communist party, known here as the People's Party [PPP], has also approved them.

The PPP jumped on Torrijos's bandwagon in a statement reported by the American Communist Party newspaper the *Daily World* on September 9:

"The PPP political bureau stressed that the U.S. government had been compelled to make some concessions." The PPP said that "while the new U.S.-Panama treaty reflects a progressive trend in international life, 'the accommodations reached do not meet fully the aspirations of the Panamanian people.'" The *Daily World* noted that "these views were similar to what was said in Washington . . . by Gen. Omar Torrijos. . . ."

The American CP likewise failed to take a principled stand against U.S. imperialism's effort to paper over continued domination of Panama. *Daily World* writer Tom Foley said in a September 27 column, "If we can refute the ultra-right campaign, we can do a great deal to ensure ratification of the treaties." The Stalinists focus all their fire on the jingoists, thus letting Carter and the more farsighted elements of the ruling class off the hook.

The Cuban Communist Party appears to have taken a lukewarm position in support of the treaty. In the September 12 English edition of *Granma*, the Cuban CP paper, a brief news item on the accord failed to make any mention of the continued U.S. military role:

The main treaty . . . will regulate activities in the Canal until the year 2000, at which time Panama will assume full control over the operation and management of the same. The second treaty deals with the neutrality of the Canal.

The *Daily World* reported September 30 that Conrado Hernandez, chairman of the Cuban Federation of University Students, said in a speech in Panama, "The Cuban people led by President Fidel Castro have stood alongside Panama in this long fight and will continue to do so. We must certainly rejoice at the Panamanian victories, which include the treaties." □

The Split in the French Union of the Left

By Gerry Foley

Only six months before the French legislative elections, with what appeared to be certain victory in sight, the electoral bloc of the Union of the Left parties broke up.

The split in the coalition began September 14, when the Left Radicals, the bourgeois component of the popular-front alliance, walked out of a summit meeting of the Union of the Left, proclaiming their determination to defend private enterprise from the "collectivist" claws of the Communist Party, cost what it might.

The open rupture in the Union of the Left was consummated on September 23-24, when the Communist and Socialist parties indicated that they were separated by an unbridgeable chasm on the question of nationalizations.

The SP refused to accept the CP's demand that 479 companies employing under 150,000 workers be included on the list of those to be nationalized under a Union of the Left government.

The Stalinists, on the other hand, claimed that the workers' confidence in the Union of the Left was at stake and their dedication to the interests of the working class was such that they were obliged to stand their ground on this issue, cost what it may.

The CP leaders had called for "updating" the Union of the Left program in order, they said, to revive the waning enthusiasm of the workers and mobilize them for the electoral struggle. But the result was the opposite of the CP's stated goal. It dashed the hopes of the workers for getting a government that would be responsive to their demands. The waning confidence it revived was that of the bourgeoisie.

In a September 23 dispatch from Paris, *New York Times* correspondent Paul Lewis described the results of the Union of the Left split:

The lethargic Paris stock exchange came to life today and relief swept through France's dispirited business community: The Communists and Socialists were quarreling.

As the news spread of a breakdown in negotiations for a joint government program among the parties of the left, French stock prices rose an average of 4 percent on the day in heavy trading.

Brokers reported a sharp revival of foreign interest in stocks. Among the strongest performing stocks were those in France's remaining privately owned and profitable banks and insurance companies, which are high on the opposition's nationalization list.

The heavily political nature of the stock rally was emphasized by French brokers. "If the opposition alliance is really breaking up, the specter of a Communist government in France will be lifted for a generation," one broker commented.

In contrast to the joy on the floor of the stock exchange, gloom spread through the factories, infecting the CP activists themselves.

The CP, together with the SP, had convinced the great majority of French workers to pin all their hopes on a Union of the Left victory in the March 1978 elections.

For many months, the workers movement had been virtually in suspended animation, waiting for the seemingly certain installation of a Union of the Left government. Now the very parties that created these expectations had suddenly exploded them.

The Stalinists mobilized their machine to try to rally their supporters behind their course and buoy up their spirits. In its September 28 issue, the French Trotskyist daily *Rouge* described the results:

Our correspondent in Rouen notes, for example, that although the CP's explanations [to its supporters] are being rather well accepted in general, in those sectors where the bosses have been sharply on the attack, signs of demoralization are appearing. This is true, in particular, among the railroad workers.

More generally, in most other places, the CP activists are running up against the incomprehension of the broad mass of workers. These workers placed their hopes in an electoral victory that would produce a change in the government. They do not understand why such a victory should be put in question for the sake of adding a few subsidiaries to the list of companies to be nationalized. Consternation is widespread, and long faces can be seen everywhere.

This mood on the part of the broad mass of workers explains the uneasiness in the CP rank and file. In a big factory in the Bordeaux region, where the CP has long been strong, our correspondents report that this time many workers think "the CP went a bit far." . . .

In the Paris region, where we questioned many plant correspondents, the conclusions tend to be the same. Except for a few nuclei of hardened sectarian CP activists, most party members are beginning to become demoralized in the face of the response of the broad mass of workers.

In the early stage of the dispute, the CP did score some points. It got the support of many militant activists, who were critical of the moderate nature of the SP proposals. After the September 23-24 split, the opposite reaction has been developing. A disgusted ministry clerk refused to take the CP leaflets, although she willingly distributed others in the previous days.

The abrupt split in the Union of the Left was seen by the workers as an inexplicable defeat. *Rouge* continued:

Many workers agreed with what was said in a guest column in the September 25 *Le Monde* by two SP activists.

"We cannot accept the idea that it has all been in vain. We see the right, which had been humiliated and in disarray, beginning to raise its head again. The Union of the Left, which so worried the right, will do the reactionaries a favor if it splits because this will enable the rightists to go on exploiting people tranquilly for many more years."

Rouge commented:

These workers have often taken the attacks of the bosses without fighting back, accepting changes in hours and layoffs in the hope that in six months' time they could settle accounts with the employers. So, a split in the Union of the Left is felt as a disaster. No one knows how long it will take to regain what has been lost if the right and its stooges remain in the government.

The CP's response to the split was rather sectarian, *Rouge* reported:

To read *l'Humanité*, you would think that all has been going well the last few days. . . . Requests to join the CP are flooding in. In Toulouse "three members of the CFTD [Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail—French Democratic Confederation of Labor, an independent federation that has moved close to the renovated SP] have asked to join our party after reading the document we published. Twenty-one workers in the Massy industrial complex have done likewise, and there are thousands like them."

Nonetheless, *Rouge* reported that the CP leadership did not seem to be launching an all-out campaign against the SP, and that the membership was not favorable to baiting of Social Democrats.

The CP assemblies that were called Saturday [September 24] in about a dozen cities, with appearances by members of the CP Political Committee, were heavily attended. The sentiment was for unity, even though a minority took the occasion to do some "Social-Democrat baiting." The anti-SP attitudes appeared most often among long-time CP activists linked to CP-controlled city governments.

Such anti-SP reactions might be encouraged by the attitude of one or another SP leader. In Marseilles, this was certainly the case. Here a CP district assembly had to meet out in the open because the [SP] mayor had refused to grant a hall. We should also note that sometimes it has been the CP that has given an "excessively" strong interpretation to the rupture.

In Dijon last Sunday, at a party in support of workers at a factory where a struggle is taking place, the CP representative made a violently

anti-SP speech and then refused to let the SP mayor of Chênove speak. That town is most directly involved in the struggle. But these lapses are still exceptions. Neither the CP or the SP ranks seem to want a split.

The French press in general seems quite sensitive to signs of sectarian rivalry between the SP and CP. Apparently the split in the Union of the Left has raised the specter of the sectarian war waged by the Portuguese CP and SP in the spring and summer of 1975. The events in Portugal had a big impact on French politics.

Up until the suspension of negotiations among the Union of the Left parties on September 24, most commentators in the French press expected the contending parties to reach some sort of compromise.

Throughout the three weeks in which the split developed, reporter after reporter and commentator after commentator in *Le Monde*, France's politically most sophisticated bourgeois daily, pointed out how unessential the differences between the CP and SP proposals were. On this basis, they generally assumed that each of the parties had limited objectives in the dispute.

It was pointed out that the CP needed to adopt a more aggressive stance toward its allies and score some points for militancy. Since the formation of the Union of the Left, the CP had been experiencing an "identity crisis." The ranks could not see what the difference was between the proposals of their party and those of the SP.

Moreover, while the CP had paid a price for the Union of the Left, the SP was getting all the gravy. By reviving the SP's credibility as an electoral party, the popular-front alliance had rescued it from a moribund state. Then, the revived SP was able to project an all-inclusive image and to benefit from a lack of identification with Stalinist dogma. So, it zoomed way ahead of the CP in electoral support. Therefore, commentators speculated, the CP had to score some points against the SP in order to mend its fences and to impress on the Social Democratic leaders that it insisted on having its interests taken into account in the division of the spoils.

Likewise, the SP objections were thought to be tactically motivated. As the elections approached, it was expected that the SP would have a greater interest in proving its moderation to the bourgeoisie, since it would obviously be the largest party in a Union of the Left government.

In the same way, the sudden intransigence of the Left Radicals was attributed to a desire simply to score some points. On its own, this fragment of the old liberal bourgeois party has very little weight. Inside the Union of the Left, it has considerable importance because it represents the liberal bourgeois forces that both the CP and SP leaders want to ally themselves with. It represents, moreover, a

guarantee to the bourgeoisie that a Union of the Left government will remain within the bourgeois framework.

The Left Radicals have tended to be the silent partner in the Union of the Left. Some commentators wrote that this party's suddenly springing to life as the paladin of private property in the alliance simply reflected a desire to take advantage of the SP-CP polemics to establish a more independent image. Some attributed this to an attempt by the party chairman, Robert Fabre, a druggist from the south of France, to bolster his own position in the Radical leadership.

The Left Radicals called for "updating" the Union of the Left program in another way than the CP. They centered their fire on a phrase in the document granting workers the right to call for nationalization of their plants. Ironically, while Fabre portrayed the CP as the "collectivist" menace in the Union of the Left, the CP representatives pointed out that the phrase in question had been included not on their insistence but on that of the Socialist Party.

In a debate with Fabre, the French CP General Secretary Georges Marchais expressed astonishment at the hue and cry raised by the Radicals. The following exchange is part of the debate, which was broadcast over French TV on September 15:

Marchais. You [the Left Radicals] approved this phrase in the Common Program when you signed it in 1972. . . . The phrase is anodyne. The phrase is anodyne.

Fabre. Why not take it out then?

Marchais. The workers already have the right to demand nationalizations. They exercise it through their unions. The 1958 constitution [imposed by de Gaulle] includes the preamble of the 1946 constitution, which says: "Any property or enterprise that becomes a public service or de facto monopoly can become the property of the collectivity." Why take a constitutional right away from the workers? Just because the right is raising a howl? We are not adding anything; we are not taking anything back either.

Fabre. Why have you changed your position? You agreed with us to take this phrase out because it was provoking baseless criticisms from our opponents.

Marchais. Taking it out would not change anything about these attacks. Better leave it in. There is no danger of the nationalized sector expanding out of the control of the government and the parliament.

Fabre. Why don't you admit that you don't want to make any concessions?

Marchais. Pierre Mauroy has said that the SP will not agree to this phrase being taken out.

On the question of the additional nationalizations, Marchais said:

We are calling for nationalizing less than 1 percent of French industrial firms. At the time of liberation, de Gaulle nationalized twice as many. Was he a horrid collectivist?

Before the breakdown of negotiations September 23-24, the CP had already reduced its list of additional nationaliza-

tions by half.

In its September 27 issue, *Rouge* listed twenty trusts not included on the list of proposed nationalizations that alone represented more in terms of workers and capital than the 479 companies the CP proposed adding, beyond the SP list. The Trotskyist daily also noted that the CP had not said anything about reducing compensation in proposing new nationalizations. The SP's main argument against the expanded list was the expense of compensating the owners. It claimed that there were cheaper ways of assuring public control than outright nationalization. Both the SP and CP pledged that under a Union of the Left government, the capitalist, market economy would be preserved.

It is not surprising that the split in the Union of the Left over the stated differences between the three parties was incomprehensible to the French people.

Of course, it is still possible to close the rift before the March elections. But the public rupture has already greatly damaged the credibility of the Union of the Left and set in motion forces difficult to control.

If the objective of the three Union of the Left parties was really to win the elections, it does not seem that any points they could score in a dispute of this type would be worth the risks.

In fact, the sudden torpedoing of an electoral alliance virtually assured of victory aroused extensive speculation in the press about ulterior motives on the part of the groups involved, virtually none of which was likely to enhance their electoral image.

For example, in the September 25 *Le Monde*, André Fontaine argued that pressure from the Kremlin may have forced the CP to scuttle the Union of the Left. He noted a number of instances in the past of Soviet leaders and representatives displaying special warmth for Gaullist politicians. He explained that the Soviet diplomatic representatives in Paris had long made no secret of their opinion that the best alternative for Soviet interests was a French bourgeois government that would take a more independent stance toward Washington.

The Soviet representatives, Fontaine said, had let it be known that they did not think a Union of the Left government would prove viable. They allegedly argued first that the economic crisis was deeper than the Union of the Left leaders realized and would force them, once in office, to apply a policy of austerity that would cost them much of their following. Secondly, they were supposed to have maintained that the U.S. would not tolerate a left government and would carry out a Chile-type operation against it. Such arguments showed, according to Fontaine, that the Soviets were willing to sacrifice a Union of the Left government for the sake of détente.

Other commentators speculated that the CP wanted to pull back from a Union of the Left victory in order to sabotage the SP. That is, the SP has grown rapidly by attracting disparate elements that could be held together only by the perspective of a rapid electoral victory. Thus, if such a victory were deferred, the SP would begin to come apart, while the more disciplined CP could afford to wait.

On the other hand, some commentators speculated that the SP might have decided to call the CP's bluff because, with the demise of the Union of the Left, it would emerge as the only alternative to the present government and might get a big enough plurality to form a minority government, with the help of the "liberal" Gaullist president, Giscard d'Estaing. During the debates around the Union of the Left split, this was actually raised as a possibility by Gaston Deferre, mayor of Marseilles and one of the most outspokenly anti-Communist of the SP leaders.

One thing is certain, and seems generally accepted, the explanations given for the rupture by the Union of the Left parties themselves do not stand up under scrutiny.

It is possible that the SP leadership entertains the idea of an SP minority government. In any case, that is the most ambitious alternative they can offer the party after a split in the Union of the Left.

But an SP minority government or alliance with "liberal" Gaullists would be a risky proposition. In the first place, taking this course would mean exchanging certain victory for an uncertain chance of a bigger SP vote. Secondly, even if the SP were successful, this would mean leaving the opposition to the CP during a period of economic decline. The French Social Democrats have seen the Italian SP cut to pieces by the CP in a similar situation.

An SP minority government is referred to as a "Soares line" in the French press, but in Portugal Soares himself insisted on including the CP in the government originally and did not shift to the idea of an SP minority government until the CP had gravely discredited itself.

Furthermore, any speculation that the SP wants to go it alone now runs up against the fact that the CP has been the aggressor all along in the dispute, and could have scored any limited points it considered necessary without pushing the operation through to a break.

On the other hand, the CP leaders must realize that the SP is less likely to break up if it does not take on governmental responsibility, since it can continue to appeal to contradictory interests.

The theory that the Kremlin forced the French CP to torpedo the Union of the Left also overlooks the fact that the party leadership has shown in the past year and a half that it is capable of clashing rather sharply with the Kremlin when it thinks its electoral interests are at stake.

Moreover, all the theories that put the

blame exclusively on one or another of the three parties in the Union of the Left run up against the fact that each one of them moved unhesitatingly, and in an apparently well-prepared way toward the break.

In all the speculation in the French press, one fairly obvious explanation for the crisis of the Union of the Left seems to have gone unnoticed. It is one that would be damaging to the pretenses of both the bourgeois and reformist forces, and a rude shock to the illusions of the petty-bourgeois supporters of the popular-front alliance. It may be that the bourgeoisie simply let the Union of the Left parties know in sufficiently forceful terms that it did not think the time was right to hand the government over to them.

The tensions in French society had been increasing in anticipation of a Union of the Left victory. A flight of capital had already been in progress for some time. Capitalist investment had seriously slowed. Scare propaganda increased with the beginning of the fall on the theme that a Union of the Left government would create chaos in France. It was obvious that the workers and poor masses were just waiting for a Union of the Left victory to start pressing their demands.

Thus, if the Union of the Left formed a government after March, it could touch off a mass upsurge that neither of the main parties in the bloc nor the bourgeoisie wants. The reformists seek the approval of the bourgeoisie on the basis of being the last hope for holding back the masses, short of direct confrontation. If a popular-front government threatens to promote struggles rather than contain them, the reformists lose their selling point to the bourgeoisie, and that would be fatal to their perspectives.

Stalinist parties around the world drew the conclusion from the Chile experience that it was necessary to be more cautious about attempting popular-front governments. This attitude has been demonstrated in practice in Portugal and Spain, as well as in the obvious determination of the Italian CP to avoid a left majority in the June 1976 national elections.

Furthermore, the French bourgeoisie had the ability to blow up the Union of the Left at any time through the Left Radicals, its Trojan horse in the front.

Thus, within the framework of the Union of the Left, the SP and CP had little alternative if the bourgeoisie decided to firmly oppose a popular-front experiment but to retreat and try to hold their respective bases, waiting for the time when the capitalists need them.

However, in trying to carry out such a retreat, the CP and SP will run the risk of losing control over sections of the working class. It is impossible to predict how extensive or long-lasting a demoralization may be caused by the split in the Union of the Left. But it is likely that sections of the working class will decide that they have to

start fighting again for their demands, without waiting anymore for elections. It is also likely that many will begin to ask questions about how victory could be snatched from them so easily.

One of the gravest dangers posed by a definitive breakdown of the Union of the Left is a growth of sectarian rivalry between the CP and SP, similar to what happened in Portugal. In particular, since the reformist leaders will have no convincing explanation for the failure of the alliance, they will need scapegoats.

In a statement published in the September 26 issue of *Rouge*, the Political Bureau of the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Communist League, French section of the Fourth International) appealed to the workers organizations not to let a breakdown of the Union of the Left divide the workers in their struggles:

The workers know that it is possible in a democratically conducted strike to discuss everything and still maintain unity in action against the bosses. . . .

Let assemblies be called in all the plants where all the unions and workers parties can explain their positions. After a democratic debate, the workers should be consulted and the CP and SP should agree to respect their decisions regarding the issue of nationalizations but also the minimum wage, the hierarchy in the plant, working conditions, jobs, and the army. . . .

The unity the workers need is not with some section of the bourgeoisie; it is unity with the workers themselves, the unity of their organizations behind their demands, behind an offensive to drive Giscard and Barre [the premier] from office.

A split in the working class will not only mean that the right will win the elections but the Barre plan [austerity] will be applied to the fullest and repression by the bosses will be stepped up. . . .

We call on the SP and CP activists to join in forming united committees in the plants and neighborhoods open to all workers who agree on the need to oust the Giscard-Barre government and who want to discuss the program of an SP-CP government to meet the aspirations of the workers. □

Still Available

Complete Back Files (Unbound) Intercontinental Press

1967	42 issues (1,072 pages)	\$25
1968	44 issues (1,176 pages)	\$25
1969	43 issues (1,152 pages)	\$25
1970	43 issues (1,120 pages)	\$25
1971	45 issues (1,128 pages)	\$25
1972	47 issues (1,448 pages)	\$25
1973	46 issues (1,520 pages)	\$25
1974	47 issues (1,888 pages)	\$25
1975	47 issues (1,888 pages)	\$35
1976	49 issues (1,888 pages)	\$35

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

The Shah Puts a New Prime Minister in Charge

By Ali Golestan

Iran's Prime Minister Amir Abbas Hoveyda, who resigned August 6 after almost thirteen years in office, was replaced the following day by Jamshid Amouzegar. Amouzegar was the chief OPEC negotiator for Iran and minister of oil in the shah's cabinet before his present appointment.

No specific reason was given by Iranian officials for this change in the administration. It was perhaps intended as a sop to a discontented populace.

Under Hoveyda, Iran's electricity network broke down. Power shortages during the summer paralyzed plants, hospitals, government offices, cold storage facilities, etc.

After the first breakdown, the government decided to schedule daily blackouts of up to five hours for various parts of the country. This situation continued for more than three months, with total breakdowns occurring frequently. Not until September 3 did the government announce a possible end to the blackouts for Tehran. The end, however, still remains only "possible." Many plants and hospitals have installed their own generators.

Both Hoveyda and Amouzegar have blamed various persons and "Western technology" for the failures. The shah, in a speech commemorating the twenty-fourth anniversary of the 1953 coup that restored him to power, blamed individual incompetence for the failures.

Another major problem has been a leap in housing shortages and a huge increase in construction costs in Tehran. A reporter in the Tehran daily *Kayhan* noted that with the money needed to obtain an average house in Tehran, one can live luxuriously in Southern California.

Changes in the mortgage rate or permitting construction in previously forbidden zones have failed to alleviate the problem. The present housing shortage followed a long period of speculation based on spiraling land prices.

A member of the parliament, quoted in the August 25 issue of *Etela'at*, asserted that the price of land has increased by an average of 2,000 percent in the last decade in Tehran. This amounts to an average yearly increase of 200 percent.

Coupled with this is a shortage of construction materials, notably cement. This factor alone caused both a price increase in housing and a slowdown in construction.

Other problems marked Hoveyda's years in office: a shortage in food items, in particular meat and dairy products; mounting bureaucratism and corruption to such an extent that bribery is almost a requisite to get anything done; and, of course, rampant inflation.

On top of all this, Iran has suffered for twenty-four years under the oppressive rule of the shah. The crowned cannibal gained power through a CIA-engineered coup in 1953 that overthrew the government of Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh.

Ever since then the masses have lived in a nightmare of terror. Immediately after the coup, thousands of persons were either executed or killed under torture. Then in 1957, SAVAK, the dreaded secret police, was created with the aid of the CIA and the Israeli secret police. Together with the military forces, SAVAK has been able to maintain the dictatorship by using violence and terrorism against political dissidents.

At present the number of political prisoners is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 100,000. Torture has been used routinely to either make the prisoners "confess" or to break them down to praise the shah on television or in the newspapers.

According to government figures, more than 400 persons have either been executed or shot on the streets in the past five years.

Today protest is rising. As has been reported in *Intercontinental Press*, Iranian writers, poets, translators, research specialists, and critics have recently written two protest letters to the government demanding the right to organize, to publish, and to meet regularly without censorship or harassment from the government officials. Forty persons signed the first letter.¹ The second letter was signed by ninety-eight.²

In another move, a group of about sixty Iranian lawyers wrote two letters this summer to the shah's office in Tehran. In their first letter, these lawyers protested the passage of a law that violates the constitution.

1. See "For an End to the Shah's Suppression of Free Speech" in *Intercontinental Press*, July 18, 1977, p. 826.

2. See "Second Open Letter to the Prime Minister of Iran" in *Intercontinental Press*, September 12, 1977, p. 982.

In their second letter, July 31, they listed four demands:

1. That the laws on the functioning of the judiciary be respected, and the independence of the courts be assured.

2. That the executive power stay within "the powers given to it by the constitution and that it be responsible to the legislative power."

3. That "the legislative power be elected free of fear of harassment by the executive power."

4. That the democratic rights of "the Iranian people, in particular freedom of speech, freedom to write, and freedom of association, be respected."

Many others have also written letters of protest to the government. The most famous of these personalities is the Iranian writer Ali Asghar Hadj-Seyed-Javadi. In fact, he was one of the first to start the protest campaign more than a year ago. In his last letter, written in July, he lodged an "indictment on behalf of the Iranian people against Hoveyda." He charged Hoveyda and his administration with the following crimes:

1. That he violated the constitution by "granting to the monarchy powers given to the ministers and the government in the constitution." According to the Iranian constitution the shah is the formal head of state as in England.

2. That SAVAK is "part of the organization of the prime minister," and that it has served as an "instrument of repression, terror, and torture against the Iranian people." Therefore, Hoveyda and his ministers are "responsible for all the crimes, torture, interrogations, and illegal arrests committed by SAVAK against the Iranian people, victim of these crimes along with the political prisoners."

3. That "... Mr. Hoveyda and his administration have stripped the Iranian people of their right to participate in associations, political parties, and genuine trade unions. They have forced many citizens and in particular government employees to join the Rastakhiz Party [the only legal party in Iran]."

He went on to protest other hardships such as inflation and the housing shortage. In this regard, he said: "You blame the 'weak Western technology' and industry for the breakdown of the power generators causing blackouts in the scorching heat of the summer. Yet it is the Westerners who land a man on the moon, and sell you the most sophisticated

arms. . . . And as long as the West supports you with its dollars and its intelligence organizations, you will continue to give the West the entire wealth belonging to the Iranian people and all their rights and freedoms."

This mood of protest is also reflected in the newspapers of Iran where various individuals have taken up such issues as censorship of books and movies and asked that it be ended.

The government has not yet cracked down on the protesters. In fact it has released some 340 political prisoners in a much publicized move and it has relaxed some of the censorship laws.

Such a concession could have been predicted, since the Iranian government had hinted earlier at a change in policy in response to criticisms directed against it from abroad. In fact the inability of the government to suppress the protests seems to be a direct result of the international campaign against repression in Iran. This has also been noted and appreciated by those fighting the repressive system inside Iran.

In a long statement that appeared in the September issue of *Payam Daneshjoo* (Students' Correspondence), a magazine published in New York, a number of Iranian intellectuals belonging to the "Group for the Freedom of Books and Thought" wrote:

First of all, we think it is necessary to send greetings on the broadest scale to the "Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran," and its conscious activists whose extended and fruitful activities have been widely reflected inside Iran. While it has given hope to those who seek freedom, it has at the same time aroused fear in the institutions of terror and repression in Iran and has forced them to react. Obviously, our deep gratitude for the antiregime activities of "the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran," does not at all mean our underestimation or ignoring of the very fruitful activities of other groups of the opposition and in particular the Confederation of the Iranian Students and the Union of the Moslem Students of Iran abroad, and other antiregime groups.

Secondly, we . . . request of all the antiregime groups that regardless of their ideological differences they utilize all the forces and facilities available to them . . . to expand their popular and wide-ranging activities. . . . And considering the favorable atmosphere now prevailing abroad against the dictator and the dictatorship, they should try to disseminate the truth about Iran among the people of the countries where they live.

The statement also discussed the use of violence and the violation of democratic rights among components of the campaign:

We hear with great regret and sorrow that some individuals and groups, who are themselves against the regime, disrupt meetings organized against repression in Iran in which foreign personalities participate; and that this causes reluctance among these individuals to participate further in them. . . . Who is to blame



SHAH: New regime—same old torture.

for such incorrect methods? SAVAK provocateurs or those who, despite their honesty, are unable to comprehend the fundamental problems involved in the struggle under these conditions? We request that all the antiregime forces and organizations, while holding to their ideological positions, do not neglect to cooperate with "the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran" whose activities have borne such fruitful results and have resulted in such great hopes.

The statement also contains considerable information about the mechanisms of Iranian censorship and its evolution; how various writers and intellectuals have been defamed through forged articles to which their names have been falsely attached, praising the shah; and information on torture and imprisonment, and the violations of human rights. The statement ends by again urging unity among the forces abroad fighting against repression in Iran.

* * *

It is against this background that the shift in prime ministers took place. Internal, as well as international pressures had reached such a level that a new administration with new promises was required. The new prime minister has done very little so far and in fact seems incapable of solving any of the problems that he inherited from Hoveyda. Power shortages, high prices, an acute shortage of housing, scarcity of some food items, and repression still persist.

In announcing the policies of his administration to the parliament, Amouzegar introduced nothing new. No reduction in the purchase of arms, no change in foreign policy, etc., as "these policies are determined by His Imperial Majesty."

There is, however, one shift in policy, and that is to keep the Iranian capitalists more satisfied by a promise to better integrate them on the governmental level and grant them a bigger share of the sector of industry now controlled by the government. To show his good will, Amouzegar appointed Kazem Khosrow Shahi, one of the richest Iranian capitalists, as the minister of trade.

It is already obvious that this administration lacks popular support. If the present momentum of the fight against repression is maintained, it is very likely that the more oppressed layers of Iranian society will mount a real challenge to the shah and his entire system of repression, economic anarchy, and misery. □

Women Protesters Defy Guinea Cops

Police in Guinea fired on a crowd of protesting women in Conakry, according to a report cited in the September 12 issue of the London weekly *West Africa*. The women, who were food vendors in the market, had marched to Sékou Touré's presidential palace to protest abuses by his economic police. According to the report, they were met by "sustained" fire from the guards and a number of them were wounded. The women reportedly responded by sacking ten police posts in the capital and by staging further demonstrations.

Touré originally denied the reports, but later admitted that "subversive" demonstrations by women had taken place. He was quoted over Radio Conakry as stating that the protests had been "premeditated" by agents of the fifth column and were carried out by a small handful of women."

A Breakthrough for Journalists?

Roger Bennett, a former newspaper reporter and editor, is at work on a new, improved method of lie detection.

Bennett claims to have discovered that "split-second facial expressions known as 'micromomentaries' occur at the precise moment a person is telling a lie," the *New York Times* reported September 25.

After he was interviewed on a national radio show about his discoveries, Bennett was besieged with requests to teach his techniques. One request came from the U.S. Treasury Department.

Bennett has declined, so far. "I want this more than anything to be a reporter's tool," he says. "I've read where a lot of public relations firms teach their clients how to deal with hostile interviewers, meaning us, the press. Well, if they're training people how to lie to us, I want to train reporters how to see right through them."

An Appraisal of the Political Life of Mao Tse-tung

[First of four parts]

[The following interview with Peng Shu-tse, a founding leader of the Chinese Communist Party and of the Chinese Trotskyist movement, was obtained by Rose Connolly on March 14, 1977. After the interview, Comrade Peng enlarged his answers.]

[Quotes from Chinese Communist Party documents and leaders' speeches and writings were generally translated by Peng from original Chinese sources. Where possible these have been changed to conform with published English versions. All footnotes are by *Intercontinental Press*.]

Q. Since the death of Mao last September 9, politicians throughout the world have praised Mao as a great leader and peacemaker. What is your opinion of Mao's achievements?

A. To analyze Mao's achievements it is necessary to outline his ideas and actions throughout his entire life. We must "call things by their right names," as Trotsky once said.

Mao joined the Communist movement in the fall of 1920 and attended the founding congress of the Chinese Communist Party in July 1921. He was sent to Hunan to become secretary of the branch there.

During his two years in Hunan, Mao was an active local leader and made certain contributions in the student and workers' movements. However, he was responsible for forcing two leading comrades, Ho Ming-fan and Li Ta,¹ out of the party, indicating his arbitrary and bureaucratic tendencies.

Q. What was Mao's role in the 1927 revolution?

A. When Stalin, through the Comintern, ordered the CCP to join the Kuomintang in early 1923, Mao not only supported this opportunistic policy but attempted to theo-

retically justify it. In an article entitled "The Peking Coup d'Etat and the Merchants,"² Mao stated:

The present political problem in China is none other than the problem of the national revolution. . . . The revolution is the task of the people as a whole. . . . Nevertheless, the merchants [the bourgeoisie] are the ones who feel these sufferings most acutely and most urgently.

Mao also stated:

The Shanghai merchants have arisen and begun to act. We hope that the merchants outside of Shanghai will all rise up and act together. . . . The broader the organization of merchants, the greater will be their influence, the greater will be their ability to lead the people of the whole country, and the more rapid the success of the revolution!³

Mao then put this Menshevik line into practice, devoting all his efforts for many years to working for China's bourgeois party, the Kuomintang (KMT).

Mao was elected to the Central Committee of the CCP at its Third Congress in June 1923 and given the post of organizational secretary, but he neglected this work in favor of working in the Shanghai headquarters of the KMT. In the autumn of 1924 Mao abandoned his CCP post and moved to Hunan, where he tried to launch a peasant movement, ending with failure. Then he moved to Canton and became secretary of the KMT propaganda section under Wang Ching-wei, and editor of the magazine *Political Weekly*. Through the pages of this publication, Mao actively propagated the "Three People's Principles" of Sun Yat-sen.

In March 1926, under pressure from CCP cadres, Mao wrote "Analysis of the Classes in China," in which he seemingly altered his rightist position. He acknowledged that "the industrial proletariat is the leading force in our revolution" but divided the bourgeoisie into "right" and "left" wings, stating "its left wing may become our friend. . . ." Hence, he reasoned, the policy of KMT-CCP collaboration should be maintained indefinitely.

Just after publication of Mao's article in *Peasant Monthly* in early March, 1926, the "left wing" of the bourgeoisie, led by Chiang Kai-shek, launched the March 20

coup d'état, expelling all the Communists, including Mao, from the headquarters of the KMT. Mao then went to Shanghai and was assigned by the CCP Central Committee to lead the peasant movement.

He went to Hunan to gather facts, which he published in his "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan." This report has been called by the Maoists a "classic document" of CCP-led peasant struggle.⁵ Some foreign scholars, such as Benjamin Schwartz, praise this report as the starting point of the rise of Mao.⁶

The report makes no proposals for resolving questions such as leadership of the peasant movement and confiscation and redistribution of the land, but only contains descriptions of the peasants' actions and defends their excesses against their detractors. Mao's only proposal was that "the revolutionary authority must correct all the mistakes regarding the peasant movement," the "revolutionary authority" at the time being Chiang Kai-shek, Wang Ching-wei, and T'ang Sheng-chih.

After leaving Hunan, Mao went to Wuhan, where he participated in a land reform committee led by the KMT. He also became an officer of the Provisional National Association of Peasants, but never made any formal proposals for land reform to that body or to the CCP leadership. On the contrary, Mao carried out Stalin's opportunistic line, while the situation in Wuhan became worse and worse.

In the Soviet Union, Trotsky proposed that the policy of KMT-CCP collaboration end immediately and that the CCP lead an independent movement of workers, peasants, and soldiers to form soviets and take power. Stalin opposed this, and as a result the so-called revolutionary authority in Wuhan, headed by Wang Ching-wei, expelled all the Communists from the KMT and the army and disbanded all the mass organizations, including the Provisional National Association of Peasants. Thus on July 15, 1927, the second Chinese revolution was tragically defeated.

Q. Since Mao was submerged inside the KMT most of this time, when did he become prominent as a Communist?

A. Following the defeat of the 1927 revolution, Stalin changed his policy from

1. Ho was a founder of the Communist group in Hunan, and Li was one of the founders of the Communist group in Shanghai. After leaving the party, both continued to propagate Communism. Ho helped establish an association of peasants in Shaoyang, his native county, and after the 1925-27 revolution was arrested and imprisoned for many years. Li translated Marxist books and influenced many students as a professor, and later president, at Wuhan University. He was dismissed from the university during the Cultural Revolution, and died in 1966 while undergoing persecution by Mao's Red Guards, who refused to allow him to receive medical treatment.

2. Published in the party organ *Hsiang-tao*, July 11, 1923.

3. *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung*, by Stuart R. Schram (New York: Praeger, 1963), p. 140.

4. *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1955), vol. 1, p. 20.

5. *Thirty Years of the CCP*, by Hu Ch'ao-mu (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1952), p. 9.

6. *Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao*, by Benjamin Schwartz (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 73-78.

extreme opportunism to extreme left adventurism, ordering the CCP to launch an armed struggle for power. To put the new plan into effect, the CCP leadership under Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai called an emergency conference on August 7, 1927. The conference adopted an open letter to the CCP membership, absolving Stalin of his role in the defeat and laying the blame on Ch'en Tu-hsiu. Mao completely supported this deception.

The conference adopted a resolution for initiation of a "harvest uprising" in Hunan and Hupeh. Mao was sent to Hunan to lead the uprising, which involved around 3,000 people and took place September 8-17, 1927. Hundreds were killed or wounded by KMT troops. In utter defeat, Mao escaped with his remaining people to Ching-kangshan, arriving in October 1927.

Mao and his followers waited in total isolation for further direction from the CCP. Two bandit groups joined them, claiming allegiance to Communism. The bandits' leaders, Yuan Wen-ts'ai and Wang Tso, pledged to struggle under Mao. However, after Mao left Ching-kangshan, the bandits returned to their former activities and were later killed by peasants.

Meanwhile, an uprising of 30,000 people in Nanchang, capital of Kiangsi Province, was led by the CCP under Ho Lung, Yeh T'ing, and Chu Te, under the leadership of Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai. The uprising was quickly defeated, forcing Ho, Yeh, and Chu to lead a retreat to Swatow in the province of Kwangtung.

In December 1927, a CCP-led uprising in Canton was tragically defeated, with the loss of more than 5,000 lives. Stalin's policy of armed struggle in China was demonstrated in blood as totally bankrupt.

A congress of the Comintern was held in Moscow in August 1928, which evaluated the situation. But rather than learning from the devastating defeats, the delegates adopted a resolution for continuing the armed struggle:

... at the present time, the Party must everywhere propagate among the masses the idea of Soviets, the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, and the inevitability of the coming revolutionary mass armed uprising. . . . it must consistently and undeviatingly follow the line of seizure of State power, organisation of Soviets as organs of the insurrection. . . . In China, the future growth of the revolution will place before the Party as an immediate practical task the preparation for and carrying through of armed insurrection as the sole path to the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and to the overthrow of the . . . Kuomintang.⁷

This resolution reached Mao at Ching-kangshan in the autumn of 1928. Chu Te had already brought the remainder of his troops there from Swatow, and they were soon joined by a large army unit commanded by P'eng Te-huai, which had

7. *International Press Correspondence*, December 12, 1928, pp. 1670, 1672.

revolted against the KMT. All these troops were formally organized into the Red Army.

The new Red Army set out from Ching-kangshan in early 1929 to expand CCP territory. They occupied a number of counties in western Kiangsi and southeast Hunan, establishing soviets, increasing the size of the army, and extending land reform wherever they went.

In December 1930, the CCP called the first Congress of Soviets in Kiangsi, which established a "Soviet government" with Mao as its elected chairman. Chu Te then became general commander of the Red Army.

In response to these advances by the CCP, Chiang Kai-shek attempted several attacks on the Soviet areas during 1931, losing thousands of troops and weapons to the Red Army. In April 1933, Chiang launched his fourth attack on the Red Army and met an even worse defeat. He lost two divisions of soldiers, and the commanders of these divisions were taken prisoner.

A representative from Moscow arrived in January 1931 in Shanghai to reorganize the CCP Central Committee there. Li Lisan was replaced in the leadership by Wang Ming.

Meanwhile, many CCP members and cadres were being arrested, some of whom were executed if they didn't capitulate. For safety, Wang's Central Committee moved to the Soviet base in early 1933. All Mao's power was taken from him and chiefly delegated to Vice-Chairman Hsiang Ying. Mao retained only the title of chairman of the Soviet government—a heavy blow.

The entire Soviet area in Kiangsi and Fukien had been surrounded by more than a million of Chiang's troops imposing a total blockade and extreme hardship. Thus, Mao and Chu Te in October 1934 began the Long March to Yen-an in the northeast of China. Already, when they left Kiangsi, over a million peasants had been killed or died of hunger.⁸

During the march, Mao held a Political Committee meeting in Tsunyi, Kweichow Province, at which he was elected chairman of the party and restored to leadership of the Red Army.

When the Red Army arrived in northern Shensi Province in October 1935, it had been reduced from 300,000 to less than 30,000.⁹ In addition, since the launching of the armed struggle, the KMT had severely suppressed CCP organizations that remained in the big cities such as Shanghai, Wuhan, Peking, and Tientsin. More than 10,000 cadres and members of the CCP and its youth affiliate had been arrested or killed or forced to capitulate. Workers' organizations were completely destroyed. Stalin's adventurous policy of armed strug-

8. *Red Star Over China*, by Edgar Snow (New York: Garden City Publishing Co., 1939), p. 171ff.

9. *Thirty Years of the CCP*, p. 9.

gle for power, promoted by Mao and the other leaders of the CCP, was defeated. A tremendous sacrifice was paid in human life.

When the remnants of the Red Army arrived in Shensi, Mao appealed to all parties and groupings, including the KMT, to establish "a national front against Japanese imperialism," modeled after the "People's Front against fascism" line of the Comintern.¹⁰

Chiang rejected Mao's proposal and sent troops led by Chang Hsuëh-liang to Shensi to surround Yen-an in hopes of destroying the Red Army. Chiang intended to personally supervise the attack but was arrested by a group of Chang Hsuëh-liang's subordinates who had a personal hatred for Chiang for allowing the Japanese to occupy their homeland in Manchuria.

The officers intended to execute Chiang, but Stalin sent a telegram to the CCP instructing them to bargain with the captive. Mao dispatched Chou En-lai to convince Chiang to lead the resistance war against Japan. He agreed. The CCP then liquidated the soviets, abandoned land reform, and reorganized the Red Army into a national army under Chiang's command. Thus, KMT-CCP collaboration was achieved for a second time with Mao's strong support.

Q. This so-called bargain with Chiang looks like a class-collaborationist agreement in which all the concessions were made by Mao.

A. In effect, yes. After ten years of struggle, the CCP virtually surrendered to the KMT. The terms of the agreement between the CCP and KMT were contained in a manifesto published by the CCP Central Committee July 15, 1937:

(1) The *San-min chui* (Three People's Principles) enunciated by Sun Yat-sen are the paramount need of China today. This Party is ready to strive for their thorough realization.

(2) (This Party) abandons all its policy of overthrowing the KMT by force and the movement of sovietization, and discontinues its policy of forcible confiscation of land from landlords.

(3) (This Party) abolishes the present Soviet government and practices democracy based on the people's rights in order to unify the national political power.

(4) (This Party) abolishes the designation of the Red Army, reorganizes it into the National Revolutionary Army, places it under the control of the Military Affairs Commission of the National government, and awaits orders for mobilization to shoulder the responsibility of resisting Japanese aggression at the front.¹¹

Chiang had been under heavy criticism by the masses for not organizing resist-

10. *Ibid.*, p. 88.

11. *A Documentary History of Chinese Communism*, by Conrad Brandt, Benjamin Schwartz, and John K. Fairbank (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 246.

ance to the Japanese, and some of his officers were on the verge of revolt. Publication of the CCP manifesto gave Chiang a new lease on life and also caused great confusion among the ranks of the CCP.

Q. Was there any opposition to the manifesto within the CCP?

A. Those who understood its real meaning were very angry. Mao was compelled to write a series of articles to justify the new opportunism. In his article "The Tasks of the CCP in the Period of Resistance to Japan," Mao explained, "The revolutionary Three People's Principles of Sun Yat-sen are necessary. . . . The collaboration between the two parties [KMT and CCP] . . . is completely in conformity with the historical needs of the Chinese revolution."¹²

Mao's illusions in the KMT are evident in this quote from his article "On the New Stage":

. . . the Kuomintang and the Communist Party are the foundation of the Anti-Japanese United Front, but of these two it is the Kuomintang that occupies first place. Without the Kuomintang, it would be inconceivable to undertake and pursue the War of Resistance. In the course of its glorious history, the Kuomintang has been responsible for the overthrow of the Ch'ing, the establishment of the Republic, opposition to Yüan Shih-k'ai, establishment of the Three Policies of uniting with Russia, with the Communist Party, and with the workers and peasants, and the great revolution of 1926-27. Today it is once more leading the great anti-Japanese war. It enjoys the historic heritage of the Three People's Principles; it has had two great leaders in succession—Mr. Sun Yat-sen and Mr. Chiang Kai-shek; it has a great number of faithful and patriotic active members. All this should not be underestimated by our compatriots and constitutes the result of China's historical development.

In carrying out the anti-Japanese war, and in organizing the Anti-Japanese United Front, the Kuomintang occupies the position of leader and framework. . . . Under the single great condition that it support to the end the war of resistance and the United Front, one can foresee a brilliant future for the Kuomintang. . . .

The task of the nation as a whole is to call on all people to honestly support Chiang as head of the KMT, support the national government and support KMT-CCP collaboration.

For this purpose we must promote the prestige of Chiang and the national government in order to avoid bad influences and to increase close solidarity between the KMT and the CCP. The so-called collaboration will last a long time—not only for the duration of the existing war but after the end of the war, when national and international conditions will be more favorable for this collaboration.¹³

Mao's most important theoretical work,

12. These sentences are translated from the original Chinese text. They were deleted from the version contained in the *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*.

13. This was published as a pamphlet in 1939, but Mao later stopped its public distribution, since its contents were so embarrassing to him.

On New Democracy, was adopted as the basic program of the party at the Seventh Congress held in 1945 and implemented as the program of the People's Republic of China after the 1949 victory. In this article, Mao explained that after the October revolution in Russia, the national-democratic revolution in the colonial and semicolonial countries was a "new bourgeois-democratic revolution," in which the national bourgeoisie remained revolutionary. Hence it was necessary to carry out a "united front" of workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie, and bourgeoisie—the bloc of four classes—in order to destroy the imperialists and feudal forces and to establish a "new democratic republic." That is, Mao advocated the establishment of a coalition government with the bourgeoisie.

He also advocated a "new democratic economy," meaning the nationalization of only "the big banks, large industry and large commercial enterprises" by the state.

In this republic big banks and big industrial and commercial enterprises shall be state-owned. . . .

. . . the republic will neither confiscate other forms of capitalist private property nor forbid the development of capitalist production that "cannot control the livelihood of the people," for China's economy is still very backward. . . .

In the rural areas, the economic activities of rich peasants will be tolerated.¹⁴

Mao further explained the theory of revolution-by-stages in the following sentences:

The present task of the revolution in China is to fight imperialism and feudalism; and socialism is out of the question until this task is completed. Two steps have to be taken in the Chinese revolution: first, New Democracy, then socialism. Moreover, the first step will take quite a long time and cannot be accomplished overnight.¹⁵

Then to justify their policies, Mao and the CCP launched a vicious and violent campaign against the Trotskyists, the only organized voice of opposition within the workers' movement to their policies. In his article "Tasks of the CCP in the Period of Resistance to Japan," Mao charged:

Our enemies—the Japanese imperialists, the Chinese collaborators, the pro-Japanese clique and the Trotskyites—have been trying with all their might to wreck every measure for peace and solidarity, democracy and freedom, and armed resistance to Japan. . . . from now on we must exert ourselves not only to conduct propaganda, agitation and criticism among the die-hards of the Kuomintang and the backward sections of the people, but to expose in every possible way and fight resolutely the intrigues of Japanese imperialism and its jackals, the pro-Japanese clique and the Trotskyites, for invading China.¹⁶

14. *On New Democracy*, by Mao Tse-tung (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1960), pp. 26-27.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

16. *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung* (London:

Trotskyists, particularly Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Peng Shu-tse, were denounced as traitors in all the newspapers and magazines controlled by the CCP, despite the fact that they had pledged support to the military effort under Chiang against Japanese imperialism.

The anti-Trotskyist campaign became violent to the point of madness, because the Trotskyists insisted on their right to criticize Chiang and his government. They called for the arming of the masses and proposed a program of struggle around freedom of speech, press, assembly and association, the eight-hour day, and the right to strike. In place of the KMT government-led resistance, they raised the slogan "Convene a National Assembly with full powers, elected by universal, equal and direct suffrage."

As for Chiang, despite Mao's praises of him, he was publicly preparing to destroy the CCP's forces. In January 1941, Chiang attacked and destroyed the New Fourth Army of the CCP in the province of Anhwei, capturing its commander Yeh T'ing and killing the head of the political commission, Hsiang Ying. At the same time, a powerful KMT force led by Hu Tsung-nan surrounded Yen-an. These defeats for the CCP were an ominous sign of things to come.

Q. What was Mao's relationship with Stalin at this time?

A. On the occasion of Stalin's sixtieth birthday, in December 1939, Mao gave a speech in which he said, "To congratulate Stalin means to support him, to support his cause, to support the victory of socialism, to support the path he points out for mankind, and to support our own close friend. This is because at present the great majority of mankind are sufferers, and only through the path Stalin points out and with the help he gives can mankind be freed from suffering."¹⁷

In 1941 at a party school in Yen-an, Mao made a speech entitled "The Reconstruction of our Studies," in which he said, "The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the highest synthesis and summary of the world Communist movement in the last hundred years, a model for the union of theory and practice."¹⁸ Actually, *The History of the CPSU* already demonstrated the theory and practice of Stalinism: revolution by stages, "socialism in one country." It contained Stalin's adventurist policies of collectivization, industrialization, and foreign policy of the so-called Third Period, and "the highest

Lawrence and Wishart, 1955), vol. 1, p. 264.

17. *Ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 102.

18. *Mao's China: Party Reform Documents, 1942-44*, translated by Boyd Compton (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1952), p. 68.

synthesis" of Marxist revisionism—the famous purges in the 1930s of all the old Bolsheviks and other revolutionists, and the firm establishment of Stalin's cult and personal dictatorship.¹⁹

Q. How did Mao explain the defeat of the 1927 revolution and the later defeats suffered under Stalin's direction?

A. In a resolution adopted at a Central Committee plenum in April 1945, Mao placed the responsibility for the defeat of the second Chinese revolution on Ch'en Tu-hsiu and responsibility for defeat of the armed struggle and soviet campaign of 1927-37 on Ch'ü Ch'ü-pai, Li Li-san, and Wang Ming. The resolution claimed that only Mao held a correct position in the Communist movement, concluding that: ". . . the practice of the Chinese revolution has confirmed for the last twenty-four years and continues to confirm that the line of the struggle of our Party and of the broad masses, a line represented by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, is perfectly correct. . . . today the whole Party recognizes the correctness of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's line with unprecedented unanimity and rallies under his banner with unprecedented consciousness."²⁰

The resolution contained not a word about the ultraopportunist policy imposed by Stalin during the second Chinese revolution and the ultra-adventuristic policy after the revolution was defeated. On the contrary, Mao cited Stalin's own words to claim that Stalin's ideas on the Chinese revolution were totally correct.

Following the April plenum, Mao made a report to the Seventh Party Congress, entitled "On Coalition Government," in which he emphasized the absolute necessity of a coalition of the KMT, CCP, and other parties and groups, i.e., a government of four classes. The KMT did not respond to this proposal, however.

The congress adopted a new statute, which contained the following sentence: "the CCP guides all its work by Mao Tse-tung's thought which integrates Marxist ideology with the practical experiences of the Chinese revolution. . . ."²¹

19. See *The Chinese Revolution*, by Peng Shu-tse and Chen Pi-lan (New York: Socialist Workers Party, 1972), part 3, p. 53.

20. "Resolution on Some Questions in the History of Our Party," adopted by the Seventh Plenum of the Sixth Central Committee of the CCP, April 20, 1945. Published as an appendix to Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1956), vol. 4, pp. 171-218 (quotation taken from pp. 217-18). This resolution was dropped from later English-language editions of Mao's works.

21. From the preamble to the new party constitution, reprinted in *A Documentary History*, Brandt et al., pp. 419ff.

Thus, Mao's personal cult, modeled after Stalin's, was officially established at this congress. Since then, Mao has been referred to as "the sole great leader of the CCP," a "Stalin in China," a "sun in the



MAO: In 1925 at beginning of his career.

East," a "messiah for the people in China."

There is a famous song called "The East Is Red," which contains the following verse:

*The East is red.
There the sun rises.
China has brought forth
Mao Tse-tung.
He works for the people.
He will free the nation.*

Q. What happened after the Japanese surrendered?

A. In August 1945, just after the Japanese surrendered to the United States, Mao went to Chungking, the provisional capital of the KMT government. Mao stayed for one and a half months to have secret discussions with Chiang Kai-shek on how to continue collaboration and establish a coalition government. The results of their discussions were published on October 10, 1945, in a communiqué containing a number of measures to keep peace between the KMT and CCP.²²

At a public meeting Mao expressed his sentiments by shouting, "Long live Chiang, head of the KMT." But soon after, a series of conflicts broke out between the two parties. Chiang sent troops to attack a number of towns and villages occupied by CCP guerrillas. In an effort to moderate the impending civil war, Truman sent his

22. *Thirty Years of the CCP*, p. 66.

special representative George Marshall to China.

Chiang Kai-shek for his part had made use of the time during the peace conference to transport his army, with the aid of American planes and warships, from the interior of China to the great cities and the strategic bases in the "recovered areas," to solidify his position. He suppressed all the newly arising mass movements, especially the student movement.

At the end of 1946, when Chiang's preparations for armed attack on the CCP were complete, the government openly barred all doors to compromise and peace parleys by holding its own National Assembly and organizing "a Constituent Government," avoiding forming a coalition with the CCP. Then a great military offensive was launched, in which Changkiakow and some small cities and towns in north Kiangsu were seized.

Even yet, the CCP had not given up its efforts at conciliation. Its delegates to the peace conference still lingered in Shanghai and Nanking, trying to reopen peace parleys with the Kuomintang through mediation of the so-called third force, the Democratic League.

Not until Chiang drove away the CCP peace delegation and succeeded in occupying the CCP capital and stronghold, Yen-an, in April 1947, did the CCP finally realize the hopelessness of compromise, and only then did it muster a military defense. The CCP still did not dare raise the slogan of overthrowing the KMT government, nor did it offer the masses a program for mobilization around agrarian reform.

Finally, Chiang issued a warrant for the arrest of Mao Tse-tung (June 25, 1947) and proclaimed the "Decree of Mobilization for Suppressing Revolts" (July 4). After several months of hesitation, during which the CCP seemed to be waiting for instructions from Moscow, on October 10 the CCP in the name of the "People's Liberation Army" openly urged the overthrow of Chiang Kai-shek and the building of a "New China."²³

Q. Some people claim that the CCP changed its position from opportunism to revolution in violation of the Kremlin's wishes in order to overthrow Chiang's regime. Do you agree with this?

A. The CCP operated with the complete agreement of the Kremlin, which had been compelled to change its line under pressure from postwar American imperialism, particularly the Marshall Plan. Communist Party members had been expelled from bourgeois governments in Western Europe, so Stalin felt he had to strengthen the East European governments by carrying out land reform and nationalizations of capi-

23. See "Report on the Chinese Situation" in *The Chinese Revolution*, part 1, p. 21.

talist property and the establishment of the "Cominform." In my opinion, Stalin, out of the same considerations, endorsed the decision of the Chinese Communist Party to overthrow the KMT after Chiang Kai-shek made further compromise impossible.

Q. How was the CCP able to overcome Chiang's army and take power after so many years of opportunist policies?

A. The CCP victory was due to exceptional conditions created by the Japanese invasion of China, particularly during

World War II. In the period of the resistance war, Chiang's regime became completely corrupt and so inefficient that it was unable to counter any severe attack from Japan without powerful assistance from the United States. American imperialism was unable to continue military aid to Chiang after the Japanese surrender, because American soldiers were unwilling to fight after the war was over.

Modern weapons taken from the Japanese by the Soviet Red Army, which had occupied Manchuria at the end of the war, were turned over to CCP troops, primarily to the Fourth Field Army led by Lin Piao.

Had this combination of historical conditions not existed, Mao's victory over Chiang Kai-shek would have been highly improbable. If Chiang had had control of Manchuria, the most industrialized area of China, he could have cut off the economic and military aid the CCP was receiving from the Soviet Union. Similarly, if American troops had remained, Mao's party would have had little chance of victory. We need only recall the terrible defeat suffered by the peasant army in Kiangsi during 1930-34 to know the difference American and other imperialist aid meant to Chiang.

[To be continued]

Revolution in Zimbabwe—5

The Rise of Zimbabwe Nationalism

By Jim Atkinson

[Fifth of a series]

After the crushing of the 1896-97 African revolt by Rhodes's British South Africa Police, the Shona people of the eastern regions of modern Zimbabwe, against whom the BSAP pursued an almost genocidal policy, took some years to regain their confidence and combativity. The Ndebele, who suffered less at the hands of the BSAP, were the first to throw up new forms of opposition to the imperialist conquerors.

The movement that the Ndebele gathered around in the first years of the present century was the Matabele Home Society, a traditionalist movement that sought to restore the Ndebele monarchy, which had been forcibly dissolved by the British. The kingship movement was led by Nyamanda, the eldest son of the Ndebele king, Lobengula, who had died in the bush in 1894 after his armies had been defeated by Rhodes's invading settler column. But the burning issue that swelled the movement's ranks was land hunger. The movement's leaders were willing to accept racial segregation and discrimination in return for more land and the establishment of an "Ndebele Home" under a British "protectorate." Nyamanda's movement failed to achieve its backward-looking goals.

The second type of African organization to spring up in the early years of the century was the African associations. These bodies, like the Rhodesian Bantu Voters' Association, founded in January 1923, and the Rhodesian Native Association, were set up by the emerging African intelligentsia, the handful of Africans who managed to satisfy the stringent property, income, and educational qualifications required to gain voting rights. These bodies had a limited horizon: They sought minor reforms within the colonial system, and they attempted to trade support for the settler parties in return for minor concessions, but they never tried to mobilize the African masses. "Their constitutions all emphasized cooperation with the government," writes Shamuyarira. "Their hopes rose no higher than wanting to be governed well by the Europeans."⁴⁶ In 1934, the Southern Rhodesian African National Congress (SRANC) was founded by Aaron Jacha and the Rev. Douglas Thompson Samkange, but it was essentially similar in character to the associations.

A broader-based vehicle for the expression of nationalist sentiments, albeit in mystical form, was the independent church movement. "Ethiopian" (all-Black) independent church sects mushroomed in Zimbabwe in reaction to the white-run missions. Among them were such groups as the Church of the White Bird, the Vapostori and Zionist movements, the Guta Ra Jehovah, and the movement of the prophetess Mai Chaza. After the Second World War, Mashonaland became one of the principal centers of Ethiopian-type churches in Africa; and the Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, who later became the president of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), worked for a while as a preacher in one of them. The appeal of these sects sprang partly from the fact that they were Black-run, partly from the millenarian message that most of them preached. This was especially true of the Watch Tower movement, which spread rapidly throughout central Africa at this time, preaching the downfall of the white man and the emancipation of Blacks in a coming "battle of Armageddon."

"You must be strong," one Watch Tower preacher urged his followers, "as the world will shortly be changed and the white people that have high positions will be our servants in heaven."⁴⁷

The Watch Tower won a broad following in the urban townships and played a key role in organizing the first major strike in Zimbabwe at the Shamva mine in 1928. In 1936, the settler regime adopted a sedition act to combat the movement's influence.

But, in Shamuyarira's opinion, "the first appeal to the masses rose from trade union leaders, centred mostly in Bulawayo and Salisbury."⁴⁸ In 1927, a branch of the South African-based Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union (ICU) of Clements Kadalie was set up in Bulawayo. The gradual growth of industry, the economic boom sparked by the Second World War, and the consequent expansion of the working class (reaching 363,000 in

47. Quoted in Loney, *Rhodesia: White Racism and Imperial Response*, p. 95. For a full account of the Watch Tower movement in Zimbabwe, see Tony Hodges, *The Jehovahs Witnesses of Central Africa* (London: Minority Rights Group, 1976).

48. *Crisis in Rhodesia*, p. 32.

46. *Crisis in Rhodesia*, p. 31.

1946 and 926,000 in 1976⁴⁹) created the objective basis for the rise of trade-union activism. After the demise of the ICU, a Reformed Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union (RICU) was organized, which Shamuyarira describes as "the first African mass movement between the two world wars."⁵⁰

It was revived by Charles Mzingeli after the Second World War in 1946. The previous year had seen the first really successful African strike—organized by the African Railway Workers Union (ARWU) against the management of Rhodesian Railways. The strikers won a wage increase and the recognition of their union. The 1945 railway strike was followed in 1948 by a general strike, which succeeded in forcing the government to grant grudging recognition to other African trade unions.

A prominent part in the 1948 strike was played by the African Voice Association, a nationalist group led by Benjamin Burumbe which also led opposition in the "native reserves" to government attempts to reduce the number of cattle held by Africans and to remove communal land rights under the 1951 Native Land Husbandry Act.

The rise of industry, the growth of the proletariat, and the mixing in the cities of Africans from different ethnic backgrounds also helped to forge a pan-Zimbabwean national outlook and consciousness. This was encouraged, too, by the common experience of oppression suffered by all Africans, Shona and Ndebele alike, at the hands of the whites. As early as the 1896-97 revolt, the Shona and the Ndebele had understood the importance of fighting together against the whites. Under the colonial system, a Zimbabwean nationalist sentiment began to take form. Increasingly, Africans looked forward to the creation of a united African-ruled Zimbabwe, rather than separate Shona and Ndebele states.

In the early and mid-1950s, however, most of the middle-class intellectuals who headed the main African organizations sought to improve their status by collaborating with the settler regime of Garfield Todd, prime minister from 1954-58, who attempted to forge an alliance with the emergent African middle class by appeals for interracial "partnership" and a few small-scale reforms.

"For the first time," notes Ranger, "Africans were welcomed as members of the ruling white party; and delegates from the African townships appeared at United Rhodesia Party Congresses and moved resolutions for the removal of discrimination. . . . The various trade unions and political associations almost fell into abeyance while their leaders tried again to work from within."⁵¹

However, the continued oppression of the African masses gave rise to new protest movements, as did the rapid demise of the mild reformism of the Todd government. The big issue that mobilized Africans at this time was the 1951 Native Land Husbandry Act, a law which the settler regime used to try to end the communal land tenure system in the "native reserves" and introduce a system of private land ownership. Under the act, the government arbitrarily attempted to allocate small plots of land to rural Africans, but those not resident in the rural areas were barred from receiving any land.

In effect, they were to lose their traditional communal land rights, on which they depended to make up for their inadequate wages in the cities and to give a modicum of security in retirement. The attempts, ultimately unsuccessful, by the government to implement the act gave rise to broad-based movements of protest in both the cities and the countryside. The removal of Todd from the premiership in 1958 and his replacement by a more openly reactionary and racist settler premier, Edgar Whitehead, stripped away the illusions of the African middle class in "partnership" and fueled the mood of anger in the Black community.

49. Loney, *Rhodesia: White Racism and Imperial Response*, p. 63; *Economic Survey of Rhodesia, 1976*.

50. *Crisis in Rhodesia*, p. 32.

51. Ranger, *African Politics in Twentieth-Century Southern Rhodesia*, in *Aspects of Central African History*, pp. 237-38.

The new spirit of militancy was in evidence at the founding meeting of the nationalist City Youth League (CYL) in Salisbury's Harare Township in August 1955. "Do not hang on to the backs of European organizations like babies; rely now on yourselves," a Nyasa nationalist, Dunduzu Chisiza, proposed in a written message to the gathering.⁵² The movement, which elected James Chikerema (now a leader of Bishop Abel Muzorewa's United African National Council) as its president, swept the Salisbury townships, winning all the seats in elections to Salisbury's African Advisory Board and leading a successful three-day bus boycott against fare hikes in August 1956.

On September 12, 1957, the CYL joined with the Bulawayo African National Congress, a group that traced its ancestry back to the SRANC founded in 1934 by Jacha and Samkange, to form a new Southern Rhodesian African National Congress (SRANC) under the presidency of Joshua Nkomo, a former secretary-general of the ARWU. This was Zimbabwe's first modern, countrywide, mass nationalist party, though it couched its nationalist aspirations in protestations of loyalty to the British empire.

"Its aim is the national unity of all the inhabitants of the country in true partnership, regardless of race, colour or creed," the party said in its first statement of "Principles, Policy and Programme." It assured the British government that "Congress affirms complete loyalty to the Crown as the symbol of national unity."⁵³

However, by leading the opposition to the settler regime on key issues like the Native Land Husbandry Act, the SRANC grew like wildfire, giving great alarm to the government. The rise of the SRANC occurred against a backdrop of nationalist ferment throughout central and southern Africa. In particular, Nyasaland (now known as Malawi), with which Southern Rhodesia along with Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) was federated between 1953 and 1963, was swept by massive nationalist mobilizations in 1959. On February 20, the federal government airlifted troops into Nyasaland; and on March 3 a state of emergency was declared in the colony.

Afraid that the huge, militant mobilizations that were rocking the colonial government in Nyasaland might spread south, the Whitehead government brought in new repressive laws (the Preventive Detention Act and the Unlawful Organisations Act) and outlawed the SRANC in February 1959. Five hundred SRANC activists were detained, and some of the movement's top leaders (Chikerema, George Nyandoro, Edson Sithole, Henry Hamadzari, and others) were kept in jail for three years.

Government repression, however, failed to quell the nationalist ferment. In January 1960, a new nationalist movement, the National Democratic Party (NDP), was founded. Joshua Nkomo, who had remained outside Zimbabwe following the banning of the SRANC, became its president at a congress in October 1960, one month before his return from exile. It was a sign of the depth of nationalist feeling and action at the time that the government did not dare to arrest Nkomo when he returned, though the other SRANC leaders remained in jail.

In its Statement of Principles, the NDP declared that it intended "to serve as a vigorous political vanguard for removing all forms of oppression, and for the establishment of a democratic government in Southern Rhodesia; to work for speedy constitutional reconstruction in Southern Rhodesia, with the object of having a government elected on the principle of 'one man, one vote'."⁵⁴

Like its predecessor, the NDP tapped the enthusiasm of the Black masses. It mobilized the African population in big street demonstrations, strikes, and boycotts. The NDP leaders staged these mass actions, however, mainly as a pressure tactic to try to prod the British imperialists to intervene against the settler

52. Quoted in Shamuyarira, *Crisis in Rhodesia*, p. 28.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 60.

regime and "decolonize" Zimbabwe.

The NDP leaders also had a tendency to vacillate and compromise on the basic principles and goals of the nationalist movement. In January 1961, at a Constitutional Conference held in London by the British government, the three NDP delegates (Nkomo, Sithole, and Herbert Chitepo) initially accepted a set of constitutional proposals agreed to by the Whitehead government and British imperialism that would have put off Black rule for fifteen years.

A wave of protest by NDP activists at home, however, forced Nkomo, Sithole, and Chitepo to backtrack and declare their opposition to the new constitution, which took effect later that year.

Despite the vacillations of the leadership, the settler regime greatly feared the potential of the nationalist movement. In July 1960, its police gunned down eleven African demonstrators in Bulawayo, one week after 40,000 Africans had marched on Salisbury from the township of Highfield and Salisbury workers had paralyzed the capital with a general strike.

To counter the growing nationalist agitation, the settler regime introduced two tough new police-state laws in 1960: the Emergency Powers Act, under which it declared a state of emergency, which remains to this day, allowing the government to detain nationalists indefinitely without charge or trial; and the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, which introduced the mandatory death sentence for acts of arson and allowed the regime to ban political meetings and publications. On December 9, 1961, the Whitehead regime banned the NDP. Meanwhile, the settler government held about 800 nationalists in jail.

Again, the nationalist movement was not cowed. Ten days after the banning of the NDP, a new party, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), was born, with aims "to establish the policy of one-man-one-vote as the basis of government in this country" and "to unite the African peoples so that they liberate themselves from all forms of imperialism and colonialism."⁵⁵ ZAPU was, in turn, banned on September 20, 1962.

The next year, the nationalist movement underwent its first important split. The issue that polarized the nationalist leaders into two competing factions was whether they should remain inside the country in face of the repression or go into exile to lead the movement from abroad. According to Shamuyarira, Sithole advocated the first course while Nkomo supported the latter. On

55. Ibid.

August 8, 1963, the Sithole faction launched the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU); and, two days later, the Nkomo group formed the People's Caretaker Council (PCC), while retaining the name ZAPU outside the country.

The split and the violence between the two factions that ensued were symptomatic of problems that have plagued the nationalist movement to this day. A leadership adequate to the tasks of leading the national liberation struggle to victory would have had little difficulty in resolving through discussion the issue of whether all or some of the leaders should go abroad. But underlying the factional conflict in this case was a bitter power struggle between rival politicians, as was evidenced by the PCC's election of Nkomo as its "life president" at its founding meeting. Furthermore, there were no discernible political differences between the two groups.

Another sign of the inadequacies of the nationalist leaderships was that both sides proceeded to condone the use of violence against their factional opponents—a development that sowed confusion and demoralization in the national liberation movement as a whole and gave an excuse for the settler regime to ban both parties on August 24, 1964.

Shamuyarira, who sided with the ZANU faction at the time, has described what happened. "In 1961 the battle to gain support went on, and became bloody and unpleasant in the Salisbury area. Several people were killed after being stabbed or beaten up; in Highfield there was nearly always one death each weekend after party clashes."⁵⁶

Shamuyarira concluded that "it was tragic to see so much of the time and energy of the nationalists dispersed in fighting the rival party after the split. The government and its police played their hands cleverly during this period: The government refrained from commenting in any way which might have unified the parties, and enjoyed watching the rivals fight the issue out."⁵⁷ Shamuyarira's words could be directed with equal weight against the leaders of the main nationalist factions today, who have been blinded by their deadly struggles for personal hegemony and supremacy to the point of being incapable of forging a united front against the settler regime.

[Next: Mobilizations and War]

56. Ibid., p. 184.

57. Ibid., pp. 188-89.

Haitian Oppositionists Recount Horrors Under Duvalier Dictatorship

September 22 marked the twentieth anniversary of the rigged election in 1957 that brought François "Papa Doc" Duvalier to power in Haiti.

Duvalier declared himself "president for life" in 1964. Following the dictator's death in 1971, his son Jean-Claude (then only nineteen years old) assumed the title and absolute power of his father. "Baby Doc" continues to rule Haiti, the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, through the methods of terror and superstition perfected by Duvalier père.

Several exiled leaders of the Haitian opposition movement issued statements on the occasion of the dictatorship's twentieth anniversary. Portions of these were published in the September 24 issue of *Le Monde*.

Serge Gilles, a representative in France of the Regroupment of Democratic Haitian Forces (RFDH), said: "Over the past twenty years the Duvalierist dictatorship

has murdered more than 36,000 workers, peasants, government officials, intellectuals, officers, and soldiers. . . .

"Jean-Claude Duvalier still enforces the fascist law of April 29, 1969, which condemns 'all communists' and their relatives to death. In Duvalierist language, 'communist' means opponent of the regime. The Haitian people know this by experience. . . .

"Far from bringing about a 'change,' Jean-Claude Duvalier has further consolidated the repressive apparatus, creating the 'Leopard' corps, whose depredations exceed even those of the Tontons Macoutes."^{*}

Auguste Maurepas, an author and leader of the Movement of Haitian Patriots (MPH), lamented the lack of unity among the anti-Duvalier forces, but noted that a conference is being planned for Montréal later this year.

Finally, Edouard Bellande, secretary of the Association of Haitian Journalists (in Exile), said: "After twenty years in power, the dictatorship installed by Duvalier is on its last legs. It is becoming so mired in the routine of violence that it can no longer disguise its generalized crisis, the symptoms of which are being exposed in the international press."

Bellande went on to list some of these symptoms: famine, extreme poverty, lack of housing, and the exodus from the country of skilled technicians and professionals. "There are more Haitian physicians practicing in Canada than in the whole of the national territory," he said.

*The Leopards were created in 1972 as a special counterinsurgency unit. The Tontons Macoutes is the private terror force created by François Duvalier.

Bankers Fear Defaults by Semicolonial Countries

By Jon Britton

[Third of three articles]

Senator Jacob Javits's warning August 29 that a worldwide depression may hit within two or three years was apparently based on a recent Senate subcommittee staff report that has been circulating quietly in Washington.

The study, entitled "International Debt, the Banks and United States Foreign Policy," was prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's subcommittee on foreign economic policy, on which Javits sits as the ranking Republican member.

Javits gave his depression warning at a Senate Banking Committee hearing. He buttressed it with facts on the buildup of debt among the semicolonial countries. He estimated this debt as of the end of 1976 at \$180 billion and predicted it would swell to \$380 billion in five years and to \$580 billion in ten years.

"That will break the back of any system, including this system," Javits said in reference to the institutions that regulate international finance.

Key concerns of the Senate subcommittee report were revealed in an article by Judith Miller in the September 18 *New York Times*. Pointing with alarm to "the massive accumulation of financial surpluses by oil-exporting nations," the report calls it a "chronic, systematic imbalance" in international trade that jeopardizes the "stability of the United States banking system and, by extension, the international financial system."

The "surplus income" of the oil-exporting countries, currently running about \$40 billion a year, is the amount these countries collectively earn over and above what they are able to spend on imports from countries that buy their oil.

A major part of this surplus is accounted for by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates. Owing to their small populations and semifeudal social structures, these countries can absorb a limited volume of imports. (The sheiks can use only so many Cadillac limousines and air-conditioned palaces, and the desperately poor peasants can buy few imported goods.)

Hardly any of this money ever leaves the imperialist countries. A substantial sum—about \$12.7 billion, according to the Treasury Department—has been invested in U.S. government securities. Much of the rest is deposited with the biggest private banks headquartered in New York, London, and Zurich.

Thus the three "wealthiest" most backward oil-producing countries have helped to finance the massive U.S. budget deficit, which is running about \$45 billion this year, and provided a huge windfall of funds for the biggest banks to use for loan-making purposes.

Because of the sluggish pace of their spending on expansion, U.S. corporations have not been borrowing much. As a result, bankers have been falling over themselves in a rush to lend their bloated deposits abroad.

While commercial and industrial loans of the eight largest New York banks increased only 1.8% to \$33.8 billion from June 30, 1976, to June 30, 1977, foreign lending jumped 26.1% to \$71.2 billion in the same period.

According to figures published by Saloman Brothers, a Wall Street investment banking firm, foreign earnings of the thirteen U.S. commercial banks in 1973 were \$477 million, or 34% of total earnings. By 1975, these earnings had nearly doubled to \$836 million, almost 50% of combined total earnings. No doubt the figures are even higher for 1976 and 1977, in view of the continued rapid growth of foreign loans.

The Senate report notes the high concentration of overseas loans within the banking "industry." Thus, 66% of the private bank debt of the non-OPEC¹ semicolonial countries is owed to U.S. banks. And two-thirds of all American bank lending to twenty-five such countries was done by only six banks.

Similarly, the recipients of loans from U.S. banks are highly concentrated. "Mexico and Brazil are United States banks' best customers," the report says. One-half of all loans for semicolonial countries from the twenty-one largest U.S. banks have gone to these two countries, where industrialization has been proceeding at a rapid clip.

The external debt of non-OPEC semicolonial governments, the study indicates, is estimated to be in the range of \$150 billion to \$200 billion. Of this, some \$75 billion is owed to private banks, including an estimated \$50 billion owed to United States banks. Taken together, these countries are spending roughly 20% of their export earnings to pay interest and principal on their foreign debt. For some, the figure is well

over 40%.

Brazil, for example, with an external debt of \$25-\$30 billion, will have a debt-servicing burden this year of almost \$5.3 billion, or about 44% of an estimated \$12 billion in export earnings. "And even with the 400 percent increase in the price of coffee," the study points out, Brazil may have to borrow an additional \$6 billion to finance its 1977 payments deficit.

The World Bank estimates that Mexico's external debt takes up 30% of its export revenues, with the figures for Argentina 22%, Indonesia 20%, and Zaïre 16.5%.

This means that a large part of current borrowing is simply going to repay old debts coming due. A study by American Express indicates that one out of every four dollars borrowed abroad by the "developing nations" in 1977 will go for debt servicing and that by 1980 one out of every two dollars will have to be used for that purpose.

The Senate report points out that funds borrowed to pay off old debts cannot be used for economic development and this will lead to a vicious circle of growing stagnation, still more borrowing, and higher interest payments as governments' creditworthiness wanes.

The prescription of the creditors for this sort of bind is, of course, austerity. The International Monetary Fund—lender of last resort for countries in financial difficulties—and the banks, with the blessings of the Carter administration, are insisting that the debt-burdened semicolonial countries "tighten their belts"; in other words slash living standards, cut government spending, and raise taxes.

In Turkey, for example, the government, under pressure from the IMF, has slashed subsidies for a whole series of basic goods and services. On September 8 it announced that gasoline prices were to be nearly doubled, electricity prices increased 43%, fuel oil for heating 42%, cement nearly 70%, and newsprint over 45%. Local telephone calls have gone up by 150%, and steep rises in postal and telex rates have gone into effect.

The international bankers pressured the Demirel regime to take these drastic—and politically dangerous—measures because Turkey has run up more than \$3 billion in short-term debts, with U.S. banks holding about half. A number of bankers, according to an article in the September 5 issue of *Time* magazine, "bitterly, though privately, insist that some repayments are months behind."

1. Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

In Peru, the ruling generals, under pressure from the bankers, have alternately imposed austerity measures, relaxed them somewhat after mass protest strikes and demonstrations such as occurred last year and again this past July, and reimposed them.

The country owes nearly \$4 billion in private debts, according to the September 5 *Business Week*. The magazine explains:

... an IMF-World Bank consultative group in 1975 recommended heavier bank lending to Peru based on projections of exports that never materialized. Instead, copper prices have fallen far below estimates, the anchovies have stopped running, and the oil in the jungle across the Andes never materialized. Exports were projected at \$2.8 billion in 1977, but will actually come to only \$1.85 billion.

The result is that Peru, like Brazil, will have to allocate a staggering 44% of its export earnings to debt payments this year.

Some of the weaker imperialist countries are also plagued by lagging exports and an increasing burden of debt required to finance the goods they buy abroad. The London *Economist* of September 10 points out that the trade balances of thirteen "smaller industrial countries,"² "have looked sicker and sicker."

"Naturally," the magazine says, "some of the unlucky 13 (such as Norway, Iceland, Portugal) were hit worse than the others . . . but they were all in the red."

The *Economist* concludes:

If they could see a world economy which would expand them out of their deficits, then the small OECD³ countries would doubtless be happy to hang on for the ride. But they cannot. So they seem to be set on a course of devaluation and deflation.

As governments devalue currencies and take other actions to "protect" domestic industries and expand exports, the danger increases of a trade war such as occurred in the 1920s and 1930s that would choke off world commerce.

"Recent data compiled by the International Monetary Fund indicate that growth of global trade is already diminishing" because of rising trade barriers, Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., writes in the August 11 *Wall Street Journal*.

Growing protectionism is particularly damaging to the more industrialized semi-colonial countries, because they have the biggest debts and are most dependent on exports to keep themselves afloat financially.

2. Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey.

3. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Its membership consists of twenty-four industrialized capitalist countries, including all the imperialist powers.

Many of these countries are now so short of funds that American bankers fear that they "will find it more in their interest to simply default or repudiate their external debts rather than to have to continue borrowing just to repay old loans," according to the Senate study.

The study continues:

And if this happens, a domino effect could take place in which other debtor countries follow suit, the banks panic and start calling in their international loans, the stock market falls precipitously, and the international capital market collapses.

This doomsday scenario may be extreme in its pessimism, but it is being taken seriously enough by responsible officials that a concerted international effort is now under way to prevent that first domino from falling.

Another reason this "doomsday scenario" is being taken seriously is the fact that the U.S. banks are themselves shaky. One indication of this is the large number of banks on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's "problem list." The FDIC, a government-sponsored agency that insures bank savings deposits, recently announced that as of June 30 there were 368 banks on this list, one more than a year earlier. The number had reached a peak of 385 last November.

A bank is added to the list if the FDIC might have to become involved in its finances or if it requires "more than ordinary concern and aggressive supervision," according to an Associated Press dispatch in the August 23 *New York Times*.

Contributing to the banks' problems is the fact that in addition to the enormous volume of questionable loans to semi-colonial countries, billions in real-estate loans have turned sour in recent years.

According to an article by James Carberry in the August 18 *Wall Street Journal*, at the end of 1976 nineteen of the country's largest bank-holding companies held close to \$1.2 billion worth of foreclosed property. Carberry also reports that \$9.1 billion of these institutions' \$21.5 billion in outstanding real-estate loans either were not earning any interest or were accruing it at reduced rates.

Miller in her *New York Times* article says that the Senate subcommittee report, despite a myriad of unsettling conclusions, "contains . . . few specific recommendations for solving the problems it raises. . . ." Members of the subcommittee have, however, made some proposals.

Javits, for example, has called for doubling the amount of money the International Monetary Fund has at its disposal to loan out. This, of course, would only postpone the day of reckoning if external debts and export earnings continue to diverge.

Senator Frank Church, the subcommittee chairman, has, according to Miller, "been far more outspoken [than the staff study] about his views on a remedy."

"I can see only one way out of the present financial and political dilemma," she quotes him as saying, "and that is to break the OPEC cartel's hold on the price of oil."

That lower oil prices could be a lasting solution is wishful thinking, useful only as anti-Arab propaganda. While the sudden sharp increase in the price of imported oil has unquestionably been an important factor in the trade deficits of many countries, it is not the only factor, and in the long run will not be the most important. The more fundamental problem is the sick state of the world capitalist economy, expressed in falling profit rates, lagging capital investment, spreading protectionism, and stagnating international trade.

Even the much-vaunted OPEC oil cartel is not immune to the effects of this deep-seated malady. "The current worldwide glut of crude oil . . . is leading to some price slippage," the September 5 *New York Times* reports. The article continues:

Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, an industry newsletter, has reported that Kuwait is now offering a discount of 10 cents a barrel to increase output. Production of the state-owned Kuwait Oil Co. ran about 1.6 million barrels a day in July and August, or about 20 percent below Kuwait's desired production level, the newsletter said.

When the next economic slump hits, the cartel's ability to maintain the current price level will be all the more called into question. While lower oil prices, by themselves, would alleviate somewhat the debt problems of oil-importing countries, the negative affects of a world downturn on the scale of 1974-75, or worse, would be much more profound.

Most of the "solutions" so far offered by capitalist politicians and professional economists are nothing but band-aids to hold the increasingly shaky international financial system together awhile longer. The only real solution from the capitalists' standpoint—and the one they are pressing most vigorously—is austerity for the working masses.

But the response of the Peruvian workers and farmers is indicative of what can be expected throughout the world as the bankers tighten their squeeze.

The closer we look the more apparent it is that the world capitalist economy—and the capitalist governments trying with less and less success to steer it—is sinking ever deeper into a quagmire of insoluble contradictions.

There is deepening gloom on Wall Street, not only because of such short-term factors as rising interest rates, but because the most clear-sighted members of the ruling class see no way out except to step up their offensive against the working people of the world. The ultimate outcome, they fear, may be the demise of the capitalist system.

Massive Antinuclear Turnout at Kalkar

By Susan Wald

Demonstrators from various European countries converged on the small town of Kalkar in the Rhine Valley on September 24, in one of the most massive turnouts yet achieved by the antinuclear movement in Western Europe.

The demonstrators, estimated by West German police to number between 40,000 and 50,000, included contingents from France, Belgium, and Denmark, as well as all parts of West Germany. Many were members of the *Bürgerinitiativen*, the local "citizens committees" that initiated several earlier protests against the construction of nuclear plants.

The main banner of the demonstration read, "Down with the fast breeder reactor,"

and "No nuclear plants in the Rhine Valley or anywhere else!" Banners were also carried by the political organizations participating in the demonstration, including the West German Communist Party, the Young Socialists (the Social Democratic youth organization), and the International Marxist Group, German section of the Fourth International.

The size of the demonstration was particularly impressive in view of the concerted effort by the government and the mass media to discourage participation by mounting a scare campaign aimed at portraying the antinuclear movement as "violent." A news program shown on West German television the night before the

march showed film clips of the 1976 antinuclear demonstration at Brokdorf, where some of the demonstrators clashed with the police.

In addition, the size of the repressive forces mobilized for the occasion indicated that the authorities were preparing for a confrontation. On Friday, September 23, public schools were closed to use them for housing police detachments. That night, police began setting up roadblocks on routes leading to Kalkar. By Saturday morning, between 8,000 and 10,000 police were deployed in the area around the site of the Kalkar nuclear plant.

A September 25 Associated Press dispatch reported:

The start of the demonstration was delayed for hours because of roadblocks manned by sub-machine gun-armed police and armored cars in a ring 30 miles around Kalkar.

Authorities said police on the Hamburg-Bremen expressway stopped 4,500 demonstrators heading for Kalkar aboard scores of buses and cars. Police detained 33 persons after confiscating thousands of masks, helmets and protective shields, 500 batons, 41 walkie-talkie sets, steel ball projectiles, slingshots, steel rods, knives and signal guns, officials said.

However, an eyewitness report of the demonstration published in the September 25 issue of the French Trotskyist daily *Rouge* revealed that most of the "dangerous weapons" confiscated by police included rain slickers, silk scarves, tent poles, and thermos bottles filled with tea!

The fact that the confrontation the authorities were hoping for did not materialize, and that a peaceful, massive demonstration was held, represented a victory for the forces opposing nuclear power.

The 300-megawatt fast-breeder prototype the West German government wants to build at Kalkar is an important target for the antinuclear movement. The place it occupies in the West German nuclear energy program is similar to that of the French "Superphénix" plant.

A joint statement by the German and Dutch Trotskyists was handed out at the Kalkar demonstration. The statement concluded with the following demands:

"Shut down all nuclear construction sites!

"Cancel the construction permits for nuclear plants immediately!

"No exports of nuclear technology!

"No nuclear plant at Kalkar or anywhere else!" □

Appeal for Solidarity With Thai Students

[We are publishing below a statement from the Committee for Solidarity With the Thai People, based in Paris. We have taken the text from the September 7 issue of the French Trotskyist daily *Rouge*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.

[In an article accompanying the statement, René Tricart reports that on the opening day of the trial, 200 spectators packed the courtroom, while another 2,000 to 3,000 persons demonstrated outside.]

The trial of eighteen students and workers opened on September 5 before a Bangkok military court. They were arrested on October 6, 1976, at the time of the military coup, along with several thousand of their comrades. They are accused of communist activities, treason, murder, attempted murder, and possession of weapons. Six of them have also been indicted for the crime of lese-majesty [affront to a sovereign power]. The eighteen defendants face a possible death sentence.

Only international protest, to which the Bangkok government is sensitive, can save them. A broad campaign to mobilize international public opinion was already undertaken, in mid-June, when the trial was scheduled to open. It forced the government to postpone the opening of the trial, revoke the charges against several prisoners, and allow international observers and the public to attend the trial. However, the eighteen defendants have not won the right to be represented by lawyers.

In France, in particular, a great many organizations and prominent individuals launched an appeal at that time, demanding that the prosecutions be stopped and that democratic freedoms be restored in Thailand.

We must win the release of the eighteen defendants. The Committee for Solidarity With the Thai People calls on all democratic organizations and individuals to lend their support to the eighteen defendants. Nothing else can save them.

The following are the names of the defendants:

Students: Sutham Saengpratum,* general secretary of the National Center for Thai Students; Orissa Lyarawannawat, general secretary of Technical Students for the Thailand United People's Front; Anupong Pongsuwan*; Apinand Bouerhapakdee*; Surachart Pamrungsk*; Witode Pangwaint*; Prayoon Akaraborworn; Ms. Sucheera Tanchainand; Attakarn Optampakoon; Suchart Patcharasorawut; Somsak Joamjirakum; Mahin Tanbunperm; Tongchai Winijakun; Prapon Wongsiripitak.*

Workers: Arome Pongpa-ngan, office worker; Kogsak Asapak; Ms. Sa-ngeam Jamduang; Saree Siriyupawong.

Committee for Solidarity With the Thai People, c/o M. Luc Thibeaut, 9, rue du Dauphiné, 93 600 Aulnay-sous-Bois, France. □

*These six defendants are also accused of the crime of lese-majesty.

Intercontinental Press will give you a week by week analysis of the most important world events.

Subscribe now!

The Smell of Watergate

By Steve Wattenmaker

Bert Lance, the millionaire Georgia businessman chosen by Carter to serve in his administration as director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), quit his post September 21. Congressional investigators charged that Lance engaged in corrupt practices as the head of two Georgia banks.

The investigation found Carter's confidant to be less than a pillar of integrity. It also raised the strong possibility that Lance's banking "excesses" had been covered up at his initial confirmation hearings in January.

Among the most serious charges leveled at Lance were that he abused his position of bank president to grant himself and his family overdrafts—i.e., interest-free loans—totaling \$450,000. Some of the overdrafts were evidently used to finance his unsuccessful 1974 bid for governor of Georgia, which, if true, violated campaign law.

Investigators also found that Lance used the bank's airplanes for personal junkets and political campaigning. These practices provoked repeated warnings from federal banking officials and finally a 1976 Justice Department investigation of illegal use of bank funds for political purposes.

Evidence that Carter and his aides covered up Lance's problems is persuasive. The Justice Department investigation was declared closed by a U.S. attorney in

Atlanta the day before Carter named Lance to head the OMB.

Robert Bloom, acting Comptroller of the Currency at the time of Lance's appointment, testified September 6 that Carter aides were aware last November of a report criticizing Lance's banking practices. Bloom said he assumed Carter had given the unfavorable document to the Senate committee responsible for confirming the budget director.

Ultimately, it was Carter, through his staunch defense of his Georgia crony, who lent the most credibility to the suspicions of a White House cover-up.

On August 18 Carter told Lance on national television, "Bert, I'm proud of you," indicating that Lance represented a model for the Carter administration in the selection of personnel.

Accepting Lance's resignation, Carter still maintained that "nothing that I have heard or read has shaken my belief in Bert's ability or his integrity."

Few observers of American politics would have predicted last January that within months of his inauguration Carter's presidency would be mired in a major scandal.

After all, the relatively obscure Georgia politician had sold himself to the U.S. ruling class as the best man around to clean up the Watergate-spattered image of government. He would, he said, forge an



LANCE: Stars in dollar juggling act.

administration the people could be proud of again.

And while Carter's corporate backers probably didn't expect him to be able to recreate the "Camelot" of earlier White House days, they clearly weren't prepared to see the president's most trusted lieutenant driven from office for playing fast and loose with money deposited in his bank.

Carter had only himself to blame for the widespread reaction to his appointment of Lance. What finally brought Bert Lance down, Carter said, were "the expectations of the American people that were engendered during my own campaign."

"Lancegate," whether or not it continues to unravel like Watergate, has at least shown once again that the two parties, as always, have as much in common as Tweedledum and Tweedledee. □

In Britain, the Poor Pay More

"In present-day Britain the poor are cheated of value for what little money they have. Their cost of living is higher, they get a worse deal from public services, they are deliberately charged more by the nationalized fuel industries, and the very poorest get least welfare help."

Those are some of the conclusions drawn in a book recently published in Britain, *Why the Poor Pay More*, reviewed in the September 20 London *Times* by Robin Young.

The book is a collection of contributions by researchers for the National Consumer Council. They document a number of ways in which the poor in Britain get less for their money than do those with higher incomes.

Fuel: "A poor family using electric fires

may pay £44 for warmth that would cost a rich family, living in a well insulated home with gas central heating, only £6."

Food: The poor are obliged to buy in small quantities. Transportation is often lacking, and as a result they are unable to shop in large stores where prices are lower.

Housing: The book claims that poor persons living in public housing "often get better value for money than the rich." Those living in private furnished dwellings, however, "get the worst value of all."

Credit: The book reports a finding that small loans may have true interest rates as high as 1,706 percent.

Insurance and taxes: The poor pay a higher proportion of their incomes in contributions to Britain's national insurance system, "but get less out of the

welfare system than the rich receive from tax allowances."

Health care: Terminally ill patients among the poor are five times less likely than upper-income patients to receive medical attention at home.

The National Consumers Council was apparently able to draw few conclusions from their assemblage of the above data, however. "The editor, Miss Frances Williams, says some of the difficulties reflect our unequal society, but the contributors do recommend some solutions, including reallocation of medical resources, abolition of the contributory principle for national insurance benefits, and formation of bulk-purchasing clubs." □

Soviet Dissidents and Oppressed Palestinians

By Israel Shahak

Many groups of the international left have adopted a dangerous and wrong attitude in their publications to Soviet dissidents who are living abroad. It is assumed that their opinions, attitudes, and relationships are above criticism, and that their most harmful activities should be explained away or excused, using arguments that would not be used in any other case.

This attitude has been lately quite apparent—to my sorrow—in *Intercontinental Press*. One can regard the article by Gerry Foley, "Soviet Political Dissidents Knifed by Healyites" (May 9, p. 508), as an example. Therefore I want to answer some of the arguments, which appear to me quite mistaken, raised in that article.

At the beginning I want to make my position clear on two crucial points. It is not my aim to hinder in any way the just support given to any man who suffers a denial of his human rights in any place—including of course the USSR. It is, however, my contention that arguments and activities of any person whatsoever should be considered exclusively on their own merit. The fact that a man has suffered—even if he has unjustly suffered—does not make his opinion right and does not put him above criticism, even severe criticism. On the other hand, the fact that Gerry Healy is, in my opinion, completely wrong in his recent accusations against others does not make his opinions about L. Plyushch wrong.

Living in Israel, I believe that I am in an especially good position to judge the behaviour of the Soviet dissidents who live outside the USSR. Israel has a numerous community of Russian Jews who have recently arrived from the USSR—more than 100,000 people. Naturally Russian dissidents, including non-Jews, come here on visits sooner or later, and those who do not come send messages, which are published in the Israeli press.

To take only two examples—Mr. L. Plyushch and Mr. V. Bukovsky: After Mr. Plyushch had appeared in various European capitals in October-November 1976, he came "to rest with his friends" in Israel in December. It so happened that this month was one of those in which the Zionist oppression of Palestinians had raged with an increased fury. Children in East Jerusalem, in Ramalla, in Nablus, in many other towns and villages, were imprisoned, tortured, beaten, threatened, and fined great sums for trying to struggle for elementary freedom.

But those were Palestinian children! Did L. Plyushch make any effort to find out who suffers in the country where he came for a rest? Had he done so, maybe he would have found two people who did try to help these children, and who worked day and night to try to help—and who also either were actually put in a psychiatric institution or were threatened with such a fate, merely for opposing Zionism.

I mean my friend and helper Eytan Grossfeld, who was actually put for some time into a "mental clinic for young criminals," and myself, who was several times threatened with such a fate, once by the editor of the *Jerusalem Post* (November 8, 1974) and once in the Knesset by Mr. Lorentz of the Agudat Israel (religious) Party, now in high favour with [Prime Minister Menahem] Begin.

Instead of this, Mr. Plyushch went on the Israeli radio and in a fulsome and disgusting exhibition of flattery praised the Israeli regime! Nor is this the end of the matter: On June 7, as reported in the Hebrew press, Mr. Plyushch appeared at a Zionist meeting in Brussels, where he equated anti-Semitism with anti-Zionism! Perhaps *Intercontinental Press* will try to excuse that!

Equally so Mr. Bukovsky. His latest exploit on the Israeli scene was to intervene in the elections on the side of the notorious Flatto-Sharon, a Zionist who fled from France after being allegedly implicated in shady financial dealings and accused of worse, and who has now been elected to the Knesset (being accused of wholesale corruption, it is true, but after the elections). Flatto-Sharon ran on a platform calling for the state of Israel to defend every and any Jew in the world, no matter what he does to "Gentiles." Truly one can say, "Tell me your friends and I will tell you who you are!"

But the matter is more important than the behaviour of two individuals, no matter who they are. The Palestinian question, apart from its own importance, has for years been the real touchstone of the behaviour of men and of organizations. The defence of Palestinian human rights against Zionist oppression is in this respect a test that all should meet, no matter what they do or do not do for other causes.

I do not mean by this to say that a tortured Chilean is less important than a tortured Palestinian, or a tortured Jew. But as a matter of recorded fact, President Carter, who is willing to utter some

ambiguous phrases about Uruguay or Chile, is completely silent about Israeli violations of human rights. Why so? Condemnations of certain countries' violations of human rights are allowed—in measured amounts, of course, and to serve as a safety valve for the benefit of U.S. interests.

Therefore the real question that has to be asked is not whether Mr. Plyushch had "made an appeal on behalf of persecuted Latin American Communists," as Gerry Foley says. After all, Kissinger and Carter made similar fake appeals. The real question is: Why has no one Soviet dissident ever made an appeal on behalf of even one Palestinian persecuted by Zionists? I repeat: not even one, for so many years. Surely this significant fact tells much about all of them!

In addition, there is the behaviour of the community of Russian Jews living in Israel. This is an extremely racist community, and its racism is directed not only towards the Palestinians but toward the "Oriental" Jews, even to the point of "threatening" to emigrate from Israel if their children are contaminated by being put in the same school as the children of the "Oriental" Jews.

Such threats, while usually successful, do evoke some protest in Israel. But none among the Soviet dissidents so frequently visiting here and who are inclined otherwise to speak about the whole world—except their own racism, of course!

I find this silence to be even worse than racism itself, and I find it distinctly Stalinist in character. The Soviet dissidents changed their aims, and for worse, but not their nature. They remained even more Stalinist than Stalin himself in their capacity for both being silent in face of unwelcome truth and of actively supporting atrocities and oppressions carried out by the regimes from whom they or their friends derive benefits—like those of the Zionist regime!

Finally, let me end with some observations on Bukovsky's comparison of Nazism with Stalinism, of which Gerry Foley approves—quoting Trotsky, who said that Nazism and Stalinism were symmetrical to each other. I must say that such use of quotations is to me the most Stalinist thing in the world. Trotsky was murdered before the worst horrors of Nazism were perpetrated. Can his opinions about Nazism be used without one asking himself whether Trotsky was right or wrong in this instance? Or is it Gerry Foley's opinion that every quotation of Trotsky is always right and also clinches every argument?

Perhaps it is a time for Trotskyists to sometimes say in print that Trotsky was wrong in some particular instance. Otherwise some people, like myself, for example, will strongly suspect that the only difference between the Stalinists and

the Trotskyists is that the latter want to make Trotsky into a Stalin.

But leaving aside those quite important matters, I undertake to show by facts some very important differences between the Stalinist regime (hateful and criminal as it was) and Nazism.

1. Stalin did not kill, or order to kill, *whole peoples, including children*, including everybody, just because they were Gypsies or Jews. True, in Stalin's banishment of the Tatars and other peoples, a high proportion of those exiled perished from cold and hunger. But no attempt was made, no order was issued, to kill Tatar children, to throw them into the gas chambers, or into the ovens, *just because they were children of Tatars!* The Nazis did this, and exactly this, to millions!

2. Even in the worst Stalinist camps and prisons, some attempt was made to care for the ill. No doubt sometimes it was a mockery, and sometimes it was grossly inadequate. But Solzhenitsyn lives, because in Stalin's prison he was treated—and properly—for a cancer. Under Hitler, to be ill in a camp was equivalent to a sentence of death—in cold blood and just because a human being was ill and therefore useless.

3. It was the accepted Nazi practice to kill whole classes of people automatically, totally, and without any other consideration taken into account, even formally. So for example, every Communist and every Jew among the prisoners taken from the Soviet Army during the war was murdered immediately. Families of resistance fighters, especially in Poland and other East European countries, were totally exterminated.

Need I remind people that in most cases the children of Stalin's chief victims have survived? True, they have suffered horribly, and I do not condone their unjust suffering for a moment, but how can one compare extermination with exile, for example?

4. The treatment of the literature and the arts. Again I do not wish to condone or to justify for a moment the atrocious persecution of so many artists by Stalin. But he never touched the common heritage of the human race. He never condemned—like Hitler—whole cultures, whole races, in fact the majority of humankind, as “degenerate.” Need one compare the treatment of the Black culture by Stalin and by Hitler? Need one remind Americans that Black people and their entire heritage were condemned by the Nazis to a status of “half-apes”? Need one remind some people that Jewish musicians of the past were “forbidden” merely because they were Jews and therefore by definition “degenerate”?

I think these four points are sufficient. It is, I think, a great mistake on Gerry Foley's part to condone the crime of Bukovsky in comparing Nazism with

Brezhnev. In my opinion such a comparison, made by a man from Leningrad who well knows how many people died there during the Nazi siege, shows that Bukovsky is a Nazi himself. I do not claim for this opinion the protection of my own sufferings under the Nazis—for such “an argument” has no end. I simply say that a man who can compare the Nazi horrors even with everything that is *claimed* to have happened in the USSR in the last ten years has reached such a degree of dishonesty and demagoguery that he can be justly compared to Adolf Hitler himself (who also suffered before he became “a

leader” and used to cite his suffering as an argument).

I think therefore that helping Nazis like Bukovsky in their propaganda, which is clearly directed to provoking a nuclear war against the USSR, and to the continuation of Hitler's war aims, is completely wrong and also very dangerous. It is so both for us here, who oppose Bukovsky's Zionist friends, and for you there, in the USA, who will sooner or later find yourselves also opposed openly by the same “friends of Bukovsky,” who help like he does Zionist oppression and apartheid.

June 16, 1977

And a Reply

The Problem Is to Convince Political Dissidents to Unite in Common Action Against Oppressors

By Gerry Foley

I agree with Dr. Shahak that the “arguments and activities” of every person who plays a role in politics have to be judged on their own merits. But they have to be judged politically and not morally.

A political assessment of wrong attitudes and positions has to take into account the context in which people develop and the direction in which they are moving. It has to start from a decision whether or not people who do wrong things or take wrong positions are definitely on the wrong side of the barricades or not. That is, whether they are enemies of the oppressed and exploited, enemies of socialism. If not, then you have the concrete political problem of trying to convince the persons involved that their actions and positions are wrong and that they should make some corrections. Moreover, in politics you have to give people a chance to learn from their own experience.

Thus, whether or not such persons do go over to the wrong side of the barricades depends to some degree on what you do. This responsibility cannot be avoided by making sweeping denunciations. That takes you out of the realm of politics and into one of moralizing.

A political approach is exactly what Plyushch does not understand. He developed out of a moral rebellion against the hypocrisy of the Stalinist bureaucracy. On the basis of moralism, he cannot make political distinctions and therefore he cannot be politically consistent.

Unfortunately, Dr. Shahak also seems to take a moralistic approach, and this leads him to make equal and opposite errors to those of Plyushch.

Shahak's moralistic way of thinking is shown first of all by the fact that he begins by raising arguments about specific acts he attributes to Plyushch and winds up by calling Bukovsky, whom Plyushch defends, a Nazi who is preparing the way for a nuclear attack on the USSR. If Shahak had reached such a conclusion on the basis of political thinking, he would be obliged to start from this in his argument and prove it, rather than simply assert it in a ringing finale.

If Plyushch associates himself with persons who are Nazis and preparing the way for a nuclear attack on the USSR, that is decisive and overshadows everything else. Why, then, get upset about his coming to Israel, “flattering” the regime, and equating anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism?

In fact, Shahak begins with an angry response to what he sees as Plyushch giving aid and comfort to the Zionist regime, and that is the only clear, concrete basis he gives for his arguments. If Plyushch did what Shahak says, it was certainly a bad thing and I would not justify it in the slightest. I have not seen the text of any such statements, but I can well believe that Plyushch has illusions about the Zionist state, since I do not know of any antibureaucratic fighter in Eastern Europe or among the European peoples of the USSR who is clear on this question.

It is natural for someone who has waged a courageous struggle against the Zionist regime to react angrily at seeing someone with Plyushch's prestige as a fighter for human rights support arguments by which this state justifies itself.

However, in an equal and opposite way to the Israeli state, the Soviet regime

against which Plyushch waged a courageous struggle, the regime that subjected him to years of torture, also equates anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism. The Stalinist bureaucrats do this by carrying on an anti-Semitic campaign in the guise of anti-Zionism.

In the society from which Plyushch comes, it is the Jews who are persecuted, and when they look for support and for refuge to the only state that claims to be dedicated to defending the Jewish people, this is used to justify persecuting them.

As a rebel and a fighter against oppression, Plyushch sides with those he himself has seen viciously persecuted. In his society it is correct politically for a supporter of human rights to defend the Jews, even those who consider themselves Zionists, against the bureaucracy.

After all, some Arabs respond to the oppression of their people at the hands of Jews by embracing reactionary anti-Jewish positions. Dr. Shahak would not think of abandoning such people to the repression of the Israeli state because of that, and correctly so. But in order to defend them against the Zionist oppressors, he would have to explain *why* they espoused such reactionary views.

Shahak would have to explain that a position of that kind, held by victims of oppression at the hands of Jews, is not the same as the anti-Semitism of the tsars or of Hitler, even though these Arabs might repeat exactly the same formulas. Would explaining this constitute justifying the wrong views and positions of such Arabs, justifying anti-Semitism? I am sure Dr. Shahak would agree with me that it would not.

I think the reason that there has been no discussion of the Zionist state among antibureaucratic fighters in the USSR and Eastern Europe, and hence no clarification, is that in their countries this is not an immediate political problem for them. The main thing for them is defending the persecuted Jews against the anti-Semitic bureaucracy.

It is only in the defense of the Crimean Tatars movement that the question of the role of Zionism in Israel has begun to become a practical question for Soviet oppositionists.

The Tatars, like the Palestinians, are a West Asian people with an Islamic tradition who have been expelled from their homeland by European settlers. Naturally, the Tatar leaders tend to identify with the Palestinians. So, how can antibureaucratic fighters among the European peoples of the USSR defend both the Tatars and the Zionists, since the latter have committed a similar genocide against a people with whom the Tatars tend to identify? This is a contradiction, moreover, that can be expected to sharpen.

The Tatars and oppressed West Asian peoples in the USSR need Arab support. It is precisely Arab anti-imperialists who can

put the most pressure on the Soviet bureaucracy on this question, since Moscow has tried so hard and for so long to identify itself with the struggle against imperialism in the Arab East.

Arab support for the Tatars would also have an important impact on the antibureaucratic movement in the USSR and begin to force it to face the issue of Zionist oppression. The question is whether Arab fighters will be able to see that in holding to a consistent position in defense of all oppressed peoples it is worth offending the Stalinists, who are half-heartedly allied with them in their fight against U.S. imperialism and its Zionist cat's-paw. In order to do that they would have to understand the Soviet bureaucracy well enough to know that they could defend the Tatars and still force Moscow to continue to give them the material support they need.

Jewish anti-Zionist fighters in Israel could do a great deal to educate Arab anti-imperialists about the need to defend the oppressed West Asian peoples in the USSR, and the Tatars in particular. It would help their own struggle if they did so, for two reasons.

First, if Arab anti-imperialists could be encouraged to take a more consistent position, defending oppressed peoples everywhere, it would help convince Jewish workers that they need not fear oppression at their hands.

Secondly, a strong defense of the Tatars by anti-Zionist Jews and Arabs would begin to drive a wedge between the Zionists and the most principled and courageous sections of the antibureaucratic movement in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, which are virtually the only countries where the anti-Semitism from which Zionism draws its strength is still an active political force. Thus, Dr. Shahak could combat any pro-Zionism on the part of Plyushch by extending his defense of the Palestinian Arabs to their Tatar brothers in the USSR.

On the other hand, Dr. Shahak's hasty statement at the end of his letter, which in effect accepts the Stalinist bureaucracy's justification for victimizing Bukovsky and Plyushch, does not help in the slightest to combat pro-Zionist illusions among those fighting the bureaucracy in the USSR and East Europe.

In fact, Shahak's making such a statement is as bad as what he says Plyushch did in Israel and at the Zionist meeting in Brussels. I can only think—and I hope that courageous anti-Stalinist fighters in the USSR and East Europe will not think that I am “justifying” Dr. Shahak's wrong “actions and arguments” by saying this—that he was led into such an error by a moralistic fervor similar to that of Plyushch.

I can only think that Dr. Shahak could not see beyond his moral indignation at

the Zionist oppression of Arabs and anti-Zionist Jews in the country where he lives. I can only think he could not see beyond his own personal experience, in which Stalinists are the allies of a people oppressed by Zionism, an experience diametrically opposite to that of Plyushch. This would explain also, the fervent but irrelevant arguments intended to prove that Hitler was qualitatively worse than Stalin.

No dictator was as bad for the Jews as Hitler. But Bukovsky is a Russian, and in the USSR he was fighting a Great Russian totalitarian bureaucracy. Bukovsky could make a good case, in my opinion, that Stalin's regime was just as repressive for the Russian people as Hitler's was for the Germans.

Hitler's aggressive militarism, in which the racism Shahak mentions was a prominent theme in Nazi propaganda, is another matter. Here the social basis of the regime comes into play.

Of course the social and economic basis of the Stalinist and Nazi dictatorships was different. Obviously Trotsky did not consider Nazi Germany the same thing as the Stalinist USSR. And saying that the two regimes were symmetrical to each other is not the same as saying that they were identical.

Bukovsky could also make a pretty good case that Stalinist repression in the USSR today is as severe as Zionist repression in Israel. It would not be very useful to argue which is worse, among other things, because that can vary from time to time without changing the basic realities in either country.

It does not do fighters against oppression in one country much good to try to convince those fighting oppression in another that they are as persecuted, or more persecuted, than the others may be.

What is important is to unite all fighters against oppression in a worldwide struggle to liberate humanity. And you cannot do that if you become so preoccupied with the wrongs suffered by one group of people that you unwittingly let yourself be led into helping those who are keeping your brothers and sisters in chains in another part of the world. □

Copies Missing?

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

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

An Open Letter to Santiago Carrillo

[The following open letter was sent to Santiago Carrillo, chairman of the Spanish Communist Party, on August 25, 1977. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Dear Comrade:

During your interview on French television several months ago, you affirmed that you are willing to participate in a public debate at any time on the problems related to "Eurocommunism." For our part, we propose that you have that debate with one of us, in Madrid, Barcelona, Paris, Milan, or some other city. We are ready to discuss with you or with representatives of your party all the material conditions necessary for the fair organization of such a debate.

In your book "*Eurocommunism and the State*," you call the murder of Andrés Nin by the GPU an "abominable crime." At the same time, you think that Trotsky—with whom you say you have fundamental differences—was a great revolutionist whose writings you will distribute inside the party that you lead. Thus, we suppose, you consider his murder—committed by a GPU agent who was a member of the PSUC*—an equally abominable crime. And you cannot judge this victim of Stalin any differently from all the old guard of the Bolshevik Party, among them the majority of the members of the Central Committee in Lenin's time.

On the other hand, we will soon be celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, the most important event of the twentieth century. So we call on you and your party, as the PCE or together with the Italian CP, the French CP, and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia if they agree, to declare yourselves publicly in favor of the rehabilitation of those who, together with Lenin, led the Bolshevik Party and the Communist International during and after the October Revolution: Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov, Rakovsky, Pyatakov, Preobrazhensky, and all their comrades who were murdered by Stalin and his followers. We also call on you to demand the publication and distribution of their writings so that the young Soviet generations can make up their own minds about whether the opinions of Stalin's

victims were correct or erroneous in the light of history. This is an elementary question of communist dignity and the necessary struggle against falsification of history; it is a question that will continue to be raised in many forms, in the Soviet

Six Workers Parties Backed Demand

LCR Wins Legal Status in Spain

The Liga Comunista Revolucionaria (LCR—Revolutionary Communist League), a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International in Spain, has won its months-long battle for legalization, according to the September 25 issue of the French Trotskyist daily *Rouge*.

Two other organizations, the Organización de la Izquierda Comunista (Organization of the Communist Left) and the Front Nacional de Catalunya (National Front of Catalonia) were granted legal status at the same time as the LCR.

Up to August, only six Spanish workers parties had been able to achieve legalization under the laws of the post-Franco regime. On August 27, all of these parties joined together to release a statement in Madrid charging the Suárez government's minister of the interior, Rodolfo Martín Villa, with illegal delay on a request for legal status from the LCR.

The LCR filed its request for legalization on February 14. Subsequently, Martín Villa failed to meet three deadlines for notification of the LCR of the status of its request, as set out in the complex provisions of the Law on Associations.

A number of central leaders of the already legalized workers parties signed the statement supporting the LCR. Among them were Felipe González, leader of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party, the largest workers party in Spain; Communist Party Chairman Santiago Carrillo and CP trade-union leader Marcelino Camacho; and Enrique Tierno Galván, who heads the Popular Socialist Party.

The text of the statement follows.

* * *

The undersigned parties charge that the minister of the interior has failed to comply with any of the legal time limits that should have been considered in

Union and on a world scale, until it is definitively resolved.

Communist greetings,

Ernest Mandel, member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.
Alain Krivine and *Daniel Bensaid*, members of the Political Bureau of the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire of France.

Miguel Romero and *Jaime Pastor*, members of the Political Bureau of the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria of Spain.

responding to the request for legalization of the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria.

They consider that this situation shows once again the arbitrary and discriminatory criteria that are being utilized in the application of the already anachronistic Law of Associations inherited from the old regime. They demonstrate their solidarity and demand that the LCR be legalized without any more delay, together with those parties whose legalization is pending or whose legalization has been denied.

Partido Socialista Obrero Español (Spanish Socialist Workers Party), Partido Comunista de España (Spanish Communist Party), Partido Socialista Popular (Popular Socialist Party), Partido del Trabajo de España (Labor Party of Spain), Organización Revolucionaria de Trabajadores (Revolutionary Workers Organization), Movimiento Comunista (Communist Movement). □

Laos Appeals for Food Relief

The Laotian Agriculture Ministry and the United Nations Development Program have issued a joint appeal for international relief aid to help stave off the effects of serious drought that threatens to cause severe food shortages in Laos.

Annual rains, which normally begin in May, failed this year, resulting in drought in many parts of the country and causing an estimated shortfall in rice production of 60 percent. Savannakhet Province, which is usually able to provide rice for neighboring provinces, received only 2.8 inches of rain in June, compared to a normal 12 inches. The predicted crop loss in that province is 80 percent.

The Laotians are asking for 367,500 tons of rice, as well as more than 2,000 tons of seeds for substitute crops such as corn, potatoes, and beans.

*Partit Socialista Unificat de Catalunya (United Socialist Party of Catalonia)—the Catalan branch of the Spanish CP.—IP

Selections From the Left

HAYTH

"*Auge*" (Dawn), the morning paper of the left. Published daily in Athens. Reflects the views of the Greek Communist Party ("interior").

The overtures to the "Eurocommunist" parties by Peking and Pyongyang have not been confined to their friendly reception of Tito, who is one of the main protectors of these parties within world Stalinist circles. A few days after the Yugoslav chief's visit, a delegation of the Greek CP ("interior") also turned up in China and North Korea, and likewise got the VIP treatment.

Such a reception must have been particularly heart-warming to the CP ("interior"), since Moscow has virtually excommunicated this party. The Soviet press ignores it and refers always to the rival "exterior" faction as "the Greek CP." Even the Italian CP leadership, with which the "interior" enthusiastically identifies itself and whose policy it unconditionally defends, has tended to be shy about maintaining open relations with these Greek supporters of "Eurocommunism."

On the other hand, since Yugoslavia borders on Greece, Tito has a special interest in having political allies in the Greek workers movement.

On the front page of its September 15 issue, *Auge* published the joint communiqué of the "interior" delegation and the North Korean leadership. It began:

At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Korea, a delegation from the Greek CP (Interior), headed by Comrade Babes Dhrakopoulos, the general secretary of the party, made a visit of friendship to the People's Republic of Korea September 6-10, 1977.

Comrade Kim Il-sung—the great leader—general secretary of the Party of Labor of Korea, welcomed our delegation and discussed with us in a comradely way.

Kim Il-sung's name is never mentioned in the North Korean press or in governmental statements without being preceded by such honorifics as "the respected and beloved leader." But the reference to him in the joint communiqué as "the great leader" seems not to be mere protocol, as for example a polite non-Catholic might address a head nun by her title of "Mother General" or a diplomat would address the shah of Iran as "your imperial majesty, the king of kings, the light of the Aryans."

The September 13 *Auge* went so far as to publish an article hailing "Juche Thought," the official ideology of the North Korean Stalinist regime.

The Greek CP ("interior") made it clear that it is perfectly willing to play the role of apologist for a Stalinist dictatorship,

not flinching even at hailing the bizarre totalitarianism of Kim Il-sung, so long as such a relationship does not unduly interfere with political maneuvers at home.

The joint communiqué thus stressed the commitment of both the Korean CP and the Greek CP ("interior") leaderships to the principle of the independence of "sister parties."

The two delegations stressed that only when sister parties accept the principle of equality and mutual respect as well as noninterference in each other's internal affairs . . . can there be really strong . . . sisterly ties.

"October," weekly newspaper of the Marxist-Leninist Movement. Published in Helsinki, Finland.

The September 9 issue tries to explain why Peking's overture to Tito, who was formerly labeled by the Mao regime as an archrevisionist, did not constitute an "unprincipled" about-face on the part of the Chinese CP leadership.

It quotes from an article by Ingvar Oja in the August 31 issue of *Helsingin Sanomat*, Finland's major bourgeois newspaper, on Tito's visit to China:

"In general, especially at the end of the 1960s, the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, has branded Tito as a revisionist and Yugoslavia as a country that exhibited many disturbing features of Western capitalism. . . . But now the gulf between these two countries seems to be a thing of the past and Yugoslavia seems more and more clearly to be becoming China's best friend in Europe."

October continues:

Has China made an unprincipled 180-degree turn and come to consider Yugoslavia socialist? Khrushchev made such a turnabout toward Yugoslavia in the 1960s.

When the Khrushchev clique seized power in the Soviet Union in the 1960s, China was quite correct to focus on the question of the class nature of Yugoslavia. The degeneration of the socialist Soviet Union and its transformation into a capitalist state was a great historical regression, and in the 1950s Yugoslavia was the "pioneer" of this process, the first socialist country to degenerate into a capitalist one. Both the Comintern and the Soviet Union adopted the basic point of view that the economic relationships established in Yugoslavia were capitalist in nature and that Tito was a revisionist.

The world situation has changed remarkably since the 1960s. The Soviet Union is now developing into the world's most powerful imperialist country. The competition among the superpowers is sharpening and thus the danger of war is growing. From the standpoint of the

present world situation, the Chinese are quite right to deemphasize the ideological differences between China and Yugoslavia. . . . The main task today is to build the strongest possible front against the superpowers in order to check their drive for domination and to postpone the danger of war.

The Chinese say: "It is necessary to unite all those forces that can be united, to assemble all the positive factors in order to bring pressure to bear, and, to the extent that this is possible, turn the negative factors into positive ones."

Yugoslavia represents such a positive factor because of its policy of nonalignment. Yugoslavia does not belong to the Warsaw Pact. Yugoslavia is one of the founders of the movement of nonaligned countries and plays an active role in this movement. It was precisely this policy of nonalignment and opposition to imperialism on Yugoslavia's part that Chairman Hua Kuo-feng stressed at the dinner in Tito's honor. . . .

Among other things, Yugoslavia has not permitted Soviet arms to be shipped through its territory to aid the Soviet Union's Cuban mercenaries occupying Angola.

THE STARRY PLOUGH

Official organ of the Irish Republican Socialist Party, published monthly in Dublin.

The September issue carried the following report from one of the main Catholic ghettos in West Belfast:

"Belfast's Turf Lodge, which has solidly resisted British presence in its area, has been subjected to British terror on a scale not seen in Belfast for some time. British troops saturated the area following the Queen's visit in August, raiding and ransacking houses, beating the occupants, irrespective of sex or age, and stealing anything of value. Numerous arrests were made and those arrested were taken to Fort Monagh and Castlereagh where they were severely beaten. One victim described Fort Monagh as an 'abattoir' [slaughterhouse] with blood splashed on walls and in pools on the ground.

"The Marine Commandos came in from the Monagh roundabout entrance and then from the other end of Turf Lodge only to be met by bin bashing, whistling and stones from youths and women of the area. These were baton charged and eyewitnesses saw women and children being beaten by riflebutts. Then British troops began their orgy of violence and looting, arresting anyone in sight and beating them senseless on the way to Fort Monagh and Castlereagh where the treatment was continued before they were released without charge. Up to twenty people were taken to the Royal Victoria Hospital.

"Women were treated just as badly. Mrs.

Berni Highland was attacked in her house, beaten about the face, dragged outside and kicked in the stomach. Kathleen Morgan complained about her bad lung during the course of an assault and was immediately beaten on the side of her body with the bad lung. Many houses were left almost uninhabitable. Hundreds of pounds [sterling], ornaments, jewellery were stolen during the raids. Almost 40,000 pounds worth of stolen property, looted from Belfast city centre shops, was discovered in the British Army base in the Grand Central Hotel."

ИЗВЕСТИЯ

"Izvestia" (News), organ of the Soviets of Workers Deputies of the USSR. Published daily in Moscow.

In a dispatch from Addis Ababa in the September 13 issue, correspondent A. Nikanorov presents a view of the situation in Ethiopia:

The internal reactionaries have grouped around the so-called Ethiopian Democratic Union, the nucleus of which consists of supporters of the monarchy. This formation is staking its chances on armed terror. A more disguised but no less dangerous enemy are the ultraleftist ranters and ravers of the notorious People's Revolutionary Party [PRP—a pro-Peking group], which is made up of petty-bourgeois elements. This party stresses demagogic slogans, seeking to divert the working masses from a genuine solution to their vital problems.

However, recently, having dissipated its political capital, the PRP has also turned to terror. The arena of its criminal activities is the capital itself. At the hands of its hired killers have fallen many trade-union leaders; heads of neighborhood associations and organs of local self-government; prominent officials of the Provisional Bureau for Organizing the Popular Masses, which is engaged in laying the groundwork for the formation of a party of the working class; and members of the Provisional Military Administrative Council. The PRP has tried to split the highest bodies of the armed forces. This February, an attempt to carry out a reactionary coup was foiled.

Tension within the country is sharpening because of the actions of separatists in the northern province of Eritrea. Incited from abroad and supplied with all the essential equipment, nationalist groupings are demanding the separation of Eritrea from Ethiopia, thereby threatening the territorial integrity of the country. A war is in progress in the eastern province of the Ogaden. The Ethiopian government has announced that Somali regular army units are involved.

The actions of these splitters corresponds entirely to the plans of certain reactionary regimes, in particular Saudi Arabia, to turn the Red Sea into "an Arab Lake."

Despite all these perils assailing "revolutionary Ethiopia," Nikanorov found grounds for optimism. After quoting a director of a nationalized factory complex about plans for increasing employment and raising the living standards of the workers, and the confidence this was arousing, the Soviet correspondent wrote:

This confidence of the working masses in their future is inspiring them to great feats in the name of building the new system that is arising in ancient Ethiopia. We were in Avras when the meeting of the Soviet-Ethiopian Friendship Society was held. At this meeting, Bassazenu Gybai spoke, saying: "For the revolutionary people of Ethiopia, the Great October Revolution is a guiding star, and it is not by chance that we chose Marxist-Leninist teaching as the basis for building our new society, which will be free from exploitation and oppression."

The official visit of the chairman of the Military Administrative Council Mengistu Haile Mariam to the USSR made a great impact on this country. In the course of this visit the traditional ties of friendship between the Ethiopian and Soviet peoples were further developed on the basis of new principles.

This country is commemorating the third anniversary of its new epoch. It is celebrating this anniversary in a difficult situation but with firm determination to defend the gains of the revolution.

rouge

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

The negotiations in progress among the three parties that make up the French Union of the Left—the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, and the Left Radicals, a small bourgeois party—on updating the Common Program were temporarily interrupted on September 14, when Robert Fabre, leader of the Left Radicals, objected to a provision allowing workers in an enterprise to demand that it be nationalized.

By the end of the week, however, a compromise had been arranged. Fabre agreed to maintain the article dealing with nationalizations while the CP agreed to drop Peugeot-Citroën from the Common Program's list of corporations to be nationalized.

Writing in the September 19 issue, F. Lourson shows how this incident reveals the central role the Left Radicals play in the class-collaborationist front:

In 1936, the French CP's theoretical justification for unity with the Radical Party was the need to "broaden the alliance with middle-class layers" against fascism. At the time, this explanation bordered on fraud, because the Radical Party, which for years had been the main bourgeois party in power (garnering more than two million votes) was, in fact—as Trotsky put it—the "democratic party of French big capital," not the so-called political representative of middle-class layers.

Today the "Left" Radicals—with whom the CP is getting ready to share the seat of government—are nothing but a pitiful remnant, whose vote totals are often lower than those of the far left. Few CPers today would take the risk of saying that the reason for the alliance with them is that "they represent the middle-class layers."

Nevertheless, it is for the sake of unity with them that the CP has declared its readiness "to make the necessary efforts." Despite its verbal

firmness, it seems to be clearly leaning toward two revisions watering down the Common Program on points directly affecting the workers:

- "Softening the clause prohibiting employers from dismissing workers without first reassigning them to an equivalent job."

[CP head Georges] Marchais himself quoted on television an interview in which Fabre boasted of having fought for the government, not the employers, to have control over job reassignments, which would make things easier for employers anxious to "cut the fat out of their payrolls."

- "A freeze on extending nationalizations."

Everyone knows about the Radicals' insistence on eliminating the "little sentence" allowing the workers to demand that their plant be nationalized by Parliament. Marchais has stated that he is opposed to eliminating it. But he constantly refers to the constitution, which provides that only those companies that hold a monopoly or provide a public service stand to be nationalized. That would rule out the workers at Idéal-Standard, Lip, Montefibre, etc.

This is a clear illustration of what purpose is served by the presence of Left Radicals today, "left" Gaullists tomorrow, or "independent figures" called into the government: to "justify" all the capitulations, all the retreats of the Communist and Socialist parties before the bourgeoisie.



"Breton People," magazine of the Democratic Union of Brittany, published monthly in Brest.

The September issue reports on the successful outcome of a six-month recruitment drive launched by the Democratic Union of Brittany in January 1977:

"During these six months, 100,000 leaflets were distributed, 10,000 posters were pasted up, and more than 100 meetings were held all over Brittany. Everyone must have seen those black, white, and red posters calling upon Bretons to join us in 'working together to build the socialist Brittany of tomorrow.'

"This call to join our fight was well received, since we went over the goal of 300 new members that had been set for the campaign.

"Our new comrades come from all backgrounds—young and old, men and women, intellectuals and workers. They also come from every part of Brittany—from Léon, Cornwall, the Nantes country. This influx of new members has been reflected in the setting up of new branches in Lesneven, Châteauneuf-du-Faou, Plestin-les-Grèves, and Malestroit, and of new cells in Hennebont and the Nantes country.

"This growth in membership represents a milestone in the struggle to decolonize Brittany. Day by day, more and more of our fellow Bretons are deciding that waging an effective struggle in Brittany today means being in the Democratic Union of Brittany."

Gandhi's Successors Stall for Time

By Sharad Jhaveri

JAMNAGAR—The Working Committee of the ruling Janata Party met August 17-21 to discuss economic policy issues. Despite three days of continuous deliberations, the committee could not work out an integrated outlook and strategy. It therefore resorted to the timeworn expedient of appointing another committee to continue to investigate the problems of economic policy. Its report will be considered at the next meeting of the committee in Ahmedabad in October.

Meanwhile, the committee passed a resolution providing a ten-point formula for mainly administrative measures to contain rising prices.

Since its inception after the general elections earlier this year, Morarji Desai's Janata Party regime has been stalling for time on the economic front. No major economic initiative has been taken so far, almost five months after it won a massive electoral victory. In its first 100 days, the Janata Party regime concentrated more on exposing the misdeeds of corruption and repression of the former Gandhi regime under the state of emergency. The Desai regime went on appointing one commission after another to inquire into such acts. But on the economic front it just allowed things to drift.

A commentator, writing in the June 1-16 issue of the New Delhi magazine *India Today*, remarked that the Janata Party approach seemed to be to go along with the crisis for a while, exhorting the various parties to do their best under the circumstances, and generally play it cool unless the situation got completely out of hand. According to the commentator, this approach did pay off for a while, and both prices and the workers were held in check. But the regime has not evolved a coherent policy.

It was thought that the delay in the presentation of the Economic Survey and the budget would give the Janata Party time to make up its mind on the future course of its policies. But the survey and budget, when they were released, showed that that hope had also failed to materialise.

The Economic Survey of the Janata Party regime stressed several areas where the Indian economy seemed to have fared "worse" than in 1975-76. According to the survey, agricultural production declined from 120.8 million tonnes in 1975-76 to 111 million tonnes in 1976-77. The gross national product increased by only 2% during

the year covered by the survey, compared to an increase of 8.5% in the previous year. The survey noted a serious drop in the output of edible oils and cotton production.

Only exports and prices increased. Exports rose by 23.2%, while prices increased by more than 12%. The growth in money supply by 17% in 1976-77—when the rate of growth in the national income showed a



DESAI: Adept at tactic of standing still.

marked deceleration—was a cause for concern in the survey. The survey described unemployment as India's "most serious problem."

An article in the June 14 *Economic Times* remarked that the survey presents "a rather dull outlook for the current year." An editorial in the same issue said that the survey painted a rather "dismal picture of the state of our economy."

A recent study by the Asian Development Bank noted that the Indian regime was seriously considering exporting food grains—when nearly 300 million people live below the destitution level, that is, they cannot even afford one square meal a day!

The *Economic Times* editorial, while conceding that the Economic Survey highlighted two "bright spots"—food-grain stocks and foreign exchange reserves—

stressed that these have not helped the economy to any significant extent. The editorial explained that this was because a large number of people continue to live on a semistarvation diet because of a lack of purchasing power. Food grains are thus rotting, without any adequate storage facilities.

The bulging foreign exchange reserves, moreover, were achieved at the expense of investment for growth and they have triggered monetary expansion because of inadequate credit control. The editorial remarked that the Economic Survey did not seem to indicate "any fresh thinking by the new government in this respect."

Writing in the June 10 *Indian Express*, Balraj Mehta, a noted economic commentator, said, "The room for manoeuvres and the options open to the budget-makers are limited." He remarked that there were built-in compulsions and constraints in the overall economic and social situation that could not be wished away.

The budget itself did not take an integrated view of economic development. It did not have any proposals for pushing up the rate of growth or for curbing inflation. The regime made a significant concession to the bourgeoisie by extending investment allowances to almost all major industries and also by increasing their rates. The estimated gain for the capitalists comes to about Rs.220 crores.* This continues the marked trend of giving concessions to the bourgeoisie to induce investment.

However, a May 3 study of capital issues in the private sector by the *Economic Times* Research Bureau showed a steep fall in fresh investment by private corporations in 1976-77. The total capital raised in 1976-77 amounted to Rs.82.1 crores against Rs.93.9 crores in 1975-76. Equity and preference shares issues came down to Rs.36.6 crores in 1976-77 from Rs.67.1 crores earlier.

Not content with the lavish budgetary concessions dished out every year by the state, the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industries, on the eve of its golden jubilee session in New Delhi April 22, presented a seven-point plan to the government to secure "a bold increase in investment." It asked for a cut in the bank rate, liberalisation of credit facilities, the sale of buffer food-grain stocks, and other concessions.

In addition, the budget proposed Rs.130 crores in additional taxes. The main burden fell on luxury items. About Rs.92 crores are direct taxes. The income tax exemption limit was raised from Rs.8,000 to Rs.10,000. Nearly 800,000 taxpayers, about 20 percent of the total, will be released from the tax net.

Two important reasons account for the Janata Party regime's failure to come to

* One rupee is equivalent to US\$0.12. A crore is 10 million.—IP

grips with the economic stagnation.

First of all, the class composition of the new officialdom is not very different from that of Gandhi's Congress Party administration. The three senior ministers, including Prime Minister Desai, belong to the old conservative school of laissez-faire capitalism. The Janata Party itself is composed mainly of parties that had been on the far right of the Indian political scene. By a twist of circumstances, the Janata Party was able to come to power by painting itself as a defender of bourgeois democracy against Gandhi's emergency rule.

On the economic front, it believes less in the use of demagogic, socialist rhetoric than in the "free play" of market forces. For the moment, the Janata Party's economic policy seems to be influenced by four currents.

One, the so-called Gandhian socialists, are best represented by Morarji Desai. They regard capitalists as the "Custodians of the Wealth." Their approach toward dealing with inflation exemplifies this view. They simply request, cajole, and exhort the capitalists and hoarders to lower their prices.

Another current is composed of former Socialist Party members, who generally

adhere to the old Nehru strategy of emphasising heavy industry, the public sector, and the public distribution system.

The third current is best represented by Home Minister Charan Singh. It reflects the interests of the new well-to-do peasants or capitalist farmers who have emerged since independence in 1947. The recent Working Committee proceedings of the Janata Party, as well as the party's election manifesto, reveal the preponderant influence of this layer. They are generally oriented toward greater rural development and planning, particularly the expansion of small-scale and handicraft industries at the expense of the large monopoly business houses.

The fourth current is the old Jan Sangh. It is the best organised, but is at present keeping a low profile.

None of these four currents, of course, favors the abolition of capitalism. Despite different interests, all are agreed on the main task of salvaging capitalism in India. They differ only on the best methods to accomplish this task.

The other major reason for the failure of the Janata Party to get a grip on the economic situation is simply the immensity and complexity of the problems confronting the country. □

May Be Viewed in 40,000 Years

Show in Outer Space Free of Sex

The Pioneer spacecraft that were sent past Jupiter in 1973 and 1974 carried a plaque portraying an unclothed man and woman standing beside a pulsar-based map of the earth's position. Although the plaque won a great deal of favorable publicity for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, (NASA), the design met with three kinds of objections.

The *Los Angeles Times* published letters asking why taxpayers' money was being spent on sending smut to outer space. Some feminists noted that only the man's hand, not the woman's, was shown raised in greeting. In Britain a number of people complained that the plaque had not been designed by a properly constituted international committee.

Recalling this in the September 16 issue of *Science*, Nicholas Wade reports on NASA's decision to include a similar message in the two Voyager spacecraft that were dispatched August 20 and September 5.

The two Voyagers are designed to send back to Earth observations of the outer planets, then "shoot out of the solar system and glide across the galaxy, unchanged and uneroded for a billion years.

Their first chance of being intercepted will come in 40,000 years time, when one of the spacecraft passes within a light year of another star."

Radio astronomer Frank Drake of Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, was invited to decide what message the spacecraft should carry to other parts of the galaxy for possible retrieval by an advanced civilization.

He decided to improve on the Pioneer message, which he also designed. A small group was set up to help him choose material for incision on a 12-inch copper phonograph record, with signals convertible to both sound and pictures.

What do you tell an alien being when you have his attention? One piece of information Drake's group deemed would be useful was the fact that humans reproduce. They included a photograph of an unclothed man and woman and an anatomical diagram of the human genital system. Much thought was given to selecting the couple. Should they be just average, dumpy human beings? "If you are really trying to tell them what we are like, you don't send Raquel Welch and Robert Redford," Drake observes. Perhaps it should be Jimmy and Rosalyn, someone had suggested.

To appease the antisex snoopers and busybodies, the group decided that the picture should be as unerotic as possible. "Drake thought he had the solution: show a man with a woman who was slightly pregnant, with a diagram indicating the position of the fetus."

That solution was axed by NASA. Herbert Rowe, NASA's associate administrator for external affairs, sniffed at the argument that the photograph was not erotic. "There are some," he said, "who don't agree with that, and it's that which makes the ball game. There are some who believe that naked pregnant women are extremely erotic."

The disk includes 115 photographs—projections of the solar system, anatomical drawings of the principal species, human families, shots of islands, seashores, deserts, valleys, mountains, and so on. Pictures of a supermarket, a superhighway, and traffic jams show life the way it is in Ithaca.

Greetings spoken in fifty-five languages are included next. Drake said, "NASA got worried because we had no American politicians, so at the last minute we put in a speech by Carter."

The president, unfortunately, declined to record his message. The solution to that problem was rather neat. The speech was shown as a photograph of a printed text.

A sampling of terrestrial sounds will enable alien beings to hear "whales, rain, mud pots, footsteps, heartbeats, blacksmiths, rockets, and pulsars."

The music section includes twenty-seven items, nineteen of them "taken from Asian classical music, folk music, and the music of primitive peoples." Eight are from Western classical scores.

The group had been prepared to show evidence of war, crime, and suffering. "But everyone acted like a typical human family and wanted to put the best foot forward." A "beautiful picture" of a nuclear explosion was "instinctively rejected." Only a picture of the Great Wall of China hints at war.

Just at the last moment, a few hours before the Voyager record had to be engraved, NASA officials realized that the message being sent into the depths of time and space was incomplete. An urgent call went to Cornell: Add the names of all the congressmen on the House and Senate space science committees.

Will this educational phonograph record be deciphered by bug-eyed monsters in 42,000 A.D.? Or will they try to speed it on its way?

For a billion years to come, as the package enters local planetary systems, will the truly civilized beings there view it with suspicion as most likely a neutron bomb intended by the long-vanished society of capitalist America to set off a star war? □

AROUND THE WORLD



1,000 Students Arrested in São Paulo

About 1,000 persons were arrested on the campus of Catholic University in São Paulo, Brazil, on September 22. An Associated Press dispatch said the arrests came in the course of a violent police attack on students attempting to hold a meeting.

Those arrested were released soon afterward, but the authorities announced that thirty-seven of them were to be charged under the National Security Law. This legislation provides that persons charged with "crimes against national security" may be held incommunicado for ten days and kept in jail for up to thirty days.

On September 26, Governor Paulo Egídio Martins of the state of São Paulo, and the federal secretary of public security, Erasmo Díaz, held a news conference. They exhibited a large quantity of material they characterized as "subversive."

"The material consisted of leftist posters, literature, and pamphlets, examples of illegal communist dailies, and other similar things," the AP dispatch reported. "Among the posters exhibited by Martins and Díaz were some that said 'total and unrestricted amnesty,' 'suffrage for illiterates and soldiers,' and 'democratic liberties.'"

Martins claimed that such materials "prove that a staging area for the Brazilian Communist Party exists at the university."

He continued: "The government has not the slightest doubt that a subversive attack is being prepared, which will utilize the student movement in an attempt to seize power. This we shall not permit."

The AP dispatch said this was the first time the regime has mentioned the outlawed Brazilian CP in its denunciations of the student movement.

"Student leaders again rejected the accusations, and said that they showed 'an attempt to justify before public opinion the arbitrary acts that are being committed in the name of national security.'"

Uruguayan Editor Expelled

Leonardo Guzmán, editor of the Montivideo opposition daily *El Día*, was ordered expelled from Uruguay on September 25 and was given forty-eight hours to leave the country. The newspaper itself was shut down for ten days. Guzmán fled Uruguay on September 27.

The government decree ordering these actions said that "a phrase contrary to morality and public decency" had ap-

peared in the classified advertising section of the paper's September 25 edition.

El Día's management protested that the advertisement, which the regime found to be "insulting to the Armed Forces," had resulted from an "act of sabotage" in the paper's printing plant.

But the government's orders were enforced nonetheless. "Such conduct," the decree said, "violated the norms that regulate printed materials and thus provoked the action of the Executive Power, which is charged with preventing disruption of government institutions and public order."

No Illusions

Sri Lankan Prime Minister J.R. Jayewardene appears a bit worried about the implications of the massive electoral victory that his United National Party won in the recent general elections.

According to the September 22 *Ceylon News*, Jayewardene commented in one of his first press statements after becoming prime minister, "Some voted for me only because they thought they could overthrow me faster."

Pretoria A-Bomb Still in the Works?

A top Carter administration official was quoted in the September 27 *New York Post* as saying that the South African government still has a nuclear test facility in the Kalahari Desert, and could explode an atomic bomb at any time.

"The official, who is in a position to read all U.S. intelligence reports filed on the subject and asked not to be quoted by name, said some of Carter's advisers believe Pretoria feels it has little to lose from exploding a nuclear device because it has few international supporters.

"I think South Africa—very much like Israel—has a view of Armageddon. And—like the Israelis—they are determined to go down fighting."

220,000 Flee Mobutu's Terror

According to a United Nations estimate, there are about 220,000 refugees from Zaïre now living in neighboring Angola. Of these, 150,000 are in Angola's Lunda Province and 70,000 in Mexico. The refugees told an official UN delegation that they had fled from Zaïre's Shaba and Kivu provinces following intensive air

bombardments and "repression" by the regime of Mobutu Sese Seko.

In March, opponents of the Mobutu regime began military actions in Shaba, which Mobutu was only able to contain with the help of Moroccan troops, French advisers, and American, Belgian, and French military aid. The numbers of refugees streaming across the border into Angola is an indication of the level of reprisals against the local population by Mobutu's forces.

The Angolan regime has appealed for international relief aid for the refugees, about 50,000 of whom were said to be in immediate danger of starvation. The Swedish government announced September 21 that it was sending a military plane to airlift food and medicine to the refugees.

Gandhi in the Dock

Public hearings into former Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's state of emergency opened in New Delhi September 29. The inquiry is expected to last several months and to involve scores of witnesses, including Gandhi herself. One official revealed that J.C. Shah, a retired chief justice who is conducting the inquiry, has already received 48,000 specific charges of "excesses" under the Gandhi regime.

On the first day of the hearings, three of Gandhi's former cabinet ministers testified, claiming that they had been unwilling accomplices in Gandhi's repressive actions. Former Commerce Minister D.P. Chattopadhyaya specifically laid responsibility on Gandhi.

Eager to Leave?

A newspaper in Zurich, Switzerland, offered free two-week trips to the United States to the first twelve persons who would call the paper at 2 p.m. on September 27.

An estimated 120,000 tried to get through. All the main fuses in the central telephone exchange blew, putting the system out of operation for fifteen minutes. Exchanges in Olten and Lucerne, thirty miles away, were also affected.

Twelve persons did manage to reach the newspaper and win the free trips before the breakdown. (*Christian Science Monitor*, September 29.)

Kremlin Crackdown on Dissidents Continues

By Marilyn Vogt

Soviet authorities have arrested four more members of the Helsinki monitoring groups.

At the end of August, Feliks Serebrov, active in the Moscow group's subcommittee on psychiatric abuse against dissidents, was arrested in Moscow. Viktoras Pyatkus and Antanas Tiplatskas were arrested in Vilnius, where they were active in the Helsinki group of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

All three arrests were announced August 24 by dissident physicist Andrei Sakharov and dissident communist Pyotr Grigorenko at a Moscow news conference.

On September 12, Oskar Rabin, who has become prominent for his officially unapproved paintings and his efforts to organize unofficial art shows in Moscow, was arrested. Rabin had joined the Moscow Helsinki group in early 1977.

These arrests bring to thirteen the number of Helsinki monitoring group members who have been seized since January 1977.

The monitoring groups were organized by human-rights activists in the Soviet Union to oversee the Kremlin's compliance with human-rights provisions of the Helsinki accords. Moscow, along with Washington and thirty-three other governments, signed the accords in August 1975.

One of the human rights the thirty-five governments pledged to strengthen was the right to travel. The Helsinki monitoring groups have documented numerous cases in which the Kremlin rulers have inhibited freedom of travel. Oskar Rabin knows of infringements of travel rights from personal experience.

According to *Chronicle of Current Events* No. 40, Rabin and seven other artists in official disfavor applied for permission to travel in Europe and America to familiarize themselves with foreign art. They wanted to visit France, Yugoslavia, Poland, East Germany and West Germany, Italy, Canada, and the United States. They said each of the eight would finance their travel by taking with them two of their own paintings to sell.

Their application was rejected because, according to the Visa Office, such applications for group visas are not subject to consideration; an application to travel to a group of countries is not considered valid; the applicants had no invitation from abroad for such travel; and besides, the applicants had not presented the necessary certificates attesting reliability from

the appropriate party, trade-union, and administrative organs.

The Helsinki monitoring groups have been under serious attack since President Carter launched his hypocritical campaign in support of Soviet dissidents at the beginning of 1977. The Kremlin began arresting monitoring group members February 3, the arrests being accompanied by a stepped-up propaganda campaign attempting to link the dissidents with Washington's anti-Communist policies.

The bureaucrats even cooked up charges of "treason" against one of those arrested, Anatoly Shcharansky, a Jewish activist who, they charge, collaborated with the CIA because, knowing English well, he frequently met with foreign correspondents. If convicted, Shcharansky could be sentenced to death.

To date, two members of the Helsinki group in the Ukrainian SSR have been sentenced at a closed trial on charges of anti-Soviet activity. Mykola Rudenko received a twelve-year term and Oleksiy Tykhy a fifteen-year term.

The other monitoring group members being held are Miroslav Marinovich and Mikola Matosevich of the Ukrainian group; two members of the Georgian group, Merab Kostava and Zviad Gamsakhurdia; and Aleksandr Ginzburg and Yuri Orlov, members of the Moscow group.

Charges of collaborating with the CIA, like those raised against Shcharansky, are intended by the Stalinist bureaucrats to intimidate the dissidents to stop them from making contact with foreigners. However, a recent incident shows how the dissidents

themselves are exposing the frame-up nature of these Kremlin slanders.

In the July 6 London *Times*, British author Peter Reddaway reported on documents from dissidents in the Georgian SSR who maintain that agents of the Kremlin's security police, KGB, may now be posing as CIA agents in an effort to entrap fighters for democracy.

On May 21-22, Reddaway said, a man calling himself William Fawcett made contact with the wife of imprisoned Georgian dissident Gamsakhurdia and two other members of the Georgian Helsinki monitoring group. Fawcett claimed he was a foreign businessman so highly valued by the Kremlin that he had immunity from KGB surveillance.

Fawcett said Gamsakhurdia had been charged with treason and that Gamsakhurdia's wife should not contact any foreign correspondents, or things could get worse. He offered to use his immunity to help get samizdat out of the country, specifically the new Georgian samizdat journal the *Georgian Herald*. The KGB is currently trying to track down those responsible for this new underground journal.

"Then later," Reddaway reports, "speaking alone with Mrs. Gamsakhurdia, he suddenly suggested that she cooperate with the CIA. At this, she and her friends became seriously alarmed and reported the whole episode to the KGB."

The result was that the two Helsinki group members were taken in for questioning by a KGB officer, "who seemed unconcerned about the activities of a CIA agent, and he carefully avoided answering a question about whether Fawcett was an agent provocateur."

The Georgian dissidents call for an investigation in the West of Fawcett and his CIA links. Setting the record straight as to their attitude toward the CIA, the dissidents say they "resolutely condemn any illegal activity by the intelligence agencies, CIA or any other." □

Castro Forecasts Slow Process in Détente Efforts

According to a Reuters dispatch from Havana, Fidel Castro said September 28 that it will take a long time to complete the process of improving relations with the United States.

"We do not believe the process will be a rapid one; we tend to think it will be a slow and long process," Castro said. "But we are not obstinate, nor do we give negative responses to any positive gesture which is made."

Speaking at a rally of one million people in Havana's Revolution Square, Castro said that relations with the United States had improved this year but enormous problems remained.

These included the United States trade embargo against Cuba and its continued occupation of the Guantánamo Naval Base.

Another block is the insistence of the Carter administration that Cuba pay the \$1.8 billion claim of American capitalists whose holdings were expropriated during the Cuban revolution.

Castro said that compensation was ruled out unless Cuba in turn was compensated for the aggression committed against the revolution by the Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford administrations.

Capitalism Fouls Things Up

Shell Knew in 1954— Workers Find Out in 1977



In 1952 the Shell Chemical Company began laboratory tests of a new pesticide—dibromochloropropane, or DBCP. By 1954, the company had an internal paper reporting medical problems such as the shrinking of testicles and sterility in animals.

Later in the 1950s, another study was done jointly by Shell, the Dow Chemical Company, and the University of California School of Medicine. Ninety days of experiments with laboratory animals showed that DBCP could be absorbed through the skin, as well as inhaled. Even at levels as low as 5 parts per million in the air, animals breathing DBCP vapor suffered damage to various tissues, including sperm cells. Higher levels caused actual destruction of sperm-producing tissue. No tests for cancer were run.

The results, published in 1961, were considered "equivocal," and Dow and Shell and other companies began manufacturing and marketing the new pesticide. Dow adopted a standard calling for no more than 1 part per million in their chemical plants.

In July of this year, male workers at the Occidental Chemical Company plant in Lathrop, California, who came into daily contact with DBCP, began to notice that none of their wives were having children. One of the workers, Ted Bricker, had learned from earlier medical tests that he was sterile. Bricker and union leaders at the plant persuaded the other workers to undergo similar tests. These revealed that fourteen of the twenty-seven men handling DBCP were either sterile or had very low sperm counts.

After this information became known, workers at a Dow Chemical plant near Magnolia, Arkansas, were tested. Sixty-two of the eighty-six men who produce DBCP there were found to have abnormally low or nonexistent sperm counts.

Similar results were soon found at Shell Oil's DBCP plants in Alabama and Colorado. And research by the National Cancer Institute was reported to have shown that DBCP causes stomach and mammary cancer in laboratory animals.

The clear dangers involved in further use of DBCP forced emergency action by

three federal agencies on September 8. The Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration imposed lower limits on DBCP exposure, suspended its use on food crops, and instituted a "food-monitoring" program to determine the extent of DBCP contamination of produce already on the market. Dow and Shell announced suspension of production of the chemical and the recall of quantities of it already in the hands of retailers and users.

Dr. Sidney Wolfe of the Public Citizens' Health Research Group called the government moves "a half-gesture toward dealing with a really serious problem." He demanded a total ban on the pesticide, calling it "one of the more powerful carcinogens."

Tens of thousands of factory and farm workers in the United States have handled DBCP. Until the government suspension was ordered, the pesticide was being used on food crops such as broccoli, cauliflower, cabbage, cucumbers, peanuts, radishes, and carrots.

"It's used on 20 to 25 crops," an EPA official said, "so I would think a large segment of the American public has been exposed at one time or another."

So great was the concern generated by the revelations about the effects of DBCP that the editors of the *New York Times* felt compelled to write the following on September 27 under the headline "Let the Workers Know the Risk":

Must we continue to make such belated discoveries? For the foreseeable future the answer appears to be yes. Our highly industrialized society has already spewed tens of thousands of chemicals about the environment, many of them approved for use at a time when knowledge was scant and standards were low. . . .

But a simple interim step needs to be taken now: Let the workers know the possible risks they run. A committee of the National Academy of Sciences recently recommended that workers and job applicants be given detailed information about cancer hazards in their workplace. Had the workers been told in 1961 that DBCP damaged the sperm of test animals, they could have acted earlier to protect themselves and possibly the public. Simple fairness requires that people be given enough information to make an

intelligent choice of jobs. This is not only imperative on ethical grounds but might also help accelerate reexamination of the chemical hazards. In the case of DBCP, it was the workers, not the regulators or manufacturers, who prepared the indictment.

Executive Secretary Robert Phillips of the National Peach Council, an association representing 6,300 peach growers, had a more novel suggestion, which he proposed in a September 12 letter to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration: "If possible sterility is the main problem, couldn't workers who were old enough that they no longer wanted to have children accept such positions voluntarily? Or could workers be advised of the situation, and some might volunteer for such work posts as an alternative to planned surgery . . . or as a means of getting around religious bans on birth control when they want no more children."

"We do believe in safety in the work place," Phillips added, "but there can be good as well as bad sides to a situation."

Warning to New York Birds: Keep Out of Apple Trees

The highly toxic pesticide Endrin will be applied to New York State apple orchards in an effort to combat the pine vole, a small rodent that damages the roots of apple trees.

State Environmental Conservation Commissioner Peter Berle approved use of the chemical, despite the fact that it has been banned in New York since 1971. "It's a stop-gap measure," Berle said.

Using Endrin in the apple orchards was opposed by the state's Division of Fish and Wildlife, and by sporting associations. One witness at a public hearing testified that "large-scale fish kills have been reported from gross misuse of Endrin."

The pesticide is manufactured by the Velsicol Chemical Corporation, which puts the following warnings on its Endrin containers: "Do not apply or allow to drift to areas occupied by unprotected humans or beneficial animals. Keep out of lakes, ponds and streams. Toxic to fish and wildlife. Birds and other wildlife in treated areas may be killed."