

# Intercontinental Press

combined with

# IMPREGOR

Vol. 16, No. 5

© 1978 by Intercontinental Press

February 6, 1978

75c



José G. Pérez/Militant

Members of Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran who face trial on false charges of "disrupting academic procedure" at Jersey City State College. Top: Siamak Zahraie, Massoud Nayeri, Kianoosh Mahdavi, Fariborz Khasha. Bottom: Kateh Zahraie, Faranak Colon.

## Six Iranian Activists Arrested in New Jersey

**Bribes to 'High White House' Officials**

**The Women's Movement in Italy Today**

**Still No Justice for Wilmington 10**

**Carter Wrings More Concessions From Japan**

**Marroquín Presses Fight for Asylum**

**The Crash of the Soviet Satellite**

**The Hunger Strike in Bolivia**

**West Germany—What the Polls Show**

**The Case of Sechaba Montsitsi**

**Speech by Fidel Castro**

—Statement by the Fourth International—

## ***The Military Clashes Between Hanoi and Pnompenh***

# NEWS ANALYSIS

## The Border 'War' Between Hanoi and Pnompnh

[The following statement was issued January 16 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press/Inprecor*.]

\* \* \*

A bloody border conflict has begun between Vietnam and Cambodia. It remains difficult to determine the real extent of the clashes that have taken place, and the exact state of the military situation on the ground. Nevertheless, the grave political consequences of these confrontations must not be underestimated.

The first border incidents between the two countries go back to the immediate aftermath of the imperialist defeat in Indochina, and have never been suspended for very long since then. The fact, dreadful in and of itself, that two peoples who had long fought side by side against a common enemy were involved in a fratricidal war, was known before the recent events.

On December 31, 1977, the conflict between Vietnam and Cambodia took on new political dimensions. Cambodian radio broadcasts announced a "temporary break-off" of diplomatic relations between Kampuchea and Vietnam, denouncing "the invasion of our territory" by Vietnamese troops and the "crimes" allegedly committed against Cambodian citizens, going so far as to compare the Hanoi regime to that of Hitler's Germany.

A short time later, the Vietnamese government issued a statement in which it too condemned the "atrocities" it claimed Cambodian troops had repeatedly carried out on Vietnamese territory. It claimed to be acting in "self-defense" and called for the immediate opening of negotiations to settle the border dispute. The depth of the rift now separating the two regimes—though both emerged out of related liberation struggles—was suddenly brought out in the open.

The ramifications of the conflict between Vietnam and Cambodia must not be underestimated. It sets up a situation that could deteriorate into a broader military conflict. Its human and material cost to the Vietnamese and Kampuchean populations is already exorbitant, for they also face terrible hardships as a legacy of their precolonial past, a century of French rule, and more than three decades of imperialist war. This conflict may deal a hard blow to the revolutionary struggles under way in Southeast Asia, including in Thailand, after the defeat of imperialism in Indo-

china had opened a period favoring their development.

The international consequences may also prove to be grave. The Indochinese peoples' struggle against American imperialism largely contributed to Washington's loss of political credibility and moral authority. The Vietnamese-Cambodian crisis is lending considerable assistance to Carter's efforts to refurbish American imperialism's image.

Since the victory of the liberation struggles in Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea in 1975, the bourgeois media around the world have pounced on all of the bureaucratic and antidemocratic measures taken by one or the other regime to feed their anticommunist campaign. This was particularly the case with respect to Cambodia, where the leadership adopted brutal measures of mass social repression. Now the mass media have seized on the Vietnamese-Kampuchean border dispute to even further discredit revolutionary struggle, internationalism, and the fight for socialism.

How such a conflict could have arisen between two regimes claiming to be socialist cannot be understood without taking into account the history of the international workers movement over the last fifty years. It provides a dramatic illustration of the terrible price workers are still paying for the victory of Stalinism in the Soviet Union and in the international communist movement. Stalinism, wedded to the defense of the narrow national interests of the Kremlin bureaucracy in the name of the "theory" of "socialism in one country," caused the destruction of the Third International by burying the program of the world revolution: revolutionary internationalism, the basis on which the Comintern was founded after the victory of October 1917.

One of the most harmful consequences of this degeneration was the abandonment of genuine internationalist cooperation by those countries that had overturned capitalism, and the development of nationalist rivalry. This tendency was clearly illustrated by the domination of Eastern Europe by the Kremlin and by the outbreak of the Sino-Soviet conflict. Had the Stalinist ideology of "socialism in one country" not triumphed, the sharpness of the confrontation between Vietnam and Cambodia would be inconceivable.

Furthermore, the Sino-Soviet conflict has played a direct role in the deterioration of relations between Vietnam and Cambodia. Moscow and Peking's share of respon-

sibility must be pointed out. In the past the Soviet leadership refused, in the name of "peaceful coexistence," to provide the type of support to the peoples of Indochina that could have brought a quick end to American escalation and substantially lessened the toll of an exhausting liberation struggle against the most powerful imperialist country in the world.

In addition, up to the last minute Moscow refused to break with the puppet regime of Lon Nol in Cambodia, for fear of the pro-Chinese sympathies of Sihanouk and the Khmers Rouges. As for the Chinese Communist Party, it has covered up for the bureaucratic and nationalist line of the present Cambodian leadership so as to resist the spread of Vietnamese influence in the area.

In Peking's view, the Vietnamese leadership is guilty of having refused to condemn Russian "social imperialism" as the "main enemy of the world's peoples." The Soviet and Chinese leaderships are both covering up for their "ally" in the conflict between Vietnam and Cambodia, on behalf of their own narrow national interests as a state bureaucracy.

The weight of Stalinism internationally and the Stalinist training of the Vietnamese and Cambodian leaderships partly explain the extent of the resurgence of nationalism in Indochina. Because, too, of the historic animosity deliberately intensified by imperialism, an outlook molded by more than thirty years of long-isolated national liberation struggles, and now, because of the extreme bureaucratic deformation that characterize these regimes, not one of the leaderships—Vietnamese, Laotian, or Cambodian—has been able to avoid taking this course.

The rejection in principle by the Cambodian leadership of any form of real cooperation among the three Indochinese countries, the sealing of the country's borders, and the intense nationalism of its political line, are the most extreme reflection of this, and certainly bear a share of the responsibility for the violence of the current conflict. However, each of these regimes is characterized, to one degree or another, by strong nationalist traits.

At a time when the "Eurocommunist" parties are helping to reinforce reformist illusions about the "national roads to socialism," there is a great danger that, after having been the leaven of internationalism for several political generations, Indochina may become a symbol of the supposedly inevitable triumph of national chauvinism. To counter this danger, it is necessary to struggle unrelentingly for the rebirth of genuine revolutionary internationalism, and therefore to work at building its indispensable tool—the international, the world party of socialist revolution.

It must be stated that the interests of the working masses of Indochina are bound up with the establishment of growing cooper-

ation on all levels—economic, military, and political—among Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. It is in this way that these countries will be able to gather the strength to rebuild to face the threat of imperialism.

However, such cooperation cannot be imposed. The federative structures it requires can only arise out of the revolutionary mobilization of the Indochinese masses, with strict respect for the rights of minorities to decide for themselves. Because of this, the struggle for internationalism is closely connected to the fight to establish genuine socialist democracy in Vietnam, Kampuchea, and Laos, to institute a government of workers and farmers councils in the Socialist United States of Indochina. Not one of the Indochinese leaderships is capable of putting forward such a program for socialist democracy.

But the most pressing issue raised today by the outbreak of this conflict is the need for an immediate suspension of the armed clashes. It is still impossible to make a final judgment as to the direct responsibility borne by each of the parties for the deterioration of the border dispute between Vietnam and Cambodia. The total control imposed by each regime over news reports, and their consistent use of secret diplomacy—both of which are in opposition to Leninist traditions—clearly present sizable obstacles to making such an assessment. But those who were the first to take up arms in the past—and would do so again in the future—must bear the responsibility in the eyes of the Indochinese masses and the worldwide workers movement.

It is criminal to involve the Vietnamese and Cambodian populations in bloody clashes for the sake of a border dispute, and all in the name of socialism! The use of weapons should be banned from the resolution of such problems. The border issue should be settled through open and public negotiations. □

## General Strike in Nicaragua

A general strike against the Somoza dictatorship began January 24 in Nicaragua. By January 27, according to news reports, the work stoppage had virtually paralyzed the country.

The strike is being supported by a broad range of opposition political parties and trade unions. It involves not only workers but shopkeepers and businessmen.

Strike leaders are demanding the resignation of President Anastasio Somoza Debayle, whose family has ruled Nicaragua since the 1930s. They are also asking that the government reveal the "intellectual authors" of the murder of Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, who was gunned down January 10. Chamorro was the publisher of the Managua daily *La Prensa* and Somoza's most prominent opponent.

## In This Issue

Closing News Date: January 28, 1978

FEATURES	150	<i>Out Now!</i> —Chapter 26: The Invasion of Cambodia and May 1970—by Fred Halstead
JAPAN	132	Carter Wrings Concessions From Tokyo—by Jon Britton
USA	134	Wilmington 10 Denied Justice—Again—by Matilde Zimmermann
	138	Six Iranian Activists Arrested at New Jersey Campus—by José G. Pérez
	139	Marroquín Presses Fight for Political Asylum
	148	What Jimmy Carter's New Budget Reveals—by Jon Britton
SOVIET UNION	135	The Crash of the Soviet Satellite—by Fred Murphy
SOUTH KOREA	136	Tongsun Park Names More Bribe Takers—by Ernest Harsch
SOUTH AFRICA	137	Censors Ban Play on U.S. Witch-hunt
	137	The Case of Sechaba Montsitsi
PAKISTAN	140	Unionists Protest Killing of Workers
BOLIVIA	140	The Hunger Strike for Political Prisoners—by Fred Murphy
ITALY	141	What We Learned From the 'Black Vote' on Abortion
SRI LANKA	143	Unions Say 'No' to IMF Austerity Measures
WEST GERMANY	144	What the Polls Show—And Don't Show—About West Germany—by Anna Armand
INDIA	147	Indian Railway Workers Plan General Strike—by Sharad Jhaveri
INDONESIA	153	Suharto Tightens Muzzle on Students
NEWS ANALYSIS	130	The Border 'War' Between Hanoi and Phnompenh
DOCUMENTS	154	Speech by Fidel Castro
SELECTIONS		
FROM THE LEFT	149	
CAPITALISM		
FOULS THINGS UP	160	Near Zero Protection From Radiation Hazards
DRAWINGS	146	Helmut Schmidt—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, 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.

**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.

In Europe: For air-speeded subscriptions, write to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 50, London N1 2XP, England. 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 ©1978 by Intercontinental Press.

# Carter Wrings Concessions From Japan

By Jon Britton

"The U.S. and Japan have averted a trade war, but the truce is a temporary one and the field is open for further skirmishes."

That is the judgment of the *Wall Street Journal's* Tokyo correspondent, Mike Tharp, on the new trade pact agreed to by Japan and the United States in mid-January.

It appears that U.S. imperialism has wrung some significant concessions from its rival across the Pacific.

"The U.S. side got more than it expected in the talks," Tharp writes in the January 16 issue, "and the Japanese conceded more than they may have wanted, at least for the time being."

U.S. trade negotiator Robert Strauss exuberantly hailed the agreement as "the beginning of a new day." "We feel it represents a change of direction and a new philosophy for Japan," he added.

Japanese Minister of External Economic Affairs Nobuhiko Ushiba's comment to reporters was more subdued: "This is a good development that we should be happy about."

According to a joint communiqué issued January 13, Ushiba pledged that his government would stimulate the Japanese economy to provide a bigger market to U.S. goods and to reduce its trade surplus with the United States—currently running at a rate of \$10 billion a year—to \$6 billion this fiscal year.

Specifically, Tokyo agreed to reduce tariffs on \$2 billion worth of imports, effective April 1; to increase imports of beef and citrus products; and to explore ways to boost imports of electric-power machinery. In addition, a Japanese delegation is to visit the Pacific Northwest as a prelude to higher lumber imports.

The new pact follows an earlier agreement by Japan to limit exports of color television sets to the United States.

The latest agreement was arrived at only after months of hard bargaining and a high-pressure campaign by Washington that combined public and private arm-twisting and "malign neglect" of the falling exchange rate of the dollar in relation to the yen. (The dollar decline squeezed Japanese exporters by forcing them to choose between raising dollar prices, thereby jeopardizing markets, or losing profits if prices were left the same.)

After a visit by a U.S. trade delegation in November, the editors of the influential newspaper *Yomiuri Shimbun* had this comment on U.S. tactics:

The behavior of the U.S. negotiators . . . was shocking because they tried to intimidate and almost dictate terms to this country.

Many Japanese could hardly believe that this was the attitude of a supposedly friendly nation and ally. The negotiators attempted to bring Japan to its heels. . . . [Quoted in the *Washington Post*, November 24, 1977.]

It turned out that Washington's arrogant demands were offers that Tokyo could not refuse. Jimmy Carter's emissaries wielded two clubs that the Japanese government could ill afford to ignore.

The first was the U.S. threat, and actual moves toward, drastically reducing Japan's access to the U.S. home market, its biggest and most lucrative.

On December 1, for example, Robert Strauss, speaking at a breakfast meeting of news reporters, warned that restrictive legislation against Japanese imports was "very imminent" if Tokyo did not make important concessions to reduce Japan's trade surplus with the United States.

Meanwhile, the Carter administration was working up new restrictions, utilizing "antidumping" laws, to cut imports of steel from Japan.\*

The other big club wielded by Carter's emissaries—if not brandished openly, at least held behind their backs—was U.S. imperialism's overwhelming superiority in military might.

"We were pushed into a corner 40 years ago," a high adviser of the Japanese government told Mike Tharp. "It isn't good to see similar unfortunate and dangerous pressure being placed on us again" (*Wall Street Journal*, December 5, 1977).

The reference, undoubtedly, was to the embargo imposed by Washington in 1940-41 on exports to Japan of oil, scrap metal, machine tools, and other "strategic" materials to discourage Japanese encroachments into the domain of U.S. imperialism.

But Japan's rulers do not have the same options available to them today that they had—and exercised—in 1941, to say the least. Moreover, should Washington's nuclear umbrella and other "security" guarantees ever be withdrawn, Japan's mo-

\*Under this law the government can impose special duties on goods imported into the United States at "unfair" prices. For steel products, these are now defined as prices below a "trigger" or "reference" level supposedly based on the production costs of the most efficient producer, Japan. Imports at prices below this level are thus effectively barred.

nopolists would be left in an even more vulnerable position.

Why is the Carter administration pursuing its trade offensive against Japan so aggressively?

The explanation given by Carter, the steel companies, and top bureaucrats of the AFL-CIO is that Japanese firms have been engaging in "unfair competition" by selling below cost in the U.S. market, thanks to government subsidies and other aid.

But this argument does not square with a recent statement by U.S. government economist Peter Allgeier. In a column appearing in the January 12 *Washington Post*, Allgeier writes that "the Japanese are in reasonable compliance with fair trading practices. . . ."

He goes on to say that Japanese exporters get no more government help in the form of subsidies and tax breaks than do their U.S. counterparts. Moreover, he points out, the government finances 50 percent of all research and development in the U.S., whereas only 25 percent of Japan's "R & D" is so financed.

The real answer to why Washington has been pressing Tokyo so hard for trade concessions and a speeding up of Japan's economy has to be sought in fundamental changes that have taken place in the world economy since the long post-World War II boom ended in the early 1970s.

Among the most important of these have been sharply reduced profitability of investment in many sectors of industry, especially when inflation is taken into account; a marked slowdown in capital spending for new factories; and a consequent crisis of overproduction in steel and other industries.

The lack of adequate markets has greatly sharpened competition among the giant imperialist monopolies. It has also, in conjunction with lagging labor productivity in the United States, led to a huge trade imbalance between the United States and Japan.

The steel industry provides a measure of how far relative U.S. productivity has slipped: Between 1971 and 1976, the yearly production of crude steel per Japanese worker was 480 tons while the comparable figure for an American worker was only 240 tons.

The discrepancy is due not to different working habits of American and Japanese workers, but rather to technology. In 1975, the Japanese produced 83% of their crude steel using highly efficient basic oxygen furnaces and only about 1% by outdated open-hearth furnaces. The figures for American producers, however, were 62% and 19% respectively.

About 31% of Japan's production in the same year was the result of the continuous-casting process—eliminating the ingot-making stage of steel production—and in the U.S. the figure was only about 9%. In addition, advanced plant technology

enabled Japanese steelmakers to use about 30% less coking coal per ton of steel produced than the Americans.

Thus, Japanese-produced steel, automobiles, and other products are flooding into the U.S. market not because of "unfair competition," but because these sectors of Japanese industry can produce goods with substantially less labor than is required by their U.S. counterparts.

This translates, as with the case of automobiles, into goods of a higher quality and with a lower price tag taking markets away from the higher priced, shoddier products offered by U.S. manufacturers.

(There are a number of reasons for slipping U.S. competitiveness vis-à-vis Japan, but a key one is the much higher level of military expenditures in the United States since the end of World War II, both in absolute terms and in relation to gross national product.)

The result was that in 1977 Japan chalked up a record trade surplus with the United States of \$7.3 billion. Exports to the U.S. and other countries jumped 20% over the level attained in 1976, while imports, reflecting sluggish growth in Japan, rose only 9%. And increasing numbers of U.S. capitalists, echoed by their lackeys "leading" American labor, called for the erection of protectionist barriers against the import tide.

The combination of sharpening competition and growing trade imbalances between the world capitalist powers raises the specter of another trade war such as the one in the 1920s and 1930s that preceded the global shooting war a few years later. It is the outbreak of such a trade war between Japan and the United States that has supposedly been averted by the new trade agreement.

While a trade war has been averted temporarily, the concrete steps promised by the Fukuda government will have little effect on the U.S.-Japan trade imbalance. "The reduction in Japanese tariffs and nontariff barriers negotiated last week . . . will help U.S. exports only marginally," *Business Week* states in its January 30 issue.

The reason is that Japanese trade barriers for most goods were already modest (the average tariff rate was about 10%, for example), and further reductions do not get at the root cause of the imbalance: lagging U.S. productivity.

On the other hand, the "voluntary" restrictions of Japanese exports of color TVs, as well as the new barriers against steel imports into the U.S. from Japan and other countries, have aided the profit drive of some U.S. corporations. The protectionist moves saved precious few jobs in the United States, however. Obsolete facilities that were closed down haven't been reopened. Instead the steel companies are raising prices an average 5.5%. And Zenith Radio Corporation has gone ahead with



Toyotas awaiting export in Nagoya. Heavy investment in high-technology plants has enabled Japanese industry to capture large foreign markets.

plans to shift most of its television-manufacturing operations abroad.

As a result of the decline of the dollar, American workers have been hit by price hikes for automobiles and other goods. Japanese firms increased the prices of cars sold in the United States, for example, to make up for the dollar's fall in relation to the yen. American manufacturers, suddenly feeling less competition, quickly followed suit.

Japanese workers, farmers, and smaller capitalists will also be hurt by American imperialism's stepped-up trade offensive. Already at the end of last year, more than a million were officially counted as unemployed, an eighteen-year high, businesses were going bankrupt at a record pace, and farmers were suffering a glut of agricultural commodities, especially rice, and falling prices for their crops. To the extent that the sinking dollar and lowered import barriers result in more American goods coming onto the Japanese market, this situation is bound to worsen.

In particular, Japan's "lifetime employment system," which has already begun breaking down under the pressure of economic stagnation and the falling dollar, will be further weakened. Complete destruction of this system, a holdover from Japan's feudal past, would be very much to the liking of American employers. They blame the tradition of keeping workers on the payroll even during slumps for triggering intensified export drives by Japan whenever business is slow at home and thus, in effect, exporting unemployment to the United States and elsewhere.

"This practice cannot continue without provoking retaliation and protectionist measures in other countries," the editors of

*Business Week* warn in the January 30 issue.

The working people of Japan probably face more inflation on top of increased unemployment. The new trade agreement calls on the Fukuda government to take stronger measures to "reflate" the Japanese economy. The idea is that faster growth will result in increased imports and therefore a reduced U.S. trade deficit with Japan.

What this means, essentially, is more deficit spending by Japan's government. Last year the deficit amounted to about 30% of the total budget; in a recent interview, Fukuda indicated that in fiscal 1978 the deficit will be 37% of the budget.

Taking into account the fact that Japan's national budget is only about one-third the size of the U.S. budget as a proportion of gross national product, Fukuda's predicted shortfall in revenue is roughly comparable to the near-record deficit projected by Carter for fiscal 1979.

To the extent that this red ink has to be financed, in effect, by simply printing new money, the result will be to "stimulate" prices much more than production.

Thus, it is safe to say that the class struggle in Japan will become hotter in the period ahead as a result of the recent actions of the United States government.

And following in Washington's footsteps are the West European powers making up the Common Market. They too have demanded that Japan step up its imports—including airplanes, automobiles, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, machinery, footwear, and agricultural products—and curtail its exports.

Both the United States and the Common Market countries have moved to limit

imports of steel, textiles, footwear, and other goods coming in from the more industrialized semicolonial countries.

All this bodes ill for the "Tokyo Round" of trade talks now going on in Geneva, Switzerland. Involving representatives of the ninety-eight countries participating in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the talks have been stalled since they were launched with much fanfare in 1973.

In the context of a deepening worldwide

crisis of overproduction, the negotiators for the major powers face an extremely difficult problem: They want other governments to reduce the barriers to their country's exports. But at the same time, powerful forces are coming forward in each country to demand increased protection for profit-threatened domestic industries. In fact, protectionist barriers to trade have been proliferating in recent years.

As long as national economies are expanding, even if slowly, the protectionist

pressures will probably be contained and even be used by the most powerful imperialists as a club to force other governments to lower trade barriers, as Washington has done with Tokyo.

But when the next generalized downturn hits the world economy, the trend toward freer trade that has prevailed since World War II could be decisively reversed, and working people of all countries will suffer the consequences. □

## North Carolina Governor Defends Rigged Trial

# Wilmington 10 Denied Justice—Again

By Matilde Zimmermann

The Wilmington 10—whose case has ripped a hole in Jimmy Carter's "human rights" mask—remain in their prison cells. North Carolina Gov. James B. Hunt announced in a television address January 23 that he would not pardon the civil rights activists whose case has caused an international outcry.

The Wilmington 10 were convicted six years ago of firebombing a grocery store on February 6, 1971, when the city of Wilmington was torn by racist violence. Vigilante attacks against the Black community were being carried out by armed white racists, following a series of marches and demonstrations by Black high-school students in favor of school desegregation.

The three witnesses whose testimony sent the Wilmington 10 to jail all recanted in May 1977. They told how the prosecutors threatened and bribed them into lying on the stand, and then coached them word-by-word in their testimony. Evidence has also been presented that four of the defendants were somewhere else entirely during the evening the store burned.

Nevertheless, the North Carolina Court of Appeals on January 5 denied the defense motion for a new trial. A letter from the prosecutor's office had previously been obtained by the defense confessing that "if a new trial is granted, the state would lack evidence sufficient to prosecute the case."

The pressure mounted on Governor Hunt to pardon the ten. He asked for television time January 23, and used it to defend the frame-up from start to finish.

"From all that I have learned in reviewing this case," Hunt said, "I have concluded that there was a fair trial, the jury made the right decision and the appellate courts reviewed it properly and ruled correctly."

Hunt admitted, however, that the twenty-to-twenty-nine-year prison terms meted out in 1972 were "excessive," and



Time

Wilmington 10: No pardon despite international protests.

reduced them by about one-third. This does not free a single defendant from jail. (One had previously been paroled.) It means that Rev. Ben Chavis, the most prominent defendant and the one who received the stiffest sentence, will not even be eligible for parole until 1980.

Amnesty International adopted the Wilmington 10 as "prisoners of conscience" at the end of 1977, and has been campaigning for their unconditional release. Support has come from international figures as well as from defenders of civil liberties in the United States. Seven former Soviet dissidents, now residing in France and the United States, sent a solidarity telegram to a defense rally held in Raleigh, North Carolina, shortly before Hunt's announcement. The telegram read, "We, former Soviet dissidents, voice our support for the appeal of Amnesty International for the release of the Wilmington 10." It was

signed by Lyudmilla Alexeyeva, Andrei Amalrik, Pavel Litvinov, Leonid Plyushch, Boris Shragin, Valentyn Turchin, and Alexander Esenin-Volpin.

The State Department has admitted that the Wilmington 10 case has caused "serious problems" for Carter's "human rights" campaign.

At a news conference at Raleigh's Central Prison January 24, Ben Chavis blasted Carter for his hypocrisy and Hunt for his role in "the racist persecution and frameup of the Wilmington 10." He called for demonstrations March 25 at the White House and at United States embassies abroad. Defense attorney James Ferguson said that the case had been appealed to the Federal District Court.

The international importance of the case was shown by the many foreign correspondents among the 300 reporters who attended the news conference. □

## The Crash of the Soviet Satellite

By Fred Murphy

A five-ton Soviet satellite fell from its orbit on January 24, at least partially burning up in the atmosphere over northern Canada.

Although space has become so littered with all kinds of objects and junk of human manufacture that similar events occur on the average of once each day, this particular "unplanned re-entry" attracted more than the usual amount of attention.

The Soviet satellite was equipped with a nuclear reactor fueled by 110 pounds of highly enriched uranium. This material is not only dangerously radioactive itself; as it reacts, even more hazardous fission products are given off—particularly strontium 90, cesium 137, and iodine 131.

As it happened, the Soviet satellite came down over a very sparsely populated region. Had it done so in an urban area, the result could have been a disaster of immense proportions.

On January 26, Canadian Defense Minister Barnett Danson said airborne search teams had detected "a high degree of radiation . . . that is likely part of the nuclear power package" in an area near Baker Lake in the Northwest Territories. Danson said there was a "90 percent chance" the radiation was coming from the remains of the satellite.

But the next day, Canadian Chief of Defense Staff Adm. R.H. Falls held a news conference to announce that all the radioactive readings had resulted from equipment malfunctions or natural outcroppings of uranium. "It is unlikely there is anything on the ground," Falls said.

Meanwhile, another Canadian military officer in Edmonton, Alberta, had told the *New York Daily News* that the joint U.S.-Canadian unit carrying out the search was "fairly certain" they had detected at least two pieces of the satellite on the ground.

These contradictory statements have yet to be cleared up.

The area of Canada's Northwest Territories where the remains of the satellite may have come down is a feeding ground for caribou and other wildlife. In addition, it is an important hunting area for the Inuit (Eskimo) and other native peoples who inhabit the region.

Soviet authorities knew in early December that the satellite was experiencing difficulties. But they apparently took no steps to alert the countries in the satellite's flight path.

U.S. military intelligence officials had been monitoring the satellite, which they



New York Times  
"X" marks area being searched for radioactive debris from satellite.

claimed was a device for radar detection of U.S. naval activity. They informed the White House December 19 that the satellite was likely to fall to earth. But Washington notified only its NATO allies and other capitalist governments in Australia, New Zealand, and Japan—even though any one of a large number of other countries could have been endangered.

Once the satellite had disintegrated and it was clear that an immediate catastrophe had been averted, Carter's National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski called a news conference at which he minimized the hazards and praised the Kremlin for secretly communicating with Washington about the problem.

For its part, the Soviet government issued only a simple announcement that the satellite had "entered the dense layers of the atmosphere over northern Canada and ceased to exist in the afternoon of Jan. 24 this year."

Although the satellite itself did "cease to exist," this was hardly the case for the estimated 1 million curies\* of radioactive material it contained. At best, the bulk of this was dispersed throughout the upper atmosphere, to be gradually added through rain and snow to the earth's environment. In that way it would join the fallout from nuclear weapons tests and the wastes given off in routine operation or in accidents at nuclear power plants. (For reports on some of the most recent nuclear mishaps, see page 160.)

At worst, a substantial portion of the satellite's nuclear material may be contaminating an area of northern Canada, where it can pose a continuing danger to the native peoples and to wildlife.

\*One curie is the radioactive equivalent of one gram of radium.

According to an unnamed White House official, "The real significance of this episode is that this was the first nuclear-related crisis in space, and it brought forth Soviet cooperation and informal preparations to deal with a potentially serious situation."

Washington to the contrary, this was not the first such accident. In 1964, a satellite of U.S. origin came down over the Indian Ocean near Madagascar, scattering 17,000 curies of plutonium 238 into the atmosphere. (This is a more intensely radioactive, but less long-lived, form of plutonium than that used in nuclear power plants.)

It might be thought that in praising the Kremlin's "cooperation" the U.S. rulers have missed an opportunity to score some propaganda points about the incident. But the Pentagon itself has at least nine nuclear-powered satellites of its own aloft. Moreover, Washington is wary of saying anything that could fuel opposition to nuclear power at a time when the Carter administration is seeking to step up its use in the United States.

As for the Kremlin bureaucracy, it also disregards the dangers posed by nuclear technology. There are at present between twelve and sixteen Soviet satellites in orbit of a type similar to the one that fell in Canada. The launching of yet another was announced at almost the same time as the accident. □

### Worldwide Housing Shortage

Housing conditions in most colonial and semicolonial countries have "deteriorated perceptibly" in the last ten years, French sociologist Bernard Granotier reports in the January 10 *Le Monde*.

Apartments are virtually unavailable for those in Africa, Asia, and Latin America who have been forced to flee the countryside in search of employment.

Consequently, squatter colonies of crudely built shacks have grown up around the major cities, increasing in population at a rate of 10 to 12 percent a year. They are now estimated to house 200 million to 300 million persons.

What few apartments are available in the cities, Granotier said, are "priced too high for the majority of citizens. A recent World Bank study carried out in six large cities (Ahmedabad, Bogotá, Hong Kong, Madras, Mexico City, and Nairobi) found that even the cheapest apartments were outside the reach of 60 percent of all families."

## Tongsun Park Names More Bribe Takers

By Ernest Harsch

When Tongsun Park started to talk in Seoul, South Korea, January 13, a shiver must have run down the spines of hundreds of former and current congressmen thousands of miles away in the United States.

After refusing for several months to answer questions on his payoffs to American government officials, Park finally agreed to reveal part of his influence peddling operations. In return, he received immunity from U.S. prosecution on charges of bribing American officials to pass legislation favoring the South Korean dictatorship.

Although the questioning in Seoul by U.S. Justice Department officials was done in secret, some details of Park's testimony have been reported and others were provided by the questioners themselves.

Speaking to a group of congressional representatives in Washington January 26, Acting Deputy Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti revealed that Park had admitted dispensing about \$1 million in political payments between 1968 and 1975. He said that the recipients included fifteen to twenty former congressmen and other officials, and fifteen to eighteen current members of Congress.

Civiletti indicated, however, that none of the current members would be indicted.

Civiletti also acknowledged that officials in the White House may have accepted money from Park and that the Justice Department had established that Park was connected with the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA). He said that his staff was investigating whether the Justice Department under former Attorney General John N. Mitchell knew of the payoffs as early as 1972 and had acted to cover them up.

Civiletti added that the \$1 million figure did not include entertainment, dinner parties, gifts, travel expenses, and other "favors" Park accorded to congressional officials.

Although Civiletti did not mention who the bribe recipients were, the names of some of those fingered by Park had already been cited in press reports within a few days after he began his testimony in Seoul. Citing "sources familiar with the testimony," correspondent Nicholas M. Horrock provided some details in the January 14 *New York Times*:

• Park said he gave cash payments, totaling about \$200,000, to former Representative Otto E. Passman. According to Park, the money was withdrawn from a bank in Bermuda by a business associate

of his, brought to the United States, and handed over to Passman in cash. However, Park also testified that a previously reported withdrawal of \$190,000 from a Swiss bank account did not go to Passman. The questioners did not ask Park what happened to the money.

• Park also said that more than \$100,000 was given to former Representative Richard T. Hanna of California, the only congressman to have been indicted so far. The forty-count indictment, handed down in October, charged Hanna, among other things, with having used his influence as a congressman to have the South Korean regime appoint Park an agent for the purchase of American rice under an arrangement in which Hanna later received kickbacks from Park's commission. Park's commission reportedly totaled about \$9 million.

• Another \$100,000 was said to have been given to former Representative Cornelius Gallagher of New Jersey. Gallagher was already under investigation, but he denies having done anything illegal.

• Former Representative William E. Minshall of Ohio received \$60,000, according to Park. He was also said to have been given \$20,000 to be contributed in Park's name to the 1972 reelection campaign of former President Richard Nixon.

• Park stated that he gave about \$20,000 to Edwin W. Edwards, now the governor of Louisiana, while Edwards was serving in the House.

Representative Bruce Caputo, who sat in on the questioning as an observer, reported in New York January 15, that Park had provided ten new names of representatives, senators, and "high-ranking White House staff people" implicated in the scandal.

As throughout its months of earlier "investigations" into the Korean bribery scandal, the Justice Department has sought to soften the impact of the revelations.

Besides trying to keep specific details of Park's testimony under wraps, the department agreed not to ask Park about the role of the South Korean government or the KCIA in the bribery operation, despite earlier congressional testimony and news reports that President Park Chung Hee had met with Tongsun Park and had conducted meetings at his official residence to plan out the campaign.

Government officials have also attempt-



Herblock/Washington Post

ted to play down the significance of Park's testimony, as well as the scope of the scandal itself. Some claimed that earlier lists made by Park of his political payoffs and gifts were "exaggerated." Those lists had shown that Park paid out up to \$3 million in bribes, three times the amount he was said to have admitted to in his testimony.

And in an unusual statement for a "prosecutor" during a criminal investigation, Civiletti said that the questioning of Park "confirms that speculation about the involvement of great numbers of officials has been wildly exaggerated." He predicted that "only a handful" of new indictments might be handed down against former officials, and mentioned nothing about bringing anyone now in office to trial.

To avoid leaving hundreds of Washington officials in suspense, Attorney General Griffin Bell said a few days later that those who had been "cleared" would be notified that they would not be prosecuted.

Staff writers Walter Pincus and Charles R. Babcock commented in the January 18 *Washington Post* that "Bell's statement yesterday seemed to underline the sensitivity with which the Carter administration views the investigation of Korean influence-buying in Congress during this election year."

With Watergate still fresh in everyone's mind, one of Carter's main goals has been to lessen the widespread public distrust of the government. The continuing revelations of corruption at every level of the government have not made this difficult task any easier.

The dilemma facing both Carter and Congress is how to keep the lid on the Korean bribery scandal, without at the same time being too obviously engaged in a cover-up. □



## South African Censors Ban Play on U.S. Witch-hunt

*Are You Now or Have You Ever Been?*, a play by the American writer and critic Eric Bentley concerning the anticommunist witch-hunts in the United States during the McCarthy era of the early 1950s, was banned in South Africa in late December. The banning by the government-appointed Publications Appeal Board forced cancellation of an eight-week run of the play in Cape Town and Johannesburg.

According to a report in the January 24 *New York Times*, an observer at the board's hearing on the play said, "I think their view was that the production might appear pro-Communist rather than anti-Communist."

The *Times* continued that the observer "said that the appeal board apparently also was concerned, although less so, with a scene in the play that depicts Paul Robeson speaking out against racial discrimination before the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

According to the *Times*, the banning of the play has caused some unease within the theatrical community in South Africa, which has thus far been affected less severely by the pervasive censorship of the apartheid regime than other cultural fields.

Prominent figures in the Afrikaans community, which provides some of the staunchest support for the white minority regime, have recently begun to publicly criticize some aspects of censorship, especially when it affects Afrikaans-language writers. The banning late last year of *Magersfontein O Magersfontein*, a novel by Etienne Leroux, one of the leading

figures in the "modernist" *sestigers* literary school, provoked the resignation of two members of the Publications Board.

The fact is, however, that censorship in South Africa has been extremely commonplace for years, especially as it has been directed against the Black population. There are scores of laws governing censorship of every conceivable variety.

To take just one of them, for example,

## Life Endangered in Vorster's Jail

### The Case of Sechaba Montsitsi

The life of Sechaba Daniel Montsitsi, a young Black leader who has been imprisoned by Vorster's jailers for more than seven months, is in danger. According to an account in the January 28 issue of the *New York weekly Nation* by Joel Bolnick, a white former political prisoner in South Africa who was held with Montsitsi for a period, the student leader has been severely beaten and tortured.

Montsitsi and nineteen other leaders and members of the now-banned Soweto Students Representative Council (SSRC) were arrested on June 10-11, 1977, after a demonstration of more than 1,000 Black youths in Soweto, the sprawling Black township of more than a million persons near Johannesburg.

At the time of his arrest, Montsitsi was president of the SSRC, the student organization that organized many of the massive protests and strikes that rocked the country throughout the second half of 1976. According to Gen. David Kriel, the head of the riot police, the arrests of Montsitsi and the others were connected with plans to hold actions in commemoration of the original June 16, 1976, student protest that initiated the upsurge.

According to Bolnick, "With the exception of Steve Biko, Sechaba was the most prominent black leader to be detained in South Africa last year. In the townships of South Africa his name has been a household word ever since he took over the SSRC leadership after Khotso Seatlalo [Seatlholo] had fled the country."

Bolnick was among five white students who were detained at the same time as the SSRC members and were held in the same maximum security jail. Of the twenty-five arrested June 10-11, twelve have been released, including all five of the white

the Publications Act of 1974 provides powers to ban any publication, object, film, or public entertainment deemed to be "undesirable," under the threat of stiff fines and imprisonment. The definition of "undesirable" includes anything considered by the censorship authorities to be "indecent or obscene," "blasphemous," "harmful to the relations between any sections of the inhabitants of the Republic," or "prejudicial to the safety of the State."

Under this and other laws, literally thousands of films, books, newspapers, magazines, records, works of art, or other cultural media or sources of information have been banned or censored by the apartheid regime. □

students and seven of the Black students. The other thirteen are still being held, without recourse to the courts or even to visits from lawyers, magistrates, or family members.

Bolnick recalled, "My most vivid and terrifying memory is of being shocked almost nightly by screams of pain and anguish emanating from neighboring cells. In the morning I would be escorted by the wardens to the showers, where I would wash in silence along with my fellow detainees. The welts, wounds and bruises all over their bodies gave horrifying testimony to the beatings that the black prisoners had received the night before."

While Bolnick was there, Montsitsi himself was not seriously assaulted. But a week after Bolnick's release, the *Johannesburg World*, a Black-run newspaper that has since been banned, reported that Montsitsi was in critical condition at the emergency ward of Johannesburg General Hospital. Minister of Justice, Police, and Prisons James T. Kruger initially denied the report, but police later confirmed it when they claimed that Montsitsi's condition had improved and that he had been returned to prison.

Bolnick reported that, to the contrary, "It has been rumored that he was so severely beaten and tortured by the police as to be crippled for life." In light of the jailhouse killings of Steve Biko and dozens of other political prisoners in recent years, Montsitsi's life is seriously endangered.

"As one of the last people to see Sechaba Montsitsi alive and well," Bolnick concluded, "I urge whoever reads my words to express indignation at the barbaric behavior of the South African Police." □

### 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
1977	48 issues (1,456 pages)	\$35

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

## Six Iranian Activists Arrested at New Jersey Campus

By José G. Pérez

[The following article appeared in the February 3 issue of the *Militant*, a revolutionary-socialist newsweekly published in New York.]

\* \* \*

Six members of the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran (CAIFI) were arrested here at Jersey City State College January 19. CAIFI leaders charge the arrests are a clear-cut case of politically motivated persecution.

The six are: Fariborz Khasha, a CAIFI national field secretary; Kateh Zahraie, CAIFI assistant national secretary; Faranak Colon, president of the CAIFI chapter at New York University; and Siamak Zahraie, Massoud Nayeri, and Kianoosh Mahdavi, all longtime CAIFI members.

The official complaints against the CAIFI Six read that they "did disrupt the normal academic procedures of the college"—in four cases "by being on the premises without permission" and in two cases "by being involved in a political dispute with several persons."

The charges are extremely serious. According to the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, conviction on such violations carries a maximum sentence of three years imprisonment and a \$1,000 fine.

The situation is especially dangerous because the six are Iranians. The U.S. government could use the trumped-up charges as a pretext for trying to send the activists back to Iran. Since all six have been outspoken opponents of the brutal dictatorship of Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, they would face certain imprisonment and torture, and possible death if forced back to Iran.

Fariborz Khasha told the *Militant* the charges against him and the other five activists were "outrageous."

"We neither intended to, nor did we in fact disrupt classes or any other 'academic procedure' at the college," he said. "We went there to set up a literature table and distribute leaflets about the human rights campaigns that CAIFI is conducting. The real issues in this case are free speech and academic freedom."

CAIFI was founded in 1973 to defend victims of the shah's repression. Sponsors of the committee include: singer Joan Baez; Prof. Noam Chomsky; U.S. Rep. Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.); former U.S.

### Where to Send Protests

The CAIFI Six are asking supporters of academic freedom and civil rights to send protest messages to the Jersey City State College administration.

They ask for messages demanding that the charges be dropped and that CAIFI be allowed to set up literature tables on campus. These should be sent

to college president William Maxwell, 2039 Kennedy Boulevard, Jersey City, New Jersey 07305.

Copies of all messages should be sent to the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran, 853 Broadway, Suite 414, New York, New York 10003.

Attorney General Ramsey Clark; Irish activist Bernadette Devlin; writer Nat Hentoff; civil liberties attorney William Kunstler; journalist I.F. Stone; Marxist philosopher George Novack; and Nobel laureate Salvador Luria.

Khasha explained CAIFI had called the college the day before the arrests. They were told to come onto the campus where they would be given a permit for a literature table after filling out a form and paying twenty dollars.

The day of the arrests two CAIFI representatives had gone to the student services office to file the application when the trouble started.

A group of Iranian students—who are also political activists but oppose CAIFI's approach of organizing a broad-based campaign in defense of democratic rights—started harassing committee members. The CAIFI activists were waiting in the cafeteria for the two members who had gone for the permit.

The students called the CAIFI members CIA agents, threatened violence, shoved some activists, and called the campus cops, demanding arrest of the CAIFI members for not being students.

The cops reacted to the situation by escorting two activists who had been special targets of the harassment to the campus security office, telling one he would receive a visitor's permit there.

On the way to the office, the cops ran into two other committee members who were heading for their car and asked them to come along.

Meanwhile, the CAIFI representatives had been told by student services that permit applications had to be filed forty-eight hours in advance. The two had returned to the cafeteria to discuss it with the others.

Kateh Zahraie and Faranak Colon then

went to student services. A plainclothes campus guard escorted them, saying it was to prevent further harassment. They got a literature table permit for the following Tuesday.

They headed back to their car. Then the anti-CAIFI Iranians started chasing them.

They caught Zahraie and began beating her. Only then did campus guards, who had been watching the incident develop, intervene, taking Zahraie and Colon to the security office.

At the office Colon was told she had been taken there for her own protection.

According to Khasha, it wasn't until after he had been in the security office for a while that the attitude of the campus cops changed.

"I think the higher-ups figured out we were political activists," he said, "and Ernest Ticky, the head of security, then told us we would be charged—although he didn't specify what we had done wrong."

"He just said our presence on campus had created a disturbance," Khasha said.

"He said he was sick and tired of 'you foreigners.' He told us not to bring 'Iranian politics' to this country or this campus and threatened to call immigration and the State Department to send us back to Iran.

"We replied that CAIFI was a legal, broadly-based organization, that we had a right to free speech like anybody else, and that what we came to do at this campus we had done at hundreds of other campuses around the country without getting arrested.

"Ticky yelled something like, 'This is not your country—this is our country. You have no rights here!' He also said this was one campus we shouldn't have come to."

After an hour and a half in the security office, Jersey City cops came, frisked the activists, handcuffed them, and took them down to the South Precinct station.

There the four men were subjected to strip searches, and all six had their personal possessions taken away. Meanwhile, a representative of the campus cops was going through the lawbooks with the city cops looking for a law to use against the activists. Initially the offense was described as "trespassing," but the complaint sworn out by the campus cops and given to the activists at their first court hearing was for the much more serious disruption charge. After several hours the CAIFI Six were released on bail.

"While we were still in jail, the student services office called the CAIFI office and canceled the permit for Tuesday," Khasha said. "This shows the whole affair is a calculated college administration attempt to gag CAIFI. This is a threat to everyone's rights."

The CAIFI Six went before the Jersey City Municipal Court Judge Zampella January 23.

At first the judge seemed startled by the case: "What is this charge? . . . What does this mean? . . . Is this indictable? . . ."

The judge then declared a recess. He and one of the prosecuting attorneys went into a room marked "Judge's Chambers—Private."

When the judge emerged eleven minutes later he announced, "I'm sorry for the delay—it had nothing to do with this case, you understand." He claimed he had a phone call about double-parking tickets.

However, the judge now agreed with the prosecutor that the charges were "indictable misdemeanors"—that is, serious crimes requiring presentation before a grand jury.

The judge then gave each of the six the official complaint form and set a new hearing date for February 23 so the six would have time to get an attorney.

He also instructed the prosecution to determine whether it would keep the case as one that will be presented to a grand jury or whether it will reduce the charges.

For its part, the Jersey City State College administration seems touchy about the case. Repeated phone calls by the *Militant* over a two-day period found no one willing to comment. The head of security, his assistant, the president's office, and the student services office all referred calls to the public information office. But William Reopoll, head of the information office, was also unavailable.

### Just the Facts, Please

"The invective in the Peking press against the 'gang of four' is becoming more colourful by week. Latest epithets produced by the *People's Daily* described 'gang' supporters as 'bandits, dandies, habitual thieves, bums and goons, with horns on their heads and thorns on their bodies.'"—Derek Davies, in the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, January 27.

## Wins Right to Speak Across United States

### Marroquín Presses Fight for Political Asylum



Susan Ellis/Militant

MARROQUIN

Héctor Marroquín, the Mexican revolutionary socialist who is appealing for political asylum in the United States, has been granted permission to tour the country to speak on his own behalf.

This is a significant victory for the recently formed Héctor Marroquín Defense Committee.\* At the end of December, when Marroquín first asked to leave Texas to attend the convention of the Young Socialist Alliance, his attorney was told by Joe Staley of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS): "I don't think that illegal aliens have the right to go waltzing around the country making speeches."

Marroquín, a member of the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, is a former student activist at the University of Nuevo León in Mexico. He fled the country in 1974 after being falsely accused of "terrorist" activity. He was afraid of meeting the same fate as his roommate—shot down by a cop acting as judge, jury, and executioner.

In the United States, Marroquín joined the Socialist Workers Party and helped lead a Teamsters union organizing drive at a Coca-Cola bottling plant in Houston, Texas.

In September 1977, Marroquín went to Mexico to consult a lawyer about his status. On his return he was arrested at a border station in Texas, charged with attempted illegal entry, and held in the

Maverick County Jail for three months.

The easing of travel restrictions is not the first time the INS has been forced to back down by public pressure in support of Marroquín. First *la migrá* tried to "exclude" Marroquín back to Mexico—where he faces certain imprisonment and possible death—without so much as a hearing on his request for political asylum. Then they were forced to grant him a formal deportation hearing, and later to postpone the hearing past the original January 17 date so that an adequate defense could be prepared. The date for the hearing has not yet been set.

The Héctor Marroquín Defense Committee already has an impressive list of supporters of Marroquín's right to asylum. Among them are José Alberto Alvarez, leader of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party; Vernon Bellecourt of the American Indian Movement; anti-Vietnam War activist Philip Berrigan; Noam Chomsky of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; actor Howard da Silva; actor John Henry Faulk; comedian Dick Gregory; Michael Harrington, national chairman of Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee; Nobel Prize winner Salvador Luria; Herbert Marcuse; author Kate Millet; Robert and Michael Meeropol, sons of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg; and journalist I.F. Stone.

A letter of support has also been received from Rodolfo Echeverría, a member of the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party. It details how Marroquín's life would be endangered by deportation to Mexico.

Protest actions and benefits to raise funds for Marroquín's defense have been held in Houston, New York, San Diego, and Berkeley.

The United States Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA) was one of the first to take up Marroquín's defense. USLA has made Marroquín's fight for political asylum their central campaign and is working closely with the Héctor Marroquín Defense Committee. □

### Silver Lining

A University of Texas press release, cited in the *Texas Observer*, notes that the plight of undocumented Mexican workers is a bonanza for academic researchers.

"For scholars," the university statement said, "the problems of the United States-Mexican border area are like a shower of sweets from an exploded piñata, releasing many varied and intriguing research possibilities."

\*853 Broadway, Suite 414, New York, N.Y. 10003.

### Pakistani Unionists Protest Killing of Workers

In the aftermath of the massacre of dozens of textile workers in the industrial city of Multan January 2, workers in a number of Pakistani cities have staged protest actions.

In Multan itself, trade unions called for a general strike in all local industries. On January 4, a *hartal* (work and business stoppage) was held, closing down trading bazaars and keeping government buses off the roads. The next day rickshaw drivers went on strike.

According to a report in the January 8 issue of the Lahore weekly *Viewpoint*, "The Multan incident involving the killing of a large number of workers in the Colony Textile Mills has shaken the labour [movement] in Lahore.

"Most of the factories in the industrial areas of the city have almost stopped working, and with every passing day tension is mounting."

The magazine reported that almost all union leaders have protested the killings. A delegation of unionists from Lahore went to Multan to express solidarity. And on January 10, workers throughout the province of Punjab hoisted black flags over their factories in mourning and protest.

The dispute in Multan began December 29 when the 12,000 workers at the textile mills struck in defiance of martial-law regulations to press their demands for better working conditions and bonuses equivalent to four and a half months' wages.

"The strike was not only peaceful," a *Viewpoint* correspondent reported, "but so well organised that it was impossible for the management to enforce a lock-out. The workers arranged things in such a way that workers of each shift would attend their duty but refuse to work."

Although the official government account of the January 2 killings claims that police fired on the strikers in "self-defense," the workers charge that the massacre was unprovoked.

A strike representative reported that on January 2 Assistant Commissioner Jam Jan came to the factory gates with a large contingent of armed police. They called on the strikers to leave the factory gates to listen to an announcement. Although the strikers refused to budge, a few hundred who were already outside gathered to hear the announcement. The assistant commissioner told them that management had agreed to give them half of their bonus and demanded that they either accept the offer or leave the factory grounds. They refused to do either.

"At this," *Viewpoint* reported, "the po-

lice are said to have resorted to tear-gassing and lathi [club]-charges to disperse the workers. Soon after, a shot was fired in the air, and shortly afterwards the workers were aimed at. Some workers alleged that the first shots were fired by goondas [thugs] of the management, led by the canteen manager Sheikh Rashid, after which police also started firing at them. Those who took shelter in the mosque or the market were chased and fired at. Those

### Bolivia—the Hunger Strike for Political Prisoners

By Fred Murphy

Bolivian dictator Hugo Banzer Suárez went on nationwide television January 17 to declare a general amnesty for political prisoners and exiles.

Only twenty-four hours earlier, Banzer's cops had arrested 600 persons who had been participating in a hunger strike that started December 28, demanding a full amnesty and the withdrawal of army troops from the country's tin-mining areas.

The hunger strike was initiated by twenty spouses and children of trade-union leaders not covered in a limited amnesty the military regime had declared December 21. The movement grew rapidly and spread throughout the country.

By January 5, eighty-three persons were refusing food in La Paz and Cochabamba. The strikers included priests, fired tin miners, university officials, and representatives of human-rights organizations. They gathered in churches, at the office of the La Paz daily *Presencia*, at universities, and at the United Nations offices in La Paz.

On January 9, 400 persons were reported on strike, and the movement had been extended to Potosí and Oruro. Eight hundred were participating in six cities by January 13.

The hunger strike was joined by several hundred university students on January 14, as well as by former Bolivian President Luis Adolfo Siles Salinas.

Almost 1,300 persons in ten cities were refusing food by January 16, and the clandestine miners' federation had called for a forty-eight-hour work stoppage in tin mines throughout the country to begin January 17.

The government put its troops on alert January 11. On January 14, fifteen persons were arrested when security agents invaded a church in Santa Cruz. This

who tried to lift the bodies of their fallen colleagues were also shot at. Within minutes, it is said, several bodies of dead and injured workers lay strewn on the fenced ground, the road, around the factory and mosque gates and in the market."

The next day, the regime confirmed that twelve workers had been killed on the spot and that two more died in the hospitals. However, an Action Committee formed by more than thirty trade unions in Multan to investigate the massacre reported that at least sixty-two workers were known to have been killed and others were missing.

One of the members of the Action Committee, Mahmood Nawaz Babar, has been arrested by the authorities, and the rest are reported to have gone into hiding. □

violation of the right to religious asylum outraged Bolivian church officials, who called a meeting to discuss excommunication of those responsible for the arrests.

Meanwhile, negotiations between the hunger strikers were being conducted through Cardinal José Clemente Mauairer. An offer by the regime on January 12 to amnesty all prisoners and exiles not involved in violations of the "law on state security" was rejected by the strikers as too vague.

The government continued negotiations until 11 p.m. on January 16, when it abruptly told the hunger strike leaders to call off the movement and send everyone home within one hour. Arrests were then ordered.

In response, university students mobilized in street demonstrations, and tin miners walked off their jobs.

Banzer then appeared to reverse himself in the television speech and give in to the movement's main demand. The extent of the new amnesty and the response of those who participated in the hunger strike remain unclear, however.

According to a report in the January 19 *Washington Post*, Banzer's declaration "did not necessarily mean that those charged with criminal activity or terrorism would be excused of their alleged crimes."

"The general amnesty will not let Bolivia's enemies go unpunished," the *Post* quoted Banzer as saying.

Elections for a president, vice-president, and constituent assembly are to be held in Bolivia July 9, and the military has said it will transfer power to the elected government on August 6.

Banzer introduced air force chief Juan Pareda as his hand-picked candidate for president January 6.

A front composed of several bourgeois

and working-class parties is reportedly planning to back the candidacy of ex-President Hernán Siles Suazo against Pareda. The front would include the Left Revolutionary Nationalist Movement; the

Communist and Socialist parties; and the Revolutionary Party of the Nationalist Left, which is headed by the miners union leader and former vice-president of Bolivia Juan Lechín.

Siles Suazo and Lechín have been in exile and were not covered in the December 21 partial amnesty. It is not clear whether they will now be allowed to return to the country. □

## Interview With an Activist in Italian Women's Movement

# What We Learned From the 'Black Vote' on Abortion

[The following interview was obtained in January with Marisa, a leader of the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari (GCR—Revolutionary Communist Groups), the Italian section of the Fourth International. Marisa is a member of the Central Committee of the GCR and has been active in the Italian women's liberation movement since its beginning.]

\* \* \*

*Question. The first thing many people outside of Italy heard of the Italian women's movement was the big demonstration around abortion in Rome in 1975. Can you tell us what led up to that march and explain why abortion has been such an explosive issue?*

*Answer.* The big abortion march on December 6, 1975, was the first public appearance of the women's movement, but in actual fact the radicalization had taken place over the preceding years. Hundreds of women's groups had been formed—consciousness raising groups, neighborhood groups, and committees of women working around specific issues. Women in the far-left organizations had begun to become conscious of the question of women's liberation.

The demonstration of December 1975 was important, because it was the first indication that the women's movement was going to be a real mass movement. It was a very large demonstration, probably around 30,000 women. In fact, those of us who were present were completely overwhelmed at the size of the march.

The demonstration was about abortion, but many related issues were raised, such as motherhood, sexual roles, and so on. The action showed that abortion was going to be the issue around which the women's movement would be built over the coming years.

The 1975 demonstration also established that the abortion movement was not going to be a mixed movement like the MLAC<sup>1</sup> experience in France and the NAC<sup>2</sup> in Britain.

I suppose that most people overseas heard of this demonstration not just because it was a very big march on abortion in a country like Italy with its Catholic heritage, but because of certain incidents that occurred. Men from Lotta Continua<sup>3</sup> tried to break into the march—not because it was on abortion, but because it was the first big demonstration of women only, and this was seen as a threat.

Finally, the whole demonstration had a very strong antigovernmental thrust. Women had clearly identified who the enemy was.

Abortion is a very volatile issue in Italy for a whole series of reasons. The Catholic Church and the Christian Democratic Party, which is the main party of the ruling class and is directly tied to the Vatican, see abortion as one of the key ways of keeping women down.

The quantity of backyard abortions in Italy is something astronomical. I don't like quoting figures because none of them are very certain. But from my own experience working in a women's clinic in Italy, I know that the number of abortions is something very considerable.

The struggle to win the right of women to abortion arose in a period in which there was a growing radicalization of women, not just on the abortion issue but on a whole series of questions relating to their lives. Women had learned from experience and from the example of other movements, such as the workers movement and the student movement. They were becoming aware of their right to a different way of life, their right to a job, their right to a different kind of motherhood, and so on.

So from the start the question of

abortion was taken up not simply as a civil rights issue but as a very central part of the whole way in which women were going to deal with their lives. And therefore it had many aspects of a struggle against the capitalist system.

*Q. Can you explain how the abortion movement was organized in this early period?*

*A.* The demonstration of December 1975 was organized by the women's movement itself, through a series of national coordinating meetings. The first of these meetings was called in October of 1975. An appeal was sent out from Turin—which is the city in which I work—calling for a meeting in Bologna, where there was also a strong women's movement. We sent out an appeal to all the women's groups for which we had addresses, and the appeal was also published in the newspapers of the far left. That meeting was very big and laid the basis for organizing the demonstration.

Prior to this the abortion movement had gone through various phases. The Radical Party, which is essentially a civil-rights party, had first initiated a campaign for a referendum on abortion. Committees were set up to collect half a million signatures to call a referendum on repeal of the old Fascist abortion law. This law—which is still on the books—states that abortion is a crime against the Italian race.

These committees came to include various political parties, essentially the Socialist Party, the Radical Party, the organizations of the far left, some women's groups, and also one of the trade union federations, the UIL.<sup>4</sup> These committees organized the first meetings, the first discussions on abortion, but they maintained the whole issue very much on the institutional level, as a parliamentary issue.

The women's groups started participating in these committees, but just

1. Mouvement pour la Liberté de l'Avortement et de la Contraception (Movement for Freedom of Abortion and Contraception).

2. National Abortion Campaign.

3. Lotta Continua (the Struggle Continues), an ultraleft organization.

4. Unione Italiana dei Lavoratori (Italian Union of Workers).

until women started to raise as the central issue, a women's right to choose, free abortion on demand. Then they had to break away and set up their own abortion coordinating committees on a city-wide basis, because the political parties were holding back the struggle.

You will have noticed from the description of the early abortion committees that the Communist Party was entirely absent. In fact, all during 1975, the Communist Party would not take part in these committees because of their particular strategy toward the Christian Democratic Party. They did not wish to push the abortion issue.

Subsequently the CP—like all the other political parties—presented a proposal in parliament for an abortion reform. The proposal that the CP first introduced was not very liberal. It restricted abortion to specific cases such as danger to the life of the woman and cases of rape and incest, and it said abortion could be permitted only after a doctor or a panel of doctors had approved. Later the CP had to modify this somewhat, in the direction of making abortion more available.

*Q. Can you explain how the women's movement, which was now in the streets around this question, related to the various abortion reform proposals in parliament?*

A. What actually took place was a rather interesting phenomenon. Because the political parties did not respond to the way in which the issue was taken up in the women's movement, a gap started to develop between the way in which the issue was being raised in the mass demonstrations and the debate that was being conducted on a parliamentary level.

Now in the course of 1976, the comrades of the Italian section of the Fourth International, the GCR, together with other women, felt that this situation was becoming dangerous. The vanguard of the women's movement was not paying sufficient attention to the way in which the abortion issue was being perceived by broad layers of women, trying instead to ignore the parliamentary debate and say it was not relevant. But it is foolish to think that masses of women don't care what the law on abortion is. You have to deal with the desires of the masses of women for a decent law on abortion.

We tried to bridge this gap with the idea of an abortion law from the women's movement itself.

The initiative came from Turin again, where the coordinating committee—which included our comrades along with women from other revolutionary left organizations and women who were not connected with any particular party or organization—put forward an abortion law proposal for the movement to discuss.

This proposal, which was in the form of a regular law, tried to put together the

main demands that had been raised in the women's movement: that is, free abortion on demand, for minors as well as for adult women, for foreigners as well as Italian women; abortions to be performed in



L'Espresso  
"For Shame!" Banner protests Senate vote that killed bill to liberalize abortions.

public hospitals free of charge under the public health scheme; and a clause saying that where spontaneous abortions could be shown to result from bad work conditions, the bosses of the factories should be fined for allowing unsafe conditions to exist. This shows the kind of attention the women's movement was paying to the overall conditions of women.

Now this proposal, which was an attempt to bridge the gap between the movement and the parliamentary debate, was discussed in a number of big national meetings attended by delegates from women's groups all over the country. These meetings, which took place mainly in Rome, were often attended by 400 to 600 women.

There were a number of currents in the movement, from reformist currents through ultraleft currents, which united in this case, with the final result that the proposal was not accepted by the movement as a whole. The reformists and ultralefts sometimes used nearly identical language in attacking us for wanting to intervene in the parliamentary debate.

The reformists said that because of the kind of proposals that other parties had put forward, it was not politically suitable for an alternative proposal to be put up. In other words, they wanted to go on giving secret support to the CP law.

Ultraleft currents pushed some of the articles in the law to extreme conclusions. For example, where the first article on the law we had proposed said simply that abortion should be free on demand, they insisted that this article should read that

abortion must be available up to the ninth month of pregnancy.

This allowed reformist and bourgeois parties—and especially bourgeois newspapers—to jump on the issue and state that the women's movement was extremist, that we were actually assassins, murderers, and that we had just gone beyond any limits that were acceptable.

*Q. What was the version of the abortion law that was ultimately defeated in the so-called "black vote"?*

A. The law that came up for a vote in the Senate in June of 1977 put a number of restrictions on the right to abortion. But it allowed abortions for reasons of financial and social hardship, which is the traditional way of giving leeway for abortion—as for example with the 1967 English law. It provided for the woman ultimately having the right to decide, although she was required to consult with a doctor.

Abortions had to be performed in public hospitals, but there was nothing in the law that said that hospitals had to perform abortions. And it had a very tricky clause giving doctors the right to be conscientious objectors when it came to abortion. Now this meant, in a country like Italy, that immediately a very large percentage of doctors declared themselves conscientious objectors—in many cases probably the very same doctors who performed backyard abortions. They had big financial interests to protect.

I think that the Communist Party really expected that this vote would go through, because for them it wasn't just a vote on abortion. It was one of the first test cases of their strategy of historic compromise with the Christian Democrats. Instead it lost by seven votes.

This was a very big defeat for the women's movement. There was an immediate reaction, and there were big protest demonstrations all over the country.

*Q. What kind of impact has the abortion campaign had on the Communist Party? I know that at the December 1975 march some of the slogans were actually directed against the CP because its position was so bad.*

A. In the beginning the Communist Party was under tremendous pressure from the women's movement. In fact, it had a great deal of trouble with its own rank-and-file women, who were very much attracted by the organizations of the women's movement.

Now, the CP has managed to recoup a certain influence on the mass level and even within the women's movement itself. Partly this is because the women's movement has not consistently carried forward the issue over the last year. And partly because the CP is extremely flexible,

when it comes to questions such as this. They always insist that the abortion law under discussion in parliament is the best law possible given the circumstances. But at the same time, their newspaper and theoretical journal now carry a lot of discussion on feminism, on the relationship between the women's movement and the class movement, and on how demands that the women's movement has raised can be incorporated into their overall strategy.

*Q. What is the situation right now in terms of the abortion law?*

A. The political parties are stalling. They were meant to rediscuss the abortion law in the Chamber of Deputies in December, but a legal clause was found whereby the discussion could be pushed off even further. This is because the Communist Party thinks it is extremely inopportune to confront the Christian Democratic Party on the issue right at this moment. And the Christian Democrats are making very strong noises on the question of abortion and saying that they are not going to concede anything on the issue.

Also, over the last year, reactionary forces financed and organized by the Vatican have been extremely active. There has been a large growth of the right-to-life movement. The Archbishop of Milan last year organized a demonstration of 80,000 people against abortion. A movement called the Right to Life is currently collecting signatures for a popular law against abortion, proposing that abortion still be considered a crime and that the solution be found through adoption.

The problem for the CP is that unless an abortion law of some sort is pushed through, the Radical Party's referendum on repealing the old abortion law will come up. This is what the Communist Party fears most of all, because the referendum would lead to a direct confrontation with the Christian Democratic Party. It would oblige the Communist Party to come out much more strongly on the abortion issue.

There are two alternatives. One is to push through an abortion reform of any kind. The other is that the referendum cannot be held if elections take place. In the meantime, the Communist Party is pushing a proposal to severely limit the possibility of holding referendums in the future. They admit that it is a democratic popular right, but say that it is inopportune. This just about explains their attitude.

*Q. Where does the women's movement go from here?*

A. It is a difficult situation. The result of the Senate vote was that a considerable part of the women's movement said that this was simply proof that the women's movement could not relate to abortion as a

parliamentary issue. The discussion in that part of the movement has continued on motherhood, sex roles in the family, and so forth, leaving aside the abortion issue as such.

However, there is another part of the movement, which is rather large and which we feel to be the most important. It reflects the growing radicalization of working women, both white-collar women and women in factories. These women have had time to reflect on the situation, and there appears to be some chance of this part of the movement taking up the issue of abortion in a more consistent fashion.

We feel that the time has come when a much stronger push must be made toward the organized working-class movement—that is, the unions—by these women.

On a national scale, trade unions in Italy haven't taken up the abortion issue as such; they always say that this is not a union issue. However, where the women's movement is strong among working women, and where there is a connection between the organized women's movement and women delegates in factories and places of work, the abortion issue has been raised—and rather well.

For example, in a number of towns where women delegates have taken part directly in the women's movement and are feminists, they have organized meetings right on the job on the subject of abortion and contraceptives. In a number of

instances, at least on a city-wide level, unions have had to come out with statements on abortion very much in the terms in which it is raised in the women's movement.

This is where we in the GCR think that the best prospects lie for building the abortion campaign. Our role here—and it is one we have played from the early stages—is trying to convince others that the movement must be built on the widest possible basis.

One of the things this means is trying to overcome the sectarianism that exists in the women's movement and among its vanguard—particularly among women who belong to or have belonged to the other far left organizations—in regard to the *Unione Donne Italiane*, the UDI, which is the mass women's movement of the Communist Party. We think that in a movement built around the central issue of free abortion on demand, a woman's right to choose, many initiatives can be built together with the rank and file of the Communist Party—as opposed to the leadership.

With this kind of perspective, we think that it is possible to reconstruct the movement. It is a long road to travel, but we feel that all is not lost on the abortion question. By forging the right kinds of alliances, it is still possible to build a mass movement for free abortion on demand in Italy. □

## Sri Lankan Unions Say 'No' to Austerity Measures

The leaders of thirty labor federations and major trade unions in Sri Lanka have decided to launch a month-long campaign against cuts in the rice subsidy introduced in the first budget of the United National Party (UNP) regime. The campaign is to consist, at least initially, of public rallies and lectures, as well as factory-floor meetings.

The call for the protest actions came a few days after a mass rally at Colombo's Hyde Park organized by the thirty unions, which represent more than a million workers. Almost every major trade union, except for the Ceylon Workers Congress (a Tamil plantation workers union) and those affiliated to the UNP, sent a representative to the rally. According to a report in the January 20 *Far Eastern Economic Review*, "The unions embrace the transport and port services, clerks in government and the mercantile sector, postal, petroleum and telecommunications workers, and the entire corporation sector."

The rally was said by many of the speakers at it to be the most significant demonstration of trade-union solidarity in more than a decade.

The cuts in the rice subsidy are only one

of the austerity measures in J. R. Jayewardene's new budget, which was drawn under the "recommendation" of the International Monetary Fund in return for a standby credit of more than \$90 million. The other measures include an 85 percent devaluation of the rupee and an end to price controls.

Rohana Wijeweera, the central leader of the radical youth movement, the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP—People's Liberation Front), has also denounced Jayewardene's budget. At a rally in Colombo, he condemned it as a "capitalist budget" drawn up in Washington by the IMF.

### It Figures

Harvard medical researchers found that a group of workers at the Converse Rubber Company who received fifteen-minute "relaxation breaks" enjoyed a significant drop in mean blood pressure. Unfortunately, reports the *Wall Street Journal*, "layoffs affecting 15 per cent of the work force hit unexpectedly near the end of the experiment, forcing blood pressure up in all the volunteers." (*The Progressive*, February 1978.)

## What the Polls Show—and Don't Show—About West Germany

By Anna Armand

Public opinion polls reflect only the mood at specific moments. They do not say very much about the long-term trends developing in class consciousness. To the contrary, they are important as gauges of the shock waves set in motion by emotionally charged events. This has to be taken into consideration in a political analysis, so as to avoid getting too caught up in the immediate situation.

At the end of 1977, one of the biggest West German illustrated magazines, *Stern*, conducted a poll on the theme of "Who and What the Germans Want." A full 76% had a good opinion of [Social Democratic Chancellor] Helmut Schmidt, and only 16% a bad one. At the end of 1975, only 67% of the representative cross section polled had a good opinion of Schmidt.

The chancellor's popularity increased because his "tough action" in Mogadishu against the terrorists achieved the success hoped for by the overwhelming majority of the population. The tourists in the hijacked airplane (although not the pilot) were rescued, and three Arab terrorists were shot.

As for Schmidt's main political rival, Helmut Kohl, leader of the Christian Democrats, 51% had a good opinion of him at the end of 1977, while 63% did at the end of 1975.

How much the terrorist scare has changed the emotional climate, at least for the moment, can be seen from the following result: Some 62% of the population would accept restriction of their personal rights—for example, being kept under surveillance and having their homes searched—if the role of the state and the police were to be increased to fight the terrorists. Only 26% rejected such a limitation of their personal rights.

### Erosion of Confidence

From the long-range standpoint, however, two other results of the poll are much more important. First, the recession has shaken the deeply rooted faith in the economic miracle, progress, and a better future through the socially directed market economy. Second, Schmidt's popularity by no means implies faith in the ability of any government to overcome the economic and other problems.

Thus, at the end of 1977, only 38% still believed that humanity was progressing toward a better and better future. In 1972,

60% did. At the end of 1977, 60% believed that people's lives were becoming more and more difficult, while in 1968 only 44% did. Some 55% looked forward to the year 1978 with apprehension (in the sixteen-to-twenty-nine-year-old age bracket, this was 69%), while in 1974, only 44% had such apprehensions. In December 1977, 61% believed that "We are going to have to expect the number of unemployed to be about a million for a long time ahead." In April 1976, only 33% thought this.

However, most impressive was the answer to the question: "What kind of government do you think can best solve our present problems—the economic problems, unemployment, and terrorism?" Only 28% thought that the present coalition of Social Democrats and Liberals could do this. About 22% thought that an all-Christian Democrat government could best accomplish this. Some 15% looked to a "grand coalition" [including both the Social Democrats and Christian Democrats] to accomplish these tasks. Only 7% thought that a Christian Democrat-Liberal government would have a chance. Some 8% thought that an all-party government would. But a fourth of those asked, 24%, were undecided, or had no confidence that any of these parties could solve these problems. (The total for the various responses was over 100%, because several possibilities could be given.)

The facts that Helmut Schmidt's popularity does not correspond to any faith in the capacity of the Socialist-Liberal government, and that a quarter of the population have no confidence (despite Mogadishu) that any possible governmental coalition can solve the present problems, point to a high degree of political uneasiness.

Unfortunately, the poll also showed that the lack of a political alternative has given rise to a dangerously muddled notion in the minds of people.

The response by the unions to the crisis has been weak. They are tied by an umbilical cord to the SPD, which does not offer the least anticapitalist alternative. Instead, it slavishly adheres to economic policies within the framework of the so-called socially directed market economy. And the adjective "socially directed" that has been added to pretty things up is strictly a joke.

How else can it be explained that 60% of those polled said they agreed that wage

raises in 1978 should only be high enough to "compensate for price increases." For lower-ranking clerks in business and government, the percentage was 64 (for higher-ranking clerks, it was 67%). Some 59% of skilled workers thought this way, and even 55% of the semiskilled workers. There was hardly any difference in the percentage between supporters of the Social Democrats (63%) and the Christian Democrats (60%).

### Blaming the Unemployed for Unemployment

The criminal irresponsibility with which the SPD and the unions have belittled the problem of unemployment for years, along with the manipulation of public opinion by the capitalist mass media, led to the result that 59% of those polled believed that many of those now unemployed "do not want to work at all." Even among SPD supporters, a majority (54%) felt this way. Among Christian Democrat supporters, the figure was 67%. The fact that during the boom all of those who supposedly do not want to work did in fact work has been successfully erased from the public memory by a campaign of denigration against the jobless, blaming them for their own fate.

We know that hunger and oppression do not by themselves drive people to rebel, if they are not conscious of the wrongs they suffer. As long as the oppressed classes believed in a better world beyond, where they would be rewarded for their suffering in an earthly vale of tears, they did not rebel.

It was the unions and Social Democratic parties that first heightened awareness of exploitation and oppression and developed class consciousness by projecting the vision of a socialist order as a "paradise on earth."

In West Germany now we are seeing that unemployment alone is not sufficient to develop an anticapitalist or socialist consciousness among masses of people. Such a consciousness has not emerged. The reason is that there are no mass unions or parties here that carry on even verbal propaganda on a regular basis—not just in occasional holiday speechmaking—pointing to the connection between capitalism and unemployment.

This state of affairs is more astonishing than it might seem at first glance, when you look only at the figure of a million now



unemployed in West Germany. In fact, *many millions* have already suffered directly from unemployment at some point in their lives.

For example, the head of the Labor Bureau in Dortmund, Gerhard Ahl, wrote in the liberal weekly *Der Zeit* of December 30 that in 1976 "3.3 million workers registered as 'newly unemployed'" and in the same period the Labor Bureaus reported 2.3 million looking for work. "In 1977, the development was similar."

In the two years of the *economic upturn* therefore about six million blue- and white-collar workers (out of about twenty-one million "employed by others") have suffered at least temporary unemployment themselves. Of course, in the years of full employment, many people changed their jobs. But at that time this occurred with scarcely any problems and usually represented *advancement*. Now, however, leaving a job generally means a *cut* in income and is bound up with anxiety and apprehension, whether or not a new one can be found quickly.

Thus, it is clear why the optimistic faith in a happy future, in the socially directed market economy, has been so profoundly shaken. However, at the same time, it is evident that an awareness of the connection between unemployment and capitalism does not develop "spontaneously." In fact, we can see that because the SPD and the unions have failed to do any anticapitalist educational work, the attempt to escape from the disagreeable social reality leads people into burying themselves in their private lives and putting the blame for the problems on the unemployed. All this, moreover, represents a major obstacle to the political forces to the left of the SPD.

Has nothing changed, after all, in the last analysis? Has there been no movement, despite the bitter experiences of millions and despite the growing lack of political confidence in the established parties? Is there an immediate danger in West Germany of a march toward an authoritarian state? The answer is clearly no. There are signs of tremors beneath the surface, although not of any *political* upheaval.

#### What the Steelworkers Congress Showed

Let's begin by noting the congress of *Industriegewerkschaft Metall* [IG-Metall, the steelworkers union]. This organization has 2.6 million members. Even though today there are 500,000 fewer persons working in the steel industry than during the boom, it has won tens of thousands of new members.

At the IG-Metall congress in September 1977, the leadership had to take some stinging defeats. It became clear that within the eleven-member union leadership, there is a "gang of four" (as it was christened by *Der Spiegel*), which has

openly begun to disagree with the majority.

In opposition to the resolution proposed by the leadership, the majority of the delegates voted to rescind the arbitration agreement, so that in entering into contract negotiations, the union will no longer be bound by a pledge to maintain labor peace.<sup>1</sup>

A majority of the delegates voted to instruct the leadership not to participate in "concerted action" while the employers organizations have appeals against the 1976 codetermination law before the Federal Supreme Court on Constitutional Matters.<sup>2</sup>

In opposition to the leadership, the delegates at the IG-Metall congress voted to establish cooperation and coordination among union grievance persons.<sup>3</sup>

In opposition to the leadership, the proposal to extend the period between congresses from three to four years was rejected. (One delegate argued: "If we don't reject this, we'll soon come to a situation like the one in China, where you find out from the wall posters that a union congress has been held.")

Contrary to the leadership's wish to have their hands left free in negotiating a reduction in working hours (more vacation time, lowering of the retirement age, lengthening of the time spent in education, reduction of the workweek), the delegates voted to include *explicitly* the call for a thirty-five hour workweek in the union's list of demands.

The leadership did manage to win approval for the construction of nuclear power plants, although a 20% minority voted against this. However, the delegates forced the inclusion of a call for *nationalizing* energy production in IG-Metall's list of demands.

1. In West Germany, the unions are pledged to maintain labor peace during the life of contracts. As long as the contract has not been annulled and has not run out, there are not supposed to be any strikes. Otherwise, the unions can be forced to pay fines that may amount to many millions of Deutschmarks. Over and above this, the arbitration agreement between IG-Metall and the Steel Industry Association requires maintaining labor peace during hearings that can take five weeks. This makes it still more difficult to mobilize the workers in the factories after contracts have expired.

2. Concerted Action is a "round table" at which representatives of capital, the government, and the unions sit together. These "round-table" discussions exercise a notable pressure on public opinion in favor of "moderation" in wage demands, since this is usually what is recommended by the "experts," the government, and the employers associations. The employers associations have challenged the legality of a new law on "codetermination" [i.e., inclusion of so-called representatives of the workers in management bodies] by appealing to the Supreme Court on Constitutional Matters [there are different appeals courts for different types of questions].

Even on the question of political blacklisting, a stronger opposition showed up this time in the discussion. It even won a partial victory. The leadership's resolution coupled the questions of "internal security" and "political extremism." This was an obvious provocation. They wanted to make an amalgam between the left opposition in the unions and the terrorists. However, the opposition was able to win a vote to separate these two questions.

The union chairman, Eugen Loderer, who has steered a course closely following the SPD leadership, was given a resounding slap in the face. He was unable to get his candidate, a representative of his policy, elected to the leadership.

#### A New Generation of Oppositionists

There were two important changes at this congress that should be especially noted. The first is a generational change in the opposition. In the 1950s there was a layer of middle functionaries, who carried forward the experiences of the Weimar period (1918-1933). They consisted mostly of former Communists, former members of the Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei [SAP—Socialist Workers Party, a left-centrist split from the SPD], former members of the KPO [Kommunistische Partei-Opposition, Brandlerites, linked to the Bukharinist right opposition in the Soviet CP], and left Social Democrats. It was this grouping that formed a "left" opposition.

This layer of veterans were the main leaders of the fight in the unions against the remilitarization of Germany (which led even to the removal of the chairman of the German Trade-Union Federation, Christian Fette, from his post). They also played an important role in the fight against the atom bomb and against the emergency powers laws. This generation is now either retired or became "co-opted" during the long period of boom, when they buried their hopes for an end to capitalism.

At the September 1977 congress of IG-Metall, a *new* generation of oppositionists appeared. They did not, to be sure, form a very coherent current. But their appearance does show that a *change* has at least begun.

Secondly, this time the opposition was not limited to any specific regions. Over the last two decades, IG-Metall has waged struggles in two regions only. In 1963 and 1971, there were strikes with lockouts in Stuttgart in the state of Baden-

3. The Factory Committees [*Betriebsräte*] are elected by the *entire* workforce. The grievance persons [*Vertrauensleute*] on the other hand are union representatives. In theory, there is one grievance person for every twenty union members. Until now, in contrast to the Factory Committees, which according to German labor law are supposed to look after the "welfare of the factory," the grievance people were not supposed to meet on a factory-wide basis.

Württemberg. In 1974, there was a struggle in Hamburg, in the region at the mouth of the River Weser.

In the region where IG-Metall has the largest concentration of members (one million), that is, in Nordrhein-Westfalen, it has not organized one strike since 1933. (There were, however, *spontaneous* strikes here in the steel industry and the coal mines in 1969.) At this congress of IG-Metall, however, the opposition extended to *all* districts, whereas previously those with strike experience had remained mostly isolated.

The expectations that the impact of Mogadishu would silence any opposition at the November 1977 SPD congress were not borne out. The same small group of Bundestag deputies that refused to vote for the laws tightening "internal security" did not give up the fight at the party gathering.

(The "internal security" laws were designed to make the rights guaranteed by the constitution a dead letter and cut the heart out of the existing democratic freedoms. They smoothed the way for the advocates of the "strong state.")

The small left conglomeration in the SPD has melted away, but a hard core has remained. And since the SPD congress, representatives of this group have spoken at public meetings, despite all the party leadership's threats. Nor have they let themselves be intimidated by boycotts, isolation, slander, and vilification within the SPD parliamentary fraction. This hard core is clearly quite different in quality from the previous left wing, which after a short time either became co-opted entirely by assuming positions of "responsibility" or, however reluctantly, accepted party discipline.

#### A Shock for the Bureaucrats

Another surprise came at the national youth conference of the German Trade-Union Federation, to which sixteen unions belong. (Of the 146 delegates to this conference, 106 were officeholders and 38 were full-timers.)

In a short report on the conference, federation executive member Karl Schwab expressed his "dismay" at the "headstrong way in which other people's opinions were dismissed as irrelevant, as out of line with the wishes of the membership, and as contrary to honestly representing the interests of young workers."

Schwab said that he was astonished that "collective bargaining is to be replaced by a concentration on actions, rallies, demonstrations, and marches." He found it "shocking" that "the organized young workers and the delegates at the national youth conference could not be convinced that the Federal Republic of Germany has not become a state without justice, that the so-called political blacklisting is not an everyday thing, and that

restrictions of political freedoms are not carried forward every day at a rapid rate." He was also shocked that resolutions were adopted with the theme of "down with political blacklisting."

It is true that a number of the delegates



SCHMIDT: A full 28% believe he will reduce unemployment, now listed at 1 million.

were members of the Communist Party youth organization, the Sozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterjugend [SDAJ—Socialist German Worker Youth], and that they refused to vote for a resolution calling for the release of Rudolf Bahro, a Marxist critic of the East German regime. Schwab seized on this as a pretext to raise an alarm about CP infiltration.

However, Schwab's proposal for taking the youth "in hand" differs only in degree from the methods used by the East German bureaucracy. He said that since "the German Trade-Union Federation is not able alone to deal with all the problems arising in youth work," the individual unions should discipline these young workers better! The young workers in the unions should be forced, "regardless of differences," to accept the decisions of the higher bodies "like all other sections of the organization."

We should not have any illusions because there are opposition currents in IG-Metall, the SPD, and the trade-union youth, or in some smaller unions such as the wood and plastic workers and the printing and paper workers. (The latter have even spoken out against political blacklisting and against the undemocratic laws that are supposed to defend "internal

order.") Among the decisive layer of union leaders, the predominant trend is to the right.

#### Union Tops Join Fans of Nuclear Power

The direction of this layer of the union leadership was made more than clear when, under the pressure brought to bear by an operation directed and financed by the nuclear industry, the leaders of the biggest unions spoke in support of nuclear power at a rally of 40,000 persons.

When the Factory Committees threatened to organize an "Energy Workers Union" to "defend jobs" in the nuclear industry if the unions did not come out for building more nuclear power plants, all the concerns about inadequate safety measures that had been voiced in the elected leadership bodies of the unions were thrown out the window. The union leaders spoke at a rally that was not organized by the unions but by the industrialists, working with the Factory Committee members!

Likewise, for example, in order to "defend jobs," the Food, Refreshment, and Restaurant Workers Union has been sponsoring ads, along with the tobacco industry, promoting the smoking habit.

On the other hand, the German Trade-Union Federation published an estimate that if the retirement age was reduced by only one year, the workweek was reduced by one hour, and yearly vacations were lengthened by one day, "This would mean, on the basis of these figures alone, 800,000 new jobs."

However, the federation has not planned the least action to win such an objective. This is something that it could not agitate for arm in arm with the employers organizations!

The result of the union leaderships' inaction is that centrifugal tendencies are developing that may threaten the very existence of the trade unions. Factory Committees are trying to "safeguard jobs" by becoming lobbyists for the arms industry, the nuclear construction industry, and the tobacco industry. Together with the defenders of the capitalists' interests they seek to pressure the government to make funds from the budget more available for "their" industries.

It is slowly beginning to dawn on the "left" that forms of united action are needed in order to effectively oppose the powerful apparatuses of the SPD and the unions and also to encourage the opposition currents that are beginning to take shape *inside* the SPD and the unions.

#### Russell Hearings on Blacklisting

An indication of this growing understanding is the fact that despite the step-up in repression, thousands of people have been coming to the meetings held by the Russell Committee, which is

organizing a tribunal on the question of political blacklisting. Another obstacle the committee had to face was the attitude of the Maoist and Maoist-centrist groups, which want the tribunal to extend its investigation to all the evils of the capitalist system rather than concentrating it on the specific dangers in West Germany. In Berlin, the Russell Committee meeting drew 5,000 persons, by no means all students. In Cologne, there were 1,200, and in Frankfurt, a similar number. Meetings are now being built in many other cities.

Likewise, the citizens initiatives against nuclear power plants sponsored by the Arbeitskreis Leben [Labor Group for Life] are arousing considerable interest. This is a group for trade-union members who want to organize to oppose the construction of nuclear plants.

More generally, it should be noted that the citizens initiatives against nuclear power have become a mass movement of tens of thousands of persons, which has won sympathy reaching deep into the established parties and unions. A still unpublished poll shows that almost a third of union members would, under certain conditions, participate in citizens initiatives.

If a united front of the left based on the interests of the working class (above all, in the factories) did develop, it would have a certain chance of getting over the 5% hurdle [the minimum required for representation] in local and even parliamentary elections. So far this has been achieved only by the Communist Party in a very few cases.

Such a success would make the idea of an "electoral alternative" to the SPD more credible. In fact, almost 10% of union members are prepared, under certain circumstances, to vote for a party to the left of the SPD. However, they would hardly do this if there were a number of competing slates with a confusing variety of action programs.

The time has come for the forces "to the left of the SPD" to join together in a united front. Failure to do this will mean leaving the working class defenseless against dangerous maneuvers designed to create confusion. □

### Don't Call Us, We'll Call You

Singapore dictator Lee Kuan Yew's People's Action Party, which resigned from the Second International in 1976 after his government's treatment of political prisoners strained relations even with that reactionary crew, apparently has no immediate intention of seeking reinstatement.

"Until the Socialist International purges itself of radicals and ceases to be an outfit for propagating Eurocommunism," a high PAP official told the press in mid-January, "we see no reason to go back."

## Demand That Desai Fulfill His Election Promises

### Indian Railway Workers Plan General Strike

By Sharad Jhaveri

JAMNAGAR—Massive rallies of railway workers in Delhi and other cities were followed recently by a meeting in Delhi of the General Council of the All-India Railwaymen's Federation (AIRF). It directed affiliated unions to convene meetings of their respective general councils by March and make necessary preparations for an indefinite general strike throughout the country. The unions have been asked to begin collecting strike funds.

The General Council of the AIRF was of the view that an indefinite strike was the only weapon the workers had to compel the Janata Party regime to meet their demands.

The council noted that there was a "large section in the ruling party which stood with us in the past and worked ceaselessly for the realisation of these very demands." The reference was to Railway Minister Madhu Dandavate and Industries Minister George Fernandes, both former labor leaders. The council believes that they will continue to support the railway workers' struggle. So far, this faith in the government ministers has borne no fruit.

The question is: What direction will the AIRF take in view of the fact that its own leaders are now government ministers?

The AIRF has declared that it will not tail behind the Janata regime and that it would oppose it if necessary to uphold the interests of the workers. While Railway Minister Dandavate is continuing the former Gandhi regime's policy of refusing to negotiate with the All-India Locomotive Running Staff Association, the AIRF has called for unity among all the railway unions.

At the same time, some of the traditional AIRF leaders experienced the power of the railway workers during the 1974 general strike and are frightened of it. They do not want militant action that could disturb the Janata Party.

On one of the major issues in the dispute, the payment of bonuses, the railway workers feel that they have been cheated by the Janata Party. During the elections it had promised to treat bonuses as deferred wages and to restore the right of all workers to a minimum bonus of 8 percent of their wages. But since coming to power, the Janata Party has refused to fulfill its promise.

However, a rising wave of militant strikes and the threat of an even greater working-class upsurge compelled it to concede a little on the bonus issue. But even then the Janata Party restored bonuses

only to their level before Gandhi's state of emergency. As for the railway workers, they were denied any bonus. Instead, they were given an allowance equivalent to one month's pay. Prime Minister Morarji Desai has categorically rejected giving any bonus payments to the railway workers.

The problem of "casual" workers is also at issue. The workers are demanding permanent employment status for hundreds of thousands of casual workers, many of whom have been employed on the railways for decades. They perform such duties as expanding and maintaining the railway network, doubling tracks, and laying and electrifying new lines. Their wages are miserably low—in many cases lower than those of agricultural labourers. Track maintenance, for instance, is a permanent job, but 65 percent of the maintenance gangs are classified as casual workers.

Another problem is the immense increase in workload. The expansion of the railways has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in the number of employees. During the state of emergency, the workload was increased even further. With the greater frequency of Bombay's suburban trains, for instance, the rest time of motormen was reduced. The working hours of gangmen have been increased by half an hour. This speedup has contributed to the rising incidence of railway accidents.

The International Railway Convention has categorised railways as an industry. The 1972 Railway Labour Tribunal has done the same. Yet the Janata regime still refuses to recognise railway workers as industrial workers. Railway workers in India are thus denied their full trade-union rights. They continue to be subjected to a different set of regulations governing working hours.

The railway workers are demanding that they be recognised as industrial workers, that their work day be eight hours, and that they be granted full trade-union rights. They are also demanding that all charges against railway workers stemming from the 1974 general strike be withdrawn and that full back wages be paid for the strike period.

January 8, 1978

A subscription to *Intercontinental Press/Inprecor* is still a BEST BUY.  
Check rates inside cover.

# What Carter's New Budget Reveals

By Jon Britton

"The first . . . budget of any new Administration is its most important. It is the Administration's first full statement of its priorities, policies and proposals for meeting our national needs."

That is how Jimmy Carter's January 23 message to Congress on his proposed budget for fiscal year 1979 begins. (The current budget was basically shaped by the Republican administration of Gerald Ford.)

So what does Carter's first budget reveal about the "priorities, policies and proposals" of his administration for meeting the needs of the American people?

It shows that Democrat Carter's program is the same, with slight variations of detail, as Ford's was.

"If Carter's economic and budget messages did not have his name on them, I would not know which Administration had issued them," Alan Greenspan, archconservative former chief economic advisor to Gerald Ford, says.

Carter himself describes his \$500 billion budget as "lean and tight." He points out that the projected increase in spending over this year is only 2% in real terms and that the budget's share of the country's gross national product will actually drop, from 22.6% to 22%.

The budget will probably be even leaner and tighter than it looks. Last year actual expenditures fell \$16 billion short of what had been projected, while this year the shortfall is expected to be at least \$8 billion.

The logic behind these figures was spelled out by Carter in his State of the Union message to Congress on January 19: "Government cannot solve our problems. It can't set our goals. . . . Government cannot eliminate poverty or provide a bountiful economy or reduce inflation, or save our cities, or cure illiteracy, or provide energy. And government cannot mandate goodness."

One would almost think that Herbert Hoover had come back from the grave and spoken these words.

Indeed, a theme running through Carter's budget message was that it is the profit drive of the corporations that must be relied upon to solve America's social ills—that is, the very cause of those ills.

Thus, in the face of 10 million unemployed, Carter proposes no increase whatsoever in the 725,000 public-service jobs provided in this year's budget, and plans

to "phase down" the number in subsequent years.

In the face of an official unemployment rate for Black teenagers of nearly 40%, a token 50,000 jobs "for the unemployed youth who most need help" are to be created next year through legislation passed by Congress in 1977. Additional jobs are to be phased in once Carter's "welfare reform" program is enacted.

(Under the guise of "reform," Carter wants to force welfare recipients "who are able to work" into menial jobs—preferably in private industry, but in the public sector if necessary—paying starvation wages with no union rights.)

Carter's "major new initiative" on jobs is his request for \$400 million to encourage private businesses, presumably through special tax breaks, to hire "the disadvantaged."

But even the relatively meager sums Carter has budgeted for dealing with massive U.S. unemployment may not be fully utilized. Nearly half a billion dollars in the 1977 budget slated for minority job-training centers was never spent.

The fact is that Carter hasn't the slightest intention of fulfilling his campaign promise that he would take effective steps to ensure that every citizen wanting to work would be able to find a job. The 1979 budget assumes an official unemployment rate of 5.9%, down only slightly from the present high level. Moreover, it defines "full employment" as 4.9%

Thus, millions will remain unemployed in 1979, even if the economy continues to expand, as Carter optimistically assumes. Despite this, he proposes lopping off \$100 million from the food-stamp program.\* His budget presumably also reflects the recent ruling of the administration that poor children will no longer be allowed to take a second container of milk with their school lunches.

The capitalist profit drive has resulted in the devastation of the "inner cities" of the large metropolitan centers as industry has moved out and landlords have stopped maintaining buildings or have burned them down for the insurance. Carter has promised a new urban program, to be unveiled in March, that will supposedly address these problems.

But the maximum funding available in

\*A government program for subsidizing food purchases by people with low incomes.

his new budget is \$1.7 billion, a mere drop in the bucket compared to the resources needed for reconstruction and aid to the victims, mostly Blacks and other minorities.

Another group that doesn't have much to look forward to in Carter's new budget is the working farmers. They have been demonstrating by the tens of thousands demanding prices for their crops that will enable them to make a decent living and avoid bankruptcy. Yet Carter's new budget projects a 33% reduction in government price supports.

One social-welfare category that shows a sizable increase in Carter's budget is "health." However, as in the past, little of this extra spending will result in an actual increase of medical services. Instead it will be siphoned off in the form of extravagant payments to hospitals and the medical-supply and drug companies. The profiteering has so gotten out of hand that the administration last year proposed legislation that would supposedly limit the growth of hospital costs. It has yet to be enacted, however.

One addition to the "health" section of the budget that should be noted is the \$142 million included for programs aimed at preventing teen-age pregnancies or "helping" young women if they become pregnant. Carter no doubt hopes that this allocation will defuse the angry protest of women in response to the government's cutoff of funds that had enabled poor women to have safe, legal abortions.

By far the biggest single category in Carter's budget, as with those of his predecessors, is military spending. If veterans' benefits and interest payments on debt from past wars are included, this portion of federal spending accounts for 37% of the entire budget. (The next biggest category, social security, takes up 23%.)

Carter, who promised in his election campaign to "reduce present defense expenditures" by \$5 billion to \$7 billion, instead increased them by more than \$10 billion in his 1979 budget. Not only that, he projects such large relative increases in subsequent years that military spending as a percentage of total government outlays will also rise, reversing a more than twenty-year declining trend. (This trend was not even reversed during the Vietnam War, although it did level off from 1964 to 1969.)

The lion's share of next year's increase is allocated to beefing up U.S. "conventional forces" in support of NATO. No doubt this is in response to increasing political instability and sharpening class struggle in West Europe.

It is clear what Jimmy Carter's "priorities, policies and proposals" are. They aim at further belt-tightening by the American people, bigger profits for the corporations, and arming U.S. imperialism to the teeth to beat back future challenges to capitalism anywhere in the world. □

# Selections From the Left

## An Phoblacht

"The Republic," weekly newspaper reflecting the views of the Provisional republican movement. Published in Dublin.

The lead story in the January 18 issue comments on a deal between the Irish Electricity Supply Board (ESB), a state corporation, and the National Power Corporation of the Philippines.

"Sinn Féin has called on the Electricity Supply Board to suspend all further business deals with the brutal dictatorial regime of President Ferdinand E. Marcos . . . until that regime respects the code of human rights laid down for the observance of civilized states by the United Nations. Sinn Féin also has protested to Marcos against the proposed executions of two political prisoners. . . ."

"Where does the E.S.B. fit into all this? The National Power Corporation of the Philippines which they are 'advising', is controlled by the family of President Marcos himself!

"It is involved in the Chico River Basin Development Project. Just one part of this project will cost the Filipino people £500 million. The World Bank is paying £25 million towards the project.

"Because of this project 100,000 local people will be driven from their homes and land, and 12,000 acres of rice terraces will be destroyed.

"Rice is to the Filipino people what potatoes were to the Irish 130 years ago. Local communities—the Kalingas and Bontocs—have resisted the project. Hundreds have been arrested and many are in jail.

"In Mindanao, in the southwest of the country, there is also resistance. The object of the Chico scheme is to 'provide energy' for the vast estates owned by the Marcos Romualdez family.

"Is this the sort of set-up the E.S.B. should be mixed up in? If the E.S.B. genuinely wishes to help the Third World it would do better to operate, say, through a United Nations agency.

"Meanwhile, surely its main function should be to provide electricity for the Irish people at a price they can afford.

"As for the multi-nationals which the E.S.B. seems to be trying to ape, we can surely echo the words of James Connolly: 'The Socialist of another country is a fellow patriot. . . . The stronger I am in my affection for national tradition, the more firmly rooted I am in my opposition to that capitalist class . . . in its soulless lust for power and gold.'"

The Provisional republican press has

been showing an increasing interest over the past year in the international struggle for socialism. This article evidently reflects this trend.

It is to be hoped, however, that the editors will consider more carefully what UN agencies represent and what role they play. The imperialists can work through these agencies, just as Irish capitalists can work through a state corporation like the ESB.

## PROLETARIAN POLITICS

*Organ of the Communist League, Indian Section of the Fourth International. Published quarterly in Baroda, Gujarat.*

The special inaugural issue, dated October-December 1977, begins with a statement by the editors:

"With this number of this journal we announce our comeback into the orbit of *leftist politics* in general and the *proletarian politics* in particular. More precisely, the politics of pauperised, propertyless people, pulverised plebians—the toiling masses subsisting through the sale of their labour-power. . . ."

The journal is a "continuer of the ideological, political orientation and principles of its precursors, the *Marxist Outlook* and the *Red Spark* that used to be published from 1966 to 1973 . . ." the editors state, and stands on the program of the Fourth International.

## labrèche

*Twice-monthly German-language organ of the Revolutionary Marxist League, published in Zurich, Switzerland.*

The January 16 issue contains a letter from a reader objecting to the paper's position toward the Red Army Faction terrorist group in West Germany.

The reader writes:

"The first point is that the German urban guerrillas (whom you call by the scare word 'terrorist') have come out of the left movement in the Federal Republic of Germany and uphold fundamentally revolutionary positions. If, in the face of the whole witch-hunt campaign against them, you have had an opportunist lapse of memory about this, I recommend that you read the documents of the Red Army Faction, the June 2 Movement, and so on. I could also quote this passage from Lenin which I think is theoretically relevant for you as well:

"Fundamentally, we have never rejected terror and cannot reject it."

In its answer, *Bresche* said:

"Our attitude to the terrorism in West Germany is clear. . . . It is also hardly any secret for the attentive reader that we consider the bourgeoisie to be the worst terrorists. As for the Lenin quotation, it speaks for itself [in the whole context] and what little sympathy there is for terrorism in it was wiped out by later experiences, as Lenin's major work *Left-wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder* shows.

"We would like, however, to stress two points. When we spoke of a false dilemma in which the discussion in the left on terrorism was caught, we meant exactly what we said. A false alternative has been posed: 'Either you consider the Red Army Faction part of the workers movement, or you will become little Scheels, Schmidts, and Genschers [West German bourgeois and Social Democratic politicians].' We reject this logic. A clear political rejection of terrorism is necessary for the revolutionary left to have any credibility in the workers movement as a whole. And this is the prerequisite for fighting against the political effects of the terrorist scare, political blacklisting and exclusion of radicals from the trade unions.

"Our taking our distance from the Red Army Faction is not contempt for . . . those who fight against the bourgeois state, as our reader contends. No! The actions of the Red Army Faction are a betrayal of all those who are struggling *collectively* for a socialist society! What started out as a false strategy of mobilizing the masses through 'propaganda of the deed' has today become simply a private war, which is given a political dimension only by atrocities committed by the reactionary forces. Only a clear political rejection of such a 'policy' by the left can prevent other comrades from falling victim to a false militancy. . . ."

"The second point concerns the frequently heard argument, repeated by our reader, that the strong state and repression come because they are inherent in capitalism. To say that capitalism is based on violence is banal. To say that it can utilize this violence to any extent it wishes is worse than nonsense. . . ."

"The logic followed by our reader will lead to saying that layoffs are inherent in capitalism and so how can the workers oppose the class-collaborationist trade-union bureaucracy. The truly 'criminal' aspect of the Red Army Faction lies in the fact that it is creating the conditions that enable the bourgeois state to exercise its violence without resistance. The actions of the Red Army Faction are a slap in the face not of the rulers but of those who are resisting political blacklisting and repression."

# OUT NOW!

## Chapter 26

### The Invasion of Cambodia and May 1970

By Fred Halstead

[Continued from last week]

On Friday afternoon, less than twenty-four hours before the demonstration, a group of the Quaker marshal-trainers, including Carl Zitlow of the Nonviolent Training and Action Center in Chicago and Bob Levering of the AFSC in Philadelphia, spoke to me. They were part of the team working on plans for the civil disobedience and the evacuation problem. They calculated it would take well over an hour to evacuate a crowd of 100,000 down Fifteenth and Seventeenth streets. There was a distinct possibility that a gas attack could cause a stampede, which would be disastrous. They said they could not in good conscience proceed with the H Street plan if the overall crowd exceeded 20,000, which it obviously would.

This later became bandied about as the "revolt" of the marshals. But it was the most experienced practitioners of nonviolent civil disobedience who "revolted."

I told them to talk to the coordinating committee. They were doing that when Phil Hirschkop—who had been negotiating vigorously up to the wire—called to say the government had finally agreed to the Ellipse. By that time we had trained some 3,000 marshals, mostly at campuses in the area. With great relief and no time to lose, we started making assignments on the Ellipse plan.

Meanwhile, in the coordinating committee meeting, Davis and Dellinger in particular acted as if something had gone wrong. Davis started coming up with a series of plans to build a confrontation back into the demonstration, including one to

With this chapter we continue the serialization of **Out Now!—A Participant's Account of the American Antiwar Movement** by Fred Halstead. Copyright ©1978 by the Anchor Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed by permission. To be published by Monad Press.

surround the White House. That night I told them I preferred to leave well enough alone, that it was too late to change most marshal assignments, but that the civil disobedience marshals would gather at a designated spot in the morning so they could tell them whatever civil disobedience plan was agreed to.

The committee met all night and into the next day without a definite decision. I took no part in these discussions. It was the advocates of civil disobedience themselves who could not agree. Preoccupied with their meeting, the New Mobe officers didn't even show up at the Ellipse rally until two hours after the huge crowd had gathered and an hour after the scheduled starting time. Brad Lyttle and I, of course, were there early, working on the defense, sound system, etc., and had to stall the rally. Brad later recalled:

Acting out of our sense of responsibility to the Coordinating Committee, Fred limited himself to announcements and non-controversial political exhortations like "Spread the strike!"; I didn't use the mike.<sup>29</sup>

At one point I noticed Professor Noam Chomsky of MIT, whose writings on the war had earned him the respect of virtually all

sections of the movement. I suggested that Brad ask him to speak while we waited for the New Mobe officers, who were in charge of the speakers list, to arrive. According to Brad,

I found Noam sitting in the shade behind the speakers' platform and invited him. He looked at me through his shiny spectacles, the honesty of a scholar beaming forth, and replied, "Oh no, I wouldn't want to upset the delicate balance of the coalition."<sup>30</sup>

There were over 100,000 present when the New Mobe officers finally arrived. They asked Dr. Spock to chair and the speaking began while the officers and a few others continued a swirling discussion, right on the platform, about the civil disobedience. Their managing of the program itself left much to be desired from the point of view of the "delicate balance of the coalition." For example, a leader of the Black Panther Party had been invited to speak but couldn't make it. Two other people claimed the Panthers had designated both of them to take his place and the officers put them on. One of these was John Froines from the "Conspiracy" and neither a Panther nor Black. His contribution at the mike was to attempt to start a chant of "Fuck Nixon," which only caused the TV cameras—covering the event live—to turn off.

Aside from several such exercises in "revolutionary" rhetoric, the rally went smoothly enough. At one point an unidentified infiltrator managed to leap to the podium to attack Dellinger. Walt Shaffer, one of the marshals, stopped him with a flying tackle. There were literally hundreds of cases of prostration from unseasonable heat but we had plenty of medics on hand. As for the civil disobedience, according to Lyttle:

At 3:30, the moment of truth had come. It was then or never. The Committee wasn't in agreement. In 20 minutes the decision was made and unmade to have a civil disobedience march. Finally, Stewart Meacham called the civil disobedience marshals to the west side of the Ellipse to prepare for a march up 17th Street to the White House. A few minutes later, Co-Chairman Dave Dellinger directed the march . . . to go up 15th Street and sent the demonstration off the east side of the Ellipse. No clear instructions were given concerning where or how the march should sit down. The march had been deprived of the civil disobedience marshals, and, a final mistake, none of the Committee members was leading the march.<sup>31</sup>

The marshals stationed at Fifteenth Street were not expecting civil disobedience in that area. They knew nothing of the last-minute decision for a march north on Fifteenth Street. They didn't stop it, but discouraged it, warning people there might be trouble north of the White House. Only a thousand or two made the march. The cops played it cool and didn't stop them, so there was no clear point for a sit-down, and most of the march just kept walking until people got tired. A few hundred did sit down in the street, and a smaller group tried to push a mock coffin over one of the buses surrounding the White House area. There was some tear gas, and some "trashing," but not much. Some 400 were arrested, the great majority in the nonviolent sit-downs.

As the main demonstration was dispersing with people drifting

29. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

30. *Loc. cit.*

31. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

back into the city, there were some provocations but the demonstrators generally handled them well. In one case a small ultraright group using clubs and blackjacks attacked the building housing the New Mobe and SMC offices. Those on duty at the entrance managed to get the doors secured with the attackers outside. One carload of the attackers was being surrounded by demonstrators when I got there. The attackers were trying to start a riot, showing Nazi symbols, brandishing blackjacks, and shouting racist epithets at the demonstrators. There were police cars nearby but they wouldn't arrest the attackers. No doubt they'd have arrested us if we had started fighting. I finally found a legal observer from a group organized by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who had become a critic of the war. The observer introduced himself to the cops and started writing on a big legal pad. Only then did the cops take away the carload of armed attackers.

The May 9 demonstration was over. I thought it had gone well under the circumstances. It had been of unprecedented size on such short notice. It had been disciplined and overwhelmingly peaceful. Nobody got killed, and nobody seriously injured. Without the marshals we had trained that would not have been possible. Brad Lyttle later observed:

This massive marshals' training program had an unexpected and profound influence on the entire Washington campus community. Early in the week, Rennie Davis reported that students on the campuses were so angry over Cambodia and Kent State that he predicted martial law in Washington by Thursday. I attended one of the campus rallies at George Washington University and could see how he came to this opinion. After the marshals' training sessions were started, hundreds of these outraged activists were drawn into them. They believed that a peaceful demonstration May 9 would be best. By Saturday, these students had become an organized force of determined, peacekeeping marshals. They cooled off not only the great rally on the Ellipse but the streets of Washington afterwards and all the campuses.<sup>32</sup>

But at a meeting that night, Davis, Dellinger, Art Waskow, and others were bitterly disappointed that there hadn't been another Chicago, 1968. They blamed the marshals for allegedly preventing massive civil disobedience. In particular, they blamed me. My reaction was a bit subjective. I called them generals without armies who could talk themselves into anything but who didn't know east from west. Essentially, I told them to go to hell, and then walked out.

\* \* \*

In a written discussion shortly thereafter, Dellinger offered the following view:

If marches and rallies take place every few weeks and are self-perpetuating activities which fail to prepare people for more militant forms of resistance, they must surely operate under the law of diminishing returns. The resulting frustration helps promote the illusion that what is needed is to break away from the next march and trash windows or battle cops. . . .

The New Mobe had no difficulty in rejecting the Monument site but had made the mistake (as I believe and as I had argued to no avail on long-distance telephone) of asking for the Ellipse. The decision to ask for the Ellipse had been made for honorable reasons: it was close to the White House, and there was a danger that the alternative areas constituted a military trap. But if there was a "failure of nerve" and a "betrayal" that weekend, it occurred when this decision was made.<sup>33</sup>

I wrote:

There should be no entrapment games played with the masses who attend antiwar demonstrations. . . . If [Rennie] Davis or anyone else wants to invite people into such a situation, clearly stating what is involved and doing it in his own name, that is his business. I might advise against it, but it would not be my place to try to stop it. But I will not be a party to inviting people to what is presented as a peaceful demonstration while behind the

backs of most of those coming an attempt is being made to structure a confrontation in which many people would be involuntary participants. . . . and probably wouldn't have come if such a plan had been the stated policy of the demonstration. This is not because the mass of the demonstrators are any less committed or brave than those who are bitter when things go peacefully and smoothly. It is because many people just don't believe such deliberately provoked confrontation between unarmed demonstrators and heavily armed police is politically productive. . . .

The purpose of these mass demonstrations is not to provide catharsis for frustrated "radicals" who have not yet learned that to stop this war, or to make any fundamental change, much less a revolution, you must involve immense masses. Nor is the purpose of such demonstrations to provide victims for additional examples of ruling-class violence. Their purpose is to provide a visible form in which dissent on the war can manifest itself; and to provide a form whereby new sections of the population can become involved.<sup>34</sup>

Brad Lyttle, who strongly favored civil disobedience and who criticized himself for not having led it on May 9, wrote:

For reasons already given, I think May 9 was a step forward for the movement. . . . If they [the New Mobe officers] didn't come up with a dramatic, massive civil disobedience effort, at least they avoided a disastrous explosion that would have torn the movement to bits, given [Attorney General] Mitchell a hundred clubs to beat us with, and panicked the public into the arms of Agnew and the Pentagon.<sup>35</sup>

Art Waskow wrote:

Who can be blamed for the actions of the marshals [at Fifteenth Street]? My first thought was of Fred Halstead, who was one chief marshal and whose politics were anti-C.D. It should be clear that I vigorously disagree with SWP politics, have battled them in the Mobe, and have been bitterly attacked by the SWP. I would have been overjoyed to find evidence that Halstead had ignored the Coordinating Committee's decisions, and instead trained the marshals "his way." *But I can find no such evidence.*<sup>36</sup> [Emphasis in original.]

But Waskow drew the following conclusion:

The wing of the anti-war movement that wants to concentrate on the war as the only issue cannot easily cohabit with that wing which wants to join the war to anti-corporate, anti-inflation, anti-welfare, anti-repression, or similar issues. That wing which wants legal rally demos only cannot easily co-exist with that wing which believes militant nonviolence absolutely required at this stage. Both wings (or more) exist. Keeping them in an unnatural embrace only stultifies them all. So the Mobe requires at least major reconstruction, and quite possibly a divorce.

This was a self-fulfilling prophecy. The New Mobe had already ceased acting as a broad coalition when the "radical caucus" took it over. The Cambodian invasion revived it momentarily, but May 9 would be its last demonstration. By June it would split.

\* \* \*

May 9 in Washington was only one in the biggest wave of mass demonstrations ever to sweep over the country. The spread was even wider and, with few exceptions, the crowds much larger than the previous October 15. For example, there were 50,000 in Minneapolis, 60,000 in Chicago, 12,000 in San Diego, 20,000 in Denver, 20,000 in Austin, Texas, all May 9; 10,000 in Sacramento, 50,000 in Boston, 10,000 in Providence, all May 8; 25,000 in Seattle May 6 and 12,000 in DeKalb, Illinois, the same day. The list could go on and on. All this came on top of the student strike.

The upsurge tore an open rift in the ruling class. Powerful sections made it clear to the administration that it was too dangerous to try to handle opposition to the war with the kind of public approach Nixon and Agnew had been using. This schism was manifested even within the Nixon cabinet. On May 6, for example, a letter was released to the press in which Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel warned President Nixon that "youth

34. *Militant*, June 5, 1970.

35. *May Ninth*, p. 17.

36. *WIN* magazine, June 15, 1970.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

33. *Village Voice*, June 4, 1970.

in its protest must be heard."<sup>37</sup> The doves in the House and Senate suddenly found their voices again and were joined by a number of sobered-up hawks.

Such divisions in all likelihood were a factor in the decision to grant the Ellipse to the Washington demonstrators. Max Frankel, Washington correspondent of the *New York Times*, reported May 7 that

until yesterday morning, it was still this administration's clear intention to ride out the protest with appeals to patriotism, the President's duty as commander-in-chief, and the long range benefits of his decision to move troops into Cambodia.

But by May 7 the White House mood, wrote Frankel, was "fear and the anxious activity inspired by fear."<sup>38</sup>

Unlike November 15, Nixon did not pretend to ignore the Washington demonstration this time, but made a show of going out of the White House to the Lincoln Memorial early Saturday morning to say a few words to some of the encamped young demonstrators. Nixon also pledged, to a nervous delegation of university administrators, to halt the use of the kind of language he and Agnew had previously directed at student demonstrators. More important, at his press conference Friday night, May 8, Nixon promised to have all U.S. troops out of Cambodia by the end of June.

\* \* \*

On May 9, in Augusta, Georgia, a sixteen-year-old Black youth was beaten to death in the county jail under mysterious circumstances. There were demands for an investigation and a series of demonstrations which became increasingly angry as county officials turned deaf ears to this and other long-standing grievances in the Black community. On the evening of May 11 a gathering of about a thousand youths, from elementary to college age, was fired upon by police. The crowd erupted. Windows of white-owned stores were broken and some were set afire.

Governor Lester Maddox branded the disorders "a Communist plot" and ordered state troopers and national guardsmen airlifted to Augusta. Through the night of May 11-12 police and troopers roamed the Black community firing at will, killing six and wounding dozens. As at Kent State, some of the police claimed they were firing at snipers, but none of those killed were carrying weapons and a coroner's report said all six were shot in the back. No police or guardsmen were wounded.

\* \* \*

Next, on May 13 in Jackson, Mississippi, some 300 students held a demonstration at Jackson State College, a Black school, protesting the war and the drafting of Black students. Five were arrested in a minor incident. The mayor called in the National Guard and ordered blockades around a thirty-block area of the Black community. (The mayor's reckless alarm was not unique at the time. The day before, the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa was put under martial law in response to an entirely peaceful rally of 1,500.)

There was no demonstration at Jackson State the night of May 14, but a small crowd of students gathered near some dormitories on campus. A large contingent of city police and state highway patrolmen arrived somewhat after eleven p.m. There were shouts of "pigs go home" and a bottle or two and a dustpan were thrown from dorm windows, landing harmlessly. A cop with a bullhorn warned the students that they were looking for trouble and not to stick their heads outside the windows. Another bottle was thrown, crashing on the pavement, and suddenly the police opened fire. Bullets raked the ground level as well as the windows of Alexander Hall, a women's dorm. Two students were shot dead and

fourteen wounded, including a number of women in the dorm. The dead were Phillip L. Gibbs, a junior at Jackson State, and James Earl Green, a senior at Jim Hill High School nearby.

\* \* \*

A number of Black colleges, not previously involved, joined the strike at this time, including Howard University in Washington where regular classes were suspended for the remainder of the semester and turned over to discussions on the problems of Black people. Antiwar groups, especially the SMC, incorporated Augusta and Jackson into their calls for protest. New York City high school students demanded—and got—an official one-day closing of the city schools in memorial to the Jackson State dead. But demonstrations in response to the Jackson State killings took place at only some fifty college campuses, many of them predominantly Black schools.

More than a few observers bitterly noted that the protest response to Jackson State where the dead were Black was a ripple compared to the wave of indignation over Kent State where the dead were white. But there were other factors involved, in addition to the weight of America's racism, in the relatively subdued response.

For one thing, the killing of demonstrators does not automatically invoke larger demonstrations. More often than not, quite the contrary. For another, Kent State occurred when the student strike over the Cambodian invasion was just beginning and strongly on the upbeat. By the time of Jackson State the strike fervor was already on the ebb.

This ebb was due to many factors. The strike had *not* spread to other sectors of the population, in particular to the labor movement. There was only so far it could go so long as it was confined to a student base. Moreover, the strike had already won important concessions at many universities and had forced a change of stance by the Nixon administration. Thus the emergency did not appear so acute by May 14.

In addition, where schools were closed as a result of the upsurge, the students for the most part quickly dispersed and were no longer concentrated in readily mobilizable form. Some schools had been struck only until certain concessions were granted, then the students went back and by mid-May were devoted to final examinations. Even where the antiwar university strategy developed, there was a tendency for some students to drift away to begin summer jobs or vacation trips early, a tendency which fed on itself in the absence of a dramatic spread of the strike wave after a week or so.

Still another element was a change in the approach of important sections of the ruling class toward the crisis. As the Cambodian invasion began, Establishment critics of the move were anxious to put pressure on a White House they were not sure was acting rationally. An editorial in the May 1 *New York Times*, for example, called the invasion a "military hallucination." The major news media virtually campaigned in protest of the Kent State killings, in good part no doubt because the more farsighted sections of the Establishment wanted to bring the administration to its senses. This adjustment appeared to have been accomplished by May 8. From then on, the central and immediate concern of the entire ruling class—and therefore of the major news media—was to dampen the student protest. The national TV news carried no interviews with parents of those killed at Jackson State, for example, and the major media as a rule played down the Augusta and Jackson events.

At Princeton, where the first strike against the invasion occurred, a move was begun early to keep the protest out of the streets. A meeting of the university assembly May 4 voted to condemn the invasion by a vote of 4,000 to 200. But a proposal by the strike committee to use the campus facilities to organize the general population against the war—essentially the antiwar university strategy—was defeated by a four to three margin. In order to defeat the strike-committee proposal the university administration made a number of concessions which included

37. *New York Times*, May 7, 1970.

38. *New York Times*, May 8, 1970.



declaring itself on the students' side against the invasion, and an agreement that the students could cease class attendance, exams, and so on without penalty.

The Princeton administration supported a counterplan that the students should direct themselves to "concrete political action," by which was meant support to the electoral campaigns of Democratic and Republican "peace" candidates. Known as the Princeton Plan, this diversion called for the university to recess for two weeks before the elections in November to allow students to campaign for candidates. Similar recesses were promised by administrations at a number of other schools. A Movement for a New Congress was initiated which worked to channel the student protest into this sort of innocuous electoral activity.

This kind of approach was encouraged by the media, politicians, and by the Congress where measures were even introduced to lower the voting age in federal elections from twenty-one to eighteen. (This resulted later in the Twenty-sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.)

All of these factors contributed to the decline of the student strike and the wave of demonstrations, though these continued to some extent here and there through the end of May.

On May 16 there were a number of significant actions by GIs which forced the military to close some thirty bases to the traditional Armed Forces Day open house. Jane Fonda, who was active in support of these demonstrations, shortly afterward aptly declared:

"Nixon's worried about being the first president to lose a war. He might be the first president to lose his army."<sup>39</sup>

In Atlanta, 10,000 attended a rally May 23 against the war and against repression at Kent, Augusta, and Jackson State. It was sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and supported by the Atlanta antiwar movement as well as a number of unions.

Earlier the Student Mobilization Committee had called demonstrations for Memorial Day, May 30. But by that time the strike was virtually over and many schools had closed for the summer. These demonstrations were of modest size, the largest being 10,000 in New York City.

\* \* \*

The May upsurge shut down or took over for a period of time some 536 college campuses, with something over 350 of them on strike and the rest closed down by school officials. Protest demonstrations of significant impact occurred at over half of the 1,350 college-level institutions in the country. Sixty percent of the college enrollment of 7.5 million, that is, over 4 million students were involved.<sup>40</sup> In addition, uncounted high school, junior high school, and even elementary school students participated. By all accounts it was the biggest student strike in world history.

The magnitude of these events showed clearly that the opposition to the war had passed far beyond a radical vanguard and now embraced virtually an entire younger generation.

The strike itself did not draw in other sectors of the population, though the antiwar consciousness was certainly enhanced. Henceforth the mood of the country would not be quite the same. Antiwar referenda in the scattered places where the movement could get them on the ballot would carry by majorities rather than just receiving large minorities. Significant trade union endorsement of antiwar activities would become the rule rather than the exception. The great bulk of the young soldiers going to Vietnam as replacements would be opposed to the war even before they got there. And the ruling class lived in fear of another upsurge which might go further than that in May 1970.

39. *Militant*, June 12, 1970.

40. Statistical details appear in "May 1970: The Campus Aftermath of Cambodia and Kent State," a study by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

Columnist James Reston, writing from Washington for the May 17 *New York Times*, gave this informed testimony:

This capital is more divided and pessimistic today than at any time since the beginning of the Vietnam war. . . . For, since the Cambodian invasion, everything has changed in Washington. The strategic problem in Indochina may be the same, but the political problem at home has been transformed. The Cabinet and the Congress are different. The universities are now organizing against him [Nixon] instead of merely demonstrating against him. His war policy is not helping the economy but hurting. . . . His advisers recognize the changed mood in the capital. They thought, when they came to power, that they were dealing with a foreign war, and they now see that they are dealing with a rebellion against that war, and maybe even with a revolution at home.

McGeorge Bundy was then president of the Ford Foundation. As an adviser to President Johnson he had been one of the authors of the major Vietnam War escalation in 1965. His estimate of May 1970 was widely shared in high circles and its essence would be repeated again and again by top ruling class advisers. On May 15 he said:

Not only must there be no new incursion of Americans across the Cambodian border, but nothing that feels like that to the American public must happen again. . . . any major action of this general sort, if undertaken in the same fashion as the Cambodian decision—now that the domestic effects of that division are visible—would tear the country and the administration to pieces. At the very least the Congress would stop money for the war, and the chances of general domestic upheaval would be real.<sup>41</sup>

As for the invasion itself, in spite of Nixon's rationalizations, it was a military dud—and a political fiasco in Southeast Asia as well as the United States. The central military headquarters of the South Vietnamese revolutionaries, which Nixon had alleged to be in Cambodia, was not "cleaned out" for the simple reason that it wasn't there. The Lon Nol regime was saved for a time by American military backing, which continued in the form of supply and heavy bombing for years after the invasion was withdrawn. The net result of this "incursion" was to spread a terribly destructive war—and a revolution—to Cambodia.

[Next chapter: *April 24, 1971, and the May Days*]

41. *New York Times*, May 17, 1970.

## Suharto Tightens Muzzle on Students

Backed by four armored cars and a helicopter, troops raided a private Christian university on the outskirts of Jakarta January 21 to break up a protest meeting by about 2,000 students. Scores of student leaders were arrested in Jakarta and other parts of the central island of Java.

In addition, the military-dominated regime of General Suharto banned all student councils throughout the country and outlawed all political activity by students. Several universities, including the University of Indonesia, were ringed by troops, and the army ordered all shops in the main markets of Jakarta to close. Troops also blocked the road leading to Suharto's residence.

Seven major newspapers were likewise banned by January 23. The crackdown was designed to put a halt to a series of protests by students against widespread corruption in the country and Suharto's plans to run for a third term of office as president.

In reference to the students, Defense Minister Maraden Panggabean declared during the crackdown, "The armed forces will not let small irresponsible groups spark trouble which can burn down the whole nation." Adm. Sudomo, the head of the security command, said the arrested students were suspected of "committing acts of subversion."

# DOCUMENTS

## Speech by Fidel Castro

### 1. Cuba Faces the 'Most Difficult Years' of the Revolution

[We are reprinting below the bulk of a speech delivered by Fidel Castro in Havana December 24, 1977, before the National Assembly of People's Power.

[We have left out Castro's opening remarks praising the National Assembly of People's Power, since the problems facing this body as a legislative institution are not the subject of his report.

[The Cuban leader deals with two questions of immediate concern to the country as a whole. The first is the grave impact of the international capitalist crisis on the Cuban economy, and the countermeasures envisioned by the Cuban leadership. The second is a reaffirmation of Cuba's right as a sovereign power to conduct its own independent foreign policy, free of retaliation from its powerful imperialist neighbor to the north.

[We have taken the text of the speech from the January 1 issue of the weekly English-language edition of *Granma*.]

\* \* \*

I've already said that this was a very important moment for our country, and you were able to see this for yourselves when we reviewed the 1978 economic guidelines.

1977 was a very difficult year for our Revolution. You, the deputies, are fully aware of all the problems we have had to face. This is due to the objective facts of the world situation.

We can say that, except for a small group of oil-producing countries, and leaving the socialist community aside, the developed and underdeveloped nonoil-producing capitalist countries are going through a very serious economic crisis, and even the best and most experienced theoreticians of capitalism don't know how they are going to overcome it. The problems are very serious indeed.

The situation of the nonoil-producing underdeveloped countries is more serious still, because, amidst the international economic crisis, the prices they get for their products have dropped; the markets are in a slump; energy, that is, oil, is five times more expensive; semifinished goods and equipment are three times more expensive; and the prices of their raw materials are ridiculously low.

To give you an idea of what this means, the following example is enough. If we were living in prerevolutionary times and the price of oil on the world market were what it is now, all of Cuba's sugar, given its present market price, would barely be enough to pay only for the oil our country uses. I've heard some people ask when the Revolution in Cuba would have taken place if it hadn't occurred in 1959. One is tempted to say that if it hadn't taken place in 1959, it would take place now, because I don't know how our country could have coped with the present situation.

Many countries haven't been able to make the revolution and don't have the relations we do, the markets that have appeared since the Revolution and the trade relations that were set up with the socialist camp and especially with the Soviet Union. Suffice it to say that we are using nearly nine million tons of oil, or rather fuel—part of what we use is refined and the other is not; if we used only crude oil, we would consume more—and by 1978 we'll consume about 9,500,000 tons of oil. At present world prices, the bill for this would come to 800 million or 900 million dollars. By exporting sugar to the capitalist world at present prices, based on a market for five million tons for Cuba in the capitalist world—of course, this market does not and will not exist—at the present

prices, five million tons would bring in just over 800 million dollars. It would barely be enough to pay for the oil, let alone all the food, raw materials, equipment and other products the country must import. What would have become of the country without the Revolution and without the excellent trade relations we have with the socialist camp and especially with the USSR?

However, many countries are living off sugar and raw materials which fetch low prices, and they don't have a revolution or the relations we do.

The price of sugar plummeted brutally. It was cut by six to seven times, from more than 50 cents to less than eight in a brief period of time. On the other hand, the price of spare parts has tripled and that of raw materials and other imported items has increased tremendously.

Since, to a large extent, our country depends on trade with the capitalist world, we had to take the consequences of that situation. These facts had to be outlined to the people on September 28, 1976, and we were forced to cut back on the goals the Congress set for the country for the 1976-80 period. It was necessary to warn the people of these problems and, at the same time, work out a policy of not affecting the people's level of consumption, upholding the basic levels of food, clothing, education, public health and employment. Given this situation, how many countries have been able to maintain these standards?

We have witnessed political crises and fascist coups, coups which are carried out in order to impose drastic restrictions on the income and standard of living of the masses. This has happened in many nations of Latin America and the rest of the world.

We explained that we would continue investing in factories which had already been purchased but that some new investment programs would have to be halted. We said that we would continue the investment programs agreed upon with the socialist countries and take the necessary steps so that our people wouldn't be affected by the crisis.

Today we can safely say that the aims we outlined on September 28, 1976, have been fulfilled. Last year we explained these problems to leaders of the Party and of the agricultural sector and told them of the need to make a special effort. We put these issues before them in a big meeting; there we discussed the problems and difficulties with the National Assembly and thousands of Party and state cadres.

We remember the situation last year when all comrades were asked to make a special effort during the sugar harvest, a harvest which proved to be difficult because it was hampered by the unusually heavy rains at that time. We explained the need to reach certain production goals, and the comrades' response was extraordinary. Thus, the 1977 sugar production goal was just about achieved despite the adverse conditions.

The issue of making a special effort in weeding the canefields in order to increase sugar production by the required amount in 1978 was raised. All the necessary measures to bring about what had been said on September 28 were taken so that our people would not be affected. We also relied on our international relations, especially our relations with the USSR. We were given aid by the USSR in various ways: in the purchase of merchandise which we couldn't have bought in the convertible currency countries and merchandise over and above that which had been agreed upon for the year. The Soviet Union purchased some products like the nickel which had

been destined for the western market and which was piled up in our warehouses due to the fact that we weren't able to sell it because of the international economic situation.

Such efforts paid off and to them were added the domestic efforts: economy, adjustment and austerity measures, the quest for greater efficiency and production. This is how we were able to overcome our problems in 1977 successfully.

The picture for 1978 looks better. In our opinion, we have already gotten through the worst problems of this international crisis, the end of which nobody can predict. We have overcome the problems with decorum, and the country has been able to fulfill all its international financial obligations. (APPLAUSE)

That is why we feel that Cuba's credit is more solid than ever before. At a time when dozens and dozens of countries are in debt to capitalist banks and international credit institutions to which we do not have access—through the blockade, the imperialists have prevented Cuba from obtaining credit in any of these institutions—our country has met and satisfied its international banking obligations.

The underdeveloped nonoil-producing countries have a debt of 300,000 million dollars. Nobody knows how and when they will be able to pay it off. There's already talk of the need to write off those debts, which are increasing rapidly.

At a time when many countries have had to resort to extreme measures—they have had to request postponement of their payments, etc.—our country has rigorously met its obligations with capitalist banks down to the very last cent. We have not defaulted and will not default even by a cent. (APPLAUSE)

We had to take rigorous measures and make a big effort, and yet, as Comrade Humberto explained, our economy will grow noticeably during 1978. In 1976 our growth rate was about 3.8 percent. It wasn't much but it was something. During these years, production in all the capitalist countries declined and they haven't been able to surpass their 1974 production rates. In 1976, our growth rate was 3.8 percent, and, in 1977, just over 4 percent not including the trade sector. In 1978 it will be 7.4 percent in spite of the serious international economic crisis.

It is logical that the economy should grow. As was explained here, more than 100 new factories built over the past few years are beginning to operate. There has been a considerable increase in the rate of construction, and a substantial growth of agriculture and sugar production among others. If my arithmetic is right, sugar production will increase by more than 15 percent in 1978 over the 1977 figure.

Some of our building material factories are beginning to operate at peak capacity. Suffice it to say that the cement factories are aiming at an output of 2,700,000 tons, which is nearly 100 percent of their capacity. Efficiency at work and productivity are increasing. Therefore, taking into account sugar, construction and other items, we expect a 7.4-percent increase in the gross national product, grounded, what's more, in a more solid financial basis.

Our trade with the socialist countries has increased and we have purchased more items from them. Trade increased particularly with the Soviet Union, where we bought more goods than before. Increased sugar production alone will give us an additional 200 million pesos in foreign currency, just increased sugar production! That is, in spite of the fact that the world crisis remains, the 15-percent increase in our sugar production will give us more than 200 million in foreign exchange.

Our exports of other items are also increasing. We will even export surplus bottles. Our exports of fish, cement, etc. are increasing, thus giving a boost to our foreign exchange income.

So we have consolidated our credit, overcome serious problems and spared our people great sacrifices, while ensuring a more than satisfactory growth rate for the economy in the coming year, and, above all, we are creating conditions for the future, better conditions for the future.

But is sparing our people great sacrifices, except reducing coffee consumption as we had to do, the only thing we have accomplished? There were some problems with certain foodstuffs, we are aware of this, delays in delivery, etc. But is sparing sacrifices all

we have done? No, we have advanced. Progress is measured not only in terms of tons of cement, increased construction, etc., not only in the field of material production.

These problems arose after the Congress.

How many schools, polyclinics, hospitals and day-care centers have we built over these years? Progress has continued.

In 1975 there were 590,000 intermediate-level students in the country, and by September 1978 there'll be 1,050,000. What country of our size can state today that it has increased the number of its students at the intermediate level by nearly half a million in only three years given the crises, given the present conditions? We have built boarding schools for some of them, and when this couldn't be done, we built nonboarding schools. When we couldn't build schools out of concrete we built them out of wood. We trained the teachers and found the books somehow, made of one kind of paper or the other, in editions of greater or lesser quality. The fact is that this coming school year, that is, in mid-1978, more than 270,000 students alone will graduate from sixth grade. (APPLAUSE) This is the highest figure in the history of our country. I said 264,000 in Matanzas, but there will be more. Of an initial registration of 284,000, we expect to graduate more than 270,000.

Fortunately, later, as the number of children whose age is over what is should be for the grade they're in declines sharply and the effects of the population boom taper off, there will be a drop in the number of sixth-grade graduates. On the other hand, in 1978 the number of students at the intermediate level will be practically what we had planned for 1980. In the next school year the number of university students will increase to 140,000, which is very near the figure expected for 1980. Our 1978 plan calls for more than 70 intermediate-level boarding schools and nearly 100 nonboarding junior high schools. In addition to the existing junior high schools in the countryside and in the cities, we will continue to build vocational schools, technological institutes, military schools, schools for training in sports, schools for training physical education teachers, schools for nurses and intermediate-level health technicians. We've even started building the first art schools in keeping with a program that will eventually enable us to have two art schools of different levels in every province. Many university schools are also being built.

We even felt we would be unable to continue providing junior high school students with uniforms made of wash and wear material, and we reasoned that if we couldn't make them out of polyester, then we'd make them with cotton and of any color. Well, we haven't even had to give up polyester, because we're going to manufacture it in a shop built in Cuba for this purpose. Next year we expect to turn out seven or eight million square meters of polyester with which to continue making top-quality school uniforms for students at all levels.

The construction of day-care centers continues; 87 are planned for next year! We continue building polyclinics; 27 will be finished next year! Dental clinics, old people's homes, homes for the disabled are being built. What other country can show such a record? And that's not all; at a time when all the countries of the capitalist world and of the underdeveloped world are plagued by unemployment and increased rates of unemployment, in 1978 we will create about 120,000 new jobs.

I think that, if we look at these things objectively, they constitute great successes. But does this mean that we think that the coming years will be easy? Does this mean we should now think about consumption? No!

There's a story in the Bible about seven very good years, the years of the fat cows, and seven very bad years, the years of the lean cows. During the last few years we have taken big steps: we've corrected mistakes, we've gained experiences and we've taken a number of decisive measures which allow us to work on a more solid, thought-out and profound basis. To sum it up, we have created unprecedented conditions; we have trained a large and experienced contingent of cadres far superior to that of the early years; we have more and more citizens who are better trained in all fields. I think we should take advantage of this new situation.

We mentioned lean cows because we want to stress that we must maintain a lean cow mentality for several years, for several years! (APPLAUSE) We must continue using all the instruments and mechanisms created after the 1st Congress in the economic field and be more austere and efficient than ever before. I say this because so far an importer's mentality has prevailed in our country and among our cadres—we must import this, this and this—and not an exporter's mentality. Everybody spoke of what he needed, what was good and what was required. Everybody talked about importing from here and there, from socialist or capitalist countries. Nobody talked about exporting.

These most difficult years have been creating in us an awareness about exporting. In a word, we need to have an awareness of exporters rather than of importers, especially in regard to convertible currency countries. We always kept saying that we needed this and that, that we needed such and such kind of raw material, and so forth. Nobody ever said anything about what we could export or with what we were going to pay for what was being imported. There have been instances in which even the paper that is being collected is not being put to use, and we're already thinking of exporting some of it. I'm talking about the paper that is collected by the Committees for the Defense of Revolution. The same thing goes for bottles, cement, etc. We'll use between 2,300,000 and 2,350,000 tons of cement out of a total production of 2,700,000 tons, so we could export around 300,000 tons of cement in spite of the fact that we are in need of cement.

I firmly believe that we actually shouldn't think of increasing our consumption. It is more important for us to put our economy on a sound footing and change the structure of our economy, so that our production growth won't be so dependent on imports and, above all, so that we won't be so dependent on capitalist countries. This is of fundamental importance.

I believe that we should aim our efforts mainly in this direction in the next seven or eight years; that we should maintain the levels that we have been able to maintain even in times of crisis. We shouldn't think of the satisfaction that improving those levels somewhat in 1979, 1980 and even 1985 would represent. We shouldn't speak of living conditions, of improving living conditions. We believe that our revolutionary people should be told very frankly that the present living conditions must be maintained but that we must also consolidate our economy and cut down on our dependence on imports from capitalist countries, (APPLAUSE) so that our country, our Revolution will not have to be exposed to the danger of these tremendous international crises, of these catastrophes, of these ups and downs in prices. And if we saw the price of sugar go up, we should not let ourselves be lured into trying to improve the level of consumption, but we should rather invest those resources in our development; we should make it our business, for a period of seven or eight years, to work mainly not toward an increase in consumption but rather toward the consolidation of the development of our economy.

If we were starving, if we were poverty-stricken, then this would be out of the question. We are basing ourselves on the present living standard of our people and on what the Revolution has devoted its main efforts to over these years: to improve the situation of the people; to make it possible for all the people to enjoy decent living conditions; to enjoy health, education, recreation, etc. And this goes not only for the entire people of the nation that existed then but also for the entire people of the nation that was born after the Revolution, for the population of this country has increased by several million since the triumph of the Revolution.

We believe that this idea is of fundamental importance.

We'll have more cement, of course. Two big cement plants, the one in Mariel and the one in Cienfuegos, whose last production lines will be completed in 1979, will be going into operation next year. We'll have twice the production facilities for cement that we have now. In fact, production will run to more than five million tons. What does this mean? Well, it means that we'll be having more cement, but it also means that we must not give up our cement market. If we sell 300,000, 500,000, 600,000 or even a million

tons and we consume four million, that's fine. And, in case we need more than four million tons for ourselves, we may decide to build another cement plant to turn out cement for export. This means that, in case the price of sugar goes up, we must not give up the cement market that we created for ourselves.

A new bottle plant is being built. If we find a market for our bottles we'll have enough bottles for our own use and for export, too.

I believe that with one and a half million tons of cement more at the disposal of the national economy many things can be done, many more things than those that we are doing now, and we can use that cement to tackle our most critical problems.

We're increasing our textile plant production facilities and we're building two enormous new plants, one covering an area of 80 million square meters and the other of 60 million square meters, in addition to expanding the old plants and the balance spinning plant. What do we mean by maintaining this mentality of the hard years, by concentrating on exports rather than on consumption in order to consolidate our economy? By this we mean that instead of turning the 140 million square meters of material that those plants are going to produce into clothing—which, needless to say, we would enjoy very much—we should think of exporting as much as we can of the material that those plants are going to turn out, provided we can find a market for it. First of all, because, logically enough, those plants have to be paid for, they have to be paid for bit by bit; and second, because part of the raw materials they use come from capitalist countries. There's no doubt that we'd be better dressed if we decided to turn those 140 million square meters of material into clothing, but that means that we'd be spending tens of millions of dollars right here. If we have to spend 20 or 30 million dollars in order to export at least 80 million, that's fine! That's the kind of thinking we have to have!

In a nutshell, what we're saying is this: that we should devote ourselves to the development of our economy, to the consolidation of our economy and to the changing of its structure with all the strength, experience and soundness that our Revolution has acquired.

I'm well aware of how much we all want to improve the situation of our people. We all know, everywhere in this country, what we are in need of: we'd like to have a beautiful park over here, a building of such and such a type over there, something else further on and still something else somewhere else. We are all consumed by the feverish desire to do more and to achieve as much as we can for our people. But, unfortunately, this generation of revolutionary militants and of revolutionary leaders must resign itself to the fact that it was its lot to participate in the worst part of a revolution.

Perhaps history is reserving for us the greatest glories, but also the greatest suffering, that is, the greatest desire for material well-being for our people which we haven't been able to satisfy immediately. Think of the Soviet Union, think of the years of the first Bolsheviks, of the first soviet, of the Lenin years, when only ridiculous amounts of cement and steel were being produced, when not a single tractor was being made, when nothing was being built. Today, millions of apartments are springing up all over the Soviet Union every year. But in those first hard years, there was absolutely nothing like that.

There's always a generation whose lot is to do the hardest work—the hardest work in a material sense, but the most stimulating work in a moral sense. This generation has one duty, and that is to create other circumstances and other conditions for the coming generations.

Our Revolution has accomplished more than a little. We believe that the Revolution has accomplished exceptional things, and we have made incredible progress in many fields. The point is to realize and to have the conviction at this moment—not at this moment of our Revolution, but at this moment of the whole world—of what the tasks of our Revolution are.

We will keep on growing. In a number of fronts we have reached such levels of investment that, in our opinion, we won't need to increase them much in the coming years. The level of investment

we have reached in highways and road building, railroads, dams and reservoirs is so high that it no longer calls for a considerable increase.

The investment in children's day-care centers, in polyclinics and hospitals that we build every year is already so high that, with the exception of the hospitals, which may call for a little more, there's no need for a considerable increase in the coming years.

By this I mean that if we build 87 and maybe as many as 90 day-care centers, we can go on building 90 of them every year for ten years and, eventually, they will run to 900, but 90 a year is already a high figure.

Investments in the intermediate education schools that we build every year are sufficiently high and do not call for a notable increase. If we were to consider boarding schools and day schools together—I'll pick a number at random, say 120—there's no need to raise the number to 130 or 180. No. A rate of 120 schools per year is so high that the number of schools that result is really impressive.

Perhaps we'll have to invest more in hospitals and perhaps in hotels, too, for economic reasons—tourism, for example—but always from an economic point of view.

In other words, over the past few years we have reached such a reasonably high level in many activities that no large investments will be necessary.

Maybe we can build a few more motion-picture theaters and theaters. That we could do.

Now then, there is one field where the level of activity is not as high as it should be. And that is the field of housing. The level here is not high. Where should we grow, then? In economic activities, in industrial investments—we must grow in industrial investments and not as much in agricultural investments—and we should maintain the levels we have reached in these last few years in agriculture, land clearing, new crops, irrigation projects, etc.

We have reached such a high level in the construction of dams and minidams that, at the rate we're going, practically all the water in the country will be impounded within the next 12 or 13 years. It can be said that, at the rate we're going—and there's no need to step it up—by 1990 or thereabouts practically all the water in the country will be impounded.

As I said, in certain activities we have reached such a level that there's no need to increase investments, while in others there's still a need to increase investments. We had to sacrifice housing on account of these projects. And the housing problem is more than evident, because the hours spent in this Assembly discussing the question of housing proves the magnitude of the problem.

Needless to say, no matter how many laws we enact, how many measures we take, how many resolutions we adopt or how many instructions we issue, regardless of whether the police forbids this or that, the fact remains that these things don't solve the housing problem. We do prevent some rule breaking, which is always harmful, but the solution to the problem is to build the number of dwellings we need. And, frankly speaking, I do believe that our country is just about able to do so.

Before, we were limited by the lack of cement. We had neither the cement nor the steel bars, pipes or floor tiles we needed. We were practically short of everything.

Many plants have been built for the construction sector, so we can already say that we're going to solve the housing problem.

In regard to schools, we should maintain the level of construction that we have now, give or take a few. If we keep going at the present rate, who knows how many schools we'll eventually have. If we can't have all the students in the schools in the countryside program, we'll have them in the cities; and, in the future, when we are able to build more schools for the intermediate-level students, the junior high schools in the cities will become elementary schools. When we have enough junior highs, we'll increase the number of elementary schools. Of course, we'll have to build more university branches. We must also build elementary schools and day-care centers for new housing projects.

In many of the areas I have mentioned we should maintain the present levels, while increasing investments in industry and housing. We should make it a point, though, in the coming years, to make all the efforts necessary to solve the housing problem. This is not an economic objective, since housing does not contribute to the growth of national production, but it does constitute a tremendous need which we must meet. The program of building 31,000 dwellings in 1978 is a good beginning.

When we speak of tackling the housing problem we mean two things: building new houses and keeping the ones we now have in good shape. I think that the proposals that the commission has been making in this regard should be examined carefully, both in connection with building new houses and making repairs. We must do both of these things and also build more houses year after year, in numbers of no less than 10,000, until we reach a rate of 100,000 as the minimum number we must build every year. We do have the resources to do this and it would mean the first step of the solution to a great problem.

Maintaining our present level of employment in coming years is a very important goal.

In addition, it won't be long before we can have the maximum number of students that we can have in the intermediate level, given our population. And, a little later, the number will even be lower in keeping with the tapering off of demographic growth of several years ago.

The number of students in the elementary level has stopped increasing. In fact, it is decreasing because there are now less and less children in grades below those corresponding to their age and because the number of children born in those years was smaller than that of the preceding years.

Logically enough, the number of university students will continue to increase considerably in the next few years. As I said before, the number of hospital beds will increase, and so will the number of health institutions, of polyclinics, dental clinics, old people's homes, etc. The number of day-care centers will continue to increase, and year after year the situation will improve in all those fields.

Is there one thing in which we can improve considerably? Yes, in the quality of services, in quality in general.

Once we have the maximum number of students in secondary and in elementary school, once we have practically all the children of that age bracket studying, and once we have a considerable growth in facilities, etc., we'll have an unlimited field for growing, and that is in the field of the quality of education. Once we have all the polyclinics and all the hospital beds we need, we'll have an unlimited field, and that is the field of improving the quality of medical service. That goes for all kinds of services: in the universities, the quality of university education; in sports, the quality of sports; in culture, the quality of culture; and the same thing in entertainment of every kind. In other words, growth is measured not only from a quantitative standpoint. It must be measured also from a qualitative standpoint.

Some services have not been paid due attention and are lax. We are aware of that. Sometimes this has been so for objective reasons, but many times it has been so for subjective reasons. We cannot let up in our struggle to have every citizen given the very best service in a hotel. We must continue this struggle relentlessly, whether it's service in a restaurant, a cafeteria, or a means of transportation. This is one battle we must wage without letup, because the quality of this kind of service has to be improved. (APPLAUSE)

So, we must grow, economically speaking, year after year; we must develop our economy and obtain increases year after year; but not with a view to consumption but rather to consolidating our economy. The resources we have must be spent not on consumption but rather to consolidating our economy. The resources we have must be spent not on consumption but rather on development, and we must register a growth not only in terms of the percentage of material production but also in terms of the unlimited field of quality in the services.

We have a vast field ahead of us on which to wage a relentless

battle against all negligence, against all manifestations of bureaucratic mentality, against indolence, in the same way that we are fighting against crime. Yes, measures have been taken and will continue to be taken and we're going to wage an all-out battle—an all-out battle—against crime! (APPLAUSE)

You have resolved that the preliminary draft of the Penal Code be presented to the people for discussion. But, even before the final Code is submitted to the Assembly, the Council of State is already studying a decree-law and stiffening certain types of punishment to help our Ministry of the Interior agencies in their battle against crime. We said that we had to fight crime, and the battle against crime has begun!

The need to improve medical services, avoiding certain kinds of inefficiency and neglect, was brought up, and an important battle is being waged on that front. And we must say that the response of our doctors was typical of the response of our people at all times.

Ever since the 13th Labor Congress the matter of rest before and after guard duty in the hospitals has been brought up. But what's the situation? The situation is that we have a great number of graduating doctors, but there is also a great demand for doctors from other countries. Some of these countries, of course, are very poor, and we provide them with this medical service free of charge, but there is also a demand for doctors and other medical personnel from countries with economic resources and which are willing to pay for this service. And here we have a new field opening up for our country: the possibility of exporting technical services. This is quite interesting and it could turn out to be yet another resource for a country like ours, which does not produce oil. But, as I was saying, the demand for doctors here and abroad keeps growing.

This year, a total of 3500 students have enrolled in medical school, and the number will continue to increase. However, if all of a sudden some country with the resources to pay handsomely for this service asked us to send it a certain number of doctors, it would be a real shame not to have enough doctors to send.

Now then, what would happen if the pre- and post-guard duty rest were put into effect? We would need hundreds, thousands of doctors more in order to do it.

The doctors were told of all the problems that might arise in terms of poor service and were asked to forfeit the right to post-duty rest. It wasn't a case of our believing that such rest was not justified whenever intensive work required it, but simply that it was impossible to put it into effect as a general rule.

The question of the rest was adopted in principle at the 13th Labor Congress and it was beginning to be put into effect, but then this new situation arose. It became necessary to ask the doctors to make an effort, to make sacrifices, and their response has really been excellent. In many hospitals doctors have forfeited their right to post-duty rest. For example, recently hundreds of doctors in the Calixto Garcia Hospital forfeited their right to rest after being on duty. (APPLAUSE)

This is a kind of attitude we should have at this time! We shouldn't think if what we aspire to is just or unjust. It's not a question of whether or not it is just or unjust. It's simply that it can't be done. It's simply that we need doctors here and abroad. Here, for our own service, and abroad for internationalist aid and also for cooperation on an economic basis. Our country needs doctors in these two ways.

Let us register thousands of students in medical school. Say 3,500 now, 4,000 or 4,500 in 1980 and 6,000 or 7,000 later on. There's a great number of young people who want to study medicine. Let us build all the medical schools we need, so that in the future we will be able to have post-duty and pre-duty rest periods and everything else we want. But not now.

This generation must make sacrifices! It must make sacrifices! This is precisely what we were talking about, of all the effort and sacrifice we must make now, of depriving ourselves of the many things we would like to give our people. Who wouldn't want our people to be able to use 40 square meters of material a year instead of 20?

There are some critical consumption items such as towels and

sheets and things like that. When we speak of making sacrifices and of maintaining present standards, we certainly aren't forgetting these things. There are certain critical standards that must be improved, that is, certain critical standards with regard to a number of products that must be improved, and we hope to improve them as soon as possible. But the main thing is that, strategically speaking, we must think of development instead of consumption or an increase in consumption. That's what we're talking about.

I was saying that our doctors' response was excellent and so was that of the students when they were told of the need for the student-teachers' detachment, that is the Internationalist Detachment. And the same can be said about the response of all our workers, of all the workers in our factories.

I wanted to tell you about this situation because our future economic possibilities are real. We will be in a position to draw up an optimal five-year plan for 1981-85, in a position to draw up magnificent plans for years. If we do not reach all the goals set forth at the 1st Congress we will at least reach a great number of the economic and social goals that were outlined.

On December 30 we will be able to celebrate another anniversary of the capture of the armored train in Santa Clara with the central railroad line completely rebuilt from Havana to Santa Clara. (APPLAUSE)

By May next year, motorists will be able to use three lanes of the six-lane highway from Havana to Santa Clara, which will be paved by then. We are making progress.

Sugar production is being consolidated and we are already making large, guaranteed harvests. Mechanization has increased considerably, the area of sugarcane under irrigation is also increasing very rapidly, new techniques and strains are being introduced, new sugar mills are being built and all this is being built up on a sound foundation. Our sugar production keeps growing steadily year after year with no slumps, and that's very important. We'll have a good harvest in 1978, but we expect to have a better one in 1979 and an even better one in 1980 and in 1981 and so on until at least 1990. And, I repeat, all this being accomplished on a very sound foundation.

We are making important investments in the nickel industry in the eastern part of the island; work has begun on the nuclear-powered electric power plant; work is to be started soon on the iron and steel works. And we have a number of industrial plans already under way in this five-year period which will be concluded in the next.

All the resolutions of the 1st Congress regarding the economic management system are being applied at the rate agreed on at the Congress, so that we are setting up favorable conditions in spite of all the difficulties plaguing the whole world. Our integration and volume of trade with the socialist camp keep growing and trade will continue to grow from 1980 to 1985 and from 1985 to 1990. Therefore, it's worthwhile making this effort and remaining on this course, because it has great possibilities—but it also demands a great contribution, a great effort, from all of us, from all the Party cadres, from all administrative cadres, from the mass organizations.

The year 1978 itself, that already augurs better prospects, calls for a notable effort in order to fulfill the plan that was outlined here; and I think it will be very interesting to discuss how 1978 developed when we meet next year around this time. We'll also discuss the plan we'll have in mind for 1979. Work is already being done on the 1981-85 plan, with plenty of time to spare. And we want all of you, the Party and state cadres and, above all, all the deputies to the National Assembly, to have as much information as possible about all these economic activities and the greatest degree of participation in and understanding and awareness of the same. You must become the defenders, the deeply aware advocates of the effort we must all make and of the intelligent policy that we are to follow (APPLAUSE) based on sound, scientific foundations. This is our duty as members of this revolutionary generation, our duty as deputies.

The same can be said about the budget. This is the first budget

approved by us. It is to be presumed that the one for next year will be one which has been studied with even greater care and that it will be a more efficient one in which we have calculated down to the very last cent, with a mentality of austerity. Austerity means many things, but it's actually a question of a spirit of economizing, of resisting the temptation to spend. I can give you an example: someone came to us with the idea of distributing a new type of candy that has just been made among the delegates to the Assembly. We said that it shouldn't be distributed because we had to economize. That's all. (APPLAUSE) We would have been only too pleased to distribute packages of candy among you, but we decided to save the candy, to save down to the last cent. This is what the economic management system and the budgets are for, to let everybody see how much money they are spending and on what it is being spent.

I should mention another kind of service: transportation. The inter-provincial transportation service has to be improved. Hundreds of new buses are being introduced, 300 very modern buses; progress is being made on the central railroad. It won't be necessary to make those long detours, and there are many stretches beyond Santa Clara that are already finished, while others will be built at the same time. Therefore, there should be a marked improvement in inter-provincial transportation, in the railroad service and in the bus service. We have to improve other transportation services, too. We must overcome completely the crisis that arose in the capital, but not through spectacular changes—that would call for thousands of buses more—but rather by improving repair work, improving service in general and increasing the number of buses by several hundred. In spite of our economic difficulties, a number of investments have been made in bus chassis in order to be able to build the buses here. So much for services.

Getting back to budgets, you've seen that our revenue is estimated at 9,159 million pesos. More than 4,000 million have been allocated to production, investments, etc.

One of the most interesting things about the budget is some of the figures. For example, the budget allocated to public health and education is 1,532 million pesos. There's also the budget for other sociocultural activities, among them social security. Social security has been allotted almost 600 million pesos. However, something that aroused interest internationally was our expenses for defense and public order: 784 million pesos. In other words, we

spend twice as much on education and public health as we do on defense and public order. This is very interesting and it attracted attention because our country has had to make such efforts and go through so much sacrifice in order to defend itself that many were taken by surprise. And if it is estimated that we have a formidable defense apparatus—which we must necessarily have!—this is a good standard by which to measure the kind of effort our country has made in regard to education and public health. Those figures are exact; not a single cent has been changed. Everything is there: what corresponds to such and such spheres, to education, to public health, to defense, to public order. It's all there for everybody to see. Yes, almost eight percent is devoted to defense and public order, but we are not afraid to say it. The imperialists have forced us to develop powerful forces.

Needless to say, our efforts in defense are not measured in terms of pesos, in hundreds of millions. They are of a different nature that is very difficult to gauge, that is incommensurable, that is, the human efforts we are putting into defense—the human effort! (APPLAUSE) The tens of thousands of young people who devote part of their lives to military service; the tens of thousands of committed officers dedicated to the intense effort of the service; the noncommissioned specialists of our Armed Forces; our reservists; the hours, the time devoted to combat training. That's worth more than all those millions put together. And we do it with pleasure, because the imperialists forced all of us to become soldiers! (APPLAUSE) Even though we spend more than 700 million on defense and public order—this includes all the activities of defense handled by the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces and the Ministry of the Interior—we have the satisfaction of being able to say that, in spite of all, we devote almost twice as much to public health and education.

We don't have doubts of any kind. If for our homeland and our Revolution to survive it had been necessary to spend twice as much on defense as on other things, we would have spent twice as much on the defense of our country! (APPLAUSE) We have no doubts about any of these matters.

Many subjects can be brought up on occasions such as this one. However, from a domestic point of view, we believe that these are the most important points. Now we must say something in regard to foreign policy. It is necessary and convenient to clear up a number of things.

[To be continued]

## 定期購読で

# インターコンティネンタル・プレスを!

"Regularly buy and read the periodical INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS!"

That's the handwritten advice from one of our supporters in Tokyo.

Right on!

We can only add that the easiest way to "regularly buy and read" is to subscribe.

So fill out the blank and mail it in.

Intercontinental Press/Inprecor  
P.O. Box 116  
Varick Street Station  
New York, New York 10014

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

( ) Enclosed is \$12 for six months.

( ) Enclosed is \$24 for one year.

# Capitalism Fouls Things Up



## Near Zero Protection Against Radiation Hazards

A U.S. Senate report released December 22 charged that federal government agencies failed to protect the public against the hazards of radiation. In fact, the report said, "some potentially significant hazards are not subject to any Federal controls."

The report was made public three months after a similar study by the General Accounting Office found that the Environmental Protection Agency "has not effectively accomplished its goals of preventing radiation contamination to the environment and protecting the public."

In addition to the risks associated with highly radioactive materials such as nuclear reactor fuel and fuel wastes, the Senate study also noted potential dangers from medical X-rays, low-level X-rays used in security and surveillance equipment (such as weapons detectors at airport gates), and radiation emitted by television sets, smoke detection devices, microwave ovens, and laser checkout systems at supermarkets.

Except for nuclear reactor materials, the above radiation sources were found by the study to be virtually unregulated.

### Hot Helium Over Colorado

An unknown amount of radioactive material was released January 23 at the Fort St. Vrain nuclear power plant near Denver, Colorado.

All 250 workers at the plant were evacuated, and six of them were examined for possible contamination. Roadblocks were set up on highways leading to the plant, although there was no evacuation of the surrounding area.

A leak in the reactor's cooling system vented radioactive helium gas through a stack on top of the plant.

The 330-megawatt power plant is still undergoing tests. It is the only high temperature gas-cooled reactor in operation in the United States.

### Radium Missing in Mississippi

About a half-dozen tubes of "extremely dangerous" radium were discovered missing from a Meridian, Mississippi, hospital on January 12.

State health officials at first tried to keep the disappearance of the radioactive materials secret so as not to "alarm the community."

As of January 19, authorities were still searching for the radium. The tubes were said to be each about the size of a small nail.

### Sudden Shutdown in Massachusetts

The Pilgrim I nuclear plant near Boston, Massachusetts, was shut down January 10 after tests showed that some electrical connections in the reactor's safety system may not have been properly installed.

Although the shutdown was ordered at two o'clock in the morning, a representative of Boston Edison said there was "no danger, no emergency. . . . We just decided it was the best thing to do under the circumstances."

The tests were ordered last November by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Union of Concerned Scientists had called public attention to evidence that certain kinds of electrical connectors failed under the extreme heat, pressure, and chemical conditions that would occur in the event a nuclear reactor lost its cooling system.

### Nuclear Dump in New Mexico

A "waste isolation pilot plant" is being planned by the U.S. government for an area near Carlsbad, New Mexico.

Containers of radioactive waste are to be buried a half mile deep in salt deposits.

While the mayor of Carlsbad claims there is "nothing the matter with the concept . . . if there is no harm to the environment and the people," other citizens are less enthusiastic.

Roxanne Kartchner heads a group called the Carlsbad Nuclear Waste Forum, which is trying to get out information on the project and its potential dangers. "One thing this fight has done for me," Kartchner says, "is that I have lost my awe of people like senators and scientists. . . . I know now that they don't have any right to have complete authority over my life."

Concern has risen since the U.S. Department of Energy decided that it wants the option to store high-level wastes from nuclear power plants in the New Mexico facility, in addition to low- and medium-level military wastes. According to a report in the January 22 *New York Times*, "Opponents of the facility are convinced that not only will all of the nation's military waste be stored there, but also its commercial waste."

"Why should we be the nuclear dump for the whole country?" one New Mexico resident asked.

### Complaints From Illinois

Governor James R. Thompson of Illinois said in December that he will not allow his state to become a dumping ground for nuclear waste materials.

The governor charged the Nixon, Ford, and Carter administrations with failure to develop a nuclear waste policy, and said the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has been "derelict" in protecting Illinois citizens.

A General Electric facility at Morris, Illinois, is the only off-site storage area in the United States for high-level commercial nuclear wastes. In addition, a burial ground for low-level radioactive materials is located at Sheffield, Illinois.

The state's attorney general has filed a lawsuit in federal court charging that the NRC failed to properly license the Sheffield dump site.

### Small Explosion in Vermont

Vermont state officials confirmed December 20 that what was described as a "minor explosion" of hydrogen gas had occurred the previous week at the Vermont Yankee nuclear power plant.

Public Service Board chairman Richard Saudek expressed disappointment that Vermont authorities had not been promptly notified of the accident, but said no one was injured and no increase in radioactivity around the plant had been detected.