

## Soviet Union: repression and dissent

by SUSAN JACOBY

A character in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *The First Circle* observes, "For a country to have a great writer—don't be shocked, I'll whisper it—is like having another government."

This viewpoint is shared by leaders of the Soviet Union and by many dissidents of all political persuasions. It helps to explain at once why Solzhenitsyn was stripped of his citizenship and exiled to the West, and why the Nobel prize-winner was a symbol for many who do not share his views on politics, history or economics.

The forced exile marks a culmination of the Soviet regime's ten year campaign against the first, fragile manifestations of political dissent since the 1930's. The loss of Solzhenitsyn deprives the dwindling band of dissidents of one of their most powerful moral leaders.

The chronicle of open dissent in modern Soviet society begins, of course, only after Stalin's death in 1953. That ended the 25 year terror which sent millions to either swift executions or slow deaths in the labor camps. The real beginning came when Khrushchev denounced Stalin's crimes in his famous "secret speech" at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956. Millions of prisoners—Solzhenitsyn among them—began to come home from the camps.

With Khrushchev's de-Stalinization and the general relaxation of tension, two streams of dissent emerged—one political, the other literary. Neither attracted much attention in the West in the '50's, but together they formed the basis for the widely publicized surge of dissent in the '60's.

Although it is little known in the West, a handful of dissidents protested the invasion of Hungary in 1956 and were imprisoned by the same Nikita Khrushchev who released Stalin's victims. Some of the young people, whose protests vanished unpublicized, reappeared in 1968 when greater numbers spoke out against the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The literary dissent, centered around the extraordinary Russian phenomenon known as *samizdat*, was far more important than the fledgling political protests of the '50's. *Samizdat* literally means self-published; it refers to the circulation of ordinary typewritten copies

(Continued on page 6)

## Congress: no energy?

by DAVID KUSNET

What happens to Big Oil will happen to all of corporate America, Barry Goldwater warned at a steel industry executives' meeting last month. Soon the Senate will call representatives of other industries to explain shortages and record profits, he continued. There'll be talk of stricter controls—or even nationalization.

But so far, nothing's happened to Big Oil that Big Oil didn't want to happen. The Alaska oil pipeline was approved over environmentalists' objections. A Senate bid to decontrol natural gas prices failed by two votes, and an eventual price hike is inevitable. A friendly administration now has the power to allocate scarce fuels, and oil industry executives are helping to administer the program. The Cost of Living Council OK'd an increase in the price of previously discovered oil from \$4.25 to \$5.25 per barrel. ("A three-billion-dollar-per-year Christmas present to the oil industry," said Senator Adlai Stevenson.) Price controls have been lifted entirely for "new oil"—allowing an increase in new oil prices from \$3.40 to over \$10 per barrel within months.

Since Big Oil seems home free, other industries undoubtedly will escape new government controls, despite the new populism and recession-induced anxieties. Instead of an effective anti-industry movement, we find a "new corporatism," with every industry and region looking out for itself.

Congress, at this writing, is heading for a modified price rollback, rather than an excess profits tax. In the legislative maneuvering over the Energy Emergency Act, the industry has benefitted from the politics of confusion.

The unpopular excess profits tax and Muskie's compromise House-Senate conference version were both defeated. Though inadequate, they at least would have

(Continued on page 2)

### INSIDE . . .

National health insurance	page 3
Socialist conference	page 4
Energy and unemployment	page 5
Chile revisited	page 7

## Congress. . .

(Continued from page 1)

gone into effect next year, creating a Congressional precedent for more effective measures.

Oil state senators and Administration backers were joined by several Northern liberals to defeat the bills. Some voted against the tax because it was bad law, others because it postponed Clean Air standards for five years.

The price rollback provision in the second draft was close to the Administration position. It rolls back prices on new oil—oil from wells that began producing last year—to \$5.25 a barrel. But the President can raise prices back to \$7.09. Energy Czar Simon testified last month that the Administration could accept the bill but with the option of raising prices to \$7.88. Given a few weeks or a veto threat, Congress and the White House may reach an agreement on a “rollback” that would allow oil to sell for twice last year’s prices.

Congress seems resigned to this situation despite constituent support for measures against Big Oil. Among many long-time liberals, the new conservative line on energy issues goes something like this:

- *Don’t roll back prices.* A scarce commodity should be costly to discourage consumption and encourage new capital investment. “Energy Malthusianism,” one consumer lobbyist calls this viewpoint, popular with economists, though it means soaking the poor.

- *Leave tax breaks alone.* As Gene McCarthy used to say, they’re built into the industry structure. The “independents” (actually multi-million dollar outfits, not the last bastions of small-time American individualism as their apologists maintain) depend on the domestic depletion allowance; they’d go out of business without it.

- *Keep the public sector out of the energy business.* A TVA-style corporation to drill for oil and natural gas won’t be a “yardstick” because it would be tax exempt, a Jackson aide warned. Besides, it would receive first preference on federally owned drilling sites.

Since many Big Oil opponents hold one or another of these three positions, the Administration and oil lobby use them to quash liberal initiatives. Probably, in this session, inaction will come disguised as reform. There’ll be a slight price rollback and cuts in tax credits for foreign payments (as proposed by Senator Bentsen and the Administration), and little else.

Yet some are fighting the tide. Liberal Senators and Ralph Nader are pushing a “Consumer Energy Program,” which includes Senator Stevenson’s Federal Oil and Gas Corporation bill.

The bill just might be reported out of committee following hearings this month. Committee Democrats backing it include Senators Pastore, Hartke, Hart, Moss, and Inouye. Tunney is reportedly doubtful—he’s worried the corporation will drill offshore. But Inouye is enormously respected, and he’s influential with Senators Hollings and Cannon, also on the committee.

Capitol Hill insiders wonder if Warren Magnuson—an old New Dealer, from public power days—will give the bill a push. His Commerce Committee staff wrote

the bill. But Magnuson’s fellow Washingtonian and favorite presidential candidate, Scoop Jackson, doesn’t look kindly on energy bills he didn’t write. Magnuson will vote for the bill, but may avoid any extra effort.

Liberal Republican support is essential. So far, Senators Javits and Mathias are the only GOP’ers to encourage lobbyists, off the record, that they’ll back the public corporation. Javits and Case are close to the AFL-CIO which officially backs the Stevenson bill. In the House, Mass. Congressman Michael Harrington (no relation) and Sylvio Conte wrote a “Dear Colleague” letter to New England Congressmen urging support for the Stevenson bill.

Some other liberal goals include trust-busting and taxing excess profits. Rep. Les Aspin and Sen. Philip Hart have introduced legislation to outlaw vertical monopolies; Aspin and McGovern have sponsored excess profits tax bills. Mondale has proposed a price rollback on oil. However, none of these bills seems to be going anywhere.

Most likely to pass among the several liberal proposals is the Jackson-Nelson public information bill. The oil companies may open their books part way, landing where the utilities are today. □

### *Peril in the pressrooms*

Asbestosis, silicosis, pneumoconiosis, all are familiar job-related diseases. Newspaper workers, however, face no such dangers on the job. Right?

Wrong. At a Newspaper Guild conference on organizing, bargaining, and servicing, Sheldon Samuels, director of health and environmental affairs for the AFL-CIO’s Industrial Union Department, outlined for Guild staffers some of the hazards newspaper workers faced. These ranged from the obvious, like noise in the pressrooms, to the more obscure, like the use of carcinogenic ink on computer printouts. Samuels also pointed to the potential hazards of the two per cent by weight of asbestos in newsprint, chemicals in darkrooms, ultraviolet light from copying machines, and fumes from printing inks and lead.

Samuels said that no one has thoroughly studied the long and short-range hazards to newspaper employees’ health. Under the OSHA (the U.S. Occupational Health and Safety Act), two approaches are available for determining and correcting job hazards:

- a complaint to OSHA urging the enforcement of specific standards already set up under the act;

- a request that OSHA examine and evaluate potential dangers or conditions for which standards have not been set or may be inadequate.

Samuels criticized the standards set by OSHA, passed in late 1970 and put into effect in 1971. Standards for radiation and noise were, he said, picked up from prior agencies, which had based them on recommendations made by the various industries involved.—C.D.

# National health insurance: the battle is on

By BETTY DOOLEY

Now that President Nixon has introduced his own national health plan, the battle over health insurance legislation will be joined.

It's been three years since Senator Kennedy introduced Senate bill #3, the Health Security Act. Although the bill still faces a long hard fight, Kennedy must feel some measure of pride that his bill has caused such an uproar. By standing foursquare on a solid issue, Kennedy managed to reorient national thinking on health care to a remarkable degree.

## *Kennedy bill*

This splendid bill, drafted by the Committee of 100 for National Health Insurance, spurred on by the late Walter Reuther, Leonard Woodcock, and Max Fine, could if adopted bring about some radical changes in our entire health care system. It is the one bill before Congress that would cover everybody and just about everything. Half of it would be financed by a payroll tax of 1 per cent a year up to \$15,000 on the employee and 3.5 per cent tax on the total payroll of the employer. There would also be a 2.5 per cent tax on self-employed people and on unearned income. The other half of the operating money would come from general revenue. Health Security would be administered by a five person board appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and it would be placed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of HEW. It is not designed to be a cost overrun bill; strong cost and quality controls are built in. The opponents of this legislation were quick to recognize these features and this is why the fight has been so fierce. The emphasis would be placed squarely on preventive medicine where it should be, instead of on crisis medicine.

The differences between national health insurance proposals are not easy to define. All promise peace of mind. But we must ask of the various bills: "Was this bill designed to help the consumer, or to help the doctors and the private health insurance industry?"

## *Long-Ribicoff bill*

It would be tragic if this country, with a good bill like the Kennedy-Griffiths Health Security Act within reach, instead bought something like the Long-Ribicoff bill which is being peddled particularly by Senator Ribicoff as an absolute cure-all. (Ribicoff is to the insurance industry what Long of Louisiana is to the oil industry—attentive.) A letter to constituents by the Connecticut Senator promised them everything: all medical costs will be paid by the government after you and your family incur \$2,000 in expenses. The letter did not say that the family would also have to satisfy a deductible of 60 hospital days in addition to the \$2,000 in doctors' fees. Nothing would be covered below this amount. In satisfying the deductibles, the family could not count costs for uncovered services  
*Betty Dooley is the director of regional organization for the Health Security Action Council.*

like prescribed drugs, or Grandma's nursing home bills or eyeglasses, or hearing aids, or indeed a list of other uncovered items that outmeasures the list of covered items by several yards.

## *Nixon bill*

The "new" Nixon bill reads like a conventional health insurance policy. It is predicated on the theory that no American is too poor to contribute to the profits of the insurance industry. According to an article in *Business Week*, health insurers could double their present annual premium income of more than \$26 billion.

The bill is deliberately deceptive in two ways. First, its promise that all Americans would have full coverage without new taxes is clever gimmickry. Instead of taxes, every employer and employee would pay insurance premiums (without the stringent cost controls basic to the Kennedy bill). Taxpayers would pick up the tab for the insurance premiums of the poor (general revenues would be tapped, again without cost controls). The second deception is the use of terrifically complicated benefit and price schedules based on income and family size. Since the federal government's role would be, at most, to establish guidelines, it would be left to 50 administrative bureaucracies within the 50 states to see that consumers are not overcharged

---

## *Nixon's health insurance scheme*

*is "taxation with misrepresentation."*

---

by the health insurers. Secretary Weinberger has as much as admitted that the bill will be an administrative nightmare, with administration costs going as high as 15 per cent (compared to 5 per cent for the Kennedy bill).

Moreover, the Nixon bill shows blatant favoritism toward the providers of health care as well as to the insurance industry. The patient would gain entrance to doctors' offices, clinics, and hospitals by showing a health card. The providers would collect their money immediately from the insurers. Then the patient would be billed for whatever the insurance benefits did not cover and for the deductibles or the coinsurance he owed. Patients who failed to pay up within 120 days would lose their health cards. Meanwhile, nothing in the bill is addressed to the serious problems underlying the health care crisis: runaway costs, shortages and maldistribution of health personnel, and ineffective delivery of quality services.

The Health Maintenance Organization Act that Nixon signed in late December can't do what its advertisers claimed. It serves the purpose of spotlighting the issue in the news media and it is, at least, a baby step in the right direction. The latest figures for total national health care expenditures in 1973 are \$94.1 billion. Now how can you take start-up money for Health

*(Continued on page 4)*

# Chicago: socialists hit Nixon and Exxon

by JACK CLARK

"I'm against President Nixon's resignation. I want to see him before the Senate, twisting slowly, slowly in the wind," Allard Lowenstein told an audience of more than 200 people at a Midwest conference of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee. The February 16th conference in Chicago's Midland Hotel drew socialist activists and supporters from as far away as Maine, Texas and California. Conference speakers included DSOC members and other democratic Left activists, like Lowenstein, Heather Booth of the Midwest Academy and Day Creamer of Women Employed.

---

## National health insurance . . .

(Continued from page 3)

Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) of \$325 million spread over *five years* and accomplish much of anything? Also, the strong quality controls and other consumer safeguards that were in the original Kennedy HMO bill were weakened by the joint Congressional conference committee. The Act resembles the more conservative House version much more than it does the Senate bill. It will, however, override state laws that do not allow group prepaid practice, now known as HMOs. And perhaps the best thing that will come out of this Act is that in the area in which HMOs are operating, people will become more comfortable with a new concept of health care.

Kennedy has pointed out that the Nixon proposal's greatest drawback is that it continues a two-tiered system of health care. So long as we divide medical consumers into two categories, the self-sufficient and the needy, there are bound to be distinctions in the quality of care they receive.

Health care could have been a hot issue in the '72 Presidential election, but it was never injected into the campaign. The 1973 session of Congress nearly ignored health care, but now there are signs that the issue is heating up. Long and Ribicoff are up for re-election this year, and both are touting their "accomplishments" on health legislation. Nixon's new bill shows that he sees health as an emerging issue. And the opponents of Kennedy-Griffiths are getting nervous about the bill's passage. AMA troops have been increasing on Capitol Hill. The Medical Association's political arm, AMPAC, spread three million dollars around in the '72 elections, and the *AMA News* reports that the operational budget for 1974 is \$37.2 million.

On the other hand, predictions abound that we'll see a lot of new faces in the next Congress. That would probably be a good sign for this landmark legislation. And the longer the fight drags on, the more time there will be to warn people about the kind of health insurance the Congress is buying for them. From where I sit, the battle for health security looks like the best fight in town. □

Lowenstein, former Congressman and antiwar activist, shared the platform with new DSOC National Board member Peter Steinfelds. Both spoke on "Wallowing out of Watergate: the politics of impeachment." Steinfelds cautioned against a cops and robbers outlook in dealing with Watergate, a mentality which presumes that once the bad guys (Agnew and Nixon) are punished, everything will be all right.

Other sessions at the conference included a major address on the energy crisis by Michael Harrington, DSOC national chairman; and panels on the economy and organizing working women.

DSOC members Tim Nulty and Lance Lindblom discussed "The economy: the mess of it all." Nulty, the UAW research director, cautioned against simplistic socialist solutions. Nationalization of oil, for example, won't necessarily solve the energy crisis; nor is nationalization per se necessarily progressive. He compared Sweden, which has a small proportion of nationalized property, with Great Britain, with much more state-owned industry. Lindblom, an economist for the state of Illinois, stressed the economy's interdependence. He gave the example of a hay harvest which was delayed even though the mechanical harvesters were ready, there was sufficient fuel and a good crop—there was a baling wire shortage. Lindblom also warned that the world economy could be dividing into exclusive and competitive trading blocs, like the European Common Market, the United States and Latin America, Japan and the Far Eastern countries. In the past, Lindblom noted, such competition between trading blocs has heightened international tension.

"Organizing Working Women" began with some comments by former UAW Education Director Brendan Sexton. He tied the labor movement's failure to organize women to a larger failure to organize workers even in highly unionized sectors of the economy. Day Creamer, the director of Women Employed, described the Chicago-based group's organizing work among women office workers. She also cited the need for organizations which can educate non-unionized working women to the need for collective action in dealing with employers.

Harrington addressed the need for a Left strategy to deal with the energy crisis. That no one believes the oil companies or Nixon, Harrington stated, is a promising sign. But the Left must at once recognize that opportunity and respond to the crisis in its full complexity. He urged support of the Stevenson bill, creating a public corporation to develop new energy resources. Opening the conference and introducing Harrington, Ralph Helstein, the president emeritus of the United Packinghouse Workers and a vice-chairman of the DSOC, spoke to the need for impeachment.

Quoting Nixon's claim that the average American's income and purchasing power is going up, Helstein said, "Maybe he's making more money than ever, with his tax breaks and his real estate deals; that's easy to

believe. And maybe his dollar is buying more than ever—after all, he seems to get a discount on everything.”

Nixon's assertions that the economy is in good shape, and that there are no prospects of a depression, Helstein said, are lies. “We must impeach Nixon because of Watergate, yes, but we must impeach him also because he has lied about jobs and about things that affect the well-being of everyone in this country.”

Speaking again at the end of the conference, Harrington reviewed the progress of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee in the twelve months since its pre-Convention committee was formed. There were,

said Harrington, the obvious successes: the enthusiastic response to the Convention call, “We are Socialists of the Democratic Left”; the founding Convention in October; and the Midwest conference itself. Harrington chose to stress newer developments within the DSOC, like the emergence of a DSOC women's group, the renewal of a socialist presence in the trade unions and the beginnings of socialist activity in areas like Iowa, Texas, Missouri and Indiana.

On Sunday February 17 and Monday February 18, the national board of the DSOC met. The April NEWSLETTER will carry fuller details on the discussions at the conference and the board meeting. □

---

## Energy and the unemployment crisis

by CAROL DRISKO

The independent truckers' strike provided a clear barometer of how sensitive the economy is to energy-related unemployment. In Pennsylvania alone, the ten-day strike caused 50-70,000 people to lose their jobs. If the strike continued, Governor Milton Shapp estimated, there would have been 300-400,000 jobless by the end of February.

So when the Labor Department released its mid-February figures, of 250,000 energy-related job losses, many breathed a perceptible sigh of relief. It could have been twice as bad.

But sighs of relief were out of order. February was the fourth consecutive month of rising unemployment. The jobless rate for January, 5.2 per cent, is the highest in a year, and the increase from December to January is the sharpest monthly jump since the recession of 1970. With unemployment going up, we can expect a new Administration definition of full employment. Currently, when 4 per cent of the work force is unable to find jobs, that is called “full employment.” Given Nixon's State of the Union commitment that we will avoid a recession (and George Schultz's recent rejoinder to the press that a recession is what the Administration says it is), we can expect a “more realistic” definition of full employment, say 4.5 or 4.8 per cent unemployed. It's worth noting that an unemployment rate of three per cent is enough to topple most European governments. Since each 0.1 per cent equals 90,000 workers, at least 500,000 more people could be out of work under the new Alice-in-Wonderland definition.

Auto workers have been particularly hard hit by the energy crisis. Statistics for the auto industry are a bit murky, since the companies issue a stream of figures following each plant closing or retooling, designating some workers to indefinite lay-offs, others to temporary furloughs. Some quarter of a million auto workers have been affected one way or another; about 100,000 are indefinitely laid off. Not surprisingly, Michigan has been hit very hard. The state's employment director anticipates state-wide unemployment topping 12 per cent (500,000) this year, a figure not

reached since the 1958 recession. Auto output was down 27 per cent from January of last year; February figures are expected to be down 20 per cent, and the downturn for the whole year is expected to average out at 15 per cent.

Although about 40 per cent of the energy-related unemployment is in the auto industry, some other sectors of the economy have also suffered. Approximately 70,000 jobs have been lost in auto dealerships and service stations; about 42,000 are out of work in other service industries, including airlines, motels, roadside eating places and resorts; 27,000 public utility workers have lost their jobs. Also expected to be threatened directly are retail trade, and the housing, plastics, rubber and chemical industries. Florida provides an example of how tourism and recreation are affected. Eighty per cent of Florida's tourist industry depends on gasoline and the auto. Even though the gas shortage is not apparent in the state, uncertainty kept tourists away, causing a 15 per cent drop in tourism and the loss of tourist-related jobs. Disney World alone laid off 700.

The Administration's apparent willingness to compromise on emergency public employment measures is the clearest proof of the extent of the unemployment threat. Although they wanted the Emergency Employment Act to die in 1972, Administration officials are reportedly friendly to a \$250 million appropriation (to be raised to \$350 million in 1975) for state and local employment programs in areas with 6.5 per cent or more of the work force unemployed. The White House also radically reversed itself by promising to provide funds for a nine week summer job program for 700,000 poor teenagers. □

### We've moved...

The NEWSLETTER has moved to Room 1112, 31 Union Square West, New York, N.Y. 10003. Please address all correspondence to the NEWSLETTER or the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee to the new address.

## Soviet dissidents . . .

(Continued from page 1)

of banned literary works. The process is similar to a chain letter: readers with access to a typewriter make additional copies before passing the manuscript on to a friend. The importance of *samzidat* cannot be exaggerated. Through these channels of communication, an entire generation of Russians was introduced to pre-Revolutionary writers whose works had been suppressed since the 1930's and to the splendid (and, of course, also suppressed) works produced during the Stalin era. *Samzidat* also encompassed works by new writers who were unacceptable to the censor.

In the early '60's, Soviet citizens who hoped for gradual liberalization and reform were optimistic. The high point of de-Stalinization came in 1962 with the publication of Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. The novel rocked the whole of Soviet society even more than Khrushchev had rocked the Party with his secret speech. For the first time, official sanction had been given to an honest description of what actually went on in the camps under Stalin.

The hopes for a continuation of that discussion—and an end to the arbitrary exercise of state power—were not to be realized. Khrushchev was ousted in 1964, in part because of his disastrous agricultural policies, in part because de-Stalinization frightened the multitude of old Stalinists who still permeated the government and the party. But the dissent which had begun could not be immediately suppressed by the new leadership.

In 1966, that dissent crystallized around the trial of Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel, the first *samzidat* writers imprisoned for allowing the publication of their works abroad. Hundreds of people lost their jobs for signing petitions protesting the trial and harsh camp sentences received by both Daniel and Sinyavsky. Others received camp sentences themselves for publicizing and protesting against the trial.

The number of active dissenters was at its height between 1968 and 1971. The '68 invasion of Czechoslovakia touched off a wave of revulsion (and despair) within the intellectual community. New petitions and one demonstration in Red Square (which involved a handful of people carrying placards) brought on a new wave of arrests and camp sentences.

The Soviet dissidents of the late '60's never merited the grand title of "movement" often accorded them in the Western press. They were fragmented and had no access to the Soviet mass media. Most of them acknowledged that they had little hope of changing the Soviet system but felt that dissent was a necessary, moral act. "This is a matter of individual moral conscience, and of the example we set for others," a young dissident named Vladimir Bukovsky told me in 1970. (He is now serving a seven year sentence in a labor camp.)

The "reformist" dissenters included Andrei D. Sakharov, the distinguished nuclear physicist who wrote a famous essay on convergence recommending reforms in both the Soviet and capitalist systems (the essay was only published in the West), and Roy Medvedev, a

Marxist who has written a history of the Stalin era (also unpublished in the Soviet Union). Sakharov's hopes for change within the Soviet Union have now dimmed; he recently warned the West against detente without an easing of internal Soviet repression.

Another group of dissenters, known as the Democratic Movement, encompassed a bewildering spectrum of political opinion. Some dreamed of "pure Marxism-Leninism." Many admired the Czech ideal of "socialism with a human face" (as Sakharov did). Most wanted to combine parliamentary democracy with economic aspects of both socialism and capitalism.

Other groups included Jews who wanted to emigrate to Israel (many of them leaders in the Democratic Movement as well), religious dissenters and national minorities who resented great Russian domination.

All of these people opposed censorship and demanded that the Soviet state observe its own laws. The dissidents, determined to publicize every violation of civil rights, published the *Chronicle of Current Events*, a *samzidat* periodical which appeared every two months between 1968 and November 1972. The *Chronicle* recorded arrests, trials, sentences and other police actions against dissidents throughout the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly, a high level decision came in December 1971 to arrest enough dissenters to shut down the *Chronicle*. This was the most significant step in the campaign of repression before Solzhenitsyn's arrest and deportation.

To be sure, the dissidents have philosophical differences. For example, in *The Gulag Archipelago*, Solzhenitsyn maintains that the Bolshevik terror led inevitably to the greater Stalinist abuses. Roy Medvedev disagrees, arguing that Stalin perverted both Marxism and Leninism. However, since there is virtually no dissident movement left, these kinds of disagreements assume less practical importance for the moment. When the campaign against Solzhenitsyn peaked during the past few weeks, Medvedev issued a long statement, agreeing with Solzhenitsyn's basic view of the Stalinist system even though he disagreed with Solzhenitsyn on some points. And, like all of the dissidents, he emphasized that all viewpoints should be openly discussed and not censored.

Solzhenitsyn's exile demonstrates that the Soviet system has evolved considerably since Stalin's day. Such a man would have been shot 25 years ago. The question is not whether the system has changed, but to what degree.

Both Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov would be serving long prison sentences if their international renown did not protect them from the usual workings of Soviet "justice." Thousands of dissenters with unknown names are doing just that, while the secret police tidy up the messy details posed by the more famous figures who might—just might—interfere with the Nixon-Brezhnev concept of detente. □

*Susan Jacoby lived in the Soviet Union from 1969 to 1971 and is the author of Moscow Conversations, a book of profiles of ten Russians, ranging from dissidents to Party members.*

# Chile: after the fall

by DAVID GLANZ

The Chilean junta, while no longer making headlines in the international press, is quietly consolidating its quasi-fascist rule.

Some of the most brutal aspects of repression have subsided. Summary executions have declined, for instance (estimates of the number dead vary from 2,000 to 10,000). But large numbers of political prisoners (here estimates range from 3,000 to 12,000) are held without charges. Old nitrate mining towns have reopened as concentration camps. Some surviving members of Allende's cabinet are imprisoned at a small military outpost near the Antarctic Circle.

Due process of law no longer exists in Chile. Amnesty International charged in a January report that "there is substantial and gross violation of the most fundamental human rights." Isidora Carrillo, a Communist and former manager of the Lota-Schwager coal mine, was sentenced to life imprisonment by a junta court; the next day, the junta retried Carrillo and imposed a new sentence: summary execution.

Under Allende, Chile became a haven for Latin American refugees, from countries like Brazil and Bolivia. In January, according to Amnesty, 4,000 of these refugees were waiting in the provincial registration centers and Santiago embassies for asylum abroad. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees has received little cooperation from two traditionally sympathetic countries, the United States and Britain, who are wary of admitting leftists. Similarly, Eastern bloc countries do not want the refugees, apparently because many are Trotskyists. According to the UN High Commission, 1,480 non-Chilean refugees have been sent out of the country, mainly to Mexico, West Germany, Sweden, Switzerland and France, with Eastern bloc and Latin American countries taking token numbers. Recent reports indicate that 1,000 Brazilians, Bolivians, Uruguayans and other foreigners are still in refugee camps. West Germany has agreed to take all but 275.

The fate of Chileans seeking to flee the junta is less certain. The junta claims that 5,214 safe-conduct passes have been issued to Chilean nationals to leave the country. These thousands of Allende supporters are not, however, eligible for UN aid, and so far, only

## Trading partners

The economic embargo which the United States initiated against Allende's Popular Unity government has been lifted since the September coup.

In November, Manufacturers' Hanover Trust announced a \$20 million loan to the Central Bank of Chile. It was the largest loan from an American bank to Chile since Allende's election. Another group of American and Canadian bankers has issued a \$170 million credit to the government. And money is on the way from the Treasury Department's Export-Import Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank (in which the U.S. has veto power) and the World Bank. All those sources had run dry during Allende's tenure.

Sweden, Mexico and West Germany have offered refuge to any significant number.

Although the junta cited economic instability allegedly created by the Allende government as a major justification for the bloody coup, its own economic record has been much worse. Prices have risen incredibly since the junta lifted government controls: bread is up 250 per cent, sugar 1400 per cent, chicken 800 per cent and cooking oil 600 per cent. Food subsidies and other aid to the poor, initiated by the Popular Unity government, have been discontinued. Real wages have fallen precipitously.

The military junta is "reconstructing" Chile's social and political structure. Immediately after the coup, all leftist and Marxist parties were banned. Now, all political parties, including Allende's chief opponents, the Christian Democrats, have been suspended. Although the Christian Democrats initially welcomed the junta, the party's leaders recently accused the junta, in a private letter, of violating basic human rights, instituting new economic policies injurious to the working class, and attempting to suppress all political activity. This letter was largely the result of fear on the part of the Christian Democrats that the very existence of their party was being threatened. The January decree of the junta "recessed" all political parties and prohibited public statements, meetings, propaganda, or any involvement with workers, student organizations, or neighborhood councils.

Meanwhile, the 800,000-member Central Worker's Confederation, Chile's largest labor organization, has been abolished. Strikes, labor union activity, and unauthorized meetings of workers have been prohibited. Anti-junta newspapers have been closed and censorship of radio and TV imposed. Chileans living abroad have been threatened with loss of citizenship for making statements critical of the junta. Entire university institutes and departments, particularly in the left-oriented social science faculties, have been dissolved and many faculty members have been purged.

Chile's future seems grim as the junta continues to dismantle Chile's democratic institutions. And the junta is spoken of as a "necessity" by some for the next five or ten years . . . or a generation. □

Newsletter of

## THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

Michael Harrington, *Editor*  
Jack Clark, *Managing Editor*

The following people helped to put this issue out:  
David Bensman, Gretchen Donart, Carol Drisko, David Glanz, Deena Rosenberg, Mark Schaeffer.

Signed articles express the views of the author.

Published ten times a year (monthly except July and August) by the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, 31 Union Square West, Room 1112, New York, N.Y. 10003.

# Jimmy Higgins reports...

**BACK INTO THE FOLD?**—Reports from the AFL-CIO Executive Council meeting in Miami indicate that the United Auto Workers are about to re-enter the Federation. The 1.6 million member union left the AFL-CIO in the wake of disputes over foreign policy and personal feuds between George Meany and Walter Reuther. If the UAW comes back, it will be the largest union in the Federation.

**DIVIDING THE DEMOCRATS**—After several months of inactivity, the Coalition for a Democratic Majority is back in action. Ever determined to keep open the wounds of '72, CDM recently held a fund-raiser at the New York apartment of Menachem Riklin, a prominent Nixon backer in the last election. The "centrist" Democrats are also pushing a document prepared by Eugene Rostow, defending LBJ's Vietnam policy; they want it discussed at this year's charter convention. Meanwhile, CDM's favorite Democrat, Scoop Jackson, is slated to receive the annual John Dewey award from New York's United Federation of Teachers.

**TALK OF NATIONALIZING** energy resources is coming from a lot of places—some of them unlikely. The Massachusetts Legislature passed a resolution favoring nationalization of oil. The Minnesota Federation of Labor, the Communications Workers and the Service Employees have all pushed nationalization proposals. Former Oregon Congressman Charles Porter is setting up a public committee for nationalization, and present Congressman Charles Rangel, (D.-N.Y.) has proposed setting up a Select House Committee to study nationalization.

**AT THE SAME TIME** the Administration is involved in a process of denationalization—turning over publicly-owned resources to private developers. The bargain basement leases to oil companies interested in exploiting oil shale are well known. Now the government is virtually giving away leases of publicly-owned land for the development of geothermal energy. One dollar an acre is the government's price for the first five years, and Shell, Union Oil,



Dow Chemical and Gulf have been grabbing them up. When can we expect the companies to start generating energy from these fields? According to the *Wall Street Journal*, the private developers are waiting for government funding.

**THE WOMAN OF THE HOUR** in Connecticut politics is Representative Ella Grasso, liberal candidate for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination. She's up against state Attorney General Robert Killian, choice of state chairman John Bailey, but her coalition just might pull off an upset. Grasso's fans include women's and reform groups, the state UAW and AFL-CIO, and Arthur Barbieri's New Haven organization. Also in the race, but with little discernible backing, are educator Homer Babbidge and former Norwalk Mayor Frank Zullo. The winner faces Gov. Thomas Meskill, who's been slashing services to hold taxes down.

**NEW YORK'S MAYOR ABE BEAME** may be dull, but his two top housing aides will add some excitement to his administration. For one thing, they're eloquent spokesmen for opposing positions on most issues. Roger Starr, the new housing administrator, is a widely published advocate of new housing construction, keeping problem families out of public housing, building in the ghetto if necessary, and loosening "environmental impact" rules. As an editor of *The Public Interest* magazine, Starr has his chance to demonstrate that he's the sort of pragmatic, no-nonsense administrator he admires.

But Beame's City Planning Chairman, John Zuccotti, a hold-over from the Lindsay years, is an enthusiast of Jane Jacobs' theories. Zuccotti gave community boards more say than ever before on zoning issues and boosted housing rehabilitation, rather than new building. Starr's selection was blasted by tenant groups, who demanded Zuccotti's re-appointment. For all their apparent differences, the two officials balance each other's preconceptions and could work well together.

Please enter my subscription to the *Newsletter of the Democratic Left*

Regular Subscription \$5    Student rate \$2.50  
Sustaining Subscription \$10

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zip .....

Send to *Newsletter of the Democratic Left*  
31 Union Square West, Room 1112, New York,  
N.Y. 10003.

"From each according to his/her ability . . ."