

in the magazines

"What is happening is that the Portuguese are being slowly but steadily defeated by Angolan guerrillas." Too optimistic, you say? Well, answers Basil Davidson, the author (unidentified further) of an article in the April issue of *Southern Africa*, a monthly "survey of news and opinion" published in New York. "It is a conclusion based on study of Angola since the 1950's; on the evidence of the Portuguese as well as of the nationalists; and on a journey of inspection of many weeks through Angola during the present dry season, a journey from which I have just returned."

Neither Holden Roberto's U.P.A. nor Jonas Savimbi's UNITA—though both have made "absurd propagandistic claims"—are at the forefront of the fight for independence from colonial rule, says Davidson, but the Movimiento Popular por La Libertacao de Angola. And the MPLA believes—and Davidson confirms, though he keeps much of the evidence to himself—"that they firmly hold the long-term strategic initiative. . . . Holding that initiative, they conclude that they are slowly winning; again one may agree that they are right. The pace at which they can make good this victory will turn on their capacity to reorganize their forces into more effective strike-units; on their political skill in mobilizing mass support in the Center and West as they have already mobilized it in the East; and, not least, on the enlargement of outside supplies of modern weapons and other necessary things. These are formidable problems. Yet they are no more formidable than other problems already solved by the MPLA."

•

The headlines were undoubtedly those we've seen recently — MILITARY INTELLIGENCE NOTIFIED, ARMY SERGEANTS ARREST LEAFLET THROWER; OPPONENTS OF AMERICAN INTERVENTION INDICTED UNDER ESPIONAGE ACT; LAWYER DECLARES 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE SIX HAVE BEEN ABRIDGED; DEFENSE ASSERTS SENDING OF TROOPS UNCONSTITUTIONAL WITHOUT DECLARATION OF WAR—but the trial described by Zosa Szajkowski in *American Jewish Archives* (April) is an old one, a *cause célèbre* of 1919.

Here, in what later became known as the Abrams case, six anarchists, immigrant New York Jews, "were indicted for conspiring to violate four clauses of the Espionage Act of 1917 as amended by the Act of May 16, 1918." Their crime? To have thrown from a window two different one-page leaflets—one in English, the other in Yiddish—protesting the sending of U.S. troops to Siberia. The "enemy" of the period? Armed Austrian and German prisoners of war who, the American Government as-

serted in its statement on intervention, were at the head of Bolshevik forces fighting in the area. "The defendants," Szajkowski notes, "were not prosecuted for pacifist or pro-German activities, but for protesting against America's Russian policy."

At the trial's end, one defendant was acquitted, one sentenced to three years in prison, three received sentences of twenty years and fines of \$1,000, and the sixth, a young woman, was sentenced to fifteen years in prison and a fine of \$5,000.

The case was argued before the Supreme Court in October, 1919 and the original sentences affirmed. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes dissented, however:

"But as against danger peculiar to war, as against others, the principle of the right to free speech is always the same. It is only the present danger of immediate evil or an intent to bring it about that warrants Congress in setting a limit to the expression of opinion where private rights are not concerned. Congress certainly cannot forbid all effort to change the mind of the country. . . . In this case sentences of twenty years imprisonment have been imposed for the publishing of two leaflets that I believe the defendants had as much right to publish as the Government has to publish the Constitution . . . now vainly invoked by them. . . . I will add, even if what I think the necessary intent were shown; the most nominal punishment seems to me all that possibly could be inflicted, unless the defendants are to be made to suffer not for what the indictment alleges but for the creed that they avow. . . ."

•

From *New World Outlook* (February): "The World Council of Churches is not encouraging young Americans to break U.S. laws by supplying funds to aid 'draft refugees' in Canada, the Council's chief executive said recently in New York.

"Dr. Eugene Carson Blake said the W.C.C.'s appeal for \$240,000 over three years, to assist the 30,000 young men who have become military deserters or draft resisters is similar to the help given any other political refugees. . . .

"Dr. Blake . . . defined a political refugee as 'one who leaves his country for political reasons.' He said the duty of the World Council in dealing with refugees is to serve the spiritual and physical needs of all.

"Dr. Blake said two-thirds of the \$240,000, if the churches give it, will go to aid centers throughout Canada. . . . The other one-third, he said, will go for pastoral counseling among the men. . . . Dr. Blake stressed that the W.C.C. was not telling people they ought to desert or fail to appear for military induction. . . ."

PAMPHILUS