

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 29

July 31, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

	<u>Page</u>
Details about Assaults in Dr. Alexander Case	1
What Goldwater Represents -- by Joseph Hansen	2
The New OAS Sanctions Against Cuba	3
What Castro Really Said in that Interview with the New York Times	10
Students See Revolutionary Cuba for Themselves	13
Britain's Big Mail Pile Up -- by Alan Adair	14
Hot Gambling Tip -- Buy British	17
Mixed Response to New Civil-Rights Law in U.S. -- by Evelyn Sell	18
A Difference Between Pujade and Goldwater	21
"Throw Wallace to the Lions," Say Toronto Pickets	22
Will the Chilean Communist Party Prove to be an Exception? -- by Emmanuel Aguinaldo	23
Indian Communist Party Opposition Holds Convention -- by A. Raheem	26
Photos of Cuban Revolution Shown in Bombay	28
German Metal Workers Win Favorable Agreement	29
New Zealanders Protest French Nuclear Tests	31
New Zealand CND "Open Letter to de Gaulle"	32
Maoris Moving Toward Towns	33
Frias Wins Release from Prison	34
Venezuela's Struggle for Freedom (The Question of Guerrilla Warfare)	34

DETAILS ABOUT ASSAULTS IN DR. ALEXANDER CASE

In our last issue we reported that Dr. Neville Alexander and two of his comrades, who are among the political prisoners held in the Robben Island prison off Cape Town, had been assaulted by warders. We are now able to supplement this bare report with the fol-

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE - Hebdomadaire

Abonnement, 26 numéros : 37,50 F, à Pierre FRANK, 21, rue d'Aboukir, Paris (2^e).

lowing additional information.

Fikele Charles Bam was assaulted, kicked and slapped by a head warder June 10 because he asked for a second helping of food.

He reported to the authorities the next morning. He was told that he is a Kaffir and that he should be thankful for the food the Department of Prisons is wasting on him.

Fikele was prepared to run the risk of making a sworn statement. The authorities gave him the chance to do this.

During the week of June 22-27 Dr. Alexander, who is one of South Africa's most distinguished intellectuals, was assaulted. This happened when he objected to the way the warders carry out their search of prisoners by forcing them to do the "tauza dance." One of his ear drums was damaged.

Since his comrades Ian Leslie v.d. Heyden, Lionel Basil Davis, and Marcus Solomons were witnesses, they have been placed in isolation.

No further information was available about Don Davis, who was also reported to be the victim of an assault at the hands of Robben Island's sadistic warders.

* * *

In addition to the above, the following report has reached us about conditions at Robben Island, South Africa's version of a Nazi concentration camp:

(1) All political prisoners are automatically classified in the lowest group on arrival without consideration to individual men's characters and contrary to the regulations.

(2) All political prisoners and those criminals who do not collaborate with the warders are given the most difficult jobs in the stone quarries.

(3) Groups of political prisoners who arrive together are split up and scattered among cells of habitual criminals. Dr. Alexander is in a cell exclusively occupied by criminals and has complained that his life is in danger as a result of gang fights among them.

(4) The greatest complaint is starvation. Not only is the standard of food ridiculously low, but the quantities served are meager. This is partially due to the fact that all kitchen jobs are given to criminals who openly smuggle huge amounts for their own use. When complaints are made, they are told that the food received is

their ration. The most appalling consequence of the starvation is that some of the youth are exposed to exploitation by criminals for immoral purposes, namely, sodomy. They are offered food smuggled from the kitchen.

(5) When coming from work all prisoners are searched. They are made to strip completely, open their mouths, and worst of all do the "tauza dance," exposing their sexual parts. Dr. Alexander and his comrades have been warned several times and threatened with strokes for refusing to do this.

(6) There are numerous instances of assaults, but care is always taken not to leave marks.

* * *

In his book South Africa's Rule of Violence (Methuen, 1964), Patrick Duncan gives on pages 79-81 an example and picture of this "tauza dance."

"Prisoners, but only non-white prisoners," he writes, "are made to strip naked when they return to jail. They are made to jump up in the air, clapping their hands, opening their mouths, then turning around. This is known as the 'tausa' or the Zulu dance."

In reality this is a way of inflicting humiliation and indignity on political prisoners in an effort to demoralize and degrade them.

* * *

The committee which has been seeking to collect funds to aid the families of the prisoners and to finance an appeal by the end of 1964, reports that an encouraging response has been received as a result of the publicity transmitted through World Outlook. The committee expresses its appreciation.

Send any checks or letters to Franz J.T.Lee, 74 Tübingen, Schwabstrasse 22, West Germany.

WHAT GOLDWATER REPRESENTS

By Joseph Hansen

The nomination of Barry Goldwater as the candidate of the Republican party sent the greatest wave of consternation and incredulity around the earth since the assassination of President Kennedy. To many it looked like a scene suddenly come real from the sardonic film "Dr. Strangelove, Or: How I Learned to Stop

Worrying and Love the Bomb."

On the eve of the San Francisco convention, The Sunday Times of London [July 12], in an almost subversive allusion to the revolutionary slogan of the former British colony, "No taxation without representation," wrote editorially: "As the San Francisco Convention gathers, the allies of the United States can fairly stake out, in this nuclear age, their claim of no annihilation (or even risk of annihilation) without representation."

After Goldwater's triumph, the New Statesman [July 24], looking with apprehension at the presidential campaign, declared that "a victory for Goldwater would be an unimaginable disaster for America and the world."

The press in almost every country except Spain and South Africa, where elation was voiced, drew analogies between the rise of the Arizona senator and Adolf Hitler in the early thirties. The sinking feeling in the pits of stomachs on all continents was therefore understandable. People, especially in Europe, saw the possibility of a madman like Hitler in the White House with the buttons controlling America's stockpile of nuclear weapons in an enticing row on his desk.

Political analysts, therefore, have been concentrating on studying the possibilities of Goldwater's winning in November. Up to now they have come up with what to them is the assuring result that the odds are with Johnson. Yet they are forced to place a question mark over the forecast. There have been too many upsets already, not only of the columnists but of the pollsters and even the former masters of the Republican machine in relation to Goldwater. Suppose there is another upset? Suppose the civil-rights issue in the United States changes all the rules of the game? What if the "white backlash" proves unexpectedly powerful? What if another crisis abroad leads the American voters to vote for the Westerner in the buckskin jacket? What if there is really a fascist groundswell in the United States?

As in the October 1962 crisis when the fate of all civilization, even the fate of mankind, was deliberately placed at stake by one man in the White House, and everything hinged on whether Khrushchev would prove to have at least some sanity, the world is again living in a nightmare. The nightmare, however, happens to be the reality of our times. An accident can lead to a nuclear holocaust -- an accident such as a turn in the elections in the United States that might spell victory for Goldwater next November, or, if not then, in 1968.

Despite the attention now being paid to American politics, the experts, for all their many cogent observations, tend to draw an unbalanced picture. Goldwater, now in charge of the Republican machine, does not yet head a fascist movement on the verge of seizing

power. Johnson, heading the Democrats, is not as safe and moderate as those frightened by Goldwater would like to believe.

First, on what is widely held to be "the two key issues" in the campaign now developing -- civil rights and foreign policy.

On civil rights, Johnson is depicted as "moderate." The following declaration will indicate his true views: "I notice when I go to New York, that the colored people have congregated in Harlem. That is due to an inborn instinct. It will be found that the members of races congregate together; they want to be together. They do not want other races to interfere with them. That is nothing but human nature. It has always been true in the past. By this bill [FEPC] there is an attempt to change something that God made. We did not make it. God made my face white and made some other face yellow and some other face black. I did not do it. Congress cannot change that state of affairs." This extract is from the Congressional Record, Vol. 92, page 579. President (then Senator) Johnson was arguing against the Fair Employment Practices Bill in January 1946.

On foreign policy, Johnson's policy is the continuation of exactly the same one followed by Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. This policy led to American involvement in Korea and South Vietnam. It has included intervention in the internal affairs of countries around the earth -- the toppling of the legitimately elected government in Guatemala, the counterrevolutionary invasion of Cuba, the reactionary coup d'état in Brazil barely three months ago, a rabid campaign in both hemispheres to seal off tiny Cuba.

Even in the case of South Vietnam where Goldwater has been shouting "Why not victory?" and advocating that to achieve this, the war be deepened and widened and perhaps the bomb used for defoliating trees, Johnson has not been less belligerent. Not a week has passed without new threats, whether from the Pentagon, the State Department, the White House or the Saigon puppets, to "escalate" the war.

Goldwater is extremely reactionary. He appeals to all the middle-class elements and the worst vermin who constitute the potential shock troops of a fascist movement in the United States. He is recognized by the racists as close to them in political outlook, as is evidenced by the deal that led Alabama Governor George Wallace to withdraw from the presidential race. Despite its potential, however, this is not yet fascism.

First of all, it is not developing in an atmosphere of economic crisis. It therefore lacks one of the distinguishing characteristics of a fascist movement -- radical-sounding demagoguery. Goldwater, in fact, offers only a conservative capitalist ideology that harks back to the days of laissez faire economics. This is one of the principal sources of the glaring contradictions in his proposed policies for an America that has long outgrown that stage, now standing as a super imperialist power dominating world capitalism as a whole.

Lacking, too, is the deep social crisis stemming from an economic crisis with ruined masses desperately seeking a way out.

Instead, the United States has gone a quarter of a century without a major depression and at the moment continues to ride an economic boom.

It is true that a social crisis is evident -- a crisis involving the thrust of the Negro people toward equal rights but this is only a harbinger of the play of class forces in America that could make fascism in the true sense of the term an immediate danger.

"Goldwaterism" represents some of the most vicious tendencies opposed to the "Freedom Now" movement but this is not its main source. "Goldwaterism" arises from the profound insecurity felt by the middle class in the United States, despite their prosperity, in face of the threat of another world war and in face of the irresistible rise of revolutionary movements on a world scale. The latter particularly, foreshadowing the doom of the capitalist system, terrorizes the new millionaires and those who think like them.

In addition to this broad class spectrum, "Goldwaterism" represents the enormously wealthy new sectors of big business in Texas and the Southwest who seek a bigger voice in ruling America. (H.L. Hunt, reputed to be the richest man in the United States, was conspicuous at the Republican convention.) This was the source of the millions of dollars required to take the Republican machine away from its holders on the Eastern seaboard.

As a development strengthening viciously reactionary currents in the American scene, Goldwater's victory is ominous. The unions, especially, should begin a most serious examination of their policies which helped pave the way for this dangerous turn.

What does Goldwater's capture of the Republican machine mean for the two-party system? This is a most pertinent question.

Instead of the two broadly parallel structures that represented but two factions serving the interests of Big Business, with the unions largely attached to the Democratic machine, Goldwater has driven for the realignment that has long been a slogan in various political circles. In the 1964 election at least, the Republican party will appear as a fairly cohesive grouping. Even with a big defeat, Goldwater would still be able to retain control of the machine for another bid in 1968, provided he has the financial backing he presently enjoys.

In the current election this will strengthen the ties between the Democratic machine and the Labor bosses -- despite the open shift of Northern capital, particularly its Eastern sector, into the same camp. With no pressure whatsoever from the left, Johnson's campaign will not at all be like Truman's in 1948, when the Kansas City poli-

tician correctly saw that his only chance was to outbid the challenge of Henry Wallace's Progressive party. Johnson will seek to reassure the Southern racists in ways best known to one of his background, while implying to the Negroes and to low-income brackets that he is the "lesser evil."

In foreign policy he will seek to exploit the fears aroused by Goldwater's frenetic demagoguery while at the same time standing on the record of his reactionary accomplishments in places like Brazil and South Vietnam. If he holds the cities of the North, as seems most likely with both the Negroes and the labor bureaucrats in his camp, his victory is assured. If he takes the South, and, as a Democrat and the first Southern presidential candidate since the Civil War, his chances are good, it will be a landslide.

After that, however, the American political scene would not be the same. The highly contradictory forces in the Democratic machine would tend toward a new differentiation, with a development toward the left symmetrical to the development to the right among the Republicans. In brief, the chances for the rise of a Labor party, for a "Freedom Now" party, would be greatly enhanced. The polarization begun by Goldwater's capture of the Republican machine would tend to be counterbalanced by the formation of a dynamic grouping representing labor and the Negro people.

The world press is so full of speculation about the "white backlash" in the United States, that a most significant study which has just appeared in the United States seems to have been largely overlooked. This is the lead article in the July issue of the Scientific American, entitled "Attitudes toward Desegregation."

Begun in 1942, the study shows a profoundly deep shift in the attitude of whites toward integration. The shift is so deep that it is apparent in all sectors of the country, including the South, and including the areas where racist violence has flared up.

This trend was summarized by the Scientific American in 1956. The studies have now been brought up to December 1963, that is, following the March on Washington. They reveal that in such a key issue as residential integration, support among whites rose from 35 per cent in 1942 to 64 per cent at the end of last year "among all whites." Among Northern whites support rose from 42 per cent to 70 per cent and for Southern whites from 12 per cent to 51 per cent. This shift is the result -- even more significantly -- of a conversion of views.

Although the study has some weaknesses, particularly in not clearly showing the attitudes of various classes, the significance of the results is unmistakable. They show that America is not ripe for a fascist takeover. On the contrary, the ground is being prepared for an enormous push in the opposite direction. Despite the savagery of the racist minority and the fears of the middle class, the average American wants to move ahead.

THE NEW OAS SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA

Meeting in the shadow of the White House in Washington, D.C., the Organization of American States [OAS] voted harsh new sanctions July 26 against revolutionary Cuba under pretext of "punishing" the Castro government for inspiring "subversive activities" in other Latin-American countries. The vote was fifteen for, four against -- Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, and Bolivia. (In a preliminary test vote, Bolivia abstained.) The measures virtually order all Latin-American countries to end all further resistance to following the example of the United States in breaking off diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba, as well as all sea and air traffic. Exceptions -- for the time being -- were made for pharmaceutical products and foods required for "humanitarian" reasons, and the thin Havana-Mexico City air link. The measures also threaten tiny Cuba with armed assault if the "subversive activities" continue.

No deadline for compliance was placed on the four governments that displayed reluctance to participate in this shameful public display of servility to the imperialist overlord who rules the Western Hemisphere from his nuclear bastion north of the Rio Grande. The OAS Charter, however, makes compliance obligatory if a resolution is passed by a two-thirds vote. A government can drop out of the organization; but it would then meet with savage reprisals from Washington.

The Paz Estenssoro government, which has been reduced to almost puppet status in Bolivia, announced that it would abide with the dictate. It is generally supposed that Uruguay will follow suit. Chile's decision hinges on the outcome of the September elections. If an "anti-Communist" regime wins the vote or seizes power, in consonance with Washington's policy, one of the first consequences will be rupture of relations with Cuba. As for Mexico, it seems that the new president-elect will defy Mexican public opinion out of deference to the wishes of Yankee imperialism when he assumes office in November and break off relations with Cuba.

This would mean that Cuba would be encircled by a cordon sanitaire of hostile Latin-American governments such as faced the Soviet Union in its early years after the October 1917 Revolution.

The sanctions were the result of a long campaign conducted by U.S. diplomats, military representatives and spokesmen of big business. The direct agent in the operation was the reactionary Venezuelan government, whose former foreign minister toured all Latin-American capitals in a relentless campaign to line up support behind Washington in its drive against the Cuban Revolution.

In some of the most important Latin-American countries, where the "national bourgeoisie" shares power with the landholding oligarchs, the campaign met with considerable resistance over the years. They sought to maintain at least normal diplomatic relations with the

Castro government in order to strengthen the appearance of maintaining a stance of independence in relation to the Yankee colossus and also as a bargaining point. This was especially true of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Uruguay. The North American imperialists worked away persistently to undermine and erode this position. The big turning point came in April with the counterrevolutionary coup d'état carried out in Brazil in April with the blessing and connivance of the Johnson administration. One of the reasons which led the White House to decide to bring down the Goulart government was precisely its maintenance of normal diplomatic relations with Cuba; and one of the first fruits of Wall Street's victory in Brazil was the rupture of diplomatic relations with Cuba ordered by strong man Castello Branco.

The temporary defeat suffered in Brazil by the Latin-American revolution thus had grave immediate consequences for the Cuban Revolution, a fact that was appreciated perhaps most keenly by the Castro government which has repeatedly shown how well it understands that the final destiny of the Cuban Revolution is intimately linked with the fate of the revolution in the rest of Latin America.

Up to now the government of Fidel Castro has consistently pointed out that with its meager resources it was ridiculous to accuse it of seeking to "export" revolution through material aid to revolutionary movements in Latin America. This is readily apparent, since Cuba could not hope to compete with the United States whose export of material aid to counterrevolutions throughout the world runs into billions of dollars each year. The Cubans, consequently, have constantly stressed that the primary importance of Cuba is the inspiration it offers to the rest of Latin America as an example of how to overthrow dictatorships like the one headed by Batista and how to overcome the worst economic and social evils besetting the peasants and workers by taking the road to socialism. The very existence of the Cuban workers state is a constant reminder that "it can be done." This is what American imperialism has determined to bring to ruin or to smash outright.

Fresh confirmation of this analysis came immediately after the OAS meeting from no less an authoritative source than the New York Times which declared editorially [July 28 international edition]:

"The real issue in the much-feared subversion by Marxist-Leninist Cuba of Latin America is not a physical one. Premier Castro is not in a position to arm any Latin-American opposition effectively even if he wanted to. . .

"The 26th of July celebrations underline Dr. Castro's effectiveness as a subversive agent. It is the fact that he and his regime survive after more than five and a half years of turmoil, economic collapse, the exodus of a great number of middle-class and professional elements, and after everything that the United States

could do to him short of a military invasion, which gives him his greatest impact on Latin America. So long as he remains a towering figure on the hemispheric scene -- hated, feared and despised by many, loved and admired by some -- he will be a grave danger to Latin America and, because of his connections with Russia, to the United States."

The sinister aims of the U.S. State Department in relation to Cuba were clearly apparent in the violent speech delivered by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on July 22, exactly one week after the nomination of Goldwater and the day following the opening of the OAS meeting. The Paris Le Monde [July 24] noted that Rusk's speech followed the line of Goldwater's position on Cuba. This position, however, happens to be indistinguishable from the one being applied by Johnson's appointee Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. The nomination of Goldwater has, however, made it easier for the Johnson administration to drop more of the talk about democracy and reform in Latin America and to reveal more nakedly its real course which is counterrevolutionary to the core.

WHAT CASTRO REALLY SAID IN THAT INTERVIEW WITH THE NEW YORK TIMES

When the New York Times reported July 6 that Fidel Castro had allegedly offered, during an interview with Richard Eder, "to withhold material support from Latin-American revolutionary movements if the United States and its hemispheric allies would cease their material support of subversive activity against Cuba," friends of the Cuban Revolution throughout the world reacted with considerable skepticism concerning the accuracy of the account. World Outlook, for instance, said [July 17 issue], "Such an offer is quite contrary to the line Castro and his government have followed."

The Algerian publication El Moudjahid [July 11] branded the report as a "falsification." It checked with the Cuban Embassy and Prensa Latina to ascertain whether such an interview had been held and if so what had actually been said by Castro. When El Moudjahid received the official text it then offered its readers a translation of the pertinent points in the Spanish text so that they could judge for themselves as to the accuracy of the version offered by the New York Times.

Since it is of some interest, we offer the following English translation of the same passages:

"If desire to establish a dialogue exists, it is necessary to seek its form," Prime Minister Fidel Castro told a correspondent of the daily New York Times in connection with the possibility of Cuba and the United States undertaking negotiations to normalize

their relations. 'The formal initiative, whether public or private, must come from the United States because this government is the main one responsible for the situation existing between our two countries. While there is no objection to reestablishing diplomatic relations between Washington and Havana, it must be preceded by the solution of questions that are still pending.'

"The most delicate and serious problem concerns the spy flights of the 'U-2' planes. These flights began in October 1962, at the time of the air-naval blockade of the island by the United States. They have continued uninterruptedly. The North American authorities pretend that these flights are carried out for reasons of security but Cuba, for its part has never utilized such means to defend itself against the attacks of counterrevolutionaries coming from the United States.

"'If diplomatic means existed it would be possible to reach an arrangement,' Fidel Castro added. 'In order to avoid repeating incidents provoked by the North American troops at the Guantánamo base, occupied illegally by the United States, we will make a contribution: we will withdraw the Cuban sentries several hundred meters from where they are now stationed.'

"Commenting on the rupture of diplomatic relations between Cuba and Washington, Fidel Castro said: 'If the government of the United States had not adopted an aggressive attitude toward the revolution, it would not have been necessary for Cuba to reply in such a rigorous manner.

"'But it is well understood that the road it would have taken would still have been that of socialism. The Soviet Union has always shown its interest in a peaceful solution of the Cuban-North American dispute, in accordance with the desire for peace which animates the socialist camp. Nevertheless, it is equally well known that the Soviet Union has given multiple evidence of its decision to grant support to Cuba in case of aggression.

"'If relations between Cuba and the United States are not re-established within a short time,' Fidel Castro added, 'Cuba will establish commercial relations with other parts of the world -- including western Europe. It will be too late to renew trade with the United States.

"'In my opinion, the people of the United States are remote from world reality and its problems. You live tranquil lives there. With the exception of the Civil War, you have never confronted the problems experienced by the rest of the world. You center attention on work and technical progress, but you never accord sufficient attention to social and historical problems and to political ideas. That's why it is so difficult for the United States to understand that the Cuban Revolution feels no hate for the North American people.

Hate accumulates when people feel frustrated and hopeless. The Cuban people feel indignant when they are attacked but indignation is something quite different from hate.

"If the United States were disposed to live with us in accordance with international norms, then we would feel the same obligation. If Cuba financed a revolution against a government that respected it, that would violate international norms. But if we finance a revolution against a government that does not respect us, then there is no violation because there are no norms.

"The Cuban revolution is an example for the peoples who are not yet free. This is the moral aid we give to movements struggling for national sovereignty in other countries. It is the United States that furnishes material aid in trying to overthrow the revolutionary government. Cuba cannot agree to withdraw its sympathy and its aid to other revolutionary movements. [Our emphasis.] 'In brief,' Fidel Castro concluded, 'the realization of an agreement between the two governments depends fundamentally on the confidence which each side has in the good faith of the other.'"

On July 28 the New York Times published a special dispatch from Santiago de Cuba, dated July 27, reporting a statement by Castro on this point in Eder's interview. The full dispatch is as follows:

"Premier Fidel Castro said last night that the published version of his interview with a New York Times reporter earlier this month was truthful but that he had been misunderstood.

"He denied he had offered to negotiate a suspension of aid to revolutionary movements because 'aid to such movements is not negotiable.'

"He said he and the reporter discussed international norms and he added that he understood 'the need of countries to live in conformity with international norms.'

"Cuba would feel free, he said, to help any revolutionary movement in any country that did not respect Cuba."

* * *

The misunderstanding -- if such it was -- of Castro's remarks seems to have led astray only certain ultralefts who place almost religious faith in the accuracy of the New York Times. In London, for instance, the Newsletter, which voices the opinions of Gerry Healy and his Socialist Labour League, interpreted it as nothing less than an offer of "an 'Alliance for Progress' to the United States," claimed it revealed the "absolute bankruptcy" of Castro's "petty-bourgeois ideology" and "also lays bare the complete betrayal of the Cuban people by the Soviet bureaucracy."

The Newsletter utilized the misinterpretation -- or falsification -- of what Castro said to offer its readers a full page article describing how this "fact" fits in with the ultraleft thesis that "in no sense has a workers' state been established" in Cuba and that the Castro government rules a "capitalist state -- at present represented by the bonapartist dictatorship of Castro" which must be "successfully overthrown." The author, Ed Stilwell, apparently a newcomer to the columns of the Newsletter, asserts: "The recent events in Cuba have confirmed irrefutably that no petty-bourgeois leadership and party can establish a workers' state. The working class in Cuba have neither power -- nor the semblance of it -- the militia, the agrarian reform and the nationalizations notwithstanding."

And why didn't the U.S. imperialists snap up the "deal" allegedly offered by Castro to "betray" the "capitalist state" he heads? Stilwell says that "this would obviously be in the best interests of US imperialism." His explanation is that Wall Street's poor judgment is due to the "thickheadedness of the US rulers." They refuse to accept a betrayal of the capitalist state in Cuba; they reject normalization of relations; they insist on the costly business of blockading it as part of their ultimate, still more costly objective of smashing it, even at the risk of nuclear war.

Another explanation is that they are just more cautious about ascertaining the facts than is the Newsletter. They want to preserve the capitalist system in face of the socialist revolution which opened in Cuba and which promises to touch off a chain reaction throughout the Western Hemisphere. In this they display none of the thickheadedness observable in quarters where the primary concern is simply to preserve certain ultraleft dogmas.

STUDENTS SEE REVOLUTIONARY CUBA FOR THEMSELVES

LONDON -- Student youth from Europe and North America are having an opportunity to see and to evaluate the Cuban experiment first hand and to make a positive contribution to the establishment of friendly and mutually beneficial relations between their countries and Cuba.

British students have sent their first student group to the revolutionary island. Traveling by rail and sea to Rotterdam, where they joined a trade boat to Cuba, the dozen students will be guests of the Federation of University Students of Cuba.

The British students, who are from universities, technical and art colleges have taken with them, at the request of Cuban students, books on chemical engineering to assist Cuban students with their studies.

On their return, they will give reports on what they have seen and what they think about it.

In France a group of students chartered a plane to take them to Cuba. They will be accompanied by some American students. Although Cuba is only 90 miles from the U.S., these students have had to go via Europe due to the State Department ban on Americans visiting Cuba to see for themselves.

Meanwhile 75 other American students, defying the official ban on travel to one of the most interesting and instructive countries of the world, reached Havana and are now touring the island.

To demonstrate their friendly feelings, they donated blood to the Havana blood bank. Referring to the attacks on Cuba conducted under the direction of the White House, State Department and Central Intelligence Agency, the leader of the U.S. delegation said, "I should like to transfuse several drops of my blood to compensate the Cuban people for the blood they have lost."

A group of French- and English-speaking students from all parts of Canada are spending their summer vacations in Cuba. Among their projects is participation in the work of repairing the damage caused when hurricane Flora hit the island last October.

BRITAIN'S BIG MAIL PILE UP

By Alan Adair

LONDON, July 27 -- For the first time since 1891, Britain's 120,000 postmen resorted to strike action. After banning overtime and Sunday work, enforcing rules-book regulations, and organizing "guerrilla" strikes -- all of which led to a monumental pile up of mail, they staged a nation-wide, one-day strike July 16 and then threatened to make it indefinite. In face of this stand, Postmaster General Bevin conceded a six and a half per cent wage increase, retroactive to January 1 and promised a serious study of pay scales which have fallen far behind comparable trades.

The July 16 stoppage scored a spectacular success. On that day not a mail van moved. Not a letter was delivered. With most of the country's 10,000 post boxes unopened, police tried desperately to put "box full" signs on those overflowing with letters. Not a stamp was sold. Graveyard quiet descended on 2,000 sorting depots.

Out of 5,000 workers at London's Mount Pleasant sorting office, only five reported for duty. Post office officials admitted that less than 100 of London's 25,000 postmen were at work, only ten in Liverpool, one in Nottingham, two in Edinburgh, twelve in Glasgow and

a "handful" in some country districts.

The backlog of undelivered mail rose to 35,500,000 pieces. The figure was "uncertain," however, due to the "accumulation of unopened bags." It was not reported who counted the letters dumped out for processing.

Banner-waving strikers were on the march in Glasgow, Birmingham, Leeds and scores of other cities. In the biggest trade-union rally in twenty years, more than 20,000 marched into Hyde Park in London.

The dispute had long been smouldering. It flared into an acute crisis July 9 when Bevin told the Union of Post Office Workers [UPW] that four per cent was his top offer and that there would have to be a further "inquiry" before anything more could even be considered. He was only repeating what he had said last April. The UPW had rejected his offer then but had submitted to waiting for the report of a special committee of inquiry. [See World Outlook April 24.] Bevin blandly argued that this new inquiry "need not take more than another two months."

Even before Bevin's stalling maneuver became public, workers had started to vote with their feet. An estimated 10,000 postmen, many still in uniform and carrying banners, converged upon the General Post Office headquarters at St. Martins-le-Grand where negotiations were taking place.

Addressing the angry demonstrators in a park nearby, UPW General Secretary Ron Smith said that the union executive had rejected the government's proposals and had decided to call a one-day strike on Thursday July 16.

"Why not now?" the crowd roared. "Why not tomorrow?"

With difficulty, Smith pleaded for silence. He urged the members to strike "not in anger" but in a "cool and disciplined way."

As the booing crowd grew more boisterous, Smith was escorted out of the park by half a dozen policemen.

By this time, Paddington workers had already staged a one-hour strike. Hammersmith postmen had taken similar action and went out again within eighteen hours. Chiswick joined in and stopped work again for an hour in the evening. Similar stoppages flared up in most parts of the country during the next 24 hours. At hastily called meetings (on the job), resolutions were passed banning overtime and Sunday work, effective at once.

The government reacted by suspending domestic parcel services and printed papers. They also urged the general public to stop using the postal system. The mail continued to accumulate, however, in

mountainous proportions.

Support for the postmen was evident everywhere. In Parliament, Labour MP's defended the "unofficial" stoppages. Unions offered huge loans.

As for the UPW leaders, they acted like most bureaucrats when they feel their chair seats getting warm. There was much wriggling. They did everything possible to avert strike action but finally went along. In face of the solidarity of the rank and file and their increasing initiative, the 29-man executive voted unanimously for an indefinite strike beginning midnight July 25. This forced Bevins to concede.

The union demand was for a ten per cent increase; and the power demonstrated by the union in action showed that this could have been gained under a leadership with anything stiffer than jelly in their spines. That many postmen have begun to think seriously about the need for more able and less cowardly leaders was one of the more interesting aspects of the strike. The Times noted this [July 15], its labour correspondent declaring:

"Quite apart from the desirability of restoring postal services to normal and preventing further dislocation, there is an internal problem facing the unions which, if left unresolved, could have serious repercussions in the future. The postmen who are taking 'unofficial action' in defiance of union instructions are led in many cases of 'left-wing agitators.' These men are rapidly gaining prestige and a reputation for militant action while the official leadership is apparently hesitant and over-moderate.

"When the next annual elections are held for the executive, left-wing candidates may win many more seats as a result of the popularity they are now gaining. This could colour the whole policy of the union, constitute a danger to the smooth relations with the Post Office and maintain an ever-present risk of a repetition of the kind of troubles now being fomented."

What we are seeing in Britain today is the radicalization of sectors of the working class that have been traditionally conservative in outlook. Nurses, white-collar workers, school teachers, scientific and professional workers have all been involved in struggles for higher wages. A political indication of this development was the recent application of the highly skilled Post Office Engineering Union to affiliate to the Labour party.

Up to now postmen have been regarded as civil servants, "faithful to the crown" and too conservative to engage in struggle. The experience of the strike struggle shows that this image is now outmoded.

HOT GAMBLING TIP -- BUY BRITISH

LONDON -- Nowhere in England can the true pulse of class relations be taken more accurately than in the famous City -- the financial district. For months this community has been in turmoil over the prospect of a Labour victory in the October election. Experts have been practically wrecking computers trying to devise various hedges against such a calamity, making up suitable portfolios of local and foreign stocks, government bonds and equities that might give their coupon-clipping clientele the best life raft.

Private companies have been rushing feverishly to convert themselves into public enterprises so as to take advantage of membership in the Stock Exchange Club and the favorable conditions granted to capital issues by the Tories. But the worst worries are evident among the big trusts and cartels, who scheme day and night against the threat so clearly poised over their vested interest. The following items from the July 9 Evening Standard indicates how ingenious some of the calculations are:

* * *

Some fascinating cross-Atlantic moves are going on which could have a noticeable effect on share prices in some of the more unfashionable market sections.

They result from advice which one or two of the more astute merchant bankers are giving their clients, particularly in industries like heavy engineering and special steel making.

The Labour Party is now on record disclaiming nationalisation ambitions beyond steel, road haulage, water and urban land. So in theory, the directors of these companies ought to have nothing to fear.

But even without attributing any double-think to the Socialists, they still don't find it easy to sleep peacefully at night.

Special circumstances might crop up, they fear, which might lead to nationalisation in their industries. A second term of office for Labour, for instance. Or an unexpectedly heavy Labour majority this time.

The question they posed to their advisors, therefore, was this: How do we make ourself nationalisation-proof?

The answer was a subtle one. A Labour Government would obviously have to make a particularly great effort to keep Anglo-American relations happy.

Now, one thing more than any other would be calculated to put

America in a huff: a Labour grab of companies with significant numbers of American shareholders. Particularly if the take-over was on poor terms.

Conclusion: Get yourself some American shareholders -- and keep the share price up.

This is what the companies were told. And the result -- a notable increase in trans-Atlantic travel by merchant bankers (and others) out to interest American institutions and private investors in the companies for which they act.

On the whole, their trips seem to have been successful, and close market observers have already noticed U.S. investment interest in some unexpected shares.

Davy-Ashmore, for instance, has been boosted by U.S. buying. So have one or two others.

MIXED RESPONSE TO NEW CIVIL-RIGHTS LAW IN U.S.

By Evelyn Sell

When President Johnson signed the civil-rights bill before a nation-wide television audience July 2 [eve of the holiday marking adoption of the Declaration of Independence by the subversive Continental Congress in 1776], he sought to make it a historic occasion as part of his presidential election campaign propaganda. "My fellow citizens," he said, "we have come now to a time of testing. We must not fail. . . This civil-rights act is a challenge to all of us to go to work in our communities and our states, in our homes and in our hearts, to eliminate the last vestiges of injustice in our beloved America."

The new civil-rights law does strengthen legal rights in this field. The effectiveness of these rights would seem to hinge, however, on the resoluteness with which the freedom fighters continue their battles from coast to coast.

A sampling of opinion indicates the varies response which the new legislation met with in different circles:

* * *

Pennsylvania Governor William Scranton voiced the views of the liberal wing of the Republican party. [This was before Goldwater nailed their hides to the wall of his Arizona bunk house]. "From 1940 until 1957," he said, "Lyndon Johnson voted with the Dixie Demo-

crats 100 per cent of the time. He voted six times against proposals to abolish the poll tax. . . twice against the anti-lynching laws. . . six times against proposals to bar discrimination in federal programs. . . twice in favor of segregation in the armed forces. . . and once in favor of perpetuating segregation in the District of Columbia."

* * *

A white waitress in a Morrison cafeteria, the South's largest cafeteria chain, asked, "May I help you?" She was addressing two Negro men who had previously been arrested for trying to obtain service in the very same cafeteria.

The chain's president stated: "We're going to obey the law. There is no other way. We can't buck the federal government."

* * *

Sign in window of a Charlottesville, Virginia, restaurant which had been in business 27 years: "Closed to the public this 2nd day of July, 1964 at 6:57 p.m. Passage of the Civil Rights Bill forced us to take this unfortunate action."

* * *

Members of the Fayetteville Restaurant Association in North Carolina announced: "We are loyal Americans and we will obey the law."

The sentiment was echoed by the directors of the Georgia Restaurant Association who said: "We have no alternative but to comply."

* * *

"Get off my property," shouted Lester Maddox, restaurant owner in Atlanta, Georgia, when three Negro ministers drove up to his eating place.

"Get some ax handles for those customers," he directed as he waved his gun, kicked the side of the Negroes' car and whacked the top of the car with an ax handle.

After the incident he told the ax-handle brigade of 200 whites, "Everybody turn in your handles so we'll have them for the next time."

Maddox said: "I'll use ax handles, I'll use guns, my fists, my customers -- this property belongs to me."

* * *

Atlanta's Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., commenting on the new civil-

rights law: ". . . now the Negro has the responsibility to be a courteous and law-abiding winner."

* * *

Instructions sent out by the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] to its Southern chapters: "Be ready to make a start -- even though a modest one -- by July 4th. First of all, quickly survey your city to determine how many facilities of accommodation there are (i.e., restaurants, hotels, theaters, etc.). . . Second, try to determine which will be the least resistant. Place those first on the list. . . Where we cannot implement the bill by negotiation, we will again resort to the sit-in, stand-in and other demonstrations of this type."

* * *

A South Carolina hotel man, who wouldn't allow newspaper reporters to use his name: ". . . when the tests have died down, things won't be much different from the way they have been."

* * *

Detroit Free Press editorial, July 4: "'Progress whets the appetite for more progress,' said Rev. King. But force is met with force, and if the integration leaders resort to force, to harassment, to stretching the letter of the law to suit their convenience, they can expect the same tactics in return.

"Between the two extremes of the determined and the diehards, there is plenty of room for peaceful progress."

* * *

"I walked down the steps with three Negroes and people jeered and booed us. We sat down and all of a sudden people picked up chairs and started to hit us over the head. I put my arms over my head to protect myself and took off my glasses. I got separated from the others. A white man covered my head with his body and led me out. He was hit by the crowd."

The speaker here is 19-year-old Karen Haberman, a white student who attended a Georgia Independence Day rally with fellow members of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee [SNCC]. The featured speaker at the rally was Ross Barnett, former governor of Mississippi. The organizer of the rally was a states rights group called the American Patriots. One of its leaders is Lester Maddox -- the gun-waving, ax handle brandishing restaurant owner already quoted.

* * *

The Ku Klux Klan distributed leaflets in Mississippi urging

whites "to stand back and to avoid conflict. . . these people want Mississippi placed under martial law."

* * *

"If Mississippi broke out in shootings or killings this summer do you think President Johnson should send in Federal troops to keep peace and order, or do you think local and state police should handle the situation?" asked the Harris survey. Of those interviewed across the nation, 71% favored sending in federal troops, 20% were against such action and 9% weren't sure. In the east, midwest and west, almost 80% would favor such action.

* * *

Negro newspaperman and author Louis Lomax: "Just after the civil rights bill passed the Senate both James Farmer and Martin Luther King, Jr., let it be known that they were readying squads of people to test enforcement of the new measure in various Southern cities.

"The NAACP's Roy Wilkins publicly chastised Farmer and King for engaging in a race toward militancy for militancy's sake. . . For what it is worth, this is my view: Negroes should not rush into hotels, motels, and other previously all-white Southern establishments while the ink is still wet on the civil rights bill. Freedom does not come by law alone; it takes a solid degree of general acceptance. . . It is a time for Negro statesmanship."

* * *

On the day the civil-rights bill was signed by President Johnson a closed session of the annual convention of CORE upheld the expulsion of Julius Hobson, head of the Washington chapter.

Hobson explained his expulsion in this way: "The Brooklyn CORE chapter was suspended for advocating the World's Fair stall-in. We supported the Brooklyn position. Our militancy has got us into trouble with the [financial] contributors to CORE. I'm speaking specifically of the big contributors. . . We want to be more militant."

A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN POUJADE AND GOLDWATER

André Frossard, satirical columnist of the Paris daily Le Figaro, discovered a number of reassuring differences between the Fascist-like Poujadist movement in France and "Goldwaterism." However, he found one "less reassuring" difference: "The French Poujade had no chance of becoming president of the United States, while the Arizona Poujade tomorrow may be president of the free world."

"THROW WALLACE TO THE LIONS," SAY TORONTO PICKETS

TORONTO -- Thousands of Torontonians demonstrated their solidarity with the U.S. Negro "Freedom Now" struggle on the evening of July 8 and again in the forenoon of July 9. Massive picket lines protested the presence of Alabama's racist Governor George Wallace as guest speaker at the international convention of the Lions [a fraternal order].

As the convention opened July 8, almost a thousand whites, with a sprinkling of Negroes and a very high proportion of youth, circled Maple Leaf Gardens in the heart of downtown Toronto.

The Lions had to run a gauntlet of pickets who sang "We Shall Overcome." Placards read: "Throw Wallace to the Lions"; "Segregation -- Democracy's Enemy"; "We Need to Extend Civil Rights in Canada, Too."

Several hundred well wishers lined other sides of the streets where the police maintained a horse-mounted squad in reserve in case any Lions found themselves mouse-trapped.

The demonstration was called by eighteen organizations and the Toronto and District Labor Council which had urged city authorities to deny Wallace the usual civic reception.

The pickets were headed by Rabbi Feinberg, a prominent spokesman of the antinuclear arms movement, and David Lewis, a vice-president of Canadian labor's New Democratic party.

The next morning Toronto unions repeated the demonstration.

Two other demonstrations occurred spontaneously during the giant evening downtown rally. A group of demonstrators appeared at Toronto's international airport to meet Wallace as he landed in his private plane emblazoned with the Stars and Stripes and the flag of the slave-holding Confederacy. He was accompanied by body guards and a squad of heavily armed Alabama state troopers. The Canadian pickets found it an unusual sight.

Another group of demonstrators met him as he arrived at the posh Royal York hotel. Here he was flanked by a busload of Royal Canadian Mounted Police who quickly whisked the Southern gentleman up to his suite.

These indignant and massive protests sharply cut across all the hoopla and shenanigans of the 35,000 Lions who jammed hotels and night clubs and tied up city traffic with their parading. Governor Wallace's address, which followed formal welcomes from city officials, was restrained.

WILL THE CHILEAN COMMUNIST PARTY PROVE TO BE AN EXCEPTION?

By Emmanuel Aguinaldo

MEXICO, D.F. -- The September election in Chile will be the most important political event in Hispanic America and perhaps in the world this year. The Communist party of Chile, together with other parties of the left, is running the socialist Salvador Allende as candidate for the presidency. In all their political analyses they consider it certain that the FRAP [Frente Revolucionario de Acción Popular] will triumph and that this will therefore signify a triumph for the Stalinist-Khrushchevist thesis of the possibility of social revolution through peaceful means. Consequently all the progressive circles in the Americas are watching the southern republic. There, in September, the prestige of the last stronghold of the Latin-American Communist parties is at stake. The triumph or defeat of Allende will accelerate or retard the development of the revolution in all the other countries of the continent.

No one has discounted the possibility that imperialism, in collaboration with the oligarchy and its "gorilas" ["gorillas" -- reactionary military figures] will again utilize its many skills and vast experience in resorting to force. Likewise no one doubts that in destroying "democracies" in the name of democracy they are really invincible. A long history of gorilazos [seizure of power by the "gorillas"] -- mounting in recent years -- demonstrates this. After the Cuban Revolution, under pretext of containing "international Communism" (meaning poor, hungry peasants and workers), military coups d'état have become the order of the day. Those carried out in Argentina, Peru, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, the Dominican Republic and Brazil have shown that imperialism and the officer caste seize power whenever and wherever they feel like it, with utmost ease. Apparently they have become invincible.

In reality they are not so invincible as they appear at first sight, as the Cuban Revolution itself demonstrates. What happened is that the manifest vulnerability, the opportunism and low militancy of the leaderships of the Communist parties of Hispanic America, gave them invincibility. To all this should be added their lack of organization, their sectarianism, and their provincialism which does not permit them to conceive the socialist revolution on a world scale. Besides this the political ignorance of many of their leading cadres. The evidence of this is mountainous.

To list a few cases, above all of sectarianism, let us begin with Codovilla accusing the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario] of being Nazi; Blas Roca, major Communist leader of Cuba, refusing to collaborate with the July 26 Movement until just before Fidel Castro took power, holding that it was a putschist movement; the Peruvian Communists avoiding giving any aid to the peasant militia of Hugo Blanco because Blanco was Trotskyist and consequently, to

them, a revisionist and provocateur. We also have in Brazil Luis Carlos Prestes, the ex-knight of hope, making out that the revolution can be carried out with hugs and kisses; and the Ecuadorian Communist leaders waiting for Moscow to give the green light, not to begin the armed struggle, but to support the lesser evil bourgeois candidate.

They argue that so long as the governments of the "representative democracies" permit a little play for democracy it is necessary to take advantage of democratic freedoms to struggle at all levels, mainly the parliamentary one. It is necessary to exhaust all peaceful means -- they say, not very ingenuously -- and they dedicate themselves to writing apologetic novels on the misery of the Indian and pseudorevolutionary poetry. They convert themselves into monopolists of the national culture and into receivers of world cultural currents. They know all about the influence of Kafka, of Thomas Mann or of Wasserman on this or that writer but they don't know anything about what Marx or Lenin or Trotsky said with regard to the world revolution.

Doubtlessly they do struggle in reality at all levels, with the exception, it is certain, of the most important: the underground. Even worse, not only do they fail in this but they lie to the cadres and rank and file members, telling them that they're ready for the underground and even have a military apparatus, as was the case in Ecuador before the coup d'état of July 11, 1963.

In this way, when the primates of the State Department and their congeners, the national gorilas, decide that enough rope has been given the Stalinists they do not run into the least problem or the least resistance in changing the order of things. Bruskiy, the small gains acquired by the Stalinist Communists in their struggle "at all levels," are undone. The most revolutionary cadres, who are generally not in the leadership, are sent into exile or placed in prison when they are not murdered in the most brutal and inhuman way.

Torture, whether of Communists or non-Communists, since they torture everyone who is not in agreement with the military caste, becomes more and more common. In short, all the "subjective conditions" (in quotation marks) are destroyed. After this, many Communists continue desperate attempts to appear as martyrs and therefore genuine revolutionary Marxists, citing as proof of this the number of cases of imprisonment and torture. Against this pedestrian argument we hold that if the revolutionary character of an organization or of a sector of the population is to be measured by the number of victims it should be measured by their fewness, since this would be concrete proof of the efficiency of the revolutionary organization. Contrariwise we would have to admit that the five million Jews who perished under the Nazi regime constituted the most revolutionary sector of the European population; and that the hundreds of members of the Nicaraguan Conservative party who fell in the slaughters organized by the Somozas were also the most revolutionary elements

of this Central American country.

As for the provincial outlook of the members of the Communist parties of Latin America, this is a weight that pulls the revolutionary movement away from the international level, since, despite calling themselves Marxist-Leninists, they hold the same nationalist prejudices as the rest of the population. Like any other citizen, they never forget for one moment the grudges created by the bourgeois governments in the history of these countries, like the border conflicts between Ecuador-Peru, Peru-Bolivia, Bolivia-Chile, Chile-Argentina, etc. Many of them, out of antipathies like these, get so that they don't want to know anything about the comrades of another country. And since in many places, these parties are completely "electoral" and not revolutionary, it is natural that like the bourgeois parties, demands related to these grudges serve them as slogans in their electoral propaganda.

Naturally this electoral propaganda is never aimed at winning the presidency for one of their own members, as would at least be logical; it is always done in backing a member of the ruling bourgeoisie. For example, Lombardo Toledano and his party supported the president just elected in Mexico, Díaz Ordaz. The Ecuadorian Communists supported Velasco Ibarra in 1944 and Carlos Julio Arosmena in 1961. The Chilean Communists displayed unconditional servility with regard to González Videla in 1948.

In the three latter instances, persecution was not long in coming from the man they had helped lift into power. No one will forget the unconditional support which Carlos Prestes gave Vargas in 1945 after being held nine years in prison by the dictator.

In the light of all this, is it possible to believe that the Chilean Communist party has learned the lesson? Are they prepared for the coup d'état which the reaction will attempt? Or, on the contrary, are they hoodwinking the working class, leading it to believe that they are ready for the underground and for the armed struggle, the way the opportunist leaders of the Ecuadorian CP did? And if they gain power by means of the ballot box, are they ready to carry out the socio-economic and political reforms they have pledged although the country may be plunged into a civil war, or are they confining themselves to bourgeois reformist measures in order not to arouse the ire of the State Department? These questions will be answered in a short time.

The Chilean Communist party is the only one in Latin America that proved capable of gaining big influence among the masses. Its commitment before the working class and the peasantry is much greater than that of the CP's in other countries of the continent. Its success or failure will accelerate or set back the social revolution in the rest of the Hispanic American countries as we said at the beginning of this article. What is really a fact is that its failure, if

this occurs, will be the last failure of the Communist parties of Latin America, and we say that it will be the last because its disappearance as a party seeking the adherence of the proletariat will be definitive. In the September election it faces a decisive test.

INDIAN COMMUNIST PARTY OPPOSITION HOLDS CONVENTION

By A. Raheem

MADRAS -- The left-wing leaders who are opposed to the opportunist leadership of S.A.Dange in the Communist party of India [CPI] began a six-day convention July 7 in Tenali, a district town in Guntur (Andhra state), amidst indications that they would decide to form a new Communist party. Nearly 130 delegates were attending.

The largest contingent came from Andhra, West Bengal, Kerala, Tamil Nad, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra. The convention was called after hectic earlier attempts in Delhi at a rapprochement between the two rival factions had failed.

Hoisting a red flag at the opening of the meeting, Muzaffer Ahmed, a veteran Communist leader from West Bengal, gave the call for formation of a new party. "Let us begin a new chapter in the life of the Communist party of India with the hoisting of this red flag," he said. "Let us start the real Communist party of India."

The prolonged and warm applause which greeted this brief speech pointed to the outcome of the convention.

On the first day the delegates were given four documents as the basis for discussion: (1) A draft programme for the party drawn up by 31 members of the national council who had been suspended by the Dange leadership. (2) A note about the programme by E.M.S. Namboodiripad. (3) A paper on the movement prepared by 11 leftist leaders, including A.K.Gopalan, Sundarayya and Basavapunniah. (4) Another paper prepared by Jyoti Basu (Bengal).

Namboodiripad, in his note, warned the party that unless it firmly adhered to the political line adopted at Vijayawada (1961), based its ideological work on the Hyderabad resolutions (1962) and reoriented the party's activities on the India-China border question, "the enemies of the party would deal devastating blows first on one faction and then on the other. The responsibility for these developments rests on the majority as well as on the minority of the national council."

He said that factionalism in the party could not be abolished by calling the left wingers an "antiparty group" or by calling the majority "revisionists."

The document prepared by the 11 left leaders charged the official leadership with deliberately committing the party "in an uncritical and factional manner to all positions taken by the Soviet Communist party."

The signatories to the paper said they had differences with both the Chinese and Soviet positions on the present Indian state, the nature of the government and its leadership. They said they were opposed to "a vulgarisation of the issue by both sides."

Jyoti Basu's paper said that from the latest developments in the world Communist movement it appeared that both revisionism and left sectarianism were dangerous. It said that as an independent unit in the world movement, the Communist party of India could not "remain idle in the great debate."

While the Soviet Union could not be said to be "in league with U.S. imperialism," as alleged by the Chinese, neither was the "Chinese party showing a Trotskyite turn." China might adopt "a posture of revolutionary impatience or left sectarian attitude," but it was "a force to contend with in Africa, Asia and Latin America."

The convention elected a three-man presidium consisting of A.K.Gopalan (Kerala), Jyoti Basu (Bengal) and Siva Kumar (Tamil Nad).

The presidium submitted resolutions condoling the death of Nehru and hailing the martyrs of the Communist party of India.

Harekishan Surjit of Punjab then made a report on the talks that Jyoti Basu and Promode Das Gupta had with the committee on party unity appointed by the official secretariat of the CPI.

The convention next heard reports from delegates from various states on the present standing of the leftists as a result of the situation created by the expulsion of 32 members of the national council.

A convention spokesman told newsmen that according to reports received from Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Tamil Nad and Madhya Pradesh, the leftists had a support of 70% in Andhra and Tamil Nad and 80% in Kerala. In Madhya Pradesh, where the entire leadership was with the rightists, the rank and file had revolted.

On the second day of the convention, the left CP leaders claimed overwhelming support for their faction in the CPI and openly spurned unity proposals from the official "rightist leadership."

P. Ramamurthi, Tamil Nad Communist leader, described the rightist proposals for unity as a "manoeuvre" to win hitherto uncommitted members to the rightist side. They were "foredoomed to failure like earlier proposals," he added.

This was a clear indication that vacillating "centrist" leaders like Namboodiripad and Jyoti Basu, who had favored unity talks with the official leadership, had been won over to the idea of forming a new party.

Ramamurthi said that Namboodiripad had reported to the convention on the recent unity talks with the rightist leaders. According to him, it was clear that the official leadership did not want to have a real and democratic party congress at which issues would be decided by majority verdict.

He said that this was proved by the manner in which the central secretariat dealt with the 1961 membership issue (the Dangeite leadership had been charged with deliberately padding membership rolls) and the probe into the "Dange letters" episode (Dange's letters to British officials in 1924 allegedly offering to serve as an agent).

PHOTOS OF CUBAN REVOLUTION SHOWN IN BOMBAY

BOMBAY -- A four-day photographic exhibition entitled "Ten Years of the Cuban Revolution" was opened here in the famous Jehangir Art Gallery June 22 by Mayor B.P.Divgi under auspices of the Indo-Cuban Society of Bombay.

It was a vivid record of the revolutionary struggle of the Cuban people for national liberation and establishment of a socialist society.

The opening of the exhibition was chaired by R.K.Karanjia, editor of a mass circulation weekly in Bombay. Speeches were given by S.S.Mirajkar, president of the All-India Trade Union Congress, Miss Kapila Khandwala, a prominent leader of the women's movement, Balraj Sahani, a film star noted for his leftist views, and S.B.Kolpe, president of the Indo-Cuban Society.

Featured guests were Martin Mora, Cuba's chargé d'affaires in Delhi, and his wife Albertina. Mora made an effective speech expressing the determination of the Cuban people to resist the aggressive designs of U.S. imperialism in solidarity with the oppressed peoples in Latin America and other parts of the world.

With about 300 photographs, the exhibition high-lighted Cuba's past, revolutionary struggles against the Batista dictatorship, the valiant and memorable victory over U.S. imperialism at Playa Girón, and the achievements of the Revolution in various fields.

The exhibition was shown earlier at Delhi, but some photographs showing the battle of Playa Girón had to be withdrawn due to

the advice of India's External Affairs Ministry. This was in response to a protest lodged by the U.S. embassy. The U.S. consulate in Bombay also lodged a protest, it seems, over the authorities of the art gallery permitting an exhibition depicting the Cuban Revolution.

Nearly 5,000 people visited the Bombay exhibition. Some of them expressed their appreciation in an "opinions book." Scores of youth expressed their desire to join the Indo-Cuban Society.

The Indo-Cuban Society planned to hold a rally July 26 in observance of Cuba's national holiday.

GERMAN METAL WORKERS WIN FAVORABLE AGREEMENT

FRANKFORT -- In 1963 Germany was shaken by the big strike of the metal workers organized in the IG Metall [Industrie-Gewerkschaft Metall] which was followed by a lockout of about 350,000 metal workers in the Land Baden-Württemberg.

This year the employers decided not to risk a big strike during a major boom. Unlike last year when the employers' organization started with "no offer," they agreed in negotiations to grant considerable concessions, thus assuring "social peace" until the new contract ends, December 31, 1965, after the September 1965 elections.

Negotiations began some months ago. A principal union demand was a boost in vacation pay of 10 DM [\$2.50] a day. The employers countered by asserting their principle that wages should reflect "personal performance." They are against "social wages" such as equal vacation pay for everybody.

In addition the workers demanded a contract in which questions involving job conditions should be taken up with IG Metall.

To appreciate the advance which this demand represents, it is necessary to know that under German law shop stewards are not union representatives but representatives of the "common weal" of the enterprise. Although about eighty per cent of them belong to IG Metall, their position is ambivalent. Under pressure from the union, workers on the job and the employers, they generally respond to the greatest pressure. During a strike they do not dare go against the workers on whose votes they depend for election. But after a strike they often become pliable to management which attempts to set them against the union.

Employers are quite willing to conclude "enterprise agreements" with the shop stewards, sometimes granting substantial concessions to "their" workers. But these agreements have no legal standing and

can easily be revoked. In contrast, the employers are resistant to concluding special enterprise agreements with the union. They are particularly concerned about blocking union representatives on the job, the so-called "Vertrauensleute," or "men of confidence," from gaining the legal or contractual status enjoyed by the shop stewards.

After some hard bargaining, the employers in the metal industry agreed to wage increases and, longer vacations, and a boost in vacation pay. They did not grant the demand for direct union representation on the job.

A wage increase of six per cent is to begin October 1 to be followed by another increase of three per cent on July 1, 1965.

Longer holidays begin this year and will be increased each year until they reach 24 paid days in 1967 for all workers older than 30. The age group 25-30 gets 22 days; 18-25 is immediately granted 17 days; in 1965, 18 days; and 1967, 19 days. (Workers under 18 get 24 days paid leave by law.)

On paid holiday pay, a bonus of 30 per cent was agreed to.

In addition, following a membership drive that increased the union rolls from five per cent to 30 per cent of the workers, IG Metall won a contract at the Ford plant in Cologne.

There is no doubt that the agreement is one of the best ever gained by a German union. For the first time an industry covering 4,000,000 workers acceded to the principle of a holiday bonus, and four-weeks paid vacation is now within sight for all those older than thirty.

The agreement met with acclaim among the metal workers. At the same time it should be noted that the victory followed the familiar pattern of negotiations at the top that did not involve the mobilization of the ranks. In addition, the union is still denied the fundamental right of direct involvement in handling disputes over job conditions. Thus the employers can more easily seek to compensate for the wage concessions by speed ups and other ways of intensifying labor.

Resistance among the employers to granting the concessions came mainly from the small and middle brackets. The big industrial bosses, however, preferred to buy industrial peace, even at the expense of the smaller operators.

Thus the agreement will give fresh impulse to the tendency to concentration of capital in Germany.

NEW ZEALANDERS PROTEST FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS

CHRISTCHURCH -- There is, in New Zealand, considerable opposition to the proposed French nuclear tests in the Pacific. Organisations as diverse as the Federation of Labour, the Townswomen's Guild, Federated Farmers and the Post Primary Teachers' Association have all made strong protests to the New Zealand government, and the government, in turn, has protested to the French government, but to no avail.

The most prominent organisation directing such protests is the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament [CND], whose sole function is embodied in its name. This group is controlled by petty-bourgeois and Christian pacifist elements, and there is very little participation in its activities by the workers.

The CND at present appears to be incapable of going beyond the tactic of petitions and trying to influence New Zealand's political decision-makers. Thus it tends to become a mere pressure group which relies on parliament to lead the country against the French tests.

The main activity of the CND has been circulating an Open Letter to de Gaulle which is supposed to be signed by organisations rather than by individuals. Both the New Zealand Labour party and the Federation of Labour have called for a consumers' boycott of French goods as a form of protest, but the CND, fearful of being called a "front" organisation with a left-wing political bias, has done nothing in support of this.

Last year the CND circulated a petition calling for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Southern Hemisphere. This petition was signed by 83,000 people out of a total population of some 2,500,000. Since its circulation was limited to half a dozen towns, this was quite exceptional.

The Labour party included advocacy of this nuclear-free zone in its policy for the 1963 general election. The CND refused to give public support to the Labour party for fear of alienating potential support from the National (right-wing) party. This party was returned as the government, and the CND now finds itself pressuring the government to do something about the nuclear-free zone and the proposed French tests.

Labour party proposals for a boycott had frightened the CND; but six months later, one of CND's supporters in the House of Representatives, S.A. Whitehead (a Labour party member) started action on a motion calling for New Zealand to take the initiative in convoking a conference to discuss the nuclear-free zone proposals. It seems likely that the Labour members of parliament generally will support this, but the CND still thinks it can remain neutral politically

without jeopardising its own support and acceptance of its programme. In support of this proposal pickets demonstrated before the House of Representatives.

The national committee of the CND has supported in principle, although it has done nothing concretely to assist, a proposal to send a boat into the test area to dramatise New Zealand's protest against any more nuclear tests in the Pacific.

NEW ZEALAND CND "OPEN LETTER TO DE GAULLE"

[The following is the text of an Open Letter to de Gaulle being circulated in New Zealand by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.]

* * *

Dear President De Gaulle,

In January 1964 your Defence Minister, M. Messmer, stated in Tahiti that "to his knowledge there had not really been any protests about the French plans to test nuclear weapons in the South Pacific from the Australian or New Zealand Governments." But the fact is that our New Zealand Government formally protested in May 1963 and a formal acknowledgement was received in July 1963. Throughout the country the indignation of New Zealanders is intense, far beyond any formal protest.

The right to conduct these tests in the name of national independence, strength and prestige, if claimed by every nation on earth, can lead only to the destruction of all. On the other hand the most important finding from the tests held already is that the world dare not countenance any more of them.

The partial test-ban treaty gave us hope that the spread of nuclear weapons would be checked and the arms race slowed down. We appeal to France, so often a friend and ally of this country, not to destroy this hope. France will gain increased respect everywhere if she will sign the treaty.

We are concerned for the wellbeing of our Island neighbours, some of whom are under our direct protection. Mothers fear for the health of their children. Farmers wish to protect their produce from contamination by possible fall-out.

The organisations who have signed this letter have a variety of aims, but the letter has only one aim. We beg France to turn away from the dangerous policy followed in testing nuclear weapons,

to withdraw this threat from the Pacific Ocean, and to exercise with us the duty of civilised nations to protect the Island peoples and the health of future generations.

MAORIS MOVING TOWARD TOWNS

CHRISTCHURCH -- The position of the Maori people in New Zealand society is becoming of increasing concern to socialists. There is a tendency for the Maoris to move, at an ever faster rate from the rural areas, where for generations they have been leading a semicomunal existence, to the towns.

When they arrive, they are not socially or academically educated to cope with a commercial and urban way of life. Thus they inevitably converge -- almost as an entire race -- into the working class. Nor do they usually enter the ranks of the proletariat as skilled tradesmen; they come as unskilled labourers.

Receiving, generally, the lowest wage rates for such work, they can afford only the cheapest housing. This makes for a tendency, which, while not yet pronounced, is still perceptible, towards the creation of "ghettoes."

The Labour party's solution for this problem is decentralisation of industry, it being the intention to provide employment for the Maoris in the countryside so that they do not have to move to the towns to find jobs.

Such a solution is, however, impracticable, not merely because it would consolidate the present isolation of the Maori and reinforce his social separateness as a race, but also on economic grounds. The small decentralised industries the Labour party envisages could not conceivably operate on the scale necessary to make them efficient. This applies whether these industries are intended to be capitalist or socialist -- and it is unlikely that the Labour party is proposing the latter. As at the moment, 37 per cent of New Zealand's factories employ less than six workers, and this situation of industrial underdevelopment is hardly one in which decentralisation should be encouraged.

What is needed is state establishments and workers control of large industries, as this would encourage the class consciousness which the workers must develop as a prerequisite to inauguration of a socialist society.

FRIAS WINS RELEASE FROM PRISON

Ismael Frias, a Peruvian Trotskyist, and Oswaldo Walderramane and Alejandro Vento, two leaders of the metal workers union, who were arrested in Lima May 29, apparently in connection with strike activities of the metal workers and bank employes, have been released, according to the July 25 Algiers weekly Révolution Africaine.

Frias, who recently spent some months in Algiers, sent the publication a letter of thanks for protesting his arrest.

He also called attention to the continued imprisonment of Hugo Blanco and said that the life of the Trotskyist peasant leader is still in danger.

VENEZUELA'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

The Question of Guerrilla Warfare

[This is a continuation of the interview held by a representative of the Venezuelan Committee of the Fourth International with Commandante Elias Manuitt in the mountains of Falcon. See World Outlook June 26 and July 3 for previous installments.]

* * *

Q: Why does the FALN maintain that the line of armed struggle in Venezuela is the line of victory? What are the perspectives for the revolutionary war in Venezuela?

A: I think that the first question has already been answered. That is to say, the only means whereby our people can win liberation is with weapons in hand. The perspectives I see are tied in with what we have seen develop up to now. Today we have four guerrilla fronts in the country, totally stabilized. They have repelled all of the enemy's attacks successfully. . . .

The most recent specific case of action with the enemy was the case of Trujillo [state] where the enemy deployed 2,500 men in the infamous and unsuccessful "Operation Tenaza." They tried to intimidate the valiant, heroic guerrillas operating in Trujillo and they came down gloomy and defeated. They had issued all kinds of publicity about how they were going to wipe out the guerrillas in Trujillo in five or six days. They established encampments in Bocono. They raised a fuss and then suddenly became silent. The press became silent. This was due simply to the fact that they came down defeated and realized that they could not defeat the guerrilla front in Trujillo. The same thing happened in Lara [state]. . . and in Falcon They utilized every conceivable method. They utilized all

the experience acquired in South Vietnam, in fighting heroic South Vietnam which is struggling for liberation and which it will obtain in spite of the North Americans, in spite of the lackey they have there. They used all that experience, and all that experience failed them.

They approached the peasants with an outstretched hand, offering them medicine, cigarettes, food, constructing houses for them with corrugated iron roofs, showing affection for the children, telling them, "We love you very much." And it turns out that they achieved nothing!

They approached the peasants the way the Spaniards approached the Indians here, with trinkets and glass beads, exchanging glass beads for gold and such, and now they come here exchanging these things for iron, for petroleum, for everything we have. So they go up to the peasants with medicine, they extract their bad teeth, they tell them the little boy looks cute, they show affection for the children, and they build houses for them with corrugated iron roofs; all this, as if they were the best people on earth.

Now the peasants, naturally, are surprised at this. They wonder about all this sudden love. . . . They see the guerrillas in the mountains and they say, "Well then." And they realize that this love was due to the guerrillas. When there were no guerrillas, well, nothing. Their teeth rotted, they died of hunger, malaria, etc. Now they are eating, they receive everything and they realize -- because our peasant is intelligent -- that this is demagoguery, that they don't want the guerrilla movement to grow and therefore they are trying to buy them off.

Our peasants, however, aren't for sale. So what happened? Since they know that those really responsible for the magnanimity of the North Americans and the lackey government here are the guerrillas; that is, our presence here, they use the medicines, they have their bad teeth extracted, take the food, the cigarettes -- imported Lucky Strike cigarettes. . . . The peasant women take these gifts and they bring them to us and offer them to us and tell us all that is going on. And we have told them to continue to take them because it is theirs; it belongs to the people of Venezuela.

The enemy realizes that these methods fail. They have seen that our peasants are not to be bought off, that our peasants turn to the guerrillas in the mountains, seeing people fighting for them, completely for them, giving their lives for them. And that the government did not worry about them until the guerrillas appeared. So these people don't fall into the trap and don't sell out.

Then what happens? Now they utilize other methods. Now, instead of coming with the little presents and so on, they bring a machete. They whip them. They torture them. There was even a case

where they hung a peasant by his testicles in the midst of the village to attempt to frighten the unfrightenable, because these people cannot be intimidated, our people are valiant, our people fight. . . . One man, in the presence of the entire village, in the presence of the rest of the inhabitants of the village, was hung by his testicles, so as to instill fear in all the people of the village and so that he would be overcome by fear. And then, after torturing him savagely, they used him as a guide. And that peasant, knowing well where we were, led them to another place. Not even by means of force could they use him. In other words, then, all these methods failed them. All the methods they brought from South Vietnam failed them.

Q: Does that mean that the Venezuelan peasants are with the guerrillas?

A: They are with the guerrillas. The peasants are with the guerrillas and each day more join our ranks, and we have peasants incorporated in the guerrillas throughout the whole country, with the weapons they have asked us for. . . . Sometimes we lack arms to give the peasants, because what they want is to struggle directly along with us.

Q: Well, we were going to ask you about the antiguerrilla measures, but you have practically covered this.

A: Yes, the antiguerrilla campaigns. Yes, they said we were assassins, that we were criminals, and as it turns out, it's precisely the opposite. They are the assassins and criminals. The U.S. lackey, Betancourt, once said that the guerrillas were like arroz con pollo [rice and chicken] but without the pollo, that they lacked the pollo, that is, the peasants. But as it turns out, what we have most of is pollo!

The mere fact, then, that armed men exist and survive in the mountains means that we have pollo, that we have the pollo that this lackey denies. Because if we didn't, then, what he says would be true. The guerrillas need the support of the peasants to survive. The mere fact that the guerrillas survive means that there is support from the peasantry. If it were different, they would no longer exist.

Q: What can you tell us about the sieges that the government has tried to carry out against the guerrilla strongholds?

A: The enemy has already attempted various sieges against us. They have even bombed us. They have used light artillery against us, and maybe medium artillery. They have also used recoilless cannon, 60 and 81 m.m. mortars. They have used all the old weapons and the new weapons that the Americans have given them. Well, all their weapons come from the United States. And up to now, they have gained nothing.

If we draw a balance sheet of the enemy's losses and our own, we note that they are in bad shape. Each day we learn more; and if before, in a combat, one enemy fell, we now have the means so that one plus a little more falls. So all this shows the progress of our struggle. Even the propaganda about my having turned myself in was to try to sow demoralization among the people. But the people didn't believe those lies. They didn't believe it because they know that the men up in these mountains are not moved by ambition and that we are ready for any sacrifice. We will only come down dead or on our feet to celebrate with the people the triumph of the war of national liberation, as I said on another occasion.

Another thing they say is that we are assassins. What a lie! When we took the village of Pueblo Nuevo, what did we do? We acted as guerrillas should act. We disarmed the prefect and the policemen. We didn't touch them at all because we do not use cheap, dirty, criminal methods. We simply overcame the police. The following day we called a meeting in the village plaza. We bought goods in the village stores, merchandise, etc., to take up into the mountains. No one wanted to accept a cent from us because they know we are broke. Naturally, right then we had the money to pay for all the merchandise, but no one wanted to accept any money, so they gave us all the things.

The following day the prefect made some declarations to a reporter from El Nacional [daily newspaper of highest circulation in the country]. All he did was praise the guerrillas, saying that they had arrived there, that they had sung, that they had held a meeting, that they had behaved very well, etc. Naturally, this prefect made his declarations to the press because he had not been briefed by the governor. The newspaper man arrived before Governor Saher. . . .

Q: Comandante, why aren't the sabotage and other actions against the enemy being carried out with the intensity of past years?

A: Well, at no time can we say that actions of this kind ceased. We have simply passed to another stage of the war and we have drawn up a balance sheet of all the actions, some positive, others which, as revolutionaries, we have to recognize as negative. There have been some cases of improvisation. In others, in some, overestimation; in others, underestimation of the enemy. In some actions, then, instead of obtaining the backing and approval of the masses, they haven't taken it very well. As genuine revolutionaries, we have recognized these errors. And also as revolutionaries we are correcting them.

The lull at no time meant paralysis of these actions. Now, with greater audacity, with greater organization and co-ordination, we shall begin these actions again on a national scale. We shall stress, above all, rural action without this signifying that urban action will cease. We will pursue a political objective in each of

these actions. We will consider first the objective we seek. Then we shall proceed with the action, well co-ordinated, without haste, without precipitousness of any kind, without falling for enemy provocation. Because we are not in a hurry. They are in a hurry to destroy us, because they can already detect in us the signs of victory. We are not in a hurry, because we are sure, completely sure that we will triumph without unnecessary sacrifices.

Our actions have been carried out with real ardor, with revolutionary fervor, but some were carried out hastily, with the sad consequence that we lost valiant combatants. But all this has been changed and corrected, practically. The lull served for preparing ourselves, for tuning up the revolutionary machine, and we will return with greater audacity, including propaganda. Before, we had many things of a propagandistic nature only. Now we are going to tie propaganda with action. The days of the Anzoategui [this refers to the FALN hijacking of the Venezuelan Navigation Line ship on the high seas and taking it to Brazil] and of Di Stefano [the kidnapping of soccer player Di Stefano] are over. . . .

Q: Does the FALN have proof of the intervention of the Pentagon and the U.S. State Department in Venezuela's revolutionary war?

A: Yes, of course we have. But we aren't jumping around desperately, like Betancourt is doing, taking it before the OAS [Organization of American States] like he is doing over the alleged landing of Cuban arms on our coast, which is totally false. They have raised a fuss. From there they are taking off to organize a new invasion of Cuba.

We have clear-cut proofs of the flagrant intervention of the United States in the revolutionary war in our country, but we are not at all surprised, because we are combatting them, that is, imperialism, so we aren't surprised that they attack us. . . .

They are intervening in the economy. They are carrying away all our riches. And with this intervention they are simply protecting the product of their robbery, their shameless robbery. So there has been intervention. They have advised, and in other instances directed military actions against all our fronts.

This has been done by the North American military mission. It is they who are organizing antiguerrilla courses. And they have even gone up to the front lines. They have directed the bombardments, as they did in the concrete example of the zone near Huque here in Falcon state. They dropped bombs. They directed the campaign to attempt to win the peasants, using medicines, food, cigarettes, trying to buy off the peasants.

If we state the flat truth, the National Armed Forces -- and this is something which, unfortunately, is unknown to its lower

ranks -- are under the orders of the United States, of the Pentagon. . . .

We have been convinced ever since we decided to win freedom for our people that we would confront this materially powerful enemy. But from the moral point of view this enemy is not worth a cent.

Q: What has been the role of Venezuelan women in this war of liberation?

A: One of the most valuable things in the Venezuelan struggle, as in the struggles of all the peoples of the world, is the women. In the case of our first War of Independence, we had Luisa Cáceres de Arismendi and many other women. One of the things that has influenced and encouraged our people is the presence of women in this struggle. They have made a grand, incomparable contribution. Because, besides the sacrifice and suffering that has always been theirs, women are the most exploited humans. They have been exploited not only by imperialism, they have been exploited in their own homes, by their own husbands, most of them.

The women are sharing with the men all the suffering and sacrifice that this war entails. The presence of women in this revolutionary war is something that should fill all the women of the world with pride, to know that they are well represented in the struggle for liberation.

Concerning international aspects, I want to say to all the women in the world who read this interview that they have been very well represented in this heroic Venezuela and in these glorious mountains, and that in urban and rural actions the Venezuelan women have given their quota of blood, and on the streets, each day, they give a still greater quota of sacrifice. We feel truly proud of a Conchita, of a Trina, of an Epifania, of the new heroines of this war; that is, the heroines of this Second War of National Independence.

We also know that in Vietnam and in all the Latin American countries, in Africa, and in all the countries of the world that are trying to win liberation, the presence of women is something very significant; it is something which is morally positive, which attracts and an example which should be followed by many wavering men.

I am not going to establish discrimination here between women and men. No, sir, we are all struggling, but the women have really struggled. The concept about their being a weaker sex, that's not true. They are not weak. We have seen cases here in the mountains where if a man carried twenty kilos, a woman would carry forty. That is to say, in almost all aspects women provide excellent examples comparable to any man.

Feminine solidarity could be realized through an international campaign among women to help the struggle that the Venezuelan people have begun for liberation. It could deal with freeing political prisoners, stopping the crimes and the torture, the atrocities to which Venezuelan revolutionaries are submitted.

It could include help of an economic nature, because we aren't going to deny that we need money. There are many weapons which we seize from the enemy, but we can't get them all from the enemy. We need money to buy them, and we have no money. That's because this struggle is being carried forward by the Venezuelans themselves. . . . Thus, naturally, we need that solidarity.

What we don't need is the solidarity expressed by one man, the Ambassador of Poland to the United Nations, Mr. Bohan Lewandowsky. The solidarity of this man is actually harmful to our struggle. It was the opposite of solidarity on his part when, upon his arrival in our country to be present at the inauguration of Dr. Raul Leoni as president, he offered bare-faced, dirty, cheap praise of this government. He even cited Venezuelan "democracy," democracy in quotation marks, as a worthy example which should be imitated by other countries of the world. Words like these from the mouth of a Communist, frankly, are unencouraging, to say the least.

This man, upon his arrival at Maiquetia [international airport] made some declarations to El Nacional in which he praised the government. That, frankly, is negative, it damages our cause, although not much, but it does damage it, because the people, the exploited, humble masses who are being jailed, murdered in the streets, hear from the mouth of a Communist that this is an ideal democracy. They say, "What is this? Is this democracy? This is the democracy of the socialist countries? Then it is a lie."

And it turns out this man isn't speaking for his people, for his government or for anyone; he is speaking for himself. This is clear if the statements in the press are true. If not, well, I ask this gentleman to forgive me.

Pseudosolidarity of this kind we can do without. In fact we reject it energetically, because we aren't tongue-tied and we say the truth to everyone that needs to hear it, running all the risks....

Concretely, I wrote him a letter that, unfortunately, never got to his hands. I would like to take advantage of your presence here to read you that letter so that it reaches him personally or publicly, either way, but I would like this letter to reach him.

[For full text of letter see World Outlook June 26.]

Q: What importance do you concede to international solidarity with Venezuela? Along what lines can a campaign of international solidarity with the Venezuelan revolution be forged?

A: Solidarity not only with Venezuela, but with all the Latin-American countries and what's more, with all the countries that are struggling to win liberation, is something fundamental, something indispensable to be able to break the chains that tie us to imperialism.

It is necessary, even obligatory, that all those nations that have won liberation offer solidarity so that the others, by means of their solidarity, attain their independence. Not only the governments but all the peoples of the world. If the governments do not collaborate -- naturally an enemy government is not going to collaborate, a capitalist government, an imperialist government, is not going to co-operate with the Venezuelan revolution -- but the governments of all the socialist countries, if they abide strictly with the principles of proletarian internationalism, are completely obligated to solidarize themselves with the struggle of all the oppressed peoples of the world.

And the oppressed peoples of the world are obligated to cooperate with those countries that have progressed along the road of their war of liberation, because this, aside from the solidarity that should logically exist between sister countries with the same anguish, the same misery, the same suffering, is something that is to the best interests of all the peoples of the world, because the more countries that are liberated in the world, the nearer the victory of the world revolution -- that day when we can really speak about a free world, without quotation marks, the world the North Americans only talk about.

We do need and ask for the solidarity of all the peoples of the world. I know we can count on that solidarity, and I want to take this opportunity to send greetings to each combatant who with pen, gun, or in some other way, is giving his or her quota of sacrifice, of revolutionary dignity to the world revolution, which shall triumph, cost what it may, cost what it may most of all to Yankee imperialism.

I send greetings to all the peoples of the world that are struggling for their freedom, and most of all, to the heroic, valiant and determined people of South Vietnam, who are hitting the North Americans with stronger punches each day. The trouble with these imperialists is that they do not learn. They want the same thing to happen to them here as is happening in South Vietnam. It will happen.

Greetings to all the peoples who, arms in hand, are trying to win freedom. And a greeting also to all those revolutionaries who in a peaceful, but ineffective, way seek liberation for their people. We support them and agree that they should try to obtain the triumph of the revolution with the minimum sacrifice of the invaluable lives of the sons of the people. But we are sure that they will finally join us in the extensive mountain range of the Andes where arms in

hand we are seeking the real liberation of Latin America.

Greetings also to the peoples under imperialist regimes who directly experience the same abuses committed against the Venezuelan people. And greetings to those heroic Negroes in North America, because I think that the ones suffering the most abuse in the world are the North American Negroes. Thank goodness they are awakening. Sooner or later they will triumph.

[The end.]

REMEMBER OUR SUMMER SCHEDULE

During July and August, World Outlook is reducing its frequency of appearance. The regular schedule will be resumed in September.