

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Volume 3, No. 27

August 20, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
"We'd Rather Fight for the Negro Here"	2
The Greek Powder Magazine	4
Martyred Greek Student Was A Trotskyist	
-- by George Sinos	6
Another Victim of the "Atomic Disease"	8
How Many Casualties at Hiroshima and Nagasaki?	8
Thousands of Years of Radioactivity Ahead	10
General Strike in Tegucigalpa	10
Demand U.S. Withdrawal from Ryukyu and Bonin Islands	11
It's Aggression in Esperanto, Too	11
Japanese Antiwar Attitude Affects Chinese Delegate	11
No Sanctuary in Japan?	12
Sohyo Denounces U.S. Role in Vietnam	13
Tell Japanese Government to End Cooperation with U.S.	14
Defeat for Imperialism in Malaysia	14
Belgians Campaign for Medical Aid to Vietnamese	16
Guerrilla War Continues in Peru	17
Hugo Blanco's Role in the Peruvian Peasant Movement	27
Boumedienne Liquidates Popular Militia	19
"Confession" Denies Torture in South Africa's Prisons	20
Just "Hunting Guns" for South Africa	37
Food Riots in India	21
The Antiwar "Teach-Ins" -- by Doug Jenness	22
Indian Trotskyists Form Party	24
Live Revolutionary Coals in Latin America	26
Documents:	
The Military Coup d'Etat in Algeria and the	
Boumedienne Regime	30
Solidarity with the Vietnamese People!	
(Speech by Fidel Castro)	38

"WE'D RATHER FIGHT FOR THE NEGRO HERE"

When President Johnson signed his "voting rights bill" on August 6, he said that the action struck away "the last major shackles of those fierce and ancient bonds" of the Negroes.

Exactly five days later the Black Ghetto of Watts in the heart of Los Angeles exploded. And from August 11 until August 17 television screens in the United States showed scenes reminiscent of Vietnam or Santo Domingo. Johnson's Emancipation Proclamation was forgotten.

The bare facts in themselves indicate something of what went on. Thirty-three people were killed. Of these, 27 were Negroes and only six were white. The official figure for the injured was 862, the overwhelming majority being black. (Including 733 civilians, 85 police, 37 firemen and 7 National Guardsmen.)

Arrests reached 3,124. If there were any whites in this huge number the press did not mention it. Property damage amounted to \$175,000,000. Most of this was due to fires, as high as 1,000 being reported during one 24-hour period by the fire department. Besides 5,000 Los Angeles police, 15,000 National Guardsmen were ordered out in response to the demand of Police Chief William H. Parker.

What were the causes of the social explosion? The incident that touched it off was the arrest of Marquette Frye, 21, by two white California highway patrolmen on charges of "drunken driving." He reportedly had the temerity to argue with the cops. As they hauled him away, a small group of youths pelted their automobile with stones. The disturbance touched off a similar violent reaction among other crowds.

The next day Police Chief Parker told a press conference: The rioting began when "one person threw a rock and then, like monkeys in a zoo, others started throwing rocks." The outburst came as "no surprise to me. When you keep telling them they are being badly treated and abused, they're going to react. The trouble is people have lost respect for the law -- no reverence for the law." Nevertheless, he said, the area was now back to normal.

The following day, however, he asked for the National Guard. His explanation was: "We have to protect the people in the area."

What this protection amounted to was eloquently shown by the dead. They were nearly all black. After the entire business was over, the police department itself admitted that one-third of the deaths were due to the police and one-third to the National Guardsmen. From the photographs of the heavily armed forces and innumerable accounts of their violence, it was clear that they played a big

role in provoking the sporadic sniper fire they met as they moved into the area.

The policy announced by Governor Edmund G. Brown on August 15 was as follows: "It is clear from our latest reports that the lawlessness in Los Angeles is the work of organized gangs and I have directed Commissioner of Public Safety Bradford Crittenden to maintain an aggressive posture in pursuing these men and arresting them."

This provocative attitude was followed to the letter by the police and National Guardsmen. During the day they made indiscriminate mass arrests: "Anyone who gives us back talk today will make trouble tonight," a police sergeant said. "So we're arresting them without question."

Figures like Martin Luther King played a miserable role. Instead of rallying to the defense of the residents of the ghetto, they expressed solidarity with the police. From Puerto Rico, the Rev. King said:

"It was necessary that as powerful a police force as possible be brought in to check them, but police power can bring only a temporary halt. Better housing and economic conditions and opportunities for Negroes will bring much needed help in their communities."

On arriving in Los Angeles August 17, he declared: "I think the trouble is that there is no vibrant nonviolent program afoot in Los Angeles. Such a program would give oppressed people a chance to vent their fury without violence."

The world press has been filled with explanations of the basic causes of the outburst in Watts. Several figures have often been cited: Out of the population of 100,000 in the area, 34% are unemployed and 60% receive relief checks. The density of the population is about double the rest of the city. One-quarter of the births are illegitimate -- a measure of the breakdown of family life. A constant reminder to the Negroes of the low station assigned them in the "Great Society" is the palatial style of living practiced by the whites in such areas as Hollywood and Beverly Hills. Homes there, each with its private swimming pool and landscaped gardens, are among the most luxurious in the world.

Another cup of bitterness in the Black Ghetto has been the endless war propaganda -- about the American Way of Life and the need to fight for it in distant places like Vietnam and Santo Domingo. One may well believe the Negro reporter who quoted one man as saying: "We want to set a fire right here on Broadway rather than go to Vietnam and fight. We'd rather fight for the Negro here." And another man as saying: "This is the Negro revolution, we want the world to know."

THE GREEK POWDER MAGAZINE

At least 60,000 persons were in the streets of Athens August 17 shouting slogans that centered against continuation of the hated monarchy. They faced some 10,000 police, armored cars, and teams with special training in the use of tear gas. Units of the army were standing by in a state of alert.

The demonstration, according to Eric Rouleau of the Paris daily Le Monde [August 19], was close to "degenerating into a battle..."

In this tense situation, which has been building up since July 15, the 25-year-old King Constantine, backed by his mother Frederika and the most ultrareactionary forces in Greece, was still maneuvering to avoid an election and to get a prime minister who would bow to the will of his advisers.

The strategists behind the king were clearly bidding for time. If the energy of the masses could be dissipated, then a "strong man" regime might be established to crack down on the workers organizations and provide Greece with another iron dictatorship like the one set up with aid of British troops and American dollars after World War II.

The leaders of the bourgeois "center" and their allies of the "left" were ably falling in with this treacherous game as was strikingly evident during the August 17 demonstration.

Throughout the day, the monarchy had broadcast the report that the huge Panathinaikos stadium would not be available for a meeting which the General Confederation of Labor as well as various unions and the "center" and "left" tendencies had scheduled there. The reports even predicted that "extremists of the left" were preparing to unleash bloody incidents.

Nevertheless "tens of thousands of young people, mostly workers and students of Athens, Piraeus and distant suburbs, were at the rendezvous," Rouleau reported.

The crowd, it was clear, had a mind of its own. "While the orators tried in vain to make themselves heard," said Rouleau, "the crowd shouted the slogans that have now become habitual in favor of a democracy and against the monarchy."

These slogans included: "Throw out the German! Throw out the German!" The allusion is to the Germanic origin of Frederika. "Take your mother and get out! Take your mother and get out!" According to Rouleau, these were the least uncomplimentary of the slogans.

Elie Tsirimokos, a former leader of the left wing of the Center Union, who has indicated his readiness to play the king's game, was a target of shouts: "Down with the court socialist! Shame to the royalist socialist!"

"The meeting lasted less than an hour," Rouleau continued. "The organizers, from all the evidence, sought less to harangue the crowd than to set it up to defy the authorities who had banned any gathering on the public thoroughfares."

In response to a signal, the crowd moved toward Omonia Plaza where it was supposed to disperse. The police were stationed at Stadiou Avenue to prevent the demonstrators from moving toward the parliament building and the royal palace.

"To avoid any confrontation the leaders of the CGT [General Confederation of Labor] had, for their part, installed patrols with the aim of containing the demonstrators. But these worker militants were very rapidly overwhelmed by the human sea that swept toward the police lines with cries of 'Murderers!'

"A clash appeared inevitable. While some tens of thousands of overexcited persons advanced resolutely to the demarcation line set by the authorities, hundreds of armed police moved into several 'defensive lines' in order to launch their counterattack. Meanwhile, trade-union leaders as well as certain deputies of the center and the EDA (the left), shouting and gesticulating, tried to prevent the masses from continuing their course. It was only within a few inches of the first police line that they succeeded, by dint of exhortations and threats, to stop the march."

Constantin Mitsotakis, one of the leaders of the right wing of the Center Union, who took the post of minister of Economic Coordination in the abortive Novas government which the king set up after ousting Papandreou, explained to Rouleau that they hoped to win now by "wearing down the resistance" of the opposition to the king.

"We no longer fear the popular reaction," Mitsotakis told Rouleau. "The masses who are hostile to us are becoming tired. Even the Communists are fatigued. We believe that Mr. Papandreou will gradually be abandoned by his troops and the next government -- whether it is headed by Mr. Tsirimokos or Mr. Stephanopoulos -- will end up by getting the unanimous support of the parliamentary representatives of the Center Union. Mr. Papandreou would then have to submit or resign."

Whether this cold-blooded calculation will prove to be accurate remains to be seen. Meanwhile King Constantine under the watchful eyes of his mother, continues to strike matches in the powder magazine that is now Greece.

MARTYRED GREEK STUDENT WAS A TROTSKYIST

[In the report below from Athens, it is mentioned that Sotirios Petroulas was expelled from the EDA for "Trotskyism" just two months before he was killed by the police.

[Sotirios Petroulas was the student whose funeral was held in Athens on July 23. The Associated Press said that "more than 150,000 demonstrators" surged through the streets in the "mammoth" demonstration. Other sources estimated the crowd at twice that figure.

[A leader of the Greek section of the Fourth International writes us: "The young comrade Sotirios Petroulas, killed by the police, was a sympathizer belonging to a group of young students expelled from the EDA for Trotskyism and with whom we are collaborating."]

* * *

By George Sinos

Athens

The most outstanding feature of the current political crisis in Greece has been the spontaneous action of the masses. For the first time in twenty years, the traditional left-wing leadership of the EDA [United Democratic Left] and the Greek Communist party does not have full control over the masses.

The principal reasons for this are: (1) A young generation is entering the political scene free from the sins and burdens of Stalinism. (2) The broad masses lost faith in the EDA and CP leadership. (3) Many militants, formerly with these movements, left them, leading to a series of splits in the EDA. (4) The leadership of the EDA is dominated by veteran bureaucrats concerned mainly about their posts and salaries. (5) These officials adapt themselves completely to Papandreu's bourgeois policies. (6) There are a number of militant tendencies active in the mass movement, including the powerful youth movement of the Center Union, and farther to the left, the Trotskyists and the pro-Chinese Communists.

This situation has opened favorable opportunities for the revolutionary Marxists. Tens of thousands of militants, especially the youth, have taken up the slogans advanced by the revolutionary Marxists. This has led to a good deal of fright among the bureaucratic leaders.

On July 17 at the huge mass meeting in the Panathinaikos stadium, where 80,000 people turned out, the slogan in favor of a referendum, a slogan directed against the monarchy, was launched by the revolutionary Marxists. The bureaucrats tried to oppose this but failed to gain support. They then tried to dissolve the huge

meeting, "prohibiting" a demonstration from being held. The masses paid no attention. The mammoth demonstration adopted the slogan favoring a referendum.

Two days later a crowd of about 1,000,000 turned out to hear Papandreou. Demonstrating and picketing went on for hours. The EDA leaders tried to halt all this, but without success.

On July 21 when the students turned out, clashes occurred with the police. It was in this demonstration that our young comrade Sotirios Petroulas was killed.

The EDA leadership found itself in an embarrassing position. Only two months before this it had expelled Sotirios and a group of youths from the EDA on grounds that they were "Trotskyists."

The EDA bureaucrats had no choice but to participate in the funeral ceremony at which 300,000 people turned out.

The slogans continued to escalate. Besides the slogan for a referendum, spread at the funeral, the slogan was launched for fraternization with the soldiers. The cry, "King, here is your victim!" was heard. For the first time since 1945 the strains of the workers' mourning song was heard.

On the eve of the July 27 general strike, Nefelondis, a leader of the EDA, an old Stalinist who is a deputy, made a deal with Police Chief Archondoulakis to peacefully end the strike meeting. But after the meeting ended, thousands of workers and students staged a huge demonstration and marched through the main thoroughfares of Athens to parliament, shouting slogans, mainly for a referendum.

All the older leaders and deputies of the EDA were in the streets trying to bring things to an end. But in vain.

Next day Avgi, the daily organ of the EDA, denounced "the Trotskyists" as being behind the "provocations" and shouting for a "red revolution."

Throughout the crisis, the reactionary bourgeois press had been saying similar things, denouncing "Trotskyism" and "the Trotskyists" for their role.

The Stalinists continued their attacks against "the Trotskyists" until the reactionary press came out with praise for the EDA leadership and their papers "because they have at last understood that the Trotskyist Communists are provoking riots and disturbances as we long ago predicted."

The EDA publications stopped their open attack on "Trotskyism" and turned instead to "educational" discussions to alert the ranks to the "role of Trotskyism" in the crisis.

The struggle is continuing; but a compromise at the expense of the mass movement is being cooked up. There is a real possibility it can be put across because of the lack of a mass revolutionary party.

But in the magnificent struggles now going on, a new generation of militants is appearing who have already begun to fight independently, although in a confused way, for big objectives. This generation, free from the contaminating influence of Stalinism, has big possibilities. Many of them have become acquainted with Trotskyism during the recent hectic weeks. In Trotskyism they will find the program which they are seeking, the program of genuine Marxism and militant class struggle.

ANOTHER VICTIM OF THE "ATOMIC DISEASE"

On the eve of the world-wide commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the opening of the atomic age at Hiroshima August 6, 1945, the twenty-fourth known victim this year of that explosion or the one in Nagasaki on August 9, 1945, made headlines in Japan.

The victim was Miss Kimiko Matsuda, a 21-year-old bus conductor, who was exposed to the atomic radiation provided by President Truman when she was one year old.

She had no hospital records until she suddenly became ill on July 17. "Miss Matsuda had purple spots all over her body, complained of a sore throat and had bleeding gums," reports the July 30 Japan Times. "These are common symptoms of what is known as 'atomic disease.'"

A check on her blood showed that she had leukemia. "She died only nine days after she was hospitalized."

HOW MANY CASUALTIES AT HIROSHIMA AND NAGASAKI?

Among the achievements which American presidents like to boast about, there is one they have become increasingly reluctant to emphasize in recent years. This is the number of casualties that resulted when President Truman displayed U.S. prowess at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In fact, the figures to be found in certain sources after diligent search, seem suspiciously low. What are the true figures?

In an article in the August 6 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, Robert Guillain raised the question. Here are his conclusions

concerning this subject:

"Twenty years later, the bomb continues to kill. Two hundred forty-six 'atomized' people were in beds at the Nagasaki Atomic Disease Hospital -- the city of the second bomb -- when I visited there in 1962. Six hundred out-patients checked in every day. And the figures were still higher at Hiroshima. 'When was your last atomic death?' I asked the head doctor, Professor Yokota. He looked at me in silence for a moment, then said: 'Just yesterday!' From 1958 to 1961 inclusive he had registered 125 deaths at the hospital due to the bomb, he told me. He cited a typical case, that of a man exposed to the bomb two kilometers from the center, who had fallen ill thirteen years later. 'He died at the end of six months. When I made the autopsy, all his organs were affected.'

"The American specialists have themselves recognized, after their studies on the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that among the effects of the atomic bomb has been a rise of up to fifty per cent in cases of leukemia (cancer of the blood), a clear increase in cancer of the lungs, the stomach, breast, an analogous increase in cataracts, in cases of microcephaly, and of mental retardment among children exposed to the bomb before they were born.

"Because of all this, atomized people feel that they are living 'on borrowed time.' They live in an agony of suddenly coming down with the 'atomic disease.' A silent social discrimination operates against them. Employers don't want them. They can't get married.

"How many victims did the bomb cause at Hiroshima? When you try to answer this question, you discover that all kinds of figures are given and that it is difficult to find hard statistics. The official publications, particularly the American publications, generally give a round total of 70,000 dead and an almost equal number of wounded. The Japanese state that these figures are quite erroneous, or deliberately below the reality.

"In any case, they are absurd, they say. Among the 'wounded' on August 6, 1945, there were a high number of deaths eight to ten days later. In addition, it must be taken into account that entire families perished without survivors; that the Japanese army made sure that members of the armed forces were not included since this was a military secret; that the daily population of Hiroshima swelled when workers came in from the suburbs to handle defense work against fires. The garrison in fact amounted to 90,000 men of whom around one-third must have perished.

"By taking into account, finally, the victims that died within a few weeks after the August 6 bomb, the Japanese estimate that the figure for the deaths at Hiroshima must be put at a minimum of 150,000, and that it is probably around 200,000. For the municipal administration and its mayor, Mr. Shinzo Hamai, who has done much

toward reconstructing the town and making it the 'City of Peace,' 200,000 is the real figure.

"At Nagasaki, in opposition to the official figures of 38,000 dead and 21,000 wounded, the Japanese cite much higher figures, going as high as 120,000 dead and 80,000 wounded -- which is probably an exaggeration in the opposite direction..."

THOUSANDS OF YEARS OF RADIOACTIVITY AHEAD

The atomic age which President Truman opened for humanity on August 6 and August 9, 1945, by wiping out two crowded cities, has already led to permanent alteration of the environment of the world, writes science specialist Walter Sullivan in the August 10 New York Times.

"Even if there are no more bomb tests -- which seems unlikely -- the radioactivity of carbon in the air, the oceans and all living matter will remain twice that of normal for a prolonged period. It will not sink to its pre-bomb level for thousands of years."

The ground level of strontium 90 is still rising. This is because much of the fallout was injected into the stratosphere from which it has been slowly drifting down. "This reservoir is believed largely to have been drained by now, but a considerable amount of the estimated total of bomb-produced strontium is unaccounted for."

Strontium 90 is especially important "because it is picked up by the body and incorporated into bones and teeth." It is a cause of cancer.

"The bomb material falls on fields, is eaten by cows and can reach the consumer within days after an explosion." Since the carrier is milk, it is especially dangerous to infants.

However, while the ground level of strontium 90 is still rising says Sullivan, it is believed that "the level in milk hit its peak in the spring of 1964."

This comforting assurance may nevertheless need readjustment if Johnson succeeds in carrying forward his "escalation" in Vietnam to its logical outcome.

GENERAL STRIKE IN TEGUCIGALPA

A general strike in Tegucigalpa against the high cost of living and for wage rises has received widespread popular support. On July 29, 10,000 people in the Honduran capital demonstrated in behalf of the strikers.

DEMAND U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM RYUKYU AND BONIN ISLANDS

Two organizations that have been demanding the immediate return of the American-occupied Ryukyu and Bonin islands to Japan, merged their forces into a single organization at a conference in Tokyo July 30. Thirty-six scholars and intellectuals had proposed the merger into a 2,000-member organization.

The conference called for the withdrawal of U.S. military bases from the islands and abolition of the Japan-U.S. Security Pact. It also called for steps to enable former inhabitants to return to their homes.

IT'S AGGRESSION IN ESPERANTO, TOO

At the fiftieth World Congress of Esperanto, a subcommittee of about 100 Esperantists from 14 countries adopted a draft resolution against "American aggression in Vietnam."

The subcommittee of experts in the synthetic international language met at Nikkei Hall in Tokyo August 3 to discuss "American aggression in Vietnam, provocation against Cuba and the Dominican Republic, and the problem of West Germany's nuclear armament."

The draft resolution said: "The United States is engaged in expansion of military activities and the crisis in Asia is deepening. We oppose America's aggression in Vietnam and demand the evacuation of U.S. bases. We also oppose the proliferation of nuclear weapons."

The Esperantists from 13 countries voted for the resolution. An American Esperantist cast an opposing vote. The action of the congress on the resolution has not yet been reported.

JAPANESE ANTIWAR ATTITUDE AFFECTS CHINESE DELEGATE

Nan Han-cheng, chief executive of the Chinese International Trade Promotion Committee, who was sent by Peking as a delegate to the annual convention of the Japan Council Against Atom and Hydrogen Bombs, was very cautious in public statements at the end of July concerning the war in Vietnam.

He told the Japan-China Trade Promotion Association, for instance, that the future of trade between the two countries could not be affected by any expansion of the war.

In a few days, however, he apparently became much impressed

by the increasingly dynamic antiwar movement in Japan, which is becoming more and more vocal in opposition to Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam and the passive acquiescence of the Japanese government in this monstrous course.

At a reception given in his honor August 3 by five organizations interested in trade with China, Nan echoed the charges about the subserviency of the Japanese government to Washington. He stated that economic relations between Japan and China will be affected adversely as long as Japan takes such an attitude.

The Japanese Foreign Office blew its top the very next day, saying it took a "serious view" of the criticism. An unnamed "source" said the Foreign Office could not overlook attempts to have Japan change its policy under threat of using trade with China as a "lever." This is a high-handed attitude, the "source" told the press, which persistently gives preference to "politics."

The "hint" was dropped that the next time Han applies for a visa his request might be rejected.

It remained unclear, nevertheless, how much of the Foreign Office anger was seriously intended and how much was sop aimed at mollifying irritation among the American diplomatic corps.

NO SANCTUARY IN JAPAN?

The "hawks," "vultures" and other carrion-eaters in Washington who are one hundred per cent behind Johnson's escalation of U.S. aggression in Vietnam feel that Secretary of State Dean Rusk was speaking for them when he declared that in the war now opening up, there will be "no privileged sanctuary." That kind of talk, however, has justifiably frightened the Japanese people. If China and the Soviet Union become targets of U.S. bombers, and if these bombers use bases in Japan...what then?

The B52s, ordered by Johnson to take off from Guam for bombing runs on Vietnam, showed how realistic these fears of the Japanese people are. B52s can carry hydrogen bombs.

Thus when the U.S. embassy in Tokyo notified the Japanese government July 27 that B52s based on Guam were going to fly to Itazuke Airport in Kyushu to "take shelter" from a threatened hurricane, a wave of fear swept Japan.

However, the B52s did not arrive. The weather changed, and instead of going to Japan, the B52s went to Okinawa. From there they took off for a bombing run on Vietnam.

The use of Okinawa as a base for a raid on Vietnam caused

such an uproar in Japan that Foreign Minister Etsusaburo Shiina called a press conference July 30 to announce that the Japanese government had requested the American government the day before not to allow the bombers to leave Okinawa for a bombing raid on Vietnam as it would give rise to "unnecessary misunderstanding." But the U.S. had ignored the plea.

The request, said Shiina, "was a unilateral one, so to speak, and if the United States does not want to go along with it, we cannot stop the bombers."

On Saturday, he told the press that the use of Okinawa as a base had made the people of Japan and Okinawa "feel uneasy and bewildered."

When the first notice was served on the Japanese government that B52s were going to use Itazuke as a shelter from a typhoon, the Diet Policy Committee of the Japan Socialist party branded this as a "smokescreen" for using the airport on a regular basis. They said the JSP would stage massive demonstrations at Itazuke if U.S. bombers should actually land there.

On August 2 the U.S. Embassy notified the Foreign office that 35 planes were going to land the next day at Itazuke to seek shelter from a typhoon. The planes turned out to be C130 transports and HU16 air rescue planes.

The Japan Socialist party decided at once to take up the question in the Diet. There were other indications that a typhoon was building in Japan -- a typhoon of public indignation.

SOHYO DENOUNCES U.S. ROLE IN VIETNAM

The 4,200,000-member General Council of Japan Trade Unions [Sohyo] ended its twenty-eighth convention August 4 in Tokyo with a resolution pledging an "all-out fight against U.S. aggression in Vietnam and the Japan-South Korea normalization treaty."

The resolution denounced the U.S. for violating the 1954 Geneva agreement and for being responsible for the present situation in Vietnam.

The only way to bring an end to the Vietnam war, declared the resolution, is through immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Vietnam and respect for its right of self-determination.

The giant trade-union federation charged the Japanese government with supporting the "unlawful U.S. aggression in Vietnam" and said that efforts to revive and strengthen Japanese militarism were

becoming more manifest.

In a speech to the convention, Secretary General Akira Iwai announced that Sohyo is planning to dispatch "international organizers" shortly to Afro-Asian and Latin-American countries. Their aim is to help solidify sentiment opposed to the war in Vietnam.

At a press conference July 26 on the eve of the convention, Iwai said that the Japan Socialist party should publicize concrete plans for a socialist revolution in Japan.

TELL JAPANESE GOVERNMENT TO END COOPERATION WITH U.S.

The Japan Socialist party announced August 3 that it will introduce a resolution in the House of Representatives urging the government to seek a peaceful settlement in Vietnam along the following lines:

(1) Refuse to permit the U.S. to use bases in Japan and Okinawa.

(2) Halt Japan's cooperation in the U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

(3) Seek an immediate halt in bombing attacks on north Vietnam and a halt to military operations in south Vietnam.

(4) Recommend withdrawal of all foreign troops, including U.S. forces.

(5) Seek to convene a summit conference of Asian nations to solve the Vietnam conflict peacefully and also seek an international conference of the countries involved in the 1954 Geneva agreement.

DEFEAT FOR IMPERIALISM IN MALAYSIA

The ouster of Singapore from Malaysia August 9 dealt a major blow to the British imperialist scheme of establishing a "bulwark against Communism" in Southeast Asia as protection for nearly \$2,000,000,000 in tin, oil and rubber investments.

The "Federation of Malaysia" was set up on September 16, 1963, under sponsorship of the British government. It was an effort to tie Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, Brunei and North Borneo together in the face of strong opposition from the masses in Borneo and Singapore and the threat of the Indonesian government to respond with permanent guerrilla warfare. The artificially contrived federation now appears

to be in process of breaking up.

Although the successful move to kick out Singapore represents a major setback for imperialism in this part of the world, it was not directly due to action undertaken by the masses or by anti-imperialist forces. It was more the result of contradictions within the ruling circles of Malaysia.

Lee Kuan Yew, the cynical labor faker who climbed to power in the island on the backs of the masses and who agreed to the "federation" because he had ambitions about heading it, was bounced not because he represented a threat to private capital but because the semifeudal landlord class governing Malaya in close collaboration with the British planters and mining interests, was not willing to share political power with the merchants and industrialists of recent vintage in Singapore.

International capital was convinced that Lee Kuan Yew was a loyal defender of its special interests. Only a few days before Singapore was ousted, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development granted his government \$15,000,000. Participating in the loan were a number of big banks including the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

Popular opposition to the federation never died down in Singapore. It included the opposition of a considerable sector of the workers. This compelled Lee Kuan Yew to be chary of the anti-guerrilla war in North Borneo and not to get involved too deeply in the campaign against Indonesia. It must be pointed out at the same time that the big Singapore shipping, trading and banking interests were not enthusiastic about this campaign which led to the big losses for them when Soekarno broke off relations.

What will happen now? London is displaying distaste for the "Malayan extremists" in Kuala Lumpur who forced Singapore out of the federation. The British government can threaten them with "complete withdrawal," thus trying to frighten them with the specter of the "Communist menace from the north" in case they don't return to "reason." Reason, in this case, would be close military, financial and commercial collaboration between the now independent states of Malaysia and Singapore -- in accordance with the basic needs which the British imperialists hoped to meet through the federation. The weekly Economist, one of the most authoritative mouthpieces of the City, advocates such a solution in its August 14 issue.

But U.S. imperialism may prefer a more sweeping maneuver. The State Department has not been happy about the sharp conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia which had the effect of compelling Soekarno to seek an understanding with Peking. Already Lee Kuan Yew, not without an eye to popular support in Singapore, has announced that in foreign policy his government will seek "nonalignment." This would put him in position to serve as a go-between in dealing with

Soekarno. Thus dissolution of the federation could open the way to an understanding with Soekarno and his resumption of a policy like that of the Indian government.

A big catch in this is the state of Indonesia's economy. To shore it up on a capitalist basis would require huge injections of dollars. Would the Johnson administration dare run the domestic political risk of making big loans to Indonesia, even under the slogan of "saving" that country from Communism? What guarantees could Soekarno provide Johnson with to meet the vociferous outcry from the extreme right wing? Only a crackdown on the Indonesian Communist party, in the style of the Indian government, would satisfy Johnson. And such a course would signify considerable risk for Soekarno.

It is thus not easy for either the British or American imperialists to retrieve something from the pieces of the broken "Federation of Malaysia."

BELGIANS CAMPAIGN FOR MEDICAL AID TO VIETNAMESE

BRUSSELS, Aug. 16 -- A campaign has been launched here to send medical supplies and blood donations to the Vietnamese freedom fighters. To organize the campaign, a "Committee for Medical and Hospital Supplies to Vietnam" was set up. It immediately received the backing of six university professors and more than one hundred physicians; and they issued the following appeal:

"In face of the suffering of the people of Vietnam, who have been fighting for more than twenty years for national independence and the right to self-determination against foreign occupiers;

"In face of the bombing carried out by U.S. planes, the aggression and full-scale use of repression by every means against a people fighting for independence;

"As men and as doctors, we cannot remain indifferent.

"The doctors who have signed this appeal feel that solidarity must be shown and that something must be done in particular in the field of medical and hospital supplies. They have therefore decided to organize the sending of such supplies through all appropriate means.

"They launch an appeal to the population, particularly the working class, social and trade-union movements and organizations in order to arouse a vast movement of solidarity throughout the country and in order to equip a surgical and hospital unit."

The supplies will be sent to the north Vietnam Red Cross for

transmission to the Red Cross organization of the National Front for Liberation in south Vietnam.

Organization of the movement is in the pattern successfully used in Belgium to gather medical and hospital supplies for the freedom fighters in Algeria. One of the achievements of that committee was three planeloads of antibiotics for the Algerians.

There has been a most encouraging response to the appeal for help to the Vietnamese fighters. New signatures to the appeal are coming in every day.

The secretary of the new committee is Jean Godin, who served as secretary for the committee for aid to Algeria. His address is 14 Avenue Beau Vallon, Waterloo, Brussels, Belgium.

GUERRILLA WAR CONTINUES IN PERU

Although the censorship operating under the "state of siege" proclaimed by the Belaúnde government has cut off news from the side of the guerrilla forces, it is clear from the official reports issued by the government itself that fighting is continuing on a considerable scale in Peru.

On August 3 an army communiqué reported that three police had been killed and three wounded in an engagement in the Pucuta region. The communiqué claimed that three guerrilla fighters had been killed.

The Peruvian government alleged that the "Soviet Union, Cuba and Communist China" were inciting the Indian population in the central Andes to revolt. The descendants of the Incas were said to be in possession of radios on which they listened to broadcasts of a subversive nature.

A similar communiqué August 9 claimed that infantry units were attacking the guerrilla fighters from the east in the Huancayo region while commandos and parachute troops were hitting them from the west. At the same time, bombers were dumping napalm on their supposed positions.

It was claimed, in addition, that troops at Rosario Pampa had arrested Jaime Martinez who was accused of heading an ambush in which the police were caught near Pucuta at the end of June.

On August 9 government forces were ambushed in the Satipo area, a communiqué admitted. An engineer, a sergeant and a second lieutenant were killed. The column was on its way to relieve a patrol of twenty-five police encircled by "rebels" at the Cuyhatia

hacienda near Huancayo when they ran into the trap.

In the province of Acombama the police arrested fourteen persons after a combat close to the farm of Apurhuay. A group of about 100 guerrillas had descended on the farm. They wounded three employees, took the son of the owner as a hostage and drove off twenty-four head of cattle.

In the province of Convención, the police arrested eight people, accusing them of having attacked a police post at Santa Anna.

The government opened a "vast counteroffensive" on August 11 against the group that had ambushed the armed forces in the Satipo area, according to an official dispatch.

At the same time the Belaúnde regime had a new worry. Government employees launched a strike to enforce their demand for a wage increase needed to catch up with the rising cost of living. Top officials asked the strikers to go back to their jobs. They gave as their reason for the request that the strike had been fomented by "anti-Peruvian" elements.

The government claimed several successes in its antiguerrilla efforts. On August 11 the armed forces captured one of the main camps of the guerrilla fighters. This was at Intiyal Hamuy. The victory was scored as troops reached Kiatari in pursuit of the rebels near Satipo. On the following day they claimed that twenty-one guerrilla fighters were killed in a pitched battle. Two hundred and fifty rebels armed with light machine guns were "dispersed" and the government forces, according to the communiqué, did not suffer a single casualty.

The conservative Lima newspaper La Prensa claimed that it had learned from the father of one of the victims that fifteen guerrilla fighters out of a group captured at Huancayo had been "executed" in that town.

Octavio Mongrup, minister of the interior, denied this August 13. He also denied that 100 rebels had been killed in a bombing raid at Satipo. It should be recalled, however, that the army was given official instructions to take no prisoners.

According to La Prensa and the other Lima papers, 100 people were killed when planes carried out the massive bombing at Satipo. Five-hundred-pound bombs, "made in the USA," were used in the operation, being dropped on a presumed position of the guerrilla fighters.

Meanwhile the strike of government employees failed to collapse. In fact it appeared on the road to becoming a general strike. The government hastily granted a wage increase of 300 soles (\$11) a month August 15 and accompanied this with an order to return to work the next day under threat of immediate dismissal. The employees

had demanded 1,000 soles.

The Chamber of Deputies passed a law August 15 calling for all guerrilla fighters caught arms in hand to be shot. The law also called for ten-years imprisonment for any Peruvian involved in "common crimes" to help the guerrilla fighters. The death penalty was specified for foreigners involved in such actions. The Chamber also passed a law authorizing the government to issue bonds amounting to \$7,400,000 to cover the costs of the antiguerrilla operation.

The Senate proposed to set up a Committee on Anti-Peruvian Activities to ferret out pro-Communist elements infiltrating into the country.

The Aprista and Odrillaista parties in the opposition supported all these ultrareactionary measures. Said a deputy of the APRA [Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana]: "It has nothing to do with fighting ideas, it's a matter of facing a Communist aggression directed from Moscow and Peking."

BOUMEDIENNE LIQUIDATES POPULAR MILITIA

A spokesman of the Boumedienne regime announced August 12 that the Algerian government planned to disband the 30,000-man popular militia set up by Ben Bella in 1963 to help combat the counter-revolutionary uprising in the Kabylie.

Two days later it was announced that the militia had already been disbanded. They were being merged into the army, gendarmes and other military or paramilitary bodies, a spokesman of the regime said. He added that the militia only served to "duplicate" the army's role and were an "illustration of the confusion" that marked the Ben Bella government.

The truth is that the popular militia were never developed and extended as they should have been. In face of Boumedienne's resistance to organizing a militia in the example set by the Cuban Revolution, Ben Bella permitted the promising beginning he had made in this direction to be circumscribed and reduced to a caricature. Thus Ben Bella failed to create a possible counter to the base which Boumedienne was developing in the army for his own purposes.

Boumedienne is now following up his coup d'état by systematically reducing all possible centers of resistance to the course he has in mind. The militia, feeble as it was, thus became one of his targets.

Another sign of the rightist direction of the Boumedienne regime is its attitude toward the freedom movements throughout Africa

which have representatives in Algeria. Ben Bella followed a policy of helping them. Boumedienne appears to be following a policy of cutting them off.

Thus news of their activities and of their views is appearing with less and less frequency in the Algerian press.

"CONFESSION" DENIES TORTURE IN SOUTH AFRICA'S PRISONS

The efforts of Minister of Justice Vorster to defend the good name of South Africa's prisons met with a notable success August 16. On that day a "confession," allegedly signed by Gysbert Johan Van Schalkwyk, a former guard at Boksburg, was read in court. According to the "confession," the 22-year-old Schalkwyk lied when he revealed to the press horrifying details about the use of torture in the prison where he was employed.

Unfortunately Schalkwyk could not be questioned about the truthfulness of the "confession" that was read for him. He was not even in court. It was announced that he had been sentenced to three years in prison as a penalty for making false declarations which cast a shadow on South Africa's prisons; and he was, of course, already serving time. In any case, the authorities revealed, Schalkwyk was "not mentally capable" of reading his "confession" himself and that was why the prosecution had to do it for him.

Schalkwyk's revelations had been supported by another guard in the same prison, but it was not revealed whether Vorster had as yet succeeded in getting a "confession" from him that could be read in court after condemnation and incarceration of the liar.

As part of his campaign, Vorster moved once more against the Rand Daily Mail which has been running a series of articles exposing the use of torture in South Africa's prisons. The facts in these articles were gathered from various sources, including victims of torture as well as prison officials.

For the fifth time in two months, the police raided the editorial offices. They seized photographs of people who had talked to reporters and sought to requisition documents that have not as yet been published by the newspaper. The editor Laurence Gandar refused to give the documents to Vorster's cops.

No information is available as yet concerning the methods employed by Vorster to persuade the unfortunate Schalkwyk to make a "confession." The possible nature of these methods, however, may be gathered from an article by Brian Kennedy which appeared in the Rand Daily Mail and which was republished in the British Guardian of August 2.

The article quotes Johannes Andries Theron, a head warder at Boksburg's Cinderella Prison as declaring in a sworn statement:

"I have seen electric shock treatment being given to prisoners -- as a punishment and in order to make them talk. Once a prisoner has had the treatment he is prepared to sign anything."

In an official report made to the Acting Director of Prisons on March 16, 1965, Head Warder Theron gave details of how warders had beaten up prisoners to make them give false evidence.

"The conditions in Cinderella Prison are among the worst I have seen in more than 17 years service with the Prisons Department," he told the Rand Daily Mail, "and I have served in Pretoria, Pretoria Central, Middelburg, Johannesburg, Cape Town, Westlake, Paarl, Worcester, Zeerust, Stellenbosch, Robertson, Colesburg, Modder B, and other prisons.

"During the past two years I have fought a running battle of protest against the victimisation of both prisoners and staff.

"I have seen brutality absolutely contrary to prison regulations. Warders who have spoken out against these appalling conditions have been victimised."

Theron, it appears, has aroused the righteous indignation of Minister of Justice Vorster. It was reported July 31 that he had been "suspended from duty and confined to barracks." And senior officials of the Prisons Department admitted that he has been "appearing before a disciplinary court."

A spokesman of the Department denied that any further measures had been taken against him -- as yet.

FOOD RIOTS IN INDIA

While China with its planned economy now seems to be able to guarantee at least a subsistence level to its population, once the most poverty-stricken in the world, conditions in India hold no prospect of improving under its capitalist system, even with American dollars to help out. The latest news is widespread riots as the hardest pressed layers seek desperately to keep from dying from hunger.

The rioting has occurred in Bihar, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh. State-controlled grain shops are the targets of the hungry crowds. In Andhra Pradesh, the press reported August 12 that 1,000 students attacked official homes. The police beat them off with clubs.

THE ANTIWAR "TEACH-INS"

By Doug Jenness

New York

The February bombings of north Vietnam by the United States government sparked an antiwar protest movement in the United States that continues to grow. At no previous time in American history has such a large antiwar movement developed against a war in which the U.S. was involved while the war was going on.

The protests against the war in Vietnam have taken many forms, ranging from the traditional rallies and demonstrations to the new and more novel "teach-in." The teach-in movement that swept across American campuses this spring was a surprising but welcome phenomenon. It was born at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor on March 24 and spread like wildfire, reaching dozens of campuses and involving several hundred thousand students and professors.

The teach-ins are usually organized by committees of professors -- most often young professors and instructors. On most campuses, however, students have played an active role in publicizing the teach-ins and in some cases have done all the organizing. The form the teach-ins take is usually a long series of talks by professors, ranging from five minutes to thirty minutes each. The normal practice is to start the teach-in about 8:00 in the evening and to continue it until early the following morning. Plenty of time is allowed for asking questions.

When the teach-ins were first initiated, many professors found them attractive because they were "objective" forums presenting many different points of view about the war in Vietnam. However, it became obvious after a short time that to openly raise questions about the war in Vietnam and to tell the truth about U.S. involvement there brought the professors into inevitable conflict with the Johnson administration.

The Johnson administration, like the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations before it, has consistently lied to the American people about the purpose and conduct of American aggression in Vietnam. To dig into Vietnamese history and dissect American foreign policy piece by piece is a form of protest in itself. The dispatch of "truth squads" from Washington to tour campuses in order to defend administration policy demonstrates the nervous sensitivity the Johnson clique has toward open discussion on the war in Vietnam.

When the professors and students learn that they have been lied to about Vietnam, they begin to wonder if the government hasn't been lying all along during the "cold war." The students especially soak up every piece of knowledge about Vietnamese history, the Vietnamese war, and the "cold war" that they possibly can from the teach-

ins. There is a powerful tendency to be open-minded and listen to all views on the war.

At the massive Berkeley teach-in in May, thousands of students stayed up all night in order to hear Isaac Deutscher speak. Ten thousand students listened attentively and then gave him a standing ovation when he was finished.

Despite the New York Times reports which tried to depict the Berkeley teach-in as a monstrous picnic with thousands of young people frolicking on the grass, there was intense interest in what all the speakers had to say and an attitude of wanting to learn.

Besides the professors, there were representatives from political organizations, including revolutionary socialists. At the Berkeley teach-in the more radical speakers received the best response. Staughton Lynd who has become the chief spokesman for the new militants in the antiwar movement received the best response of any of the speakers when he attacked coalitionism with the Democratic party as "coalitionism with the marines."

Although many of the teach-ins have not dealt directly with the origins of the Vietnamese war, they have raised many important questions. For example at the National Teach-In in Washington the question of whether or not the United States is capable of supporting nationalist movements was discussed. Another question that has received much attention is why does President Johnson have the "right" to involve the U.S. in a land war in Asia without consulting congress or broader layers of the population? There is a strong feeling that the ordinary American is not represented when it comes to the question of war and peace.

The administration has reacted very defensively to the teach-ins and has been condescending in their attitude to the professors. For example when McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Johnson, was asked to participate in a teach-in at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, he replied, "I find strange your assumption that a public official is somehow accountable to the profession in which he worked before coming to the government..."

He closed by saying that if the invitation which raised questions about American policy in Vietnam "came to me for grading as a professor of government, I would not be able to give it high marks."

This correspondence became national news and after failing to show up for the National Teach-In in Washington, Bundy was soon dubbed "the teach-in drop-out of the month." [A "drop-out" is a student who abruptly leaves school because of failure in studies or for other reasons.]

When students at Cornell University peppered Averell Harriman with questions that he was unable to answer, he defended himself by

screaming, "How many of you are Communists?" This did not sit well with the students and they continued to demand answers to their questions.

The Johnson "truth squads" found that facing up to the students' questions was too much for them. They usually became the focal point for anti-administration protests.

So far the government's condescension and red-baiting have only served to aggravate the conflict between the administration and the antiwar movement. The professors have not sought refuge from administration attacks by excluding or red-baiting the more radical elements.

An interesting example of this attitude is evident in the case of Professor Eugene Genovese. Genovese speaking at a teach-in held at Rutgers University said, "Those of you who know me, know that I am a Marxist and a socialist. I do not fear or regret the impending victory in Vietnam. I welcome it." These remarks which in effect declared support to the "enemy" while the country is at war would have been considered close to treason in any previous war. Yet when his right to teach at Rutgers was raised by two New Jersey legislators, both the university administration and the governor of New Jersey defended his right to teach and hold his opinions.

After the National Teach-In in Washington a permanent committee was set up nationally to coordinate activity among the various committees of professors that had developed in the course of the teach-in movement. The next major project of this organization is an International Teach-In to be held in Toronto on October 8.

INDIAN TROTSKYISTS FORM PARTY

A three-day conference of Trotskyists from different states, which concluded in Bombay August 9, decided to form a new political party to be known as the Socialist Workers party, with the immediate objective of bringing about a regroupment of the Marxist-Leninist forces to achieve a speedy socialist transformation of Indian society.

The conference, which was chaired by Shri Somendra Kumar, a trade-union leader of Bihar, elected a nine-member organizing committee, with Shri Murlidhar Parija of Bombay as secretary, to organize units in different states and to convene a regular conference of the new party. A constitution was adopted.

The Trotskyists, who had merged with the Revolutionary Communist party of India [RCPI] in 1960, severed connections with that organization in 1963 due to serious differences over the attitude of

the Congress government, particularly since the Sino-Indian border conflict.

The conference was of the view that it is necessary for the Trotskyists, who have been vindicated in their struggle against Stalinism on a world scale, to project themselves as a distinct communist tendency in Indian left politics in view of the crisis in the official Communist movement internationally and the gross distortions of Trotskyist positions disseminated by the Communist parties.

A 23-page policy statement adopted by the conference attributed the present deepening crisis in the Indian economy (acute food shortage, inflationary trend, etc.) eighteen years after independence and despite three five-year plans, as due to the basic policies of the Congress government, which seeks to build capitalism in the country under the false disguise of a "socialist pattern" in a period of the decay of world capitalism.

The new party believes that only a socialist transformation of society on the basis of a program of nationalization of the key industries, credit institutions, import and export trade -- i.e., social ownership of the means of production under a workers and peasants government -- can free the productive forces in the industrial and agricultural sphere from the present fetters and bring about a resolution of the crisis.

The party therefore calls for the creation of a united front of the left to fight for dislodging the ruling capitalist class from the seats of power and establishing a workers and peasants government based on elected panchayats [councils] of workers and peasants.

The party maintains that the Congress government, despite its policy of nonalignment, is basically allied to the imperialist camp. The party calls for a negotiated settlement of India's border and other disputes with neighboring countries, including China, Pakistan, Ceylon, Nepal and Burma.

A resolution adopted by the conference states that the people of Kashmir should have the right of self-determination. On Goa, the conference favored a referendum, letting the Goan people freely decide whether they would like to merge with the neighboring state of Maharashtra or remain as an independent state within the Indian Union.

The party called for the settlement of all interstate border disputes within the Indian Union on the basis of the democratically determined will of the people concerned. It criticized the traditional left parties for exhibiting a regional chauvinistic attitude on these questions.

The declaration of the new party explains the differences it has with the traditional left parties, including the Praja Socialist

party, the Samyukta Socialist party, the two rival Communist parties, the Revolutionary Socialist party of India, etc. The split in the Communist party is considered to be a projection of the Sino-Soviet conflict but is recognized to have its main roots in Indian politics and to be of far-reaching consequence for the Indian left movement as a whole.

Internationally, the new party is pledged to support the struggles of the workers of the advanced capitalist countries for socialism and solidarizes with the liberation struggle of the colonial and semicolonial people against colonialism and neocolonialism. It also supports the people in the workers states in their struggle against the bureaucracy and for socialist democracy.

The party is committed to a policy of unconditional defense of the workers states, including the Soviet Union, China, north Vietnam, Yugoslavia and Cuba in the event of imperialist aggression.

On Vietnam, the party calls for united action by the Indian and international working-class movement in support of the heroic liberation war of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialist aggression. It scored the Shastri government for its servile attitude toward U.S. imperialism on Vietnam and other questions. It stands for India's immediate withdrawal from the Commonwealth.

The new party has fraternal relations with the Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky. Its headquarters are to be in Bombay.

LIVE REVOLUTIONARY GOALS IN LATIN AMERICA

On August 12 Ecuador police claimed to have discovered large stores of arms and munitions that were to be used for guerrilla operations near Guayaquil. Rafael Garcia Velasco, the new minister of interior, said that "all the agitators are mobilizing" on the eve of a strike projected by the merchants of Quito.

On the same day, a report from Venezuela said that government forces had discovered five tons of arms and supplies "abandoned" by guerrilla forces in Falcon. At Cantauro a band of twenty guerrilla fighters helped themselves to supplies from a store.

In Washington fears were expressed that Guatemala may soon erupt into a "second Dominican Republic," according to the August 11 New York Herald Tribune. The situation is "potentially far worse" because a band of guerrillas are operating in the mountains. They are led by Yon Sosa, who took advantage of the U.S. to gain training at the Fort Gulick counterinsurgency school in Panama.

HUGO BLANCO'S ROLE IN THE PERUVIAN PEASANT MOVEMENT

[The following letter concerning Hugo Blanco was sent by Pierre Frank to James Aronson, editor of the New York weekly National Guardian.]

* * *

August 16, 1965

Dear Mr. Aronson,

In Cedric Belfrage's otherwise excellent article on the outbreak of guerrilla warfare in Peru (National Guardian, July 31), there are two references to the Trotskyist peasant leader Hugo Blanco which seem to be based on misinformation and which we are sure you will want to correct.

"In 1959," the article states, "Hugo Blanco, an intellectual inspired by Trotsky and Fidel Castro, learned Quechua and began organizing resistance in the Convención Valley near Cuzco, but gave himself up to the police in 1963."

Further on, the conduct of Luis de la Puente Uceda, one of the three guerrilla leaders currently in the resistance movement, is stated to be in "contrast to the mystery in which predecessor Blanco clothed his actions..."

Hugo Blanco was an agricultural student in Buenos Aires when, inspired by the Cuban Revolution, he decided to return home to Peru to participate in the peasant struggles. Practical experience led him to conclude that while much could be learned from the Cuban example, it could not be mechanically duplicated in Peru. Adjusting his tactics to the inclinations of the peasants themselves, among whom he was very popular, he took the lead in organizing unions. These defended the daily interests of the peasants -- much like the Peasant League organized by Francisco Julião in Brazil -- and engaged, where conditions were favorable, in "recuperating" land from big landholders. This led to armed conflicts in which Blanco was pictured in the press as a "guerrilla" leader although he actually headed a federation of some 10,000 members whose struggles were mainly on the economic front.

The Peruvian government mounted a repressive operation like the one now directed against Luis de la Puente, Guillermo Lobatón and Gonzalo Fernández Gasco. Hugo Blanco was captured on May 30, 1963, when, desperately ill, he was brought by his followers down out of the mountains in search of clandestine medical treatment. Blanco did not give himself up any more than Castro did after the affair at the Moncada barracks. At the time, the press reported that Blanco was charged with "responsibility" for the death of "five

rural policemen" killed during skirmishes with the land-hungry peasants.

As for the "mystery" in which "Blanco clothed his actions..." Che Guevara had this to say in an interview given in Algiers, July 23, 1963, published in the August 3 issue of El Moudjahid: "Hugo Blanco is the head of one of the guerrilla movements in Peru. He struggled stubbornly but the repression was strong. I don't know what his tactics of struggle were, but his fall does not signify the end of the movement. It is only a man that has fallen, but the movement continues. One time, when we were preparing to make our landing from the Granma, and when there was great risk that all of us would be killed, Fidel said: 'What is more important than us is the example we set.' It's the same thing. Hugo Blanco has set an example, a good example, and he struggled as much as he could. But he suffered a defeat, the popular forces suffered a defeat. It's only a passing stage. Afterward will come another stage."

Guevara's tribute was not without more immediate reason than reference to the general example set by Hugo Blanco. At the end of October 1962 during the Caribbean crisis, Hugo Blanco, as a demonstration of solidarity in behalf of the Cuban Revolution, led a march of 5,000 peasants from villages in the Andes into Cuzco. They occupied the city for several hours before withdrawing. The action received due publicity in Peru at the time.

Readers of the National Guardian will undoubtedly be interested in the way Peruvians look at Hugo Blanco. Last year Hugo Neira, who is on the staff of the Lima daily Expreso, published a book of reportage (Cuzco: Tierra y Muerte) on the peasant movement that swept the Cuzco area from December 1963 to March 1964. This began, Neira states, when "the city of Quillabamba was taken by unions carrying out an order to go on strike issued in Cuzco by the Federation in order to win the release of imprisoned union leaders, among them, Hugo Blanco."

Neira travelled throughout the region, making a first-hand investigation of this novel turn in Peru's peasant movement. (The movement was put down by a massive "operation" of the government's armed forces in which hundreds of arrests were made, including the entire leadership of the peasant federation.) Among other things, Neira indicates the imprisoned Hugo Blanco's role:

"Fought by the right, his image distorted by prestige due to erroneous reports about him being a guerrilla fighter, injured by the silence, if not sabotage, of the traditional, bureaucratic groups of Communism, extolled by the FIR (Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario), feared and hated by the unorganized yanacunas and the hacendados, admired by the union ranks, Hugo Blanco looms over the whole South.

"This is the straight truth, without falsification, of what this man, who is a prisoner today in Arequipa, means to the peasant masses....'We owe him everything,' say the peasants. In fact every

change in Convención and elsewhere in the country, was accelerated due to the danger they saw in the peasants having no hope other than hope in the revolutionary unionism of Blanco.

"Devotion to Blanco is total; they don't dare bring him to trial. I am referring to the unionized peasants. 'He is our chief,' they say....And in every peasant's home there is an empty bed. It's the one that was waiting hopefully for the leader when he was going around the region organizing or when he was passing during the night, under the stars, fleeing from the police...."

At the moment, the MIR (Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario), as Mr. Belfrage reports, is leading a guerrilla struggle, which the government is trying to suppress, as in previous operations, with napalm and bombs. The guerrilla fighters undoubtedly enjoy wide sympathy in Peru, although the tactical wisdom of the initiative taken by the MIR and the attitude of the other sectors on this is not yet clear. Neira had the following to say in his book concerning the leadership of the peasant movement:

"For the moment no party as yet holds a monopoly on this network of realities. The leaders come from various groups. It seems that those with the most weight are from the FIR, the MIR, Trotskyist people. But there are also peasant leaders of great capacity linked to the PCP (the Peruvian Communist party)..."

All of these groups, as well as the unions, student organizations and broad intellectual circles are at present the target of a massive nation-wide witch-hunt mounted by the Belaúnde government in conjunction with its effort to stamp out the guerrilla movement. Fresh fears have been expressed for Hugo Blanco's life in view of the announcement by the Peruvian Minister of the Interior July 4 (as reported in the Paris Le Monde July 6) that the operation of the armed forces was aimed "at eliminating subversive extremism once and for all" and that instructions had been given to the army "to give no quarter and not to capture any heroes."

It would seem that the Peruvian authorities now regret not having summarily dispatched Hugo Blanco and that they have decided not to repeat the "error." That they may well take advantage of the current antiguerrilla operation to do away with Hugo Blanco is obvious.

A word should also be said for Hugo Blanco's sister Luchi. According to a February 11, 1964, Prensa Latina dispatch from Lima, she was arrested among hundreds of others when 8,000 peasants engaged in land seizures at Sicuana, during which 17 were killed by government forces. Of those arrested, 18, including Luchi, "were sent to the grim Sepa prison in the Loreto Department in the Amazon jungle," Prensa Latina reported. No further word has been received as to her fate or that of the seventeen others.

Sincerely,

Pierre FRANK

THE MILITARY COUP D'ETAT IN ALGERIA AND THE BOUMEDIENNE REGIME

[At a plenum in July, the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International approved the general line of a declaration issued by the United Secretariat June 23, four days after Colonel Boumedienne's coup d'état in Algeria. (See World Outlook June 25.) After considerable discussion of the turn in the Algerian situation and its ramifications, the IEC adopted the following resolution on the coup d'état and the regime established by Boumedienne a month later.]

* * *

I.

Meaning of the Military Coup d'Etat in Algeria

Colonel Boumedienne's coup d'état unquestionably constitutes a turn to the right in the development of the Algerian revolution. The main conquests of the revolution are now gravely threatened, particularly the institution of workers self-management in the socialized enterprises.

Following the elimination of representatives of the bourgeois forces like Ferhat Abbas and Mohamed Khider, the government of Ben Bella was characterized by the Fourth International as a "workers and peasants government" of the kind referred to in the first four congresses of the Communist International and in the Transitional Program of the Fourth International, that is, a government of non-Marxist political forces based on the workers and poor peasants, which have broken with the bourgeoisie under the pressure of the masses but which have not yet completed the revolution by shattering the bourgeois state apparatus, ending capitalist property relations and establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Such a government is by nature highly transitory; that is, it can move either toward the right, paving the way for reestablishment of a bourgeois government (which, in a country with a semi-colonial economy like Algeria, could only be a neocolonialist government), or it can evolve toward the left, paving the way for creation of a workers state.

Colonel Boumedienne's coup d'état signifies neither the end of the Algerian revolution nor the victory of the neocolonialist counterrevolution. But it has initiated, or more exactly accentuated, a process that can lead to the reestablishment of a bourgeois government by heightening the demobilization and political apathy of the masses.

Condemnation of the military coup d'état does not at all constitute "intervention" in the internal affairs of Algeria, as Colonel

Boumedienne charged in response to the criticisms expressed by Fidel Castro. The fate of the Algerian revolution is of concern to revolutionists throughout the world. Their interest in the Algerian revolution was amply demonstrated by their tenacious defense of its cause and the material aid which they mobilized, often at great risk, during the difficult years of the war. In fact, Algeria could scarcely have won its political freedom without this aid. The truth is that in itself Colonel Boumedienne's military coup d'état constituted "intervention" not only in the development of Algeria's revolution, but in the development of the revolution on an international scale and in the defense of the socialist achievements in the workers states, above all in the case of Cuba, which has not been the last in line to solidarize with the Algerian revolution in its difficult moments.

The evolution toward the right under Boumedienne has already been clearly shown by the following:

(1) Ben Bella based himself mainly on mobilizing the masses from time to time and on his popularity among them. Boumedienne's base is mainly the army, which, without having definitively outlived its revolutionary origin, has become increasingly converted into a professional army, a privileged body separated from the Algerian masses.

(2) The Boumedienne regime displays pronounced hostility toward all the avowed Marxist tendencies -- both the official Communist parties and the revolutionary Marxist tendencies, and is stressing the "Arab Islamic" character of "Algerian socialism."

(3) While relations with the workers states, particularly with Cuba, have deteriorated, relations with American and French imperialism are improving.

(4) Under pretext of improving their "efficiency," the management committees of the self-managed sector have been threatened with a purge. This could be the prelude to weakening or even suppressing them.

(5) The limited degree of trade-union autonomy, painfully reconquered at the last congress of the UGTA [Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens], is under threat of being suppressed again.

(6) The tentative moves toward establishment of a militia were bitterly opposed by Boumedienne when they were initiated under Ben Bella. The arming of the people would now have to be undertaken in direct opposition to the regime.

(7) Boumedienne has placed a military figure in charge of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] in contradiction to the need to democratize, strengthen and develop a broadly based vanguard party in Algeria.

(8) A significant lowering of aid to the revolutionary movements fighting against colonialism in the Portuguese colonies and against the fascist-like dictatorship in South Africa was one of the first measures put into effect by Boumedienne.

The principal social force that rallied immediately to the military coup d'état in Algeria was the "bourgeois bureaucracy," a product in large part of the former colonial administration, which is closely linked with the neocolonialist business circles. From this force -- independently of the wishes of Colonel Boumedienne -- emanates the threat of regression in the Algerian revolution, a threat increased by the successful coup d'état.

II.

Origin of the Coup d'Etat

After seizing power at the end of the crisis of the FLN in July 1962, Ben Bella balanced between two forces: on one hand the army of the frontiers, which had brought him to power against the resistance of certain Wilayas [districts] of the interior which were struggling for local prerogatives; and, on the other hand, the masses, the mobilization of which reached its high point with the publication of the March 1963 decrees on self-management in the socialized "biens vacants" ["vacant property"], Ben Bella's tour of the country and the celebration of May Day. Ben Bella's great popularity among the masses, coupled with their occasional mobilization, acted as a counterweight to the army. In addition, Boumedienne supported the March decrees at the time.

This equilibrium of forces was, however, extremely unstable. It could not endure, and had to give way, either to an increasing role of the masses, or, in the opposite direction, of the army. The first variant called for maintaining a fighting spirit among the masses, both urban and rural, and keeping them mobilized. This in turn required a functioning democracy and the autonomy of the mass organizations. In addition, a series of revolutionary measures were needed to improve living conditions for the broad masses in the rural areas; i.e., a deep-going agrarian reform. Particularly important was immediate relief and the opening of a perspective for the unemployed to whom the revolution has not yet brought any improvements.

Even had these conditions been fulfilled, the ultimate victory of the socialist revolution would not have been assured so long as an essentially neocolonialist bureaucracy, hostile to socialism, remained in place, and along with it a state structure inherited from the colonial administration and a professional army capable of enforcing obedience. The completion of the revolution required, besides the economic measures indicated below [see section IV], the arming of the workers and the poor peasants (people's militia), a

radical purge of the administration, and particularly the creation of the apparatus of a new kind of state based on committees of workers, soldiers and poor peasants. The realization of these conditions would open the possibility of continuing the revolution in Algeria toward socialism and establishing a workers state in the relatively near future.

In the absence of measures to maintain the fighting spirit and mobilization of the masses at a high level, the whole fragile equilibrium of power shifted imperceptibly toward the army at the expense of Ben Bella. The longer that measures like the second agrarian reform were delayed, the greater became the demobilization and apathy of the masses, and the more Ben Bella became a mere hostage of the army whom it could eliminate almost without striking a blow. This is what happened June 19.

After the elimination of procapitalist forces like Ferhat Abbas, Belkacem Krim and Mohamed Khider, the FLN was dominated by an internal struggle between an unorganized left tendency, which to a considerable degree understood the need to carry out the indispensable measures to complete the revolution, and a rightist tendency favoring "Arab Islamic socialism" of a Nasserian variety supported by the army and the state apparatus. Although Ben Bella undoubtedly favored measures that could have led to completion of the revolution, particularly the program of the FLN passed at the Algiers congress (the Algiers Charter remains valid as a whole), he rejected organizing a genuine vanguard party based on the masses of workers and poor peasants and maintaining workers democracy and a climate of continual mobilization in the country. He preferred to play a bonapartist role between the two tendencies, of searching particularly for compromises at the top rather than of continually appealing to the masses. In this there was a fundamental difference between him and Fidel Castro, which likewise determined the different dynamics of the Algerian revolution as compared with that of the Cuban revolution.

The left-wing vanguard, which included members of the dissolved Algerian Communist party, as well as sectors further to the left (militants who embodied the best revolutionary tradition of the rank-and-file of the FLN) and independent revolutionists, fell in with Ben Bella's maneuverist policy of compromises at the top instead of offering a revolutionary Marxist criticism of Ben Bella's course and seeking to organize their own forces in an effective way. Some of them are continuing to follow the same course in relation to Boumedienne as if they had learned nothing from the military coup d'état and were blind to the mounting danger to the revolution. The road they are following points to disaster.

Ben Bella's maneuverist orientation was bound to end in weakening the revolution. Ben Bella felt this after a time, and early this year, particularly under the pressure of the strike wave that shook the country last winter, he made concessions to the masses and to the left which held promise of giving new life to the revolution.

At the UGTA congress, the former leadership imposed by the bureaucratic apparatus of Mohamed Khider against the will of the immense majority of the trade-union militants was ousted and replaced by a leadership that could be considered as being partially representative of the rank and file. Nationalization of the major part of industry was promised. On the eve of the coup d'état, the central committee of the FLN, under the pressure of Ben Bella, decided to move ahead in a more serious way with construction of a people's militia. A few days later, Ben Bella wanted the political bureau to organize the party inside the army and to eliminate several right-wing ministers. These measures would have radically altered the relation of forces. To block this, the army seized power. But it is significant that in face of the growing resistance of the army, particularly to his attempt to push the army's political representative out of the government (Abdelaziz Bouteflika, the minister of foreign affairs), Ben Bella, far from appealing to the masses, once again was content with maneuvers and secret conferences at the top. He thereby provided history with a fresh example of how much more costly it is to conceive of carrying on a revolution by commands or maneuvers "from above" than by mobilizing the giant power of the masses and proceeding with the revolution "from below." The latter method, it is proved once again, is much less disorderly, costly, painful, and dangerous.

Boumedienne's coup d'état also places a harsh light on the role of Khrushchevism. After isolating itself from the mainstream of the Algerian revolution until it was victorious, the Algerian Communist party, upon being banned by Ben Bella, accepted the decree, making a face-saving protest, and the leaders actually went so far in applying the Kremlin's line as to formally dissolve the party. It was through the FLN under Ben Bella's leadership, according to the CP leaders, that the main goals of the Algerian revolution were to be achieved. Algeria was described as a kind of "national democratic state," one of the great new innovations of Khrushchevist "theory" adopted at the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

This line suffered the usual fate of illusions. The FLN proved incapable of preventing Boumedienne's "action" or of mobilizing resistance against it. The need for an organized revolutionary Marxist vanguard was proved to be more imperative than ever in Algeria. And it was shown that to guarantee and complete the conquests of the revolution, it is necessary to build a workers state and achieve the socialist revolution, without halting at any non-existent stage of "national democracy."

III.

The Immediate Perspectives of the Algerian Revolution

Colonel Boumedienne's regime is itself of unstable and transitory character. It is based mainly on the army, the only cohesive ruling apparatus in Algeria. But this army is not homogeneous; it tends, in its own way, to reflect all the contradictions of Algerian society and a state still enmeshed in a revolution that has not been crushed nor become exhausted, and which is far from having disappeared from the minds of the toiling masses.

Colonel Boumedienne, it is evident, has gathered into his own hands all the reins of power; he directs the army, the administration, the Council of the Revolution. He seeks to reconstruct the party from above. The model he has in mind is undoubtedly a "socialist" regime like Nasser's. But Algerian realities are quite different from those in Egypt.

On the one hand, Boumedienne and the army find support in heterogeneous anti-Benbellist and "antileftist" forces corresponding to quite different social interests and aims. These include the big Algerian landholders anxious to indefinitely postpone the second agrarian reform; technocrats and top functionaries eager to consolidate exorbitant privileges and, under cover of "efficiency," to eliminate self-management and some other much too bothersome forms of control from below; the bureaucratic layers, shot through with neocolonialist memories, nostalgia and interests; the merchant bourgeoisie and various direct representatives of imperialism. The Algerian economy remains profoundly integrated in the international imperialist economy; its government budget even depends strictly on subsidies granted by France. (The latter relationship, it should be noted, scarcely represents a gamble for the French government, since up to now the profits from the exploitation of Algerian oil reserves have largely compensated for the subsidies.) Under these conditions, the combination that supports Boumedienne will rapidly come to pieces, part of them seeking to accelerate the course toward the right, others seeking to continue the revolution "from above."

On the other hand, the main conquests of the Algerian revolution were the product of a mobilization of the masses. Any retreat with regard to these measures, particularly anything putting self-management in question, any resort to repression against a new wave of strikes, any attempt to install a regime of austerity at the expense of wages, etc., would be bitterly resented by the masses, who retain their capacity to react. A fresh initiative on the part of the masses would have a dialectic of its own. The numerical and social weakness of the neocolonialist forces, moreover, favors vigorous actions by the masses. In short, after ten years of popular struggle and a tumultuous rise of the revolution, the Boumedienne regime will reveal itself to the masses as a dangerous setback, with

a perspective of bitter consequences.

In addition, the Algerian economy has growing contradictions resulting from the coexistence of a nonintegrated "socialized" sector and a still predominant capitalist sector in industry (oil), as well as in the field of foreign trade, credit and banking. These contradictions will likewise block stabilization of Boumedienne's power at the present level.

Either the Algerian revolution will take a new leap forward, experiencing a fresh upsurge, thanks to another rise in the mass struggle -- as has occurred so many times since November 1954 -- or the Algerian government will shift increasingly toward the right, in the direction of reestablishment of a bourgeois government, and the road will be opened to imitators of Boumedienne in the art of coups d'état. This is the alternative that faces Algeria following the June 19 military coup d'état.

IV.

The Tasks of the Revolutionary Marxists in Algeria

From this analysis, revolutionary Marxists must conclude that the Algerian revolution is still alive, that it has suffered a serious but not a definitive defeat. A new upsurge of revolution is possible. The revolutionary Marxists in Algeria must concentrate their efforts on preparing for and facilitating the resurgence of the revolution. This work involves in particular:

- (1) Defense of self-management and all the conquests of the revolution.
- (2) Defense of the democratic rights of the workers movement, including the right to organize workers parties loyal to the Algerian revolution and completely hostile to imperialism and neocolonialism. In the same spirit it is necessary to demand either a fair public trial or the immediate release of Ben Bella and all the revolutionists who have been made victims of political repression.
- (3) Defense of the Algiers Charter and a struggle to apply it.
- (4) Defense of Marxism as a revolutionary theory that must be taken as the only valid guide to action in Algeria as everywhere else in moving toward a classless society.
- (5) Struggle for the consolidation of the socialized sector to block its becoming an adjunct to the private sector and disintegrating. This struggle must be linked to the slogan of extending the self-managed socialized sector to include all the key industries,

and of nationalizing the credit system, transportation and foreign trade, and initiating genuine socialist planning.

(6) Struggle for a genuine second agrarian reform, capable of considerably increasing the income of the poor peasants and establishing a broad cooperative sector alongside the self-managed sector.

(7) Arming of the workers and poor peasants in a genuine popular militia democratically constituted and electing its own commanders.

(8) Special attention must be paid to the struggle for equality of women. This is of great political importance in the current situation in Algeria as a counter to the "Arab Islamic" tendency, one of the aims of which is to keep the women from breaking out of the inferior status allotted to them in this retrograde outlook. The revolution in Algeria cannot develop and progress without the active and massive participation of the women.

(9) A radical cleaning out of all the neocolonialist elements in the state apparatus; and the organization of councils and committees in all the factories, neighborhoods, douars [villages], and farms, as the basis of a workers state.

(10) Continuation and extension of active solidarity with regard to all the movements struggling against colonialism and neocolonialism, particularly in Africa.

(11) Continuation of the struggle to build a mass party with a revolutionary socialist program, based on the vanguard of the masses of workers and poor peasants in Algeria, with a genuinely democratic structure, and aiming at carrying out the Algiers Charter and completing the revolution in Algeria, by establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, with power in the hands of the workers and poor peasants.

(12) In order to struggle more effectively for these objectives, the revolutionary Marxists should seek to construct a section of the Fourth International in Algeria.

JUST "HUNTING GUNS" FOR SOUTH AFRICA

Achkar Marof of Guinea, chairman of the UN General Assembly's Special Committee on Apartheid, accused the Japanese government on July 27 of selling arms and shotguns to South Africa under the label of "hunting guns." He revealed that Japanese officials are considering selling under the same label "a highly sophisticated 7.62 mm. rifle, used by Japan's ground forces." Japan had reported to the United Nations that it was applying a strict arms embargo against South Africa.

SOLIDARITY WITH THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE!

[The following excerpts have been translated from the speech given by Fidel Castro on July 26 at Santa Clara in the province of Las Villas in commemoration of the twelfth anniversary of Moncada, where the armed struggle against the Batista dictatorship began. Photographs in the July 27 issue of the Havana daily El Mundo show that the crowd was as huge as at previous celebrations, and evidently just as enthusiastic.]

* * *

Today, under the revolutionary power, who needs to use influence to have his life saved in a hospital? (Shouts of: "No one.") Who needs to use influence to get a chance to study? (Shouts of: "No one.") Who needs to organize a neighborhood committee to plead for a school teacher or construction of a road? (Shouts of: "No one.") Who needs to use influence of any kind? No one!

And this is the enormous difference between that system and this system. And thus it would be good if our enemies, so blind, so stupid, could just get a glimpse of this sight this afternoon. Because as a demonstration of the power of the people, as a demonstration of the revolutionary spirit of the people, we, who have the privilege to see this meeting from the platform, are sorry that each and every one of you can't be up here to see what you can't see from where you're standing, what you could see in a photograph from here perhaps. But how can a photograph show what we are looking at from here? It would be good if those who send murderers to kill school teachers could see this, could see that nearby, where they murdered Conrado Benítez, 6,000 youth are studying to be school teachers. (Applause.)

It would be good if they could see the results of the terror they tried to sow among our people, to see how little their crimes paid off, of what little use their money was, how useless their weapons were. It would be good in this way to destroy their illusions once and for all. It would be good for them to understand that the Revolution cannot possibly go back, that the Revolution is an indestructible fact in the history of our country, and that our people are able not only to overcome all economic obstacles that the enemy is trying to put in their path, but that our people are able to resist any attacks the enemy dares launch. And that our people are able to struggle for a year, for ten years, a hundred years, against our only enemy if he tries to invade this country and conquer it.

In this sense, all the people of the world must be infinitely grateful to the people of South Vietnam (applause), because the people of South Vietnam have provided the world with an extraordinary lesson. The people of South Vietnam, confronting hundreds of

Yankee bombers, and tens of thousands of Yankee soldiers intervening in their country, are carrying on a victorious struggle, defeating the imperialists, and they are teaching them, they are teaching them that there is no military force great enough to overcome a revolutionary people no matter how small the nation, and that all modern technology, all the bombers, and all the economic resources, are not enough to defeat a small nation that has decided to struggle.

Our people have given lessons, our people have always shown this same spirit, but when we look at the example of South Vietnam, all of us feel admiration, all of us feel moved, and from here we send to the Vietnamese fighters, from the invincible bastion of Las Villas, our message of solidarity (ovation), our message of solidarity and support to this heroic people, whose youth know how to die, facing the imperialist firing squads without faltering, without begging for mercy, saying long live their country, shouting, "Death to imperialism and long live the Revolution!" "Long live freedom and long live Communism!" (Applause.)

Because these heroic people, who are undergoing massive bombing, these heroic people are fighting and dying not only for themselves, but also for us. They are fighting and dying for all people who in one way or another are threatened by the imperialists. They are fighting and dying to curb the imperialist aggression, to curb the aggressiveness of the imperialists.

In desperation the imperialists are talking about sending more and more soldiers. But how can the imperialists stop the liberation of the peoples? How can the imperialists crush the Revolution in all parts of the world? They do not have enough planes, nor enough troops to simultaneously crush the Revolution in Asia, the Revolution in Africa, the Revolution in Latin America. (Applause.)

The imperialists have powerful weapons; they have great military and economic resources, but they cannot exterminate Humanity. To crush the Revolution they would have to crush the peoples of two-thirds of the world; they would have to crush all the peoples of Asia; they would have to crush all the peoples defending their freedom or struggling for freedom in Asia; they would have to annihilate the peoples of Latin America.

Because the imperialists are persisting in their repression in Vietnam just as they are intervening in Santo Domingo in order to frighten the peoples, in order to intimidate the peoples. But the peoples understand the weakness of the imperialists; they understand that it is their weakness and their fear that is driving them to intervene in Vietnam, that is driving them to intervene in Santo Domingo, that is driving them to threaten Cuba, that is driving them to threaten to intervene in any country in the Americas where a Revolution breaks out.

But how can the imperialists intervene in all the countries

of Latin America? Today they are intervening in Santo Domingo; tomorrow they will have to intervene in Peru; the day after, they will have to intervene in Colombia; the day after that they will have to intervene in Guatemala; the next day they will have to intervene in Brazil. And one day they will find themselves obliged to intervene throughout the Continent; and they will perish in its mountains, in its jungles, in its rivers and cities.

For us this attitude of imperialism involves a danger, because some imperialists preach that it is necessary to liquidate Cuba, that to liquidate Cuba is to liquidate the Revolution in Latin America. And to this, in reality, it is necessary to tell them in reply that in the first place Cuba cannot be liquidated; in the second place, the example of Cuba can never be liquidated.

To invade our country the imperialists would run big risks. In the first place, they would run the risk of unpredictable consequences of an international character, and they would run the risk of a struggle that would never come to an end; because all the divisions they have -- even if they called up the reserves -- would not be enough to make the Cuban people submit (applause), would not be enough to crush the resistance of millions of Cubans. But in addition -- we know this -- to crush Cuba would not crush the Revolution in Latin America.

The Revolution in Latin America, the same as in Africa and the same as in Asia and the same as in any part of the world where oppression exists, is inevitable with Cuba or without Cuba, with the Cuban Revolution or without the Cuban Revolution. (Applause.)

Naturally the Cuban Revolution has given it an impulse, has -- in the first place -- set the example, shown solidarity, given moral encouragement. And there is no way of crushing this example.

No matter how much they exert themselves, or how irritated they become, or how they train mercenary troops, or how they threaten, the Yankee imperialists cannot prevent the liberation of Latin America sooner or later. No matter how irritated they are they cannot prevent the liberation of Vietnam or the liberation of the other peoples oppressed by them in Asia. This is inevitable. This is what we proclaim here; we have no fear of proclaiming it.

We have no illusions; we do not believe we are immune to risks and dangers. We do not believe we are immune to an attack which the imperialists in their impotence, in their hate and desperation can launch at any time against our country. We have no illusions. We are running these risks, we are running them consciously. And naturally we are preparing for these risks.

And it is our duty to be better and better prepared in face of these risks. As the revolutionary movement develops in Latin America, the hatred of the imperialists will mount against us.

As the revolutionary movement develops in Latin America, the imperialists will blame us more and more. As the revolutionary movement develops in Latin America, the threats and dangers will increase. But we will not tell the peoples of Latin America because of that, "Wait, don't make the revolution, because it will endanger us." No! We exhort the revolutionists of Latin America to struggle! (Applause.) We exhort the revolutionists of Latin America to follow our example, and we readily run the risk. We show the peoples of Latin America the possibility of Revolution, and the threats and the dangers and the risks don't bother us.

Naturally we don't want the fruit of our efforts destroyed, naturally. We have worked arduously for the well-being of our country, for the security of our country, for the future of our country, but we are not afraid of the danger because of that, we don't flee from the dangers because of that. Although Cuba runs a risk, although the imperialists menace us, we want the Revolution, we want the liberation of the peoples of Latin America; we don't stop to look at our triumphs in an egoistic way; we don't stop to enjoy our triumphs in an egoistic way; we want the peoples of Latin America to have the same triumphs as us; we want the peoples of Latin America to follow our example, because we know, in addition, that when peoples rise nothing and nobody can stop them. (Applause.)

The OAS [Organization of American States]? What is the OAS used for? (Shouts.) The right of intervention? What good will the right of intervention be? The imperialists claim that the OAS has reached agreement on intervening militarily against a revolution in any country. What good will these agreements be? What good will the OAS be if along with imperialism the institutions and organizations used by the imperialists to exploit and oppress the people are torn to shreds? Along with the OAS the military castes are going to be overturned, the feudal oligarchies are going to be overturned, as the Revolution develops; and the Revolution will develop inevitably because it is a law of history.

And what is our duty at the present moment in which the world is living? Because the world is living through some of the most extraordinary moments in all its history, a universal awakening of the desire for freedom among the peoples, of the desire for justice among the peoples. We have to work in various ways. In the first place we must more and more develop the revolutionary consciousness and the internationalist consciousness of our people; we must develop our armed forces and our means of defense; we must work arduously in the economic field to achieve the social and economic objectives of the Revolution.

That is, we must work on various fronts. It is necessary for the Revolution to advance in the economic field; this will make the Revolution stronger politically, morally and militarily. We have to develop the people ideologically; this will also make us stronger; and we must increase our people's means of combat.

[Castro then discussed some of the economic problems facing the country, the struggle against bureaucratism, the role of the revolutionary party, problems of administration, the need for independent thinking in all the problems facing the Cuban people, and the unity of the people and its leadership in the struggle against imperialism.]

* * *

Sometimes we ask ourselves on a day like this if it's going to be us bringing a message to the people, saying something new to the people, or if it is the people who are going to give a message to us, if the people are going to tell us something new. Because, who is speaking here, you or us? Formally, us. In reality you. Because it is you who are going to give a new impulse to the Revolution, you who are going to give fresh energy to our minds and spirits, new fervor and revolutionary inspiration. (Applause.) It's just as if every twenty-sixth of July the people met and demonstrated their strength in order to give a new impulse to the Revolution, in order to give a new impulse to the revolutionary leaders.

Because we don't meet to go over history; we don't meet to talk about history; we don't meet to record past history; we meet to write new history; we meet with the strength which this enormous column has accumulated on the road in order to resume the march with this strength; we meet in order to say that we are not just a few, that we are not just a hundred men; that we are not just a dozen men; that we are a whole people on the march, writing history, that we are writing it as other peoples have written it, as they have written it with sacrifices, as they have written it with blood.

With blood the Dominicans are writing the history of their country today! (Applause.) With blood, they are writing it -- the Venezuelans, the Colombians, the Peruvians, the Guatemalans! With blood the Congolese are writing it! With blood and sacrifices the peoples are writing their history! (Prolonged applause and cries of: "Fidel! Fidel! Fidel!")

And who are they, who are they who are spilling our blood? Who are they who are filling our road with obstacles? They are the same ones who are spilling the blood of the Dominicans; they are the same ones who are spilling the blood of the Vietnamese; they are the same ones who are spilling the blood of the Congolese; they are the ones who are spilling the blood of the peoples who want a better life, who want culture, who want peace, who want health, who want decency, who want freedom. They are the exploiters, those who cannot live without spilling the blood of the people, who cannot live without sponging on the labor of others, thriving on the sweat of the peoples. And thus the peoples have to write their history with sacrifices, with sorrow, with blood, and pay this price. (Applause.) And that is how we wrote our history.

This is not a gift; the Revolution was not a gift; the Revo-

lution was only the fruit of this effort, of this blood, of this sacrifice by a whole people. And it will continue to be like that.

It doesn't matter how long the road may prove to be; it doesn't matter how hard the struggle may be, our struggle and the struggles of the other peoples. Our enemies are powerful; but the peoples are more powerful. (Applause.) It doesn't matter how great the obstacles are; the will of the people to overcome these obstacles is greater. It doesn't matter how great our lack of culture was; the thirst of our people to know and to learn is greater. It doesn't matter how great our underdevelopment was, our poverty and our economic backwardness, the creative labor of the people is greater. And with the creative labor of the people we will overcome our economic backwardness, we will overcome our underdevelopment, we will overcome our poverty (applause); with the creative labor of the people, led by revolutionists, with a revolutionary spirit, we have to continue constructing at the cost of sacrifices a beautiful homeland (ovation); we have to continue constructing the world of tomorrow, this world in which the youth already growing up are an example.

The spirit of our youth is already shining, and they are showing it by their actions, as we saw yesterday in this same place, as we see in this contingent that is part of the 15,000 youths who are studying to be school teachers; as we see in the spirit of our future school teachers (applause), in the spirit with which they work, because they say that there, there in that school, neither sun nor shade makes any difference in how they work (applause), in that school there's neither cold, nor heat, nor rain, nor drought when they begin a job; these youth who, when some machines broke down and they had to finish the work, ended up breaking the rocks with sledge hammers. (Ovation.)

Our hopes are in this generation, in this generation which with this spirit in the fields and cities will educate our children; with this same spirit, improving all the time. And thus what they achieve -- which will be more than us -- will be outdone by the very ones they educate.

And this homeland, this country, we will build it, overcoming all the obstacles. We know we can do it! (Applause.) The sweat it costs doesn't matter, the dangers it costs don't matter. What we are doing and creating is in line with the future. The threats bearing down on the fruit of our labor don't worry us. What we have done once, we will be capable of doing again (applause) and of doing it as many times as may be necessary.

There is something that cannot ever be destroyed with bombs, or planes or weapons; there is something which, as in a seasoned soldier is not lost; those conditions, those characteristics that make a veteran soldier, and like a seasoned, veteran soldier, a formidable soldier, it isn't lost in battles, instead it grows. And as a seasoned and veteran people, our people, its spirit doesn't

give way in battles, its revolutionary spirit rises!

There is something not built of stone. A factory is built of stone, irrigation works, a highway, are built of stone. There is a work not done with cement, with nails, nor with stones; it is what a people build, the education a people receive, the consciousness a people acquires. The virtues which a people develop are not seen but they exist and they are invulnerable.

Everything material can be destroyed here; with the material many lives can be destroyed, but no one can destroy the spirit of our people, nobody can destroy the history of our people, nobody can destroy the example of our people (applause); the revolutionary consciousness of our people, their extraordinary generosity, their magnificent humanity, their enthusiasm, their optimism, their character, which is the cement of their strength, nothing -- nobody -- can destroy this.

Thus on a day like this we meet to look ahead; we meet to renew our strength, to gather fresh inspiration, and so that the next year will be even better than this one, and so that the economic progress will be greater than this year (applause); so let us profit from this experience, this impulse, let's intensify it.

Since our homeland is united today, since it is without distinctions as to regions or provinces, since it is without discrimination or oppression, since it is a whole without privileges, the July 26 celebration will move from place to place in the Island, in the West, in the Center, and in the East, a year in each region of the country, bearing the message of union and brotherhood among all, bearing the glorious banners of our dead, the spirit of our martyrs, who rose up in all corners of the Island to conquer freedom for all, dignity for all, a triumph for all. And it will rotate year by year, and year by year will be like a plebiscite, year by year it will be like a trial, so that the people can judge the acts of the Revolution because it is the people who judge the acts of the Revolution; it is the people who have the say and not the slanderers.

It is the people who have the say, the final say, not the tons of paper and ink which the detractors of our homeland and of our Revolution write, caught up over there in the eternal dreams of those with illusions, dreaming of returning to a past loaded with ignominy and crime, of shame and humiliation, consoling themselves over there in their intrigues, in their slanders, in their lives, in their ugly profession of serving a foreign master and of fighting their homeland as mercenaries, paid by foreigners.

And I believe that a North American correspondent -- I don't know if he was invited or if he came by himself -- who came here two or three days ago, because there was another correspondent which was authorized, who was with the Broadcasting System, I believe, or something like that, who said that he was arrested.

And the truth is that last year we invited some North American journalists, some of them wrote more objectively, others less objectively...But, in short, this year when they were bombing Vietnam and when they were intervening in Santo Domingo, we didn't want to invite any Yankee journalist here, to our country (applause and exclamations of: "Throw him out!") -- no, no, no, don't throw out the one who came -- except a journalist who had the dignity and courage to combat the crimes his rulers were committing.

But one came -- and we learned about it by cable. Good, let him look around; good, let him take photographs, let him take films, let's see if the imperialists there can count on such support from the people; let's see if the imperialists there in Washington or in New York, or anywhere, are capable of arousing the enthusiasm of a total of more than 500,000 citizens assembled together (applause); let's see if any of these puppet rulers, like those in Brazil, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Paraguay and the rest, who order their mercenary soldiers to trample on the independence of a brother country in the Americas, if any of these puppet rulers, representatives of this farce called "representative democracy," those who say over there that they are going to guarantee freedom against socialism, against Communism, let's see if any of them -- or all of them together -- are capable of bringing together a people, are capable of bringing together a half million (applause), like those who are meeting here, under the banners of socialism, under the banners of Communism, because our banners, by being correct, by representing the interests of the humble and of the exploited, increase our strength. While they, all together, under the banners of ignominy, don't succeed in bringing together -- not even with all those on their payroll, all their cops, and all their thieves put together -- not a tenth of the people who have assembled here (applause).

And more or less of a crowd can be brought together by various means; what is not possible is to artificially inspire enthusiasm in the crowd. And over there they can't figure it out. How is it possible that this people that lived under capitalism and knew all that, the same and even better than in other places, is meeting here supporting their Revolution, supporting their party? So, what power lies in revolutionary ideas? What are the powers of Marxism? Because we are Marxist-Leninists! (Applause.)

Were we always that? No, most of us were not; and, nevertheless, now we are! I was not a Marxist-Leninist; I was not one when I was ignorant, when I knew nothing about the laws of history, when I knew nothing about society, about social processes and about the history of humanity. The most I had -- like many others -- was a rebel spirit, an enthusiasm and liking for public problems. But as I overcame this ignorance, as I came to know something, as I came to understand, I began to be a revolutionist.

What were we on July 26 [1953]? We could not be called Marxist-Leninists on July 26, conscious Marxist-Leninists, but a group

of youth who organized the July 26 Movement. We studied Marx and we studied Lenin. And among the books we were going over at the time of the attack on Moncada, were the books of Martí and the books of Lenin. (Applause.)

Could we be called Marxist-Leninists? No! We had much to learn; we still had much to understand. And if we were capable of understanding some of the essential principles of Marxism, the reality of a society divided between exploited and exploiters, if we were capable of understanding the role of the masses in history, we had not yet developed our consciousness and our revolutionary culture sufficiently to understand, in all its profundity and magnitude, the phenomenon of imperialism. It can be said that we understood it theoretically and we saw it from a distance. Our immediate task, our struggle with minute resources against the military power crushing our country, occupied the greater part of our attention.

We did not learn about the imperialist phenomenon in a book; we read about it in books, but we learned about it in the flesh. We learned about it in the fresh blood of the workers, in the crimes that were committed; we learned about it in the course of the revolutionary process; we learned about it on a daily basis in the way these same imperialists proceed throughout the world.

We felt impelled to take up the calling of revolutionists; we had the feeling of revolutionists and the conviction of revolutionists. We lacked theory; we did not learn it day by day; we did not learn it in only a theoretical way; we learned it in reality. Nobody taught it to us; we learned it by ourselves; we developed our ideas as we became revolutionists more and more, as we understood scientific socialism more and more, as we sought a better explanation for the problems of history and of society.

And this was the way we acquired our theory, our political philosophy; and it wasn't a surface varnish; but something in our bones, something in our minds and in our lives, and we made ourselves into Marxist-Leninists. (Applause.)

Naturally our enemies would have liked us to be some kind of "liberaloids," petty-bourgeois reformists. And we were petty-bourgeois, but fortunately we broke out of this ideological and class shell (applause), and adopted the ideology of the exploited, of the oppressed, of the humble, of the workers.

They would have liked us to remain in dirty politics, and in ignorance; they would have liked to perpetuate the past in this land. But the misconceptions of the imperialists! They said that Marxism-Leninism was an exotic idea, a foreign idea.

Ideas, however, are a universal heritage; the ideas of the French Revolution were scattered throughout the world; the bourgeois ideas of the United States arose from a philosophy that was not the

work of North American authors or philosophers, but of Europeans. They said that they were exotic, but what they didn't know was how well these so-called Marxist-Leninist ideas take root in this climate. (Applause.)

Because likewise here; when Columbus arrived, there was no sugar cane, but how well sugar cane grows in this country! (Applause.) And we are the biggest producer of sugar, and our cane gives the highest yield of sugar. And if this grows well, how well revolutionary ideas grow in this country! And we will be one of the best producers of revolutionary ideas! (Applause.)

And this is what they didn't expect. They thought that the ideas of the exploiters would flower here, the ideas of the slaveholders, the ideas of those who practice discrimination, the ideas of the oppressors of people; and these ideas were swept out -- and with them, their apostles, and with them the class that carries and defends these ideas -- to give way to the ideas, the ideology of the workers, of the humble of our homeland, and the cultivation of these ideas.

And in the strength and the truth of these ideas lies the explanation of the power of the Revolution; in the rise of the humble men and women of the people lies the irrefutable proof of the theory of the class struggle; in the invincible power of the Revolution, the irrefutable confirmation that the masses are the motor of history; that a revolution of the masses, led by a party armed with a scientific ideology, is invincible. And this is the explanation for the successes of the Revolution, of the strength of the Revolution.

We learned Marxism in books, but above all we learned it in life. And thus we are becoming more and more socialist, we are becoming more and more Marxist, and we will struggle more and more for a world of good men, of generous men, for a people that is like a great family, in which every man and every woman has not just a brother but millions of brothers and sisters, millions of sons, millions of fathers and mothers (applause), because we are not like the capitalists who believe that man is a wild beast, we do not think like the capitalists who believe that man is a wolf, egoistic and brutal; because we believe in man, in the feelings of man, in the goodness to be found in the human heart; because we believe that these feelings are capable of growing limitlessly and boundlessly.

Thus we can call ourselves fighters for Communism, fighters for this better world, and be sure that we will achieve it.

Let us turn our thoughts and dedicate ourselves at this moment to those who fell in the struggle, to expressing our solidarity with their families, with their mothers, with their brothers, with their wives, telling them how dear they are to all of us, and how certain it is that lives sacrificed in a good cause are never sacri-

ficed in vain.

Homeland or death!

We will win!

(Ovation.)