

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Volume 3, No. 28

September 17, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
International Days of Protest Against War in Vietnam	1
Bertrand Russell on the Revolt in Los Angeles	4
The War Between India and Pakistan -- by Pierre Frank	6
Young Japanese Workers Turning to Socialism	9
Abrupt End to "Teach-In" in Tokyo	10
Korean Students Clash with Police	11
Unemployment in the Soviet Union? -- by Ernest Germain	12
Bolivian Trotskyist Leader Slain by Military Junta	16
Colonel Boumedienne Seeks More Scapegoats -- by Henri Dumoulin	18
Seven French Technicians Arrested in Algeria	23
Campaign Opened in Behalf of Ben Bella	24
Japanese Housewives Stage Peace March	24
The "Deacons for Defense and Justice" -- by Evelyn Sell	25
Gained Dignity Through Watts Revolt	30
Le Corbusier -- by David Daumesnil	31
"Quiet Profits" in Napalm Business	32
Revolutionary Marxist Party Founded in Chile -- by José Valdéz	33
The Sentences Against the Spanish Professors -- by Ramón Vázquez	41
Spanish Poet Released	43
Indian Press Notes Formation of Trotskyist Party	44
Japanese Pickets Protest Use of Airport for War	45
Documents:	
The Crisis in Greece	46

## INTERNATIONAL DAYS OF PROTEST AGAINST WAR IN VIETNAM

[The following is the text of an appeal received from "The Vietnam Day Committee" of 2407 Fulton Street, Berkeley, California. As the appeal notes, this is the committee that sponsored the "teach-in" at the University of California last May at which 35,000 people

turned out to hear such speakers as Norman Mailer, Isaac Deutscher and Bertrand Russell explain the true issues involved in American escalation of the war in Vietnam.]

\* \* \*

Organizations all over the United States that oppose the American intervention have proclaimed October 15 and 16 "International Days of Protest" against American military intervention in Vietnam. WE ASK YOU TO JOIN OUR PROTEST.

The Vietnam Day Committee is the International headquarters and one of the thirty-three member groups of the National Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which was founded on August 7th-9th in Washington, D.C. The Vietnam Day Committee is a group of students, faculty, and residents of the San Francisco Bay Area opposed to American intervention in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and wherever else it may occur.

Revolutionary struggles for self-determination are sweeping the world today. American suppression of these movements is immoral and a threat to the peace of the world. We believe that the struggle for self-determination in other continents is related to the struggle for democracy in America. The struggles in America against racism, poverty, and bureaucratic conformity are part of the same movement as the struggle against American militarism and imperialism. We must build a new America and join with those peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in building a New World.

American involvement in Vietnam transcends questions of politics. Indiscriminate bombings of peasant villages by the world's most massive military machine has outraged the conscience of the world. The time has come to go beyond debates about the politics of war; it is time for the peoples of the world to say to the U.S.A.: "STOP!"

The Vietnam war has also illuminated the political crises in the United States. The people have lost control of the government. The Congress has abdicated its function of leading and transmitting popular discussion. The American people are treated as objects to be ignored or manipulated; they voted for peace, but they received a policy of war. Every day, people in the United States are coming to see that the struggle for civil rights, the struggle against poverty, the struggle for free speech in the universities and the struggle against the Vietnam war have at least one basic element in common: the inability of the American people to play a role in the decisions which affect their lives. With the slogan "fighting Communism" all discussion is closed, and any action justified. On August 9th even while hundreds of people were demonstrating outside the White House, calling for an end to U.S. military intervention in Vietnam, President Johnson stated that he believes there is "no substantial division" within the country.

On May 21st and 22nd of this year the Vietnam Day Committee organized its first major public activity which also provided its name: a teach-in and educational rally held at the University of California in Berkeley, in which more than 30 persons spoke to the crowd about Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. It lasted 35 hours, bringing at least 35,000 people to the event, and reaching by radio an estimated half million people. Speakers included: Ruben Brache, Special Ambassador of the Dominican constitutionalist forces at the U.N. (by telephone); Norman Mailer, novelist; B. Parris, leader of SNCC, an organization devoted to the struggle for civil rights; Norman Thomas, former president of the U.S.A. Socialist Party; Isaac Deutscher; Ernest Gruening, Senator for Alaska; Bertrand Russell (through a tape), and many others.

We picketed President Johnson when he addressed the U.N. on its 20th anniversary in San Francisco, showing our opposition to his belligerent policies.

We are organizing several activities such as blocking trains with troops bound for Vietnam and distributing our literature among them. We are going from door-to-door in selected districts, talking to people at length about the war in Vietnam, and attempting to organize neighborhood meetings to discuss the war, which we hope will lead to political action against the war.

We maintain a newspaper, a speakers' bureau, and a research project; and are producing a book and film based on the original Vietnam Day. The other 32 member organizations of the National Committee to End the War in Vietnam are organizing similar activities in their regions.

The Vietnam Day Committee feels that dramatic, large-scale actions are needed to increase public alarm about the war in Vietnam. The bombing of North and South Vietnam and the slaughter of the Vietnamese are not sufficient to stir the American conscience. Nor might even the bombing of China. Vietnamese and Chinese are "non-people" to Americans. Unlike the civil rights struggle, there is no group in America which suffers directly from the war in Vietnam; nor do the American people identify with those who do suffer.

People throughout the world must now move beyond single demonstrations and rallies to one massive internationally coordinated action. Here in the United States we are discussing blocking the gates of army bases from which troops and munitions are being sent to Vietnam by acts of massive civil disobedience as our part of the October 15th-16th protest. We ask that organizations throughout the world take the most militant and dramatic actions compatible with local conditions on October 16th. Of course, this should not preclude demonstrations against the war in Vietnam on other dates; however, the full impact of world opinion can best be brought to bear against the policy of the American government by simultaneous protest on October 16.

The Syndicate National de l'Enseignement Superior (F.E.N.) has translated our call to protest and is sending it throughout France. We are asking groups in all countries to do the same. Japanese representatives of student, faculty, religious, and labor groups have written, giving their support of October 15th-16th as International Days of Protest. We are awaiting further word from them on their specific plans for these days. Let us also hear from you. We urge you to join the protest against this war against the Vietnamese people, this war which affronts the dignity of all mankind and threatens it with nuclear destruction.

We must unite! We must begin now!

BERTRAND RUSSELL ON THE REVOLT IN LOS ANGELES

[The following declaration, entitled "The Negro Rising," was issued to the press by Bertrand Russell on August 22.]

\* \* \*

I have read with a certain incomprehension reactions of many liberal and Negro leaders in the United States to the revolutionary uprising of American Negroes in Los Angeles.

Who can deny that the entire Negro population rose up as one against the conditions with which they have had to live for decades? It is instructive that those who placed such emphasis on formal legislation involving voting rights (yet unimplemented) only discover the true situation of the American Negro when he takes to revolutionary action.

Los Angeles has placed its Negro population in slums where crowding and insanitary conditions are so appalling that there is no alternative but to seek the streets for air and release.

The white police function as an occupying army keeping a helot class in order. Suppression of deprived people historically has inspired revolution, but when those people suffer humiliation and contempt on racial grounds the cruelty of the oppression is magnified and the uprising assumes a national character.

The oppressed Negro nation is rising against its three hundred years of subjection. Why should people not revolt against conditions wherein they are shot down or beaten to death in police cells? The density of population in the Negro section of Los Angeles is five times that of white people in Los Angeles. The incidence of disease is equally high. It is increasingly clear that American Negroes are discovering the unreformability of the system which oppresses them.

It is not possible for the American military industrial system to depend upon exploitation and domination as in Vietnam and, also, to effect a revolutionary transformation of the conditions of the Negro within the United States. I suspect that only the American Negro is able to understand fully the nature of U.S. oppression in Vietnam, the Congo, the Dominican Republic or other areas of Latin America, Asia and Africa.

The President has decried what he calls violence and rioting. I had never before realised that the President was an advocate of nonviolence. He is not an advocate of nonviolence in Vietnam or in the Congo, nor when he encourages State police in their use of dogs, gas and bullets. It is only when the Negro, in desperation, defends himself by violent means against long-endured violent oppression that President Johnson, and those who think like him, discover their antipathy to violence.

What is to be done? The elementary step is the tearing down of every slum in the United States and the construction of new and adequate houses, schools, hospitals and cultural facilities in their place. Beyond this, professional training programmes and full educational opportunities should be made available, particularly to the oppressed sections of the United States. Such a programme would require an end to military expansion and domination on the part of America. It could not be undertaken at the same time as a war of oppression in South East Asia, nor could it be undertaken without a fundamental transformation of social and economic relations in the United States. Is it likely that large industry, its military partner and the intelligence agencies which guard this partnership will countenance the transformation of social relations in the United States or abandon their control over sixty per cent of this world's natural resources? It is unlikely, and no amount of reformist legislation would appear to have a chance of effecting such a transformation.

It is my hope, therefore, that the revolutionary mood which is taking hold of the oppressed Negro people will find an organised political expression and that sections of the white population, particularly the more deprived, will come to see the way they have been used.

Such an alliance may, in time, change the United States. The absence of one will bring America to the threshold of overt fascism, in which martial rule and terror will be needed. It will be necessary to continue the oppression of the Negro nation and those whites who suffer comparable conditions.

The very least middle class and professional white people can do is to understand and support the Negro in his struggle. Such understanding and support must encompass Los Angeles.

THE WAR BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

By Pierre Frank

The war between India and Pakistan has not stopped, although the "big two," the United States and the Soviet Union, are supporting the efforts of U Thant, the secretary-general of the United Nations to at least get a ceasefire. These steps are doubtlessly being accompanied by various pressure moves. The United States and Great Britain have already suspended all shipments of arms. The question of economic sanctions has been raised.

Will this pressure prove sufficient to halt the fighting or will the war become extended? It would be hazardous to offer a forecast on this; the conflict has deep causes.

It is necessary to go back to 1947 when the British government of that period (the Attlee Labour government) granted independence to the colony that constituted the crown jewel of the British empire. The Labour party glorified this action.

But the Labour government in London favored installing in power a bourgeoisie which for the past eighteen years has let India stagnate in the worst misery. In addition, faithful to the old maxim of "divide and rule," which British imperialism has applied throughout the world, the Labour government supported the demands of the Moslem League headed by Jinnah; i.e., one of the most reactionary political factions, in order to divide the Indian subcontinent along religious lines into two countries, India and Pakistan.

Still worse, since the former British colony was made up of a number of states and principalities, it was the maharajahs and other princes, and not the people living there who were called on to decide the fate of their states, choosing either India or Pakistan. The massacres at the time affected millions of persons; and the new war could set off new bloodbaths since 50,000,000 Moslems still live in India and 10,000,000 Hindus still live in Pakistan.

Upon reaching power, the bourgeoisie failed to carry out one of the traditional tasks of the bourgeois revolution; namely, unification of the country. On the contrary, Pakistan was set up as two separate pieces almost 1,000 miles apart. And many disputes remained between India and Pakistan, the most important one concerning Kashmir.

This territory was inhabited in the great majority by Moslems but the maharajah was a Hindu. After some equivocation, he came out for attaching Kashmir to India. This led to fighting which ended in 1948 with a ceasefire, the division of Kashmir between the occupying forces, and a decision agreed to by both sides for a referendum that would enable the population to choose which country they wished to join.

There was every reason to believe that in a referendum the big majority of the population of Kashmir would come out for joining Pakistan. In any case, it has been this consideration that has determined the policy of the New Delhi government since 1948. It has continually blocked holding a referendum. The prime minister of the part of Kashmir occupied by India, Sheik Abdullah, who cooperated with the Congress party before independence, was ousted and arrested in August 1953 and not freed, as we will see later, until April 1964 when he was released for a short period. His assistant, who became his successor, Bakshi Ghulam Mohamed, was eliminated in turn in 1963. Beginning in 1948, the Indian government took a series of legislative and constitutional measures to convert the part of Kashmir under its occupation into an integral part of the Indian Union. Recently Prime Minister Shastri declared that the territory belonged to the Indian Union like any other territory, without any different status.

Pakistan at no time subscribed to the concept that guided the New Delhi regime.

Pakistan was created as a reactionary bastion designed to block any advance of the Indian revolution. This was the reason why it was favored from the beginning by British imperialism. In February 1954, American imperialism, which at that time looked with disfavor on Nehru's "neutralism," began to send military aid to Pakistan, military aid which in its view was to be aimed against China and not against India. In 1962, when the first frontier incidents broke out between India and China, the United States likewise sent arms to India to fight China.

But India and Pakistan had not forgotten the Kashmir business and this moved into the forefront. It appears that Nehru, before he died, thought of making a turn on this question. In April 1964 he freed Sheik Abdullah and permitted him to go to Pakistan. Whatever the truth about Nehru's intentions, the Shastri government continued to follow the line practiced by New Delhi since 1948. Sheik Abdullah only had to interview Chou En-lai in Algiers to be arrested again upon his return to India in May 1965. American and British arms were to serve India as well as Pakistan for an attempt to settle the dispute.

It is known that in recent weeks guerrilla fighters appeared in the part of Kashmir occupied by India. The Indian government, claiming that they were not guerrilla forces but regular troops of the Pakistan army, moved in the Indian army and hostilities flared.

\* \* \*

The underlying cause of the war, as we have seen, lies in the way British imperialism, through the Labour government, granted independence to India, building in multiple explosive charges -- religious, racial, etc. In other words, the struggle led by the Indian bourgeoisie against British imperialism ended in a form that has for many years blocked the development of the Indian revolution into a social-

ist revolution, which alone would have enabled the enormous difficulties to be overcome through a socialist federation of the peoples of the whole subcontinent. The example of India constitutes one of the most characteristic verifications in a negative way of the theory of permanent revolution. The Indian bourgeoisie have proved incapable of carrying out scarcely a single one of the bourgeois-democratic tasks (unification of the country, agrarian reform, rights of minority peoples).

Among the immediate causes of the outbreak of the conflict the following should be noted in particular:

(1) The bankruptcy of the leadership of the Congress party in India. This is to be seen all the more glaringly in light of the fact that despite the aid constantly received from the United States and the Soviet Union, India has stagnated economically whereas neighboring China has made impressive progress during the same fifteen-year period. The crisis in bourgeois leadership in India took on wider scope with the passing of Nehru. Reactionary tendencies grew more virulent in India and the idea of a military dictatorship has taken on more substance. It is a plausible contention that the army, in order to refurbish a prestige tarnished by its defeat on the Sino-Indian frontier, initiated hostilities against Pakistan in hope of an easy success.

(2) In India, as in Pakistan, in face of the tragic misery of the masses, the war is a diversion aimed at channeling the anger and passion visible in recent months in the hunger revolts.

(3) The development of the war in Vietnam and the American "escalation" there could not help but strongly affect the neighboring countries, particularly by encouraging tendencies to try to resolve difficult problems by force. A London newspaper, the Daily Telegraph, reported that the CIA was involved in the Indian government's decision to unleash hostilities. The report, of course, has been officially denied as is always the custom in Washington. Nevertheless, one cannot fail to notice that the Indo-Pakistan war has captured interest, that it is getting the major headlines, and that it has diverted attention from Vietnam as American reinforcement of troops there mounts day by day.

\* \* \*

The attitude of China and Indonesia in the Indo-Pakistan conflict, has been singled out by the press -- and not only the press -- as a scandalous opposition to the "peace" efforts of the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Nations. However, skepticism may well be expressed over the "pacifism" of the one side and the "belligerency" of the other.

Long before the war broke out, the United States armed both India and Pakistan against China. The Soviet government, it cannot



be forgotten, likewise furnished planes to India during the conflict between India and China. The "pacifists" of today played the big power game for years at the expense of China.

It happens that China is now able to turn the tables, to play the same big power game. Those who are caught in their own moves really have nothing to complain about. No revolutionist can blame China, in seeking as a state power to profit from the consequences of a situation which she not only did not create but which in its origin was directed against her.

Where revolutionists should judge the Chinese policy in the Indo-Pakistan conflict, aside from the governmental aspect, is on the level of revolutionary politics. Unfortunately, from all the information at our disposal, it must be concluded that the Chinese leaders are seeking to subordinate the vanguard, including the pro-Chinese Communists to their temporary diplomatic needs in Pakistan.

\* \* \*

Can India and Pakistan continue the war if they are subjected to economic sanctions by the big powers? We must not forget that some 500,000,000 people are involved in the struggle and that it is impossible to foresee what their reactions might be.

In a situation as serious as this one, one of the most somber aspects is the situation facing the revolutionary vanguard. In Pakistan they are extremely weak in number. In India most of the organizations that have been speaking in the name of socialism, including some that have been champions of nonviolence, have voiced outrageous chauvinist sentiments in connection with the war against Pakistan.

The opponents of the war include in particular the left Communist party and the Trotskyists who have just organized the Socialist Workers party. They face a difficult period. There is no doubt that the repression will be severe.

But the struggle which they have undertaken, aside from the vicissitudes that can be expected, will contribute to accelerating the decomposition of the bourgeois system.

#### YOUNG JAPANESE WORKERS TURNING TO SOCIALISM

A poll conducted by the Tokyo journal Asahi Shimbun revealed that support for the Sato cabinet dropped from 47% last November to 37% this August. Young workers were revealed to be shifting to the Socialist party "in large numbers." About 36% of those polled were found to be opposed to war.

ABRUPT END TO "TEACH-IN" IN TOKYO

A 24-hour "teach-in" patterned on the American experiment in education was scheduled in Tokyo August 14. It began at 10:30 p.m. with the country's leading commentators, representatives of political circles and former Imperial Army officers facing an audience of some 600 persons. The subject, as in the U.S. teach-ins, was the war in Vietnam.

Prof. Yoshikazu Sakamoto of Tokyo University opened the marathon session with a 40-minute introductory presentation of the characteristics of the South Vietnam freedom fighters, American policy in Vietnam, the attitude of China, the Soviet Union and other workers states, the international import of the Vietnamese war and what Japan should do to help achieve peace.

He made four points: (1) The Vietnamese fighters are not necessarily all Communists. (2) American policy is mistaken; it is driving the Vietnamese toward Communism and inviting the "Communist nations to support" the National Front for Liberation. (3) Because of the American mistakes, North Vietnam, China and the other "Communist nations" might increase their aid to a "dangerous extent." (4) Japan, as well as the U.S. should realize that there is stronger public support in Vietnam for the "Viet Cong" than for the South Vietnam government.

The representative of the ruling Liberal-Democratic party defended American policy. The representatives of all the other parties attacked it.

The debate got hotter and hotter but still seemed well under control. Finally moderator Shunsuke Tsurumi, in charge of the first part of the program, called on a "bearded American" from the audience. His name (as published in Japanese) was Karl Ogrezbie. He was introduced as a leader of the Students for a Democratic Society.

"Upon hearing that this meeting would be held today," the press reported him as saying, "I flew to Japan from the opposite side of the earth. The atmosphere is so good that I feel I am one of your friends. I think the way the U.S. has chosen is very difficult, no matter what Ambassador Reischauer thinks. I can never forgive what the U.S. is doing in Vietnam now."

He was further quoted by the Tokyo papers as saying, "I went to Vietnam and witnessed an American burning a child to death with his cigarette lighter. I saw napalm, too. I was ashamed of myself..."

As he went on, the Liberal-Democrats became angrier and angrier. They claimed that the moderator had "schemed" it, that the speech was unfair and that it should be stopped immediately.

The twenty-four participating speakers began to shout at each other. The audience then joined in. A division of the house rapidly occurred pro and con.

"Trembling in excitement," the chief producer, according to the Sunday Mainichi, ordered his man to convey a message to moderator Tsurumi: "If this confusion continues, we will cut the broadcast."

The moderator intervened, stopped the bearded American and apologized. The program moved into its second part. However, moderator Nariuasu Muchaku, who was in charge of this part, opened as follows:

"When we lost the war, the situation was settled on the Emperor's order. But if we must start war again according to the Emperor's order, will we do it? Or do those who experienced atom bombs agree with the U.S. view that the use of bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki can be justified? Or why have many of those who were labeled as war criminals by the occupation become prime ministers after being released from prison? We would like to hear about that now."

On hearing that introduction, the management of TV Channel 12 panicked. At exactly 4:08 a.m., the show "War and Peace" went off the air and something less educational than a teach-in abruptly appeared on the nation's TV screens.

### KOREAN STUDENTS CLASH WITH POLICE

Students in South Korea returned from their summer vacation in a militant mood. On August 20 they mounted a demonstration in Seoul that brought out 1,500 carrying placards demanding nullification of the recent treaty with Japan, which, they state, paves the way for renewed domination of Korea by Japanese imperialism. Police blocked them from marching downtown.

On the following day they assembled again. When police blocked their march, they responded with rocks. The police then resorted to tear-gas shells before charging their ranks. On August 23 the students demonstrated once more. This time their ranks had grown to 6,000. Police battled them on eight separate fronts. Against tear-gas shells the students hurled showers of rocks. About 50 students were arrested. Several policemen and students were injured. The cops used a 20-truck convoy carrying 1,000 fully armed soldiers in a show of force.

The next day the students were out 8,000 strong. The police used tear-gas shells and billy clubs. The students threw rocks. The demonstrations swelled even larger the following day with still more violence and the cabinet went into session to determine what to do.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE SOVIET UNION?

By Ernest Germain

The August 31 issue of l'Humanité, the French Communist party daily, carried a long article by Jean Kanapa replying to reports in the bourgeois press (particularly Le Monde and l'Express) alleging that unemployment exists at present in the USSR.

It should be said, to begin with, that the choice of Kanapa to give lessons in intellectual integrity to the bourgeois press was not exactly an inspired one -- but could the editors of l'Humanité have done any better? This old Stalinist hack has for more than two decades dutifully approved without the slightest critical spirit all the successive shifts of the Soviet bureaucracy, distinguishing himself particularly by his use of invective and slander against anyone who dares call attention to this or that "dark spot" in Soviet society.

Today he tells us in passing that "the law now [sic] bans women from working in the mines." Is it necessary to recall that for years this same Kanapa hailed giving women heavy labor in the mines as a "socialist conquest of equality between men and women," brazenly denying that this was not how the founders of scientific socialism and the Soviet state -- including the authors of the first labor laws of the USSR -- conceived this equality?

Today he tells us in passing: "Since [sic] the period inaugurated by the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, Soviet workers have been completely free to work wherever they want to and to change jobs whenever they please."

This means that in Stalin's time, this freedom did not exist and Soviet workers did not have the right to change jobs without prior authorization from the bureaucrats. How did it happen that the Kanapas did not notice during those long years the heavy constraints weighing down the working class in the "land of socialism"? How did it happen that they did not understand that it was truly monstrous to put the label "socialist" on a society in which the workers -- supposed to enjoy a thousand times more freedom under socialism than capitalism! -- did not even have the right to change jobs?

But this witness, who is without morals, remains true to himself in dealing with a problem which is raised with more frankness in the Soviet Union itself. The articles in Le Monde and l'Express were based largely on a study by J. Manevitch which appeared in the June 1965 issue of the magazine Voprossi Ekonomiki. In leveling his attack, Kanapa based himself in turn mainly on this article, which he sought to use to refute the really fantastic interpretations offered by the bourgeois journalists. But seeking to prove himself more Catholic than the Pope, he chose to falsify his own sources in order to hide from the readers of l'Humanité that there really is

unemployment -- marginal unemployment -- in the USSR. He states in short:

"The problem that is posed is thus not at all that of unemployment -- unemployment has disappeared in the Soviet Union since 1930 -- but just exactly the reverse." [Emphasis added.]

He continues, affirming that the only problem posed is a labor shortage, the mobilization of the labor reserves, which are, "in the first place, women who are still monopolized by domestic chores and the care of children -- in brief the housewives. They are to a lesser degree the members of the kolkhoz or working-class family who work on merely their tiny individual plot of land."

We note in passing that Kanapa does not seem to have perceived that the question of individual plots -- which Khrushchev imprudently sought to reduce, even to suppress, and which his successors hastened to reestablish with all their rights! -- has much greater socio-economic implications than one might suppose at first glance. If adults -- women and men -- prefer to work on these plots rather than in the state enterprises, this is because the real income gained by this work is certainly not lower than the real wages paid by the state sector. What can be concluded from this, particularly with regard to the miserable level of labor productivity on the kolkhozes? And what must be concluded with regard to the relation between the new value created by the worker and the wages paid him (it can hardly be supposed that labor productivity in industry is below that of the ...private plots!)? But we leave this for future consideration.

Kanapa lies brazenly when he states that unemployment has disappeared in the USSR since 1930 and that the problem posed is that of a labor shortage. In the very article by J. Manevitch, which he quotes so abundantly, we read:

"Thanks [!] to the uninterrupted development of mechanization and the automation of production, as well as the growth of the working youth (classes of 1946-48) a slight excess of labor was registered in some of the big cities, particularly in the central industrial regions of the country. At the beginning of the seven-year plan, in Leningrad, Moscow and other big cities, there were still unused labor reserves. Meanwhile the population capable of working likewise increased in a number of small towns, particularly in Transcaucasia, in White Russia, in the central black earth region and in the southwest of the country, in the central Asian republics, as well as in the republics of Moldavia and Lithuania. In these regions, and in others, some groups of workers are experiencing difficulty in finding work in their trade. Due to the insufficient industrial development of the medium-sized and small towns, the workers are compelled [!] to take up housework and private domestic labor." [Emphasis added.]

These sentences in J. Manevitch's article demonstrate to any-

one who is not motivated by bad faith: (1) There really is marginal unemployment in the USSR ("a slight excess of labor"); (2) that the "labor reserves" are composed not only of peasants and housewives, but also of workers who are compelled to remain at home (working a small plot of land), because they can't find jobs in the small and medium-sized towns, due to the insufficient development of industry. We are far from the bustling picture showing a labor shortage to be the only problem facing the USSR...

Kanapa discovered that there are hidden reserves of labor in enterprises which are pushed into such practices by the way in which the plan functions (particularly the way in which bonuses are given). It is necessary to rationalize full employment, he says, and to accomplish this, the enterprises must be induced to give up their surplus of labor. Thus modification of the "code for the enterprises" and "planning methods" is to be expected.

What should be said in response?

Neither Manevitch nor Kanapa express themselves with precision. But the context is perfectly clear.

By making the "individual profitability of the enterprises" the basic criterion for planning, enterprises must be given the right to lay off surplus personnel. The demand to "increase the rights of the managers" has in mind particularly the right to lay off personnel. Of course, the "workers must in no case be the ones to suffer," Manevitch and Kanapa add. The state must "finance their reclassification" (with what polite and discreet terms these things are mentioned!). To put it more bluntly: a proviso for unemployment must be reintroduced in the USSR, otherwise enterprises cannot possibly lay off some of their excess personnel.

What Manevitch and Kanapa say by implication and with discretion, the Yugoslav theoreticians, more happily advanced down this strange road of "socialist market economy," say with great brutality. At the time of the last reform of the Yugoslav economy, they proclaimed that to make the reform a success, it would be necessary to lay off 500,000 workers in enterprises that had too many...

Must it be concluded that "capitalism has been restored" in the USSR and Yugoslavia, as the Chinese theoreticians affirm in the wake of a number of Western "ultralefts"? (The Chinese are imprudent; they would do well to await the appearance of some of these problems ...in their own country!)

Clearly, capitalism has not been restored in the USSR. There is no unemployment due to an economic crisis. The enterprises are not periodically compelled to lay off personnel because of inability to sell their products; the economy does not undergo a business cycle; it is continually expanding, only the rate of growth fluctuates from time to time.

The Soviet economy is not a capitalist economy. But neither is it a socialist economy -- otherwise it would be necessary to advance the monstrous image of a "socialism"...in which unemployment has reappeared! It is an economy still in transition between capitalism and socialism. It has already proved its superiority over capitalist economy (the rate of growth of Soviet economy is proof). It already represents a colossal advance over capitalism. (The USSR spends for education sixteen times more than countries like France or Great Britain, that is, four times more on a per capita basis!) But it is still far from being a socialist society -- the problems raised by the transitional phase have been enormously complicated and worsened by the existence of a privileged bureaucratic caste which has arrogated to itself the sole right to manage the state economy.

The problems currently posed within the framework of widely disorganized planning (recently Pravda noted that it would soon be necessary to ration electricity) are due in major part to the malpractices of this bureaucracy.

The bureaucracy first headed blindly down the road of hypercentralization. But to manage 500,000 enterprises from a single "center," to seek to dictate to each one in complete detail what it must produce and where its products must be sent, was clearly a hopeless task. The result was mounting disorganization and waste. Rails and turbines made in Leningrad were sent to Vladivostok while those made in Vladivostok were in transit to Leningrad. And so on.

To find a way out, Khrushchev had a "genius-like" idea -- decentralization in Sovnarkhozes. At the time, we noted that this was a bureaucratic reform of the bureaucracy, and we predicted what would happen. In exchange for the malpractices of hypercentralization, the USSR was given the malpractices of decentralization. Each Sovnarkhoze now sought to produce all types of machines, energy and consumers goods needed in the region. The resulting disorder and waste was just as bad as before, being manifested particularly in a gap between the "academic plans" and the "labor plans," between the "production plans" and the "labor plans." Hence the reappearance of marginal unemployment.

Since then, the bureaucracy has been toying with a third formula -- to return to the "market economy." But in generalizing market relations, competition is generalized. While this has certain advantages, it also entails certain...small disadvantages: periodic layoffs, periodic overproduction of certain goods, over-all waste that is not less than that of the preceding two methods.

A genuine solution can come only through an integral recasting of the economy in accordance with three principles: central planning, democratically worked out and controlled by the masses; workers self-management of the enterprises within the framework of this central plan (that is, without autonomy in the field of major investments); Soviet democracy in the political field, permitting running public

criticism of the political economy and the collective working out of alternative solutions.

Only through the interaction of these three factors can the contradictions imposed by bureaucratic planning be resolved in a harmonious and positive way. Any attempt to apply but one of these means in an exclusive way will inevitably end in rebirth of the contradictions, greater and greater waste, and a strengthening of the power of the bureaucracy. Workers who are unemployed, or threatened with unemployment, constitute no real counterweight to "power drunk" bureaucrats and technicians.

### BOLIVIAN TROTSKYIST LEADER SLAIN BY MILITARY JUNTA

César Lora, a well-known leader of the Bolivian Trotskyists, was murdered after being arrested by an army contingent on July 29. He was the brother of Guillermo Lora, editor of Masas and head of one of the two Trotskyist groupings in Bolivia that have recently been seeking to unite their forces.

When the military junta decided to move against the political opposition last May, ordering army occupation of the key centers and exiling prominent trade-union and political figures as part of a repressive action directed primarily against the working class, the miners responded with a general strike.

At Siglo XX, one of the biggest mines, where César Lora worked as a miner, a meeting of the Miners Federation was held as the troops approached. In face of the news about the shooting of workers, both Trotskyist groupings argued that the miners should defend themselves with armed action. The followers of Juan Lechín and the Communist party opposed this.

César Lora called for the militants to leave at once and not to agree to any kind of deal with the repressive forces of the military junta.

By the time the armed forces entered the area, the Trotskyists of both groups at Siglo XX had gone underground. Since then the army has been trying to hunt them down. The government claims that they are fomenting guerrilla war.

On July 29 a contingent of troops commanded by one Captain Zacarías Plaza took César Lora prisoner at San Pedro de Buena Vista, a town in the northern part of the province of Potosí. Lora was tied up; a revolver was placed at his right eyebrow and fired, killing him instantly.

His body was then buried secretly, not even his executioners



being informed of the place.

Numerous political and trade-union organizations denounced the government-sponsored political assassination. The miners at Siglo XX called a 24-hour work stoppage as a form of protest.

"The death of César Lora is a blow to Trotskyism," writes a member of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Bolivian section of the Fourth International). "He was a mature leader and a strong partisan of unifying the Trotskyist forces. He was an active, capable and brave man. I was with him in jail many times because of union or political activities and he always conducted himself firmly and courageously."

The murder of César Lora is not considered to be an isolated incident. One of the leaders of the construction workers, Adrián Arce, was recently slain in similar style. He was arrested at the Excelsior broadcasting station by a contingent of the Waldo Ballivián regiment. Without further ado, he was tied up and shot in the head.

The military junta has other working-class leaders on the list marked for death, particularly Trotskyists and those who think like them. "Nevertheless we will carry on our revolutionary work," declare the Bolivian Trotskyists. "But if we fall, others will take our posts. We are working to create an organization and cadres capable of continuing the struggle."

In a declaration sent to the radio and press, condemning the murder of César Lora, the Partido Obrero Revolucionario appealed for a united front of the whole vanguard and the masses in confronting the fascist-minded generals now ruling Bolivia.

On August 4, the miners at Siglo XX called a demonstration and general meeting that began at 8:30 a.m. and lasted for three hours. The evening before they had sent trucks to San Pedro de Buena Vista to seek the body of César Lora and bring it to the meeting. However, the trucks were intercepted by the army.

The miners began with a "Silent March" through the shops at Cancañiri, the Siglo XX offices and the Sink and Float plant. To prevent them from going to Catavi, armed troops were posted around the mining camp but the workers did not try to break through.

Carrying banners and pay receipts, which they waved, they shouted slogans against the military junta as they marched toward the Plaza del Minero. They exploded occasional sticks of dynamite to emphasize their shouts.

At the Plaza del Minero they heard speakers who paid tribute to César Lora and his revolutionary-socialist ideas and who explained why the junta wanted him out of the way. They bitterly attacked the wage slashes put through by the junta, the massive lay offs, the

absence of trade-union freedom, and the intervention of the junta's Movimiento Popular Cristiano in the workers problems.

They passed the following eight-point resolution:

- (1) Immediate restoration of the former wage system and other economic benefits.
- (2) A normal amount of provisions to be carried by the stores.
- (3) Immediate return to work of all workers fired since the first of June.
- (4) That the government military junta grant full guarantees to the miners' trade-union movement and the workers in general.
- (5) That the persecution against the mine workers be halted.
- (6) The immediate return of exiled mine leaders and workers.
- (7) Immediate withdrawal of the armed forces from all the mining centers in the country.
- (8) That César Lora's remains be brought to Siglo XX and those responsible for his death be punished.

#### COLONEL BOUMEDIENNE SEEKS MORE SCAPEGOATS

By Henri Dumoulin

Algiers

SEPT. 8 -- Up to now the new regime that came to power on June 19 has done little to explain its program, particularly in the economic field. The "Council of the Revolution" has proclaimed in particular its intention to "put things in order," to return to the nationalist authorities (symbolized by the Soummam platform of 1956) and to bring an end to the differences born of independence -- or, to be more precise, to the natural and multiform process of the class struggle.

It was tempting to blame all the present difficulties on one person, yesterday hailed as the symbol of national unity, in short to convert Ben Bella into a scapegoat.

The first phase of the operation could succeed partially, insofar as the popularity of the former president was in decline. But it is one thing to eliminate a man from power; it is something else again to win the confidence of the masses through a constructive program, and particularly to gain its support through concrete achievements.

The support of the Algerian people, however, is indispensable, since it acquired and proved its militant capacities, its political maturity and its revolutionary dynamism through rich experience. All the more so, since parallel to the political shake-up on the level of power, the social contradictions are becoming starker month by month. Between the towns and the countryside; between the newly privileged layers and the rural unemployed who have been gathering in the urban shanty towns; between the rich plains, former cradles of the colonization, and the disinherited regions hard hit by chronic unemployment; between the poor peasantry and the big owners and rural capitalists...

At the opening of the Second International Fair in Algiers September 4, President Boumedienne defined the perspectives of the Council of the Revolution that emerged from the June 19 coup d'état with regard to the economic and industrial development of the country.

Denouncing the relative pauperization of the countries of the "third world" and the growing gap separating them from the highly industrialized countries, the president of the Council explained the fundamental cause as follows: "The industrialized countries often practice, with regard to exports from the underdeveloped countries, a completely discriminatory tariff policy. Worked-up or finished products are frequently hit by a stiffer protective customs duty than is placed on raw materials which are often granted free entry."

If this analysis told everything, it would be sufficient for the countries of the third world to impose tariffs as they chose and, as Boumedienne said elsewhere, "international trade, far from constituting one means of development among others, would determine in great part, if not altogether, our effort at industrialization."

These words were curiously echoed by George Gorse, the French ambassador in Algeria, at the same international fair on September 6, the National Day for France: "Algeria remains one of France's primary partners. This stream of trade, amounting to more than five billion dinars [\$250,000,000], is becoming consolidated by becoming diversified. Some of the things done by France toward this end will illustrate the possibilities that France offers for industrializing Algeria."

Unfortunately, the fundamental cause of the relative pauperization of the countries of the third world goes much deeper. It lies in the transfer of value from the poor countries to the rich ones occurring in every exchange of commodities in accordance with prices on the world market between unequally developed countries. This phenomenon is explained in the final analysis by the difference in the level of productivity between the two categories of countries.

Thus only nationalization and a state monopoly of foreign trade would permit the beginning of genuine economic planning and a

take-off in industrializing the country.

But while the president spoke of consolidating the organisms now holding a monopoly on importing and exporting certain goods, nowhere did he bring up the question of the nationalization pure and simple of foreign trade.

However that constitutes the first indispensable step if Algeria is to hope to finally break the traditional vicious circle of the neocolonialist system with its train of evils and exploitation.

The speech correctly stressed the plague of chronic unemployment in rural areas and advocated an attempt at massive industrialization to overcome it. To achieve this, the president proposed "an interim plan for industrialization."

Along the same line, an article appeared in the August 28 issue of El Djeich entitled "The Tasks of the State," which, while recognizing the need to undertake a plan in agriculture, industry and trade, advocated elaborating a preliminary plan on the basis of approximate figures.

In referring to the Second Afro-Asian Seminar held in Algiers last February, Colonel Boumedienne would have done well to reread the remarks of Comandante Che Guevara in which the Cuban leader strongly reminded his listeners that not only is planning one of the laws of socialism but still more that without a correct plan there can be no leap forward in the development of the economy in the present epoch.

It is true that the Cuban socialists, and Che Guevara in particular, are no longer held in repute in the entourage of Algeria's ministers.

In recent weeks, El Djeich, which is published by the People's National Army [Armée Nationale Populaire], has become particularly interesting to read. It was announced that it is to appear twice a month. For technical reasons this had to be postponed. In addition, issue No. 28 (August) denied the rumors that have been circulating about No. 27 being seized. It is quite possible that here, too, the homogeneity is not total...

However that may be, in an interview published without commentary in the same publication, the assistant director of the People's Bank for Algerian Trade and Industry [Banque Populaire pour Le Commerce et l'Industrie Algérien] made the glorious announcement that the financial balance for 1964 was positive, that for the first time profits had been recorded, and that deposits had doubled over those of 1962. There is nothing astonishing about this, since the Algiers Charter, adopted by the April 1964 congress of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale], stated that "the banks still control, directly or indirectly, the economy of the country as a whole, and exercise a

threatening pressure on the entire socialist sector."

The Algiers Charter added: "Absorption by the socialist sector of all the deposit and credit establishments must constitute one of the fundamental objectives to be undertaken by the party and the government..."

In the declaration of the assistant director of the BPCIA, this is transmuted into the following: "At present, the BPCIA is addressing the management committees as it has addressed the companies. Instead of granting them credit in response to a mere letter as in the past, it is demanding an accounting situation permitting it to undertake a study of the files [sic]. It is a question of accustoming the self-managed enterprises to banking practices [sic again]."

This "nuance" reveals the unbridgeable barrier that separates the opposing classes within the capitalist structure.

Finally, touching on the crying disparity separating the traditional peasantry from the modern sector, Boumedienne, in his programmatic speech, advocated developing the projects now underway: reforestation, stock breeding, irrigation, soil reclamation, etc. Of the necessary readjustment in ownership and the galvanizing of the poverty-stricken rural economy through a radical agrarian reform, not a thing was said. The Algiers Charter nevertheless put it on the agenda and the central committee of the FLN let it be known first in February and again in June that this would be carried out in the summer of 1965.

A program of this kind leaves the road wide open to neocolonialism. In keeping with its incapacity to resolve the present crisis and to offer a genuine solution to the current economic difficulties, the Boumedienne regime is searching desperately for diversionary political issues.

Thus, since the beginning of September, the Algerian press has launched a big offensive against...the "pieds-rouges."\* The offensive was mounted under pretext of replying to an article by André Laude in the August 21 Le Monde entitled "In Defense of the Pieds-Rouges." Laude stated in his article that he was referring to those French who offered disinterested aid to the Algerian Revolution during and after the war for national liberation.

An editorial in the September 4 El Moudjahid was the opening gun. After commenting on the "benefits and unquestionable successes"

---

\*The French colonialists were contemptuously referred to in their time as "pieds-noirs" (black feet). Boumedienne's propagandists have now coined the term "pieds-rouges" (red feet) for French socialists who rallied to the cause of the Algerians in their freedom struggle and who, with the victory, went to Algeria to offer help in reconstructing the war-torn country.

of the traditional technical cooperation between France and Algeria, the editor wrote: "Certain people cooperated in the struggle for the country's independence. Friends in the difficult times and in our combat, they are continuing to serve our country with faith and ardor, but quite often it is difficult for them to reach equilibrium... Algeria has no need to accept the collaboration of adventurers, of 'cloudy' minds or representatives of minority tendencies within minority movements..."

The September 4 Révolution Africaine likewise took this theme for the subject of an editorial by Dr. A. Khaldi. (Omar Ouzegane was removed from his post as editor of this weekly with the August 20 issue following two editorials advocating a certain agrarian reform.) The new editor attacked the "pasture-seekers, advisers more than technicians, who distinguished themselves more by their toadyism than by their scruples, adventurers making the rounds of certain African capitals, these 'pieds-rouges' sneaking around in rubber soles who know how to put on green Turkish slippers if needed."

Finally, still in Révolution Africaine, an article by Malek Bennabi on the level of the worst period of McCarthyism and rabid anti-Communism:

"At the present time, the evil we must worry about in Algeria is sabotage of the state apparatus. Communist Russia had to face this peril in the 1927-1939 period.

"It is worse than an armed attack because they can gnaw away at this apparatus silently, in the dark, until it falls to pieces, without our hearing anything or seeing anything while it is going on...

"The virulent saboteur is the one who works in liaison with other elements of the same kind knowing the objective of their work. He knows that he wants to destroy a society, a state, a regime.

"In addition, this type of social microbe can be unaware of other members of the same pathological family -- it is even a technical necessity for those with the card-index (the foreign power utilizing them) -- but he cannot be unaware of the nature of his work and the pay for his work.

"He knows that he is working in accordance with a plan drawn up abroad within the framework of a global strategy that applies all the methods of microscopic work wherever the atomic bomb is not necessary or possible."

Such literature would warrant only an ironic smile were it not combined with repression of the former left wing of Ben Bellism\* and

---

\*The partisans of Hocine Zahoane, author of a proclamation by a new resistance movement, the Organisation de la Résistance Populaire,

blind but rigorous repression directed essentially against French technicians cooperating with Algeria who are considered to one degree or another to hold leftist views.

Whatever the propaganda intended to disorient the working masses of the towns and countryside, while hunting down new scapegoats, the diversion has little chance of being long lived.

---

[see World Outlook August 6]; Mohamed Harbi, who, according to a report in Le Monde, was arrested August 9, etc.

### SEVEN FRENCH TECHNICIANS ARRESTED IN ALGERIA

Paris

SEPT. 16 -- Agence France-Presse reported yesterday in a dispatch from Algiers that seven French nationals have been arrested in Algeria under accusation of "collusion" with the underground Organisation de la Résistance Populaire [see World Outlook August 6] which is struggling against Colonel Boumedienne's arbitrary regime.

The name of only one of the victims has been revealed: Albert Roux, a technician working with the Office des Céréales.

Le Monde, which reported the arrest of Albert Roux in its September 14 issue, describes him as a member of the left socialist Parti Socialiste Unifié (one of the more radical groupings in France), a collaborator of Tribune Socialiste, and the main figure in the Committee to Aid the Victims of the Repression, which was formed in France at the end of the war with Algeria.

The other six included a technician of Algier's radio-television, a youth called up for military service in France who opted to serve his time helping Algeria (a choice open to French draftees), and a woman who formerly worked with the Algérie Presse Service.

Boumedienne's police claimed that they found "incriminating documents" in the homes of the victims.

Official French circles gave anonymous backing to the charges of the Boumedienne regime, stating that there did not "seem to be any doubt about the reality of the facts charged against those arrested."

The Boumedienne regime notified the French embassy of the arrests and, in accordance with the terms of the "cooperation" granted by the de Gaulle government, turned the youth serving military time in Algeria, over to the embassy. What fate awaits the others was not reported.

CAMPAIGN OPENED IN BEHALF OF BEN BELLA

Paris

SEPT. 15 -- The "Provisional Committee for the Liberation of Ben Bella" expressed worry today over the fate of Ben Bella and asked world opinion to lodge protests with the Boumedienne regime which is presumably holding him incommunicado in an unknown place.

"The undersigned," the committee declared in a press release, "worried over the fate of Ahmed Ben Bella, of whom no news has been received up to nearly three months after his arrest, observes that in any case it is impossible for him to provide for his defense, and addresses a pressing appeal to international opinion to intervene with the Algerian leaders to get them to authorize his being visited by his own attorneys, to receive visits, and to be examined by his doctor, in one word, that he be granted the elementary rights of a human being."

Up to now, Boumedienne has refused permission for even Ben Bella's mother to see her son.

Among those signing the appeal were the following: Arthur Adamov, Colette Audry, Denise Barrat, Simone de Beauvoir, Marc Beigbeder, Loleh Bellon, Jacques Berque, Claude Bourdet, Michel Butor, Aimé Césaire, François Châtelet, Alain Cuny, Jean-Marie Domenach, Daniel Guérin, Claude Lanzmann, René Leibowitz, Michel Leiris, Jacques Madaule, Louis Martin-Chauffier, Jehan Mayoux, Yves Montand, Maurice Nadeau, Pierre Naville, Marcel Peju, André Pieyre de Mandiargues, Alain Resnais, David Rousset, Claude Roy, Françoise Sagan, André Salmon, Nathalie Sarraute, Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone Signoret, Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Andrée Pierre-Vienot, Lucien Goldman, Marcel Prenant.

JAPANESE HOUSEWIVES STAGE PEACE MARCH

Some 15,000 Japanese housewives staged an outdoor rally followed by a chanting parade in the downtown streets of Tokyo August 23 to deliver a three-point protest to the Diet.

The resolution, which will be advanced through the Diet by the Japan Socialist party and the Japan Communist party, asks the government and the Diet to drop their pro-American attitude on the war in Vietnam, not to ratify the Japan-Republic of Korea "normalization" treaty, and to initiate countermeasures against the rising cost of living.

The action followed a two-day national convention of the Japan Housewives Association headed by Natsu Kawasaki, a former representative of the Japan Socialist party in the House of Councillors.



THE "DEACONS FOR DEFENSE AND JUSTICE"

By Evelyn Sell

For the past year Southern Negroes have been arming and organizing themselves in self-defense against racist terror. National publicity has focused primarily on the "Deacons for Defense and Justice" which first sprang up in Jonesboro, Louisiana. Jonesboro is a small town of some 4,000 inhabitants, about one-third of them Negroes. The people of Jonesboro own guns as do most rural Southerners, both black and white, but this fact has taken on new and untraditional expressions over the past year.

The parentage of the Deacons was the long, bitter history of black-white relations in the United States. The midwife that assisted in bringing the Deacons into the world was the civil-rights campaign of the summer of 1964. Young field workers of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] came to Jonesboro last summer. They were threatened by some local white youths and within minutes word spread through the Negro community. In very short order dozens of Negroes appeared carrying guns to defend the civil-rights workers. It was decided at a later meeting to organize a self-defense group and to let the white community know that they were prepared to protect the lives of Negroes and civil-rights workers.

Although not a shot was fired for many months, the mere existence of the Deacons had a salutary effect. On several occasions, for example, they have informed county law-enforcement officers that they were interested in the treatment given Negroes who had been arrested for minor law violations. The authorities were uncommonly careful about how they treated these Negro prisoners -- unusual in the South where Negroes are beaten and even killed by law-enforcement officials.

Another example of the powerful effect of the Deacons' defensive tactics involved a 17-year-old Negro who had been accused of kissing a white girl against her will. While a white posse hunted for the youth, the Deacons found him and took him into protective custody. The white girl later changed her story about the unwilling kiss. One member of the Deacons told a New York Times reporter, "If it hadn't been for this club, doubtless this boy would have been lynched."

The Deacons carefully explain that they are not a terrorist organization; they are a disciplined self-defense formation. Their aim is to protect Negroes and civil-rights workers who have not been protected to date by the established law-enforcement agencies.

They are very efficient protectors. Using citizens-band radios they patrol the Negro neighborhood and every white-driven car that enters is closely watched. Earnest Thomas, 32-year-old full-time organizer for the Deacons, explained, "Usually, when they knew

they were under surveillance, they'd just go on through and not stop." In this manner the Deacons' patrols have ended cross-burnings and harassments by whites in the Negro community.

It wasn't until April 10 (almost a year after the formation of the Deacons) that shots were exchanged between whites and Negroes. Elmo Jacobs, 38-year-old Jonesboro Negro, was driving a car full of white civil-rights volunteers from the University of Kansas. A group of white teenagers shot into the car and Jacobs fired back. He and Oretha Castle, a field secretary for CORE, later counted 14 bullet holes in Jacobs' car.

From its fairly modest beginnings in Jonesboro, the Deacons have spread out into other Louisiana towns and other southern states. Although membership figures are not given out, it is estimated that from 5,000 to 15,000 Negroes are organized in about 50 to 55 chapters in Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama.

The Bogalusa chapter has been receiving national attention because of the many racial explosions that have been taking place in that Louisiana town. Bogalusa is a lumber-mill town of about 27,000 persons. It is located some 160 miles from Jonesboro. Because of its closeness to the Mississippi border, many of Bogalusa's workers come from Mississippi. Earlier this year James Farmer, national leader of CORE, stated that Bogalusa would be a major target of his organization.

At the beginning of April the CORE-inspired Bogalusa Civic and Voters League launched a drive for fuller voting rights and employment opportunities. The situation in the town was packed with social dynamite: the Ku Klux Klan had been revived in 1963 and during the course of the civil-rights campaign was meeting and passing out leaflets and threats; the mayor, Jesse Cutrer, was considered a racial moderate but as soon as a crisis loomed he hurriedly appealed to Negroes to halt demonstrations, to the governor to send state troops and to racists to avoid "another Selma"; the Bogalusa Voters League persisted in attempts to upgrade Negro life in the city; the Deacons were on the scene.

The head of the Bogalusa Deacons is Charles Sims who spent four years in the United States army as a technical sergeant in charge of arms instruction -- good training ground for a real fight to protect and extend freedom!

"I never had a chance to fight for freedom before," Sims told a Los Angeles television audience. "Now I want a whole lot of freedom. Through the civil-rights movement, with the Deacons' help, we can get it."

The Deacons have been active in the Bogalusa civil-rights campaign and they have been needed because the racists have been attacking demonstrators and civil-rights activists throughout the

campaign. On April 8, for example, whites attacked the residence of Robert Hicks, member of the Deacons and vice-president of the Bogalusa Voters League. Hicks was providing housing for CORE field workers. A brick was thrown from a car driving past the Hicks' home; the brick shattered the rear window of a station wagon parked in the yard. Shots were fired from the Hicks' house at the fleeing car; the occupants of the car retaliated. Then a second group of cars sped past the house but by this time a dozen Deacons, armed with shotguns and rifles, were on the scene and responded to this second attack.

Other instances of racist violence occurred during May when crowds of whites tried to chase Negroes out of a park the Negroes were trying to integrate and during June when whites repeatedly beat up Negro pickets. On June 2 a Negro deputy sheriff was killed and his companion deputy wounded. Police arrested a white man, Ernis McElveen, who they claim shot the deputies as he drove past them in his truck.

On July 8 a Negro shot and seriously wounded a white man who had attacked him during a civil-rights march. The Negro, Henry Austin, told television newsmen that he was a Deacon. The white man, Alton Crowe, had rushed up to Austin and a Negro companion swinging his fists. Don Lee Keith, a reporter from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, said he saw the white man attack the Negroes and then he heard two shots. The white walked away, stumbled and fell. He was taken to a hospital and the police immediately arrested the two Negroes and took them to an unidentified jail. Austin, who had a 38-caliber pistol, told police that he had shot Crowe. CORE officials called the shooting self-defense.

It is apparent from the above material that CORE and the Deacons have maintained a sympathetic and close working relationship. The birth of the Deacons, it was noted, was precipitated by the need to defend CORE field workers. The Deacons have continued to protect CORE activists in Jonesboro and Bogalusa and this is publicly acknowledged by both groups. Richard Haley, southern director of CORE, explained, "The Deacons made the difference between safety and bad health last summer for CORE workers in Jonesboro." Sims, head of the Bogalusa Deacons has said, "If those three civil-rights workers who were killed in Mississippi last year had been in Bogalusa, nothing would have happened to them."

This working relationship between CORE and the Deacons has been criticized by other civil-rights leaders and organizations. Clarence Laws, Southwest regional director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], stated:

"We don't want to see such groups as the Deacons spread but we are afraid they will unless legitimate law enforcement agencies, from federal to local level, start giving adequate protection to all citizens."

Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., severely attacked CORE's rela-

tionship with the Deacons. The line between "aggressive and defensive violence is very slim," said King. "We can't win our struggle with violence and to cloak it under the name of defensive violence really is no answer."

"The Negro must have allies to win his struggle for equality," King continued, "and our allies will not surround a violent movement. What protects us from the Klan is to expose its brutality. We can't outshoot the Klan. We would only alienate our allies and lose sympathy for our cause."

King and his lieutenants have been frantically preaching against self-defense moves within the Negro community -- but the plain facts of life and death in a racist society are very potent. Although CORE is officially pledged to a philosophy of nonviolence, the events of the last year have impelled them to seek and support the work of the Deacons and the whole concept of self-defense.

James Farmer, answering King's attack, stated: "CORE is in the rights business and the Deacons are in the protecting business. I don't believe in electric chairs, because that is the society retaliating violently, but I do believe in the personal right to self defense and can only work and hope that that right is rigidly disciplined through organizations such as the Deacons."

Farmer reiterated that "CORE is and will remain a nonviolent organization." He insisted that nonviolence must still be the rule inside demonstrations, i.e., civil-rights demonstrators must accept any violence from whites without striking back or defending themselves. In the next breath, however, Farmer states, "But I believe that when threatened any man has the right to protect his life. . . I can't find fault with a man for exercising his constitutional rights to protect his home, with weapons if necessary."

There are some obvious contradictions in what CORE preaches and what it practices -- contradictions brought about by the forceful reality of the Freedom Now struggle. The organization of the Deacons and the controversy between CORE and King are indicative of the seething creativity of the Negro masses who set about to solve their problems without benefit of approval from the capitalist-chosen Negro leaders and without regard to the tender feelings of "allies" who would be horrified because black men exercise rights proclaimed in the Constitution of the United States.

The passing of civil-rights legislation and the appointment of Negroes to high offices and the token integration of bus stations and restaurants and schools has not lessened the need for self-defense against racist terror. The continued violence against black freedom fighters and their white allies makes it increasingly imperative to continue and spread groups such as the Deacons. Negroes recognize this need and they are dragging their "leaders" along with them on this question. That is why James Farmer can write in an article for

the Harlem weekly, The Amsterdam News:

"Negroes in this nation are down to about their last ounce of patience. For all the hoopla and the speechmaking and legislation, very little has changed in the reality of Negro life in this country ...rats still bite kids and the citizens of Bogalusa still don't have the vote...And if violence is on the horizon, I would certainly prefer to see it channeled into a defense discipline."

The last words on this matter properly come from spokesmen for the Deacons for Defense and Justice. "Martin Luther King and I have never seen eye to eye," says Charles Sims, head of the Bogalusa Deacons. "He has never been to Bogalusa. If we didn't have the Deacons here there is no telling how many killings there would have been."

"We stand guard here in the Negro quarter," Sims continued. "We are the defensive team. We will never go on the offensive. But if the Klan or anybody else comes in here to hit us, I guarantee they will get hit back."

Sims and Robert Hicks, vice-president of the Bogalusa Voters League, were in Detroit on August 22 in order to speak at a Freedom Dinner sponsored by the Group on Advanced Leadership [GOAL]. The dinner was organized to publicize the work of the Deacons and the League and to secure financial contributions so that they could continue their work in the South. During his talk Hicks pointed out the similarities in the struggles in Bogalusa and Detroit:

"Our main goal is freedom. I don't mean token freedom. The people in Bogalusa want the whole hog, hair and all!...We're trying to get jobs, a police review board -- same as you are trying to get here."

In a personal interview with this writer, Hicks and Sims described other support gained from the North. On the West Coast, CORE initiated the San Francisco "Concern for Bogalusa." Members of this group have been picketing and sitting-in at the home offices of the Crown-Zellerbach Corp. whose paper mill and container factory provides the main employment in the Bogalusa area. The pickets, echoing the demands of the Bogalusa Negroes, are demanding that Crown-Zellerbach establish fair promotion policies for Negroes and place black men in better jobs. On the East Coast there is the "Friends of the Deacons" in Boston which provides moral and financial support.

The August 21 Michigan Chronicle reported that residents of Austin, Texas, have organized the "Committee to Aid the Deacons" in order to publicize Deacons' activities, win favorable public opinion and raise money. Mark Klein, spokesman for the Texas group, stated:

"Any civil-rights supporter who is tired of reading about bomb-

ings, beatings and murders should be heartened to learn about the Deacons. Racist terrorism has stopped where the Deacons have organized. But they need our help."

The Deacons need the help of all people concerned with freedom now -- and all people struggling for freedom need the help of the Deacons. As was frequently commented during the Freedom Dinner in Detroit: "We could use some Deacons here!"

### GAINED DIGNITY THROUGH WATTS REVOLT

As a result of the Watts "insurrection," the Negroes of Los Angeles, California, now feel more confident about themselves. This is the conclusion of Dr. Harold W. Jones, a Negro psychiatrist who heads a mental health clinic in the area.

"They feel morally right about what they have done," Dr. Jones is quoted as saying by the Los Angeles Times [August 17]. "They look upon it as a revolt rather than a riot and therefore subject to a different value system.

"They see their insurrection as an opportunity to achieve dignity and self-respect. It is as if they are saying, 'It's better to be feared than to be held in contempt.'"

One of the significant reasons listed by the psychiatrist for the Watts revolt was the "gradual realization" among Negroes through civil-rights victories that they are entitled to more respect than they receive.

A good many of the participants "were white-collar workers from many parts of the county who came over to applaud what was going on because they felt the need to demonstrate their worth and importance."

A political motive was also discernible. The participants were attempting to give Negro leadership in the Los Angeles area a bargaining position it now lacks with white authorities.

A common motivation was shared by the participants, "a determination to show their strength by using violence -- and in this sense their activities were not without direction."

Dr. Jones noted that the looting and burning were not merely expressions of uncontrolled passion; "they were controlled in the sense that they were directed chiefly at merchants whom the people feel are exploiting the neighborhood without contributing to the Negro good."

To illustrate his point about the incorrectness of seeing

merely total lawlessness, Dr. Jones told about one Negro whom he saw loading a truck with furniture from a store. He drove off only to wait several minutes at an intersection for a traffic light to change.

In Watts, the police are only too often white and thus a symbol of persecution. The people "truly hate the members of the Los Angeles police department."

Besides an extremely high rate of unemployment (34%), overcrowding in the ghetto was held to be a factor in the social explosion. According to the mental health department, the nonwhite population of Los Angeles rose from 218,000 to 462,000 between 1950 and 1960, an increase of over 100%. This compared with a 25% growth in the white population.

In 1960, 37% of the housing units in the south-central area of Los Angeles were substandard compared with 5% for the county as a whole.

Twenty-eight per cent of the dwelling units in Watts are listed as overcrowded. This compares with 8% for the whole county, 6 to 8% for Granada Hills, 0.5% for Beverly Hills, 15% for Venice and 30% for Compton-Willowbrook.

The population density of Watts in 1960 was 14,090 persons per square mile and slightly less than 16,000 for the Santa Barbara Ave. area. The county average was 4,800. In the Harlem district of New York City it is about 20,000.

### LE CORBUSIER

By David Daumesnil

Paris

Charles Edouard Le Corbusier, who died August 27 at the age of seventy-eight, was one of the greatest artists of our time. To a higher degree than anyone else, he contributed an architecture to the twentieth century. The nineteenth century, the era of triumphant bourgeois individualism, had no genuine architecture and left no monument that achieved beauty.

In his folders, to which he added throughout his life, Le Corbusier compiled his responses to the architectural needs of our time. But at his grave, a government minister could offer a eulogy, repeated by all Le Corbusier's opponents, proclaiming that "through depreciation glory achieves its supreme splendor." We could hardly say anything different in France. If India and Latin America are able to contemplate the genius of Le Corbusier in several patterns of cement, France has only a church as a worthy product bearing the name of this atheist architect. This man, who wanted to build for mankind,

saw his plans caricatured, shrunk and slashed to bits by municipal mediocrities and technicians to fit the needs of greedy promoters; and he did not acknowledge as his own the buildings that bear his name in France.

Brunelleschi's plans for the Duomo in Florence led people to treat him as a madman the way Le Corbusier was called "le fada" [a little crazy]. But Brunelleschi was able to carry out his work integrally, an opportunity not granted to Le Corbusier. At Saint Peter's in Rome, Michelangelo's work was partly spoiled after his death, but Le Corbusier's work was sabotaged while he was alive. The France which pays him honor is that of the H.L.M. [low-cost housing] destined from the beginning to become slums, and buildings that collapse. The biggest construction company in the country, controlled by the government, eats into the green spaces that Le Corbusier wanted as genuine parks with no streets.

Le Corbusier's misfortune, which he continually fought throughout his life, was that his conception of a dwelling implicitly called for socialism. Bringing in all the conquests of modern science, it boldly resolved the anachronistic, still surviving opposition between town and countryside.

Although Le Corbusier did not hold strong political views, he keenly felt what kind of men and conditions offered the only possibility of reaching the "radiant city" which he envisioned. He dreamed, with Trotsky, of constructing in Moscow, after the destruction of the civil-war period, a new, colorful city, revolutionary in concept and yet linked to the deepest Russian tradition. Instead, Stalinism erected the heavy, lugubrious structures afflicted with gigantism.

He created a scandal one day in 1936 when he came to a serious meeting which he was scheduled to chair and excused himself for being late by saying that he could not stop reading a book, "the stunning, magnificent and revealing Revolution Betrayed by Leon Trotsky."

Le Corbusier recalled these things when he gave our party [the French Trotskyist movement] a beautiful drawing of the human forms of a hand and a woman.

A whole pack of former depreciators and authorities who denied him the means to overcome French urbanism can try like clerics to claim his body. Hailed by everyone, Le Corbusier was nonetheless a "reviled" creator whose passionate struggle did not achieve the world he dreamed of. And no speech can bury that fact, because no words of a government minister have ever succeeded in cheating history.

#### "QUIET PROFITS" IN NAPALM BUSINESS

"At least 90 per cent of the napalm American planes drop on Vietnam comes from two Japanese concerns," reports the Christian Science Monitor of Boston. If there is a "quiet profit" in napalm for Japanese business, as the paper puts it, what a bonanza the war is for Wall Street!



REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST PARTY FOUNDED IN CHILE

By José Valdés

Santiago de Chile

The founding congress of a revolutionary Marxist party was held here on August 14-15. Various groups and parties with delegates from the most important provinces of the country attended. After a full democratic discussion they approved the following reports: International, Latin-American, National, Declaration of Principles and Program, Organization and Statutes. By majority vote the new united party was named "Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario" (MIR) [Revolutionary Left Movement]. This new revolutionary Marxist party starts with regional committees and bases in the following provinces: Antofagasta, Coquimbo, Aconcagua, Valparaíso, Santiago, O'Higgins, Talca, Concepción, Temuco, Los Angeles, Osorno and Llanquihue, in addition to many sympathizers in the rest of the provinces of Chile (Linares, Aysen, Magallanes).

The MIR is the result of successive unifications that took place during the past year, the details of which are as follows: (1) Unification in February 1964 of the POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario], which had a long Trotskyist tradition, with the MRC [Movimiento Revolucionario Comunista], a group of Communist youth that came forward in the Sino-Soviet conflict. (2) Unification in May 1964 of the MRC with the OSI [Oposición Socialista de Izquierda], giving birth to the PSP [Partido Socialista Popular]. (3) Unification in May 1965 of the PSP with the MIDI [Movimiento de Independientes de Izquierda Allendista], a group composed of rank-and-file committees that supported the presidential candidacy of Allende. This formation retained the name of the PSP. (4) The PSP and Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista, together with groups that had left the Communist and Socialist parties, and revolutionary trade unionists like Clotario Blest called the Founding Congress that created the MIR.

This process of revolutionary regroupment in Chile is part and parcel of the unity process bringing together the Marxist groups that have appeared generally in Latin America since the Cuban Revolution.

In this way the most important Marxist-Leninist party yet to be formed in Chile has come into being. Its importance can be judged not only by its political positions and the quality of its leaders but by the number of active members, the majority of them young workers, peasants and students.

The congress elected a central committee of 21 members -- 11 from Santiago and 10 from the provinces. The central committee is composed of youth in its great majority and experienced leaders like Enrique Sepúlveda, founder of the POR and Chilean Trotskyism, who was unanimously elected general secretary; Humberto Valenzuela, former general secretary of the POR; Clotario Blest, president of the Central Unica de Trabajadores for nine years; Oscar Waiss, who was a member

of the central committee of the Socialist party for various terms until he broke with it because of its reformism; Santibañez, regional leader of the Communist party who just broke away from the CP because of its revisionism; the author of this article; and other worker and student leaders.

The documents that were approved can be judged from the following extracts:

### Declaration of Principles and Program

I. "The aim of the MIR is to overthrow the capitalist system and replace it by a Workers and Peasants Government, led by the organs of proletarian power, whose task will be to construct socialism and gradually eliminate the state until a classless society is reached."

II. "The MIR bases its revolutionary action on the historical fact of the class struggle. The MIR recognizes the proletariat as the vanguard class that must win to its cause the peasants, intellectuals and impoverished middle class."

III. "The twentieth century is the century of the definitive death agony of the capitalist system. This system, in its highest stage, imperialism, is unable to offer humanity any other perspective except dictatorial regimes and war, in a final attempt to get out of its chronic structural crisis."

IV. "The most outstanding feature of this century is the world character which the revolutionary process has acquired. All continents have been shaken by revolution and the relation of forces between the classes has altered to the disadvantage of imperialism. The triumph of the revolution in numerous backward countries has demonstrated that all nations have sufficient objective conditions to carry out a socialist revolution and that there are no 'mature and immature' proletariats. Struggles for national liberation and agrarian reform have been transformed through a process of permanent and uninterrupted revolution into social revolutions, thus demonstrating that without the defeat of the bourgeoisie there are no real possibilities for national liberation and radical agrarian reform -- democratic tasks that combine with socialist measures. The revolutions in the colonial and semicolonial countries have not yet resolved the basic problems of socialism. Until revolution triumphs in the highly industrialized countries, the danger will always remain of a nuclear war and it will not be possible to reach a classless society. Imperialism will not be defeated through mere economic competition between opposing social regimes in a world of formal peaceful coexistence, but through socialist revolution in the very bastions of imperialism."

V. "The objective conditions are more than ripe for the overthrow of the capitalist system. Despite this, reformism and revisionism continue to betray the interests of the proletariat. It follows that the crisis of humanity is reduced to a crisis in the world leader-

ship of the proletariat, in face of which we reaffirm the principles of proletarian internationalism. Nevertheless, the revolutionary process in the last decades has produced a crisis in the traditional political parties of the left and has begun to give rise to new revolutionary movements which open the historic perspective of overcoming the crisis in leadership of the proletariat."

VI. "Chile has been converted into a semicolonial country, of backward, unequal and combined capitalist development. The course of the ruling classes since the declaration of our independence in the past century has demonstrated the incapacity of the native bourgeoisie and its parties to resolve the bourgeois-democratic tasks. We consequently reject the 'theory of stages' which mistakenly holds that it is first necessary to wait for a bourgeois-democratic stage, led by the industrial bourgeoisie, before the proletariat takes power. We will combat this conception which fosters illusions in the 'progressive bourgeoisie' and practices class collaboration. We emphatically maintain that the only class capable of carrying out 'democratic' tasks in combination with socialist tasks is the proletariat at the head of the peasantry and the impoverished middle class."

VII. "The MIR rejects the theory of a 'peaceful' and 'parliamentary road' because it disarms the proletariat politically and is inapplicable since the bourgeoisie itself will resist, including by means of totalitarian dictatorship and civil war instead of peacefully handing over power. We reaffirm the Marxist-Leninist principle that the only way to demolish the capitalist system is through popular armed insurrection."

VIII. "The MIR defines itself as a Marxist-Leninist organization that is governed by the principles of democratic centralism."

### Program

#### Internationally:

"The present world is divided into nations of the capitalist system and countries with a socialist structure. Within the capitalist system there are oppressor countries and oppressed countries. The MIR proclaims its support to the socialist camp and categorically rejects the idea of any possible neutrality. Peaceful coexistence, active or passive, represents a provisional agreement between the bureaucracies and imperialism aimed at slowing down or blocking the world revolution. The MIR is for the defense of the socialist countries in case of aggression. In the socialist countries, we support the revolutionary people and not its bureaucratic leaderships who have deformed the process of constructing socialism and have betrayed revolutionary Marxism.

"The MIR is in favor of the colonial revolution and every anti-imperialist struggle; it supports the revolutionary wars of liberation which the oppressed peoples are advancing, just as it stands in favor

of self-determination for the peoples.

"The MIR proclaims its support for the Cuban Revolution, pointing out that its methods of insurrectional struggle, liquidation of the national bourgeoisie and imperialism, its forms of constructing socialism, including its proposals not to permit either sectarianism or bureaucratism, constitute an example for the guidance of the revolutionists of the continent.

"The MIR will struggle for the United Socialist Republics of Latin America, a unity which we conceive not as a single country but as a united federation of the Latin-American nations, in a socialist system, as a step toward complete unity.

"The MIR, on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism, will maintain, without any sectarianism, fraternal relations with the revolutionary parties of the whole world, maintaining independence to resolve its own national politics. In our continent, the MIR will seek to form a united movement of revolutionary groups and parties of Latin America with the aim of coordinating and accelerating the revolutionary process."

Nationally:

"Our semicolonial country must undertake to carry out two basic tasks: the liquidation of imperialism and the agrarian revolution.

"The expulsion of imperialism means: (a) Nationalization, without indemnification, of the copper, nitrates, iron, electric and telephone companies, the big commercial houses and the foreign banks. (b) Breaking the pacts tying us to imperialism (military pact with the USA, OAS, International Monetary Fund). (c) Repudiation of the foreign debt contracted by the bourgeois governments with imperialism. (d) Commercial and diplomatic relations with all the countries in the world, including the socialist states.

"The agrarian revolution means (a) expropriation, without payment, of the land held by the latifundistas and turning it over to the peasants who till it. This will be on a family or collective basis in accordance with the specific conditions in each zone, and will be accompanied by technical aid, machines, and other measures designed to raise the level of productivity of agriculture.

"These two tasks of democratic nature must be intimately linked in an uninterrupted way to the objectives of socialist nature which are as follows: (a) Socialization of the key sectors of the country like the banks and credit, insurance, transport, medicine and social security, urban revolution, etc. (b) Expropriation, without payment, of the plants and enterprises of the national bourgeoisie and their management through the unions and workers councils. (c) State control of foreign and domestic trade. (d) Planning and management of the

economy by a socialist government with the leadership of the unions, revolutionary committees and councils of the workers, peasants and employees.

"This program can be carried out through the liquidation of the bourgeois state apparatus and its replacement by direct proletarian democracy and armed militia of the workers and peasants.

"The struggle for these revolutionary objectives does not exclude mobilizing the masses for immediate demands like: a sliding scale of wages and salaries, sliding and equalitarian family incomes, collective bargaining and union recognition, sliding scale of hours, workers control of production, progressive income tax on the capitalists, reduction of the indirect taxes on the workers, forty-hour week, the right to organize for government workers, extension of the right to vote to illiterates and those who have reached the age of eighteen, as well as to noncommissioned officers and the troops.

"Let us mobilize the workers, applying the methods of the class struggle, such as strikes, occupation of the land, factories and fields, fighting and self-defense groups. The struggle for immediate demands must not be converted into a final end, as is done by the reformists, but must serve to lift the revolutionary political level of the masses that are mobilized for such concrete objectives. The program as a whole can be realized only by overturning the bourgeoisie and installing a workers and peasants government."

### International Theses

The congress of the MIR analyzed the relation of forces between the classes on a world scale as developing unfavorably for imperialism. It was held that the Soviet bureaucracy is making desperate efforts to concretize its policy of peaceful coexistence. On the Sino-Soviet conflict, the congress of the MIR decided to give critical support to the positions of the Chinese Communist party with regard to its policy against peaceful coexistence and against the parliamentary and peaceful road supported by the Soviet bureaucracy. But along with the support for the Chinese position of furthering the colonial revolution, the congress indicated the errors committed by the Chinese Communist party (Indonesia, recognition of the Boumedienne coup d'état in Algeria, mistaken characterization of Yugoslavia and also the USSR, etc.).

The fact was pointed out that since the Chinese Revolution, all the revolutionary processes have escaped the control of the Communist parties, the revolutions have been led by revolutionary movements and parties of a new kind (Cuba, Algeria, the Congo, Angola).

Latin America: The latter thesis was stated in a document approved by the congress of the MIR, maintaining that all the revolutionary movements of Latin America have escaped the control of the Communist parties, forming new revolutionary Marxist parties. Since

the Cuban Revolution, the following revolutionary parties have been formed, constituting an active and real vanguard: Movimiento 14 de Junio in the Dominican Republic, the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria] of Venezuela, the MOEC [Movimiento de Obreros, Estudiantes y Campesinos] of Colombia, the Movimiento 13 de Noviembre of Guatemala, the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria] and FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionaria] of Peru, the Juventud Revolucionaria Ecuatoriana, the POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario] of Bolivia, the PRT [Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores] of Argentina, etc. The development of these revolutionary movements of a new kind is a positive base for overcoming the crisis in the leadership of the proletariat in Latin America.

The congress of the MIR agreed to call for a Latin-American conference of these revolutionary groups and parties with the aim of coordinating the revolutionary struggle and centralizing the anti-imperialist action.

The invasion of the North American marines in Santo Domingo opens a new stage in the tactics of imperialism. The United States is on the point of cancelling its policy of an "Alliance for Progress" and is ready to intervene with sword and fire in any country where a government exists which it does not like, trampling on the right of the peoples to self-determination. The protests and opposition of governments like those of Frei, Belaúnde and Leoni against the Yankee occupation of Santo Domingo constitute a warning to the USA not to abandon the policy of the "Alliance for Progress" in which these bourgeois governments placed such high hopes. In face of the imperialist threat, the congress of the MIR appealed for formation of an Anti-imperialist Resistance Command headed by the socialist Cuba of Fidel and including all the anti-imperialist movements of Latin America and the union federations of every country.

### Report on National Politics

The congress of the MIR pointed out that three fundamental features characterize the present stage: (a) the relative stabilization of bourgeois rule, which, through the demagogic program of the Christian Democracy, succeeded in gaining the support of broad layers of the people; (b) the crisis of the Communist and Socialist parties; (c) the tendency toward unity among the revolutionary Marxist forces.

The Frei government was characterized as representing the general interests of the bourgeoisie and the plans of imperialism expressed by means of the "Alliance for Progress." Nevertheless, it would be quite mechanical to consider it to be a puppet government of the oligarchy and imperialism. Frei represents the interests of a bourgeoisie in a semicolonial country that is incapable of freeing itself from the foreign monopolists, but which wishes to play an active role as the junior partner, seeking better prices for raw materials, permanent markets, full credit and investments, aspiring to negotiate the national income with imperialism under the best pos-

sible conditions. The popular support won by Frei is a triumph for the political demagogy of the Christian Democracy, to which the opportunist, vacillating and reformist line of the FRAP\* contributed. But the popular support carries its own contradiction which will come to the fore in coming months when the masses demand fulfillment of the program. This will sharpen the contradiction between the militant rank and file of the Christian Democracy, which is of popular composition, and the bourgeois leadership. In the next period we will witness the failure of the so-called "Revolución en libertad" (free revolution) and frustration once again of this variant of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

As for the character of the present stage, it was held that the September 4, 1964, electoral victory of the Christian Democracy signified a defeat for the working class. But this setback is of transitory character. The prognosis on economic perspectives is that the Frei government will not be able to prevent a crisis. The projected increase in production of copper does not depend on the "good intentions" of the government but on demand in the world market and on the price of copper which will continue to be controlled by imperialism. Agricultural and industrial production, with the exception perhaps of the export industries, will remain stagnant, because the process of inflation at a higher rate than the twenty-five per cent envisioned by the government, will reduce the buying power of the masses, thus narrowing the domestic market. The crisis will mean a worsening of the standard of living of the workers, which will create conditions favorable for initiation of a workers counteroffensive. In addition, the masses that voted for Frei did so because of the program of promised changes. Wide sectors of the people made a mistake in placing confidence in bourgeois reformism but they don't feel defeated; they will demand that the program be carried out. The key to the situation is to accelerate the experiences of the popular sectors with the Frei government.

In view of this analysis and the perspectives, the congress of the MIR held that the situation is favorable for initiation of a proletarian counteroffensive with the following program of action:

(a) An anti-imperialist struggle: Against the government projects of associating with imperialism with regard to copper, a struggle must be waged for the expropriation, without indemnification, of the big Minería del Cobre. The Central Unica de Trabajadores must support the resolution of the Confederación de Trabajadores del Cobre to go forward to a general strike in defense of our national wealth. The MIR appealed for organization of a big campaign for nationalization of the copper industry, the telephone company and the electric company.

(b) Agrarian revolution: To meet the present agrarian reform

---

\*Frente Revolucionario de Acción Popular through which the Communist and Socialist parties opposed Frei and supported Allende.

project of the government, it is necessary to foster occupation of the land, a slogan that has begun to catch on in some peasant sectors (Cañete, Melipilla, El Monte, etc.). The slogan of occupation must be linked with the line of defending the occupied land through militia and peasant committees. The situation is favorable for initiation of a big campaign to unionize the peasants which would permit a massive struggle in this field and the consolidation of worker-peasant unity.

The congress likewise approved a plan of struggle for wage and salary increases, workers control, homes, holding that one of the basic tasks of the present period is to defend trade-union unity and the Central Unica de Trabajadores, threatened by the project of the Christian-Democratic government to divide the trade-union movement as in other countries where the Christian Democrats rule.

### Insurrectional Thesis

The congress of the MIR approved a thesis on insurrectional struggle, the most complete work on this subject yet presented at a congress of Chilean revolutionists. The document makes a comparative analysis of all the revolutions, studying the theses on the art of insurrection advanced by Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Mao Tse-tung, Che Guevara, etc. The different stages of the Latin-American insurrectional movement are then analyzed, particularly guerrilla warfare in Latin America since the Cuban Revolution. It is held that every insurrectional project must take into account three basic aspects: (a) the characterization of the country, whether it is predominantly agrarian or industrial-mining; (b) the national tradition of struggle among the proletariat and peasantry; and (c) the character of the present stage, whether it is one of retreat or advance.

The insurrectional thesis approved by the congress of the MIR closes the door on putschism and adventurism but contains a firm decision to prepare, seriously and responsibly, for the insurrectional struggle in intimate connection with the workers and peasant movement. It reaffirms the role of the revolutionary party and does not overestimate the military and agitational apparatus, which remains subordinated to the central committee of the party.

### Statutes

Some of the basic provisions of the statutes approved by the delegates include: (a) recognition of the right to form ideological and political tendencies; (b) the obligation of each member to work within the masses; (c) a national congress of the party to be held each year; (d) the general secretary cannot be reelected for more than two consecutive terms; (e) each congress must renew at least one-third of the central committee each year.



THE SENTENCES AGAINST THE SPANISH PROFESSORS

By Ramón Vázquez.

Many observers were surprised at the severity of the sentences pronounced August 21 by the Franco regime against the professors prominently involved in the student demonstrations in Spain last spring. Enrique Tierno Galván (professor of political law at the University of Salamanca), José Luis Aranguren and García Calvo (professors of ethics and Latin respectively at the University of Madrid) were expelled for life. Aguilar Navarro and Montero Díaz (professors of international law and ancient history at the University of Madrid) were suspended for two years. All five were interested in "peacefully canalizing" the unrest among the students, as Tierno Galván stated in an article in the August 25 Le Monde.

It is natural to wonder at the meaning of such measures. To find an answer -- which can only be approximate -- the zigzags of the repressive policy of the Franco regime must be taken into account. The truth is that if a tendency toward softening the repression has undoubtedly been noticeable in recent years, abrupt turns and flagrant contradictions have accompanied the slow and timid (and how!) "liberalization" in this field.

All the Spanish militants are aware of the contradictions in Franco's policy of repression. Examples abound. Typically, in the university sector, students are arrested for distributing leaflets; they are recognized to be members of the Communist party (for example) and nevertheless they are acquitted. This happened in Barcelona last summer. Yet other students accused of the same "crime" are condemned to sentences varying from two to six years in prison and often more.

This...incoherence is ascribed to frictions and struggles within the regime between the "toughs" and the "liberals," whose views triumph in turn. It is certain that differences in views exist within the top circles of the regime, although less on the general line than on the methods to be used and particularly on the rate of applying the line, and hence on whether or not to maintain the policy of the "mano dura" (hard hand) which was the golden rule for more than twenty years. In the case under consideration, the severity and the...incoherence both triumphed. Severity: expulsion for life of three respectable university professors (it should be remembered that to become a professor it is necessary to take a loyalty oath). Incoherence: in contrast to these sentences, no student has been severely condemned.

\* \* \*

The new readjustment on the ministerial level which took place this summer was likewise a disappointment to some. They hoped for a step forward in the so-called "liberalization" policy. They counted concretely on a separation of powers between the head of the state

and the head of the government which has been talked about for a long time and which was to constitute a first step toward the progressive effacing of General Franco. Some kind of painless transition.

Nothing like that happened and the present government is, it seems, one of the most homogeneous Spain has had. The position of the Opus Dei is no longer merely important but quite preponderant. The regime appears to be banking everything on its new economic policy -- industrialization, modernization of equipment, more and more complete integration with international capitalism, etc.

There are those who see a flagrant contradiction between this policy of economic expansion (on the scale of Spain) and the preponderance of the Opus Dei within the government. But it is a serious error to take, or feign to take, the Opus Dei for some kind of feudal Mafia, completely incapable of commanding the levers of a modern economy -- or rather the "modernization" of the economy. The truth is that if the men of the Opus Dei are in ministerial seats it is not as representatives of a Catholic sect blindly opposed to any political or social compromise with modern society, but rather as representatives of the big banks and big capitalist companies, quite directly interested precisely in this neocapitalist policy. In a way they are the key technicians of present-day Spain.

Here is a symptomatic fact: The Honorable Laureano López Rodo, who was Commissar of the Development Plan, has been made a minister without portfolio in the present government, in charge of supervising all the economic ministries, and, of course, the Plan itself. Don Laureano -- as he is called -- is a member of the Opus Dei naturally. But more than ten years ago, the Opus Dei, with an acute sense of the interests of big capital in Spain, began preparing its men for the great task of transforming Spain economically. A transformation that will doubtlessly be seasoned with a certain very controlled and excessively moderate "liberalization." It is a question of a transformation initiated from above, in an authoritarian and technological way.

Against disorders and strife, these gentlemen are just as capable of moving with severity as anyone else. However, a new apparent contradiction appeared in the current situation -- the students in the universities of the Opus Dei (there are several in Spain) solidarized with their comrades in their struggle against the Sindicato Español Universitario [Spanish Student Union]. But did they not take a position before this in their publications in favor of trade-union freedom for the workers? This, too, cannot be explained unless one takes into account the present dynamics, the changes that have occurred in the economic field and those in preparation. It cannot be explained unless it is noted that the "unions" -- both those for students as well as for workers -- are still headed by the Falangist bureaucracy which the Opus Dei wishes to sweep aside, inasmuch as today it is only a useless residue for Spanish capitalism.

With regard to the professors expelled for life from the uni-

versity, it is also necessary to take into account the fact that they publicly and very violently attacked the Opus Dei. A settlement of accounts? It is not excluded.

In any case, it could also be said that the expulsion is a most opportune turn for the political career of a Tierno Galván, an ultramoderate socialist leader, of an Aguilar Navarro, a "leftist" Christian Democrat leader; likewise -- although he is less a political figure -- for a Montero Diaz, who needs to obscure his Falangist past. As for García Calvo, his is a case apart, since he belongs, it would appear, to no political grouping and he defended the students more courageously than his colleagues, quite simply and quite obstinately because he considered their demands to be just.

Objectively, without entering into an analysis of the personal motives, of the good will or calculations of any of them, the Spanish bourgeoisie requires -- in case of necessity -- several alternative teams to continue its rule and its policy in changing the government. It happens that the immense majority in the new bourgeois opposition who bear the label of "socialist" or Christian Democrat or liberal, were followers of Franco not so long ago. What better way to cause this past to be forgotten, to restore their political virginity, than the one being followed by the regime today? And, in the final analysis, how does the program of this new bourgeois opposition differ essentially from the one being carried out by the Opus Dei? The practical difference can be summed up as follows: The bourgeois opposition wants greater freedom of expression and movement...for itself. And, following the example of the "great Western democracies," which it likes to cite, this respectful opposition seeks to replace the party in power without a shake-up, the better to serve the same basic interests.

Having pointed this out, one can nevertheless ask if the government did not blunder in taking these measures against the professors. In fact, a solidarity movement among the students and professors would seem inevitable.

Already, on August 28, José María Valverde, professor of the history of art at the University of Barcelona and a Catholic poet, announced his decision to resign as a gesture of solidarity. And the students are preparing to resume big demonstrations, taking as a pretext -- pretext is the right word -- the reprisals against the professors.

#### SPANISH POET RELEASED

The Spanish poet Carlos Alvarez was reported to have been freed from prison in Madrid August 28. He was sentenced last October to three years and two months for publicly protesting Julian Grimau's death sentence, and then given another six months and one day last December for the crime of "slandering the army" by what he said during his first trial.

INDIAN PRESS NOTES FORMATION OF TROTSKYIST PARTY

Bombay

Considerable interest has been shown in leftist circles and sectors of the press in India over the formation of an independent Trotskyist organization, the Socialist Workers party, at a three-day conference (August 6-8) in Bombay.

The press attached special meaning to the fact that the SWP is a "Trotskyist" party, seeking to establish "fraternal relations with the Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky."

The Indian Express, a mass circulation English daily printed simultaneously in Bombay and four other cities, including New Delhi, devoted an editorial to it August 16 under the title, "Trotskyist Party." This conservative paper, of course, did not look favorably at the new organization:

"To the list of political groups peddling nostrums for India's -- and the world's -- ills is now to be added the Socialist Workers Party formed as the result of deliberations recently held in Bombay of Trotskyists from different States. The objective of the new party is described as being a speedy socialist transformation of the Indian society, to be achieved by bringing about a regrouping of the Marxist-Leninist forces."

The newspaper added: "The party has adopted a constitution and will meet in a regular conference shortly. Its headquarters will be in Bombay and it will maintain 'fraternal relations' with the Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky. One of the few Trotskyist groups now extant is to be found in the Lanka Sama Samaj Party of Ceylon which collaborated with the Bandaranaike Government in its last days."

The dig at the LSSP is obvious; but the Indian Express is ignorant of the strength of the world Trotskyist movement.

The Patriot of Delhi, a "left" Congress daily edited by a former Communist party of India leader, E. Narayanan (who supports the Dangeite right-wing CPI), also gave prominent display to the outcome of the "Trotskyist" conference.

The two principal Indian news agencies, the Press Trust of India and the United News of India, carried the report on their national teleprinter services.

Significantly enough, the Trotskyists are launching their independent activity -- after their break with the Revolutionary Communist Party of India in 1963 -- at a time when big mass movements are erupting on questions like food and civil liberties throughout India and when the Congress government is resorting to a policy of ruthless suppression of these movements.

The government is indiscriminately arresting leftist workers in every state. Recently in West Bengal, two Trotskyist leaders, Kanai Pal, a member of the West Bengal Assembly, and Naren Biswas were arrested and detained under the witch-hunting Defence of India Rules.

The emergence of the new party revived discussion in the Indian press about the "Stalin-Trotsky" controversy in the international Communist movement, especially in relation to the present Sino-Soviet dispute and the split in the Indian Communist party.

Considerable interest has been shown by the rank and file of the two rival Communist parties in the political positions of the Trotskyist movement. The leadership of the right-wing CPI is openly critical of the formation of the Socialist Workers party dubbing it an "attempt to disrupt the left." The reaction of the left-wing CPI leaders has been more cautious.

A well-attended public meeting was held in Bombay on August 21 to observe the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Trotsky, who was killed by a Stalinist assassin in Mexico. The meeting was sponsored by a committee headed by Dr. A.R. Desai, a prominent Marxist sociologist who teaches at the Bombay University.

Among the speakers were C.G. Shah, a 70-year-old Marxist thinker and one of the early Communist leaders in India; S.B. Kolpe, a journalist and spokesman of the newly formed SWP; N.K. Karunakaran, secretary of the Maharashtra unit of the Revolutionary Socialist party of India; and Mrs. Pushpa Mehta, president of Maharashtra branch of the United Trades Union Congress.

A resolution was unanimously adopted urging the Soviet Union and the other workers states to lift the ban on the writings of Leon Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders such as Zinoviev and Bukharin.

#### JAPANESE PICKETS PROTEST USE OF AIRPORT FOR WAR

In an effort to block U.S. use of Itazuke airport as a base for B-52s in the war in Vietnam, the Fukouka Prefectural Congress Against the Revision of the Constitution and Nuclear Arming began picketing the airport August 25.

About 100 members set up a barricade of six wooden frames, each about 5 feet high and 13 feet wide on a highway near the end of one of the runways. They ran up 20 red flags on 23-foot poles attached to four cars. Airport officials feared these would interfere with planes.

Police sought to remove the barricades. The leaders of the demonstrators, all Socialists, resisted and were arrested. They said that the demonstration would go on indefinitely.

THE CRISIS IN GREECE

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following statement September 6.]

\* \* \*

The crisis that has shaken Greece since the first part of July is deepening and moving toward a climax.

For almost thirty years dictatorial regimes governed Greece. At the end of the second world war, the Greek masses, who had already struggled heroically against the Metaxas dictatorship and the occupation by Italian and German fascist troops, took up arms to get rid of the monarchy and capitalism. They were defeated due to a betrayal by Stalin, who made a deal with Roosevelt and Churchill at Teheran and Yalta, putting Greece in the Western "zone of influence." The Greek revolution was crushed. Greece became the only remaining capitalist state on the Balkan peninsula.

A dictatorial regime ruled for long years. However, due to a Common Market boom, Greece underwent a certain economic development and some of the bourgeois parties projected expansion of the internal market and structural modernization (these are the forces behind Papandreu); while the traditional capitalist circles, particularly the big shipowners, backed the court and the reactionary generals.

In face of a divided bourgeoisie, a mass upsurge began in 1964. The right wing was beaten in the elections. Papandreu, the leader of the Center Union, gained power. A fresh breeze of liberalism swept the country. The masses regained some of their civil and political rights. It was not much. But as the masses began moving, regaining self-confidence, Greek capitalism and the monarchist camarilla, supported by the representatives of American imperialism, decided that the Papandreu government was not strong enough to hold back the mounting mass movement.

An operation that closely resembled a coup d'état removed Papandreu from power. Carried out precipitately, the operation led to results opposite from those expected by its authors. It served to whip up the masses. For some two months demonstrations have continued in Athens, in the towns and countryside. In the big cities workers and students have been struggling in the streets with the police. Up to now the bloody repression has increased the militancy of the masses. It is these multiple and powerful demonstrations that have frustrated the court's numerous attempts to buy off members of parliament who would ordinarily respond to such offers. No minister has been able to win a vote of confidence in parliament despite three attempts to split the Center Union either toward the right or to the left. The crisis is tending toward a prerevolutionary situation.

The masses are displaying admirable militancy. But the out-

come of the crisis has not yet been decided. Great dangers threaten the Greek workers and peasants. The forces of reaction have not yet undertaken to settle things by military force because they know that such an attempt, under present conditions, would unleash the working masses. But they have not at all renounced such a course. They are only waiting for the masses to become tired, for their spirit to die down.

Papandreou's policy in particular fosters this hope among the reactionaries. It is a policy which the Greek Communist party is backing to the hilt.

Papandreou has openly declared that all he desires is to maintain the constitutional monarchy and to keep Greece in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; that is, in the world's main capitalist coalition. He accuses the right and the court of creating, through their provocations and blunders, a situation in which the masses can escape from control and start a course of action that would liquidate the monarchy and the capitalist regime. Knowing that after so much suffering the Greek masses place their hopes in socialism, Papandreou offers himself as the last card of Greek capitalism.

It is the Greek Communist party that is playing this role at present. Although it enjoys the support of the majority of the Greek workers, who associate it with socialism, it is refusing to inspire the masses by opening up the perspective of a socialist republic. Doing just the opposite, it does not even dare advance the slogan of a "referendum" which would pose the alternative of "monarchy or republic"; it backs Papandreou in demanding respect for the bourgeois constitution; it even demands "democratization" of the court! In a situation like the present one in Greece, such a policy of maintaining the status quo in face of the efforts of the right to overturn it to its own advantage, leads to nothing and can only end in draining away the energy of the masses.

The present situation in Greece is unstable. It can give way to a military crackdown and a new dictatorship if the upsurge of the masses does not turn into a revolutionary struggle. The present situation thus calls for a bold policy in the workers movement, a policy that calls on the masses not only for a vigorous struggle for their immediate demands and defense of civil and political liberties but also to end the monarchy and to establish a workers and peasants government. The slogan for a referendum poses the alternative of "monarchy or republic." This alternative will not have a favorable outcome unless the masses engage in extraparliamentary action, in a general strike. The struggle now demands the formation of big mass organizations in the form of defense or vigilance committees aimed at blocking any attempt at a coup d'état or a plot by the army or the reactionaries and at developing mass action in a great struggle for a workers and peasants government, for a socialist republic.

The struggle of the toiling Greek masses is an integral part

of the international struggle for socialism. It is of prime interest to the European workers movement which must show its readiness to grant the necessary aid to the Greek workers. Like the Belgian general strike of 1960-61, it demonstrates once again that the European proletariat has retained its potential for struggles intact, and that relatively small changes in the political or economic situation are sufficient to unleash big mass struggles that can turn into prerevolutionary situations. Revolutionary Marxist organizations must constantly be ready for such situations and struggles, without letting themselves be hypnotized by the apparent stability of the regime.

To the militants of the Greek section of the Fourth International, who have a rich history of heroic combat and who are engaged in the current struggles, the United Secretariat of the Fourth International sends fraternal greetings and assures them of the wholehearted solidarity of the International. It salutes the memory of Sotirios Petroulas, member of a group of young students recently expelled from the EDA [United Democratic Left] for "Trotskyism," who was murdered by the police during a street demonstration.