

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Volume 3, No. 31

October 29, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
A Big Step Forward in Fight Against Vietnam War.....	2
The Brussels Demonstration.....	4
U.S. Role Comes Under Fire at Toronto Teach-In.....	24
State Department Uneasy over Antiwar Sentiment in Japan.....	15
Japanese Farmers Halt Little John Rocket Tests.....	16
Mounting Witch-Hunt in Indonesia.....	5
Armed Conflict Breaks Out in Indonesia.....	28
Gen. Castelo Declares Himself Absolute Dictator of Brazil.....	27
Santo Domingo Again Near Point of Explosion.....	29
Luis de la Puente Reported Killed.....	17
Something Stirring in the "Switzerland of the Americas".....	22
The Repression at Bolivia's Tin Mines.....	9
Bolivian Mine Named "Free Territory".....	13
Arrests of Trade-Union Leaders Begin in Greece.....	7
Strike Shuts Down Belgian CP Newspaper.....	15
Tabata on Tour in United States.....	19
Unrest in Nigeria.....	20
Nigerian Officials Rig the Elections.....	20
Interest Rising in Trotsky's Views.....	14
Plea Made to Convert Trotsky's Home into Museum.....	26
In Spain, Watch Your Tongue.....	21
But the Maine Goal Still Lies Ahead.....	9
Documents:	
"America's Rulers Justify Cruelties Equalling Those of Hitler" -- by Bertrand Russell.....	30
Text of Guevara's Letter to Castro.....	37
Trotskyist Declaration Against Indo-Pakistan War.....	39
Wipe Out Labour's Shame.....	42

A BIG STEP FORWARD IN FIGHT AGAINST VIETNAM WAR

"For the first time since the intervention of the United States in the Vietnam war, demonstrations organized on American soil to protest against this war -- and particularly against the intervention -- have reached sufficient size to be called mass demonstrations.

"Of course, the masses set in motion during this weekend continued essentially to be made up of students. But the new fact is not only that their size surpassed by far the most optimistic hopes of the organizers and the most pessimistic fears of the authorities. Still more important, especially in New York, was the attitude of the spectators, who showed themselves on the whole to be rather friendly, the hostile acts emanating from isolated and well defined groups, generally of the extreme right."

The above estimate of the October 16 demonstrations in the United States against Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam is not from a participant in the marches. It constitutes the two opening paragraphs of a dispatch sent from New York by Léo Sauvage, special correspondent of the conservative Paris daily Le Figaro [October 18].

"Washington," he said, "is displaying great embarrassment over these demonstrations and the repercussions they may have throughout the world."

The American capitalist press, while giving headlines to the demonstrations, sought to minimize them by reporting a much lower number than actually marched and by giving equal prominence to the few isolated scuffles staged by ultrarightists, some of whom are self-declared Nazis and admirers of Hitler.

The New York Times, for instance, gave the number of marchers as "over 10,000" in New York. Reporters estimated the crowd at from 25,000 to 40,000; one police estimate was 35,000. The parade committee itself, deciding to be conservative, listed the turnout in New York as 30,000.

Similar demonstrations were staged in some sixty cities throughout the United States, the total number of participants reaching an estimated 70,000 to 100,000.

Perhaps even more significantly, sympathetic demonstrations were held in many cities in other lands on the very same day. The call for such demonstrations, sent out by the "Vietnam Day Committee" in Berkeley, California [see World Outlook September 17], met with a surprisingly good response. The spirit of international solidarity is clearly on the rise.

The most notable feature of the demonstrations in the United States is the proof they offer of the swiftness with which antiwar sentiment is developing among the American people. Nothing like it was seen at the beginning of World War I, World War II or even the highly unpopular Korean war.

In World War I the dominant mood at the beginning was vulgar patriotism. At the opening of World War II there was little blatant patriotism among the masses but rather a feeling of fatalism which did not burst into active opposition until victory was won. After that a movement to get the troops back home spread very rapidly. The swift opening of the Korean war stunned the American people. Within a year, however, the opposition had begun to appear and by 1952 it was sufficiently strong to lead to the defeat of the Democrats in a presidential election after Eisenhower promised to end the war.

The present opposition began in an organized way within weeks of February 7, the day Johnson escalated the war, the first teach-ins being held in late March. The October 16 demonstrations thus give promise of rapid development into a powerful movement with a political potential not yet seen in the United States.

Another fact of symptomatic importance was the policy of non-exclusion followed by the organizers of the demonstrations. The pacifist demonstrations staged in recent years in centers like New York against nuclear weapons have barred "Communists." This antidemocratic and self-defeating policy meant weak marches characterized by slogans that played into the hands of the very elements who favor war and the use of nuclear weapons in war.

In the October 16 parades, all political tendencies of the left were included. The slogans thus included some very good ones, with the main emphasis being on the demand to "Withdraw the troops." Léo Sauvage noted the presence of "Castroist and Trotskyist activists" among the marchers.

The Johnson administration was obviously disconcerted. Johnson himself attacked the demonstrations October 18, saying he was deeply disturbed -- the demonstrations might be "misinterpreted" by "adversaries of America" as showing opposition in the American public to the war in Vietnam!

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach said that the Justice Department had started an "investigation" of the groups involved in the demonstrations, which, he believes, are connected with the swift rise in opposition to conscription among the youth.

These, along with some red-baiting statements by J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI political police, were obvious trial balloons to test the reaction to a wave of government-sponsored witch-hunting. What effect these threats will have on the new generation of youth who are spearheading the antiwar movement remains to be seen. If their

mood is in any way indicative of the mood of their families, the witch-hunting can prove to be a boomerang with a hard wallop.

The capitalist press also sought to get statements from American troops in Vietnam that might be used as propaganda against the demonstrators. Most of the troops who were queried, however, chose to say nothing. They have been indoctrinated to believe that it is illegal for them to express a political opinion -- that is, a political opinion in opposition to official policy. Their real views should presently begin filtering through to their families at home, as they did in the Korean war.

As for the freedom fighters of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, they voiced their gratitude over their underground broadcasting station, saying they were "profoundly thankful" for the demonstrations. Similar comments were published in the press in Hanoi and Peking.

Amidst the rain of napalm and high explosives poured down on their homes and families by the most powerful imperialist country on earth, they were deeply moved by the demonstrative proof that there are sectors of the American people who put humanity above imperialist policies and who are not afraid to speak out.

THE BRUSSELS DEMONSTRATION

Some 3,000 persons marched in Brussels October 16 in observance of the "International Days of Protest" against U.S. military intervention in Vietnam called for by the "Vietnam Day Committee" of Berkeley, California. It proved to be the biggest demonstration in Europe.

The march was sponsored by the "Committee for Struggle Against Neocolonialism and Fascism" headed by Pierre Le Grève, the left socialist member of parliament. The main organizer of the demonstration was Jean Godin, who became prominent during the Algerian war for his work in the solidarity movement in behalf of the Algerian freedom fighters.

The Brussels demonstration was backed by three unions -- the railway workers, gas and electricity workers, and teachers -- as well as the Young Guard Socialists, the Socialist students, the Communist Youth and the Communist Students.

In fact, it proved to be a united-front demonstration that included all the left wingers of the Brussels regions -- members of the new Socialist Workers Confederation, the pro-Moscow Communist party, pro-Peking Communist party and left-wing Social Democrats still inside the Socialist party, all marching together.

The parade was headed by Pierre Le Grève; the Liège member of parliament, François Perin; two senators of the Communist party; Ernest Mandel, editor of the weekly La Gauche; Jean Godin; and leading representatives of the youth movements supporting the march.

The main slogan of the march was "U.S., Get Out of Vietnam!" This slogan appeared on hundreds of posters and banners and was chanted along with other militant slogans expressing solidarity with the Vietnam revolution and hostility to the policies of American imperialism and the support it has been receiving from the Belgian government.

In the forefront of the parade was a huge placard proclaiming solidarity with the thousands of progressive Americans demonstrating the same day against the aggression of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam.

The march has already had a very significant and important result. The congress of the Liège regional federation of the Belgian trade-union movement, which met October 23-24, passed a resolution extending fraternal greetings to the Vietnam Day Committee and expressing its solidarity with all demonstrations against the war in Vietnam. The regional federation represents 100,000 workers.

The Social Democratic and pro-Moscow currents succeeded in watering down the resolution by including the clichés about "peace through negotiations" and "an appeal to the United Nations" for a cease-fire among all concerned, including the "Viet Cong." Nevertheless the stand taken by the congress is of great importance. This is the first time that a large trade-union body in Western Europe has solidarized with the appeal issued by the Vietnam Day Committee.

MOUNTING WITCH-HUNT IN INDONESIA

The officer caste of the Indonesian army, headed by General Nasution, is driving toward consolidation of its seizure of power, attempting to smash the Communist party and completely eliminate it as a potential political rival. President Sukarno, seeking to re-establish the former balance on which he maintained his personal rule, has sought to stem the red-baiting but up to now has been unable to achieve anything effective; and, in fact, he appears to be a captive of the generals who are really running things.

Among the blows, delivered either directly by the generals or by "spontaneous mobs" inspired by them and by reactionary religious organizations, have been the padlocking of Communist party headquarters throughout the country and the burning down of the main headquarters in Djakarta, the banning of the Communist Youth movement, the banning of the Communist-led All-Indonesian Central Organization of Trade Unions [SOBSI], the firing of all members of SOBSI who carried out any kind of protest actions in factories, plantations or

offices; the suspension of members of parliament belonging to the Communist party; and, finally, the banning of the Communist party, first in Djakarta, then in the other military districts in Java, and finally throughout the country.

Up to now not a single leading body of the Indonesian Communist party has issued a word of protest against the mounting witch-hunt. Reports have appeared in the press that the Communist party is preparing to respond to the repression with defensive military measures. Up to now, however, the rumors, originating primarily in Malaysia and Singapore, have not been confirmed.

Even more striking was the long silence of the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies over the persecution visited on the Indonesian Communist party. This criminal attitude began to resemble complaisance in face of the attempted destruction of what up to now has been boasted to be the biggest Communist party in the world outside of the workers states themselves.

Peking finally found its voice and on October 20 denounced the "atmosphere of terror" fostered by "right-wing army generals."

On the same day, the Kremlin decided to go on record. An editorial in Pravda denounced the witch-hunt; and five days later Pravda again registered a complaint.

Peking's embarrassed wriggling is to be explained not only by the desire to keep up friendly relations with the Sukarno regime but also by the difficulty it faces in explaining how such a catastrophe could hit a party that has faithfully followed the "teachings of Mao Tse-tung."

The Kremlin, of course, is adhering to its line of "peaceful coexistence" which obviously includes buttoning your mouth while the Indonesian generals, backed by the CIA, go to work on the Communist party with knife and cleaver.

And "the army is not losing a minute," according to J. Jacquet-Francillon, Far East special correspondent of the Paris daily Le Figaro. Writing from Djakarta October 20, he reports:

"The hunt for Communists is being pursued night and day from one end of the Indonesian archipelago to the other. Everywhere the buildings belonging to the PKI are burning like haystacks. Here and there, popular demonstrations inspired by the military command are taking on an outright anti-Chinese character. In the suburbs of Djakarta, near the port of Priok, the businesses of Chinese merchants have been sacked.

"The number of summary arrests in the capital are said to have now reached more than 4,000. No dependable figure can be obtained for the country as a whole."

In a rather cynical way, Jacquet-Francillon professed amazement in a dispatch the following day over the way delegates to a conference backed by both Moscow and Peking in Djakarta held their hands over their eyes, ears and mouth in face of what was going on.

The gathering was sponsored as an "International Conference for the Liquidation of Foreign Military Bases." Some 160 delegates, representing 54 nations, met at the Hotel Indonesia. "From time to time, paratroopers entered this holy of holies to make disturbing identity checks. Saturday [October 16], on the eve of the opening of the conference, without any warrant, they arrested five Indonesian members of the secretariat."

Sukarno personally opened the conference with an impassioned speech against "Necolim" (neocolonialism, colonialism and imperialism).

Despite the presence of the paratroopers, the delegates, according to Le Figaro's correspondent, were again smiling by October 21 when they learned that 10,000 Moslem youth were organizing a march against the British embassy. "But alongside the vengeful slogans against imperialism, the demonstrators carried banners on which one could read: 'Down with the PKI!' or 'Hang the Communists.' The diplomats of her Gracious Majesty were not able to enjoy this spectacle because the army coolly stopped the parade before it reached its goal. A leader then harangued the crowd, shouting: 'We must break all relations with People's China.' The listeners responded with delirious shouts: 'Bravo! Down with Necolim.'"

The army has already begun to move in the field of foreign policy. Barter trade is to be resumed with Singapore, thus renewing a link with the capitalist market in Asia which was broken by Sukarno when London and Kuala Lumpur decided to create Malaysia.

ARRESTS OF TRADE-UNION LEADERS BEGIN IN GREECE

The failure of the leadership of the Greek working class to mobilize last summer's popular upsurge into a direct challenge to the monarchy and its "liberal" front headed by Papandreu has had its inevitable consequences. The reaction is now attempting to mount a witch-hunt in evident hope of again succeeding in putting the masses in a totalitarian strait jacket.

The Athens police announced that on October 19, between one o'clock and nine o'clock in the morning, fourteen trade-union leaders and members of the EDA [United Democratic Left] had been arrested. They were accused of having participated in a public meeting the evening before at the Academos theater where illegal words were voiced.

The police did not tell the full truth. According to Marc Marceau, special correspondent of the Paris daily Le Monde, the number arrested in the predawn raids, was forty. [Le Monde October 22.]

Six of them were held in prison, twenty-eight were brought into court and charged with violating Law No. 4234-62 which bars any kind of demonstration that refers to the banned Greek Communist party, or the anti-Nazi resistance organizations of World War II. The fate of the other six was not reported.

The specific charge was shouting, "Long live the resistance"; "Recognize the resistance movement"; and "Elections!"

The trade unionists denied the charges and accused the police of giving false testimony. Four of the victims said they could prove that not only were they absent at the time, they were not even in Athens at the time of the alleged crime.

The right-wing press approved the arrests, finding them "natural" and "justified."

The liberal newspaper Vima, however, stated flatly that the arrests were intended to "create a climate of fear in the country," in order to "muzzle the democratic masses."

Elieff Iliou, an EDA member of parliament, said in denouncing the arrests that they were evidence of the "fascist outlook of the authorities."

On October 21, eight more members of the EDA were arrested in Athens. They were accused of singing the hymn of the ELAS in the streets. The ELAS was the militant resistance movement that fought the Nazis during the German occupation of Greece. The hymn contains the phrase, "To arms, citizens!" taken from the national anthem of France, "La Marseillaise."

The eight youths were condemned on October 25 to terms ranging from twenty to forty days in prison and provisionally released pending appeal.

In Paris the League for the Rights of Man issued a statement under the heading "Against a New Wave of Terror in Greece." The appeal exhorted the Stephanopoulos cabinet to "renounce the policy of blind repression in which it is engaging." This policy, said the declaration, "will inevitably engender defensive reactions among the Greek people, and end in new and grave disorders."

BUT THE MAINE GOAL STILL LIES AHEAD

On October 20, newsmen recorded the latest history-making accomplishment of the head of the "great society." At a press conference, held while sunning himself near Bethesda Naval Hospital, President Johnson opened up his pyjamas and proudly displayed the remarkable scar of the operation he underwent recently for removal of his gall bladder.

The Associated Press wirephoto, reproduced on the front page of the October 21 New York Herald Tribune, shows a slash running from the belly button of the great man clear to his right side, where it is lost to sight as it rounds his abdomen. The scar is at least the length of an ax handle, as they would say in Texas. It is bordered by two rows of scars left by the stitches. Judging from the artistic way they blend in with and yet set off the main cut, they were put in by a knowledgeable craftsman in hand-tooled leatherwork. The scar appears to be a bright red throughout its length. The hue, of course, is not to be taken as any portent of a shift in Johnson's politics, whatever it may indicate concerning the secret views of his surgeons.

The day after the epochal photograph was featured as a new "first" for the great society, an unidentified woman in Maine wrote a letter of appreciation to the Herald Tribune. The editor published the full text as follows:

"Let's hope LBJ never has hemorrhoids!"

THE REPRESSION AT BOLIVIA'S TIN MINES

[In the latter part of September, a violent struggle flared up between Bolivian government forces and the miners. This was reported in the October 1 World Outlook, along with news about the formation of guerrilla forces there. Since then we have received additional information indicating the extent of the battles. The following account is a translation of the lead article in the September 22 issue of El Diario, the biggest daily in La Paz. The newspaper, it should be added, is conservative in its politics.]

* * *

At Catavi and Siglo XX, the climate of violence unleashed Saturday evening is still in evidence. Already the lamentable results include more than thirty dead and around one hundred wounded, many of them very seriously as a result of the bloody events.

Catavi, Llallagua, Siglo XX, Uncía and Huairapata have been

converted into a big battlefield in which two unequal factions are engaged in a sterile and fratricidal struggle.

The agitation began as a consequence of the arrest of various underground workers carried out by the National Guard and the DIC [Dirección Investigación Criminal -- Bolivia's secret political police], following special instructions from the Military Junta. The miners held a meeting Saturday evening which degenerated into a violent demonstration that was beaten back by the special security forces after a prolonged combat lasting almost all night.

The killing of two mine workers and the arrest of many others angered the underground workers still more. All day Sunday they discussed organizational plans on how to meet the police action.

On Monday morning, some of the extremist agitators appeared in the plaza in Llallagua where they shouted for the release of their comrades. The group was soon strengthened by the families of the prisoners and the many wounded who had fallen Saturday night.

At first the members of the National Guard and the Public Security defended themselves by using tear gas, but soon had to resort to their firearms again, causing fresh casualties.

The miners' action, more energetic than that of the carabinieri, tipped things in their favor to such a point that they took the headquarters of the National Guard and the DIC; and their occupants had to flee.

Three agents of the DIC were not lucky enough to escape and were captured by the enraged miners. They dragged them inside the mine and locked them up in a "stope," their final fate not being known.

[The imperialist press reported that three police agents had been executed by being thrown down a deep shaft. However, all three were released after a couple of days. -- Editor.]

After the first shots, the soldiers of the regiment known as the "Ranger's," who held various positions in the region, assembled to receive instructions from their superiors. Meanwhile, fighting between the miners and the police broke out again in the streets of Llallagua, becoming general in a wide zone.

The first wounded began to fall close to the main plaza in Llallagua, among them Captain Miguel Rubín de Celis. The work of the volunteer stretcher-bearers was very difficult. A priest of Siglo XX parish participated in this, carrying out wounded at the height of the combat.

While this was going on at Llallagua, the people at Catavi, who had remained at their posts, working until around noon, decided

to join in the struggle. Some youth got together to go to Llallagua by way of the Huairapata zone, where they pitched in to fight the soldiers of the Ranger's regiment, using dynamite which they had brought expressly for this.

Upon receiving the news in La Paz of the conflicts, the head of the army general staff, Colonel Marcos Vásquez, immediately took a plane for Uncía where he took command of operations.

It is necessary to note that during their actions, the miners brought out various firearms which they had hidden, but their ammunition consisted in the most part of dynamite used for its purely psychological effect. The miners who were armed or who had taken arms away from the DIC agents were responsible for eight of the ten casualties among members of the National Guard.

It was two o'clock on Monday afternoon when the Ranger's assault regiment decided to go into action. Most of the contingent at the Miraflores barracks at Uncía moved into battle and the few who were left occupied themselves with standing off a student demonstration.

The soldiers moved through the narrow streets of the mining district of Llallagua until they completely dominated it and they then continued advancing in the direction of Catavi. They ran into the heaviest resistance at Huairapata where groups of miners had been posted with firearms and dynamite.

The combat was a hard one. The miners lost ground as their ammunition ran out until, finally, they had to flee in the direction of the camp. The officers in command of the Ranger's could not control their troops who, from then on, committed a series of atrocities against innocent people who had nothing to do with the battle. The soldiers advanced in a flagrant way against the huts of the miners, kicking in the doors and machinegunning them. Entire families fell in this, like the Pomares and the Cruz's, including babies.

The action of the "Ranger's," in the military phase known as "exploitation of victory," was interminable. After breaking into almost all the homes, they took prisoners. These mounted into the hundreds although a little later, when it proved to be impossible to get so many people into the Miraflores barracks, they were reduced to approximately one hundred.

Meanwhile the mine hospital at Catavi was busy taking care of the casualties of the bloody struggle. The equipment of the big modern hospital proved inadequate to take care of the victims from both sides. The doctors had to conduct a series of emergency operations, including amputations in some cases. Drugs ran low at a certain point and it was necessary to send to Huanuni for more.

The morgue of the hospital, located three hundred meters to

the south, was packed with bodies, according to the stretcher-bearers. The bodies of the victims were removed by their weeping families and all that were left were the bodies of some of the carabineros whom nobody came to claim.

During the action at Huairapata, military planes, including T-6's and Mustang F-51's went into action, their 50-caliber machine-guns causing many casualties. The wounds caused by these planes were the most difficult to take care of due to the size of the bullets.

The Comibol radio station at Catavi was cut off by the miners so that it made it difficult to call for help at the most difficult moments, or at least to avoid the attack by the planes of the Air Force.

Afraid that the miners would again go into action during the night, the Ranger soldiers retreated to their barracks, leaving the populations at Siglo XX and Llallagua without a guard. A group of soldiers from the army and the police stayed in Catavi. They were sufficient to block the miners from moving into action.

The agitators of the miners showed up again at the plaza in Llallagua yesterday morning and seized the installations of the National Guard, of Public Security and the town hall.

Lieutenant Reynaldo Barrancos, of the National Guard, was caught by surprise in his room at the Hotel Llallagua by a group of angry miners who beat him unconscious. He was taken to the hospital at Catavi with most of his ribs broken and a fractured skull.

While they held the plaza at Llallagua, the miners went to work destroying the public buildings, dynamiting them and then setting them on fire.

Meanwhile the Ranger soldiers at the Miraflores barracks took their prisoners in four "Caimanes" trucks to be sent by plane to La Paz. At the Uncía airstrip they waited for four C-47 planes of Lloyd Aéreo Boliviano, Yacimientos Petrolíferos, the Corporación Boliviana de Fomento, and Transportes Aéreos Militares. A little before ten in the morning, two of the planes brought in soldiers from the "Braun 8 de Caballería" regiment in Santa Cruz. They had fighting equipment although they were in khaki uniform.

The prisoners were put into the planes while their families, a hundred meters away, wept disconsolately. They had hurried on foot for almost ten kilometers to beg for the release of their sons and husbands.

The four planes could not carry all the prisoners, among whom were more than thirty adolescents. These were sent back to the barracks at Miraflores to wait for the next flights.

The Braun regiment, which had arrived from Santa Cruz, was given the mission of retaking the Llallagua plaza. They advanced against it in a cautious, slow way, due mainly to the fact that the soldiers from the east were beginning to feel the effects of the altitude and the cold.

By noon yesterday, the Santa Cruz soldiers succeeded in dislodging the rebels from the Llallagua plaza, taking over the destroyed buildings where they temporarily installed themselves. Various soldiers of the regiments had to be given medical attention due to the effects of the elevation.

While the Braun soldiers were cleaning their guns, sticks of dynamite were exploded on the neighboring hills. The soldiers replied by firing in all directions.

From the alleys of Llallagua, angry miners insulted the soldiers, provoking a new battle. This ended with more dead and wounded. It has not been possible to determine how many.

The violence continued during the night as the miners brought in abundant supplies of dynamite and home-made "molotov" cocktails to throw at their adversaries.

When the reporters of El Diario were returning to La Paz, soldiers of the maintenance center of the army held up our car to search it. They were looking for "two deserters from the Ranger's" who left Llallagua in civilian clothes.

Funeral services for the victims at Catavi are being held this morning at the cemetery in the Maria Barzola camp. Fresh violence is feared.

BOLIVIAN MINE NAMED "FREE TERRITORY"

The miners at the Huanuni tin mine held a general assembly September 21, according to the La Paz El Diario, at which they voted to stage a 48-hour strike as a token of mourning for the victims killed and wounded by armed forces at Catavi and Siglo XX.

They also declared the interior of their mine to be "free territory" and decided to slow down their work to the level of the wages they are now receiving after the cuts put into effect by the Barrientos military junta.

The miners began by organizing a march in which they carried the power drills used in the mine. They were joined by workers in the area and by members of the Karazapato cooperative. They chanted, "Death to the Military Junta and General Barrientos!"

A motorized column of troops sought to block the parade. The "state of siege" decreed by Barrientos bars all such demonstrations.

The miners changed their route, circling around the troops. The commander of the troops sought to stop the miners by arguing violently with their leaders.

However, they invited a delegation to address the assembly. The invitation was accepted and two officers spoke. They took a conciliatory tone.

The miners then succeeded in getting three company officials to attend the assembly.

In face of the officers and the company officials, the miners said that it was impossible for them to extract minerals for wages amounting to only 280 pesos a month [\$22.40].

One of the officers, Major Juan Soliz, went so far as to promise the miners that wage increases would be put through during October.

INTEREST RISING IN TROTSKY'S VIEWS

Interest in the views of Leon Trotsky appears to be on the rise in several countries in Europe after declining for a number of years.

In the Spanish emigration and underground press, several interesting studies on Trotsky have recently appeared.

The underground magazine Acción Comunista printed excerpts from the Revolution Betrayed and Permanent Revolution, along with a positive appraisal of the author.

Ruedo Iberico, a Spanish emigration magazine published in Paris, printed an article by Francisco Fernandez-Santos entitled "Trotsky, Our Contemporary," a very favorable commentary on Trotsky's life and role. In the same magazine, Jorge Semprun, a former member of the central committee of the Spanish Communist party, commented favorably on Trotsky's book Terrorism and Communism.

In Denmark, the weekly S.F., organ of the left Socialist party, ran two articles entitled "Trotsky: Prophet or Traitor?" The author is Kai Moltke, a member of parliament and the Danish delegation to the United Nations. The articles are very favorable to Trotsky and contain a scathing attack against Stalinism. Moltke, the author of many books, was a leading member of the Danish Communist party for twenty years.

In Sweden, the Socialist students' official organ, S, printed an article in a recent issue by Olaf O. Berggren, "Trotsky in Memoriam." This was accompanied by a poem written by Karl O. Andersson, "Homage to Trotsky."

STRIKE SHUTS DOWN BELGIAN CP NEWSPAPER

BRUSSELS, Oct. 25 -- The editorial staff of Le Drapeau Rouge [Red Flag], the official daily newspaper of the Belgian Communist party, have been out on strike for the past week. The typographical workers decided to go out in solidarity with them.

The strike was all the more embarrassing to the Communist party leadership in view of the national congress which happened to have been scheduled for the same time. The congress thus remains unreported to the members and sympathizers of the Communist party.

The editorial staff is seeking the union wage level. The response of the CP leadership to this is that editorial staff members cannot be considered to be professional journalists. They are party professionals and therefore should receive the same pay as other full-time workers for the party.

The argument would have been more convincing if (1) some of the party leaders did not obviously enjoy a much higher income than the editorial staff; (2) the editors of Le Drapeau Rouge had not appealed to the newspaper employers association -- to which they belong! -- in order to bring pressure to bear against the strikers.

The strike was touched off by a decision of the editors -- the political bureau of the Communist party, in fact -- to fire the secretary of the editorial board. He was guilty of organizing the campaign for higher wages. He is not a newcomer to the party, having worked on Le Drapeau Rouge for fifteen years.

STATE DEPARTMENT UNEASY OVER ANTIWAR SENTIMENT IN JAPAN

The U.S. State Department appears to be somewhat uneasy over the mounting protests in Japan against Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam. Speaking before 150 leading businessmen of Osaka October 5, Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer sought to give a push to sentiments of an opposite kind. He talked about the profitable trade relations between the U.S. and Japan, the "threat" of Communist China, and the "misunderstanding" in Japan over U.S. policies.

He said he could understand that as a result of the "great mis-

fortune" experienced by Japan in the second world war feeling could arise that to avoid the "sad events of the past" the country ought to carefully avoid involvement in the controversies which embroil the nations of the world.

This, he declared, was a mistake. Japan should give up the "passive" approach to peace and resort to an "active" approach like the one now being followed by the United States.

Referring to the Vietnam war, the American diplomat said that he was shocked at the results of a recent poll by the Asahi Shumbun which revealed that 42% or more of those who replied believed that it really does not matter if South Vietnam is overrun by the Communist North.

On the following day in Washington, the State Department attacked a report made by foreign editor Omori in Mainichi as "utterly false." Omori's report included the statement that American planes had "deliberately" bombed a hospital for lepers in north Vietnam.

Omori gave his reaction to a film produced by the north Vietnamese national motion picture department. He said that "although this documentary film must have been made for propoganda purposes to fan the North Vietnamese anti-American feeling, for a third party like me the film's effect was great."

JAPANESE FARMERS HALT LITTLE JOHN ROCKET TESTS

U.S. troops are finding it harder to get away with firing practice missiles in Japan. In fact, on October 7 the U.S. Army command bowed to popular pressure and made a significant concession.

Some 2,000 farmers and other local residents had gathered amid drizzle and fog at the missile impact area in the Higashifuji firing range (eastern foothills of Mt. Fuji) to protest scheduled firings of Little John rockets. They had driven thirty bulldozers onto the range to make it more difficult for police to dislodge them.

As the demonstrators waited courageously for the police to open their expected attack, Raizo Matsuno, director of the Defense Agency, met with Lt.Gen. Maurice A. Preston and officially asked him to stop the firing practice for the time being. The representative of the Pentagon acceded.

When the news came of the postponement, cries of "Banzai!" went up from the farmers.

Meanwhile in another impact area, Kitafuji (northern Fuji), about 500 women broke through police lines to stage a demonstration

against the missile firings. One of them suffered a broken shoulder bone as the crowd rushed onto the practice range. A number of others suffered minor injuries.

Mayor Shunichi Katsumata of Gotemba, in Shizuoka prefecture where residents are spearheading the opposition, said that people were opposed to the firing of the rockets because they were frightened at the thought of nuclear warheads which can be attached to the Little Johns.

On October 9 the Defense Agency of the Japanese government announced that it would fire rockets of its own on the same firing range on November 25 and 26. Japanese officials claim that the rockets are incapable of carrying nuclear warheads.

Despite this claim, farmers and other residents of the range are expected to protest against the firings exactly as they did in the case of the American rockets.

On October 10, representatives of a local labor federation at Mito handed U.S. authorities a written protest against the accidental shelling of farm houses in Katsuta September 23.

The note declared that it was "highly regrettable that the U.S. Forces should continue to cause accidents involving erroneous firing despite frequent protests and petitions."

LUIS DE LA PUENTE REPORTED KILLED

Luis de la Puente, head of one of the guerrilla fronts in Peru, was killed October 23, according to a press release issued by the general staff of the Peruvian army. The communiqué said that the guerrilla leader, together with seven others, attacked a small ranch in the department of Cuzco, killing three peasants.

All eight freedom fighters were then killed by government troops as "they sought to flee."

In view of the decree passed by the Fernando Belaúnde Terry government last August providing the death penalty for anyone caught with arms in his possession, it may well be that the eight guerrilla fighters were captured and then simply butchered by the government troops. "Shot while trying to flee" is the standard Latin-American formula used to cover up the cold-blooded execution of prisoners.

The government claimed that the death of Luis de la Puente signifies the end of guerrilla fighting in the eastern part of Peru. Similar claims have been made repeatedly by government officials since last spring when the guerrilla struggle again took on fresh

life after dying down for several years.

The Paris daily Le Monde [October 26], for instance, while agreeing that the death of Luis de la Puente "dealt a heavy blow to the insurrection," held that this did not necessarily mean the end of "extremist subversive activities," as claimed by the government. "It is not known if one of his lieutenants is now able to take the leadership in the maquis in the department of Cuzco."

"But," continues Le Monde, "three other guerrilla groups of the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria] are continuing their revolutionary activities in any case. This includes the one in Junín, headed by Guillermo Lobatón, and in Huancavelica headed by J. Paredes, both of them between Lima and Cuzco, and the maquis of Ayabaca, led by E. Portocarrero, in the north of the country, near the Ecuador border."

Le Monde also notes that guerrilla activities increased to such an extent over the summer months that the Peruvian government not only decreed the death sentence for carrying arms, but resorted to the use of napalm.

Small items have continually appeared in the press in the past month concerning the indiscriminate dumping of napalm in the areas where guerrilla fighting has been going on.

De la Puente has been variously reported as 35 years old and 40 years old. He was a leading figure in the APRA [Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana] of Haya de la Torre, a former anti-imperialist movement that at one time came close to Communism.

With the victory of the Cuban Revolution, there was big pressure among the rank and file of the APRA to follow Cuba's example. Haya de la Torre, now an ageing figure, decided against it, turning sharply to the right and becoming a more and more open supporter of U.S. imperialism.

The left wing of the APRA thereupon split away to form "APRA Rebelde." De la Puente was one of its leading figures. This group eventually formed the MIR. It sought to bring the various groupings in the Peruvian left together on the basis of a revolutionary program committed to following the Cuban example. The MIR was particularly friendly with the Peruvian Trotskyists and they worked closely together on some issues.

The Peruvian Trotskyists, headed by Hugo Blanco, the well-known peasant leader, had differences with the MIR on the question of guerrilla warfare as well as party building. The Trotskyists maintain that guerrilla warfare cannot be substituted for solid organization of the peasants into unions around the slogan of "Land to those who till it."

Conflicting reports make it difficult to get a clear picture

of the various guerrilla fronts in Peru. The one in Cuzco was considered to be the most dangerous by the Belaúnde government because of the size and militancy of the peasant movement in this region.

The Junín front was reported by the Santiago, Chile, El Mercurio [September 4] to be headed by Guillermo Lobatón, whom it described as a 30-year-old student of law, "married to a French girl, a former student of the Sorbonne." Lobatón, said El Mercurio, visited "Russia, Algeria, Vietnam and Red China." He was "a member of the Fourth International (and of the Communist party) before joining the MIR....His lieutenant, Máximo Lazo, is a Huancayo journalist without any known militant past."

The "Piura" front in the north is headed by Gonzalo Fernandez Gasco, a 25-year-old lawyer, according to the same source. He is "second in importance in the MIR and his political history is closely linked to that of De la Puente."

Due to the censorship existing in Peru under successive extensions of a "state of siege," the fighters in the Andes face exceptional difficulties in counteracting the lying propaganda of the reactionary Peruvian government. However, their movement appears to be attracting sympathy among the peasants despite grievous losses in the fighting. At least that would seem the logical conclusion to be drawn from the fact that the Lima papers continue to devote headlines week after week to the strenuous efforts of the general staff to burn out "extremist subversion" in Peru, if necessary with napalm made in the USA.

TABATA ON TOUR IN UNITED STATES

I.B.Tabata, a leader of the South African freedom movement since the early thirties, is touring the United States under the auspices of the Alexander Defense Committee. His subject is the present political situation in South Africa and the problems faced by the liberation movement. He is appealing for support to Dr. Neville Alexander and other political prisoners in South Africa. Meetings have been scheduled in the larger cities and on campuses throughout the country.

Tabata is president of the African Peoples Democratic Union of Southern Africa [APDUSA], a multiracial political party based on a ten-point program of demands for democratic rights and a radical land reform.

Of the studies published by Tabata, the best known is Education for Barbarism, a penetrating analysis of the social, cultural and political background of the South African regime's attempt to fragment the African community by imposing "tribal" education.

UNREST IN NIGERIA

The October 11 elections in Nigeria, Africa's most populous country, was marked by such irregularities, including the stuffing of ballot boxes, that civil strife broke out in most of the towns.

In the suburbs of Lagos itself houses and factories were set on fire by demonstrators.

At Ibadan police charged demonstrating students, injuring at least five. A three-hour battle between demonstrators and police reinforced by troops took place at Abeokuta, while at Idanre, Akure, Ekiti and Gboyin many were reported injured in demonstrations.

M.D.S. Adegbenro, leader of the opposition United Progressive Grand Alliance, was arrested October 14 on charges of setting up a dual government when he refused to recognize the official count. Eight other UPGA leaders were arrested on the same charge within a few days. They were acquitted October 21 by the high court at Ibadan when the prosecution dropped the charges.

Nigeria has been unstable since June 1964, when a two-week general strike virtually paralyzed the country. The principal issue was wage demands.

The government responded with a nationwide witch-hunt which succeeded in bottling up the unrest. The temporary nature of this solution is shown by the fresh rise in tension.

NIGERIAN OFFICIALS RIG THE ELECTIONS

Lagos

OCTOBER 13 -- Monday was election day in Nigeria's Western Region. Out of the 5,000,000 qualified voters, some 4,000,000 went to the polls.

By the end of the day reports floated in of constituencies where no election was held because the electoral officials had "postponed the election" on their own decision.

In the outskirts of Lagos a local candidate of the United Progressive Grand Alliance threatened to murder the premier if he rigged the election. Your correspondent saw this candidate, shoeless and in shorts, shake an election official (a member of the Nigerian National Democratic party) and tell him that he would shoot him through the ears if he did not allow elections. The pressure is great since Lagos is about 90% UPGA.

I also saw a crowd break into a house and drag out ballot boxes

stuffed to the brim with NNNDP ballots. The crowd then set fire to the house.

At Ibadan an election official was killed in broad daylight. It was rumored that he had been bought up.

In Epe two officials were kidnapped by rightists.

A UPGA man in Ado was generally recognized to be backed by about 99.99% of the electorate. Nevertheless the NNNDP nominee was declared the "winner."

The regional secretary of the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens defeated the NNNDP minister of justice and attorney general. The announcement was later "corrected" and the incumbent NNNDP man was reported to have won.

In many cases the government announced the results even before the votes were counted.

On Tuesday the radio controlled by the UPGA in the Eastern Region said that the results up to that point showed the UPGA to be leading in 68 out of 96 seats. However on Wednesday, the newspapers, which are controlled by the NNNDP, showed a photograph of the NNNDP leaders in an elated victory clutch.

This was the background to the UPGA move setting up a counter government. It was based on the conviction of the UPGA that it had really won the election.

The government response to this was to call a curfew from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.

The UPGA leaders are affirming that this will be the last election of its kind in Nigeria. However, this is just talk. They cannot be counted on to do anything that would take them away from the parliamentary road.

The people are very angry but they have not yet built a leadership capable of providing a revolutionary alternative.

IN SPAIN, WATCH YOUR TONGUE

Even if you're only a visitor, watch your tongue. That's the clear lesson to be drawn from the experience of Hans Winberg, a 28-year-old Swedish tourist.

At La Lina on the Gibraltar border last June 26, Franco's political police noticed Winberg's tongue hanging out. It appears that he was facing in the direction of the Spanish flag. And he did

not have an ice-cream cone in his hand. In Spain, that's indecent exposure.

He was arrested at once and thrown into jail where he was left to think it over until October 27. On that day he was dragged handcuffed into a Madrid court. The prosecuting attorney demanded a three-year prison sentence.

In self-defense, Winberg denied that he had been engaging in an "offensive or disrespectful demonstration." The press did not report the explanation of how his tongue happened to come loose and fall outside into public view.

The judge is deliberating over the case, as well he might in view of the dangerous nature of the instrument involved.

Our advice to tourists: While in Spain don't violate the local custom. Show respect for Franco's institutions at all times -- tongue in cheek!

SOMETHING STIRRING IN THE "SWITZERLAND OF THE AMERICAS"

[The following article has been translated from the October 18 issue of La Verdad, weekly publication of the Argentine Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (Revolutionary Workers party).]

* * *

The "Switzerland of the Americas," the label for Uruguay that used to appeal to the exploiting oligarchies, has now become a melancholy phrase among the political commentators of the boss press. A profound crisis is shaking Uruguay from top to bottom, from its economic structure to its political institutions, demonstrating that the idyllic country where "nothing ever happens," is nothing but a link in the chain of imperialist domination, a link inevitably condemned to bankruptcy and frustration.

This "Switzerland" where it was traditional to praise the Western and Christian way of life, has become converted into an example of what a semicolonial country can expect nowadays from a capitalist class politically and economically dominated by imperialism.

The fact is that a country which has traditionally exported agricultural products, like so many other Latin-American countries, has been dealt the coup de grace by the world market, so far as its basic crop, wool, is concerned. The manufacture of synthetic fibers in the U.S. with the consequent fall in the price of wool as well as in meat, coupled with limited production of cattle, knocked out two

of the foundation stones of economic stability in Uruguay.

The drop in national income is aggravated by something else. This income must provide for a naturally growing population. For a regime that holds profits and free enterprise sacred, this means spreading the misery among the bulk of the inhabitants so as not to sharpen the quarrels and disputes among the narrow sectors clinging to their special privileges.

This economic crisis has shaken the foliage of the political superstructure, aggravating all its contradictions. The traditional parties of the Uruguayan oligarchy could find no way out except to transform the state apparatus itself into a source of jobs. The offices of the administration and the public services are filled with a swarm of hungry bureaucrats. Public employment has been transformed into a life-saver for those who are unemployed or incapable of working at any other productive occupation. But, for the very reasons that gave rise to it, the bureaucracy does not have a swelling public treasury at its disposal; on the contrary, the pork barrel belongs to a state in crisis. This has served as a powerful ferment in the present popular discontent.

The broad masses in Uruguay, including the numerous middle class dependent on the government, thus face misery with no perspective of a way out. This is the background to the mobilization behind the general strike that has brought wide layers of the population into conflict with the regime.

But despite their growing radicalization, these sectors of the population, including the workers, have not yet succeeded in creating the class-conscious and revolutionary leadership needed under the circumstances to find a way out of the crisis.

The trade-union and political leaderships, from the Communist party to the various currents that claim to be Castroist have not succeeded in providing clear objectives for the popular mobilization, that is, a program, tactics and strategy. The proof of this is that the general strike itself has not raised the slogan of taking power. The forceful and extreme means of a general strike cannot lead to the desired results without posing this fundamental objective, since in the absence of this aim, it is senseless to paralyze the country and neutralize the organs of power of the class enemy, unless the leaders of the mobilization are seeking nothing more than to utilize it for negotiations.

But this means nothing less than capitulation and reformism, in the old pattern of the politicians of the Socialist party and as is now being done by the Peronist trade-union bureaucrats.

Only failure can come along this road.

This is exactly what we believe is occurring in Uruguay today

with the current general strike.

The present crisis in Uruguay -- a crisis of revolutionary leadership -- can however, due to the impasse, hasten the process of forming a genuine workers and popular current with the clear political aim of taking power. The masses will go through the experience of failing with their traditional reformist leaderships, and this process will soon determine the outcome for this semicolonial country that is being smothered today by imperialism.

Meanwhile the possibility of a turn to the right, including desperate recourse to a military coup d'état, will be opened, threatening the Uruguayan people.

In brief, the cronic crisis in Uruguay adds one more country to the series which imperialism is confronting with a decisive alternative -- either a friendly union with sister countries of Latin America in a Federation of Socialist States, or transformation into a bastion of the "Johnson doctrine against subversive wars" in the continent via the Armed Forces.

Thus we believe that "something has begun to stir" in Uruguay. The appearance of a revolutionary leadership and party will prove decisively whether or not what is now happening in Uruguay marked the hour when the country caught up with the present stage of the Latin-American revolution.

U.S. ROLE COMES UNDER FIRE AT TORONTO TEACH-IN

Toronto

An estimated 135,000 students attending 80 U.S. and Canadian universities, through radio-telephone hookups, and another million citizens of the United States and Canada, through their radio and television sets, heard the International Teach-in held here October 8-10. Peak attendance at the teach-in was 6,000.

The University of Toronto faculty, who organized it, aimed to make it an educational teach-in as distinct from the protest teach-ins that have recently been held across the United States. This teach-in was to be "at the extreme of the educational pole of the spectrum." It was not to deal "merely with the Vietnam problem or the foreign policy of any single power," according to the statement of purpose. And it was to be strictly a dialogue.

It started out as such. But in the course of the three days, the teach-in evolved into a denunciation of U.S. aggression in Vietnam. Finally, particularly in the contribution of Yale University Professor Staughton Lynd, it became an appeal for action to stop the war in Vietnam.

The speakers were drawn from a wide political spectrum. There were authoritative spokesmen from the U.S. State Department in Adolf Berle, a longtime consultant to the U.S. Secretary of State on Latin America, Robert Scalapino, who was the stand-in for McGeorge Bundy at the Washington teach-in, and Z.K. Brzezinski, director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs, Columbia University. They had their apologists in a spokesman for the Saigon regime, and the former British Labour party Foreign Secretary, Patrick Gordon Walker.

Brzezinski appeared in the opening session with Nekrasov, chief foreign editor of the Soviet daily Pravda. Other speakers included the deposed prime minister of British Guiana, Cheddi Jagan; Andres Lockward, a member of the executive committee of the Social Christian party, Dominican Republic; Roger Garaudy, of the French Communist party's political bureau; the prominent Afro-American journalist, William Worthy; and British Labour Lord Fenner Brockway.

Worthy, who presented the viewpoint of the Vietnam National Liberation Front, expressed his profound regret that the NLF had not seen fit to send a prominent spokesman. He informed the audience that the NLF had accepted an invitation but withdrew when, under the pressure of the Canadian government, the arrangements committee had agreed to present a spokesman for the Saigon regime. In fact no authentic voice of the socialist revolution was heard. There was no representative of the Cuban Revolution, the Peoples Republic of China, or any genuine exponent of revolutionary socialism from the working-class movement of any of the advanced capitalist countries.

Teach-in officials affirmed that both the Cuban and Chinese governments had been invited. From the reply of the Chinese People's Association for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries it would appear that they considered the teach-in to be a dialogue between world powers over the fate of the revolution in Vietnam -- rather than an opportunity to confront mouthpieces of the U.S. State Department before the peoples of North America. Teach-in officials informed this reporter that they had a statement of refusal from Cuban officials but were not prepared to release it to the press at this time.

The first day's session, featuring the Pravda editor and the Columbia University expert was a dialogue all right -- with only one polite mention by Nekrasov of the war in Vietnam. Brzezinski's speech was conciliatory in the direction of establishing a policy of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet government. He attacked the Chinese, characterizing their outlook as "largely coinciding with that of the Trotskyists." The Chinese have "the Trotskyite attitude," he said, "in their view that the main revolutionary thrust today comes from the colonial world. Berle followed this up in the next session when he characterized some comments by Jagan as "the Trotskyite theses of world revolution."

Over the Sunday and Monday full-day sessions the atmosphere gradually changed. The evidence of U.S. imperialist exploitation of

Latin America and aggression against the popular freedom struggle in Vietnam accumulated. The youthful audience began more and more to express its disagreement with Washington's spokesmen and its identity with the opposition tendencies. A recent Gallup poll revealed that less than 50% of the Canadian people support the U.S. war in Vietnam and 33% are definitely opposed. This teach-in demonstrated that among the youth the opposition is higher and can only increase.

The last session, "Revolution and the Citizen's Moral Responsibility," brought the whole teach-in to a climax with the contribution by Staughton Lynd. Lynd ridiculed previous attempts to dismiss U.S. actions, like the rape of the peoples of the Dominican Republic, as errors, by comparing them to attempts by Soviet officials to dismiss events of the Stalin era as errors. Lynd dramatically sketched in "the pattern of errors," (a Quaker, he used the word "sins") that are Washington's policies against the peoples of the entire world.

Lynd ended his contribution with a powerful appeal for action against the war in Vietnam.

PLEA MADE TO CONVERT TROTSKY'S HOME INTO MUSEUM

In an article in the October 13 issue of the widely circulated Mexican weekly Siempre, Jacobo Zabudovsky puts the case for converting the home of Leon Trotsky in Coyoacán into a public museum. The place where Trotsky spent his final years and fell victim to a Stalinist assassin constitutes part of "contemporary history," he declares. "The house in itself is one of the most valuable vestiges left to posterity by the man who forged the Soviet army and who, persecuted to the end, died fighting."

"The old house is located at Viena and Morelos," he writes; "its exterior is distinguished from the neighboring ones -- on the roof and in the windows the walls still stand that were put up as part of the defense. An ordinary house with protection against fire. High walls and a metal door. Those who have visited it say that Trotsky's grandson, now living there, has kept it unchanged, carrying out the wishes of Natalia Trotsky, the widow of the revolutionist. It is said to be the way it was when Trotsky was alive. Behind the blank door, a patio and garden with high trees and cactus. It is difficult to imagine, looking at the towers and the embrasures that there could be flowers growing inside and some one to greet you. The house is built like a 'T.' The rooms were furnished very modestly and filled with books, magazines, newspapers, all arranged with the scrupulous order characteristic of Trotsky."

After describing the assassination of Trotsky, Zabudovsky argues that whatever one's politics may be, Communist or anti-Communist, Trotskyist or anti-Trotskyist, it is in Mexico's interest to con-

vert the house into a public museum.

He points out that Coyoacán itself has a number of other historic sites such as the palace of Hernán Cortés, still standing after more than four centuries.

GEN. CASTELO DECREES HIMSELF ABSOLUTE DICTATOR OF BRAZIL

Brazil's reactionary officer caste has now made it crystal clear what the alternative is for all of Latin America. Either a socialist revolution like the one in Cuba or an absolute fascist-like dictatorship. This is the basic meaning of the decree announced by General Humberto Castelo Branco October 27, converting himself into absolute dictator of Brazil.

Entitled the "Second Institutional Act," the decree declares all political parties in the country "extinct."

It empowers Castelo to dismiss from office any member of parliament or any other elective body any time he chooses.

The courts are to be packed immediately. The Supreme Court, for instance, is expanded from 11 judges to 16, with Castelo empowered to designate the appointees.

The powers of the governors of states are reduced, enabling Castelo to dictate to local administrations.

No elections can be held until the dictator decides. This in effect cancels the presidential elections scheduled for October 1966.

Castelo has the power to cancel the political rights of anyone he wishes for ten years. Political opponents can be placed under house arrest or ordered to stay in remote parts of the country in a kind of internal exile.

As for Castelo's successor, this will not be determined by universal suffrage but by a parliament handpicked by Castelo himself.

The decree is to run until March 15, 1967. There is, of course, nothing to stop the dictator from issuing a new decree extending this one if he wishes.

As for the constitution of Brazil, this was already violated by the coup d'état that put Castelo in power in April last year. This scrap of paper has now been torn to shreds. If there is any doubt about it, Castelo can call a "state of siege" at any time, suspending any constitutional rights that anyone may imagine still exist.

The immediate reason for Castelo's decree was transparent. The dictator had hoped to gain a democratic façade through elections October 3 in which the "opposition" was limited to barely token candidates approved by Castelo. The voters utilized this chink to roll up such a strong vote for the "opposition" that the regime stood discredited, obviously repudiated by the electorate.

The oligarchy, which displays almost pathological fear of the mildest kind of reforms, panicked at what the election revealed concerning public sentiment. Screams went up from the most reactionary figures such as Carlos Lacerda that Castelo had "betrayed." A "crack-down" was demanded to "stop" the "subversion." Castelo responded to this pressure, as was to be expected.

When Castelo seized power in April 1964 by toppling the legally elected Goulart government, his coup d'état was immediately recognized with the most indecent acclamations by the Johnson administration. The evidence showed, in fact, that the counterrevolutionary move was fomented by American business interests and actively pushed by the State Department. Since then the coup d'état has been presented as a great victory for the Johnson administration. The process put into motion by Wall Street and their indigenous allies, servants and bootlickers has now reached its logical culmination. Latin America has been presented with Washington's alternative to the Cuban Revolution.

The absolute dictatorship instituted by Castelo is an example of what American imperialism would like to see throughout the world. This is the kind of regime Johnson is seeking to establish in Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, in the Congo and wherever it can possibly be rammed down the throats of the people.

ARMED CONFLICT BREAKS OUT IN INDONESIA

The generals now running Indonesia have declared the center of Java to be in a "state of war," according to an October 28 Reuters dispatch.

The excuse given for this is that "the Communists" have been "massacring civilians." According to the army propaganda, "the Communists" have been "terrorizing the population, committing arson, robbery, pillage and proceeding to uprisings."

If there is any substance whatever to these assertions, it could mean that serious resistance has appeared to the counterrevolutionary repressive drive launched by the generals in Indonesia at the beginning of the month.

An army communiqué lists several towns where atrocities were allegedly committed by "the Communists." This could mean that armed

opposition to the army-inspired witch-hunt appeared in these areas.

The Reuters dispatch was based on news broadcast by Radio Djakarta, reporting that "General Surjosumpeno, military commander of central Java, instituted a state of war throughout the province, including Djogjakarta. According to the military, the Communists began to blockade the roads with rocks and trees."

The October 29 Paris daily Le Monde said, "On the other hand, according to certain indications, the army is not in control of the whole country. General Suharto launched an appeal to rebel units in central Java. It thus appears that elements of the army have gone over to the insurrection. This information was reported not long after the September 30 putsch, but it was indicated that most of the mutinous soldiers had given up to the forces of order."

SANTO DOMINGO AGAIN NEAR POINT OF EXPLOSION

A threatened blood bath appears to have again brought Santo Domingo close to civil war. The new crisis began October 18 when troops at the San Isidro base, armed with tanks and artillery, suddenly invaded sectors of the city still held by armed civilians.

The move was apparently inspired from outside the island. Léo Sauvage wrote from New York October 22 to the Paris daily Le Figaro: "From Miami, backed by everything that is reactionary in the Pentagon and still more, naturally, by the inevitable and uncontrollable CIA, General Wessin y Wessin continues to openly instigate the Dominican reactionaries in the name of the same principle [the fight against Communism]."

A further precipitating factor in the new rise in tension was the reactionary move of the regime headed by Hector García Godoy to disarm the civilians. This was to begin October 21. Functionaries of the government's justice department, accompanied by armed patrols, were entrusted with this operation -- one of the basic goals of the U.S. occupation of the island.

Colonel Caamaño was reported to have given his approval to this; but it remained to be seen if even his popularity could overcome the very healthy suspicion of the armed civilians. The arms happen to be their main protection. Without them they can be slaughtered like helpless sheep.

The reluctance of the civilians to give up the arms which they seized in the first days of their insurrection last May was reinforced by the surprise move of the San Isidro troops. The impatience of Gen. Wessin y Wessin may have upset the delicate disarming operation undertaken by García Godoy.

"AMERICA'S RULERS JUSTIFY CRUELITIES EQUALLING THOSE OF HITLER"

By Bertrand Russell

[The following speech, explaining why he decided to tear up his card in the Labour party, was given by Bertrand Russell in London October 14 at a public meeting organized by the Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

[While members of the left wing of the Labour party would have much preferred to see Bertrand Russell keep his membership and use his influence inside the party to help mobilize an effective struggle against the right-wing leadership headed by Wilson, there is no doubt that they share Russell's revulsion over the betrayal of Labour party election promises.

[Russell's denunciation of Wilson's support to Johnson in escalating the war in Vietnam reflects the feelings of wide sectors of the British public.]

* * *

As some of you may possibly remember, I made a speech at the London School of Economics on the 15th of February [see World Outlook March 12] in which I, first, recalled the election Manifesto of the Labour Party before last year's General Election and, then, compared it with what the Labour Government had been doing. It appeared that the Labour Government's record had completely failed to make even a beginning of carrying out its electoral promises. Today, I wish to consider the actions of the Labour Government since that time and to inquire, in view of their record, how anybody can continue to support them.

The Labour Government, as I shall try to persuade you, has acted in complete subservience to the Government of the United States. Those who had hoped for any improvement in international policies, have suffered a double misfortune: there were elections both in America and in Britain. In both elections, the more ferocious party was defeated. After those elections, the Governments which had been elected adopted the policy of their defeated opponents. The result has been a growth of atrocious cruelty in various parts of the world. Attempts have been made to conceal these acts. I wish to join those who try to defeat such attempts.

In my speech of February 15 I came to the conclusion that the only promise concerning foreign policy made by the Labour Party in its electoral Manifesto which the Labour Government had carried out in its early months of office was to appoint a Minister for Disarmament in the Foreign Office. After a year, this remains the sum of the Government's achievement in carrying out its promises.

But I propose now to consider what the Government has done.

The sins of the present British Government in foreign policy are of two sorts: there are minor sins which consist of desperate efforts to hang onto some shreds of the decaying British Empire, and there are other, much worse, sins which consist of supporting America in unspeakable atrocities. Of the former sort, one might mention Aden, where Britain is carrying out her old imperialist policies in support of her continuing imperialism in the Far East. One may mention, also, North Borneo where we have a large army at war with Indonesia. British Guiana has a constitution forced upon it by the Tories and so jerrymandered as to be totally unacceptable to the majority of the inhabitants. This constitution, our present "Labour" Government continues to support. In all these cases its policy is merely a continuation of the bad policy of previous Governments.

In Rhodesia, the situation is in doubt. Though up to this time the Labour Government has continued Tory policy, it now appears to be making some real effort to support majority rule there. It remains to be seen if it will act strongly, or merely talk.

To come nearer home, the Government has issued a White Paper concerned with the problem of immigration. It has attacked none of the problems which make the present immigration difficult -- problems such as housing and education of immigrants -- but it merely proposes to limit the numbers of immigrants. Even there, it misses the point. Its proposals would limit the unskilled immigrants who are necessary to British economy as it is now geared, but leaves loopholes whereby the number of skilled workers remains high while our own skilled workers, themselves, emigrate.

But what is much more serious is our Government's support of America no matter what America may do. The holders of power in America have invented a myth by which they profess to justify cruelties equalling those of Hitler. This myth has two sides: on the one hand, it holds that all Communists are wicked; on the other hand, it holds that all movements of reform, everywhere, are inspired or captured by Communists and are, therefore, to be combatted from their inception. This myth is held to justify the upholding of corrupt governments wherever the United States has the power to do so. It is pretended that populations cannot possibly like the sort of Governments that Communists inspire, or dislike the kind of tyranny which Americans describe as "The Free World."

Throughout South America there are political contests between democratic parties and parties supported by America. The latter represents capitalism in its crudest form. But everywhere, excepting Cuba, American hostility has prevented the democratic parties from achieving power. The recent troubles in San Domingo are a case very much in point.

The worst aspects of American dominion, however, are being dis-

played in South Vietnam -- again supported by Britain. America has no vestige or shred of right to take any part in the affairs of Vietnam. When the French were finally expelled from Indo-China, of which Vietnam was a part, an international congress at Geneva decided that Vietnam, North and South, should be independent and should if they wished be unified after free elections. Britain and Russia jointly were the initiators of this policy. The Americans, however, though they agreed to support it, did not like it. They sent "Observers" to South Vietnam who reported that the country was too disturbed for elections. The Americans proceeded to make friends with the small faction that had previously supported the French. Their "Observers" became more and more numerous and more and more in the habit, as "Advisers", of giving orders to the puppet Government which they installed. The population rebelled and the peasants were moved into "Strategic Hamlets" -- "for their protection" it was said, but the Hamlets were, in fact, concentration camps. They refused to submit and inaugurated guerrilla warfare. The guerrilla armies were nicknamed the "Vietcong", and the civilian authority which they acknowledged was called the National Liberation Front. A long, long war began. So far, there is no prospect of an end to it. The Chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Preparedness stated recently: "We still have a long, hard, bloody road ahead. We may have to keep our troops in Vietnam for fifteen years or longer". (Herald Tribune, 27 September 1965).

Gradually, we have been allowed to become aware that American troops in South Vietnam behave in a manner in which, one would have thought, no civilized troops would behave. They use Napalm which adheres to the skin and causes unspeakable agony. They use gas to smoke out suspected Vietcong hiding places. They attack civilians from the air. When they capture civilians, they torture them. According to the New York Times of October 3, 1965, there have been up to the beginning of October, 170,000 civilians killed; 800,000 maimed by torture; 5,000 burnt alive, disembowelled or beheaded; 100,000 killed or maimed by chemical poisons; 400,000 detained and tortured savagely. One method of torture used by the American troops is partial electrocution or "frying" as one United States Adviser called it -- by attaching live wires to male genital organs or to the breasts of Vietcong women prisoners. Other techniques which are designed to force on-looking prisoners to talk, involve their watching the cutting off of the fingers, ears, fingernails or sexual organs of other prisoners. A string of ears decorates the wall of a Government installation. These details were reported by the New York Herald Tribune (not a subversive journal) on July 21, 1965.

On July 18 of this year, the U.S. Associated Press reported: "The wailing of women and the stench of burnt bodies greeted the troops as they marched in Bagia" (a province of South Vietnam). "A United States Air Force officer said, 'When we are in a bind we unload on the whole area. We kill more women and children than we do Vietcong, but the Government troops just aren't available, so this is the only answer.'" I could continue indefinitely with such quotations.

The stomachs of pregnant women have been ripped open and their unborn children publicly exhibited. But the tale is sickening. I cannot bear to tell the whole of it -- nor could you bear to listen.

Meantime, of course -- and again with our concurrence -- the Americans have carried the war into North Vietnam where they have deliberately bombed schools, hospitals and orphanages -- more civilians than armed forces. They even proposed for a time to bomb the great dams which would have caused such flooding and devastation and loss of life that the rest of the world cried out against it and it has been ostensibly given up and the U.S. has denied that it ever had such an intention.

There are other matters such as the problem of the refugees, who are suffering exposure and starvation, and the public execution of prisoners. But there is not time for me to go into all the horrors even if I would.

Apropos of the public execution of prisoners, however, I should like to bring up another problem:

These public executions were first indulged in by the United States Forces and the South Vietnamese Government. They have been answered by reprisals in kind, though so far, I believe, fewer in number, by the Vietcong. There is an acceleration in savagery which is to be expected and which is one of the worst aspects of guerrilla war -- indeed, any war. But this is the responsibility of the invader.

I should like to call your attention to an article concerning the Congo which appeared in the Observer of August 29 entitled "Mercenary exposes Horror" which was answered in the following week's Observer by a letter entitled "Congo Mercenaries". This letter points up what I am trying to say about the inevitable and limitless hardening of cruelty under the stress of war. The policies at present condoned by the Labour Government involve, inevitably, the condoning of the methods of carrying them out.

In the Congo, as well as in Vietnam, our Labour Government has supported the United States.

Concurrently with the savageries and unbridled cruelty of the war in Vietnam the United States has initiated a programme of sweetness and light: The U.S. Forces there are given small cards urging a display of strength, understanding and generosity upon them and nine rules of conduct for their guidance. These were printed in the Daily Worker, 22 September 1965, and are as follows:

- "1. Remember we are guests here. We make no demands and seek no special treatment;
2. Join with the people, understand their life, use phrases from their language and honour their customs and laws;

3. Treat women with politeness and respect;
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people;
5. Always give the Vietnamese right of way;
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill;
7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude or unusual behaviour;
8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege;
9. Above all else you are members of the U.S. military forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions."

These cards of exhortations end: "Reflect honour upon yourself and the United States of America".

I ask you to contrast these precepts with the actions of the armed forces of the U.S. in Vietnam to a few of which I called your attention a short time ago.

For anyone interested in hypocrisy these exhortations make an absorbing study. For anyone interested in humanity this gilding of a very rotten and stinking lily is nauseating.

But this propaganda campaign has been carried further than mere precepts. On September 11 our papers, most, if not all of them, carried reports of one of its most egregious actions:

On September 10, the day of a children's festival in North Vietnam, American aircraft showered on five North Vietnamese cities 10,000 packages of toys, school supplies and soap labelled "From the children of South Vietnam to the children of North Vietnam."

"The United States and South Vietnamese psychological warfare experts", reports The Times on September 11, "devised the packages for which the Vietnamese Government paid. The five cities are all in an area from 30 miles north of the border to 70 miles north of Hanoi." The report ends: "In South Vietnam American and Vietnamese marines pressed on with a search and destroy operation which has so far killed 167 guerrillas." The day before, the U.S. aircraft had been employed in destroying bridges in North Vietnam.

It is to be noted that the area over which the packages were rained upon the inhabitants had been bombed by the U.S. forces. As the Daily Worker remarked (September 11) the precious parcels fell

upon children, some of whom had no eyes to see them and no hands to grasp them, because of previous raids of the U.S. Air Force with their high explosives, Napalm and Lazy Dogs.

The extreme cynicism of these propaganda actions has rarely, if ever, been equalled. Yet there has been little notice taken of them in our press -- save in the Daily Worker -- and very little outcry against them amongst the general public.

We, through our Government, are condoning such actions.

If further evidence of the hypocrisy that we support is needed, there is plenty of it: On September 23, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations said: "We seek only to insure the independence of South Vietnam...and opportunity for its people to determine their own future...by the principles of self-determination." On September 23 he also said, in arguing against the admission of Communist China: "The Members of the United Nations, under the Charter, share a common responsibility to demonstrate to those who use violence that violence does not pay." It will be difficult for the Pope's plea for peace to move very deeply those who subscribe to such double talk -- and our Government is among such subscribers. Mr. Stewart's "handbook for nations" will hardly help.

We must remember that this sort of thing is supported by a Government for which we voted and which promised in its election Manifesto things far different from these. It may be that the Government finds it easier than many laymen to accept the cynical opposition of fair words and savage cruelty since it has apparently accepted and defended the opposition of its actions to its own promises of little more than a year ago.

When I compare the horrors of the Vietnam war with the election Manifesto of the Labour Government, I find myself confronted with the most shameful betrayal of modern times in this country. Hitler, at least, never professed humanity, but these men who now pollute the chairs of office professed, before election, the most noble and lofty ideals on human brotherhood.

The British Government has, it is true, made some apparent efforts to bring an end to the Vietnam war. It has refused to send troops to South Vietnam -- but that, one suspects, was due to the fact that all the troops that we could spare were needed in Malaysia. Our Government, supported by the majority of the Commonwealth countries, has suggested terms of peace, but these always have been such as would leave American forces on the soil of Vietnam and were plainly and blatantly illusory.

Concurrently with these unreal efforts for peace, the British Government has iterated and reiterated, again and again, its support of United States policy in Vietnam. It has done everything in its power, moreover, to prevent a knowledge of the atrocities which are

taking place there -- let alone a knowledge of the reasons for the Government's complacency in face of them.

Representatives of the National Liberation Front applied for visas to be allowed to state their case in Britain. Visas were refused by the Home Secretary, supported by the Prime Minister, without explanation.

It will be remembered that at Oxford Mr. Stewart stated the importance of all points of view being heard by the British public on Vietnam. It will also be remembered that the Labour Party Manifesto states that the Labour Government would welcome criticism and discussion with all in the Party.

When the visas -- for which the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation had applied on behalf of the three members of the National Liberation Front -- had been refused, Field Marshal Auchinleck, Archbishop Roberts, The Bishop of Southwark, Lord Silkin (the Leader in the Lords), Kingsley Martin, and Professors from several universities, joined 25 Members of Parliament in requesting the visas on the ground of free speech and the right of the British people to hear the spokesman on Foreign Affairs of the NLF. But the Home Secretary refused to receive a delegation of these people to discuss the matter as "no useful purpose would be served."

At the Labour Party Conference the Executive refused to allow the emergency resolution of Nottingham City Labour Party calling for the granting of visas to be put on the agenda. When the President of the Nottingham Labour Party tried to give a speech on the subject, the microphones were cut off by the Chairman.

And yet France has granted visas to them and they toured France. Sweden has officially invited them and Canada has granted them visas. Only Britain under a Labour Government refuses.

The Prime Minister, speaking at Blackpool said that were the members of the NLF coming for the purpose of serious negotiation they would come to the Government. But since they were coming to speak to the British public, it was evident that they were coming for purposes of propaganda and that could not be permitted. One wonders why Mr. Cabot Lodge was given a visa to come to speak at the Teach-in at Oxford.

It is to be noted that visas which the CND tried to obtain for representatives of North Vietnam have also been refused.

The immediate situation is dark. The Labour Government has not only not carried out its electoral promises, but has reversed them. In carrying out Tory policies and in its subservience to America, it is helping to bring the world to complete disaster. One must hope that opposition to this policy will grow stronger before long. Especially, it must be hoped that the young, who have not

shared in the atrocities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki or in the shameful dishonesty of so-called "disarmament" conferences, will retain their indignation as they grow older and will, at last, prevail upon mankind to permit the creation of that happier world which was once the aspiration of the Labour Party.

For my part, I feel that I can no longer remain a member of this so-called "Labour" Party, and I am resigning after 51 years.

It is time that a new movement leading to a new Party more nearly like the movement for which Keir Hardie struggled, be formed to carry out the aspirations of those who have hitherto upheld the present Party.

TEXT OF GUEVARA'S LETTER TO CASTRO

[In our October 15 issue, we ran an article by Joseph Hansen concerning Fidel Castro's announcement that Ernesto "Che" Guevara had taken an assignment in "a new field of battle." Castro read a letter which he had received from Guevara last April. The international press ran only excerpts from this letter. Since then the full text has been published in an English translation by the Militant, a New York revolutionary-socialist weekly.

[The full text of the letter bears out the main conclusion of World Outlook's analysis; namely, Guevara's identification with the foreign policy of Cuba's revolution and the need to free the Cuban government of responsibility for Guevara's activities in this field. "I have always been identified with the foreign policy of our revolution and I will continue to be," Guevara declares. "I state once more that I free Cuba from all responsibility, except that which stems from its example."

[Guevara also makes clear his complete loyalty to the Cuban Revolution: "I carry to new battle fronts the faith that you taught me, the revolutionary spirit of my people, the feeling of fulfilling the most sacred of duties: to fight against imperialism wherever it may be." He also indicates in several places that there are no differences between him and Castro in matters of fundamental revolutionary principles: "I am thankful for your teaching, your example, and I will try to be faithful to the final consequences of my acts."]

* * *

Fidel,

At this moment I remember many things -- when I met you in Maria Antonia's house, when you suggested my coming, all the tensions involved in the preparations.

One day they asked who should be notified in case of death, and the real possibility of that fact affected us all. Later we knew that it was true, that in revolution one wins or dies (if it is a real one). Many comrades fell along the way to victory.

Today everything is less dramatic because we are more mature. But the fact is repeated. I feel that I have fulfilled the part of my duty that tied me to the Cuban revolution in its territory, and I say good-bye to you, the comrades, your people, who are already mine.

I formally renounce my positions in the national leadership of the party, my post as minister, my rank of major, and my Cuban citizenship. Nothing legal binds me to Cuba. The only ties are of another nature; those which cannot be broken as appointments can.

Recalling my past life, I believe I have worked with sufficient honor and dedication to consolidate the revolutionary triumph. My only serious failing was not having confided more in you from the first moments in the Sierra Maestra, and not having understood quickly enough your qualities as a leader and a revolutionary.

I have lived magnificent days and I felt at your side the pride of belonging to our people in the brilliant yet sad days of the Caribbean crisis.

Few times has a statesman been more brilliant than you in those days. I am also proud of having followed you without hesitation, identified with your way of thinking and of seeing and of appraising dangers and principles.

Other nations of the world call for my modest efforts. I can do that which is denied you because of your responsibility as the head of Cuba and the time has come for us to part.

I want it known that I do it with mixed feelings of joy and sorrow: I leave here the purest of my hopes as a builder, and the dearest of those I love. And I leave a people that received me as a son. That wounds me deeply. I carry to new battle fronts the faith that you taught me, the revolutionary spirit of my people, the feeling of fulfilling the most sacred of duties: to fight against imperialism wherever it may be. This comforts and heals the deepest wounds.

I state once more that I free Cuba from all responsibility, except that which stems from its example. If my final hour finds me under other skies, my last thought will be of this people and especially of you. I am thankful for your teaching, your example, and I will try to be faithful to the final consequences of my acts.

I have always been identified with the foreign policy of our revolution and I will continue to be. Wherever I am, I will feel the responsibility of being a Cuban revolutionary, and as such I shall

behave. I am not sorry that I leave my children and my wife nothing material. I am happy it is that way. I ask nothing for them, as I know the state will provide enough for their expenses and education.

I would like to say much to you and to our people, but I feel it is not necessary. Words cannot express what I would want them to, and I don't think it's worth while to banter phrases.

Ever onward to victory! Homeland or death!

I embrace you with all my revolutionary fervor.

"Che"

TROTSKYIST DECLARATION AGAINST INDO-PAKISTAN WAR

[The following statement of position on the war between India and Pakistan was issued by the Socialist Workers party in Bombay September 19.]

* * *

What started since August 5, 1965, as a mopping up operation directed against "armed infiltrators" into Kashmir from Pakistan-held territory has escalated into a major war between India and Pakistan. In the first week of September, the Indian troops crossed the cease-fire line ostensibly to prevent large-scale entry of the infiltrators and prevent them from fomenting an internal revolt in the states of Jammu and Kashmir. This led to an attack by the regular Pakistani troops into Jammu in the Chhamb region. The Indian troops retaliated by entering Pakistan at several points in the Lahore sector and along the Sind-Rajasthan border.

During the last two weeks extensive military operations have been undertaken by the governments of India and Pakistan against each other, engaging their ground and air forces in a big way. Although no war has been formally declared, a heavy toll of human lives, both military and civilian, has been claimed on either side. Several towns and villages in both countries have been subjected to heavy bombings and an unprecedented war hysteria has been worked up in the entire subcontinent.

Attempts made by the UN Secretary General U Thant, with the support of all major powers including the USA and the USSR, to bring about an immediate cessation of hostilities has not succeeded. While the government of India, insistent that Kashmir has been an integral part of the Indian Union since its accession in 1948, agreed to an immediate cease-fire as proposed by Thant, the government of Pakistan wanted the cease-fire proposal to be linked with immediate withdrawal

of Indian and Pakistani troops from Kashmir, induction of an Afro-Asian force and holding of a plebiscite within a specified time limit.

[On September 22 India and Pakistan agreed to a UN-sponsored cease-fire. Both sides have accused the other, however, of repeated violations since then, and the truce remains an uneasy one. --Editor.]

As the UN Security Council and the imperialist powers, including the USA and Britain, are engaged in considering steps to pressurize both the governments through economic and military sanctions to end the war, a new situation has been created by a Chinese ultimatum to India pertaining to military installations along the Sikkim Tibetan border, obviously intended as a pressure tactic in favor of Pakistan. It is obvious that any Chinese intervention in the conflict would escalate it into a global conflagration with U.S. imperialism decisively intervening on the side of India. In the present conflict China has been openly supporting Pakistan while the Soviet Union despite its avowed neutrality has been partial towards India.

It is unfortunate that both the Soviet and the Chinese bureaucracies have renounced their responsibilities as representatives of the two major workers' states and are trying to gain temporary factional advantages in their ideological conflict by supporting one bourgeois state against another, at the cost of international solidarity of the working-class movement and the workers states, thereby objectively strengthening imperialist reaction.

The present armed confrontation between India and Pakistan, both fundamentally allied to the world capitalist system and both dependent on substantial economic and military aid from imperialist powers, cannot be continued till a decisive victory is won by either side. While the Indo-Pak war has helped U.S. imperialism to divert world attention from its criminal and barbarous war against the people in Vietnam, it has also helped the ruling bourgeoisie of both India and Pakistan to stifle the growing discontent of the masses which had found widespread manifestations in the subcontinent in the recent period.

The workers, peasants and other exploited masses of the entire subcontinent, who are denied their minimum essential needs of life, like food and shelter, eighteen years after independence, have nothing to gain from the present conflict. They will have to face greater miseries and hardships and only the capitalist class will prosper. It is in the interest of the exploited masses that the hostilities are ended as early as possible and normal relations are established between the people of the two countries. As Kashmir has been made the bone of contention between the two countries, the only course open is to let the people of Kashmir themselves decide their own future on the basis of their democratically determined will under peaceful conditions. In any case the government of Pakistan which has denied the right of self-determination to the people of Pakhtoonistan and the fundamental democratic rights to its own people has no

right whatsoever to speak on behalf of the people of Kashmir, nor dictate a plebiscite for Kashmir by force.

The theocratic military dictatorship of Ayub Khan has ruthlessly suppressed all democratic opposition and banned working-class political parties. It has been sustained hitherto by the massive military aid received from U.S. imperialism. In the absence of any democratic opposition, the Ayub regime has managed to work up temporarily a chauvinistic war hysteria against India. Unfortunately the traditional left parties in India, including the Right and Left CPI's, SSP and RSP [Communist parties of India, Samyukta Socialist party and Revolutionary Socialist party] have also succumbed to anti-Pakistani war hysteria and have completely identified themselves with the bourgeois regime in its war of attrition. Thereby they have forfeited their right to speak to the exploited masses of Pakistan in the name of the Indian masses. What is worse, the traditional left has surrendered the rights of workers, peasants and middle-class wage earners in India to defend themselves against their own capitalist-landlord exploiters.

The government is fully utilizing the present war-like atmosphere to liquidate all vestiges of civil liberties in the name of national emergency. Reactionary communal elements are trying to foment communal disturbances in the subcontinent. But the chauvinistic hysteria cannot last long. We have no illusion that our voice of protest on behalf of the revolutionary Marxist movement will have any appreciable impact in the context of present war hysteria and utter collapse of the traditional left leadership. But we are confident that the exploited masses both in India and Pakistan will soon realize the futility of the present conflict and will bring pressure on their governments to end the hostilities. The communal partition of the country, effected eighteen years ago as a part of the "Independence deal" between the Indian propertied classes and British imperialism, has been the basic source of friction between the people of the two countries and we are convinced that only a socialist confederation of India and Pakistan can eradicate all the causes of friction.

We therefore call upon, to the extent our voice can reach, all working-class, kisan and youth organizations in both India and Pakistan not to lose hope but remain alert, not to succumb to the war hysteria, preserve communal harmony and defend the democratic rights and liberties of the people against onslaughts by the capitalist rulers in the name of war.

WIPE OUT LABOUR'S SHAME

[The following is the text of a speech given at the Labour party conference at Blackpool by Ken Coates, a member of the Nottingham delegation. It is taken from The Week, a news analysis for socialists, published at 54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham, England.

[The speech was made in seconding a resolution aimed against Wilson's policy of backing the American imperialist aggression in Vietnam.]

* * *

Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stewart have set their faces against this resolution. They are maintaining that it is an extremist one. This is not true. It is a moderate resolution; one which is so moderate, that in the face of the terror and misery of the people of Vietnam, I had great difficulty in bringing myself to support it. But I think it must be supported; because it gives every delegate present who has had any regard for libertarian, socialist, humanist values the chance to stand up and be counted.

The essence of the resolution is that it calls upon the government to dissociate itself from American policy. Not to "condemn," "defy" or "oppose"; but simply to dissociate. If every delegate understands the nature of the Vietnam war, this elementary request will be carried unanimously. What is this war? It is a national liberation struggle, part of a worldwide fight against old empires, by the hungry peoples of the third world. It has developed, sometimes under one banner, sometimes under another, sometimes under one of the varieties of world Communism, in India, through Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is the biggest social upheaval of our time.

In Vietnam, this war has been going on for twenty-five years. It began against the Japanese. It continued under the French. Now it is against the Americans. Every village, for all that time, has felt the weight of its terror. In every town square the guillotine was set up to kill suspect malcontents. Hundreds of thousands have been killed, tortured and maimed. As a direct result, the overwhelming majority of the Vietnamese people have come round to the side of Ho Chi Minh, a fact which has been witnessed in the past by President Eisenhower and numerous front bench spokesmen of our party, including Mr. Crossman -- I only wish that he had the courage to say today what he said a few years ago, because under the Americans it has become ten times more true than it was then.

Mr. Stewart talks about North and South Vietnam. There are not two Vietnams, any more than there were two Frances when that country was cut in half by Hitler during the second world war. Half of Vietnam has been annexed by the Americans, who installed at the beginning of the year their empteenth puppet, who then said: "My only hero

is Hitler. We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam." Under this regime, eight million peasants, 59% of the population, are herded into concentration camps called 'strategic hamlets.'

There is in Vietnam a very right-wing party, called the Democratic Party, which has as its motto, "For the defeat of Communism everywhere." This right-wing party has testified about these camps. They mean: "a forced labour under the control of 300,000 secret police. The programme is planned for fifteen million people. It is the only conflict on record in which every means is employed to destroy one's own people by a series of barbaric attacks with American arms. These police commit numerous atrocities...."

And again, this right-wing party says: "It is certainly an ironic way to protect the peasant masses from communism...to herd them behind barbed wire walls under police control, to burn their villages. Poor as the Vietnamese are, they are not domestic animals."

Now, as this genocidal war escalates, as the Americans move in more and more troops, the South Vietnamese conscript soldiers themselves are being confined to these camps, to stop them from deserting en masse.

Why can't the most powerful military nation on earth defeat these poor peasants? They fight with the most primitive weapons, they fight without pay, they risk their lives and the lives of their families in a desperate struggle against indiscriminate and total terror...Bombs which slice people into fragments, napalm which burns away its powerless living victim with a fire that cannot be quenched until he sees his flesh in ashes, mass eviscerations, torture as a systematic device. People say that the Vietcong also use terror. So they do: they use limited discriminate terror against the occupiers and their quislings, after repeated warnings, as did the resistance in Europe. American bombs kill everything, poison everyone, char all the life within their range, which is at the limit of scientific fiendishness.

How can men find the will to fight such awful things? They find this will from the same springs which inspired our grandfathers to form unions, and our own fight against fascism. If delegates here were Vietnamese and saw the walls of American outposts, decorated with strings of human ears (the American liberal press reports such scenes every day of the week), if they saw the mutilated women, the butchered children, who can doubt that they would be with the Vietcong? They would have no choice, just as, during the war, we had no choice but to fight, with the Communists, against fascism.

The government's support of this evil American war is the worst shame ever to be inflicted on our Labour movement. [At this point the chairman, Gunter, intervened to silence the speaker.] They say that the bank rate is 6%. But what is the interest which Vietnamese children are paying on the vast loan with which the Americans

saved the pound? I appeal to the unions; you, too, tomorrow, will be asked to yield your powers to the pound. It is not worth these sacrifices. If you vote against this resolution you are supporting these murders and mutilations. By voting for this very mild resolution, at least you take a step to wipe out our shame.