

# WORLD OUTLOOK

## PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 4, No. 2

February 11, 1966

### In this issue

Page

Luna 9 and "Operation Masher" .....	1
Johnson's Secret Conference in Hawaii .....	3
Entrenching Themselves in Vietnam as New Colonial Masters .....	5
Antigovernment Demonstration in Ecuador .....	5
The Gleam in the Elephant's Eye -- by Joseph Hansen .....	6
India's Rulers Select a New Leader -- by Kailas Chandra .....	9
More About Imprisoned Polish Trotskyist .....	13
Greek Workers and Students Again in Action .....	13
Background to Gen. Ironsi's Take-Over -- by Dick Roberts .....	15
MIR Confirms Lobaton Still Alive .....	19
Documents: Castro's Closing Speech at Tricontinental Congress .....	20

### LUNA 9 AND "OPERATION MASHER"

The first successful soft landing on the moon of a rocketed vehicle capable of transmitting back to earth photographs of the surface in detail down to a fiftieth of an inch marks the opening of a new stage in the exploration of our solar system.

The experiment can be repeated on the other planets. Before long such seemingly impenetrable mysteries as the exact nature of the surface of the eternally cloud-covered Venus will be solved. Even more exciting possibilities are opened. Unmanned astronomical observatories can be stationed on the moon to record and transmit information about the universe that has been barred to us up to now by the screening effect of our atmosphere. The spokesmen of the capitalist system spoke truly when they grudgingly admitted that the advance scored by the Soviet Union was an advance for all humanity.

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station,

New York, N.Y. 10010

"The solar system has in reality become mankind's laboratory," was the way the New York Times (February 6) put it.

There was another side to the immense achievement that was not mentioned by the proponents of capitalism, although this is undoubtedly the most astounding feature of all. The success, again testifying to the world lead held by the USSR in this field, was achieved by a country that only fifty years ago was notorious for its backwardness, standing far below Great Britain, France and Germany -- not to mention the United States.

The landing of Luna 9 on February 3 was really one more reminder to mankind of the October 1917 Revolution in Russia and the potentialities that were opened up for the country by the overturn of Czarism and the capitalist system. Behind the Soviet scientists stands the planned economy made possible by the revolution led by Lenin and Trotsky.

The fact that economic planning in the Soviet Union is hampered by bureaucratic parasitism and lack of proletarian democracy does not alter the conclusion to be drawn. Just the opposite. If such achievements as the Luna 9 feat were made possible in the final analysis by establishment of a planned economy, then planning free from Stalinist malpractices and guided by the collective will of the workers in a free and democratic way is capable of incomparably more!

While Luna 9 was streaking toward the moon, the American capitalist press was filled with news about a different kind of achievement -- the first results of Johnson's order January 31 to resume bombing north Vietnam, and the successes in the daily "kill" of Vietnamese victims in the appropriately named "Operation Masher" in south Vietnam, the biggest foray of American troops yet organized in Vietnam and one that marks a new phase in escalation of the war.

With napalm, high explosives and all the other fiendish devices employed to butcher, tear to shreds or burn alive human beings, the most advanced capitalist country moved ahead methodically in a war of colonial conquest that differed little in pattern from those mounted by the older imperialist powers in their time. Even the same sickening terms appear in the press releases issued by the American military commanders -- "ink spot" tactics, "pacification" of the countryside...

Behind the aggression of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam is to be seen the operation of the basic laws of the capitalist economic system. Like Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Japan before it, American capitalism must expand, must seek colonies, must seek world domination. The need for profits leaves open no other choice. That is why a figure like Johnson is willing to risk a land war in Asia, war with China, war with the Soviet Union, even a nuclear conflict. The profit system must be maintained, advanced and imposed on others whether they like it or not and no matter what the risk!

The lesson of the contrast between Luna 9 and "Operation

Masher" could not be more striking. Hundreds of millions of people in the colonial and semicolonial world will not fail to notice it.

### JOHNSON'S SECRET CONFERENCE IN HAWAII

After refraining from bombing north Vietnam for 37 days, Johnson ordered the forays to resume January 31. The lull was designed to give plausibility to a "peace offensive" in the diplomatic field aimed at closing the "credibility gap" in Washington's propaganda about its role in Vietnam. The objective was to pin on Hanoi the responsibility for continuation of the war.

This hypocritical maneuver failed to convince many people, however. The lull in the bombing was not ended by Hanoi sending bombers over California, but by Johnson sending planes over Vietnamese territory.

Johnson's resumption of bombing north Vietnam was likewise interpreted by informed people the world around as a clear indication that the White House had decided on further escalation of the war, including extending it elsewhere in Southeast Asia. This was already implicit, of course, in the intensification of the war in south Vietnam carried out by American troops during the bombing lull itself.

In an obvious effort to cushion the repercussions of again dropping bombs on north Vietnam, Johnson announced that his administration would ask the United Nations Security Council to help in the "pursuit of peace." The cynicism of this move was too transparent to give it much effect. Why didn't Johnson appeal to the UN before resuming the bombing? Before stepping up operations in south Vietnam? Before sending massive additions to the U.S. forces in Vietnam? Before escalating the war in the first place?

Johnson's decision to step up and extend the war shocked sectors of the American people who had hoped that the lull in bombing north Vietnam might signal a turn in the belligerent policy of the White House. The pressure of these layers of the population has been mounting on Congress, especially the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which has become a focal point for the expression of doubts about the advisability of Johnson's course in Vietnam.

On January 30, the day before the bombing was again started, a panel of congressmen, including senators Fulbright and Morse, was televised for an hour and a half on CBS, a nationwide hookup. The deep doubts voiced by Fulbright and the direct appeals made by Morse for action by the people undoubtedly had a strong effect on the millions of viewers. But the very next day, before they could do much, Johnson ended the lull!

The rebuff to the critical voices in Congress was like a public slap in the face. The Foreign Relations Committee responded by scheduling a public hearing on the administration's policy in

the Vietnam war and arranged to have it televised, again, over CBS. The hearings began with a full day on television February 4.

Depending on the depth of the antiwar sentiment in the United States, these hearings, with their constant references to secret documents and with administration representatives being grilled hour after hour in the glare of the klieg lights, could become a nationwide sensation. The possibility of spectacular developments in the hearings was indicated the first day they opened when Secretary of Defense McNamara and Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, refused to testify publicly before the committee, demanding that they be heard behind closed doors. The response of Senator Morse before the TV cameras was angry.

Since the American people "are going to die by the millions," he said, they have a right to have the testimony on the public record. "Let's have it out with the Secretary of Defense because the American people are going to have it out with the Administration at the ballot box."

This was the background to Johnson's sudden trip to Hawaii. He called an emergency press conference during the televised Foreign Relations Committee hearing. This sensational development compelled CBS to cut into its coverage of the inquiry, bringing Johnson before the television audience with his announcement about flying to Hawaii. It remains to be seen how successful this diversionary move was in counteracting the effect of the material brought out in the first day of the committee's public hearing.

Besides his immediate objective of setting up an administration show in Hawaii to counteract the public inquiry into his war policy now going on in the Senate, Johnson had another obvious aim. He wished to give South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky a public pat on the back to show that he is the puppet personally favored by the president of the United States.

Evidently those in charge of the war of conquest believe this is a good move in trying to stabilize some semblance of government in Saigon. Recently there have been persistent rumors of another impending coup d'etat there.

Ky, a self-avowed admirer of Adolf Hitler, will no doubt find that Johnson measures up to his ideals in many ways and that the conference will prove mutually profitable and agreeable.

Very likely the conference will be utilized to announce decisions already made concerning further measures to be undertaken in Vietnam. References have appeared in the press to more intensive bombing, the spreading out of American troops on a broader basis, the building up of a south Vietnamese constabulary, the setting up of new villages -- in short, the standard "pacification" and "re-organization" measures that have accompanied wars of colonial conquest undertaken by other imperialist powers.

## ENTRENCHING THEMSELVES IN VIETNAM AS NEW COLONIAL MASTERS

In the official 14-point statement of the position of the Johnson administration on "negotiations" with regard to the Vietnam war, point No. 7 reads: "It wants no military bases in Southeast Asia." Point No. 8 even implies readiness to withdraw U.S. troops: "It does not want a continuing American military presence in South Vietnam."

Among the American forces in Saigon, however, the attitude is quite the opposite to the one expressed in these fair statements which Johnson's diplomatic emissaries sought to peddle during the lull ordered by the White House in the bombing of north Vietnam.

Writing from Saigon January 24, Robert Guillain, special correspondent of the Paris daily Le Monde, reported that the phrase he heard everywhere was "We are here to stay."

"'We'll still be here in five years, in ten years, in twenty years, if it's necessary.' Those are the literal words of all the Americans I questioned concerning their long-range plans, whether it was decision-making leaders, civilian administrators or soldiers of all ranks. One of them reminded me of the declaration made by Mr. Goldberg, ambassador to the United Nations: 'The United States remains ready to withdraw its forces as soon as South Vietnam is capable of determining its own future without foreign intervention.' But this official added his own personal commentary:

"'It will obviously be a good ten years before South Vietnam can do that.' Another official, talking about the bay of Cam-Ranh, said: 'There's a naval base big enough for our Pacific fleet. We will still be there twenty years from now, believe me'; A third one, commenting on President Johnson's 'peace offensive,' declared: 'Leave? That's unthinkable now. We will leave only when we have cleaned up, protected and reconstructed this country enough so it will be safe from danger.'"

Guillain quotes an American as summing up the situation in the following words:

"The United States can't sign a promise to leave unless it makes it years from now. The North Vietnamese can tell their people, 'Wait another ten years and the United States will leave.' Conclusion: negotiations were doomed to fail from the beginning. In reality, there is nothing to negotiate."

## ANTIGOVERNMENT DEMONSTRATION IN ECUADOR

Students and workers fought police in Quito who used tear gas to break up a demonstration January 28 demanding a return to constitutional government. The crowds threw stones at the U.S. embassy. In anticipation of the demonstration the military junta had decreed martial law two days before.

THE GLEAM IN THE ELEPHANT'S EYE

By Joseph Hansen

The day after the 1964 presidential election, political cartoonists in the United States outdid each other on the theme of the Republican elephant, bruised and battered, on crutches and obviously out of the running for a long time to come. Today some of the cartoonists are showing the elephant perking up; the rogue animal even has a gleam in his eye.

What has given hope to the Republicans is Johnson's continued escalation of the war in Southeast Asia. Republican strategists are recalling how the American people reacted after Truman plunged the country into the Korean conflict and how the Republican party capitalized on it in 1952. Some Republican aspirants are even sending up trial balloons labeled "Peace Candidate."

A good example is John V. Lindsay, Republican winner of the November mayoralty contest in New York City, a Democratic party stronghold. The photogenic mayor was quoted in the January 30 New York Times on the situation in Vietnam: "The most unwanted war" in American history.

This was his first statement on foreign policy since last April when he expressed doubt about the advisability of bombing north Vietnam.

"I've never thought these long-range bombings should be the solution at all," he added. "I never thought they would necessarily improve the situation."

Not to get too far in front of the crowd, Lindsay told the Times that he was opposed to withdrawal from Vietnam. "You can't pack your bags up and sneak out. We're committed too deeply." His proposed solution is "solid diplomacy" -- whatever that means.

The wheels clicking in Lindsay's ambitious mind are almost audible. "I have absolutely no interest whatsoever in running for President...none at all," he assured the reporter of the most influential newspaper in the country.

This is the conventional opener made by all prospective candidates of both the Democratic and Republican parties when they set their sights on the White House.

That even the right wing of the Republican party -- notorious in recent years for its warmongering -- is willing to back a "peace candidate" has been indicated by no one less than Vice-President Richard Nixon himself. Lindsay, said Nixon on January 29, will be "a national political figure in 1968 or 1972, whether he likes it or not."

Nixon, the hero of the Republican machine politicians, who

lost to Kennedy only by a hair-line vote in 1960, offered his considered judgment of Lindsay: "He's a winner."

The congressional strategists of the Republican party, who voice the party's public positions most authoritatively in the years when it does not hold the White House, are thinking along similar lines. Tom Wicker, Washington correspondent of the New York Times reported February 2 that they believe "divisions within the Democratic party and the prospect of an expanding land war in Vietnam may be giving them a winning political issue against President Johnson."

Looking forward hopefully, they calculate that the country may turn against a president "whose party does not fully support him and whose war policy may produce long casualty lists without military victory or a negotiated settlement." Political as well as constitutional responsibility for the war will then lie "squarely" on Johnson.

"By 1968, they believe, Mr. Johnson may be in political trouble as a result of bearing that responsibility and the country may be ready to turn to a Republican, just as it turned to General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952 during the Korean War.

"In that event, some Republican strategists do not rule out the possibility that their party might run a Presidential candidate who would promise to end the war by negotiations, as did General Eisenhower."

But how could the party that ran the "bomb-them-now" Goldwater switch to a "peace candidate"? The cynicism of the machine politicians of both the Democratic and Republican parties is perhaps even greater than their contempt for the American voter -- which is close to bottomless. The right wing will be blamed for the ill-starred Goldwater and the liberal wing will be pushed to the fore, "peace" banners flying.

It was with such a contingency in mind that figures like Lindsay remained aloof from Goldwater and even avoided using the name of their party as the Arizona senator campaigned for escalating the war in Vietnam.

The liberal Republicans, moreover, are capable of marshaling plausible arguments. Whatever Goldwater said, it was Johnson, after all, who carried out Goldwater's platform, they can contend; and they are against "Goldwaterism" no matter where it raises its ugly head. Johnson ran as a "peace candidate" but proved to be a war-monger. That is completely in the tradition of the Democratic party. Woodrow Wilson, probably the greatest "peace candidate" of them all, set the pattern. He ran on the slogan, "He kept us out of war." That was in 1916. The following year Wilson took the country into the world's first great slaughter.

Roosevelt, too, was a "peace candidate." Running for his unprecedented third term in 1940, he promised the mothers of America

"again and again and again" that he would not send their boys to die in any foreign wars. Nonetheless, he sent quite a few to die in World War II.

Truman did not run as a "peace candidate" in 1948. He espoused the cold war against the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, out of fear of the third-party threat represented by Wallace, who favored continuing Roosevelt's deals with Stalin, Truman veered far to the left, making demagogic appeals to the workers and farmers. He looked like a real man of the people; yet he became the first president to take the country into a major war without first submitting the question to Congress as is required by the constitution.

Now Johnson, the Democratic "peace candidate" of 1964, has followed Truman's example in Korea, maneuvering the United States into the civil war in Vietnam in violation of both the constitution he took an oath to uphold and the United Nations charter. Isn't this pretty decisive proof that the Democratic party is the "war party," no matter how solemnly its candidates swear to keep the country out of war if elected?

So far, the only "peace candidate" to carry out a campaign promise on the war issue has been a Republican -- Eisenhower, who brought the bloody conflict in Korea to an end.

Such, one may well imagine, will be the line of argument of the "peace candidates" of the Republican party. It is difficult to see how a Democratic "peace candidate" could put up a stronger case in the vote-snaring contest unless he were to maintain that the Democratic party can be counted on to take over the Republican platform and really carry it out. Didn't Johnson do it to perfection in the case of Goldwater?

The schemes and counterschemes of the Republicans and Democrats with regard to the 1968 presidential election are not of much interest, it must be admitted. They are engaged in nothing but the well-worn fraud of serving as alternatives to each other. As parties committed to maintaining the capitalist system, both are equally responsible for the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. Through Goldwater, in fact, the Republicans greatly facilitated Johnson's belligerent foreign policy.

What is of real current interest is the antiwar mood of the American people which was registered in a distorted way in the overwhelming vote against Goldwater in 1964 and which stands behind the phenomenal rise of opposition on a coast-to-coast scale against Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The Republican machine politicians would, of course, like to take advantage of this. Their immediate interests coincide, moreover, with wider interests which they share in common with the Democrats. A rise in popular opposition to either party, if it is extensive enough, potentially threatens the stability of the setup whereby the Democrats and Republicans periodically relieve each



other when the image they create for themselves by their conduct in office becomes too badly tarnished.

To divert dissatisfied voters, ways and means must be found for them to express their discontent within the two-party system. If that is not done, third-party formations or even worse can arise -- an independent labor party or a mass revolutionary-socialist movement.

That is why candidates in either party are capable at times of speaking quite radically. Like the Madison Avenue hucksters, they know their trade. For instance, if "peace candidates" must be deployed to block formation of an antiwar movement that could achieve genuine peace and much more besides, the Republicans can be counted on to loyally do their share.

Today the Republican elephant, standing amidst discarded splints and bandages, is trying on "peace-style" suits for size and looks. And the Democratic donkey, still wearing Goldwater's clothes, now splotted with blood, is looking apprehensively at his rival. Perhaps he, too, should switch to a "peacenik" outfit?

#### INDIA'S RULERS SELECT A NEW LEADER

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

Even before the cremation of the body of Lal Bahadur Shastri, the late prime minister of India who died at Tashkent January 11 after signing a "peace pact" with President Ayub Khan of Pakistan under Soviet auspices, a dog fight for succession to the prime ministership of the "biggest democracy in Asia" had begun in New Delhi.

There were several candidates in the field. The ruling factions in the parliamentary Congress party, the majority party in the Indian parliament, would have liked Gulzarilal Nanda -- who was sworn in as acting prime minister immediately after Shastri's death -- to continue as the "status quo" prime minister until the next general elections in 1967. He was, however, challenged by Gujarat's "strong man," Morarji Desai, a former finance minister in the Nehru cabinet, considered to be a "puritanist" (because of his strong views on prohibition) and "more open" exponent of the capitalist interests of the country.

The Congress president, Kamaraj, a shrewd though less sophisticated politician from the South (Tamilnad) and the coterie of party bosses around him, including Railway Minister S.K. Patil from Bombay city, Defence Minister Chavan of Maharashtra, Sanjiya Reddy of Andhra and the West Bengal Congress boss Atulya Ghosh thought it would be too risky to have a "controversial" figure like Morarji Desai in office in the present "delicate" situation (with a major economic crisis threatening and with famine conditions in some states) facing the country. They were in search of a candidate who would be acceptable to big business while at the same time having a

"popular image" inside the country -- and also a candidate who would be "acceptable" to both Washington and Moscow!

Several alternatives were tried. There was a great deal of horse trading. Patil was found unsuitable because of his image as an open "Washington patriot" in India. Chavan, the "hero" of the Indo-Pakistan War, was considered to be a "regional chauvinist" in Maharashtra's border disputes with neighboring states in the South. The Birla group of industrialists, the real power behind the Congress party, also entered the search for a new leader. Finally they hit upon Indira Gandhi, daughter of the late Jawaharlal Nehru.

She was considered to be the least controversial figure among the available party leaders, and probably the best vote catcher for the Congress in the next elections. Besides being relatively young (49), she is a woman, an attraction for the youth and the women. So all the warring factions in the Congress "High Command" combined to choose her as their leader. Once this was decided, a powerful campaign was mounted in her favor by the big business press even before the parliamentary Congress party met formally to elect a new leader. On January 19 the party chose Mrs. Gandhi as its leader by 355 votes to 169. If there was any surprise at the outcome it was over the size of the opposition.

The new cabinet announced by Mrs. Gandhi consists of the old team almost in its entirety. The only new face is that of Asoka Mehta, a former "Praja Socialist" now deputy chairman of the Planning Commission. Jagjivan Ram, the "Harijan" leader from Bihar who was a minister in the Nehru cabinet until he resigned in 1963 along with Morarji Desai under the so-called "Kamaraj Plan," has been brought back as "Number 3" in the cabinet in charge of Labour. At the last moment, obviously for a price, he switched his support from Desai to Mrs. Gandhi. Home Minister Nanda continues as "Number 2" in the cabinet and leader of the Lok Sabha (lower chamber of parliament) since Mrs. Gandhi is only a member of the Rajya Sabha (upper chamber).

Finance Minister Sachin Choudhary from Bengal, supposed to be a trusted spokesman of the "Marwari" business interests of Calcutta, also continues in the new government. He was brought in earlier by Shastri himself to replace T.T.Krishnamacari, who had to resign in December 1965 following serious allegations of corruption made against him by members of parliament. Mrs. Gandhi has tried to satisfy all factions that backed her in the leadership contest. She sacked two former ministers -- A.K.Sen, in charge of Law, and Humayun Kabir, in charge of Scientific Research -- at the behest of the West Bengal Congress chief, Atulya Ghosh.

There are no indications whatsoever to suggest that Mrs. Gandhi is contemplating any major changes in the policies pursued by the Shastri team. The old wine continues in a new bottle. And the reason why the big bourgeoisie of India backed Mrs. Gandhi is quite obvious. The need of the hour is to maintain the status quo. Naturally the stock markets showed no perturbations as the new team was sworn in.

Rumors have circulated that the new government might release leaders of the various left political parties, including the left-wing Communist party, detained under the so-called Defence of India Rules (DIR) since the border conflict with China. Another rumor is that Mrs. Gandhi might initiate negotiations with Peking over the Sino-Indian border disputes. The initial steps for the withdrawal of Indian and Pakistan troops to positions held by them before August 5, 1965, when the Indo-Pak conflict began, have been taken. This has naturally reduced tension in the subcontinent. But it does not seem likely that Mrs. Gandhi would release the left-wing political prisoners, especially with new hunger demonstrations flaring in Kerala and other states. In fact, following the successful statewide general strike in Kerala on January 28 to protest the government's food policy (cutting down the rice ration from 200 grams to 120 grams a day), new arrests have been made, including the arrest of the left-wing Communist party leader E.M.S. Namboodiripad and the Revolutionary Socialist party leader Srikanten Nair. These marked the beginning of a new wave of government repression. The real character of the "Indira Cabinet" is being exposed in the face of a new mass upsurge.

Among the left parties in India, only the pro-Moscow Communist party has reacted enthusiastically to the election of Mrs. Gandhi as prime minister. Bhupash Gupta, the "centrist" leader of this party, who was recently named editor of New Age, the party's English-language weekly, wrote on January 23: "It (Mrs. Gandhi's election) is a defeat of yet another bid by the rightists and reactionaries to install as the country's Prime Minister one who is all but alien to any progressive ideas and whose solicitude for big business and reaction is well-tested and beyond all doubt. Naturally the nation has every reason to congratulate itself that this knight-errant of reaction has not been allowed to disgrace and defile the highest office in the Government of the country."

It is understandable why the pro-Moscow Communist party leaders are so concerned about putting the "right" person in the "highest office" of the Indian bourgeois state. Mrs. Gandhi was more acceptable to the Soviet bureaucracy than perhaps Desai but she is equally acceptable to President Johnson, who has invited her to Washington on a state visit. Soviet Premier Kosygin and U.S. Vice-President Humphrey, who went to New Delhi to attend Shastri's funeral, stayed there for a while to indicate their "preferences" in the leadership contest.

"Against Morarji Desai," says the editor of the New Age, "India would not have won the day but for the healthy forces within the ruling Congress Party and the vigilance of the whole nation." (New Age, January 23.) But he has tried to explain in the same article why "many other Congressmen who are by no means progressive" ("progressive" in the neo-Stalinist sense no doubt) supported Mrs. Gandhi. According to Bhupesh Gupta, the "impact of the good national sentiments and of progressive forces that are within the Congress" could not be ignored by the "reactionaries." "Under this impact," says he, "the traditionally right camp" split over the issue of the

election and "even the rightists among the party managers knew that it would be too risky to venture to put up Morarji Desai as Prime Minister...And 1967 is not too far when the ruling party would have to face the electorate." (Emphasis added.)

With all his enthusiasm for Mrs. Gandhi as an associate in his student days in London and with all his neo-Stalinist sophistry, even Bhupash Gupta cannot conceal the alignment of class forces behind the new prime minister. For he admits that "evidently the rightists also bank on the possibilities of holding Indira Gandhi on tight reins and using her 'public image' to serve their ends."

Developments since the Indira team took over have shown that the rightists in the Congress were shrewder and saw more clearly than the pro-Moscow Communist party leaders how their interests would be served by a figure like Mrs. Gandhi.

Bhupesh Gupta has expressed the hope that Indira Gandhi will carry the government along more "progressive" lines than those pursued by Shastri. He has also expressed the hope that she will restore civil liberties by releasing political prisoners; and that she will initiate steps to open negotiations with China.

But the new prime minister will disappoint her supporters in the right-wing Communist party. No "leftist deviation" is visible in her policies. They are the same as those laid down by her father and later carried on by Shastri under different conditions. As a leader selected by the Indian bourgeoisie she cannot do otherwise.

#### BOUMEDIENNE REGIME STILL USING TORTURE

The families of fifty-nine political prisoners held by the Boumedienne regime at El Harrach on charges of "associating with criminals"; i.e., the underground ORP (Organisation de Resistance Populaire organized by Hocine Zahouane) sent out a letter to the press reporting that conditions have worsened for the defendants since January 16.

"The minister of justice, despite our efforts and the verbal assurances given to the families and the defense attorneys to recognize the defendants in El Harrach as political prisoners, has decided to consider them common criminals and to reduce visits to once in two weeks," the letter declares.

The special correspondent of the Paris daily Le Monde who reports this in the issue of January 28 adds:

"It is certain that most of the detainees, like those jailed in the Lambeze penitentiary, were tortured before being brought before the examining magistrate. All the defense attorneys confirm this.

"But it also appears that these methods were utilized without

the knowledge of the authorities. As soon as the latter learned about it -- the detainees themselves confirm it -- these practices ceased. Today, despite the fresh administrative interference, the El Harrach detainees are, even in the opinion of their attorneys, rather well treated."

Several things are to be noted about the report by the Le Monde correspondent. He seems to be anxious to write in such a way as to placate Boumedienne's censorship, which customarily bans issues of any journal that contains news reflecting unfavorably on the Colonel's regime. The assurances about how well the prisoners are being treated is quite noticeably not confirmed by any statements from the "detainees" themselves.

Finally the claim of the authorities that they didn't know about torture being used is an old dodge. When the first cases of torture were reported by the victims after getting out of Algeria (these included several French technicians of Trotskyist outlook with long records of struggle in defense of the Algerian Revolution), the first response of Boumedienne's officials was to flatly deny the exposure. When it became impossible to continue this course in face of the evidence, they shifted to the story about not knowing about it.

The first victims of torture in Algeria under Boumedienne testified otherwise, however, and stated their willingness to appear before any impartial body to present the facts. The challenge was never accepted by the regime.

#### MORE ABOUT IMPRISONED POLISH TROTSKYIST

(In our last issue we reported the trial of political oppositionists in Poland whom the government charged with being connected with the cases of Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Kuron which attracted international attention last May. Among the defendants in the most recent trial was an avowed Trotskyist, Ludwig Haas. The February issue of l'Internationale, monthly journal of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste, French section of the Fourth International, carries the following additional information, which we have translated.)

\* \* \*

Ludwig Haas belonged to the Polish Trotskyist organization before the second world war. When the Soviet troops entered Poland in 1939, he was arrested by the Soviet authorities and deported to a camp.

He was kept there for seventeen years. According to the testimony of other deportees, he conducted himself very courageously.

Upon returning to Poland, he stated openly that he was a Trotskyist. He belonged to a circle of intellectuals where he was noted for his exceptional intellectual level.

He worked in the history section for the central committee of the Polish trade unions. He published material on the participation of Polish revolutionists in the Paris Commune.

Thus there can be no doubt that the trial that was just held, like the one in which Modzelewski and Kuron were condemned last summer, were trials aimed against revolutionists, against Communists struggling against a bureaucratic regime, a regime which in Poland is vainly seeking to win the good graces of the Catholic church, including the Vatican.

The fate of Communists victimized in this way by Gomulka is of concern to all revolutionists throughout the world. A man like Ludwig, who spent seventeen years of his life in one of Stalin's camps, cannot be allowed to be locked up again for long years simply because he is a Communist.

#### GREEK WORKERS AND STUDENTS AGAIN IN ACTION

Some 50,000 municipal workers in the major cities of Greece temporarily suspended their strike February 1 in order to give the government time to pass legislation that will presumably grant the concessions they had been demanding on wages and pensions. The effects of the strike became quite perceptible during the nine days the workers were out as hundreds of tons of garbage accumulated in the streets.

Troops were brought in by the government in a move directed against the strikers. Some baked bread while others drove buses and collected garbage. They proved insufficient, however, to make up for the labor of the 50,000 workers on strike.

More than 2,000 students met at the University of Athens February 1 in order "to defend trade-union and university rights." Among the slogans were: "For free university unionism"; "The struggle of the students is a struggle for social justice"; "Fascism shall not pass"; "Democracy!"

The students acclaimed Georges Papandreou, the premier ousted by the king last summer, demanded the resignation of the new administration and called for new elections.

When the students set out through the streets to visit the national ministry of education, the police refused to let them march in a body. Fighting broke out in which seven students and eight policemen were seriously injured.

The violence of the police was denounced by the journals of organizations favoring a return to democracy in Greece.

The strike of the municipal workers and the reappearance of Athenian students in the streets may herald a resumption of the struggle that shook the monarchy last summer.

BACKGROUND TO GEN. IRONSI'S TAKE-OVER

By Dick Roberts

The military coup in Nigeria, January 15, brought to an abrupt close the first phase of Nigeria's political independence from England. Nigeria, with a total population of nearly 50,000,000, and an organized working class of over 1,000,000, had been the "pilot test" of neocolonial bourgeois democracy in Africa.

Nigeria's indigenous bourgeoisie, which had been given years of training in the colonial administration of the country, was supposed to become the model ruling class for Africa. Nigeria's leaders were heralded by the imperialist world as the "most able," the "most responsible," the "most reliable," African politicians.

Nigeria was on the road to becoming a major arena for capital investment and one of the largest markets in Africa for imperialist products. Nigeria was considered a dependable ally of the Western World and she had been granted increasingly larger loans to maintain financial stability by the International Monetary Fund.

In one fell swoop, however, these "highly reliable" leaders and their closest associates, even including the trusted financial minister, were struck down. The framework of parliamentary democracy was abolished, and the army established martial law.

In point of fact, the Nigerian "experiment" was destined to failure from the beginning. The five-year period of independence, dating to October 1, 1960, far from being a period of stable political development, was one fraught with crises.

The Nigerian bourgeoisie was ridden with internal rivalries, particularly between the leaders of the more developed southern regions and the feudal, even slave-owning emirs of the Moslem Northern Region. And the working class delivered heavy blows at the capitalist rulers, particularly in the south, time after time.

Far from proving that bourgeois democracy could work in the "Third World," the Nigerian experience showed the utter incapacity of the indigenous bourgeoisie to solve the problems of economic development within the framework of a parliamentary democracy. Long before this "democracy" crumbled in January, it had become little more than a masquerade, barely disguising colossally fraudulent elections throughout the land, and depending upon harsh repressions of the militant working-class leadership.

Events leading to the January crisis can be traced to June, 1964, when Nigerian workers conducted a general strike for higher wages which paralyzed the country for two weeks. The strike had loomed since the trade unions formed a Joint Action Committee shortly after the country became a republic, in October 1963.

This committee brought together all sections of the trade-union movement, which range from a right wing associated with the ICFTU (International Confederation of Trade Unions), to a left wing led by the long-standing radical labor leader, Michael Imoudu. The left wing included the Nigerian Trade Union Congress, a member of the WFTU (World Federation of Trade Unions), controlled by an independent Nigerian political party, the Socialist Workers, Artisans and Farmers party (SWAFP).

The Joint Action Committee had called for a federal minimum wage equivalent to \$56 a month. Under this pressure, the government set up a commission to make recommendations for improving wages and working conditions. The commission, however, dallied interminably, and a strike was prepared May 30, simply to demand that the commission hand down a report.

The government responded by attempting to break up the May 30 meeting, injuring dozens of people in a fight which ensued, and arresting many of the leaders. Word of this action precipitated the general strike. In some places, workers occupied the factories and set up political committees -- ultimately leading to the formation of the Nigerian Labour party (NLP), under Imoudu's leadership. The NLP drew into its ranks the more militant workers, including the left wing of the SWAFP.

Although the strike gained only half the minimum wage originally demanded, it shook the government to the core, and served warning of mass social ferment, barely beneath the surface. In the following weeks, the government attempted to crack down on labor militants, arrested many leaders, and banned public meetings in the large cities.

The deep effect of the general strike on the Nigerian ruling class could be seen in the elections of December 1964, which were the country's first federal elections following independence. In these elections, the five largest bourgeois political parties formed two opposing coalitions.

On one side stood the United Progressive Grand Alliance (UPGA), a coalition of more moderate bourgeois politicians whose strength lay mainly in the Western, Midwest and Eastern regions of the south. Their main and only goal was to wrest political control of the country out of the hands of the emirs of the Northern Region and their cohorts in the Western Region.

UPGA was composed of three parties. The predominant one was the National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) which traces its history back to the mid-war period, when it was the most militant Nigerian nationalist organization in the struggle for independence, under the leadership of Nnamdi Azikiwe. Over two decades later, however, the NCNC had become thoroughly conservatized, as could be seen in Azikiwe's own behavior in these elections.

With the NCNC were the Northern Elements' Progressive Union (NEPU) and the Action Group (AG). NEPU is the progressive capital-



ist party of the Northern Region -- where even moderate capitalist politicians are subject to intensive pressure by the emirs, face possible prison sentences, and often are not allowed to hold meetings.

Action Group is probably the Nigerian capitalist party closest to the demands and pressures of the masses at the present time. Drawing most of its support from the Western Region, AG leaders had begun as early as 1955 to attempt to pressure Nigerian politics in a nationalist direction; but AG's leader, Chief Awolowo, was convicted in August 1962 on grounds that he was preparing to take over the government, and is still in prison.

UPGA was supported by the pro-ICFTU wing of the trade-union movement, and SWAFP attempted to join the UPGA front, but was rejected.

In response to UPGA, the Northern emirs entered into a coalition with a right-wing split-off group from AG in the Western Region, the Nigerian National Democratic party (NNDP) under Chief Samuel Akintola. The emirate party of the Northern Region is called the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC) and was under the leadership of the premier of the Northern Region, Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Sardauna of Sokoto, and Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa. The coalition with Akintola called itself the Nigerian National Alliance (NNA).

This alliance showed, of course, that in the final analysis the traditionalist Northern rulers could be found to be more interested in a stable federal government than their own regional control. NNA and UPGA, each in a different way, cut across the regional and tribal divisions of the land.

Imoudu's National Labour party did not attempt to join the popular front in UPGA, and instead ran its own candidates for the first time.

As the 1964 elections neared, Nigeria became the scene of an intense factional struggle. In the Northern Region, NEPU was almost completely repressed, and NPA announced that it would run "unopposed" in most of the districts.

In the Western Region, Akintola's goons harassed and beat up AG candidates. Only in the Eastern Region, where NCNC candidate Dr. Michael Okpara ran relatively unopposed by the NNA coalition was politics anything like normal. Talk of a secession by the Eastern Region in objection to the heavy-handed dealings of the Balewa-Akintola coalition, however, was so much political ballyhoo, only designed to fire up tribal jealousies.

On the day before elections, the UPGA leadership in the Western Region announced that it would boycott the ballots. The result, naturally enough, was that it confused the masses even more than they had been by the preceding weeks of the campaign. SWAFP, although it wasn't in UPGA, announced that it would support the boycott also.

NNA was returned to power, literally unopposed in most of the country. Okpara was elected in the East, in spite of the boycott, but the total votes cast, about 4,000,000, was only half the votes cast in the 1959 elections preceding independence, and reflected general apathy on the part of the populace to the electoral debacle.

Had UPGA refused to accept the election results, it would have likely precipitated civil chaos. Instead, Azikiwe read the danger signals, and entered into a compromise with Balewa, whereby the election results would stand in all areas except those, particularly in the Western Region, where UPGA candidates would have been elected if they hadn't followed the boycott. The new elections were held in March 1965 and were relatively without incident by previous agreement of the ruling parties.

Azikiwe's compromise was strongly condemned by the militant rank and file of UPGA. The Zikest youth group attacked its founder for his "gross betrayal of those nationalists whose sacrifices had made independence possible." Thus, in the end, the compromise only deepened the hostility of the militants towards the electoral machines, and set the stage for an even bitterer electoral struggle in the Western regional elections of October 1965.

These elections were a straight two-party contest between Akintola's ruling NNDP and the Action Group, which was highly popular after Akintola's previous behavior in the 1964 elections and the heavy police repressions which had followed. In an "impartial" vote, there is no question AG would have come out the victor, particularly in Lagos, which would have seen large-scale working-class support for Chief Awolowo's party.

But Akintola had nothing of this kind in mind. The elections were completely rigged, with most of the pro-AG electoral officials thrown in jail on the day of voting. Besides wide arrests, AG candidates were often prevented from speaking. The official result was a 3-1 victory in favor of NNDP.

The October election fraud led to the severest political crisis in Nigeria's history. Far from accepting the results, crowds all over the Western Region took to the streets, day after day, for over a month, overturning cars, burning homes, and fighting the police. By November 7, the New York Times reported 50 deaths, hundreds of arrests, and fire and arson damage estimated at \$560,000 in Lagos, alone.

By mid-November, Akintola was able to establish police rule in Lagos. Top AG leaders were imprisoned, the AG newspapers were banned and their editors arrested, and it was established a crime to listen to the anti-Akintola Eastern Region radio. At least, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson could attend the January 10 meeting of the Commonwealth nations in Lagos to discuss the Rhodesian crisis without the annoyance of local rioting.

In the Lagos suburb of Mushin, however, violence broke out.

on the eve of the conference and policemen opened fire on the crowd with automatic rifles.

The military seizure occurred six days later.

It is now clear that the entire military take over was carefully planned, and that the so-called division between the young officers who slew the Sultan of Sokoto and Sir Abubakar, and General Aguiyi-Ironsi who emerged in control, was simply a front to take blame off Ironsi's shoulders for assassinating the "cherished" leaders. Major Nzeogwu, who killed the Sardauna, has since been "reconciled" with Ironsi.

It is also evident that the UPGA leadership had no qualms about accepting a military take-over. Besides the two leaders of NPC, Akintola was murdered, along with the Finance Minister, Chief Festus Okitie-Eboh, a former member of UPGA who had gone over to the NNA after the 1964 elections.

Azikiwe and Okpara have not been touched.

This is not to say that Ironsi's coup represents an UPGA military front. Ironsi, himself, was always closer to the NNA. In 1962, he had been sent into the Congo as the head of the Nigerian contribution to the UN "peace-keeping" force; he became commander of the UN forces in 1964; and he had been appointed major general by Balewa in 1965.

It is not clear at this time what the attitude is of the two labor parties to the new government. That they will be the first targets of further repressions to follow, goes without saying. Most likely they will give tacit support to the military regime while attempting to gain time to regroup and form a viable opposition.

While promising to reform the "corruptions" of government, and build new housing for the poor, etc., Ironsi has also promised not to nationalize property, and so far, has not raised any eyebrows in London or Washington.

The Nigerian coup is a further setback to the African revolution. It proves -- if proof were needed -- that there is no real alternative between capitalist dictatorship and revolutionary socialism for the underdeveloped countries of the continent. In Nigeria, it will open a new period of instability, but one which will sharpen the pressure against the working class and the forces of the left.

#### MIR CONFIRMS LOBATON STILL ALIVE

The Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario declared in a letter quoted in the February 1 Le Monde that the news published about the alleged death of Guillermo Lobaton, leader of one of the guerrilla fronts in Peru, is "absolutely false."

## CASTRO'S CLOSING SPEECH AT TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

(We are reproducing below the complete text of the speech made by Fidel Castro January 15 at the close of the Tricontinental Conference held in Havana. The translation is the official one published in the January 16 issue of the special English edition of the daily Granma provided for delegates at the gathering. We have attempted to follow the text exactly, correcting only a few obvious typographical errors.

(In our opinion the first part of the speech contains much that is commendable, particularly its bold defiance of imperialism and its eloquent appeal for militant resistance against the aggressive moves of imperialism. We share in particular the view that true peace can be achieved in Vietnam only "when the Yankee imperialists no longer occupy the territory or part of the territory of Viet Nam and when the Yankee imperialists withdraw their mercenary troops and dismantle their military bases in the territory of Viet Nam."

(In the first part of his speech, Castro stresses the need for unity in the difficult struggle against the imperialist foe. Unfortunately, in the last part of his speech he violates the very precepts he has just advocated so forcefully. He singles out a sector of the revolutionary forces for attack on a basis reminiscent of Stalin's time. His target is "Trotskyism." We have scheduled for the next issue of World Outlook a full reply by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938. This reply, we think, will prove to be of considerable interest to all well-wishers of the Cuban Revolution.

(Meanwhile, we should like to point to just two of the glaring flaws in Castro's attack. (1) Neither the publications he cites nor the individuals he mentions are Trotskyist. Aside from "Felipe Albaguante, leader of the Mexican Trotskyites," a creation of the Mexico City El Universal and United Press International or even more sinister agencies, Castro quotes lengthily from only one person who claims to be "Trotskyist." Castro does not identify him. We will. The lengthy quotations are utterances of Posadas, the obscure leader of a small group that split from the official Trotskyist movement a few years ago. Posadas holds opinions about the world situation that only a crank could entertain; they have nothing to do with Trotskyism or any other rational outlook as can easily be verified by anyone genuinely interested in ascertaining the facts. (2) Besides refraining from quoting from official Trotskyist publications, all of which strongly support the Cuban Revolution, Castro says nothing about the North American Trotskyists who are struggling on a not unimportant front as revolutionary socialists. The truth is that the Trotskyists in the United States and Canada have not only stood in the forefront of the defense of the Cuban Revolution from the beginning -- and pointed to it as an example for all Latin America and a source of immense inspiration to revolutionary socialists in the heartland of imperialism -- they have constituted one of the main

sources inside the United States and Canada of documentary material about revolutionary Cuba. It should be sufficient to point out that they have published more speeches by Fidel Castro and the other Cuban leaders than any other political tendency in the English-speaking world.

(Castro's attack against "Trotskyism" will not change the attitude of the Trotskyists toward revolutionary Cuba. Their support is based on the solid principles of class solidarity with a workers state under imperialist blockade and attack and not on personal admiration for individual leaders however brilliant their role. At the same time it is not the custom of the Trotskyist movement to let an attack of this kind go by without reply. To do so would be a disservice to the struggle for a socialist world, not to mention the interests of truth. As we indicated above, the official answer of the Fourth International has been scheduled for reproduction in the next issue of World Outlook.)

\* \* \*

Distinguished Delegates,

Cuban Comrades:

The significance of this event which culminates tonight does not escape us. Despite the auguries and predictions of imperialism, revealing the imperialists' great hopes that this Conference would bear no fruit, that this Conference, in treating problems of the international communist movement, was bound to be divided and doomed to failure, the results of the Conference have been what they least expected: the Conference has been a success; this Conference has created a Tricontinental Organization; it has arrived at agreements which represent the most heartfelt aspirations of the peoples struggling for their liberation; it has created a Committee of Aid to Liberation Movements. And not only that, there is yet another agreement which unquestionably pains the imperialists very much: that is, that Cuba has been chosen as the headquarters of the Executive Secretariat of the Organization until the next Tricontinental Conference is held. (Applause.)

It is not a question of expressing here a feeling of national pride. Because of the particular circumstances of our country, its geographical position, the efforts of imperialists to isolate it from the world, and the measures adopted to prevent practically anyone from visiting us, the fact that this Conference has taken place so successfully in our homeland, in addition to the fact that despite all obstacles and difficulties, our country has been considered the appropriate place for its temporary headquarters, undoubtedly pains the Yankee imperialists extraordinarily.

Therefore, this has been a great victory for the revolutionary movement. Never before has a meeting of such wide scope and magnitude taken place, in which the revolutionary representatives of 82 countries have gathered to discuss problems of common interest.

Never before has there been so broad a meeting. The peoples of three continents are represented here, the revolutionary movements of the peoples of three continents, having a common anti-imperialist position, representing the struggles of their peoples, representing different philosophical ideas or positions and different religious beliefs, representatives in many cases of different ideologies, but having in common the most important factor which today unites the peoples of these three continents and the whole world: the fight against imperialism (APPLAUSE) -- the fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism, against racism and, finally, against all those phenomena which are the contemporary expression of what we must call imperialism, having its center, principal axis, and principal support in Yankee imperialism.

And that which the peoples of our epoch have in common, was what made possible the meeting, the agreements and the conclusions of this Conference. Obviously it was not an easy task. It might seem to be, but it was not nor could it be an easy task, because at a meeting of representatives of peoples so diverse, of movements so different, with particular problems which involve practically all the contemporary problems of the world, it was not easy. Without arduous labor, the development of criteria and agreements acceptable to all could not have been achieved.

In these past few days, as we have been discussing different questions and as we discussed the Final Declaration, we remembered how Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (Applause) worked for many months developing and writing the Communist Manifesto and how they published it only after having rewritten, retouched and perfected it a great number of times.

And naturally, in our Conference, lasting only two weeks -- less than two weeks -- in only a few days, we had to draw up a document incorporating all the different criteria, drafted in such a way as to satisfy all delegations as fully as possible. In spite of these limitations, the final document is, without doubt, the profoundest, most complete, the most radical of any that has been drafted and agreed upon in any Conference of this kind.

For the first time, the representatives of the peoples of Latin America took part in a meeting together with the peoples of Africa and Asia. Naturally, in the case of Latin America, the majority or almost all of the representatives belong to liberation movements and represent peoples who are fighting or will fight for liberation. And our delegation represented the only people totally liberated from Yankee domination, and wielding revolutionary power.

We understand that this Conference will undoubtedly occupy a place in the history of the struggle of the peoples for their liberation, in the history of the revolutionary movement. Likewise, we understand that the bonds established, the ties created among all the movements, the increase of the strength of the revolution, and the organizations established, will play an unquestionable role in the aid, solidarity and growth of revolutionary struggle.

We have had the opportunity to acquaint ourselves more profoundly, in greater detail, with the thinking and concrete situation of each of the movements fighting for liberation at present. We have had the opportunity of learning about the concrete situation of each of the peoples who are fighting and, above all, we have had the opportunity of witnessing the growth of solidarity among the peoples (Applause), the increase of the strength of the revolutionary movement on a world scale, and how the aid of the peoples to each other, the aid of all the peoples to each people engaged in the struggle -- aid on a scale and at a level never known before to mankind -- grows and will be able to grow in the future.

And how in spite of the military and technological power of the imperialists, the united strength of revolutionary peoples will be unquestionably more powerful. (Applause.)

Imperialism will be inevitably defeated. Who have taught us this lesson? The peoples have taught it to us. Who among the peoples have in our times taught us the most extraordinary lesson? The people of Viet Nam (Applause). Viet Nam is a small country. The imperialists have divided it into two parts: North and South Viet Nam. For us, for revolutionaries, there is only one Viet Nam. (Applause.)

The Yankee imperialists have unleashed a large part of their power against the people of South Viet Nam. Hundreds of thousands of regular soldiers of the imperialist armed forces, as well as hundreds of thousands of soldiers drafted by the puppet government, hundreds of planes, thousands of helicopters; and yet Yankee imperialism has not been able to crush this part of the people of Viet Nam.

Trying to intimidate their brothers of the other part of Viet Nam, they started daily bombings with hundreds of planes, to force their surrender, to try to make the Vietnamese kneel down. And yet, according to what the imperialists themselves confess, instead of gaining ground they have lost ground. And, to the astonishment of the world, the people of Viet Nam, showing the most extraordinary example of heroism known in the history of any liberation movement -- because a revolutionary movement never had to face more powerful forces -- are frustrating and defeating Yankee imperialist might.

But they not only bomb Viet Nam. They also continuously bomb the patriots of Laos (Applause) and threaten to bomb and attack the people of Cambodia (Applause). This attitude, these threats of the Yankee imperialists, reveal their impotence and their despair. They are the consequence of a situation which becomes ever more critical for them in that part of the world, the consequence of the defeats they have been suffering in that region of Asia where, undoubtedly, a decisive battle is being waged between the peoples and imperialism, not Yankee imperialism alone, but also Yankee imperialism and its allies, Yankee imperialism and its partners in adventure in Asia. This situation is manifested by the mobilization of South Korean, Australian and Thai soldiers and by the attempts to obtain

the complicity, either in the form of military forces or auxiliary troops, from the largest possible number of governments in the world.

This battle against the peoples of Viet Nam and Laos, together with the threats against Cambodia, shows the need for increasing to the utmost the help and solidarity to those peoples.

Yankee imperialists enjoy there the help of one state, Thailand, where they have numerous bases and a considerable number of troops, and from where they threaten Laos, Viet Nam and Cambodia.

This does not mean that such a situation will last indefinitely; we are sure that, as in the case of the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia, the time will come when the people of Thailand will demand a settling of accounts from the Yankee imperialists. (Applause.) The time will come when that country, also oppressed and exploited, inspired by the example of neighbouring brother peoples, will also join the struggle against the imperialists. But in the meantime, the imperialists have not only carried the war to Viet Nam, to the whole of Viet Nam, as well as to Laos, but they are also threatening Cambodia. And Cambodia is a small country, not yet attacked, but seriously threatened by Yankee imperialists. And therefore the need arises for us, the revolutionary states, to help strengthen the defenses of the small country of Cambodia. (Applause.)

While talking with the representative of Cambodia, during his participation in the Tricontinental Conference, when we heard from his own lips the situation of his country and the dangers which threaten it, we told him our opinion. And we also told him that although we are a small State a long way from Cambodia, we Cubans are ready to contribute, to the extent of our strength, to help strengthen their defenses (Applause), and that all we need is for them to tell us, all we need is for them to ask, in any circumstances, whenever they consider it necessary, and we are ready to give our contribution.

And we are ready to do the same with respect to Laos and with respect to North Viet Nam and to South Viet Nam! (Applause.)

We are a small State, quite close to the coast of the imperialist Metropolis; our arms are eminently defensive, but our men, our revolutionary militants, our combatants (Applause) are ready to fight wholeheartedly against the imperialists in any part of the world (Applause). Our country is small, and even though our territory may be partially occupied by the enemy, that would never mean that we would stop fighting.

The world is big and the imperialists are everywhere. And for Cuban revolutionaries, the battlefield against imperialism covers the whole globe! (Prolonged applause.)

Without boasting and without immodesty, that is the way we Cuban revolutionaries understand our internationalist duty; that is



the way our people understand their duty, because they realize that the enemy is one and the same: the same who attacks our coasts and our land, the same who attacks others. And because of that we state and proclaim that revolutionary movements in any corner of the globe can count on Cuban combatants. (Prolonged applause.)

Thousands upon thousands of Cubans have expressed their desire and willingness to go to any part of the world, wherever they may be needed, to aid the revolutionary movement. (Applause.)

And this is logical.

If Yankee imperialists take the liberty of bombing wherever they wish and of sending their mercenary troops to suppress the revolutionary movement in any part of the world, revolutionary peoples feel they have the right to help, even with their physical presence (Applause), the peoples who fight against the Yankee imperialists.

And thus, if each one helps according to his capacity, if each one helps according to his possibilities, the Yankee imperialists will be defeated. And if there is any place where they are doomed to suffer a crushing defeat, that place is South East Asia (Applause).

Because there it is possible to establish a correlation of forces incomparably superior to those of the Yankee imperialists.

That is why we have not the slightest doubt that they will be defeated, that they will be crushed by the peoples themselves of that area, and if they increase their forces and those of their reactionary allies, they will be defeated not only by the forces of the peoples of that area, but by the forces of the socialist camp and of the other peoples. (Applause.) That is why the Yankee imperialists launch their hypocritical peace offensive in order to create confusion and deception. And that is why the peoples of Viet Nam have correctly stated that peace, true peace, can only be achieved when the Yankee imperialists cease attacking, when the Yankee imperialists no longer occupy the territory or part of the territory of Viet Nam and when the Yankee imperialists withdraw their mercenary troops and dismantle their military bases in the territory of Viet Nam.

That is to say, they have told the imperialists the only thing that under these circumstances they could tell them: that true peace -- since they are the only disturbers of the peace -- will be achieved when they withdraw from Viet Nam. (Applause.)

And it is evident that the imperialists are waging a hopeless fight there, that the imperialists are waging a fight which will inevitably lead them to defeat. And, consequently, they want to turn defeat into a false peace.

And it is logical for the people of Viet Nam to refuse this; it is logical for the people of Viet Nam to be unwilling to trade their victory for this sort of false peace.

And if we were in a similar situation, I am completely sure that we would say exactly the same. (Applause.) We would refuse to negotiate while under bombardment, we would refuse to negotiate in the midst of aggression, we would refuse to negotiate while under occupation.

And that is why our people and the Conference unanimously supported the positions and the points set forth by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the Liberation Movement of South Viet Nam. (Applause.)

On this question, on this theme, the most burning issue of the present moment, there was practically unanimous agreement. And it is very good for the Yankee imperialists to know the degree of solidarity of the peoples of the world with South Viet Nam. It is good for the Yankee imperialists to understand the degree of support that the people of Viet Nam have throughout the world.

For that reason we consider that this Conference of Solidarity of the peoples of the three continents has expressed itself and has acted in such a way that the support and the feelings of solidarity towards Viet Nam have been made evident, and that this, furthermore will grow. And what is felt for Viet Nam is also felt for Laos and Cambodia, the other peoples in that area who have been attacked, or run the risk of being attacked. In all the problems of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the position of the Conference was similar.

The peoples and the liberation movements of Africa and in order not to leave out any, I also want to mention that, in that zone of Asia, a small country is struggling to win its liberation. That people, though not very well known, is a people that is struggling bravely: the people of North Kalimantan (Applause) received the warm support of the Conference, as also did the people of Yemen and the people of Palestine (Applause).

Those from Africa -- as I was saying before -- the liberation movements which were so worthily represented at this Conference; the people of Portuguese-occupied Guinea and those of the Cape Verde Islands, represented here by one of the most serious revolutionary movements of Africa (Applause), and by one of the most talented and brilliant leaders of Africa, comrade Amilcar Cabral (Applause), who made us feel tremendous confidence in the future and in the success of their fight for liberation; the liberation movement of Angola and Mozambique, two other Portuguese colonies (Applause) who fight arms-in-hand for their liberation; the people of Zimbabwe, oppressed by the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia (Applause); the people of the Congo (Leopoldville) (Applause); the oppressed people of South Africa (Applause); the Protectorates of Swaziland, Bechuanaland and Basutoland (Applause), the names of which reveal in their grammatical roots the imperial profile of the country that colonized them. And thus, all the liberation movements of Africa were represented with dignity and had the warm support and solidarity of all the delegates.

In Africa, the imperialist attempts to penetrate, divide and subdue are more evident each day. During the last weeks, coups d'etat have become fashionable. Coup d'etat in the Congo; coup d'etat in the Central African Republic; coup d'etat in Nigeria, as the cables report, demonstrating the desperate efforts of imperialism to fortify its domination of that part of the world.

In Africa, a decisive struggle is also being waged, and the role of revolutionary movements, the role of the new states which have not been contaminated by the evils of neo-colonialism, will be of extraordinary importance in resisting this pressure and this penetration on the part of the imperialists. Because there, the help given the revolutionary movement, the determined aid to liberation movements, the determined aid given the majorities oppressed by racists, will be a decisive factor. The sense of responsibility, the seriousness and the unity of African revolutionary leaders will be equally decisive.

Some movements have suffered certain blows, they have suffered certain setbacks. But these setbacks must not cause discouragement; they must serve as an experience, they must serve as a lesson, so that measures may be adopted and the necessary steps taken to overcome the present difficulties, and thus overcome the faults and weaknesses of the revolutionary movement.

The movement of solidarity, which started in Africa and Asia, and has already extended to the third continent of the world oppressed and exploited by imperialism, will celebrate its next meeting -- by agreement of the Conference -- in the city of Cairo, accepting the invitation of President Nasser (Applause), who offered the capital of the United Arab Republic as the site of the next Tricontinental Conference in 1968; and we are certain -- and we must dedicate our best efforts to that end -- that, by that date, among the peoples who have liberated themselves from imperialism and colonialism, we will greet several more brother peoples of Africa (Applause).

The problems of Latin America -- starting with the most burning, the most critical issue: the problem of the military occupation of the Dominican Republic by the regular troops of Yankee imperialism -- have merited the attention of this Conference and the full support of the delegates representing their respective peoples.

Latin America faces in the years to come, on the Dominican scene, one of its most serious struggles. The Dominican Republic, a small country occupied by tens of thousands of Yankee soldiers, faces a long and hard struggle. The Dominican Republic, the Dominican people, must not confront Yankee imperialism alone. (Applause.)

In many other nations of America there are ample conditions for armed revolutionary struggle. This struggle has been underway, for some time now, in Venezuela (Applause), in Peru (Applause), in Colombia (Applause), and in Guatemala (Applause).

In Latin America there should not be just one, or two, or

three peoples struggling alone against imperialism. The correlation of forces of the imperialists on this Continent, the proximity of its metropolitan territory, the zeal with which they will try to defend their dominions in this part of the world, require a common strategy on this Continent, more than anywhere else: a common and simultaneous struggle. (Applause.) If the imperialists have to face not just the Dominican people alone, or the Guatemalan people alone, or the Venezuelan people alone, or the Colombian people alone, or the Peruvian people alone; if they must also fight -- at the same time as in each of these countries -- against other oppressed peoples, such as those of Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, Ecuador, Argentina (Applause) and other peoples of Central America; if the struggle is carried out on a broad scale, if each one of these peoples, if each one of the revolutionaries of this continent fulfills his duty -- and the duty of every revolutionary, as stated in the Declaration of Havana, is to carry out the revolution (Applause and Shouts), but to carry it out not with words but with deeds (Applause), to be a revolutionary, not only in theory, but in practice (Applause and Shouts) -- if revolutionaries devote less of their energy and time to theorizing and more to practical work, and if they don't emit so many agreements, alternatives and dilemmas, and finally understand that sooner or later all, or nearly all, of the peoples will have to fight, arms in hand, for their liberation (Applause and Shouts); then the hour of liberation of this continent will be nearer.

And among the people who theorize, and those who criticize the ones who theorize while also theorizing themselves (Laughter), quite a lot of energy and time is unfortunately lost.

We believe that on this continent, in all or almost all countries, the struggle will assume more violent forms. And when one is aware of this, the only correct thing to do is to prepare for the time when that struggle arrives: prepare! (Applause.)

Naturally, this struggle will first explode where -- as stated in the Declaration of Havana -- the conditions of imperialist oppression are more inhuman, where all doors are absolutely closed, such as in the majority of the countries on this continent. And even in the countries where the bourgeoisie and imperialism impose their class domination through constitutional means, as is the case of Uruguay, evidence can be found, increasingly clear, of the force of the mass movements and the revolutionary spirit of the people (Applause).

And we must express the great sympathy of our country towards Uruguay, because it is a very, very small country, with no mountains, surrounded by two giant reactionary countries, but where invariably, without exception, under all circumstances Uruguay's solidarity and support of the Cuban Revolution has always been similar to that given by the people of Venezuela (Applause).

We still remember how, immediately after the breaking of

diplomatic relations with Cuba, because of the OAS decision imposed by the United States as a sanction against Cuba, the people of Uruguay, guided by their revolutionary organizations, went into the streets to protest with incomparable energy against that servile and traitorous act towards a people of this continent.

So with reference to this problem of Latin America, distinguished delegates, allow me to speak at length on some questions, since we are situated on this continent.

The Yankee imperialists not only have used the economic blockade against us, not only have they used armed aggressions, not only have they mortally threatened us under certain circumstances, not only have they carried out against this country all kinds of sabotages, infiltration of spies, and pirate raids, but Yankee imperialism has employed more subtle weapons against our country, such as the weapons of propaganda and slander. In addition to this, Yankee imperialism and its agents have tried to destroy the prestige of the Cuban Revolution; they have tried to picture the Cuban Revolution as alien to the revolutionary struggles of this continent, and have tried to discredit the Revolution in a most vile and slanderous manner. They have availed themselves of all means, of all events, of all weapons.

Of course, the imperialists would like a detailed discussion of these problems; an irresponsible person, a charlatan, a puppet of any sort, does not mind making any kind of irresponsible charge or uttering any sort of calumny.

It is well known that only the enemy is interested in the way this word, called solidarity, is carried out in practice, not only among the revolutionary peoples of this continent, but those of all the world (Applause).

But what has happened? There is a fact I am going to mention, as an example showing how imperialism and its agents work, and it is extremely interesting. I refer to the campaign carried out by imperialism and its agents with regard to the departure of our comrade, Ernesto Guevara (Applause).

I think this is a matter which has to be taken by the "horns" (Laughter) in order to make some things clearer.

A few revolutionaries in this country, and some few outside of this country, know when comrade Ernesto Guevara left, what he has been doing all this time; and of course the imperialists would be most eager to learn, in every detail, where he is, what he has done, how he is doing it.

Of course, apparently they do not know it and, if they do, they conceal it. (Laughter.)

But naturally, these are matters which in time, when circumstances allow it, will be clarified. However, for us, revolutionaries, these clarifications are not necessary; it is the

enemy who tries to use these circumstances in order to scheme, to create confusion and to slander.

Comrade Guevara joined us during our exile in Mexico, and always, from the very first day, he clearly expressed the idea that when the struggle was completed in Cuba, he would have other duties to fulfill in another place, and we always gave him our word that no State interest, no national interest, no circumstances would lead us to ask him to remain in our country, or hinder him from carrying out that wish, that desire. And we fully and faithfully kept that promise made to comrade Guevara (Applause).

Naturally, if comrade Guevara was going to leave the country, it was logical for him to do it secretly, it was logical for him to move secretly, it was logical for him not to be in contact with journalists, it was logical for him not to give any press conferences. It was logical for him to act as he did, because of the task he proposed to undertake.

And, yet, how the imperialists have tried to derive profit from this circumstance and how they have used it!

That is why I have brought some papers with me. Don't be alarmed, thinking that I am going to read all of them. I am merely going to read several things, for here is what all imperialist and bourgeois papers have written with regard to the case of Major Guevara, what the newspapers in the United States have written, their magazines, their news agencies, the bourgeois newspapers of Latin America and those of the entire world. And let us see who, precisely, have been the main spokesmen in the imperialist campaign of intrigue and slander against Cuba in regard to the case of comrade Guevara. To begin with, certain elements have been used constantly during the last decades against the revolutionary movement.

And so, if you will concede me a little time, I will look for a very interesting item among a great many.

Ah, I found it. (Laughter and Applause.) This is a UPI cable dated December 6, 1965, which reads: "Ernesto Guevara was murdered by Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro (Shouts) following orders from the USSR" (Shouts) "declared Felipe Albaguante, leader of the Mexican Trotskyites, in a statement made to El Universal. He adds that Che was liquidated because he insisted on aligning Cuba with the Chinese line." (Shouts.)

This, naturally, was in tone with a campaign that Trotskyite elements began to launch everywhere simultaneously.

And on October 22, the weekly Marcha published an article in which a well-known Trotskyite theorist, Adolfo Gilly, stated that Che had left Cuba because of differences with Fidel arising from the Sino-Soviet conflict, and that Che could not impose his opinions on the leadership. He said that Che, in a confused manner, advocated extending the Revolution to the rest of Latin America, in opposition to the Soviet line; that the Cuban leadership is divided

between a conservative wing, including old leaders of the Popular Socialist Party and the followers of Che and Fidel, with his team in a central oscillating and conciliatory position. He added that Che had left Cuba because he lacked means to express himself, and that Fidel was afraid to face the masses and explain Che's case.

This same Trotskyite theorist on October 31, 1965, writing in the Italian publication Nuovo Mondo in an article branding the Cuban leadership as pro-Soviet and accusing Fidel of not having explained politically to the people what had happened to Che. He says that Major Guevara was defeated by the Popular Socialist Party and the Castroite team; he criticises Che for not having taken his struggle to impose his own political theory to the masses, and finishes by saying that the Cuban state, paralysed by its policy, did not openly support the Dominican Revolution.

And I am going to refer to this a bit more fully a little further on.

In the issue of October 1965 of the newspaper Batalla, organ of the Spanish Trotskyites, it was stated that the mystery surrounding the case of Che Guevara ought to be cleared up. It said that friends of Che supposed that the letter read by Castro was false and ask themselves whether the Cuban leadership tends towards submission to the Kremlin bureaucracy.

On approximately the same date, the official Trotskyite organ in Argentina published an article affirming that Che is dead, or in prison in Cuba. It said "...he entered into conflict with Fidel Castro because of the operation of the Trade Unions and the organization of the militia."

It added that "Che was opposed to the Central Committee being composed of the favorites of Castro, especially the army officers, followers of the Moscow right wing."

But one of the dirtiest, most insulting and most indecent writings was that by the leader of the Latin-American Political Bureau of the Fourth International in the Italian publication Lotta Operaia. From this article, extremely long, I shall read only three paragraphs.

It begins by saying:

"An aspect of the deepening of the worldwide crisis of bureaucracy is the expulsion of Guevara. Guevara was thrown out now, and not eight months ago. The discussion with Guevara lasted eight months; which were not spent drinking coffee; they have fought rigorously and perhaps there have been deaths; perhaps they discussed at gun point. We cannot say if Guevara has been killed or not, but the right to suppose that they have killed him exists. Why does Guevara not appear? They have not shown him in Havana, fearing the consequences, and the reaction of the population. But, after all, hiding him produces the same effect: the population asks why Guevara

does not come out, does not appear. There is no political accusation; he is politically praised.

"Why have they not shown Guevara? Why has he not spoken? How is it possible that one of the founders of the Cuban worker's state, who a short time ago travelled throughout the world on behalf of that worker's state, should suddenly say: I have grown weary of the Cuban Revolution; I will make revolution elsewhere?"

"On the other hand, they do not say where he has gone, and he does not show up. If there is no divergence, why does he not appear? The entire Cuban people understand that there is a tremendous struggle, and that this struggle is not over.

"Guevara was and is not alone. If they take such measures against Guevara, it is because he has great support. And besides this great support, there is enormous concern among the people.

"Not long ago, the Cuban Government published a rather severe decree: all arms must be returned to the State. At that moment, the issue was a bit confused. Now the objective of that resolution is clear: it was against the Guevara faction. They are afraid of an uprising."

Another paragraph: "Why have they silenced Guevara? The Fourth International must carry on a public campaign in this respect, demanding the appearance of Guevara, the right of Guevara to defend himself and discuss, appeal to the masses, not to trust the measures adopted by the Cuban government, because these are methods of bureaucrats and maybe murderers. They have eliminated Guevara to silence his struggle; they have silenced Guevara, despite the fact that his position was not consequent from the view point of a revolutionary, because it tried to harmonize his positions within the revolutionary trend."

And further on it says: "This demonstrates, not the power of Guevara or of a pro-Guevara group in Cuba, but the maturity of the conditions in the rest of the worker's states so that in a short time these positions will bear fruit. Bureaucracy is not deceived by procedures and methods of this kind. To bureaucracy, the elimination of Guevara means an attempt to eliminate a base for possible regrouping of revolutionary tendencies which continue to develop World Revolution. This is the basis of Guevara's elimination; and not only for the danger this represents to Cuba, but because it includes the rest of the Latin American Revolution.

"Guatemala is on Cuba's side, with the program of the Socialist Revolution. And notwithstanding its strength and the speeches of its leader, Fidel Castro, Cuba has not been able to prevent the transformation of the "13th of November" Movement into a socialist revolutionary movement which fights directly for socialism."

It is by no means a coincidence that this gentleman, leader of the Fourth International, mentions here very proudly the case of Guatemala and the "13th of November" Movement, because precisely



in regard to this Movement that Yankee imperialism has used one of the most subtle tactics to liquidate a revolutionary movement, that is, the infiltration of agents of the Fourth International in it, who brought it to adopt -- on account of the lack of political knowledge of the principal leader of this Movement -- this discredited thing, this anti-historic thing, this fraudulent thing which emanates from individuals so known to be at the service of Yankee imperialism, as is the program of the Fourth International.

How did this happen? Yon Sosa was, undoubtedly, a patriotic officer. Army officer -- as a movement of a group of Army officers -- as a matter of fact, the mercenary troops who later invaded Giron took part in the crushing of this movement -- and through an individual who was a merchant, who took charge of the political part of the movement, the Fourth International arranged matters so that this leader, lacking knowledge of the profound political and historical problems of revolutionary thought, allowed that agent of Trotskyism -- who we have not the slightest doubt is an agent of imperialism -- to take charge of editing a newspaper in which the program of the Fourth International was copied from head to tail.

What the Fourth International thus committed was a true crime against the revolutionary movement, to isolate it from the rest of the people, to isolate it from the masses, by corrupting it with the stupidities, the discredit and the repugnant and nauseating thing that is Trotskyism today within the field of politics. (Applause.) For if Trotskyism represented at a certain stage an erroneous position, but a position within the field of political ideas, Trotskyism became in later years a vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction.

These gentlemen reason in such a way that, for instance, with regard to South Viet Nam, where a vast revolutionary front has united the immense majority of the people and has closely grouped different sectors of the population around the liberation movement in the struggle against imperialism, to Trotskyites this is absurd, it is counterrevolutionary. And these gentlemen have the incredible effrontery to express themselves in this way when faced with the facts and the realities of history and of the revolutionary movements.

Fortunately, the revolutionary movement in Guatemala was saved. And it was saved because of the clear vision of one of the officers who, together with Sosa, had started the revolutionary movement, and who, on understanding that folly, that stupidity, broke away from the "13th of November Movement" and organized, with other progressive and revolutionary sectors, the Rebel Armed Forces of Guatemala (Applause).

And this young officer, who had such a clear vision of the situation, is the representative of the revolutionary movement of Guatemala in this Conference, Major Turcios (Prolonged Applause). Major Turcios has to his credit not only having been one of the first in the armed struggle for the liberation of his oppressed

people, but also the merit of having saved the Guatemalan revolutionary movement from one of the most subtle and perfidious stratagems of Yankee imperialism. He raised the revolutionary flag of Guatemala and its anti-imperialist movement, rescuing it from the dirty hands of mercenaries in the service of Yankee imperialism.

And we hope that Yon Sosa, whose patriotic intentions at the beginning of the struggle are not in doubt, and whose condition as an honest man is not in doubt -- although we do have very serious reservations about his attitude as a revolutionary leader -- will not take too long to separate himself from those elements and rejoin the revolutionary movement in Guatemala, but this time under another leadership, under another leader who demonstrated, in moments such as those, clarity of vision and the attitude of a revolutionary leader. (Applause.)

This position adopted by the Trotskyites is the same as that adopted by all the newspapers and news agencies of Yankee imperialism; the same as that adopted in the case of comrade Ernesto Guevara by all the imperialist press in the United States, by its news agencies, by the Cuban counterrevolutionary press, by the bourgeois press in all the Continent and in the rest of the world. That is to say, this campaign of slander and intrigue against Revolutionary Cuba in the case of comrade Guevara made all the reactionary and bourgeois sectors of the imperialists, all the slanders and all the intriguers against the Cuban Revolution, coincide exactly.

Because it is unquestionable that only reaction and only imperialism can be interested in discrediting the Cuban Revolution, in destroying the faith which the revolutionary movements have placed in the Cuban Revolution, in destroying the confidence the peoples of Latin America have placed in the Cuban Revolution, in destroying their faith. And that is the reason why they have not hesitated to use the filthiest and most indecent weapons.

This same Gilly, who once in a while poses among other U.S. intellectuals in the Monthly Review, a magazine of the United States, was villainous enough to write the following paragraph, which is well worth analyzing, on the crisis of the Dominican Republic. This is what he said:

"The culminating point of this crisis must have been the Dominican Revolution, where the State of the Cuban workers was paralyzed by its own policy, without openly supporting the Revolution, although in Cuba there was tremendous internal pressure for a policy of active support. If this crisis was previous to that of the Dominican Republic, undoubtedly the Dominican Republic hastened the revolution."

This person had the vileness to accuse the Cuban Revolution of not having given active aid to the Revolution in the Dominican Republic. And while the imperialists were accusing Cuba, while they were trying to justify their intervention with the pretext that leftists and Communists, trained in Cuba, were heading the uprising

there; while imperialism was accusing Cuba and presenting the Dominican Revolution, not as an internal question but as an external problem, this person accused the Revolution of not having given active aid.

And what does active aid mean? Did they expect that Cuba, whose weapons and resources are well known, could stop and should stop the landing of U.S. troops in the Dominican Republic? Cuba has weapons to defend itself and has these defense weapons in an infinitely inferior number with relation to the imperialists. And these gentlemen are so despicable, so shameless, that they blame Cuba for not having prevented... Because what else does active support mean? Because all that Cuba could do under those circumstances, all that it could have done, and should have done, it did. To ask Cuba to prevent the landing is like asking Cambodia in southeast Asia to prevent bombings of North Viet Nam, and to prevent occupation of South Viet Nam by Yankee marines. (Applause.)

Unfortunately, the forces of Cuba are limited. But to the extent of these forces, in the best way possible, and in the most decided manner, as well as the most adequate in the circumstances, Cuba lends and will lend its maximum support to the Revolution.

To those who believe that this country is afraid of the imperialists, to those who believe -- with a spirit of superiority or with insolent deliriums of superiority over everybody -- that this country is afraid of the imperialists -- it would have been worth their while to have lived a few hours, here, in this country, during the October Crisis, when, for the first time a small people like ours saw itself threatened with a massive attack of nuclear weapons on its territory, and to have seen the attitude taken by this people and the attitude taken by the Revolutionary Government (Applause).

A lot of nonsense, a lot of nonsense, a lot of foolishness is written, above all by irresponsible people, when certain documents cannot be published.

But some day mankind will know, and some day mankind will learn all the facts. That will be the day when the villains will see that comrade Guevara was not murdered; each of his steps will be fully known. They will also know then the position taken by Cuba in those difficult days, and how serene this people was. When that day comes there will be nobody, no matter how insolent, no matter how provocative, who will dare to doubt the feeling of solidarity of this people and the valor of this people -- that valor demonstrated by its conduct. Despite the fact that this is a country ninety miles from the imperialist metropolis, over whose head tremendous danger will hover during the coming years, to the same extent that the revolutionary movement grows -- the revolutionary movement that grows following, above all, the example of the Cuban Revolution -- the growing revolutionary movement, that increases because of the example of Cuba, because of the victories of Cuba, because of Cuba's posture before the enemy.

And we must keep in mind that when this country defies this danger, it is not a country having millions of men under arms, it is not a country having nuclear weapons, because here our missiles are moral (Applause); and the number of millions is not infinite, the number of men is not infinite, but the dignity and decorum of this people is infinite.

And the coming years will speak for us, and the coming years will be responsible for destroying the slanderers, not those who are known agents of the imperialists, but those who are confused, the intriguers, those who let themselves be misled and are used as tools to spread lies against our Revolution.

Highly rewarding is the fact that has been demonstrated in this Conference. Because in this Conference many things were proved. In the first place, it was proved how discussions can revolve, above all, around really interesting matters and around what is really important for the peoples who are struggling. It was proved how the peoples -- regardless of their strength, their resources and their size -- raise their voices and express their opinions, and how the peoples are capable of having their own criteria and their own independent voices. All this was demonstrated by this Conference. But, in addition, we Cubans feel satisfaction at knowing that the Cubans and the revolutionary movements, no matter from which continent, were always united in the same positions; and that the united force, the revolutionary criteria, and the most honest positions prevailed; that in this Conference -- as an answer to intriguers and slanderers, the peoples, the revolutionary liberation movements, at all times, demonstrated a great confidence, an immeasurable confidence in Cuba and its revolutionary Party; and that for this reason our country was honored by granting it the General Secretaryship and choosing it as the temporary headquarters of the Organization.

And considering the task which has been performed by the Cuban delegation, by the Cuban Committee for Solidarity, working on behalf of the Conference; tirelessly struggling in order to overcome all difficulties; maintaining at every moment an objective and just position of principles; even to the point of risking the relations of Cuba with some countries, as in the case of Indonesia, when it was left in the hands of the Cuban Delegation to make a decision, it rejected the official delegation of Indonesia, risking our relations with an important State in that part of the world.

And although for us all States are equally important, and all peoples are entitled to equal rights, in any event this fact should be an example of how fair the Cuban Delegation was, or tried to be just, tried to be objective and tried to maintain a position of principles.

We know how hard all the delegations worked, because in the opinion of many who have attended various international conferences this is one of the conferences where the most serious and tireless work has been done. Therefore, since the headquarters will be in Cuba, and Cuba will hold the position of Secretary General of the Organization, the Political Bureau of our Party has agreed to

appoint Comrade Osmany Cienfuegos, Secretary General of the Organization (Applause).

All the Delegations have had the opportunity of knowing the efforts, and the honesty with which these efforts were made by Comrade Osmany, both in the preparatory work and in the course of the Conference. It must be acknowledged that everybody cooperated, that all contributed, in one way or another, to unify viewpoints and to the success of this Conference.

For, as I said before, these viewpoints did not always coincide but everyone, in the end contributed to its success with a really disinterested effort.

I do not want to finish without referring to two matters: the deep concern that fills us all about the events in Indonesia, about the news from Indonesia that over a hundred thousand revolutionary activists have been savagely murdered; about the news that Aidit and some other leaders of the Communist Party in Indonesia have been murdered. I want to state our repugnance, our protest and our solidarity with the Indonesian revolutionaries persecuted today by the militarist reaction instigated by Yankee imperialism. And, at the same time, as a homage to someone who had much to do with the success of this Conference, I want to state that Ben Barka (Applause) was a decisive factor with his firmness, with his personal work, in the organization of this First Tricontinental Conference. His effort and his work was the cause of the later events.

It is the general opinion that Ben Barka has been murdered in a cruel and cowardly manner. And if this Conference of Solidarity has the duty to take a step precisely in loyalty and as an elementary duty towards one who so devotedly worked for its success, it must demand that the murder of Ben Barka should be made clear and that the murderers of Ben Barka should be punished.

Everything indicates that the direct responsibility falls upon the Minister of Interior of Morocco, General Oufkir, to whom all indications point and upon whom all suspicions fall.

This Conference must not rest until the facts are clearly known: who were the actual perpetrators, and who were the intellectual authors of the assassination of Ben Barka, the murder of he who was President of the Preparatory Committee of this Tricontinental Conference. And this monstrous and repulsive action showed from the very beginning the interest of imperialism in jeopardizing the Conference to make it fail. Yet the results of this Conference show that the blood of Ben Barka was not shed in vain, and that the crime committed against Ben Barka, his assassination, as those of Lumumba, Aidit and Sandino, that with none of these horrible crimes, that with none of these barbarous actions, will imperialism be able to check the victorious march and the final liberation of the peoples.

It is only fair that we devote our thoughts to those who have sacrificed themselves for the victory of their peoples, to

those who have fallen victims of imperialism in all Continents and that we propose to be always faithful to this cause, to be always faithful, in Asia, Africa and in Latin America, to the cause of those who have given their lives and their blood for the liberation of the peoples. The people of our country, as you have been able to see, is of diverse ethnic origin, as a result of the mixing of peoples of different continents, and therefore fraternally bound to Latin America, fraternally bound to Africa, fraternally bound to all the peoples of all continents. The people of Cuba has done the utmost to make the stay of the delegations here pleasant, has shown all its enthusiasm, its hospitality and its warmth.

Thousands of Cubans have incessantly worked for the success of this Conference regardless of rest or vacations; they have worked to care for the representatives of brother peoples. Our entire people has lived through a great festival of international solidarity during these days.

Our people has felt as its own each and every one of the problems of all the peoples. Our people, as I said on January 2, welcomed you with open arms and bids you farewell embracing you, as a symbol of a bond which will never be broken, a symbol of its fraternal feelings of solidarity towards all peoples who struggle, for whom it is willing to shed its blood.

Our country or death!

We will win!