

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. 3

February 18, 1966

In this issue

Page

Senate Witnesses Deplore U.S. Involvement in Vietnam	1
Moscow's Balancing Act Between Peking and Washington	
-- by George Novack	4
Belgian Unions Back Vietnam Day Committee	8
Demonstrations in Support of Belgian Miners	9
Is Kremlin Seeking to Unite Communists in India?	
-- by Kailas Chandra	11
Inflation in Brazil	15
UN Observer Fears New Explosion in Santo Domingo	16
Students Seek Downfall of Junta in Ecuador	16
Tension Mounts in Korea	17
Is Wall Street Marxist?	18
Soil Contaminated by H-Bomb in Spain	19
Japanese Socialists Demand	
U.S. Withdraw Troops from Vietnam	20
Jacques Birger	21
And in World War III?	21
Documents:	
Open Letter to Comandante Fidel Castro	22
The Present Situation in Ceylon	29

SENATE WITNESSES DEPLORE U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Johnson's hastily contrived Honolulu sideshow succeeded in capturing newspaper headlines for a few days in the United States. But the spotlight placed on Hitler-loving Gen. Cao Ky, the favorite puppet of the president of the United States, failed to dislodge the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from the attention being paid to them by the American public, which is becoming increasingly worried over the administration's escalation of the war in Southeast Asia. What the key witnesses said last week is being discussed from coast to coast.

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

Lieut. Gen. James Gavin appeared before the committee February 8. A paratroop commander in World War II and later ambassador to France, he is considered to be a leading authority in the field of military strategy. It was Gen. Gavin who advised President Eisenhower in 1954 not to send U.S. troops to back French forces in their effort to maintain French colonial domination of Indo-China.

The general made clear that in view of the extent of current U.S. involvement in Vietnam, he was opposed to withdrawing from the scene. He held that U.S. troops should be maintained in south Vietnam. But he argued insistently against any major escalation of the war. It would affect the capacity of the United States to meet what he considered to be more important "commitments" elsewhere in the world. He warned about the possibility of provoking China into intervening in the situation.

He charged that the government had become so "mesmerized" with Vietnam that it had allowed its involvement to become "alarmingly out of balance." As a result, "we have been escalating at the will of our opponents rather than on our own judgment."

If the escalation of the war were carried too far, China, in the general's opinion, would be provoked into intervening. And the Chinese might not confine themselves to Vietnam. They might open a second front in Korea. Embroiled in an Asian land war, the U.S. would be tempted to resort to nuclear weapons.

Gen. Gavin also argued that "if you got far down the road" of a "war with China," this might well bring in the Soviet Union at some point.

The military expert stated that he felt that the U.S. was "slowly creeping" toward "urban bombing" in Vietnam. He deplored this trend. "The bombing of Hanoi or Peking would achieve little," he said. After World War II, he recalled, a survey showed that "strategic bombing" had not achieved either its projected military or psychological aims. Moreover, to bomb cities would have a bad effect on world opinion.

George F. Kennan testified February 10. The author of the Marshall Plan and the postwar policy of the "containment of Communism," Kennan is viewed in knowledgeable capitalist circles as one of the country's top experts in the diplomatic field, particularly with regard to the Soviet Union.

Kennan backed the position of Gen. Gavin, holding that the U.S. should not undertake further escalation but simply "dig in." When asked if this position did not contradict his 1947 policy, Kennan said that at that time there had been only "one center of world Communism," Moscow, and that the policy had aimed at protecting Western Europe, a big industrial complex with the will and capacity to contribute in carrying out the policy.

"Vietnam is not a region of major industrial-military impor-

tance," he said. "It is difficult to believe that any decisive development of the world situation is going to be determined by what happens on that territory." Even if "the Vietcong" gained complete control in south Vietnam, Kennan said he saw no dangers "great enough to justify our direct military intervention." Only "considerations of prestige" are involved in maintaining U.S. troops in Vietnam today.

Kennan held that it was "a most dangerous assumption" to believe that if "sufficient military pressure" is brought to bear in south Vietnam "there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation by the other side." The fighters of the National Liberation Front have much "space and manpower to give up, if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it."

To attempt to crush Hanoi "would almost certainly have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of 'volunteers,' thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China on one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose."

"Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our preoccupation with Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy, and hopeful possibilities we should be developing, are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater of activity."

Kennan indicated some of the things he had in mind. "Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously, as was to be expected -- and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than what is involved in Vietnam, and when we had special reason to cultivate them."

Besides the Soviet Union, Kennan expressed concern about relations with Japan. "The confidence and the good disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had -- and the greatest asset we could have in East Asia." With its war-making potential, "Japan is of vital importance to us..." Yet relations with Japan are being seriously affected by the "military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing."

Kennan likewise deplored the injury to the "image" of the United States due to "inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color..."

Neither Gavin nor Kennan fundamentally oppose the war in Vietnam. They represent the view of the sector of the capitalist class that believes this to be the wrong war at the wrong time at the wrong place. But this rift in the capitalist class over tactics is of importance to genuine opponents of the imperialist aggression in Vietnam and they should utilize it to the utmost in pursuing their own objective -- immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops.

MOSCOW'S BALANCING ACT BETWEEN PEKING AND WASHINGTON

By George Novack

World politics today is dominated by three major powers: the United States, the Soviet Union and China.

De Gaulle aspires to bring his government into that lofty company but France does not have the demographic, economic, military and strategic weight to do more than maneuver among the big three. As for Harold Wilson, he is following the policy long ago laid down by the British ruling class -- resignation to the role of a satellite to the American colossus.

The position and policies of the United States and China in respect to each other are well known and well defined. These regimes are open enemies; they entertain no friendship for each other; and in the colonial world they tend to clash at every point. Jenmin Jih Pao, the Chinese Communist party newspaper, is wholly warranted in its charge February 2 that American imperialism is seeking to tighten its military encirclement of China. The containment of Chinese Communism is one of the reasons avowed by American imperialists and militarists for expanding intervention in Southeast Asia.

The ambiguous role is that played by the Soviet Union in the present international situation. Where does it stand, what are its aims, where is its diplomacy headed? This complex problem admits of no simple answer.

It is significant that Washington and Peking concur from opposing points of view on their appraisal of the principal objective of Moscow's foreign policy. Both are aware that the Soviet leaders would appreciate a deal with the United States on the touchiest areas of conflict between the two superpowers. These range all the way from prohibiting West German access to nuclear weapons to a settlement of the Vietnam war.

Such a global agreement is implicit in the Kremlin's official doctrine of indefinite peaceful coexistence between the capitalist and the workers states which guides the calculations of its diplomats as well as the line of its followers in the Communist parties. If it were officially concluded and ratified, this would be tantamount to a de facto condominium of the two capitals over world affairs.

But there has been and remains a winding and rocky road between the desired aim of the heads of the Soviet bureaucracy and its realization. Recurrent and irrepressible conflicts between the forces of revolution and the imperialist counterrevolution and the deepening antagonism between Washington and Peking keep upsetting the status quo and hindering Moscow from moving as fast or as far as it would like in coming to terms with Washington.

This was dramatized by Johnson's decision to bomb north Viet-

nam while Kosygin was in Hanoi last February. It has been further emphasized by U.S. commitment of massive armed forces to the south-east Asian mainland. These developments have pushed off the possibilities of any general agreement between Washington and Moscow at least until that conflict is disposed of.

At the same time Washington and Moscow are taking care not to blow up any more bridges that might lead later toward such an agreement, whatever conflicts and tactical considerations may hold it up or even set it back for a period. More than that, both sides are projecting new points of support which can pave the way to it.

Johnson made a sizable concession to the Kremlin's demands last December when he quietly scuttled the proposed multilateral nuclear force under NATO which was to give Bonn a finger, and possibly a whole hand, on the nuclear trigger. In his State of the Union message the president suggested lowering the barriers of trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The Russian representatives have reciprocated by indicating at Geneva their readiness to negotiate a nonproliferation treaty and sign an agreement not to resort to nuclear weapons first.

The latest charges and countercharges exchanged between Peking and Moscow revolve around this question of Soviet relations with the United States. China has accused the Soviet leaders of collaborating with Washington in its encirclement policy. They are also indicted for following "a policy of appeasement in Europe" by refusing to open a second front in Berlin, thus allowing American troops to be released for duty in Vietnam.

The Kremlin in turn has accused Peking of trying to push the Soviet Union into reckless military confrontations which would threaten world peace, of provoking more than 150 border incidents in 1965, and of holding up shipments of Russian military equipment to north Vietnam. The Chinese have officially denied the latter charge.

The crucial point at issue in these mutual recriminations is whether, and to what extent and with what ends in view, Moscow is in collusion with Washington against China. Such an alignment of one workers state against another alongside the mightiest and most aggressive imperialist power would be a most reprehensible and perfidious breach of solidarity.

The Chinese Communist leaders have ample grounds for suspecting and distrusting the direction of Soviet foreign policy. The withdrawal of Soviet technical aid and curtailment of trade after the 1960 split was followed by the supplying of Russian military equipment to India during the India-China border dispute. Then Moscow signed the nuclear test-ban treaty with Washington which was implicitly designed to slow down China's acquisition of nuclear arms.

Washington and Moscow worked along parallel diplomatic lines to halt the India-Pakistan war and Premier Kosygin's efforts to settle that conflict at Tashkent met with U.S. approval. As The Economist commented on January 15, 1966: "However embarrassing it may be for Moscow to admit it, the new extent of Russian involvement [in south Asia through the Tashkent agreement] also implies a greater degree of co-operation with the United States. Not that the Russians would not like to replace western influence with their own. But the subcontinent has not been summarily removed by Tashkent from what the Americans regard as their sphere of concern. The point is that the two super-powers both want peace there, they both want economic progress, they both want stability. And they both dislike China. Common interests like these do not exclude competition, but they do as a minimum imply that it will not be destructive competition."

The Economist also points out that the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty would involve a joint Russian-American guarantee to protect India which would imply a joint foreign policy in Asia directed against China and its nuclear capability.

This series of moves gives substance to Peking's claims that Moscow is seeking to create a cordon sanitaire of India, Pakistan and Japan around China.

This opinion is not limited to Peking. It is confirmed from the opposite side of the three-power triangle. When U.S. Vice-President Humphrey returned from attending Shastri's funeral in New Delhi, where he talked with Premier Kosygin, he stated flatly in a television interview that the Soviet government was intent upon encircling China. Similar views have been voiced by such well-informed U.S. statesmen as Ambassador Harriman.

Buffeted between Washington and Peking and between the pressures of imperialism and the world revolution, the Soviet leaders have been compelled to steer a devious course on the international political arena. On the one hand, they must formally, and sometimes even truculently, oppose and try to block the most insolent and perilous of Washington's aggressions while maintaining lines of communication, conducting parallel actions, and taking small specific steps toward agreement with the U.S.

On the other hand, they cannot too openly consort with Washington before they have secured the basic conditions for a general agreement satisfactory to themselves. That would risk damaging their prestige and losing their influence in the world Communist movement and among the unaligned colonial nations and handing over leadership of the international anti-imperialist struggle to Peking. These considerations oblige the Kremlin to tread cautiously between the contending forces and occasionally jut its chin to the left in an anti-American stance.

Thus, many months after a shameful lack of response to Johnson's bombings of north Vietnam, Premier Kosygin took a tough

tone toward Washington in his December 6 interview with New York Times correspondent James Reston, as did Foreign Minister Gromyko in a follow-up speech to the Supreme Soviet in connection with the five-per-cent increase in the military budget. Similar motives may well have induced the Soviet representatives to set aside their previous conciliatory policy and formally accede to the perspective of armed guerrilla struggle as the main line for the Latin-American revolution voted by the Tricontinental Conference at Havana.

From the time of his meeting at Camp David with Eisenhower in 1959, Khrushchev strove to arrive at an understanding with the U.S. even at the cost of a rupture with China. After his downfall, the Kosygin-Brezhnev team hoped for a time to assume a more neutral stance and remain on good terms with both antagonists. Khrushchev's successors refrained from public polemics with Peking and sought to moderate and muffle the points of conflict between them.

Now the sharpening of tensions generated by the expansion of the war in Southeast Asia has made it increasingly difficult to find and hold a middle ground against both of the contending sides. Vietnam has become the focal point and testing ground of world politics today. And the relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are being strained to the breaking point by the year-long escalation of U.S. intervention there.

The two strongest noncapitalist governments had the elementary duty to have closed ranks instantly in reply to the stepped-up imperialist aggression. Such coordination of aid and action was dictated by the need to back up the national liberation struggle in south Vietnam, defend the independence of north Vietnam brutally assaulted by U.S. air raids, and to ward off the threat of war against China and a possible nuclear conflict.

Instead, just as Johnson proceeds to send in more U.S. troops, Moscow and Peking present the spectacle of open disunity and mutual recriminations. Let us assume that the worst is true and the Kremlin is in league with Washington against Moscow, as Peking charges. What more effective means could Peking have used to block that policy and expose the hidden aims of the Soviet leaders than to have grasped with both hands Shelepin's call for "all socialist countries to pool their efforts to aid Vietnam by all means."

However, Mao and his associates have assumed the attitude of refusing to accept Moscow's proposal for joint action on the factional pretext that it is impossible to work together with "renegades" and "revisionists."

For example, the February 10 Hung Chi, organ of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist party, declared: "We will never take any united action with the new leaders of the Soviet party so long as they do not abandon the Khrushchev revisionist line, do not change their line of Soviet-U.S.-Indian-Japanese alliance."

This sectarianism has not only weakened the anti-imperialist front to the benefit of the enemy but has laid Peking open to the

Soviet charges of interfering with military shipments to north Vietnam and contributing nothing "positive" to the struggle.

Meanwhile the Soviet and Chinese representatives are each seeking to attain predominant influence in Hanoi, which would prefer to remain equidistant from the quarreling powers. Washington is counting on the Soviet leaders to cast their weight into the balance at the proper juncture to bring the Vietnamese to the conference table. There are signs that Moscow would not be unwilling to perform the same mediating role in Southeast Asia as it has on the Indian subcontinent.

This is hinted at by a February 7 New York Times editorial speculating on a "Sino-Soviet Showdown" when the twenty-third congress of the Soviet Communist party meets next month. It concludes: "Should such a formal schism take place, it might increase Moscow's freedom of action in exerting pressure for reason in Vietnam, assuming -- as appears probable -- that the Chinese are correct in charging that Moscow agrees with Washington that the time has come for negotiations to end the savage struggle in Vietnam."

The added supplies pledged to Hanoi by Soviet leader Shelepin on his recent visit to Hanoi does not necessarily contradict this possibility; it can serve as a means for strengthening Moscow's position for such a purpose.

However, great obstacles stand in the way of the would-be "peacemakers." The Pentagon's decision to crush the national liberation movements and contain the People's Republic of China, the firmness of Peking, and, not least, the determination of the Vietnamese, north and south, not to be again cheated by diplomacy of what they have won through years of costly struggle.

BELGIAN UNIONS BACK VIETNAM DAY COMMITTEE

At a recent meeting of the national committee of the Confederation Generale des Services Publics, which is affiliated to the Federation Generale des Travailleurs de Belgique, a motion to support the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee and its political opposition to U.S. involvement in the civil war in Vietnam was adopted by a very large majority.

The chairman was instructed to place the same motion before the national congress of the FGTB, but failed to do so. Thus it has not been possible as yet to determine the extent of the support which the Vietnam Day Committee has received in the Belgian trade-union movement.

However, the two trade-union organizations that have already gone on record -- the Liege Region of the FGTB and the CGSP -- represent almost 250,000 workers.

DEMONSTRATIONS IN SUPPORT OF BELGIAN MINERS

Brussels

For the first time in many years, violence has flared in workers' struggles in the Flemish (northern) part of Belgium. Barricades were set up on roads, trees were cut down and police cars burned. Wide-scale fighting occurred between strikers and state police.

This occurred in Limburg, the most backward of Belgium's provinces, where the reactionary Catholic party usually obtains between sixty and seventy per cent of the votes in general elections and where even the reformist unions headed by the Social Democrats hardly have a foothold in the plants.

What triggered off this sudden outburst of the class struggle was the government's decision to close down one of the six coal mines in Limburg, a pit named Zwartberg (black mountain) near the industrial center of the province, the town of Genck (where a big Ford truck assembly plant is located).

As in the rest of Western Europe, the Belgian coal industry has suffered a continual crisis of overproduction since 1957 due to (1) the competition of oil and gas as fuels for homes and industries; (2) the competition of cheap American coal which is delivered at the ports cheaper than most European mines can offer it at the pit head.

The Belgian coal barons, who had pocketed more than \$1,000,000,000 in subsidies from the public treasury, were quite unprepared for the crisis in overproduction. The various governments that have been in office since 1957 have similarly been unable to cope with the problem. Their sole response has been to close down one mine after another without undertaking any serious measures to recon-vert the regions industrially. As a result, the industries of the Borinage, one of the first regions to be industrialized in the nineteenth century have been practically wiped out.

Up until the late thirties, the Borinage had one of the most militant labor movements in the country. In 1959, in a desperate effort to save their jobs, the Borinage miners went out on strike. The rest of the labor movement failed to back them up and so their struggle was defeated.

In recent years the Flemish part of the country has seen more investment and building of new industries than the Walloon sector. The Flemish workers were told again and again by the government parties and the trade-union bureaucracy that they had "definitively won full employment."

This is why the sudden announcement that the Zwartberg mine was to be shut down provoked such anger, particularly when nothing precise was said about new jobs for the workers laid off. When the first ones got their notices, the whole pit went out on strike.

On January 31 the strikers spontaneously resorted to an old

tradition among the Walloon workers -- they organized a flying squad to go to adjoining enterprises and persuade the workers to come out in solidarity with the strike.

A large contingent of gendarmes (state police under the command of the minister of the Interior) sought to prevent them from reaching the nearby pits of Winterslag and Waterschei. Scuffling broke out. When the gendarmes threw tear-gas grenades, the strikers pried stones loose from the road and threw these along with bricks, chunks of asphalt, branches and whatever else that was handy. The gendarmes responded with gunfire, killing two young strikers -- one at Winterslag and the other near Waterschei.

In hope of diverting the indignation of the workers over these brutal murders, government spokesmen and the leaders of both government coalition parties (the right-wing Social Christians and the Social Democrats) claimed that the Limburg incidents were due to agitators who had "incited" the extreme right-wing Flemish nationalists. In this way they sought to divide the Belgian working class over the national question which has been much in the forefront in recent years. However, the attempt failed miserably.

The next morning, 10,000 Liege metal workers, alerted by working-class members of the new left Socialist party, stopped work in solidarity with their martyred Flemish brothers. In Liege, where the federalist tendency of the Walloon Popular Movement is the strongest, the anger of the workers over the killing gave rise to the most militant demonstrations.

For three successive days one work stoppage after another was interspersed with action in the streets. The official trade-union leadership identified itself with this solidarity movement and sent a big delegation of 300 metal workers to the funeral services for the two miners which were held February 3. They arrived with a huge banner: "The Liege Workers in Solidarity with the Striking Miners of Limburg." This drew tremendous applause. More than 4,000 persons attended the funeral.

The crowd was addressed by Camille Huysmans. Notwithstanding his age of 95, he made the trip from Antwerp to Limburg to condemn the government for its repressive action and to express solidarity with the miners. The old socialist leader received a big ovation.

When the news was broadcast about the murder of the two miners, the new left Socialist party, the Parti Wallon des Travailleurs (Walloon Workers party), issued a leaflet calling attention to the fact that this was the first time in the history of Belgium that strikers had been killed as a result of orders issued by a Social-Democratic minister of the Interior.

The leaflet supported the strike, called upon the workers to support the miners by extending strike action, and proposed the following slogans: no layoffs; a 40-hour week without reduction in weekly pay; nationalization, under workers control, of the coal

mines and all other sources of energy.

A second leaflet was distributed at the funeral calling upon the workers to solidarize with forty-five mine workers of foreign nationality who had been threatened with deportation by the government for participating in the strike and in demonstrations. The Belgian mining industry is a real melting pot, including workers from Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Morocco, Holland, Poland and various other countries.

Work stoppages to express solidarity with the Limburg miners have flared throughout the country. Students have staged street demonstrations in four different towns.

Under pressure of these actions, the government finally granted a concession to the strikers, promising not to close the Zwartberg mine until all the miners have been given jobs elsewhere.

IS KREMLIN SEEKING TO UNITE COMMUNISTS IN INDIA?

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

There have been persistent reports in the Indian press about the possibility of a rapprochement between the pro-Moscow right-wing Communist party of India and the pro-Peking left-wing Communist party of India. The initiative in this, it is claimed, was taken by Suslov, one of the secretaries of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. Suslov is alleged to have held a series of meetings with P. Sundarayya, general secretary of the left CPI, who is convalescing in Moscow after an abdominal operation there. Sundarayya, one of those arrested and detained under the Defence of India Rules was released by the Indian authorities on medical grounds and given special permission to go to Moscow last year.

The Times of India reported from New Delhi on February 5:

"While the prospects of a merger of the two split communist groups in India are considered remote by both factions, a serious attempt is being made to secure a measure of understanding to enable them to forge a joint front in the general election in 1967 as well as to make common cause with other left parties for agitational purposes.

"It is now fairly well known that the Soviet top communist theoretician, Mr. Suslov, has been urging the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party (Marxist) to get together.

"The proposal was made to Mr. S.A. Dange when he visited Russia soon after the outbreak of the Indo-Pakistani conflict and to Mr. P. Sundarayya, who is in Moscow and is expected to return to India about the middle of this month.

"Even Mr. Suslov does not appear to have suggested a reunification of the two factions of communists in India and is further believed to have pleaded with the left communist leader not to make things embarrassing to the chairman of the CPI.

"The Russian leader was presumably encouraged to moot the idea of the two factions getting together by a change in the dogmatic pro-Peking attitude of Mr. Sundarayya, particularly as a result of the India-Pakistan conflict in which China not only actively sided with Pakistan but also made every effort to fan the flames.

"The animus between the two factions seems to persist if the correspondence between Mr. Sundarayya and a colleague of his, said to have been deliberately leaked out, reflects the present thinking of the left Communists."

Although it has been officially denied in both Moscow and India that Suslov and Sundarayya held formal meetings, Rajeshwar Rao, general secretary of the right CPI, speaking in New Delhi February 6 at a function to mark the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Communist party of India, formally "invited" the left CPI to join it in mass movements without raising "fissiparous ideological and political debates."

Rajeshwar Rao, who, like Sundarayya, is from Andhra, made it clear that his party is not thinking of merger now. He said that it has been his experience that the "communist movement closed ranks whenever it took up mass action." This was a reference to the agitation conducted by the two CPI's jointly with other left parties in India on food and other questions in different states, including Kerala. He is supposed to have said that "such unity in action" would be in accordance with the decision taken at the Bombay congress of the right CPI.

Referring to newspaper reports about a Moscow directive, he said he was not aware of any "order" from the Soviet Communist leader, Suslov, to the "two Indian parties to come together." However, he referred to a letter allegedly written by Sundarayya from Moscow to his party members but said it was for Sundarayya to explain whether or not it was authentic. What is purported to be the full text of this letter from Sundarayya was published in the February 5 issue of Current, an anti-Communist Bombay weekly.

Rajeshwar Rao made some significant remarks about the relationship of the right CPI with Communist parties in other countries. He said that the international Communist movement had "passed the stage when it put its faith in any one individual or any single party." He added: "Nobody in the international movement after the death of Stalin has been able to do such a thing as ordering us." This is the first time a CPI leader has publicly admitted that in Stalin's time the CPI took "orders" from Moscow.

Rao admitted that it was a matter of regret that the Communist movement is split in India like the international movement. He

said: "If both the parties in India work unitedly other leftist parties would also come into the movement: then we can actually change the events and mould them. Bitterness between the two parties will also be overcome. Comrades must think more in terms of going to the people and working among them in terms of debates. Then we can unite the communist movement and united progressive force, and show a path to our country." (Free Press Journal, February 7.)

Evidently Rajeshwar Rao is not prepared for "a debate" on the differences that separate the two CP's in India nor is he prepared to discuss the issues that have brought about a split in the international Communist movement. He wants "unity in action without debates." Debates can be embarrassing to the right CPI. Rao has in view the coming general elections in India in 1967. He really is more worried about winning a few seats for the party in the Indian parliament and state legislatures than about building up a powerful mass movement to oust the present bourgeois regime.

The two CPI's have some things in common. They reject the perspective of a socialist revolution in India, both of them maintaining that the immediate stage facing the Indian revolution is bourgeois-democratic in character. Both of them advocate a "four-class bloc" with the national bourgeoisie.

Among the differences, the right CPI stands for the creation of a "National Democratic Front" in which leadership would be handed to the national bourgeoisie, while the left CPI stands for setting up a "People's Democratic Front," including the national bourgeoisie but with leadership held by the proletariat. In addition, the left CPI holds open the "possibility" of the proletarian leadership of the "People's Democratic Front" carrying forward an "anti-imperialist and antifeudal revolution" uninterruptedly to the next stage of a socialist revolution. In actual practice the left CPI stands for the workers and poor peasants conducting a militant struggle against the Congress government. That is why it has been subjected to severe repression by the Congress government since 1962 when the border conflict between India and China erupted.

Within both groups various tendencies are opposed to an opportunistic unity move. But centrist elements on both sides are much in favor of a merger of some kind. Bupesh Gupta in the right CPI and Namboodiripad in the left CPI are among these. They conceive of a process of "elimination of undesirables" in both groups.

Recent reports have also appeared in the bourgeois press that some leaders of the left CPI in jail, including B.I. Ranadive, have been disillusioned with the so-called "Chinese strategy of world revolution" and have become critical of the Chinese leadership, especially after the debacle suffered by the powerful pro-Chinese Indonesian Communist party.

The right CPI headquarters in Delhi has admitted that the central committee of the CPSU sent a message wishing every success to the CPI "in achieving unity of its ranks." A letter from the CPSU

on this topic was in fact read at the meeting held at New Delhi on February 6. Similar interest in achieving unity between the two CP's in India is believed to have been taken by the Communist parties of Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Rumania. The Rumanian party is supposed to be inclined toward taking a neutral stand in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

On February 6 Pravda officially denied the report in Indian newspapers that Suslov had met with Sundarayya. The report was termed a "concoction" and one which "does not accord with reality." It may be noted, however, that the report first appeared in Janashakti, a Telugu daily newspaper published by the left CPI in Andhra. Janashakti later repudiated the report as did the People's Democracy, the party's English-language weekly.

Sundarayya's letter from Moscow is said to have been circulated as early as January 11 by the Punjab leader of the left CPI, Harkishan Singh Surjeet. The following extracts are taken from the version published by Current:

"The stay in Moscow has been useful in another respect. During the last few days, Suslov of the CPSU leadership visited me on three occasions and had fairly long talks with me. He expressed concern for my health and soon we were having thorough organisational and ideological discussions.

"He seemed to be interested in improving the relations between the CPSU and ourselves.

"Such an attempt is not without value to us in providing an opportunity to neutralise or in any case reduce the support of the CPSU to the Dange clique without giving in at all on our positions on national or international issues, and I feel that I have definitively gained in this objective.

"The substance of these discussions should be discussed by the Politbureau and I am, therefore, summarising it here to the extent possible.

"I want again to point out that our talks were held at the initiative of Com. Suslov, who appeared keen to have an exchange of views. I welcomed the same by telling him that I hoped that a clear understanding of our position by the CPSU would contribute to a greater harmony within the world Communist Movement, which you will no doubt agree is now sadly lacking.

"During our talks I clearly enunciated our ideological stand and did not yield on any issue of ideology or tactics. So far the discussion has centred around the split in the CPI as Suslov has avoided any discussion on international issues....

"Suslov was thus very keen for the reunification of the Communist Movement in India and gave me the impression that the Dange-ites make necessary changes, expulsions and concessions to facili-

tate this, though it is clear that the CPSU had no intention of denouncing the Dangeites at any stage as they believe this to be tactically inferior and in the long run unnecessary....

"Suslov assured me that the CPSU had rather strongly asked the Dange group to desist from slanders against the CPI and that he had personally advised Dange to do the needful to forge a Left United Front with the CPI and other progressive parties for the 1967 elections....

"Suslov suggested that the most vulnerable aspect of the Congress regime was its inability to feed the people and this offered a very valuable opportunity for joint action on the agricultural front.

"Joint campaigns with other progressive parties must be prepared against food shortages and to expose among the peasantry the bogus schemes of food procurement hatched by the Government.

"The dependence on American food could also be utilised to show the close working relationship between the Shastri regime, the comprador bourgeoisie of India and the imperialists.

"This is in summary the substance of my discussion with Com. Suslov so far. I shall write again if any other such discussions are held. I have a clear impression from these talks that the leaders of the CPSU are shedding their illusions about the strength and potential of the Dange clique and are willing to accept the viewpoint of the CPI on important national issues."

Although the existence of the letter has not been denied by the left CPI, it cannot be ruled out that it is a CIA forgery. The CIA propagandists would naturally like to frighten New Delhi with planted stories about "Soviet designs" with regard to building up an antigovernment "popular" movement in India on the food question.

But if Sundarayya's letter is authentic, it only indicates that the Kremlin bosses are trying to win over the left CPI by agreeing to sacrifice Dange and his discredited associates in the right CPI. But, as Rajeshwar Rao has pointed out, Moscow can no longer "order" the CPI to bring about a sudden change in line to suit the diplomatic needs of the Soviet Union. In this case in particular, the right CPI is too much committed to a line of class collaboration with the national bourgeoisie and opportunistic parliamentarism to embark on a line of militant class struggle. The left CPI has not yet formally responded to the unity overtures of the right CPI.

INFLATION IN BRAZIL

In his 31 months in office, Goulart printed 700,000,000,000 cruzeiros. Accused among other things of fostering inflation he was overthrown by Castelo Branco. In the 21 months since then, 1,385,000,000,000 cruzeiros have rolled off the printing presses.

UN OBSERVER FEARS NEW EXPLOSION IN SANTO DOMINGO

The situation in Santo Domingo remains "so tense," according to a report issued by the United Nations February 11 that it could end "in an explosion at any moment."

The report was sent to U Thant by the UN secretary general's personal envoy to the Dominican Republic, Jose Antonio Mayobre.

Thant's representative also said that the general strike declared by the trade unions February 10 was eighty per cent effective and that the public administration and the sugar mills were "completely paralyzed."

The general strike was called to emphasize the demand for immediate departure from the island of ultrarightist leaders. On the evening of February 11, one of them, Commodore Francisco Rivera Caminero, left for the United States to take a post as naval attache at the Dominican embassy in Washington. Leftist leaders had already departed in accordance with a scheme of the Garcia Godoy government to weaken both the right and left by having their leaders go into voluntary exile.

The general strike was also called to demand punishment of the police who were guilty February 9 of shooting demonstrating students.

The police continued firing into crowds despite the general strike, however, and this was one of the sources of the mounting tension noted in the report to U Thant.

STUDENTS SEEK DOWNFALL OF JUNTA IN ECUADOR

The student federation in Ecuador launched an appeal February 7 calling for the overthrow of the junta now in power. In Guayaquil representatives of the student federation met with leaders of the provincial federation of workers to study common action to find "a solution to the hard conditions suffered by the people of Ecuador under the present military dictatorship."

They demanded the release of students arrested at Cuenca and Guayaquil for participating in demonstrations.

At the end of the meeting, the participants formed a procession to march in the streets but were charged by police who used tear-gas grenades to disperse them.

The next day, a group of about fifteen persons equipped with automatic arms attacked a barracks at Cuenca. This was the second attack of its kind, a previous one having occurred February 6 at a military post 130 kilometers south of Quito.

The junta appeared to be uneasy over the widespread unrest. It was announced that Gen. Antonio Rivas Hidalgo was being replaced by Gen. Telmo Vargas because of "service needs." It was learned, however, that at a recent meeting of the heads of the army, Gen. Rivas expressed worry over the sharp tension existing between the military junta and certain civilian layers, including the students.

The former mayor of Guayaquil also launched a vehement attack against the military junta, accusing them of "incompetence" and of turning to foreign experts, particularly Americans, to put into effect arbitrary economic and administrative measures.

TENSION MOUNTS IN KOREA

In an article date-lined from Seoul and published in the February 1 issue of The Japan Times, Richard Halloran reports that tension is mounting in Korea.

"The intensified war in Vietnam has caused a distinct tensing of mind and muscle here in Korea, the northern anchor of the Western Pacific defense line that runs from here through Okinawa and Taiwan to Southeast Asia."

The military, in particular, he states are becoming nervous about incidents to which little attention would have been paid before Johnson escalated the conflict in Vietnam.

"If the war in Vietnam expands, the state of alert here will increase. Both Americans and Koreans think of their situation as an integral part of one struggle between the Communists and non-Communists in Asia."

According to the American military sources from which Halloran obtained his information a "sharp rise" occurred in the number of "infiltrators from North Korea last fall."

"Military sources here say they noticed an upgrading in quality and aggressiveness of agents trying to come across the 4,000-meter wide demilitarized zone that separates the opposing armies. They say Communist infiltrators are better trained, armed, and equipped, and are carrying radio receivers and transmitters."

"Instead of melting away when accosted by an American or Korean patrol, the agents more often will try to fight their way through. Stopping these infiltrators has become the main job of forces here."

What the American occupation forces are afraid of is the opening of a guerrilla war in south Korea, it would seem. Says Halloran:

"Should the war in Vietnam spread into a general war in Asia,

Korea would most likely be the second front to be hit. American military officials do not expect a resumption of the same sort of war that was fought from 1950 to 1953. Instead they expect to see guerrilla and terrorist action behind the lines."

Another possible, and even more likely, explanation is that the widespread dissatisfaction with the puppet government set up by Washington may be again taking an active form. The heroic example of the freedom fighters in south Vietnam and their considerable successes despite the vastly superior military forces pitted against them may have inspired the beginnings of a guerrilla movement in south Korea. The U.S. occupation forces would naturally ascribe this to "agitators" and "infiltrators" from the North. But it is well known that guerrilla forces cannot possibly survive unless they have the active support of the population in which they operate.

IS WALL STREET MARXIST?

(The following is a translation of a column by the rather cynical Robert Escarpit which appeared in the February 10 Paris daily Le Monde. The original title is "Wall Street est-elle marxiste?")

* * *

Between the skyscrapers of lower Manhattan, the streets are like bottomless pits out of which truth at times manages to emerge far enough to show the tip of his nose. Yesterday the rumor of a peace overture from North Vietnam, even mediation by India, unleashed minor panic in Wall Street and industrial stocks fell at once.

It must be understood that a country devoting more than half its colossal budget to war feels a little terror at the idea of seeing this powerful economic motor slowing down or stopping. Where to reinvest the capital and, secondarily, where to find jobs for all the workers?

Look at France which has never been able to solve the small problem of excess vineyards and sugar beets. Replace the beets with bombs, the wine with blood, and the situation is hopeless.

In the final analysis there is nothing more Marxist than a certain capitalist country. With extraordinary firmness and unequalled success it insists on resembling as exactly as possible the rather unflattering portrait which was drawn just a hundred years ago by the old revolutionary theoretician.

SOIL CONTAMINATED BY H-BOMB IN SPAIN

Conflicting accounts are still being given of what happened to the H-bombs a B-52 was carrying when it collided with a tanker plane over Almeria. One fact, however, has been officially admitted. An H-bomb landed in the Mediterranean off the coast of Spain. The search is still on for it.

Troops are also methodically scraping the surface of the ground in certain areas and the soil they dig up is being transported for burial in trenches opened near the beach.

Explorations are still being continued in the zone although the accident occurred January 17. The heavy precautions taken indicate the dangerous nature of the mission. The troops wear masks protecting their mouths and noses; they wear gloves up to their elbows as well as boots up to their knees. A strange sight in sunny Spain!

The special correspondent of the Paris daily Le Monde cabled from Madrid February 11 that those taking part in this work are submitted to continual inspection for signs of radioactive contamination. "It seems that one of the bombs hit a rock. The shock broke the protective band and radioactive elements were presumably spread over the soil."

Despite the assuring words of the American authorities that no harmful consequences need be feared from the accident, sales of fish from the region have declined and prices have dropped considerably. Nobody wants fish from Almeria because of fear that they may be contaminated with the insides of an H-bomb or its A-bomb trigger.

A Spanish diplomat, Rafael Lorente, told the Le Monde correspondent that he and a friend, the well-known architect Robert Puig, happened to be in the area when the planes collided. Both of them were examined and it was discovered that the architect had suffered a radioactive burn on the knee. His treatment is expected to last another three months.

Puig told Le Monde that the clothing he was wearing at the time were burned by the medical authorities, leading him to suspect that they had been dangerously contaminated.

According to Rafael Lorente, the population of Almeria is in anguish over what happened. One of the poorest regions of Spain, its development as a center for tourists began only a few years ago. "This accident can plunge the whole zone once again into the misery from which it had just begun to emerge."

Lorente proposed that "neutral international experts should estimate the contamination or noncontamination of the land and water of this region. If there is actually no contamination, the experts should make it clearly known to all the nations whose eyes are on us at the moment. In case the danger of contamination is real, the

demand should, be made that the contaminated zone, no matter how big, should be evacuated. The United States must not limit itself to paying only a few thousand pesetas to a small number of peasants and fishermen, as it has done up to now; it must, in accordance with the decision of the international experts, indemnify the whole population who suffered damages through this accident."

These damages were caused merely by one or more nuclear weapons cracking open when they hit the ground. What if they had exploded?

JAPANESE SOCIALISTS DEMAND U.S. WITHDRAW TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

At the age of 64, Kozo Sasaki was reelected chairman of the Japan Socialist party in a narrow vote January 22 at the organization's twenty-seventh national convention. Sasaki has become convinced that the Japan Socialist party has a good chance of winning a national election by 1970. A wave of protest is mounting among the Japanese people against the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, he holds. He declared that "American imperialism is the common enemy not only of Communist China and Japan but also of the whole world."

The program adopted by the convention includes a demand for abrogation of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and conversion of the embryonic Japanese imperialist army, the so-called "Self-Defense Forces" into a national construction corps. If elected, the Socialists promise to compel the U.S. to withdraw its troops from Japan, Okinawa and the Bonin Islands.

Japan's key industries such as banking, insurance, energy and the airlines industries will be completely nationalized -- but with "fair compensation" to individual owners.

The steel, sugar, fertilizer, agricultural, chemical, feed and pharmaceutical industries will be placed under government control but ownership will remain in private hands.

Trade in foods, sugar, feed, raw cotton, wool, lumber and oil will be placed under government control to stabilize prices and assure steady supplies.

In the Diet, the lower house of parliament, Tomomi Narita, secretary general of the Japan Socialist party, challenged the government January 31 for supporting the U.S. in the Vietnamese war. He demanded the withdrawal of U.S. troops from south Vietnam as a precondition for settling the conflict.

Prime Minister Eisaku Sato made a weak defense, claiming that U.S. troops were in Vietnam at the express request of the government in south Vietnam.

Narita accused the prime minister of merely echoing the false peace bids of the U.S. in the Vietnam dispute.

JACQUES BIRGER

Jacques Birger, one of the leaders of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (French section of the Fourth International), died at the end of December after a lingering illness at the age of 44, the January issue of La Quatrieme Internationale reports.

Born in Lithuania in 1921, Birger was brought by his parents to France at an early age. When he was 12, he joined the Red Falcons, the Socialist youth organization, and then the Red Pioneers. At the age of 16 he became a member of the Trotskyist movement, participating in the founding of the Jeunesse Communiste Internationaliste, which adhered to the Fourth International after that world-wide revolutionary-socialist organization was founded in 1938 by Leon Trotsky.

When World War II broke out, Birger joined in the underground resistance movement against the Nazi occupation forces. He organized the first underground meeting of the Comite Communiste Internationale, which was held July 14, 1940, in the woods at Saint-Cloud.

Among his tasks in the underground was the difficult and dangerous work of getting out clandestine publications. He became distinguished for his ability to organize the production and distribution of material in a methodical way that reduced to a minimum the risk of discovery and arrest.

His political activities did not prevent him from continuing his studies in the field of mathematics and he became a specialist in aerodynamics.

To further the underground political work, Birger took a job in the Panhard automobile plant. There he put out a factory newspaper that gained influence among the workers. He participated in the organization of a workers militia which remained active until after the war when Maurice Thorez, the Communist leader, succeeded as a minister in de Gaulle's cabinet in getting the workers to give up their arms and dissolve their militia.

Up to the time of his death, "Bruno," as he was affectionately called by his comrades, remained an energetic participant in the leadership of the French Trotskyist movement. For the past ten years he served as a member of the party's Control Commission.

AND IN WORLD WAR III?

"In World War I there were 9,800,000 killed, 5 per cent of whom were civilians; in World War II, of 52,000,000 dead, 48 per cent were civilians; the Korean conflict produced 9,200,000 dead, of whom 84 per cent were civilians." -- Tom Stonier in Nuclear Disaster.

OPEN LETTER TO COMANDANTE FIDEL CASTRO

(In our last issue, we ran the full text of Fidel Castro's closing speech at the Tricontinental Conference which was recently held in Havana. The speech included a considerable section attacking "Trotskyism." Below we are publishing the full text of a reply by the United Secretariat, the highest body of the Fourth International. The reply is dated February 1 and the translation is by World Outlook.)

* * *

We have just read the full text of your closing speech at the First Tricontinental Conference, as published by Prensa Latina January 20, 1966. On the one hand this speech is imbued with an incomparable revolutionary spirit, as when you proclaim that "for Cuban revolutionaries the battleground against imperialism covers the whole globe," when you promise that "revolutionary movements in any corner of the globe can count on Cuban combatants," when you tell the American imperialists once again that the only way they can gain peace is to get out of Vietnam, when you call upon the Latin-American revolutionists to extend armed struggle to an ever growing number of countries in order to make it impossible for the imperialists to concentrate their forces against the revolutionary forces of a sister people. Reading this part of your speech we feel in solidarity more than ever with this orientation and line of action.

But on the other hand the speech also levels systematic, slanderous attacks against Trotskyism, the Trotskyist movement and the Trotskyist program as a whole, attacks whose unjustified nature is felt by us with the deepest indignation and revulsion.

The "dossier" you placed before the participants at the First Tricontinental Conference and offered to world public opinion is made up of amalgams and linkages which collapse at the slightest touch under objective examination.

You make much of the assertions of one Felipe Albaguante, according to whom Che Guevara was quite likely assassinated in Cuba. You present this person as the "leader of the Mexican Trotskyists" on the basis of a dispatch issued by the UPI, an imperialist press agency. But this Felipe Albaguante is not the "leader" or even a member of the Mexican Trotskyist organization. This is not his first provocation; he made a provocative declaration on November 26, 1963, attributing Oswald's assassination by Jack Ruby to the Communist party. On November 30, 1963, Comrade Pierre Frank, speaking for the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, denied in the most categorical way that this person had anything whatsoever to do with Trotskyism and the Fourth International. This declaration was sent to Cuba, to you personally, as well as to many other Cuban officials.

If it was a question of ascertaining the truth, and not of taking the UPI dispatch as a pretext for attacking the Trotskyist movement, you could have asked your research services -- which are efficient -- for material about the provocateur Albaguante; and these

services would then have brought our November 30, 1963, statement to your attention.

You link up the declaration of this person with the articles by Adolfo Gilly published in the leftist weeklies Marcha and Nuovo Mondo as well as in the Monthly Review. It must first of all be pointed out that the excerpts from Gilly which you refer to say nothing at all about Che Guevara's alleged assassination; they say only that Che Guevara left Cuba because of political differences with you. To place on the same plane provocative declarations about Che's alleged assassination and the hypothesis of differences between Che and you is to manufacture an amalgam. This is a dishonest method of engaging in polemics and levelling accusations. You likewise manufacture an amalgam when you place on the same plane the provocative declarations of Albaguante and a quotation from the newspaper La Batalla, organ of the POUM (Partido Obrero de Unificacion Marxista), which does not belong to the Fourth International and which spoke only of differences between you and Che Guevara.

You next make a link between Gilly and a group that calls itself Trotskyist which split from the Fourth International and which is led by one Juan Posadas. You focus attention on the irresponsible criticisms which this group directs at Cuba and its government, particularly with regard to Che's leaving Cuba and the alleged inadequate aid Cuba gave to the Dominican revolutionists. You know that the irresponsible positions of this group are not at all the positions of the Fourth International, the organization founded by Leon Trotsky, organized on a world scale, represented by magazines, periodicals and officially edited bulletins in a great many countries and which are sent both to Cuba and to its representatives abroad. These publications printed an article by Comrade Joseph Hansen, editor of the Trotskyist newspaper in the United States The Militant, entitled "A New Field of Battle for Che Guevara," which gives a responsible interpretation of Che's departure from Cuba.

On January 20 we again sent you our official position expressly on Che's leaving Cuba. It is now your duty to make clear to the international revolutionary audience that only a small faction of splitters adopted an irresponsible attitude on this question, the official bodies of the Fourth International and the overwhelming majority of the international Trotskyist movement showing themselves on this occasion as always to be stubborn defenders of the Cuban Revolution. Unfortunately this rectification will not be forthcoming because your good faith was not abused. The text of your speech leads one in fact to draw the conclusion that you are utilizing the confusion in order to try to discredit and attack the Trotskyist movement as a whole. To take but one example -- you well know that the organ presenting the views of the Italian Trotskyists is not the one with an insignificant circulation which you cite (Lotta Operaia) but Bandiera Rossa which has been in existence for almost ten years, which has a circulation in the thousands among the vanguard of the workers movement, including the Italian Communist party, and which was the first Italian publication to reproduce the Second Declaration of Havana.

How else can the scandalous passages of your speech be interpreted where, for example, you say, "this discredited thing, this antihistoric 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." (Prensa Latina, p. 11.) Or again, in relation to Guatemala:

"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. 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." (Ibid., p. 11-12.)

It is shameful, Comrade Fidel Castro, to utilize your prestige and the admiration and affection which the revolutionary masses of the entire world feel for the Cuban Revolution to dig out of the dustbin of history the slanders and lies that no one dares to utter, even in the Soviet Union itself, after the twentieth and twenty-second congresses of the Communist party of the Soviet Union!

Trotskyism has become "a vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction"? At what time? What are the proofs? Stalin assassinated the majority of the members of the Central Committee of the CPSU of Lenin's day, tens of thousands of Old Bolsheviks, including Leon Trotsky himself, the founder of the Red Army, under the vile and slanderous accusation of being "agents of Nazi imperialism." At the end of the war, the archives were opened, tons of documents were searched from top to bottom with the participation of Soviet judges, the Nuremberg trials took place -- not a document, not a line, could be produced in support of this slanderous accusation. The twentieth congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union revealed that the "confessions" made by Stalin's victims were wrung from them through torture and other barbarous and inhuman means. No reasonable person gives the slightest credence any longer to these slanders. And it is you, the great leader of the Cuban Revolution, the man who said that the revolution above all needs the truth, who is exhuming these infamous slanders buried by history!

After the terrible experience with Stalin, no one will accept accusations without proofs no matter what the authority of the accuser. Take care that your irresponsible accusations do not turn against you and -- despite our efforts -- gravely discredit the magnificent, the immortal Cuban Revolution itself.

For contrary to what you seem to imagine, the world Trotskyist movement today is no longer a handful of persecuted people without an audience, without influence, unknown and isolated from the masses. Thanks to its heroic resistance to the murderous assault of Stalin and Stalinism; thanks to its courageous and enduring participation in all the mass movements, Trotskyism today is widely known and recognized by the revolutionary vanguard in many countries. And this

vanguard will address numerous questions to you which you will find it embarrassing to answer, Comrade Fidel Castro:

Is Comrade Hugo Blanco a "vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction" -- Hugo Blanco, who organized the poor peasants in his own country, led them in occupying the land stolen from them by the proprietors, brought them to resist arms in hand the repressive measures undertaken by the army and the proprietors, thereby actually launching the Peruvian Revolution to which you attach so much importance in your speech?

Are the Trotskyist militants of Bolivia "vulgar instruments of imperialism and reaction," the militants at the head of the armed miners who dealt the first military defeat to reaction in their country in the battle of Sora-Sora? Is Comrade Cesar Lora a "vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction," this trade-union leader foully murdered by the reaction whose funeral procession, attended by thousands of miners, constituted a veritable challenge to the military dictatorship? Or Comrade Hugo Gonzalez Moscoso, whose arrest was protested by thousands of students and workers in La Paz in a spontaneous strike?

Is Comrade Kanai Pal a "vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction," Kanai Pal, the Trotskyist deputy in the legislature of East Bengal, arrested for his intransigent fidelity to proletarian internationalism, for his refusal to support the bourgeoisie of his own country against the Chinese workers state?

Are the Trotskyists of the United States, who were among the first to raise the banner of defense of the Cuban Revolution within the very heart of the main imperialist stronghold in the world -- are they "vulgar instruments of imperialism and reaction"? What about Comrade Farrell Dobbs, presidential candidate of the Socialist Workers party, who made defense of the Cuban Revolution the main plank in his electoral campaign in 1960 and toured the entire country, speaking out in defense of this Revolution?

Are the French Trotskyists "vulgar instruments of imperialism," they who were the first in their country to organize political and material aid for the Algerian Revolution, at a time when the French Communist party considered the leaders of this revolution to be "putschist adventurers"?

Are the Trotskyists "vulgar instruments of imperialism" -- the Trotskyists who are organizing, aiding and promoting committees today in forty countries of the world to mobilize the masses with the aim of forcing the unconditional withdrawal of the American troops from Vietnam in order to help the National Liberation Front and the Vietnamese Revolution to win?

No, Comrade Fidel Castro, for the first time, no one will believe you when you launch this slander; and it will ricochet -- through your fault -- injuring the prestige and the hearing given the Cuban Revolution throughout the world.

To give a semblance of political justification to your unjustifiable attack upon Trotskyism, you touch briefly on the case of Guatemala, insinuating that "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."

We give wholehearted support to the guerrilla movement in Guatemala. We do not know who is responsible for the division that has occurred in this movement, although your account would imply that the responsibility does not lie with Comandante Yon Sosa but with Comandante Turcios, since you praise him because he "broke away from the '13th of November Movement.'" At least it is a strange way to uphold the idea of a united anti-imperialist revolutionary front -- glorifying a split in this front under pretext that it is impossible to collaborate with anyone who collaborates with Trotskyists. Whatever the case may be, we object most strenuously to your insinuation that the Trotskyists, in Guatemala, Vietnam, or anywhere else, consider the establishment of a united anti-imperialist front to be "absurd" or "counterrevolutionary." This is an added slander.

The Trotskyists, the revolutionary Marxists, are partisans of the broadest united anti-imperialist front, of the sincere collaboration of all the forces within the colonial revolution ready to deal blows against the imperialist enemy. But they add two lessons from history, two lessons formulated by Lenin, two lessons that the whole course of the revolution since 1917 has continually confirmed.

First, the party of the working class and the poor peasants must under no pretext give up its organizational independence within this united anti-imperialist front, for only the proletariat and poor peasantry are capable of fighting imperialism without reservation or hesitation up to the very end. Second, if -- under pretext of constituting a united anti-imperialist front and winning over the "national bourgeoisie" to this front -- the program, the slogans, the forms and methods of action are shaped to fit, not the aspirations of the masses and the possibilities open to them, but unity with the "national" bourgeoisie, then leadership of the anti-imperialist movement is abdicated and what is constituted in fact is a "bloc of classes" with the bourgeoisie and under its direction. The outcome is defeats and disasters of the bloodiest kind.

Without going further back, it is sufficient to cite two recent cases. In Brazil the whole movement was subordinated to the directives and initiatives of a Goulart, who could only capitulate before imperialism. In Indonesia the same kind of bloc, named NASEKOM, ended in the massacre of 100,000 Communists and the imprisonment of another 100,000 militants. These two cases show that the teachings and warnings of the Trotskyists in this respect are not without foundation.

This is also what the Cuban people clearly proclaimed in the Second Declaration of Havana, thus putting down as false the policy

pursued by the Communist parties and confirming the correctness of the theory of permanent revolution:

"In the present historical conditions of Latin America, the national bourgeoisie cannot lead the antifeudal and anti-imperialist struggle. Experience has demonstrated that in our countries, even when their interests run counter to those of Yankee imperialism, this class has always been incapable of resistance due to fear of the social revolution and the exploited masses."

As early as 1905, Trotsky said the same thing in his theory of permanent revolution. Wherever the revolutionary workers movement took the leadership of the revolution, guiding it uninterruptedly up to the victory of the socialist revolution, it has triumphed. This was the case in Russia in 1917, in Yugoslavia in 1945, in China in 1949, in north Vietnam in 1954, in Cuba in 1959-60. Wherever it has abdicated, handing over this leading role to other classes or to other social forces, the outcome has been a bloody defeat. This is what the Trotskyists, armed with the lessons of a half century of revolutionary experiences, have continually proclaimed.

Your attack against the Trotskyists will objectively reinforce the opportunists in Latin America who in practice reject the teachings of the Second Declaration of Havana, the teachings of the Cuban Revolution, and who continue to peddle the "peaceful road" and an "alliance with the national bourgeoisie." And this can have grave consequences for the Latin-American revolution.

You dared, finally, to characterize the program of the Fourth International and the organization itself as "antihistoric" and "discredited."

Stalin and the Soviet bureaucracy attempted to discredit Trotskyism. In 1937, at the time of the infamous Moscow Trials, Trotsky hurled his celebrated prophecy in the faces of the masters of the Kremlin: "The revolution will open all the secret archives, review all the trials, rehabilitate the slandered, raise monuments to the victims, swear an everlasting malediction on the executioners. Stalin will disappear from the scene under the weight of his crimes as the gravedigger of the revolution and the most sinister figure in history."*At the time, Trotsky hardly had an organization, his friends and partisans were being murdered in great numbers; Stalin stood at the head of one of the world's principal powers which emerged victorious in the second world war. But a quarter of a century later Trotsky's prophecy has largely come true. Today in the USSR and among the Communist parties, despite the monstrous falsifications launched against Trotsky, despite the difficulties that militants often experience in trying to gain access to Trotskyist literature, between Trotsky and Stalin, it is certainly not the former who is "discredited" but rather the one who besmirched the banner of socialism by organizing such crimes as the "purges" and setting up concentration camps about which millions of the citizens

*Les Crimes de Staline, p. 376.

in the workers states today know at least a part of the truth.

Trotskyism, an antihistoric undertaking? It is the Marxism of our epoch, and those who wish to develop in a creative and living way the Marxist analysis of the problems of contemporary imperialism, of monopoly capitalism, of the colonial revolution, of the construction of socialist society, are continually obliged to drink at this spring.

Trotskyism, an antihistoric undertaking? But since the second world war, from Chile to Japan, from Great Britain to Argentina, from Ceylon to Belgium, from Greece and Italy to the United States, young socialists and communists, the vanguard of the young workers and students, keep moving in large numbers toward Trotskyism.

Trotskyism, an antihistoric undertaking? Trotskyism is the struggle for the international extension of the socialist revolution, for the overthrow of the capitalist regime in all countries, for the organization of a dictatorship of the proletariat based upon genuine democracy for the workers and poor peasants, for the organization of the workers state on the basis of democratically elected committees of workers and poor peasants, for the management of the plants by the workers themselves, for the free play of art and culture, for the withering away of the state, of classes, of the market economy. Trotskyism is the untiring struggle to recreate a new mass Communist International. Trotskyism is simply the conscious expression of the march of history in our century. For no force in the world can definitively prevent the realization of our program, otherwise neither the well-being nor even the survival of mankind can be assured in the long run.

The Fourth International has never ceased to defend all revolutions, no matter what the attitude of the leadership toward Trotskyism. We completely identify ourselves with the Cuban Revolution and with its repercussions in Latin America and in the world, whatever you may say or do against us, Comrade Fidel Castro. Nothing can stop Trotskyism, the Fourth International. But your imitation of the Soviet and Chinese leaders in the employment of amalgams, of epithets like "agents of imperialism," instead of political discussion, injures the Cuban Revolution.

To the Fidel Castro of January 15, 1966, the Fourth International and all revolutionists will reply with the Fidel Castro of March 13, 1962, who at the University of Havana, denounced the doctoring of documents and the falsification of history, who proclaimed that "the revolution must be a school of unfettered thought" and who said:

"How can we, in the presence of a new generation, a generation which is beginning to study, which is thirsting for knowledge, which is thirsting to read, which is thirsting to embark on the study of history, which is thirsting to embark on the study of Marxism, how can we put on that generation blinders so large that we will not permit them to read the full text of a historical document...?"

They will reply with the Castro who, in the same speech, declared:

"The revolution has to induce men to study, to think, to analyze in order to possess profound conviction, so profound that there will be no need to have recourse to such tricks (like the falsification of documents)...It is simply because of this, because we have faith in our ideas and in the people that we are not so cowardly as to be able to accept such a thing."

And to the Castro who has just declared that Trotskyism has become "a vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction," the Fourth International makes the following challenge: that he submit his proofs before a tribunal of the Cuban people; five of the most representative leaders of the Fourth International are ready to stand before such a public tribunal and answer the accuser before the people of all Cuba. Thus the people of Cuba will discover that the entire activities of the Fourth International are devoted to but one aim: the victory of the world socialist revolution!

United Secretariat of the
Fourth International

THE PRESENT SITUATION IN CEYLON

(The following resolution was adopted by the Central Committee of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary) on February 7.)

* * *

1) Since the general elections of March 1965 the SLFP, LSSP and CP coalitionists* carried on propaganda alleging that the UNP-led government was pro-Tamil and that this government was not giving Buddhism its proper place. When the issue of the Draft Regulations Under Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act came to the forefront the coalition parties opposed any language concessions to the Tamil-speaking people. Their agitational campaign soon degenerated into a virtual call for anti-Tamil riots. The aim of these parties was to pressure the UNP MPs and prevent them from supporting these regulations in parliament. In this way they hoped to defeat the government in parliament and force a general election.

2) Their campaigning around the issue of the regulations gathered momentum with the approach of the 8th January which was

*The Sri Lanka Freedom party and the right-wing Lanka Sama Samaja party formed a coalition government on June 11, 1964, which was supported by the pro-Moscow Communist party. On December 3, 1964, the coalition lost a vote of confidence in parliament and in the subsequent general elections held March 22, 1965, lost to the United National party, the traditional ruling party of the Ceylonese capitalists and landlords and their imperialist backers.

fixed for the debate in parliament. They called upon the Sinhala Buddhists to consider the 8th January as a day of mourning and to put up black flags. They also called for a one-day strike on the 8th January.

3) The outcome of this campaign on the issue of the regulations helped to rouse considerable anti-Tamil feelings among a large section of the Sinhala Buddhists. Although physical violence on Tamils had not been reported there was a situation of communal tensions and anti-Tamil rioting was a near possibility. However the hoisting of black flags was not effective. Black flags had appeared only in certain parts of the rural areas. And as for the general strike, the government workers in Colombo and the suburbs appeared to have responded to the call and the strike was more or less confined to the unions under the influence of the coalitionists and also of the CP (Peking). Nevertheless the combined effect of their activities up to the 8th January was the collection of a very large crowd of coalition supporters in Colombo and their demonstration and march towards parliament premises.

4) In the situation a confrontation of coalition supporters with the police was a probability and this was what happened. With police action against the crowd at Kollupitiya leading to the killing of a Buddhist monk and the injuring of a large number of persons and the connected incidents like extensive damage to a number of shops in the vicinity was the excuse for the government to declare a state of emergency. And soon regulations were gazetted by which public meetings and processions were banned and strikes illegalised. A severe press censorship has been imposed and the police and military have been given wide powers of arrest and search of persons.

5) The state of emergency continues and it is likely that the UNP-led government will maintain it for some time. The government is aware that there was a growing unrest among the people generally consequent on the government's incapacity to solve their pressing problems. Prior to the 8th of January the government did not dare to resort to repression to meet the unrest among the people. Besides, the existence of a still viable and active trade-union movement was a factor for the government's reckoning when contemplating "strong arm" action. However the activities of the coalitionists up to and on the 8th of January gave the UNP-led government the opportunity to stifle the existing unrest and commence the offensive against the trade unions and the masses generally.

6) The responsibility falls squarely on the coalitionists for the "strong arm" action of the UNP-led government and for providing the government with the opportunity to launch their attacks on the trade-union movement and the democratic rights of the people. In furtherance of their aim of somehow winning more support among Sinhala Buddhist masses in preparation for another parliamentary election, the coalitionists led by the SLFP, LSSP and CP have recklessly raised the anti-Tamil and anti-minority slogans and strengthened the forces of Sinhala racialism and Buddhist clericalism. They have used the trade-union movement as a pawn in their campaign to win the Sinhala Buddhist voters for parliamentary elections to get

parliamentary power for the bourgeois SLFP. By their anti-Tamil incitement campaign the coalitionists have driven the Tamils and other minorities to have more and more confidence in the UNP-led government. This is all the more so because the possibility of even physical violence on the Tamils and persons among the minorities remain. The SLFP, LSSP and CP coalitionists have no other perspective than mobilising the dark forces of racialism and clericalism to attain their ends.

7) Consequential to the criminal activities and policies of the coalitionists are the blows already struck at the working-class movement and at the democratic rights of the people by the UNP-led government. The working class and the Left movement remain virtually paralyzed as a result of the banning of public meetings, processions, press censorship and other far-reaching encroachments on the democratic liberties of the people through Emergency Rule. The government has already taken action on a wide scale at the victimization of government and state corporation employees who had failed to turn up for work on the 8th January. "Show Cause" notices have been served on hundreds of these employees and a number of them have already been interdicted. The action of the government is nothing less than a frontal attack on the working-class movement and may well be the beginning of a move by the government to destroy the trade-union movement and the suppression indefinitely of the democratic rights of the people.

8) In this situation the principal and immediate task facing the working-class movement is the defense of its own class and its organizations in both the trade-union and political field against the attacks already launched by the UNP-led government since the 8th January. However steps separately taken by workers organizations and political parties to resist the present attacks by the government cannot meet the needs of the situation. Nothing less than concerted action of the working class can adequately meet the present offensive of this government. Such concerted action of the working class can be realized only if the workers organizations in the trade-union and political field could reach agreement on the issue of the defense of the working class through opposition and fight against victimization and against Emergency Rule.

9) In the present context of serious division in the ranks of the working class the achievement of unity for action in connection with the blow struck by the UNP-led government is extremely difficult. And today especially the working class has been further divided through the poison of communalism. And since the strike of January 8th in relation to its aims brought further division in the ranks of the working class the achievement of unity for action has become still more difficult. Furthermore, the existing leaderships of reformist unions are not concerned with the interests of the working class and do not seek to defend the working class even when the working class is facing a direct assault from the UNP-led government. However the state of mind of the rank-and-file workers within these organizations cannot be the same. The need for defending themselves from the UNP-led government must soon become the foremost question in the consciousness of workers. Those who have felt the

blow already struck and realize the seriousness of the situation will even now respond to a call for united action in defense of the working class. And, if as can be expected, the present leadership of their organizations shows resistance to the need to defend the working class through united action, such conduct of the leadership would open the road for these workers to begin the fight against these reactionary leaders. Besides, in any event it is only through united action of the working class on real working-class issues that the workers could be freed from the poison of communalism.

Tasks of the Party

In the present political situation the party is faced with the task of:

- 1) Explaining to the working class in particular the criminal responsibility of the coalition parties in the opposition for dividing, disorganizing and disorienting the working class and bringing it to a position in which sections under coalition leadership are already under attack by the UNP-led government and the masses in general have been subjected once more to Emergency Rule with complete suppression or severe restriction of their democratic rights and civil liberties. Further the party will point out the necessity of a break of working-class organizations from coalition politics with bourgeois parties.
- 2) Setting going the processes of reorganization and regroupment of the working class in this situation in opposition to the continuance of Emergency Rule and the immediate attacks to which sections of the working class under coalition leadership have been subjected since January 8th. For this purpose the party should call for and promote in the first instance a united front amongst trade-union organizations, while agitating for the realization of the united front with the political parties of the working class as well, in the context of a break with coalition politics with bourgeois parties.