

# 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. 12

April 22, 1966

| <u>In this volume</u>  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Bring the Troops Home Now!.....  | 1           |
| Militant Celebration of April 9 in Bolivia.....                            | 4           |
| United Front Helps Bolivian Revolutionists.....                            | 6           |
| "Grisly Cataclysm" Continues in Indonesia.....                             | 9           |
| Berkeley Committee Defends Polish Oppositionists.....                      | 12          |
| Has de Gaulle Doomed the NATO Alliance?<br>-- by Gerhardt Knebel.....      | 13          |
| Belgian Women Workers Stage Demonstration.....                             | 15          |
| The Meaning of the British Labour Party Victory<br>-- by John Walters..... | 16          |
| After the Austrian Elections<br>-- by Wilhelm Werner.....                  | 19          |
| Cap and Gown Included<br>in CIA Cloak and Dagger Paraphernalia.....        | 21          |
| The Demonstrations in West Bengal<br>-- by Gayatri Devi.....               | 22          |
| Squatters Battle Police in Bogotá.....                                     | 24          |
| Greek Monarchy Preparing New Offensive<br>against Workers.....             | 25          |
| Luu Thanh Kiem.....  | 27          |
| Mallikarjun Rao.....   | 28          |
| Documents:<br>Castro's Views on the Chilean Revolution.....                | 30          |

### BRING THE TROOPS HOME NOW!

The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., announced April 13 that the executive board of the organization had adopted a resolution at a meeting in Miami calling on the Johnson administration to abandon the south Vietnam military junta and consider withdrawing from the country.

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

The Rev. King told a press conference that the U.S. involvement in Vietnam was "rapidly degenerating into a sordid military adventure." He said, "It is imperative to end a war that has played havoc with our domestic destinies."

Although King has previously questioned the U.S. role in Vietnam, this was the first time that the SCLC came out as an organization against the war. Among the civil-rights organizations, only the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee had previously taken a militant stand against Johnson's escalation of the war.

The resolution passed by the SCLC executive board said in part:

"The immorality and tragic absurdity of our position is revealed by the necessity to protect our nationals from the population and army we were told were our cherished allies and toward whom we were benefactors.

"More important, SCLC, as an organization committed to non-violence, must condemn this war on the grounds that war is not the way to solve social problems. Mass murder can never lead to constructive and creative government or to the creation of a democratic society in Vietnam."

The resolution said more specifically, "We call on our Government to desist from aiding the military junta against the Buddhists, Catholics and students of Vietnam, whose efforts to democratize their Government are more in consonance with our traditions than the policy of the military oligarchy.

"If we are true to our own ideals we have no choice but to abandon the military junta under such manifestly vigorous popular opposition.

"We believe the moment is now opportune and the need urgent to reassess our position and seriously examine the wisdom of prompt withdrawal."

The most significant political note in this declaration is the suggestion that it would be the part of wisdom to undertake "prompt withdrawal" from Vietnam. That King's organization would finally make this an official position testifies to the mounting opposition among the American people to Johnson's war.

Voices considerably further to the right were also broaching the question of withdrawing.

Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky and former ambassador to India, said April 13, "If the people of South Vietnam do not want to continue the struggle, it is obvious to me that the United States should not continue it for them." He added that "we cannot defend people who are not willing to defend themselves." The implication in Cooper's statement ran counter to the Republican line of criticizing Johnson for allegedly keeping the Pentagon on a leash.

On the same day in Congress, Senator Richard Russell, Democrat of Georgia, who heads the powerful Senate Armed Services Committee, said, "If it becomes clearly evident that a majority of the Vietnamese do not want our help, I would favor withdrawing immediately both military forces and economic aid."

A still more direct gauge of the mounting disapproval among the American populace of Johnson's belligerent policy in Vietnam, were the demonstrations that took place in Berkeley and New York in immediate response to the anti-Ky demonstrations in Saigon and Danang. In both demonstrations variants of "Bring the Troops Home Now!" constituted the dominant slogan.

In the New York demonstration April 16, which brought out between four and five thousand people in Times Square, most of the chants voiced the demand to bring the GI's home now. The placards carrying this theme were overwhelmingly in the majority.

The rise in popularity of this slogan is proof of a considerable shift in political mood among the American people in the past year. It is a tribute, too, to the political foresight of the very small minority -- principally the circles around the Young Socialist Alliance -- who first raised the slogan and fought for it against at times strenuous resistance.

In concept, the slogan is of a "transitional" character; i.e., it expresses an objective need, in this instance of the masses in both Vietnam and in the United States, and it is not beyond their political understanding. In fact, experience has shown that it came closer to the present level of political consciousness among the American populace than any of the other slogans proposed in the antiwar movement at an earlier stage.

The acid test came in the contest with the slogan calling for "negotiations" which was pressed in particular by the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs. The argument of the partisans of the Young Socialist Alliance that the demand for "negotiations" played into the hands of the Johnson administration was proved in life to be correct.

The "transitional" character of the slogan is further indicated by the fact that once it catches on, it leads to a whole series of other questions, all pointing toward the program of revolutionary socialism. For instance, why is it that the present government does not respond to this obvious, elementary requirement for ending the war in Vietnam? What social and economic interests does it represent? Which class stands to gain and which to lose from a colonial war in Vietnam that might lead to a war with China and even touch off a nuclear catastrophe? The greater the mobilizations around this single slogan, the greater the opportunity to spread an understanding of all the fundamental issues involved.

The partisans of this slogan should feel greatly encouraged at the success that has already crowned their efforts. "Bring the Troops Home Now!" has every chance of becoming one of the most popular demands ever voiced in the United States.

## MILITANT CELEBRATION OF APRIL 9 IN BOLIVIA

La Paz

Bolivia in 1952 was governed by a Military Junta headed by General Hugo Ballivián. President Mamerto Urriolagoitia had handed power over to them in order to prevent the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario], which had won the 1951 elections, from taking office.

The MNR, on the basis of its electoral victory, began to plot, but it feared a popular mobilization; it wished to gain power without involving the masses. Accordingly, on the evening of April 8, a conspiracy came to a head involving the then minister of the government, Colonel Seleme and a sector of the police. This palace coup d'état was rapidly brought under control by the military, and the conspirators had to seek asylum in various embassies. Hernán Siles Suazo, the inspirer and leader of the coup, took asylum in the nunciature.

It was at this moment, when the army had defeated the coup, that the workers in the factories of La Paz, the poor sectors of the middle class in the heavily populated districts, the miners of Lilluni, rose up. They built barricades to block the army, attacked the arsenals, made grenades and bombs out of dynamite. The army found itself under attack on numerous fronts and every street, every house, was a fighting fortress, impossible to overcome. The struggle lasted for three days until finally on April 11 the army was defeated.

The POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario] participated in all these actions, its militants joining in the assault on the arsenals, the building of barricades and in the bloody struggle against the regiments defending the military regime.

In this way the palace coup was defeated and converted into a victorious popular insurrection. But if the workers of the POR fought heroically until they defeated the Military Junta, they did not gain power, which passed into the hands of the MNR, initiating the long period of struggle between the masses and the usurping MNR which lasted fourteen years, up to the downfall of Paz Estenssoro through a preventive coup undertaken by the military which now rules under the Military Junta headed by General Alfredo Ovando.

April 9, 1952, the day on which the defeated coup of the MNR was converted into a popular insurrection, is a historic date which the people and the workers commemorate as the downfall of the feudal bourgeoisie (rosca) and the beginning of the revolutionary period in which the masses pressured the MNR into granting nationalization of the mines, an agrarian reform, workers control, the formation of the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana], etc., etc., conquests which the MNR then mutilated, distorted and even repudiated on the eve of its fall. The MNR, for its part, also claimed this date as marking its rise to power. This double meaning has been observed each year.

This year, too, on April 9 the dual significance could be seen

The MNR tried to convert the anniversary into a party celebration and called for a turnout at a stadium in the factory zone.

The CODEP [Consejo Democrático del Pueblo -- Democratic Council of the People], a kind of front of leftist groupings that includes the POR, the PCB [pro-Peking Communist party of Bolivia], the PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista], a popular anti-Paz sector of the MNR, called for a turnout in the Plaza 14 de Septiembre located in the most heavily populated area of the city. The MNR, seeing that it would fail if it acted separately, finally joined in the call of the CODEP.

The workers and the people in general began to gather at 3 p.m. on Saturday April 9. The meeting was set for 4 p.m. At that time armed plainclothesmen and uniformed carabineros attacked the Plaza, throwing tear-gas grenades. After a brief stand, the crowd backed away from the heavy clouds of gas, only to unite again and undergo a new attack. This was repeated several times.

Since it was impossible to occupy the Plaza, groups organized demonstrations in the neighboring streets. These finally converged in the Avenida Tumusla to then parade through the heavily populated working-class districts. If at the beginning the demonstrators were few, some 1,000, they grew in number until they reached about 10,000. This entire excited, almost delirious crowd poured through the streets, shouting slogans about the anti-imperialist, anticapitalist revolutionary content of April 9 and against the murderous military. Chants were heard like "Los Obreros al Poder; los Militares al Cordel!" [The workers to power; the military to the gallows.] "Izquierda, Izquierda, Izquierda, Siempre Izquierda!" [Left, left, left, forever left.] These drowned out and silenced the efforts of the MNR to shout viva's for their leader Paz Estenssoro.

The demonstrators carried a Bolivian flag at the head of the procession, then a big placard with the name of the Consejo Democrático del Pueblo, followed by a large number of placards of the POR, of the PCB, the PRIN and the MNR.

The predominance of POR slogans led the MNR to complain that the Trotskyists wanted to take advantage...of the demonstration. This met with no sympathy among the people. At the head of the crowd marched the CODEP committee, then the leadership of the POR, followed by the PCB, the PRIN, the COB and the MNR. In a tug-of-war for leadership of the demonstration and its general orientation, the left came out victorious.

Going through the heavily populated districts, the column of demonstrators went along Avenida Santa Cruz. When they reached the headquarters of the COMIBOL [Corporación Minera de Bolivia, in charge of the nationalized mining industry] they were met with gunshots and tear-gas grenades. Five were killed and thirty wounded.

The column broke up and returned to the heavily populated areas where it reformed and ended the demonstration a little later.

During the attack on Avenida Santa Cruz many people took refuge in nearby houses. These were searched by the police, and men and women were arrested after being brutally beaten.

The fear of the Military Junta was quite evident. In face of a mass mobilization the military feels lost and is capable of the worst atrocities. The day before, they had passed out revolvers, ammunition and money in order to block the demonstration, but the popular pressure disrupted their plans.

After many years, this celebration of April 9 marked a step forward. It was completely successful. The masses demonstrated their hatred of the military regime and their determination to struggle. Despite the brutality of the repression, the masses returned to the streets. The day of an armed confrontation is nearing which will finish off the fascist generals.

Another significant fact is the challenge to the bourgeois or petty-bourgeois currents like the MNR in control of the streets and leadership of the masses. In this struggle the POR is playing a decisive role. The recent unification has given the party greater force and weight in the eyes of the workers. In the demonstration the number of POR adherents, placards and leaflets was greater than that of any of the other parties. Because of this the dominant note in the April 9 demonstration was revolutionary and proletarian. The bourgeois press, however, tried to ignore the POR and the Consejo Democrático del Pueblo, picturing the demonstration as a mere party action of the MNR.

Throughout the country, the celebration of April 9 was much the same. It proved to be a test of strength between the reaction represented by the Military Junta and the masses, the latter winning the round. At the same time it was a test of strength among the ranks of the left, the POR appearing publicly as the most solid and aggressive.

#### UNITED FRONT HELPS BOLIVIAN REVOLUTIONISTS

[The following article has been translated by World Outlook from the April issue of Masas, the newspaper of the Bolivian Trotskyist movement.]

\* \* \*

Toward the end of 1965, the year of massacres, the constitution of a united front of left forces was achieved -- the Consejo Democrático del Pueblo [Democratic Council of the People]. Exceptionally favorable circumstances permitted the realization of one of the great popular aspirations, the unification of mass revolutionary forces in a single bloc, making it possible to attack the fascist government now in power under a unified leadership, with

good prospects of success. For the first time in our history, it has been possible to construct an effective front of left forces, in spite of the negative and reactionary attitude of two small groups which make a great fanfare over the name "Communist."

"The Consejo Democrático del Pueblo is nothing less than the organized expression of the response of the people to the maneuvers of the reactionary forces whose unmistakable aim is to keep the mass murderers of the workers in the Quemado Palace. If this great revolutionary response can be consolidated, it is destined to change the course of politics in our country and set the present stagnant process of social transformation in motion again. At the same time, the united front of left forces is a touchstone by which to test all the so-called left parties. All of those who support it are with the people, and those who oppose it serve, directly or indirectly, the mass murderer generals and imperialism."

The front of left forces must begin by overcoming the hatreds and narrowness of sectarianism in order not to lose itself in impotence and byzantine disputes. The creation of another chapel in addition to the many already existing is not on the agenda, but rather the setting in motion of an extremely broad movement embracing the greater part of the country.

In order to achieve this objective, all ultimatism in organizational and ideological questions must be cast off. The problem concerns coordinating Marxist-Leninist parties which have similar internal structures; the front of left forces in Bolivia must extend from nationalist organizations to those that base themselves on the Communist Manifesto.

In spite of this reality, the front must have a revolutionary program corresponding to the nature of the country as its point of departure. The point of convergence of these various forces that take a left position, the point of convergence that explains the existence of the front, for the moment, is no other than that of seeking the means to carry the revolutionary process forward and of dealing a hard blow to reaction. The Consejo Democrático del Pueblo has inscribed in its program a struggle to the death against the fascist Military Junta. It has proclaimed itself the political leadership of the country to achieve this object, to struggle for the implementation of democratic guarantees, for respect for the right to organize, for the social benefits won by past struggles, for the rights of unions, for freedom of expression, etc. The front of left forces realizes that it cannot fight against the foreign enemy in a real, and not merely rhetorical way, unless it takes the same stand against its indigenous bourgeois instrument. To sum up, anti-imperialism, which constitutes the basic plank of the front and together with it the determination to liquidate all traces of bossism, forms part of the bridge that unites the various political tendencies.

The Consejo Democrático del Pueblo is an unmistakably revolutionary force in both program and methods of struggle. It has declared that it does not harbor the least confidence in an empty and

capitulationist parliamentarianism but that it will use the mobilization of the masses and the methods appropriate to it to realize its aspirations.

"The government, the puppets of the Yankees, and the mouth-pieces of reaction have united in a chorus of direct opposition to the Consejo Democrático del Pueblo. This was inevitable and the discordant howling of this pack does nothing but emphasize the revolutionary essence of the front of left forces.

"The antipopular and treacherous attitude displayed by the right wings of the MNR and PRIN (both parties are a part of the Consejo Democrático del Pueblo) was not unexpected either. These factions are fighting against the Consejo in their own parties. They are fighting to destroy it because they believe that it constitutes the greatest danger to their treacherous policies, to their ties with the Military Junta, to their privileges."

The right wings of the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario] and the PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista] justify their war on the Consejo with an argument that exposes their true reactionary essence: avoid all contact with the Marxist parties in order not to lose the confidence of the State Department. They are set on reaching power or thriving in the shadow of power, always with the approval or the aid of American imperialism. A pitiless struggle is being waged in the PRIN and MNR between the supporters and the enemies of the Consejo; i.e., between the left and the right. We revolutionists have the right and the obligation to aid those who are trying to advance the left front.

"We must alert the people. A new betrayal of the Bolivian people is about to be committed. The right wings of the PRIN and MNR are not only tools in the hands of the State Department, but without any qualms they have concluded a sinister alliance with the fascist generals. Some encourage the presidential ambitions of the shameless general, Barrientos, others are partners in the sinister and hypocritical game of Ovando Candia. For the future of Bolivia, it is not a question of choosing between two mass murderers but of expelling the military boot from power. This must be kept clear. It means nothing to us that the right PRINistas masquerade as 'unionists,' for when Ovando uses them as his puppets, they become vulgar traitors to the people."

If the right wins control of the PRIN and MNR, these parties may end by giving their official support to the military; this tendency can already be perceived in the subterranean currents in the political scene. The victory of the instruments of fascism would signify the most serious defeat for the left front and for the revolution itself. This must be avoided.

To crush the murderers of the workers, the Consejo Democrático del Pueblo must be strengthened. This organization is the road to the victory of the people.



"GRISLY CATAclySM" CONTINUES IN INDONESIA

Reports continue to add new details about the fearful mass slaughter of members or alleged members of the Indonesian Communist party which began last October and is still going on. The April issue of Atlas magazine carries an English translation of an article that appeared in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung telling about the killings in Bali.

"Villages were burned, the houses of leading Communists plundered and the Chinese were not overlooked," writes the author, Adelbert Weinstein. "There was a general slaughter. Bali is still gripped by violence. As in a cockfight, there must be a victory, unless the hourglass has run down. The end of the struggle with 'the Red demons of Communism' is not yet in sight on the island."

Weinstein tells about arriving in the capital, Denpasar. "All over Bali they were burying their dead. The rampage had begun three days before. There were relatively few victims in Denpasar. Fifty Communists killed, the rest were being held in jail and beaten mercilessly."

In Negara things were much worse. "There were rumors of 16,000 dead. Negara is the Communist stronghold on Bali. At the sound of the name all faces froze. We asked about Negara in many villages and were hesitantly told that the Reds had been mowed down in rows by machine guns, but this turned out to be a legend. However, three thousand Communists were killed there. The accounts imply that the Army took a direct hand in the mass murder."

The reporter continues: "Sesetan is a tragic sight: not a single house is still standing, the wooden huts were burned down, and the stone bungalows of leading Communists were smashed by iron bars."

New York Times correspondent C.L.Sulzberger provided further facts in a dispatch from Jakarta [April 13]. "It is impossible to give any precise figure on the number slain. One careful diplomatic estimate puts the total at 300,000. Others range higher."

The capital of Indonesia now appears tranquil to Sulzberger. The military coup that stripped Sukarno of power is even called a "Javanese courtesy coup," he reports.

"But there is nothing courteous about the mass bloodshed that has raged and still rages in the hinterland. Officials seek to minimize its scope and claim the ghastly episode is closed. Nevertheless, along an immense island arc, from Sumatra to Timor, the killing attained a volume impressive even in violent Asia, where life is cheap."

Sulzberger lists what he describes as "many monstrous slaughters" in the twentieth century: "Turkey's Armenian massacres; Stalin's

starvation of the Kulaks; Hitler's Jewish genocide; the Moslem-Hindu killings following India's partition; the enormous purges after China's communization." Sulzberger's reference to "enormous purges in China" after the victory of the revolution in 1949 is highly dubious. He would have been much more accurate if he had recalled the truly colossal slaughter undertaken by Chiang Kai-shek in suppressing the revolutionary upsurge of 1925-27, which bears close resemblance in a number of ways to the current slaughter in Indonesia. In any case, Sulzberger is accurate in adding: "Indonesia's bloody persecution of its Communists rivals these terrible events in both scale and savagery."

After the failure of the attempted coup last September 30, declares Sulzberger, "Almost immediately Moslem youth organizations, many of whose members had been persecuted by the P.K.I. [Indonesian Communist party], started to hunt down Communist suspects, exterminating them, their wives and children."

"In February," he continues, "public beheadings were still being held outside Ende, capital of Flores Island. Each night soldiers were trucking groups of 20 or more P.K.I. suspects from the prison and out of town to decapitate them with heavy machetes. Sometimes heads were left on the ledge of a monument in Ende's central square."

The beheading of suspects, it might be noted, was standard practice under Chiang Kai-shek, who became known as the butcher of the Chinese revolution of 1925-27.

"From East Java and Bali across the island group called Nusa Tenggara, which includes Flores," the Times correspondent reports, "similar tragedies continue. At Kupang, capital of Indonesian Timor, the public is permitted to watch beheadings -- but witnesses must take part."

"Several dancing girls in the palace of an Agung (prince) in Bali are reported to have been executed on suspicion of Communist affiliations. There have been atrocious wholesale killings in both central and eastern Java. Decapitation is favored because Indonesian animist tradition claims that if an enemy's head and body are buried apart his spirit cannot return."

"Near coastal Surabaya early risers in March were pushing bodies away from the jetties before their houses. Jails near Jogjakarta are said still to be crammed with P.K.I. suspects who are not tried, but taken out in nightly batches and killed."

"Unburied bodies recently littered village streets in central Java. Recently a traveler was told of a bullock cart loaded with human heads."

"Last week a visitor to Tamgerang, near Jakarta, was told by army guards the local prison held five thousand Communists. He was depressed by the dismal silence of the place and suspected the accused were being starved. In distant provinces P.K.I. press gangs

have been worked on short rations until they drop."

According to Sulzberger, "Few people in Jakarta know details of this grisly cataclysm, but everyone knows dreadful things have been happening and aren't quite sure just what provoked such intense bestiality "

Sulzberger, who generally displays an acute awareness of the ins and outs of political happenings appears very reluctant to discuss the political causes of the blood purge conducted by Indonesia's new rulers. He refers to a claim offered by some observers that an "anxiety psychosis" was touched off by atrocity pictures displayed by the generals after their coup October 1. He himself talks about "that strange Malay streak, that inner, frenzied blood-lust which has given to other languages one of their few Malay words, amok. This time an entire nation ran amok."

The reasons for Sulzberger's embarrassment are fairly obvious. The American press, including Sulzberger's own paper, the mighty New York Times, has remained virtually silent throughout the grisly cataclysm which swept Indonesia and which is still going on. They remained silent because they were pleased at the turn of events, pleased to see the military coup d'état, pleased to see Sukarno lose power, pleased to see the Communist party crushed and its members slaughtered.

Bourgeois opponents of Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam have even pointed to the turn in Indonesia as an American victory that proves the falsity of the Pentagon theory concerning the "domino effect" of a possible National Liberation Front victory in south Vietnam. The satisfaction with which these opponents of escalation in Vietnam viewed the counterrevolutionary coup d'état in Indonesia provides the most convincing proof that their differences with Johnson in the field of foreign policy are only tactical.

American imperialist circles are thus guilty of moral complicity in the blood bath in Indonesia, if they are not even more directly involved through the machinations of the CIA.

In addition Washington is doing everything possible to help the generals consolidate their bloody victory in Indonesia. The generals, in turn, are responding to the overtures of the State Department.

Thus an announcement by Hamengku Buwono IX, Sultan of Jogjakarta and deputy premier in charge of economic affairs, made top billing on the front page of the very same issue of the New York Times that printed Sulzberger's dispatch on the editorial page. The sultan's announcement was a pledge by Indonesia's new military rulers to support "private enterprise." "His statement reversed the socialist trend of the last few years," said the Times.

The sultan read a statement promising that the government "would cease to consider big and moderate-sized businesses as ene-

mies of our state." All regulations "slowing down the development of private enterprise" are to be reconsidered.

This was the voice of triumphant counterrevolution signaling to the countinghouses of Wall Street. Indonesia's blood-soaked soil, he was telling the American bankers and investment brokers, is now ready for the sowing of dollars.

BERKELEY COMMITTEE DEFENDS POLISH OPPOSITIONISTS

An Ad Hoc Committee was organized in Berkeley, California, in March to protest the imprisonment in Poland of a group of revolutionary socialists, including Ludwik Hass, a well-known Trotskyist, critical of the Gomulka regime. More than 100 members of the Berkeley campus community joined. Among its first actions, the Ad Hoc Committee addressed the following letter to the Polish government:

"We the undersigned, who have protested and will continue to protest violations of freedom in our own country, and who are engaged even now in defending the civil liberties of American dissidents such as the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs and others who have come under government attack, are appalled that Polish citizens Hass, Modzelewski, Smiech, Badowski and Kuron have been sentenced to imprisonment for the exercise of political rights which we regard as elementary. We protest this repression of freedom. We demand that the defendants be released and that their political rights, including their rights to distribute literature of protest and organize political opposition, be affirmed."

Besides a large number of faculty members, the letter carried the names of the following signers, with organizations listed for identification: Robert Scheer; Executive Committee--Berkeley W.E.B. DuBois Club; Paul Jacobs; Hal Draper; Steve Weissman; Jack Weinberg; Michael Shute (Independent Socialist Club); Susan Pollard (Intn'l Committee Vietnam Day Committee); Michael Lerner (Grad. Coord. Committee); Savannah Bello (CORE); Saul Landau (Associate Studies on the Left); Jamie Huberman; David Friedman (VDC); Bob Nakamura (SLATE); Martin Roysher; Buddy Stein (Students for a Democratic Society); Randy Rappaport (VDC); Marvin Garson (Peace/Rights Organizing Committee); Susan Stein; Brian O'Brien (Pres. AFT Local 1570); Jim Glass (Free University); Geoffrey White (Spartacist); Sol Stern (Edit. Bd. Ramparts); Anne Draper; David Warren (Young Socialist Alliance); Sidney Ingerman (AFT); Ken Blum (Student Committee for Agricultural Labor); Jerry Rubin; Victory Levine (CORE); Joanne Landy (P/ROC); Joe Hacker (SLATE); Keith Nason (AFT); Robert Novick; Earl Gilman (Amer. Committee for the Fourth International); Joel Geier (ISC); Bernardo A.E. Garcia (AFT); Michael R. Marrus; Beth Stapleton; Neal Blumenfeld (VDC, ACLU); Norman Pereira; Mickey Rowntree; David McCullough (AFT); Frank Bardacke; James Burnett (Young Peoples Socialist League); Lewis Rubman (GCC); Eric Levine (SDS); Barbara Gullahorn; Gerald Rosenfield and others.

HAS DE GAULLE DOOMED THE NATO ALLIANCE?

By Gerhardt Knebel

After a long search, it proved possible to find the H-bomb that fell into the Mediterranean following a mid-air collision between an American bomber and a tanker plane. No doubt it was quickly defused.

The diplomatic bomb that de Gaulle placed on the table at NATO headquarters for the consideration of his fourteen allies is a different matter. All of them see it, all of them hear it ticking; but no one knows how to defuse it; no one knows whether it will just give off a harmless cloud of smoke that will finally drift away, or whether it will shatter the whole NATO structure like a blockbuster.

De Gaulle's unvarnished views and opinions were clearly expressed in the French memorandum of March 9 to the members of the alliance:

(1) As a member of the Atlantic Pact, France pledges complicity and solidarity with the imperialist industrial countries against the noncapitalist countries and the "third world" of underdeveloped nations. If de Gaulle in theory holds the nation to be an enduring entity standing above its changing social systems, he nevertheless conceives the "grandeur" of France to rest solely on the foundation of monopoly capitalism -- one with competing large concerns -- which he hopes to build at the cost of the workers under a Five Year Plan and with a modern capitalistic national economy erected at the expense of his Common Market partners.

(2) France withdraws from the "integrated" military setup of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, withdraws its officers from the unified command units, demands French control over the NATO bases in France and respectfully requests that the NATO High Command and the NATO Central European High Command get out of France. France is willing to leave its two divisions in West Germany under a special provision to be defined later.

The grounds given in de Gaulle's memorandum for his move are very interesting. Unfortunately, we can touch on these only briefly.

According to the memorandum, "there is no longer a direct threat in Europe"; secondly, "France has acquired an atomic armament of a type that excludes any form of integration"; finally, the nuclear equality between the USA and the Soviet Union, "which has succeeded the earlier American monopoly, has changed the general conditions for the defense of the West."

If NATO were a defensive organization, as it always used to be pictured, then it is difficult to see how the threat of war in Europe could disappear through the breaking of the American atomic monopoly. We have held that NATO, particularly in the period of John Foster Dulles' "roll-back" policy, was aimed aggressively at

the workers states and that if the danger of war and a "crusade to the East" declined it was due to the increase in Soviet atomic armaments. Is de Gaulle saying this in a diplomatic way?

Leaving this aside, de Gaulle in any case confirms what we and the antinuclear protest movement have long asserted -- a war in Europe with all its criminal atrocities has become impossible as a "reasonable" means of settling questions, since any such war would necessarily escalate into an atomic conflict. And de Gaulle confirms the view that atomic arms are in fundamental contradiction to any kind of alliance inasmuch as no member would permit another member to drag it into an atomic war.

Concerning de Gaulle's aims in striking this blow against NATO, speculation has varied. It appears to us that what he is seeking to do primarily is to demonstrate his independence from Washington in the international arena in a dramatic way, thus opening the possibility, in conjunction with French capacities in nuclear weapons, of playing a greater role in world politics than is justified by French atomic strength.

As an alternative to the "integrated" NATO, in which the United States holds an unassailable leading position, de Gaulle is working for an independent West Europe, federated economically, politically and militarily, but not integrated.

In such a Europe, the leading role would fall to France (along with England eventually), thanks to the "force de frappe" [atomic striking force]. This capitalist West Europe could then nurture the economic and cultural contacts with East Europe that would later contribute to restoring capitalism in that area.

De Gaulle appears to discount the danger that France's withdrawal from NATO might increase the relative weight of West Germany, contribute to its securing atomic arms and lead to the formation of a Washington-Bonn axis directed against the East. He adheres, it would seem, to the concept that the nuclear "balance of terror," as well as common opposition to China, will bring Washington and Moscow into a "partnership" that Washington would not relinquish for the sake of Bonn.

De Gaulle may recall that in its time, bourgeois England joined in an alliance with the feudal powers in Europe against the French bourgeois revolution (thus putting national above class interests). He may calculate on a similar development in the three-cornered rivalry of the U.S.A., the Soviet Union and China. Unfortunately, the national policies of the "Communist" leaderships in Moscow and Peking are scarcely designed to discourage such calculations.

Will de Gaulle's grandiose concept of an independent Europe (extending some day to the Urals) under French leadership be realized? The first stage -- "West Europe" -- has already run into insurmountable obstacles. In neither West Germany nor England is there any likelihood of forces emerging in the near future that would seriously oppose American dominance and lend support to de Gaulle.

Yet it must not be overlooked that de Gaulle is basing himself on real, present tendencies of development. The verbal pledges of the other NATO states to continue the integrated military organization even without France does not hide the fact that removal of the French beam has left the framework shaky.

The question of whether or not to follow de Gaulle's example will be carefully weighed in Norway where the leftist Socialist party, despite its numerical weakness, holds something of a key position. It is well known that Greece and Turkey, the partners in south-east Europe, are antagonistic and both are angry at the U.S. In Italy, in Belgium, in Denmark, the demand to withdraw from NATO will find more of an echo. Even in West Germany "signals and signs" can be noted, like Adenauer's sudden discovery that the Soviet Union wants peace, or the credits underwritten by the West German government, in open disregard of American wishes, to construct a giant steel plant in the People's Republic of China.

In view of the temporary impossibility of cracking open the East European markets by military force, sharpening capitalist competition necessarily operates as the main divisive factor in the capitalist NATO alliance, leading to anti-American tendencies and to competition in peaceful penetration of the markets of the noncapitalist states.

This situation opens up new possibilities for action by the socialist left: sharpened struggle in England and Germany against the pro-American policy of the Labour party and of the Social Democratic party, for an independent left-wing policy; in France, a struggle for complete withdrawal from NATO and the liquidation of the "force de frappe"; a general struggle for withdrawal from NATO and for a denuclearized Europe with the perspective of a United States of Europe.

If the left fails in this struggle, then the developments which were given impetus by de Gaulle's move threaten to lead to a strengthening of the national capitalist forces in West Europe (most dangerously in West Germany) and national bureaucratic forces in East Europe, with unforeseeable consequences. There are no grounds, therefore, for complacent rejoicing over de Gaulle's blow against NATO; what should be done is to take active advantage of it for the benefit of peace and the development of socialism.

#### BELGIAN WOMEN WORKERS STAGE DEMONSTRATION

Three thousand women, on strike since February 16 at one of Belgium's biggest armament plants, paraded in the streets of Herstal April 7 carrying placards stating their demands: "Equal pay for equal work!" "Stop the exploitation of women!" The men in the plant staged a one-hour solidarity strike during the demonstration. Operations at the huge Fabrique Nationale d'Armes de Guerre have been virtually paralyzed since the women workers went into action.

THE MEANING OF THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY VICTORY

By John Walters

London

The British general election was a great victory for the Labour party. Labour gained 49 seats, the Liberals 2, the Tories losing 51. The overall national swing to Labour was 3.1%, there being regional variations. Labour also gained 48.0% of all votes cast as against 44.2% in the 1964 election. Comparable figures for the Tories were 41.9% and 43.4%. In actual numbers of votes cast, Labour had 13,027,800. This is the first time that Labour's total vote has increased since the 1951 general election, also being nearly a million more than in 1964.

This is an important and interesting result in a number of ways. Firstly, there is the significance of a Social Democratic party being elected with such a big parliamentary majority (overall it is 97) at a time when there is no obvious economic crisis. This indicates a crisis of confidence for the British bourgeoisie. There has never before been an occasion when a working-class party has been elected to office in a period of apparent stability.

Secondly, the increased vote for Labour was gained from all sections of the population, but more particularly from the middle-class voters. This is shown in a decline in the Liberal vote -- despite their gain of 4 seats. This is one of the contradictions of the election result. Contradiction because the mass of the traditional working-class Labour vote not only held firm but increased, while at the same time the middle-class voters swung over to Labour in 1966 -- after hesitating in 1964 -- because they are convinced that the Labour government will take a tough line with the unions in seeking to maintain its "incomes" policy.

Thirdly, with such a big majority in Parliament the possibility opens up for some of the parliamentary "Lefts" to rediscover their principles and backbones. If they do, and in most cases it's a big if, and they start raising opposition to Wilson's policies on Vietnam, incomes policy, etc., they will receive support from among the rank and file, both in the Labour party and in the unions.

This brings me to the fourth aspect of the election victory. This is that it has demonstrated that the bulk of the British working class are committed to social change, despite nearly twenty years of economic euphoria. This victory will help generate even more self-confidence and militancy.

As I tried to indicate in previous articles [see World Outlook March 25 and April 1] the present period is one of contradictions, and this can be seen by a reading of the press. Most of the serious bourgeois publications are very open in their statements giving their views of the election result. It will be worth while to quote some of these to show this. The leader in the Financial Times for April 2 said:



"Two great dangers now face the Labour party and the country ....The tendency was to talk tough and, if action had to be taken, to choose the path of least resistance....But there comes a point when caution ceases to be a virtue. It is only now that we will be able to judge whether Mr. Wilson is in fact capable of decisive action. Second, there is the possibility that either Mr. Wilson himself or a substantial proportion of the Labour party will interpret victory as an endorsement of Socialism....He will now have the opportunity to prove that he is not an old-fashioned Socialist, that in his handling of both internal and external questions he can overcome the views and prejudices largely formed by the Labour party in the thirties."

Leonard Beaton writing in The Sunday Telegraph on April 3 heads his article "Wilson Needs An Economic Miracle," and says:

"Mr. Wilson returns to Downing Street with his greatest challenge before him. Can he bring Britain back into the first rank of industrial economies? Can he escape from debt, avoid unemployment and preside over something like an economic miracle? This is the great unknown of the next five years. His first problem is debt.... The means that Mr. Wilson has chosen to achieve this objective range over a wide field. Among them we can expect a tough budget within a few weeks. But the most important...is his determination to discourage investment abroad....Mr. Wilson has a great capacity to adapt. In 17 short months, he has forgotten a commendable amount of what he once knew about the virtues of socialism. He may forget a lot more.... Labour has not been elected to give the country socialism. It is there to put the economy right and will be judged on this and nothing else."

That is pretty clear and straightforward, but there is more to come. Harold Lever, who is a Labour M.P. wrote in The Observer on April 3 about the relations between the Labour government and business, and he had this to say:

"Labour's decisive victory has aroused anxiety in the City and large areas of the business world. In my view these fears are unjustified and need to be promptly dispelled lest they create the kind of melancholia in which sterling could weaken and the economy falter....The Labour leadership knows as well as any businessman that an engine which runs on profit cannot be made to move faster without extra fuel....Share values will continue to reflect assets and earning power -- even after a 40 per cent Corporation Tax and a Capital Gains Tax which, at 30 per cent, can hardly be described as confiscatory....For 18 months when he was vulnerable to pressure from his Left, Mr. Wilson showed no sign of departing from his moderate course or of softening his forthright exposition of them. The deterrent to rebellion with a big majority as with a small one, is the danger of defeating the Government. Mr. Wilson is no more vulnerable now than he was after October 1964. He has no more reason to swerve from his chosen path of moderation than he had then."

Finally I come to the leader in The Sunday Times of April 3: "The Election result is not, however, a vindication for the old Labour Party or a repudiation of the new Conservative Party. It is

not a demand for steel nationalisation....It is not a mandate for the solemn complacencies of old-style trade unionism....The final question, which will decide the fate of the Government is the economy. Here there is an immediate and critical situation to be dealt with and a long-term problem as well. The immediate need is to bring the present inflation under control....The point to be taken is that you cannot make an incomes policy work against the main stream of the economy. If economic forces are pushing wages up no incomes policy will hold them down. In this matter it is Mr. Callaghan who will need to be supported and the pressure of events will probably see to it that he prevails."

It is clear from all the above that two clear strands emerge, one that there is still no solution to Britain's economic problems, and that the economy will have to be deflated to the point of producing significant unemployment. Also that having done this, an incomes policy must be imposed, one that will be effective in holding down wages. Secondly, that big business has nothing to fear from the Labour government. It is worth noting here that contrary to the previous two elections the steel industry did not indulge in its usual massive antinationalization campaign. This seems to indicate that the bourgeoisie has come to accept some measure of state control of the steel industry as being necessary if it is to be rationalized and British steel products made competitive in the world market. However, steel apart, they do not see Wilson as any threat, rather they look to him for their salvation.

But like all Social Democratic governments, and parties, this one in Britain is subject to many contradictory pressures. This means that in the first stages of any struggle over the imposition of an incomes policy this will probably manifest itself as pressure on the Wilson government, and not as a struggle against it. Precisely how this struggle will develop is difficult to predict at this point. What British revolutionary Marxists will have to combat is any tendency to substitute break-away rank-and-file committees for struggle within the trade-union and labor movement. This is not to say of course that such committees should not be supported; just the reverse -- it is such committees that must be the basis for any determined fight against the incomes policy. However, such a fight needs a strategy that will combine both unofficial rank-and-file committees and those elements within the trade-union bureaucracy who are at this stage prepared to oppose the Wilson government.

The most important aspect of this election victory is that it marks a qualitative change in the British political scene. Contrary to what some commentators have said, this election was not merely an endorsement of Wilson. That endorsement flows from the crumbling of the grip of bourgeois ideas on sections of the middle class and the previously backward sections of the working class. This is not to say that this is a realization of socialist consciousness, but it is a first step towards it, because it entails a rejection of the mystique of the Tory party as being the only one that can govern.

Also the election result can be seen as an act of class consciousness on the part of the working class, in that there was a

determination not to allow the Tories back into power. This expressed itself in two ways, firstly in the massive increase in Labour's vote, secondly in the decline in the votes of most of the individual Communist party and other radical candidates who stood in opposition to Labour. In other words there seemed to be a determination not to split the vote and allow any Tory in.

Another pointer to the growing sophistication on the part of the workers was that in seats where Labour has been used to having overwhelming majorities; i.e., 20,000 or so, there was a tendency for the turnout to decline, yet in all the marginal seats there was usually a higher than average turnout of the voters. This would indicate not apathy, in the safe seats, but rather confidence; and determination in the marginal ones.

Therefore the coming year or so in British politics will be of some importance for the development of the left both in the Labour party and trade unions. The election result emphasizes once again the basic proposition of revolutionary Marxists that it is within these that we have to look for emergence of a mass revolutionary party. The present situation does not mean that this will be automatic, rather it presents possibilities.

#### AFTER THE AUSTRIAN ELECTIONS

By Wilhelm Werner

Vienna

In view of the traditional stability of the Austrian electorate, the elections of March 6 in Austria can be accounted a landslide for the bourgeois parties.

The main bourgeois party, the Austrian People's party [Oesterreichische Volkspartei -- OVP] got 48.4% of the vote and an absolute majority in parliament with 85 seats out of 165. This is the first time since 1945 that it has registered such a success. The Socialist party [SP] won 42.6%, a loss of 1.4%, its seats falling from 76 to 74.

The distance between the two big parties is now the greatest -- 269,000 votes, 3% of the total -- since the founding of the Second Austrian Republic. In 1959, the SP still had a higher vote than the OVP.

The results were still more negative in view of the fact that the Communist party called on its supporters to vote for the SP throughout the country with the exception of a single district in Vienna where it ran a candidate of its own. He got 18,638 votes (3,000 less than in the previous election) and lost out.

The electoral defeat suffered by the Social Democrats was due in particular to the appearance of a new party founded by the former trade-union leader and Social Democratic Minister of the Interior

Franz Olah. This organization, the Democratic Progress party, got 148,500 votes in its first try, picking up more than one-half of its votes from the working-class districts in Vienna.

Olah was expelled from the SP because he came into conflict with a wing of the reformist bureaucracy when he exposed some of their shady dealings although he was guilty himself of not less shady transactions with trade-union funds. He very quickly became a kind of Austrian Poujade. He runs a sensationalist daily, the Kronen-Zeitung, which he uses to expose the "corruption" of the Social Democratic leadership. He is denigrating the labor movement as a whole more and more; and there appears to be little doubt that he is getting money from big business. He did not hesitate to use anti-Semitic language in his campaign to the great joy of the petty bourgeoisie whose neo-Nazi nostalgia is well known.

The reformist apparatus tried to fight by resorting to use of the bourgeois state machinery. This succeeded only in antagonizing a sector of the public who resent the "monopolistic claims" of the two big parties and their "infractions of our freedoms." This clumsy defense undoubtedly strengthened Olah's position still more.

In a historical sense, the Social Democratic defeat is due to the policy of coalition with the People's party for the past twenty years and more.

A vigorous debate over the causes of the defeat has begun in the labor movement. The systematic subordination of the interests of the working class and the needs of the struggle for socialism in Austria to the imperatives of the coalition provoked apathy and even hostility in larger and larger sectors of the working class. In large part, the vote against the SP was a vote against the coalition policy, still more so since one of the main themes in the electoral propaganda of the OVP was the promise to change the coalition's "hackneyed" way of functioning. Thus impressionable layers of petty-bourgeois voters and young workers, politically uneducated for twenty years, abandoned the workers parties for the People's party and Olah's party.

Nor did the Communist party understand the fundamental reason for the defeat. Thus, on the very eve of the Social Democratic defeat of March 6, the central CP organ continued to campaign for maintenance of the OVP-SP coalition.

In the Social Democracy, the doubts and hesitations aroused by the electoral results have not led to reconsideration of the coalition policy as a fundamental question. The only preoccupation of the reformist leadership is that their weakened position in the relationship of forces may be reflected by a marked worsening of the bargaining conditions under which the new cabinet will be constituted.

Furthermore, there are extreme right-wing reformists who are using the defeat to criticize the attitude of the leaders of the Socialist party as too "neutralist" and not "anti-Communist" enough!

As for the socialist left, its position was expressed particularly in a letter from the Socialist Students and the Association of Socialist High School Students demanding that the Socialist party leave the government and become an opposition party.

The victorious party is not inclined to eliminate the reformists from the cabinet. The OVP wants to maintain the coalition but change the balance in its own favor. Its principal demands include abandonment of the post of minister of foreign affairs by the Socialist party (or rather the prime minister assuming all responsibilities in the area of foreign affairs); changes in the law on nationalized enterprises; lower taxes on high incomes; rapprochement with the Common Market; control by the OVP over radio and television.

The bourgeoisie is trying to accelerate the process of returning the nationalized enterprises to private ownership by making them "autonomous," by abolishing the centralized management of the nationalized sector of industry.\*

The capitalist victors in the election know no limit in their thirst for profits -- they are also demanding an increase in interest rates and in rent for apartments.

Will the electoral defeat of March 6 create enough of a shake-up to enable a larger working-class vanguard to emerge from the lethargy in which the working class has remained for so many years in Austria? It is probably too early to say with assurance. But Austrian revolutionary Marxists must work toward this end and try to bring this vanguard into struggle against the fatal policy of coalition with the bourgeois parties.

---

\*Of all the capitalist countries in Europe, Austria has the largest nationalized sector due to the nationalizations that took place in the former Soviet occupation zone (oil in particular) and the nationalization of the property of German capitalists throughout the country after 1945. [Editor's note.]

#### CAP AND GOWN INCLUDED IN CIA CLOAK AND DAGGER PARAPHERNALIA

Officials at Michigan State University are squirming over the disclosure by Ramparts magazine that they provided support and cover for operations of the Central Intelligence Agency in south Vietnam from 1955 to 1959. The university was presumably operating a seven-year, multimillion-dollar "technical assistance" program. At least five of the men hired by the university and given "faculty rank" were actually engaged in "counterespionage and counterintelligence."

The exposure added another bit of evidence showing the sinister side of the foreign "aid" programs pictured by American propagandists as the acme of "generosity" and "humanitarianism."

## THE DEMONSTRATIONS IN WEST BENGAL

By Gayatri Devi

Calcutta

The food movement in West Bengal that commenced in February has been described as the "most violent upsurge of the people since the advent of independence in India." Home Minister Gulzarilal Nanda at one point attacked it as "an artificial uprising."

Unprecedented in its widespread and violent nature, there was no single issue on which the movement was launched. It was in fact the expression of bitterness born out of eighteen years of frustration, suffering and endless misery.

In mid February the students of Basirhat, a district town, demonstrated before a local administrative office, demanding food and kerosene, Chief Minister Sen having stated earlier in the state legislature that rice and wheat would be distributed regularly in "modified rationing" areas. The promise had not been carried out in many districts. Likewise people were not satisfied with the ration of 1,500 grams [3 lbs. 5 oz.] of rice and wheat per person each week.

The modified rationing system introduced by the government was a hoax in itself. Only "A" card holders were entitled to food grains, which were distributed once a month and sometimes only once in two months. But the "B" and "C" card holders were not even entitled to this.

In addition, the government had adopted a policy of cordoning off deficit areas, causing a great deal of hardship. In the so-called deficit districts, villagers had to pay an exorbitant price of Rs. 2.50 [one rupee = \$.21] for a kilo of rice. Kerosene, the only means of lighting their homes, was in short supply. In villages and small towns, plunged into darkness for months because of lack of kerosene, school children could not study at night.

So the students demanded food and kerosene. At Basirhat the police opened fire, killing Nurul Islam, a ten-year-old boy. This aroused people all over the state. Students in every district held demonstrations demanding food and kerosene. They also demanded an inquiry into the shooting of Nurul Islam.

To suppress statewide strikes of students, police resorted to gunfire at several places, including the district towns of Sarupnagar and Baduria. Three persons were killed. The government promptly ordered all schools, colleges and other educational institutions closed. In the legislature, opposition members demanded a judicial inquiry into the shootings. Chief Minister Sen, however, was not prepared to go beyond a departmental inquiry.

On February 25, the United Left Front of West Bengal (consisting of six left parties, including the Right and Left Communist parties of India, the Revolutionary Socialist party of India and the

Revolutionary Communist party of India) observed a "Release of All Political Prisoners Day." The front also demanded an adequate supply of food grains and kerosene and a judicial inquiry into the police shootings. Chief Minister Sen arrogantly accused the opposition of exploiting the food and kerosene shortage as a "political game" and condemned the students and refugees for their agitation.

There were statewide protests against the chief minister's statement. The opposition in the legislature sought a meeting with the chief minister but he refused to sit with the leaders of the Left Communist party of India. In protest, the United Left Front legislators tried to block the legislative proceedings and sixteen of them were suspended by the speaker of the legislative assembly.

On March 1, the government dramatically ordered the schools and colleges to be reopened; but students went on strike. On March 3, the students staged protest demonstrations and marches in Calcutta and other urban centers. There were clashes with police for hours in Calcutta as students attempted to burn buses and trains. In Krishnanagar, a suburban town near Calcutta, a young student, Ananda Hait, was killed and two others were injured.

As the police refused to hand over the body of Ananda Hait to his relatives, the residents of Krishnanagar raided the morgue on March 4 and took the body out in a procession. The police opened fire on this march of several thousand people. In retaliation, the demonstrators formed into groups and attacked the Congress party and government offices and also burned a minister's home. With rail lines and all other means of communication cut, the town was completely paralyzed. Barricades were put across the roads by crowds of people who engaged the police in pitched battles.

The anger of the populace soon spread to Santipur, district headquarters of Nadia. Municipal and government offices, the local branch of the State Bank and the Congress party office were set on fire. The state government called out the army and handed over Krishnanagar and Santipur to the armed personnel. The opposition decided to boycott the budget session of the Assembly.

The "West Bengal Food and Prisoners Release Convention," held on March 5, called for a statewide general strike and hartal [general shutdown] for March 10. This "Bengal Bandh" call met with an unprecedented success. But the government resorted to repression. According to an unconfirmed report, more than fifty persons were killed by the police and armed forces on that day. The government resorted to indiscriminate arrests -- more than 7,000 persons being rounded up, including all known leaders of the United Left Front and other left groups like the Forward Bloc and the Praja Socialist party. West Bengal remained completely paralyzed until March 13.

Faced with a serious deadlock, Home Minister Nanda and Food Minister Subramaniam came down to Calcutta and, seeing no other alternative, advised the state government to release the leaders of the United Left Front. Chief Minister Sen was also forced to release another group of leaders of the Left Communist party of India, including

Jyoti Basu, leader of the opposition in the legislature, who had been arrested earlier under the "Defence of India Rules." Sen at first threatened to resign, but finally yielded to the pressure of the central government.

On March 13 the people of Calcutta organized the historical silent procession to mourn the martyrs of the movement. The procession was banned, but hundreds of thousands joined in the impressive protest march in defiance of the ban.

The government thought perhaps that the movement could be ended by releasing the United Left Front leaders. Sen agreed to meet them and they placed before him a charter of eleven demands which included introduction of statutory rationing throughout the state and release of all political prisoners detained under the Defence of India Rules.

The state government at first indicated that it would consider some of the demands made by the United Left Front. Jyoti Basu flew to Delhi for a meeting with President Radhakrishnan and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Despite the parleys, the West Bengal government did not meet the eleven-point charter.

The government's strategy is to make some concessions to the urban layers and thus isolate them from the rural masses. The shortage of food and kerosene is more acutely felt in the villages than in the urban areas. Indeed the movement in West Bengal has been unorganized. The leadership came from the petty bourgeoisie. Experience has shown that a movement of this magnitude cannot be properly organized unless a proletarian leadership comes to the forefront. After several attempts at conciliation the United Left Front rejected the latest note from the West Bengal government as unsatisfactory and scheduled another general strike and hartal in the state (a "Bengal Bandh") for April 6.

What form the food movement in the state will finally take is difficult to predict. To carry the movement to a higher stage it is necessary to organize factory committees of workers, area committees and elected committees of the rural masses in villages and coordinate them at various levels. Only thus can a long-drawn-out movement of this type be conducted on the basis of a fighting program to resolve the basic problems of the people.

#### SQUATTERS BATTLE POLICE IN BOGOTA

Two children and an adult were killed by police in Bogotá April 8 as they drove squatters out of privately owned land on the fringes of the city. Another 100 persons, including 17 policemen, were wounded. The squatters put up a pitched battle for two hours defending their newly erected shacks. After being driven away, their homes were set on fire. Said Mayor Jorge Gaitan Cortes, "Personal property has to be defended."



GREEK MONARCHY PREPARING NEW OFFENSIVE AGAINST WORKERS

[The following article has been translated by World Outlook from the March issue of Ergatike Demokratia (Workers Democracy), a publication of the Greek Trotskyist movement.]

\* \* \*

Since the events that broke out last July 15 [with the forced resignation of Premier Papandreou], we have repeatedly said that the basic aim of the palace coup was to crush the workers movement and to take away even the most minor economic and political conquests of the working class and the exploited and oppressed masses.

In a preceding article, we summed up the basic political events of December and January as follows:

"It is obvious. The bourgeois reactionary forces, standing behind the court, are preparing an all-out offensive to crush the workers movement. They are organizing and preparing their forces for the propitious moment. The entire question as they see it is to wear out the masses, to exhaust them, to confuse them, and thus make their victory more certain..."

Almost two months have gone by since then. And the class collaborationists have not missed a single opportunity to sow confusion and to cultivate fatal illusions by calling for the "isolation of the forces of disorder" and pleading for "order." But how quickly the harsh logic of the facts is exposing the petty-bourgeois theories of class collaboration and class harmony.

In the past two months the unstable court government, seeking to get out of the blind alley in which it finds itself, and relying on the reassuring line of the EDA [the United Democratic Left] and the KKE [the Communist Party of Greece] in favor of restoring order, has undertaken increasingly severe measures against the workers movement.

In addition to the continually broadening use of the law for drafting strikers, we have had the following in the two months that have just ended: the creation of military groups for the organization of the mechanics of strikebreaking; bloody repression of students in Athens and Thessalonika, including arrests of cadres of the student movement; trials and harsh sentences for the cadres of the left. The terroristic activities of ultra right-wing elements have grown. And on top of all this, the law authorizing administrative deportations has been revived, under the pretext of "limiting the number of foreigners." This fact alone shows how the offensive of the court government to take away the most elementary political liberties of the working class and the masses of this country is being stepped up.

Who can doubt the purely political character of these deportations, since it is common knowledge that the deportees are fighters

for the people who were born in Greece?

And who can still maintain that these deportations do not constitute a kind of trial balloon, a way of measuring the reaction of the working class and the broad masses of the people, before worse repressions are undertaken?

All of this should make the aims and intentions of the court-army camarilla obvious to the blind.

They are trying to create a defeatist mood among the workers and broad masses of the people. They are bringing to bear their strongest, most pitiless repressive apparatus. They want to cultivate the idea that any struggle against them is fraught with danger and doomed to defeat.

Their ultimate goal is to create the proper climate for the abolition of all political and trade-union freedoms, for the establishment of an open dictatorship.

How has the leadership of the workers movement, the EDA and KKE reacted to all of this? They have not held a single demonstration against the arrests and trials. They have no perspective of mobilizing the working class. Their answer is declarations, negotiations, debates in parliament; this is the "fighting" of the petty-bourgeois left democrats of the EDA. They ask the court government to respect national and international law concerning the rights of men and citizens. They ask those who have wet their hands in the blood of the workers so many times to respect the political and trade-union freedoms of the working class. They make offers and seek a dialogue and an understanding with those who organized the coup d'état, always with the same goal, "order."

All of this is mere paper warfare, the familiar parliamentary chatter and illusions of the class-collaborationist leaders. These are the familiar methods with which they cultivate illusions and seduce the workers and the masses of the people. These are the same methods with which they have facilitated the crushing of the workers movement by the exploiting class so many times before. We indict them today, however, for pursuing this policy after the great popular mobilizations of last summer, for allowing fighters for the people to be arrested and deported, without even a protest demonstration.

There is no room for doubt that these prosecutions, arrests and deportations will multiply every day, if the working class and the left movement do not give a direct, determined reply.

And the only effective reply at this point is the militant mobilization of the working class and the broad masses of the people, with rallies and demonstrations in all of the cities of the country, and organization of a general strike throughout Greece against the prosecutions, arrests and deportations. For the abolition of all laws against the workers! For the legalization of all workers parties!

By taking the goal of overthrowing the court government and the court-military camarilla, of halting bourgeois reaction, the workers movement will be able to hold and extend its conquests and open up the fight to abolish the exploitive regime. There is no other road. The opposite policy of "the peaceful road" and "order" will lead to a new defeat for the working class -- to the unveiled dictatorship of big business.

We repeat. The responsibility for mobilizing the workers in a class front of struggle, without compromise with the capitalist parties, with the above goals and linked to the day-to-day economic struggle, falls on the vanguard fighters who have come to understand the treacherous role of the two class-collaborationist parties, the EDA and the KKE.

In face of the danger of a new disaster for the working class, no doubts about the solidarity and united action of the working class can be tolerated.

The working class, supported by the poor people of Athens and of the country, is continuing its resistance to the offensive of the court-military camarilla. However, the basic obstacle to their struggle is their class-collaborationist leadership. Thus a basic need of revolutionaries parallel to the struggle against the class enemy is to fight the class collaborationists courageously, laying the groundwork for the consolidation of a new revolutionary leadership. For a revolutionary workers party!

Only thus will the offensive of bourgeois reaction be repelled. We will hold our small economic and political conquests and we will extend them. And we will open the road for the overthrow of this rotten bourgeois society which can offer us only unemployment, hunger and war, and we will lay the foundations for the construction of a new society, without exploitation and oppression, for socialism.

#### LUU THANH KIEM

Luu Thanh Kiem, a 35-year-old Vietnamese Trotskyist leader, died recently in Paris of cancer, the April issue of Quatrième Internationale reports. According to the monthly organ of the French Trotskyists, Kiem joined a vanguard revolutionary youth organization in south Vietnam when he was very young.

After the French imperialists launched their war to reconquer the rebellious colony, Kiem became a guerrilla fighter, participating in the struggle for two years.

As a guerrilla fighter, Kiem ran across some of the works of Leon Trotsky. These clarified a whole series of problems for him and determined his subsequent outlook.

As he explained the new concepts to his comrades-in-arms, he found himself the object of increasing suspicion and hostility from Stalinists fighting in the same struggle and he returned to the city where he joined the Fourth International. After the Geneva agreement he went to France to study for qualification as an engineer.

He participated in the political activities of the French section of the Fourth International while continuing his studies and also maintaining contact with his Trotskyist comrades in Vietnam. He was about to return to Vietnam when his lingering illness began.

The revolution constituted the essence of his life, declares Quatrième Internationale. He never spared himself. He was a talented writer, a tireless recruiter and he had an extraordinary number of contacts whom he knew how to bring closer to the revolutionary movement. "His gentle demeanor was linked with the need for the greatest rigor in his work in which he never spared himself and in which no task was beneath him."

Two years ago the French Trotskyists nominated him to serve as an alternate on their Central Committee and he became a full member at their eighteenth congress.

His last article, speaking out against the war in Vietnam, appeared in the October issue of Quatrième Internationale under the pen name of Long Tuyen.

The Vietnamese Trotskyists sent a cable from Saigon reading: "Vietnamese comrades regret stunning loss of Kiem. Sincere condolences."

Besides relatives in Vietnam, Kiem is survived by his wife and a newly born daughter.

#### MALLIKARJUN RAO

Mallikarjun Rao, a leader of the Socialist Workers party of India, died at Secunderabad in March. Neither his age nor the cause of death were reported. He is survived by his wife and three children.

Born in the Guntur district, Mallikarjun Rao joined the students movement in Andhra in the thirties. In 1936 he went to Bombay to attend Sydenham College. There he joined the Bombay Girni Kamgar Union, the biggest trade union led by the Communist party of India, becoming assistant secretary. He also worked as a journalist on the staffs of the Free Press Journal and the Bombay Chronicle.

Repelled by Stalinism, he became a Trotskyist. In 1941, along with Dr.M.G.Purdy and others, he founded the Mazdoor Trotskyist party of India. An active participant in the 1942 "Quit India" movement

which was directed against British imperialism as part of the struggle to win freedom for India, Mallik worked in the underground.

In 1942-43 he moved to Secunderabad where he helped organize the railwaymen and other workers in the then Nizam state under difficult conditions. He was arrested in Bombay in 1944 and imprisoned for more than two years. He once made a daring but unsuccessful attempt to escape.

Released from prison in 1946, he organized the first squatters movement in Bombay in the postwar period. He led thousands of homeless workers in occupying empty army barracks at Sion-Koliwada, compelling the authorities to recognize the squatters as rightful tenants.

In 1947-48, he participated in the anti-Nizam movement in Hyderabad. He led a group of guerrilla-type freedom fighters in operating from the Sholapur borders inside the Nizam territory.

After Hyderabad was integrated with the Indian Union, he settled in Secunderabad, soon becoming a prominent trade-union leader. He was elected general secretary of the Central Railway Workers Union (Secunderabad Zone), was a founding leader of the United Trades Union Congress in 1948 and was elected for a term to the Secunderabad Municipal Corporation.

As a leader of the Trotskyist movement, Mallik initiated a move in 1953 to unify the various Marxist parties in India under the banner of the "Mazdoor Kisan Party of India." When this did not succeed, he joined in sponsoring a merger in 1958 of the different Trotskyist groups to form the Revolutionary Workers party of India.

This organization then joined with the Revolutionary Communist party of India in 1960. But serious differences arose between the two components, particularly after the Sino-Indian border war, and a break occurred in 1963.

In 1965, the Trotskyists from various states met in Bombay and founded the Socialist Workers party as a section of the Fourth International.

Mallik's health broke down after he was jailed by the Congress government in 1959 because of his role in connection with the all-India strike of the Central government employees. He directed the strike in Andhra Pradesh as chairman of the Joint Action Committee in that area.

Mallik suffered persecution from the bourgeois state because of his revolutionary activities and he was maligned by the Stalinists because of his loyalty to the principles of revolutionary socialism. But he never buckled under the tremendous pressure.

CASTRO'S VIEWS ON THE CHILEAN REVOLUTION

[In our issue of March 25, we called attention to an evidently important speech made by Fidel Castro in Havana on March 13. We translated a few sentences that were quoted by the Paris daily Le Monde, including a phrase referring to the "worst elements of Trotskyism." We noted at the time that the phrase was broken off abruptly at this point in the Le Monde account. We now have the complete text of this speech in an official English translation. Castro said no more about "Trotskyism" than the phrase indicated above. Aside from this very bad and completely unjustified remark, which obviously refers to his Stalinist-type attack against Trotskyism, delivered January 15, Castro says nothing more on the subject. The rest of the speech is of great interest. In our April 8 issue, we called attention in particular to Castro's appeal for effective aid to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Vietnamese freedom fighters.

[In another part of this very long speech, Castro took up the question of Chile and the repressive measures employed by the Frei government against the striking copper miners. These remarks caused an international furor, Frei himself attempting to answer Castro's charges. This dispute was given considerable publicity in the bourgeois press, but what Castro said was either greatly distorted or left unreported. We are therefore reprinting this section of his speech below.

[Ultralefts, who have been charging Castro with openly giving up advocacy of the class struggle, with openly espousing peaceful coexistence, and with openly giving up the concept of socialist revolution in order to advance the Stalinist idea of limiting the revolutionary process in Latin America to a "bourgeois-democratic stage," are invited to study this section of Castro's speech with care. We particularly call the attention of Michael Banda of the Socialist Labour League in England to what Fidel Castro said. Banda, we have previously noted in World Outlook, contended in the February 5 Newsletter that the "main purpose" of the Tricontinental Conference "was to provide a safety-valve for middle-class charlatans like Cheddi Jagan and upper-class demagogues like Allende to blow off steam against imperialism, neocolonialism and what-have-you." Banda may find some comfort in Castro's agreement that nationalizations alone are not sufficient to judge the character of a revolution. This has been a big point with the SLL theoreticians who claim that Cuba still remains "capitalist."

[A final point is the current importance of Chile in the Latin-American revolution. As Castro noted earlier in his speech, the "imperialists have wanted to turn the so-called 'Chilean experience' into an alternative to Cuba." Frei was presented to the peoples of Latin America, "he, his Party and his Doctrine, as an example of what they called 'a bloodless revolution.'"

[By way of explaining Castro's opening reference in the section below, he had just finished telling how a delegation of members of the Chilean parliament had come to Cuba, a delegation including

representatives of the bourgeois parties as well as a deputy from the FRAP (Frente Revolucionario de Acción Popular). All but two of the Christian Democratic deputies took umbrage at some militant remarks Castro made in a letter to U Thant and immediately returned to Chile. The Christian Democratic party then sent a cable to the two remaining deputies ordering them to return. In Chile a Christian Democratic deputy by the name of Hurtado cabled them that they ought to stay. He was immediately expelled by the Christian Democratic leadership. Castro then had some talks with the two remaining deputies.

[We have used the text printed in the English-language Granma of March 20, correcting obvious typographical errors. The subtitles appear in the original.]

\* \* \*

### Chile needs a Socialist Revolution

We had discussions with those deputies. And we explained to them that to make a revolution it is first necessary to confront imperialism; that to make a revolution, although it may not be socialist, but a bourgeois-democratic revolution, a nationalist revolution, they had to confront imperialism and they had to confront the national oligarchy.

I told them also that I did not think that conditions in Chile permitted a revolution of that type, and that in the conditions of Chile if a revolution was desired, it would necessarily have to be a socialist revolution, and I explained why. Because an underdeveloped country, burdened with debts as Chile is, a country where large masses of the population live in the worst conditions, would necessarily have to strike a blow against the interests of imperialism, of the oligarchy, of big industry, of the import-export trade and of the Bank if something was to be done, to give something to the peasant masses and to the masses of workers in the country.

And, also that to wage a battle against the oligarchy and against imperialism, the support of the worker and peasant masses was necessary to confront imperialism; and also that to wage a battle against the oligarchy and against imperialism, the support of the worker and peasant masses was necessary, and that the masses of workers and peasants would not lend support to any bourgeois revolution, because the workers and the peasants would not be willing to collaborate to serve the interests of an exploiting class.\*

I told them not to judge the nature of the Chilean Revolution by the nationalization or not, of the copper industry; that nation-

\*In the official English text, a typographical error in this paragraph is combined with a missing phrase. We have corrected the translation, utilizing the extracts of the speech published in the March 30 issue of the Mexican weekly Siempre. -- Editor.

alization measures could be taken sooner or later. That what really defined a revolution was the will to change the social structure for the benefit of the exploited classes, which can only be done, to the detriment of the exploiting classes; that the policy which they follow with copper was not what would determine if it was a revolution or not, because sometimes there are governments which nationalize a foreign enterprise and do not make a revolution; that the determining factor would not be the moment when copper was or was not nationalized, but rather that the nature of that revolution had to be judged by all its acts, by all its policies toward each social class, the existence or nonexistence of its will to make a revolution for the benefit of the workers, for the benefit of the peasants, for the benefit of the exploited.

They said that they were going to carry out an agrarian reform which was going to establish a limit of 80 hectares. And I told them: If you are going to make an "80 hectare" revolution you will have to fight against the oligarchy, and you cannot fight against the oligarchy without the support of the peasants and workers.

We recalled that our agrarian reform at first placed the limit at more than 300 hectares, and everybody knows the resistance the large landowners put up against that, how they immediately started conspiracies. And, naturally, I pointed out to them that if they compensated the large landowners in cash, with what resources would they be able to help the peasants? With what resources could they carry out the mechanization of the rural areas?

And, in short, all these questions of a general order which determine whether or not there is a revolution, and which show that in the conditions of our countries it is not possible to make an anti-oligarchy, anti-imperialist revolution without the support of the workers and the farmers, since that revolution will march toward socialism, independently of whether or not copper is nationalized, because the imperialists have multiple interests in any country of Latin America; because the copper problem can wait, that in the end when a country possesses a source of wealth such as copper or oil, it is in much better conditions to demand its rights from imperialism, to impose its conditions upon imperialism, than a country such as ours which only has sugar. And that the possession of copper gave Chile special advantages to impose conditions upon imperialism.

It only remains to say that if we were Chileans the first thing we would have done would have been to nationalize copper.

But, naturally, we wanted to say that this did not necessarily have to be a dogma and that in the final analysis, this would not in itself define whether or not a revolution was going to take place in Chile.

What is really happening in Chile? Could it be that a revolution is really taking place? Could it be that the government of Chile is willing to confront imperialism, the oligarchy, the great industrial bourgeoisie, the banking and business interests? No. The first



great error of these attempts is the belief in the possibility of conciliating the interests of the different classes, to believe that one can make a Revolution, or that one can even speak of Revolution with a spirit of conciliation among classes; to believe that one can conciliate the interests of imperialism and the interests of the Nation; to believe that one can conciliate the interests of the oligarchies and the interest of the peasants; to believe that one can conciliate the interests of the great bourgeoisie and the interests of the workers.

And this is very old; these problems have been discussed for over a century. What has occurred in reality? The workers are against the Christian Democratic government, and they are against the Christian Democratic government because they will never be willing to make sacrifices for the benefit of the bourgeoisie, for the benefit of the rich.

### Frei: blood without Revolution

A government can ask the workers to make sacrifices when a Revolution has been made for the workers, when there is a change in the social structure to the benefit of the workers, but no government can tell the workers to make sacrifices for the benefit of the bourgeoisie, for the benefit of the rich. No government can tell the workers not to demand salary increases in order to develop an industry as the private property of the capitalists, as the private property of the bourgeoisie. A revolutionary socialist government can ask sacrifices from the workers in order to develop an economy for the workers and peasants, to develop a socialist economy.

The Chilean government has met with tenacious resistance on the part of the mine workers of Chile. It has met with tenacious resistance on the part of the workers in general, because the government of Chile asks the workers for sacrifices in order to develop an economy which benefits the wealthy classes, industrial capital, commercial capital, banking capital and which benefits imperialist interests. A consequence of this has been the constant conflict between the Chilean workers and the government of Chile. Nevertheless, as Sr. Frei deflates like a balloon, as Sr. Frei faces these social contradictions, he can't think of anything better to blame than the Tricontinental Conference for his problems. And on the occasion of a strike of Chilean workers in one of the great copper mines, he sent troops against the workers, causing eight dead and thirty-five wounded.

While this was happening, what was Sr. Frei doing? According to the AP, "President Eduardo Frei tonight denounced before the country that in the Tricontinental Conference in Havana the plans were forged to create the trade-union and political unrest which has rocked Chile during the past weeks; he spoke with dramatic force over radio and television hours after a mob..." -- for the UPI and the AP, the workers, the people, are always mobs -- "...of a thousand people attacked the police and the soldiers in the giant El Salvador copper mine owned by the Anaconda Company, and a skirmish took place

in which at least six people were killed. Frei said, 'In the recent conference in Havana, it was publicly declared that guerrillas in Chile would take another form and that action would take place through lockouts, strikes, seizure of rural property, collective mobilization and revolutionary violence.'

To tell the truth, I have always believed that Frei was a representative of the Chilean bourgeoisie and that his government was a bourgeois government. I never believed that Frei was going to make a revolution. And you will recall that I spoke of this right after the Christian Democratic election triumph. But I thought that Frei was trying to experiment with a different kind of bourgeois government; I believed that Frei at least was an individual with bourgeois morality, that Frei at least was an individual with Christian morality; not revolutionary, but a type of bourgeois government different from the other bourgeois and oligarchic governments of the continent, and with some bourgeois morality.

When I see Sr. Frei, in order to explain Chile's internal problems, in order to justify his massacre of workers, stoop to the vulgar expedient of blaming the Tricontinental for his problems, what I feel for this individual more than anything else, is sincere pity, sincere embarrassment, to see bourgeois Frei, the victim of his contradictions, victim of social contradictions, victim of his bourgeois illusions, using this sorry expedient of accusing the Tricontinental. Frei said he was going to make a revolution without blood, and what he is really making, what he is giving Chile, is not revolution without blood but blood without revolution (APPLAUSE), killing workers, massacring workers. They made a great campaign, about Cuba's firing squads, they made a great campaign about the laws and sanctions that revolutionaries find themselves obliged to apply to class enemies, but nevertheless, they massacre workers, murder workers, kill workers, eliminate workers without law or previous trial.

These actions, and even more, this declaration of Sr. Eduardo Frei, unmask him completely, and has demonstrated all too soon the points of view that we sustained in our discussions with the Christian Democratic deputies. Frei, in defense of the interests of the bourgeois and of imperialism, begins to kill workers, begins to massacre workers, begins to wield all the weight of the law -- no, not the law -- of repression against the workers.

We did not believe that a revolution could be made in Chile by peaceful means; but neither did we believe that armed rebellion was the order of the day in Chile. We believed that while specific liberties, special constitutional institutions, specific rights, exist in a country -- when all the paths are not closed in a country as they are in the immense majority of the Latin-American countries -- revolutionary armed rebellion, we believe, does not become the order of the day.

Frei: A coward, abusing his power

Therefore, we did not believe, we have never believed that in the conditions of recent years guerrilla warfare could be considered

as a logical tactic.

We do believe that in the long run in Chile the class contradictions, the struggle of the people against imperialism, against the oligarchy and the bourgeoisie, will sooner or later turn to the path of armed struggle.

These actions, the policy of massacring workers -- this, and not the Tricontinental Conference -- the policy of assassinating workers in defense of the interests of imperialism, of the oligarchy and of the bourgeoisie, is what will sooner or later make the Chilean workers arrive at the conclusion that in Chile, as in many other countries of Latin America, the conquest of revolutionary power can only be brought about by armed struggle. But it will be the facts, and not the Tricontinental Conference that create this. The Tricontinental Conference blazes a trail, but it is absolutely false and absolutely slanderous to state that there was any concrete given plan organized in the Tricontinental Conference with respect to Chile. That is a lie, and a calumny.

And let it be clear that we are not interested in clearing ourselves of blame, let it be clear that we are not concerned with those who accuse us or what they accuse us of, let it be understood that it does not matter to us if they want to place the blame on us. I am making this clarification for the sake of historical accuracy.

And we know that imperialism blames Cuba, we know that the oligarchies blame Cuba, we know that they will blame Cuba more and more, and we do not care; we have nothing to fear; it holds no terror for us. We are ready now and we will be prepared for them when they might decide to attack our country as a result of these accusations.

We cannot be deluded, we must have no illusions with respect to the fact that as the revolutionary struggle develops in Latin America as a result of imperialist exploitation and of the contradictions that exist, our country will be ever more in danger of being attacked.

But there is nothing more false, nothing more untrue than the declaration of Frei. But this exposes Frei, it exposes the oligarchy, the reactionary elements that control Christian Democracy; this will serve to convince all those positive elements, all those well-intentioned elements who for a time were able to believe that Christian Democracy, that is, the Christian Democratic party of Eduardo Frei, was going to produce any kind of a revolution in Chile.

Frei is a reactionary. He has demonstrated by this act that he is not a person with a firm hand, but a cowardly person who abuses power, who orders troops out against the workers. Frei has shown himself to be a liar. Frei has shown himself to be a vulgar politician who tries to blame the Tricontinental in order to justify his own bloody gesture; Frei exposes himself and is showing the Chilean people and the world what kind of a revolution he is going to make.

what type of government he is going to strike for, that is, not a revolution without blood, but a policy of blood without a revolution.

Blood without revolution! That is the policy of Frei. Blood without revolution! That is Frei's government. Blood without revolution! That is the policy of the "Alliance for Progress."

We send our message of solidarity to the courageous miners of Chile who are defending their rights with their blood, (APPLAUSE) to those courageous Chilean miners massacred by Frei's government, and to the combative Workers' Confederation of Chile. (APPLAUSE) We who have not been promoting strikes, and who have not been carrying out concrete plans, or anything else in the line of subversion or rebellion in Chile, we offer the aid of the Cuban people to the widows and orphans of the workers assassinated in the El Salvador mine. (APPLAUSE)

When the imperialists fire on these workers, the imperialists and their cohorts are bringing grief to these families, as well as misery and hunger. No bourgeois state has ever given help to the children or widows of its victims.

But the workers are not alone in their struggle. Nor are the children and widows of those assassinated workers alone. For they have, first of all, the support and solidarity of the other Chilean workers, and the support and solidarity of the workers of the whole world.

To the slanderous charges of Frei that the massacre of the workers of El Salvador is the result of plans organized in the Tri-continental, our answer is the truth, the clarification of the facts, the rejection of the imputation and our solidarity with the workers on strike. But our solidarity with the victims is not a solidarity of words but of deeds. And from here on this 13th of March, the Cuban people's offer of solidarity goes out to the victims and to the organized workers of Chile, in the face of massacre and crime.