

a labor press service

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. 14

May 6, 1966

In this issue

Page

"The Country Wants Out".....	1
Impressive Antinuclear March in Brussels.....	7
Israeli Youth Demand U.S. Withdraw Troops from Vietnam.....	7
Behind the Curtain of Censorship in Rhodesia -- by John Walters.....	9
Oginga Odinga's Opposition to Kenyatta -- by Juan Santos.....	10
Student Protests Continue at Waseda.....	12
The Twenty-Third Congress -- A Preliminary Appraisal -- by Henri Vallin.....	13
Opposition Strong in Philippines to Sending Troops to Vietnam.....	16
The Sinister CIA.....	17
Koreans Demonstrate in Tokyo.....	22
Is Nuclear War a Family Matter?.....	23
A Letter from Cuba.....	25
One-Day General Strike in Aden.....	26
Gus Hall Answers a Question on Revolutions.....	27
Gus Hall's Formula for Dooming Revolutions -- by Joseph Hansen.....	30

"THE COUNTRY WANTS OUT"

"America is showing some signs of that fatal presumption, that overextension of power and mission, which brought ruin to ancient Athens, to Napoleonic France and to Nazi Germany. The process has hardly begun, but the war which we are now fighting can only accelerate it."

These were not the words of some somber historian interested in the doom of empires. They were spoken by J.W. Fulbright, head of

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010.

the U.S. Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, in a speech in New York April 28. Fulbright's warning to the ruling class came in reaction to Johnson's latest escalation of the war -- the use of B-52 bombers in north Vietnam -- and the beginning of aerial skirmishes between U.S. jet fighters and Soviet-built MIG planes.

With the first aerial combats, a spokesman of the State Department, Robert J. McCloskey, reiterating official policy as laid down by Secretary of State Rusk last July 11, said April 26: "There is no sanctuary."

This clearly implied that the Pentagon had been given a green light to either pursue the MIG's into China, if they went there, or to bomb their bases in China, if it was decided that they came from bases in China. Such an action could mean the beginning of World War III.

In his overall estimate of the current situation, Fulbright indicated the bellicose nature of Johnson's foreign policy: "The principal reason why things are not a lot worse than they are is the restraint shown by the Russians with respect to the war. They are providing the North Vietnamese with a steady flow of supplies, including the ground-to-air missiles that are used against American aircraft, but they show no inclination to participate directly in the war and even their anti-American propaganda is comparatively mild.

"If positions were reversed, if the Russians were conducting daily bombing raids against an American ally, it is just about inconceivable that we would confine ourselves to providing equipment to the country under attack. If we did, one can well imagine the field day the superpatriots would have charging our Government with cowardice and treason."

Why do the heads of the Soviet Union act with such "restraint"? Can they be counted on to act that way indefinitely? Here are Fulbright's answers:

"My feeling about the matter is that the Russians are frightened of us, not only because of our enormous power but also because of our erratic behavior in such places as Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, which may make our policies seem, from their viewpoint, dangerously unpredictable.

"What is wrong with that? it may be asked. What is wrong with it is that it puts Soviet-American relations on an exceedingly unstable basis. Though not as powerful as the United States, Russia is a very great power and it is unlikely to be restrained indefinitely by fear of the United States.

"As long as the Vietnamese war is fought on its present scale, the Russians may remain essentially outside of the conflict -- although that is by no means certain. But if the war is significantly

expanded, the Russians will be brought under mounting Chinese goading for standing aside while the Americans devastate a Soviet ally. With their prestige thus impaired, fear could give way to anger, and the Russians might then take the enormous risk of direct intervention in the war."

Fulbright considers the present foreign policy of the White House to be both unproductive and exceedingly dangerous. "One detects in Europe," he declared, "a growing uneasiness about American policy, a feeling that the United States is becoming unreliable and that it may be better -- safer, that is -- to keep the Americans at a distance." He cited France's withdrawal from NATO as indicative of "a general loss of European confidence in American policy and judgment."

On the home front, Fulbright said he detected "the beginning of a war fever in the minds of the American people and their leaders." Aside from the witch-hunt atmosphere this tends to engender, it also has an effect on foreign policy. As "the war goes on and the casualty lists grow longer and affect more and more American homes, the fever will rise and the patience of the American people will give way to mounting demands for an expanded war, for a lightning blow that will get it over with at a stroke."

"The first demand," the senator continued, "might be a blockade of Haiphong; then, if that doesn't work, a strike against China; and then we will have a global war."

In his opinion, "East-West relations now hinge on the war in Vietnam. If it goes on indefinitely, or if it is greatly escalated, it will destroy prospects for accommodation on issues ranging from trade to arms control and the future of Germany, and eventually it may bring the Russians -- to say nothing of the Chinese -- into direct conflict with the United States. If these things happen, then the fallout from Vietnam will indeed be far more destructive than the war itself."

Fulbright was not the only prominent figure to express alarm over Johnson's latest escalation of the war. Senator Richard B. Russell said in an article in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, that a survey of public opinion should be made in the cities of south Vietnam. "If that survey shows that a majority of them are anti-American, I think we should withdraw now."

Russell's statement is important since it comes from one of the most prominent spokesmen of the more reactionary wing of the Democratic party. He has also been advocating extension of the bombings in order to achieve a lightning victory. His latest stand is considered to be a warning to Johnson.

In the April 27 New York Times, Washington columnist James Reston succinctly expressed the basis for the fresh doubts that have been provoked in certain sectors of the American capitalist class about the advisability of continuing to escalate the war.

"In this situation," he asked, "does the doctrine of 'no sanctuary' work both ways? If we are free to attack their bases, are they then free to attack ours? The answer to that here is: 'Let them try.' For this Government is confident that it can wipe out all the planes in North Vietnam and in China too if the Chinese really commit their air force to the battle, leaving China and North Vietnam with nothing but the most massive armies in Asia."

The risks are increasing, Reston noted. They are increasing "because the new MIG-21 fighters promised by Moscow to North Vietnam are now entering the battle." The danger that escalating the fighting could bring in China "used to deter officials here." But this is now no longer the case.

"In fact," Reston declared, "our air power has run into so little opposition in the past that the men running the war from here have gradually come to believe that China and the Soviet Union will tolerate military defeats the United States clearly would not tolerate itself.

"In short, we are assuming we can attack their sanctuaries and that they will not or cannot attack our sanctuaries in Saigon, or on the U.S. aircraft carriers in the China Sea; that the Russians will give North Vietnam MIG's and let them be destroyed, but that they will not give them submarines to carry the battle under the sea; that we are free to hit their bases anywhere in any country and that they will leave our air bases alone in Thailand.

"Maybe these assumptions are right. The Chinese and the Soviets have been very cautious and have given us the freedom of both the skies and the seas so far, but if there are now to be 'no sanctuaries,' this could be a very dicey business."

If the conservative wing of the Democratic party, as represented by Senator Russell has become increasingly dubious about the advisability of continuing to escalate the war, the liberal wing is no less uneasy. "There even has developed among liberal Democrats a sort of 'government-in-exile' led by Senator Robert Kennedy of New York," reports the May 1 New York Times.

Citing the criticisms voiced by James Reston, Senator Kennedy issued a public statement April 27 on the State Department's "no sanctuary" declaration. "What will be the Chinese response, if her territory is bombed or her airspace invaded? Will the Chinese seek to strike at our bases -- in Vietnam, or Thailand, or aboard our aircraft carriers? And if they do, what then will our response be? -- further bombing? And if the scale of bombing increases, will China confine herself to air fighting -- or will it send its troops to engage ours on the ground in South Vietnam?"

The assumption that China and the Soviet Union will tolerate military defeats that would not be tolerated by the United States, is not a "sound basis for policy," declared Kennedy. "Similar assumptions about the Vietcong and North Vietnam have been proven

wrong time and again in this war."

Kennedy stressed the political instability in south Vietnam. "Premier Ky and the Buddhist Tri Quang do not talk with one another." Escalation of the war in the north, the senator added, "will not bring these two gentlemen to the conference table with one another."

The problem is to achieve greater political stability in south Vietnam, he continued. "There is some disagreement with our over-all course in Vietnam. But even accepting our basic policy, it appears to me neither prudent nor wise to undertake risks of a still wider war until some progress has been made toward achieving the stability that is essential for the successful prosecution of our efforts in Vietnam."

The evidence that Soviet military aid was finally beginning to reach north Vietnam in sufficient amounts to significantly strengthen the Vietnamese defense came on top of the worsening political situation in south Vietnam; i.e., popular pressure to get rid of the puppet Ky government and to compel the withdrawal of U.S. troops. In addition there was another source of pressure on Washington -- the increasing unpopularity of the Vietnamese war among the American people.

Up until recently when critics confronted Johnson with evidence of the growing antiwar sentiments of the American people as shown in mounting demonstrations, teach-ins, letters to Congress and opinion polls, Johnson always triumphantly drew from his pocket the latest figures of his own private public opinion polls (which may have been provided by the CIA, the FBI or personal sycophants). Apparently even these figures have now changed. Johnson is reported to be in a gloomy mood. He appears to be at the "nadir of his career," said the May 1 New York Times.

"Mr. Johnson's war has gone awry," the New York daily explained. "It is troubling the home economy and putting a crimp in his ambitious domestic plans."

On top of this, the president is becoming increasingly concerned at "criticism of the Vietnam war."

"He plainly fears that the mounting criticism ultimately may make it impossible for him to fight the present limited war for limited objectives, and this gives him a rising sense of frustration and offends his rather basic sense of patriotism."

Besides the principle of the thing, political considerations are involved. "The Administration's inability to solve the Vietnam problem (U.N. Secretary General Thant said last week, 'The situation in Vietnam is going from bad to worse.')

has put the President in a political bind between liberals who urge greater peace efforts and conservatives who advocate stronger military measures."

In other words, as against the warmongers, who want to plunge

ahead no matter what happens, Johnson is beginning to feel the weight of the countersentiment, arising at a grass-roots level from Maine to California.

Speaking even more plainly in its editorial column, the New York Times said that in Washington and the U.S. as a whole "there is a growing feeling of impotence in the face of the social and political upheaval in Vietnam -- factors with which, it has become evident, American military power cannot deal and for which American diplomats have no adequate answer."

Still worse from the viewpoint of America's imperialist rulers, "There is broad agreement about Vietnam, as every public opinion poll shows: the country wants out, and its representatives in Washington know it and agree."

But they don't know how to accomplish it without a terrific loss of face. How to find an "honorable out"? "For the moment, everyone is groping in the dark."

It was against this background of crisis in the administration, that Johnson made a small concession. "Official sources" in Washington said April 28 that "President Johnson alone would decide whether American planes would cross into Communist China on 'hot pursuit' missions." The decision would not be left to either generals in the field or the Pentagon.

In view of the anonymity of the source, the record of deliberate lies and the arrogation to one man alone -- and one suffering from megalomania -- of the power to decide whether or not to take the fatal step that could mean nuclear destruction for all of humanity, there was not much cause for shouting over the concession.

More to the point was the satisfied observation of Hanson W. Baldwin, in the May 1 New York Times. This well-known American military expert said that the war in Vietnam has to a limited degree become "a proving ground of new military technology." The fights between American and Soviet-built fighting planes indicated to him that the American product was superior -- "the 'battle is the pay-off.'" And he added:

"Vietnam, in a different way and to some extent a more limited degree, has become, like the Spanish civil war of 1936-39, a proving ground for new weapons, new tactics, new ideas."

What Baldwin did not say -- no doubt deliberately -- was that Spain was used by Hitler and Mussolini as a proving ground in their preparations for World War II. Will Vietnam turn out to be the proving ground for World War III?

In the light of this very serious possibility, it is quite evident that redoubled efforts must be made by the antiwar movement, particularly in the United States, to stop the warmongers and turn them back. The slogan for this is "Withdraw U.S. Troops Now -- The Country Wants Out!"

IMPRESSIVE ANTINUCLEAR MARCH IN BRUSSELS

An impressive antinuclear demonstration was staged in Brussels April 24. Radio commentators put the turnout at some 30,000.

The marchers were mostly young people. They gave a spirited tone to the demonstration. Workers from other lands, who now constitute a sizeable part of the labor force in Belgium, were well represented.

Opposition to the war in Vietnam was included among the official slogans issued by the organizing committee.

The most militant note was sounded by the Belgian section of the Fourth International. In a leaflet distributed to the demonstrators, the Belgian Trotskyists praised the initiative displayed in organizing the protest action but said that in the long run a nuclear holocaust can be prevented only by the workers taking power in the imperialist countries themselves.

"In Vietnam," the leaflet said, "a heroic people are resisting practically alone the assaults of the most powerful army in the world. Their struggle is inspiring other peoples, who will follow the example of the October Revolution, of the Yugoslav Revolution, the Chinese Revolution, the Cuban Revolution and the Vietnamese Revolution. They will abolish capitalism."

The leaflet called for more effective and better coordinated aid for the revolutions already under way. "The last world congress of the Fourth International appealed to the workers of all countries to demand from the governments of the workers states, jet planes and missiles for the heroic Vietnamese people. No difference in views, no tactical considerations, can justify failure to provide more effective aid for the Vietnamese Revolution."

The best aid, however, is international extension of the revolution, continued the leaflet. "With American imperialism committing the bulk of its forces in Vietnam, the moment is particularly propitious to unleash revolutionary struggles in other continents and other parts of the world."

ISRAELI YOUTH DEMAND U.S. WITHDRAW TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

Tel-Aviv

More than 1,000 youth participated in a meeting and demonstration protesting American intervention in Vietnam that took place here April 14 under sponsorship of the youth section of the Mapam [United Workers party], a left-wing Socialist party.

Dizengoff Square, located in one of the busiest sections of the main city of Israel, was filled with young demonstrators, some

of them from distant Kibbutzim [collective settlements]. They carried placards in Hebrew and English demanding the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, accusing the United States of genocide, and demanding the right of self-determination for the Vietnamese people.

The speeches delivered at the meeting were in the same vein. The speakers reminded their young listeners that the Israeli youth belonged to a people who were exterminated by the Nazis during World War II, and as such should protest the mass murder conducted by the American troops in Vietnam and their use of poison gas.

The speakers also warned against sending a proposed delegation of Israeli journalists to Vietnam at the invitation of the American army. They declared they supported the current stand of the Israeli government not to become involved in anything that could be interpreted as backing American intervention in Vietnam.

At the end of the meeting, the participants marched down the streets to the American embassy. However they were met by police who had been mobilized to keep them from approaching the building. The demonstrators shouted anti-American slogans and sang antiwar and freedom songs.

On their way back to the point of dispersal, they passed the plush Dan hotel. Some American tourists standing on the steps greeted them in a friendly way with thumbs up.

A strong police force was deployed at the meeting and along the line of march. They charged a sector of the demonstrators in the square with their batons and arrested five of them. Those arrested were released later that evening.

Protest resolutions adopted at the meeting were forwarded to the American ambassador.

The Mapam Central Committee adopted a resolution April 20 condemning the role of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. The resolution demanded an immediate cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, an end to the American intervention and letting the Vietnamese people decide their political future without any outside pressure.

The resolution also called on the Israeli government to abstain from anything that could be interpreted as assistance or aid, in any way whatsoever, to either side in the bloody struggle in Vietnam.

The last part of the resolution, concerning "both" sides, reflects the pressure of the right wing in the Mapam leadership who are participating in a coalition government under the premiership of Levi Eshkol of the Mapai (Social-Democratic party).

This part of the resolution is completely out of tune with the spirit permeating the resolutions adopted at the demonstration

organized by the Mapam's youth section, the overwhelming majority of which was and is against Mapam's participating in the coalition government. The youth section's fortnightly paper Chotam frequently expresses this view.

BEHIND THE CURTAIN OF CENSORSHIP IN RHODESIA

By John Walters

London

Reports appearing in the April 24 Observer indicate that the apparent calm that prevailed inside Rhodesia at the time of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence [UDI] by the Smith regime was in fact only the result of an efficient censorship. The report by the Commonwealth correspondent opens with "Reports of proceedings in the Rhodesian courts made it clear that there has been considerably more active African opposition to the Rhodesian rebel regime than has been allowed to show through censorship regulations."

Several incidents and court proceedings are reported, and significantly these are only now being dealt with, despite the fact that most of them relate to last November. Attacks on crops, cattle and farm buildings seem to have been numerous.

Bearing in mind that Rhodesia is a largely agricultural economy, these attacks should not be seen as of little importance. One individual case was reported: "A former hospital orderly, Amos Tshuma, was jailed for eight years at Bulawayo for burning down a European womens club." He was quoted as saying: "This was the only thing I could do to show my disgust for Smith's U.D.I." That this should have happened is an indication of the feelings that must be running through the African people of Rhodesia, but it is also a sad comment on the disunity in the nationalist movement, because it would seem to have been an uncoordinated action.

However, more important as an indication of the opposition of the Rhodesian Africans is a report of an army mutiny at the time of UDI. This was reported as follows: "It is clearly established that there was a mutiny among soldiers of the Rhodesian African Rifles immediately after U.D.I. The mutineers were recently court-martialed at Llewelin Barracks, Bulawayo. The number of men involved is hard to establish, the figure varying between 110-120."

That such a mutiny took place is an indication of the isolated position of the Smith regime, and indeed of the majority of the white population. Army and police are notoriously the last section in the colonial world to defect from imperialism, being selected and trained for loyalty to the white regime. Given this fact, the mutiny indicates the tremendous pressure that must be generating under the surface calm in Rhodesia.

The mutiny also throws a clear light on Prime Minister

Wilson's declaration that Britain would only use force in Rhodesia in an event of a breakdown of "law and order." The law being of course that of the "rebel" regime, the order that of a police regime. The mutiny shows why this particular phrase was used at that time. Clearly, what Wilson feared was that the Rhodesian African masses would rise up and throw out Smith, and have a UDI of their own. Certainly not the best thing for British investments! Therefore he was preparing opinion in Britain, and elsewhere, for British troops moving in to help the white Rhodesians to suppress the Africans.

This would explain the odd disposition of the British troops sent to Zambia. They were not sent to Kariba to guard the dam, but held in the interior presumably near airfields ready to rush to Rhodesia if the need arose. This also explains why these troops took no heavy equipment with them, such as they would need if they were to fight the Rhodesian army. However they were equipped to deal with unarmed, or lightly armed Africans.

This report -- of mutiny, crop burning, etc. -- shows two things. Firstly the demand by some left-wing elements in Britain that Wilson should take "strong action"; i.e., send in British troops, is a complete misunderstanding of the role of British imperialism, and its hired "labour leader." British imperialism is not going to use its troops as a colonial liberation force. Ascension Island, Aden, Malaysia, support for U.S. imperialism in Vietnam, should give these people the truth of Wilson's role. Secondly, all the reported events expose those "liberals" who agree that British intervention will not set up a socialist regime, but merely a "softer" type of capitalism and so should be supported, because the Africans are not able to throw out Smith themselves. These latter-day Uncle Toms now have their answer. Support by elements of the British left for British troops intervening shows a lack of confidence in the African masses, and a covert racialism.

OGINGA ODINGA'S OPPOSITION TO KENYATTA

By Juan Santos

Since Oginga Odinga resigned as vice-president of the republic of Kenya April 14, under pressure from President Jomo Kenyatta, and announced formation of a new political party, the Kenya African Union, the same day, events in that important East African country have been in rapid flux.

Twenty-seven deputies and senators, four members of the cabinet and five of the seven trade unions in the country expressed solidarity with the new opposition. From now on Oginga Odinga is certain to command a large mass following, one which is liable to grow should he open an intensive campaign for immediate distribution of land to the peasants, free education and a free health service, and against the widespread corruption introduced by the Kenyatta administration.

Not only is the left wing of Kenyatta's Kenya African National Union [KANU] -- up to now the only political party of any importance in the country -- rallying around Oginga Odinga, but also the most important forces of the national resistance movement, the Mau Mau, which conquered national independence from British imperialism through a heroic armed uprising.

It is too early to tell whether Oginga Odinga will set up a left-wing nationalist organization just a bit more to the left than the KANU or whether something more will be initiated.

The accusation of "tribalism" levelled against Odinga is unfounded. The new party can count on a mass following not only among the Luo (Oginga Odinga's own tribe), but also among the Kiluyu (Kenyatta's tribe), where most of the Mau Mau fighters were recruited. Kenyatta himself, if he is not engaging in mere red-baiting, appears to fear that the specter of socialist revolution has reared its head.

In a dispatch published in the April 22 Paris daily Le Monde, Kenyatta is quoted as saying, "We reject Communism as well as capitalism...The heads of the dissident group have become spokesmen of the East." And once again Kenyatta made an open bid to his capitalist backers both at home and abroad: "We are not pillagers. We will uphold the Constitution which demands respect for property rights and fair compensation in case of expropriation."

These developments have not escaped the attention of imperialism, whose uppermost interest is to maintain "order" in Kenya. The country is extremely important among other reasons as the main approach from the east to Equatorial Africa (including the Congo) and to the turbulent masses of Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. Uganda and Tanzania have governments which London and Washington consider hostile to imperialism. Zanzibar, constitutionally a part of Tanzania, has undergone a revolution coming closer than any of the other African revolutions to passing into its socialist phase.

Oginga Odinga's break with Kenyatta clearly opens the possibility of Kenya turning to the left. In fact various British newspapers have stated that if Kenyatta does not proceed circumspectly he may find himself shortly out of office.

If Kenya turns to the left, this would halt the general counterrevolutionary trend apparent in Africa for the past year and a half. It could become the starting point for a new revolutionary upheaval in all of East Africa. This would represent a deadly threat to the imperialist positions in the copper belt and in South Africa involving billions of dollars in capitalist investments.

Thus it can be expected that the imperialist powers are at this very moment preparing a counterblow -- perhaps a conspiracy to oust Nyerere in Tanzania or military intervention in Kenya. Two British warships -- an aircraft carrier and a cruiser -- were

reported steaming towards East African waters in an obvious intimidating move.

Britain no longer has military bases in Kenya itself. The nearest base is Aden, one of the mainstays of the imperialist "life line" to the East. But in Kenya nearly 10,000 white settlers have served in the British army. They could be rapidly mobilized into a new fighting force. Kenyatta's own army consists of only 7,000 men, a force too weak to cope with a broad mass movement. It appears, too, that Kenyatta signed a secret agreement whereby the British can intervene militarily to restore "law and order" should the need arise.

If the imperialists intervene, Kenyatta will be one of the first victims as the imperialist schemers seek to install a more stable regime. The fresh lessons of Indonesia and Ghana should be borne in mind in this respect.

Extreme vigilance on the part of the African masses and the friends of the African revolution throughout the world is therefore called for lest imperialism succeed in adding a new chapter to its long history of crimes against the peoples of the black continent.

STUDENT PROTESTS CONTINUE AT WASEDA

In face of persistent student demonstrations protesting a sharp increase in tuition and other fees, the twelve directors of Waseda University, one of Japan's largest and most famous private schools, submitted their resignations April 24. Nobumoto Ohama, president of the institution, announced that he, too, intends to resign. The resignations will be considered by the Board of Trustees at its next meeting.

Meanwhile the students continued their campaign of blocking examinations in order to give their protests more substance than they would otherwise have.

On April 20 some 700 students staged a campus rally where they reconfirmed their boycott plan. In the evening they assembled in front of Tokyo Hozen High School where examinations were to be held for juniors of the first school of political science and economics.

The students were met by 500 police; and a number of clashes occurred. No arrests or injuries were reported, however.

The University administration then announced postponement of the examination. The demonstrators, having won their point, dispersed.

One professor, Tetsuo Yanai, reportedly suffered a nervous breakdown because of the turmoil on the campus. He disappeared April 13. His body was found floating in the Tamagawa River twelve days later. Apparently he committed suicide.

THE TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS -- A PRELIMINARY APPRAISAL

By Henri Vallin

Since the texts of the reports and speeches are still unavailable, it is too early to make a final appraisal of the twenty-third congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union [CPSU]. But the main aspects of the congress are quite clear. Doubtless the analysis will have to be filled in later, but this will involve only the secondary features of the congress.

The twenty-third congress seems particularly "bleak" and "lackluster" as against the three previous congresses with their sensational events, turns and settling of accounts. But contrary to Brezhnev's declaration that the lack of sensations at this congress testified to the "ceaselessly strengthened unity" of the Central Committee of the CPSU, it must have expressed the balancing of profound differences among the various tendencies in the Soviet bureaucracy, differences that threatened to flare into a public rift, if they were not previously arbitrated by the Central Committee, which met on the eve of the congress.

The congress was therefore dominated by the aim of staging everything without a hitch, leaving nothing to chance. All of the speeches of the reporters and top leaders as well as those of the so-called representatives of the "rank and file," were perfectly orchestrated. Success in this was made possible by the collective fear of the bureaucracy that any "slip up" might touch off a conflict with unforeseeable consequences.

Two Focal Points of Difference

The two focal points around which internal differences in the bureaucracy revolved were unquestionably policies in the economic and ideological (attitude toward culture and the youth) fields.

Foreign observers, not only among the Western bourgeoisie but also in the Western Communist parties had anticipated various "sensational turns" in the two fields. On the one hand there was the possibility of extending "Libermanism" (the reforms inspired by Professor Liberman with respect to using profitability in individual enterprises as an essential criterion in fulfilling the plan) and on the other of condemning it. On the one hand, there was talk of a brutal offensive against the so-called "liberal" or "modern" writers and artists; and, on the other, of a comeback of the "de-Stalinizers."

Furthermore, there was no lack of portents in both areas before the congress.

In the economic field, the technocratic partisans of "realism" appear to have won their case for slowing down economic growth, the growth rates proposed by the new plan being less than those of the Khrushchev plans. Stress was placed on the effort to raise the stan-

dard of living of the workers on the Kolkhozes and in the cities. Stress was similarly placed on the growth of productivity; that is, on the necessity to pass from an "extensive" to an "intensive" phase of industrialization, but without lending fresh importance to the Liberman reforms.

In the ideological field, one blow after another was struck -- the Daniel-Sinyavsky trial, the lauding of Zhdanov in the press, the elimination of Tvardovsky and Polevoy as delegates to the congress and the alarming rumors of a "rehabilitation of Stalin" that gave foreign and domestic partisans of "de-Stalinization" cause to fear the worst.

If -- aside from the brutal attacks on the youth and on the "liberal" artists by Sholokhov and Pavlov, the head of the Komsomol -- the congress did not end up by reverting to the worst aspects of Stalinism and Zhdanovism, this was doubtlessly due to a last-minute counterattack which came both from the vanguard of the intellectuals and from oppositionists in the Soviet Union itself and from several Western Communist parties.

In this connection there was the courageous attitude of the accused in the Daniel-Sinyavsky trial; the Kolokol movement in Leningrad, which was shielded by influential atomic scientists, the demonstration of old Bolsheviks in Red Square; the semiofficial intervention of the Italian Communist party which made it known that it would not support in any way whatever the possible "rehabilitation of Stalin."

The resultant of all these pressures, and of counterpressures emanating from certain currents in the bureaucracy, was precisely the absence of any decision in favor of one side or the other at the twenty-third congress.

If such an analysis of the twenty-third congress is correct, we must expect new convulsions within the Soviet bureaucracy before long, such as the manifestation of outright oppositionist sentiments among the vanguard Soviet youth on a widening scale.

The Soviet generation on the threshold of civic and political life today is the first generation which never knew the worst excesses of Stalinism. It is a generation which is not terrorized and which is not turned toward the past; on the contrary, it is chafing at the Kremlin's petty and bureaucratic attempts to regiment them.

The fear inspired in the bureaucrats by the youth can be judged by the complaints of Pavlov at the twenty-third congress. He insisted on the necessity of taking the "army spirit" as the model upon which to more and more mold the ideology of today's Soviet youth.

Vietnam and the Sino-Soviet Dispute

In the realm of international policy, the twenty-third congress was marked by the same lack of decisiveness as elsewhere.

On the eve of the conflict a definitive rupture with China was expected. The Kremlin's accusations became more violent; while the attempt of the Chinese to create an underground "Polish Communist party" opposed to the official Khrushchevist Polish party -- for the first time in a country where a Communist party is in power! -- could only reflect a desire to complete the split.

However, in the congress itself Brezhnev's references to the Sino-Soviet conflict were astonishingly moderate, so moderate that some explained this new turn by his desire to hide differences on this question within the CPSU itself.

With respect to the question of the struggle against the American intervention in Vietnam, one got the impression at the beginning of the congress that the Soviet bureaucracy was thinking of getting away with merely sharpening its tone in Washington's direction -- which was done by Kosygin, Gromyko and various military figures -- and with emphasizing Chinese "sabotage" of aid to Vietnam.

But here again things did not turn out exactly as the Kremlin leaders had foreseen. The strong appeal made by Armando Hart, the delegate of the Communist party of Cuba, to support the Vietnamese revolutionaries by extending the revolution internationally aroused the unconcealed hostility of the bureaucrats assembled in the Hall of Congresses. (See World Outlook April 15.)

In addition, it was learned -- a week after the event! -- that a young Soviet truck driver committed suicide in the way of a Vietnamese monk because his application to go to Vietnam as a volunteer had not been accepted. This incident undoubtedly shows that there is at least a current of opinion in the Soviet Union favoring much more energetic and effective aid for the Vietnamese revolution than the trickle the bureaucracy has been willing to give up to now.

On this issue, too, the differences were suppressed at the twenty-third congress. But they existed nonetheless and they will come to the surface with one of the inevitable twists and turns in the international situation.

What the twenty-third congress confirmed was that the "reformist climate," the hope that Soviet society would evolve by way of "reforms from above" which was prevalent among the principal layers of Soviet society in Khrushchev's time, is now coming to an end. Decisions like those made by the twenty-third congress are not the kind to revive such hopes. Therein lies still another reason to expect that different currents of Soviet society will take the path of "action from below."

April 18, 1966

OPPOSITION STRONG IN PHILIPPINES TO SENDING TROOPS TO VIETNAM

A bitter debate has been touched off in the Philippines over the enormous pressure brought to bear by the Johnson administration for contingents of Filipino troops to go to Vietnam.

Last November 9, Ferdinand E. Marcos won the presidency on a campaign promise to oppose the Pentagon's demand. Almost immediately after taking office, however, Marcos tore up his promise the way spokesmen of the capitalist system generally do. In return for assurances of substantial foreign "aid" from Washington, Marcos decided to back a bill in congress earmarking 35,000,000 pesos [\$8,750,000] to finance sending 2,000 military engineers and security troops to Vietnam.

As M.N. Monosco, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Laging Una, put it [April 15]: "The dirty war in Viet Nam is under the direction of Washington. Marcos is permitted an auxiliary role, like the heads of such puppet states as South Korea and Thailand. Persuaded (by Hubert Humphrey among others) that the U.S. is going to win, Marcos fell into a baited trap -- the bait being an offer of financial aid to his administration if the Philippines would shed the blood of its sons to disprove the widespread belief that in Viet Nam white imperialists are making war against colored colonials."

The opposition to the move to send Filipino troops to Vietnam has been widespread, including a number of militant demonstrations. The measure has now been slowed down somewhat in the Senate in view of the recent evidence in south Vietnam of the extreme unpopularity of the Ky regime.

The opposition in the Senate may not be strong enough to block passage, according to the April 24 issue of The Asia Magazine, but it has certainly echoed popular sentiment in this segment of Wall Street's colonial empire.

Senator Lorenzo Tanada put the case against sending Filipino troops as follows: "They say it would raise the morale of the South Vietnamese if they saw their Filipino brothers fighting side by side with them. If South Vietnamese morale has not been sufficiently boosted by the sight of these magnificent American giants with their marvelous modern weapons and their inexhaustible supply of dollars and K-rations, then nothing and no one can lift their morale. Why then this American insistence in getting us involved in the war? The only answer is that our presence there is needed to dissipate the growing impression that this is an American war against Asians."

THE SINISTER CIA

The Central Intelligence Agency has a well-merited notoriety as one of the most sinister vehicles of U.S. foreign policy. Its sphere of operations covers the globe and, through U-2 spy planes, extends into the stratosphere. Many consider it to be "an invisible government" more powerful than even the president.

Carl Rowan, former director of the United States Information Agency, wrote last year that "during a recent tour of East Africa and Southeast Asia, it was made clear to me that suspicion and fear of the CIA has become a sort of Achilles heel of American foreign policy."

How well grounded is this suspicion and fear? Although most of its work is secret and unpublicized, two disclosures in the past weeks have shed some light on the nature of its operations. The April Ramparts magazine published an article, authenticated by one of the professorial participants, telling how the CIA planted at least five agents among Michigan State University scholars who engaged in a project to set up and arm the Diem dictatorship in south Vietnam from 1955 to 1959.

In a trial now going on in Baltimore, it has been brought out that the CIA ordered one of its hirelings, Juri Raus, to discredit another Esthonian emigré leader by accusing him of being a Soviet agent. The accused, Eerik Heine, has challenged the government to arrest and try him so he can get a legal hearing on the charges. To shield its agent from questioning, the CIA has asked the court to summarily dismiss the slander suit on the ground that it would compromise "the security of the United States."

So widespread is the apprehension about the nefarious role of the CIA that the New York Times assigned a team of its top correspondents to collect available information about its activities. The results of their research over several months were digested in five articles published from April 24 to 29.

This extensive account certifies that the CIA is as much an executive arm of official policy as the armed forces and the State Department. It performs those special functions which demand secrecy and illegitimacy. Although its staff may occasionally overstep directives in the zealous pursuit of its duties; the executive branch of the government headed by the president supervises and controls its operations.

The CIA initiates such a diversified range of activities from running radio stations and buying elections to the overthrow of governments and military actions by proxy that even the Times series cannot deal adequately with them. It fails, for example, to delve into the penetration of the labor movements in foreign lands with the aid of compliant AFL-CIO officials, the participation of its agents in political assassinations or its clandestine operations in

Venezuela, Peru, Brazil and the Dominican Republic.

But enough is related to demonstrate how vicious a threat this instrumentality of worldwide subversion is to the principles of democracy and the cause of socialism. The CIA does not hesitate to violate the sovereignty of any nation or regime that gets in the way of the aggressions of American corporate capital and its representatives in Washington.

It is generally assumed that CIA agents are hard at work in the Communist countries. The U-2 flights, the discovery of the tunnel wiretaps underneath East Berlin that eavesdropped on Soviet Army headquarters, the burnings of crops and buildings in Cuba have focused attention upon its espionage and sabotage.

The Times lists the following "achievements" along these lines as follows -- "its precise prediction of the date on which the Chinese Communists would explode a nuclear device; its fantastic world of electronic devices; its use of a spy, Oleg Penkovsky, to reach into the Kremlin itself; its work in keeping the Congo out of Communist control; or the feat -- straight from a spy novel -- of arranging things so that when Gamal Abdel Nasser came to power in Egypt the 'management consultant' who had an office next to the Arab leader's and who was one of his principal advisers was a CIA operative."

Here we shall simply itemize the cases related by the Times correspondents of its clandestine interventions in the internal affairs of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

ASIA

Singapore: When this strategic port was about to get its independence from Britain and enter the Malaysian Federation in 1960, the CIA decided to infiltrate the city with its own agents, not only to check on the large Chinese population, but also on its British colleagues. This operation was uncovered when the lie detector of one of its recruiters, intended to test the reliability of a local candidate for the spying job, blew out the lights in his hotel. The CIA man and the would-be spy were arrested and "processed" by the local authorities.

In negotiations for their release Premier Lee was offered \$3.3 million but the deal fell through when he held out for \$33 million. In 1961 Secretary of State Rusk wrote a letter of apology to the offended premier.

When news of this incident leaked out in 1965, U.S. State Department officials at first denied the facts. But they retracted when Mr. Lee published Rusk's letter and threatened also to play some interesting tape recordings for the press.

Burma: In the early 1950's the CIA gathered remnants of Chiang Kai-shek's defeated armies in the jungles of northeast Burma, sup-

plied them with gold and arms, and encouraged them to raid Communist China. With the help of General Phao Sriyanod, the police chief of Thailand and a leading narcotics dealer, the Nationalist mercenaries, with U.S. planes and gold, went into the opium trade. They are still doing business in that area.

Cambodia: In 1958 the CIA mounted an operation involving south Vietnamese agents and native rebels to overthrow Prince Sihanoul because of his neutralist leanings. This effort failed.

Indonesia: That same year the CIA flew in supplies from Taiwan and the Philippines to aid army officers in revolt against President Sukarno in Sumatra and Java. An American pilot, shot down on a bombing mission in connection with this venture, was released only at the urgent insistence of the Kennedy administration in 1962.

In 1965 the CIA chalked up greater success in Indonesia. Here is how the Times delicately describes its part in the bloody army takeover last October. "In Southeast Asia over the last decade, the CIA has been so active that the agency in some countries has been the principal arm of American policy.

"It is said, for instance, to have been so successful at infiltrating the top of the Indonesian government and army that the United States was reluctant to disrupt CIA covering operations by withdrawing aid and information programs in 1964 and 1965. What was presented officially in Washington as toleration of President Sukarno's insults and provocations was in much larger measure a desire to keep the CIA fronts in business as long as possible.

"Though it is not thought to have been involved in any of the maneuvering that has curbed President Sukarno's power in recent months, the agency was well poised to follow events and to predict the emergence of anti-Communist forces "

Laos: On orders from Eisenhower and Dulles, in 1960 CIA agents, disguised as "military advisers," stuffed ballot boxes and engineered local uprisings to help a hand-picked strongman, General Phoumi Nosavan, set up a "pro-American government." Later the Kennedy administration changed this policy and negotiated with the Soviet Union and other powers to substitute the neutralist regime now in office.

Thailand: Here the CIA, acting through foreign aid officers and subsidized airlines such as Air America, is working among hill tribes along the Burmese and Laotian borders and helping to build a provincial police network to guard the Laos and Cambodian borders.

Iran: In 1953 the CIA masterminded the overthrow of the radical bourgeois nationalist Premier Mohammed Mossadegh who threatened the interests of the oil companies. This piece of subversion was directed by Kermit Roosevelt who afterwards boasted of his success in bribing mobs to act against the Premier and restore the Shah to his throne.

South Vietnam: The CIA built up Diem as its prize puppet and its support sustained his tyranny until 1963. The Times says nothing about its more recent activities there.

Philippines: CIA money went to elect Ramon Magsaysay president in 1953.

China: A major part of the CIA's intelligence efforts is of course aimed at Communist China. Among other enterprises, it sends U-2 spy planes over its territory, dispatches agents to stir unrest in Tibet, and obtains information on China's nuclear capability and installations.

AFRICA

The CIA network covers the entire continent from Capetown to Cairo. The best known and most flagrant example of its intervention is in the heart of Africa.

Congo: After the Congo gained independence in 1960, says the Times, "a modest little CIA office in Leopoldville mushroomed overnight into a virtual embassy and miniature war department.... The CIA dispersed its agents to learn Congolese politics from the bush on up, to recruit likely leaders and to finance their bids for power.

"The CIA soon found Joseph Mobutu, Victor Nendaka and Albert Ndele. Their eventual emergence as President of the country, Minister of Transportation and head of the national bank, respectively, proved a tribute to the Americans' judgment and tactics," as well as to the power of their purse.

The Times absolves the CIA of Lumumba's assassination, while admitting that it did play a major role in making Adoula his successor.

The present government is bought and paid for by the U.S., even though an American agent did complain at one juncture: "Purchased? You can't even rent this group for the afternoon."

In 1964 the CIA recruited and paid for "an instant air force" to help crush the Congolese rebels. This was staffed by anti-Castro Cubans, left over from the Bay of Pigs invasion three years before, who were enrolled in Miami. Their planes were serviced by twenty British mechanics. They strafed the rebel fighters who had ambushed a column of 600 government troops and 100 South African and Rhodesian white mercenary killers.

Algeria: The agency, writes the Times, "gathers special dossiers on the activities of various nationalist and liberation movements and befriends opposition leaders in such countries as Algeria and the United Arab Republic, in the hope that it can predict upheavals or at least be familiar with new rulers if their bids for power are successful.

"The CIA, long in advance, had information on the plan by which Algerian Army officers overthrew Ahmed Ben Bella last June -- but it did not know the month in which the officers would make their move, and it had nothing to do with plotting or carrying out the coup."

Egypt: "Thanks to contacts with Gamal Abdel Nasser before he seized power in Egypt, the CIA had almost intimate dealings with the Nasser government before the United States drew his ire by reneging on its promised aid to build the Aswan dam."

Ghana: The Times gives no information on the recent military coup against Nkrumah, although it has been widely rumored that both the CIA and British intelligence had a hand in the conspiracy that brought about his overthrow while on a trip to the Communist countries in East Asia.

LATIN AMERICA

Latin America swarms with CIA agents, as the Times indicates. "CIA analysts reading the punchcards of their computers in Virginia can determine that a new youth group in Bogotá appears to have fallen under the control of suspected Communists, but it takes an agent on the spot to trade information with the local police, collect photographs and telephone taps of those involved, organize and finance a countermovement of, say, young Christians or democratic labor youth, and help them erect billboards and turn mimeograph machines at the next election."

The CIA has conducted two counterrevolutionary wars in Latin America so far.

Guatemala: In 1954 it engineered the coup against the reformist government of Arbenz who was not sufficiently subservient to the United Fruit Company and other American interests. One incident during this operation shows how little consideration the CIA gives to national sovereignty and international legality not only of its opponents but of its allies. A P-38 fighter, piloted by an American, bombarded a British ship which was believed to be carrying aircraft to the legal Arbenz government.

Cuba: Seven years later the CIA sponsored the expedition which took off from secret training camps in Guatemala and Nicaragua to invade Cuba. The defeat at the Bay of Pigs is responsible for much of the opposition to the CIA and suspicion of its motives in the United States today.

Less well-known was the contamination of the cargo of Cuban sugar aboard a British freighter which had to put in for repairs in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in August 1962. When this stroke was brought to President Kennedy's attention, he was "furious, because the operation had taken place on American territory, because it would, if discovered, provide the Soviet Union with a propaganda field day, and because it would set a terrible precedent for chemical sabotage

in the undeclared 'back-alley' struggle that rages constantly between the West and the Communist countries."

According to the Times, "it finally required the combined efforts of the CIA, the Justice Department, the FBI, the State Department, customs agents and harbor authorities to dis-intrigue the intrigue."

"Not so melodramatically," the Times sums up, "the agency runs dozens of other operations throughout the hemisphere."

"It provides 'technical assistance' to most Latin nations by helping them establish anti-Communist police forces. It promotes anti-Communist front organizations for students, workers, professional and business men, farmers and political parties. It arranges for contact between these groups and American labor organizations, institutes and foundations.

"It has poured money into Latin-American election campaigns in support of moderate candidates and against leftist leaders such as Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana."

* * *

The Times editors express no objections in principle to the existence or activities of the CIA. They are primarily concerned about the question whether it is firmly enough controlled by the appropriate government councils. "Far more significant than whether the CIA is right in subverting this or that government abroad," they say, "is the question of whether exclusive Executive control of the intelligence community does not subvert the American system of government itself."

This servant of American imperialism is undoubtedly a grave danger to American democracy, no matter who formally directs its operations. But the principal criminality of the CIA consists in its brutal violations of the sovereign rights of other peoples to choose their own form of government and social regime.

In countries that have had first-hand experience with American beneficence, it has long been customary to spell Uncle Sam as Uncle \$am; it fits the character better. Now they have added an honorary degree in keeping with the unusual efforts undertaken by the generous uncle to maintain his standing in the world -- Uncle \$am, C.I.A.

KOREANS DEMONSTRATE IN TOKYO

An estimated 3,000 resident Koreans demonstrated in Tokyo April 22 against a proposed education law that would give the Ministry of Education authority to ban "anti-Japanese thoughts" in foreign schools. The bill would "suppress Korean education," said a resolution passed at a rally attended by the Koreans.

IS NUCLEAR WAR A FAMILY MATTER?

[The British Broadcasting Corp. recently banned a film because it was "too horrible" to show on the family television screen. The censorship touched off considerable criticism in England. In an attempt to justify its decision, BBC arranged for a few newspaper editors, war correspondents and members of Parliament to see a special preview of the fifty-minute documentary -- "The War Game" produced by Peter Watkins. Some of them called it a masterpiece. One said it was "perhaps the most important film ever made."

[The following is part of a review by Ken Mallett which was published in the April 2 issue of the Toronto Star.]

* * *

Although I was warned of its brutality, "The War Game" is a shattering experience.

It is deeply moving at a level beyond panic or grief.

It shows us as shattered, mindless, burned-out specimens of a race that was foolish enough to believe it could play "The War Game" and not get hurt.

It questions the record of the churches, the nuclear theorists and hammers savagely at the ignorance of the public. Watkins' message is simple: It is insane to possess the Bomb and even more insane to tolerate public ignorance of it.

The film opens by noting how vulnerable Britain is to nuclear attack.

It moves on to a make-believe newscast about Chinese troops entering South Viet Nam and the United States threatening to use atomic weapons unless she withdraws them.

Russia decides to go to China's aid by saying she'll take over West Berlin unless the Americans remove their nuclear weapons.

Finally rioting at Check Point Charlie provokes Russia to move in.

When NATO troops move through East Germany to relieve the city they are met by overwhelming odds. The use of nuclear weapons is authorized by the Allies.

As the crisis heightens, the camera swings back to Kent where man-in-street interviews demonstrate public disbelief that war will come. There is a kind of childish faith that "the authorities" will find a solution.

And then it happens.

A blinding white light flashes across the landscape and heat as fierce as the sun melts eyeballs and limbs as though they were made of plastic.

A firestorm howls through towns. The ground gales reach 100 miles an hour and once life-giving oxygen turns to deadly gases. Everything dies, shrivels, melts.

Rescuers and firemen can do nothing. There is a breakdown in civil defence. And then there is no civil defence at all.

A bewildered, stricken father gazes into the camera. His wife and children have been severely irradiated -- perhaps fatally so. He wonders if -- or when -- they will die.

There were scenes that will haunt me for days.

Scenes like the blinding flash near the enemy weapon's point of impact; the sight of walls 40 miles distant trembling from the shock wave; the parade of numbed, expressionless faces.

A doctor sobs, "some of these people are just falling apart."

A policeman puts his pistol to the heads of the mortally wounded and pulls the trigger.

Said Watkins after he resigned from the BBC:

"There is a shocking lack of public information on the entire thermonuclear question.

"The public is encouraged not to think too deeply about the whole question of nuclear weapons.

"A mystique has grown up around the subject and now it is regarded as a field to which only 'qualified experts' are granted entry."

British critic Kenneth Tynan also saw the film. Afterward, he wrote:

"In refusing to show it, the BBC is like a doctor withholding the truth from a patient who is suffering from a potentially fatal disease.

"So long as adequate warning is given to depressives and other victims of nervous illness, it should not only be televised but screened not just here but everywhere on earth -- especially in countries that possess or would like to possess the bomb."

I'd be hard put to disagree with Tynan. "The War Game" is a film that demands action. It would be a shame if it finished up on the art-cinema circuit. For nuclear war, after all, is a family matter.

A LETTER FROM CUBA

[The following is a translation of part of a letter from a European Trotskyist who has lived in Cuba a number of years. It is of special interest, we believe, because of its references to the speech made January 15 by Fidel Castro attacking "Trotskyism."]

* * *

As you can imagine, the January 15 Tricontinental speech was a bad blow for me because of the effect I know it will have on the revolutionary groups throughout America and the world. The real splitters and betrayers who have never really supported the Cuban Revolution will take advantage of this sad mistake to attack the very line which the Cuban Revolution puts forth. The only groupings that honestly support this line are the independents and the real Marxists. By real Marxists I mean what Fidel said in the Second Declaration of Havana -- those who are making the revolution and not waiting for the corpse of imperialism to be carted past their door.

Doesn't Fidel know the difference between the real Trotskyists and the Posadas group? No, he doesn't. He is not interested because the information he receives is not of the kind to awaken his interest or to indicate that the subject is important.

How has the revolutionary government reacted to the defeats in Brazil and in Indonesia and the failure to help Vietnam on the scale needed? I don't think they've been fooled. They see what has been happening. But the tendency against theory has been strengthened. Everywhere they see a huge gap between theory and practice.

While it's true that Fidel has attacked the theory of peaceful coexistence various times; he does it because he can see that it doesn't work. But there's no interest in investigating how and why it arose or if it's really a Leninist doctrine or its effects where it has been applied in past years. No, Fidel looks at the policy as it stands today, sees that it doesn't work and denounces it.

To Fidel the most important thing is the advance of the revolution and his particular interest is in the three economically underdeveloped continents, Asia, Africa and Latin America. He denounces anything that he sees holds up the process. In the case of Vietnam this became very clear. Fidel's call for unity between the Chinese and the Soviets is not at all like the Stalinist appeals. He doesn't attack them because they have differences but because they allow them to interfere in their support.

But on "theory," there are just too many practical problems to worry about it. We'll leave that to the students and teachers of materialism. So that in Cuba, theory continues to occupy the same position as in bourgeois society -- as something separate and apart

from reality, as another course in which people become specialists.

Given these conditions, when Fidel is told about people who call themselves "Trotskyists," and they have consciously or unconsciously done damage to the Latin-American revolution, he reacts without going any deeper into the question.

The dangers of such a method are apparent but few in Cuba are aware of it. That is why it was possible for the doctrine that is closest to the line of the Cuban Revolution to be attacked.

On Fidel's attack on Mao. I don't think it is appreciated outside of Cuba how heroic this was. It's not only a question of rice. If that was all, we could get by because there's a great increase in vegetable production and eggs are again in good supply. But things like cloth, medical supplies like gauze and bandages, cotton thread, needles, pins, safety pins, some canned foods, pencils, razors, cosmetics, office supplies, etc., etc. -- there are so many of these things that have been coming from China that to be cut off cold, as Cuba now has been, will cause a crisis worse than the Yankee blockade.

The most criminal of all is the medical supplies. As of the moment, all operations except for emergencies, have been postponed for lack of bandages and above all gauze.

As to the repercussions inside Cuba to Fidel's attack against Trotskyism, nothing has changed. There is no witch-hunt atmosphere. No one is disturbed about the question since the majority of people here were never interested in it or knew anything about it. In this respect, in Cuba, things continue as usual.

ONE-DAY GENERAL STRIKE IN ADEN

A one-day general strike was called by the workers of Aden April 14 to protest persecution of the local population by British forces and the violation of the sanctity of the mosques by British troops. The strike was sponsored by the Trade Unions Congress in Aden and was backed by the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions.

Workers employed at the British military base, one of the biggest in the empire, joined in the demonstration. As a result, the airport was forced to close down and buses and taxis stopped running.

On the same day, political prisoners in Aden began a three-day hunger strike to protest the use of torture. The hunger strike was also intended to protest the British ban against Arab lawyers entering Aden to defend the political prisoners, according to the Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen.

GUS HALL ANSWERS A QUESTION ON REVOLUTIONS

[In the April 24 issue of The Worker, Gus Hall, the main spokesman of the American Communist party, attempts a reply to the editorial in the April issue of the Monthly Review rejecting Fidel Castro's attack on "Trotskyism" and pointing to the damage done the Cuban Revolution by the continued silence over Che Guevara. Hall's reply, in the form of an answer to a question from a reader of The Worker, is entitled "Gus Hall Answers a Question on Revolution." The question was formulated as follows: "Mr. Hall, Would you please explain to me what is the meaning of the following sentences in an editorial in the April issue of Monthly Review: '...In our opinion, the only kind of revolution that has any chance of succeeding in Latin America today is a socialist revolution. We were, we believe, among the first to say that the Cuban Revolution would be forced to advance rapidly to socialism...in 1963 we stated our opinion in these pages that there is no such thing as feudalism in Latin America and that it therefore makes no sense to talk about a bourgeois revolution.'"

[We have provided the full text of Mr. Hall's reply below.]

* * *

THE EDITORIAL that you quote is wrong on most counts. Among other things it is an ill-tempered, slanderous, personal attack on Fidel Castro and the leaders of the Cuban Revolution in general. The editorial slanders Castro as "ignorant" and a "latecomer," and calls his concluding speech to the Tri-Continental Conference "ugly and perhaps ominous," and states that Castro's "malice comes from his advisers."

This ill-tempered slander is in fact a cover for some very fundamental errors in the editorial policies of the Monthly Review. As you can see, there are obvious contradictions even in the lines that you quote. They say, "The only kind of revolution that has any chance in Latin America is a socialist revolution." Then, as seeming proof for this conclusion, they cite the Cuban Revolution. But what is the meaning of the words, "...Cuban Revolution would be forced to advance rapidly to socialism?" "Advance rapidly to socialism" are the key words. Because if the Cuban Revolution started as a socialist revolution, it would not have had the task of advancing to it.

The first stage of the Cuban Revolution was anti-imperialist, was for national independence. The fascist Batista regime was a puppet of U.S. imperialism. It had to be overthrown. This was correctly placed by the Cuban revolutionaries as the first task of the revolution. After this was successfully concluded, then it "rapidly advanced to" a socialist reorganization of society. So, if anything, this sentence disproves the main contention of the editorial.

THE ERROR of MR is in the attempt to ignore the nature of the struggle against imperialism and to replace it with a socialist revolution. In practice such a policy would not result in a successful struggle against imperialism, and it would not set the stage for a socialist revolution. Wherever imperialism is a factor, a mass struggle against imperialism is a necessary ingredient and a phase in the struggle for socialism.

Why are these concepts so important? Because the locomotive of social revolutions are people. And people will fight for what objective processes have placed on the order of the day. Therefore, if socialism is not on the order of this day, but in spite of that, the advanced forces present it as if it is, this can only result in isolation for such forces.

The conscious organization and advocacy of advanced ideas, including socialism, are very important. But they can generate power only if they are related to the level of objective developments of the period.

THE LAST SENTENCE you quote from the editorial does not resolve the contradiction when it states "...there is no such thing as feudalism in Latin America and that it therefore makes no sense to talk about a bourgeois revolution." The realities of Latin America, of course, refute such a blanket assertion. Most Latin American societies are a mixture of capitalism and feudalism.

But what is the overriding dominant phenomenon facing most, if not all, of the Latin American countries? It is that they are all victims of imperialist oppression.

Thus, breaking the chains of U.S. imperialist domination is the present overriding historic task. This is on the order of this day. Masses who have had enough of colonial oppression but who have not yet decided what kind of a society should be built will join those who are convinced of the need for socialism in the struggle against imperialism. This is a necessary and an unavoidable step.

The period between this hurdle and the struggle for socialism may be very brief, and the two may even overlap. The existence of the socialist world has a direct influence on these struggles. But the two tasks cannot be confused. Those with socialist convictions will be a part of and in fact the organizers of the anti-imperialist front and while doing so, will be working to convince all, about the advantages of the socialist path after the victory over imperialism. But the mass mobilization will be to achieve the first task first.

EDUARDO VALVERDE, member of the Secretariat of the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, discusses these questions:

"Feudal survivals, too, still make themselves felt, or even predominate, in the countryside in most Latin American countries. In Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay, Guatemala, El Salvador and some other countries pre-capitalist production relations are much more pronounced than in Argentina, Uruguay, Chile or Mexico.

"...But in all circumstances in order to pave the way to economic progress, it is essential to win freedom from imperialist domination....

"Needless to say, our Party as well as the other Latin American Communist parties, unlike some 'ultra-revolutionary' groups...do not consider the winning of power by the working class and the full realization of the program of the socialist revolution to be the immediate task. The immediate prospect in our countries, as we see it, is the anti-imperialist and democratic revolution...

"Moreover, worldwide experience (and for us Latin-Americans the experience of Cuba above all) shows that at the present time the victory of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution is, as a rule, a precondition and point of departure for the socialist path of development."

THE PROGRAM of the Communist Party, U.S.A., also places this question in a correct and clear manner:

"We live in a revolutionary age that in scope and depth eclipses all prior ages of social upheaval and transformation...Today the revolutionary tide extends to all continents, penetrates into the most remote jungles of Africa, climbs the most inaccessible mountain peaks of Asia, stalks the plantations and mines of Latin America, sweeping in its wake the overwhelming majority of mankind.... Today's revolutions challenge the reign of imperialism and monopoly capital everywhere. Those former revolutions ushered in the age of capitalism. Today's revolutions mark mankind's historic transition from capitalism to socialism....

"The contemporary revolutions bear two distinctive marks: they are socialist, they are anti-imperialist. More than a billion human beings are embarked on socialist revolution. A larger number is in varying stages of anti-colonial revolution....

"The anti-colonial revolutions aim to destroy imperialist domination, feudal bondage and political tyranny. In the struggle for such aims a broad national unity is attainable, including capitalist elements who chafe under the oppressive restrictions of foreign monopoly. The attainment of such aims, progressive and liberating as they are, is not yet socialism. However, there is a close relation between the socialist and colonial revolutions.

"1. Imperialism is the common enemy of both.

"2. The speed and scope of the colonial liberation tide is

made possible by the existence of the socialist world -- by its revolutionary example, by its economic, diplomatic and military assistance, which greatly restricts imperialism's ability to suppress or strangle colonial revolutions....

"Thus, the two kinds of revolution typical of the age -- socialist and anti-colonial -- are distinct and yet interconnected parts of one vast revolutionary process. Each reinforces the other."

GUS HALL'S FORMULA FOR DOOMING REVOLUTIONS

By Joseph Hansen

In the April issue of the Monthly Review, Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, the editors of this internationally circulated independent socialist magazine, took sharp issue with the way Fidel Castro criticized a wing of the Guatemalan guerrilla movement. In a speech January 15, Castro said that "Trotskyites" had infiltrated the movement and that Trotskyism was "a vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction." The charge, said the editors of the Monthly Review, was "ugly and perhaps ominous." It was "precisely this accusation," they pointed out, "which provided the rationalization for the Soviet purge trials of the 1930's."

"If anything has been proved -- and not least by the Soviet government itself," they continued, "--it is that the trials were a shameless frame-up; and no evidence has ever been produced to restore credibility to the accusation."

They ascribed Castro's use of "Trotskyism" in this way to either ignorance or malice. "For our part," they said, "we prefer to believe that in this matter Fidel himself is ignorant and that the malice comes from advisers who never abandoned the attitudes and methods which underlay the trials." They suggested that Fidel Castro as a "latecomer" to the history of the movement ("for reasons which do him no discredit") should take time out for some serious study and that "he could do worse than begin with Isaac Deutscher's brilliant three-volume study of Trotsky which is much more than a personal biography."

In addition, the editors of the Monthly Review called Fidel Castro's attention to the damage that was being done the Cuban Revolution by the continued silence on Che Guevara. Does Castro realize, they asked, "that every day's delay in clearing up the mystery brings anxiety and doubt to honest revolutionaries everywhere and joy to their enemies?"

They also pointed to the positive achievements of the Tri-continental Conference, disagreeing with Adolfo Gilly, who in the same issue of the Monthly Review declared that it was "a conference without glory and without program."

To strengthen Cuba's independent position, they called for diversification of the economy instead of relying mainly on sugar.

Finally, they reiterated their position favoring the perspective of "socialist" as opposed to "bourgeois" revolutions in Latin America.

A Reader Wonders Why

The forthright stand taken by the Monthly Review on these issues appears to have dismayed the leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In the April 24 issue of The Worker, Gus Hall, the leading spokesman of the pro-Moscow, anti-Peking party, tried his hand at replying in an article entitled "Gus Hall Answers a Question on Revolutions."

Hall's answer is not exactly straightforward. It is couched as a response to a question from an unidentified "reader" of The Worker. As reported by the editor, the question was as follows:

"Mr. Hall, Would you please explain to me what is the meaning of the following sentence in an editorial in the April issue of the Monthly Review?

"...In our opinion, the only kind of revolution that has any chance of succeeding in Latin America today is a socialist revolution. We were, we believe, among the first to say that the Cuban Revolution would be forced to advance rapidly to socialism...in 1963 we stated our opinion in these pages that there is no such thing as feudalism in Latin America and that it therefore makes no sense to talk about a bourgeois revolution."

This question, if we are to believe the editor of The Worker, inspired Mr. Hall to take up his pen and put down his views so as to satisfy the curiosity of the inquiring reader. The correspondent who reposes such confidence in the theoretical capacities of the leading spokesman of the American Communist party was no doubt elated at his success in eliciting this fresh example of Mr. Hall's thought. While we, too, feel a certain admiration for the audacity of the reply, we are forced to admit that we did not find it free of faults. We may as well list the main ones at once to get them out of the way.

Masterful Evasion of the Issues

(1) Mr. Hall failed to mention by a single word the repetition by Fidel Castro of the most notorious charge in the infamous Moscow purge trials of the thirties, a charge that was long ago conclusively proved to be a shameless frame-up cooked up by Stalin.

(2) Mr. Hall failed to mention by a single word the pertinence of the program of Trotskyism to the question of socialist revolutions in Latin America.

(3) Mr. Hall failed to mention by a single word the damaging silence in Cuba on Che Guevara.

(4) Mr. Hall failed to mention by a single word the strong stress placed by the Tricontinental Conference on the need for armed struggle in Latin America in view of the suppression of democratic rights throughout the continent.

(5) In place of taking up the key points raised by the Monthly Review editorial and considering them with reasoned argument, Mr. Hall engaged in name calling. "Among other things," he said of the editorial, "it is an ill-tempered, slanderous, personal attack on Fidel Castro and the leaders of the Cuban Revolution in general. The editorial slanders Castro as 'ignorant' and a 'latecomer,' and calls his concluding speech to the Tri-Continental Conference 'ugly and perhaps ominous,' and states that Castro's 'malice comes from his advisers.'"

As to the content of this alleged "ill-tempered slander," Mr. Hall preserves a most discreet silence.

Instead of considering these important issues raised by the editors of the Monthly Review, Mr. Hall juggles with a single quotation torn from the editorial by the curious reader of The Worker. The correct label for this way of replying to the Monthly Review is sophistry. However, the leading spokesman of the Communist party does deserve praise for his dexterity in converting a multi-issue problem into a single issue.

But why this particular issue? Could it be that Mr. Hall's real aim is not so much to defend Fidel Castro as to come to the rescue of those advisers of the Cuban leader who never abandoned the attitudes and methods which underlay the Moscow frame-up trials? Perhaps Mr. Hall received an SOS.

However, let us follow Mr. Hall in his evasion of the issues and see where he comes out.

The Theory of Two Stages

He divides the Latin-American revolutionary process into two distinct stages. First a bourgeois revolution, then a socialist revolution.

So obvious does this seem to him, that he immediately proceeds to illustrate his thesis by finding "obvious contradictions even in the lines that you quote." For how could the editors of the Monthly Review say that the "Cuban Revolution would be forced to advance rapidly to socialism" (Hall's emphasis) unless a bourgeois revolution had already occurred? "'Advance rapidly' are the key words," Hall tells us. "Because if the Cuban Revolution started as a socialist revolution it would not have had the task of advancing to it."

To clinch his argument, he cites the example of the Cuban Revolution:

"The first stage of the Cuban Revolution was anti-imperialist, was for national independence. The fascist Batista regime was a puppet of U.S. imperialism. It had to be overthrown. This was correctly placed by the Cuban revolutionaries as the first task of the revolution. After this was successfully concluded, then it 'rapidly advanced to' a socialist reorganization of society."

We note, in passing, several not unimportant omissions. Mr. Hall fails to explain why the Communist party in Cuba supported Batista for a number of years, even accepting posts in his regime. He fails to explain why the Communist party opposed the struggle led by Castro, considering it adventurism until the victory was in sight. He fails to explain why the Communist party was so sluggish in recognizing the socialist character of the revolution in Cuba even long after the socialist victory of the movement led by Fidel Castro. Can the theory of the two-stage revolution which he clings to have had something to do with all that?

Mr. Hall expresses his basic thought as follows: "The error of MR is in the attempt to ignore the nature of the struggle against imperialism and to replace it with a socialist revolution. In practice such a policy would not result in a successful struggle against imperialism, and it would not set the stage for a socialist revolution."

Pursuing this idea, Mr. Hall asserts, "Most Latin American societies are a mixture of capitalism and feudalism." In addition, "the overriding dominant phenomenon facing most, if not all, of the Latin American countries...is that they are all victims of imperialist oppression."

From this it follows that the first stage of the revolution in Latin America is not socialist but bourgeois. While Mr. Hall does not state it that flatly, he does quote with approval Eduardo Valverde, a member of the Secretariat of the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica: "Needless to say, our Party as well as the other Latin American Communist parties, unlike some 'ultra-revolutionary' groups...do not consider the winning of power by the working class and the full realization of the program of the socialist revolution to be the immediate task. The immediate prospect in our countries, as we see it, is the anti-imperialist and democratic revolution..." (Emphasis added.)

What class does face the immediate task of winning power? Mr. Hall indicates that by quoting from the program of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which, he says, also places the question of revolution by stages "in a correct and clear manner." In the quotation provided by Mr. Hall from the program, we read:

"The anti-colonial revolutions aim to destroy imperialist domination, feudal bondage and political tyranny. In the struggle for such aims a broad national unity is attainable, including capitalist elements who chafe under the oppressive restrictions of foreign monopoly." (Emphasis added.)

The program of the American Communist party agrees that there is a "close relation between the socialist and colonial revolutions" but insists on separating them into two "distinct" kinds of revolution.

In brief, Mr. Hall contends that due to "feudalism" and the oppressive rule of imperialism, progressive capitalist elements exist in Latin America who can be trusted to lead a bourgeois or "democratic" revolution; after which will come a new stage when it will be possible for the working class to advance its own leadership charged with the "immediate task" of winning power and carrying out a socialist revolution.

Example of the Russian Revolution

The question as to whether or not it is correct to call certain archaic social structures in Latin America "feudalism" -- on which Hall challenges the Monthly Review -- is somewhat beside the point. Engels long ago asked whether feudalism ever corresponded to its concept.* The key political question -- whether the owners of the latifundia are called feudalistic or oligarchical -- remains the need for a radical agrarian reform.

Fortunately it is not necessary to hinge our analysis on Latin-American social and political forces and the probable course of coming revolutions in that continent. We have at hand an example in which the struggle was most certainly directed against "feudalism" and which should in all respects satisfy Mr. Hall's stringent requirement that policies must be tested "in practice." This is the 1917 Russian Revolution, an example that remains very much apropos today.

Before the October victory, three main theories were projected as to the course and perspectives of the Russian Revolution. Let us note them if only in barest outline.

(1) The Populists had raised the possibility of Russia bypassing capitalist development and going directly to socialism. Plekhanov, standing on the ground of scientific socialism, contended that Russia was not privileged and could not avoid capitalism. The coming revolution would therefore be bourgeois in character whether this was or was not in conformity with anyone's wishes.

The logical conclusion appeared to be that liberal capitalists would head this revolution under the banner of democracy. Only later would the workers be able to come forward as a class with the program of socialist revolution. This was the source of the Menshevik view that the Russian Revolution would have two distinct phases, would consist of two kinds of revolution separated in time and in leadership, and that the immediate task was to back the liberal bourgeoisie as the logical leadership of the first stage or first kind of revolution.

*In a letter to Conrad Schmidt dated March 12, 1895.

Lenin's View

(2) Lenin agreed on the scientific definition of the coming revolution as "bourgeois" in character; but he held that the bourgeoisie could not be trusted to carry out their own revolution in view of the specific alignment of class forces in Czarist Russia and the decay of the capitalist system internationally. The bourgeois revolution would have to be led by the workers.

This meant that in competition with the bourgeoisie, the working class must appeal to the peasantry, promising to give them what the bourgeoisie would not give -- a radical agrarian reform. In turn, this would become the basis for an alliance with the peasantry. As to the kind of government that would emerge from the revolution, Lenin did not go beyond abstract formulas, holding that one of the main results would be to give a big impulsion to the world socialist revolution, particularly in Europe.

(3) Trotsky agreed with Plekhanov and Lenin that the coming revolution faced bourgeois tasks. He agreed with Lenin that the only class capable of carrying the revolution through to the end was the working class and that therefore the immediate task was for the workers to seek political power, forging an alliance with the peasantry in the process by means of a program of radical agrarian reform. But once in power, what would the working class do next? It had to carry out bourgeois tasks with its own methods and its own goals and these are socialist in character! The world would witness a spectacular case of the law of combined development, in which the most advanced political, social and economic forms would be used to carry out historically superseded tasks.

Therefore, he argued, the coming revolution will begin with bourgeois goals. The proletariat will have an opportunity to take power under revolutionary-socialist leadership. In power the proletariat will transcend the bourgeois character of the revolution by establishing a proletarian dictatorship with socialist aims. Such a government cannot exist indefinitely in isolation. It will give a big impulsion to the world socialist revolution, particularly in Europe, and will in turn be rescued by that revolution from defeat at the hands of Russian reaction.

Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution," which he developed in 1905-07, was, of course, confirmed in life. By accepting its general prognosis in time and formulating the prospects for a Soviet republic in his famous April 1917 "theses," Lenin assured the first victory of socialist revolution and the establishment of the first workers state in history. He rigorously corrected the Kamenevs and Stalins who initially followed the Mensheviks in supporting the liberal bourgeoisie and Kerensky's "democratic" government as against going ahead with a socialist revolution.

And in Lenin's time, the theory of "permanent revolution" was viewed as a great achievement of Marxism, for it made it possible to understand the revolutions of our time as a continuous, unfolding

process rather than as isolated, disconnected, arbitrarily separated stages or "kinds." Above all, Trotsky's contribution to Marxist theory enabled revolutionists to better see the central political role that falls to the working class in the underdeveloped countries in leading society forward out of the historical impasse in which the capitalist system has landed humanity.

It was only after Stalin usurped power that the old Menshevik theory of revolution by stages and the "progressive" role of liberal capitalism was resuscitated and repeatedly offered to the world as the latest thought of the various Gus Halls trained in the school of Stalinism.

Why Did the Mensheviks Fail?

Naturally, one cannot oppose the Menshevik two-stage theory and practice simply because of its age or its unfortunate resemblance to the antiquated two-cylinder automobiles of the day. We are entitled, however, to an explanation from Gus Hall for its lack of success in 1917 and an explanation as to why, in the light of the record, it should be considered today as more likely to win in places like Latin America than the theory and practice of Lenin and Trotsky.

Mr. Hall also owes us an explanation as to just why Menshevik theory should prove superior to the theory of victorious Bolshevism in understanding the Cuban Revolution. Our own impression has been that developments in Cuba offer rather striking confirmation of the theory of the permanent revolution. To avoid swift defeat, the leaders of the Cuban Revolution had no choice but to carry their revolution forward, passing beyond the limits of "bourgeois" goals. If they did not foresee the socialist outcome, the theory is not thereby invalidated. On the contrary, it is confirmed by the costly method of trial and error. Yet the Cuban leaders did not proceed altogether blindly. They learned something from revolutionary experience in China, Bolivia, Guatemala, previous struggles in Cuba and elsewhere in Latin America. The Russian Revolution itself was a source of inspiration to them. It remains to be told how well they studied it.

Thus we find that it requires little serious examination of the theory offered to us by Mr. Hall to find ourselves confronted by that very Trotskyism which the main spokesman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., so sedulously sought to avoid even mentioning. Instead of the abstract statement in the editorial of the Monthly Review which the curiosity-driven reader of The Worker dug up, Mr. Hall might just as well have selected the following quotation from the same editorial:

"But if Fidel Castro and the Latin American Communist Parties duck the question of socialism, and still more if they attack as Trotskyites all those who openly struggle for a specifically socialist revolution, then the prospects for Latin American Trotskyism will be vastly improved."

After all, that is what is really bothering the readers of The Worker and the circuitous Mr. Hall, isn't it?

Gus Hall Versus Fidel Castro

But what about the problem of getting isolated through advancing such an "ultrarevolutionary" program as the working class to power? Or as Gus Hall puts it: "Why are these concepts so important? Because the locomotive of social revolutions are people. And people will fight for what objective processes have placed on the order of the day. Therefore, if socialism is not on the order of this day, but in spite of that, the advanced forces present it as if it is, this can only result in isolation for such forces."

We learned from Marx and Engels that "people" are divided into classes and that it is class interests that provide both the locomotive and braking power in revolutions. However, let us hear a word from Fidel Castro on this subject.

"I told them also," said Castro, referring to a Chilean delegation of Christian Democrats who came to the Tricontinental Conference, "that I did not think that conditions in Chile permitted a revolution of that type [a bourgeois-democratic revolution], 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...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."

These remarks were made by Fidel Castro in a speech given at the University of Havana March 13. Gus Hall's article appeared April 24. Since the chief spokesman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., must read and ponder over Fidel Castro's speeches (although you would never know it to read The Worker), it can only be wondered why Gus Hall chose this occasion to come out so strongly against the perspective of socialist revolutions in Latin America. Was he really aiming his barbs at Fidel Castro despite the guff about rising to Castro's defense against "ill-tempered slander"?

Of course, the possibility exists that Mr. Hall might not have read Fidel Castro's March 13 speech. In that case, when he finally gets around to it, as a man of principle he will undoubtedly take on Fidel Castro in a polemic equal in vigor to his polemic

against the "fundamental errors in the editorial policies of the Monthly Review." We look forward to seeing that. How long will we have to wait?

It should be added that the view expressed by Fidel Castro does not appear to be an isolated instance. Thus at the recently concluded twenty-third congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, Armando Hart Davalos, the head of the Cuban delegation, said on this point:

"Cuba proves unmistakably that under present conditions in Latin America, a genuine revolution rapidly leads to socialism. Cuba palpably demonstrates that the struggle for national liberation, in our continent, forms an inseparable part of the struggle for socialism. Cuba makes it clear that in the Latin-American continent, the question of the working class taking power and the Socialist Revolution triumphing depend in great measure on subjective factors, on the determination of the vanguard, on willingness to win or die." (My translation from the April 8 issue of Bohemia.)

Mr. Hall, it appears, has considerable work piling up on his desk. We wish him luck in handling the flood of inquiries from puzzled readers of The Worker.

The Problem of Political Leadership

It is completely false to argue that "isolation" is certain if you take a firm stand on the Leninist principle of seeking to establish a working-class government, whatever alliances are made along the road. The masses are won through slogans appealing to their own class interests. These include democratic slogans which from a rigorously scientific point of view are "bourgeois" in character: free speech, the right to assemble, free elections, and so on. The truth is that nowhere in the world today can the bourgeoisie, no matter what their pretensions to liberalism, be trusted to uphold and defend democratic rights. The erosion of democratic rights in the United States is proof enough of that as the American Communist party and other sectors of the American radical movement have good reason to know. Leadership in the defense of these rights today falls to the working class and its vanguard parties. This increases the opportunities for them to gain a wide popular following. The political wheel is turning in their direction.

A great deal follows from the historic political bankruptcy of the bourgeoisie. If no political confidence whatsoever can be placed in the bourgeoisie anywhere on earth in defending simple democratic rights, what confidence can be placed in them in a revolutionary struggle involving economic and social structural changes that signify their doom as a class?

It could be argued that "logically" it is up to the bourgeoisie to defend the democratic rights associated with the bourgeois revolutions that overthrew feudalism; the workers have other, more advanced historical tasks, such as initiating a planned economy and

eventually a classless society. And, in fact, such an argument would be logically consistent with the position held by Gus Hall.

But class-conscious workers would only laugh at such an argument. They would be right, for the working class includes as its heritage all the gains of previous revolutions and defends them as its own. By the same right -- the right of the class representing historic progress -- they are not only entitled but duty bound to strive to take power even in a country with strong feudal hangovers. They cannot trust the liberal bourgeoisie to carry out bourgeois-democratic tasks. They must project doing this themselves by their own methods and in consonance with their own socialist goals.

This lesson is particularly important in the underdeveloped countries where the bourgeoisie has emerged on the political scene too late to do anything except play a reactionary or diversionary role; but it is also not without bearing in more advanced countries where the bourgeoisie are prepared to resort to fascism.

Does vigorous application of the policy of seeking proletarian power frighten the liberal bourgeoisie? Of course. This was one of the considerations advanced by the Menshevik leaders. On the other hand, a firm revolutionary policy has the merit of attracting the best minds from the upper classes and wide sectors of the petty bourgeoisie. Many of them are capable, under competent proletarian leadership, of transcending their narrow class outlook and joining in the great forward march of humanity represented by socialism. That has been one of the teachings of Marxism since the Communist Manifesto.

It is not at all a matter of splitting doctrinal hairs. The question is crucial for our epoch. On this the evidence is overwhelming for all who care to open their eyes to see. We will confine ourselves to citing but two recent examples.

Brazil and Indonesia

In Brazil, the Communist party under the leadership of Luis Carlos Prestes followed precisely the concept explained to such perfection by Gus Hall. Everything was staked on avoiding "isolation" by leaving leadership in the hands of Goulart and Brizzola, representatives of the "progressive" wing of the bourgeoisie, the "capitalist elements who chafe under the oppressive restrictions of foreign monopoly." Everything was done to reject taking as an "immediate task" the "winning of power by the working class." And, "in practice," what happened?

On April 1, 1964, these capitalist elements proved utterly impotent in face of a military coup d'état engineered by the Brazilian oligarchy, Brazilian business interests and American imperialism. They proved impotent because their own intimate connections with these circles paralyzed them. The result was a crushing defeat that dealt a terrible setback to the Latin-American revolution as a whole.

In Indonesia, the Stalinist (or Menshevik) concept of revolution "by stages" has just received a most fearful test in practice. The bodies of 300,000 Communists -- if we accept the conservative estimate of one embassy -- testify to the thoroughness of the experiment. The concept followed by D.N. Aidit, the head of the Indonesian Communist party, was that in the approaching revolution "first" would come a stage headed by the liberal bourgeoisie represented by Sukarno; and "then" a socialist revolution at a later stage sometime in the future.

The Communist party had 3,000,000 members, a youth movement of another 3,000,000 members and headed an organized labor force of some 20,000,000 members. The swift rise of the Communist party in Indonesia was due to the revolutionary aspirations of the workers and peasants who took its name to mean it stood for a communist program and not the program of serving as a left cover for the liberal bourgeoisie.

What more was required for victory except clear consciousness in the Communist party of the mortal danger of a political alliance with the bourgeoisie under Sukarno's leadership, plus firm determination to put the working class in power? D.N. Aidit, the Indonesian Gus Hall, lacked both requisites. When the reactionary generals under Nasution and Suharto decided that the time had come to strike, the Indonesian Communist party was reduced to a shambles within a few days; the revolutionary-minded workers and peasants, caught unawares, were butchered like sheep; and D.N. Aidit himself, from all accounts, lost his life.

The historic lesson was all the clearer in that the Kremlin, which stresses "peaceful coexistence" -- meaning class collaboration -- was not alone in responsibility for the disaster. The Mao leadership was directly involved since Aidit stood on their side in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Like Khrushchev and Brezhnev-Kosygin, the Mao leadership approved Aidit's concept of revolution by stages. All the celebrated omniscience of Mao's thought did not lessen by one jot the catastrophic consequences of this baneful theory.

It would seem high time for the Gus Halls -- or at least their followers -- to consider the results of the concepts that were put into practice in Brazil and Indonesia. Those concepts spelled doom for the workers movement in both countries. Instead they continue to peddle nostrums that have proved in practice again and again in the past half century to contain a deadly poison.