

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. 19

June 10, 1966

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
Opposition to War Hardens Among U.S. Intellectuals	1
Johnson in Secret Deal for Korean Mercenaries	4
German Students Demonstrate Against War in Vietnam	5
The Final Conclusion	7
-- by Ralph Schoenman	7
Cuba Mobilizes in Reply to U.S. Provocation	34
Alexander Defense Committee Under Attack	12
Text of ADC Letter to President Johnson	14
Statements of Support to Alexander Defense Committee	17
Hugo Blanco on Hunger Strike	16
Manifesto of Peru's Political Prisoners	19
FIR Appeals for International Solidarity	20
Francisco Amado Killed in Guatemala	21
-- by José Valdes	21
Canadian Socialists Hold Conference	22
Havemann's Proposal for a "New Communist Party"	24
-- by G. Gerbel	6
Hekmatdjou's Wife Appeals for Help	13
Verwoerd Takes Reprisals Against Fischer's Daughter	13
Documents:	
New Ominous U.S. Moves in Southeast Asia	36
Political Assassination in Detroit	38

OPPOSITION TO WAR HARDENS AMONG U.S. INTELLECTUALS

Sentiment against Johnson's war in Vietnam appears to be hardening and moving toward the left among intellectuals in the United States. Of the many signs of this shift, a significant one was the three-page advertisement which appeared in the June 5 issue of The New York Times. It included more than 6,400 signatures, of which 3,938 were from 180 college and university faculties in 39 states, including two presidents and 20 deans. The sponsors said

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

that they believed it to be the "largest political advertisement ever run" in a daily newspaper in terms of pages and number of signers. The advertisement cost \$20,880.

Most of the three pages were utilized merely to list and identify the signers, who also paid for the advertisement. The text was as follows:

"On Vietnam:

"Events of the past few months have further undermined the administration's stated rationale for involvement in Vietnam -- that American armed force is there to defend the Vietnamese. The continuing demonstrations in Hue, Danang and Saigon, with their anti-Ky and anti-American slogans, have made it clearer than ever that the Saigon regime has virtually no popular support. Military activities have been steadily escalated, and American military power has been forced to assume the brunt of the fighting from the South Vietnamese army. An estimated 100,000 soldiers deserted this army in 1965 alone (N.Y. Times 2/24/66).

"The successive regimes in Saigon which our government has been supporting were never popularly elected, and since shortly after the inception of the civil war have not governed more than a portion of South Vietnam. Nonetheless, the administration has attempted justification for American military intervention by claiming that these regimes have had popular support and could therefore be considered legitimate governments for all of South Vietnam.

"The dramatic exposure of these false premises and of the fragile basis for our policies has led many prominent Americans, including some former supporters of the war, to declare that our forces must be prepared to leave Vietnam if a new government there asks us to do so.

"But our administration's previous response to reverses in Vietnam has been escalation, bringing with it increasing death and destruction, and we are particularly alarmed at the extension of B-52 bombings to the North and new air raids in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. To escalate militarily while our position disintegrates politically is immoral, futile and perilous.

"Furthermore, while increasing numbers of political leaders and commentators question the entire policy of the United States in Vietnam, the American force, approximately a quarter of a million men, is conducting 'search-and-kill' operations and continues massive daily bombings in the course of which thousands of Vietnamese and Americans are being killed and wounded.

"The interests of our country and the strength of our belief in the right of self-determination demand that ways be immediately found to disengage ourselves from this intolerable situation. We are convinced that such a course is in accord with the mood of increasing numbers of Americans.

"We call upon our government:

"To cease all bombing, North and South, and all other offensive military operations immediately;

"To indicate that it will negotiate with the National Liberation Front and all other interested parties for a peaceful settlement;

"To encourage in every way, and in no way to interfere with, the free exercise of popular sovereignty in Vietnam;

"To evaluate seriously whether self-determination for the Vietnamese as well as our own national interests would not be best served by termination of our military presence in Vietnam."

As the advertisement indicates, this new development in the community of intellectuals was touched off by the political resistance to the Ky regime that flared up in Danang and Hue in March. A group set up last summer -- the "Committee of the Professions," headed by Dr. Oscar Sachs, a New York psychiatrist, and Miss Ruth Lassoff, an industrial psychologist -- got together with an "Ad Hoc Universities Committee for the Statement on Vietnam" to collect funds. The latter committee is headed by Prof. Harry Lustig of the City College physics department and Martin Davis, professor of mathematics at the New York University. They ran a quarter-page advertisement costing \$2,581 in the May 22 New York Times carrying the basic statement and announcing the plan for a multipage list of endorsers. Most of the response came in \$1 to \$10 contributions. More money is being collected to run the advertisement in other newspapers.

Besides the widespread backing manifested by the number of signatures, the content of the advertisement is to be noted. The slogan of "negotiations" which was dominant in the pacifist and antiwar movement not so long ago has been subordinated. Moreover, instead of being directed at Hanoi, it is directed at Washington, and the National Liberation Front has been singled out as the principal "interested" party.

To this has been added an immediate slogan that goes squarely against the line of the Pentagon, the State Department, the CIA and the White House -- to cease all bombing, and all other offensive military operations. This coincides with the line advocated by General Gavin about the advisability of withdrawing to "enclaves."

But the advertisement goes much beyond this by demanding serious evaluation of the advisability of "termination of our military presence in Vietnam."

This is a clear reflection of the slogan that is being raised on an increasing scale in demonstrations from coast to coast: "Get U.S. Troops Out of Vietnam Now!"

With the growing crystallization of antiwar feeling among academic circles, the professions, artists, scientists, technologists and religious representatives, the pressure is mounting for a similar response among the trade unions. Up to now the conservative heads of the labor bureaucracy have stubbornly displayed an ultra pro-Johnson attitude. This will become increasingly difficult to maintain, however, in face of the growing unpopularity of Johnson's war in Vietnam.

Once the labor movement starts action, the Johnson administration will be faced with a domestic crisis of major proportions.

JOHNSON IN SECRET DEAL FOR KOREAN MERCENARIES

In a May 23 dispatch from Seoul printed in the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune, Arthur J. Dommen reveals that he obtained the text of an American note to the South Korean government involving a secret deal for mercenaries to be used in Vietnam.

"According to the note handed the Korean government March 7, the United States promise includes 'the complete equipping of three regular divisions and plans to expedite the modernization of 17 army divisions and one marine division.'

"The United States also promised to provide 'all equipment, including weapons,' and to bear the financial costs of new Korean troops sent to Vietnam."

Dommen continues his sensational revelation of the result of negotiations between American Ambassador Winthrop G. Brown and Korean Foreign Minister Lee Tong Won: "In other paragraphs of the note, the United States committed itself to covering the cost of deploying additional Korean forces to Vietnam. It also committed itself to providing 'communications facilities for exclusive Republic of Korea use' between South Korea and South Vietnam and to paying for 'mobilization and maintenance in Korea of one reserve division, one brigade and their supporting units' to back up the troops in Vietnam. It also calls for the suspension 'for as long as there are substantial Republic of Korea forces in the Republic of Vietnam' of the current program of shifting the burden of support of the South Korean armed forces from the U.S. government to the South Korean government."

Dommen notes that the South Korean government has already sent 23,000 troops to Vietnam and has indicated it will send another division this summer. "The Korean government also has under study a plan to dispatch Korean Air Force pilots and crews to Vietnam."

The cost for the mercenaries is not indicated in the note, but Dommen estimates it will be in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

GERMAN STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST WAR IN VIETNAM

Frankfurt

An unexpected number of students -- some 2,200 -- turned out for a conference on Vietnam organized by the Socialist Students of Germany at Frankfurt University May 22.

The conference was followed by a march through Frankfurt in which about 4,000 participated. At a subsequent open-air meeting, the crowd was estimated at 6,000.

The conference, the march and the meeting were all militant in character, openly defending the social revolution in Vietnam and demanding the withdrawal of American troops.

The main slogan was, "Not a penny not a man for the war in Vietnam."

A huge banner was carried by eleven people: "No German participation in genocide" and "Amis [Yanks] out of Vietnam."

Groups of Iraqi, Iranian, Greek and other foreign students participated in the march despite the fact that the secret political police of their respective countries is keeping them under close surveillance in collaboration with their German counterparts.

Herbert Marcuse, a professor of German origin, now teaching at an American university, was the main speaker at the conference. With a wealth of facts and figures, he proved that to survive Vietnam has no choice but to undertake profound social changes, particularly a radical land reform. He pointed out that the forces fighting for such a radical program of social revolution in the underdeveloped countries will win in the end. He ridiculed the position that they should seek an alliance with "their" national bourgeoisie.

The USA, said Marcuse, is not defending "direct economic interests" in Vietnam, but something much more important -- its global interests. If the National Liberation Front should prove that despite its weakness in arms it is possible through human courage to win against the most powerful armed forces in the world, then this would mean the end of colonial domination internationally because it would inspire uprisings everywhere.

Professor Marcuse expressed a pessimistic view about the role of the American working class in opposing the war in Vietnam. Nevertheless, his remarks were most inspiring. They are to be published shortly by a major German publishing house.

Four panels took up the political and juridical problems of the Vietnam war, the domestic causes of the Vietnamese Revolution, aspects of foreign policy in the Vietnam conflict, and "Vietnam and the Federal Republic."

The final session was addressed by Konni Zilliacus, a member of the British Parliament. He promised that the left wing would do everything it could to convince the Labour party congress and the Trades Union Congress, scheduled for later in the year, that Wilson must change his attitude towards the Vietnam war. Zilliacus said that he was sure the left would have an antiwar majority in both congresses and could put tremendous pressure on the government through the parliamentary group.

Claude Bourdet, a municipal councillor of the Parti Socialiste Unifié [United Socialist party] in Paris, warned that the USA, not knowing how to escape from its self-entrapment, might start a third world war.

For the German trade-union youth, a secretary of the Wood Workers read a resolution in the name of his organization which had been adopted by the congress of the Confederation of German Trade Unions. The resolution called for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and negotiations on the basis of the Geneva agreement.

Heinz Brandt, who spent ten years in a German concentration camp and three years in a Stalinist prison in East Germany, and who is now on the editorial staff of the Metal Workers paper Metall, said:

"Vietnam may be far away, but Auschwitz is near. How can we overcome the guilt of the past, if we assume responsibility -- if only by keeping silent -- for the guilt of today?"

He called for opposition to any chauvinist anti-Americanism and for support to "the other America" which is fighting against the war in Vietnam just as we are.

Two telegrams were sent by the meeting: one to Senator Morse to encourage him in his fight against the war in Vietnam; the other to Chancellor Erhard, telling him that he has no right to speak for the German people when he declares that Germany is giving "moral support" to the USA in its war in Vietnam.

HEKMATDJOU'S WIFE APPEALS FOR HELP

Mahine Hekmatdjou, the wife of Parviz Hekmatdjou, who was sentenced to death by an Iranian military tribunal in a secret trial, has appealed for help to save her husband. She is at present in Europe with her two children. In a letter to Le Monde, she said:

"Knowing the profound patriotism of my husband, his humane sentiments and his sincere love for everything concerning the legitimate interests of the Iranian people, I am absolutely certain he is innocent and I can assure you that he is being persecuted only because of his political and social opinions." She hopes that international opinion will persuade the shah to commute the savage sentence.

THE FINAL CONCLUSION

By Ralph Schoenman

What is a war crime? That question has been put to me many times over recent years by fellow Americans and, I might say, by fellow Englishmen, amongst whom I have lived for eight years. "Propaganda" is the instinctive response of those in the West confronted with the facts of the war waged by the United States against the Vietnamese Revolution. It is a curious response.

I arrived in Vietnam on February 21, sent by Bertrand Russell, to acquire firsthand data in support of David Mitchell's stand against the draft, in support of his clear call for resistance by Americans to the use of poison gas, poison chemicals, torture and the bombings of hospitals. Who, in his heart, can say that these are not realities with which we have lived for several years? The American mass media themselves have unself-consciously documented a war of atrocity and oppression, an experimental war. I traveled in five of the provinces during bombardment and I saw the result of 650 sorties per week, south of Thanh Hoa, in Ha Tay, Nam Ha, Ninh Binh and the surrounds of Hanoi. We traveled by night, a team of eight, including doctors and photographers. The radio carried the poems continually recited by Vietnamese in a living oral tradition, applying recitative to the experience of recent days. The poetry of Vietnam and its people.

In village after village I listened to the accounts of the survivors and surveyed the results of napalm. One afternoon, rummaging in the rubble of a school, I picked out stained pages from the lesson book of a twelve-year-old Vietnamese child:

Page 2: "The Little Korean Child --
a poem composed by a Vietnamese poet
at the time of the Korean War:

'Where is your mother?
There is nobody around to ask. Everywhere
there are but fire and smoke.'

Page 9: "Memories

'I am losing my father. I am losing my
mother.' (Excerpts from the story of a
young girl.)"

Page 15: "The last days of Huang Van Thu (executed
by the French in the early forties)"

Page 1: "Our hands can do everything."

Page 5: "Land Reclamation Song"

Page 24: "How he faced the firing squad."

Page 19: "Grammar: subordinate clauses, auxiliary verbs"

Page 10: "Human efforts can turn arid soil into rice."

On this village and school were dropped thousand-pound bombs and lazy dogs. At another part of the village I picked up a lazy-dog bomb. This was Van Dinh hamlet, Van Hon village, Thieu Hon district, February 26, 1966. A lazy dog contains 250 slivers of razor-sharp steel. There are forty such bombs in a cylinder. 10,000 pieces of steel in a sudden storm of hail, lacerating anyone exposed or seeking shelter from the half-ton bombs. 10,000 cylinders of lazy-dog bombs have fallen on Thanh Hoa province since April, 1965. 1,281 rockets have been used. 37 guided missiles have been launched against villages in Thanh Hua province. 3,000 bombs alone were dropped on Ham Rong bridge, which still stands. Roads, means of communication, schools, hospitals, the tuberculosis clinic, sanatoria and old-age rest houses have been bombed in Thanh Hua province. I visited all.

"Usually, my friends go to school every day. We like to sing 'Ha Tinh Quang Binh.' My friends are Nhung, Ky, Chau, Nguyen. They are thirteen, twelve, fourteen, twelve. They are all girls. I have a friend who is a boy, named Liem. He was thirteen. My friend Ky liked to play. She would say: 'You go first. You go quickly, or I will step on your heel.'" (Rhymes in Vietnamese.)

"When the bombs fell I saw Ky's bowel and intestine come out of her body. Her head blew away. Her arm and leg blew away. Nhung was buried alive and was dug out dead. Chau's teeth were broken by stones which shattered them. Nguyen was buried alive. Liem was beheaded. My friend Phuong laughs sometimes; cries; speaks without knowing what she says; she screams; she is twelve. I have pains in my spine. Canh and Khoa had their chests crushed.

"When I become a grown-up I would like to be a teacher. I would like to ask you, uncle, to convey my best wishes of good health to my American small friends."

Nguyen Thai Mao was recently twelve. She has been strafed frequently on the way to school. She spoke of a bombing attack on her village on February 9 of this year. Her teacher, a young man of 24, named Thai Van Nham:

"Fragments of clothing, books and furniture flew so high that all in the vicinity knew the school was bombed. Students were blasted. Many were buried in the earth. I was among those buried alive. I was dug out later and was brought to consciousness. There was nothing left but a bomb crater, 55 feet wide and 21 feet deep. Everything was levelled. Parts of the

children were protruding from the earth. We found their heads twenty yards away. Their bowels and intestines were scattered everywhere. Two of my children were spattered on a palm tree and hung from it. Children were pressed to the trench walls. Blood filled the trenches. Children clutched their books tightly to their chests. The books were smeared in blood and ink. Some of them could speak a little when dug out. Then blood shot from their mouths, due to their crushed organs and they died. One little girl, Hoang Thai Nha, twelve, could only be recognised and identified by her rubber shoes. Six of the children were too mutilated to be recognisable to the parents. One dug out became conscious and asked how many of her friends died before haemorrhaging. Little Hung's body was found on top of unfinished poems he had written, along with a notebook of paintings. He had aspired to be a poet, painter and composer. His poems, paintings and songs are all signed: 'Composer, Dinh Hung.' He was thirteen."

The bombing of Huong Phuc school on February 9 is one event: a daily event for the past fourteen months in Vietnam. For Vietnam, 650 sorties per week with tonnages in excess of those used during the Second World War, with napalm and fragmentation bombs, the targets and the victims are the population at large. There are no other targets. The population knows that the United States wishes to impose so ghastly a price in national suffering that the will to resist will be broken. The will to resist is like ozone after a bombing storm in Vietnam. In every village, production teams work round the clock to increase food output. Militia units, under the command of nineteen-year-old girls, mount the most exposed positions to fire at diving jets with rifles and what amount to little more than muskets. Old machine guns are mounted on the very bridges subject to attack. The militia do not take shelter. When American planes are at the climax of their dive, bullets fly from thousands of rifles and machine guns and the whole population is in arms, and everyone who can hold a rifle is firing one.

The destruction of Thanh Hoa tuberculosis sanatorium is a study in horror: the patients strafed as they ran, many haemorrhaging as they carried those too weak to escape. Red Cross flags had been flying, but everything was destroyed. Patients, X-ray machines, medicines -- everything. Three successive waves of attacks on separate days were launched in case any survivors sheltered in the ruins. The old-age and invalid home in Thanh Hoa was leveled. It is a scene of vast craters, filled with water, and the shells of buildings. Mosaics litter the ground -- lovely pieces of the floor and walls in soft watercolour design. Out of one crater I picked the tattered pages of books which had once been part of the old-age home library. Here, those Vietnamese who had lived through three generations of struggle against the Japanese, the French and the Americans had retired in the ill health of old age to rest. Many of them were feeble through years of brutal labour before the victory of Dien Bien Phu released them from feudalism. Even in their

old age, the fruits of their struggle were denied them and, like the children of the schools, their soft bodies were smashed and splattered. One very famous hero of the resistance to France, recuperating from severe wounds, went insane in this final attack.

But the Vietnamese have endured more, for they have fought from the forests since 1940, and the Resistance was unable to enter the villages until the French were driven out. The population is locked together with that bond of profound self-esteem and mutual regard which a child of the West has never had, and cannot understand without encountering it. Their self-respect is based upon the dedication they see around them. All struggle, all sacrifice and what we understand by heroism comprise the minutiae of everyday existence.

Just as a peace mission from Mussolini would have been absurd to any Englishman in 1940, and just as negotiations with Hitler while the bombs fell on London and Coventry would have been treated as an insult to the self-respect and intelligence of every Englishman, so to the Vietnamese the suggestion that they must negotiate with the United States, while American troops are in occupation of their country, is but another expression of Western arrogance and racism. It does not matter whether the Communist party, U.S.A., the Soviet Union or President Johnson request them to betray their struggle, the response will be much the same. They have negotiated once in 1954 when they abandoned half of their country, having liberated it, for the sake of international considerations which proved to be illusory and which led to twelve years of horror. When Ho Chi Minh says: We will go on another five, ten, fifteen or twenty years, if necessary, he is not indulging in rhetoric. The Vietnamese resistance will not be ended. The Vietnamese war will be ended when the American resistance has made it impossible for it to go on.

In my talks with Ho Chi Minh and Pham Van Dong, we discussed mainly the state of awareness in the West and the quality and level of understanding of Western resistance to American imperialism. I saw the prime minister at seven in the morning following the night of my arrival. The warmth and the comradeship which were shown me moved me, because I retained the terrible feeling that I was an American, moving amongst the victims of the crimes of my government and obliging them to repeat for me their everyday experience, so I might write it down. Pham Van Dong knows the West, our culture and our history. Ho Chi Minh is at home in the streets of London, New York and Paris.

In 1940, England was under the Blitz. To the English, this was their finest hour, because, after a few months of bombing of a few cities the expectation on the part of others that the great power of Germany would intimidate the British was not fulfilled. The English were proud and indignant at the expectation that they would yield. They had not fought for 25 years against three vast and powerful invaders. The English countryside was not razed with chemicals and gas. The cities had not been saturated with jelly-gasoline. An occupying army had not placed 59 percent of the rural

population in forced labour camps. One hundred million pieces of razor-sharp steel had not rained on heavily populated East Anglia. No, only a few cities were bombed for a few months, but Churchill said: "We will fight them on the beaches. We will fight them in the streets. We will fight them with curbstones. We will fight them with our bare hands. We will never surrender."

President Ho Chi Minh and Prime Minister Pham Van Dong are life-long revolutionary leaders, internationalists, literally men of the world. They know our history. What is it that makes such resistance and such sentiments permissible for Englishmen after a few months of bombing, but impermissible for an agrarian people withstanding the invasion and atrocity of the United States of America? The answer is a simple answer. I feel it passionately since my return to the West. The answer is racism. The racism of imperialism, which is in the air we breathe.

More Vietnamese died between 1954 and 1959, the years of "peace," than in the years 1960 to 1966, the years of popular resistance in the south and American bombardments in the north. But the Vietnamese, from the president and prime minister to the villagers who spoke to me of their sufferings, are patient and exceedingly gentle. Nothing was so harrowing as their gentleness.

They know that our people have been corrupted. Americans and Europeans have been the beneficiaries of the exploitation against which the people of Vietnam struggle. Even while they expect little from us, they are moved and grateful for the little they receive, for they see the birth of an American resistance as one of the rewards for their sacrifice. An American emergence and an American consciousness of our place in the world and our relationship to our rulers will be the gift of the people of Vietnam to the people of the United States.

It would be a mistake to think that we do them any favour, and the pity of the horror which has been borne by Vietnam is not a pity deserved by the Vietnamese. There is nothing pitiful about them. In their very suffering they are heroic, because it is not passivity which marks them, but sacrifice and resistance.

The pity lies in the cruel historic reality which renders the American people apathetic and acquiescent as this horror is perpetrated in their name.

I feel certain that the American emergence of the next generation, and the generation after that, will trace its origins to the quarter-century Revolution in Vietnam: that great and liberating event to which we owe more than solidarity.

ALEXANDER DEFENSE COMMITTEE UNDER ATTACK

New York

The officers of the Alexander Defense Committee, an organization providing funds for legal defense and family relief to persecuted opponents of the South African regime, announced June 2 that the committee will refuse to comply with an order by the Justice Department to register as an "agent of a foreign principal." The "foreign principal" named by the Justice Department is Dr. Neville Alexander, a young scholar now serving a ten-year sentence in South Africa's notorious Robben Island concentration camp for his opposition to apartheid.

Civil-liberties attorney Stanley Faulkner, who has been retained as counsel by the Alexander Defense Committee, notified Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley that the committee "has no intention of filing as a Foreign Agent" as it "does not consider that it comes within the meaning of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 as amended." According to Mel Wulf, legal director of the American Civil Liberties Union: "The Act was intended to disclose the relationship between a domestic agent and a foreign power by whom he is employed. It was never intended to require registration by a domestic group organized to defend an individual against persecution by a foreign government."

ADC officers Paul B. Boutelle, Dave Dellinger, Berta Green and Robert H. Langston, who face possible ten-thousand-dollar fines and five-year prison sentences for refusal to register, protested the order in a letter to President Johnson. The letter cites the president's speech of May 26 at a White House reception commemorating the third anniversary of the founding of the Organization of African Unity.

Johnson pledged the U.S. to aid the peoples of Africa in their efforts to win "freedom, equality, justice and dignity" and declared: "The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country....We will not live by a double standard -- professing abroad what we do not practice at home, or venerating at home what we ignore abroad."

The ADC letter states: "If you should permit the Justice Department to proceed against the Alexander Defense Committee, you would demonstrate that American policy abroad is indeed consistent with American policy at home, but, alas, not in the defense of human rights but in their suppression; you would deny Americans the right to aid those abroad who are suffering for the cause of human rights, and you would deprive those who are struggling for human rights in Africa of support by their American friends." The committee has not yet received a reply from the president.

Numerous organizations and individuals have rallied to the support of the ADC. Statements denouncing the government's demand

that the committee register as a foreign agent have been received from Mel Wulf, legal director, American Civil Liberties Union; Rowland Watts, president, Workers Defense League; the Executive Committee, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; George Houser, executive director, American Committee on Africa; Stokeley Carmichael, chairman, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; Paul Booth, national secretary, Students for a Democratic Society; and others.

The Alexander Defense Committee was formed in February 1965 to provide funds for the legal defense of Dr. Alexander and ten other South Africans who had been convicted of "sabotage" for forming discussion groups to consider methods of fighting apartheid. Since the appeals in the Alexander case were lost, the committee has given financial aid to the destitute families of the victims and has provided funds for legal defense and family relief to other persecuted opponents of the Verwoerd regime.

The committee, all of whose officers are American citizens, has no salaried personnel and has no agency agreement of any kind with anyone. Its officers decide what cases the committee will support on the basis of specific pleas for aid.

In 1965, the ADC, as a part of its educational and fund-raising campaign, sponsored an American lecture tour by exiled South African liberation leader I.B. Tabata. It is planning a similar tour later this year for Franz J.T. Lee, a young South African who has written and lectured extensively on South African affairs since living in West Germany. The committee recently issued a fund appeal signed by Congressman John Conyers, Jr., one of the sponsors of the ADC.

The officers of the ADC have declared their intention to fight this harassment by the Justice Department by all legal means available to them. Funds are urgently needed for the legal fight as well as for the continuing work of the committee. Contributions and inquiries should be addressed to: Alexander Defense Committee, 873 Broadway, 2nd Floor South, New York, N.Y., 10003.

VERWOERD TAKES REPRISALS AGAINST FISCHER'S DAUGHTER

Under the fascist concept of guilt by association, the Verwoerd government has begun moving against the relatives of Abram Fischer, who was recently given a life sentence because of his opposition to apartheid. Miss Ilse Fischer, the 22-year-old daughter of South Africa's distinguished attorney, and her fiancé John Sholto Cross, a journalist, were listed as "Communists" May 22. This means that they cannot be quoted or write for publication in South Africa and cannot belong to any organization that discusses state policy. Mr. Cross writes for a business and financial journal in Johannesburg. Miss Fischer is studying to be a librarian.

TEXT OF ADC LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

[The following is the full text of a letter sent to President Johnson by the Alexander Defense Committee protesting a Justice Department move to compel the committee to register as an "agent of a foreign principal."]

* * *

May 28, 1966

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

The Internal Security Division of the United States Department of Justice, by means of a communication dated May 20, 1966 and signed by Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, has ordered the Alexander Defense Committee to register as an "agent of a foreign principal" under the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

Counsel for the Committee, civil-liberties attorney Stanley Faulkner, has advised us that we do not fall under the provisions of the Act, and he will so inform Mr. Yeagley.

We therefore request that you, as Chief Executive, ultimately responsible for the conduct of the Justice Department, order an end to this harassment of the Alexander Defense Committee.

The "foreign principal" whose "agent" Mr. Yeagley alleges us to be is Dr. Neville Alexander. Who is Neville Alexander? Is he the head of some foreign state or the leader of a conspiratorial network devoted to the subversion of democratic institutions? Hardly. He is a young teacher of German literature who received his Ph.D. degree in West Germany. Together with ten of his comrades, he was "convicted" in the Republic of South Africa, not of attempting to destroy or subvert democratic institutions, but of the "crime" of trying to create them, of the "crime"-of being an opponent of apartheid.

He was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, which, in today's South Africa, really means an indefinite term, since any prisoner can be held after serving his sentence as long as his further detention is deemed by the Minister of Justice to be in the "interest of public order." He was thrown into the notorious Robben Island concentration camp in 1963. And he is still there.

And the Alexander Defense Committee: Is it a tightly knit organization of highly trained and well-paid professional agents,

financed from abroad, and directed, perhaps, by Dr. Alexander from his Robben Island cell? Not quite. Rather it is a group of men and women who, incensed at the savagery of the oppression in South Africa and, in particular, moved by the plight of Dr. Alexander and his ten comrades, formed the Committee in February, 1965 to help finance the court appeal of these eleven courageous fighters for democracy and human dignity.

After the appeal was lost, the members of the Committee felt an obligation to aid the families of the Eleven, who had been left penniless by the imprisonment of their breadwinners. And, having become aware of the extent of the need, we further felt it our duty to contribute to the legal defense of other victimized opponents of the Verwoerd regime, to aid the families of those who were hauled off to Verwoerd's dungeons, and to help in the resettlement of political exiles from South Africa.

The A.D.C. has no salaried personnel, and every cent collected, above minimal operating expenses, is sent to the victims of the racist barbarism in South Africa. The A.D.C. has no "agency agreement," explicitly or otherwise, with Dr. Alexander or anyone else; it determines for itself what cases it will support, in response to specific pleas for help. This is the organization, Mr. President, that your Justice Department is attempting to stigmatize as a "foreign agent."

In a speech you made on May 26th at a White House reception commemorating the third anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, you pledged the people and the government of the United States to the cause of the peoples of Africa in their efforts to win "freedom, equality, justice and dignity."

You expressed repugnance at "the outmoded policy which in some parts of Africa permits the few to rule at the expense of the many," just as your Ambassador to the United Nations has several times expressed repugnance at the South African government's apartheid policy, truly a policy whereby "the few rule at the expense of the many."

Further, you declared: "Just as we are determined to remove the remnants of inequality from our own midst, we are also with you - heart and soul - as you try to do the same," and you promised that "we shall continue to provide our full share of assistance to refugees from social and political oppression."

Mr. President, we take the sentiment you expressed with utmost seriousness. But how can the people of Africa, or the people of America, believe that you do likewise when, at the very moment you were uttering these things, your Department of Justice was moving to harass an American organization devoted to translating into reality, in whatever limited way, these very principles?

There is another aspect to the matter, Mr. President. Not long ago, the South African government liquidated Defense and

Aid, the last remaining organization operating openly in South Africa which offered legal aid to opponents of the Verwoerd regime. We trust you would not wish to imitate Verwoerd by suppressing our organization.

In the address on the third anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, you stated "The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country...We will not live by a double standard - professing abroad what we do not practice at home, or venerating at home what we ignore abroad." If you should permit the Justice Department to proceed against the Alexander Defense Committee, you would demonstrate that American policy abroad is indeed consistent with American policy at home, but, alas, not in the defense of human rights but in their suppression; you would deny Americans the right to aid those abroad who are suffering for the cause of human rights, and you would deprive those who are struggling for human rights in Africa of support by their American friends.

We, in any case, will not be deterred; we will go about our work, confident in the justice of our cause, and, if necessary, we will fight this attempt to destroy us by using every legal means at our disposal.

Sincerely yours,

Paul B. Boutelle, Chairman
Robert H. Langston, Executive Secretary
Berta Green, Corresponding Secretary
Dave Dellinger, Treasurer

HUGO BLANCO ON HUNGER STRIKE

According to the May 25 issue of Revolución Peruana [Peruvian Revolution], the underground publication of the Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario, Hugo Blanco, the well-known Trotskyist peasant leader and head of the FIR, has gone on a hunger strike.

Revolución Peruana reports that Hugo Blanco is staging the strike as a protest against the cruel and inhuman measures under which he has been held for three years in the Arequipa prison.

"He is not permitted to receive visits," says Revolución Peruana, "not even from his family. His correspondence is minutely checked, a continual arbitrary censorship is placed on what he can read, the judge being an ignorant captain of the guard. He is denied medical attention, even dental care."

The publication was unable to say how long Hugo Blanco intended to continue his hunger strike.

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT TO ALEXANDER DEFENSE COMMITTEE

[The following statements, expressing support for the Alexander Defense Committee and denouncing the reactionary move of the Justice Department under President Johnson to compel the committee to register as the "agent of a foreign principal," were released to the press by the ADC June 2.]

[In view of the brazen nature of the Justice Department's attack, it is expected that similar declarations of opinion will be voiced on a wide scale both nationally and internationally.]

[Protests should be directed to the White House and copies should be sent to the Alexander Defense Committee, 2nd Floor South, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003.]

* * *

Mel Wulf, Legal Director,
American Civil Liberties Union:

"The government's demand that the Alexander Defense Committee register as a foreign agent under the Foreign Agents Registration Act is a perversion of the purpose which that statute is supposed to serve. The Act was intended to disclose the relationship between a domestic agent and a foreign power by whom he is employed. It was never intended to require registration by a domestic group organized to defend an individual against persecution by a foreign government.

"The statute inevitably imposes restraints on freedom of speech. Because of its vague language, it presents the danger of infringing the freedoms of Americans engaged in perfectly lawful activity which the government for some reason finds objectionable. It must, therefore, be construed very narrowly and not used as a weapon of harassment as it obviously is being used against the A.D.C."

Executive Committee,
Emergency Civil Liberties Committee:

"The proposal of the Department of Justice that the Alexander Defense Committee register as a foreign agent is clearly wrong as a matter of policy and law. The Alexander Defense Committee is engaged in raising funds to support the families of South Africans who are imprisoned for opposing apartheid. It is not employed by, is not responsible to, and is not an agent of a foreign government or other principal. The families which it helps are its beneficiaries, not its masters. It is a cruel absurdity to extend administratively to such charitable purposes a statute intended by Congress to regulate very different conduct."

Rowland Watts, President,
Workers Defense League:

"The demand that the Alexander Defense Committee register as an agent of a foreign principal is an utterly ludicrous example of the absurd Foreign Agents Registration Act. The Committee is specifically established to defend victims of the foreign totalitarian power of the Republic of South Africa. It is not the agent of any foreign principal; indeed its purposes make it the agent of all the people of the United States who believe in freedom and democracy for all the world."

George Houser, Executive Director,
American Committee on Africa:

"It is ridiculous for the Department of Justice to order the Alexander Defense Committee to register as a foreign agent. As I understand it, A.D.C. is an American organization whose policies are set by officers who are all American. No 'foreign principal' can set policy for this committee.

"The object of the Foreign Agents Registration Act is to make clear to the American public the interests that are being furthered by the activities of organizations in the U.S. receiving funds or final guidance from abroad. There is a multitude of organizations in the U.S. whose program supports one kind of cause or another abroad, but whose funds and guidance come from within the U.S. The A.D.C., I have always assumed, is one of these.

"Ordering the A.D.C. to register seems therefore to be either an act based on misinformation or a technique for discrediting it. In either case, the order should be rescinded."

Stokeley Carmichael, Chairman,
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee:

"This order is typical of the theory and operation that is characteristic of the American political establishment. If you don't conform to their ideas of 'American society' you are harassed and persecuted. Having ourselves been victims of similar harassment, we of SNCC protest this political persecution of the Alexander Defense Committee and urge that it be stopped."

Paul Booth, National Secretary,
Students for a Democratic Society:

"The United States government has always been very ready to denounce apartheid in its rhetoric but never able to do the things necessary to bring it down. Now its attack on this committee (the Alexander Defense Committee) for defending the victims of Verwoerd

must be added to a list which includes its promotion of U.S. investment in South Africa and its opposition to a program of realistic sanctions."

MANIFESTO OF PERU'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

[The following manifesto, written in the name of all the political prisoners in Peru, has been issued by the Asociación de Centros de la Universidad Nacional de Ingeniería (ACUNI -- Central Association of the National University of Engineering). Many organizations and public figures are supporting it, according to the May 25 issue of Revolución Peruana, from which it has been translated by World Outlook.]

* * *

Our country is going through one of the most critical periods in its history. The number of those imprisoned, detained or under prosecution, in Lima and the interior, is above 1,000. Throughout the length and breadth of the country, more than 1,000 men and women are being held incommunicado, under harassment, submitted to humiliating and inhuman conditions in the prisons of Lima, Cuzco, Arequipa, Chiclayo, Piura and other departmental and provincial capitals.

The great majority of them have not been brought to trial yet, or they are awaiting questioning which is postponed in order to block their early release.

There are hundreds of Peruvians under "provisional freedom," a precarious freedom that converts them into second-class citizens living under permanent threat of being jailed. And there are many others, hunted by the police, who have been compelled to go underground.

In the countryside, the repressive forces have tortured and shot peaceful villagers for the "crime" of sympathizing with guerrilla fighters, or because of mere suspicion, or the word of informers.

It is public knowledge that Luis de la Puente Uceda, Máximo Velando, Luis Zapata Boderó and other guerrilla leaders and fighters were submitted to unspeakable abuse and torture in order to wring confessions out of them. When they didn't succeed, the butchers shot them without a trial, without respecting their status as prisoners of war, without observing even the drastic repressive laws passed by the government.

We socio-political prisoners are denied the right to defend ourselves, since we are turned over to arbitrary military tribunals and have been placed under the unconstitutional Code of Military Justice making illiterate military men both our prosecutors and

judges. This violates specific articles of the country's constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of which Peru is a signatory country.

All this is going on while the president of the republic continues to affirm that Peru is enjoying economic prosperity, democracy and respect for human rights and freedoms. How can one speak of economic prosperity in a country suffering from a shocking rise in the death rate, the cost of living, sickness and illiteracy? Where is the respect for rights and freedoms when the organizations of the people are systematically destroyed and their leaders arrested and hounded even if they go abroad? Where is the democracy when Peruvians are jailed for publicly advancing their ideas?

We are living today, not in a democratic but a dictatorial atmosphere, not with respect for the human person but with shocking violations of their most elementary rights; not with freedom but with repression and McCarthyism.

This situation is systematically kept from the people by a venal press and a servile parliament. The government is in deep fear of being definitively rejected by the people and condemned by international public opinion.

In view of this situation we appeal to the intellectuals, the workers, students and peasants to mobilize together to win repeal of the unconstitutional Code of Military Justice, Law 15590 and Supreme Decree 78 (which authorizes the prosecution of people who visit the socialist countries) in order to demonstrate their solidarity with the political prisoners and to win their freedom; in order to demand that the government grant a full general amnesty.

For a general amnesty.

For repeal of the Code of Military Justice, Law 15590 and Supreme Decree 78.

For the release of all the political prisoners.

FIR APPEALS FOR INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY

The National Secretariat of the Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario [Left Revolutionary Front] of Peru has issued an appeal for international protest against the repressive measures being used by the Belaúnde government against political opponents.

"We ask," says the appeal, which was released in Lima May 28, "that demands be placed with the Peruvian government to respect the lives of political prisoners. They are the victims of unspeakable torture, when they are not murdered in cold blood, without any

trial, or left without adequate medical attention."

The FIR calls special attention to the case of their comrade, Hugo Blanco, who is being held "practically incommunicado in Arequipa, deprived of the possibility of reading and working, gravely ill."

In Huancayo, according to the appeal, thirty-seven people are being held on charges of guerrilla activities. They have been savagely tortured, particularly Antonio Meza Bravo. The medical report itself in his case notes that his liver, kidneys and lungs are affected and that he is close to a mental breakdown.

Pancha Durand Borda, Pilar Borda Viuda de Durand and Nieves Rado Calderón have been held since August 1965 in the Women's Jail in Belén (Cuzco). They are gravely ill. The 18-year-old Nieves Rado Calderón is reported to have suffered a mental breakdown.

The FIR appeals for protests and actions to let the Belaúnde government know what the world thinks about such things. The demand should be made that it end its criminal, indiscriminate repression, respect the lives of political prisoners and grant them a general amnesty.

FRANCISCO AMADO KILLED IN GUATEMALA

By José Valdes

At the beginning of April, after a short skirmish, the repressive forces of the dictatorial Guatemalan government murdered Francisco Amado G. and Francisco Arce.

According to the May issue of El Rebelde [The Rebel], the journal of the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria [MIR -- Left Revolutionary Movement] in Chile, Amado was "a talented 36-year-old university professor in charge of the organization and politics of the MR-13 de Noviembre [Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre] in Guatemala City and the urban centers, and was at the same time in charge of publishing the journal Revolución Socialista. Amado was the faithful comrade-in-arms of Comandante Yon Sosa from the time both of them were cadets in a military school. In 1961, Amado gave up his chair at the University of Mexico and joined the guerrilla struggle. From that time on, he faced the constant risk of being arrested for his steady underground activities in the urban centers. Amado combined the characteristics of both a man of action and a theoretician. He was one of the signers of the Declaration of the Sierra de las Minas; and his firm position as a revolutionary Marxist brought him into conflict with the reformists and revisionists, those who vilely slandered and even informed on him."

These two new crimes follow the murder of Alejandro de León,

Vallese, Vicente August Lorca and Rodolfo Chacón and others. A number of prisoners are faced with summary execution. These include David Aguilar, Mónica Castro, José Angel Pesquera, Beto and more than one hundred workers and peasants. These losses have been felt by the MR-13, but its guerrillas and militiamen continue to struggle resolutely.

As for the FAR [Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes] led by Luis Augusto Turcios Lima, which separated from the MR-13, it initiated a series of actions, the most spectacular of which was the kidnapping of the head of the Supreme Court and the secretary of the press and news of the presidency of the republic. These actions, aimed at winning the release of imprisoned guerrilla fighters and workers, do not exactly follow the line of the "peaceful road" advocated by the PGT [Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo -- the Communist party] which nevertheless wields influence in the political program of the FAR. This consists of reviving the old, bankrupt line of a "revolution by stages"; that is, first make a front with the bourgeoisie in order to make the bourgeois (antifeudal?) revolution, and then (when?) struggle for socialism.

As evidence of this, in the recent presidential elections, the PGT and the FAR supported Mendez Montenegro.

Nevertheless, the tactics of the FAR indicate the possibility that it is not a monolithic body under the complete control of the PGT. It seems rather to include various tendencies, one of which is the line of armed insurrection.

Within coming months, it is likely that we will witness political differentiation within the Guatemalan guerrilla movement, as has occurred in the other insurrectional movements, particularly in Venezuela, Colombia and Peru.

CANADIAN SOCIALISTS HOLD CONFERENCE

A highly successful delegated conference of the League for Socialist Action [LSA] and the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière [LSO] took place in Toronto May 21-23. The LSA is the revolutionary-socialist organization in English-speaking Canada -- the LSO is its homologue in French-speaking Québec.

The exceptional growth, youthfulness and political development of both organizations during the past two years were reflected in many ways. The all-day sessions were attended by more than one hundred persons. The average age of the delegates was under twenty-five.

The conference began by paying tribute to the young socialist antiwar fighter Leo Bernard, who was slain just a few days before in the Detroit headquarters of the Socialist Workers party by an ultra-

rightist influenced by the Vietnamese war propaganda, and to Jan Garrett and Walter Graham of the Young Socialist Alliance, who were seriously wounded in the same murderous attack. A telegram was sent expressing sympathy and solidarity. It was the conviction of the delegates that the SWP, YSA and the entire U.S. antiwar movement will not falter in their efforts to force U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam.

Both the LSA and LSO have closely identified themselves with the Fourth International -- the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938. The assemblage heard a presentation of the major documents adopted at the last world congress of the Fourth International and expressed solidarity with their socialist aims. The report was given by Alan Adair who had attended the recent congress.

High on the agenda was a discussion on how to step up the opposition in Canada to the American-waged war in Vietnam. The conference was unanimous in its opinion that the Pentagon's "escalation" policy in Southeast Asia is aimed at China and ultimately the USSR. The conference took a firm decision to strengthen every effort to build bigger and better antiwar committees across the country and to popularize the slogans: "Get American Troops Out of Vietnam Now!" and "End Canadian Complicity."

Testifying to the growth and development of the vanguard forces in Canada was the important and thorough discussion on the situation in Québec. A complete day was devoted to analyzing the class forces at work in this highly industrialized and superexploited part of the country. This discussion was on a high plane as it involved the whole question of nationalism and what kind of program revolutionary socialists should project in light of this complex question.

The conference took into account the increased radicalization of the Québec working class and the favorable opportunities open before revolutionary socialists. Decisions were taken to aid the LSO in various ways.

Among the other major documents was one on the New Democratic party (Canada's labor party) and one on the trade unions.

John Riddell, editor of the Young Socialist Forum (a bimonthly magazine) presented a report on the reasons for a marked increase in political activity among Canada's youth, particularly in opposing the war in Vietnam.

In summing up the conference and indicating the tasks ahead, Ross Dowson, editor of Workers Vanguard, said: "I have attended many conferences of this nature in the past but none have been as important and impressive as this one. None have been as big -- not only from the point of view of numbers but also in the realm of ideas. And none have been as youthful. This conference marks a turning point in the struggle for a socialist Canada."

HAVEMANN'S PROPOSAL FOR A "NEW COMMUNIST PARTY"

[Recently Professor Robert Havemann, the well-known East German chemist, came under fresh attack from the Ulbricht government. The East German Academy of Sciences voted March 24 to strike his name from the rolls. The March 26 Berliner Zeitung said that seventy percent favored expulsion. This measure was challenged, however, since a seventy-five percent majority is required to make it binding.

[The 66-year-old Professor Havemann was director of the Physico-Chemical Institute of Humboldt University in East Berlin and a life-long Communist who has continued to characterize himself as a "true Marxist." A controversial figure in the academic world of East Germany since 1956, the eminent scholar-scientist was dismissed from his post on March 12, 1964, and subsequently expelled from the Socialist Unity (Communist) party of East Germany for his critical views.

[He had told students in a lecture series on freedom and morality that under Stalinism man is "educated to hypocrisy and dishonesty" by a police state that kills thought. "All this must change completely." When dogma blocks the free exchange of ideas, it "creates the conditions for a disastrous development" by blocking social progress. But then "reactionary regimes have always striven to keep their people stupid."

[He scoffed at the party's "pitiful distortion" of Hegel's dictum that freedom is the recognition of necessity. "One cannot attain freedom by doing 'voluntarily' what one must do in order to stay out of jail."

[He called for freedom to encourage "dissatisfaction with things as they are."

[Professor Havemann was assailed in the East German press as "a degenerate thinker" and the party's Central Committee condemned him as one of "those intellectuals who lay rotten eggs in the party's nest."

[Nevertheless, the Communist party cell at the Humboldt University voted to back the outspoken chemist.

[The following article, a critical appraisal of Professor Havemann's views concerning the kind of party that is needed, has been translated from Die Internationale, the German-language quarterly of the Fourth International. A one-year subscription to Die Internationale can be obtained by sending \$2 to Franz Pokorny, Marchettigasse 18/13, Vienna VI, Austria.]

* * *

Through the public initiative of Professor Robert Havemann, the profound process of transformation visible in most of the

European Communist parties has likewise become apparent in both parts of Germany. When Apel, the head of the state planning agency, committed suicide at the end of February, 1966, the public became aware of critical developments in the economy of the German Democratic Republic and in its trade relations with the Soviet Union. Shortly before this incident, Havemann published a sensational article in the weekly magazine, Der Spiegel, on the need for a new Communist party in the Federal Republic.

While the campaign against those writers who dare to go beyond the limits of the "liberalization" acceptable to the bureaucracy continued in East Berlin and the entire German Democratic Republic, and while Ulbricht was proposing "necessary measures for the maintenance of order" against those who had developed a "free market economy" in literature, cinema and art; Havemann protested the undemocratic law banning the German Communist party [KPD -- Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands] in the Federal Republic. And he proposed to neutralize this ban by founding a new Communist party on democratic organizational principles, free of dogmatism and the residue of Stalinism.

At the same time, he linked this proposal with an overture to the leaders of the German Democratic Republic to replace the merely formal existence of several parties within the national front, which presents a single, unified list of candidates at elections, with a multiparty system via the legalization of a German Socialist party [SPD -- Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands] in the Democratic Republic. He also raised a series of other democratic demands in connection with this proposal.

The rather ordinary and often contradictory ideas expressed in this article were demonstratively rejected by the leadership of the illegal KPD. Furthermore, the form and tone were such as to make objective discussion impossible.

The December 1965 declaration of the Central Committee, signed by Max Reimann, states among other things:

"Professor Havemann, who was expelled from the SED [Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands -- Socialist Unity party of Germany (the East German Communist party)], has published a made-to-order letter in the West German publication, Der Spiegel. With the connivance of West German agents and the approval of the West German minister, Mende, he calls for a split in the KPD and in the West German working class. In his article, Havemann opposed the legalization of the KPD in the Federal Republic and proposed to dissolve the KPD and found a new Communist party of the Federal Republic in its place. In Havemann's opinion, this party must be completely purged of all Marxist-Leninist ideas and function as a kind of auxiliary force for the defense of the constitution.

"It is no accident that the Springer press quoted excerpts from this article before the magazine appeared; it shows that

higher directives from Bonn were involved. The haste with which Mende seized on the statements of Havemann clearly reveals their source."

The Central Committee of the KPD relapses here into a period in which slanderous epithets like "agents" or "auxiliaries" of the bourgeoisie were the mildest phrases used in political disputes.

If we question some of Havemann's remarks in a critical manner, this has nothing in common with such contemptible accusations.

On the other hand, the actions of the SED against Havemann and the treatment he has received from the Central Committee of the KPD must not be used as an excuse to give up the unconditional demand for legalization of the KPD. Freedom of the press, of assembly, organization and association are among the elementary rights in defense of which the workers movement has continually raised its voice in the course of its century-long struggle. And it has not proceeded on the basis of political agreement with the political tendencies involved. As long as Havemann keeps to this line, he will have our support. But we cannot second him if he seeks to achieve the legalization of the KPD by pointing out its hopeless weaknesses. Democratic rights are indivisible. We are absolutely opposed to his attempt to link the demand for the legalization of the KPD with relations between the Federal Republic and the Democratic Republic, with reunification and other demands of a diplomatic or state character.

The legalization of the KPD would in no wise alter the political and social character of West German bourgeois rule or the reactionary content of its opposition to reunification, or its policy toward the Eastern bloc. Neither should the legalization of the KPD be proposed as a political exchange, as Havemann intimates -- the legalization of the KPD here for the legalization of an SPD in the Democratic Republic -- especially when he poses no political conditions for the legalization of an SPD in the Democratic Republic.

Revolutionary Marxists, as such, support the legalization of multiple workers parties in the German Democratic Republic. Nowhere in the Marxist classics is there a demand for a one-party state in the transition from capitalism to socialism. Furthermore, the creation of a state of this kind in the Soviet Union was not foreseen by the leaders of the October Revolution.

But precisely the experience of the Soviet Union leads us to pose this question more concretely and to make the legalization of opposition workers parties and groupings dependent on their recognition of the new basis of society. What is on the agenda in this period is not the implementation of formal democracy but rather the realization of socialist, or workers democracy.

This means that the policy of a new SPD in the Democratic Republic could not be based on the model that has been developed by the SPD in the Federal Republic, at least since the failure of the "Plan for Germany," since Bad Godesberg, etc. Support for such a model would virtually amount to support for capitalist restoration.

Having made these preliminary remarks, we come now to the real heart of Havemann's proposal for a new Communist party. He formulates it as follows:

"...in any case, the Communist party that emerges from the shadowy existence of illegality, now or in the future, must be a new changed party, from the ground up. The party must say both yea and nay to the old KPD. The party is no specter but a living being. Therefore, it must learn to draw conclusions from its own experiences."

The need for a new Communist party, which is expressed by Havemann today, corresponds entirely to the precepts of the Trotskyist movement and was already recognized thirty years ago. Since that time, recognition of the need has been the guideline for all our strategic and tactical considerations and practices. New organizations of historical importance, like a new Communist party, cannot be called into existence on the basis of purely subjective insights. The organization of the First, Second, and Third Internationals developed in accordance with the historical process. Each stood at the level of the given stage of social development and the maturity of the class struggle as well as the level of the best of the preceding movement. The older organizations had to give way to the new, not arbitrarily, but at the crossroads of the historical process.

We experienced such a turning point in 1933 with the fascist seizure of power. In 1933, the German working class was led into a defeat of historic proportions without a struggle. It was not the lack of understanding of the masses, but the leaderships of the big workers organizations, the SPD and the KPD which, by their policies and actions, made the working class incapable of resisting the massive assault of fascism. If the historic guilt for this defeat weighs more heavily on the Communist party than the Social Democracy, it is because, since 1914, the Social Democracy ceased irrevocably to be a socialist organization with the historic responsibility of leading the working class. It went over to the camp of the bourgeoisie with all its banners and it has not left it to this day.

The decisive turning point which occurred on August 4, 1914, did not involve suddenly giving up abstract fundamentals of Marxism or adherence to a Marxist program. The leaders of the Social Democracy had already thrown these overboard at various stages of their evolution. (If they ever really understood what Marxism was all about.) What was in question was their duty to the masses to protect them against the horrors of the imperialist war and, failing this, to put a quick end to this war through mass action. Instead of fulfilling this responsibility, the leaders deserted to the camp of the forces that had steered consciously

toward war.

They helped to mobilize the masses for the war instead of in opposition to it and suppressed any movement that had the least possibility of bringing a quick end to the war. This was the historic crime of the leaders of the Social Democracy in the August days of 1914. This was their historic betrayal of the workers movement, a knife blow against the concrete interests of the working class in the imperialist war. This behavior of the party leadership during those critical days and during the entire imperialist war made the development of a revolutionary political leadership of the working class a necessity. The entire development of the Social Democracy since that time has justified the decision of the revolutionary groups and tendencies to constitute a Communist party (KPD) in the years 1918 and 1919.

From that time on, or at the latest since the unification of the KPD with the proletarian left wing of the USP [Independent Social-Democratic party], the Communist party took on the tasks of a leadership and thereby the responsibility for the politics of the revolutionary class struggle. This was especially true, in the years 1932-33. The initiative in the struggle against fascism rested necessarily with the KPD.

The decisive defeat, which at the same time sealed the fate of the Communist party, was the victory of fascism. The mistakes of the party in those years, which were the immediate basis for the fascist seizure of power, were of such a scope that quantity (mistakes) became transformed into quality (crimes) that delivered the working class over to fascism without a fight.

Through the construction of their own unions [RGO -- Rote Gewerkschafts-Opposition (Red Trade Union Opposition), the de facto splitoff trade-union organizations set up by the German Communist party during the ultraleft "third period" of 1929-33], they split the German trade-union movement and left a large section under the exclusive influence of the reformist leaders who had already shown themselves ready to betray the unions to fascism. The Social Democracy was branded as a fascist movement ("social fascism"), with the logical consequence that it was impossible to fight together with it against fascism in a united front.

The struggle against fascism was further weakened because they viewed fascism as already in power in the shape of the Social Democratic government, and in the succeeding transitional governments like that of Brüning, Papen, Schleicher. The Nazi movement was contemptuously ignored -- German fascism was not rallying under the swastika, but under the black, red and gold banner of the Social Democracy. Later, they prepared the proletariat for the "inevitable" victory of the Nazis with the slogan, "After Hitler, us," or with the claim, "The Nazis won't stay in power twenty-four hours." As a consequence of this policy, they backed a Nazi-sponsored referendum to oust the Social Democratic government of Prussia.

In 1933, the Communist party did not solve the problem of the fate of the German working class.

They have not yet been able to undertake a serious self-criticism and to acknowledge their historic guilt for this defeat of the working class, with all of its horrible consequences. Therefore, they have not been able to draw the necessary conclusions from it and to raise the demand that Havemann raises: The construction of a new Communist party.

This consequence of the evolution of the Communist party is a necessity. But if there is no longer any possibility of reforming the SPD or the KPD, or of restoring them to their original positive roles, it is not enough to merely declare this truth and to proclaim a new party.

The formation of a new working-class party is closely bound up with the immediate condition of the class and the tempo of the class struggle. If this party is not to be a "splinter sect" (Havemann) without influence on the movement of the class, then it can only arise out of the tide of the political struggle and the process of differentiation which it produces in the party that is at present followed by the majority of the politically conscious elements of the working class. The need for a new party must be an axiom for the strategy of the left and the revolutionary forces. It can only make the leap from theoretical understanding to political reality when it has succeeded in separating the decisive class forces from their present leadership. In the present social relationship of forces and in the present situation of the workers movement, this is a long and difficult process.

The formation of a new working-class leadership, furthermore, does not consist in gathering together the many scattered "homeless" individuals and groupings. That would be a caricature of a genuine revolutionary party. Before a new Communist party can take form, important sections of the working class must undergo larger processes of political and organizational transformation, processes effected through serious discussions on the program, strategy and tactics of the new party. Whoever seeks to avoid this task or to use it as a springboard for irresponsible phrasemongering or uninspiring halfway measures cannot lay a serious foundation for a new Communist party. On the contrary, they would prepare new illusions for the revolutionary cadres by their failures and distortions.

Havemann sees the problem clearly when he raises the demand for the liquidation of the Stalinist epoch. Unfortunately, Havemann's critique of the causes of Stalinism is limited to organizational questions. He neglects thereby the very important national and international conditions that led to the development of the bureaucratic deformations and distortions. Thus, he contents himself, like many "leftists," with a one-sided application of Rosa Luxemburg's critique of the Bolshevik form of organization:

"The reconstruction of the party, which is unalterably on

the agenda today, can and must be based directly on Liebknecht and especially on Rosa Luxemburg, whose writings have been suppressed for many decades by the Stalinists. They were suppressed because she saw the first dangerous steps toward the abandonment of inner-party democracy, that would later lead to Stalinism. With prophetic clarity, she recognized and criticized them."

The most important element in Luxemburg's criticism of the actions of the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution was her fear that the dictatorship of the proletariat would become a dictatorship of the party and finally the dictatorship of the dominant group in the party.

She wrote:

"However, with the suppression of political life in the entire country, the life of the Soviets must also wane. Without general elections, a free press and freedom of assembly, the free conflict of opinions, the vitality of all public institutions will wither away; it will become a mere semblance of life, in which the bureaucracy alone will remain an active element. No one can escape from this law. Public life gradually becomes dormant; a few dozen party leaders of inexhaustible energy and idealism rule...Fundamentally, a clique-run economy, a dictatorship certainly; but not the dictatorship of the proletariat, rather the dictatorship of a handful of politicians..."

This is where almost all the critics of Bolshevism stop in quoting Rosa Luxemburg. Up until this point, everything that Rosa Luxemburg wrote against the Bolsheviks seems to have found confirmation in the actual development of things. For, in fact, the character of the Stalinist dictatorship largely resembles the picture that Rosa sketched in 1918.

She was by no means a devotee of "pure democracy," however. She was for decisive and powerful revolutionary assaults on the political and property rights of the defeated bourgeoisie. A dictatorship of the proletariat otherwise would be unthinkable. However, Rosa Luxemburg wanted to be sure that the principle of democracy would be preserved for the workers. She was for the control of the state apparatus by the broad masses as Lenin outlined it in State and Revolution. And she was firmly convinced that the Bolsheviks also would have followed this direction if there were not more powerful circumstances that were beyond their control and opposed to their will. She expressed this judgment directly following the criticism cited above:

"The Bolsheviks would have proceeded in exactly the same way [in accordance with their original aims] if they had not suffered from the terrible pressures of the World War, the German occupation and the difficulties which accompanied it, which of necessity, would distort a socialist policy with the best aims and the most beautiful principles."

These lines have been deliberately overlooked by otherwise "conscientious" critics. Rosa indicated the deeper context of the actions of the Bolsheviki which she criticized in a letter to Warski:

"I also shared all your reservations and hesitations, but dismissed them with respect to the most important questions, and often I did not go as far as you do. Terrorism, certainly, demonstrates a great weakness; but it is directed against an internal enemy that bases its hopes on the survival of capitalism outside Russia and on receiving support and encouragement from it. With the advent of the European revolution, the Russian counterrevolution would lose its support and more importantly also its courage. Thus, the Russian terror is above all the expression of the weakness of the European proletariat."

Rosa Luxemburg by no means presented an exhaustive analysis of the conditions under which the degeneration of the dictatorship would ensue; but she indicated clearly the line of approach.

All the critics of the Russian Revolution and the Russian one-party state consciously ignore the fact that there was a civil war in Russia, that the enemies of the Bolsheviki did not "criticize" Soviet power but fought against it arms in hand, that they did not object to the commands of the bureaucracy but fired at these leaders with pistols. Neither before nor after the October Revolution did the Bolsheviki plan to eliminate their political opponents. The latter, through their counterrevolutionary activities, which made necessary all-out mobilization of the party forces and forced the civil-war regime on the party, themselves contributed to the conditions that led to bureaucratic degeneration in the wake of the defeat of the revolution in the West in 1923.

The Mensheviks (Social Democrats) were not outlawed and suppressed because they proposed an evolutionary path to socialism but because they fought arms in hand on the side of national and international militarism in the Revolution and in the civil war and because their leaders took part in White governments.

The break with the left Social-Revolutionaries came only when they tried to substitute the assassination of leading Bolshevik comrades (Lenin, for example) for political debate on social problems and the concrete questions of Soviet policy (for example, they opposed the signing of the Brest Litovsk Treaty and called for continuation of the war.)

In the same sense, the machinations of the international Social Democracy (support for the counterrevolution in Russia and betrayal of the European revolution) contributed decisively to the bureaucratic degeneration.

Rosa Luxemburg's criticism, which she restricted more and more, as we have shown, could only be borne out subsequently by history through the interaction of the various national and international conditions under which the Russian Revolution took place. Under these

conditions, Stalin played the role of the representative of the Thermidorian forces which arose and constituted themselves into a ruling bureaucratic stratum.

Thus, it is correct to say, as Havemann does, that the causes did not reside in the "person of Stalin" but rather that Stalin represented the entire period of deterioration and degeneration of the workers state as well as the crimes that went with it.

It has been necessary in connection with some aspects of our critical remarks to go far back into the past. Only an understanding of the stages of development of the workers movement in its various phases can lead us to a correct view of present-day measures. It must be stated that not Bad Godesberg, but the fourth of August, 1914, already condemned the SPD and condemned it irrevocably. Therefore, it follows that the splitting of the Social Democracy in 1914-18 was a necessity, even if the KPD in its later evolution did not fulfill the hopes that were placed in it. Havemann questions the necessity of this and asks if the split was not the underlying factor of the weakness of the German workers movement, without which Hitler's victory in 1933 would not have been possible.

We have already determined the conditions of Hitler's victory. Havemann's question, "whether this split was a mistake," interests us here from another aspect.

It is quite typical of opposition Communists in the German Democratic Republic and in the other East bloc states that their political orientation follows the same lines as that of the revisionists, Togliatti, Amendola and Lombardo Radice, in Italy; Ernst Fischer and Franz Mareck in Austria; as well as Kolakowski in Poland, etc. The recently concluded CP conference in Italy should have shown the kind of liquidationist dead end into which this course leads. The actions of the Communist parties in several countries which are aimed at a reunification with the Social Democracy or the subordination of the Communist parties to it are part of this tendency which, in these parties also, would "throw the revolutionary deadweight overboard." Havemann follows these tendencies not only on the question of the split, but also on other questions.

For example, he demands that the Communists free themselves "from the odium of being a party of radical revolution," and later asks the question: "Ought not the question of socialism or capitalism in Germany, after all, be decided by the will of the people, thus by elections?" These statements agree entirely with the line of the Swedish CP which figures prominently in his article and in which the process of liquidation has gone the furthest.

We would go beyond the limits of this article if we expanded on this problem and ventured into another historical digression. We merely want to stress a few historical facts at this point. Under the pretext of the peaceful, democratic road to socialism, the November Revolution of 1918-19 was beheaded. Under the same sign, the Social Democracy helped German capitalism to overcome its postwar

crises of 1919-23 and thereafter. This peaceful road to socialism disarmed the defense of the German working class against the fascist onslaught. The history of the Weimar Republic and its collapse were in the last analysis also the collapse of this "theory." In the history of the workers movement, "theoretical" considerations of this sort have been merely the ideological reflection of acts of class treachery. This holds true also beyond the borders of Germany for the actions of the Communist parties of other countries and their class collaboration in peoples fronts, "peaceful coexistence," etc.

However, Havemann's article expresses his inconsistency in all its contradictions -- an inconsistency which is probably characteristic also of the forces which, in a certain sense, he represents.

It bears the stamp of isolation, of the position of a single individual. It is a collection of many still unelucidated problems, problems which are often not entirely thought out, and many highly speculative reflections. The absence of collective judgment and consideration, of an intellectual and organizational center for the antibureaucratic struggle in the Democratic Republic comes out clearly.

We have discussed primarily the negative aspects of the article. A whole series of points are positive without qualification and of great usefulness as fresh formulations for which Havemann is to be thanked. (In one or another form they have already been sketched in the pages of the Die Internationale.)

Particularly relevant, in our opinion, is his demand for democratization of the organizational life of the party, which includes the right of factions.

Of especial importance, moreover, are his proposals for the broadening of democratic rights in the Democratic Republic, which he views in connection with the development of a new socialist movement in the Federal Republic.

He proceeds from the correct consideration that "socialism with less democratic rights and freedoms than the bourgeois state already has achieved is a distortion" and, finally, that "the democratic conquests of the bourgeoisie must not be destroyed but guaranteed and increased."

He calls for a multiparty system and a parliamentary opposition in the Democratic Republic. The emphasis which he puts on his demand for the right to strike in the transitional stage of society from capitalism to socialism is very positive. Unfortunately, we must express some reservations here also. This catalog of democratic demands is buried in a desert of ambiguous and dubious formulations, as is the greater part of his article; this considerably weakens the forcefulness of these demands.

Thus, the article can only serve as a basis for discussion on a variety of problems. In itself, it is by no means a document that clarifies the positions of opposition Communists, to say nothing of being a manifesto of an opposition Communist organization, or the starting point of a process of differentiation in the KPD and the SED.

-- G. Gerbel

CUBA MOBILIZES IN REPLY TO U.S. PROVOCATION

On May 21, a Cuban sentry, Luis Ramírez López, who was standing guard outside the Guantánamo enclave held by U.S. troops, was killed by rifle fire emanating from the base which lasted sporadically for about two hours.

On the following day, Guantánamo officials answered the Cuban protest over the murder by flatly denying that any Cuban sentry had been killed by rifle fire from the base. They stated that there had not been any rifle fire whatsoever.

A few hours later, the Pentagon announced that an "incident" had been reported which it was investigating. On completion of the "investigation," the Pentagon said that the Cuban sentry had intruded into the base, fled when noticed and was shot while climbing over the fence to get away.

This is the version that has been widely publicized by the capitalist press in the United States. In Europe, the Pentagon version has been questioned. Thus the May 29-30 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde declared:

"According to Western journalists who visited the Cuban posts near Guantánamo Friday [May 27], it appears difficult to accept the American version of the incidents. In fact, the base is surrounded by three enclosures of barbed wire, and 40 meters beyond that, another high fence. Beyond this fence a mine field marks the perimeter of the base. According to the version confirmed by Mr. Dean Rusk Friday evening, a wounded Cuban soldier was presumably capable of getting through all these obstacles. The Cuban comandante showed the journalists photographs of the body of Ramírez, the Cuban soldier killed last week, showing that the bullet cut through the aorta, causing instant death."

Besides injury, the Pentagon added provocative insult, claiming that there had been eleven Cuban intrusions into Guantánamo since last March, three of them resulting in exchanges of gunfire. The latest intrusion, according to this same source, occurred May 23, following the killing of Ramírez.

In a May 27 statement, the Pentagon claimed, as reported by

the New York Times, "that six Cubans had climbed into the base, fleeing only after an exchange of fire with American guards."

The State Department utilized this claim, in turn, to send a formal diplomatic protest through the Swiss Embassy, describing this alleged intrusion as a "serious matter."

The most serious thing about the claim was what it revealed about the state of the U.S. mine field. Six Cubans crossed it, to believe the Pentagon, going perhaps cautiously but returning on the run without a single mine exploding! The capacity of the Cubans to skim over barbed wire fences should also be of serious concern to the Pentagon. The United States has only two men capable of that -- Batman and Superman.

The Cuban response to this provocation showed that they are as alert as ever. If the Pentagon and State Department were testing their reflexes, they got the answer they deserved.

Castro denounced the Washington warmongers in two statements May 27, charging that the State Department version of the Guantánamo incidents was a lie. The Pentagon and State Department, said the Cuban prime minister, were attempting to "create the psychological conditions to unleash armed aggression against Cuba." He ordered a nationwide state of alert.

On May 28 President Dorticós called in all the ambassadors of the Soviet bloc countries to bring them up to date on the situation. He declared that "if the United States attacks, we will accept volunteers from all countries to help us."

As the Cubans mobilized from one end of the island to the other, the Soviet government warned the United States to retreat. In a statement issued by Tass on May 29, the Soviet Union said:

"The Soviet ruling circles follow developments in that area closely and consider it necessary to issue a reminder of earlier pledges of support for heroic Cuba, which is fighting for its freedom and independence."

"Those who harbor aggressive designs against the Republic of Cuba should not forget that Cuba has true and reliable friends."

The State Department professed puzzlement over Havana's sharp reaction. According to a Washington dispatch in the May 29 New York Times, "officials here said they did not really understand what lay behind the Cuban agitation." They understand well enough. Ever since Johnson began escalating the war in Vietnam, Castro has openly stated that the best way to meet American aggression is as quickly and as energetically as possible, so as to serve clear warning and to block the military assault before it gets started and gains momentum.

Castro advocated this for others. Would he apply it to Cuba, too? Rusk and McNamara now have their answer.

NEW OMINOUS U.S. MOVES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938, issued the following statement May 21.]

* * *

The present stage of the imperialist aggression against the Vietnamese revolution has clearly reached a blind alley. The growing resistance of the south Vietnamese masses against the corrupt Ky regime has completely exposed the lie with which American imperialism justified its intervention in the Vietnamese civil war; their fraudulent claim of acting in conformity with the wishes of the people of south Vietnam.

The decomposition of the south Vietnam puppet armies now puts on the imperialist troops the main burden of the war against the south Vietnamese National Liberation Front. The heroic resistance of these freedom fighters has destroyed any hope of military victory for the Pentagon in the present form of war which it conducts against them.

The barbarous bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has in no way broken the fighting spirit of the people of north Vietnam, who more than ever are determined to participate in the common struggle of the Vietnamese people for a free and united socialist Vietnam.

Under these conditions the ruling circles of American imperialism, unwilling to recognize the defeat of their attempt to stop the tide of the Vietnamese Revolution by military repression, seriously consider opening up a higher stage in the escalation towards global war.

They have started to participate in the military repression against the rising masses of north Thailand and are busy planning interventions against the liberated territories of Laos and the neutral regime of Cambodia. These new acts of aggression will spread the flames of war over a large part of the Southeast Asian peninsula.

A blockade of the harbor of Haiphong and direct air attacks against the cities of Haiphong and Hanoi are now openly projected as a new stage of the imperialist aggression. These new outrages would directly endanger the military security of the People's Republic of China. These have been clearly and repeatedly defined as the signals which would bring down large-scale intervention of Chinese volunteers to the side of their embattled ally.

The maddest circles in the Pentagon not only are not frightened by such an eventuality but actually welcome it. For them the whole purpose of the military intervention against the

Vietnamese Revolution is to provoke as early as possible a military showdown with the People's Republic of China and to destroy by atomic bombing the main industrial centers which make China the third nuclear power.

An ominous sign of what is in the making is the cynical warning by the Pentagon against the use of the latest type aircraft by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the further announcement that south Chinese airfields would not be "recognized as privileged sanctuaries." This warning was promptly underscored by the violation of Chinese territory by American aircraft and the downing of a Chinese plane over the province of Yunan.

In this preparatory phase of a new stage of American imperialism's escalation towards global war the one voice which has been silent on a decisive point has been the voice of the leaders of the Soviet Union. They have the power to stop any project of American aggression against China by making a clear and unequivocal declaration that the government of the Soviet Union would consider such an attack as an attack against its own territory to be answered with all appropriate means at its disposal.

Such a declaration is not only an elementary duty from the point of view of the defense of the Soviet Union; it is the main contribution which could be made today to stop the escalation toward global nuclear war. For it is certain that the crisis of American imperialism and the world imperialist system has not yet reached the point where Washington is ready to risk nuclear death as against retreating from Vietnam.

A declaration of basic solidarity with the People's Republic of China would also be the main prerequisite for establishing the necessary united front of all the workers states in the defense of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. It would help dissipate the suspicions of the Chinese leaders that the Kremlin plans to stay on the sidelines in the event of an American aggression against China. It should be underlined that notwithstanding their incorrect talk about "capitalist restoration" in the Soviet Union, the Chinese leaders have solemnly reconfirmed their resolution to come to the assistance of the Soviet Union in the event of an American military aggression; this as late as April 1966.

The silence of the leaders of the Soviet Union on the preparation of war against China is a blow against the interests of defense of the Soviet Union and all the workers states, a crime against the interests of peace.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International calls upon all communists, working-class and anti-imperialist militants and movements throughout the world to demand from the Soviet leaders an immediate declaration of solidarity with People's China in face of the growing threat.

It calls upon them to step up their actions for solidarity with the Vietnamese Revolution, their actions of struggle against the counterrevolutionary wars of United States imperialism, their actions to extend the revolution to new countries and thereby force imperialism to disperse its forces more and more over the globe and to weaken its pressure upon the revolutionary masses of Southeast Asia.

POLITICAL ASSASSINATION IN DETROIT

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following statement May 21.]

* * *

The murder of Leo Bernard and the wounding of Jan Garrett and Walter Graham, members of the Socialist Workers party and Young Socialist Alliance in Detroit this week arouses the indignation of revolutionists throughout the world. We grasp the hands of our American comrades in solidarity against this assault and the threat it implies. And to the families of the young victims we extend our heartfelt sympathy. These young men stood in the vanguard of their generation fighting to rid the world of the violence generated by decaying capitalism and were struck down in retaliation. Leo Bernard's memory will always be honored and in this moment we salute him and his companions.

This act of terror was carried out by a self-proclaimed anti-Communist executioner who had previously notified the authorities of his desire "to fight Communism" and had boasted that he was "armed and prepared." This tells much of the moral and political atmosphere in the USA poisoned by the official crusade of "anti-Communism." The terror and horror supplied by advanced technology and directed against the aspirations of peoples everywhere puts the American ruling class on trial before all humanity. They glorify and intensify their monstrous violence against the Vietnamese people. They prepare the moral ground justifying acts of terror and violence against their opponents at home. This is where the blame lies.

The American working-class organizations should take serious notice of this crime and the other acts of terror reported in the American press such as the bombing of the offices of the anti-war movement. These fascist-minded terrorists who gather in the dark and strike from the dark can become a menace to the labor movement itself. And the forces of the antiwar movement actively engaged in opposing their country's involvement in Vietnam should have no illusions as to the meaning of these attacks. A closing of ranks and a common front against the violence engendered by American capitalism must be sought by every serious participant in the antiwar and working-class movement.