

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 24

July 29, 1966

<u>In this volume</u>	<u>Page</u>
Notable Victory for Alexander Defense Committee	1
Wilson Faces the Bankers -- and the Workers	3
Case of the Fort Hood Three	
-- by Dick Roberts	5
Leftist Prisoners Slain by Guatemalan Police	8
America's Ghettos Explode Again	
-- by Evelyn Sell	9
Tensions Remain in Dominican Republic	14
Back to the Trujillo Machine	16
Robert Williams Moves to China	18
De Gaulle's Trip to Moscow	
-- by Ernest Mandel	19
Vietnam in Background at Kyoto Meeting	22
The Crisis in Yugoslavia	
-- by Henri Valin	24
One Reason Why War in Vietnam	
Is Unpopular among Negroes	26
A Seat for Japan in Nuclear Club?	27
Plantation Strike in Ceylon	
-- by Edmund Samarakkody	28
Perspectiva Mundial	31
A Tribute to Malcolm X from Japan	32
Japanese Communists Explain Silence on China	34
Documents:	
On the MR-13's Break with Posadas	35
Free Adolfo Gilly!	37

NOTABLE VICTORY FOR ALEXANDER DEFENSE COMMITTEE

The American civil-liberties movement won a signal victory July 15 when Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley of the U.S. Department of Justice announced that the government had decided to drop the case it was seeking to develop against the Alexander

Defense Committee. The victory was one of the swiftest, if not the swiftest in this field in the United States. The original order to the committee to register as the "agent" of a "foreign principal" was dated May 20.

The committee was formed to help get funds for the legal defense of Dr. Neville Alexander, who, together with ten comrades, was placed on trial in South Africa for political opposition to the racist policies of the fascist Verwoerd regime. Dr. Alexander, a noted scholar, was given a ten-year sentence. After the conviction of the eleven, the committee helped in appealing the sentences; and, when the appeal was lost, collected funds to help maintain the families of the victims. It has also offered help to other victims of the Verwoerd government.

The order from the Justice Department to register, would have compelled the committee to file reports on the source of all contributions and would in other ways have acted as a repressive measure aimed at crippling the committee's activities. Failure to register entailed possible sentences of five years in prison and heavy fines.

Robert H. Langston, executive secretary of the committee, announced that the organization had decided not to register and would fight the order.

Appeals were made to all organizations concerned about civil liberties to help defend the organization against the attempt to repress it. It was the resounding response to this appeal that actually caused the government to decide to retreat.

Statements of support rapidly came from the American Civil Liberties Union, the Workers Defense League, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the American Committee on Africa, the Congress of Racial Equality, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Students for a Democratic Society. The National Council of the latter organization authorized its president, Carl Oglesby, to become an officer of the Alexander group. He became co-chairman.

Upon returning from his trip to Africa Senator Robert F. Kennedy learned of the order issued by the Justice Department, which he formerly headed. He wrote to Yeagley June 29 inquiring about the order.

The Justice Department utilized this opening to back down. Yeagley replied to Senator Kennedy in a letter dated July 15 stating that in view of certain changes in the law that went into effect July 4 and also in the absence of "evidence indicating that the committee is acting under the direction or control of a foreign principal," it had reviewed the order and was withdrawing it.

The victory set an important precedent for other organizations engaged in activities of a similar nature in the United States.

WILSON FACES THE BANKERS -- AND THE WORKERS

Less than four months after he steered the Labour party to a smashing electoral victory March 31, increasing its majority in Commons from 3 to 97, Prime Minister Harold Wilson's government has been plunged into a severe financial crisis.

To prop up the weakening pound, the prime minister was forced July 20 to saddle the British economy with a burden of deflationary restrictions. These included the raising of a variety of taxes, some by ten percent or more; restraints on installment buying and on personal foreign travel expenditures by British citizens; and the curtailment of construction.

The long-impending crisis has been made still sharper by two collateral factors. Throughout his twenty-one months in Downing Street, Wilson has been blithely assuring his country and the rest of the world that the pound was in a healthy condition under his ministrations. Only two weeks before these emergency moves he had lashed out at the "moaning minnies" and "wet editorials," both to the right and to the left of him, that had criticized his inertia and called for a program of more drastic action. He now appears to have been taken by surprise and to be, not a shrewd and strong leader, but a short-sighted, vacillating victim of economic events.

This judgment is being openly expressed by some of his supporters. Among them is the New Statesman which has been campaigning for more stringent controls to cope with the situation. On July 15 its editors accused Wilson of compromising and maneuvering, of failing to fulfill his promise made a year ago of being a "government with guts," and of "being slowly obliged to adopt the Tory measures it originally rejected (no doubt concluding, in time with devaluation) because it lacks the will to apply the real alternatives."

The following week, after the announcement of Wilson's emergency package, they charged the Labour government with a lack of "competence and judgment" which has seriously damaged its image as a confident, trustworthy government team.

No less ominous for Wilson has been the reaction -- or rather, the absence of enthusiastic response -- from international financial circles. The British and foreign money interests have been looking to the Wilson government to perform the same nasty chore in 1966 as Ramsay MacDonald had carried out during the crisis of 1931 under quite different circumstances and in a different manner. That is to take the immense costs of restoring stability and profitability to British capitalism out of the hides of the working masses by reducing their wages and living standards. This method of salvaging a capitalist economy faced with bankruptcy has been a traditional role assigned to Social Democratic regimes in Western Europe.

Wilson's new measures are oriented in this direction. But

the refusal of the bankers at home and abroad to rally to the battered pound signifies that they are far from satisfied with these concessions. They want a full pound of flesh. Their wait-and-see attitude leaves the future of sterling in doubt and even places it in jeopardy.

As the July 24 New York Times points out, "the pound is plainly not out of trouble, and the next week or two will be critical. Even if the immediate pressure is relieved, the deflationary package raises its own questions about the long-run hopes for growth and greater productivity in the British economy."

The international financial sharks are now concerned to see how much further Wilson is prepared to proceed on their behalf and against the welfare of the workers in order to uphold the pound and the profit system. On the other side, the seamen's strike showed the determination of the workers to resist the imposing of the wage ceilings which the government has been trying to enforce by a series of measures ranging from exhortation to a mandatory cooling-off period.

The pressure from below has been dramatized by the resignation from the Cabinet of Frank Cousins, leader of the huge transport workers union, and the declaration that his union will not accept any official straitjacket on wage claims or struggles.

Wilson is therefore caught in the cleft of the two major class forces: the skeptical bankers and avaricious speculators, dissatisfied with his half-measures and pressing for more deflation at the expense of the workers, and the organized workers who put him into office with a big majority and who are increasingly opposed to the antilabor edge of his economic policies.

Britain's present sterling crisis is the fourth to hit the country in the last twenty-one months of the Labour government and by far the most serious since the pound was devalued in 1949.

It is highly doubtful whether the deflationary steps already taken, including the tightening of credit and raising the bank rate to seven percent, will suffice to stave off another devaluation.

It is even more unlikely that Wilson will reverse his course and apply a socialist economic policy that would give priority to the needs of his working-class constituency over the demands of the plutocrats.

These two factors presage that the current financial crisis may well be the prelude to a political crisis of these labor caretakers of the capitalist regime who were so jubilant over their prospective five-year tenure in office only a few months ago.

CASE OF THE FORT HOOD THREE

By Dick Roberts

For the past two weeks, attention in the world press has been drawn away from the U.S. bombings and slaughter in Vietnam onto the question of what would happen if Hanoi decided to try U.S. pilots who have been captured in that country.

The Johnson administration has attempted to use this question to stir up prowar support among the American people while making threats of a major "retaliatory" escalation of the war if the trial takes place. The so-called doves in the U.S. government have found in the question a means of diverting attention from their own failure to slow the war down in any way whatsoever.

Most importantly, the worldwide publicity given to the possible Hanoi trials, has obscured a trial that is actually taking place in the United States, and is the most significant new development in the antiwar movement in this country. This is the trial of three GI's who have refused to go to Vietnam.

The three are Pfc. James Johnson, a 20-year-old Negro, Pvt. David Samas, a 20-year-old white of Lithuanian and Italian parent-hood, and Pvt. Dennis Mora, a Puerto Rican aged 25. Johnson, Samas and Mora were arrested on July 7 just one-half hour before they were scheduled to speak at a public meeting in New York City to explain their position.

They were taken -- two of them in handcuffs -- to Fort Dix, New Jersey, and held under tight restrictions for a week. When they were ordered to go to Vietnam, they refused; and now they are being held in the stockade at Fort Dix, awaiting court-martial.

Johnson, Mora and Samas originally had announced their intentions on June 30, at a New York press conference, while they were on the 30-day leave preceding their shipment to Vietnam. "We have decided to take a stand against this war," they stated in a joint press release, "which we consider immoral, illegal and unjust...."

"We have been in the army long enough to know that we are not the only GI's who feel as we do. Large numbers of men in the service either do not understand this war or are against it....We know that Negroes and Puerto Ricans are being drafted and end up in the worst of the fighting all out of proportion to their numbers in the population; and we have first hand knowledge that these are the ones who have been deprived of decent education and jobs at home...."

"We have made our decision. We will not be a part of this unjust, immoral and illegal war. We want no part of a war of extermination. We oppose the criminal waste of American lives and resources. We refuse to go to Vietnam!!!!"

The case of the "Fort Hood Three" -- which they are called because the three GI's had been stationed in Fort Hood, Texas, for basic training -- has received widespread support from antiwar committees throughout the country. These committees are doing everything possible to get the facts about the case into the hands of other soldiers.

This activity includes leafleting bases and towns near bases, and bus terminals -- a place where you can be certain of meeting a steady flow of soldiers on their way to and from nearby bases.

The meeting at which the three GI's were scheduled to speak prior to their arrests was sponsored by the New York Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee, the organization which sponsored the two massive antiwar protests in New York, October 16 and March 26. This was the committee which the GI's first turned to when they were looking for help from the peace movement.

Although the GI's couldn't be present at the meeting, it was held anyway, and the wives and other relations of the GI's presented their speeches instead. Pvt. Samas' wife, Marlene Samas, read the speech which he had written. In part of it, Samas described the police harassment which his parents had been subjected to:

"The Modesto city police visited my parents in California saying they had been sent by some 'higher authorities,'...." Samas wrote. "It didn't prove hard for the police to persuade my parents into believing I was being used as a tool of the Communists. They were told that I was in serious trouble and that the only way for them to help was to reveal my address to the police..."

When Samas talked to his parents, he wrote, "they told me what the police had said to them. Although they have absolutely no authority the Modesto city police had offered me a deal. They had told my father that if I would retract my statement and withdraw completely from the civil action now in progress that I would receive a discharge from the army and no serious repercussions would result. In their concern for me my parents believed this fantastic story."

Samas concluded his speech: "The GI should be reached somehow. He doesn't want to fight. He has no reasons to risk his life. Yet he doesn't realize that the peace movement is dedicated to his safety. Give the GI something to believe in and he will fight for that belief. Let them know in Vietnam that you want them home, let them know that you are concerned about their lives also. Tell them you want them to live, not die. Bring our men home in Vietnam!"

"The three of us here, James, Dennis, and I came to the movement for help and we received help. We asked for support in our stand and we received that support. We asked for money for the case and have gotten some. The legal aspects of our case are numerous and

complex, but we cannot depend alone upon our legal stand. The war in Vietnam cannot be stopped just by legal action. The war can only be stopped with the sympathy of the public.

"In the end we depend entirely upon the public. We have placed ourselves in the hands of the people of the United States, and all our hopes lie with them. We risk our futures and maybe our lives on the hopes of the American public. We need your help."

On Saturday, July 9, two days after the arrest, several hundred antiwar activists went to Fort Dix to distribute a leaflet containing the facts of the case. Two hours before they arrived, the army closed off the town to GI's, attempted to herd as many of them as possible back to the base, and to prevent any soldiers from getting the leaflet.

In the base, it was later learned from GI's themselves, the army attempted to indoctrinate the soldiers that A.J. Muste, co-chairman of the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, was a "well known Communist." July 11 Muste dispatched a telegram to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, reading in part:

"We have evidence that Fort Dix personnel have been briefed in a manner which would discredit the Defense Committee and the peace groups which are giving moral support to the young men under detention and personnel have been told that the undersigned [A.J. Muste] was deprived of his clerical standing because he was a 'Communist.' This is completely false....

"We request the opportunity to correct any erroneous information the military personnel may have been given.

"We repeat our conviction that young men in the armed services are entitled to engage freely in discussion about issues related to the Vietnam War with fellow personnel.

"Citizens are likewise entitled to communicate the truth about the war to servicemen and the peace movement is determined to exercise that right."

The last two sentences of that telegram seem to be the key to the work of the antiwar committees in the Fort Hood Three case. Leaflets, simply printing the facts about the case, have been given to soldiers at various terminals, and these have led to lively conversations about the nature of the war and the case. In some instances soldiers have taken bundles of leaflets back to their bases.

The Fort Hood Three Defense Committee has urged national and international support to this work. While the three soldiers themselves are restricted from receiving letters, they may receive telegrams, and the Fort Hood Three Committee has issued the following directions in this regard:

"Send telegrams of support to the three men themselves.... They are under tremendous pressure and the antiwar movement must let them know it is backing them up. Telegrams should be addressed individually to Pfc. James Johnson, 51581277, Bldg. 6769, Fort Dix, N.J., or Pvt. Dennis Mora, 51581308, Bldg. 6769, Fort Dix, N.J., or Pvt. David Samas, 56408577, Bldg., 6769, Fort Dix, N.J."

LEFTIST PRISONERS SLAIN BY GUATEMALAN POLICE

According to a special dispatch in the July 18 New York Times, two former Guatemalan police agents supplied the University Students Association in Guatemala City with shocking details July 16 about the Enrique Peralta Azurdia government murdering 28 students and leftists after arresting them last February and March.

Among the victims were former Communist party leader, Victor Manuel Gutierrez; the former farm labor leader, Leonardo Castillo Flores; and Fernando Arce Behrens, a law student on vacation from the University of Mexico.

They were tortured in the police headquarters in the capital. Later they were taken to a military base near the Pacific coast and shot. Their bodies were sewn into burlap sacks and dropped into the ocean from an army transport plane.

The victims included Kris Yon Cerna, the niece of the guerrilla leader, Marco Antonio Yon Sosa; and Eunice Campiran de Aguilar Mora, wife of a Mexican student, David Aguilar Mora. She disappeared after she came to Guatemala in search of her husband, David Aguilar Mora, who vanished after being arrested last December. David Aguilar considered himself a Trotskyist and belonged to the Posadas group, which was formerly on friendly terms with Yon Sosa.

According to the two former police agents, both young women were beaten to death with clubs and buried in shallow graves near the Zacapa military base.

The University Students Association, which has been conducting an investigation since last March on the many missing victims in Guatemala, was told that most of the police killings had been ordered by Albert Barrios, chief of the judicial police under Peralta. Many more have been murdered beside the 28.

The guerrilla movement in Guatemala has suffered lately from various divisions among its ranks. One tendency, influenced by the Communist party, even made "Trotskyism" a splitting issue. Castro himself gave weight to this tendency. The Guatemalan police, however, made no distinction along these lines. They butchered all they caught, whatever their differences.

AMERICA'S GHETTOS EXPLODE AGAIN

By Evelyn Sell

For weeks the headlines in the United States have revolved around "riots," "Negro mobs," "racial rows" and the efforts of city and state authorities to put them down through the use of armed force. The headlines are not exactly novel. They echo the events of the two previous summers.

Between July 18 and August 31, 1964, there were explosions in the ghettos of seven East Coast cities. In 1965, from August 11 to August 17, there was the record-breaking eruption in the Watts ghetto of Los Angeles on the West Coast.

These actions signified a generalized protest against the totality of Northern ghetto life. They compelled the capitalist power structure to consider what to do to avert further social blowups. In the pacification campaign that was decided on, major emphasis was placed on the War Against Poverty.

Despite the Johnson administration's year-long efforts, however, the summer of 1966 has again brought ghetto explosions and new peaks in militancy.

One day before the summer was officially listed on the calendar, the Detroit News carried an article which began: "Pompano Beach, Fla., June 22 -- Hundreds of Negroes rioted early today, throwing rocks and bottles at police, stores and cars. Riot police finally cleared the streets with billy clubs and the threat of tear gas."

The incident that set off these actions was a white merchant's slapping of a ten-year-old Negro boy. Local Negroes explained how such an incident could lead to a flare-up of tensions. Attorney Alcee Hastings stated, "When you have people living in squalor and seething desperation -- with poor housing, miserable menial jobs, inferior schools -- you have the exact situation they have in Watts."

W.K. Johnson, now working in a community improvement project, placed major blame on the police. "I was sitting one night in my car, talking quietly with friends when a tough cop shined a light on me and said, 'Hey, boy, what the hell are you doing here?'" While white America was looking the other way, a new Negro has emerged. He is a Negro who has had a little more education, has a little more money, has been exposed to the better things. He has more pride in himself and wants a little more for his family.

"He's a Negro who won't be pushed around any more."

The same day that Pompano Beach flared up, Negroes in Cleveland, Ohio, set off a two-day disturbance along Superior Avenue which marks the boundary between white and Negro neighborhoods.

A nine-year-old boy was wounded by a white man shooting from a passing convertible. Two policemen were fired at. A white woman was hit by a brick thrown by someone in a group of Negro teen-agers shouting, "We want freedom."

In Omaha, Nebraska, national guardsmen with bayonet-mounted rifles and police armed with shotguns went into action because "there was a general assault on the police officers," according to Public Safety Director Francis Lynch. The trouble started on the night of July 2 when a group of Negro youths set off fireworks in a supermarket parking lot located in the North Side's predominately Negro area. Neighbors complained about the fireworks and police rushed in, provoking a strong reaction from the crowd of about 200 Negro teen-agers.

When asked about the cause for the defiance of the police and the breaking of store windows, Nebraska Governor Frank Morrison stated, "Omaha's near North Side isn't the best place to live. It's underdeveloped as far as housing is concerned and there are places there that aren't fit to live in."

Government spokesmen again and again pointed to the anti-poverty program as a means of forestalling such ghetto uprisings. Speaking before a congressional subcommittee hearing in October, 1965, Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, said, "The difference [between a peaceful Harlem and a riot-torn Watts] is \$1.5 million invested in antipoverty." He told the congressmen that community leaders and police officers believe that the Harlem Neighborhood Youth Corps "has been a definite factor in reducing racial tension this summer."

In actuality, the glittering promises of the antipoverty program have only served to increase the frustration and bitterness of black people in this country. Shriver was booed off the platform by dissatisfied black militants when he addressed a "poor peoples convention" held in Washington during April. The gathering was organized by the privately financed Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty, a broadly based coalition of 180 national organizations such as churches and labor unions.

When Shriver took the platform to make his usual glowing speech about the efforts of the government to wipe out poverty, Mrs. Unitia Blackwell, a leader of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, shook her fist in his face and shouted, "I want to ask a question." The podium was taken over physically by the protesters who said they were tired of "pussyfooting," tired of people "all smiling and juicy" when nothing was being done "in Cleveland or Brooklyn or Washington or you name it." A resident of the Watts ghetto summed up the antipoverty program results as "one big laugh."

Even more recently, Shriver and the antipoverty program were lashed by James Farmer, who had been so seduced by the war-on-poverty propaganda that he resigned his post as national director

of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] March 1 in order to become the head of a new nationwide literacy and job-training program financed by federal and private antipoverty funds. Farmer had proposed the idea of such a program to President Johnson in October, 1965, and it was reported that Johnson was enthusiastic about it.

The New York Times hailed Farmer's step as a sign that the civil-rights movement had entered a new phase. M.S. Handler wrote that Farmer's new position "signals the decline of the [civil rights] movement now that the Federal Government and Congress have taken over many of its essential functions...The massive move of the Federal Government into the vast arena of rehabilitating the Negroes' economic, social, and political status in the United States has also created a new situation for the civil rights movement. Formerly, the movement enjoyed a monopoly in this social struggle...The relevant question today is who is going to lead the parade and who is going to set the pattern. Under these changed circumstances, can the civil rights movement preserve its high visibility on the American scene since it has become quite clear that the Federal Government has decided to take charge of the new social revolution?"

Although the federal government clearly intended to "take charge of the new social revolution," it failed miserably as the debacle at the "poor peoples convention" and the Farmer affair proved. Speaking on July 3 to 200 delegates at the CORE national convention, Farmer announced that he was withdrawing his proposal for a nationwide literacy and job-training program because he had been given the silent treatment by Sargent Shriver and the Office of Economic Opportunity [OEO]. The former CORE chief declared that the federal government's failure to act on his proposal was "another broken promise to the millions outside the mainstream." He said the antipoverty program was like "trying to cure tuberculosis with cough drops." "I consider this a colossal betrayal," he told the delegates. The war on poverty "failed to make any change in the life of the ghetto dweller."

Hyman Bookbinder, assistant director of the OEO, answered Farmer's blast by saying that the proposed literacy and job-training program was not dead. The problem was that Farmer's "was a very raw project. The concept was great but needed strengthening in a number of areas." Bookbinder explained that it is not unusual for a proposal to take a year to get through the OEO.

But black people have said NOW! -- not a year from now.

The war on poverty was not the only method used by the administration during the last year in its aim to divert and stifle black social protests. A great deal of scheming and effort was put into gestures at passing additional civil-rights legislation and into attempts to further entangle civil-rights leaders into the machinery and goals of the established organs of the

government. The failure to keep Farmer ensnared was only one example of how these methods failed. The highly touted, long-prepared-for White House Conference on Civil Rights was another example.

President Johnson first promised a White House Conference on civil rights in a June 4, 1965, speech to graduates of Howard University. The original plan was to hold the conference during the fall of 1965 but the civil-rights movement wasn't docile enough to be trusted to follow Johnson's script so the conference was put off and a "planning session" was scheduled instead for November 17-18. The planning session was an obvious attempt to line up civil-rights, business and community leaders ahead of time so that the full conference could be staged exactly as Johnson desired. President Johnson set the stage by announcing just before the opening meeting of the planning session that he was preparing legislation to correct the abuses of the all-white jury system in the south and had asked the Civil Rights Commission to start a study aimed at making the nation's schools "colorblind." Vice-President Hubert Humphrey carried the soothing promises one step further when he addressed the planning session and guaranteed that the federal government would take whatever action was necessary to assure that all civil-rights laws were obeyed.

Although the 200 planning session members applauded the remarks of Johnson and Humphrey, even stronger measures were urged. A. Philip Randolph, honorary chairman of the Conference and a veteran civil-rights and union leader, asked for a \$100 billion "freedom budget" to wipe out the nation's black ghettos. The planning session turned into a series of "speak bitterness" meetings in which the government was criticized for lack of progress in ameliorating discrimination and President Johnson was castigated for not using the powers he already possessed to combat racism.

Analyzing the results of the planning session, a Detroit News [November 28, 1965] article stated: "Nothing in the glittering two-year history of President Johnson's Great Society has failed so dismally..." Despite all attempts to smooth over differences, reports filtered out about the "Dissident civil rights leaders seeking a more militant approach..."

These grim forebodings for the full White House Conference set for June were underlined by the news that a more militant southern activist, Stokely Carmichael, was elected as new head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC] already the most militant of the civil-rights organizations in the South. On May 23 SNCC rejected an invitation to the White House Conference, declaring, "Our organization is opposed to the war in Vietnam and we cannot in good conscience meet with the chief policymaker of the Vietnam war to discuss human rights in this country when he flagrantly violates the human rights of colored people in Vietnam."

On May 31, the day before the Conference was to open, another crisis loomed for the carefully made administration plans.

Floyd McKissick, who became the head of CORE after Farmer quit, stated that the reason CORE was participating in the conference was "in order that the militant can bring forth ideas which otherwise would not be brought forth." He announced that he was planning to introduce a motion to throw away the prepared agenda. "There's a prevailing sentiment that the conference has been rigged by the Administration," he said.

The agenda had been prepared by a 30-member council appointed by President Johnson when the original November planning session hadn't proved reliable enough for administration purposes. The council had prepared a 102-page document listing recommendations and proposals in four major areas: economic security and welfare, education, housing and administration of justice. The 2,600 conference members were to read and discuss these proposals but were not going to be allowed to vote on anything or make any motions of their own!

CORE's pressure on this point resulted in a hasty compromise; resolutions and votes were allowed at the panel discussions -- but the full conference was still prevented from voting on anything and all panel discussion leaders were briefed to "maintain control."

Rev. Andrew Young, executive director of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, characterized the conference this way: "It's a nice tea party where we can renew old acquaintances, but it's not much more than that. The President got himself into a corner last year promising things he couldn't deliver. Vietnam got in the way. So, now we have this conference so we can all do a little talking, and let the people know we're still thinking about civil rights."

The June 5, 1966 New York Times summed up the effects of the conference: "...it was evident that Mr. Johnson was still firmly in control and that his influence among civil rights leaders was as high as ever...But the conference also revealed a split between the mass of the civil rights workers and the leaders. The dissatisfaction was all in the ranks. The leaders -- with the exception of Mr. McKissick -- seemed willing to let the President set the pace and the direction."

The dissatisfaction and pressure of the ranks burst out in full view during Meredith's March in Mississippi which started just two days after the conclusion of the White House Conference. The events of the March brought to the surface changes in outlook and tactics that had been evolving during the relative calm that existed in the freedom now struggle during the last months of 1965 and the early months of 1966. New leaders and new slogans of struggle were catapulted into national prominence.

TENSIONS REMAIN IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

[The following is part of an article by Norman Gall which appeared in the July 1 New Statesman under the title, "Why Bosch Lost." The author reports on a visit to the small municipality of Salcedo in the northern region of the Cibao. The town was one of the most conspicuous centers of resistance to Trujillo. In the 1962 elections 13,000 of the province's 25,000 votes went to Bosch. In the recent election, Bosch won barely a quarter of the votes there.]

* * *

Two Canadian reporters and I came to Salcedo to look into confusing reports of fraud and repression in the Dominican interior which had been circulating in the capital after the 1 June election. Here we met Lieutenant Francisco Antonio Vega, a tall, tough man with muscular arms and shoulders and a bulging belly, who before the election was assigned here from the élite tank and infantry units (known by the initials CEFA) of the San Isidro air force base outside Santo Domingo, to command this tiny town's army post. The CEFA units have formed the hard core of the apparatus of repression of the Trujillo and post-Trujillo periods and have figured critically in every attempted coup since Trujillo's death. CEFA was commanded until last year by Brigadier General Elias Wessin y Wessin, who directed the bombing of Santo Domingo to stop the 1965 pro-Bosch revolution and was rescued by US military intervention.

According to witnesses, Lt Vega went with a detachment of soldiers among the rural polling centres of Salcedo during the 1 June voting. When they reached poll No 27 in the rural barrio of Las Cuevas, Vega pointed his machine-gun at the line of voters and shouted: 'Viva la democracia!' Ironically, this slogan was one of the rallying cries of the Trujillo dictatorship. The army and police and Spanish-born parish priests had been telling peasants during the campaign that the main issue was 'communism' (embodied by Bosch) versus 'democracy' (Balaguer). 'Do you believe in God?' the unlettered and deeply religious peasantry was asked. 'Then vote for Balaguer.'

Leaders in Salcedo of Bosch's Partido Revolucionario Dominicano (PRD), the Social Christians and the 14 June Movement told me the town's two parish priests, responsible for distributing US Food for Peace in the area, handed the food over to the army for distribution during the campaign. In the days before the election, P-15 fighter planes from the Santiago air force base buzzed low over several towns of the Cibao region where Salcedo lies

On Sunday 15 May at 8 p.m. in the nearby town of Luperon, Luz Santos Reynoso -- mother of six children -- was shot dead by

police when she shouted 'Viva Juan Bosch.' The policemen were never punished. On election eve in the Barrio Ranchito de las Vargas, in the nearby province of Puerto Plata, five soldiers appeared to warn the peasants of the pro-Bosch community that if Juan Bosch won there no one would remain alive the following day. The five soldiers stayed to supervise the voting until the polls closed.

Before Lt Vega left the polling booths at Barrio Las Cuevas of Salcedo he chased away poll-watchers of the competing parties as well as election board officials and left the ballots to be counted by a soldier and a policeman. In Salcedo's urban zone, the votes from three of the seven polling places, once in the hands of the army and police, took 22 hours after the closing of the polls to reach the electoral board office three blocks away.

'We knew we were strong in some places and that Balaguer was strong in others,' said a PRD leader from the area. 'The trouble was that our votes never appeared. Our party was disorganised and afraid and Balaguer's people were well-financed. We never even got the tally sheets from many of the polls in rural areas. Either the electoral officials and the soldiers refused to provide them or our PRD poll-watchers, mostly peasants, did not dare to demand them, since all Dominican peasants are terrified of the armed forces.'

Many observers, including myself, believe Balaguer could win an honest count of ballots under existing conditions. First, Bosch did not campaign in the countryside because more than 200 of his followers had been killed since last September and his home had been attacked on more than one occasion. Second, some key aides had left the Bosch camp, mainly because of personality clashes. Third, while in 1962 Bosch enjoyed financial and electoral support from some of Trujillo's old retainers, this year the Trujillistas had their own candidate in Balaguer. Fourth, Balaguer endeared himself to the poor by lowering the prices of rice and cooking oil when he was Trujillo's last puppet president during the seven months following the dictator's assassination.

Both Bosch and Balaguer come from the provincial lower-middle class -- which advanced dramatically in the Trujillo days -- and are both literary men who have maintained very cordial relations over the years. Though they collaborated politically in the past -- notably after Trujillo's death -- it has to be seen whether they will collaborate again. Balaguer said in an interview with the AP printed on 20 June that he will continue with the austerity programme which the US imposed on the provisional regime of Donald Reid Cabral after the country had been brought to its knees economically by wild corruption, military contraband operations and sharp drops in commodity production and world prices for its exports. And the US does not seem to have veered from its policy, adopted since the Kennedy assassination, of reliance on the Dominican military as a bulwark of 'anti-communism' and of antagonism toward Juan Bosch.

Nor is it certain whether Balaguer can control the military enough to keep peace with the PRD and the slum-dwellers of Santo Domingo. When he visited the towns of Bonao and La Vega after midnight on our post-election tour, soldiers in combat uniform were manning machine-guns at strong points set up in key places. In Puerto Plata there was a power failure while the ballots were being counted on election night, although the town had just installed a new power plant. Throughout the area PRD leaders were in hiding or flight. On 19 June the PRD party president and general secretary were detained at the local army barracks. On the same day, in the town of San Jose de las Matas, a PRD Congressional candidate was stabbed to death. Hatreds in the Dominican Republic remain very strong.

BACK TO THE TRUJILLO MACHINE

[The following article by Antonio T. Díaz Royo appeared in the July 9 issue of Claridad, the weekly publication of the Movimiento Pro Independencia de Puerto Rico, under the title, "Balaguer toma el poder -- República Dominicana retorna al trujillato" (Balaguer takes power -- the Dominican Republic returned to the Trujillo machine). The translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

Santo Domingo

An atmosphere of tension, which began during the elections won by President Joaquín Balaguer and which has continued to mount, featured the ceremonies inaugurating the new president. Still more important, with the seating of Balaguer, the tension grew even sharper.

All the evidence, in fact, shows that the Trujillo machine is rapidly reestablishing itself as a direct result of the intervention of the armed forces of the United States. The violation of Dominican sovereignty placed in the presidency a man who once held it under Trujillo, the same man who served as a puppet "president" while the bloody Trujillo, likewise a product of Yankee intervention, ruled the roost.

And along with Balaguer, the whole Trujillo machine, well oiled, is again running smoothly. For example, Balaguer's cabinet is made up entirely of old Trujillo figures with the exception of two ministers who say they belong to the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano headed by Juan Bosch but who in reality belong to the Dominican oligarchy. Both were expelled from the party by Juan Bosch.

With the installation of Balaguer as the "constitutional president," the CEFA went into operation. This military body,

formerly headed by the sinister Elías Wessin y Wessin, was set up under Trujillo to maintain the "peace and order" needed to exploit the people. The notorious corps has already carried out numerous raids on the homes of well-known Constitutionnalists. In fact the family with whom I was staying during my visit here, and whose oldest daughter suffered a bullet wound during the Constitutionalist uprising, was raided. After going through everything in the house on the claim that they were searching for arms, the CEFA guards left without finding anything.

In addition, the CEFA, in connivance with the police -- whose new chief likewise has a Trujillo background -- have been arresting activists of the Movimiento Revolucionario 14 de Junio [Revolutionary Movement of June 14] in the countryside. Arrests and the torture of prisoners have been reported in Santiago, La Romana and other areas. I just had the opportunity to meet a June 14 activist who was tortured for eleven consecutive days and who after being released resolutely resumed the struggle despite the blows he had received in prison. Besides being a leader of the June 14 Movement, this activist held a high post in the Constitutionalist army during the April uprising.

As the transition toward a new edition of the Trujillo regime grimly moves forward, the people are coming to understand the accuracy of the slogan advanced by the June 14 Movement during the elections: "If you want the 40 back and Ramfis again in sight, vote for Balaguer." [Si a la 40 quieres volver y a Ramfis quieres ver, vota por Balaguer.] The "40" is the well-known prison and scene of inhuman torture of Trujillo's days; Ramfis, the son of the dictator, is in Paris at present biding his time.

Many persons who participated in the ranks of the Constitutionnalists are already looking for other jobs, since it is public knowledge that the Balaguer government plans to fire everyone who openly opposed the North American intervention, whether in words or deeds.

The political parties of the left for their part are also bracing themselves for the most brutal repressive measures. All of them are preoccupied with this, taking the necessary steps in anticipation of difficult days.

An indication of the drift of things is offered by the fact that it is possible to buy leftist books in the streets at surprisingly low prices. But this is not due to the existence of an atmosphere of freedom -- on the contrary. What is happening is that all the bookstores are unloading books that might be "hot" and letting them go at bargain prices. Bookstore owners know that they will soon be the target of raids to destroy everything that "smells bad." As a current popular phrase puts it, "These books are now hot enough to burn." [De ahora en adelante esos libros quemaran.]

Meanwhile Balaguer's inauguration ceremonies served to demonstrate the low standing of the "free associated state"

[ELA -- estado libre asociado. The legal fiction is that Puerto Rico is a "free commonwealth associated with the United States"]. The representative of the ELA, Secretary of State Dr. Carlos Lastra, suffered a humiliating rebuff from the budding dictator. It was on television for the whole country to see.

First of all, Lastra had trouble gaining entrance due to failure to recognize his credentials. The Credentials Committee held that "this gentleman does not represent any government" and would not let him into the salon. Hence his conspicuous entrance after all the others were at their places. He stuck out all the more because while all the others were dressed in strict white -- the color for a celebration in the tropics and even more among the Trujillo aristocracy -- Lastra was in black.

But it would have been better if he had stayed away. There, among photographers and cameramen from countries the world over, in front of the television cameras and consequently in front of the whole country, he was humiliated (and along with him the alleged government he represented) when, getting ready to give the new "chief" an embrace, the president barred him, keeping him away with his hand.

And the truth is that Washington's aspirant dictators and puppets have utter contempt for the crawling colonialism that seeks to mask itself with the label of ELA.

ROBERT WILLIAMS MOVES TO CHINA

According to a July 20 UPI dispatch from Moscow, Robert Williams has decided to change his place of residence from Cuba to China. He stopped off in Moscow July 19 together with his wife en route to their new home.

He told the press that while he remained an American citizen, he would not return to the United States until he has been declared not guilty of the "kidnapping" charge filed against him in Monroe, North Carolina, in 1961.

The victim of a frame-up in the small town, Williams was the target of a nationwide FBI hunt. The publicity issued by the FBI gave every reason to fear that he would be shot on sight.

His real "crime" was to advocate black self-defense and to organize it on a local scale. In connection with a series of civil-rights cases centering in Monroe, Williams became nationally known. His ardent defense of the Cuban Revolution also made him a hated figure to the American authorities.

Williams managed to escape the FBI dragnet and went into exile in Cuba as a political refugee, arriving there in October 1961.

In Havana, besides continuing to publish his newspaper The Crusader, he conducted a radio program beamed to the U.S. and directed to black Americans. He wrote a book Negroes with Guns which met with a favorable reception in the civil-rights and revolutionary movements.

Robert Williams has visited China previously. He was warmly received there as a representative of the most oppressed sector of the American working class.

DE GAULLE'S TRIP TO MOSCOW

By Ernest Mandel

[The following article has been translated from the July 9 issue of the Belgian left socialist weekly La Gauche.]

* * *

"As to alliances, we would think that they ought to be constructed 'in three stages': a Franco-Russian treaty procuring a first degree of security; the Anglo-Soviet pact and an agreement to be concluded between France and Great Britain constituting a second degree; the future pact of the United Nations, in which America would be a capital element, crowning the whole and serving as the ultimate recourse." It was in these terms that Charles de Gaulle in December 1944, at the time of his first trip to Moscow, defined his concepts concerning European security, according to his Memoirs. (Volume III, p. 83, "Livre de Poche" edition.) Many things indicate that he has not changed his mind twenty-two years later. Wasn't his second trip to Moscow designed to advance this concept?

Those with a more dour outlook will immediately object. The head of the Fifth Republic had something much more Machiavellian in mind. What he is aiming at is the predominance of France in Europe, or at least Western Europe if he is unable to extend it "from the Atlantic to the Urals."

Since France doesn't have the necessary economic weight, it must neutralize the drive of German industry through military superiority and diplomatic ruses. Hence it has two interests in common with the Kremlin -- to block the Bundeswehr from getting nuclear arms and to break the American grip on "little Europe." Thus the trip to Moscow was a power play against Washington and Bonn.

No doubt these analysts are right on the long-range aims of the general. But the nature of things is such that the designs of men -- no matter how imbued with their own "grandeur" -- are not at all sufficient to shape the destiny of the world. This is determined by the relationship among the big social forces. More than

once in history, the diplomatic maneuvers of a power that was too weak have ended in serving the "big ones" despite the best intentions in the world. Didn't this happen once again with the trip to Moscow?

Thus in the United States, the most cunning, like the servile tools of the Johnson administration, carefully refrained from denouncing the general. "De Gaulle in Moscow served the United States despite the United States," said some. "He worked for the whole West," others said approvingly. In Bonn, after weeks of glacial chill, the barometer of Franco-German relations again points to "fair weather."

The truth is that de Gaulle, contrary to the groundless fears of some, did not betray his West German class brothers any more than he did his Polish class brothers at the time of his first trip.

In December 1944, Stalin dangled a "good, firm alliance," real support against the Anglo-Saxons, in return for immediate recognition of the Lublin committee. But de Gaulle was not deceived. This would mean betraying a perhaps "democratic" but certainly bourgeois Poland in behalf of a perhaps despotic but certainly noncapitalist Poland. And he did not want to take responsibility for an act contrary to "honor and honesty." (Memoirs, Volume III, p. 88.)

In June 1966, Brezhnev and Kosygin dangled an offer of just as real support against the United States, even genuine political leadership in Europe. In exchange they asked for recognition of the German Democratic Republic; that is, "of the two German states." De Gaulle brusquely replied that there could be no question of recognizing this "artificial construction." And with that rejoinder the serious conversation came to an end. The balance was nothing but decorations and fine talk.

Of course, the differences between Paris and Washington, between Paris and Bonn, are real in relation to the political future of our continent, its relations with the United States and the best strategy to follow to block the rise of the anti-imperialist and anticapitalist forces in the world.

De Gaulle seeks a Europe freed largely from American supremacy. He seeks an Atlantic alliance on the basis of equality between North America and a Western Europe combined under his guidance. He favors a more supple policy with regard to the USSR, which in his opinion should be definitively separated from China and the "extremists" among the revolutionists of the Third World, through some indispensable concessions.

He holds that it is necessary to "relax" the tensions to be able to resolve the questions in dispute, such as the reunification of Germany, while the Americans and the Germans of Bonn maintain that without this reunification no real relaxation is possible in Europe.

But at bottom, they all defend a common cause -- the cause of Big Capital. They all seek to hold back the enemy -- socialism and the peoples of the Third World who are rising and seeking to break out of the capitalist world market. They all seek refuge under the "nuclear umbrella" of the Pentagon, without which they cannot counterbalance Soviet military power on the European continent (if anything confirms this, it is the explosion of the ridiculous French nuclear device in Polynesia which amounts to nothing in face of the power of the USSR). The means may differ, the aim is the same.

In this respect the Soviet Union represents something else again. The means are perhaps the same, but the aim is entirely different. Thus treaties on mutual consultation can be concluded -- even by means of a direct telephone line! -- treaties on technical cooperation, or whatever cultural and commercial exchanges are desired; the fundamental opposition between the interests of the French bourgeoisie and the Soviet leaders will by no means make it possible to form a genuine alliance in the present world context.

The Soviet leaders are aware of the weakness of the present Communist parties in Western Europe (for which they are in part responsible). They are aware of the temporary stabilization of capitalism in this part of the world (which they largely contributed to). From this they draw the conclusion that it is necessary to return to a policy that seeks to "exploit the interimperialist contradictions," as before the second world war. They commit an error in believing that de Gaulle is ready to follow them into a tête-à-tête, when he seeks in reality only to increase his power and prestige within the Atlantic Alliance.

The French Communist leaders would obviously make a still greater error in concluding that the time has come for an "agonizing revision" of their political orientation in France, as in 1935 or 1944.

It is true that the policy of the USSR places them before a cruel dilemma; they no longer know if they should applaud or complain when the Soviet crowds cheer the person who remains, until proved otherwise, the fiercest and most dangerous class enemy of the French workers. If they oppose him, they are tempted to make an alliance with de Gaulle's pro-American adversaries like Mollet and Mitterrand -- and then the capitals of Eastern Europe are not very contented. And if they approve, what remains of their role as an opposition in France? There remains the socialist perspective which stands in complete opposition to the politics of de Gaulle; but the leaders of the French Communist party do not think this is any more "realistic" than do the Social Democratic leaders of the SFIO, or even the technocratic ideologists of neocapitalism.

What will the practical results of the trip amount to? The American Newsweek summarized the situation as follows: "At least he will have succeeded in engaging the Russians in a new diplomatic dialogue with the West." That puts it in a nutshell. At a time when

the intensification of the American aggression against the Vietnamese people makes a public dialogue between Moscow and Washington more difficult, de Gaulle is playing, objectively, the role of go-between for the Atlantic Alliance as a whole. Thanks to him, the head of one of the capitalist states in this alliance has been acclaimed by crowds in the Soviet Union. For the first time in many years they have been shown a face of capitalism which their own leaders now say is benevolent, attractive, peaceful, full of good intentions toward the peoples of the world.

Pravda, in connection with this trip, talks about an "irreversible process." Let them beware of certain processes, which while still reversible, bode nothing good for the USSR. By attending mass in Leningrad, de Gaulle, like a good politician, was already preparing for his coming trip to Poland. Rumania, ceaselessly increasing its trade with the West, already told the Russians in Bucharest that it would like to see the Warsaw pact modified just as de Gaulle wants to modify NATO. Decidely, if things are in movement, thanks not a little to the general, not everything is stirring in favor of socialism and not everything is stirring against the interests of American imperialism.

VIETNAM IN BACKGROUND AT KYOTO MEETING

While the diplomatic formalities could not have been more punctilious at the heavily guarded fifth Joint U.S.-Japan Ministerial Meeting in Kyoto July 5-7, Secretary of State Dean Rusk's aim, it appears, was to bring his fist down on the table. The representatives of the Sato government, bowed politely before their heavy-handed guest, but nevertheless advanced certain differences along with Foreign Minister Etsusaburo Shiina's acknowledgment that "the basic policies and objectives in the international community of the two countries are the same."

The Japanese indicated their worries over the situation in Vietnam, an understandable reaction in view of the way the escalation has aroused popular opinion in Japan and fostered a huge and growing antiwar movement.

Rusk sought to leave the impression that a turning point had been reached in Vietnam. In a conference with Prime Minister Eisaku Sato July 7, he reportedly promised "that his country has no intention of expanding its bombing operations in North Vietnam beyond the strikes on oil storage facilities near Hanoi and Haiphong." [The Japan Times July 9.]

The Japanese diplomats did not press the point. Their real views, however, may be guessed at from the following comments by Kazushige Hirasawa which appeared in the July 9 Japan Times: "In Japanese eyes, the war seems to be nearing a turning point. By that it is meant that the war is about to sink into the quagmire of a

military stalemate where it can no longer be won or lost by either belligerent.

"The more the military stalemate grows, the more decisive will become political and economic factors in determining the future course of the war.

"This anticipated change in the situation will make it a matter of concern for Japan what steps should be prepared to cope with it.

"Japan makes it a point that economic assistance toward Southeast Asia, too, should be examined comprehensively, with this question in mind.

"However, the Americans seem to be still preoccupied with the military phase of the war."

Another "shade of difference" involved Japan's relations with China. At the conference itself, International Trade and Industry Minister Takeo Miki told the U.S. representatives that Japan wants to ease its trade terms with China to the level of those adopted by West European countries. He suggested extending long-term credits to China and using Export-Import Bank funds for plant exports to China.

The American delegation hedged somewhat on this. They objected to extending credits but did not meet the other suggestions head on. They were in a rather uncomfortable position at the moment, since Johnson's latest "peace" offensive has raised the question of a modification in Washington's policy of "absolute quarantine" of China. Rusk could hardly blow up this ploy while in Japan.

But the Americans argued stiffly that increased contacts with China would bring "little profit." As a staff writer of the Japan Times [July 9] put it: "The U.S. seems to believe that the best thing to do at the moment is to drive Red China into a corner so that it will be forced to end its isolation spontaneously. [!]"

The policy of the U.S. delegation appears to have been to give Japan a green light in promoting its "leadership" in the "regional development" of Southeast Asia. At the moment this would appear to relate primarily to Indonesia and its new anti-Communist dictatorship.

In passing, the Americans brushed aside Japanese efforts for abolition of the U.S. tariffs assessment system and easing of "anti-dumping" controls.

They then rubbed salt into this wound by putting the squeeze on their hosts for a "liberalization" of direct investments by Americans in Japan. They got the concession, though it may prove to be a token gesture.

THE CRISIS IN YUGOSLAVIA

By Henri Valin

The elimination of Aleksandar Rankovic from the leadership of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia -- he was the No. 2 man in the regime for almost fifteen years! -- and of Svetislav Stefanovic from the secret police, brought into the open the crisis which the Yugoslav workers state is currently undergoing -- a crisis which Tito (as against some of his sycophants abroad) fully recognized in the first speech he gave at the sensational July 1-2 meeting of the Central Committee.

The most diverse accounts are being circulated as to the substance of the crisis. Some characterize it as merely a crisis over the succession to Tito, Rankovic presumably having attempted to assure himself of the position through a "plot" -- with Tito blocking it. Others characterize it as a governmental crisis touched off by the resistance of the hard "Stalinist" core in the party apparatus to the 1965 economic reforms and the political reform now underway which aims at really separating the state and party apparatuses.

These different versions, however, disregard the social background of the crisis; namely, the objective consequences of the 1965 economic reform itself. A series of articles which appeared in the French daily Le Monde [July 8, 9 and 10] revealed a tragedy that had remained largely unsuspected among international revolutionary circles. The reform caused or increased massive layoffs of workers in the plants. It caused a considerable drop in the standard of living of the workers in various areas. It seriously deepened the gap between income and even the rate of growth between the "advanced" and "backward" republics.

To grasp the extent of these phenomena, one must bear in mind that since the beginning of 1964 the official figure for unemployment in Yugoslavia has been put at 230,000 and that in addition 250,000 Yugoslav workers have gone abroad. Unemployment at present, both the officially acknowledged and the hidden (through emigration) is not far from six to seven percent of the active population; that is, twelve to thirteen percent of the working class. While the decline in the standard of living is very real for hundreds of thousands of workers, today there are citizens, according to the July 8 Le Monde who make five million dinars [750 dinars = U.S. \$1] a season through private hotels which they have built. According to the July 9 Le Monde, the gap between the rich regions and the poor ones, which is widening, amounts to 600 percent on a per capita basis between Slovenia and the autonomous district of Kosovo. Since 1956, the total investment per capita, which was formerly higher in the poor regions, has shifted to 101.4 in the rich regions (taking 100 as the average for Yugoslavia as a whole) and fallen to 79.4 in the poor regions.

This is an inevitable consequence of the principle of "individual plant profitability," of "free competition" lifted to the level of a dogma and considerably strengthened by the 1965 reform. The Trotskyist movement has pointed this out for years. "Competition" between the rich and poor plants inevitably strengthens the rich at the expense of the poor; the wider and wider application of the principle of "individual plant profitability" must inevitably end in massive layoffs and unemployment. To seek to orient the economy of a multinational country like Yugoslavia in substantial accordance with the criteria of a market economy must widen the gap between the nationalities and provoke new conflicts among them. Events have shown the correctness of this view.

There are some "Marxists" who went beyond correctly accepting the principle of workers self-management to accepting the anti-Marxist theses which hold that self-management of the plants necessarily involves greater and greater economic decentralization, more and more unlimited financial autonomy of the plants, increasingly "free" competition among them, progressive reduction of centralized investments: in short, the establishment of a "socialist market economy" functioning more and more in accordance with autonomous economic forces. They accepted these revisionist theses under pretext that without this economic decentralization, "the material infrastructure of the bureaucracy" -- which is based on "centralization" -- could not be broken.

What do we see today? Sixteen years after the establishment of self-management, and ten years after the beginning of the process of "decentralization," Tito himself is compelled to admit that a small core of Stalinist police tightly controlled the entire state apparatus! The power of the bureaucracy is so great that the July 10 London Observer reported Tito's political proposals after the fall of Rankovic as follows: "He asked for open discussion between all shades of opinion and all interests, so that the party and the managers, from the directors of factories to the highest administrators, can arrive at a consensus." Apparently, the workers interests are not part of this "gamut," just as the press of the Fourth International cannot be found in Yugoslavia whereas the bourgeois press is freely distributed there...

That 400 Stalinist-type bureaucrats have been fired; that 800 have been suspended; that the cops can no longer hide microphones in the offices of ministers -- all this is good. We will evidently still be kept waiting for restoration of the right to strike and recognition of the right to establish workers parties. But without these it is idle to use the term "socialist democracy" in connection with Yugoslavia. But this is not the essence of the problem.

In analyzing the social origin of the conflicts and contradictions that affect a society in transition from capitalism to socialism in a backward country like the USSR in 1925 or even 1936 (and like the Yugoslavia of today), Trotsky reached the conclusion that what gave strength to the bureaucracy was in the final analy-

sis neither "centralization" nor "decentralization" but the political passivity of the proletariat. He carefully analyzed the objective and subjective causes of this political passivity and proposed some remedies as a result: Soviet democracy, industrialization, a course towards the world revolution. All these remedies had one point in common -- they tended to reactivate the proletariat politically and socially.

Today the balance sheet of the Yugoslav test is clear. Self-management is a step forward in comparison to Stalinist hypercentralization. But combined with excessive economic decentralization, with exaggerated recourse to the "market mechanisms," extreme opportunism with regard to imperialism and the international bourgeoisie, an almost total absence of workers democracy on the political level, it has failed to accomplish its primary task -- to convert the Yugoslav proletariat into a force displacing the bureaucracy in management of the state and the economy. The bureaucracy today is at least as strong as it was in 1950 or in 1956. And the proletariat, depoliticized, atomized, lacking political education, sees with dread that after twenty years of a Communist government, unemployment, a high cost of living, a drop in real wages, even a conflict between nationalities and the rule of the secret police can again afflict the country.

In face of this lamentable balance sheet, no Trotskyist worthy of the name can celebrate self-management as a universal panacea capable of assuring victory over the bureaucracy. It would be more modest and wiser to go back to Trotsky and to advocate with him the combination of socialist political and economic democracy (which would involve workers management of the plants), centralized planning with limited recourse to the mechanisms of the market, and a course toward world revolution, as the only policy capable of limiting the power of the bureaucracy in the transitional period.

ONE REASON WHY WAR IN VIETNAM IS UNPOPULAR AMONG NEGROES

In the armed forces of the U.S., as in American society as a whole, black-skinned citizens get the roughest deal and have the least chance for advancement, no matter what their abilities. The facts are graphically shown by the following data on Negro enlistment in the U.S. armed forces which was prepared by the deputy assistant secretary of defense and published in the Congressional Record, July 18, 1966, p. 15233.

Percentages of Negro enlisted personnel as of Dec. 31, 1965:

Army	13.9
Navy	5.8
Marine Corps	9.0
Air Force	10.7

Percentages of Negro commissioned officers as of the same date:

Army	3.6
Navy	0.3
Marine Corps	0.3
Air Force	1.6

Percentages of fatalities of Negro enlisted men in Vietnam from 1961-1965:

Army	22.1
Navy	5.8
Marine Corps	12.0
Air Force	No fatalities

A SEAT FOR JAPAN IN NUCLEAR CLUB?

The Weekly Economist, published in Japan, declared July 1 that if the Japanese government should decide to begin producing nuclear weapons, the first models might be ready within twelve to fifteen months.

The rockets with which to deliver them have been in production for some time.

"Japan is already ahead of Communist China in missile development," said the magazine, "and has all the necessary components for a medium-range ballistic missile except for the highly sophisticated guidance systems which are needed, but could conceivably be supplied by the Americans."

According to the Weekly Economist there are indications in Tokyo that the ruling Liberal-Democratic party has launched a gradual conditioning campaign to accustom the nation to a new military role for Japan in face of the nuclear threat from China.

"The first step is already being proposed in the Diet: elevation of the present Defense Agency to full ministerial status in the cabinet," the magazine said.

Washington has been pressing the Japanese government for some time to begin rearming, and the Johnson administration has been seeking to involve Japan more deeply in the Vietnam conflict.

The big problem facing the Japanese government is the resistance of the people to a warmongering course. As the first recipients of nuclear weapons, their deep opposition to another war stems from bitter experience.

PLANTATION STRIKE IN CEYLON

By Edmund Samarakody

Colombo

JULY 13 -- For thirty days now, since June 13, nearly 400,000 plantation workers (tea and rubber estates) have been on strike under the leadership of the Democratic Workers' Congress headed by Abdul Aziz. The workers are demanding 17.50 rupees [Rs. 4.788 = U.S. \$1] as a cost of living allowance.

The leaderships of the other plantation unions sought to keep their members from being drawn into the strike. Despite their efforts, from the outset large sections of workers from all the plantation unions, including the Ceylon Workers' Congress headed by Thondaman, who is in alliance with the United National party government, have joined in the strike action.

Involving four out of the nine provinces of the country, this strike is easily the biggest numerically ever mounted by Ceylon's working class. In relation to the economy, the strike has affected about a third of the plantation sector, which still remains the key sector despite all the attempts at industrialization and diversification of the economy. And in the case of the tea industry, the strike has already meant the loss of 2,500,000 pounds of tea.

The workers in government service won Rs. 17.50 as a cost of living allowance in a struggle in October 1957. Thereafter numerous categories of workers in the private sector, including employees in small mercantile establishments, obtained a similar concession. But as for the plantation workers, nine years of representations to the employers and the government on this issue brought no results.

The cost of living continued to rise during this period consequent to increased prices of imported consumer goods and imported foods (over seventy percent of consumer goods are imported). In this context, the case for a wage increase for all categories of workers became irresistible.

The strongest case was that of the plantation workers, whose wages have remained frozen for more than twelve years while both tea and rubber production increased considerably during the same period.

Nor have the tea manufacturing and trading companies concealed their satisfaction at their progress in gathering profits. One of the largest tea companies -- Brooke Bond (Ceylon) Ltd, which purchases between one-third and one-half of Ceylon's total tea crop -- publicly admitted that in 1962-64 their profits increased at the rate of a million pounds sterling a year. The average monthly wage of a tea estate worker remains at the subhuman level of Rs. 55 a month.

And if the plantation employers and proprietors refer to the so-called fringe benefits these workers receive as compensation for low wages, they only expose the severity of human misery on the estates. "Free" housing for these workers consists of half-century-old, one-room tenements with a common verandah for the average family of five. "Free" hospital service amounts to medical attention that has changed little since the worst period of colonialism -- mere dispensers of medicine called apothecaries are permitted to perform the functions of qualified medical personnel.

What makes the oppression of the estate workers especially severe is that the large majority of them, who are of recent Indian origin, have been deprived since 1949 of citizenship rights. This means that in addition to the loss of a wide range of human rights, these workers remain outside the operation of government social services.

Legally sanctioned discrimination against these workers has gone so far as to virtually deprive them of even the facilities for a bare primary education. The estate superintendent is still the manager of the estate school in which so-called teaching is carried on by unqualified teachers -- and even that only to the fifth standard.

Under the prevailing exploitation, class oppression and discrimination affecting a wide field of basic human rights, this strike of the estate workers has more content than appears on the surface. The sustained enthusiasm, militancy and readiness to endure severe hardships manifest in all areas even after thirty days of struggle indicate that for the estate workers this strike over the single issue of a Rs. 17.50 cost-of-living allowance is in reality the beginning of a liberation movement to end the state of virtual slavery which they have endured now for nearly a hundred years.

At first their oppressors were the British imperialists. Today their oppressors are both the imperialists and the native planters and the capitalist government.

It was their inability to fathom the real driving forces behind this strike that upset the calculations of the government, the employers and many leaders of the plantation unions. As only the Democratic Workers' Congress led by Aziz called the strike, the government and the employers expected it to soon fizzle out. Apparently this was the reason the government did not seek to use the powers they had under the existing state of emergency to block the strike from being launched.

As for the leaders of the other plantation trade unions, most of them preferred to ignore the strike while some of them did not conceal their opposition. The Ceylon Workers' Congress headed by Thondaman, by arrangement with the employers, entered into so-called "negotiations" over a wage demand of one rupee a day, which was a common demand of all plantation unions. The

Thondaman leadership categorically stated that they were opposed to the strike. The Communist party [Moscow] union leader Keuneman called upon Aziz to suspend the strike, which had already been launched, until his union got a chance to negotiate a settlement with the employers! The Communist party [Peking], led by Shan-mugathasan, resorted to diversionary tactics. They called for a token general strike of their unions for a few hours. As for the Ceylon Federation of Labour headed by Dr. N.M. Perera, it dealt a frontal blow to the striking workers. Perera made the shocking statement a few days after the strike began that it would not be a success since Aziz had launched it without any reference to the other unions.

In contrast to the virtual strikebreaking tactics of many plantation union leaders, the unions of the United Committee of Ceylon Trade Unions (Bank Clerks Union, Estate Staff Union, Ceylon Mercantile Union and the Democratic Workers' Congress) have from the outset actively supported the strike and continue to play a leading part in the struggle. Of the political parties only the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary) came out in support of the strike.

Contrary to the expectations of the employers, the government and the leaders of most of the plantation unions, the strike gathered strength from the beginning, winning recruits from the other plantation unions. The numerous strike meetings addressed by leaders of the Democratic Workers' Congress, the Ceylon Mercantile Union and the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary) were attended by thousands of workers. Often men, women and children have waited at meeting places and along roads for several hours till the arrival of speakers.

There has been unusual amity between the Tamil-speaking and Sinhala workers. The latter are generally nonresident, coming from the village areas. Furthermore there has been noticeable sympathy and support for the strike among people in the rural areas and in small towns close to the estates.

It became impossible for some of the plantation unions to remain on the sidelines, especially when hundreds of their own members joined in the strike. Thirteen days after the strike began, the unions led by the Lanka Sama Samaja (Reformists) and the two Communist parties announced their support, saying that their members in the area would participate.

While thirty days is long for a plantation strike, the support from the other plantation unions, except the Thondaman-led Ceylon Workers' Congress, has not only given considerable strength to the struggle but has brightened the hopes for victory.

In addition a 69-day-old bank strike (National and Grinlays bank), leading to a general strike of all the banks that is seriously affecting the entire economy, has helped to generate

considerable pressure on the government itself to seek a settlement of both the plantation and bank strikes.

Although present conditions favor a successful outcome of the plantation workers strike, the failure of the unions led by the Lanka Sama Samaja (Reformist) and the two Communist parties to do hardly anything more than announce their support unnecessarily delayed fuller mobilization of the estate workers.

Properly coordinated joint campaigning by all the unions involved can raise the struggle to higher levels of class action and assure success. A united front of all the plantation unions at all levels to continue the struggle against a formidable section of the class enemy -- the plantation bourgeoisie (British imperialists in partnership with Ceylonese planters) -- is unpostponable and imperative. It would be nothing less than criminal folly and irresponsibility if the plantation union leadership were to allow trade-union rivalry and existing political differences to interfere with the task of winning a victory.

And success in forming a united front in the plantation struggle can well mean the beginning of a new orientation, pointing to a wider united front of all the trade unions and working-class political parties against the capitalist class and the capitalist government. This alone is the road forward for the workers and toilers of Ceylon.

PERSPECTIVA MUNDIAL

The first issue of a Spanish edition of World Outlook appeared June 29. It contains nineteen items, including translations of George Novack's "The Internal Struggle in Peking"; Ernest Mandel's "When Will They Explain the Tragedy in Indonesia?"; and the first part of Joseph Hansen's "Trotskyism Versus Stalinism in the Cuban Revolution." (The second part of the latter article is scheduled for the second issue.)

Perspectiva Mundial is mimeographed and will appear every two weeks.

The subscription rates are as follows: To the USA, Canada and Central America, for 26 issues, by third-class mail \$2; by first-class mail \$5; by third-class airmail \$8; by first-class airmail \$14. The prices for South America are the same except for airmail, these being \$10 and \$19 respectively for third class and first class.

For a subscription send a check or international money order to C. Alcazar, Apdo. Postal 27-509, Mexico 7, D.F., Mexico.

A TRIBUTE TO MALCOLM X FROM JAPAN

[A study of Malcolm X has just been published in Japan. Entitled THE BLACK REVOLT: Malcolm X, The Man and His Ideas, it makes a book of 242 pages. The author is Ei Nagata. A translation of his epilogue follows.]

* * *

It was on the afternoon of February 21, 1965, that Malcolm X, the revolutionary Black Nationalist leader, was assassinated at the Audubon Ballroom in Harlem. Malcolm, known in our country as a black follower of Islam, left the Black Muslims in March 1964 and immediately after set up a religious as well as a political organization (Muslim Mosque, Inc. and the Organization of Afro-American Unity) in attempting anew to advance by one more step the black revolutionary movement. But he died before he really could.

On the day of his assassination I was present at the ballroom, and I felt utterly lost for words at his sudden death. During my stay of approximately one year in New York City I had visited Small's Paradise, Count Basie's Bar, the Top Club, and other places where the people of Harlem frequent. Guided by a Negro friend, I had also walked around Harlem's side streets where the dope addicts, homosexuals, alcoholics, hustlers, and like persons congregated. And so I was under the illusion that I more or less understood the mood of Negro society and the realities of the ghetto. This illusion, however, was quickly dispelled at the time of Malcolm X's assassination. The reason was simple. I was viewing Negro society and Malcolm X's revolutionary movement as an observer, as a third party from the outside looking in.

When I realized this right after his assassination, a certain emptiness swept over me. I understood that my way of grasping Malcolm X and his ideas had a limitation which could not be surmounted. So I have taken up my pen, firmly aware of this limitation, and have written this book about the man and his movement.

The assassination of Malcolm X aroused an inordinate amount of sharp reaction not only within America, but also in Africa and in every country in Europe. That Malcolm X was different from previous Negro leaders; that he understood the American black revolution in terms of an international perspective; that at the same time he advocated independence and clearly offered a philosophy of self-defense for Afro-Americans -- this unique way of thinking, I think, accounts for this type of reaction.

After the assassination, George Breitman, the American Socialist, frankly stated his shock: "I was still a young man 25 years ago when another great revolutionary was assassinated -- Leon Trotsky. Perhaps I did not fully realize how much his leadership, advice and political wisdom would be missed, and probably I was

under the influence of the belief common among young people that to show certain kinds of strong emotion is a sign of weakness. Anyhow, I did not cry when Trotsky was killed, and I could not help crying when Malcolm was killed.

"It was not because I considered Malcolm the greater of the two men. One reason for the difference was the realization that Malcolm, at the age of 39, was still in the process of reaching his full height, still in the process of working out his program, still in the early stage of building a new movement -- whereas Trotsky, at the age of 59, had already reached full maturity, had already worked out his main ideas and his program, and left behind him the solid foundations of a movement that could not be destroyed by war, by persecution from both the Allied and Axis powers, or by cold war reaction and witch-hunts." James Baldwin, who was in Europe at the time of the assassination, stated: "The killing of Malcolm X was a major setback for the Negro movement. Whoever did it was formed in the crucible of the Western World, of the American Republic. It is because of you -- the men who created this white supremacy -- that this man is dead. Your mills, your cities, your rape of a continent started all this."

Having lived as a hustler during his youth in the black ghetto, Malcolm X became a Black Muslim in prison, and upon his release after several years of being active in the organization as a member he became, next to Muhammad, the most powerful leader. The strength of the Black Muslims rapidly increased because of him. The official paper itself, Muhammad Speaks, was created by Malcolm X. Thus, fearful and jealous of Malcolm X's growing influence, Muhammad devised a scheme to expel him from his organization.

In 1964 Malcolm departed on his first trip to Africa after separating from the Black Muslims. His travel experience had a strong impact on him which acted as a turning point for his political philosophy. Subsequent to his return home from his second trip to Africa on November 24, 1964, every Sunday night at the Audubon Ballroom he spoke about his black revolutionary philosophy to the black masses from the speaker's rostrum.

To explain the language of his speech is near to impossible, for he spoke in the jargon of the ghetto, always using metaphors and biting ironies. His speech delivery was now fiery, now calm; while his booming voice retained its distinct quality throughout. His meetings in Harlem took place in an emotionally charged atmosphere in which capacity crowds stomped their feet, shook their bodies, yelling and screaming while responding in agreement with Malcolm's every word and phrase. My wife and I went to hear one of these meetings on December 13, 1964. At that time Che Guevara had come to New York City as the representative of Cuba to attend the UN General Assembly meetings, and he had sent a telegram to Malcolm X expressing his support for his revolutionary movement. I can still remember the thunderous applause and ovation which shook the Audubon Ballroom at the moment when Malcolm read this telegram.

On February 27, 1965, Malcolm X's funeral was held at Faith Temple in Harlem. At this small temple, crowds of black people crammed together both in the front and sides, so much so that they were unable to move, awaiting for his body to be borne out. And at the moment when it did appear, nearly 10,000 black people bid their final farewell to their one and only true revolutionary leader.

JAPANESE COMMUNISTS EXPLAIN SILENCE ON CHINA

The Japan Communist party, which was in Peking's camp in the Sino-Soviet dispute, has manifested increasing signs of cooling off. One tendency apparently is right wing. It holds that Peking followed a provocative policy in Indonesia and that this led to the disaster there! Others may hold the opposite opinion - which is nearer the truth -- that Peking followed a grossly opportunistic policy in Indonesia.

One of the consequences has been a virtual boycott on news from China in the party's daily newspaper Akahata. On July 11 Editor Masayoshi Oka explained why the CP organ is not taking up the "incidents affecting foreign Communist and workers' parties which are prominently dealt with in the commercial newspapers."

Akahata is a "weapon for correctly promoting the revolution in Japan." Therefore, "it must be specially prudent in handling issues concerning the Communist and workers' parties of other countries." With this in mind, "There are occasions when it is not proper to give a full report on an incident or an issue...There are also occasions when giving an assessment of such an issue would be ill-timed."

Oka explained further, "It is often not proper for Akahata to comment on policies of such parties, even though it may not approve of them."

The imperialists seek to take advantage of the "contradictions, controversies, confusion and discord between the Socialist and Marxist-Leninist regimes." Hence they make slanderous comments. "Simply because the bourgeois press takes them up, however, it does not mean that Akahata, too, must offer unprincipled comments and criticism. If it did so, it would merely please the imperialist and reactionary forces and would not serve the interests of the international Communist movement at all."

Akahata has even discontinued carrying the radio programs beamed by China. The reason for that is that there are no "reasons why it must carry foreign radio programs."

Unfortunately for the editor of Akahata, silence, too, can speak volumes.

ON THE MR-13'S BREAK WITH POSADAS

[The following statement on a question concerning primarily the Guatemalan guerrilla movement was issued by the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International. Between world congresses, this is the most authoritative body of the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938. For other documents on this question see World Outlook July 15.]

* * *

The attention of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International has been called to a communiqué issued by the National Leadership of the Revolutionary Movement of November 13 (MR-13) in Guatemala, dated May 13, 1966, making public the expulsion of three members from this movement and a decision "to break all ties with the Fourth International." The reference is to the group headed by Posadas to which the three belong. They were charged with taking funds belonging to the MR-13 and diverting them in accordance with a preconceived plan for the benefit of their own organization.

The MR-13 communiqué states that the decision was taken after a people's revolutionary court, consisting of leaders of the MR-13 and representatives of the guerrillas, militia and peasant committees, had been held. The defendants, according to the communiqué, were able to speak freely. They admitted the facts, adding that they did not take the money out of selfish personal motives but to help the organization to which they belonged. They defended their political positions before the court although it had not brought them up. The communiqué attributed the conduct of the defendants to their "sectarianism." The MR-13 reaffirmed its "unswerving" decision to continue armed struggle for the program of the socialist revolution." The communiqué speaks in a calm tone, levels no slanderous accusations against those expelled, and gives the impression that the court functioned in accordance with the rules of proletarian democracy.

A declaration of the followers of Posadas in Mexico, which has just been published, does not deny the facts.

The International Executive Committee of the Fourth International calls attention to the fact that the Posadas group was expelled from the Fourth International a few years ago. Its fraudulent use of the name of the Fourth International was publicly denounced in June 1962 as follows:

"The International Executive Committee and the International Secretariat of the Fourth International declare that the news published by certain Latin-American newspapers concerning a so-called 'emergency conference of the Fourth International' which reportedly 'designated a new IEC and a new IS' is completely false.

The last congress of the Fourth International took place in January 1961. A new congress is now in preparation. The IEC and the IS likewise declare that the so-called Latin-American Bureau of the Fourth International does not in the least way represent the Fourth International or its political line and that the positions expressed by the Argentine newspaper Voz Proletaria, particularly on the question of nuclear war and the Second Declaration of Havana, do not correspond to those of the Fourth International." (This statement, dated June 4, 1962, appeared in the magazine Quatrième Internationale, No. 16, July 1962.)

People who resorted to such methods in connection with the organization which they had just left are obviously capable of resorting to methods in connection with other revolutionary organizations that are completely foreign to the tradition of the Fourth International and revolutionary Marxism, methods which the International Executive Committee condemns in the most explicit way.

Since then the Posadas group has hardened its sectarian characteristics, developing political positions of a more and more extravagant nature. In addition, the group, which is very small numerically, has kept up its political swindle with regard to the Fourth International, proclaiming the existence of so-called sections in a certain number of countries where it could not even set up a single cell, and publishing papers which the few militants involved could by no means support through their own efforts, no matter how devoted they might be.

Once again denouncing the activities of this irresponsible group which played into the attacks launched by Fidel Castro against the Fourth International a few months ago and which have given the Guatemalan MR-13 a mistaken picture of the world Trotskyist movement and its political and organizational concepts, the International Executive Committee appeals to the militants who may have been taken in by Posadas to break with him and rejoin the ranks of the Fourth International.

The International Executive Committee of the Fourth International sends warmest revolutionary greetings to the Guatemalan MR-13, expresses solidarity with its program of armed struggle for the socialist revolution in Guatemala, and appeals to the international revolutionary vanguard to give it unconditional support in this struggle.

SUMMER SCHEDULE

During July and August World Outlook will appear on a reduced schedule. No issues will be skipped, but we will shift over to approximately a biweekly basis, resuming weekly publication in September.

FREE ADOLFO GILLY!

[An appeal for united action in defense of Adolfo Gilly and the other political prisoners arrested at the same time as the Argentine journalist has been issued by the Liga Obrera Marxista (Workers Marxist League). The text of the appeal is as follows.]

* * *

The Liga Obrera Marxista (LOM), Mexican section of the Fourth International, appeals to the workers, peasants, students and revolutionary organizations to protest against the arbitrary and gangsterlike imprisonment of the Argentine journalist Adolfo Gilly and the alleged members of the Posadist group in Mexico, Oscar Fernández Bruno, Eduwiges Teresa Confreta de Fernández, Gildardo de las Islas Carranza, Ramón Vargas Salguero, Sergio García Estrada and Leocadio Francisco Zapata Múzquiz.

We appeal to all revolutionists to protest against the torture of Adolfo Gilly and the other defendants. Gilly is well known in many countries for his articles on the Cuban revolution and the guerrilla movement in Guatemala. The Mexican political police suddenly arrested him and then tortured him for three consecutive days in an attempt to compel him to confess that he belonged to the "Fourth International" and to make him inform on his comrades. In seven sessions he was beaten on the head, over his kidneys and punched in the abdomen. He was then seated in a chair for an entire night. Next he was submerged under water until he nearly drowned. Next they threatened to take him out on a highway and shoot him while "fleeing." None of this wrung the desired confession from him. He was then brought before a higher officer who told him they were considering taking him to the border and handing him over to the Guatemalan authorities, who would immediately execute him.

In relation to the Posadist comrades, we must point out that the Liga Obrera Marxista, as well as the entire Fourth International, has deep differences with the Posadist group and in particular with the dictatorial chieftain of Posadism, J. Posadas, who was expelled from our world party in 1962. J. Posadas is a confirmed sectarian and opportunist, a mental case, whose actions and declarations in the name of his phantom "Fourth International" and "Trotskyism" have injured the revolutionary movement in Latin America in general and in Guatemala in particular. There Posadas stole a considerable amount of money from the Revolutionary Movement of November 13, the vanguard of the Guatemalan Socialist Revolution. In addition, the sectarian and adventurous Posadist groups have created confusion with respect to our party, the Fourth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution, founded in 1938 which represents the overwhelming majority of the Trotskyists on a world scale, including Mexico where the Trotskyists belong to or sympathize with the Liga Obrera Marxista.

Despite our complete opposition to the eccentric concepts of Posadism, a small group expelled from our ranks three years ago, we appeal to all revolutionary organizations to form a united front against this blow dealt by the class enemy. It is a question of repression directed by the police, who understand the role of political groups in the class struggle, against political groups. Today they are striking at the weakest; tomorrow the target can be any or all of the other revolutionary organizations.

We appeal to the PMT, PRP, ARE, PPS, MLN, CCI, FEP, MRM and the PCM and all revolutionary, working-class, peasant and student organizations to organize protest meetings among the workers, the peasants and on the campus.

We appeal to all these organizations to form a united front on the basis of a single issue: unconditional defense against political repression.

We appeal for signatures and resolutions demanding the release of the political prisoners. These should be sent to: Juzgado Primero de Distrito en Materia Penal; Juez, Lic. Eduardo Ferrer MacGregor; Av. Bucareli 20-601, Mexico 1, D.F., Mexico. Let every organization send a resolution!

This fascistlike blow dealt by the repressive bodies of the bourgeoisie must be met by the Mexican masses and their organized vanguard.

Free Adolfo Gilly!

Free the alleged members of the Posadist group!

Free Demetrio Vallejo and his comrades!

Free all the political prisoners now!

LIGA OBRERA MARXISTA

Mexican Section of the Fourth International

July 1966