

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. 29

September 30, 1966

## In this issue

Page

De Gaulle Bans Vietnam War Crimes Tribunal	1
French Intellectuals Support Hugo Blanco	2
The Young Red Guards and Mao's "Cultural Revolution" -- by George Novack	3
Students Demonstrate in Brazil	9
Fort Hood Three Show High Morale	10
Barbarous Treatment of Fort Hood Three	10
Japanese Protest Call of U.S. Nuclear Submarine	11
The Japanese Labor Movement Reaches a Turning Point -- by S. Okatani	12
Why America's Ghettos Keep Exploding -- by Evelyn Sell	24
North Korean CP Attacks "Trotskyism" -- by Dick Roberts	25
"Multi-Issue" Advocates Split Antiwar Movement in Canada -- by P. Kent	28
Unrest on the Rise in Ecuador	30
Why Healy Bolted from the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign	31
Terrorists Bomb Cuban Embassy in Ottawa	35
Documents: Should USSR Give Effective Aid to Beleaguered Vietnamese? (Bertrand Russell Answers Francis Flavius)	36

## DE GAULLE BANS VIETNAM WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

De Gaulle has been reaping a good deal of publicity putting up a show of "independence" in relation to Washington and its dirty colonial war in Vietnam. He nevertheless knows how to make a cheap concession aimed at pleasing the White House. On September 19, the Paris correspondent of the New York Times reported that "On one point France wants no further aggravation of relations with the

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

United States. This is the 'international war crimes tribunal' that Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher, has been organizing to decide whether the United States and its ranking officials are guilty of a crime against humanity. The announced meeting place was Paris. The French Government does not want it here, and presumably has the power to prevent it."

It is possible that the State Department hinted to the French that a ban would be well received. The tribunal is headed by such figures as Simone de Beauvoir, Jean-Paul Sartre, Isaac Deutscher and Lázaro Cárdenas. Its hearings can prove highly embarrassing to Johnson, Rusk and McNamara.

On August 28 the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation announced that a letter had been sent to President Johnson requesting his appearance at the hearings of the tribunal "in your own defense." The letter charged that "Within living memory, only the Nazis could be said to have exceeded in brutality the war waged by your Administration against the people of Vietnam, and it is because this war is loathed and condemned by the vast majority of mankind that demands are heard throughout the world for a formal international tribunal to hear the full evidence."

Another site for the tribunal is under consideration. According to the Times it may be held in Sweden.

#### FRENCH INTELLECTUALS SUPPORT HUGO BLANCO

A list of distinguished intellectuals in France have rallied to the support of Hugo Blanco, the Peruvian peasant leader who was condemned September 8 to a 25-year sentence in the dungeons of El Frontón. During the kangaroo court-martial staged at Tacna, the French intellectuals joined in sending a telegram of protest to President Belaúnde Terry in which they appealed for his immediate release.

Among the first signers of the appeal were the following:

Arthur Adamov, Simone de Beauvoir, Roger Blin, Marguerite Bonnet, Edouard Depreux, Me. de Félice, Daniel Guérin, Maurice Jardot, Yves Jouffa, Me. Manville, Maurice Nadeau, Jacques Prévert, Alain Resnais, Frédéric Rossif, Claude Roy, Jean-Paul Sartre, Catherine Sauvage, Simone Signoret, J.-M. Vincent.

André Breton and Jean Schuster for the Surrealist group.

Jacques Lanzman for the editorial board of Temps Modernes.

Eric Losfeld for the editorial board of Positif.

François Maspéro for the editorial board of Partisans.

## THE YOUNG RED GUARDS AND MAO'S "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

By George Novack

The activities of the young Red Guards that have marked the second stage of the so-called "cultural revolution" convulsing China have startled the world. The bizarre and repellent features attending them have led many people to wonder what these events are all about. Have the Chinese Communist leaders gone out of their minds? they ask. What is the meaning of this turbulent campaign against a bewildering array of targets ranging from aged Catholic nuns and statues of Buddha, Western-style clothes, shoes and hair-cuts, to noted intellectuals, educators and veteran party leaders? It is indicative that even the Albanian Communist party leaders have been noticeably reserved in their references to the "cultural revolution."

There is a rational motivation and a consistent method discernible in this apparent madness. The People's Republic of China confronts the very real and growing threat of attack by the United States. Secretary of State Rusk has proclaimed that Peking is the prime instigator of the National Liberation Front and Hanoi in sustaining the war in Vietnam. In the escalation of its operations the U.S. military machine is heading toward China's borders. On September 19 the State Department, in trying to answer Peking's charges that American planes twice bombed Chinese territory this month, wounding three peasants, could only claim that the raids may have been made in error.

Since the extension of U.S. intervention, Peking has been extremely careful not to give the Pentagon war hawks pretexts for implementing their contingency plans to destroy China's nuclear installations. Johnson's fabrication of an armed encounter in the Gulf of Tonkin to justify the initiation of air attacks on north Vietnam shows that he, like Hitler, can trump up whatever incidents are needed for aggression. Nonetheless, the Chinese leaders are obligated to take all precautions to meet the anticipated armed assault. The well-known writer on Chinese affairs, Edgar Snow, who has excellent sources of information, is reported to have said that since early 1965 Mao and his entourage have been acting as though Washington intends to wage war on mainland China.

Apart from the military moves involved, the civilian population has to be prepared for resistance and possibly prolonged guerrilla warfare. The "cultural revolution" makes sense as a device thought up by the Maoists to promote this purpose. They thereby seek to solidify the masses around the regime and remove all sources and traces of disaffection which might impair national unity.

Facing a comparable threat from imperialist aggression before the Second World War, Stalin resorted to similar methods, stimulating the nationalist as well as the defensive revolutionary sentiments of the Russian people, attempting to cement their solidarity before the class enemy while tightening his bureaucratic

grip upon the country.

The prominence given the People's Liberation Army, which is being held up as the original "school of the revolution," confirms this supposition. The country is increasingly dominated by military men from Defense Minister Lin Piao, who has been designated Mao's second in command, to the new acting Minister of Culture, who was recently a soldier. To accentuate the army's importance Mao himself appeared at an August 18 rally in military uniform.

If the new turn in domestic policy is comprehensible as a response to this critical external danger, the ways of furthering its objectives are surely open to question.

The Chinese leaders not only fear an American attack; they evidently believe that the Soviet Union will not come to their defense if it materializes. That is why they keep accusing Moscow of collusion with Washington and Tokyo against them and why Red Guards demonstrated in front of the Soviet embassy and manhandled several of its officials. These incidents have drawn sharp protests from Moscow and deepened the Sino-Soviet rift on the state level.

Even if Brezhnev and Kosygin intend to leave China in the lurch (a possibility which cannot be excluded), does that justify the tactics followed by Peking? It is imperative for all the workers states to close ranks and act together against the fateful expansion of American aggression in Southeast Asia. Instead of inciting and applauding attacks on Soviet representatives in China, Peking should have seized upon the Russian proposals for common action, requested the convening of a conference of all Communist governments to consider concerted steps to aid the Vietnamese, and should have proposed a Sino-Soviet warning to Washington that any further escalation would be countered with graduated reprisals. The USSR has the deterrents to make such an ultimatum credible and give pause to the Pentagon strategists.

Cuba, the Japanese CP, the editorial board of Sartre's Temps Modernes and the Fourth International have been urging some such course of action. It would serve to mobilize the maximum forces on a global scale to slow down the Washington warmakers, assist the Vietnamese revolution and north Vietnam, and defend the People's Republic of China itself. Such a line would certainly muster far more understanding and support from friends of China all over the world than the present sectarian attitude and excesses attending Mao's "great cultural revolution" which have been denounced by Communist leaders from Cuba to north Korea.

\* \* \*

The actions of the Red Guards are unlikely to win friends for the regime at home either. Under the approving eyes of Mao and Lin Piao, detachments of young militants have been striking out wildly at "old ideas, old customs and old habits."

Whatever is foreign, "bourgeois," or associated with China's past has been liable to indiscriminate attack. The cemetery for foreigners in Peking has been closed and renamed the "Anti-imperialist, Antirevisionist Orchard." Classical Greek and Roman statues have been smashed. Goethe and Shakespeare have been blacklisted. Pravda reports that a memorial to Pushkin was torn down in Shanghai and "posters eulogizing Mao Tse-tung were pasted on the pedestal."

Ancient Chinese art objects have been destroyed as "demons and monsters of the old ruling class." The Shanghai home of 75-year-old Madame Sun Yat-sen, vice-president of the nation, has been ransacked. Premier Chou En-lai had to admonish Red Guards for pasting up posters against Mrs. Sun and trying to remove busts of her dead husband, the honored founder of the first Chinese Republic in 1911, from buildings.

People have been stripped of their jewelry and other ornaments, forced to take off Western clothes and change "bourgeois" haircuts. Cosmetics have been removed from shop counters. Statues of Buddha have been taken out of Tibetan lamaseries. Old women have been dragged through the streets of Peking with placards hanging around their necks reading "I oppose the revolution."

Is this how to "destroy the old world" and "establish a new world"? Why do the party leaders feel impelled, seventeen years after the conquest of power, to encourage measures of this kind which damage the reputation of the regime, weaken the already demoralized and disoriented pro-Maoist forces elsewhere, and intensify Peking's isolation in the Communist and colonial world?

According to the official explanation, these drastic steps are being taken to extirpate revisionists, right opportunists, restorationists, and bourgeois "monsters" aided and abetted by "sinister anti-party and anti-socialist counter-revolutionary gangsters." We are told that the Red Guards are the banner bearers of an epoch-making "proletarian cultural revolution" which will totally transform the nature of Chinese man. Let us examine these two points.

So little reliable information is available that one can only guess at the views and orientations of the forces now locked in struggle. Selected capitalist entrepreneurs, who are often exhibited to foreign visitors, have been permitted to operate in Communist China under strict supervision by the government. One demand of the demonstrators is that these and other privileged elements be deprived of their dividends, bank accounts and opulent living standards.

However, these remnants of the old order carry little social weight compared to the widespread petty-bourgeois forces which are deeply rooted in the predominantly peasant population and among the state functionaries and intelligensia. Spokesmen for such tendencies with rightist and even counterrevolutionary leanings may have been emboldened by China's string of reverses on the

foreign field and the domestic difficulties and errors committed by the regime to raise their heads and look about for openings and allies.

But the spectrum of dissent extends far beyond such quarters. It reaches into the party, the government, the army and intellectual circles where highly placed personages are dissatisfied with Mao's policies on one ground or another. Some have reportedly been pressing to change the out-of-hand rejection of any alliance with the Soviet Union and may even have evinced sympathy for Moscow. The confluence of these variegated trends may well have presented the specter of a rising opposition from the right to Mao's general line.

It is asserted that the Red Guards are mobilized exclusively against such rightist forces. But this is only part of the picture. They are being used to suppress all dissent, whether from revisionist and "opportunist" opponents or from more radical communist voices on the left. This is the most ominous and reactionary aspect of the affair. Any sort of criticism, regardless of its aims or inspiration, is being lumped together and branded as counterrevolutionary and unpatriotic. The formula for this stringent thought control is craven obeisance to the all-sufficing thought of Mao Tse-tung who has just been elevated to an almost god-like status as "supreme commander."\*

The wave of suicides among prominent personages and the unrestrained and unfounded accusations launched against others shows how unbearable the atmosphere of intimidation has become. Typical are the denunciations in the press of Li Ta, one of the three surviving founders of the Chinese Communist party and for the past fourteen years president of Wuhan University. According to the army paper, "Li Ta is a shameless traitor, a national disgrace, a veteran anti-Communist, a despotic landlord and anti-socialist, anti-Mao Tse-tung-in-thought shock trooper, and an extremely rabid and stubborn counter-revolutionary element." Jenmin Jih Pao called him "a landlord element who has always exploited the peasants."

\* \* \*

Mao and his associates have not scrupulously conformed to constitutional rules of party life. The CP has not held a national convention for a decade. This time Mao has gone further by forming battalions outside the party and its youth organizations which are conducting the purge through extralegal channels from one end of the country to the other.

The Red Guards have castigated the party figures or administrative units that the men at the top want to undermine or remove

---

\*The Paris daily Le Monde reported September 17 that placards and banners have appeared in Peking calling Mao Tse-tung the "great leader, spiritual guide and supreme commander of the Chinese people."

from their posts. This has split the CP in many places and provoked sharp encounters between the Red Guards and local leaders and organizations. "In provinces as far apart as Shensi and Heilungkiang in the north and Kweichow and Szechwan in the south," says a September 7 New York Times dispatch from Hong Kong, "struggles are developing between Maoist and anti-Maoist factions using rival groups as pawns in their power play." That same day the theoretical journal of the Central Committee, Hung Chi, declared that powerful elements within the party were waging a power struggle against Mao Tse-tung and Defense Minister Lin Piao. It said these "enemies" would be crushed.

The youth movement is in disarray. The Central Committee of the Young Communist League was disbanded a month ago on the ground that its leaders wanted to transform the organization into a weapon for restoring capitalism. It was replaced by a "revolutionary group" that was then also removed. Now fresh posters call for a new youth organization to be formed under a different name. All foreign students have been asked to leave China by the end of September.

The youth cadres appear to have divided into different contingents. On one side is a minority centered in the universities which is critical of the leadership and afraid of being beaten down. On the other side are those who make up the Red Guards. These less sophisticated zealous young militants are accustomed to carry out directives from Mao and his men in whom they repose blind confidence and unlimited trust. They have apparently plunged into this latest crusade, as they have in previous campaigns, full of fervor and intent on sweeping away all who are pointed out as open or hidden opponents of the regime.

In some cases and places the drive has gotten out of hand and passed beyond the control of its promoters. Its participants have had to be curbed and called to account. This can be deduced from orders issued to the Red Guards not to interfere with agricultural or industrial production. An editorial in Hung Chi on September 19 admonished the Guards to follow rules of obedience to orders, speaking politely, not hitting or swearing at people, not damaging crops, not taking liberties with women or maltreating captives. Such warnings would not have been given unless incidents of this kind had occurred.

Pravda has been printing more detailed and chilling accounts of brutalities. "The Red Guards beat up a worker because he happened to be in a room where they found a portrait of Mao Tse-tung with a crack in the frame," it said. "They beat people with sticks, rifle butts, belts, chains and electric rods. One man was tortured a whole night until he died."

The "proletarian cultural revolution" is running up against resistance from workers and peasants. Japanese and other correspondents in Peking have reported numerous bloody clashes in which Chinese army troops have been forced to intervene.

The employment of teen-age militants in this fashion is risky for the leadership. Their eagerness in attacking certain sections of the party apparatus betrays a hostility toward its officialdom which may later boomerang. In any event, the regime is at fault for abusing and misdirecting the ardor and idealism of these youth.

\* \* \*

Mao has exceedingly ambitious ends in view. In his twilight years he aspires to shape the youth and remold their elders into incorruptible soldiers of communism, as he understands it, who will be armored against all temptations to relapse into the old ways. This accounts in part for the Spartan severity and ruthlessness of this new "leap forward" which is being carried out in the now familiar extreme "Maoist" manner.

Is this campaign an authentic "proletarian cultural revolution," as Peking and its followers contend?

A thoroughgoing reconstruction of human relations, customs and habits, art and culture, is the logical sequel and eventual culmination of a profound popular revolution like that in China. However, this can only be the ripened achievement of a wholly renovated social order, based not only on new economic foundations but on an unprecedented flow of wealth, a reduction of compulsory labor, an end to state coercion, and harmonious human relations. This is the collective work of a succession of generations. It cannot be produced on command from above in obedience to the edict of an all-powerful individual. Such an arbitrary conception could only emanate from the heads of autocrats who travesty the aims of scientific socialism.

In any case, such a profound transformation of life cannot be consummated in an impoverished, backward and besieged country, with immense unsolved economic problems, like China today. It cannot be accomplished amidst fierce social conflicts. The socialist cultural revolution in the Marxist, not Maoist sense, is not a weapon or a phase in the class struggle. It will have to grow out of the dying away of social differentiations, cleavages and antagonisms in a stateless and classless society of equals elevated high above the standards yet attained anywhere. China is very far from that.

Nor can the coming socialist culture be created within the boundaries of a single country, as the Maoists, imitating Stalin, proclaim. It will not bear a class imprint even of a proletarian character. It will be the first classless and universal culture, built on the highest technology and science, to which each country and people will contribute its distinctive gifts and proper share.

To be sure, these radically new human relations and its appropriate art and culture will have to be prepared in the transitional period leading from class society to socialism. But its



major objectives cannot be taken by storm or by forced marches on short rations, any more than the roots of religious belief can be eliminated by government edict or desecration of churches. Such tactics reinforce anticommunist prejudices, cast discredit upon socialism, and repel people from its principles.

At the very least a proletarian campaign and culture should serve to enlarge the democratic control of the workers and peasants over their economy, their party and their government. The very methods employed ensure that the masses and the communist ranks will emerge from this upheaval not with more but with less of a role in decision-making on a local, regional and national level.

The recent meeting of the Central Committee -- the first in four years (aside from possible secret ones) -- consolidated all powers around Mao and Lin Piao, the army chief. The ousting of all dissidents, right and left, right or wrong, should further tighten the hold of the Maoist bureaucracy over all spheres of Chinese life.

\* \* \*

During the campaign a sign outside a pedicab depot in Peking read that vehicles may still be hired but the passenger is to do the work while the driver sits in the passenger seat behind. (The pedicab is a tricycle pedaled by a man. This kind of coolie transportation was a symbol of personal and national degradation under imperialist domination.)

Superficial observers might interpret this as a sign that the privileged elements are being overturned in Communist China as the toilers move into the driver's seat. This is what the official promoters of the purge would have us believe.

However, the very absurdity of the innovation should put us on guard against so simple a conclusion. The reversal of roles between the passenger and the chauffeur-pedaler has not worked in practice.

So, whatever is being knocked topsy-turvy, the powers and political influence of the working masses are not being augmented. On the contrary, autonomy of the bureaucracy is being buttressed by the smothering of the rights of expression within the party and the country. Regardless of the motives of its initiators, the "great cultural revolution" testifies to the hardening of bureaucratic rulership, not to any revolutionary replenishment from below or extension of workers and peasants democracy in China.

#### STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE IN BRAZIL

Despite police brutality, some 5,000 students in São Paulo demonstrated September 20, carrying out a "march against the dictatorship" of Gen. Castelo Branco. The crowds displayed sympathy with the students, helping them to escape from police pursuit.

### FORT HOOD THREE SHOW HIGH MORALE

Despite harsh treatment in the stockade at Fort Meade, Maryland, the Fort Hood Three are displaying high morale. The three American soldiers, Private Dennis Mora, Private First Class James Johnson and Private David Samas were recently given heavy sentences for refusing to go to Vietnam. [See World Outlook July 15, July 29, September 16.]

In an interview with Barry Sheppard, managing editor of The Militant, Mrs. Grace Mora Newman, the sister of Pvt. Dennis Mora, released the text of the following statement written by her brother immediately after the court-martial at Fort Dix:

"We are proud of our dishonorable discharge in times when we are asked to serve in a brutal war of aggression against humanity and peace. An honorable man can only do the honorable and right thing, and not serve. We feel confident that our action has not been lost in the wilderness of lies and hypocrisy our foreign policy is today. We know that all decent and democratic Americans will see the justice of our cause. More importantly, we hope our action has moved other young men to thinking and questioning this corporate establishment... We have done only a part of what remains to be done for peace in Vietnam. The American people will get on with the work of putting an end to the bombing and burning. They are our judges. They will find us innocent."

### BARBAROUS TREATMENT OF FORT HOOD THREE

The Fort Hood Three -- Pvt. David Samas, Pvt. Dennis Mora, and Pfc. James Johnson -- were transferred from Fort Dix, New Jersey to Fort Meade, Maryland, on September 12. The three American soldiers who refused to accept orders to go to Vietnam are awaiting completion of a review of their harsh sentences, ranging from three to five years in prison at hard labor, plus loss of pay and dishonorable discharges from the armed forces.

Mrs. Grace Mora Newman, the sister of Pvt. Dennis Mora, after visiting her brother on September 18, reported that the Fort Meade authorities are treating the three men in an inhuman manner.

They have been denied library privileges during the week, are no longer permitted to receive letters except from members of their immediate families, are forced to eat their meals on the floor in their cells, are kept in solitary confinement, and held incomunicado.

The brutal U.S. army officials have even gone so far as to require the three political prisoners to stand up all day in their cells. If they lean against the wall, sit down, or fail to comply in any way with this requirement, they are subjected to a degrading and punishing "push-up" routine.

The Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, which is supported by a distinguished list of liberal and civil-liberties figures in the United States, is appealing for protests against the cruel and inhuman treatment to which the three political prisoners are being subjected.

Protests should be sent to Lt. Gen. William F. Train, CG, 1st U.S. Army, Fort Meade, Maryland.

The defense committee is also appealing for the widest possible publicity for this important case.

### JAPANESE PROTEST CALL OF U.S. NUCLEAR SUBMARINE

A demonstration at Yokosuka September 7, protesting the call of the U.S. nuclear submarine Seadragon, was indicative of the deepening bitterness of the Japanese people over the escalation of the war in Vietnam and the increasing trend toward united action in registering that feeling.

The demonstration began with a mass meeting in Rinkai Park. The speakers included Kozo Sasaki, chairman of the Socialist party; Sanzo Nosaka, chairman of the Communist party, and Akira Iwai, secretary general of Sohyo, the powerful trade-union federation.

Following the meeting, the crowd marched three kilometers to the docks. The estimated 12,000 demonstrators were met by large contingents of riot police, guarding the U.S. nuclear pigboat.

Suddenly some 700 students broke loose from the tail of the demonstration and charged the file of police. They clashed three times and were thrown back each time.

A student leader was reported to have shouted: "Get rocks because we cannot beat police with bare hands."

The students then pulled back to the other side of the street where they picked up bottles, rocks, and pieces of lumber. They hurled the missiles at the advancing line of police.

During the scuffle, the students set fire to a police van, smashed windows of a number of automobiles, broke window panes and caved in some doors of houses on the street.

Calmness returned only after the students disbanded about two hours after the skirmishing opened.

According to the police, 7 students, 5 reporters and 267 police were injured.

THE JAPANESE LABOR MOVEMENT REACHES A TURNING POINT

By S. Okatani

There are many indications that the Japanese labor movement has reached a turning point. Among the signs are the recent changes in the top hierarchy of the big unions and the changes in their policies and roles as they begin to grapple with the process of rationalization and automation that has swept Japanese industry in the past few years. Differences over how to deal with the problems that have arisen are touching off sharp debate and discussion in all the working-class organizations. The purpose of this article is to indicate the causes and background of the present ferment.

The ouster of the chairmen of the two big federations at their respective national conferences at the end of July is only one manifestation of the change. Kaoru Ohta, chairman of Soyho, the largest federation and also the one standing farthest to the left, was forced to resign after eight years in office. His successor, significantly enough, is Toshikatsu Horii, chairman of the National Federation of Railway Workers. Horii won due to the support of one of the more right-wing Soyho leaders, Fumihiko Takaragi, head of the Postal Workers union.

Yukich Takehama was forced to withdraw as chairman of the large Neutral Federation of Trade Unions when he lost the leadership in his own union, the National Federation of Electrical Machinery Workers. Takehama's defeat was the result of a major shift in his federation. The Neutral Federation, which until recently was aligned with Soyho, switched and is now supporting the more rightist federation, the General Union of Trade Unions, the second largest in Japan.

These changes in the top posts seem to show, at first sight, that a general shift to the right has occurred in the Japanese labor movement; but they should be assessed against the background of a remarkable upsurge in the working class, with an increasing number of workers going into struggle, with the struggles intensifying, with leadership in the struggles shifting more and more toward the youth, and with the workers movement going so far as to prepare strike action against the war in Vietnam.

In every political group in the country, a major topic of discussion is the course of the Japanese working class and its meaning for the future. The new splits, the regroupments, the apparent confusion should be viewed as part of the phenomena necessarily to be expected at a major turning point in any mass movement.

1.

United Front of the Workers Movement

Against the Capitalist Industrial Rationalization Measures

First of all, a brief outline of the questions preoccupying most trade unionists is essential.

The Soyho national conference adopted three major proposals brought in by its National Executive -- on the resignation of the former chairman and nomination of a new one; on the struggle against the war in Vietnam; and on the tactic of a united front against the war in Vietnam and against the rationalization measures being introduced into industry. The resolution on the united front argued for the adherence of all the unions and all the workers parties regardless of their differences.

Soyho's General Secretary Akira Iwai expressed it this way in the July issue of the federation's official journal, Monthly Soyho: "I believe the Communist party's program for the trade-union movement to be incorrect; however, I think that if the Communist party is excluded from our 'United Front' then we will have committed the error of allowing a sectarian attitude that will prevail in all the workers' parties and in the trade unions."

"We should take the position," he stated, "of giving support to all progressive parties, a position that will allow unionists to organize special groups to support respectively, either the Socialist party, the Democratic Socialist party or the Communist party, and to carry out campaigns during general elections, and to pursue various other political matters."

In contrast to this, the head of the Postal Workers union, Takaragi, recognized as the power behind the new chairman of Soyho, is advancing a different interpretation of the united front concept. At its national conference, held in Kyoto from July 27 to August 1, this union adopted a resolution refusing in effect to cooperate in any struggles that included the Communist party. Instead, they put forward a more limited idea of a "united front," one that would involve joint action with only the conservative General Union.

In applying their resolution in practice, however, the Postal Workers face a dilemma over relations with that special category in Japan known as the "second trade unions" which constitute part of the General Union. Their nature can best be understood in the context of the organizational setup of the Japanese labor movement.

Quite unlike England or the United States, where a union may view an entire industry as coming under its jurisdiction, in Japan workers in a particular company may organize their trade union as an autonomous unit. For example, the workers of the Mitsubishi Shipbuilding Company and the workers of the Hitachi Shipbuilding Company have their own individual unions. This is compulsory under Japanese labor laws -- the only exceptions being the coal miners

and the seamen. Thus the unions in an industry are but loosely connected through the national federations.

Normally, therefore, only one trade union exists in a given company.

The "second trade unions" are different. They are organized by the company alongside the "legitimate" union as an attempt to weaken it. Usually this occurs when the legitimate union becomes involved in a sharp struggle with the employer.

All these "second trade unions," or "company unions" to use the American expression, are now affiliating to the General Union. This poses a special problem for the Postal Workers, since where they are organized, "company unions" exist alongside.

If the Postal Workers put into practice their resolution on forming a united front only with the General Union, then each branch of the union will be forced to make clear just what they mean when they talk about forming a "united front" with their rivals, the branches of the "second trade unions." Certainly, if they can pull it off, such a united front is necessary and useful for them when they are in struggle. But if the Postal Workers leaders go so far as to demand the unification of Soyho with the General Union, while excluding everyone else, then the Postal Workers branches will have the problem of implementing it with those who acted as strike-breakers during the difficult period when the union was fighting to establish itself. And the same will hold true in other industries.

At the national conference of the Postal Workers union, militant opposition was in evidence, so sharp in fact that the leadership had to bend, allowing the following amendments to be included in the main resolution: (1) That the political party most deserving of support is the Socialist party. (2) That the union should campaign against the policy encouraged by the government and management of increasing productivity through speedup. (3) That it is the responsibility of all trade unions not only to struggle for better wages and improved working conditions but also to orient toward achieving political objectives. (4) That the union should always uphold a working-class perspective.

It is almost a foregone conclusion that the General Union will find none of these amendments acceptable in view of its own four proposals: (1) That the party deserving support is not the Socialist party but the Democratic Socialist party. (2) That the drive to increase productivity should not be opposed but actively supported instead by all unionists, since wage increases can be gained by increasing productivity. (3) That inasmuch as the central aim of a union is not political but merely the improvement of working conditions and wages, the unions should avoid leading struggles aimed at political objectives. (4) In carrying out actions, the workers should be guided by "the national interest" rather than their own class interests.

What kind of "united front" the Horii-Iwai combination hope to put across, if they ever succeed, remains to be seen; and it is difficult to visualize how the Postal Workers union can implement its resolution.

2.

Wage Increases or a Fight against Rationalization?

Around which struggle will the trade unionists organize a united front? Ohta and Iwai have stressed the prime importance to the trade unions of concentrating on the struggle for wage demands in which, they say, all unionists have an interest. The program adopted by Sohyo at its national conference is in line with this.

But some of the militant Sohyo leaders like Haihara, secretary general of the National Coal Mine Workers union, are demanding that it be made clear that the task is to struggle against the industrial rationalization process that has been advancing rapidly in Japan in conjunction with the fast growth of the economy. Haihara's view that without sharp opposition to the rationalization measures workers cannot achieve any significant improvement in conditions, is rooted in his experience as a leader of the coal miners.

Up to 1962, the coal miners, because of their stronger and more militant union, were able to gain comparatively higher wages than the other sectors. Therefore the crippling and destruction of the miners' union was moved into top priority by the Japanese capitalists. They viewed it as a concomitant to intensifying the rationalization process in industry required to achieve the technical level demanded to successfully meet competition from the other advanced imperialist countries.

Through direct police intervention, the mine operators were able to get away with ousting literally thousands of militants from their jobs, nearly destroying the Coal Mine Workers union. The net result of the campaign is vividly shown by the following facts. The total number of miners has decreased since 1960. (See Table 1.) Labor productivity and average hours worked have increased. (See Table 2 and Table 3.) The annual wage increase for the miners is lagging considerably behind the other industrial workers. (See Table 4.) Here we can see how the working conditions and standard of living of the miners have been affected in actuality, even though the union was able to survive the attacks and to remain to this day one of the strongest and most militant unions in Japan.

The rapid expansion of the Japanese economy was made possible by an increase in size of the work force together with an increase in per capita productivity. Because of this, earnings have increased while the average hours worked has actually decreased. This is but one expression of the progress of industrialization and rationalization through mechanization and automation.

TABLE 1

Adult Population by Employment Status and  
Employment of Persons by Industry

(Monthly averages, 1,000 persons)

	<u>1958</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1964</u>
1. Population 15 years old and over	62,950	65,200	67,550	71,220
2. Labor force, total	43,870	45,110	46,140	47,100
(1) Totally unemployed	630	500	400	370
(2) Employed	43,240	44,660	45,740	46,730
(i) Agriculture and Forestry	14,710	13,910	13,110	11,970
(ii) Non-Agricultural Industry	28,540	30,670	32,600	34,710
(a) Mining	500	500	480	360
(b) Construction	2,060	2,360	2,700	2,890
(c) Manufacturing	9,000	9,510	10,720	11,370
(d) Wholesale, Retail Trade, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	8,000	8,490	8,470	9,270
(e) Transport, Communications and other Public Utilities	2,210	2,450	2,660	2,940
(f) Services	5,040	5,520	5,630	5,900
(g) Governmental Services	1,220	1,280	1,360	1,460

Source: Statistical Survey of Economy of Japan, 1965. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. p. 9.



TABLE 2

Index Number of Labor Productivity

(1955 = 100)

	<u>1960</u>	<u>1964</u>
Mining	117.8	223.3
Manufacturing	143.3	187.4
Textiles	138.6	178.4
Paper and Pulp	116.5	143.6
Chemicals	141.9	207.6
Ceramics	113.4	143.1
Iron and Steel	141.2	193.3
Nonferrous Metals	122.7	157.5
Machinery-general	151.7	194.2
(a) Electrical	250.6	342.8
(b) Precision Instrument	129.7	180.0

Source: Statistical Survey of Economy of Japan, 1965. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. p. 11.

TABLE 3

Hours Worked of Regular Workers by Industry

(Establishments with 30 workers or more --  
hours per worker a month)

	<u>1956</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1964</u>
General	199.3	202.7	195.7
Mining	193.8	193.6	196.3
Construction	200.8	211.3	204.7
Manufacturing	204.4	207.0	195.7
Wholesale and Retail Trade	194.4	197.1	194.1
Finance and Insurance	178.2	179.4	173.3
Real Estate	192.2	191.6	187.7
Transport and Communications	194.8	198.7	199.9
Electricity, Gas and Water	184.7	182.5	178.6

Source: Statistical Survey of Economy of Japan, 1965. Ministry of  
Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. p. 11.

TABLE 4

Cash Earning Index of Number of Workers  
by Industry

(1960 = 100)

		<u>1958</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1964</u>
General	Nominal	88.2	122.7	150.0
	Real	92.4	109.1	119.4
Mining	Nominal	91.2	117.0	144.2
	Real	95.5	104.0	114.8
Construction	Nominal	87.3	133.7	173.6
	Real	91.4	118.8	138.2
Manufacturing	Nominal	86.2	122.1	149.3
	Real	90.3	108.5	118.4
Electricity, Gas and Water	Nominal	90.1	126.3	152.5
	Real	94.3	112.3	121.4
Transportation	Nominal	88.7	125.3	152.5
	Real	92.9	111.4	121.4
Wholesale and Retail Trade	Nominal	89.4	122.2	149.3
	Real	93.6	108.6	118.9
Finance and Insurance	Nominal	91.0	121.2	143.1
	Real	95.3	107.7	113.9

Source: Statistical Survey of Economy of Japan, 1965. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo. p. 61.

But what has happened to the miners is extraordinary. Their total number is decreasing; at the same time the average number of hours worked per capita has been going up since 1960; and per capita productivity has increased tremendously. In other industries, hours have been reduced. Miners' earnings have remained stagnant.

Despite the widespread pressure from rank-and-file militants and the official leadership of the Coal Mine Workers union in favor of struggling against the rationalization measures, the bulk of the Soyho leaders support Ohta's and Iwai's line of concentrating on wage increases. By arguing for the importance of this line, and, in the process, opposing the militants who want a program of genuine struggle, Ohta and Iwai have identified with the right-wing tendency in the movement and moved closer toward it.

3.

The Effect of Industrial Rationalization  
On the Trade-Union Movement

The concern in the trade-union movement over these problems, the reason why many of them are so timid about struggling against the industrial rationalization measures -- whereas in the past they might have been militant -- is rooted in the very real way in which the reorganization and rationalization of industry, now proceeding at such a fast pace in Japan, have affected the organizational setup of the unions themselves. Recent mergers, regroupments and the further strengthening of monopoly control among some of the big companies, have pushed the specific trade unions involved toward the right.

Most typical was the recent merger engaged in by the giant Mitsubishi Heavy Industry Company.

This company was established and developed as a heavy armaments enterprise before the Second World War. The antimonopoly law, enacted and put into force immediately after the war, was ostensibly designed to dissolve the Zaibatsu system (a peculiar monopolistic system based on family ties and connections) by forcing the huge complex to divide itself into three separate units -- the New Mitsubishi, the Naka-Nahon Heavy Industry, and the Mitsubishi Shipbuilding Company. Each devoted itself to a main product -- automobiles, heavy machinery and shipbuilding respectively -- and increased its size and efficiency.

Revision of the antimonopoly legislation on September 1, 1953, made it possible for the three to eventually carry out reunification in 1965 in order to rationalize their management. Most important, however, was the impact the new measures had on the trade unions of the Mitsubishi workers. Before the merger, an autonomous union existed in each company. Two of these unions were aligned with the right wing in the national federation; but the shipbuilding workers

were under a left-wing leadership in one of the strongest unions in Japan. Its executive consisted of a number of militants -- Socialists and Communists, some of whom had split from the Communist party in 1958-59 and evolved toward Trotskyism. After the merger, the workers of the former shipbuilding company who had constituted an autonomous union under left-wing leadership were transformed into a minority in the new setup. They now face a difficult situation.

The same thing occurred in the merger of the Nissan and Prince companies (the new company is the largest or second largest manufacturer of automobiles) and in the Toyo Koatsu (biggest producer of chemicals); but in the latter case the workers split from Soyho during the process of rationalization. The National Federation of Electrical Machinery Workers unions stopped supporting Soyho and the former chairman of the Neutral Federation resigned as a consequence.

Why are right-wing Soyho leaders like Takaragi and centrists like Ohta and Iwai, so cautious and conservative? It is because of the capitalist offensive mounted in conjunction with the rapid development of the companies.

4.

Basis of the New Surge of Militancy in the Workers Movement

What has given rise to the present struggle of the Japanese workers -- what is its main cause and how is it developing?

The recent upsurge in militancy has a double origin. On the one hand workers in the small industrial concerns face serious conditions as a result of the rationalization. Although the Japanese capitalists are immensely proud of the economic prosperity they are now enjoying, the number of bankruptcies among small companies is nevertheless on the increase, giving some cause for concern. Wage increases in small factories have been minimal although the workers need more money due to inflation. In addition there is the contagious effect of the buying habits of other workers, increasing their desire for more consumers goods. They are impelled to give battle and the militants in the small plants find it easier to provide leadership -- the local union bureaucracies are not as firmly established as in the bigger industrial units.

At the same time, it must be recognized that the influence of the small-factories sector of the work force has been decreasing. A short sketch of Sohyo's history will make this clear. Founded in July 1950, Sohyo organized a membership of four million in a very short period under conditions when Communist leaders and activists, who had been at the head of the working class until then, were being expelled and fired from their jobs by the American occupation army. In the "red purge," Sanbetsu Kaigi (National Congress of Industrial Unions, in which the Communist party had the strongest influence) was eventually destroyed and more than 10,000 militants lost their jobs.

This brought about a drastic shift in the labor front. No major struggles occurred for several years. Minora Takano, secretary general of Sohyo after the purge, based his predominance in the movement on his influence among the skilled workers and foremen, a sector of the class that became more and more important as the reconstruction of Japanese industry proceeded.

The workers in the small plants still played a crucial role in the labor movement as a whole at the time. For example, Sohyo regularly conducted strikes that actually involved the families of the striking unionists and other members of the community.

In 1955 Iwai replaced Takano as secretary of Sohyo. The change in leadership was held to symbolize the end of the cooperative struggle of the community and the beginning of a new policy of conducting industry-wide strikes. During the Korean war, at the time of the purge, the movement stagnated; but by 1956 industry-wide strikes were taking place in the iron- and steel-making industry. Before 1955 the workers in the small plants constituted the most dynamic sector; after that, the initiative shifted to the workers in the big plants.

The trade-union militants in the small plants came to be known as "the anti-mainstream" tendency. One Japanese writer summarized the situation very well when he stated:

"The left-wing segment is comprised of two groups, the anti-mainstream (Takano) faction within Sohyo, and those labor organizations in the medium, small and very small enterprises which are not affiliated with any of the major national labor groups.... Although left-wing unionism is supposedly obsolete, it does continue to exert considerable influence here in Japan. It is still influential primarily because it appeals to the workers in the smaller enterprises. Thus, while left-wing unionism is still a factor to be considered, it is not playing a leading part in the present struggle between the main forces of labor and capital... Capital regards left-wing unionism as constituting just a relatively small sector of the labor movement and therefore of no great significance or threat to capital's new policy aims. In a sense capital is correct in its judgment." (Makoto Omori. "A Turning Point in the Japanese Labor Movement," The Journal of Social and Political Ideas in Japan. August 1965.)

Because the number of workers in the big plants increased rapidly, it was not difficult for them to struggle to improve working conditions. The workers established their hegemony in the big factories as a whole. Ohta and Iwai could propose radical programs to improve conditions; and as a result they were able to stay in their positions at the head of the labor movement for a decade.

Ohta's downfall is a manifestation of new conditions that could provide the basis for a new leadership in the movement. The new conditions do not signify restoration in the labor movement of the primacy of the workers in small establishments. We must

look elsewhere for it.

Japan's rapid economic growth has involved technological innovations and alterations in the structure of industry that have in turn produced decisive changes in the nature and structure of the labor force. For example all-round machinists and qualified technicians have continuously risen in importance at the expense of skilled craftsmen; and there has been a similar shift from a wage system based on seniority to one based on job classification. The new militancy in the working class is rooted in the changed nature and structure of the labor force.

The construction of new factories, the onrush of technological development have engendered new labor problems -- on the one hand, an acute shortage of younger workers; on the other, acute difficulties for the older workers in finding job replacements. Skilled workers, who were trained under the older techniques, who could get higher wages because of a system based on seniority, now find themselves no longer in demand. The modernized, automated plants, with their simplified mass-production methods, fit in with management's aim of finding a more adaptable and suitable work force among the youth. Young workers are in short supply and their wages as a consequence have risen.

Facing a shortage of young workers, the capitalists are promoting the shifting of workers from the low-productivity sector, especially small enterprises and agriculture, and they are weighing extension of the wage system based on job classification. Today it is not too difficult for young workers to stage struggles for wage increases against managers competing with each other for labor power to meet the needs of expanded capital investment.

But the workers in the larger plants, who may have been satisfied some years ago with relatively higher wages, have now begun to find neither modern capitalism nor its modern automated factories to be particularly appealing. Through struggles, even ones confined to economic demands, they can awaken to class consciousness. In addition, Japan, although an advanced imperialist country, cannot escape its geographical location in Asia close to the colonial revolution, especially the Vietnamese war, the influence of which is so direct that Sohyo has decided to begin strike action to protest the escalation.

At the same time, the capitalists, facing the increasing militancy of the younger workers, can no longer rely on the loyalty of the older workers, who in the past would have pressed the youth not to go too far. Older skilled workers, who remained loyal to management, are now victims of the rationalization measures; and in the countryside -- the traditional backbone of conservatism -- there have been many changes in recent years.

The options open to Japanese capitalism are growing fewer.

August 22, 1966

## WHY AMERICA'S GHETTOS KEEP EXPLODING

By Evelyn Sell

The ghetto explosions in the United States continue -- in Atlanta, Georgia; in Dayton, Ohio; in Waukegan, Illinois; in Benton Harbor, Battle Creek and Jackson, Michigan. Despite the promises of the Great Society's War on Poverty, despite the bayonets and tear-gas bombs, despite the pleas by "responsible" Negro leaders -- black Americans continue to express their feelings with fire bombs, bricks and cries of "Burn, baby, burn!"

A recent report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics states some cold, hard facts which explain a great deal about the long hot summers since the 1960 sit-in movement ushered in a new stage in the Afro-American freedom struggle. Almost 3,000,000 new jobs have been created in the U.S. during the past year; 250,000 workers started newly created jobs during August alone. Yet -- unemployment among black workers went up during August.

The ratio of Negroes unemployed rose from 7.9% of the nonwhite labor force in July to 8.2% in August. (Negroes make up 92% of the nonwhite labor force.) The proportion of whites unemployed ran 3.4%. That means that Negro unemployment is now almost 2.5 times that of white unemployment although Negroes represent about one-ninth of the country's population.

White unemployment has been steadily decreasing over the past five years. Nonwhite unemployment, however, has recently begun to go up and up. Teen-age unemployment for both groups remains high but Negro teen-age unemployment is more than twice as high as unemployment among white youths.

Arthur Ross, commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, estimated that 250,000 more jobs were needed to bring Negro unemployment figures down to the level of white unemployment. Note: the 250,000 jobs would not erase Negro unemployment but merely equalize it with white joblessness...true equality! However, 250,000 new jobs were created during August; yet Negro unemployment climbed.

It has been pointed out repeatedly that Negroes lack the skills; that is, the education, to compete successfully in today's job market. Because they are black, Afro-Americans receive an inferior education. Then because they have an inferior education, they cannot get jobs. Lack of job opportunities drives black families deeper into poverty and despair and cripples the next generation which is again faced with the same vicious cycle.

Is it any wonder black Americans throw bricks at a society which surrounds them with the promises and visions of plenty and then deprives them of any chance of obtaining the good things of life? Is it any wonder Afro-Americans cry, "Burn, baby, burn! If we can't have it, we won't let you keep it either!"



NORTH KOREAN CP ATTACKS "TROTSKYISM"

By Dick Roberts

The North Korean Communist party has taken another step towards the Kremlin's side in the Sino-Soviet debate; and, in tried and true Stalinist fashion, the North Korean party's position was indicated by a polemic in its theoretical newspaper Rodong Shinmoon attacking ...Trotskyism.

Pravda summarized the editorial in the North Korean newspaper. The account in Pravda was given worldwide distribution by the Soviet press agency Tass. New York Times correspondent Peter Grose, in turn, reported it from Moscow September 18.

"There is no mention of China in the version of the North Korean editorial printed in Pravda," Grose states. "But in denouncing Trotskyism it defined that vague ideological word as the principles now being put forth by Peking."

For the sake of its readers who do not have the proper conditioned reflex to the word "Trotskyism," Rodong Shinmoon added the following characterizations according to the Pravda summary:

"Trotskyism is an antirevolutionary theory denying the possibility of the victory of Socialist revolution and construction of Socialism in one country...The Trotskyites claimed that the improvement of material and cultural conditions of the people under Socialism would lead to corruption and degradation of the society and create the danger of the restoration of capitalism..."

Further, Rodong Shinmoon asserts, "Trotskyites emphatically objected to combining violent and nonviolent methods in the revolutionary struggle. They insisted on only an 'offensive' and reckless rebellion. Trotskyites tried their utmost to unite their supporters in various countries by inciting them to engineer a split in the ranks of the international Communist movement.

"In addition they committed all kinds of subversive acts in an effort to prevent the revolutionary development and the activity of the Marxist-Leninist parties in different countries."

The Pyongyang version of "Trotskyism" is so distorted that even the New York Times feels compelled to note it. "Students of Soviet politics," Grose writes, "might find this a rather strained characterization of the policies of Leon Trotsky, Stalin's great rival for leadership in the early years of Bolshevik power...."

"In Communist parlance," Grose explains, "'Trotskyism' is a general term of the highest abuse for an ideological adversary -- it has been variously defined to suit the circumstances."

The best that can be said for the authors of the Rodong

Shinmoon editorial is that they are not the first to use the epithet of "Trotskyism" in the context of the Kremlin's long-lasting dispute with Peking. The epithet was handed down by Stalin and has been used with equal license by his bureaucratic heirs in both Moscow and Peking. In fact, the stubborn reappearance of the epithet testifies to the fact that more is involved than simply exchanging denunciations.

The first extensive explanation on the part of the Soviet leaders about why they insisted upon connecting Peking and Trotskyism was contained in an article in the September 13, 1963, issue of Izvestia under the signature of "S. Ivanovitch." [See World Outlook, September 27, 1963, for the complete text. A reply by Pierre Frank, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, appeared in World Outlook October 4, 1963. For further examples see also World Outlook, November 8, 1963; and April 17 and 24, 1964.]

After denouncing Trotskyism as "a gathering of unmitigated opportunists," "conspiratorial," "rotten," "bearers of arch-reactionary concepts," etc., etc., Ivanovitch came to what was really bothering him:

"The Fourth International," Ivanovitch complained, "invariably characterizes our epoch as the epoch of imperialism, of wars and of proletarian revolutions, leaving out of account the fundamental changes in the relation of forces in the world arena that came about through the liquidation in a series of countries of Europe and Asia of the rule of the bourgeoisie and of the creation of a world socialist system.

"Recognizing the weakening of the forces of capitalism, it at the same time holds that the positions of the forces of socialism are precarious and denies the inevitability of the victory of the latter in peaceful competition."

No Marxist, of course, would deny the inevitability of the victory of socialism in peaceful competition with capitalism. Socialism is a superior economic system to capitalism and under peaceful conditions it would certainly triumph. In this sense, Ivanovitch only heaped another of many distortions on the views of Trotskyism.

But how "peaceful" is the "competition between socialism and capitalism"? It is precisely because capitalism is far from a "peaceful" system -- as every single person is daily and horribly reminded by the slaughter waged by Johnson in Vietnam -- that Trotskyists do not spread illusions about a "peaceful" transition from the present period of "imperialism, wars and proletarian revolutions" to the future "creation of a world socialist system."

Trotskyism stands for uncompromising struggle against imperialism; and the key question is not as Rodong Shinmoon sees it, whether this struggle is "violent" or "nonviolent" -- the ruling class decides that -- but whether it is effective or ineffective.

Does it hinder the expansion of imperialism? Does it stop the world-wide forces of counterrevolution and advance the forces of the international workers and peasants? Or does it aid imperialism, weaken the resistance of the workers and peasants, and ensure the victory of counterrevolution?

Such questions are not something artificial injected by "Trotskyists" from somewhere outside the class struggle. They arise in the process of the struggle itself and are of crucial importance. A good example is the case of the Indonesian Communist party which went down to defeat last year in one of the greatest political catastrophes of modern times.

Through a grossly opportunist policy, D.N.Aidit, the head of the Indonesian CP paved the way for the crushing of the Communist party and the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of its followers. His error was to place full confidence in Sukarno, the representative of the "national" bourgeoisie; i.e., the class enemy. And one of the ways he succeeded in maintaining this fatal policy against criticism from the left was to accuse his critics of "Trotskyism." For instance, at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist party in May 1965, Aidit declared: "The revolutionary offensive must also be directed at Trotskyism which has since long ago ceased to be a deviation from Marxism and which is nothing more than a gang of political bandits whose work is to organize intrigues and political crimes. The Trotskyites don the cloak of Marxism to attack Marxism, they raise revolutionary and 'left' slogans to oppose the revolutionary movement, so that they can within limits win over the politically uneducated masses.

"The Trotskyites are not forces of the left, nor are they middle-of-the-roaders; they are ultrarightists, consciously anti-Communist and anti-Nasakom. Therefore it is out of the question to build unity with Nasakom as the axis unless action is taken against the Trotskyites, as President Sukarno and the Indonesian government have done." [World Outlook, June 11, 1965.]

But what happened to the "unity" of Nasakom -- the coalition of nationalists, religious believers and Communists -- which Aidit (and Peking) so fervently desired? That "unity" ended in a slaughter of historic proportions.

The question must be put to Rodong Shinmoon: which position was "reckless" in Indonesia? The Stalinist position of "peaceful coexistence" with the bourgeoisie and a "peaceful transition" from that "stage" to "socialism," or the Trotskyist position of uncompromising struggle?

But it is not to be expected that the editors of Rodong Shinmoon will seriously consider this question. They chose to take up the cudgels against "Trotskyism" as a convenient way of signaling to Moscow that insofar as the leadership of the Chinese Communist party may actually follow a policy of international class struggle, the Korean CP leaders disapprove.

They prefer the line of "peaceful coexistence" in the style of the Khrushchevs, Aidits and Kosygin. It is the line least likely to disturb a comfortably ensconced bureaucracy, whatever the consequences otherwise.

"MULTI-ISSUE" ADVOCATES SPLIT ANTIWAR MOVEMENT IN CANADA

By P. Kent

Toronto

As Washington ruthlessly continued to mount its murderous assault on the people of north Vietnam, and Prime Minister Lester Pearson reaffirmed his government's approval of Johnson's policy at the well-publicized "meeting of minds" at Campobello, the opposition in Canada to these crimes suffered a serious setback.

The Toronto Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam [TCCEWV] was split wide open when some of its most viable forces were arrogantly excluded.

A few weeks earlier, the unity of the Vancouver movement against the war in Vietnam was broken when the largely campus-based Vietnam Day Committee was muscled out of the preparations for the August 6-9 actions.

These and similar developments elsewhere suggest a calculated effort to split this promising movement right across the country.

The Toronto Coordinating Committee was launched last February as a non-exclusionist body around the March on Ottawa, held last March 26 against Canadian complicity in Washington's war. However, at its August 29 meeting, a motion was jammed through excluding the University of Toronto Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the Students [highschool] Against the War in Vietnam [SAWV] and the representatives of the Toronto International Vietnam Day Committee and the Committee of Concerned New Democrats, both of which played a big role in launching the Coordinating Committee and the actions taken since.

The motion was motivated by a statement presented in the name of the liberal-pacifist Toronto Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, the Toronto Peace Center and the Toronto group of Canadian Action for Peace. It was backed to the hilt, if not actually inspired, by the Communist party.

The statement called for the exclusion of those (1) who want to build a "single issue" movement, (2) who want to link the Canadian antiwar movement with the antiwar movement in the United States, (3) who see the Canadian movement as part of a worldwide antiwar movement.

As against these aims, the signers of the statement contrasted their desire to build a "multi-issue" peace movement in Canada. In the ensuing argument, those marked out for exclusion from the committee were labeled "Trotskyists." The representatives of SAWV and the University of Toronto Committee, recognized by all as representing the most promising and dynamic forces, were called a "Greek chorus" of the "Trotskyists." Along with the Trotsky-baiting went all kinds of slanders against those under attack, including the charge that they had in effect "imposed" the demand for withdrawal of U.S. troops on the committee. The truth is that all official statements, including the large newspaper advertisement published in relation to the March 26 demonstration, listed withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam as a key demand.

The motion to dissolve the committee as it had been constituted and to reconstitute it, leaving out those holding the three specified aims, was passed by a very small majority after several delegates had walked out in disgust. Representatives of some important groups such as the vital York Committee were not present. Some of those present showed considerable uneasiness.

But the promoters of the splitting action blatantly admitted that the action was not democratic, that democracy was of no concern to them since they had the right to exclude anyone they wished. Underlying everything was the blackmail threat that if the motion did not carry, some of them would withdraw support from the committee. Attempts to reverse this wrecking action were frustrated by an announcement that the meeting was to be held at a certain place while a select group was informed that it would actually be held elsewhere.

The Coordinating Committee was thus converted into more of a name than a reality. What the splitters think they have gained is not yet clear. Some of them have a strong desire to play down Vietnam as a peace issue, for opposition to the war there demands more than perfunctory actions of the kind open to a multi-issue peace movement. For others the demand, "Withdrawal of U.S. Troops," which helps in mobilizing action because of its simplicity and clarity, is embarrassing. They feel that the slogan tends to alienate the wide spectrum of respectable currents that favor "negotiations." In addition, the slogan, "End Canadian Complicity," brands the Canadian Liberal government for supporting the crimes of Washington. It has been given only equivocal support by such forces as the Communist party, which has been vainly seeking allies in the Walter Gordon wing of the Liberal party for an anti-U.S. policy.

It is possible that the major forces in the newly constituted TCCEWV intend to content themselves with merely token opposition to the war in Vietnam in the future.

While the splitting action will temporarily confuse the

picture, playing into the hands of sectarians and opponents of the antiwar movement for a while, it will certainly not stop those who have been excluded. They will continue to move forward in their efforts to mobilize powerful forces in this country to end the war in Vietnam.

Efforts to build neighborhood organizations, delayed because at one time it appeared that the TCCEWV might stir itself to move in this direction, are now underway. Meetings have been called in three separate Toronto areas to launch neighborhood clubs. Two have held their first meeting and it is apparent that it is possible to attract new and viable forces into the struggle.

The possibility of mobilizing support for a large benefit affair for the Fort Hood Three (three U.S. soldiers who have been sentenced to prison for refusing to fight in a war which they consider to be unjust) is being worked on.

SAWV has just held a highly successful conference to launch this term's work.

The University of Toronto Committee to End the War in Vietnam has moved out boldly to build a powerful movement on the key Toronto campus and to spark a United Student Protest on November 11-12 on campuses right across the country.

The response to its appeal for support on registration days shows that there is a new, wide and active interest in Vietnam.

The first consolidating action sponsored by the University of Toronto Committee will be a mass meeting on September 28 which will be addressed by A.J. Muste, head of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee and initiator of the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee.

The call for a United Student Protest Action over November 11-12, days customarily set aside for commemorating the millions who died in the first two world wars, is winning Canada-wide support. The New Democratic party youth have already moved in to assure a big success on Alberta campuses. The Toronto committee has set up a communications committee to provide some coordination and to prepare buttons and posters.

#### UNREST ON THE RISE IN ECUADOR

The rising cost of living has led to a new rise in unrest in Ecuador. On August 24 bakers in Cuenca urged a nationwide strike by all bakers to protest a new boost in the price of flour. Demonstrations broke out in the streets of Quito August 25 to protest a 50% increase in bus fares. Students in Esmeraldas and Guayaquil struck for an increase in the educational budget, while 11,000 fruit workers demanded that companies be forced to obey labor laws.

WHY HEALY BOLTED FROM THE VIETNAM SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN

London

Anyone who relies on The Newsletter, the weekly organ of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League, for an appreciation of British politics, must arrive at a rather bizarre impression of what goes on in this country. In the left, for instance, to believe the editors, everything divides neatly into only two categories -- the good guys of the SLL and the bad guys who are trying to do them in, the latter consisting of assorted "fake lefts," "betrayers," "liars," and the ultimate in monsters, the "Pabloites."

The latest to be added to the list of evildoers in SLL folklore is Bertrand Russell, his secretary Ralph Schoenman and the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. The additions were made after a fancy maneuver under the auspices of National Secretary Gerry Healy that ended with heads spinning in at least his own organization if nowhere else.

The documents speak for themselves. [See World Outlook September 23 for full texts.] But they can be better appreciated in the light of a few facts concerning the background.

The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign got underway last December. It arose in response to the need felt by left socialists to take some action in England in opposition to the war in Vietnam and in behalf of the Vietnamese freedom fighters. The Campaign was projected as "a united front of individuals and groups, holding diverse political views and diverse estimates of the world political situation" organized in "defense of the principle of self-determination: defense of a small peasant country against the aggression, intervention and domination of the world's strongest industrial power." The Campaign called for "the unconditional withdrawal of the aggressor's forces, the removal of his military bases from Vietnam and the restoration of Vietnamese sovereignty to the Vietnamese people. We are ready therefore to support any and only those conditions for peace which are acceptable to the Vietnamese themselves, to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the National Liberation Front." (Why Vietnam Solidarity? Policy Statement by the National Council of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. Emphasis in the original.)

It was a relatively small formation -- a united front of various Maoist tendencies (which later broke from the Campaign); several African and Asian student organizations; the supporters of The Week, a journal that received national attention when one of its leading spokesmen, Ken Coates, was expelled from the Nottingham Labour party; the supporters of the International Socialist, which is distinguished by its contention that the Soviet Union is state capitalist in character; and the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (Russell himself having been the initiator). The leaders of the SLL expressed no interest at the time.

After participating in the Easter March and leading several

demonstrations outside the American embassy, in which several of its members were arrested, the Campaign attracted some attention and support around the country, becoming established as a factor in the antiwar movement. Its successes were mainly propagandistic, since it addressed itself to setting larger forces in motion, particularly the Labour movement. Its representatives held meetings and film showings where they argued for withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam in opposition to the position that echoes the Johnsonite line of demanding that Hanoi enter into "negotiations."

When Johnson gave the order to bomb Hanoi, the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, in combination with the Committee of 100, organized a protest march in London involving 1,000 participants.

If criticism could be made of the Campaign it would lie in its too close identification with Hanoi and the National Liberation Front. A sufficient basis for a united front would seem to be opposition to the course of American imperialism, its policy of genocide, the Pentagon's escalation of the war, and the mounting danger that Johnson will plunge humanity into a nuclear conflict, coupled with a demand for immediate withdrawal of the American troops.

In response to a call sent out by the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee of New York for International Days of Protest around August 6-9, the Campaign leadership decided to organize a protest meeting in London. This was to end with a torchlight parade to the U.S. embassy.

It was then that the Socialist Labour League decided to get into the act. Shortly after the protest meeting was announced, the chairman of the Campaign, Ralph Schoenman, was queried by a representative of the SLL concerning participation.

The overture was accepted by the executive of the Campaign and a meeting was held at which an understanding was reached. The nature of this understanding is now in dispute, Healy claiming he made no commitments, Schoenman claiming that Healy did commit the SLL not to use the Campaign as a forum for attacking other members of the united front (whatever the SLL did in its press), to drop the use of the offensive term "Vietcong" (it is especially offensive to the Vietnamese freedom fighters, being equivalent to the derogatory designation "Comms"), and not to attack the Vietnamese leaders nor the 1954 Geneva accords. On the basis of this agreement, Schoenman welcomed the SLL into the campaign, including giving them a prominent place on the platform of the protest meeting.

Healy's next move was to nominate Mike Banda, "the assistant General Secretary of the S.L.L.," for the list of speakers. This caused a reaction in the executive committee of the Campaign as it was felt that due to past bad experiences, some of the other speakers would be unwilling to appear on the same platform with Banda and this would complicate the problem of getting a balanced representation for the meeting.



The executive committee asked the SLL leadership to consider submitting a different nominee, if only for tactical reasons. The intention was not to veto a decision of the SLL but to engage in consultation on the special problems presented by including the SLL in the Campaign. The SLL insisted on Mike Banda, however, and the others in the Campaign went along.

Up until the time of the protest meeting, the SLL leaders appeared to be trying to act within the spirit of the verbal agreements that had been reached. The Newsletter dropped the use of the offensive term "Vietcong" and carried notices of the meeting. The SLL issued special publicity, including leaflets, to help make a success of the gathering.

Despite a thunderstorm and heavy rain, some 500 people packed into Mahatma Gandhi Hall, an estimated 200 of them being members or sympathizers of the SLL and the Young Socialists under SLL influence.

The main speakers were Laurence Daly, head of the Scottish Miners; Tariq Ali, former head of the Oxford Union; John Palmer of the International Socialist tendency; and Mike Banda.

The speeches were fine ones -- including the one made by Mike Banda, who went out of his way to thank the organizers of the Campaign for agreeing to representation of the SLL on the platform. "It's been a long time since we have had the opportunity," he said, "to speak on the same platform as other political tendencies."

The meeting was an enthusiastic one. As it progressed, the feeling grew that perhaps unity could be achieved after all in opposing the complicity of the British government in the war in Vietnam. The first speaker, Tariq Ali, received a rather lukewarm reception from SLL supporters in the audience, although his speech about how a person in the colonial world looks at America's actions was a good one. But it became evident in the actual course of the meeting that the factional lines drawn by the SLL were breaking down. For instance, John Palmer, whose name is anathema in SLL circles, got a long round of applause. Laurence Daly, too, was given a good reception.

It wasn't until the discussion period opened that the first discordant note was sounded -- and it was indeed a grating one. Several excellent contributions had been made from the floor, further inspiring hopes that a fruitful exchange of views might occur on how to build an effective opposition in England to the escalation of the war in Vietnam. Gerry Healy himself then took the floor.

The national secretary of the SLL launched a vitriolic attack against John Palmer, and then -- by allusion -- against all other tendencies, including the Communist party, the "fake lefts" and the Chinese and Russian bureaucracies.

To counter the effect of Healy's bitter remarks, the chair-

man appealed to the meeting to refrain from factionalism, urging that the platform of the meeting should not be converted into an arena for a tendency struggle, and that everyone should bear in mind the need to unite in support of the Vietnamese struggle for liberation.

It rapidly became clear, however, that Healy's speech was a signal. The very next SLL speaker took up where Healy had left off.

The chairman at once called him to order; and, evidently angry over the way Healy had violated the agreement, gave the floor to other speakers. When they tried to speak, they were howled down by the SLL and could not be heard in the din that was set up and the screams of "We'll smash you!" "Fake lefts!" and so on.

The meeting broke up in the disorder created by the supporters of the SLL.

An attempt was made by the organizers of the program to assemble the participants outside the hall in order to carry through with the scheduled torchlight parade. The less experienced and less hardened members of the gathering, however, were already leaving in disgust over the antics of the SLL.

Out came a huge SLL banner and off marched the SLL supporters behind the slogan, "Victory to the Vietcong."

Why did Healy engage in a maneuver of this kind, so discrediting to the SLL? Perhaps a sector of the SLL is uneasy over the extreme isolation to which Healy's policies have brought the organization and would genuinely like to find a way to open at least normal relations with the rest of the left. Perhaps some of them realize the need for a united front at least in the case of opposing the war in Vietnam. Did Healy come to the conclusion that he had to make a concession to these feelings?

It is difficult to determine what goes on in Healy's head. Perhaps he decided to engage in a united front tactic in order to "expose" the "fake lefts" -- in a single meeting!

The deduction appears plausible in the light of the way The Newsletter handled the August 6 protest meeting. In the write-up not a single speaker was mentioned outside of Mike Banda. An official SLL statement in the same issue of the paper declared that the SLL was "not in any way connected with this united front agreement" of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign.

The Newsletter followed this up by making public a letter from Healy to Ralph Schoenman further separating the SLL from the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign.

Another letter, dated August 16, was sent to Schoenman "breaking off all relations" with the Campaign.

When Schoenman responded with a letter, presenting his side of the dispute, the letter was published -- with the major parts conveniently deleted. This was accompanied with a long article answering the bowdlerized letter!

Banda's argument, like the "case histories" now common in The Newsletter, seeks to divert attention from the important issues at stake by attacking the person involved.

Thus a big point with Banda is Ralph Schoenman's opposition to the suppression of the free speech rights of Colin Jordan, the British fascist. The insinuation is that Schoenman has some connection with fascism, whereas he was only standing on the abstract principle of opposition to the suppression of free speech for anyone, no matter how detestable his views.

Likewise in the case of Bertrand Russell, the initiator of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. Banda attacks him for making war-mongering statements against the Soviet Union twenty years ago. A neat way of evading the fact that today Bertrand Russell is giving outstanding service in opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam! What is most curious about this is that The Newsletter breathed not a word about Russell's past when they published his appeal for the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign in the June 25 issue.

Banda's article ends with the ringing declaration: "To Messrs. Schoenman and Russell we say: To hell with your rotten 'united front' of state capitalists, Pabloites, Stalinists and centrists. Your campaign stinks and will continue to do so until you learn to fight in a principled manner. The Vietnamese will win, in spite of you."

Quite probably, the reasons for Healy's sudden entry into the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and his just as sudden departure are not unrelated to difficulties which the SLL is undergoing internally. The internal documents of the organization are riddled with appeals and exhortations from Healy. The ranks remain silent; or they respond with "silent" splits, "silent" factions, indifference and walkouts.

Healy's heavy-handed and ludicrous maneuver with the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign will scarcely improve matters in this respect. The forecast for the SLL is deepening isolation from the Labour movement despite one of the most favorable situations for revolutionary socialism in all of Europe.

#### TERRORISTS BOMB CUBAN EMBASSY IN OTTAWA

A bomb was set off in front of the Cuban embassy in Ottawa September 22, splintering the door and shattering windows in the area. A Cuban counterrevolutionary group in Miami said it was "only the beginning" of a new effort to overthrow Castro.

Bertrand Russell Answers Francis Flavius

SHOULD USSR GIVE EFFECTIVE AID TO BELEAGUERED VIETNAMESE?

[A sharp debate recently flared up among French intellectuals when Jean-Paul Sartre, the well-known playwright and Existentialist philosopher, advocated that the Soviet Union come to the aid of north Vietnam with more effective material means.

[This proposal was attacked as a "provocation" by such sources as l'Humanité, the official newspaper of the French Communist party. (See World Outlook September 9.)

[A proposal similar to Sartre's, made by Bertrand Russell in the form of a letter to Premier Kosygin July 20, met with comparable criticism from columnist Francis Flavius in the August 26 issue of the London Tribune. Bertrand Russell replied in the September 2 issue. The editor of the Tribune also published a letter from Tariq Ali supporting Bertrand Russell. Flavius then answered both Ali and Russell in his column published in the same issue. Below we have reproduced the attack levelled by Francis Flavius together with Bertrand Russell's reply.

\* \* \*

Flavius Scores Russell

I have the utmost respect for Bertrand Russell and his views, but I was shocked and amazed by the letter which he sent to the Soviet Premier Mr. Kosygin, on the subject of Vietnam, urging the Russians to send the Soviet Air Force to defend North Vietnamese cities from the vicious American air attacks.

Does not the man who requested both Kennedy and Khrushchev to draw back from the brink over Cuba, know what this could mean? It could spell out the first actions which would be the start of World War III? Does he want that?

Premier Kosygin replied [August 2] to Bertrand Russell in the most moderate of terms, pointing out that the Soviet Union has done everything to avoid a dangerous escalation of the war, but condemning the American action in no uncertain terms.

But why should Russell want something to occur in Vietnam which he rejected so vociferously in Cuba? It is surely a piece of muddled thinking. Or why did he not write to the Prime Minister of China and ask his reasons for not using the Chinese Air Force to defend the North Vietnamese cities? Indeed the Chinese Government itself has blamed the Russians for not sending more aid to North Vietnam, while at the same time making it difficult for the Russians to send such aid through to Hanoi.

What is even sadder about the whole business of Bertrand Russell's letter was that it was he who so clearly spelled out the dangers which nuclear strategy brought to the world. A small war could easily become the start of a large nuclear conflict. The very thing that Russell and his supporters have been so vigorously combating.

Francis Flavius (Tribune, August 26) is critical of my cable to Premier Kosygin, which he apparently has not read. I asked the Premier to turn part of the Soviet air force over to the Vietnamese for the purpose of defending the territory of Vietnam against their unrelenting air bombardment of the United States.

The issue which Francis Flavius chooses to raise is that of increasing the dangers of World War III and he compares my appeal to Kosygin with my request to Khrushchev and Kennedy to draw back from confrontation over Cuba.

The fundamental problem in both crises has been how is this world war to be averted without sacrificing the rights of the oppressed people whose social revolution was under such vicious attack by the United States. I am in no doubt that had the Soviet Union made clear at the time of the Bay of Tonkin that the Soviet air force would defend Vietnam against air attack, that air attack would not have occurred. The vast bombardment of a small people without an air force is the supreme atrocity and it is too terrible for supposed allies to allow such destruction to be rained on an heroic people, pitting their revolutionary spirit against the evil and gigantic power of the largest military arsenal possessed by any nation in the history of warfare. Thus, on grounds of elementary morality, there is an absolute obligation incumbent upon the Soviet Union, which has the means to accomplish adequately the defence of Vietnam against air attack.

I should point out to Francis Flavius that every piece of evidence we have about the war in Vietnam shows that the United States tests the water before plunging in. The Bay of Tonkin incident was faked, preparatory to full-scale bombardment of the North. World reaction was observed in between time. An incident involving poison gas took place before the massive and indiscriminate use of the gas was undertaken. Air strikes on the periphery of Hanoi and Haiphong were performed before direct strikes on these cities were risked. In all these instances, the pattern is that of Hitler's in the Rhineland and in Czechoslovakia.

Those who are anxious to prevent world war without betraying the Vietnamese revolution must consider how this is really to be done. It is too easy to say any defence of the Vietnamese is a provocation to the bully and the aggressor. On the contrary, unless the Soviet Union intervenes now with its air force to protect Viet-

nam, American imperialism will extend the scale of the war outside Vietnam precisely as it has within Vietnam. The Soviet Union will then be obliged to intervene on a massive scale or to permit the United States to carry on in its aggression. The lesson of appeasement is that nothing is gained by delay. In fact, delay makes more likely the larger conflict later.

The Soviet air force over Vietnam is clearly a defensive action restricting the conflict to the borders of Vietnam, but when Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and China are attacked the problem of the Soviet Union will be vastly more serious. It is precisely because the confrontation over Cuba occurred at the penultimate moment that nuclear war was so imminent. It is precisely because that penultimate moment will be more likely to occur that the Soviet Union is asked to act now, the better to avoid having the penultimate moment the only moment when it is possible to intervene.

Francis Flavius advances the official Soviet view regarding China's unwillingness to let Soviet military equipment and personnel pass through its territory. The Russians have been asked to say that an attack on China would be an attack on the Soviet Union. They decline to do this. The implications of such a refusal when combined with the request that Chinese territory should be so used, is clear.

Francis Flavius is late in supporting the Vietnamese, for he has been occupied, in the pages of Tribune, with pressing on them formulae for negotiations which would ratify the American aggression and the presence of American troops in Vietnam. If a world war is to be avoided, universal defence of the Vietnamese is the first prerequisite. Sitting on one's hands while the Americans do their worst is the surest way to bring the world to the point of no return, the point at which Cuba was in 1962.