

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. 38

December 2, 1966

In this issue

Page

Demonstration for Hugo Blanco at Peruvian United Nations Mission	1
Italian Labor Confederation Sends Appeal for Hugo Blanco	2
A Good Beginning for the International War Crimes Tribunal	2
Johnson Pounded Table at Manila Conference for More Troops	4
Saigon Cutthroats Trained by British Labour Government	4
The Political Crisis in Germany -- by Franz Dreher	5
Neo-Nazis Gain in German Elections -- by J.C.Vergeylen	6
Topic of Gromyko's Secret Talks with Johnson-Rusk Leaked to Press	8
High Proportion of Black Soldiers Sent to Vietnam -- by Evelyn Sell	9
Montreal Police Raid Socialist Opponents of War in Vietnam	10
Like Whites Exterminating the Indians	10
Behind the Resignation of Juan Bosch -- by George Saunders	11
Furor over Warren Report Grows in Volume -- by Arthur Maglin	13
Hanoi Reports Negro GI "Bring Us Home!" Demonstration	17
New Left-Wing Magazine in Italy	18
Reactionary Moves Against "Política" and Mexican CP	19
Desertions Said to Be on Rise Among Saigon Forces	19
Ernest Tate Beaten by Squad at SLL Meeting	20
Documents:	
Note on Four Documents Concerning Ernest Tate Case	20
SWP National Committee Demands Healy Be Expelled	21
Text of Letter from SWP to Pierre Lambert	22
Text of Letter from SWP to Tim Wohlforth	23
Text of Letter from SWP to James Robertson	24
Indonesian Generals Order Destruction of "Communist" Books	24

DEMONSTRATION FOR HUGO BLANCO AT PERUVIAN UNITED NATIONS MISSION

A petition, appealing for amnesty for the Peruvian peasant leader Hugo Blanco, was taken to the Peruvian Mission to the United Nations in New York City November 22 by John Gerassi, Felix McGowan and Paul Sweezy, officers of the newly established U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners. However, the petition could not be delivered for the time being. The mission had locked its doors.

The petition had been circulated and signed by students on New York campuses after news from Peru indicated that Blanco's appeal to the Supreme Council of Military Justice against his 25-year sentence in the dungeons of El Frontón had led to a new demand by military authorities for the death penalty.

Some 130 pickets, representing the Pro Independence Movement of Puerto Rico, the Young Socialist Alliance, the DuBois Club, the Socialist Workers party, Spartacus League

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

and student groups, marched in front of the mission for an hour protesting the threat to the peasant leader's life. Their signs read: "Down with Belaúnde's Democratic Farce"; "Free Hugo Blanco Now!"; "Support the Just Struggles of the Latin American People"; "Free Latin American Trotskyists."

A heavy police detail encircled the shouting pickets but did not attack them.

Hugo Blanco, the noted leader of the Cuzco Peasant Federation, was tried by a military court and sentenced to 25 years imprisonment in September, after having been held incommunicado in prison at Arequipa for three years. When his counsel appealed the savage sentence, prosecutor Alberto Vargas Ruiz moved that it be changed to the death penalty. The Supreme Council of Military Justice, the highest court for military trials, heard the appeal November 7-12.

After the picketing, the committee officers addressed a brief meeting of the demonstrators across the street from the mission. "This first action is only part of the big job that has to be done in acquainting the people of the United States with what is going on in Latin America," declared Paul Sweezy, Monthly Review editor.

New sponsors of the committee include Prof. Thomas I. Emerson of Yale Law School; Prof. Robert S. Cohen, chairman of the Physics Department, Boston University; Paul Booth, Students for a Democratic Society; William Kunstler, noted attorney; Sidney Lens, author; Harvey O'Connor; and André Gunder Frank of Sir George Williams University, Montreal.

ITALIAN LABOR CONFEDERATION SENDS APPEAL FOR HUGO BLANCO

Rome

As soon as the news was received about the fresh threat to execute Hugo Blanco, the campaign in defense of Peru's revolutionary leader picked up rapidly.

On November 12 the National Secretariat of the Italian General Confederation of Labor decided to send a telegram to the president of Peru, Belaúnde Terry. L'Unità, the daily newspaper of the Italian Communist party, reported November 15 that the telegram had been sent.

At the same time, in response to the initiative of several left-wing members in parliament, the new United Socialist party, which resulted from a fusion between the two parties headed by Nenni and Saragat, also sent a telegram to Belaúnde Terry signed by two secretaries, De Martino and Tanassi.

Other actions occurring at various levels were reported from various cities. In Turin a telegram was sent to the Peruvian embassy in Rome by the CIMO [Information Center of the Workers Movement]. Similar telegrams were sent by other circles or groups of militants in certain centers in Tuscany and Sicily.

The editorial board of the magazine Falcesmartello [Hammer and Sickle], composed of young militants of the Communist party and the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, sent a strong protest in a telegram to Belaúnde Terry.

A GOOD BEGINNING FOR THE INTERNATIONAL WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

London

After a three-day meeting of leading participants here November 13-16, an International War Crimes Tribunal was formally constituted. A declaration of aims and objectives was adopted and legal and technical machinery set up to prepare for formal hearings scheduled for next March in Paris.

At the invitation of Bertrand Russell, who initiated the body, a distinguished group of intellectuals and legal experts have joined the tribunal. Headed by Jean-Paul Sartre, they include Vladimir Dedijer, Yugoslav historian and writer; Isaac Deutscher, writer and historian; Mehmet Ali Aybar, expert in international law and a member of parliament in Turkey; Mahmud Ali Pasuri, senior advocate Supreme Court of Pakistan; former President Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico; the Americans, David Dellinger and Stokely Carmichael, well known for their vigorous opposition to Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam; and similar prominent figures in the academic and legal fields in Italy, France, Japan and the Philippines.

As the preliminary meetings convened, the leading conservative paper here, the Daily Telegraph, opened a full-dress attack, headlining the resignations of various heads of state from the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. These included President Léopold Senghor of Senegal, Emperor Hailé Selassié of Ethiopia, President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia and President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania.

The Daily Telegraph candidly admitted that "The Americans are known to have put diplomatic pressure on friendly Governments not to support the tribunal."

The same newspaper also carried a dispatch from its staff correspondent in Washington that the "United States Government let it be known today particularly in Paris that it would be displeased if any official support or consent was given to Earl Russell's tribunal on Vietnam 'war crimes.'"

Bertrand Russell replied to the resignations by regretting that sponsors of the Russell Peace Foundation had "yielded to intolerable pressure." He added that the tribunal was fully autonomous and would not bend to governmental pressure. This position was backed by members of the tribunal at a press conference November 16. Isaac Deutscher and Vladimir Dedijer emphasized that the tribunal would rigorously guard its independence from any interference by any state power, official or unofficial agency. They made it clear that it would finance its work through contributions from sympathetic individuals and organizations. They stressed that all funds expended initially came from a loan extended by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation which would be paid back and that control of the finances were under the jurisdiction of a special commission that would issue a public report at the conclusion of its work.

At the press conference, Russell read a moving statement on the establishment of the tribunal. He recalled that he had characterized the war in Vietnam as far back as 1963 as a "war of annihilation" by the United States government and that the events in the three and a half years since then had confirmed this assessment.

"We command no armies," he said, "and compel no audience to hear us. If civilisation is to be more than an unfounded hope, it must be possible for people who have sought only to contribute to it to claim the right to speak in its name and to defend it." He recalled the many wars and crimes that he had witnessed and lived through from the Dreyfus case and the crimes committed by King Leopold in the Congo to the injustices and crimes of the present. The acts reported by the Western press today "force one to look back twenty years for anything comparable in our collective experience....I cannot recall a people so tormented, yet so devoid of the failings of their tormentors. I do not know any other conflict in which the disparity in physical power was so vast. I have no memory of any people so enduring, or of any nation with a spirit of resistance so unquenchable."

The tribunal has set up a Public Liaison Commission, a Finance Commission, a Scientific Commission and a Legal Commission. It will send investigators to north and south Vietnam and invite witnesses to appear in Paris.

Skilled scientific workers have already volunteered to help in the inquiry and they will function under the direction of Professor Laurent Schwartz of the University of Paris, an eminent mathematician. The hearings scheduled to begin in Paris next March are expected to last three months.

The U.S. government and President Johnson will be invited to appear or to submit whatever material evidence they wish. The government of the People's Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of south Vietnam have offered their cooperation to facilitate the work of investigating teams in their respective areas.

At the three-day preliminary meeting here it was amply clear that the tribunal members, who are from many lands and diverse backgrounds and who hold divergent philosophies, shared a common feeling of historic responsibility to bring out the truth about what is happening in Vietnam and just who is guilty.

Some of the tribunal members were conscious of the historic precedent set by the commission headed by the American educator and philosopher John Dewey which undertook an impartial investigation into the notorious Moscow Trials of the thirties, and which amassed definitive proof that they were frame-ups concocted by Stalin and his secret police. The work of that courageous group of intellectuals, who resisted great pressures at the time, was eventually vindicated in the most resounding way.

The attitude of the Communist parties, both of the Khrushchevist and Maoist varieties, is still not clear. It appears that uncertainty exists in these circles as to what to say about the establishment of the International War Crimes Tribunal. While some

Communist papers have sought to ignore or minimize its significance, others have responded positively. The Bulgarian Communist party, for instance, gave it front-page prominence November 15.

In a British Broadcasting Corporation program November 14, Jean-Paul Sartre sharply criticized the negative and ambiguous line of the Khrushchevists as being responsible for the continuation of the tragedy in Vietnam.

It was quite evident in the preliminary meetings, that unlike many previous broad united-front committees, the leading participants in this one, such as Sartre, Dedijer and Deutscher, are determined to play an aggressive public role to push the work of the tribunal to a successful conclusion.

JOHNSON POUNDED TABLE AT MANILA CONFERENCE FOR MORE TROOPS

At the Manila conference October 24-25, Johnson issued soothing words about bringing "peace" to Vietnam. At the conference table itself, however, he raged at the other "summitteers," insisting that they escalate their participation in the war. He pounded the table with his fists to emphasize his demand.

The inside story was told by Manila Times staff writer Federico Pascual in the October 27 issue of his paper. He said his information came from "diplomatic sources who had access to the closed-door deliberations of the summitteers at Malacanang."

President Marcos of the Philippines, according to these sources, refused to sign an early draft of the communiqué finally issued by the conference because it was "bristling with warlike and provocative" phrases. The communiqué was then toned down to make it sound more peacelike.

Johnson jacked up President Marcos over committing only 2,000 Filipino troops to the war in Vietnam. He "reminded the Philippines," reported Pascual, "that its participation in the war effort...was meager and should be stepped up."

The communiqué issued by the conference was denounced by Ignacio P. Lacsina, general secretary of Lapiang Manggagawa, a labor organization, as a "counterrevolutionary charter whose objective is a fictional peace based on the suppression of the Vietnamese people's right to self-determination."

Johnson was met by antiwar pickets at the Manila Hotel where he was lodged. A number of them were injured by club-swinging police. Their placards bore such slogans as "Marcos: Puppet"; "Johnson, Dollar-Devil of the World"; "Stop This Crime Against Humanity."

SAIGON CUTTHROATS TRAINED BY BRITISH LABOUR GOVERNMENT

According to a London Sunday Times dispatch, reprinted in the November 10 Los Angeles Times, the British government's "attempt to assume the role of honest broker" in the Vietnam war is not as aboveboard as Prime Minister Wilson would like it to appear. In fact, during the past two years the Labour government has paid all expenses for training 1,450 South Vietnamese in the British Jungle Warfare School in Johore, South Malaya. "And the training program shows no signs of letting up."

"This year," according to the report, "seven specially designed 6-week courses are being run for the Vietnamese in Johore. And the arrivals have boasted some of the top Saigon brass. Other pupils this year included 22 Americans."

The Johore school was set up in 1948 to train British soldiers in putting down Malaysians. It was also very active in training experts for the fighting with Indonesia before the reactionary coup d'état in Djakarta in October 1965.

"Half the 6-week course is spent in the lecture theater," the article continues, "and in such activities as learning to jump from hovering helicopters and to recognize edible jungle fruits and berries. The rest is devoted to extremely tough exercises -- 'They painfully learn to use muscles they never knew they had' -- in the surrounding countryside."

THE POLITICAL CRISIS IN GERMANY

By Franz Dreher

Frankfort

At the end of October West Germany was shaken by two events: a full-blown cabinet crisis and a powerful political demonstration that brought out 24,000 persons in this city in protest against the "state of siege" laws proposed by the government and accepted in fact by the Social Democrats. These two events mark the beginning of the end of the exceptional stability which the German bourgeoisie have enjoyed for the past seventeen years.

The heavy defeat suffered by the government party, the CDU [Christlich-Demokratische Union -- Christian Democratic Union], in the Landtag [provincial legislature] elections in Nordrhein-Westfalen was the first overt symptom of the political crisis now affecting the West German bourgeoisie. This crisis is dual in origin. It is the result of a turn in the economic cycle and developments in the international situation, primarily a shift in American imperialist policies in Europe.

The slowing down of the boom in West Germany and the current scarcity of capital have caught the federal government in a contradictory squeeze. On the one hand, the Bundesbank, the bankers and wide circles in heavy industry are demanding a deflationary policy, a "hard money" policy, in order to balance the budget at any cost and stop the rise in prices. This would entail not only the elimination of many subsidized social gains granted to various sectors of the population during the "seven years of great plenty"; but also the imposition of new taxes. On the other hand, the unions (including the "Christian workers" wing within the CDU itself), commercial circles and even industries engaged in the production of consumers goods, demand a policy aimed at maintaining overall demand, with an increase in social expenditures and no increases in income taxes.

Because it did not agree with the increase in taxes projected by Chancellor Erhard, the FDP [Freie Demokratische Partei -- Free Democratic party] broke the coalition it had with the CDU, precipitating the governmental crisis inasmuch as the CDU lacked the majority of seats in the Bundestag [federal legislature] necessary to constitute a new administration.

The international situation is dominated by the war in Vietnam and by the concern of American imperialism to protect its European flank during the conflict in Asia. This has involved advancing and accentuating a policy of relaxing tensions with the USSR and placing increasing pressure on its "favorite ally" in Europe, West Germany, to recognize the Oder-Neisse line, reestablish diplomatic relations with the Soviet bloc countries, normalize its relations with the DDR [Deutsche Demokratische Republik -- German Democratic Republic] and give up the push for nuclear arms. West German diplomacy is not ready to "let go" in this way; it has not yet adjusted to this new situation.

The different elements in this crisis came to a head around Chancellor Erhard, leading to his replacement. Erhard seemed resigned to going, but sought to throw his weight behind Schroeder as his successor.

The SPD [Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands -- German Social Democratic party] has long sought to get back into the government, no matter what the cost. It is even ready to join in a "grand" SPD-CDU coalition headed by the most dangerous and corrupt of all the Christian Democratic politicians, the former minister of defense, Franz Josef Strauss. Yet it seems unwilling to lose a unique chance to gain an electoral triumph. All the polls indicate that if general legislative elections were held now in West Germany, the Social Democrats would win, if not an absolute majority, at least a higher percentage than it has ever gained in the past, including 1919. It would most certainly become the main political party in West Germany.

If Wehner and Brandt appear to be "hardening" in their attitude, it is not at all because they have given up the idea of a "grand coalition" with the Christian Democrats; it is only because they want to gain a more advantageous position in the coalition with the bourgeoisie. That is why they are demanding new general elections before constituting such a coalition.

An important wing of the bourgeoisie is not unfavorable to the Social Democrats returning to the central government of capitalist Germany from which they have been absent since 1930. The central problem at present, as they see it, is to stop the rise in wages resulting from the long period of full employment. They expect that an administration in which the Social Democrats would be included would help in this by

placing more effective pressure on the unions. They hope in particular that an administration including the Social Democrats would succeed in gaining the two-thirds majority necessary to revise the constitution and institute the "laws providing for a state of seige" [Notstandsgesetze]. This would provide the necessary legal instrument for establishing a "strong government," even a dictatorship, as in 1933.

In the current climate of "relaxed tensions" in Europe, the arguments of the ruling circles in Bonn on the need to adopt such laws in face of the "foreign threat" appear completely hypocritical. The admissions of the current minister of the interior are more believable. According to him, the laws ought to be passed in order to arm the state in case "the sun of the economic boom should cease to shine." The target is not so much the "foreign foe" as the "domestic foe" -- the German workers movement, the trade unions or at least their most radical wing, the socialist movement and its various groupings.

The unremitting campaign for these laws is aimed in particular at ending the procrastination and sham resistance of the Social Democratic leaders. As always, these leaders end up by accepting a little "arm twisting." They are ready now for the main thing; i.e., to collaborate in working out and voting for the laws, provided that parliament (that is, their own parliamentary fraction) is associated in applying them.

But among the youth, the intellectuals of the left, and the trade-union movement, opposition to these laws has likewise grown stronger and found expression during the long preparatory period. Initiated by a group of university professors and the SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- Association of Socialist Students of Germany, a group expelled by the Social Democrats], this opposition gained a broader mass base when a considerable section of the unions (particularly those in metalworking, chemicals, bookmaking, lumber) accorded it official organized support.

Thus the initiative of the SDS in calling a congress "to protect democracy" was picked up by a coordinating commission in which the metalworkers union constitutes the main force. The leaders of this union at first sought to convert the congress into a rather academic affair, limiting the number of participants to 3,000. But under the pressure of other unions, combined with the pressure of their own rank and file, the straitjacket burst. It ended up with 24,000 participants gathering in Frankfurt on October 30 in the most powerful political demonstration of the left seen in West Germany in many years.

The meeting devoted a day to study and discussion during which 7,500 participants (particularly trade-union militants and students) took up all the aspects of the Notstandsgesetze in six different panels.

Hundreds of automobiles brought the demonstrators from all parts of the country, and the smoothness with which the congress was organized impressed the participants no less than the energetic approach of the speakers (among whom were the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch, in exile for several years from East Germany, and Georg Benz, a member of the leadership of the metalworkers union).

Thus something more is occurring in West Germany than a bourgeois political crisis. The workers movement in turn is moving toward a situation in which a collision appears inevitable between the forces ready to go to the end in integrating themselves in the bourgeois state and the trade-union militants, who are step by step becoming more radical and political in their thinking.

NEO-NAZIS GAIN IN GERMAN ELECTIONS

By J. C. Vergeylen

[Since October 27, when the Free Democratic party left Chancellor Ludwig Erhard's coalition cabinet, the German government has been in a state of crisis. The elections in Hesse on November 6 and in Bavaria on November 20, it was hoped by the bourgeoisie, would indicate a way out.

[Unexpectedly, however, the Free Democratic party was reduced still further and the Social Democrats failed to come through with a smashing victory. Instead, the neo-Nazi National Democratic party made gains. These came on top of the showing made by the ultrareactionary political formation in the local elections last March in Bavaria and Schleswig-Holstein, when it chalked up around 10% of the vote.

[In Bavaria on November 20, the neo-Nazis made their strongest showing to date in that state, scoring 7.4% of the vote and winning 15 out of 204 seats in the state legislature. The Christian Social Union, the Bavarian branch of the Christian Democratic Union, won 48.2% of the statewide vote, and the Social Democrats scored 35.8%. This was slightly better for both parties than in the elections of 1962. The Free Democrats dropped only slightly.

[The article translated below appeared in the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche of November 19. The analysis it provides of the returns in Hesse anticipates the results two weeks later in Bavaria.]

* * *

The results in the Hesse legislative elections constitute a disquieting sign. A victory for the Social Democrats [SPD] at the expense of the Christian Democratic Union [CDU] was expected, along with a slight advance for the liberals [FDP -- Free Democratic party], who hoped to gain from their demagogic attitude toward a proposed tax increase. [The FDP resigned from the coalition when Erhard proposed a plan to increase taxes to meet a deficit of \$1,000,000,000 in the government budget.]

Upsetting all the forecasts, the Social Democrats increased their vote but little (0.2%), while the losses of the CDU (2.4%) and the Refugees Association (2.2%) helped swell the vote for the slate of the New Democratic party [NDP], the neo-Nazi party which thus won 9 seats in one of the parliaments of the Federal Republic as against 52 for the Social Democrats, 26 for the Christian Democrats and 10 for the liberals.

The NDP, which is shot through with the Nazi ideology, displayed virulent anti-parliamentarism during the election campaign. As the NDP put it, a parliamentary regime ends in nothing but incoherence and division. From this it is only a step to calling for a strong man capable of solving all problems.

Three officials of the Bavarian section of the NDP, including its chairman, Franz Florian Winter, resigned, holding that the NDP is honeycombed today with former Nazis, and that as a party it no longer offers what they had hoped from it.

About a year ago, La Gauche devoted an entire page to the NDP and the racist and fascist smell of its press.

If it is true that the voters in Hesse wanted to vote for new faces, it is also true that what turned them in this direction was the circus performance that has recently been put on at Bonn.

Last March in the municipal elections in Franconia, the NDP reaped its first successes. A little later it doubled its vote in the state of Hamburg. Now it has picked up 9 seats in the Hesse legislature. In the November 20 elections, another warning signal will certainly be seen.

While the ultraright is able to participate in the elections, move freely about and spread its racist poison, the KPD [German Communist party] is banned and can carry on only in the underground. The chairman of the KPD, Max Reimann, asked the party's sympathizers to cast their votes for the SPD in the November 6 elections in Hesse and the November 20 elections in Bavaria.

The federal authorities, so tolerant with regard to the activities of the NDP, are less tolerant when a militant of the left is concerned. A shocking example: the antifascist fighter Emil Bechtle, who is seriously ill, is still held in the prison hospital at Hohenasperg. He was condemned to eight months in prison in 1955 by the federal court at Karlsruhe for his militant participation four years earlier in the "Committee against the Remilitarization of Germany." He was not even allowed to see his wife, of Jewish origin, who was persecuted under the Nazis and who died while he was in prison. Meanwhile, the federal courts placed new charges against him for demonstrating against nuclear arms for the Bundeswehr and against the proposed "state of siege" laws.

The Social Democrats, Christian Democrats and liberals shrug off any responsibility for the progress of the NDP. Up to now none of them have suggested any measures whatever to bar a new version of Hitlerism.

Minister of the Interior Lücke has offered a quite simple explanation for the victory of these "ghosts":

"Certain demands of the Allied powers arouse bad memories of the Versailles

Treaty. Our Western friends must take into account the fact that we need a respite. We must give the youth a chance to believe in their own country and to convince themselves that we are not a mere appendage of Great Britain or France."

As to how to choke off the rising Nazism, Lücke replied: "Remind the Allies that it is their duty to wipe out the lawless Communist regime of East Berlin."

I prefer to leave it to the newspaper Le Monde (November 10) to draw the conclusion: "That's something to think about. The Communists, as is well known, are the electoral agents of Nazism. What if they should get the fantastic idea of setting fire to the Bundestag?"

TOPIC OF GROMYKO'S SECRET TALKS WITH JOHNSON-RUSK LEAKED TO PRESS

When Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko held secret talks with President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk in October, there was wide speculation as to the subject matter. Persistent rumors held that the People's Republic of China was one of the main topics discussed by the representative of the Soviet Union and the two representatives of American imperialism.

This has now been confirmed by the New York Times. In an article signed by the paper's Washington correspondent, William Beecher, the Times revealed some of the details November 22. They add up to evidence of one of the grossest betrayals in Soviet diplomatic history. At the very moment when American imperialism is reaching new heights of savagery in its war on the Vietnamese people and steadily increasing the threat to China -- thus while one workers state is under imperialist attack and another faces possible attack at any time -- Gromyko coolly told the White House and the State Department that the real danger lay in the direction of Peking! Truly not much has changed in the Kremlin's diplomacy since the days when Gromyko operated under the personal direction of his master Stalin.

In his talks with U.S. officials, said the Times, Gromyko "repeatedly stressed his nation's concern over a China armed with a growing arsenal of nuclear weapons.... According to some high American officials, the Russians have transferred special intelligence units and equipment to the border to monitor Chinese tests of missiles and nuclear warheads. These units were said to have focused previously on United States military activities."

"The discussions between Mr. Gromyko and the American officials were said to have ranged over a wide spectrum of world problems," continued the Times, "but to have returned often to the Chinese question."

An official "with access to the details of the conversations," was quoted as declaring, "Mr. Gromyko made clear that the break with China is quite fundamental and that Russia is now more interested than ever in settling other outstanding issues."

This includes a treaty banning the spread of nuclear weapons, according to a Washington official, but does not extend "unfortunately" to the war in Vietnam.

Here are some more choice bits: Gromyko felt that none of the disputes with China were worth a war "but that in a period of continuing ill-will between the two countries, there was always the danger that neither would be willing to back off from a small border clash and that such clashes could escalate and lead to a nuclear explosion."

Gromyko also implied that "as frictions continued to increase between the Soviet Union and China, a confrontation might develop. Mr. Gromyko was said to have indicated concern that the Chinese leadership might be tempted to launch an atomic attack."

The Kremlin's spokesman told the American imperialist leaders in addition that while the Soviet Union has such vast superiority in nuclear weapons that it ought to deter "any logical leadership group from initiating a nuclear strike...the Russians are not at all sure that Peking will always be guided by rationality in such matters."

The shamelessness of Gromyko's application of the Kremlin's line of "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism can be judged from the fact that in the same account, "experts on China" -- Washington's experts! -- were reported as agreeing that "for now at least, China is as eager as the Soviet Union to avoid a serious armed clash along the border." They noted that China has been involved in only two border clashes: once with India in 1962 and once with the U.S. in Korea in 1950 when U.S. troops were knifing toward the Yalu. In both instances, the clashes occurred with capitalist countries.

HIGH PROPORTION OF BLACK SOLDIERS SENT TO VIETNAM

By Evelyn Sell

The war in Vietnam has laid especially heavy burdens on black people in the United States. The bare statistics on Negroes ordered to go to Vietnam and Negroes killed in action testify to the fact that Afro-Americans are playing a role in the war far out of proportion to their percentage in the American population as a whole.

The Defense Department has released figures which show that 18.3% of Americans killed in Vietnam since 1961 were black soldiers; 23.5% of army enlisted men killed in 1965 were black; 14.8% of the American soldiers in Vietnam are black; 16.3% of Americans drafted are black. Measure those figures against the fact that Afro-Americans make up about 11% of the U.S. population. Another significant figure to be measured against the percentage of black men in uniforms and in graves is the fact that only 3.5% of the army's officers are black.

Michigan's two Negro congressmen, John Conyers and Charles Diggs Jr., have pointed to statistics that show that 50% of the front-line combatants in Vietnam are black.

In April of this year the draft rules were "toughened up," causing a drop in Negro draft figures to 10.8%. However, in October an "easing up" was announced in order to bring more men into the armed forces. It was found that too many men were being deferred because they had failed the mental tests. Lowering the standards on the mental tests meant 40,000 more men available for service -- and of that number, 33% would be Negro. Because the mental tests measure educational training rather than basic intelligence, the lowered standards affect Negroes more than any other section of the population.

A survey coauthored by Mrs. Caryl Conner, the editor of American Education, a journal of the U.S. Office of Education, showed that the rate of failure on mental tests among Negroes across the country was 67.5%. This compares with a failure rate of 18.8% among non-Negroes. The survey stated that a close correlation was found between the gulf in performance between Negroes and whites and the quality of education given to both races. Significantly, the rejection rates were highest in the South which is still notorious for its separate and unequal educational facilities. In South Carolina, for example, 85.6% of the Negroes taking the army examination failed.

Segregation and discrimination in the U.S. educational system is literally a life and death matter for black Americans. Jack Moskowitz, deputy assistant secretary of defense for civil rights, explained why so many Negroes end up in the front ranks: "Because they have second class educations. They have neither the skills nor the education to qualify them for work in technical or special fields."

He added that a major factor behind the disproportionately high percentage of Negro draftees is that more Negro youths are high school dropouts and unemployed; and, therefore, cannot claim draft deferments for reasons of college studies or employment in essential occupations.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell from New York pointed out another way in which inferior educational facilities for Negroes affect their service in the armed forces. Powell blasted the national deferment tests administered to college students this year and predicted that "an excessively disproportionate number of those failing [and thus made eligible for the draft] would be black students...because of inferior educational opportunities."

Lack of technical skills and training is one reason why an excessive number of Negroes end up in the front lines in Vietnam. Additional reasons were cited in a July 24 New York Times Magazine article. Victor Hall, a six-year veteran was quoted as saying: "There's a common reason why Negroes volunteer for the service and then re-enlist. The units in Vietnam, where those guys are dying, are almost all volunteer units, like the airborne. That means they asked to go there, or at least they asked to be put in a combat outfit and they wound up there. They did that for the same reason I did it and for the same reason most of the Negroes here did it. They did it because you get incentive pay in the airborne and the promotions are better in a combat unit.

"There's a dire need for money in most Negro cases."

Another veteran interviewed was Pvt. Lee Ward Jackson. With only one more year to complete in high school, he was forced to go to work to support his divorced, ill

mother. "I was going to high school at night to finish up," Jackson explained, "and I only had three months to go when I was drafted last December. They said night school wasn't good enough for a student deferment. I wanted to go to Grambling College. All I ever wanted to do was to teach. Then when I got into the Army I found out there was \$55 a month extra for being a paratrooper, and so I volunteered for the jump school. The one reason I did it was for my mother. That was the main reason. I went for the extra money, but I didn't know what I was getting into. I nearly quit the first time I had to jump, but I just kept it in my mind why I was doing it."

After citing a number of such interviews, the Times reporter summarizes: "There are, then, many reasons for the disproportion of Negroes in the Army. Fewer Negro parents can afford to send their children to college and so the draft law's preferential treatment for students militates against young Negroes. There are fewer and poorer job opportunities in civilian life for Negroes and so proportionately more enlist. Once trained by the service, whites can be sure of obtaining jobs with their service-acquired skills, while Negroes are uncertain that they can obtain jobs commensurate with their training.

"Once Negroes are in the service, their economically deprived backgrounds continue to influence their choices. As noted, they are more likely to be attracted by the \$55 a month extra paid to airborne troops..."

Stokely Carmichael, one of the most eloquent black spokesmen against the war, points out: "A mercenary is a hired killer and I think that when this country says to black youths...their only chance to a decent living is when you join the army...It's saying to that black man his only chance to a decent life is to become a hired killer."

Carmichael represents an increasingly articulate section of black militants who are opposed to the war in Vietnam. This black opposition had been blunted during the earlier stages of the antiwar movement because of the overwhelming problems of the day-to-day struggle against racism and because of the paralyzing effects of political alliances with the Democratic party and the Kennedy-Johnson administrations. During the past year, however, civil-rights militants have made giant steps towards independence from the capitalist power structure and towards a clearer understanding of the fact that opposition to the war in Vietnam is an integral part of their struggle against racism at home.

MONTREAL POLICE RAID SOCIALIST OPPONENTS OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Montreal

Four plainclothesmen, armed with a search warrant, invaded the headquarters of the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière at 66 ouest, rue Guilbault, and searched the premises for an hour November 10. They refused to show identification but stated their names verbally. The warrant stated that the search was for guns, explosive material, electrical devices, dynamite, detonators, clocks, documents and rubber stamps.

Of the listed items, the raiders found one clock, some rubber stamps and some correspondence. They took these as well as socialist literature, some files and a list of subscribers to La Lutte Ouvrière, a socialist publication available in bookstores throughout Montreal.

The Ligue's activities include the promotion of socialist ideas through literature, forums and demonstrations in opposition to the war in Vietnam.

Mrs. Patricia Mitchell, the president of the Ligue, stated: "The raid follows a pattern of harassment established in August when two members of the Ligue were arrested and held incommunicado for fourteen hours for distributing leaflets advertising a demonstration against the American actions in Vietnam. The raid yesterday occurs as the Ligue prepared for participation in the Student Days of Protest on November 11 and 12. It is an obvious attempt to intimidate those who oppose both the presence of American troops in Vietnam and the role of the Canadian government in supporting American actions." She called for the formation of a committee backed by unions, political groups and others to fight this and similar invasions of democratic rights.

LIKE WHITES EXTERMINATING THE INDIANS

In a Vietnam war propaganda story aimed at whipping up support on the home front, Lt. Col. Luis J. North, a commander of U.S. troops moving into the Mekong Delta, was quoted November 25 in the New York Times as saying, "Make them understand that this is just like the Indian wars, except that the helicopter has replaced the horse."

BEHIND THE RESIGNATION OF JUAN BOSCH

By George Saunders

A cryptic October 31 Reuters dispatch from Santo Domingo reported that Juan Bosch had resigned his leadership of the Dominican Revolutionary party [PRD -- Partido Revolucionario Dominicano], the social reformist grouping which rode to the fore on the wave of the April 1965 uprising. (Colonel Francisco Caamaño Deñó was a PRD activist.) According to the dispatch, Bosch "told the closing session of his party's congress last night that his resignation would avoid the danger of bossism in the party." It was added that he intended to leave soon for a vacation in Europe.

The report mentioned two other developments of interest. The congress expelled Martínez Francisco, who is serving as finance minister in the Balaguer government. It also demanded that PRD member José Antonio Brea Pena resign as Balaguer's industry and commerce minister. Clearly the attitude toward the Balaguer government has become an issue in the PRD.

Since losing the presidential race to Balaguer last June, Bosch has counseled a "constructive" attitude toward the conservative and pro-U.S. regime. Even before that, Bosch's willingness to run in an election imposed by the U.S. occupying force, coupled with the extremely conciliatory tone of his campaign, showed that he had no fundamental opposition to Balaguer and the pro-imperialist oligarchy Balaguer represents.

Bosch's campaign was supported uncritically, even enthusiastically, by the pro-Moscow Dominican Communist party [PCD -- Partido Comunista Dominicana]. The Fidelista June 14 Movement [Movimiento Revolucionario 14 de Junio] gave the Bosch campaign critical support -- offering some very sharp and very valid criticism -- and they blasted the PCD for its glossing over of Bosch's role. Although they did not field a revolutionary alternative to the two bourgeois candidates on the presidential level, the June 14 Movement did run their own candidates, showing healthy revolutionary instincts. Their avowed aim was to use the electoral arena to bring a revolutionary view before the masses. The pro-Peking Dominican Popular Movement [MPD -- Movimiento Popular Dominicano-Partido Marxista Leninista] followed a policy of boycott toward the elections.

Now the question of the elections, of attitude toward the regime that issued from them, and of the road to Dominican liberation in general has been sharply posed within the reformist PRD itself.

Revolutionary processes most commonly appear first among the youth. The documents approved at the recent national plenum of the Dominican Revolutionary Youth [JRD -- Juventud Revolucionaria Dominicana] are a case in point. The documents were considered "explosive" by the top leaders of the adult party.

The Dominican press was also disconcerted by these documents; none of the Dominican dailies would print them. Finally, Ahora [Now], a magazine which has a reactionary government mouthpiece before the April uprising but which since then has had a remarkable evolution to the left, printed them in its October 31 issue.

The two most important documents are the "Political Declaration" and the "Declaration of Principles." The first "condemns U.S. aggression in Vietnam and demands withdrawal of the troops." It also "condemns the dictatorial regimes of Latin America and Europe," (Onganía, Castelo Branco, Franco, Salazar, etc.).

The "Political Declaration" takes the following attitude toward the Balaguer government: "In the light of the corrupt origin of the present government, the PRD cannot consider it 'legal' and therefore should not confront it with a 'constructive and creative' position."

The document continues: "The Dominican people have rejected this government. How then can a revolutionary party collaborate with an antipopular, antinational government committed to the interests of the exploiters?" It demands that the Balaguer regime be confronted "with a resolute and revolutionary position." (Emphasis in original.)

The JRD envisages its own role as "not to support the 'constitutionality' of a fraud and an imposition, but to prepare our people for the long and bloody struggle that they will have to launch in order to achieve their liberation." The major step is "to end the Yankee domination of our country." And it concludes that "our principal enemy is Yankee imperialism." The task of the JRD is said to be "to make our party the vanguard of that struggle" whose victory can be assured only "with people, not with conciliators."

When Bosch at the PRD congress deplored U.S. imperialism because it "divides people in underdeveloped countries into Communists and anti-Communists," he must have had the evolution of his own youth movement in mind. But, a true liberal to the last, he does not choose sides; he chooses to go to Europe.

The JRD's "Declaration of Principles" is even more significant. In it the JRD defines itself as "a front of exploited classes which has emerged from the national reality as an instrument of the anti-imperialist and antifeudal revolution and which derives its principles from the materialist study of society and history."

The declaration goes on, "Our party has been created to contribute to the profound and radical transformation of the social, economic, and political structure of our country," adding that this transformation "must take place through the wise teachings of democratic socialism."

Within the left, the JRD declares that it is the "only left movement with possibilities of confronting the offensive of the right wing and of Social Christian reformism." (It defines the latter as "a fulcrum of the Catholic Church" which "preaches timid reforms that will not destroy the capitalist system.")

Rejecting blind anti-Communism the document states that the JRD "was founded to fight against imperialism, feudalism and the oligarchy. Our differences and our struggle with the Communist parties is not our first task as a revolutionary youth. We have to see in communism a competitive force, and our youth must, for the sake of democratic socialism, present the Dominican people with a clear and optimistic alternative." As for the parent PRD, the document has some implied criticism: "The PRD was not established simply to achieve power or to maintain certain formal aspects of democracy, which in our country only serve the interests of a privileged minority."

Giving the concept "democratic socialism" a more militant interpretation than is usually found, the "Declaration of Principles" states: "Democratic socialism means that it depends on the exploiting class whether peaceful or violent means are required to carry out a revolution." Also, "In struggling for the national revolution, democratic socialism takes as its goal the building of a democratic, socialist society. Socialist because the wealth, public services and the basic industries of the country will be in the hands of the state, while the other means of production will be directly in the hands of the workers through cooperatives; and the state will control all phases of the economic and social process. Democratic because the people will be assured of housing, education, food, and will be able to express their political and religious opinions freely and also to choose, without any compulsion, their political leaders."

On the immediate tasks of the Dominican revolution, the JRD took some strong positions. On land reform: "...we...call for an integral agrarian reform capable of destroying the latifundist system, which involves not only distributing state-owned land, but expropriating the land of the oligarchs in order to destroy their political power." On national independence: "...we will struggle against the subjugation of our country by foreign powers." On democracy: "...we believe in the democratic system of government, but the struggle for democracy cannot take place through democratic means... Even when the electoral process is functioning, there are other class mechanisms of compulsion, military and religious threats, which falsify and take away its content."

Thus Bosch's reformist party seems to be following a pattern familiar in Latin America in recent years. It was out of Betancourt's party that the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria] split, primarily as a youth movement. And in Chile, whole layers of the youth of the reformist Socialist party have evolved toward revolutionary Marxism.

Within the PRD itself there are differences suggested by Bosch's resignation and the condemnation of the PRD ministers in the Balaguer government. The magazine Ahora reports that the PRD leadership is divided into "moderate" and "radical" wings. The moderates are "inclined to maintain a so-called creative political opposition" to Balaguer. The "radicals" are those who "combat that line and propose that the party adopt a more resolute position." But while the "radicals" refuse to cooperate with the Balaguer government, they do not take a position in regard to imperialism or on the perspectives of the struggle.

The JRD, with its call for struggle against imperialism, not shying even from an armed struggle, and for nationalization of industry and the basic means of production, has departed sharply from both wings of the adult movement.

FUROR OVER WARREN REPORT GROWS IN VOLUME

By Arthur Maglin

The new wave of controversy over the Warren Commission's report on the assassination of President Kennedy is growing steadily sharper. Upholders of the Warren Report are now decidedly on the defensive. Former supporters of the Warren Commission's work have begun to join in the call for a reopening of the case.

The present situation in the United States was summed up by columnist Jimmy Breslin in the New York World Journal Tribune, November 21: "Today, an enormous amount of the American people feel the Warren Report is anything from a sloppy, incomplete job right out to a blatant cover-up filled with outright lies. At the very best, most view the Warren Report as a narrowly prepared document. The government, which issued the report, is looked on with suspicion."

Among the most significant of the Warren Report's growing list of critics is Life magazine. Life, a publication with one of the largest circulations in the United States, had formerly been one of the staunchest supporters of the official line on the assassination. Now, in its November 25 issue, Life presents the view that it is a matter of reasonable doubt that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in assassinating the president. (Other critics have argued that the commission failed to prove that Oswald was involved at all.)

Life examines in detail the question of where the shots that killed President Kennedy and wounded Texas' Governor John Connally came from. It concludes that the evidence about the timing and direction of the shots leads to the reasonable doubt that one man could have fired the shots. In the course of its examination of the evidence concerning the direction of the bullets, Life quotes Governor Connally's wife on how the crucial evidence of the governor's shirt and suit coat was handled by the official investigators:

"'As a matter of fact,' says Mrs. Connally, 'it was almost two months before any of the investigators showed any interest in examining John's clothing. When he went into surgery they gave me his tie, trousers and socks in a paper bag. We finally located John's shirt and suit coat, which we were concerned about because of the wallet and personal papers in his breast pocket, in Congressman Henry Gonzales' clothes closet in Washington.

"'I told the Secret Service and I guess the FBI that I had the clothes, but nobody seemed interested. After about seven weeks I took John's shirt -- it was all smeared with his flesh and blood, and dipped it in cold water several times to try and preserve it. Someone finally came to pick up his clothes. I think the Commission said his shirt was useless as evidence because it had been "laundered." But I never laundered it, I just soaked it in cold water.'"

In commenting on various recent books critical of the Warren Report, Life says:

"The most nearly objective book so far is Inquest by Edward Jay Epstein. It started out as a master's thesis in political science. Epstein, then a graduate student at Cornell, conceived it simply as a study of a government investigating body at work. In interviewing Warren Commission members and staff, he found bureaucratic bungling, hasty research to meet a deadline and a tendency to tailor evidence to fit a pre-conceived notion of Oswald's sole guilt. Epstein's own speculations on the assassination are open to question. But his report on the workings of the Commission is enough by itself to throw doubt on the Commission's conclusions."

Life ends its article with a call for reopening the case:

"One conclusion is inescapable: the national interest deserves clear resolution of the doubts. A new investigating body should be set up, perhaps at the initiative of Congress. In a scrupulously objective unhurried atmosphere, without the pressure to give reassurance to a shocked country, it should re-examine the evidence and consider other evidence the Warren Commission failed to evaluate."

Another mass-circulation magazine, Esquire, in its December issue, carries articles by two of the most prominent critics of the Warren Commission, Edward Jay Epstein and Sylvia Meagher. Epstein reviews several theories concerning the assassination and Sylvia Meagher offers details of what a new investigation into the assassination ought to look into.

Another surprising development in the assassination controversy is Harrison E. Salisbury's second thoughts expressed in a book-review article in the November issue of The Progressive. Salisbury, who is assistant managing editor of the New York Times, was originally one of the Warren Report's most vigorous defenders. Now, Salisbury calls for reopening the case. He writes:

"I began this review by citing my own conviction immediately after the assassination that Oswald was the killer -- a lone killer. My belief in this explanation was strengthened -- not weakened -- by the Warren report. I still hold to that belief.

"But the interesting, shrewd (and sometimes unfair) analysis by Edward Jay Epstein, in Inquest, of the methods, procedures, and internal 'checks and balances' within the Warren Commission convinces me that there are questions -- some of them of major importance -- which must be answered. And the exhaustive, stimulating (and sometimes prejudiced) reinvestigation by Mark Lane in Rush to Judgment establishes half a dozen areas which must be reexamined."

In addition to all the written criticism the Warren Report has been receiving, considerable critical comment has been aired over television and radio by such prominent reinvestigators of the Dallas events as Mark Lane, Harold Weisberg, Leo Sauvage, Edward Jay Epstein, Penn Jones and David Welsh.

Writing in Ramparts magazine's November issue, Welsh assesses the effect the revived assassination controversy has been having in Washington:

"The Warren Commission was appointed by Lyndon Johnson, was responsible to Johnson and respected a lawyer-client relationship with Johnson. It was truly 'the President's Commission'. A nationally syndicated columnist for the Hearst newspapers recently had an interview with Lyndon Johnson. He asked if it were true that Warren had been reluctant to head the Commission. Johnson replied in the affirmative. Warren, he said, had sent a note through an intermediary that he would not accept the job. 'But I ordered him to,' said the President.

"The Hearst reporter asked if the President had read the recent books about the Kennedy assassination. No, Johnson replied, but an aide had given him a full report.

"'What do you think?' asked the columnist.

"The President looked down for a moment, knitted his brow, then fixed his doe eyes on the reporter and said:

"'Warren's in trouble.'"

The reaction of the Warren commissioners to the assassination controversy has been varied. The November 22 New York Times quotes the head of the commission, Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court, as saying: "I was a district attorney in California for 12 years, and I tried a number of murder cases [an average of 15 a year -- N.Y. Times]. If I were still a district attorney and the Oswald case came into my jurisdiction, given the same evidence I could have gotten a conviction in two days and never heard about the case again."

The Times article deals at length with the present feelings of another commission member, Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia. Russell now says that he had some criticisms of the Warren Report when it was being written. His so-called "criticisms" reflect his rabidly anti-Communist political disposition. We quote in full what the Times says about Russell:

The Associated Press reported yesterday that Senator Russell had recently told The Atlanta Journal he was not fully satisfied with the report, and had prepared dissents that led to revisions in the final version.

"One was an objection to original wording that said categorically that there had been no conspiracy involved. Senator Russell was quoted as saying Justice Warren 'finally took that part and rewrote it himself' because 'Warren was determined he was going to have a unanimous report.'

"The final version said 'the commission has found no evidence that either Lee Harvey Oswald or Jack Ruby was part of any conspiracy, domestic or foreign, to assassinate President Kennedy.' Ruby killed Oswald two days after Mr. Kennedy's assassination.

"Senator Russell was further quoted as saying he did not feel assured that the Soviet Union had provided all available information on Oswald's stay there from 1959 to 1962. Further, he was quoted as not being satisfied that all facts about Oswald's Cuba-related activities had been brought out.

"Senator Russell, the report went on, said he agreed with Governor Connally, 'a deer hunter', in rejecting the theory of a single bullet wounding both the Governor and the President.

"He was also described as dubious about the value of testimony by Oswald's wife, Marina, who said under his questioning that she believed her husband was trying to shoot Governor Connally -- not the President -- although she added, 'I have no facts whatsoever.'

"Nevertheless, Senator Russell was reported to have said, despite his own lingering dissatisfaction, that any group of honorable men, given the same evidence, would have come to the same conclusions as the Warren Commission did."

A worse right-wing entry into the assassination controversy has been presented to television viewers in the form of a so-called documentary called "Hitler in Havana." This program was presented at the behest of Patrick J. Frawley, Jr., president of Eversharp, Inc., in behalf of Schick safety razor blades. Frawley and the Eversharp company frequently finance right-wing projects.

Columnist Jack Gould of the New York Times, wrote in the October 28 issue of that paper that through this pseudo-documentary "the affluent element of the extreme right wing makes a striking anti-Communist rallying cry out of the Kennedy assassination."

Gould gives this description of "Hitler in Havana":

"With inflammatory words and pictures but no pretense to hard documentation, the program invited the conclusion that Premier Fidel Castro, through use of propaganda, aroused Lee Harvey Oswald to violence and therefore was responsible for the assassination of President Kennedy.

"After newsreel scenes of the murder of the President, the program went on to contend that Communist influences in this country wanted 'to get a grip on the minds of a minority of American youngsters and convert them into carbon copies of Lee Harvey Oswald.'"

By contrast, the Goldwaterite National Review carried a much less frenzied opinion about the assassination controversy in its September 6 issue. National Review has Francis Russell, author of a right-wing book on the Sacco and Vanzetti case, review two books on the assassination. Russell writes:

"Lee Harvey Oswald's fantastic appearance on television after the assassination, and his even more fantastic television-viewed murder by Jack Ruby were the stuff of which myths are made -- and the myths were not long in coming. In spite of Oswald's checkered Communist background, the Left will-to-believe in a right-wing conspiracy was stronger than the facts.

"So, the expatriate Thomas Buchanan invented his Mr. X, a Texas millionaire who had arranged to do away with Kennedy in order to protect that Texas bill of rights, the oil depletion allowance. Leo Sauvage in France saw the killing as a conspiracy of police, gangsters and assorted right-wingers. The German-born Joachim Joesten imagined a league of death that included the FBI, the CIA, the Army and the by-now-inevitable oil millionaires. From the other side of the 'nut' spectrum the John Birch Society also saw government officials as involved in the assassination, made necessary after Kennedy showed signs of renegeing on his 'Communist' past. In the Birch version Secretary McNamara was already making arrangements for the funeral a week before the President was killed."

Francis Russell says later on in his article:

"I must admit to having picked up these two books critical of the Commission and its findings -- Edward Jay Epstein's Inquest and Mark Lane's Rush to Judgment -- with the irritated feeling that two dissenters were engaged in a process similar to that of challenging the Sacco ballistics evidence. I finished by absorbing certain of the authors' doubts, and certainly doubts as to the adequacy of the task performed by the Warren Commission."

In his concluding paragraph, Francis Russell joins the call for reopening the investigation:

"In many such examples, including the mystery of the photographs made of the Depository sixth-floor window at the very moment of the crime, it seems to me that Lane has proved his point against the Commission. It just did not do its job properly. Senator Ted Kennedy was interviewed after the Epstein book appeared. He said he had not read the Warren Report but he was convinced from other sources that Oswald alone and without other assistance was his brother's killer. Certainly the resources of the Kennedy family are large enough for them to have investigated amply on their own, and no doubt they have done so. I think Senator Kennedy is right. The contradictions and apparent enigmas can be resolved. There is probably a rational explanation for the throat wound, for the time sequences shown by the Zapruder film, for the pseudo-Oswald and other questions raised by Mr. Lane. What is needed now is a commission to investigate the Warren Commission and its findings."

The most important recent development concerning the evidence in the Kennedy case was the turning over to the National Archives by the Kennedy family of autopsy X-rays and photographs. A November 1 dispatch to the New York Times says:

"Photographs and X-rays taken of President Kennedy's body at the autopsy after his assassination were turned over to the National Archives yesterday by the Kennedy family.

"This was disclosed tonight by the Justice Department, which said that under an agreement with the family the 65 X-rays, color slides and black and white negatives would be available to Federal law-enforcement agencies.

"However, for the next five years access by scholars and other unofficial investigators will be granted only with the consent of the family."

Later the article goes on to say:

"The department spokesman, who asked not to be identified, said tonight that the action was prompted in part by several recent books that expressed doubt about the Warren Commission's conclusions.

"A rash of recent books and articles have questioned the commission's conclusion that a single bullet from the rifle of Lee Harvey Oswald passed through the President's body and struck Gov. John B. Connally Jr. of Texas."

Further on the Times reports:

"According to the spokesman, use of the photographs and X-rays will be restricted as follows:

"-- Access will be immediately granted to law-enforcement officials of all Federal investigative agencies.

"-- No public display or release will be permitted.

"-- For the next five years access by scholars and other unofficial investigators will be granted only with the specific consent of the Kennedy family. After five years, the family will permit qualified pathologists and other medical experts to study the items.

"These limitations will remain in effect throughout the lifetimes of Mrs. Kennedy, the late President's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, and the President's two brothers and sisters and his two children."

The restrictions on the examination of the photographs by unofficial investigators have tended to increase suspicion of the Warren Report. At his November 4 press conference President Johnson was asked about "why this material is still not available to competent nongovernment investigators." It is clear from the full answer that Johnson tried to duck the question:

"Well first I think it's been available to the Warren Commission any time it wanted to see it. Second, I think it's available to any official body now. Third, I think that every American can understand the reasons why we wouldn't want to have the garments and the records and everything paraded out in every sewing circle in the country to be exploited and used without serving any good or official purpose.

"And it is my understanding -- all this took place while I was away [on his Far East tour -- A.M.] -- but it's my understanding that there's never -- most of this has been over in the archives, stored, all the time. It's always been available to the Warren Commission or the Government, the Justice Department, the F.B.I., to the late beloved President's brother, the Attorney General, during the period the Warren Commission was studying this thing and I certainly would think he'd have a very thorough interest in seeing that the truth was made evident and I believe he did have.

"And I think that he and the F.B.I. and the entire Government made available everything that the commission wanted and I think they made a very thorough study. I know of no evidence that would in any way cause any reasonable person to have a doubt about the Warren Commission, but if there is any evidence brought forth, I'm sure that the commission and the appropriate authorities will take action that may be justified."

The New York Times reported another reaction to the turning up of the X-rays and photographs, the whereabouts of which previously had been unknown, in its November 21 issue. The following quotation from the Times also contains some other interesting notes on the assassination controversy:

"In a taped 'Youth Wants to Know' interview over WABC-TV yesterday, Mr. Lane proposed that such a commission [of prominent and respected individuals not connected with the government to reinvestigate the assassination -- A.M.] get full Government support, with power of subpoena and power to punish witnesses for contempt. He said it should not have members associated with the Government.

"Mr. Lane also reported he had written to the late President's brother, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Democrat of New York, asking permission to examine X-rays and photographs taken during the autopsy on the President.

"The New York lawyer asserted Senator Kennedy had not yet responded, but said:

"'I know Robert Kennedy sent a message to Professor [Hugh] Trevor-Roper, who wrote the introduction to my book, in which he said to keep up the good work.'

"Professor Trevor-Roper, a historian, reached last night in Oxford, England, said, 'No such message from Robert Kennedy has ever been received by me.'

"Mr. Lane could not be reached for further comment, nor could Senator Kennedy or spokesmen for him."

In any case, the only concerted effort to counter the critics thus far made public has been that of two teams of researchers at the University of California at Los Angeles Law School under the direction of Wesley J. Liebeler. Liebeler was a key man on the Warren Commission's legal staff. He says that the study had been prompted by two books: Inquest by Edward Jay Epstein and Rush to Judgment by Mark Lane. Lane's book has been on the nonfiction best-seller list for about three months. It is now at the top of the list. The publisher recently reported that there were 195,000 copies in print.

So, the American people are now confronted with a wide-open "credibility gap" and one that gets wider all the time. Suspicion falls on the Warren commissioners, the FBI which did most of its investigative work, and on the president who appointed the commission.

HANOI REPORTS NEGRO GI "BRING US HOME!" DEMONSTRATION

According to an October 27 Hanoi dispatch reported by the Hsinhua News Agency, eight Negro soldiers of the U.S. 3rd Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, stationed at Lai Khe, Thu Dau province, south Vietnam, demonstrated September 23 in front of the U.S. billet, shouting, "Bring us home!" and "No fighting!"

They were roughly handled, according to the report which emanated from the National Liberation Front and three were killed on the spot. Next day the remaining five resumed their struggle, repeating their demand to go back home. They were supported by white GI's in the same division, again according to the same source.

"In August," the Hsinhua News Agency continues, "over 3,000 American marines at Chy Lai base, Quang Nam province, also refused to go raiding and urged repatriation. Two hundred of them were arrested and savagely beaten by their U.S. commanders."

NEW LEFT-WING MAGAZINE IN ITALY

Rome

The appearance of a new monthly magazine La Sinistra [The Left] has aroused wide interest in left-wing circles in Italy. With a national circulation of possibly 13,000 copies to begin with, the first issue [October] became an immediate topic of conversation.

The table of contents includes:

-- "Verso una nuova unità sindacale?" [Toward Another Trade Union Unification?] by Antonio Lettieri, a union leader and member of the Central Committee of the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity.

-- "Sulla Cina" [On China], an editorial on the internal situation in China and the threat of imperialist aggression.

-- "La socialdemocrazia unita: partito di ricambio della borghesia" [The United Social Democracy -- Alternative Party of the Bourgeoisie] by Augusto Illuminati, a former secretary of the Communist Youth in Rome and until recently a full-scale official of the Communist party, who was expelled in a very bureaucratic way.

-- "Antonio Gramsci e la rivoluzione in Italia" [Antonio Gramsci and the Italian Revolution] by Lucio Colletti, the editor of La Sinistra and a former member of the Communist party.

-- Greetings to La Sinistra from Bertrand Russell together with a translation of his appeal to the American conscience and explanation of the purpose of the International War Crimes Tribunal initiated by him.

-- "Stalin e l'aggressione nazista all'Unione Sovietica" [Stalin and the Nazi Aggression Against the Soviet Union], the minutes of a discussion between Soviet historians and representatives of the General Staff of the Soviet Army. [See World Outlook November 11 for an English translation.]

-- "Programmazione e Capitalismo" [Programming and Capitalism], an unsigned article dealing with capitalist efforts to stabilize the economy, particularly in Italy, and the attitude in left circles towards capitalist programming.

-- "La Rivoluzione Timorata" [The Pious Revolution] by Antonio Moscata. This is an article by a member of the Communist party on a recent congress held by an organization of Catholic workers.

-- "Lo sviluppo scientifico-tecnico e la società sovietica" [Soviet Society and Developments in Science and Technology] by Massimo Aloisi, a well-known scientist.

There are, in addition, several short items, including one by Luigi Nono, a member of the Communist party celebrated for his work in music. His article is entitled "Il musicista nella fabbrica" [A Musician in the Factories].

The views of La Sinistra were indicated in a prospectus sent out before the first issue appeared. Among other things, the prospectus declared:

"The escalation of American imperialist aggression against Vietnam; the fact that there has been no spontaneous evolution, in a progressive sense, of the underdeveloped countries, many of which, on the contrary, have recently undergone violent and terroristic forms of reaction; the deep crisis which has invested the socialist countries as a whole, the Sino-Soviet conflict being but its more open and consequential expression -- these are all elements inviting drastic reexamination of the analyses and strategies proposed for the past ten years, with special reference to the concept of 'peaceful coexistence' and all its multiform implications."

The prospectus stressed the need for research work dealing with some of the "big political theoretical themes, such as the nature and the role of the state, the crisis and limitations of parliamentary institutions, the dynamics of the class struggle, the development of tendencies and internal contradictions in the capitalist system of today in America and Europe."

The prospectus stated the need for a new revolutionary party and concluded as follows: "Not a party of the typical left, consisting of a regroupment of 48% of 'democratic public opinion,' but a homogeneous class force, living and fighting, capable of

constructing a socialist alternative, free from strings leading to foreign states but strongly internationalist. This organized force can and must emerge by combining existing energies, mainly in the various parties of the left, on the basis of a new strategy and a regime of genuine internal democracy. La Sinistra aims to serve as a point of connection and as an intellectual and political spur in that direction."

A one-year subscription is 1,500 lire [US\$2.40]. The address is La Sinistra, Casella Postale 6163, Rome, Italy.

REACTIONARY MOVES AGAINST "POLITICA" AND MEXICAN CP

According to the October 30 La Voz de México [The Voice of Mexico], the newspaper of the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist party, the Mexican bourgeoisie project an immediate "escalation" of repressive measures in the country.

The government appears about ready to launch a two-pronged attack -- one to suppress the biweekly magazine Política, the other to ban the Communist party.

Commenting on the projected scheme against Política, the weekly CP paper said that the campaign launched against its editor Manuel Marcué Pardiñas was part and parcel of the plot. The ferocious campaign was aimed at removing Política's editor from the political scene, "including physically."

"The disappearance of Política as a victim of reactionary violence, besides being a crime would mean losing a tribune...on which the democratic and progressive forces of Mexico depend."

The presidium of the Central Committee issued a communiqué October 27 stressing the meaning of the reactionary moves, linking them to the way in which such "left" publications as El Día [The Day] and Siempre! [Always!] have recently turned to applauding repressive acts in Mexico. Previously they had never joined in the McCarthyite chorus of the ultrareactionary press.

The most ominous and telling note in the moves now underway was the attack levelled against the Communist party by the sinister Lombardo Toledano in the November 2 issue of Siempre! Among the choice bits was the affirmation that the CP, "former enemy of the Trotskyists...parallels them and the emulators of China and advocates following the experience of the Cuban Revolution."

In this way Lombardo is indicating a legal angle whereby the Mexican police could arrest any member of the Mexican Communist party under accusation of committing the "crimes" of social dissolution, rioting, advocating violence, etc.

It is worth noting that accusations made by Lombardo in the past have been utilized by the police to condemn revolutionists to long years in prison. For instance, in the trial in which the leaders of the railway workers were convicted following the 1959 strike, Lombardo's attacks against them were presented as "proof" of the charges lodged against them. The general secretary of the Railway union, Demetrio Vallejo, was condemned to twenty-six years in prison.

Víctor Rico Galán, the well-known socialist-minded journalist, was arrested just two days after one of Lombardo's lieutenants denounced him as a "Trotskyist"! After he was arrested, Rico Galán was accused by a member of the Central Committee of Lombardo's party of being an "agent" of the Guatemalan guerrilla leaders Yon Sosa and Luis Turcios.

DESERTIONS SAID TO BE ON RISE AMONG SAIGON FORCES

Hanoi continues to report rising desertions among the armed forces of the puppet Saigon regime. Two revolts were cited in the November 7 news release of the Hsinhua News Agency. One occurred October 5 among the troops stationed in Chau Thanh; the second on October 16 in Ong Tong. "Taking coordinate action with the Liberation Armed Forces," Hsinhua declared, "they wiped out an entire enemy platoon, killed and captured two dozen troops and captured large quantities of arms and military equipment."

In the first nine months of this year, there were 36 similar cases in Tan An and Cholon provinces. "The growing scale of insurrections has caused a grave shortage of manpower in many puppet units."

ERNEST TATE BEATEN BY SQUAD AT SLL MEETING

London

An attempt to revive the methods made notorious by Stalinism in the thirties appears to be underway in England. This time it is being done by the leadership of the Socialist Labour League, an ultraleft sectarian organization that makes the fraudulent claim of being "Trotskyist."

The latest incident was the brutal beating of Ernest Tate, an internationally known Trotskyist who has been active in London in the work of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the International War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell. He is the manager of Pioneer Book Service, the major supplier of Trotskyist literature in England.

Ernest Tate was distributing literature in front of a meeting sponsored by the Socialist Labour League at Caxton Hall November 17. The items he was selling included the International Socialist Review and a pamphlet Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International.

Six young toughs jumped Tate, smashing his glasses and bringing him down to the pavement. In commando fashion they continued to kick him, aiming at his genitals, kidneys and head, until pulled off by horrified spectators. Tate had to be hospitalized.

Witnesses stated that they recognized the assailants as members of the Socialist Labour League. Thomas Gerard Healy, the general secretary of the organization, appeared to be supervising the action personally.

Nothing like this has been seen in the radical movement in England since the thirties when Stalinists physically assaulted Trotskyists to prevent them from speaking their views and selling their newspapers. In those days, the Stalinists tried to rationalize their gangster attacks by slandering the Trotskyists as counterrevolutionaries.

The attempt to revive Stalinist methods was preceded by comparable slander in the Healyite press aimed at prejudicing members of the Socialist Labour League so as to prevent them from reading material such as that provided by the Socialist Workers Party and the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

A particular target has been the pamphlet Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International, which includes a series of documents exposing the dictatorial methods employed by Healy in running the Socialist Labour League.

In denouncing the pamphlet in the August 20 Newsletter, the Political Committee of the Socialist Labour League included the following open threat: "We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it around the cynical fake-left in England."

The news of the shameful and cowardly attack spread swiftly in left circles in London. Messages began coming in very quickly from many politically left circles and trade unions. A conference is being called at an early date to consider what steps can be taken to block any further development of such cancerous methods threatening the democratic rights of all radicals.

NOTE ON FOUR DOCUMENTS CONCERNING ERNEST TATE CASE

The four documents printed below all concern the assault committed on Ernest Tate at the entrance of a meeting sponsored by the Socialist Labour League in London November 17. The importance of the case lies in the fact that from all the evidence, it appears to have been deliberately incited and even planned by the leadership of the Socialist Labour League.

The documents are largely self-explanatory. All that needs be added is a brief indication of the nature of the dispute among those involved.

Ernest Tate is the manager of Pioneer Book Service, the main source of Trotskyist literature in England. Politically he is with the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.

The Socialist Labour League is an ultraleft sectarian formation that refused to

abide by majority decision in 1963 when the bulk of the world Trotskyist movement decided, on the basis of a statement of principles reaffirming the program of Trotskyism, to heal a split that had existed for almost ten years. Since this reunification, the SLL leaders -- and this boils down in practice to Healy -- have carried on a bitter war against the Fourth International.

Pierre Lambert is the head of a grouping in France that agrees with Healy in this, although the group has displayed less energy in pursuing the subject.

The Socialist Workers party supported the reunification of the world Trotskyist movement and shares the political outlook of the United Secretariat on the major current political questions, such as opposition to U.S. aggression in Vietnam and defense of the Vietnamese revolution. The Socialist Workers party is not affiliated to the Fourth International because of reactionary legislation in the United States.

Tim Wohlforth and James Robertson were members of the Socialist Workers party. They disagreed with the reunification of the world Trotskyist movement. In addition they developed serious political differences with the Socialist Workers party on a number of questions, particularly in relation to the Cuban revolution.

Both Wohlforth and Robertson moved closer and closer to Healy's position. This involved them in violations of discipline that were incompatible with membership in the Socialist Workers party and they were eventually expelled.

However the two developed their own differences. Healy sought to play the role of arbiter between them for a time but finally chose Wohlforth as the more pliant of the two. At an international conference organized by Healy and Lambert, Robertson was thrown out in quite unceremonious fashion.

A number of documents related to this expulsion and similar events at the conference were compiled as a pamphlet and published under the title Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International. A preface was supplied by Joseph Hansen, "Sectarianism and Tinpot Despotism -- an Example for the Textbooks." The preface examined the happenings at the conference in detail and drew some general conclusions as to what had been revealed about the political positions of the participants.

Completely unable to answer, still less refute, this small forty-page pamphlet, which was published last June, the leadership of the Socialist Labour League responded instead with charges, thought up around Healy's desk, the flavor of which can be sampled from phrases like the following: The United Secretariat of the Fourth International "now emerges as the 'left cover' for bureaucracy and imperialism, and calls in the police to deal with the Young Socialists who commemorate the Hungarian Revolution"; by offering critical support to Herbert Aptheker, a candidate of the Communist party, the Socialist Workers party "is merely covering up the fact that it is initiating a sly stage-by-stage orientation towards the Democratic Party itself"; "When you say A. for Aptheker, you will be soon shouting P. for the police"; "Any revisionist tendencies which in one form or another adapt themselves politically to the Stalinists are, in our opinion, mortal enemies." These are taken from a single article signed by Healy and published in the November 5 Newsletter.

The pamphlet itself was greeted with nothing less than a statement by the Political Committee of the SLL charging the Socialist Workers party with having "capitulated to imperialism," and "sold out the anti-war movement" and with acting as "finger-men for the State Department." The pamphlet was called a "provocation" that "constitutes a complete and irreversible departure even from revisionism." The course of action decided on by this body was indicated as follows: "We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it around the cynical fake-left in England."

From "theory" -- if it can be called that -- it was but a small step to practice. Healy's politics thus became reduced to the level of physically assaulting those whom he is incapable of meeting on the plane of ideas and arguments.

SWP NATIONAL COMMITTEE DEMANDS HEALY BE EXPELLED

National Committee, Socialist Labour League
186 Clapham High St., London, S.W.4, England

November 21, 1966

Dear Comrades,

We call your attention to an exceedingly grave occurrence that will forever dis-

grace the Socialist Labour League unless you undertake the most rapid and energetic action.

On November 17, Ernest Tate, an internationally known Trotskyist who has been active in furthering the work of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the International War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell, was set upon by a gang at the entrance of your public meeting on that date at Caxton Hall. He was seriously beaten by six young toughs and had to be hospitalized.

All the evidence shows that these assailants were not would-be fascists attracted to your meeting but members of your organization and that they were acting under the direct personal supervision of your general secretary Thomas Gerard Healy.

The six who overpowered Comrade Tate and kicked him in the head, kidneys and genitals used this way of preventing him from selling literature to people entering the hall.

This literature included copies of the International Socialist Review and a pamphlet, Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International.

We ask you to do four things:

(1) To at once place your general secretary on trial for sponsoring such methods. The least that can be said of the employment of physical violence in this way is that it is reminiscent of the tactics employed by the Stalinists against their political opponents in the workers movement, particularly against Trotskyists, in the worst period of the thirties.

(2) To publicly and forthrightly condemn these hoodlum tactics sponsored by your general secretary against a member of a workers organization holding different political views from yours.

(3) To expel all those involved for engaging in an act that dishonors the labor and socialist movement.

(4) To immediately assure all workers organizations in Britain, through a prominently placed notice in your journal, The Newsletter, that you have undertaken measures to prevent any repetition of such criminal assaults on workers holding political views differing from your own and that you will guarantee protection of the democratic right of all opponent groups to offer their literature at the entrance to your meetings.

Fraternally,

National Committee

Socialist Workers Party

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

TEXT OF LETTER FROM SWP TO PIERRE LAMBERT

November 21, 1966

Pierre Lambert
Informations Ouvrières
39, rue du Faubourg du Temple
Paris 10, France

Dear Comrade Lambert,

We are enclosing copies of various communications concerning a matter that holds the gravest implications for the organization you head, as you will no doubt quickly see.

The principal one is a letter from the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the National Committee of the Socialist Labour League. It concerns the serious beating inflicted on Ernest Tate by six assailants who, from all the evidence, were acting under the direct personal supervision of Thomas Gerard Healy, the general secretary of the Socialist Labour League.

Since you are in complete political agreement with Healy, judging from the dec-

larations of your group as well as your joining Healy in recently sponsoring an international conference to advance your joint aims, it is clear that your political reputation has been compromised by the assault perpetrated on Comrade Tate.

We expect that you will join us in demanding that the Socialist Labour League immediately place Healy on trial, publicly condemn the hoodlum tactics he sponsored, expel all those members of the Socialist Labour League involved in the attack, and issue assurances that the Socialist Labour League has undertaken measures to prevent any repetition of such methods smacking of Stalinism at its worst period.

We call your attention in particular to the statement in the August 20 issue of The Newsletter in which the Political Committee of the Socialist Labour League denounced the pamphlet, Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International, and gave the following notice: "We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it around the cynical fake-left in England."

In view of your own long record of vigorously advocating the practice of democracy in workers organizations, we naturally count on your issuing a public statement at once making your own stand in this matter crystal clear.

Fraternally,

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

TEXT OF LETTER FROM SWP TO TIM WOHLFORTH

November 21, 1966

Tim Wohlforth, Editor
American Committee for the Fourth International
339 Lafayette Street, Room 305
New York, N Y. 10012

Dear Comrade Wohlforth,

Enclosed is a copy of a communication sent by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the National Committee of the Socialist Labour League.

In view of the declaration carried in the masthead of your organ, the Bulletin of International Socialism, that you are "in political solidarity with the International Committee of the Fourth International," the body set up by Thomas Gerard Healy as a front for the top leadership of the Socialist Labour League, and since you have vigorously advanced your claim to be the "official" spokesman in the United States for Healy, whom you even represent as a model, it is clear that your own political reputation has now been placed under a cloud.

We call this to your attention in the expectation that you will seek to remove this cloud by publicly and unambiguously dissociating yourself from Healy and the methods he is sponsoring.

We point especially to the statement by the Political Committee of the Socialist Labour League, denouncing the pamphlet Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International, in which the following open threat was issued: "We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it around the cynical fake-left in England."

This open instigation of members of the Socialist Labour League to physically attack vendors of a pamphlet taking issue with Healy was published in the August 20 number of The Newsletter, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League.

Whatever you do or do not do about this matter is of course up to you. Lest there be any misunderstanding, however, we take the opportunity to assure you that regardless of your stand, the Socialist Workers Party will continue to maintain the attitude it has always advocated, practiced and fought for; namely, complete respect for the democratic rights of all workers organizations and maintenance of a common front against any attempt to revive the poisonous methods that were the hallmark of Stalinism in its worst period.

Specifically, we wish to assure members of your organization that the Socialist

Workers Party will continue to respect their right to sell Healyite literature at the entrance of our meetings. Our own members, we are completely confident, despite their anger over the beating inflicted on Ernest Tate, will continue to respect your literature distributors and freely buy from them whatever they wish to as part of their right as members of the Socialist Workers Party to read any literature they wish to or in line with their obligation to remain abreast of the literature of all opponent organizations.

We are enclosing, in addition, copies of correspondence sent to James Robertson and to Pierre Lambert, concerning this matter.

Fraternally,

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

TEXT OF LETTER FROM SWP TO JAMES ROBERTSON

November 21, 1966

James Robertson, National Chairman
Spartacist League
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York City, N.Y. 10001

Dear Comrade Robertson,

Enclosed is a copy of a communication sent by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the National Committee of the Socialist Labour League.

In view of the declaration in the November-December issue of Spartacist that your organization remains in "essential political agreement" with the organizations headed by Thomas Gerard Healy and Tim Wohlforth, the main spokesman in the United States for the SLL, your own stand on the issue of the employment of physical violence against members of other workers organizations is placed in question.

We trust that you will clarify your stand -- and its relation to your expression of political solidarity with Healy -- in an adequate way and as rapidly as possible.

We are also enclosing copies of correspondence sent to Tim Wohlforth and to Pierre Lambert, the main spokesman in France for the SLL.

Fraternally,

Farrell Dobbs, National Secretary

INDONESIAN GENERALS ORDER DESTRUCTION OF "COMMUNIST" BOOKS

The ultrareactionary generals who seized power in Indonesia and launched one of the worst blood purges of modern times have now decided to proceed in logical fashion along the lines laid down by Hitler. A "special team on controlling Communist, Marxist-Leninist theories" announced November 2, according to Antara, the official Indonesian news agency, that a ban, effective the next day, had been placed on the keeping or possession of books, magazines or other publications which propagate "Communism" or "Marxism-Leninism."

All residents in Djakarta as well as printing shops, bookstores, libraries, schools, ministries and other government or private agencies are required by the decree to destroy or turn over the literature in their possession within thirty days. Any failure to comply with the order is liable to imprisonment or fine.

Reaction has always sought to ban progress by stifling new ideas through proscribing them and resorting to physical violence against those suspected of harboring them. Unfortunately for those who want to maintain the feudal view against the sweep of science and social progress, it is too late to rectify the invention of the printing press. The decree issued by the Indonesian generals will prove to be as ineffective in the long run as all the similar efforts of their kind before them.