

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 5, No. 1

January 6, 1967

In this issue

Page

Prominent Mexican Leftists Appeal for Hugo Blanco	1
Demonstration for Hugo Blanco at Peruvian Embassy in Paris	2
An Appeal from Alberta, Canada, in Behalf of Hugo Blanco	2
Swedish Youth Organization Speaks Up for Hugo Blanco	3
Amnesty International Asks Clemency for Hugo Blanco	3
Yugoslavs Demonstrate Against U.S. Aggression in Vietnam	3
Salisbury Confirms Bombing of Civilian Targets in Vietnam	4
What America Is Doing to the Children of Vietnam	5
Johnson's Ranch-Size Sense of History	7
Wouldn't Gas Ovens Be Cheaper?	7
Unhappy New Year Foreseen for Johnson Administration -- by George Novack	8
China Buying More Machine Tools from Japan	9
Left Socialists in Belgium Hold Second Congress	10
How Much Aid Is Being Sent to the Vietnamese?	11
Kosaka's Trip to Washington -- Via Peking	12
French Communist Youth Regroup to the Left -- by H. Ancelot	13
French Youth Protest Vietnam War Despite CP	14
Japanese Unionists Protest Visit of Nuclear-Powered Submarine	15
Another World War Will Fix That Up	15
The Crisis in American Cities -- by Evelyn Sell	16
Committee Formed in Bombay to Support War Crimes Tribunal	17
Birla Acknowledges Debt to Namboodiripad	17
Indian Trotskyist to Run for Bihar Assembly	18
An Odd United Front in Kerala	18
Another Step Ahead for "Perspective Mundial"	18
The Meaning of the Cow-Slaughter Demonstrations -- by Kailas Chandra	19
Healy's French Followers Strike a Blow Against Hugo Blanco	20
Documents:	
Jean-Paul Sartre Explains Aims of War Crimes Tribunal	21
Indonesian Communist Leaders Begin Self-Criticism	25
Fidel Castro on the Role of Women in Cuba Today	28
Healy Scores Another "Triumph" over Ernest Tate	32

PROMINENT MEXICAN LEFTISTS APPEAL FOR HUGO BLANCO

In a strongly worded cablegram sent to the Peruvian government December 16, eighty-eight prominent figures in the Mexican radical movement indicated their support for the campaign to secure an immediate amnesty for Hugo Blanco.

Among the signers were Manuel Marcue Pardiñas, editor of the magazine Política; Arnaldo Reynal, editor of Siglo XXI; Víctor Rico Galán, the well-known journalist now a political prisoner in Mexico City; Mario Menéndez Rodríguez, editor of Sucesos; Renato Leduc, a well-known journalist and columnist; Eduardo Jardon Arzate, editor of Prensa Latina; Enrique Semo, editor of Historia y Sociedad; Ramón Danzos Palomino, Secretary General of the Central Campesina Independiente; Arnoldo Martínez Verdugo, secretary general of the Mexican Communist party; Margaret Randall, poet and publisher of

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

El Corno Emplumado; and Carlos Alcazar, editor of Perspectiva Mundial.

The text of the cablegram was as follows:

"Architect Fernando Belaúnde Terry
"President of the Republic of Peru
"Presidential Palace
"Lima, Peru

"We beg you to stop unspeakable attempt to shoot leader Peruvian peasants Hugo Blanco and grant amnesty to all political prisoners your government."

A copy of the cablegram was delivered to the Peruvian embassy in Mexico City.

DEMONSTRATION FOR HUGO BLANCO AT PERUVIAN EMBASSY IN PARIS

Some 400 demonstrators turned out December 14 to shout in front of the Peruvian embassy in Paris in behalf of Hugo Blanco, the Peruvian peasant leader threatened with a death sentence because he appealed a 25-year prison sentence to the Supreme Council of Military Justice in Lima.

The crowd demanded an immediate amnesty for Hugo Blanco and all the political prisoners in Peru who have been incarcerated because of participation in anti-imperialist struggles.

One of the demonstrators was delegated to present a message to the embassy indicating the sentiments of those participating in the action.

The rally lasted twenty minutes before the police arrived (such demonstrations are illegal in Paris) and then dispersed without any incidents.

The organizers of the demonstration were the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire, the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (French section of the Fourth International), the Mouvement des Jeunes Anarchistes, the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency of the Fourth International, Voix Ouvrière (Union Communiste) and Pouvoir Ouvrier.

AN APPEAL FROM ALBERTA, CANADA, IN BEHALF OF HUGO BLANCO

Edmonton

Joining the widening international campaign to save the life of Hugo Blanco, 32 prominent political, antiwar and academic figures in Alberta, Canada, have demanded that Blanco and his companions be freed. The text of the petition, which was sent to Peru December 10, was as follows:

"President Fernando Belaúnde Terry
"Lima, Peru

"Dear Mr. President:

"We would like to remind you of the recent petition sent by 400 scholars from New York City asking for clemency for Hugo Blanco. In addition we know that other messages were sent from the U.S., Europe and Asia all concerned about Hugo Blanco and his companions.

"Therefore when we hear that the Supreme Council of Military Justice is being asked to reinstate the death penalty we are shocked. Blanco was not a military man and should have been tried before a civil court. That is how things are done in most civilized countries. In addition it is plain that the death of Blanco will not stop social change in Peru. His death would however brand his executioners as bereft of humanity and sanity. Only fear would drive anyone to the insane conclusion that Blanco's death will halt social movement in Peru. Do not allow Peru to be disgraced by the wanton murder of a man who has desired only that justice be done the people of Peru.

"Free Hugo Blanco and his companions."

The signers of the petition included the top leadership of the Alberta Young New Democrats (the youth of Canada's Labor party the New Democratic party); P. Quinlan,

editor of Alberta Labor, organ of the Alberta Federation of Labor (CLC-AFL-CIO); the entire executive of the University of Alberta Vietnam Action Committee; Professor R. Furcht, chairman of the Edmonton Committee to End the War in Vietnam; and University of Alberta professors Charles Nunn and Kenneth Mills.

SWEDISH YOUTH ORGANIZATION SPEAKS UP FOR HUGO BLANCO

The following telegram to President Belaúnde was sent from Stockholm November 22 by the Democratic Youth:

"The Democratic Youth, socialist youth organization of Sweden, protests strongly against the imprisonment of Hugo Blanco. We demand that Hugo Blanco and all the other political prisoners be freed immediately.

"Militant democratic opinion in Sweden expresses its solidarity towards the Peruvian people and its struggle for democratic rights. We condemn corruption in Peru, repression against the people by your government and neocolonialist domination of the economy and official political life of your country by the United States."

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL ASKS CLEMENCY FOR HUGO BLANCO

Amnesty International, the big organization that has consultative status with the United Nations and the Council of Europe, and whose American section is headed by such respectable figures as Francis Biddle, Victor Reuther and Roger Baldwin, has decided to intervene in behalf of Hugo Blanco.

The action is extraordinary inasmuch as the organization follows a policy of not intervening in any cases where "violence" is involved.

In a letter to its national sections summarizing the facts in the case, including the conflicting versions as to what happened at the time three policemen were killed, the London office stated: "It was felt that there was too great an element of doubt about the violence or non-violence to make this a good case for adoption by a Group but that the savagery of the sentence and Blanco's known idealism justified an appeal for clemency. It is entirely a matter for National Sections whether they also wish to take action."

The London office, however, took the initiative to intervene in its own right. "We have sent on behalf of HUGO BLANCO an appeal for clemency to President Belaunde Terry of Peru," the office told the National Sections. "A similar letter has been sent to General de Brigada Nestor Mendoza Rodriguez (President of the Supreme Military Tribunal) at his two addresses:

"Ministerio de Guerra,
"Departamento Legal,
"291 Ave. de Arequipa
"Lima, Peru.

"(Private Address)
"602, 2 de Mayo
"Lima, Peru."

Anyone wishing to know the stand of Amnesty International in more detail can write their London office at 12 Crane Court, Fleet Street, London ECR, England.

The American section of Amnesty International has not yet taken a stand, but is holding a conference January 21 at which the subject may come up. Their address is 7203 Forty-fifth Street, Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015, USA.

YUGOSLAVS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST U.S. AGGRESSION IN VIETNAM

A series of demonstrations against the U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam swept through Yugoslavia on December 20. In Zagreb some 10,000 students kicked off the massive protest. Thousands of people appeared before the U.S. consulate to vent their anger. Six windows were smashed and the walls were damaged. The Yugoslav government ordered out police, who moved in with tear gas and dispersed the crowds. Similar demonstrations were staged under student leadership in towns throughout the country.

SALISBURY CONFIRMS BOMBING OF CIVILIAN TARGETS IN VIETNAM

In a dispatch from Hanoi dated December 25, Harrison E. Salisbury, an assistant managing editor of The New York Times, provided eyewitness testimony of the most crushing kind, verifying the charge that American bombing missions include civilian areas as "military" targets. On a visit to Namdinh, the third largest city in Vietnam, he was taken on an inspection tour by Mayor Tran Thi Doan, "a petite 40-year-old woman."

"Mayor Doan regards her city as essentially a cotton-and-silk textile town containing nothing of military significance," he reports. "Namdinh has been systematically attacked by American planes since June 28, 1965.

"The cathedral tower looks out on block after block of utter desolation; the city's population of 90,000 has been reduced to less than 20,000 because of evacuation; 13 per cent of the city's housing, including the homes of 12,464 people, have been destroyed; 89 people have been killed and 405 wounded.

"No American communiqué has asserted that Namdinh contains some facility that the United States regards as a military objective. It is apparent, on personal inspection that block after block of ordinary housing, particularly surrounding a textile plant, has been smashed to rubble by repeated attacks by Seventh Fleet planes.

"The town lies only 20 miles inland, which may explain why the Seventh Fleet seems to have made it its particular target. The textile plant, whose most dangerous output from a military point of view would presumably be cloth for uniforms, has been bombed 19 times, but is still operating under great difficulty.

"Other industries in Namdinh include a rice-processing plant, a silk factory, an agricultural-tool plant, a fruit-canning plant and a thread cooperative. All have been damaged in raids. The least affected operation is the rice mill, which is working at normal capacity.

"Street after street in Namdinh has been abandoned and houses stand torn and gaping. One deserted street is Hang Thao or Silk Street, which was the center of the silk industry. Almost every house on the street was blasted down April 14 about 6:30 A.M. just as the factory shifts were changing.

"Forty-nine people were killed, 135 were wounded on Hang Thao and 240 houses collapsed. Eight bombs -- MK-84's -- accomplished this. These are huge weapons weighing about 2,000 pounds.

"The residents of Namdinh have become specialists in United States weapons. They rattle off names like MK-81, MK-83 and MK-84 and various categories of missiles, including Bullpups, as baseball fans do batting averages; most attacks have been carried out by F-105's and F-4's but B-57's, A-3's, A-4's and A-6A's have also been used.

"Another target in Namdinh has been the Dao (Black) River dike. The dike has been hit six times and there have been many near-misses. Breaching of the dike would seriously affect the region's rice agriculture. However, supplemental and reinforcing dikes have been built. And with a plentiful labor force always at hand to repair gaps quickly, the danger of serious damage by air attack seems minimal."

As to the reasons for deliberately bombing a civilian area like this, the local city officials could only speculate on the calculations of the American military staff in Saigon and their superiors in the Pentagon and the White House.

Nguyen Tien Canh of Namdinh's City Council thought the Americans believed they could intimidate the population by continuous attacks.

"A second suggestion was that the unannounced assault on Namdinh was supposed to be an object lesson to show Hanoi what United States air power could accomplish if it were directed more powerfully to North Vietnam's capital.

"Whatever the explanation, one can see that United States planes are dropping an enormous weight of explosives on purely civilian targets. Whatever else there may be or might have been in Namdinh, it is the civilians who have taken the punishment."

Namdinh, Salisbury continues, "is far from being exceptional." In a brief tour of Namha Province, in which the city of Namdinh lies, he saw other civilian targets that had been the object of American bombing missions.

"President Johnson's announced policy that American targets in North Vietnam are steel and concrete rather than human lives seems to have little connection with the reality of attacks carried out by United States planes.

"A notable example is Phuly, a town about 35 miles south of Hanoi on Route 1. The town had a population of about 10,000. In attacks on Oct. 1, 2 and 9, every house and building was destroyed. Only 40 were killed and wounded because many people had left town and because an excellent manhole-shelter system was available.

"The community had no industry, but lay astride a highway and a railroad line running from Hanoi, which had a couple of sidings in town. Presumably, planes were attacking the railroad. But in the process they destroyed another residential community."

Salisbury also confirmed that Hanoi had been bombed. In a December 27 dispatch, he reported crossing the Paul Doumer Bridge. "It appeared from this trip across the bridge, that bombing on Dec. 14 was directed at its approaches and fell short in each case, striking residential quarters. The bombs dropped in the Hoan Kiem and Gialem and Yenvien quarters."

With regard to an American communiqué that the target was rail yards, Salisbury said: "Some bombs certainly fell along the railroad. But there are large numbers of apartment houses close by, and one after another was blasted out."

Salisbury's reports compelled the Johnson administration to alter its propaganda concerning the bombing of Hanoi. A spokesman had previously quibbled over the meaning of "Hanoi," claiming that "Hanoi" as defined by the Pentagon had not been bombed. The American command in Saigon had issued a flat denial that Hanoi had been selected as a target. On December 26, however, when questioned about Salisbury's eyewitness testimony, the Pentagon admitted the attack but claimed that bombs or other explosives had accidentally fallen in civilian areas while pilots had been aiming at "military" targets.

WHAT AMERICA IS DOING TO THE CHILDREN OF VIETNAM

The January issue of Ramparts magazine, published in San Francisco, California, carries an article, "The Children of Vietnam," which should be read by everyone concerned about the escalation of the war. In particular, it should be read by every American with the slightest capacity to respond to the sufferings of others. The article is an account of what is happening to the children of Vietnam under the hail of bombs being poured on their country by the mightiest military power in all history.

For those who might decide -- before they read the article -- that it is just "Communist propaganda," an accompanying series of candid photographs in color should prove sufficient to shock them into realization of the truth.

The author is William F. Pepper, executive director of the New Rochelle Commission on Human Rights, instructor in Political Science at Mercy College in Dobbs Ferry, New York, and director of that college's Children's Institute for Advanced Study and Research. He spent between five and six weeks in Vietnam in the spring of 1966 as a freelance correspondent accredited by the Military Assistance Command in that country, and by the Saigon regime.

After describing two typical cases of children maimed by "the weapons of America" -- napalm and white phosphorous -- who were lucky enough to be brought to Britain for treatment, Pepper continues:

"There is no one to provide such care for most of the other horribly maimed children of Vietnam; and despite growing efforts by American and South Vietnamese authorities to conceal the fact, it's clear that there are hundreds of thousands of terribly injured children with no hope for decent treatment on even a day-to-day basis, much less for the long months and years of restorative surgery needed to repair ten searing seconds of napalm.

"When we hear about these burned children at all, they're simply called 'civilians,' and there's no real way to tell how many of them are killed and injured every day. By putting together some of the figures that are available, however, we can get some idea of the shocking story.

"Nearly two years ago, for instance -- before the major escalation that began in

early 1965 -- Hugh Campbell, former Canadian member of the International Control Commission in Vietnam, said that from 1961 through 1963, 160,000 Vietnamese civilians died in the war. This figure was borne out by officials in Saigon. According to conservative estimates, another 55,000 died during 1964 and 100,000 in each of the two escalated years since, or at least 415,000 civilians have been killed since 1961. But just who are these civilians?

"In 1964, according to a UNESCO population study, 47.5 per cent of the people of Vietnam were under 16. Today, the figure is certainly over 50 per cent. Other United Nations statistics for Southeast Asia generally bear out this figure. Since the males over 16 are away fighting -- on one side or the other -- it's clear that in the rural villages which bear the brunt of the napalm raids, at least 70 per cent and probably more of the residents are children.

"In other words, at least a quarter of a million of the children of Vietnam have been killed in the war.

"If there are that many dead, using the military rule-of-thumb, there must be three times that many wounded -- or at least a million child casualties since 1961."

Pepper cites other figures to support this fearful conclusion. Then he puts it in "American" terms:

"What we are doing to the children of Vietnam may become clearer if the same percentages are applied to the American population. They mean that one out of every two American families with four children would be struck with having at least one child killed or maimed. There is a good chance, too, that the father would be dead as well. At the very least, he is probably far from home."

Pepper describes in the most vivid detail the fate of the children in Vietnam -- those in hospitals, in camps, or in the streets, orphans without homes or known relatives. Here is an example:

"Torn flesh, splintered bones, screaming agony are bad enough. But perhaps most heart-rending of all are the tiny faces and bodies scorched and seared by fire.

"Napalm, and its more horrible companion, white phosphorous, liquidize young flesh and carve it into grotesque forms. The little figures are afterward often scarcely human in appearance, and one cannot be confronted with the monstrous effects of the burning without being totally shaken. Perhaps it was due to a previous lack of direct contact with war, but I never left the tiny victims without losing composure. The initial urge to reach out and soothe the hurt was restrained by the fear that the ash-like skin could crumble in my fingers."

In a preface to the article, Dr. Benjamin Spock had the following to say:

"A million children have been killed or wounded or burned in the war America is carrying on in Vietnam, according to the estimate of William Pepper. Not many of them even get to hospitals, which are few and far between, but when they do, they may lie three in a bed or on newspapers on the floor. Flies are in the wounds. Even such simple equipment as cups and plates are in short supply. Materials for the adequate treatment of burns -- gauze, ointments, antibiotics and plasma -- are usually non-existent. This contrasts with the incredible speed and efficiency with which American troops napalmed by mistake are given elaborate first aid while being lifted out of the battlefield and then flown to a Texas hospital for treatment.

"When Terre des Hommes, a Swiss humanitarian organization, asked for American government assistance in flying burned and wounded children to Europe for repair, our officials refused. With crocodile tears they explained children are unhappy when separated from their families. The fact is that a third of all Vietnamese children in institutions have already lost both parents or been abandoned.

"Can America, which manufactures and delivers the efficient napalm that causes deep and deforming burns, deny all responsibility for their treatment?"

"Many American physicians are now volunteering to treat the children if they are brought to America. But citizens must be asked to pay the bill for transportation and hospitalization. They will also have to persuade our government to allow the children to be brought here."

Dr. Spock's humanitarian instincts are laudable. However, he might have added a political demand: This massacre of children must be stopped at once! The American people

are duty bound to demonstrate in such numbers and with such power that even the sadistic monsters in Washington will feel they have no choice but to immediately withdraw their troops from Vietnam.

JOHNSON'S RANCH-SIZE SENSE OF HISTORY

In 1964 Johnson won the most smashing victory in American electoral history as the "peace" candidate running against the warmonger Goldwater, who openly advocated escalating American involvement in the civil war in Vietnam. In view of Johnson's success at the polls, White House circles began inspiring talk in the press about the Texas politician turning out to be "one of the great presidents of the United States, if not the greatest."

Today Johnson's popularity has plummeted so low that the Republicans are thinking in terms of beating the Democrats in 1968. The reason, of course, is Vietnam.

In the Democratic party, there is subversive talk about finding a new candidate -- just who is not certain, although Robert F. Kennedy is frequently mentioned. The operation is a difficult one in view of the vast resources at the disposal of the president and the strong tendency to give the "people's choice" eight years in the White House, a constitutional amendment now barring a longer term.

However he ends up in "greatness" as an American president, Johnson does seem to have a good chance of making his mark as a real-estate operator.

For the past six years, he has been busy buying up land in his area. With five ranches, totaling more than 14,000 acres, he is now considered to be one of the biggest ranchowners in that part of Texas.

"And where Mr. Johnson has bought, Texas has not been far behind with highway improvements," reports the December 26 New York Times. State officials aver, however, that "none" of the costly highway projects that indirectly increase the value of Johnson's holdings is "the result of favoritism." One explanation is that wherever Johnson has gone, "there has been increase in automobile traffic."

Thus Texas state officials, always alert to traffic needs, have been compelled to speed improvements. In the past two years alone, almost \$1,000,000 in highway improvements have benefited Johnson's land and that of his neighbors.

Among the projects now on the drawing boards is a \$725,000 bridge that will open up two subdivisions for more profitable real-estate speculation at the rear of one of Johnson's ranches. Here 256 "ranchettes" have been laid out. Covering 242 acres, the selling price is up to \$8,000 each.

A touching demonstration of Texas neighborliness has been the "voluntary" contributions from anonymous sources to buy the 244 acres in front of Johnson's ranch in order to convert this piece of land into the "LBJ State Park." With the land converted into a "park," it cannot be sold as sites for unsightly motels or restaurants overlooking the president's ranch.

At present, Johnson has leased part of the projected "park" and is grazing cows on it.

While Johnson has not announced such plans as yet, his friends say he has talked about eventually willing his ranch house to the government as a Texas version of George Washington's Mount Vernon or Franklin D. Roosevelt's Hyde Park. A friend said, "Lyndon has a great sense of history."

So no matter how fickle public opinion may prove to be, Johnson has an excellent chance of ending up as a gentleman farmer -- Texas size. In the meantime he can find relief from the cares of office, especially the ups and downs in Vietnam, by playing the real-estate market. And when you play it right, the way Johnson does, it's mighty hard to lose.

WOULDN'T GAS OVENS BE CHEAPER?

L. Mendel Rivers, joint head of the congressional Armed Services committee, flew into a Hitler-like rage at the New York Times exposure of White House lies about not bombing civilians in Vietnam. On a nationwide TV newscast December 29, he demanded deliberate bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong and all towns in Vietnam until the U.S. wins "victory."

UNHAPPY NEW YEAR FORESEEN FOR JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

By George Novack

The Johnson administration enters 1967 in a much weaker position at home and abroad than it enjoyed on New Year's Day 1965. Two years ago, after his overwhelming electoral victory, the president was master of all he surveyed from the windows of the White House. He had a clear mandate for his proposed programs and large majorities ready to do his bidding in both houses of Congress. He could draw on an immense reservoir of goodwill among the citizens anticipating the promised bounties of the Great Society.

His supporters, relieved that the bomb-rattling Goldwater had been so decisively repudiated, hugged the illusion that the conservative Republican's defeat assured no further expansion of military operations in Southeast Asia. How remote this pre-escalation period of the Vietnam war seems today!

Since the shock of the first air attacks upon north Vietnam in February 1965, the nation's confidence in the sure and beneficent guidance of the man from Texas has steadily deteriorated. In a world news roundup on ABC TV network December 28, White House correspondent Bill Lawrence declared that the most important development of the year in national politics was the phenomenal decline in the president's prestige and popularity.

The broad consensus, from big business to organized labor and the black voters, upon which Johnson sought to take his stand has been eroded beyond repair. A sizeable segment of leading figures in his own party are even questioning his continuance in the White House after 1968.

This decline is all the more surprising in view of the uninterrupted boom that has accompanied his years in office and the array of welfare measures, including Medicare, aid to education and the antipoverty bills, he succeeded in pushing through Congress. However inadequate for the people's needs, this social legislation was the most extensive since Roosevelt's New Deal.

Everyone agrees that the Vietnam war is the fundamental reason for Johnson's loss of popularity. Opposition to the war, or criticism of the government's conduct of it, emanates from diverse sources, ranging from unrestrained war hawks who want U.S. bombers to obliterate all north Vietnam and take on China right now to antiwar militants who demonstrate for immediate withdrawal of American troops.

Much of the discontent stems from the economic effects of the war which has stepped up inflation and brought exorbitant profits to the corporations. Housewives are incensed about rising prices in the markets. The unions are much more resolutely fighting for wage increases to cope with higher living costs. The poor are aroused by the cutbacks in appropriations for the popgun war on poverty in order to take care of the swelling budget for the brutal war upon the people of Vietnam. Negro spokesmen lash out at the administration for its failure to enforce civil-rights legislation or make any noticeable improvements in education, employment, housing or equality for the black masses.

Despite cheerful forecasts from the Secretary of Commerce, it looks as though the U.S. may experience the paradoxical and painful combination of inflation and a slackening of business activity in 1967.

One of the major factors in the estrangement of the administration from the nation has been the widening of "the credibility gap." Johnson's word is no longer taken on faith; he is less and less trusted. Washington correspondents openly accuse him of duplicity, of deliberately misleading the people and the world on great and small matters alike. The Pentagon's sham denial about bombing civilian targets in north Vietnam is only the latest instance where the administration has been caught in a flagrant lie.

Those malcontents who may still be reluctant to squarely oppose Johnson's policies keep sniping at his personal faults. They complain that he is egotistical, overbearing, obtuse, uncouth and mistreats his closest subordinates so badly that, like Press Secretary Bill Moyers, they are forced to resign.

Hatred and distrust have gone to the extreme of a whispering campaign that the president may have had a hand in removing Kennedy from his path. This accounts for the astonishing opinions registered in one Gallup poll. Two percent of the people queried believed that Johnson was in some way implicated in Kennedy's assassination while only one percent pointed a finger at Fidel Castro! Not since the last months of Hoover's

rule in 1932 has the public been so suspicious of a president's lack of candor.

All these feelings were vented in the November midterm elections which were an indirect referendum on Johnson's policies and performance. The heavy political losses sustained by the Democrats were generally interpreted as a slap at the president. Republicans won governorships in New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin and California, the pivotal states in a national election.

These setbacks have disturbed the Democratic politicians. At the Governors' Conference in mid-December some Democratic governors were outspokenly critical of the president's leadership and even hinted he would be well-advised not to run again in 1968. Such a revolt, the New York Times editors point out, "would have been inconceivable" two years ago and "improbable even a year ago."

To head off the revolt, Johnson invited a delegation of nine Democratic governors to celebrate Christmas with him at his Texas ranch. But he could not appease the dissidents and their gripes spoiled the festivities.

The extent of the grumblings in his own party was disclosed in a year-end poll taken by the New York Times which interviewed 125 key Democrats in 30 states about their attitudes toward the president, his programs and his prospects. Of those questioned, 43 percent felt that the party would be better off with a candidate other than Johnson or are presently unwilling to endorse his nomination. This does not mean that LBJ's renomination would be seriously challenged. But the fact that nearly half of a group of representative Democratic leaders were hostile or noncommittal toward Johnson indicates how much he has fallen into disrepute.

A West Coast leader, who supports Johnson's renomination said: "Credibility is the biggest problem for the party and Johnson. Rightly or wrongly, the President is not being taken at face value by the American people. We must recapture public confidence. The President ought to avoid any appearance of not being candid and forthright to both the people and Congress."

The results of the November elections have altered the atmosphere in the nation's capital and changed the relationship of forces between the White House and Capitol Hill. Since he took office, Johnson could expect cooperation from Congress or exact it. Now the Republican Senate leader Everett Dirksen has the upper hand and, together with the most conservative Democrats, can decide the pace and the disposal of legislation in the coming session. This will thwart many parts of the president's domestic and foreign program.

Vietnam also remains the biggest stumbling block to improving Washington's relations with other capitals in the world. The administration refusal to stop bombing north Vietnam or make any serious moves toward the cessation of hostilities continues to irritate and anger a host of powers from U Thant at the United Nations and the Pope in Rome to the countries of the Soviet bloc and the Third World. It has deepened the political and moral isolation of the United States.

However, Johnson will not budge. He is bent on staying indefinitely in Vietnam. He has staked the prestige, and even the fate, of his leadership upon gaining a favorable outcome of the intervention in Southeast Asia which he and his advisers regard as indispensable for the global military strategy of U.S. imperialism.

Despite the billions of dollars expended and the massive deployment of men and equipment in that area, this goal is no nearer realization than it was two years ago. Nonetheless, Johnson hopes to come before the electorate in 1968 as the tough and dauntless commander-in-chief who beat the "Comms" in Vietnam and did not buckle before his "panty-waisted" critics. He has raised Vietnam into a make-or-break issue for his administration.

Up to now the war has weakened rather than reinforced his hold on power. This unpopular, undeclared, seemingly interminable conflict is bound to create more bitterness among the American people and more resentment against its directors as it goes on and on. And, if Johnson persists in his reckless course, the even more stubborn revolutionary resistance of the Vietnamese freedom-fighters may also help bring about his undoing.

CHINA BUYING MORE MACHINE TOOLS FROM JAPAN

The People's Republic of China has become Japan's second biggest market for machine tools, the largest market being the U.S. In the first nine months of 1966, exports topped one billion yen [about US\$2,750,000]. The figure for all of 1965 was 886 million yen. Most of the purchases were high-priced, high-precision tools.

LEFT SOCIALISTS IN BELGIUM HOLD SECOND CONGRESS

Brussels

The second congress of the Belgian Socialist Workers Confederation, which is composed of the Walloon Workers party, the Flemish Socialist Movement and the Union of Left Socialists of Brussels, was held here December 11. It was attended by 130 delegates from the three organizations.

In conformity with the federated structure of the SWC, the congress was preceded by congresses of the three organizations during October and November. The political decisions under consideration at the congress emerged from these gatherings. As a result they were adopted unanimously, with only one or two delegates abstaining in some instances.

The presidium consisted of Pierre Le Grève, the Brussels left socialist member of parliament, Jean Dessart, a railway workers leader of the La Louvière region and municipal councilman in the small township of Familleureux, and Willy Caluwaerts, a former Communist party provincial councilman of Antwerp, who has joined the new left socialist party.

The agenda included four points: the adoption of statutes for the SWC; a report on political developments in Belgium centering around the offensive of the employers and the bourgeoisie and the development of a strategy to meet that offensive; an international report by Ernest Mandel, the editor of the weekly La Gauche; and a report on the economic and social problems facing the party in the coming months which was given by a woman comrade from Liège, Mathé Lambert.

Fraternal delegates from left socialist parties in France, Holland and Italy were present and took the floor. A delegation from the West German Socialist Students (SDS) were prevented at the last moment from attending and sent the congress a telegram of greetings.

The congress elected a national leadership of 21 members, the majority of them workers.

The Flemish wing of the CSW has made considerable progress since its founding congress a year ago, nearly half the speakers at the congress being Flemish. In November, at the first national conference held by the Flemish wing, 80 delegates were present, representing nearly all the main industries of the Flemish part of the country.

The congress noted the importance of the growing collaboration between the three wings of the movement in the field of action. The first big achievement in the class struggle came in January 1966 when the militants of the Walloon Workers party in Liège organized the only strike that took place in the whole country in solidarity with the striking Flemish mine workers of Zwartberg.

The speeches of many delegates clearly reflected the rising temper of the working class, especially in the Walloon area. The threat of a deep crisis, of massive layoffs and even shutdowns in the steel industry -- the key industry in Walloon -- is arousing the most militant sectors of the Belgian proletariat.

The response to the threat could be a new wave of working-class struggle of even bigger scope than the upsurge in 1960-61 provided the workers are presented with clear anticapitalist objectives and are given leadership able to progressively coordinate and broaden their spontaneous action.

The SWC is seeking to concentrate its efforts on these goals although it is, of course, well aware that it influences only a relatively small vanguard of the working class. It is significant, however, that the agitation begun by the SWC and the weekly La Gauche around the looming steel crisis, has already compelled the trade-union leadership to take steps in the direction of a broader struggle.

A joint call by the Social Democratic and Catholic trade unions for a demonstration against the economic decline in their region, brought out 35,000 workers in the streets of Charleroi on December 12. Under pressure of the SWC militants, the trade-union leaders also organized a strike at the country's largest plant, the Cockerill-Ougrée works in Liège, as a demonstration of solidarity with the Charleroi workers.

Even more significant is the fact that in contrast to what happened during the general strike in 1950 and again in 1960-61, the trade-union and Social Democratic bureaucracy has lost the initiative and from the very beginning of the agitation has had to face massive opposition from the left.

During the Charleroi demonstration, the workers from many factories refused to line up behind the ultrareformist, class-collaborationist slogans of the official trade-union leadership. They made up their own banners and placards, hanging on to them despite heavy pressure and even physical violence from the bureaucrats and their goons.

The hundreds of workers of the Glaverbel glass plant in Charleroi came to the demonstration with the revolutionary-socialist slogans of the CSW. This was reported by the press and carried on television.

Left militants from the largest Charleroi electrical equipment plant, ACEC, heckled the top Charleroi union bureaucrat throughout the mass meeting that concluded the demonstration; and a big section of the crowd of workers booed the speaker, particularly after attempts were made to silence the criticism.

The general atmosphere in the country is, of course, not as favorable as in 1960-1961, due in particular to the big shift to the right among the official Social Democratic and trade-union leadership and the many divisions in the left wing.

But the emergence of a left-wing alternative leadership, offering a comprehensive program of transitional demands to the workers, is unquestionably serving as a brake on betrayals by the leadership and as an inspiring factor in the rising class consciousness of the vanguard.

This is the conclusion to be drawn from the second congress of the SWC as well as from the heartening indication of a new wave of mass struggle which the country saw the day after the congress.

HOW MUCH AID IS BEING SENT TO THE VIETNAMESE?

A rising flood of dollars is being poured into the American imperialist aggression in Vietnam as Johnson continually asks Congress for more money and Congress rubber-stamps the requests without the slightest hesitation. Official figures on the cost are issued from time to time; and while a big credibility gap can doubtless be found in them, still they at least give a rough idea of the astronomical sums going into bombs, napalm and still more fiendish instruments of mass slaughter.

But how much help is going to the Vietnamese fighters, those in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and those in the National Liberation Front? No official figures are available; yet it is absolutely certain that this aid is far below what the United States is spending.

Obviously the Sino-Soviet conflict has hurt the flow of aid, but the reciprocal charges leveled on this point by the Chinese and Soviet governments do not help matters an iota.

The London Economist offered in its December 3 issue some interesting estimates on the amount of aid going to the Vietnamese. The estimates no doubt reflect careful pencil work in top circles of the Western imperialist strategists.

"The size of China's aid to the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong cannot be estimated with accuracy," says the London weekly magazine. "It is certainly a small fraction of the \$20,000 million that the Americans will have spent on the war this year: China's total military budget is estimated at only about \$6,000 million a year. But President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam is reported to have told a delegation of Japanese communists in September that China was supplying 70 per cent of all military aid Hanoi was receiving against 20 per cent from Russia and 10 per cent from East Europe. Recent reports from Hanoi suggest that Russia and East Europe have pledged to double their aid over next year. The pressure on China to do the same will be strong, despite recent frictions between Peking and Hanoi." [p. 1056.]

The same article also reports a shift in China's buying pattern on the metal market. "China has sharply increased its buying of non-ferrous metals in the world markets over the past year. Dealers on the London Metal Exchange estimate that the Chinese have bought 40,000 tons of copper in Europe already this year, compared with a yearly average of about 20,000 tons over the previous five." This is on the European market only and does not take into account direct purchases in Chile. Zinc purchases have shown a similar sharp increase from an average of 10,000 tons a year to some 20,000 tons in the first nine months of this year. Purchases of the two metals are of interest inasmuch as they are utilized in the manufacture of brass cartridge cases.

The Economist reports that "much of the zinc the Chinese have bought has come from Eastern Europe, though they have given express instructions that they are not willing to buy any Russian metal, nor American or South African metal....Some of the zinc has even come from North Korea which presumably prefers to sell via the LME and thus get its hands on hard currency rather than barter with the Chinese."

While the evidence seems to indicate a step up in material aid to the Vietnamese people, the fact remains that they have been fighting with woefully inadequate means against the mightiest military colossus in all history. With the courage and self-sacrifice such as the Vietnamese have shown, it would seem that Peking and Moscow should be able to find a way to aid them more effectively than they have. As for the international antiwar movement it should redouble its efforts to encourage and sustain the Vietnamese and to help them in the most effective way possible -- by advancing the revolutionary socialist cause in their own countries.

KOSAKA'S TRIP TO WASHINGTON -- VIA PEKING

A move on the chessboard of international diplomacy that aroused considerable interest in Japan, if nowhere else, was the visit of Zentaro Kosaka, former foreign minister of Japan and a well-known figure in the ruling Liberal-Democratic party, first to Peking and then to Washington.

During a trip to China in September and October he engaged in talks with China's Foreign Minister Chen Yi and with Premier Chou En-lai.

It was reported in the Japanese press that Chen Yi had indicated willingness on the part of China to negotiate. This was promptly denied in Peking as a "misinterpretation."

Kosaka nonetheless maintained that Chen Yi had told him "the fundamental attitude of Chinese diplomacy is to solve questions like Vietnam by negotiations on an equal footing." Chen Yi added, according to Kosaka, that "it was very difficult to make negotiations with the United States because of misunderstandings. This was due to the fact that the United States is standing on the basis of imperialism."

Chen Yi, it should be added, told a Latin-American journalist last summer that he was convinced that the United States is deliberately preparing to attack China. In the face of these preparations it is perfectly in order, of course, for China to seek to stave off the imperialist aggression by diplomatic means so long as it is done without injuring the cause of socialism.

Whatever the situation may be in this respect, Kosaka acted as if the conversations were of sufficient interest to warrant a special trip to Washington. He arrived there in the middle of November and was soon closeted with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State William P. Bundy, who is in charge of Far Eastern affairs, and Johnson's special adviser Walter W. Rostow. He also had talks with U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur J. Goldberg and with UN Secretary General U Thant.

Kosaka maintained an enigmatic stance about his conversations with the State Department brain men. Upon his return to Tokyo, he made some inconsequential remarks to the press such as finding "U.S. Government leaders adamant in their view that communism will not contribute to the prosperity of the people." He said Thant wondered why the "Communist Chinese have become belligerent like they are today." As to the central topic of his conversations in Washington, Kosaka kept up the veil of mystery by saying his talks were "significant." And what was the subject matter? He said he had stressed the need for a fresh outlook regarding Communist China. The November 27 Japan Times quoted him as saying "he had told U.S. leaders and the U.N. Secretary General that the cultural revolution in continental China can be regarded as a power struggle and has signs of lasting for a long time."

It remains to be learned what Kosaka really relayed to the White House and what he thought he could accomplish by his hop first to Peking and then to Washington. Perhaps it was only a stunt aimed at giving the Japanese people the impression the government is trying to do something to halt the war in Vietnam. Wilson leaned heavily on such stunts in England during the opening stages of Johnson's escalation of the war. All Wilson's diplomatic hocus pocus ended in nothing, however. He did not even win a face-saving gesture from the head of Western imperialism in the White House. Kosaka would do well to study this precedent before buying anymore airplane tickets.

FRENCH COMMUNIST YOUTH REGROUP TO THE LEFT

By H. Ancelot

[The following article has been translated by World Outlook from the December issue of La Quatrième Internationale, the monthly organ of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (French Section of the Fourth International).]

* * *

The Union des Etudiants Communistes [UEC -- Communist Students Union] has just been shaken by another crisis which has all the earmarks of being the final one before its complete disintegration as an organization and its reconstitution by the Parti Communiste Français [PCF -- French Communist party] in other forms.

With the expulsion of the left opposition last April, the UEC lost the bulk of its militant wing, which reformed in the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire [JCR -- Revolutionary Communist Youth]. Only a leadership devoted body and soul to the Political Bureau of the PCF remained in the UEC along with a few rank and filers who were attracted by the Chinese position. A considerable number, confused by the crisis and paralysis of the organization, did not renew their cards in October. Since the opening of the new school term, the UEC has been inactive in most of the university towns, relinquishing the political lead to the JCR.

However, in the past couple of months one tendency became stronger and better organized and rapidly gained control of the remnants of the organization in Paris and in many provincial cities. This current, headed by the sector in the Ecoles Normales Supérieures [ENS -- Teachers College Graduate Schools], came out several months ago for the positions of Louis Althusser. At the time the left was expelled, this faction, still relatively undeveloped, took a stand against all disciplinary measures. It was of the opinion, however, that nothing should be done to risk a break with the PCF. From then on, despite their closeness to the Chinese positions, these militants refused to take a stand on the big political questions, notably on Mitterrand [the bourgeois candidate supported by the PCF], and confined themselves to theoretical studies aimed at shaping the future rejuvenators of the PCF.

The Communist party leadership was thus able to use this current as a buffer on the left against the revolutionary opposition. When this opposition was expelled, the ENS current found itself in an untenable position, without any choice except to line up or get into the next cart headed for the guillotine.

It was a split within this current that touched off the crisis. A dozen Paris leaders decided last month to break with this "confused, vacillating, etc.," current, and, together with Gilbert Mury, secretary of the Communist party's Center of Marxist Study and Research, joined the Mouvement Communiste Français (the pro-Chinese CP).

The UEC leadership then put a pistol to the head of the Uln Street current. It laid down the condition that they could renew their UEC cards only if they signed a four-point declaration condemning the Chinese Communist party and the cultural revolution. Most of the Paris circles refused and then "discovered," within a few short weeks, the "betrayal" committed by the PCF, which, it seems ceased being a revolutionary party after the Argenteuil meeting of the Central Committee, which, will be recalled, condemned Althusser's works.

On November 23, a general membership meeting in Paris was banned by the national leadership which locked up the headquarters. More than eighty students showed up at the iron-shuttered door only to find two carloads of police there... On November 27, the National Committee of the UEC, in the middle of a statement congratulating itself on its "successes," indicated that the Paris sectors were being "reorganized"; that is, liquidated.

With the help of certain intellectuals in the PCF, the expelled members (about 200 throughout France) have issued a newspaper, Garde Rouge [Red Guard], and have launched a "Jeunesse Communiste Marxiste-Léniniste" [Marxist-Leninist Communist Youth]. In a coming issue we will discuss this current, but it can already be said that it will probably be able to pull out the remaining members of the UEC. In the main, these students are former conformists to the PCF leadership who developed very rapidly on the basis of the Vietnamese revolution; but due to their Stalinist training they still remain hostile to the JCR, shifting from the camp of Khrushchevism to the Chinese with a lack of independence that has occasionally bordered on the ridiculous. It will not be long before this current will face an alternative that may tear it apart.

In fact, while completely pro-Chinese, the JCML refuses to join the official pro-Chinese CP, which it considers to be too sectarian and too primitive in its theoretical level. But the day must come when the JCML, aside from those benefiting from the support of the Chinese CP, will have to establish its own independent basis or decide to merge with the others. Discussions are already underway which may well wind up in new splits.

One thing, however, is already certain -- the crisis of Stalinism has liquidated the student organizations of the CP. From now on only the JCR and the pro-Chinese are in position to organize student struggles. Under these conditions, it is all to the good that these two organizations have reached agreement on working together in the rank-and-file committees opposing the American aggression in Vietnam.

FRENCH YOUTH PROTEST VIETNAM WAR DESPITE CP

Paris

The radicalization of a part of the French youth, particularly in the struggle against the American aggression in Vietnam, has completely overwhelmed the French Communist party in youth and university circles. During December some good illustrations were provided as to the means the CP leadership intends to utilize in hope of stopping this movement.

On December 6 the first meeting of the Communist students, expelled for their pro-Chinese positions, was to be held.* A half hour before the meeting was to open, some 300 members of the Communist party entered the hall. When the speakers representing the students came to the microphone, there was a rush for the rostrum. After several minutes of fisticuffs the students were driven from the hall with blows.

The next day, the Communist party daily l'Humanité proudly gave a two-column headline to the exploit: "The Pro-Chinese Were Not Able to Speak in the Latin Quarter."

A week later the operation was repeated in the same hall but with less violence. Half of those attending consisted of CP stewards. The meeting could not be held. For an hour and a half, slogans were shouted back and forth, everybody by common accord chanting, "Down with the 'Trotskards.'" "

It should be observed that while these incidents were taking place, the Latin Quarter was the scene of violent fascist attacks, the ultraright groups coming out in particular against the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire [JCR]. (Pierre Rousset, a member of the JCR, suffered a skull injury that put him in the hospital for two weeks.) Throughout the struggles with the fascists, the Communists were nowhere to be seen; they were occupied with other business.

This pattern was not isolated to Paris, but appears to have been the same in all the cities where the pro-Chinese members tried to get organized, for instance most recently in Grenoble and Tours. The use of such methods threatens to spread to all the vanguard organizations in France where a similar radicalization occurs.

On December 10, the Communist party in Paris organized a pacifist rally at the Place de la Bastille for "Peace in Vietnam." There were around six or seven thousand persons. At the end of the meeting, the militants of the JCR, together with the pro-Chinese youth succeeded in organizing a march of 1,000 youth behind a flag of the National Liberation Front and a banner, "Long Live the Vietnamese Revolution."

The enthusiastic youth sang the Internationale and shouted, "The NLF Will Win." The demonstration lasted for more than a half hour, coming to an end after a speech by a leader of the JCR. But the marchers had to confront the stewards of the Communist party, who made four efforts to block them from moving ahead. The youth had to break through four times in violent scuffles during which some of the members of the Communist party showed their repugnance at the use of such methods.

Finally, on the evening of December 15, following the bombing of Hanoi, the

* Last April the Union des Etudiants Communistes expelled its left-wing opposition which then organized the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire. Since then, the remaining members of the UEC became pro-Chinese and were expelled in their turn. They launched the "Jeunesse Communiste Marxiste Léniniste" with a membership of around 200 nationally in France.

Union National des Etudiants Français and the National Vietnam Committee* decided to organize a street demonstration for the following day. The Communist party had confined itself to a headline in their newspaper about the bombing: "They Start It Again."

The appeal for a street demonstration was broadcast on radio at 10 p.m. One hour later the CP telephoned the UNEF to let them know they were organizing a different demonstration at the same time at a different place.

Finally the student union and the National Vietnam Committee succeeded in getting the CP leadership to agree to a joint demonstration with the correct slogans.

The police then decided to ban the rally which had been set for the Place de l'Opéra at 6:30 p.m.

At fifteen minutes before the time jointly agreed upon with the students, the CP launched the march.

At 6:30 the students arrived at the assembly point. Some 3,000 persons had already set out with the CP without too much trouble from the police.

The students were caught in a genuine police trap. Despite the arrests and the clubbings, about 1,000 succeeded in holding their position.

As for the CP-led march, which was already a long ways ahead, it also had scuffles, but not with the police. The CP stewards ganged up on those carrying a banner of one of the participating organizations -- the National Vietnam Committee. The banner was torn down and trampled on.

According to the latest information, the PSU, the UNEF and the Vietnam Committee; that is, three out of the four sponsoring organizations have made a joint agreement not to let these scandals go by without protesting.

* Sponsored by figures like Jean-Paul Sartre, the Comité National Vietnam is in process of bringing together all the rank-and-file committees that refuse to struggle against the war in Vietnam under the slogans of the Communist party. Among the students, the committee is being advanced particularly by the JCR and youth of the Parti Socialiste Unifié (United Socialist party). This was the body that succeeded in bringing out 7,000 persons at a rally November 28 against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. The CP holds that in practice the National Vietnam Committee is "waging war" against its position.

JAPANESE UNIONISTS PROTEST VISIT OF NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINE

The U.S. nuclear-powered submarine Sculpin docked in Japan for the first time December 20 to provide Christmas shore leave for its 102-man crew. As it docked at Sasebo it was greeted by 200 Japanese union members. They demonstrated on the piers, shouting, "Go home, N-sub." A spokesman for the Socialist party announced that a larger demonstration was being planned at Shimase Park. It was expected that 15,000 unionists and students would turn out.

The visit by the Sculpin marks the thirteenth time U.S. nuclear-powered submarines have tied up in Japanese ports. All of them have been met by angry demonstrators who maintain that the Japanese people have had sufficient experience with nuclear weapons and want no more to do with them.

ANOTHER WORLD WAR WILL FIX THAT UP

On being released from the Walter Reed Army Medical Center December 27, following gall bladder surgery, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's first public act was to make the patriotic statement that he knew U.S. bombing operations in north Vietnam "are aimed exclusively at military targets."

As for the civilian casualties (about half of them children) that have led to such a clamor in some circles, Eisenhower agreed that "unfortunately, there are some civilians around these targets." It's an old military problem. Pointedly the general asked, "Is there any place in the world where there are not civilians?"

THE CRISIS IN AMERICAN CITIES

By Evelyn Sell

The struggle for black power, the war in Vietnam and increasing criticism of the Johnson administration were forcefully linked during the recently concluded Senate subcommittee hearings into the crisis in American cities. Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE], defended the basic concepts of black power against charges by Senator Robert F. Kennedy that "the slogan of black power... has set the civil-rights movement back considerably in the United States."

McKissick explained that black power is a call to mobilize the political, economic and social strength of black people and give them pride in themselves. He stated it was time for Negro leaders to turn their attention from the black community in the south to the vast numbers who are in the northern ghettos. When asked what could be done to help ghetto Negroes, McKissick answered that "the first thing we could do is stop the war...a \$10 billion error." His statement brought applause from the audience.

Martin Luther King, testifying before the subcommittee, charged the administration with "squandering" the nation's resources on war and space races while giving "miniscule" amounts to the fight against poverty and prejudice. Pointing out that Johnson's "war on poverty" is lagging badly, King said the war in Vietnam has become a "national obsession." He stated:

"While the antipoverty program is cautiously initiated, zealously supervised and evaluated for immediate results, billions are literally expended for ill-considered warfare.

"The recently revealed misestimate of the war budget amounts to \$10 billion for a single year. The error alone is more than five times the amount committed to antipoverty programs.

"The security we profess to seek in foreign adventures we will lose in our decaying cities."

King clearly warned of forthcoming ghetto explosions if the poverty programs are not carried out: "I am convinced that if the intolerable conditions of Negroes in the ghettos are not dealt with and removed with haste, we are faced with many more dark nights of hate."

Bayard Rustin, organizer of the massive civil-rights march on Washington in 1963, and A. Philip Randolph, trade-union leader, predicted an explosion among Negro youth if President Johnson finances the Vietnam war at the expense of the war on poverty. Rustin said the president must not allow the Vietnam war costs to be put "on the backs of the poor people." He called cutbacks in antipoverty spending "not only stupid and dangerous but criminal" and warned that Johnson "cannot get away with it."

"Negro leaders cannot be held responsible for the reaction that occurs as a result of paring down the War on Poverty," stated Rustin at the subcommittee hearings.

Rustin and Randolph emphasized the need for a "freedom budget" -- an idea announced by Randolph on October 26. His plan calls for increasing the federal budget to \$155 billion within nine years, a \$2-an-hour minimum wage, a guaranteed income program for unemployed, and increased investments in education, housing, vocational training and health services. "We propose and insist," he declared, "that poverty in America can and therefore must be abolished within 10 years."

The freedom budget plan has won the support of top national figures in the fields of labor, economics and civil rights. Its provisions attack the economic policies and arguments of the Johnson administration such as the wage-price guideposts which have been strangling the labor movement. Although Randolph himself says that adoption of his freedom budget would not mean cutbacks in expenditures for war, most of the people calling for more antipoverty funds point to a direct connection between decreased spending on antipoverty programs and increased war expenditures.

In a speech given November 28 at Stanford University, Rep. John Conyers (Democrat from Michigan) declared, "The war in Vietnam is very likely to kill some of the new domestic programs such as the Teachers' Corps, the rent subsidy program and the model cities program in the next few months...The effect of the increased spending for the war can only be the destruction of vital domestic programs because there just isn't enough money in the national budget to pay for both. With the war expected to cost more

than the current rate of \$30 billion a year in 1967, a tax increase is going to be needed just to cover the cost of the war alone."

Other Democratic politicians, pressured by the discontented millions in the cities, echo these statements. Expenditures for the space program, for example, were the target of Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh, president of the National League of Cities. The League, representing almost 14,000 communities, met while the Senate subcommittee hearings were taking place. Noting that the space program was supported by a \$70 billion commitment from Congress, Cavanagh said that the League was "asking that the programs which strike at the major problems of cities have no more than equal priority with the space program." He predicted that "if we overlook the urgent and flaming problems of our slums, then we can find our nation crumbling beneath the climbing spaceships."

Cavanagh warned, "The poor, hemmed in by hopelessness, poor education and poverty, are tired of waiting." He reminded the convention -- and the nation -- of serious racial explosions in almost 40 major cities last year.

Republican opponents of the administration are attempting to win over disgruntled Democrats and angry Negroes by playing up Johnson's sell-out of the war on poverty. The December 16 editorial of the Detroit Free Press states in its headline: "IT'S THE POOR WHO PAY." The editorial explains that "to finance the war in Vietnam, the funds to fight another war, closer to home, have been cut by \$4 million in Detroit. It is the poor who pay for our misdirected vision of world leadership."

"One of the first to pay is the Mom and Tots Neighborhood Center at 9226 Kercheval, in the heart of urban poverty and last summer's urban unrest."

The Senate subcommittee hearings allowed many of these antiadministration sentiments to be aired publicly. The "big names" who were called to testify before the subcommittee reflected the constantly growing rank-and-file discontent with the crises of capitalist society. There are increasing indications that the civil-rights movement and the labor movement are groping toward alliances with each other to struggle against a lowering of the standards of living while the war escalates and escalates.

COMMITTEE FORMED IN BOMBAY TO SUPPORT WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

Bombay

A new organization, "The Committee of One Hundred," has been formed in Bombay to undertake a campaign against the atrocities committed by the Johnson administration in Vietnam. Composed of leading scientists, artists, journalists and economists, it is seeking to set up broad-based committees throughout India to support the International War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell.

The chairman of the committee is V.V.Prasad, a senior journalist, and the secretary is T.V.Jayaraman. The members include Dev Anand and Balraj Sahni, popular movie stars, and Harindranath Chattopadhyaya, a well-known poet.

The committee has been in touch with the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. In a message to the committee, Bertrand Russell said, "I welcome any move in support of the Vietnamese and in opposition to American aggression in the world."

The Committee of One Hundred would welcome literature on the war in Vietnam. Its office is 6 Bueno Vista, Windy Hall Lane, Colaba, Bombay 5, India.

BIRLA ACKNOWLEDGES DEBT TO NAMBOODIRIPAD

Bombay

While inaugurating a new building of the Malabar Chamber of Commerce in Calicut, Kerala, on November 26, G.D.Birla, India's No. 1 industrialist, said that the "credit for bringing me to Kerala for business should rightly go to Shri E.M.S.Namboodiripad, the Left Communist leader."

Birla said that at the time, some of the prominent men in the central government had advised him not to set up a plant in Kerala. "But Shri Namboodiripad gave me good terms, which a Congress government would not have given."

Agreement was reached on the terms and conditions for setting up Birla's Walior

Rayons Factory near Calicut when Namboodiripad was the chief minister of Kerala. This might sound out of character to those who know Namboodiripad as a leader of the left Communist party of India. However, Namboodiripad has not changed his basic outlook since he was in the Kerala government in 1958-59. To him Birla is a leader of the "national bourgeoisie" with whom the CPI can seek a "bloc" in order to achieve an "anti-imperialist and antifeudal people's democratic revolution" in India. Unfortunately, this has meant placing political confidence in the bourgeoisie at the cost not only of the socialist revolution but any revolution whatsoever.

INDIAN TROTSKYIST TO RUN FOR BIHAR ASSEMBLY

Bombay

The Bihar Organising Committee of the Socialist Workers Party of India has decided to set up Somendra Kumar, a prominent trade-union leader and member of the Central Organising Committee of the SWPI, as a candidate in the elections for the Bihar legislative assembly. He will run in the Samastipur constituency in Darbhanga district.

A practising lawyer, Somendra Kumar is president of the Samastipur Central Sugar Factory Labour Union, vice-president of the Bihar State Electric Supply Workers Union and general secretary of the Rameshwar Jute Mills Labour Union. In addition, he holds offices in the municipal and postal employees unions in the state. He has been actively associated with the working-class movement of Bihar for more than 25 years.

R.K.Lall, secretary of the State Organising Committee of the SWPI has addressed letters to the state units of all left parties, including the Praja Socialist Party, Samyukta Socialist Party, Communist Party of India, Communist Party of India (Marxist), the Revolutionary Socialist Party of India and the Socialist Unity Centre, seeking their support for Kumar's candidacy.

AN ODD UNITED FRONT IN KERALA

Bombay

A so-called "Progressive Leftist United Front" has been formed in Kerala to fight the Congress party in the coming elections. Unlike in West Bengal, the members of the front have succeeded in agreeing on the distribution of assembly seats for which they will campaign.

The front consists of the pro-Peking and pro-Moscow Communist parties, the Samyukta Socialist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party of India and two reactionary rightist communalist parties. The latter are the Muslim League and the Karshaka Thozhilali Party (a new name given to the erstwhile Anti-Communist Front led by Father Vadakkan, a notorious red-baiting Catholic priest who campaigned for the dismissal of the Communist ministry in Kerala in 1959).

In order to please these new rightist "allies," none of the "Marxist" parties commemorated the October Revolution anywhere in Kerala. In past years these parties engaged in a kind of "socialist competition" in observing the victory of the Russian workers in 1917.

This year two public meetings were held on that day, one at Trivandrum, the other at Ernakulam. These were not organised by any political party but by the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society. Speakers were nonpolitical "Friends of the Soviet Union."

The Trivandrum meeting was presided over by a former president of the Pradesh Congress Committee, now a member of the Public Service Commission.

ANOTHER STEP AHEAD FOR "PERSPECTIVE MUNDIAL"

The Spanish-language edition of World Outlook has taken another encouraging step ahead. The latest issue of Perspectiva Mundial, a double number containing 52 pages, is photo-offset. Besides a series of items in a type face like that used by World Outlook, the editors have taken advantage of the process to reprint the chapter from Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution on "The Bolsheviks and Lenin." The address of Perspectiva Mundial is Apdo. Postal 27-509, Mexico 7, D.F., Mexico.

THE MEANING OF THE COW-SLAUGHTER DEMONSTRATIONS

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

More than 500,000 people, led by reactionary sadhus [holy men] and Hindu communalists, staged a violent demonstration in New Delhi last November 7 to demand enactment of legislation banning cow slaughter in India. The demonstrators attacked government buildings, ransacked houses of some prominent Congress leaders, including the home of Congress President Kamaraj and burned up motor cars parked in the streets. Seven persons were killed and scores were injured as the police fired at the crowds. The army had to be called in.

This was the first time that communal reaction was able to divert popular discontent with the Congress government in such a massive way over an obscurantist issue like cow slaughter. What is more, it provoked a serious governmental crisis.

Home Minister Nanda, charged with failure to maintain law and order, resigned from the cabinet and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi had to reshuffle her cabinet. Nanda was replaced by Defence Minister Chavan. Swaran Singh was shifted from the Foreign Affairs ministry to Defence and Chagla went from Education to Foreign Affairs. The shifts do not indicate any changes in policy.

The government took into custody a few ultrarightist leaders along with some sadhus and heads of Hindu "Mutts" [temples] but released them later.

The pro-Moscow Communist party leader S.A.Dange, who is shrewd enough to understand the implications of the New Delhi demonstrations, described them as a "dress rehearsal for counterrevolution" by "extreme reactionary forces under the cover of the sadhus."

But, blinded by the Stalinist concept of an alliance with the "national bourgeoisie," Dange wants to fight these "extreme reactionary forces," not by building an independent revolutionary leadership of the proletariat bidding for power, but by seeking collaboration with "progressive" bourgeois leaders like Kamaraj! Dange still thinks that the target of the attack mounted by the ultrarightists was the "liberal bourgeoisie" and not the proletariat.

But a bourgeois leader like Nanda, who was made the scapegoat for the crimes of the Congress government, seemed to have a better understanding of the present alignment of class forces despite his confused ideas about so-called "Gandhian socialism."

In a statement issued soon after his resignation, Nanda asserted that the "vested interests" found him inconvenient in the position he held and succeeded in getting rid of him. He then made the following significant observations: "The country needs a non-violent revolution -- a deep moral, economic and political change. The dreams of the people for a better life and a fair deal to the common man await fulfillment. They can be realised only by a speedier advance towards the establishment of a socialist society based on democratic values."

What Nanda, a bourgeois ideologue, cannot understand is that a "revolution" involving "a deep moral, economic and political change" can take place only if the proletariat at the head of the oppressed masses liquidates the present capitalist system and establishes a new order based on social ownership of the means of production.

The present crisis of the Indian society, both moral, economic and political, is the outcome of the failure of the bourgeois rulers to solve any of the basic problems. To what extent a social revolution of this kind will be "nonviolent" will, of course, depend on the relationship of forces and the willingness or not of the bourgeoisie to surrender power without a fight.

The tragedy of the present situation is that while the masses lack a revolutionary leadership capable of guiding them to their objective, the "extreme reactionary" forces are mobilising to exploit the present confusion among the masses.

In fact, forces of revivalism, regional chauvinism and communalism are again raising their heads as the anticapitalist struggles of the workers and peasants recede into the background.

The anticow-slaughter demonstrations in New Delhi and other state capitals show clearly how the forces of obscurantism and revivalism can exploit the growing popular

frustration to serve their reactionary objectives. The fact that the anticow-slaughter campaign receives such popular response is in itself a strong indictment of the revolutionary and left movement in the country -- its failure to mobilise the masses on a nationwide basis for struggle against the bourgeois state.

In states like Maharashtra and Andhra, the forces of regionalism are being roused in pursuit of sectarian aims, unfortunately with the connivance of the so-called left forces. The creation of a body like the "Shiv Sena" (named after the sixteenth-century Maratha ruler) ostensibly to improve job opportunities for Marathi-speaking people in Bombay -- with a chauvinist slogan, "Bombay for Maharashtra" -- is yet another move to disrupt the unity of the working class in India's major city.

The bourgeois rulers and a section of the Congress leadership in Maharashtra are enthusiastically supporting the "Shiv Sena" and financing its activities. Unfortunately, the left parties -- the two Communist parties, the Samyukta Socialist Party, the Peasants and Workers Party, etc. -- have also indirectly contributed to the proliferation of regional chauvinism in Maharashtra through their preoccupation with interstate border disputes.

In Andhra, for example, a big mass movement was organised by the Congress and the "left" opposition parties to demand that a steel plant be set up in Vishakapatnam instead of Sale in Tamilnad. When basic problems of the people await a solution at the hands of the bourgeois state, it is indeed tragic that the working-class parties (both of the two Communist parties) should help the regional bourgeois interests. Some Communist party members have resigned from parliament over this issue. The same can be said about the agitation in Kerala for a shipyard in Cochin.

When the working-class parties give up their basic strategy of class struggle and resort to opportunist tactics, forming alliances with this or that sector of the bourgeoisie, they inevitably sink into the quagmire of bourgeois nationalism or regional chauvinism. The traditional left parties in India today are engaged in the futile exercise of building opportunistic electoral coalitions in different states when what is required is readying the masses for a determined struggle against the present decaying capitalist order. The left-sponsored electoral fronts in Kerala, West Bengal and other states and the violent controversies among the left parties over the allocation of seats, in the absence of a definite revolutionary political perspective have caused only confusion among the masses, who are not able to distinguish between the bourgeois Congress and the reactionary right-wing parties on the one hand and the traditional left and Marxist parties on the other.

This has brought about a dangerous political disorientation among the masses. By sponsoring mass agitation on issues like cow slaughter, the bourgeois reaction is cleverly exploiting the present confusion in order to disrupt the unity of the working-class movement. Efforts are also being made by the bourgeoisie to foment conflicts between different regional groups and to create communal tension. When the revolutionary forces fail to assert themselves in a positive direction, reaction invariably tries to seize the initiative.

HEALY'S FRENCH FOLLOWERS STRIKE A BLOW AGAINST HUGO BLANCO

On December 14 a demonstration in behalf of Hugo Blanco was staged in front of the Peruvian embassy in Paris. [See page 2.] All the French organizations that consider themselves to be in the Trotskyist tradition or sympathetic to it were represented save one -- the followers of the Socialist Labour League headed by Thomas Gerard Healy.

They sent a representative, Stephane Just, to a preliminary meeting. He objected to the demonstration for Hugo Blanco on two grounds: (1) Some of those participating were involved in the campaign "One Billion for Vietnam" the drive to get funds to help the National Liberation Front, and this campaign is also supported by some Gaullists and priests; (2) action for Hugo Blanco should be carried out by the unions but with the exclusion of the Catholic-dominated Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail.

When this sectarian view failed to be accepted by the others, Just walked out. He was not merely showing contempt for those who proposed an action in behalf of Hugo Blanco. Healy's French followers boycotted the demonstration!

[Next week we will have more about this stab in the back to the defense of the Peruvian Trotskyist leader whose life may hinge on the capacity of his supporters to organize a broad international movement in his behalf.]

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE EXPLAINS AIMS OF WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

[The following interview with the French philosopher and playwright Jean-Paul Sartre on the subject of the scope and aims of the International War Crimes Tribunal that was initiated by Bertrand Russell appeared in the November 30 issue of the Paris weekly, le Nouvel Observateur. Because of its special interest to opponents of the war in Vietnam, particularly in the United States, World Outlook has translated the full text, which appears below.]

* * *

Question: It has been said of the Bertrand Russell "tribunal" that it could only turn out to be a parody of justice since it is composed of partisan figures, hostile to American policies, whose verdict is known in advance. According to an English journalist, "It's like 'Alice in Wonderland,' first the sentence, then the trial."

J.P.Sartre: Here is the meaning of what our "tribunal" proposes to do and its limits: It is not up to us to determine whether American policies in Vietnam are bad -- most of us do not have the least doubt about that -- but to see if they come within the purview of international legislation on "war crimes."

It would be meaningless to condemn, in the juridical sense of the term, the struggle of American imperialism against the countries of the third world that are trying to break loose from its domination. This struggle is in fact only an extension of the class struggle to the international level and it is determined by the structure of the groups involved. The politics of imperialism is a necessary historical reality and, by that fact, it is beyond any juridical or moral condemnation. You can only combat it, either as an intellectual, showing its mechanism, or politically by trying to get away from it (despite appearances, the French government does not really do this), or by armed struggle. I acknowledge that like other members of the "tribunal" I am a declared adversary of imperialism and that I feel in solidarity with all those who are combating it. And the commitment, from this point of view, must be total. Everyone sees the struggle as a whole and lines up with one side or the other according to motives ranging all the way from his objective situation to his ideas on human life. On this level you can hate the class enemy. But you can't judge the class enemy in the juridical sense of the term. It is even difficult if not impossible, insofar as one takes a purely realistic view of the class struggle, to submit one's own allies to a juridical test and rigorously define the "crimes" committed by their governments. This was quite clear with the problem of the Stalinist camps. Either you brought in a moral judgment, which was completely beside the point, or you confined yourself to evaluating the "positive" and the "negative" in Stalin's politics. Some said, "The positive tilts the scales"; for others it was "the negative." These were not good grounds either.

In fact, if the development of History is not guided by law and by morals -- which on the contrary are products of it -- these two elements of the superstructure do exercise a "feedback action" on this development. This is what enables us to judge a society in the light of criteria which it itself has established. It is thus completely normal to ask, at a given moment, whether this or that action has not passed beyond the domain of the "useful" and the "bad" and fallen within the purview of an international jurisprudence that has been built up little by little.

In one of his prefaces to Capital, Marx said something along the following lines: "We are the last who can be accused of condemning the bourgeoisie, since we hold that conditioned by the process of capital and the class struggle, their conduct is necessary. But there are times, just the same, when they rise above it."

The whole problem is to find out whether, today, the imperialists have risen above it.

When Talleyrand said, "It is more than a crime; it is a blunder," he summarized very well the way in which, in the course of history, political actions were always considered; they could be skillful or clumsy, useful or bad -- they were always free from juridical penalties. There was no "criminal politics."

And then, at Nuremberg, in 1945, for the first time the concept of "political crime" appeared. It was suspect, of course, since it was a matter of the conqueror imposing a law on the conquered. But the condemnation of the heads of Nazi Germany by the Nuremberg tribunal was meaningless unless it implied that any government which, in the future, committed punishable acts, would be held accountable before an analogous tribunal. Our "tribunal" proposes today only to apply to capitalist imperialism its own laws. The arsenal of jurisprudence moreover is not limited to the Nuremberg laws; before

that there was the Briand-Kellogg pact, there was the Geneva Convention and other international accords.

Once again, it is not a question here of condemning a policy in the name of history, of judging whether it is contrary or not to the interests of humanity, but of seeing whether it comes under the purview of existing laws. For example, you can criticize the current politics of France, you can be completely opposed to it, as I am, but you cannot characterize it as "criminal." This would be meaningless. You could do it, on the other hand, during the Algerian war. Torture, the organization of regroupment camps, reprisals against civilian populations, executions without trials were identifiable with certain crimes condemned at Nuremberg. If, at the time, a "tribunal" had been set up like this one conceived by Bertrand Russell, I would certainly have agreed to take part in it. Because it was not done in the case of France is no reason for not doing it today in the case of the United States.

Q: It can be asked by what law, since you are invoking the law, you set yourselves up as judges, which you don't happen to be...

J.P.Sartre: That's so. Right now, one could say, anyone can be the judge of anything he wants! And then doesn't the undertaking face the danger of falling on the one hand into petty-bourgeois idealism (a certain number of well-known figures are protesting in the name of cherished values) and on the other hand into fascism, through a vengeful side reminiscent of Arsène Lupin and all the fascist literature?

To this I would answer first of all that it is not a matter of sentencing anyone to any penalty at all. Any judgment that is not enforceable is obviously absurd. I don't see myself passing a death sentence on President Johnson. It would be ridiculous.

Our aim is something different. It is to study all the existing documents on the war in Vietnam, to hear all the witnesses possible -- American and Vietnamese -- and to determine solemnly and sincerely whether certain actions come under the purview of the laws I have mentioned. We will not make up any new legislation. We will only say, if we establish it, which I don't say in advance that we will: "Such and such acts, committed at such and such places, constitute a violation of such and such international laws, and are, consequently, crimes. And those responsible are as follows." Which would, if a genuine international tribunal existed, make them liable, for example under the laws applied at Nuremberg, to such and such a penalty. Thus it is not at all a matter of giving vent to the indignant disapproval of a group of honest citizens, but of providing a juridical measure of international political acts, in order to combat the tendency of the majority of people to pronounce only practical or moral judgments on the behavior of a social group or a government.

Q: Doesn't this compel you to admit that there is a way of conducting war that should be condemned and another way that shouldn't be?

J.P.Sartre: Certainly not! The struggle of imperialism against certain peoples of the third world is a fact that I recognize. I am opposed to it with all my being, to the extent of my feeble means, but I don't have to say whether there is a good or bad way of conducting it. The truth is, although the good peaceable people of our societies of consumption prefer to ignore it, the world is in flames and we can have a world war at any time. I have to take part in the struggle but I don't have to humanize it. We only need to know, as this struggle unfolds, if there are people who have "risen above it," if the imperialist policy comes under the purview of laws enacted by imperialism itself.

The question can be raised, obviously, whether or not it is possible to conduct a war of imperialist repression without violating international laws. But that is not our concern. As a mere citizen, a philosopher, a Marxist, I have the right to believe that this kind of war always leads to the utilization of torture, the creation of concentration camps, etc. As a member of Bertrand Russell's "tribunal," this is of no interest to me. My task is only to seek to determine if laws have been violated, in order to revive the juridical concept of international crime.

We must ask ourselves if our ideas of political policies, however correct our ideas may be -- namely, that policies must be judged from a realistic point of view, that they are determined by the relationship of forces, that the aim sought for must be borne in mind, etc. -- do not lead us, as they did many people in Stalin's time, to consider policies only from the angle of their effectiveness and to fall into a passive complicity by not judging the acts of a government except from a practical viewpoint. Doesn't a political deed likewise have an ethico-juridical structure?

In this field, our judgments cannot be rendered in advance, even if we are com-

mitted, as individuals, in the struggle against imperialism. Once again, I combat the de Gaulle government with my ballot but it never occurs to me to say that Gaullist policies are criminal. You can speak with indignation about a crime in connection with the Ben Barka affair, but I don't know what law would be applicable if we sought to sentence the French government in this affair. It is completely different in the question of judging this or that act of war carried out by the Americans in Vietnam, this or that bombing, this or that operation ordered in high quarters. To seek to set up a real tribunal and levy penalties would be to act like idealists. But we have the right to meet, as citizens, to again give vitality to the concept of war crimes by showing that policies can and must be judged objectively in the light of existing juridical criteria.

When someone shouts in a meeting: "The war in Vietnam is a crime," this pertains to the field of passions. This war is certainly contrary to the interests of the immense majority of men but is it criminal juridically? This is what we will try to determine without being able to say in advance what our findings may be.

There are cases where the violation of international law is clearly apparent. When the government of South Africa, which exercises a mere mandate over Southwest Africa, refuses to carry out a decision of the United Nations requiring it to give up this territory, open international delinquency is involved. Everyone can see it.

In Vietnam the situation is different -- there certain deeds occurred that can be established -- our objective is to see if they are in the purview of a law.

Q: Some people accuse you of not judging the Vietnamese at the same time as the Americans and claim that war crimes are being committed by both sides.

J.P.Sartre: I refuse to put on the same plane the action of a group of poor, hunted peasants, compelled to maintain iron discipline in their ranks, and that of an immense army maintained by a superindustrialized country with 200 million inhabitants. And then it is not the Vietnamese who have invaded America and are raining down a deluge of fire on a foreign people. During the war in Algeria, I always refused to draw a parallel between bombs placed by terrorists, which was the only weapon the Algerians had, and the actions and exactions of a wealthy army of 500,000 men occupying the whole country. It's the same in Vietnam.

Q: On the possibility, open to you during the "trial," of including in the evidence the juridical norms applicable to the policies of any government, could this lead to a wider action against American policies in Vietnam?

J.P.Sartre: Obviously. But that could only occur later. On the basis of our inquiry -- if it results in a condemnation -- demonstrations, meetings, marches, signature campaigns could be organized. Our first job is to get materials, information, and our "hearings" will obviously be public.

We have been accused of petty-bourgeois legalism. This is true and I accept the objection. But whom do you wish us to convince? The classes that are struggling against capitalism and that are already convinced ("crimes" or not) that imperialism must be fought to the bitter end, or the very broad fringe of the middle class that is hesitant at present? It is the petty-bourgeois masses that must be aroused and shaken up today, because their alliance -- even on a domestic level -- with the working class is desirable. And it is via legalism that their eyes can be opened. It is not bad either to remind the working class, which is only too often trained to consider only what is effective that every historical action has an ethico-juridical structure. In the post-Stalinist period in which we are living, it is very important to bring out this structure.

Q: How do you explain the fact that demonstrations against the war in Vietnam have been more numerous and more vigorous in West Germany, England, Italy and Belgium than in France?

J.P.Sartre: In France, actually, a certain callousness in the conscience of the petty bourgeoisie and even the working class at times has been evident. This, I think, is due to the fact that we have only just emerged from a long period of colonial wars. We were "cut off" for a very long time from all the problems of world importance -- particularly those of the third world -- because we were the ones oppressing Indochina, then Algeria. That was the time, you will recall, when the entire world was disturbed by the development of nuclear arms. The French never paid any attention. They never understood that their country, which opened its territory to American bases, would be annihilated like the others in the event of a nuclear war. They didn't understand it because their attention was constantly centered on our colonial problems.

There is another reason for the French apathy, this is the confusion resulting from de Gaulle's success in passing off purely verbal affirmations of independence as a genuinely anti-imperialist policy. The Phnom-Penh speech consisted of nothing but words, since de Gaulle, while condemning American policies, provided no economic means domestically for breaking loose from American tutelage.

But the fact that de Gaulle is the only head of a capitalist state to denounce the policies of the United States gives the French a clear conscience. The same citizen who was hostile to independence for Algeria and then only too happy that a venerated chief brought to an end a war that could not possibly be won is today very satisfied with the definitive words of a great man, with whom he identifies, furnishing him with a justification for his passivity: "Since de Gaulle is so firm on Vietnam, there is no need for me to do more."

If the parties of the left were united, they could show that the Gaullist ambition to convert France into a serious adversary of American imperialism is meaningless, since it is not backed by a domestic policy capable of really freeing us from the American grip.

France today is only a rebellious slave who remains subject to American commands. The NATO general staff is going to locate its headquarters somewhere else, it seems, but the Americans can throw the French workers out of their jobs whenever and wherever they want; they can paralyze our economy merely by withdrawing their computers; they can wield enormous pressures against which we are defenseless.

The first point of a program for the left should be to struggle, through an investment policy establishing priorities -- largely public ones -- against the invasion of American capital. This would be very difficult, I know, and France could not do it alone. It would be necessary to utilize the Common Market and get the partners in it to follow the same policy. They, too, are dominated right now by American economic power but one could imagine certain countries, Italy for example, being led to revise their attitude if France followed a policy of genuine economic independence.

Right now, we must wait for the left to unite. And I do not see the gulf separating the partisans and opponents of the Atlantic Pact being filled in. The problem is partially masked because the Communists have made some concessions in the elections but it remains and it continues to paralyze the left. We had a perfect example when Guy Mollet sought to get a motion last spring to censure the government's foreign policy. The Communists were annoyed because certain aspects of this policy correspond with their line and they said, "Instead let's condemn the government's policy as a whole, by showing that it's just as unsatisfactory at home as abroad." Guy Mollet refused.

In my opinion, opposition to the Atlantic Pact should be the principal criterion for a left policy. I would even say that the only point in common between the abstract position of de Gaulle and what should be the attitude of the left, is the demand for national sovereignty. Sovereignty which should be regained not in order to defend it jealously -- one can associate with equally sovereign countries and set up national bodies to which certain powers would be delegated -- but in order to oppose American imperialism which is breaking down national structures everywhere.

Q: If the left were united, could it do something effective in the Vietnam situation?

J.P.Sartre: First of all, it could mobilize public opinion. This is not easy, but there are countries where it has been done. In France, a strike of a certain amplitude unleashed in relation with economic demands but in which the real aim would be opposition to the policies of the Americans in Vietnam is inconceivable. In Japan -- I have just come from there -- a general strike took place October 21 "against American imperialism." I don't claim that it was a complete success, but it was possible for it to take place.

The French, too, of course, are "against" the war in Vietnam, but they don't feel involved. They don't understand that they are threatened with being dragged into a world conflict by the development of a struggle that is of interest only to the Americans. As for de Gaulle, he knows it. I was struck by the reaction of the Japanese to the Phnom-Penh speech. They said, "De Gaulle is afraid." They meant that he had suddenly seen the danger of his country being destroyed because of something that did not concern it. It was in fact a speech expressing fear, and from that angle it was a good speech. But a mere cry of alarm is not much.

We must conceive our struggle today within the perspective of a long-lasting American hegemony. The world is not dominated by two great powers but by only one. And

peaceful coexistence, despite its very positive aspects, serves the United States. Thanks to peaceful coexistence and the Sino-Soviet dispute -- which is largely a result of it -- the Americans are able to bomb Vietnam with complete tranquility. The socialist camp has unquestionably suffered a setback due to the rivalries that have torn it and the policy begun by Khrushchev. The Americans today feel that they have such free rein that Johnson made it known in a recent speech that he would not permit the Chinese to develop their nuclear arms beyond a certain point. This alarming and cynical threat could not have been made if Johnson was certain that the USSR would come to the aid of China.

The present hegemony of the United States does not exclude, however, a certain vulnerability. In the absence of a direct confrontation with the socialist camp -- which is too gravely divided -- the solution can come from the weariness of the American masses and the uneasiness of the leaders in Washington in face of the growing censure of the entire world and in particular all their allies.

Q: Do you think that acts like the one by David Mitchell, the young American who cited the Nuremberg laws in refusing to serve in Vietnam, can contribute to stirring the American conscience?

J.P.Sartre: It was precisely from David Mitchell's action and that of several others that the idea of our "tribunal" was born. Our inquiry, if it finds the United States guilty, should enable all the young Americans who are combatting Johnson's policies to invoke not only the Nuremberg laws but also the judgment of a certain number of free men who do not represent any country, any party. It is much better that we do not represent anything. What invalidates the Nuremberg judgments in the eyes of the neo-Nazis is that they were handed down by conquerors whose law rested on force. We, in contrast, are not mandated by any power and no one can say that we are imposing our law on people under the boot. We are independent because we are weak. And our position is strong because we are not trying to send anyone to prison but, at a calamitous moment in our history, are trying to revive in public opinion the idea that there can be policies that are objectively and juridically criminal.

INDONESIAN COMMUNIST LEADERS BEGIN SELF-CRITICISM

[The following message of greetings from a delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Indonesia to the Tenth Congress of the Communist party of Japan, has been translated from the November (No. 31) issue of Suara Pemuda Indonesia, the bulletin of the Indonesian Students Association, which is published in China.

[It is noteworthy as the first attempt by the surviving leaders of the PKI to make a public assessment of the reasons for the catastrophic defeat suffered by their party a little more than a year ago. The document indicates that an internal discussion has been going on and this may be the first public result.

[The two main lessons advanced by the document; i.e., that the PKI held illusions as to the character of the state power in Indonesia and thought that it was possible to capture the existing state structure by peaceful means and then utilize it to build socialism, are absolutely correct. It is to be hoped that the sources and ramifications of these two key errors will now be further explored.

[Despite the good beginning on these two points, other items in the document are not so promising.

[Instead of examining the role played by the leadership of the Chinese Communist party in covering up and fostering Aidit's grossly revisionist and opportunist line, the authors of the document join in adulating the "thought of Mao Tse-tung." It is understandable why the exiles of the PKI feel that they must adopt a diplomatic attitude toward the Maoist group, but it is nonetheless true that it is not possible to overcome great defeats by whitewashing those who share a major part of the responsibility.

[The document also reveals a strong ultraleft sectarian streak which may be due to overcompensation for the opportunism of the Aidit leadership but which more likely is a direct reflection of Maoist attitudes in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

[Thus the authors see no difference between the interests, aims and policies of American and Japanese imperialism. While there is no difference between the two imperialist powers in a fundamental sense, it is simplistic not to take into account the fact that they are also rival powers and that it is perfectly in order for a workers state

like the People's Republic of China, for instance, to try to explore the rivalry and to take advantage of it -- a course which the Maoist group has given little indication of following.

[A far worse error is to see no differences between the "modern revisionists"; i.e., the government of the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Khrushchevists, and American and Japanese imperialism. To reject a united front with the Soviet Union on such fallacious grounds in defending Vietnam against American imperialist aggression can prove to be as disastrous as the opportunist policy followed by the PKI in Indonesia under Aidit and with Mao's connivance and approval.

[Nevertheless, the beginning of a serious effort at self-criticism on the part of the surviving PKI leadership is to be welcomed. Other sectors of the revolutionary Marxist movement should help them in this course by offering their own opinions.]

* * *

Dear Comrades,

The delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia [PKI] conveys its warmest and sincerest greetings to the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Japan, and therewith to all the Communists and working people of Japan. By leading the militant and courageous Japanese people in their struggle for democracy and national independence against U.S. imperialist domination, against the Japanese monopolists and militarists and against the modern revisionists, the Communist Party of Japan has been standing in the forefront of the struggle on a world scale against imperialism headed by the U.S. and the modern revisionists.

The Communists and the people of Indonesia express their warmest appreciation for the struggle waged by the Communists and the people of Japan, which also means concretely contributing to strengthening the struggle of the Indonesian people to achieve complete national independence and democracy.

In greeting the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Japan, we hope that the congress will succeed in contributing to further strengthening the struggle against U.S. imperialism, the modern revisionists and the domestic reactionary forces.

At present the Communists and the people of Indonesia are passing through a very difficult stage. White terror and tyrannical oppression launched by the military-fascist clique of generals headed by Nasution and Suharto after the September 30 [1965] Affair against the Communists and progressive people have dealt a serious setback to the revolutionary movement in Indonesia. Being responsible to the Indonesian and international proletariat, the PKI has begun seriously drawing the lessons and the necessary conclusions from this bitter experience.

We are sure that the PKI has been able to overcome the serious crisis it suffered under the counterrevolutionary terror.

At the present time, the PKI is not only rebuilding its organization which has suffered heavy destruction, but by seriously applying criticism and self-criticism within the leadership and the whole party, the PKI is now returning to the right path; namely, the revolutionary path of Marxism-Leninism. Step by step the Indonesian revolutionary forces and the partisans of democracy are carrying out the task of reorganizing and resuming the struggle against the military dictatorship headed by Suharto and Nasution.

Among the lessons to be drawn from this bitter experience, it must be said that one of the principal causes of the setback to the people's struggle at the time was the misjudgment of state power in Indonesia.

This misjudgment provided grounds for the formulation that there were two aspects to state power in Indonesia: a pro-people aspect and an anti-people aspect. According to this false theory, the state was no longer an instrument of the ruling class for suppressing other classes, but a common instrument of service to both the suppressing and the suppressed classes.

This theory fed the illusion that a fundamental change in state power; namely, the establishment of the people's power, could be achieved by peaceful means. That is by developing "the pro-people aspect" and liquidating "the anti-people aspect."

The theory of "two aspects within the state power" in fact deprived the proletariat of freedom in the united front with the national bourgeoisie, subordinating the

interests of the proletariat to those of the bourgeoisie, and reducing the proletariat to the role of a mere servant of the national bourgeoisie.

To recover its position as leader of the people's struggle for independence, it is absolutely necessary for the PKI to correct its error; namely, the theory of "two aspects within the state power," and apply the correct Marxist-Leninist principles about the state and revolution.

Events in Indonesia have proved the total bankruptcy of all forms of the theory of "peaceful transition" to socialism. They have shown us what a great sacrifice must be paid by the proletariat due to illusions about "peaceful transition" and discarding the principles of a "people's war" in solving the contradiction between the people and the reactionary classes, such as the comprador bourgeoisie, bureaucratic capitalists and feudalists.

The way to achieve victory for the people of Indonesia is through a people's war adapted to the concrete conditions in Indonesia. This is the path of Mao Tse-tung, the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our time, who has inherited, defended and developed creatively Marxism-Leninism as a whole, and brought it to a new stage.

The PKI, which is now more united, has drafted three urgent tasks under the heading of "Three Banners of the Party" [Tri Pandji Partai] to guide the People's Democratic Revolution to victory:

First: Carry out the task of rebuilding the PKI on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist line, free from any kind of opportunism and consistently against subjectivism and modern revisionism; and at the same time to arouse, organize and mobilize the masses, especially the workers and peasants.

Second: Prepare to lead a protracted armed struggle integrated with the agrarian revolution of the peasants in the villages.

Third: Establish a united front of all forces which are against the military dictatorship of the rightist army generals headed by Suharto and Nasution; namely, a united front based upon an alliance of the workers and peasants under the leadership of the proletariat. (Statement of the PKI, August 17, 1966.)

The program, "Three Banners of the Party," formulated after a serious internal struggle within the party over questions of principle, has united the rank and file of the party and given full confidence to all Indonesian Communists that the PKI will be capable of leading the revolutionary movement of the Indonesian people toward a new upsurge in the near future.

The experience of our people shows that at the present time there is no difference between U.S. imperialism, the ruling class in Japan and the modern revisionists. On the one hand the modern revisionists have expelled one of the PKI cadres from their country; and, on the other hand, they have invited Adam Malik, the foreign minister of the Indonesian fascist regime, with open arms. These facts, plus the establishment of the "Tokyo Club," are only some examples of how the ruling class in Japan, the modern revisionists and the U.S. imperialists are working shoulder to shoulder in a united action against the people of Indonesia and their vanguard, the PKI.

Therefore, our party is of the opinion that the struggle against U.S. imperialism and against the fascist regime of Suharto-Nasution is only verbiage if it does not at the same time carry on a struggle against modern revisionism.

The modern revisionists are in fact the ideological and political mercenaries of the U.S. imperialists and other reactionary forces. Modern revisionism is a bourgeois ideology concealed under a cloak of Marxism-Leninism. Therefore it is impossible to bring the modern revisionists into a united action against U.S. imperialism.

Through its own experience, the PKI has learned that the struggle against modern revisionism must be carried out in conjunction with a struggle against any kind of modern revisionism that appears within its own ranks.

At the present moment, modern revisionism, which has been the principal danger in the international Communist movement, is becoming more dangerous because of its smooth-tongued, hypocritical and lying behavior.

The people of Indonesia, who are now struggling against the fascist regime of Suharto-Nasution, are fully convinced that by arming themselves with Marxism-Leninism, the thought of Mao Tse-tung and the Three Banners of the Party, they will prove capable

of overthrowing the fascist regime of Suharto-Nasution and bringing the Indonesian revolution to final victory.

Our people and our party are grateful to all the fraternal parties of Marxism-Leninism, including the Marxist-Leninists of Japan, for the solidarity and aid given us.

Now, and even more in the days to come, the people and the Marxist-Leninists of Indonesia and of Japan must unite ever closer in the struggle against the common enemy: U.S. imperialism and its lackeys; namely, the ruling class in Japan, the fascist regime in Indonesia and the modern revisionists, who are now all working shoulder to shoulder.

On the question of Vietnam, the Indonesian fascist regime at present is following the deceitful policy of the "peaceful solution" propagated by U.S. imperialism and the modern revisionists and backed up by the ruling class in Japan. In face of this treacherous policy, the Marxist-Leninists and the people of Japan and Indonesia must strengthen their unity in the common struggle to aid the struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialism, to liberate the South, to defend the North, and to unite all again into a single whole.

We are fully convinced that by holding high the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the Marxist-Leninists of Japan will be able to achieve a greater success in the struggle against U.S. imperialism, the Japanese reactionary forces and the modern revisionists.

Long live the Marxist-Leninists of Japan, the vanguard of the Japanese people!

Long live militant friendship between the Marxist-Leninists and the people of Japan and Indonesia!

The Delegation of the CC of the PKI

October 22, 1966

Joesoef Adjitorop

FIDEL CASTRO ON THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN CUBA TODAY

[The following is part of a speech made by Fidel Castro December 9 in Santa Clara before an audience of 15,000 women at the Fifth National Plenary Session of the Federation of Cuban Women. In the United States, a brief notice of the speech appeared in the New York Times. Sent from Miami, it mentioned only Castro's remarks later on dealing with the struggle against bureaucratism. Not a word about the rest of the contents. In Cuba, the part of the speech dealing with the contribution of women to the revolution was singled out for big headlines.

[The part below has been taken from the December 18 English edition of Granma, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba, published in Havana.]

* * *

Arriving here this evening, I commented to a comrade that this phenomenon of women's participation in the Revolution was a revolution within a Revolution (APPLAUSE). And if we were asked what the most revolutionary thing is that the Revolution is doing, we would answer that it is precisely this! the revolution that is occurring among the women of our country (APPLAUSE). If we were asked what things in the Revolution have been most instructive for us, we would answer that one of the most interesting lessons for revolutionaries is that being offered by our women (APPLAUSE).

You all know perfectly well that, in saying this, we are not uttering given words with intent to please the compañeras who are here tonight, but that we say it because it is what we firmly believe and feel.

But why is this one of the most interesting lessons? You yourselves may ask why. In reality, the most honest answer that we could give -- and I assure you that the person who offers this answer is precisely one who has always believed himself free from prejudice -- the answer is, I believe, that in reality all of us were prejudiced in regard to women (APPLAUSE). And if anyone had ever asked me if I considered myself prejudiced in regard to women, I would have said absolutely not, because I believed myself to be quite the opposite. I believed that an enormous potential force and extraordinary human resources for the Revolution existed in our women.

But what has happened? What has occurred, or rather, what is occurring? We are finding that, in reality, this potential force is superior to anything that the most optimistic of us ever dreamed of. We say that perhaps at heart, unconsciously, something of bias or underestimation existed. For events are demonstrating, even now, the possibilities of women and the role that women can play in a revolutionary process in which society is liberating itself, above all, from exploitation, and from prejudices and a whole series of circumstances in which women were doubly exploited, doubly humiliated.

What have we found, for example, in regard to the work of women? I have been talking with several comrades and, following my visit to the Banao Plan (APPLAUSE), I told Comrade Milián: "I have the impression that the women working in this Plan are more responsible and more disciplined than the men (APPLAUSE). I have the impression that they will dedicate themselves to the work with more enthusiasm, more passion, more dedication." And Milián -- although I certainly don't want to give this comrade a bad name with the women of Las Villas -- argued with me, "Well, but...really...the case of the young men who are in the Juraguá Plan of the Young Communists..."

I told him that finding a spirit of discipline and enthusiasm for work in a program involving selected Young Communists was not as extraordinary as finding the same spirit of discipline and enthusiasm in a program carried out by women who had not been specially chosen for this program, who had not been chosen by any organization, but had simply volunteered to do this work (APPLAUSE).

What have we found? What is being found everywhere in this revolutionary program, as far as the Cuban women are concerned? Well, we are finding a whole series of things such as those I mentioned before: a great sense of responsibility, great seriousness, great discipline and enthusiasm.

What have we found right here in the province of Las Villas? Well, let us take the Banao Plan, for example. This program was growing and needed a cadre. Comrade Milián sought a cadre from the Party; Comrade Santiago Acosta, from the Santo Domingo zone, I believe, and sent him to the Banao Plan as administrator. But one day, comrades Santiago Acosta and René Acosta -- the specialist on technical matters -- had to go abroad. They were the men holding the positions of greatest responsibility in the Plan. Someone had to be appointed to take their place and we decided to appoint Comrade Osoria, who was representing the Federation of Cuban Women on the directing board of the Plan (APPLAUSE).

We firmly believe that this even may some day have historic significance, for it was the first time that a woman had been assigned to such a task, not for political reasons or to impress anyone, but simply because she had, objectively speaking, proved herself capable of heading such a program.

And from that moment on, we thought it would be reasonable and an excellent thing, indeed, to have a woman directing a plan involving thousands of women workers (APPLAUSE).

Moreover, when it became necessary to organize the work brigades, a number of women who had distinguished themselves for their great spirit of work were chosen as brigade leaders.

This gave us an idea:

We had to train a group of technicians for this type of work and, at first, ten comrades from the Technological Institute had been sent here to specialize in this branch of agriculture. We decided that twenty additional students who were to be sent here to specialize in this field should be chosen from among the girl students at the Technological Institute.

Thus, the workers, the brigade leaders, and the technicians -- that is, the technical and administrative staff -- is going to be made up almost entirely of women. Yes, women! (APPLAUSE).

This is one of the great lessons we spoke about before: one of the great lessons and perhaps one of the greatest victories over prejudices that have existed, not for decades or centuries, but for thousands of years. We refer to the belief that all a woman could do was wash dishes, wash and iron clothes, cook, keep house, and bear children (APPLAUSE AND EXCLAMATIONS), age-old prejudices, that placed women in an inferior position in society. In effect, she did not have a productive place in society.

Such prejudices are thousands of years old and have survived through various

social systems. If we consider capitalism, women, that is, lower-class women, were doubly exploited or doubly humiliated. A poor woman, part of the working class or of a working-class family, was exploited simply because she was poor, because she was a member of the working class. But in addition, although she was a woman of the working class, even her own class looked down on and underrated her. Not only was she underestimated, exploited and looked down upon by the exploiting classes but, even within her own class, she was the object of numerous prejudices.

So all these events have been a great lesson to all of us, to every revolutionary. Naturally, a considerable amount of prejudice still persists. If women were to believe that they have totally fulfilled their role as revolutionaries in society, they would be making a mistake. It seems to us that women must still fight and exert great efforts to attain the place that they should really hold in society.

If women in our country were doubly exploited, doubly humiliated in the past, then this simply means that women in a social revolution should be doubly revolutionary (APPLAUSE).

And perhaps this is the explanation, or at least the social basis for the resolute, enthusiastic, firm and loyal support given by Cuban women to this Revolution.

This Revolution has really been two revolutions for women; it has meant a double liberation as part of the exploited sector of the country and, second, as women, who were discriminated not only as workers but also as women, in that society of exploitation.

The attitude of Cuban women toward the Revolution corresponds to this reality; it corresponds to what the Revolution has meant to them.

And the support of the popular masses for the Revolution is directly proportionate to what the revolution has meant to them in terms of their liberation.

There are two sectors in this country, two sectors of society which, aside from economic reasons, have had other motives for sympathizing and feeling enthusiasm for the Revolution. These two sectors are the Negro population of Cuba and the female population.

I suppose you recall that in Cuba's old bourgeois Constitution, there was an article which declared illegal any discrimination for reasons of race or sex. The Constitution declared such discrimination illegal. But a Constitution in a capitalist society, or such an article in a capitalist society, solves nothing, because the discrimination for reason of race and for reasons of sex existed in practice. And the basis for all of this was the existence of a class society which practiced exploitation.

In a class society which is to say, a society of exploiters and exploited, there was no way of eliminating discrimination for reasons of race or sex. Now the problem of such discrimination has disappeared from our country, because the basis for these two types of discrimination which is, quite simply, the exploitation of man by man, has disappeared (APPLAUSE).

Much news reaches us from the United States, for example, about the civil-rights struggle for Negroes. Nevertheless, racial discrimination in the United States will not disappear until capitalist society has disappeared.

That is discrimination will never be wiped out within the framework of capitalist society. Discrimination with respect to race and sex can only be wiped out through a socialist revolution, which eradicates the exploitation of man by man (APPLAUSE). Now, does the disappearance of the exploitation of man by man mean that all the conditions are immediately created whereby woman may elevate her position in society? No. The conditions for the liberation of women, for the full development of women in society, for an authentic equality of rights, or for authentic equality of women with men in society, require a material base; they require the material foundations of economic and social development. I described before the opinion held by many men concerning the functions of women, and I said that among the functions considered to belong to women was -- almost exclusively -- that of having children. Naturally, reproduction is one of the most important of women's functions in human society, in any kind of human society.

But it is precisely this function, relegated by nature to women, which has enslaved them to a series of chores within the home.

There is a sign here in front of us, for example, which says, "One million women working in production by 1970." Unfortunately, it will not be possible to have one mil-

lion working in production by 1970. We feel that this goal may be reached, perhaps, within 10 years but not within four. We could propose it as a goal to be reached by 1975. Why can't this goal be reached in four years? Because in order to have one million women working in production, we must have thousands of children's day nurseries, thousands of primary boarding schools, thousands of school dining halls, thousands of workers' dining halls, thousands of centers of social services of this type, must be set up, because if not, who is going to cook for the second- or third-grade child when he comes home for lunch? Who is going to care for unweaned infants, or babies of two, three and four years of age? Who is going to prepare dinner for the man when he comes home from work? Who is going to wash, clean, all of those things? (APPLAUSE)

In other words, in order to reach the social goal of liberating woman from all these activities that enslave her and impede her from full incorporation into work outside the home and all these activities she can engage in society, it is necessary to create the necessary material base, to attain the necessary social development. It is impossible to construct the required thousands of children's day nurseries, school dining halls, laundries, workers' dining halls, boarding schools, in four years. In fact, merely to meet present needs, great effort is necessary on all fronts.

Everywhere women are working it has been necessary to make a special effort to establish day nurseries, set up boarding schools and all of the necessary institutions so that these women could be free to work.

In Sancti Spiritus, for example, several day nurseries had to be opened, and scholarships had to be provided for children already at primary school age, children of mothers who are working in the Sancti Spiritus plan. The same had to be done in Santiago de Cuba. And a big effort will also have to be made next year in several areas so that great numbers of women may join production.

To have day nurseries and schools, qualified personnel is required as well as materials and equipment of all kinds. The women working in the day nurseries who are responsible for the organization of these day nurseries, have told us of the difficulties and limitations they are facing. They tell us, for example, that many women who work as teachers, nurses, many women who work not only in agriculture but in other very important services, are constantly demanding more day nurseries, and that this is impossible at the moment. Why? Because the number of agricultural plans has increased and the demand for day nurseries is enormous.

They have told us that in some provinces the problem has been easier to solve. They have explained that in the province of Las Villas, the Party has been of great help in solving the problem and good headway has been made. But in Camagüey, things are more difficult. Why? Because Camagüey is an area where great economic development is underway: cane-conditioning centers are being constructed, the Nuevitas projects are in progress, thousands of houses, thousands of miles of roads are under construction. The Ministry of Construction is working at full capacity in Camagüey, it can do no more, and it has been discovered that when the necessity arises of converting a house into a day nursery, the Ministry is unable to provide for one cubic meter more of construction on account of the great number of jobs on its hands at present. The Camagüey case is especially difficult.

In Havana, the problem is similar. Many day nurseries are also needed here, yet the Ministry of Construction is unable to do more than it is doing.

At this stage, of scarcity of cement, machinery and construction equipment, the problem can be solved only through maximum efforts on all fronts: sometimes at a regional level, other times at a provincial or national level, using the resources we have at hand.

Nor can we expect that the day nurseries be perfect, that the constructions be perfect, nor the service. They must be as good as possible, but they cannot be perfect.

These problems will have to be solved in many areas of the country, little by little. One million women cannot be employed in one day. A whole series of economic steps must be taken, and agricultural plans set in motion. It would be interesting to know how many women have already started to work in the production of consumers' goods as well as in services since the triumph of the Revolution, how many are working as nurses aides, technicians, industrial and agricultural workers. If a statistical study were made as to how many women have begun to work since the triumph of the Revolution, the number would probably be close to 150,000, and certainly no less than that! (APPLAUSE)

This figure, of course, is not based on exact statistics, and it seems to us that

a study should be made in order to learn precisely how many women have found work in newly created jobs, in jobs created by the Revolution.

Next year the number of women working will be considerably greater. Why? Because a whole series of plans will get underway, mainly in agriculture. Several thousand women are to be incorporated into the Banao Plan and when that Plan reaches its maximum development, it will require six or seven thousand women. In Pinares de Mayari, some eight thousand women will be working by springtime. In the coffee-plant nurseries set up for the 1967-68 coffee-growing plan, 30,000 women will be needed and many thousands will work in the reforestation plans, in vegetable cultivation, and other thousands are being incorporated into jobs in the cities. This means that more than 50,000 women will be involved in tasks related to production by next year, and this will require an enormous and simultaneous effort to be made so that all of the problems related to dining halls, schools, and children's day nurseries may be worked out.

I am going to tell you something. Without the incorporation of women, the Banao Plan could never have gotten off the ground, nor could the plans for microclimate vegetable cultivation in Oriente Province have been carried out. Without the incorporation of women, the plans for coffee growing could not even have been considered.

Many of the plans that the Revolution is today drawing up and beginning to carry out could not have been conceived until the great reservoir of human resources that our society possesses in its women was clearly seen for what it was. These plans, which stand for extraordinary contributions to the economic development of our country, to the increased well-being of our people, could not have been conceived without the mass incorporation of women into work.

HEALY SCORES ANOTHER "TRIUMPH" OVER ERNEST TATE

In previous issues we have reported how Ernest Tate, a Trotskyist, was beaten up in front of a Socialist Labour League meeting held at Caxton Hall in London on November 17. We have also reported how Ernest Tate refused to call the cops, preferring to register his protest with organizations in the socialist and labor movement. For instance, he wrote a circular letter in which he gave his impression of what happened in front of Caxton Hall and fixed the responsibility on Healy.

Healy's reply to this was to go over the letter in hope of finding formulations that could be utilized in the bourgeois courts in a shyster lawsuit. He hired attorneys to open proceedings. Solicitors' letters were sent to Tate and to two working-class newspapers that had published Tate's letter, the Socialist Leader and Peace News.

The two working-class papers, which have no large sums at hand to fight shyster lawsuits in the bourgeois courts, felt it best to print formal retractions and pay the "costs" demanded by Healy -- 10 guineas in each case.

We now come to Healy's latest "triumph" over Ernest Tate. In the December 17 Newsletter, under the heading "Apologies," Healy reprinted the two formal retractions. Almost identical in text, they obviously show the fine touch of the SLL's great legal brain. First they refer to having published a letter by Ernest Tate in which he accused "Mr. Gerry Healy, National Secretary of the Socialist Labour League, of having instigated several of his supporters to assault and prevent him from selling literature outside Caxton Hall, where an SLL meeting was being held."

Then the two formal retractions, which are really choice examples of such instances in the bourgeois system of jurisprudence, print the alibi provided by the SLL's wily expert in this field: "We have been informed that Mr. Healy asked a steward to clear the pavement in front of the entrance of the Hall so that passengers alighting from coaches would not be delayed in getting to the meeting; that he did nothing to prevent Mr. Tate or anyone else from selling literature; and that others were selling literature at each side of the entrance without interference." Both retractions then "sincerely apologise to Mr. Healy for having published the suggestion that he employs violence or seeks to curtail freedom of expression."

And the beating inflicted on Ernest Tate? Not a word outside of the reference in these two formal retractions. Not a whisper yet in The Newsletter! Like resorting to the bourgeois courts, you see, clearing the pavement in front of a meeting is routine for the SLL. Particularly clearing the pavement of the one person among "others" selling literature who happens to be offering the pamphlet, Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International. That pamphlet really obstructs traffic...