

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. 3

January 20, 1967

In this issue

Page

Johnson Escalates the War Another Notch	57
A New Phase in the Political Crisis in China -- by Joseph Hansen	58
Ouster of Adam Clayton Powell Angers Black Americans	61
New Year's Greetings for American Sailors in Italy -- by F. Bassi	62
Nine PAC Members Sentenced to Die in South Africa -- by Barney Desai	62
Japan Teachers Union Officials Arrested for Protesting Vietnam War	63
Japanese Socialists and Communists Vie in Membership Drive	63
Struggle over Program in Dominican June 14 Movement -- by Antonio Valdés	64
A Militant Strike in Chile -- by José Valdés	66
Dissatisfaction on the Campus in Japan	67
Canadian Professors Call for Immediate End to Bombings in Vietnam	68
Protests Mount in Britain Against Wilson's Role in Vietnam War -- by John Walters	68
Publisher of "La Sinistra" Expelled from Italian Communist Party	70
War Crimes Tribunal Group Visits Cambodia	72
Irish Farmers Barricade Key Points on Highways	72
Inflation Continues in Brazil	72
Coup Being Plotted in Guinea?	73
Wang Jen-Chung No Longer in the Swim	73
New Book by Livio Maitan	73
Well-Organized Sitdown Strike in Madrid	74
Police Fire on Demonstrating Students in India, Killing 9	74
Ruby's Death Arouses New Doubts about Warren Commission Report -- by Arthur Maglin	75
Art:	
Johnson Is Right for Once	77
Hooliganism at Liège -- Desertion at the Avenue Kleber -- by Pierre Frank	78
Savage Conduct under Americans in Mekong Delta	79
Documents:	
"Bureaucracy Is Always on the Prowl" [Conclusion of Castro Speech]	80
Canadian Trotskyists Demand SLL Answer on Tate Case	85
American Student Youth Schedule Spring Antiwar Mobilization	87
"Irish Militant" Scores Healy in Ernest Tate Case	88

JOHNSON ESCALATES THE WAR ANOTHER NOTCH

With its decision to escalate the war in Vietnam another notch by opening a drive in the Mekong Delta, the Johnson administration has discarded the last pretense that the U.S. armed forces constitute merely a supporting arm for the Saigon regime. The assault forces in this new area of war consist principally of American troops. They are being deployed in the way imperialist troops have always been deployed in campaigns to conquer a country and convert it into a colony.

The brazen way in which Johnson is now proceeding is due in part to the complete exposure of the lies and duplicity with which he has proceeded up to now. The "credibility gap" became all "gap" and no credibility. Having been utterly exposed, Johnson is now proceeding without bothering about "peace" offensives, wanting to drag Hanoi into "negotiations" and similar malarkey cooked up by public relations experts in the effort

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

to sell the war to the American people. Johnson is in the position of the gangster caught in a searchlight but who thinks he still has time to finish the holdup and make a get away if he operates fast-enough.

Johnson's boldness, however, is due primarily to his conviction that he has little to worry about from China, where the Mao regime is undergoing an acute political crisis, and still less from the Soviet Union, where Khrushchev's heirs give every indication that they do not intend to open any kind of counterescalation that could cause the Pentagon to hesitate, still less to retreat.

The most serious blow to Johnson on the "credibility" front was dealt by Harrison E. Salisbury, an assistant managing editor of The New York Times, who, after eighteen months from the time he applied, was granted permission by the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to visit the country. As the representative of the most powerful and influential single capitalist newspaper in the United States if not the Western world, what he wrote was bound to have great influence among broad circles that have been hesitant about the war in Vietnam but not ready to move into opposition.

Salisbury's eyewitness accounts from Hanoi, verifying the fact that the U.S. has been bombing civilians -- assertions of the White House, State Department, Pentagon, U.S. field command and Saigon puppets to the contrary -- created a sensation in the United States. Washington really had been lying and Hanoi had been telling the truth!

Some of the administration spokesmen pushed the line that Salisbury could not speak otherwise while he was in Hanoi and while his dispatches were subject to censorship. They predicted that he would reveal "the truth" upon leaving the country.

Salisbury has now done this. On reaching Hong Kong, he wrote a series of long articles which at this writing (January 15) are still running in the New York Times. They not only confirm everything he reported while in Hanoi, they reinforce his exposures. They in fact constitute a most interesting and valuable account that speaks decidedly in favor of the Vietnamese people and their heroic struggle against the military colossus that has invaded their country and inflicted indescribable horrors and suffering on them.

Besides offering his own tribute to their indomitable spirit, Salisbury cites the reactions of others. Among them, he quotes the observation of a "Communist visitor":

"Imagine! Their pilots get up at 4 A.M. They go out into rice paddies and work for three or four hours standing in cold water up to their hips. Then they come in and fly their planes against the Americans. I have never heard of such people."

With all the attendant publicity in other newspapers and over television and radio, the account provided by Salisbury is certain to be accepted by the great majority of Americans as an authentic account of what the Vietnamese are really like, how they feel and what their aims are. The image is one that is most appealing to the American imagination, a heroic, determined people fighting for their freedom against a monstrous ruthless bully. The result will be to considerably strengthen the antiwar movement in the United States and to win fresh adherents to it in circles that have as yet not moved into action.

A NEW PHASE IN THE POLITICAL CRISIS IN CHINA

By Joseph Hansen

The political crisis that has been shaking the Mao regime, appears to have entered a new phase, finally involving masses of workers in the plants. The conflict that began in the top circles of the ruling group has thus become extended further and further into the population as those in the leadership seek a definitive solution.

Sensational headlines, based on reports in wall bulletins put up primarily in Peking and relayed through consular attachés and Japanese correspondents, have appeared in the Western press. According to these sources, battles between the adherents of Mao and his opponents reached such sharpness in a number of cities, including Canton and Shanghai as to amount to "civil war."

These interpretations, however, have been discounted among the Western powers, conspicuously so in the case of the U.S. State Department which hopes to reduce its credibility gap by discounting speculation and sticking to hard facts in this instance.

One of the most striking features of the situation remains its obscurity. Although the crisis involves the key country in Asia and a quarter of the human race and weighs heavily in the immediate world situation through its effect on the course of American escalation of the war in Southeast Asia, the real issues, as well as the true alignment of forces and the figures representing them can only be deduced.

This fact alone directly belies the image of intransigent Marxism which Mao seeks to present to the world. The main characteristic of Marxism is its effort to secure full consciousness of reality in order to be able to intervene correctly in changing it. This is impossible without adequate factual information.

In the current conflict access to the facts is deliberately barred. The press and radio in China is controlled by the Mao faction and it puts out only tendentious information. The opposition is barred from free presentation of its views. There are no free discussions or debates.

On top of this, such information as does pierce the curtain of censorship is often highly contradictory. Leaders who are presented one day as sterling representatives of "Mao's thought," even entrusted with the most responsible posts in defending, disseminating and advancing Mao's views, come under fire themselves sometimes almost as soon as their names have become familiar. Declarations that appear to be completely in the spirit of "Mao's thought" are shortly denounced as being a mere smokescreen intended to cover up the very opposite of what the declarations say.

The forces set in motion prove to be far from homogeneous. Thus the Red Guard movement, created as the sword and shield of Mao, presently is found to contain contradictory currents so that reports appear of one sector of Red Guards being opposed to another. The same holds true in other areas, not excluding the armed forces.

An impression of confusion and even chaos is inevitably created abroad and it is probably not far from the mark to conclude that the confusion is even greater inside China itself.

Such a situation is characteristic of a blind factional struggle in which the programmatic differences have not yet come out into the open, or are deliberately kept bottled up, while the contending groups battle over what they are most interested in -- power. The factional lines tend to form along false issues or exaggerated issues, and gossip, slander and vilification play an inordinate role. The most damning thing that can be said about both the two main groupings, the one around Mao and the other around Liu Shao-chi, is that both of them appear to be playing the same kind of game, neither of them seeking in the Leninist way to bring out the real programmatic issues.

If there is a difference in responsibility in this, the heaviest charge must be laid against Mao, for he is in position to change the way in which the factional struggle is being conducted.

A single instance will illustrate the point. The Maoists claim that the opposition is seeking to restore capitalism. If true, this is an exceedingly serious charge. Yet if an examination is made into the real import of the charge, it is seen at once that Mao is not referring to the capitalists still remaining in China. In a study published in the current issue of the Harvard Business Review, Professor Barry M. Richman, a Canadian who visited China in the spring of 1966 and who was permitted to make a survey of 38 factories in a wide range of industries in 11 major cities, estimated that there are still 300,000 capitalists in China. They are scattered throughout industry and occupy influential positions. In Shanghai about 30 to 35 percent of all textile enterprises and many retail stores are run by them. They draw five percent interest on their capital and high salaries.

One of them, who was interviewed by Richman, picked him up in a new Jaguar and drove him to his luxurious home.

These capitalists, protected, fostered and even pampered by the regime, have not yet come under attack in the current crisis. On the contrary. They have been reassured that any shots falling in their direction are accidental or incidental.

The talk about "capitalist restoration" thus refers in reality to proposals or arguments in top circles of the bureaucracy either identical, or closely similar, to the proposals of Liberman in the Soviet Union to put individual plants on a "profitability" basis. It can be argued that in the long run this would tend to foster a capitalist restoration more quickly than other bureaucratic ways of running the planned economy; but the immediate objective of those in the Soviet Union who advocate such a "reform" is to gain a greater voice for the technocrats in political decisions and along with it

more extensive privileges and greater security in their enjoyment. Other sectors of the bureaucracy, particularly those specializing in the manipulation of political power, understandably resist this pressure.

This is not debated openly in the Soviet Union due to the fact that all sectors of the bureaucracy are concerned about covering up the special privileges enjoyed by the bureaucracy as a whole. The debate thus swings around "efficiency."

Similar considerations appear to weigh heavily with the Mao regime although it is obvious that bureaucratic privileges in China are not nearly so gross as they are in the Soviet Union. Thus the argument there swings around whether or not such proposals signify the "restoration of capitalism."

Despite the secrecy and the confusion it is possible to peg the point where the current phase of the struggle opened.

It was made public with an editorial in the December 26 issue of the People's Daily stating that "a new upsurge of the great proletarian cultural revolution is rising in industrial and mining enterprises throughout the country."

According to the editorial, "great achievements" have been made in the past 17 years. "However, it should be noted that many of our industrial and mining enterprises, to various degrees, are seriously influenced by capitalism, revisionism and even feudalism in political ideology, organization, administration and the work of leadership. Such influences not only shackle the workers' revolutionary enthusiasm and hinder the development of the productive forces, but also breed the seeds of revisionism and are potential hot-beds of capitalist restoration."

As further described in this important editorial, "In some enterprises, in collaboration with the landlord, [the] rich peasant, [the] counter-revolutionary and bad elements who have sneaked into the ranks of the workers, [that is] with bourgeois elements who have not reformed themselves sufficiently and [with] degenerated elements, a handful of people within the party who are in authority and have taken the capitalist road have doggedly opposed Chairman Mao's correct line and done their utmost to promote revisionist practices. They have been vainly attempting to lead the socialist enterprises onto the capitalist road."

Although the efforts of the "handful" have been in vain, "tens of millions of workers" are now rising up in defense of the correct line of Chairman Mao.

The editorial held out a perspective of electing "cultural revolutionary groups, committees or conferences" to represent the masses. "A system of general elections must be instituted in accordance with the principles of the Paris Commune,"

As yet there have been no indications that Mao really intends to institute a system of proletarian democracy such as that exemplified by the Paris Commune. The promise, however, certainly makes an attractive plank in the faction's platform whatever Mao's real aims are.

On December 27, the day after the editorial appeared, a Red Guard newspaper in Peking announced that the Federation of Trade Unions in China had been dissolved and its official organ suspended. Since the trade unions include 21,000,000 members, it was rather dubious that they had been dissolved with a stroke of the pen. More likely what is involved is the reorganization of the union bureaucracy.

Thus, instead of a step toward the establishment of proletarian democracy along the lines of the Paris Commune, it appears that the actual objective in opening this new phase of the factional struggle was to strike at the mass base on which the Liu Shao-chi group stands. Since this meant the involvement of "tens of millions of workers," as the editorial in the People's Daily put it, it also signified a more spectacular and even more dangerous stage of struggle in which the final outcome remains to be seen.

It was following this aggressive move by the Mao-Lin group that clashes were reported between Red Guards and workers and between different sectors of workers in a series of cities.

As for the Communist party, it is torn by the conflict. Instead of holding the initiative, it occupies the strange position in a single-party system of apparently constituting the opposition party, as one acute observer has noted. Yet to become activated in the struggle is the peasantry. This most powerful force is reflected primarily through the army. The next moves may therefore be made there. These could well prove decisive, bringing the struggle to its culmination.

OUSTER OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL ANGERS BLACK AMERICANS

The new Congress which opened in Washington January 10 provided fresh evidence the very first day on how well the two-party system serves the interests of the American capitalist system. Lacking any other means of registering dissatisfaction with the ruling party and its war in Vietnam, voters in many areas turned to the Republicans in the elections last November. With strengthened forces, the Republicans resumed their old game of setting up a coalition with the Southern Democrats to run Congress.

Their first action was to strike down Adam Clayton Powell, the Negro who has represented Harlem for 22 years in the House of Representatives and who, through the operation of the unofficial seniority system in Congress, had become chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, a prominent congressional position and one that carries substantial control of jobs, financial outlays and other "patronage."

On January 9 the Democrats met in caucus to decide on nominations. It was this body that decided to remove Powell as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and to nominate in his place the white liberal Democrat Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky. The following day the House voted 364 to 64 for a motion barring him from taking his seat in the new Congress while a committee conducts a five-week "investigation" of his qualifications.

The excuse used for this action was his alleged use of congressional funds for personal travels. How flimsy the pretext was can be judged from the fact that this is a common practice among congressmen. Other irregularities have been charged against him such as failure to pay sufficient attention to his legislative duties and seeking to get around a court judgment in a defamation suit.

The truth is that Powell, if anything, stands on a somewhat higher level than most congressmen. His remissness in office is around average. His real "crime" is that he is not white.

A ruthless campaign has been waged against him for a number of years in the press and other media, full advantage being taken of his faults and foibles and especially the \$164,000 lawsuit against him which has taken dramatic turns as the lawyers sought to trap him when he visited his district and his church in Harlem.

Those who did the knife job on him in Congress had two aims. One was to get their hands on the patronage that went with the chairmanship of the powerful committee he headed. The other was to strike a blow at "black power" aspirations by removing a leading representative of the Negro community from such a prominent position in Congress. In the calculation of the leaders of the two-party system, the blow struck at Adam Clayton Powell is a slap in the face to all the black voters.

Actually Powell has not been an advocate of "black power" although he has made a few equivocal statements in this direction. His career has been in the Democratic machine -- and even against the wishes of some of the New York political bosses who would have preferred someone less inclined to cut his own swath. Various efforts have been made to defeat him in Harlem but each time Powell has managed to survive due to his popularity among the masses.

The liberals of the Democratic party played the most reacherous role in the move against Powell. This is affirmed by the country's leading liberal Democratic newspaper, the New York Post. "The liberals got him, of course; they exist for the dirty jobs," wrote Murray Kempton in the January 11 issue.

The reaction in Harlem and other black ghettos was an angry one. The January 12 New York Times quoted David Henderson, an 18-year-old bank teller as saying:

"When you're black you stand out. They unseated Adam to show black people that they're not as big as they think they are. I hope we put him back where he belongs -- by rebellion, strength. I'm all for violence, any shape any form if this is what it takes to get him back."

The same paper also quoted Mrs. Lucille Lanclos, a 70-year-old woman: "You got to stick with him through the thick and thin. All they want us to be is porters and scrub-women. He's a black man so they don't want him to have power."

"Why do they hate the black man so? We put him there -- why do they have to take him away? I don't believe in violence but I believe you reap what you sow -- that's what the Bible says, so I'm praying."

NEW YEAR'S GREETINGS FOR AMERICAN SAILORS IN ITALY

By F. Bassi

Rome

According to Italian folklore, if anything special happens on New Year's Day, it is bound to be repeated throughout the year. The headquarters of the American NATO military base at Livorno (Leghorn) in Tuscany must be hoping that it ain't so, at least for 1967. On that day 5,000 American sailors on shore leave got very warm greetings from the local working-class population.

About a week previously, a big demonstration had been staged in the city in solidarity with the Vietnamese people. Thus when the sailors began coming ashore, feelings were already high. These were not assuaged by the behavior of the sailors in the following days. They broke shop windows and street lamps and injured a girl.

Around the docks they tore down all the posters put up in Italian and English by the youth organizations of the Communist party and the PSIUP [Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity]. These read: "Red Livorno greets you in the same spirit and with the same anger as the Vietnamese people greet your bombs."

On New Year's Eve an effigy of an American sailor was strung up to a palm tree. A placard was attached to it reading in both Italian and English: "Joe, stop killing; go home!"

The local authorities, worried about the effect of such a New Year's greeting card, had the effigy taken down by firemen. A crowd gathered and began protesting. A squad car pulled up and one of the policemen got out and began wielding his club.

Unfortunately the crowd was not in a receiving mood and the result was that the squad of cops had to leave, three of them being taken to the hospital.

By now the temper of the crowd, particularly the youth, was such that a spontaneous demonstration flared up. They went after any American sailors they could find.

They beat them up and chased them to their ships. As the crowd overturned one of their automobiles, the Communist mayor of the city and a Communist deputy sought to calm down the demonstrators. But they could do nothing. Along with the police, they had to beat a retreat. Only when the city was cleared of American sailors did the demonstration end.

As usual the local Communist party leaders played the role of peacemakers. They did not want the demonstration and they did not encourage it. However, the situation continued to roll beyond their control.

A leaflet was distributed the next day criticizing them. "It is an illusion," said the leaflet among other things, "to hope that peace can be preserved by leaving imperialism free to act. The insane logic of imperialism is the logic of exploitation and destruction, which does not halt unless it is defeated. Enough of peaceful strolls organized in agreement with the police! Vietnam is not distant. The USA is not distant. Imperialism has NATO bases in Italy."

The leaflet was signed, "Militants of the PCI [Italian Communist party], PSIUP and independents in favor of a Livorno Committee against American Aggression in Vietnam."

NINE PAC MEMBERS SENTENCED TO DIE IN SOUTH AFRICA

By Barney Desai

London

According to the South African Rand Daily Mail (December 15, 1966), nine members of the banned Pan Africanist Congress [PAC] of Azania were sentenced to death in the Cape Supreme Court for their part in the death of a shopkeeper in 1962. This is confirmed by a report in the December 15 London Times.

All but one of the condemned men, it is reported, were already serving sentences ranging from six to twenty years for their part in the 1963 Paarl revolt.

The PAC headquarters in Maseru, Lesotho, in an urgent report states that one of

the condemned men, Wellington Mzimase Tyhobeka, had disappeared on August 29, 1966, under mysterious circumstances from Maseru, capital of the then Basutoland, a British colony. Although his disappearance had been reported to the Basutoland mounted police, his whereabouts could not be traced.

This once again raises the question whether Tyhobeka had in fact been kidnapped from Basutoland by the South African police. It brings to mind the recent kidnapping from Basutoland of the Pan Africanist Congress Acting National Secretary John Nyati Pokela, who has now been traced to a South African jail in East London, South Africa, where he is awaiting trial.

In view of the fact that a South African refugee, last seen in British territory, has now been sentenced to death, the case of Pokela assumes alarming proportions as well.

The violation by the South African police of British territory in order to kidnap and then sentence to death people who had been given sanctuary in Basutoland (now Lesotho) needs a thorough investigation immediately, so that every effort can be made to save both Tyhobeka and Pokela from the gallows.

The PAC strongly contends that although Basutoland became independent since these events, the British government is nonetheless morally responsible for the fate of these victims of South African Prime Minister Vorster.

An unequivocal demand should now be made to the Pretoria regime for the immediate release and return of Pokela and Tyhobeka to Lesotho.

JAPAN TEACHERS UNION OFFICIALS ARRESTED FOR PROTESTING VIETNAM WAR

The 587,000-strong Japan Teachers Union [Nikkyoso] is simmering over the police reprisals taken against the organization's participation in the nationwide demonstrations October 21 against the war in Vietnam.

On that day 64% of the organized teachers in the Tokyo area walked out of their classrooms for two hours. The figure for Saga was 72% and similar turnouts occurred throughout the country.

The police crackdown did not begin until December 10 when they picked up Chairman Yukio Fujiyama and Vice-Chairman Harunosuke Suzuki of the Metropolitan Teachers Union, an affiliate of the national organization. They were charged with violating a civil-service law banning strikes by local public service workers.

The Japan Teachers Union at once began mobilizing a nationwide protest movement. However, the police continued their reprisals. On December 12 they arrested eight more Tokyo area leaders. In Saga they arrested nine leaders of the local chapter and announced that similar arrests would be made in other parts of the country.

Finally on December 21 they arrested the union's two top leaders, Chairman Sadamitsu Miyahara and Secretary General Motobumi Makieda.

Engaging in an illegal strike is an offense punishable with imprisonment of not more than three years or a fine of less than 100,000 yen [about US\$300].

The union charges that the arrests were inspired by the government with the aim of diverting attention from the corruption scandals that have shocked the country. The union also points out that the arrests violate the International Labor Organization's Convention 105 which bars police intervention in labor movements.

JAPANESE SOCIALISTS AND COMMUNISTS VIE IN MEMBERSHIP DRIVES

The Japan Socialist party announced January 3 that it plans to increase its membership during 1967 to 100,000. On November 30, 1966, it had 52,900 on the books. The paid subscription to the party newspaper on that date stood at 102,128 copies. Besides doubling its membership the party hopes to double the circulation of its press in 1967.

Last November the Japan Communist party, a much smaller organization, announced that its membership had increased 170% during the previous two years.

STRUGGLE OVER PROGRAM IN DOMINICAN JUNE 14 MOVEMENT

By Antonio Valdés

The June 14 Movement of the Dominican Republic [1J4 -- pronounced one-jay-four, from the emblem used by the movement in its literature] has recently taken an interesting turn in a development that sheds light on the course of the Dominican revolution in general. A dispute has been going on in the 1J4 for some time (a process we will detail below). The issue is a curious one: whether the movement could or should "transform itself" into a proletarian party advocating socialist revolution.

One section of the leadership, influenced by the dogmatically Maoist Movimiento Popular Dominicano [MPD], held that the 1J4 could not and should not take this turn. The other section, independent-minded revolutionists, said that the party could and should -- and they have gone ahead and done it.

The Dominican political scene today is characterized by two contradictory trends. On the one hand, there is a rightward drift on the part of the U.S.-backed Balaguer regime, most sharply expressed in the continuing terrorist campaign by police and militarists against former rebel fighters. On the other hand, there is an increasing radicalization among the masses. This can be seen in a recent rash of strikes and a leftward turn in the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano [PRD], till recently headed by Juan Bosch. Bosch himself has left the scene, and PRD "moderates" have been resigning under pressure from the rank and file who favor a militant policy. What has happened in the June 14 Movement was the result of a similar, though more radical, process.

The recent report from Santo Domingo by the journalist Norman Gall [World Outlook, Vol. 4, No. 39] is worth recalling in regard to the mood of the masses: "The slum dwellers of Santo Domingo, who defeated crack tank and infantry units during the revolt, still have thousands of arms hidden. Many are frightened and angry about the beatings, deaths, and disappearances in recent months of members of the rebel forces..." Gall quoted a PRD slum dweller who fought in the April 1965 uprising: "The people want to fight again because they don't want to be killed this way."

A more detailed look at the June 14 Movement's evolution is valuable for two reasons. First, it indicates a development similar to that undergone by the Guatemalan guerrillas and, for that matter, by the Cuban leaders after they came to power -- toward the view that the Latin-American revolution must be socialist. Second, it reveals once again the sectarian and nonrevolutionary role played by those who follow the theories of that "inspired genius" -- Mao Tse-tung.

The June 14 Movement was named after an attempted uprising against Trujillo on that date in 1959. It began as a radical nationalist, antidictator party, much like the July 26 Movement of Fidel Castro; and it was composed, like the July 26, primarily of student youth. After Trujillo's death in May 1961 it became a focal point for the increasingly radical activists who militantly opposed the leftovers of Trujilloism. After the overthrow of Bosch in 1963, Manolo Tavares Justo, the 1J4 leader at that time, led an abortive guerrilla fight, but when he surrendered, he was brutally slaughtered together with about a dozen comrades. In the constitutionalist uprising of 1965, 1J4 militants participated actively in defense of the rebel zone. Following that uprising, in the fire of events the intense debate over the possibility of the 1J4 transforming itself began.

Up to the June 1966 elections the debate was kept within the limits of the leading bodies of the party, without being put up for discussion in the cells. However, a number of cells independently raised the question. The discussion began to spread to all the cells of the party, and after the elections it became the issue of the day.

Within the top leadership the majority maintained that transformation was impossible or undesirable. But a sizable minority in the leadership favored "transformism." They pointed to the increasing influx of workers into the 1J4, which had developed a reputation for militant struggle. The "transformists" argued that the growing working-class element in the 1J4 would eventually demand radical changes in the program and perspectives of the party.

In the midst of this discussion, elements of the Maoist MPD, who favored the "nontransformist" position, entered the 1J4. Making a bloc with the nontransformist majority in the leadership -- who were on a lower political level -- these Maoists soon achieved control of the leading organs of the party. Once in controlling positions, they began a campaign against the "harmful and anti-Marxist thesis" of transformism.

(A word is in order on what we mean by "Maoism" in this article. Both transformists and nontransformists admire Mao. But the MPD follows the Chinese line faithfully -- including the two-stage theory of revolution, advocating a national democratic revolution to be followed later by a socialist revolution. They hew blindly to a factional and sectarian attitude toward the pro-Moscow Communists. In these ways the MPD leaders show themselves true Maoists. The 1J4 transformists, while they are attracted by Peking's more militant verbal stand in the Sino-Soviet dispute, have not been trained in the Stalinist school of blind obedience. They reject both sectarianism and revisionism. Though influenced by Maoism, they are not, strictly speaking, Maoists.)

The entry of the MPD into the June 14 Movement produced splits within the Maoists' own ranks. A group of MPD'ers who held their own variant of "nontransformism" broke away and formed their own party, the Partido Comunista de la Republica Dominicana [PCRD]. Secondary splits occurred, all on the question of the class nature of the 1J4. Now there are five MPD factions -- the various positions of which are not at all clear. The confusion created by the splintering process in the Dominican left can be seen in the party labels. The new Maoist PCRD is distinct from the PCD [Partido Comunista Dominicana], which is the current name of the traditional pro-Moscow tendency. Before 1965 the old-line Communists used the same name as those in prerevolutionary Cuba -- Partido Socialista Popular [PSP].

A congress of the 1J4 was held in November. Presumably it would resolve the "transformist" dispute. Those MPD'ers who still remained in the movement successfully dominated the congress, although which splinter they represented was hard to tell. Their political line was carried at the congress, namely that Santo Domingo is a "semifeudal and semicolonial country," that the task at the present stage is the restoration of the constitutionalist government (i.e., the bourgeois democratic revolution), the same stand substantially as that of the class-collaborationist PCD. This similarity of political line did not prevent the Maoist elements from pushing through the congress a whole series of slanderous and sectarian denunciations of the pro-Moscow Communists.

Finally, these "leaders" declared, as though inspired by divine revelation, that the 1J4 "has been, is, and will be a petty-bourgeois party."

Others in the 1J4 did not fully absorb these dialectics according to Mao, but began a stubborn fight for the transformation of the party. With two factions formally established after the congress, the transformists rapidly increased in number and influence among the cadres and cells of the party. Before long the nontransformists were reduced to a small group of MPD'ers and sympathizers, mostly at the top.

Things came to a head when the party committees in the eastern provinces, representing cells with a heavy workers' composition, sent in a resolution demanding the expulsion of the nontransformists. Faced with this situation, the nontransformists left the party without being formally expelled and entered one of the factions of the MPD.

Although they took some prominent individuals with them and much of the party's material resources, they did not take the name of the 1J4 or the bulk of the militants. Seven of the former Central Committee of twelve left, among them two outstanding fighters with honorable records of struggle: "Fafa" Tavares, who had run for Congress on the 1J4 ticket in the June elections and who had been a close collaborator of Manolo Tavares Justo; and Guido Gil, also a former collaborator of Manolo and author of two books on Dominican history. Strong in revolutionary spirit, these men lacked political understanding. As one Dominican revolutionary put it, "The problem is they're true revolutionaries, but they're not Marxists."

A closer look at the conflicting political positions shows a deformed, scholastic Marxism on one side and a healthy instinct for the revolutionary essence of Marxism on the other.

The nontransformists (Maoists) used two basic arguments: (1) that the petty bourgeoisie has the predominant role to play in the current stage of the Dominican struggle; and (2) that the class nature of a party is determined solely by its social composition.

"In our country the petty bourgeoisie constitutes 80 percent of the total population," argued the MPD. "Without the incorporation, active participation, and support of these masses, the proletariat cannot carry on the antifeudal and anti-imperialist revolution corresponding to this stage." They maintained that the petty-bourgeois masses had to have a party that would mobilize and represent them and that this party would play the decisive role at this stage. And they nominated the 1J4 to be that party, whether it wanted to or not.

The transformists replied that the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses must be organized and led not by a petty-bourgeois but by a proletarian party. And they pointed to nothing less than the experience of the Chinese revolution as a model, where a Communist party organized and led the peasants. The Leninist concept of the worker-peasant alliance, the transformists reminded their opponents, assigns the leading role to the workers' party.

To the nontransformist assertion that the LJ4 was petty bourgeois in social composition and therefore must eternally remain so, the transformists replied that the character of a party is basically defined by its ideological position. If a party has a proletarian ideology and form of organization, it is no longer petty bourgeois, they argued. And they reminded the learned "Marxists" of the MPD what Marx and Engels had said of the petty bourgeoisie in the Communist Manifesto: "If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat. They thus defend not their present, but their future interests. They desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat."

In essence, the Maoists did not want to see a tendency emerge that would call for a workers and peasants government and the immediate struggle for proletarian revolution. If they could convince the LJ4 militants that they were eternally decreed to be "petty bourgeois," then they would stick to the program of national democratic revolution. It is important to note that of all the left tendencies in Santo Domingo only the LJ4 transformists oppose the concept of "alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie." The transformists hold the position: "War to the death against liberalism!" (Trotsky long ago defined the attitude toward liberalism as the dividing line between Bolshevism and class-collaborationist Menshevism.)

The impossible involutions of the Maoist theory were brought out when the transformists asked: If the LJ4 is inevitably a petty-bourgeois party, then why is the proletarian MPD in it? To preserve the working-class elements within it from corruption by the petty-bourgeois tendency, came the ineluctable reply. Why a "working class" tendency was fighting to dissuade a group from advocating a proletarian revolutionary program was a more subtle problem.

The militants of the LJ4 broke through this murky theorizing and transformed their party. The Dominican ruling class and its imperialist masters were not slow to recognize the danger to their interests in this development. They have unleashed sharp repressions against these courageous youths who have "placed themselves at the standpoint of the proletariat."

A MILITANT STRIKE IN CHILE

By José Valdés

Santiago, Chile

A national strike of health workers that lasted 19 days ended here recently. Some 38,000 were involved in the struggle against the ridiculous wage adjustment offered by the Frei government.

The strike was characterized by great militancy. The workers stood up to police violence in street demonstrations that were held on various occasions in the central areas of Santiago, Concepción, Valparaíso and other cities.

The Christian Democrat government arrested the majority of the leaders of the Federación de Trabajadores de la Salud [Federation of Health Workers] and kept them in jail for ten days.

Other unions like the APEUCH [teachers and employees union] began joining the strike, further strengthening the strikers.

At this point the Communist and Socialist leaders of the CUT [Central Unica de Trabajadores] went behind the backs of the workers, selling them out with an agreement to accept the government offer which had touched off the strike.

The rank and file protested by remaining out for a few more days before going back to their jobs.

The strikers belonging to the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria] and PSR [Partido Socialista y Revolucionario] worked together in the picket squads, advancing proposals in the struggle that were accepted by the rank and file in meetings. They

proved themselves to be energetic fighters in the street demonstrations where the police caused trouble. Three members of the MIR were arrested in Santiago and ten in Concepción.

Leaders of the Unión Obreros Municipales [Municipal Workers Union] belonging to the MIR succeeded in getting the Santiago provincial congress of this union to declare a 48-hour sympathy strike in behalf of the Health workers.

During the strike, the MIR distributed thousands of leaflets and three issues of the union paper La Jeringa [The Syringe].

One of the lessons of the strike is that the Christian Democrat government is not ready to grant wage increases but is prepared to jail workers and use violence against any protest demonstrations.

In addition, the Communist party showed once more that it aims at maintaining "peaceful coexistence" with the Frei government at the expense of the interests of the proletariat.

Finally, the recent strikes show that the workers are in process of again turning to militant struggles and want to open a counteroffensive. Coming actions will show whether or not they are capable of toppling their bureaucratic leaderships.

DISSATISFACTION ON THE CAMPUS IN JAPAN

Last November 20, some 300 students at Meiji University in Tokyo barricaded themselves in a few wooden buildings in which they were living. Outside 800 riot police sought to dislodge them. As the police advanced, shielded by armored cars, they were met with a hail of rocks and beer bottles. Before the clash was over, at least 52 persons had been injured, most of them policemen.

At issue was a demolition order. The old wooden buildings were to be torn down and the students had been ordered to move into new reinforced concrete dormitories. They had refused because it meant double the rent -- from 340 yen to 680 yen [US\$1.88] a month.

On the same week end, a rally was held by Meiji students to protest a rumored increase in tuition fees from an average 50,000 yen [US\$138.89] a year to 60,000 yen [US\$166.67].

These figures may look low in comparison to costs in some countries such as the United States. Their import can be better grasped by the following figures. For a year at a private university in Japan, including food, lodging and clothing, the cost to students is now estimated at about 170,000 yen [US\$472.23]. This is no less than 69% of the average Japanese annual income.

Public schools have lower tuition fees than the private institutions, but the difference is not great.

While costs have been rising, the pressures compelling Japanese youth to seek a college education have likewise been increasing. Academic standing is of great importance in the business world and in industry.

The economic motive is thus a very strong component in the unrest among students that has characterized Japan's huge educational mills in the past few years. Their reactions to increases in costs, even relatively minor ones, have at times been quite violent leading to pitched battles with the police when university administrations have called in the forces of "law and order."

Political factors have likewise been operative. Among these the issue of student autonomy has come increasingly to the fore. Another issue has been the escalation of U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam with its acute reminder to Japanese sensibilities of the specter of a possible nuclear war.

The scandals involving malfeasance in office have also served to stir dissatisfaction among students, underlining the unattractiveness of the entire perspective under capitalism, with Japan reduced to a satellite in the orbit of the supergiant American power.

The coming year on Japan's campuses will thus most likely see more of the same. And perhaps on a broader and more militant scale.

CANADIAN PROFESSORS CALL FOR IMMEDIATE END TO BOMBINGS IN VIETNAM

Toronto

In a statement issued to the press January 5, 338 members of the University of Toronto faculty called for an "immediate, unconditional and permanent end to the bombings of north and south Vietnam."

They urged the Canadian government to demand this of the U.S. and at the same time "reveal all military production contracts related in any way to the Vietnam war." Ottawa, they said, should "consider following the example of Sweden in refusing to sell arms to the U.S. until this intervention ceases."

The statement had been circulated throughout the faculty just before the Christmas celebrations. Its initiators pointed out in an accompanying statement that "although the students at this University have been fairly active in searching for ways of exerting pressure to bring this slaughter to an end, the faculty have done very little."

In behalf of the faculty, and in answer to a previous protest, Professor McNaught explained that "a group of us came together and decided that with the fourth or fifth escalation of the war it was time to make known the opinion of the faculty again."

While the petition does not refer to it, some of the faculty are known to be gravely concerned about the use of Canadian university research facilities and personnel to aid the U.S. aggression. Early in November the editor of the Montreal McGill university student paper was fired for publishing an article revealing that a professor on that campus was working on a U.S.-financed project involving a method of determining the solidity of the ground from the air so that planes can land in an unknown area.

The University of Toronto student Committee to End the War in Vietnam organized a protest meeting which was addressed by the deposed editor. He was later reinstated.

The statement signed by the 338 also called for the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Vietnam -- with the rider, "as early as possible." The professors did not make clear why they did not call for immediate withdrawal and why they thought it should be left to the American aggressors to decide when to withdraw.

Despite this limitation, the statement by the 338 may well mark a significant development for the entire Canadian anti-Vietnam-war movement.

The first serious sign of concern in professorial circles came in response to the November 11-12 Student Days of Protest initiated by the University of Toronto Committee to End the War in Vietnam. A sizeable group of faculty members of Montreal's Sir George Williams University firmly solidarized themselves with the student action.

In Toronto several University of Toronto faculty members participated in student actions around the November 11-12 protest.

The University of Toronto committee intends to send a delegation to the prime minister and the minister of External Affairs. Professor McNaught expressed the opinion that there "seems to be a marked interest in making the committee a vehicle for continued action."

The statement was sent to all full-time, on-campus faculty members. More than twenty-five percent signed, including sixty deans of faculties and full professors. Along with leading Canadian academicians were at least three college principals -- Professor Northrop Frye of Victoria, Dr. D.C. Williams of Erindale and Dr. Robin Harris of Innis College.

PROTESTS MOUNT IN BRITAIN AGAINST WILSON'S ROLE IN VIETNAM WAR

By John Walters

London

On December 19 George Brown, British foreign secretary, answering questions in the House of Commons regarding the bombing of Hanoi, said: "I don't believe the American Government has done any such thing." This was despite the fact that, even then, evidence was accumulating that left no doubt about the question. In the Sunday Times of December 18 there had appeared a dispatch by Jacques Moalie which confirmed the reported bombing and went on to say, "...it is plain enough that the official North

Vietnamese assessment of the damage can be taken as accurate."

The following day Richard Crossman, speaking for the government in the House of Commons, refused to reaffirm the previous stand taken on the bombing of urban centres. Despite being pressed by various Labour members he remained evasive.

The U.S. State Department's admission on December 22 that there was the possibility of "errors" in bombing raids over north Vietnam further weakened the Wilson Government's credibility on the issue. Such were the doubts raised that in an editorial on December 24 The Guardian said:

"American generals in Vietnam are apt to disconcert us all from time to time by such apparently naive remarks. They might almost be fighting the war in a closed political circuit, insulated from all those ungovernable currents that cause turbulences in Washington, New York, Moscow, and Rome. To be fair to them, the President, and particularly the Secretary of State, can be even more disconcerting. The generals have more excuses. Their professional task is the military one of winning the war; President Johnson's is the political one of ending it.

"He does make gestures towards peace -- some more convincing than others. The Christmas truce is one such; presumably the generals could do their job better without it. But these gestures usually look pretty feeble in the lurid light of what is going on at the same time in Vietnam. It doesn't cost much to gratify Mr. Goldberg with an appeal to U Thant, if you are meanwhile allowing your air force to drop bombs so close to Hanoi that at last you have to admit that an 'accident' may have happened. A Christmas truce loses its seasonal glitter when your bombers have the day before been dropping leaflets on Hanoi saying 'These aircraft will return.' Even the most spectacular of the President's peace efforts -- the bombing pause a year ago -- was accompanied by the bringing in of thousands of new American troops, and later by the launching of an ambitious land offensive. (This should be remembered when holiday truces are objected to as opportunities for the Communists to regroup.)

"All the military activity that goes with the peace talk makes it look fairly unconvincing even to many Americans. How does it look in Hanoi? Either President Johnson is hypocritical or, if sincere (as is more likely), he is powerless to prevent his approaches from being condemned to failure by what his soldiers are doing. Most likely of all, his motives are mixed; but in any case it seems increasingly likely that, even if he wants a negotiated settlement, he will not be allowed to have it."

In this equivocal way The Guardian rejected Johnson's bombing and the lies to cover it up.

Harrison Salisbury's dispatches from on the spot in Hanoi exposed completely the hypocrisy both of Johnson and Brown, and has produced very strong reactions within the Parliamentary Labour party and the rest of the Labour movement.

John Mendelson, Labour MP said: "It is now the Foreign Secretary's duty, first of all as a member of a Government closely linked to the United States, and secondly as co-chairman of the Geneva Conference to raise his voice on our behalf against this bombing."

Eric Heffer, Labour MP, came out even more strongly: "This is proof of what many of us have been saying in the House of Commons for some time. It is no good for the Americans to imagine for one moment that they can bomb military targets without bombing civilians. This must mean that the campaign to end this war in Vietnam will inevitably be stepped up."

Frank Allaun was quoted in the Morning Star of December 29 as saying: "I and two other M.P.'s, Mr. Peter Jackson and Mrs. Ann Kerr, have written to six leading newspapers in America pleading that this genocide should be stopped."

Further protests were made from the trade-union movement. William McLean President of the Scottish Trades Union Congress commented: "What has happened to the Government's decision to dissociate with the bombing on Hanoi earlier this year? ... Those of us who are opposed to the American aggression in Vietnam, and warned of the horrors and dangers, are now fully entitled to call on all British trade unionists to demand that the British Government ends its support for U.S. activities there."

Similar statements were made by a number of other MP's and trade-union leaders. Tribune, the labour left-wing weekly, said in its front page editorial on December 30: "It is Britain's peculiar disgrace that our Government has constantly associated itself with the American Administration and has even allowed itself to be entangled in Washing-

ton's duplicities."

The journal The Week rose to the occasion by devoting its whole December 29 issue to the Vietnam war, opening with an editorial entitled "George Brown the Liar." Referring to the Harrison Salisbury reports, it said: "Never has there been a clearer expression of this Government's subordination to the American Administration. Every unit of the Labour movement should demand that George Brown apologise for this deception."

In face of this mounting campaign of criticism, the Labour Government has been hard pressed to maintain its credibility even to its most loyal supporters.

Such was the pressure that George Brown has sought to divert it by launching his own "peace offensive." Late on Friday December 31 there was an announcement from the Foreign Office that a call had been made for the U.S., North Vietnam and South Vietnam to get together for talks to end the conflict.

However this very obvious decoy has not even got off the ground. It was so obviously an attempt both to cover up Brown's blunder and the lies of the U.S. administration, that it has brought nothing but scorn from all quarters. Even Shinwell the chairman of the Parliamentary Labour party, who is normally a loyal Wilson man said in a radio interview on January 1 that George Brown's "peace offensive" was an empty gesture.

There is no doubt that the campaign against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam and the Wilson government's complicity will be powerfully stimulated by the recent events, both here and in Vietnam. The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign has called a demonstration and meeting for January 14. This time they will march to the Foreign Office, seeking Brown and the rest of the Wilson government as their target.

PUBLISHER OF "LA SINISTRA" EXPELLED FROM ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Rome

Giulio Savelli, of the Samonà e Savelli Publishing House which puts out La Sinistra [see World Outlook December 2, 1966] has been expelled from the Italian Communist party [PCI]. The decision was taken by the Control Commission of the Rome federation of the PCI last November 30.

The measure was the final step in a series of moves aimed at pressuring and brow-beating Savelli into giving up the newly launched magazine. Other actions were aimed at him in various party bodies, all of which shook the prestige of the Rome PCI leadership.

The first attempt to expel Savelli was made through the executive of the party local where he held membership. As a member of the executive, Savelli put up an energetic defense, maintaining his right to publish a magazine as an instrument for discussion within the Italian working-class movement. The majority of the local's leadership rejected the proposal to expel Savelli and limited itself to asking him to make a declaration of loyalty to the party.

Subsequently, after weightier intervention by the federal leadership, the local executive met again and decided by a majority vote to refer the matter to the local's general assembly.

An unusually well-attended assembly met to discuss the case, proving that free discussions inside the PCI are not as harmful to the organization as the leadership makes out. (The local in question has a poor record in attendance and activities, never succeeding in getting the members out.)

After a discussion that lasted until very late at night, the local decided by a majority vote to reject the proposal to expel Savelli; they merely suspended him for three months.

The Rome federation bureaucrats, of course, had counted on more. A hasty maneuver was cooked up to retrieve the situation. In a very irregular procedure that violated the party statutes, the Control Commission of the Rome federation took up the case and decided to expel Savelli.

The decision was sent to Unità, the daily paper of the Italian Communist party, but the editors appeared to think that the item did not redound to the party's credit

and they put it only in the Rome news page which is not circulated nationally but only in the province of Rome.

The Control Commission then made another move, sending a short statement to Unità attacking La Sinistra as a publication seeking to disrupt the party. They demanded that this be published on a page having national circulation. The editors complied.

This statement was in contradiction with the position of the Federal Committee (the political leadership of the Rome federation). That body after a discussion lasting two days decided that it is incompatible for a member of the Italian Communist party to hold a position as publisher, editor or circulator of La Sinistra. A proposal to also include anyone who submitted articles was rejected. But the Control Commission decided to include this category, too, in the ban.

The decision of the Rome Control Commission proved unpopular in left Communist circles. There was also a reaction in the PSIUP [the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, the left socialist group which split from Nenni's party]. The editor of Mondo Nuovo [New World], the PSIUP weekly, deplored the measure taken against Savelli. In addition, a critical position was taken by Problemi del Socialismo [Problems of Socialism], the magazine edited by Lelio Basso, the chairman of the PSIUP Central Committee and member of the War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell.

Meanwhile La Sinistra is following up the success of its first issue. The second number was as interesting as the first. It contained an interview with Isaac Deutscher on the "cultural revolution" in China, articles on Vietnam, on workers struggles and trade-union problems. The signed articles include Savelli, Libertini (a member of the Political Bureau of the PSIUP), Tagliazucchi (a PSIUP militant, member of the Editorial Board of Problemi del Socialismo), Gorla (a well-known and influential Communist militant of Milan), Piersanti (the national secretary of the Union of Doctors of the General Confederation of Labor and a member of the Communist party). Some articles are signed with three stars, indicating contributors who thought it best not to reveal their identity in view of what happened to Savelli.

The third issue was published after Savelli's expulsion. The contents show that his ouster had little effect on left Communist militants, who are continuing to write articles for the magazine. Two Communist leaders of Florence and a well-known militant in Turin are among the Communist party members who contributed.

At the same time the attempt to read La Sinistra out of the working-class movement proved to be a failure. Libertini and three members of the Communist party wrote letters criticizing the statement of the Control Commission. Foa, a member of the national leadership of the PSIUP and a member of the National Secretariat of the General Confederation of Labor, wrote an article for the magazine.

For more than two months the national leadership of the PCI tried to ignore La Sinistra. Aside from the small items submitted by the Rome Control Commission, the official Communist press avoided taking a stand on the magazine and its political line. At the beginning of January, Rinascita, the official weekly magazine of the PCI, took the plunge, honoring La Sinistra in a conspicuous way.

In the January 6 issue, the editor of Rinascita, G.C.Paietta, who is one of the top leaders of the PCI, wrote an article expressing his estimate of La Sinistra. Instead of the expected sharp attack, however, such as the Rome federation had launched, Paietta took a rather mild tone.

He said that the PCI is not against discussing with publications like La Sinistra. "We are not against a dialogue, polemics and even a clash with anyone who claims to be a socialist in any way if these are part of an effort to find ways and means of meeting and working together. In this issue we offer evidence of this, if further evidence is required, in the article by Comrade Achille Occhetto dealing with what Foa wrote in the monthly magazine in question.* Of course, the preliminary question could be asked (one which in no way refers to Comrade Foa, who is also one of the appreciated collaborators in our magazine) concerning the legitimacy of the relations of such people with the working-class movement and socialism; the question could also be raised about just when and at what border line, criticism and differences pass into open attack so that whoever resorts to them becomes an enemy. Having read, discussed and thought over the legitimate differences, we are prepared to offer our appreciation. This involves discussing the

*The reference is to an article in the January 6 Rinascita by Occhetto (former national secretary of the Communist youth) in reply to an article by Foa in the third issue of La Sinistra.

various positions, always utilizing arguments based on reasoned grounds."

After stating this, Paietta justifies the action taken by the Rome federation, arguing that in a situation in which the party press is in financial straits, it is not permissible for a member of the PCI to use his own money to publish a magazine outside the control of the party.

In a postscript to his article, Paietta replies to Basso's defense of Savelli. Basso's main argument was that through such methods as those used against Savelli, the PCI could not hope to encourage the building of a united party of the Italian working class. Somewhat embarrassed at being trapped in the unity line advanced by the PCI, Paietta declares that as long as a united party has not been constructed, the PCI claims the right to apply its own statutes to its internal life.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL GROUP VISITS CAMBODIA

Five members of the War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell arrived in Phnompenh, Cambodia, January 12. They were scheduled to stay ten days collecting evidence for the hearings of the tribunal. The five were Ralph Schoenman, the American secretary to Bertrand Russell; Dr. Gustave Tolentino of Toronto; Carol Brightman of New York; Abraham Bejar of France; and Lawrence Daly of Scotland.

It was reported that upon arriving in Paris from London en route to Hanoi, Ralph Schoenman was detained overnight by the French authorities. They held him at the hotel at Orly Airport. No official explanation was given and he was permitted to proceed by Air France the next morning.

The U.S. State Department has been seeking in various ways to block the War Crimes Tribunal and if possible prevent it from holding hearings. One of its recent steps was to invalidate Schoenman's passport.

In contrast, the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, declaring that it has nothing to hide from world public opinion, has done its utmost to facilitate the fact-finding work of the tribunal.

IRISH FARMERS BARRICADE KEY POINTS ON HIGHWAYS

A nationwide, one-day demonstration was staged in Ireland January 9 by farmers seeking increased government aid and subsidies. They blocked roads and bridges to emphasize their demands. An estimated 30,000 farmers used tractors, trucks, trailers and carts to halt traffic on key highways and bridges.

Cars were backed up for long distances where the improvised barricades had been put up. The entire provincial bus system was stalled.

The farmers have been hard hit by bad weather and -- more importantly -- by the effects of the recession in Britain engineered by the Wilson government.

Most Irish farm products are sold on the British market.

INFLATION CONTINUES IN BRAZIL

The Getulio Vargas Foundation, which keeps the official cost of living index in Brazil, reported January 8 that the rise for last year was 41.1%.

This continues what has been regarded by American backers of the Castelo Branco dictatorship as a quite favorable trend. In 1964, the year the general seized power in a coup d'état, the rise was 86%. In 1965, through "austerity" measures advised by the powers that be in Wall Street, the rise was only 45.4%.

However, the Brazilian press estimates that in January of this year the cost of living may suddenly shoot up 5% as compared with 1.2% in December. Not exactly an auspicious beginning for 1967...

COUP BEING PLOTTED IN GUINEA?

The Statist indicates in its December 30 issue that a coup d'état may be in preparation in Guinea.

"According to Western diplomatic sources," says the British magazine, "three major Guinean figures have in recent weeks approached three major Conakry embassies -- one East, one West and one Gaullist, with offers to stage a bloodless, Indonesian style 'deposal' coup on Touré, to bring Guinea back into the French African franc area, and to drop the espousal of extremist lost causes...."

"The time is certainly ripe. US aid is partially suspended: Washington will shortly announce that it will be resumed in 1967 -- with a 75 per cent slash. Ambassador Robbie McIlvaine, a shirtsleeved intellectual who jokes about his recent house arrest but who realises it marks a turning point in US-Guinean relations, may prolong his current consultations in Washington in order to leave the embassy downgraded to charge d'affaires level for a while. The Russians, still friendly with the Guinean Government, seem hesitant to increase their aid to counterbalance America's three-quarter withdrawal. France, pressured by the jealous Ivory Coast, cannot be too anti-Americanly opportunistic until Sekou Touré is overthrown.

"Touré is still popular with the Guinean crowds. He drives his own car in the streets without fear of being stoned or shot....It is feared that his arrest would be unpopular."

The reference to a "bloodless, Indonesian style" coup is not without cynicism. The estimates of the number butchered in the nationwide witch-hunt following the coup that put the generals in power run as high as 500,000.

The author of the report probably had Nkrumah in mind when he mentioned "extremist lost causes." Touré granted Nkrumah political asylum when the latter was ousted by a coup d'état in Ghana last February.

WANG JEN-CHUNG NO LONGER IN THE SWIM

Wang Jen-chung, famous throughout China for being such an ardent disciple of the thought of Mao Tse-tung that the great helmsman invited him to join him in the famous breasting of the turbulent waters of the Yangtze River last July 16, now appears to be badly in need of a life jacket.

The first secretary of the Communist party in the south-center region, he has reportedly been denounced by Mao's wife, Chiang Ching.

According to the East is Red, a journal of the Red Guards, at a Red Guard meeting in Peking December 16, Mrs. Chiang Ching accused him and two others of responsibility in various incidents. The other two were also disciples of Mao's thought -- Chou Jung-hsin, general secretary in the cabinet of the prime minister and Yung Wen-tao, the first secretary of the Communist party in Canton.

NEW BOOK BY LIVIO MAITAN

Rome

The publishing house of Samonà e Savelli has just issued a book written by Livio Maitan, a leader of the Italian Trotskyist movement, entitled The Workers Movement at a Critical Juncture. It is part of their series "Political Culture." As yet the book is available only in Italian.*

The introduction explains that the book constitutes "an analysis of the positions taken by the workers parties and unions on major problems that have been posed during recent years and which have not yet been solved. The first chapter deals in particular with discussions on the subject of economic programming (Pieraccini Plan). The second chapter examines problems related to the center-left. The third poses the crucial question of transitional objectives and the conditions for the conquest of

*Write to Samonà e Savelli, via Chinotto 1, Rome, Italy. US\$3.

power by the working class. The fourth examines concepts of the workers party such as were outlined in the polemics of 1965-66. The fifth is devoted to certain very current problems of the world situation.

"The analysis," continues the introduction, "is developed from a critical left point of view and to a certain degree represents a rounding out of other essays and articles by the same author... For an entire period, not only in the eyes of the public in general but also within the ranks of the workers movement, the Communist party has appeared as the extreme left beyond which there was room for only absolutely insignificant marginal groups. Today, besides the traditional criticisms of the other political parties, it is under more and more numerous and sweeping attacks from the left, with considerable repercussions in its own ranks.

"The book seeks to offer a contribution to this critical current, particularly in the field of today's political problems but also including references to less contingent generalizations, attempting in any case to draw from the episodic phenomena the main thread of the strategy of the whole as determined in the final analysis by the nature and position of leading groups and bureaucratic layers crystallized in the workers movement."

The book will be presented at a series of conferences in a number of cities in Italy, the first one having taken place already at Naples on December 15 at a cultural circle of the left. It was a notable success not only in the record number of those who attended but in the way in which the remarks of the speaker were greeted.

WELL-ORGANIZED SITDOWN STRIKE IN MADRID

An unusual sight in the streets of downtown Madrid December 31 was a demonstration staged by 3,000 workers of the Standard Electrica plant, the largest industrial establishment in the area. They were demanding full-time employment and production bonuses.

Astounded by such an action in a fascist country where labor demonstrations are strictly forbidden, the government ordered out riot squads and mounted police. They charged the demonstration and broke it up. During the clash, they arrested six alleged leaders. However, this did not close the books on the case.

In their jail cells, the six went on a hunger strike. News of this leaked out to the workers.

On January 2, nothing was produced in the four plants of the big electronic company. A sitdown strike, involving 13,000 employees, completely paralyzed operations.

In face of this powerful demonstration of solidarity, management had little choice. They got busy on the phone.

By nightfall the Tribunal of Military Order had agreed to release the six labor leaders. They demanded a face-saving condition -- that work be resumed -- and this was agreed to by the workers.

The most significant aspect of the incident was the capacity of the workers to get together under such short notice under the illegal conditions prevailing in Franco's Spain. The sitdown strike caught the authorities completely by surprise.

POLICE FIRE ON DEMONSTRATING STUDENTS IN INDIA, KILLING 9

Violence flared again in India when police of the Congress government fired into a crowd of demonstrating students in Patna January 5. Nine people were killed and 46 wounded by the cops. Several thousand students were involved. They burned down a bus depot and a government warehouse and threw stones at the police.

The demonstration was one of a series of protest actions staged since December 9 when police fired on students at Muzaffarpur, killing two. A curfew was imposed in Patna and army units were ordered to stand by in the tense city. Demonstrations were banned and schools were closed down.

RUBY'S DEATH AROUSES NEW DOUBTS ABOUT WARREN COMMISSION REPORT

By Arthur Maglin

[First of three articles.]

It is becoming more and more difficult for anyone to seriously defend the report issued by President Lyndon B. Johnson's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy. There has been a groundswell of demands for reopening the investigation and the suspiciously confusing events surrounding the death of Jack Ruby on January 3 will almost certainly give further impetus to the controversy over the assassination.

Ruby, an associate of underworld characters and a crony of the police, shot Lee Harvey Oswald to death in the basement of the Dallas police headquarters just two days after Kennedy was killed. Later, Ruby was convicted of killing Oswald, but this past October his conviction was vacated and a new trial set for this February.

Then, on December 9, Ruby was transferred from the Dallas County Jail to Parkland Memorial Hospital. According to the New York Times of December 10 Ruby was "suffering from pneumonia." The Times went on to say that, "Ruby, who is 55 years old, has a heart condition." The Times also reported Dallas County Sheriff Bill Decker as saying, "I understand Jack has had some cold for the last week."

Ruby's pneumonia then turned into cancer. According to the December 11 Times:

"Doctors at Parkland Memorial Hospital said today that Jack Ruby is suffering from cancer.

"Drs. Jay Sanford and Watts Webb of the Southwestern Medical School in Dallas said that Ruby had undergone surgery early today [December 10] and that cancer had been found in Ruby's lymph node. They said it had spread from some other part of his body."

The December 14 Times reported that:

"A physician who is treating Jack Ruby said today [December 13] that Ruby's cancer was too widespread to be successfully treated by surgery or by radiation."

Another doctor predicted that Ruby was a doomed man:

"A physician who treated Ruby over the weekend said that he may be near death.

"'It could be a month, it could be five years,' said Dr. Watts R. Webb, a professor of surgery at Southwestern Medical College.

"Sheriff J.E. Decker of Dallas County," the article continues, "who had custody of Ruby, has refused to allow newsmen to talk to him or photograph him."

On December 23 it was reported that doctors at Parkland had ruled out a lie detector test for Ruby on the basis that in his present condition it would not produce valid results. Jack Ruby's brother, Earl, had said that his brother wanted to take a lie-detector test to prove for history that he was not part of a conspiracy to kill Kennedy.

It was reported on January 3, just before the announcement of Ruby's death, that on about December 18 Ruby had secretly tape-recorded a denial of any conspiracy in killing Oswald.

According to the newspaper stories, an unwitting Dallas policeman was in the hospital room and two were outside the door when the recording was made. The tape recorder was hidden in an attaché case. The policeman did not know what was happening because Ruby's brother, Earl, told Ruby in Yiddish, "Jack, in the briefcase, the tape recorder is hidden here."

Ruby, speaking haltingly in English, gave an account of the events of November 24, 1963 -- the day he killed Oswald. In the recorded interview, Ruby insisted that it was purely coincidence, partly caused by his making an illegal turn into a parking lot, that brought him into the City Hall at the instant Oswald was being transferred. Ruby further claimed that the moment of killing Oswald is a blank in his memory.

Later news reports on January 3 told of Ruby's death from "cancer." The front page of the New York World Journal Tribune, however, reported the following as well:

"Penn Jones Jr., editor and publisher of the small Texas weekly, the Midlothian Mirror, a severe critic of the Warren Commission findings and a man who has spent thousands of hours during the last three years investigating the circumstances surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy, commented:

"I always said he [Ruby] would never live to get away from the Dallas authorities.

"My prediction has come true and I don't know what else I can say. He was still in the hands of the Dallas authorities when he made those tapes. I still think the assassination can be solved if the American people want it to be. I'm not sure the American people want it to be solved."

The January 3 New York Post reported:

"One of his sisters, Mrs. Eva Grant of Dallas, visited him today about an hour and a half before he died. While hospital officials described his condition then as 'comatose,' Mrs. Grant said he was 'sleeping peacefully.'

"Many of the policemen and reporters in Dallas knew Ruby before the tragedy as a 'friendly, puppy dog-type, eager to please,' as one put it.

"But he often flew off the handle, according to strip-girls and bartenders in the club he ran, the Carousel. Ruby had pushed around misbehaving customers and bump-and-grind girls who crossed him.

"Ruby explained he had pumped the pistol bullet into Oswald to spare Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy the anguish of returning to Dallas for Oswald's murder trial.

"Always he insisted that there had been no conspiracy and that he had not known Oswald."

It turns out, however, after all of this that the cause of Ruby's death was not "cancer," his "heart condition," nor a case of "pneumonia." On January 4 it was revealed that Ruby had died of a massive blood clot in the lungs. The January 4 New York Post reported this reaction:

"Sol Dann of Detroit, a Ruby family lawyer, and Melvin Belli of San Francisco, chief defense counsel at Ruby's Dallas trial, both said his death was probably caused by police doctors' neglect.

"Dann said he has 'strong feelings' that Ruby's health was not 'properly protected' during his long stay behind bars. He said 'an investigation should be made' to determine what was done to save Ruby's health.

"'Instead of dying in the electric chair he died in a hospital,' said Dann, who led the successful drive to have Ruby's conviction nullified on appeal. 'It should be determined whether that was the result of neglect.'

"Belli, in Paris en route to Rome, said Ruby's death was 'as callous as it sounds.'

"'I don't see how a man can be on a suicide watch and how they cannot pick out that the man is damn near dead. How the hell could it have been missed?' Belli asked."

In Europe the manner in which Ruby died scarcely served to allay the widespread suspicions that were expressed from the beginning that Kennedy was the victim of a plot with sinister ramifications.

Jacques Almaric, writing in the very respectable Le Monde (January 5) called special attention to the astonishing exchange between Jack Ruby and Earl Warren, reported by a now dead journalist, but included in the volumes of the Warren report without any denial as to its authenticity.

In this interview, Ruby begged Warren to have him transferred from Dallas to Washington. As long as he remained in Dallas, Ruby said, they would learn little from him. He demanded to be transferred as quickly as possible, saying that it was of importance to Warren.

Almaric expresses his surprise that this request was never granted, that the commission did not follow up this clue, nor even go into Ruby's relations with the police.

Almaric adds, however, that this failure does not prove anything. "It does not prove in any case that Jack Ruby was inoculated with cancer to prevent him from disclosing a vast plot -- knowing that he was doomed, he did not risk much in revealing what he had succeeded in hiding such a long time."

The reference to the way in which Ruby may have contracted his fatal illness is no doubt directed against ugly rumors circulating in Europe.

JOHNSON IS RIGHT FOR ONCE

Among other things putting him above ordinary men, such as being equipped with "extra glands," President Johnson has a feeling for art. So far as is known, he has displayed this only once; but the quality of judgment revealed in the instance is sufficient to show that the world lost an art critic of highest caliber when Johnson decided to go into politics.

The great man's hidden talent came to light last year when the official Presidential portrait, which he had commissioned, was sent to him at his ranch for approval. When the artist arrived, he found that Johnson had set it up under fluorescent lights and "It looked like death warmed over."

In a single pithy phrase, Johnson gave artist Peter Hurd the distillation of his judgment -- "That's the ugliest thing I ever saw."

As Hurd told the story later, "My hair began to bristle. I said, 'What do you like, Mr. President?' And he said, 'I'll show you what I like,' and whisked out Rockwell."

This was a drawing of the President done by the magazine illustrator Norman Rockwell from a photograph and maybe one sitting by the great subject for a few minutes. Johnson, as a true connoisseur of art, kept this beautiful work in his desk drawer for handy reference.

According to Hurd, Mrs. Johnson told him afterwards that she didn't expect to endure any meeting so grim again if she "lived to be 1,000." Over the phone she explained to Hurd, "The only thing that didn't go wrong that day was that the government of Viet Nam didn't fall."

No doors were slammed as the artist left the LBJ Ranch. But, naturally, with the customer dissatisfied, the sale didn't go through. The price tag, incidentally, was only \$6,000 -- just half the usual price, seeing who this patron of the arts was and what it meant in reputation, free advertising and other good and valuable considerations to have a portrait of him accepted.

Hurd said, "I was damn glad to get out of the whole thing." Still, he was bound to feel some disappointment, and considered the President's comment "very damn rude," as he had spent fifty hours on the canvas, twice the usual time, and "I had worked my tail off."

The New York Times took an editorial position on the esthetic values where the artist and critic were at loggerheads, saying, "Mr. Johnson's reaction to Mr. Hurd's painting -- 'the ugliest thing I ever saw' -- is not easy to understand, since Mr. Hurd is only a slightly slicker, if less sentimental, practitioner of the illustrative realism that is Mr. Rockwell's standard style."

By way of consolation to the President, the Times declared that compared with news and TV photographs, "any painted likeness of Mr. Johnson or any other public figure is likely to take on the quality of a mortuary exercise..."

As for our own position, in this case we think the art critic is, in the main, correct. He is a little off base, of course, in putting such strong stress on nuances of style. Nonetheless, in view of the subject matter -- which must also concern the critic as well as the artist -- he is undoubtedly dead right in coming to the conclusion, "That's the ugliest thing I ever saw."

HOOLOGANISM AT LIEGE -- DESERTION AT THE AVENUE KLEBER

By Pierre Frank

A demonstration in behalf of Hugo Blanco was held December 14 in front of the Peruvian embassy in Paris at the Avenue Kleber. [See World Outlook January 6.] All the organizations claiming adherence to Trotskyism were there save one, the group that recently baptized itself "Organisation Communiste Internationaliste," plus the youth organization it guides, "Révolte." These two organizations had nonetheless been invited to a meeting to discuss undertaking the action in favor of Hugo Blanco and they were represented there by Stephane Just, who began by affirming amid general smiles that they were the only Trotskyists.

They refused to go along with the action for two main reasons: (1) We were associated with officeholders of the UNR [de Gaulle's Union pour la Nouvelle République] and priests in the appeal for "A Billion for Vietnam";* (2) the action in behalf of Hugo Blanco ought to try to mobilize the unions with the exception of the CFDT [the Catholic-dominated Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail]. These two reasons warrant some comments.

We signed the appeal for a billion and gave our reasons for it publicly. All that is involved in the appeal is a simple demonstration of solidarity, the weight of which we do not overestimate, couched in terms that are unassailable, expressing solidarity without any reservations towards the Vietnamese people against American imperialism. The appeal does not concede anything at all to "pacifist," "humanitarian" sentiments masking more or less dubious orientations. If some UNR deputies, some priests, etc., have subscribed to this appeal, is that any reason for saying, as did the spokesman of one of these groups at a meeting: "Not a sou for the billion!"?

We repeat: All that is involved is a simple act of solidarity with human beings who each day are subjected to tons of bombs by American imperialism.

Let us consider a less important example. Some workers are involved in a long strike, and a solidarity committee is set up to help the families of the strikers by collecting funds. And let us suppose that the bourgeois deputy (UNR or any other) of the constituency and the parish priest, for their own reasons, subscribe to the appeal. (Don't let anyone tell us that this is an absurd hypothesis; it has been seen. Only a few months ago a bishop marched at the head of a demonstration of strikers in a city in the south.) Are our "purists" going to tell a striker who asks them to put their names down for something on the list: "Since the deputy and the curé on the corner are contributing, I'm not giving a sou"? With such "Trotskyism," we obviously have nothing in common.

We are certainly in favor of steps to get the unions to take up the defense of Hugo Blanco. But why exclude the CFDT? When we were trying to save the Rosenbergs from the electric chair, appeals were addressed to the Vatican, which intervened. We wonder what objection could be made to that!

But for our sectarians, the argument is that the CFDT is a "Trojan horse" in the workers movement; that it is the vehicle of the Catholic hierarchy in the workers movement, etc. The latter point does not appear to us very exact since the split occurred with the CFTC [Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens -- French Confederation of Christian Workers], because this split had an objective significance and cannot be interpreted as a maneuver.

However, let us grant the argument -- that the CFDT represents interests alien to the workers movement. By the same logic, it could be said just as accurately that the FO [Force Ouvrière] is the "Trojan horse" of American imperialism, this confederation having been supported since its foundation with American funds (the unions of that country serving in this instance as a transmission belt for the State Department). Why exclude one "Trojan horse" and not the other?

Stephane Just and his comrades are against the CGT-CFDT [CGT -- Confédération Générale du Travail] accord not because of its reformist content, but in principle, since they are against an accord on the trade-union level with the CFDT. On this point, moreover, they support the thoroughly reformist leaders of the Fédération de l'Education Nationale. We will return to this later.

*The current campaign in France to collect one billion old francs (US\$2,000,000) to help the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression.

As for us, we are not only for agreements (their content is something else again), we are for even more; we are for the unity of the CGT, FO and CFDT. This, of course, must not be unity at any price. But in principle, communists are against splits on the trade-union level; and there was a time when they fought in favor of trade-union unity not only against the traditional reformists but also against the CFTC concept of "union plurality."

That's not all. If these "Trotskyists," horrified at the Catholic hierarchy, did not belong to a phony International Committee, if they were members of a genuine international organization, they would know, for example, that in Germany before 1933 there were Social Democratic and Christian unions, and that in 1945 trade-union unity was achieved. What is their slogan for Germany? To kick out the spokesman of the Catholic hierarchy -- because there is one -- and split the unions?

This is still not all, because the workers movement, unfortunately, does not lack in "Trojan horses." The members of the organization who don't want the CFDT to defend Hugo Blanco are in the FO where they are in alliance among others with Hébert of Nantes. In the latter city, this anarcho-syndicalist supports the reactionary Morice, celebrated at least for having belonged to the Comité de Vincennes pour l'Algérie Française and constructing a line bearing his name that sought to isolate Algeria from Tunisia. What does this indicate about the ties between Morice and Hébert?

Let's take a look, if you don't mind, in the direction of the Masonic lodges. We also see there the leaders of the Fédération de l'Education Nationale. Aren't the lodges a "Trojan horse" in the workers movement? Do Stephane Just, Lambert and the others prefer the apron, hammer and Masonic rigamarole to the chasuble, stole and rituals of the Holy Roman Church?

The "arguments" that were trotted out didn't mean much to anyone except Stephane Just, for whom not much is really needed. They were only a pretext, after all, not to get involved in an action with "Pabloites," "Frankites," etc., in which it would not be possible to operate the way these organizations did at Liège. There, in October, a demonstration was organized by the Jeune Garde Socialiste [Socialist Young Guard] of Belgium against NATO and for Vietnam. The organizations for whom Just spoke sent a delegation of some 300 youth, their main objective being to "unmask" the Fourth International. In this operation they conducted themselves in hooligan fashion.*

At Avenue Kleber they could not put us "on trial" in front of the Peruvian embassy. They would have had to march shoulder to shoulder with "traitors," "petty bourgeois," etc. This is not really possible for sectarians who do not know where the class line really runs and for whom the main enemy is not the bourgeoisie but those who belong at least as much as they do to the Trotskyist school. This sectarianism ran the whole gamut in less than two months -- from hooliganism at Liège to desertion at Avenue Kleber, as they have deserted in all the actions for Vietnam (National Vietnam Committee, War Crimes Tribunal...)

It is to be hoped that these experiences will begin to signify something to some of the youth who have been attracted up to now by formulas in which one denounces the Stalinists, the Catholics, the Fourth International, the Chinese, the nationalists of the underdeveloped countries -- everyone excepting a few reformist or Freemason friends.

* Their friend, Healy, continued the operation in England, where a comrade selling literature at the entrance of one of his meetings was badly beaten. Afterward, the victim denounced the scandal in the press, and for this, the same Healy who spread the lie that the Belgian Young Guards had called the police against comrades in the demonstration at Liège is now threatening to drag him into the courts of Her Majesty the Queen.

SAVAGE CONDUCT UNDER AMERICANS IN MEKONG DELTA

The savagery with which American attack in the Mekong Delta is proceeding is indicated by a January 10 Agence France Presse dispatch reporting that in Long An province, the South Vietnam "Rangers," accompanying the Americans, entered a small village and seized four youths. Labeling them "Vietcong," the Rangers cut off their heads. Leaving the bodies at the roadside, they strolled through the village, swinging the heads by the hair as trophies of war. The officers of the American unit in the area were reported to have been disappointed at such conduct as it was not calculated to help them win the hearts and minds of the local population, which Ky's American advisers have repeatedly affirmed is required to "win" the war.

"BUREAUCRACY IS ALWAYS ON THE PROWL" [CONCLUSION OF CASTRO SPEECH]

[In our January 6 issue we published the first part of a speech given by Fidel Castro December 9. After the opening part of his speech, Castro took up in specific detail a number of developments in agriculture in Cuba, reporting what was being done to solve concrete problems and the achievements up to now as illustrated in various parts of the country. In the part below, he has reached the question of sugar, the country's most important industry.]

* * *

This coming year we're going to have an excellent sugarcane harvest, in the harvest that is already underway. As you know, there are now 48 mills grinding approximately 25 million cwt. of cane. (APPLAUSE) Being able to start the sugar harvest in December has been of great importance. Because to complete the sugar plan, it will be necessary for the mills to operate five or six months; to reach the sugar goal it is not only necessary to enlarge the sugar mills, which is being done. It will also be necessary to extend the duration of the sugarcane harvests. And now, this year, for the first time in the history of our country, no less than half a hundred sugar mills are in operation and have ground nearly 25 million cwt. of cane in the first 10 days of December. That achievement is an excellent, a magnificent omen. It means that pursuing this path, we will be able to fulfill our sugar goal for 1970; it means that even though we have an imposing, arduous goal, we can fulfill it. Next year we plan to apply 400,000 tons of fertilizer to cane alone. This year, between September and June, we will apply 105,000 tons of fertilizer to coffee. To get an idea of how much fertilizer 105,000 tons is, it is enough to say that before the Revolution the fertilizer used in agriculture throughout the entire country did not come to much over 100,000 tons; and nevertheless, only for coffee -- for coffee alone -- during the period between September and next June, 105,000 tons of fertilizer will be used.

The coffee plantations here formerly produced 30 cwt. for every 13.5 hectares, perhaps 40 or 50. On some occasions, a new coffee plantation produced 100, or slightly more, cwt. for every 13.5 hectares. We must commit ourselves to elevating the production of coffee to no less than 200 cwt. for every 13.5 hectares; that is, we have to practically triple or quadruple the production for every 13.5 hectares that existed under capitalism.

In other words, in only two areas, coffee and sugarcane, half a million tons of fertilizer will be employed. To this figure must be added the fertilizer that will be applied to vegetables in general, to fruits in general, and to all crops in general. That is, our country is entering the stage of employing fertilizer, machines, and technology on an extensive scale.

If, for example, fertilizer were not applied to those hectares of onions of Banao that are going to produce 5,000 cwt. in the first year, they would produce only 2,000 or 3,000 cwt. and the second, they would produce only 1,000 cwt. Employing fertilizer, agricultural production in our country can practically be tripled, because technology, except in a few crops -- such as potatoes and in some tobacco areas -- was not used in the past. Only in very rare cases under capitalism was fertilizer applied to sugarcane in the capitalist era and it was practically never applied to coffee. The major part of our agriculture lacked fertilizer. But, naturally, under capitalism, if 13.5 hectares produced only 50 cwt. we had not only sufficient coffee but excess coffee. But under the present conditions in our country, if 13.5 hectares produced 100 cwt., there would still be a shortage of coffee. But we shall cultivate to meet the maximum consumption of coffee, since we estimate that we will one day consume a million and a half cwt. in our country. Before the triumph of the Revolution, some 600,000 or 700,000 cwt. of coffee were consumed. We estimate that the consumption of coffee -- once it is no longer rationed -- will reach a million and a half cwt.

Some 150,000 tons of sugar were formerly consumed in our country. Presently, approximately half a million tons are consumed.

And this is the picture in every area of agriculture.

For that reason, we all must work; for that reason, all society must work. But not simply with physical effort, but with technology, with machines, with all the means that man can employ to increase production, to increase the wealth, to satisfy his needs.

In our notion not only will society as a whole be incorporated into productive work, but, in addition, technology and mechanization will be the handmaidens of production. The enemies of the Revolution, the imperialists and the members of the bourgeoisie,

believed that the Cuban people could not progress; that without the landowners and technicians of the capitalist era, and suffering the imperialists' economic blockade, our nation would collapse. However, it is not turning out as they believed. Much to the contrary, our nation will achieve extraordinary success; our country will attain production figures that will surprise the entire world.

In the production of cattle, for example, there are at present 1,200,000 cows included in the artificial insemination plan. We can state that today we are among the top-ranking nations in the world in artificial insemination of cattle. (APPLAUSE)

By the end of next year more than two million cows will have been artificially inseminated. And by that date, with that percentage, we may be the leading country in this field.

A great many persons ask what this means exactly. They wish to know what artificial insemination means in practice. Take the Zebu cow -- I think that everyone around here has seen a Zebu at least once in his life -- which produces about a liter and a half of milk daily. The offspring of such a cow, produced by genetics and artificial insemination, may produce eight and ten liters of milk daily. Of course these changes do not come about from one year to the next.

What is the significance of such a program? Could we have had even a million cows inseminated artificially in 1960? No. Because at the time of the triumph of the Revolution I believe there were just one or two experts in artificial insemination in the entire country. And how many technicians are there in this field today? Two thousand. (APPLAUSE)

Why have we been able to reach the million mark in artificial insemination, and even surpass it? Because in spite of the long backwardness in this field, we have two thousand technicians today. And it is not enough to speak only of the number of experts in artificial insemination, for their productivity has increased five-fold since that time when we first organized them by group and they received motorcycles with sidecars to ride out to their jobs. We are able to "motorize" these technicians, and today you can see them constantly going back and forth on the country roads.

What does all this mean? That several years have been required to train these two thousand experts; to arrive at the figure of a million cows inseminated artificially. These cows will give birth in 1967, the heifers will be ready for artificial insemination in 1969, and by 1970, hundreds of thousands of offspring of the original million cows will be producing milk.

Let us extrapolate even further. While by 1970 there will be approximately 400,000 such dairy cows producing, by 1971 there will be close to a million more; approximately a million more cows.

We have had to wait some years for this; we have had to work at this for some time. But the time is not far off when we will be reaping the benefits of these efforts.

In fact it is already of benefit to us simply to have two thousand trained specialists in an important field. By 1970 we will have five thousand such specialists. And does anyone know how many specialists in artificial insemination we will have by 1975? Twelve thousand!

Perhaps you are asking yourselves, "Why so many specialists in this field?" The answer is that we plan to have some eight million cows and heifers by that date. Moreover, we know from experience that certain underdeveloped countries may very well need specialized assistance and ask us for much aid.

But why twelve thousand experts? Wouldn't nine or ten thousand do? There are two good reasons why we are planning to train more specialists than we need.

These two reasons are: one, some nations may ask us for technical aid in the future; and two, if we have two or three thousand more than our immediate needs demand, this means two or three thousand technicians studying, advancing. For instance if we need nine thousand technicians and we have ten thousand, we can take a thousand off the job for a full year of higher studies.

On December 18, several hundred technicians will be the first graduates of the Technological Institutes. Are you aware how many students there are in those schools at present? Sixteen thousand five hundred. And how many will be studying there by January, 1967? Twenty-five thousand. And how many agricultural experts will have graduated by 1970? Twelve thousand. And by 1975, forty thousand. (APPLAUSE)

We can have an idea of what our country will be like when these tens of thousands of students graduate...thousands are studying for the fishing fleet, thousands for the merchant marine, and more than twenty thousand are studying for a career in teaching. Close to thirty thousand students are enrolled in the universities of Havana, Las Villas, and Oriente. What does this mean? I was explaining to some of the comrades here that in order to have an idea of a society where there are hundreds of thousands of technicians, all we had to do was to look at what Acosta has done here in Banao, or what Eliseo, an agronomist specializing in sugarcane, has done in Camaguey. Suffice it to see what an enthusiastic, capable, revolutionary technician can do, what two or three of them can do, to realize what a society that can boast hundreds of thousands of technicians can be like and what it can accomplish.

In an effort to crush the Revolution, the imperialists did their utmost to make our technicians leave the country. They carried on all sorts of campaigns. Naturally, Yankee imperialism does not limit its efforts simply to taking technicians away from Cuba. We had very few technicians, and our technical level in many fields of science was quite poor. The imperialists lure technicians from England and from all of Europe as well. Every industrialized country is faced by the same problem: by offering higher wages -- sometimes two or three times as much -- the Yankees manage to entice technicians away from England and many countries in Europe. They take technicians away from their own allies. Many physicians and engineers who graduate in Latin America emigrate to the United States because the United States tries to entice away technicians from everywhere. As I said before, they even take technicians away from their own allies.

They did not do this in Cuba simply because Cuba had good or many technicians. They did it in order to crush us. They are not interested in those technicians. I can tell you that all the technicians they took away, put together, are worth less than one good revolutionary technician. (APPLAUSE)

I am sure that the technicians they took from us will never help the imperialists reach the moon or discover anything, for they were mostly a conglomeration of incompetents, parasites, reactionaries, and scoundrels. (APPLAUSE)

One cannot think of a specialist in a technical field who is not first of all a real human being, and it is impossible to think of a human being who is an egoist. An egoist cannot be called a human being. One cannot think of a technician without human feelings. And only a technician who loves others, who feels a passion for work, who is stimulated by the ideal of serving his country, of being of service to his fellowman, can be a good technician.

The imperialists tried to take away all those miserable specimens. Did this cause any harm? Some, perhaps, but what does it matter? What do the few miserable specimens they took away mean? What does this trash they took away mean when compared with the technicians, the tens of thousands of revolutionary technicians the Revolution is now training? (APPLAUSE)

We are happy to say that notwithstanding the imperialists' campaign to lure away technicians, in coming years our country will be among those with the largest number of technicians -- in the underdeveloped sector of the world -- and on a level with many of the developed countries.

Speaking of a certain modern technique, I was explaining the case of artificial insemination, aimed at the development of our cattle industry. We are close to being in first place in the world in use of this technique. Undoubtedly, by next year we will be in first place. This is one type of technique; tomorrow it will be another, then still another, and so on. Take sports, for instance. You all know about the development of sports in our country; you know the place our country occupies in sports; we have just had the Chess Olympiad, and all the visitors, many of whom had become accustomed to the lies and vilifications that the imperialists print about our Revolution, were amazed at the attention they received, at the organization of the event, at the people's interest in chess. They were amazed at their mass participation in such an activity that in many countries, especially capitalist countries, has always been reserved for a privileged minority. This very stadium, for example, can hold over 10,000 people. You know very well that when the baseball season begins it will be filled to capacity. We have estimated that over 10 percent of the population of Santa Clara has come to this stadium, and not all of those interested in coming have done so.

This means that mass participation of the people in cultural and educational activities, in sports, in production, in national defense, in building the nation's future, is a real, powerful, irrefutable fact, that has prevailed over the wrath of our imperialist enemy, over their blockades, aggressions, attempts to crush our country.

And as each day goes by, as each month goes by, as each year goes by, it becomes more evident that they will never be able to destroy our Revolution. Each day it becomes more impossible to crush our Revolution! (APPLAUSE) Our Revolution becomes more powerful, more solid every day.

What will they have to say about this? What will they say about the tens of thousands of women who have gone into production, who have begun working, who have enrolled in the Schools of Technology, Medicine and Humanities at our universities. What will they say about the thousands and thousands of women working in medical services?

What will they say about the tens of thousands of women who entered the field of education, and who have gone to work in day nurseries and schools? What will they say about the women who have gone into the field of production? What can they say?

What future could our women look forward to under capitalism and imperialism? To work at the worst tasks. What future awaited the daughters of workers and peasants? An honest job, by any chance? No, only a brothel. But brothels no longer await women in this country! (APPLAUSE)

All that our women could expect from capitalism and imperialism were the worst jobs, the most humiliating jobs, discrimination, underestimation.

Today, this all appears to be a nightmare from the past. No worker, no father, has to send his daughter away to work as a maid for wealthy families, or to work in a bar or brothel. The past, that nightmare, that odious future which that society offered Cuban women has been eradicated forever.

In order to realize what the Revolution has done for the Cuban women and in turn, what the Cuban women have done for the Revolution, one must go to Banao, San Andrés, to Pinares de Mayarí, La Caoba and Palenquito. (APPLAUSE)

One must visit the hundreds of avicultural centers in the country, the dozens of rabbit farms that are being developed through the country, to see our women employed at a decent, worthy, liberating job. And one of these places -- because it is the one that has impressed me the most, because it is where woman's revolutionary spirit and fervor were most evident -- was precisely one that I mentioned before: Banao.

Let the skeptics, those who did not believe -- or do not believe -- go to Banao; let those who underestimate women, those who cannot conceive of their capability and potentiality, come to Banao and visit many other places as well. (APPLAUSE)

This does not mean that the Revolution is trying to solve the problem of woman's work by means of bureaucracy, by means of some unimportant job in some office.

And when I say this I repeat that it should be understood that we do not believe that working in an office is undignified, or useless. No, office work is something we cannot do without, it is a necessary thing. What we can do without is bureaucracy, what we can do without is the accumulation of bureaucrats in offices. (APPLAUSE)

Those who do not seem to understand what bureaucracy means; those who do not seem to understand that bureaucracy does not make anybody happy, that bureaucracy does not make any worker or any woman happy, should go to an office full of women employees and afterwards they should go to Banao. Let them try, let them see for themselves, let them make a comparison. Let them verify the different kind of enthusiasm and happiness resulting from creative, productive work.

The result of knowing that they are serving their children, their husbands, their parents, their country, and the Revolution (APPLAUSE), by struggling, creating useful things, and contributing to the general welfare.

Let a minimum number of employees remain in the offices. Let us be relentless in our attack on bureaucracy. This is an ill requiring years of permanent struggle because once we let down our guard, bureaucracy will take the offensive.

We have explained the whole process in one sentence: the Commissions of the Fight Against Bureaucracy have become bureaucratized. In other words, they have let down their guard and tried to solve problems by bureaucratic means. Some organizations have added to their personnel without consulting the Commissions; many offices, many administrators have increased their personnel without previous consultation. But we remain alert, without lowering our guard. The next step is to de-bureaucratize the Commissions of the Fight Against Bureaucracy and invest them once again with the revolutionary spirit and method. (APPLAUSE)

We did gain some ground in the fight against bureaucracy; an antibureaucratic awareness was created. But bureaucracy is always on the prowl. The vices of bureaucracy become manifest under various forms: there are certain government officials who hire students even though they know very well that it is forbidden to hire students -- that is, if a student is in financial trouble we prefer to grant him a scholarship, or a loan, instead of a job which will turn him into a bad worker and a bad student -- some organizations hire students at will; some offices and departments have violated the laws of the struggle against bureaucracy by hiring additional personnel.

Finally, I take this opportunity to sound the alarm, to tell the bureaucrats that we are on the alert; to tell the revolutionary comrades in the Commissions for the Fight Against Bureaucracy that these Commissions have shown signs of bureaucracy and therefore they must be de-bureaucratized.

We can count upon the people's enthusiasm, with the enthusiasm of all the women in this country, with the enthusiasm of every one of us, to promote plans, to promote woman's creative work, and to develop the country's economy.

By the same token, we would never do this while on the one hand we call upon the women to work in our fields, to send their children to nurseries, to get up at dawn, and to go to work and create material goods, and on the other hand we allow bureaucrats who have not the slightest idea of what productive or creative work means, free spenders of the people's money, free spenders of money they have not earned by the sweat of their brow, to go around wasting money.

And it is not only money that they waste. They do something worse than just wasting money: they are wasting intelligence and human beings. Because if one of those bureaucrats who could do his job with the help of twenty people goes round inventing organograms, and creating positions to be occupied by eighty additional people, without turning out any paperwork, or worse yet, producing papers that become veritable stumbling blocks, bottlenecks, this bureaucrat, this antisocial entity, this enemy of the Revolution, is doing something worse than just spending one hundred thousand, or one hundred and fifty thousand, or two hundred thousand pesos. What does it take to produce one hundred thousand pesos' worth of onions, tomatoes, strawberries, milk, beef, grapes, sugar, or what have you? How much does it take? How much work, how much sweat, how many acres of land, how many hours, how much sacrifice? And what does it take for a bureaucrat to waste 100,000 pesos, to pay 100,000 pesos, to pay 100,000 pesos in unnecessary salaries in payment for abstract work? Can anyone call himself a revolutionary, a socialist, a communist, or a participant in a proletarian revolution if he is ignorant of the work involved in producing one liter of milk, or a tomato, or a grain of coffee, or a pound of malanga?

When I want to find out who is a revolutionary and who is not a revolutionary, I am guided by the following criterion: Does this man know how much it costs to produce any of these things? Does he know that in order to produce a liter of milk a man has to get up at 2 a.m. and work until dawn in the milking of cows, or run around the pastures day and night, taking care of the animals, in order to produce one or ten or one hundred liters of milk? Does he know the value of that effort? Can he appreciate the product of work, and does he know how to appreciate human beings?

I would say that such a bureaucrat not only wastes 100,000 pesos -- and perhaps it would take 100 women an entire year of work to produce 100,000 pesos -- an amount he wastes on a single payroll; he not only squanders the 100,000 pesos; even worse, he wastes 80 people; he misuses the work of 80 persons, wasting both their intelligence and their energy.

Can we say that there is no more bureaucracy? Yes, there has been a campaign against bureaucracy, but nonetheless, bureaucracy exists. Does this mean that there are no more bureaucrats? There are still bureaucrats, and many of them, most of them, do not know what a peso represents; many who have no conception of what it means to produce a peso's worth of milk, meat, vegetables or fish; and that is really what they throw away, what they waste. This is hardly revolutionary; this helps absolutely nobody. I believe that the greatest harm one can do another person is to make him do work that is useless, to make a person do a job where the uselessness of his efforts are all too clear to him. And this explains why a woman can feel useful and happy cultivating a tomato plant, planting a coffee bush in a nursery. She can feel happy at such tasks.

There are still a lot of people with petty-bourgeois mentalities. Can one have proletarian awareness and yet be blind to these things? No! To act so is to retain petty-bourgeois viewpoints, habits and ideas. This petty-bourgeois mentality still infects our socialist administration but the proletarian spirit advances more rapidly every day throughout the entire nation. In contraposition to that spirit, to reaction-

ary, conservative, and petty-bourgeois tendencies, the proletarian spirit which we see from one end of the nation to the other, is advancing. The people enthusiastically enroll in productive tasks; the people constantly develop awareness. And the pace at which we develop our awareness -- I repeat -- determines the ground we gain in the battle against the petty-bourgeois mentality, and our freedom to proceed full steam ahead in our proletarian Revolution, of our socialist Revolution, of our communist Revolution. (APPLAUSE)

And I only wish to add, enthusiastically:

Long live the women of Cuba! (APPLAUSE)

Long live the revolutionary spirit, the revolutionary discipline and the revolutionary dedication of Cuban women! (APPLAUSE)

Long live the feminine Revolution within the socialist Revolution! (APPLAUSE)

Patria o Muerte!

Venceremos! (OVATION)

CANADIAN TROTSKYISTS DEMAND SLL ANSWER ON TATE CASE

[The following is the text of a letter which the League for Socialist Action addressed to the National Committee of the Socialist Labour League in London. The letter deals with the beating of Ernest Tate in front of a meeting held under the auspices of the SLL. This was first reported in World Outlook December 2, 1966. Subsequent developments have been reported in succeeding issues.]

* * *

1 Cumberland Street
Toronto 5, Ontario
January 1, 1967

To the National Committee of
The Socialist Labour League

Comrades:

We are astonished to see that you have not responded in any positive way to the appeal issued by the Socialist Workers Party of the United States, and which you acknowledge receipt of in the December 3 issue of your official organ, The Newsletter. They asked you to place your national secretary on trial and that you expel from your ranks everyone involved in the hooligan attack against Ernest Tate outside your meeting at Caxton Hall on November 17.

For our part we do not question for one moment that Comrade Ernest Tate is telling the truth when he states that he was viciously assaulted as he was attempting to encourage those attending the meeting to purchase, so they could study, a pamphlet entitled Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International. As a leader of our movement, the League for Socialist Action, he informed us that a group of persons known to him and other witnesses as members of the SLL, and under the direction of your national secretary, assaulted him and gave him such a working over that he had to be hospitalized. It was only by good chance that he was not killed and appears to have suffered no permanent injury.

You see, we know Comrade Tate. We know him as a revolutionary socialist, as a Trotskyist of the highest integrity and the firmest dedication to the cause of the international working-class movement that bears the name of Leon Trotsky and numbers within its ranks such fearless fighters as Hugo Blanco.

Aside from the political and moral credentials of the accuser, and they are impeccable, your political committee published a statement in your official organ on August 20 that sustain his charge. It is in fact a directive to members of your movement to act as Tate claims they did against him. It declared publicly in your name that, "We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it around the cynical fake-left in England." Since then your paper, in its November 12 issue, reported an incident where a revolutionary was beaten up and thrown out of a meeting where your national secretary was the featured speaker because

he wanted to defend his organization from the attack and revilement that had been leveled at it throughout the meeting. Instead of denouncing the assault of this revolutionary and his associates, the Newsletter approved. It seems clear to us that these incidents sustain Tate's charges.

Even should you believe that Tate has concocted his story, and that others, such as the Voix Ouvrière, have concocted their stories for reasons unknown to us, it is obvious that you yourselves must initiate the action suggested by the SWP or some alternative action which will make it possible to ascertain the truth of Tate's charge.

Failure to do so, you must admit, tends strongly to affirm the truth of the charges leveled against your national secretary and certain members of your movement.

Do not think that this is a small matter, an incident that will blow over or that can be permitted to be overlooked by serious revolutionary socialists committed to the herculean task of building a new society. And do not justify your failure to act along the lines of the SWP proposal with any kind of rationalization that to do so would be a form of capitulation to the pressure of the SWP, that it would amount to some kind of "win" for the SWP, which for many months now you have been abusing in the columns of your press.

This would truly be spite that amounts to cutting off your own nose to save your face.

Even should you feel that the SWP has taken up this matter, not at all in the interests of world Trotskyism, but for some petty factional consideration -- and nothing whatsoever in our long and close association with the SWP permits of such an interpretation -- you should seriously consider how your failure to act will be interpreted by all those across the world who consider themselves to be Trotskyists. Think what it means to those sections of the British left who have already heard or will yet hear of this accusation. Think what it means to the internal life of your own movement.

We take it for granted that you are familiar with the longstanding and tested policies adhered to by any movement that calls itself Trotskyist in respect to the democratic rights of members of this movement, of working-class opponents, and even of exponents of views that can be said to be petty-bourgeois opposition views. Our movement has always stood for a full and free discussion of ideas. It has always rejected absolutely all attempts of any kind to infringe on, to curtail, or to suppress this process in any way, not to speak of violent physical suppression. We have taken this stand not at all because it has long been the Trotskyists who have been denied a hearing, whose rights have been trampled on, suppressed, and whose activists have been beaten up and even murdered. We have taken this stand because the movement required to carry out the task that we have set ourselves cannot be built on any other principle -- because no characterizations of us or our ideas hold any terror for us, because we have nothing, not anything to hide.

If you have any doubts in this respect we would refer you to the conduct of the SWP in collaboration with Trotsky himself in respect to one James Burnham. And since the Newsletter on occasion has seen fit in its personal vendettas against leaders of the United Secretariat to dip far back in the history of such sections as the French -- we would refer you to Trotsky's intervention in the Molinier incident.

Instead of responding to the SWP's very simple and logical request that you face your national secretary with Tate's charges, that you place him on trial, you have allowed your leadership to go to the courts. Not to a court of labor and socialist opinion composed of trade unionists, socialists, whose collectivity would assure impartiality and the determination of the truth, but to the bourgeois courts, the courts of the class enemy.

The first result of this violation of elementary working-class principle has already heaped ignominy on you. What satisfaction there must be in knowing that you have succeeded in wringing 21 guineas out of two working-class papers for having published a letter by Tate protesting the assault on him, and in winning the threat of worse should they comment on the Tate incident!

We cannot help but recall to your mind when you were taken to court, and the capitalist judges handed down awards against you. In the tradition of working-class solidarity with victims of capitalist court injustice, when you were the victim we responded to your appeal to the full limit of our resources. We welcomed your national secretary on our platform. We launched a special financial drive through the ranks of our members and sympathizers and gave you a very large sum of money.

And now having forced, with bourgeois court orders, the working-class press of Britain into silence, your victorious solicitors have, upon the advice of Gerry Healy, threatened our comrade with a court injunction restraining him from circulating information relevant to his case, including the contents of this letter, we assume, or suffer the consequences. You should know that no single issue in Canada today, not wages, not working conditions, but court injunctions unites the ranks of the working-class opposition to capitalism.

Let us assure you that we are as fully behind Comrade Ernest Tate as we were behind you when you were being harassed by the courts. We will not have him silenced and we will aid him in his efforts to the fullest extent of our resources.

What a legacy of hatred for your movement, what awful precedents are being set by the course that your leadership launched you upon by their action in front of your meeting just last November at Caxton Hall. Where will you go from here? What was the logic of the course that was set then? Are you prepared to send Comrade Tate to jail for defiance of a court injunction? Stop now! Turn back! Act on the suggestions of the SWP -- or you will be forever lost to the ideology of which you claim to be the sole practitioners.

Comradely,

Ross Dowson

Executive Secretary
League for Socialist Action

AMERICAN STUDENT YOUTH SCHEDULE SPRING ANTIWAR MOBILIZATION

[On December 28-30, an important gathering of representatives of some 37 different student groups and 17 local independent committees to end the war was held in Chicago. The 257 delegates included representatives from Canada and Puerto Rico. After an intensive discussion, it was decided that a nationwide strike against the war in Vietnam is not feasible at this time but that a nationwide mobilization of students could be carried out. Agreement was reached on organizing "Vietnam Week" April 8-15. This will be a week of intensive campus antiwar activity, culminating in massive demonstrations in New York and San Francisco on April 15. Student youth from all over the country will converge on the two centers to voice their feelings against the role of the U.S. in Vietnam. The following is the text of the call issued by the Chicago conference.]

* * *

"They have made a desert and called it peace." -- Tacitus.

It is two years since the U.S. government began bombing North Vietnam. For two years the U.S. government has continued to escalate the war and spent ever increasing sums of money. In Vietnam the war is being paid for by the increased shedding of the blood of American and Vietnamese soldiers, and the ever increasing killing of Vietnamese civilians. At home the war is being paid for by increased food prices, increased tuition, and the ever increasing disruption of the lives of American youth. This poses a challenge to those Americans who for the past two years have been striving to bring the horror of the war to the attention of their fellow Americans: for now large segments of America can be reached with the message that the war is a barrier both to their own individual happiness and to the fulfillment of the American dream of a nation with liberty and justice for all.

We must respond to this challenge by confronting our fellow students and our professors with the truth about the war and its perverse effects upon our society:

We must face the true nature of the war. It is first of all a war of aggression against the people of Vietnam, who seek only to exercise that right of self-determination for which Americans fought in 1776. It is a racist war, a murderous war against a colored people. It is an illegal war fought in our name but without our consent. It is but one symptom of a diseased society, a symptom that must be ended if it is to be possible to begin treating the disease itself.

We must face the true nature of the draft system. It is that system by which the war machine is nourished by the blood of young men. It is that system which makes the war possible. It further perpetuates a system of racism in the United States. It calcu-

lately penalizes the poor. It is used by the government to crush the aspirations of American racial minorities. It converts the classroom into an arena in which the losers are sent out to kill and be killed and the winners must live with the knowledge that their "success" in school may mean another's death on the battlefield.

The war in Vietnam makes it clear that the administration of this country with the complicity of the colleges and universities prefers to train Americans to become instruments of war instead of enlightened human beings.

We, the Student Mobilization Committee, urge all those students who wish to oppose the criminal war in Vietnam to dedicate themselves anew to the task of ending the war. Specifically we propose that April 8-15 be designated as Vietnam Week. We urge national student action during Vietnam Week which will culminate in the transportation of as many students as possible to New York and San Francisco as part of the general Spring Mobilization of the antiwar movement on April 15. Finally, we propose that the focus of End the War in Vietnam Week be on: (1) Bringing the GI's home now; (2) Opposing the draft, and supporting the right of individuals to refuse to cooperate with the military system; and (3) Ending campus complicity with the war effort.

It is especially appropriate that we American students, fighting for the right to determine our own future, support the right of self-determination throughout the world and call for international opposition to the war in Vietnam, which denies the right of self-determination to the people of Vietnam.

"IRISH MILITANT" SCORES HEALY IN ERNEST TATE CASE

[The following item, under the title, "Healy Goes to Court," appeared in the January issue of the Irish Militant.]

* * *

Different sections of the British working class movement adopt different attitudes to the repressive arms of the capitalist state machine. One organisation which evinced outright hostility at the whole legal apparatus and contempt for the "collaborators" was the Socialist Labour League, led by Gerry Healy. Their publications are replete with fulminations against any "socialist" who dares have truck with any capitalist institution.

Now Peace News and Socialist Leader recently published a letter from Ernie Tate, manager of the Marxist Pioneer Bookshop, alleging that S.L.L. members had, at Healy's instigation, beaten him up. What was Gerry scourge-of-the-fake-lefts Healy's reaction? He went whining to his lawyer and dispatched writs in all directions.