

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. 11

March 17, 1967

In this issue

Page

Appeal for Student Antiwar Demonstrations Internationally April 8-15	273
Like the Fourth of July or Like a Flowering Rose?	274
U.S. General Finds Iron Triangle a Depressing Experience	275
"Rectification Campaign" Curbs "Cultural Revolution" [II] -- by Joseph Hansen	276
Supardjo Accuses Generals of Murdering 500,000 in Indonesia	280
The March 5 Election -- by Pierre Frank	281
Antiwar Demonstration in Brussels	282
Lodge Reported Quitting as Ky's Boss	283
Brazilian Communist Leader Given Savage Sentence	283
Mandel Reports in Bombay on War Crimes Tribunal Work	284
Was Joan Baez a Victim of Translator or the CIA?	285
Congress Party Barely Wins Majority in India -- by Kailas Chandra	286
Moscow Dubs Mao a "Trotskyist"	289
German Social Democrats Offer Olive Branch to Swordsmen	290
What Mao's Thought Can Do for You:	
End Neurotic Need to Make Your Own Pile	290
1966 -- Year of Limited Gains for Soviet Economy -- by Sandro Mantovani	291
Impressive List of CIA Front Organizations -- by C.D. Cavanagh	293
Arrest Made in Kennedy Case -- by Arthur Maglin	294
Chance and Necessity in Vietnam and the U.S. Draft	296
A Shift in Peking's Attitude on Shipping Soviet Aid to Vietnam?	296
Documents:	
The Cubans Come to Closer Grips with the Bureaucratic Danger -- by Joseph Hansen	297
"The Struggle Against Bureaucracy: A Decisive Task"	
[Text of Editorial in "Granma."]	298
A Possible Source of Mao's Infallibility	304

APPEAL FOR STUDENT ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS INTERNATIONALLY APRIL 8-15

[Preparations are underway from coast to coast in the United States for what looks like will be a very impressive "Spring Mobilization" April 15 against Johnson's policy of continuing the war in Vietnam. The key slogan for the activists in the movement is immediate withdrawal of the U.S. troops from Vietnam.

[On the campuses, as part of the antiwar effort, the Student Mobilization Committee has set aside April 8-15 as "Vietnam Week." To give maximum impact to the campus protest rallies and actions scheduled for that week, the committee is appealing for international assistance. The following is the full text of the call sent out by the committee.]

* * *

We, as American citizens, condemn our government's role in Vietnam. We condemn its support of puppet regimes in Saigon, the massive troop and arms intervention, the daily bombing attacks on the people of North and South Vietnam. We condemn our govern-

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

ment's acquiescence in the torture of prisoners. We condemn the use of chemical warfare and the napalm, phosphorus, and "lazy-dog" bombs, which together with other innovations in weaponry mark American intervention in Vietnam.

The United States government is conducting a criminal war against the Vietnamese people, which is every bit as horrible as the French operations in Algeria, and the Nazi atrocities in World War II. This war against the Vietnamese people is being carried out in violation of the Geneva Accords, the United Nations Charter, our nation's own Constitution, and all standards of humanity.

Periodically, our government has issued declarations of peaceful intent, and has stated its willingness to hold "unconditional" discussions. But these hypocritical declarations are almost always followed by new escalation of the war. Thus far, our government has been unwilling to put an end to this horrible war by getting out of Vietnam and letting the Vietnamese people determine their own destiny.

The overwhelming majority of mankind, from Melbourne to Moscow, from Manila to Montevideo, have justly condemned the war in Vietnam. And never in our nation's history has a war been so unpopular among our own people.

The peace movement in our country continues to grow as thousands upon thousands of our people come to learn the truth about the war. We realize that, of all the world's peoples, it is ourselves who have the primary responsibility and burden to bring a halt to the war. Towards this purpose, we are calling for a nationwide student week of protest, April 8-15, culminating in massive demonstrations in New York and San Francisco on April 15. This will be the largest expression of antiwar sentiment among students ever held in our nation's history.

We issue this statement to call upon the peoples of the world to join with us during Vietnam Week in an international demonstration against U.S. aggression in Vietnam. We ask the students of the world to join us April 8-15 in making our protest an international student protest against the war. We ask this expression in the name of international brotherhood and peace, in the name of humanity.

* * *

[The committee asks those interested to write or cable about their plans. The address is: Student Mobilization Committee, 29 Park Row, Fifth Floor, New York, N.Y. 10038.]

LIKE THE FOURTH OF JULY OR LIKE A FLOWERING ROSE?

The New York Times published an article on the front page of its January 19 issue which began as follows:

"SAIGON, South Vietnam, Thursday, Jan. 19 -- United States Air Force B-52 bombers dropped tons of incendiary bombs yesterday on War Zone D, a Vietcong sanctuary, in an attempt to burn away dense foliage hiding suspected enemy camps and infiltration routes.

"Ten waves of the big bombers dropped magnesium incendiary bombs in radar-controlled parallel patterns over a 28-square-mile patch of the thickly forested area 30 miles northeast of Saigon.

"It looked just like the Fourth of July," said an American military spokesman who watched the air strikes from a helicopter near the target area."

* * *

While not exactly a plagiarism, this poetic reaction of the unidentified American military spokesman does echo in the most striking way a simile used by another military figure who gained fame in the Italian imperialist invasion of Ethiopia in the thirties:

"I still remember the effect I produced on a small group of Galla tribesmen massed around a man in black clothes. I dropped an aerial torpedo right in the center, and the group opened up like a flowering rose. It was most entertaining."

Those memorable sentences appeared in a self-glorifying account written by one of the Italian fascist dictator's sons, the swaggering Vittorio Mussolini.

U.S. GENERAL FINDS IRON TRIANGLE A DEPRESSING EXPERIENCE

Recently the American press was filled with reports about the success of a drive mounted by the U.S. armed forces in Vietnam to obliterate a stronghold of the National Liberation Front designated by the Saigon forces as the "Iron Triangle." The operation was held to mark a promising beginning in reducing a number of areas by force of American weaponry, strategy and fighting capacity. It appears, however, that the actual results do not measure up to the publicity. This is the opinion of no one less than Brig. Gen. S.L.A. Marshall, a military affairs analyst.

Writing from Bien Hoa, Vietnam, in a column that appeared in the March 5 Japan Times, the general describes the Iron Triangle as "a messy maze of low ground cut up by canals, dikes and paddy banks, with some bamboo thickets and tangled jungle patches."

"When the Army decided shortly before the New Year that the Iron Triangle had to be obliterated, there were great expectations," he continues. "The attack would be made in unexampled numbers, following a deceptive feint. The enemy would be bagged and their burrows blown to Kingdom Come. That piece of real estate could be forgotten."

How did it actually work out? "A relatively few enemy were either snared or killed. The tunnel systems were not destroyed but only damaged for a time.

"Flying a reconnaissance over the Triangle a few days before the whistle blew, I saw mainly an unbroken green and slightly repellent countryside which appeared wholly devoid of life. The panorama is now scarred from end to end, not only by bomb craters running in crisscross patterns but also by ribbons of turned red soil 300 meters wide where great earth movers and fleets of bulldozers did their work. At dead center of the triangle is the symbol of what was done -- a clearing of turned-up earth large as two city blocks and cut in the shape of an engineer's castle.

"Still it remains true that not one B52 crater and none of this bustle and bang over the surface hit deep enough to damage even slightly any one of the tunnel systems, according to the engineers who explored the tunnels."

The general's account of what the engineers found indicates with what energy and determination the Vietnamese freedom fighters are defending their country against the colossally powerful imperialist invader:

"They found it impossible to destroy them, despite our scientific knowhow, our plenitude of explosives, stores of chemicals and experience in coping with other earth-works dug by the enemies of late years. The best that could be done was to interrupt them here and there by blowing them up or by saturating them with chemicals that might last a little while longer.

"It is not simply that the tunnels are too far below the surface, averaging between 12 and 20 feet. But rather nowhere do they maintain a straight line for more than 20 or 25 feet; it is always zig-zag, the purpose being to thwart any weapon or chemical aimed to neutralize more than a local section. Baffle doors and vents are numerous. The effect is to limit the area of destructiveness.

"There are no props nor shorings of any kind, only earth walls. Because of the vents and baffle doors, chemical smoke projected into one entrance will emerge maybe 300 yards or so farther along. The air is more stale than foul; the engineers went through the whole system without losing a man. But they could not destroy it. Furthermore, the evidence shows that before our combat troops had completed withdrawing from the Triangle, the Viet Cong were moving back in. It is supposed to be an indispensable link in their North-to-South supply route."

In view of this experience Brig. Gen. Marshall writes pessimistically about future possibilities. And in passing he testifies, perhaps unwittingly, to the defensive nature of the struggle being waged by the Vietnamese.

"Whether going at such a target is worth the energy expended remains a good question. The surface works of the Triangle were notably lacking in tenable, formidable fighting positions. Almost without exception the bunkers were built for protection only.

"The deserted brigade camp from which I write bespeaks only that the U.S. command intends to fight it out on this line. It is a bright day. Columns of Huey helicopters, looking like so many dragon flies, are overhead, bound on a short hop to the Triangle. The squads aboard will soon be nibbling at War Zone D again. It may be worth doing. It might not."

"RECTIFICATION CAMPAIGN" CURBS "CULTURAL REVOLUTION

By Joseph Hansen

[Continued from last issue.]

The cultural revolution began, it will be recalled, with an attack on the intellectuals, the closing of the schools and the mobilization of tens of millions of Red Guards at public expense. These were thrown at party and government institutions under the slogan of seizing power. The main targets were thus the cadres in the Chinese Communist party who had not lined up to the satisfaction of Mao Tse-tung in his factional struggle with other old-line leaders such as Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping.

Behind the Red Guards stood the army headed by Lin Piao; and at a certain point the army openly intervened in the struggle as we noted earlier. Even as it intervened, signal bells were sounded, indicating that a further turn was in the offing -- a "rectification campaign." This campaign, now underway, is directed in behalf of the main target in the previous stage of the "cultural revolution" -- the party cadres -- and against the forces raised up by Mao under the slogan of seizing power. We documented the steps in this from the dispatches sent out officially by the Hsinhua News Agency itself.

The most important single document, the one that most clearly lays down the line for the new stage, is the editorial already cited which appeared in Red Flag, "Cadres Must Be Treated Correctly." The arguments advanced by Red Flag will undoubtedly constitute the main themes for much of the propaganda in the effort to again achieve stabilization. They are worth noting.

First of all, we learn that among those who responded to the call to seize power, "a misconception has emerged." The misconception is "that all those in authority are not good and unreliable and should therefore be overthrown en masse." Surprising as it may seem in view of all that was said about the virtue of making a revolution within a revolution, sweeping out the four olds and sweeping in the four news, "This viewpoint is completely wrong. It is contrary to Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, and is not justified by the facts."

A clear distinction must be made between "the handful" who took the capitalist road and those who did not. It is necessary to "relentlessly overthrow" the former but to "firmly support the people in authority belonging to the proletariat." To act otherwise is wrong. In fact, "It is an anarchist trend of thought to refuse to make a class analysis of the people in authority, and instead to suspect, negate, exclude and overthrow them all indiscriminately." In other words, cadres who are critical of Mao, or designated as critical, are to be relentlessly overthrown, but those who pass inspection are to be firmly supported. Mao's appeals to the masses to intervene have suddenly become hedged with a considerable restriction!

A rather surprising argument is advanced. The masses had been told that the "monsters and demons" wanting to take the capitalist road had wormed their way into positions of authority years ago, even as far back as the thirties. Now it is suddenly recalled that "the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao has been in the dominant position and the majority of the cadres and members of the Chinese Communist party and the Chinese Communist Youth League have been carrying out this line."

It follows quite logically, of course, that "The view of overthrowing cadres indiscriminately negates the basic facts of the past 17 years and fails to acknowledge the great achievements made in those years." This was forgotten when Mao was issuing his appeals, it seems.

Aside from the famous "small handful," the cadres fall into two categories, "the good and comparatively good." There is more to come about the cadres, but the editors of Red Flag first take up the composition of the new organs of power that have been projected in a "three-way alliance." "This provisional 'three-way alliance' organ of power is formed by leading members of the revolutionary mass organizations that truly represent the masses, representatives of the Chinese People's Liberation Army units stationed locally and revolutionary leading cadres." This body operates on the level of provinces and cities "where power must be seized."

Further specifications are given:

"In the factories, mines and enterprises where power must be seized, a provisional organ of power by the 'three-way alliance' must also be established, incorporating revolutionary cadres (leading cadres, ordinary cadres and technical personnel), workers'

representatives (veteran workers and young workers) and representatives of the militia."

"In party and government organs where power must be seized, the principle of a combination of revolutionary leading cadres, revolutionary middle-ranking cadres and revolutionary masses must be carried out."

To be noted in this, aside from the role of the army at the top level, is the play given to the cadres -- the category previously under heavy attack. In view of this it is readily understandable why the editors state that "it is imperative, at the present, to lay stress on solving the problem of the correct treatment of revolutionary cadres."

A brilliant perspective is opened for them. "Those leading cadres who follow the proletarian revolutionary line that Chairman Mao represents...may and can become the leading force in the struggle to seize power from the handful of party people in authority taking the capitalist road." They can, in fact, even "act as the core of the leadership..."

Further compelling arguments are advanced: "The revolutionary leading cadres are more mature politically. They have greater organisational skill. They are more experienced in struggle. They have the ability to exercise power and administer work for the state of the proletariat." What bureaucrat could ask for a better presentation of his case against the immature, unskilled, inexperienced, blundering Red Guards who were called on to overthrow them?

Shouldn't the "cultural revolution" then be dropped? Not at all! Let these capable bureaucrats lead it. And that is what is proposed: "Experience shows that with these revolutionary leading cadres in the core of leadership and integrated with the revolutionary masses, it will be possible to carry out the struggle to seize power more smoothly, put their power into effect more quickly, grasp both revolution and production effectively, and take action in accordance with the party's policy."

How wrong then, to rely on the initiative of the masses! Or as the editors of Red Flag argue: "On the contrary, if the revolutionary leading cadres are excluded, no powerful core of leadership can be formed, the revolutionary masses and revolutionary mass organizations cannot be joined together into well organized and disciplined revolutionary battalions, with centralised leadership and unified command. Instead, there will be 'no leader in a herd of dragons.'" The opposing monsters and demons would of course rejoice at that.

Besides the quality of the cadres in the Communist party and the Communist Youth League, as described in this favorable way, there is the quantity of them to consider. "Large numbers of cadres in the party and government organisations are good and they want to make revolution. The proletarian revolutionaries among them are the main force in the seizure of power in their own departments."

Thus we reach the foreordained conclusion. Full confidence must be placed in them! "They know best whether the power in their own departments should be seized...it is necessary to rely on them...The revolutionary masses and revolutionary mass organizations from other departments should trust them, support them and give them the necessary assistance instead of excluding them..."

The editorial finally gets around, as was to be expected, to the "revolutionary rebels" who had been led by the proclamations issued in Mao's name to believe that the masses should take the initiative and seize power away from the bureaucrats: "In some localities, a few persons proposed that 'all persons who can be classified as "leading" cadres should step aside.' This view is devoid of class analysis. It counterposes the masses to all cadres. It does not direct its spearhead against the handful of persons in authority taking the capitalist road [bureaucrats opposed or held to be opposed to the Mao faction] but against the great number of cadres [the bureaucracy as a whole]. It therefore runs counter to the basic spirit of the sixteen-point decision of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist party concerning the great proletarian cultural revolution, to the general orientation of the struggle and to Mao Tse-tung's thought. To do things in this way would objectively be to help the class enemy."

A clear warning is issued: "Those comrades who committed such mistakes without thinking should immediately correct them. It would be very dangerous for them to persist obstinately in their own view."

This editorial was, of course, at once hailed. Throughout the vast country, the switch was made instantly by key groups. Thus on February 24, the day following publication of the piece, Hsinhua reported "widespread acclaim" from Shanghai, Tsingtao, Heil-

ungkiang, Shansi and Kweichow where the Maoists had "successfully seized power."

With this send-off, the "rectification campaign" was soon in high gear. A wall bulletin posted by the "revolutionary students" of the Lu Hsun Corps in Shanghai was reprinted in its entirety by the People's Daily February 26 together with an article from a Shanghai paper hailing the bulletin. Hsinhua had it translated and in its own daily bulletin of the same date.

The article posted by the Maoist students poses some "new problems" that have arisen and issues a call for a "rectification campaign." In contrast to the model bureaucrats who are now called on to lead the cultural revolution "more smoothly" in seizing power from themselves, the revolutionary students who were previously entrusted with this task are suddenly discovered to be full of faults. If you don't believe this, then you must read what they themselves say.

"The purely military viewpoint is fairly rampant among some comrades (including certain leading comrades) of the Lu Hsun Corps." These comrades make the grievous error of concentrating "attention and energy solely on 'overthrowing so and so' and 'dismissing so and so from office.'" They also mistakenly hold "that the ultimate purpose of this great proletarian cultural revolution is merely to pick out a number of counter-revolutionary revisionists." Thus they have "neglected their own ideological revolution, neglected political and ideological education among the cadres and the masses, and have slackened their efforts in political study and ideological remoulding."

Still worse, "obsessed by the purely military viewpoint," they fail to understand what the cultural revolution is really about. True, the fundamental task is to "oppose revisionism, prevent the rise of revisionism, thoroughly uproot revisionism" and so on; but the "purely military viewpoint would make this great proletarian cultural revolution just a matter of formality..." The revisionists would be dismissed from office "organizationally, but not ideologically." As one revisionist went down, another would rise in his place. And where do you think these new revisionists would come from? Why from those doing all the purging and overthrowing! "...we ourselves might even follow the bourgeois reactionary line...our comrades have been more or less influenced by revisionism unconsciously and our heads are more or less filled with bourgeois ideas of all kinds."

How can you expect such uncertain elements to spearhead the cultural revolution? But even this is not all. There is worse to come. "An evil wind of counterrevolutionary economism has also risen within our revolutionaries. Some comrades have been conquered by the sugar-coated bullets of the enemy and have begun to rest content with their past achievements. They chase after motorcycles, telephones and bicycles and seek a high standard of living and material benefits. Many facts proved that this wrong trend exists in the Lu Hsun Corps."

Some of the members of the Corps "have become conceited." They "look down upon others and adopt a closed-door attitude toward those people who made mistakes yet have the determination to correct them..." The correct attitude, as Chairman Mao has pointed out, is to be a "proletarian statesman" and "be good at uniting with those who disagree and even with those who formerly opposed them..." Again a warning is issued: a conceited attitude is "extremely dangerous."

The Lu Hsun Corps, let it be noted, is in position to speak with authority. They were in the forefront of the struggle to seize power. "The requirements of the struggle brought members of the Lu Hsun Corps close together in October when the Corps was suppressed, encircled and attacked. The struggle between two different ideas and two different world outlooks within the corps did not manifest itself in the face of the major contradiction [between Mao and his factional opponents]. Now, as the ranks have been expanded and victories have been won [including taking over Shanghai], closed-doorism, liberalism, mountain-stronghold mentality, sectarianism, ultrademocracy and the tendency to seek the limelight, all of which existed below the surface in the Corps are gradually coming to light. These all run counter to Mao Tse-tung's thought and are as incompatible with the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao as fire with water. In the final analysis, it is the word 'self-interest' that has been the root of all these evils." One can scarcely disagree with that final sentence, although it would seem advisable to include the leaders of the Maoist faction among the humans of whom this could be said.

The article concludes with the statement that "We of the Lu Hsun Corps must put our house in order ideologically and organisationally...At present, the Lu Hsun Corps badly needs to put things in order, badly needs an 'open rectification.'"

Other moves were afoot in Shanghai at the same time. On February 24 the Shanghai Municipal Revolutionary Committee, the highest organ of power in the city, held an en-

larged meeting that unanimously adopted a draft resolution on the present situation and tasks in Shanghai. It recognized that the "armed core of the militia, the People's Liberation Army and the armed people are the strong pillars of the temporary organ of power at each level." It called for close coordination with units of the army stationed in Shanghai. It opposed "anarchism, ultrademocracy, sectarianism, guild mentality and small group mentality [the tendency to set up new organizations having distinctive political colorations]." And it recommended that "all revolutionary organisations openly carry out rectification campaigns." This, obviously, was an important step in widening the turn and giving it momentum.

By February 28 in Shanghai "open-door rectification" was in full swing and a dispatch from that city associated it with "a new stage" in the cultural revolution.

A few general observations appear in order. If we leave aside Mao's campaign propaganda with its promises about an "extensive" democracy modeled on the "Paris Commune," the aim of the "cultural revolution" from the beginning boiled down to placing "politics in command." Sufficient citations can be adduced to show quite conclusively that what was meant by this was the Mao faction in command.

In the factional struggle that waged over this question and the more obscure associated issues at stake, it was evident that Mao was in a minority in the Communist party and the Communist Youth League. Without bothering about the procedures of democratic centralism to which he pays lip service, Mao appealed directly to the masses, but not as a whole and not on a clear programmatic basis.

First the school youth were mobilized and organized into Red Guards. The real power behind the Red Guards was the army which opened the way for them and checked actual or potential countermoves by Mao's factional opponents.

As the factional struggle came to a head, appeals went out to the workers. Simultaneously the army intervened openly in the struggle to one degree or another wherever it was felt necessary; and its intervention appears to have been decisive, although in face of the paucity of hard information, a very tight censorship and news deliberately distorted by many interested parties, not least of all the Maoists, this conclusion can only be advanced tentatively. In addition, the internal strains in the army, as well as those in the peasantry, remain unknown; and these are extremely important in reaching an accurate assessment.

In the process of bringing the factional struggle to a head, broad forces were set in motion. These, particularly the working-class sectors, tended to move against the bureaucratic structure as a whole much in the pattern of the Hungarian workers although only in an incipient way up to now. Were this movement to continue, it would tend to develop into a political revolution that would retain and reinforce the big gains of the revolution, above all the new property forms, while instituting some form of proletarian democracy in the example set by the soviets that appeared in the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917.

Mao and the leaders around him are well aware of this as can be gathered from their repeated references to "Petöfi clubs" and "anarchistic" elements who want "ultra-democracy."

In face of this threat to their "self-interest," the bureaucratic factions had much to gain by closing ranks, if necessary even settling for an arbiter, whether a sector of the bureaucracy or an individual, around which a modus vivendi could be reached. Both the advance of the army in the factional dispute and the subsequent "rectification campaign" reflect this.

There is considerable speculation in the bourgeois press about a "sag" in Mao's drive, about the army not having succeeded in taking over in some areas, of suffering reverses and even being torn internally. There may be some substance to the speculation; it is more likely, however, that this is incidental phenomena.

If the weight of the army has proved decisive in the scales, it is in the logic of the situation for immediate moves to be made to show that its aim in its new role is not to bring chaos and disaster but on the contrary to serve as a responsible stabilizing force. Aside from the objective of winning over the opposition (one of the main themes in the "rectification campaign") or at least neutralizing it, the regime is faced with an imperious need to bring order into the situation. Dangers are pressing from all sides, ranging from the threat of an imperialist attack to a dip on the agricultural front that could entail acute scarcities in the near future if not worse.

Besides this, a breathing space is required to consolidate the factional gains

and sift things out. Whether it is Mao or a new combination in the leadership, the exact lineaments of which cannot yet be determined exactly, the immediate need facing the ruling group is to relax tensions.

To accomplish this, concessions are required, particularly to those sectors of the bureaucracy which have been under heaviest pressure and upon which the regime after all rests. This is one of the main purposes of the present "rectification campaign." Other moves, such as getting the Red Guards back home, opening the schools and dealing some educational blows to those elements who had begun to hope for a bit of proletarian democracy and an improvement in living standards, fall naturally into the same pattern.

A big question remains. Can the forces unleashed by the appeals to the revolutionary-minded youth and vanguard sectors of the workers be bottled up again? The question is fateful for the Chinese Revolution, the defense of the Chinese workers state and the possibility of a truly giant stride forward; for it will determine whether a mere shift has occurred in the relative positions of the various sectors of the bureaucracy or whether a rift was opened of such proportions as to permit the masses to surge forward in the political arena with innovations of their own aimed at bringing the bureaucracy as a whole under democratic control. As yet it is impossible to say how soon an answer will be forthcoming.

SUPARDJO ACCUSES GENERALS OF MURDERING 500,000 IN INDONESIA

On trial in Jakarta for his alleged participation in the attempted coup d'état September 30, 1965, which was defeated by generals on whom Sukarno leaned, and utilized by them as an excuse for their own coup and the subsequent witch-hunt that drenched the archipelago with blood, General Supardjo has conducted himself with extraordinary dignity, judging from the sparse reports appearing in the Western press.

According to the February 25 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, Supardjo turned the tables on the generals who put him on trial, accusing them of being guilty of the murder of "500,000 innocent people."

He told his judges: "Who should be considered responsible for the assassination of 500,000 innocent people? It was the Council of Generals that killed these people."

Supardjo admitted that six generals had been killed in the abortive September 30 coup d'état. Then he added: "But there would have been no uprising if a Council of Generals had not been formed previously. The plotters had something to plot against."

In the following issue, Le Monde quoted General Supardjo as saying, "I will defend Sukarno to the death. It was the generals who sabotaged the confrontation with Malaysia. It is the Council of Generals that is now in power, while the legal ministers are in prison."

On March 3 the prosecution demanded that Supardjo be sentenced to death. He accused the general of participating in the action in which the six generals were killed September 30, 1965, and also accused him of having had connections with the Communist party.

Meanwhile strife was reported to be flaring at several points in Java. In Surabaya in the eastern part of Java, youthful partisans of Sukarno wearing black uniforms, red berets, reportedly stormed the printing plant of an anti-Sukarno newspaper Merdeka.

The army newspaper Berita Yudha made the incident public, saying that the demonstrators shouted, "Long live Sukarno!" According to the same source, which is not a trustworthy one in view of the current campaign being waged by the generals against Sukarno, the youths then raided a school where they threw a bomb in a corridor and beat up a few students who were in favor of Sukarno.

Similarly, the commander of the military region of Jakarta claimed February 24 that "the Communists" were waging a "psychological war" against the army by launching "vicious rumors to envenom public opinion." According to the commander, "slanderous letters" were being circulated attacking government leaders and some of the principal figures in the army.

On the other hand, a police station in Pemalang in the center of Java, was attacked by a crowd of anti-Sukarno Muslims armed with daggers. The police opened fire, killing six and wounding thirteen.

THE MARCH 5 ELECTION

By Pierre Frank

Paris

The first round in the legislative elections in France has just taken place. The second round will be March 12. Already a certain number of conclusions can clearly be drawn as a result of the balloting.

There were a quarter of a million more voters than in the preceding elections in November 1962. About a million more have become qualified to vote. There were at least three million abstentions.

Must this be taken, as is claimed by a number of bourgeois journalists, to signify a growing politicalization? In our opinion, a revival of interest in politics has been evident for several years, but this is not the reason for the participation of such a large number of voters who habitually abstain in the legislative elections. The revival of interest in politics is still rather weak.

The massive participation is reminiscent, on the contrary, of the referendums utilized by de Gaulle as a plebiscite at one time or another. In addition, de Gaulle himself made the March 5 elections into a kind of plebiscite. In fact, the evening before the vote, when the electoral campaign was closed legally and no candidate could carry on further publicity under penalty of being barred from taking office, de Gaulle appeared on television for a brief but distinct statement. His theme was simple: you give me the National Assembly which I need, that is, a majority of unconditional supporters, or there will be chaos, catastrophe. (In passing, it should be noted that only the radio and television campaigns were followed; the public meetings were ill attended, except for two or three which turned out like staged wrestling matches.)

This theme, a usual one with de Gaulle, that it's the Fifth Republic or nothing, is attractive in this period of economic prosperity to the least politically developed sectors of the population. All that was most backward in the country -- and in France in 1967 there is no lack of "rotten boroughs" -- responded to a personal appeal like this from de Gaulle and voted for candidates, who, if they have no talents in particular, compensate for this by a hearty appetite and know-how in backing "gaullism" to the hilt.

The gaullists, that is de Gaulle, achieved the following results with this policy:

(a) They reaped almost the entire rightist vote. Thus Poujade appealed to the voters to support de Gaulle. The extreme right, those like Tixier-Vignancour, who hold nostalgic memories either of Petain or "French Algeria," were virtually wiped off the map politically.

(b) The center, or rather the center-right, was flattened. This included some of the most typical figures of the big and middle French bourgeoisie. Most of them, like Giscard d'Estaing, preferred to fight in the gaullist ranks. It is true that in the past year, the regime granted many financial and tax advantages to these social categories. Lecanuet, who claimed that he would be able to influence de Gaulle from "outside," who gave up the label of the MRP [de Gaulle's Mouvement républicain populaire] in exchange for the "Democratic Center" [Centre démocrate], and who at the beginning of the electoral campaign asked the electors to support a hundred candidates of his in order to wield real blackmail power over de Gaulle, saw in the final week that he was close to disaster and he sought in vain to redress the situation by asking de Gaulle to say a few words that would permit him to save face as he offered his services.

De Gaulle's moves for several months in behalf of his retainers certainly succeeded in holding the votes for the gaullist candidates. But to jump to the conclusion that this is a sign of the stability of the regime is something else again. To bisect the country and suppress the center will not be without consequences later on when, for one reason or another it will be impossible to appeal to de Gaulle. The theme -- me or chaos -- carries because it is launched by de Gaulle. Let a Pompidou or Debré or anyone else try it in turn and it will have no success.

Let us now turn to the anti-gaullists. The Fédération de la Gauche Socialiste et Démocrate [FGDS -- Federation of the Socialist and Democratic Left], combining the Socialist party and Radical party (of which little remains) and the "clubs" of technocrats claiming to lean toward socialism, hoped that by presenting themselves as a bloc they would carry sufficient weight to gain a higher percentage of votes than the Communist party and thus be in position to haggle with it in reaching an electoral deal in the

second round. The FGDS candidates did not succeed in gaining this objective even if one adds to their vote, the votes cast for the candidates of the Parti socialiste unifié [United Socialist party], the percentage won by the Communist party was higher. The fact is that while they gained votes, the candidates of the FGDS and the PSU failed to attain the percentage they won in 1962. The difference is small, certainly, but it is sufficient to affect the future of the FGDS when, after the elections, Mollet, Mitterrand, etc., get around to working out the statutes of the FGDS.

The PSU made a big effort to achieve national status in the elections, running around eighty candidates. In a formation of this kind, there is nothing astonishing in an electoral period about a rightist tendency predominating. In this election, things went very far. The most characteristic feature of the situation was that the official leadership, the one elected by a party congress and which, for good or ill, directs the party's activities from one year to the next, turned this function over to Mendès-France. The PSU has appeared before the public as the "party of Mendès-France." The latter, it should be noted, is a great champion of democracy for the French nation but couldn't care less about democracy when it comes to "his" party. He attends none of its congresses, he never defends his point of view, he uses the label of the PSU only as its candidate and as its spokesman on radio and television.

The candidates of the French Communist party gained around a million votes in comparison with November 1962 and the percentage cast for them rose from 21.84% to 22.46%. The considerable satisfaction shown by the leadership (and this is not a mere show) over these results provides a measure of its real ambitions. All the leaders want is sufficient cards to negotiate an alliance with the "left" with the aim of going back to bourgeois democracy and, in case this is realized, of participating in it adequately, including posts in the government. Not even something resembling the Labour party in Great Britain, but something more like what the Social Democratic party in Germany just did, with certain provisos with regard to the possible French Kissingers. If things depended only on the leadership of the French Communist party and the "lefts" with whom it seeks an alliance, the gaullists could remain tranquil, even after de Gaulle has gone.

The March 5 elections offered confirmation, if there was still need of it, of how strongly the French Communist party is entrenched in the big industrial centers. In the electoral arena it remains the party of the majority of the working class. The candidates of the Socialist party (under the FGDS label) who also have a working-class base in certain important regions, hardly cut into the Communist vote.

* * *

The general staffs of the political formations are now busy with the withdrawals and candidacies for the second round. In the 404 seats remaining at stake, the situation is such that at most there are not more than fifteen districts where difficulties can arise between the FGDS and the PCF. In fact, in a few districts, the candidates of the two formations came quite close to each other in votes, the PCF candidate being in the lead but the FGDS candidate being able to argue that a PCF withdrawal in behalf of its candidate would enable him to also secure the votes of the Democratic Center candidate, thus defeating the gaullist. In some cases the candidate himself will insist on staying in, even without the approval of the FGDS. We will not enter this smoke-filled room.

It is obviously in the logic of parliamentarian conceptions, but the PCF which in 1962 accepted in various cases, will probably be more reluctant this time, obviously not for principled reasons. In any case, the results will be minimum on the composition of the next National Assembly.

We will return to this subject after the second round.

March 7, 1967

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION IN BRUSSELS

An antiwar demonstration of such size as to block all traffic in downtown Brussels was held March 6. Agence France Presse gave a figure of eight to ten thousand participants but did not indicate the source of its estimate.

The slogans included a demand for an immediate halt in the bombings being carried out by Johnson, the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops, and respect for the right of the Vietnamese people to determine their own fate.

In our next issue we hope to have an eyewitness account of this important demonstration which evidently voiced the feelings of the overwhelming majority of Europeans.

LODGE REPORTED QUITTING AS KY'S BOSS

In a very prominently placed front-page story, the New York Times reported March 7 that Henry Cabot Lodge "has asked to be relieved of his duties in Saigon late in the spring or early in the summer, according to friends." The staid, authoritative newspaper of the eastern seaboard capitalists described Lodge approvingly as "A tall, elegant New England Brahmin" now serving his second term as Johnson's ambassador to Saigon. Less staid newspapers have described Lodge as the American "proconsul" in charge of the Ky puppet government. A still more accurate label would be "gauleiter."

The Times quoted "observers" as believing that Lodge would not leave Saigon until after the new constitution had been promulgated. Lodge, said the Times, considers passage of the constitution to be "a major step forward not only for South Vietnam but also for American policy here."

The White House, again according to the Times, "was conducting an intensive search for a successor. The search has proved more difficult than expected...so the Ambassador's departure date has not yet been set."

On March 8, Lodge denied that he intended to resign soon. The Times gave this a brief notice at the bottom of page 5 in the next day's edition, a sufficient commentary on how much stock can be placed in the tall, elegant Brahmin's disclaimer that he intends to pull out, that reports like this have cropped up "every so often" and that he has "no definite plans or firm decisions whatsoever."

The political interest in Lodge's possible resignation lies in the fact that he is a Republican and a possible presidential candidate. Johnson picked him in the first place in order to commit the Republican party leadership to directly sharing the responsibility for his policies in Vietnam. It was a routine move under the two-party system in the United States. In foreign policy in particular both Democrats and Republicans seek to maintain a "bipartisan" stance no matter which party holds the White House.

Lodge's motive in accepting the assignment was clear enough. As a politically ambitious figure, he no doubt counted on the gains that would accrue to him through prominent association with the "honor and the glory" of advancing the American flag on the Asian mainland. It might even become a ticket good for the White House under a favorable set of circumstances.

If the sources quoted by the Times are accurate about Lodge having asked to be "relieved of his duties," the question at once arises: Is Lodge calculating his move in relation to the Republican convention that will choose the candidates for the 1968 election? If so, does it mean that Lodge now feels that further association with Johnson's war constitutes a grave danger for his own political prospects?

What goes on in a tall, elegant Brahmin's head is, of course, an impenetrable mystery to most mortal souls. But it is not without interest that Johnson's search for a successor has proved more difficult than expected. Could the old adage be true after all about rats deserting a sinking ship?



HENRY CABOT LODGE

BRAZILIAN COMMUNIST LEADER GIVEN SAVAGE SENTENCE

A savage sentence of 19 years in prison was handed down by a military tribunal in Recife against the Brazilian Communist party leader Gregorio Becerra February 23. Becerra is 70 years old and has been held in prison since April 1964, the month Castelo Branco seized power. Becerra was accused of "subversion." All the incidents alleged against him occurred before the April coup d'état. One of the main charges was that he had been a well-known agitator in the poverty-stricken northeast region.

MANDEL REPORTS IN BOMBAY ON WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL WORK

Bombay

Ernest Mandel, editor of La Gauche and convener of the Belgian National Committee in support of the International War Crimes Tribunal, said in Bombay on February 3 that there was no justification for anybody to plead ignorance about "the terrible crimes of American imperialism in Vietnam."

The crimes were being brought to public attention every day, Mandel said, by eminent persons who visited Vietnam, and who were known for their impartiality and integrity. Mandel was speaking to the Bertrand Russell Committee of Bombay, which has just been formed here to support the War Crimes Tribunal.

The Belgian editor expressed his disappointment that in India the press and other communication media reported so little of the happenings in Vietnam. This was in contrast to the massive protests within the United States itself against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. Even in countries like Belgium, which are members of NATO and thoroughly subservient to the U.S. government, there have been big protest demonstrations.

Mandel said that the International War Crimes Tribunal was likely to hold its sessions not only in Paris and London but also in many other cities of the world. V.V. Prasad, chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, who presided, said that this committee has already invited the International War Crimes Tribunal to hold its sessions on Indian soil.

Prasad also announced the formation of a Bertrand Russell Committee of Bombay in support of the International War Crimes Tribunal. He said that the Committee of One Hundred was in touch with like-minded people in New Delhi, Calcutta, Madras, Trivandrum and Hyderabad, and that similar Bertrand Russell committees would be formed in these cities in the next few weeks.

Mandel explained that the International War Crimes Tribunal would find answers for the following questions:

- (1) Has the United States government (and the governments of Australia, New Zealand and South Korea) committed acts of aggression according to international law?
- (2) Has the American army made use of or experimented with new weapons or with weapons forbidden by laws of war (gas, special chemical products, napalm, etc.)?
- (3) Has there been bombardment of targets of purely civilian character, for example, hospitals, schools, sanatoria, dams, etc., and on what scale has this occurred?
- (4) Have Vietnamese prisoners been subjected to inhuman treatment forbidden by the laws of war and in particular, to torture or mutilation? Have there been unjustified reprisals against the civilian population, in particular, the execution of hostages?
- (5) Have forced labour camps been created, has there been deportation of the population or other acts tending to the extermination of the population, and which can be characterised judicially as acts of genocide?

Prasad said that the Committee of One Hundred in Bombay have urged an eminent Indian to serve on the War Crimes Tribunal and thus ensure proper geographical representation for this body. After the formation of different regional committees, he added, a National Bertrand Russell Committee to Support the International War Crimes Tribunal will be formed with the participation of all the regional committees. He expected to announce the National Committee early in March -- in time for the Paris session of the tribunal. He said that the Bertrand Russell committees would be set up not only in all state capitals but also in many cities and towns all over the country. "Our target is one hundred Bertrand Russell committees by the end of 1967. This is a modest target, and we hope to overfulfill our plan," he declared.

He referred to Bertrand Russell as "a magic name in India," with a mighty following among the intellectuals and humanitarians of India -- philosophers, mathematicians, economists, historians, sociologists, scientists, writers and even politicians.

Replying to the question, "Why Bertrand Russell committees?" he said: "The aim of these committees is to focus our attention on Vietnam. Vietnam is a beacon light in the struggle against the enslavement of mankind. Vietnam is a model for all the countries of Asia and Africa and Latin America -- and even Europe. There is a clear attempt by American big business and the Pentagon and the American government today to enslave mankind for the sake of steady profits to the giant corporations of the U.S.A., which

employ hundreds of generals and other military officials as directors and top executives -- including designations ranging from president to sixth vice-president."

WAS JOAN BAEZ A VICTIM OF TRANSLATOR OR THE CIA?

The U.S. embassy in Tokyo has denied that any American authorities in Japan, including the CIA, had anything whatsoever to do with interfering with the translation of folk singer Joan Baez's statements during the recent elections in that country. The admissions of her translator Ichiro Takasaki nonetheless remain very damaging despite some rather remarkable backpedaling on his part.

When tapes of Miss Baez's shows were run off, it turned out that references of the singer to Nagasaki and Hiroshima were translated as "the show would be televised." An explanation of the song, "What Have They Done to the Rain?" dealing with the atomic bomb, were translated again as "the show was being televised." Her famous antiwar song, "Saigon Bride," one of her big hits, was reported to the audience as, "This is a song about the Vietnam war."

When the scandal broke, the translator told the press he had been pressured by a "Harold Cooper" of the American embassy to change the meaning when Miss Baez made political statements. The reason was to help the Conservative party. "It is a fact that pressure was applied on me by a man who said he was from the CIA," Takasaki was quoted as saying by the February 21 Asahi Evening News. According to the same source, "Harold Cooper" told Takasaki, "If you don't cooperate, you'll have trouble in your work in the future."

Takasaki said that he decided to cooperate since he felt that if he refused he would be denied visas to the United States where he works two months out of each year.

"I met Mr. Cooper once in the presence of a Japan Times reporter, but even in that meeting, he openly demanded that I mistranslate. I tried to reject the absurd demands -- but he knew the name of my child and the contents of my work very well. I became afraid and agreed."

The report made such a sensation in Japan, that Takasaki immediately found himself in the headlines. Thereupon he began to "rectify" his account. "I never felt I was being threatened or given orders by this man named Cooper," he told the Japan Times (February 22). "To tell the truth, I was favorably impressed by him, whatever kind of job he may have."

Takasaki also took the rap. He said that Cooper had hinted that it would work unfavorably for him in applying for visas if he did not alter Miss Baez's remarks. "I should say that what he suggested agreed exactly with what I was thinking myself. It would be inaccurate to say that this man's advice did not come to mind while I was interpreting for Miss Baez on the stage. But he never threatened me or forced me to do anything."

So why did Takasaki do it? "I don't believe in political comments at musical concerts and I determined not to interpret Miss Baez's comments if they weren't connected to music."

In other words all that was involved was one of the time-honored specialities of the translating trade which long ago gave rise to the saying, traduttori traditori [translators are traitors].

Seishi Ishibashi, a Socialist member of the House of Representatives, said it was a clear case of an "excessive action" on the part of the CIA. He was quoted by the Asahi Evening News as saying: "Ever since the report by a Japanese newspaper reporter on the U.S.'s North Vietnam bombing aroused major repercussions, the U.S. has been particularly concerned about public opinion in Japan -- and it has been making all-out efforts to try to suppress the antiwar mood."

"I had surmised that the CIA operated through the upper classes -- but this time, it has appeared even among the people, and this is a noteworthy point."

"Since the CIA has infiltrated the student movement even in America and engages in secret actions, there is no need to be particularly surprised."

"But applying pressure on a Japanese radio producer really is going too far."

CONGRESS PARTY BARELY WINS MAJORITY IN INDIA

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

In the fourth general elections just concluded in India in the largest (bourgeois) "democracy" of the world, the 260-million strong electorate returned an overwhelming verdict against the Congress rule of the capitalist class. But the popular upsurge against the bourgeois state was largely to the advantage of extreme right-wing or regional capitalist parties like the Swatantra, Jan Sangh, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam [DMK] and Akali Dal, in the absence of a positive revolutionary alternative provided by the traditional working-class parties. The anti-Congress swing at the polls was so decisive on a national scale (nearly 70 percent of the voters exercised their franchise) that in the 521-member Lok Sabha [lower house of parliament] the Congress party managed to secure only 280 seats (with 15 more to be filled). The Swatantra emerged as the largest opposition party in the Lok Sabha with 43 seats, followed by the Jan Sangh which won 35 seats and the DMK, 25 seats. Among the various left parties the SSP [Samyukta Socialist party] improved its position from 5 to 23 seats, the "right" CPI [Communist party of India] raised its strength to 21, the "left" CPI has 19, the PSP [Praja Socialist party] retained its strength at 10, the RSP [Revolutionary Socialist party] at 2, while the other parties and independents together have 47.

The outcome of the elections to various state legislative assemblies is very complex. While the two Communist parties along with other left parties have achieved fairly good results in two states, Kerala and West Bengal, a distinct rightward swing is evident in almost all the north Indian states, where the Jan Sangh, Swatantra and the dissident groups of Congress members have emerged as the main challenge to the Congress party.

In Kerala, the left CPI-led United Front, which includes such ideologically disparate groups as the Muslim League, secured an absolute majority in the 133-member legislative assembly, conceding only 9 seats to the Congress and 5 to the rebel Kerala Congress. The standing of the various constituents of the United Front is as follows: left CPI 52, right CPI 19, SSP 19, Muslim League 14, RSP 6, Kerala Socialist party 2, Karshaka Thozhilali party 2 and Independents 6.

In West Bengal, Congress failed to secure a majority in the 280-member legislative assembly. The Congress secured only 127 seats. The left CPI won 43 seats, the dissident Bangla Congress 34, CPI 16, Forward Bloc 13, SSP 7, PSP 7, RSP 6, Socialist Unity party and other left groups 6. Among the rightist parties, the Swatantra and Jan Sangh managed to secure only 1 seat each, while 4 went to the Lok Seva Sangh and 2 to the Gorkha League (two regional groups), and 13 to independents. The non-Congress parties fought the elections in West Bengal under the banner of the two rival united fronts -- one led by the left CPI and the other by the right CPI and the Bangla Congress. The two fronts fought each other in many constituencies neutralising one another in favour of the Congress party. The rift was not due to political differences but inability to agree on the allocation of seats. Now that the Congress party has failed to secure a decisive majority in the assembly, a move has been sponsored by the opposition parties including the two CPIs and the RSP to set up a non-Congress ministry under the leadership of Ajoy Mukherji, leader of the Bangla Congress.

A disconcerting situation has arisen for the ruling Congress party in the two major states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, considered to be its "traditional" strongholds. In Uttar Pradesh the Congress secured only 198 seats in the 425-member legislative assembly while Jan Sangh emerged as the largest single opposition party with 97 members, followed by the SSP which won 43 seats. The right CPI won 14 seats, the left CPI one, the PSP 11 and the Republican party 9. The Swatantra secured 12 seats while 37 went to the independents.

In the famine-affected state of Bihar, where there were big food riots and an upsurge of students only last year, in the 318-member legislative assembly the Congress managed to secure only 128 seats, conceding 68 seats to the SSP which has emerged as the main opposition party in the state. The Jan Sangh became the second opposition group with 26 seats and the right CPI won 24 seats. Among the other parties in the state legislature, the left CPI secured 4 seats, PSP 18, Swatantra 3, Jana Kranti Dal (a group of dissident Congress members) 24, Republican party 1, and independents 22.

Neither the Congress nor a combination of opposition parties in the two states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are in a position to form a government. Nevertheless attempts are being made by the SSP, dissident Congress members and the Jan Sangh to form so-called "non-Congress" ministries in these states. The question is whether the disparate political groups can come together to run "stable" governments even within the present constitutional framework. In any case the prospect of presidential rule being imposed in the

two states appears high. The Congress party itself might seek coalitions with other right-wing parties like Jan Sangh, Swatantra and dissident Congress groups, once the initial attempts by the "opposition" parties to form "alternative" governments end up in stalemates.

In Orissa, another state where a mighty student upheaval was witnessed in recent years in the wake of an extremely difficult food situation, the Swatantra and the Jana Congress together won an absolute majority in the 133-member assembly (49 Swatantra, 24 Jana Congress) conceding only 29 seats to the Congress party. Efforts are already afoot to form a Swatantra-Jana Congress coalition with the PSP (which has secured 19 seats) supporting it. Among the other parties, the right CPI secured only 7 seats in the assembly, the left CPI one, the SSP 2 and independents 2.

In Rajasthan, the Congress party which secured only 89 seats in the 184-member assembly announced its decision to form a government with the support of some independents who have joined it. The Swatantra party emerged as the main opposition with 49 seats in the assembly, while the Jan Sangh won 22 seats. The SSP secured 8 seats while the CPI got only one seat, and 15 seats went to independents.

The most convincing defeat of the congress party occurred in the southern state of Madras where a regional bourgeois party, the DMK [Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam], which once campaigned for a separate Dravida nation, secured 138 seats in the 234-member legislative assembly conceding only 40 seats to the Congress. The DMK had an electoral alliance with the Swatantra (which secured 13 seats), the left CPI (which won 11 seats), the Muslim League (3 seats), and the SSP (2 seats). The right CPI, which did not join any electoral alliance in the state, secured only two seats in the assembly, while 4 seats went to the PSP. Annadurai, leader of the DMK, announced his party's decision to form a DMK ministry in Madras with the support of his allies.

In the newly created northwest frontier state of Punjab, the Congress also suffered a debacle, securing only 48 seats in the 104-member legislative assembly. The Akali Dal led by Sant Fateh Singh, an advocate of a separate state for Sikhs, emerged as the largest single opposition party with 22 members while the Jan Sangh secured 9 seats, the right CPI 5, left CPI 3, the Akali Dal (Tara Singh group) 2, the SSP 1, independents 9. In this state also, the opposition groups are trying to explore the possibilities of setting up a non-Congress ministry. The Jan Sangh emerged as the ruling party in the Delhi Metropolitan Council annexing 33 seats in the 61-member house (including five nominated members), conceding only 19 seats to the Congress. The Jan Sangh captured six out of seven Lok Sabha seats from the Delhi metropolitan area.

In the other states of Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Mysore and Hariana (a part of old Punjab) and the centrally administered states, Himachal Pradesh and Manipur, the Congress managed to secure absolute majorities in the local legislatures.

In Andhra especially, the factional squabbles between the two CPIs and their refusal to cooperate even on the basis of a common electoral front enabled the Congress to sweep the polls and secure 165 seats in the 287-member legislature. The Swatantra with 29 members replaced the United CPI, which had 51 members in the outgoing assembly, as the main opposition party. The right CPI won only 10 seats in the new house and the left CPI 9 seats. The Jan Sangh made its first appearance in the legislature in this state, considered at one time as a CPI stronghold, winning 3 seats. The SSP won only one seat while as many as 68 seats went to independents, mostly rebels from the Congress party.

Thanks to the regional chauvinist politics of the two CPIs and other left parties in Maharashtra which fought the elections as constituents of the so-called Sampurna Maharashtra Samiti, the Congress secured an absolute majority of 202 seats in the 270-member assembly. The Peasants and Workers party (a peasant formation) retained its status as the biggest single opposition group, securing 19 seats in the legislature. The right CPI improved its position from 6 to 10 seats. The left CPI won only 1 seat. Among the other parties, the PSP secured 8, SSP 4, and RPI [Republican Party of India] 5.

In Bombay city particularly where some prestige contests for parliament were fought, the SSP's George Fernandez defeated the Union Railway Minister S.K.Patil and the Chairman S.A.Dange of the right CPI was elected to the Lok Sabha, defeating Harish Mahendra, an industrialist sponsored by the Congress. The former Defence Minister V.K. Krishna Menon, who contested as a nonparty candidate supported by the left parties, lost to the Congress candidate, S.G.Barve, though by a small margin of 12,000 votes. The Congress, however, managed to win 22 out of 28 assembly seats in Bombay city.

In Gujarat the two CPIs forged an electoral front, the Mahagujarat Janata Pari-

shad, but failed to secure any representation in the assembly. Only two independents supporting the MJP were returned while Dinkar Mehta, the left CPI mayor of Ahmedabad also lost in the contest for the assembly. The Swatantra party, which secured 64 seats, emerged as the main opposition. Indulal Yagnik, leader of the MJP, supported by the left, however, was elected to parliament from the state capital of Ahmedabad.

In the backward state of Madhya Pradesh, which witnessed big student demonstrations only last year, the Congress secured an absolute majority of 167 seats in the 296-member assembly. The Jan Sangh with 78 seats emerged as the main opposition, reducing the electoral strength of the SSP, which won only 10 seats. The PSP won only 29 seats. The CPI gained only one member in the assembly, while the Swatantra secured 9 seats and the independents most of whom are dissident Congressmen, won 24 seats.

In Mysore where the Congress came out relatively unscathed with 126 seats in the 216-member house, the PSP retained its position as the main opposition group with 20 seats, but the Swatantra improved its strength to 16 and the Jan Sangh made its first appearance in the state with 4 members in the assembly. The SSP secured 4 seats and the right CPI 2 while 40 seats went to independents, mostly dissident Congressmen.

An outstanding feature of the Congress debacle was the defeat of some of the unpopular central ministers like Railway Minister Patil in Bombay, Finance Minister Sachin Choudhuri in West Bengal, Food Minister Subramaniam in Madras and Commerce Minister Manubhai Shah in Gujarat. The Congress party's President Kamaraj himself lost to a DMK rival, a student leader in Madras, in a contest for the state legislative assembly, while the treasurer of the Congress party, Atulya Ghosh, was defeated by the Forward Bloc leader Amiya Bose in West Bengal in a contest for the Lok Sabha.

Elections under a bourgeois parliamentary system no doubt impose financial and other burdens on the traditional left, especially on the working-class parties. The Congress leaders were so confident of winning in most states that it cannot be said that they resorted to unfair practices to rig the elections except perhaps in Jammu and Kashmir where 22 Congress party supporters were declared elected without contest. The factional squabbles between the two CPIs resulted in their losing at least 100 assembly seats and 15 to 20 Lok Sabha seats. And political gains accrued out of the conflict are in any case dubious since both the CPIs entered opportunist electoral coalitions with reactionary bourgeois parties wherever it suited them as in Kerala, Tamilnad and Maharashtra. They, however, failed to unite where they should have forged a united front against the Congress as in West Bengal, Tripura and Andhra. The right CPI fielded 630 candidates for state assemblies and 105 for parliament and won about 118 and 21 seats respectively. The left CPI returned 128 out of 520 candidates it fielded for state assemblies and 19 out of 62 candidates it put up for the Lok Sabha. In Andhra, the debacle of the CPI was spectacular. In the 1962 elections the United CPI had won 51 seats in the assembly and returned 7 members to the Lok Sabha. This time the two CPIs together won only 19 assembly seats and a solitary seat for the Lok Sabha.

E.M.S.Namboodiripad, the left CPI leader who is going to head the seven-party coalition ministry in Kerala, said that the result of the election was "not a vote for communism." He added: "The Communists did not ask for any vote for the Communist Party but went to the voters with a minimum programme. It was a vote both against the Congress and anti-communism." (Free Press Journal, Bombay, February 25.) The RSP, one of the left coalition partners which had said that it would not join the coalition ministry, has also decided to enter the cabinet.

Indeed the two CPIs did not fight the elections in Kerala, or, for that matter, in any other state on a working-class programme of "communism" but on a "minimum programme" (of "national" or "peoples democracy") on the basis of an alliance with the bourgeois parties. The leaders of both the CPIs suffer under the deadweight of deep-rooted illusions in bourgeois parliamentarism. They believe that the outcome of the general elections is a vindication of their class collaborationist policies!

The chairman of the right CPI, S.A.Dange, said in Trivandrum on February 28 that the election outcome was a "success for the democratic leftist forces" in the country. In West Bengal, the two CPIs readily agreed to join a coalition headed by Ajoy Mukherji, a dissident Congress leader who is a bourgeois liberal at best! The question is whether the hotch-potch coalition ministries being cooked up with the support of left parties in some of the states where the Congress has failed to secure a majority will work at all because of their obvious inner contradictions. Even if such coalition ministries are actually put together, the question remains -- how long will they last?

What is the reaction of the bourgeois leadership of the Congress, Swatantra and the Jan Sangh to the outcome of the elections? The Bombay Congress boss S.K.Patil soon after his defeat in Bombay claimed that the election showed "an increased popularity of

rightist ideology" (Bharat Jyoti, Bombay, February 26.) Swatantra leader C. Rajagopalachari has been counseling his partymen to seek a coalition with the Congress in the interest of creating stable governments at the centre and in the states where the Congress has suffered defeats. Rajagopalachari has also mooted the idea of a "national government" comprising "talents drawn from all sections of the people." At least a section of the farsighted bourgeois leadership knows the gravity of the present crisis facing the Indian ruling class, both politically and economically. Its strategy is to enlist the cooperation of the various political parties including the CPIs in averting the crisis facing the bourgeois rulers.

The problems confronting the masses are so complex today that they cannot be resolved within the framework of the bourgeois society. The reformist socialist parties like the SSP would readily fall a prey to the idea of a "national coalition." In fact, in a state like Bihar where the SSP has emerged as the largest single opposition party, it is initiating a move to form a coalition ministry with Jan Sangh, etc. There are indications that both the right and left CPIs might also follow the line in the name of coalescing with the so-called progressive sections of the bourgeoisie. The Stalinist leaders of both parties appear to have lost faith in the possibility of a revolutionary intervention of the working class in the present situation.

In reality, however, new massive struggles of workers and peasants are bound to erupt throughout the country. The debacle of the Congress at the polls has aroused the hopes of the masses. The new governments that are going to be set up both at the centre and in the states, however, despite their diverse political colours, will not be in a position to solve any of their basic problems within the present crisis-ridden capitalist framework.

The bourgeois leadership of the Congress is also playing a very shrewd game at the present juncture. There is indeed a fight for leadership within the Congress parliamentary party. But the Congress leadership is agreed on the strategy of giving plenty of rope to the various opposition parties in the states to exhaust themselves in their attempts to form coalition ministries. These are bound to fall sooner or later. That would open up the way for the Congress to seek coalitions with the reactionary bourgeois parties like Swatantra and Jan Sangh on a national scale. Unless the Congress leaders succeed in forging a united front of the bourgeois parties, they correctly fear that their grip on the political life of the country will be lost forever.

An alternative for the bourgeoisie would be to resort to a military dictatorship. This is not a mere theoretical possibility today. With the American imperialists actively interested in installing a stable bourgeois regime in New Delhi which occupies a pivotal position in its political and military strategy in South Asia, the possibility of an imperialist intervention in the present crisis in a big way is also not ruled out.

The only answer that the working-class parties might give to the challenge posed by the bourgeois reaction to it is to mobilise the united intervention of the working class supported by the rural poor and the lower middle-class wage earners in the country, for a revolutionary settlement with the capitalist system and the establishment of a workers and peasants government in India. The bourgeois rulers and their imperialist advisers in India might have been temporarily thrown into disarray by the unexpected results of the general elections but they are bound to recover from the initial shock and take steps to consolidate themselves. The question is whether the revolutionary socialist movement in the country will assert itself in time.

March 1, 1967

MOSCOW DUBS MAO A "TROTSKYIST"

The latest issue of Kommunist, the theoretical magazine of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, carries an article attacking Mao with the most fearsome epithet in the entire lexicon of Stalinism -- "Trotskyist." As reported by the February 25 issue of Le Monde, the article attacks the "cultural revolution" as counterrevolutionary and aimed against the socialist conquests of the Chinese people. Mao's petty-bourgeois concepts, declares Kommunist, "coincide in all details with the slogans of Trotsky and his emulators."

Kommunist's sally on this front appears to be on a par with the arrest in Peking last December of the student Tan Li-fu on charges of being a "Trotskyist." [See World Outlook February 3.] However much Moscow and Peking may hurl the epithet of "Trotskyism" at each other, both of them maintain a firm united front in barring even a whisper in their press of the real views of the world Trotskyist movement.

GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATS OFFER OLIVE BRANCH TO SWORDSMEN

[The following ironic bit of commentary by H. Hagedorn, entitled "Duelist Democrats," has been translated by World Outlook from the January 23 issue of the Frankfurt Express International.]

* * *

Dueling fans among the West German students have cause for rejoicing. The SPD [Sozialistische Partei Deutschlands] leadership has publicly declared that it no longer considers itself bound by the 1954 party congress resolution barring members of student dueling societies from membership in the party.

The SPD leadership is to be warmly congratulated for turning its back on this outmoded resolution. This is new evidence that the SPD can rid itself of all the muddle-headed socialist ballast not already thrown overboard by the Bad Godesberg party congress. [In the name of "modernism," virtually all of the historic program of socialism that still remained formally a part of the SPD platform was eliminated by this party congress.]

The way in which Brandt and Wehner carried out this rapprochement with the student sword-wielders is particularly praiseworthy. It would have been cumbersome to have voted out the old resolution. The party of progress does well to avoid becoming entangled in old-fashioned democratic procedures.

The SPD's reconciliation with the duelists is also consistent from a social and political angle -- those who support rearmament ought likewise to endorse the use of cold steel in testing and hardening men. Furthermore, anyone seriously drawing away from the mistaken notions of socialism is well advised in taking into consideration the traditional groups that stand for the concept of an elite.

To put it briefly -- 5,000 Burschenschaften [members of an old patriotic students association], plus 6,000 members of the Coburg Convent of Dueling societies and 8,000 in the Corps can now both vote for the SPD as well as demand satisfaction of it.

Does anyone care to be reminded that the student Corpsman Otto von Bismark was the one who outlawed our socialist forebears?

What Mao's Thought Can Do for You

END NEUROTIC NEED TO MAKE YOUR OWN FILE

Students of Mao's thought will appreciate an article carried by Hsinhua, the Chinese News Agency, in its January 28 bulletin under the title, "Living Study and Application of Chairman Mao's Works Leads to Growth of Communist Ideas among Chinese Peasants." The instructive experience of the Wupaili production team is one of the highlights of this inspirational piece:

"The peasants of the Wupaili production team began studying Chairman Mao's writings in 1959. Today, all those who can read are eager students of Chairman Mao's works.

"The primary purpose of the peasants' studies of Chairman Mao's works is to eliminate selfishness and foster the idea of the public interest, or in other words, to destroy the bourgeois mentality and foster the proletarian ideology. In this ideological struggle they have not lost sight of Chairman Mao's observation: 'Invariably, remnants of old ideas reflecting the old system remain in people's minds for a long time, and they do not easily give way.'

"On one occasion when the team collected manure from its members, all handed in high quality manure except a middle peasant. It turned out that this person had secretly made a manure pit for his own private use. The team restudied the article 'In Memory of Norman Bethune' and had a discussion during which bourgeois ideas of selfishness were criticised. After the discussion, the middle peasant filled in his private dung pit.

"In this way the peasants apply Chairman Mao's teachings in their daily lives and try to fight the selfish ideas in their minds. All have the resolve to 'follow Chairman Mao's teachings to promote collectivism, to run our collective economy properly and to stick to socialism.'"

1966 -- YEAR OF LIMITED GAINS FOR SOVIET ECONOMY

By Sandro Mantovani

The USSR scored some economic successes this past year. If 1965 was a year of readjustment after the final disastrous period of Khrushchevite economic management, 1966 marked a significant increase in overall production. Agriculture, thanks partly to favorable climatic conditions, was the prime contributor to this with the best harvest ever of cereals and cotton. Besides Divine Providence, as the saying goes, these results were achieved owing to increased prices for produce delivered to the state and the more liberal policy with respect to private plots decided on at the March 1965 plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The success obtained in what is traditionally the weakest and most backward sector of the Soviet economy was accompanied by a significant though not spectacular increase in industrial production (8.4 percent as against the 6.7 percent provided for by the plan). All this was expressed, particularly in the second half of the year, in greater availability of consumer goods and in a relative improvement in the traditionally poor quality of manufactured consumer goods. Also, the results of the harvest make it possible for the Soviet leaders to divert the enormous amounts of currency which had been earmarked for cereals procurement to additional purchases of prime capital goods and, probably, of the sort of consumer goods that meet the thirst of the bureaucrats and the upper strata of the intelligentsia for high quality products.

It seems, therefore, that the series of economic measures undertaken by Khrushchev's successors during 1965 is producing positive results, at least in the first phase. On closer inspection, however, such a judgment would have to be at least partially re-considered.

The basic proposals for agriculture made at the March 1965 plenum were contained in a long-term program of intensive investments. However, some years will be necessary to see the results of these investments. On the other hand, the high prices paid for deliveries to the state and the more liberal policy regarding private peasant plots have had positive effects, as already noted; but these were the emergency measures proposed at the plenum to deal with an agricultural situation which was growing ever more ominous.

For industry, the Kosygin reform meant, on the one hand, a return to centralized management in the respective industrial sectors (reconstitution of the industrial ministries); and, on the other, new methods of plant management, based among other things on imposing a lesser number of leading indexes on the plants from the center and on giving the priority among these indexes to the profit index, which had been considered of secondary importance before. The process of organizing the ministries went on throughout 1966; and, in fact, if not formally, it still cannot be said to have been totally concluded -- as Baibakov, the president of Gosplan, revealed in his December report to the Supreme Soviet.

The new managerial methods at this time are in force in 673 plants with cadres equal to 10 percent of those in industry. To judge from the official Soviet sources, it seems that these plants obtained excellent results in 1966. Even if this is true, it is very difficult to attribute all the credit for increased industrial production to them alone.

On the other hand, we may reasonably conjecture that the successes obtained are primarily owed to the guarantees which the Soviet leaders, in official and semiofficial form, have repeatedly given the industrial and agricultural leaders that there will be no heavy-handed political and administrative interference in the affairs of the individual enterprises as there always had been in the past, both under Stalin and Khrushchev. This was what impelled the factory managers to seek to accumulate and make use of these "internal reserves" which have been so much discussed for so long in the Soviet press. These reserves were always kept in the background to meet the challenge of unforeseen political or administrative interference by the central bodies, which otherwise would threaten the normal management of the plants.

This is a success, therefore, even if a limited one which should not be overrated, of the general line of the group in power. We defined this general line when it first appeared as an attempt to politically unify all layers of the bureaucracy, and which therefore meant that confidence was to be placed in all the bureaucrats.

Nonetheless, as has been stated, the positive importance of these economic achievements should not be overrated. The fundamental contradictions of this phase of Soviet economic development are still unresolved. For the sake of brevity, we can turn

the floor over to the president of Gosplan, who lists these contradictions concisely and efficiently in the report already cited: "The national economy has suffered large unnecessary losses due to the squandering of material and financial resources. More than 17 percent of the plants are not meeting the objectives set by the plan. Such plants have underfulfilled the plan by more than one billion rubles' worth of production. In many sectors, production has not been of the type specified by the plan, and the most important types of goods are not being produced. Fixed capital is not being utilized in a satisfactory manner, and the new industrial complexes are coming into production too slowly. The planned goals for realizing investments and for starting the installation of new machinery have not been met. In spite of a notable increase in production, in 1967 the lack of a series of consumer goods will still be felt. The service network is still insufficiently developed, especially in the rural areas."

These basic contradictions cannot but make their influence felt on the overall functioning of the Soviet economy as soon as the effects of the factors which have caused this revival are exhausted. Moreover, as has been emphasized several times, even if the contradictions existing today are partially eliminated, when the effects of the economic reform (which presumably will begin at the end of next year) begin to make themselves felt, they will reappear later in a more acute form.

In any case, the economic achievements of 1966, even if they are ephemeral, have had a definite political result -- the consolidation of the dominant group in power.

The beginning of 1966 was marked by the rise toward power of the Shelepin group, supported by the political police and the central leadership of the Komsomol, which had a neo-Stalinist political line whose calling card was the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial and a constant emphasis on the "positive role played by Stalin." The nostalgic themes were meant to impress the bureaucrats with their desire for a firm and decisive policy. But the vast, energetic, if ill-defined, opposition of the country found its expression in the resistance of important groups of intellectuals. Shelepin was forced to retreat without having brought his campaign to its culmination. Brezhnev and Kosygin remained in power. Shelepin, however, had not lost the battle; he had simply not fought it and remained with his forces intact. However, the at least temporary stabilization of the economic situation reinforces, for the time being, Brezhnev and Kosygin's position. The enthusiasm with which Brezhnev's birthday was celebrated, which was clearly reminiscent of the minor-key cultism characteristic of the Khrushchev period, is only the external manifestation of this.

However, if, for the present, Shelepin has not succeeded in winning power, part of his political line has been appropriated by the present ruling group and is being put into practice discreetly little by little. The entire period subsequent to the Twenty-third Congress has been characterized by the multiplication and extension of attempts to educate the youth along so-called "patriotic-military" lines. A campaign is being waged with extensive means to recapture ideological hegemony over the youth by commending militarism and chauvinism to them as the highest values. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the outbreak of the war and of the Battle of Moscow served as the pretexts for unleashing this campaign. Innumerable "excursions to sites of glorious military episodes" were staged throughout the summer culminating in a grandiose march on Moscow by thousands of youth in paramilitary uniforms.

The entire academic and extracurricular education of the youth is keyed to these themes. In short, it seems that the most recent ideological invention of the bureaucracy, after "Goulash socialism," is "patriotic-military socialism."

In this atmosphere rumors of an imminent Chinese aggression and war with China as a result, probably spread deliberately, are given credence. In this atmosphere the ever more insistent campaign against the "threat of ideological subversion" by foreign visitors to the USSR is emerging as a factor. The intellectuals are under fire for their "lack of patriotism," and Novy Mir, the organ of the intellectual opposition, was forbidden to publish a diary of Simonov on the first days of the war which once again strongly emphasized Stalin's responsibility. The Conference on Ideological Problems held this past November apparently marked the defeat and isolation of those elements most blatantly nostalgic for Stalinism (Sturua, Bodiul, etc.); but not so much because their line was rejected as because it was maintained that this line must be executed with greater tact and discretion.

The intellectuals who had become the standard-bearers of the struggle against Stalinism in the beginning of the year seem passive and indecisive even though conscious that developments might take a dangerous turn. For the time being, they are primarily occupied with defending their power positions (the constantly threatened Novy Mir, for example).

The reason for this kind of attitude is their lack of cohesion, their ideological confusion, but most of all, the persistent passivity of the masses in this period. However, this passivity is not so much due to the hopes the masses place in the new leadership as it is to their inability to express their dissatisfaction given their extreme atomization and the lack of a good opening to express this dissatisfaction; therefore, we may safely assume that at the first sign of economic difficulty, Soviet society in toto will find itself in a state of the most acute tension.

IMPRESSIVE LIST OF CIA FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

By C.D.Cavanagh

Fresh revelations continue to appear in the American press on organizations that have been receiving secret finances from the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. The purpose of the CIA money is quite clear. The March 6 issue of Newsweek magazine put it plainly enough when it stated, "What the CIA was doing, of course, was secretly underwriting a miscellany of American organizations abroad, sometimes as cover for intelligence-gathering, more often to mount a social-democratic counterforce to Communist propaganda."

Thus, the CIA not only wanted to improve its ability to spy, but, more importantly, it also wanted to shore up the pro-imperialist "left."

The press has made the CIA's method of financing organizations explicit. First, the CIA set up a series of dummy foundations. These included:

Andrew Hamilton Fund	Kentfield Fund
Appalachian Fund	Michigan Fund
Beacon Fund	Monroe Fund
Borden Trust	Price Fund
Broad-High Foundation	San Miguel Fund
Charles Price Whitten Trust	Tower Fund
Chesapeake Foundation	Victoria Strauss Fund
Edsel Fund	Warden Trust
Gotham Foundation	Williford-Telford Fund
Heights Fund	Wynnewood Fund
James Carlisle Trust	

Then, these outfits transferred the CIA money over to several authentic foundations with whom agreements had been reached to act as conduits to the intended recipients. These conduit groups included:

Baird (David, Josephine, and Winfield) Foundation, Inc.	J.M.Kaplan Fund, Inc.
Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs	John Hay Whitney's Trust for Charitable Purposes
Granary Fund	Marshall Foundation
Hobby Foundation	M.D.Anderson Foundation
Hoblitzelle Foundation	Pan American Foundation
Independence Foundation	Rabb (Sidney and Esther) Charitable Foundation
J. Frederick Brown Foundation	

The eventual recipients of the CIA secret contributions included a wide variety of organizations which had only one key thing in common -- a policy of anti-Communism. This was enough to make them useful for the nefarious purposes of the CIA. The recipients that have been named thus far include:

AFL-CIO Foreign Department	American Newspaper Guild
African-American Institute	American Society of African Culture
African American Labor Center	Asian Student Press Bureau
American Council for the International Commission of Jurists	Atwater Research Program in North Africa
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO	Berliner Verein zur Förderung der Publizistik in den Entwicklungsländern
American Friends of the Middle East	Committee of Correspondence, Inc.
American Friends Service Committee	Conference on the Atlantic Community
American Fund for Free Jurists	Congress for Cultural Freedom
American Institute of Free Labor Development	Congrès pour la Liberté de la Culture

Council for International Programs for Youth Leaders and Social Workers
Council of European National Youth Committees
Crossroads Africa
Encounter magazine
Food and Restaurant Workers Secretariat
Foreign Policy Association
Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania
Fund for International Social and Economic Education
Gambia National Youth Council
Guyana Assembly of Youth
Independent Research Service
Inter-American Affairs Branch of the Public Service International
Inter-American Federation of Working Newspapermen's Organizations
Inter-American Labor Organization (ORIT)
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
International Cooperative Development Fund
International Development Foundation
International Federation of Journalists
International Federation of Petroleum Workers
International Food and Drink Workers Federation
International Student Conference
International Union of Socialist Youth
International Union of Young Christian Democrats
International Youth Center, New Delhi
Institute of International Education
Institute of International Labor Research, Inc.
Institute of Public Administration
National Council of Churches
National Education Association
National Federation of Canadian University Students
National Newman Club Federation
National Student Association
National Student Press Council of India
North American Secretariat of Pax Romana
Oficina Relacionadora Movimientos Estudiantiles Universitarios
Operations and Policy Research, Inc.
Pax Romana, International Secretariat
People-to-People
Project Hope
Radio Free Europe
Retail Clerks International Association
School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University
Synod of Bishops of the Russian Church Outside of Russia
United States Student Press Association
United States Youth Council
World Assembly of Youth
World University Service
Young Christian Workers
Young Women's Christian Association

More revelations are coming out all the time. Ramparts magazine, which set off the whole controversy with its exposure of the CIA financing behind the National Student Association, is reported to be preparing a special issue to examine the CIA's role in several other organizations.

ARREST MADE IN KENNEDY CASE

By Arthur Maglin

More and more doubt is being cast on the conclusions of the report issued by President Johnson's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy as new developments unfold in New Orleans. The most significant recent events were the death of David Ferrie on February 22 and the arrest of Clay Shaw on March 1.

William Turner reports on the death of Ferrie in the February 26 issue of The Sunday Ramparts, which is published in San Francisco:

"The un-opportune death of the New Orleans commercial pilot, David William Ferrie, and the simultaneous disclosure by Orleans Parish District Attorney Jim Garrison that he

was going to arrest Ferrie this week in connection with the Kennedy assassination has raised the curtain higher on this new and third act of the affair.

"Ferrie was found dead in bed on February 22, some 31 hours after being exhaustively interviewed by Garrison. The coroner ascribed death to a ruptured blood vessel at the base of the brain. Because of pills at the bedside, Garrison termed it a suicide.

"It might also be pointed out that a competently administered karate chop to the neck, such as possibly killed another assassination figure, Jim Koethe of the Dallas Times-Herald, could cause a fatal embolism in the brain vessels."

On March 1, Garrison arrested Clay Shaw, the retired director of the New Orleans International Trade Mart, and accused him of having taken part "in a conspiracy to assassinate President John F. Kennedy."

The March 3 New York Times reported:

"In an application for a warrant to search Mr. Shaw's home, the District Attorney's office said that a 'confidential informant' had disclosed that he had attended a meeting in which Mr. Shaw, Mr. Ferrie, Oswald and 'other persons' agreed to kill the President.

"According to the warrant application, the informant was administered sodium pentothol, commonly called truth serum, and 'corroborated and reaffirmed' his story while under the influence of the drug."

Meanwhile, the New York World Journal Tribune for March 3 reported:

"In Washington yesterday [March 2], President Johnson said he saw no reason to change his previous statements accepting the conclusions of the Warren Commission report, which concluded that Oswald acted alone in the assassination."

The March 4 issue of the National Guardian, a progressive news weekly published in New York, reported what Mark Lane, the most widely known critic of the Warren Commission, had to say about the new developments in New Orleans. Lane, speaking at a press conference in Rome, Italy, said, "What impressed me is that Garrison has initiated his investigations on the basis of his studies of the Warren Report and the investigations seem to flow from evidence in this Report. If the matter is reopened it will be reopened in New Orleans. If Garrison indicts people for complicity in the assassination, it seems unlikely to me that President Johnson could hold off the appointment of a new commission of inquiry until after the 1968 elections."

Lane supported Garrison's refusal to turn his evidence over to the Warren Commission and commented that, "He is quite justified in not wishing to share the evidence with those who have falsified the facts." And when asked about the role of Senator Robert Kennedy in the inquiry, Lane said, "He is in a delicate political position. If he were to say that the Report (which he says he has not read) were false, it would split the Democratic Party. Robert Kennedy believes that to become President is the most important thing. I think it is more important to find out the truth about the death of his brother."

On a different aspect of the New Orleans developments, the Louisiana branch of the American Civil Liberties Union criticized Garrison on March 6 for turning his investigation into a "Roman circus" and for attempting to convict people in the press rather than in the courtroom.

A very ominous note was struck in a column by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson which appeared in the March 7 issue of the New York Post:

"The publicity over New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison's investigation of a 'Kennedy assassination plot' has focused attention in Washington on a reported CIA plan in 1963 to assassinate Cuba's Fidel Castro, which, according to some sources, may have resulted in a counter-plot by Castro to assassinate President Kennedy.

"Senator Russell Long (Democrat of Louisiana) has told us that Lee Harvey Oswald, the accused Kennedy assassin, trained with Castro revolutionaries in Minsk during his Soviet stay. This information, which Long swore is reliable, was never revealed by the Warren Commission.

"Other highly placed sources have confirmed that an anti-Castro plot was cooked up within the CIA.

"Our sources agree that a plot against Castro definitely was taken up inside the CIA at the time Senator Robert Kennedy (Democrat of New York) was riding herd on the agency for his brother. The report is that Castro got wind of the plot and threatened to find someone to assassinate President Kennedy.

"Shortly after the tragedy, the FBI submitted a memo to President Johnson reporting that Cuban leaders had wanted to kill Kennedy. The information was not sufficiently specific, however, to be accepted as certain."

What do these reports from "highly placed sources" portend? Are there people in Washington who hope to divert attention away from themselves by making accusations about others? Will an attempt be made to frame-up the international radical movement for the Kennedy assassination?

CHANCE AND NECESSITY IN VIETNAM AND THE U.S. DRAFT

[The rather sardonic Parisian columnist Robert Escarpit took as his subject in the March 8 issue of Le Monde Johnson's recent proposals on revising the draft system in the United States. Escarpit's comments, under the title of "The Judgment of God," were as follows as translated by World Outlook.]

* * *

President Johnson has just reinvented the system of conscription by drawing lots, well known to our grandparents, and, if you can believe the folklore, one for which they had little taste.

What is new is that President Johnson praises the system as the most equitable and by far the most impartial. Perhaps that is giving too much credit to chance and disregarding a little cavalierly all the efforts made by moralists, jurists and legislators through the ages precisely to correct what is cruel, unjust and absurd in chance.

Unless President Johnson, betraying here his real thought, merely intends to refer things to what was once called God's will. If this is so, one can better appreciate his policy in Vietnam. There's no martyred people, no scorched earth, no errors in bombing, no useless deaths; there's just culprits whom divine chance designates by striking them down.

A SHIFT IN PEKING'S ATTITUDE ON SHIPPING SOVIET AID TO VIETNAM?

In a statement issued in Hanoi February 28, the Vietnam News Agency said it had been "authorized" to declare that the reports "spread by American and other Western news agencies" about shipments of matériel being held up in transit across China "are sheer fabrications invented for the most vile purposes." China has given its "whole-hearted help in transporting to Vietnam, adequately and according to schedule, aid goods from the Soviet Union and some other countries."

This release was published by the Hsinhua News Agency March 2. Hsinhua also carried a lengthy Peking dispatch on the same subject. This blamed Moscow as the source of the "preposterous anti-China slander." Despite the harshness of the article, it was more restrained than have been other attacks leveled against Brezhnev-Kosygin recently.

The People's Daily in Peking carried a similar article March 2. It, too, took a violent tone, denouncing the "slanders" as "an attempt to drive a wedge into the militant solidarity between the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples." However, the article wound up with the declaration, "We have never failed to transport every little bit of the material in transit through China as our responsibility requires and so long as the Vietnamese comrades wanted."

Opponents of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam will be little interested in allocating the blame in this dispute. What they will want to know is, does this represent complete readiness on the part of Peking to assist in getting supplies to the Vietnamese freedom fighters and the beleaguered Vietnamese workers state? If so, the implied promise to handle shipments in accordance with the norms of international solidarity is to be welcomed as a step in the right direction. It should be followed up by offering the Soviet government a united front in mobilizing such aid.

THE CUBANS COME TO CLOSER GRIPS WITH THE BUREAUCRATIC DANGER

By Joseph Hansen

The problem of the struggle against bureaucratism in a workers state arose early in Cuba, reaching its first crisis with the battle against the grouping headed by Anibal Escalante, a functionary inherited from the Communist party of the prerevolutionary period. The successful outcome of this particular struggle in 1962 testified to the capacity of the Cuban leadership to recognize the problem and their concern about coping with it. Besides the immediate effect on the Cuban Revolution, which was altogether favorable, the militant attitude of the Cuban leaders with regard to this crucial question served to give fresh encouragement and inspiration to friends and supporters of the Cuban workers state everywhere. However, the measures instituted in 1962 proved to be inadequate. This testified not only to the stubbornness of the problem but also, perhaps, to an incomplete appreciation among the Cuban leaders of the nature of bureaucratism and what to do about it.

In the past year, Fidel Castro has returned to the problem in a rather emphatic way. His recent speeches reveal a certain worry about the persistence of the phenomenon and the difficulty of counteracting it. Granma, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba, has recently taken up the question in a vigorous way. One of the most interesting aspects is the effort to find a theoretical understanding of bureaucratism. This alone marks a considerable advance in view of the well-known tendency of the Cuban revolutionists to rather disparage theory and to consider action alone to be sufficient to solve all problems.

A good example of the current thinking in Havana on the problem of bureaucratism is provided by the lengthy editorial in two parts which appeared in Granma and which was made available to the English-speaking world in a translation in the March 5 number of the English-language edition of the Cuban newspaper. World Outlook has reprinted the editorial below in its entirety.

The editorial is well worth studying. Of special interest is the obvious reflection in part II of living experience with the development of bureaucratism in a workers state.

Various limitations in the two parts of the editorial will not escape those familiar with the contributions of Leon Trotsky on the subject. In part I of the editorial, for instance, the editors of Granma fail to explore how the ruling class in capitalist society is able to keep its bureaucrats under control normally. The editorial leaves the impression that it is due to psychological conditioning. This aspect, however, is secondary. The basic means are economic and political. The ruling class can hire and fire and use bribery of the most varied nature, the ultimate in awards being inclusion into their own ranks of occasional individuals from the "lower" levels of society.

If the editors of Granma were to pursue this line of inquiry, they would find the illuminating case of a fascist state, where the bureaucratic servant assumes the prerogatives of the ruling class. A study of fascism is particularly instructive in gaining a basic theoretical appreciation of the complex problem of bureaucratism in capitalist society.

In part II of the editorial, we note a parallel limitation. Nothing is said about the reasons making it so difficult for the ruling class in a workers state -- the ruling class, of course, being the workers -- to keep the bureaucrats under control. One of the main reasons pointed out by Trotsky is the comparative lack of political experience among the workers in contrast to the centuries of experience accumulated by the bourgeoisie and carefully handed down from generation to generation.

Again, it would prove instructive for the editors of Granma to inquire into the specific case of the Soviet Union where the bureaucracy actually crystallized into a hardened caste and usurped power. The basic material on this is readily available in the works of Trotsky.

The final point to be made is that just as the capitalists find it easier to control their bureaucrats under the conditions of bourgeois democracy, so the workers find it easiest to control their bureaucrats under the institutions of proletarian democracy. This was not the least of the reasons why Lenin was a strong advocate of proletarian democracy. Lenin's theory, of course, did not exist in a vacuum. His approach to the question, particularly as worked out in State and Revolution, should be considered in the light of the practical experience of the first great socialist revolution. Proletarian democracy was one of the essential means by which the Russian workers carried

forward their struggle in both 1905 and 1917. The specific institution, in addition to a revolutionary party that practiced genuine democracy as well as centralism, was soviets. Moreover -- the Cubans should appreciate this -- the soviets provided a means of effective struggle in areas which most guerrilla fighters consider the most difficult of all: cities.

After the 1917 Revolution, the soviets continued to serve in Russia as the organs of power, the key institution of workers government. They were among the chief vehicles in fighting the bureaucratic danger and thus became one of the main targets of those seeking to usurp power. They were liquidated under Stalin.

It is to be hoped that the Cuban revolutionists will continue their dual approach to this problem; that is, both on the practical and theoretical level. If they maintain complete objectivity in probing all aspects of the question and do not hesitate to examine what history can really teach in this respect, there is no doubt as to the ultimate conclusions they will reach. Cuba, having opened the socialist revolution in the Western Hemisphere, may yet provide it with an example of proletarian democracy superior to that given the world by the Bolsheviks, who, as the pioneers blazing the trail, faced incomparably greater difficulties.

"The Struggle Against Bureaucracy: A Decisive Task"*

I.

"A PURELY AND EXCLUSIVELY BOURGEOIS INSTITUTION"

The struggle against bureaucracy is of decisive importance in the progress of the Revolution. Fidel Castro has given this definition: "The struggle against the bureaucratic mentality is almost as difficult as the struggle against imperialism itself. More difficult than the struggle against the landowners, of course, since these were the minority, and there are many more people with bureaucratic mentalities than there were landowners in this country."

This is a long and complex struggle that cannot be won in one day. The mere establishment of revolutionary measures and laws is not enough. Action is necessary on the part of the masses and the Party, as well as the constant application of a policy based on the principle of maximum reduction in numbers and maximum increase in efficiency. As Fidel has said, "...the only way to lend dignity to administrative work is to liberate it from bureaucratic concepts and methods..." Bureaucracy is a legacy from the capitalist system. Its complete and radical elimination is fundamental in achieving the complete triumph of the Revolution.

Only if we are clearly aware of the danger posed by the existence of the petty-bourgeois mentality within the state apparatus can we properly understand, in all its magnitude, the importance of this key struggle in a country such as ours that proposes to achieve the maximum aims of revolution: the construction of the communist society. This is why we cannot detain ourselves in a mere struggle against the most obvious quantitative aspects of this evil. We could make the mistake of reducing all of the personnel in a given place without taking their methods of work into consideration, thereby, even with a minimum of employees and functionaries, permitting bureaucratic work to continue, allowing obstacles to action, divorce from the masses and from the real problems at hand, to prevail. This is well known by all who have thought over this matter. What does this ideological origin reveal? It reveals that the problem of bureaucracy has ideological origins, that it originates in a concept and a mentality, not only of excess administrative personnel. Fidel Castro expresses this clearly when he says, "...the principal cause is the petty-bourgeois mentality, the lack of awareness of the importance of a country's human resources, of a country's material resources."

Since this is the case, we must complement the struggle against bureaucracy's external manifestations -- such as the proliferation of administrative personnel, inertia, red tape, the "run-around," etc. -- with ideological struggle against the concepts that engender these evils, against the petty-bourgeois mentality within the revolutionary State.

*The translation of this editorial from Granma is taken from the March 5 issue of the English-language edition of the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba. The subheadings appear in the original. Some obvious typographical errors have been corrected. Emphasis, where indicated, appears in the original.

This editorial, as well as those that will be appearing during the next few days, proposes to collaborate on this struggle.

"A Purely and Exclusively Bourgeois Institution"

Where and when did bureaucracy arise? In what social system did it originate? This is the first question we must analyse, because bureaucracy is not a product of our society, but rather one of the most unsavory holdovers from the past we have had to deal with. The rise of bureaucracy is closely related to the capitalist system. Its development has taken place parallel with that of the bourgeoisie in its rise to the position of the ruling class in contemporaneous capitalist states. Although in former societies there did exist some incipient forms of bureaucratic work, such as that of functionaries, scribes and priests, it cannot be said that a highly developed bureaucracy existed under slavery or feudalism. Why not? Because in those societies, such activity did not favor the growth and consolidation of a social stratum that would exercise power in the name of the ruling class. But such a parasitic stratum does exist in bourgeois society. The basis for its existence is the greater complexity in administration and government demanded by the centralized bourgeois state -- which involves multiple forms of mercantile and financial relations determined by an active domestic and world trade requiring numerous controls; a government with a complex fiscal system, and finally a state apparatus with forms of organization that must necessarily be complex in view of the veiled character of exploitation in bourgeois society.

Bureaucracy also constitutes the most negative product of the division between manual and intellectual labour.

This division, between the productive work of society and that of the members of the ruling class -- dedicated to political or cultural activities -- arose at the onset of class society. The slave system's ruling class, owners of great extensions of land and slaves, was exempt from all physical productive work. This they relegated to the great masses of the people, considering it "unworthy of true men." This also was a characteristic of the feudal regime, in which the landowning aristocracy considered the work of the agricultural serfs as unfit for them.

Under capitalism, this division is sharpened to even greater extremes by the bourgeoisie. Bureaucracy, a bourgeois creation, is profoundly steeped in this attitude toward manual labour. Educated in the petty-bourgeois ideology, bureaucrats disdain productive activity and consider themselves an intellectual stratum on a level with the bourgeoisie, situated above the working people.

Indeed, it must be stressed that even if we go so far as to classify bureaucratic work as "intellectual," if it is "intellectual" at all, it is one of the most simple and mediocre forms of intellectual work. Of this there is no doubt. There is nothing creative about bureaucratic work: deviation from the beaten path of routine can cost any functionary or employee his job.

There are other products of the division between physical and intellectual work that can be considered as historically necessary, since they have played a very important role during class society in the development of science, art and literature. But bureaucracy, on the contrary, is a sterile entity that can claim no important accomplishment in the history of human culture.

Social Mainstay and Weapon of the Bourgeoisie

Where could the bourgeoisie discover a social base to use in the establishment of this bureaucratic stratum? The bourgeoisie had no interest, nor were they in the position, to take over intermediate posts in government and business, since they were busy with the running of their own private affairs. They reserved high offices in the State and business for themselves. Therefore, they needed a specified sector of society to be used as instruments in the running of government matters and the management of the companies they owned, with the purpose of organizing, controlling and administering their exploitation of wage earners. Moreover, the bourgeoisie, although they were masters of the nation's economy, were a rather small group numerically. A wider social stratum was required to give them support, one allied to their own interests, which could be used in the exercising of their dictatorial class power, as a direct instrument against the working classes. The creation of a bureaucratic stratum was one of the solutions seized upon to fill this need. Together with the bureaucracy, we also had the "labour aristocracy," set up with the same end in mind, the strengthening of the basis of power and extension of social influence.

Both the bureaucracy and the labour aristocracy in a bourgeois regime became mere extensions of the capitalist class into the petty-bourgeois sectors and the proletariat.

Both groups served as supports to the dominant power, carrying on political maneuvering, causing division in the ranks of the proletariat and hampering any kind of popular movement.

In the early days of capitalism this stratum was drawn from middle-class urban groups whose position was neither that of the feudal aristocrats nor of the workers and poorer artisans. In this environment the bourgeoisie created and nurtured the appropriate ideology and outlook on life. It developed a petty-bourgeois mentality in this social sector.

This was achieved through a hierarchy of officials and employees. Each of these was subject to the authority of an immediate superior, and all were trained to stick to routine work, obey more or less inflexible rules and regulations and to abhor the introduction of innovations. They sought security and rank in society which would give them certain "respectability," placing them above the working class.

This gave rise to the criteria of the bureaucratic post as a profession, and the concept became ingrained that the duty of one holding such a post was to blindly abide by the orders of superiors in the hierarchy. The bureaucrat was given the guarantee of a secure livelihood in exchange for his absolute submission to the bourgeoisie's planning. This explains why bureaucracy was born and grew identified with the capitalist class ideology, possibly to a greater degree than any other sector of the petty-bourgeoisie.

Bureaucrats were formed by the division between manual and intellectual work. They were trained to completely ignore and despise production and those who made it possible.

What is bureaucracy?

As Lenin points out, it is "that particular stratum holding power..." It is the intermediary entrusted by the dominant class with the handling of affairs of State and administrative work in capitalist enterprises; an intermediary which reflects faithfully the thinking and the conceptions of the capitalist class. That is, in a bourgeois regime bureaucracy constitutes a social stratum playing a role subordinate to the political and administrative authority of the dominant class. It is an intermediary stratum that executes the decisions of the bourgeois dictatorship. It is the administration of power by employees and officials placed between the capitalist and the working masses. This stratum is invested with power and government by the exploiting classes whom it serves.

Therefore, we should define bureaucracy on the basis of its relations with the capitalist class and its participation in the government of that class, rather than on the basis of its concrete administrative functions.

We have analysed the origin of the bureaucratic stratum, have determined at what moment in history it arose and have shown what classes it merged with: This proves Lenin's idea that, "...owing to its historical origin as well as to its contemporary sources and its mission, bureaucracy is always a purely and exclusively bourgeois institution."

Imperialism and Underdevelopment

Engendered by and serving the interests of the bourgeoisie, bureaucracy reaches the zenith of its reactionary, antipopular nature under imperialism.

Impersonal bureaucratic functions reach their highest degree of dehumanization. There is a veritable army of clerks and offices, acting as a machine of international oppression.

The phenomenon that had appeared with the rise of capitalism grows more pronounced: in industry, in commerce, in the trade unions, in social institutions: on every hand, bureaucracy manifests itself and becomes entrenched. Its end is always the same: alienation of the worker -- turning him into an object, a cipher, one more item of merchandise -- expediting the exploitation of man by man.

In underdeveloped countries, the problem of bureaucracy takes on very particular characteristics. It is tied to and facilitates exploitation by foreign monopolies; it is steeped in the imperialist ideology and often comes into conflict with the interests of the nation itself.

Servitor of neocolonial governments, bureaucracy is allied with administrative

corruption and the sinecures typical of countries under the national domination of militarists and land barons.

It no longer serves only as a social bulwark of the bourgeoisie, but has become an international mainstay of imperialist policy and exploitation.

While this may not be so in each and every case, it is a widespread reality affecting bureaucracy in underdeveloped countries.

Bureaucracy in Bourgeois Armies

The bourgeois states formed their armies in keeping with their particular organizational concepts. The armies of the capitalist states took on a bureaucratic structure. The growing use of artillery, complex troop movements, the formation of enormous armies, required the presence of an extensive apparatus of officers, liaison men and many other command cadres, directed from the top down through a hierarchy.

In the era of bourgeois revolutions, these armies represented a force superior in organization to the feudal forces. Obviously, the methods brought into play were not the only determining factor; many others determined the superiority of the bourgeois armies over the feudal counterparts. But the establishment of bureaucratic methods in modern armies is sufficiently important for us to pursue the matter further.

Side by side with expansion of its sphere of action and development in its highest stage -- imperialism -- capitalism needed to augment its entire military apparatus, to create a large war industry and to operate transports that could move its armies anywhere. As this took place, the bureaucratic structure of the armies expanded.

The military forces of any imperialist nation have thousands of command cadres; there are modern armies that need seven men in the rear to back up three men in the front lines.

Besides the administrative or command function realized by this entrenched bureaucracy in the armed forces, it also fulfills the function of a stratum closely tied to the military caste and to the monopolists of the regime; that is, from the army, this stratum serves the political interests of the most reactionary class.

Bourgeois ideologists claim that there is no organization technically superior to that of an imperialist army, and they point to the structure of modern armies as an example of the efficiency and superiority of bureaucratic methods.

But history teaches us something else. The peoples who fight for liberation organize their armed forces without resorting to bureaucratic techniques.

We are not going to enter upon an analysis of all the factors moving the struggle forward nor all the elements present in a victory in a war of liberation. We only wish to stress that there exist organizations which are not constituted bureaucratically and which are capable of standing up to armies set up with the highest techniques of bourgeois organization.

To take only a few examples, we have the War of Liberation of the Algerian and Vietnamese peoples against the French army, and the present battle of the Vietnamese guerrillas against the hierarchically superorganized forces of the imperialists.

The armies of the underdeveloped countries are characterized by their swollen staffs.

In an article entitled "Latin American Viet Cong" in the Canadian newspaper Toronto Star, appearing on November 5, 1966, it is stated:

"U.S. officials in Guatemala City are astonished at the rapid tendency of Guatemalan officers, returning after months of tough training in the United States to develop large stomachs and settle down in easy, secure office jobs which they do not seem to want to relinquish."

The article later describes the Guatemalan army as: "An overgrown corps of top-ranking officers, with 400 out of the thousand officers assigned the high rank of colonel."

This army has tried and failed on numerous occasions to destroy the popular forces organized into guerrilla detachments.

Of course, this bureaucratic tendency typical in all spheres in underdeveloped countries is not the essence of the phenomenon, but it is one of its most injurious manifestations. It is an element that comes to have a determining character in the decomposition of these regimes.

We Cubans know this situation very well. The pro-imperialist army of the tyranny was completely rigid in structure. Among the consequences of the decomposition of the capitalist system under the exploitation of Yankee capital was the bureaucratizing of the army, a sort of fossilization, an inability to face a new form of struggle. Our Rebel Army -- the popular forces -- dispensed with everything superfluous, conducting the war in a direct, very concrete way, bringing into play a nonbureaucratic organization that showed organizational superiority over the bureaucratic military apparatus.

We can draw a conclusion from the confrontation of the Liberation Forces, based on the incorporation of the masses, with the traditional armies: it is possible to excel bureaucratic ways of organization. There are organizational forms which are far more efficient than bureaucratic ones.

In Socialism, the incorporation of workers via the militias -- the revolutionary origin of the armed forces -- and the system of an army of technically trained cadres, with large numbers of young men coming in through conscription makes possible an army free of the evil of bureaucracy.

II.

"THE DANGER OF BUREAUCRACY AS A SPECIAL STRATUM"

We have been analysing the more obvious and immediate aspects of bureaucracy in our country, which we have fought and will continue to fight tirelessly. But it is also necessary to ponder deeply the problems posed by the existence of a bureaucratic stratum to the process of constructing socialism and communism. This is a phenomenon of universal validity. It is a danger we must abolish from our country since the complete success of the Revolution depends to a great extent on its elimination.

Bureaucracy, without any doubt, constitutes a special sector with a specified relationship to the means of production. We can affirm that, with the triumph of the Socialist Revolution, bureaucracy acquires a new character.

On what basis do we affirm this? Under capitalism bureaucracy holds the same positions and apparently has the same relationship to the means of production. Nevertheless, in such a regime, it plays a subordinate role to the administrative and political power and authority of the dominant class, the bourgeoisie.

Capitalist bureaucracy is made up of public employees and the functionaries and employees of private enterprises. Neither group is directly concerned with political or governmental policy. In fact public functionaries and employees as well as those in private enterprise are trained to think of their activity as a specialized professional function, removed from politics, and even to view political activity with a certain disdain. Thus capitalist bureaucracy serves as an intermediary, totally submissive to the domination of the bourgeoisie.

But what happens following the triumph of the Revolution? In the first place, all of the formerly dispersed bureaucratic apparatus is vertically redeployed into the State apparatus and, to a certain extent, organized and strengthened. If we add to this the problems of lack of experience and knowledge on the part of revolutionaries, the tendency toward centralization or the application of bureaucratized foreign patterns, it is clear that bureaucracy will grow, develop and gain strength during the early years of revolutionary power.

However, there is much more to the question than this. In addition to greater organization and growth in size, bureaucracy takes on a new character in its relationship to the means of production and, therefore, to political activity as well. When the Revolution triumphs and the direction of the economy passes into the hands of the State, bureaucracy intervenes in the administration of production, in the control and governing of the material and human resources of the nation.

Minor functionaries, who previously were not entrusted with making decisions on political and administrative questions, move into posts which require political decisions and decisions affecting the means of production. That is, a change occurs in their

relation to the entire life of the nation.

The fact that many workers begin to hold administrative posts does not give a class content to State administration. On the contrary, when a worker or farmer takes over an administrative post, he is in danger of being influenced politically and ideologically by this administrative job, of becoming one more bureaucratic functionary. A worker transformed into a position of authority in the direction of production is not necessarily thereby transformed into a leader of the working class.

As long as the State exists as an institution and as long as organization, administration and policy are not all fully of a communist nature, the danger will continue to exist that a special stratum of citizens will form in the heart of the bureaucratic apparatus which directs and administers the State. This apparatus has given relationship to the means of production, different from that of the rest of the population, which can convert bureaucratic posts into comfortable, stagnant or privileged positions.

And this is the most profound and serious problem to be considered in the campaign against bureaucracy!

Starting on the Road to Communism is no Guarantee of Arrival

Socialism and communism are not spontaneous phenomena. Arrival at these higher stages of social development is achieved by following a correct policy and orientation. The fact that a Revolution triumphs and proclaims its intention to construct a new society is no guarantee that this society will become a reality.

To achieve socialism and communism, two factors must be combined: the development of the new man with new awareness and attitudes toward life, and the advance of technology to a level which will multiply productivity and bring about abundance of material goods. In order to reach this high goal in human society, a policy consequent with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, with the concepts developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin and other great leaders of the working class, is essential. A policy which will lead to the disappearance of the concepts and ideology of the exploiting classes and of petty-bourgeois mentality is essential. This demands the existence of a Party which is always youthful, always alert, never stagnant. The Party must be ever creative and united with the masses, never a Party which is simply resigned to repeating what has been done by others without first evaluating this critically in the light of the concrete situations under which it must exercise its function of leader and guide.

Starting on the road to communism is no guarantee of arrival. At the least, it could happen that the Revolution's ascendant movement be frustrated and that stagnation and decomposition appear in the earliest stages of the process.

A number of factors are involved in this problem which, taken as whole, depend upon the general conception that is held of how socialism and communism are to be constructed.

If we allow certain categories characteristic of the capitalist system to survive within the organization and development of our economy, if we take the easiest way out, using material interest as the driving force in the construction of socialism, if merchandise is held up as the central core of the economy, if the presence of money remains omnipotent within the new society, then selfishness and individualism will continue to be the predominant characteristics in the conscience of men and we shall never arrive at the formation of the new man.

And if such concepts prevail within the society, if an individualist and petty-bourgeois ideology survives, a bureaucratic mentality will likewise survive, together with a bureaucratic concept of administration and politics, but with the aggravating factor that now this concept will prevail among a special stratum of men whose relation to the means of production and political decisions places them in a position of leadership. Thus there is nothing strange about the fact that the desire to belong to this bureaucratic stratum of society is kept alive or that this becomes a material objective for those seeking comfort and privilege.

If the Party does not win this battle over bureaucracy, if this danger is not eliminated through the formation of the new man and the application of an unyielding policy, consequent with Marxist-Leninist principles, the Party will end by bureaucratizing itself. And a Party which stagnates is a party in decomposition.

What does this mean? What occurs if the Party organization sinks into this bureaucratic morass? When that occurs, a special stratum consolidates itself in the administration and direction of the State and in political leadership, a special stratum

with aspirations toward self-perpetuation that draws constantly farther away from the masses, divorced from fruitful productive labor and from those who perform it, to become a privileged body, incapable of impelling the people forward, incapable of leading the conscience of the people toward high levels.

And when this occurs the construction of socialism and communism has already been abandoned.

Avoiding the Danger

As long as certain functions of an administrative nature, necessary in the transitional period, continue to exist, certain measures can be taken to aid in the avoidance of this danger. One of these is to maintain mobility in the posts of administrative officials and public employees, to prevent their becoming fossilized and to avoid the formation of a special stratum of society.

The apparatus for the direction of the State must be kept simple and at the same time dynamic, informed in the technical processes involved in production, capable of coordinating efforts of stimulating activity, and of inspiring the spirit of work in those who function under their leadership.

Danger also exists that, within political organizations and the Party itself, a special category of citizen be created among professional cadres, differentiated from the rest of the population. This is a danger that must be assessed and taken into consideration, because the historical and social process is a result of certain laws and principles which we must understand extremely well or run the risk of falling into grave errors.

The way to avoid functionaries and administrative cadres within the Party becoming a special sector of society is by confronting them directly with problems of production. This danger will be avoided to the extent to which the cadres face up to the concrete tasks of agriculture and industry in the closest possible contact with production itself. And this rule is valid for functionaries and administrative employees as well.

In our own present reality, since the Party is a product of the Revolution and grew out of the Revolution, the need has arisen for the Party cadres to dedicate themselves to tasks of production and management in the most direct and immediate form. They must be in contact with technical problems as they come up in the fields, on State Farms, in industrial plants. We are aided in this task by the fact that our party is young, without professional experience in most cases.

Thus, measures are being taken within the Party to avoid the development of a special stratum of professionals, which in any case should always be as limited and reduced in size as possible, and as close as is possible to production. We will be helped in this task by the constantly increasing trend toward the formation of new cadres which will provide greater movement among them from production to the Party, and from the Party to production.

A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF MAO'S INFALLIBILITY

In a graphic account of a tour which she and other Australian and New Zealand students recently made of China, Janet Lang reports in the February 27 Newsweek that one of the outstanding impressions they received was the "appalling ignorance of the outside world which almost all the Chinese displayed." She mentions specifically, "Most young Red Guards we met had never heard of Winston Churchill, or even of Trotsky, though they know all about 'Comrade Ted Hill,' the leader of Australia's tiny pro-Chinese Communist splinter party."

The 20-year-old Miss Lang describes a conversation with their guides and some "Red Guard friends" about Mao. "I asked how they could be so sure that Mao is infallible. Such a question clearly seemed absurd. 'Mao reads the foreign newspapers,' one of them answered with assurance. 'He knows what's going on. He must be right -- look what he's done for China.'"

It is to be hoped that Miss Lang assured her Red Guard friends that reading the foreign newspapers does not exactly guarantee infallibility. But the implication that it is highly desirable to read something besides quotations from the works of Mao would seem to indicate that at least one Red Guard has not yet firmly grasped the true nature of the "cultural revolution."