

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

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. 19
May 12, 1967



COUP D'ÉTAT IN GREECE brings out protesting pickets in New York, as in many other cities in world. "Freedom for All Political Prisoners" was one of many banners displayed at Greek consulate. See page 489.

War Crimes Tribunal Opens in Stockholm

•
**Text of de Gaulle's Letter
Barring Sessions in France**

•
**Jean-Paul Sartre's Answer
to General de Gaulle**

•
**Fidel Castro Pays Tribute
to April 15 Demonstration**

•
**5,500 Quebec Workers Call
for Release of Hugo Blanco**

•
**Review of Isaac Deutscher's
'Ironies of History'**

•
**What Johnson's 'Pacification'
Program Really Signifies**

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010.

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S OPENING STATEMENT AT WAR CRIMES HEARING

[After being barred by de Gaulle from holding its sessions in Paris, the International War Crimes Tribunal transferred to Stockholm, opening its hearings May 2.

[Due to his frail health, Bertrand Russell, who initiated the tribunal, could not attend. He sent the tribunal a statement, however, which was read by his secretary, Ralph Schoenman.

[The text of Bertrand Russell's statement, which served to open the sessions, was as follows.]

* * *

The world is numbed by the arrogant brutality of the United States Government. We meet in this opening session of the International War Crimes Tribunal at an alarming time. The United States is beginning an enormous new onslaught against the people of Vietnam. The sordid military machine which rules Washington is readying itself for greater destruction. In a fever of frustration over the humiliating defeats inflicted on her occupying armies in South Vietnam, the United States Government in hysteria and hate boasts of its intent, and its intent is evil.

Our Tribunal is not a group of disembodied formalists, quibbling over definitions or posturing an immoral lack of decision about these events. There is one reason for this International War Crimes Tribunal: Overwhelming evidence besieges us daily of crimes without precedent. Each moment greater horror is perpetrated against the people of Vietnam. We investigate in order to expose. We document in order to indict. We arouse consciousness in order to create mass resistance. This is our purpose and the acid test of our integrity and honour.

How frantic is the United States Government to stop us. Lies are hurled like napalm bombs. The fragments of these planned untruths find their way into the media of communication so responsible for the deception of ignorant men. The Government of France exposes itself before the world as a pathetic citadel of hypocrisy and spinelessness.

This is no token of our weakness. It is the very opposite. The feverish effort to conceal American crimes is matched by the frantic campaign against those who stand out against them. Let us take this as a tribute.

Hitler's Nazis buried the evidence of their barbarism throughout Europe. This Europe is a vast grave of interred

cruelty. Auschwitz did its work for years. The evidence cannot be denied.

When Nazi power was defeated belatedly, did anyone lack knowledge of the extermination and experiment, of the cold cruelty and arrogance of the Nazi war criminals? The evidence was overwhelming.

Must we contort ourselves to deny the equally compelling evidence of war crimes in Vietnam? It is unseemly for men with a particle of self-respect to dissemble about what the United States Government has done to Vietnam. Auschwitz existed. It was all the more incumbent upon men to investigate why it was built, what it did and who was responsible. The vast evidence was no reason to hold back from enquiry; it was a mandate to expose, in the vain hope that men might learn the shameful lesson of their moral cowardice -- for Auschwitz is our responsibility. We failed to stop it. We condemned it too late.

Crimes, barbarous crimes, are reported daily from Vietnam. They are crimes of an aggressor, an occupier, a tormentor. Our task is to display this truth to the people of the world. Our duty is to investigate every fact so that every fact will serve to arouse passionate resistance. We do this because we have knowledge which compels us to act against inhuman behaviour. Those who wish to apologise for U.S. crimes and who would excuse their own failure to act against them will try to impose a distinction between moral clarity and intellectual probity. In doing so they project their own double default. We must state the evidence before our eyes. Without this overwhelming evidence there would have been no Tribunal. Where crime is known, it is cause for enquiry and judgment. The truth compels an exhaustive investigation to document and compile the full record.

The full record includes the moving and unparalleled resistance of the people of Vietnam. Those who would call the rising of the Warsaw Ghetto a crime will consider the resistance in Vietnam in the same light. Those who lack all feeling for the heroism of the partisans in Yugoslavia, Denmark and Norway will seek to equate the relentless annihilation of Vietnam by the U.S. rulers with the valiant resistance of the Vietnamese partisans. Let apologists for Nazism make this equation. There is no truth in it, less honour in its advocacy and complete moral turpitude in its imposition.

The force of our Tribunal lies in the impeccability of its procedures and the thoroughness of its investigation. The

[Turn to page 488.]

TEXT OF DE GAULLE'S LETTER BANNING WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

[When the International War Crimes Tribunal sponsored by Bertrand Russell announced shortly after its formation last year that it would hold public hearings in Paris, heavy pressure began to be applied to block the tribunal's work.

[This ranged from attacks on the concept of the tribunal and invidious propaganda about its individual members -- including poisonous essays on the personality of Bertrand Russell himself -- to direct government moves. Thus the U.S. State Department revoked the passport of Ralph Schoenman, the secretary of Bertrand Russell and one of the most active figures in the tribunal, and the French authorities took him into custody for a night in a petty move to block his flight plans on one occasion.

[The source of this pressure was not difficult to determine. In fact it was indicated by such knowledgeable newspapers as the New York Times. Forecasts were made that General de Gaulle would concede to this pressure and bar the hearings from being held in Paris.

[The petty obstructions placed in the way of the tribunal by the French authorities reached the point of an international scandal when one of the key figures in the tribunal, the Yugoslav historian Vladimir Dedijer, was denied a visa on the eve of the hearings. Jean-Paul Sartre thereupon wrote a letter to de Gaulle April 13 asking the general to intervene.

[De Gaulle replied April 19. His letter, in effect, assumed personal responsibility for banning the War Crimes Tribunal from holding any kind of hearings in France. De Gaulle's ban on the tribunal made headlines, of course, and no doubt gave President Johnson considerable satisfaction as another of his famous victories in his holy war against the Vietnamese people.

[The tribunal was able to transfer to Stockholm where it is now holding public hearings.

[Washington's satisfaction with General de Gaulle's small present is well indicated by the comments made in Congress by Representative Paul Findley (a Republican of Illinois). He inserted the text of de Gaulle's letter in the Congressional Record (April 27) and voiced his approval of de Gaulle's action in the following terms:

["Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that France is our oldest ally, there continues to be those in this country -- some of them in positions of great influ-

ence -- who believe President de Gaulle is hostile to the United States and seeks ways to frustrate or embarrass our policies. In my judgment, these opinions are unjustified. This position was substantiated by President de Gaulle's letter to Jean-Paul Sartre, dated April 13, concerning the 'Tribunal' proposed by Lord Russell.

["Lord Russell and Mr. Sartre had requested President de Gaulle to permit the 'tribunal' to meet in Paris. This gathering was for the purpose of putting President Johnson on 'trial' for his 'crimes in Vietnam.' Since France is not only a member of NATO but SEATO as well, Sartre believed he would score a propaganda coup if President de Gaulle would permit this event to occur on French soil. President de Gaulle's letter must have been a bitter disappointment to Sartre, because he refused permission for the undertaking in France."

[In accordance with democratic practices -- as observed by the Findleys -- Sartre's response to de Gaulle was not placed in the Congressional Record.

[Similarly, Findley left out the salutation and polite ending of de Gaulle's letter. Thus, in the Congressional Record, de Gaulle sounds almost as discourteous and brutal as the "ugly American" of worldwide notoriety.

[Below, we have reproduced the translation of de Gaulle's letter to Jean-Paul Sartre as it appeared in the Congressional Record, except that we have included the items Findley found offensively polite, as judged by the standards of an American congressman.]

* * *

Mon cher Maître,

In your letter of April 13, you asked me to examine the case of Mr. Vladimir Dedijer and, more generally, that of the persons called on to take part, in one or other capacity, in the work of the Russell Tribunal.

The sponsors of this tribunal propose to criticize the United State's Vietnam policy. There is nothing in this to cause the Government to restrict their normal freedom of assembly and of expression. Besides, you know what the Government thinks of the Vietnam war and what I myself have said about it publicly and unequivocally. Regardless of the fact that, in our country, freedom of the pen and of expression exist, it would, therefore, not be a question of restricting private individuals whose theses on this subject are,

moreover, close to the French Republic's official position.

In any case, it is a question neither of the right to assemble nor of the freedom of expression but of the duty -- all the more binding on France since she has taken the stand she has on the substance of the matter -- to make sure that a State with which she has relations and which, despite all their differences, remains her traditional friend, be not the subject on her territory of proceedings that greatly oversteps international law and customs.

Now, this would seem to be the case of the action being undertaken by Lord Russell and his friends, since they intend to give a legal appearance to their investigations and the semblance of a verdict to their conclusions. You are well aware that all justice, in its principle as in its execution, belongs to the State alone. Without questioning the motives that inspire Lord Russell and his

friends, I must note that they are invested with no power nor do they have any international mandate and that, therefore, they could not carry out any act of justice.

That is why the Government is bound to oppose the holding on our territory of a meeting which, by the form it would take, would be contrary to that very thing for which the Government is bound to enforce respect.

I will add that, to the extent that some of the people gathered around Lord Russell may have moral credit, lacking a public jurisdiction it does not seem to me that they give more weight to their warnings by wearing robes borrowed for the occasion.

Veillez agréer, mon cher Maître, l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

C. de Gaulle

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE'S ANSWER TO DE GAULLE

[Jean-Paul Sartre's answer to de Gaulle was made publicly in the columns of the Paris weekly Le Nouvel Observateur (April 26). The world press scarcely noted it, although they gave big publicity to de Gaulle's letter to the French philosopher and playwright barring the International War Crimes Tribunal from meeting in France. The attitude of the bourgeois press, naturally, reflects the pressure emanating from the State Department.

[Below, World Outlook offers a translation of the full text of the interview in which Sartre defends the work of the tribunal which he heads as executive chairman.]

* * *

I wrote de Gaulle, as a matter of fact, concerning the Yugoslav historian Vladimir Dedijer. The reason was this -- he is one of the members of the "tribunal" which Lord Bertrand Russell took the initiative to found and he was chosen as chairman of its sessions. I am "executive" chairman myself; but when we meet it will be Dedijer who will direct the working sessions and the rest of us will only be members of the jury.

Vladimir Dedijer visited London several times in recent months to meet with Bertrand Russell and other members of the tribunal. On each occasion he has been able to stop in Paris for 24 hours on a French transit visa. On his last trip, about ten days ago, he asked the

French embassy in London for a visitor's visa instead of a transit visa so he could attend the tribunal's first meeting which had been scheduled for April 26 in Paris. Not only was he turned down on this but his transit visa was withdrawn. In other words, he had become an "undesirable" in France.

This was a serious matter because the tribunal could not meet without its presiding chairman and because this decision ran counter to the indirect assurances we had been given. We had sounded out persons close to the government on four occasions and each time we were led to believe that we could meet in France without difficulty. Confirmation of this official authorization was even given one member of the tribunal two days before the cancellation of Dedijer's visa.

The tribunal then asked me to write a letter to de Gaulle -- in its name, of course, and not in my own. I did this. I said in effect: "Up to now nothing has indicated that the government is opposed to the tribunal's meeting in France, but the incident which has just occurred in London seems to demonstrate that the authorities have changed their mind; I cannot imagine our being informed of this through the actions of the consular service and I presume to hope that visas will be granted not only to Dedijer but to all those who will be called upon to sit on the tribunal or to testify before it." I emphasized the fact, moreover, that Dedijer had never meddled in French affairs either here or from abroad.

Twenty-four hours later, I received the letter which you have read. De Gaulle calls me "mon cher maître."* This is to make it clear, I suppose, that it is the writer he is addressing and not the chairman of a tribunal which he does not want to recognize. I am only "maître" for the cafe waiters who know that I am a writer -- in reality de Gaulle is replying to the representative of the tribunal.

His letter, moreover, had so little of the "private" about it that two days later it was followed by a second letter from the prefect of police which began by repeating de Gaulle's very words: "As you know, the government has concluded that it would greatly overstep international law and customs for an organization called 'the International Tribunal Against War Crimes in Vietnam' to meet in France..." And the prefect of police informed me that the meetings we had scheduled were banned. I therefore consider that de Gaulle's letter -- which moreover was later published by courtesy of the government -- is an open letter to which I must reply openly.

It is constructed, as his speeches often are, in two parts: de Gaulle begins by saying "of course, naturally," to conclude thereafter with "obviously not."

The "of course, naturally," is the paragraph on the fact that "in our country, freedom of the pen and of expression exist" and that "it would...not be a question of restricting private citizens whose theses on this subject are, moreover, close to the French Republic's official position." This protestation of liberalism impresses me all the less since recent incidents demonstrate that, to the contrary, the government intends to ban all free and popular demonstration against the war in Vietnam.

For example, the National Vietnam Committee, which has no connection with the tribunal, rented the hall at the Issy-les-Moulineaux municipal theater to hold some meetings. However, it received a letter from the Hauts-de-Seine prefect that stated: "We are forced to prohibit these meetings because it would be neither customary nor lawful for a meeting of a political type to be held in a municipal theater." This is particularly comic because numerous political meetings have already taken place in this theater and in many others. The National Vietnam Committee was finally able to hold its meetings in Paris itself, in the Pleyel Hall, but the decision of the Hauts-de-Seine prefect along with the banning of

the "Russell tribunal" indicates the intention to impede the development of mass movements against the war in Vietnam as much as possible.

Two reasons, in my opinion, explain this very marked change in the government's attitude. The first is that the American pressure is continually mounting. To mention only the tribunal, it is very likely that Vice-president Humphrey stressed the importance the Americans attached to preventing us from meeting in France when he met with de Gaulle two weeks ago. And the United States holds many means of blackmail, despite de Gaulle's policy of "independence." The French economy's dependence on the American economy is not decreasing, as they would have us believe; it is increasing. It would be sufficient for the Americans to stop lending France their big computers to disorganize our entire economy; and they could do it in a score of other ways.

Today, the government is still more vulnerable to American pressures -- and this is the second reason for its about-face -- because its failure in the recent elections, far from forcing it to "turn to the left," as some naive persons believed, compelled it to seek new support from the right, from the "Atlantistes" [pro-American partisans of the North Atlantic Alliance]. The banning of the tribunal is a favor to Lecanuet and Giscard, whom de Gaulle will need more and more.

Le Nouvel Observateur: De Gaulle's main argument is that of a statesman. Opposing the war in Vietnam is the government's affair -- and it is taking charge of it. Don't interfere in its business, it doesn't need you. But the government has responsibilities with respect to its allies nonetheless and it cannot permit anyone to pass judgment on one of them on its own territory in a parody of justice.

Jean-Paul Sartre: I will answer those two points: the "don't interfere," and the "parody of justice."

The first is the most important. It expresses de Gaulle's concept of political authority. In his view, the government must not rely on the support of the country, but stand above it without ever bringing it directly into the actions it undertakes. But a country is not just its government. This attitude which consists in censuring the policy of the United States in measured words and terms while forbidding the masses to directly demonstrate their opposition to the war in Vietnam is completely antidemocratic.

The same thing happened with the OAS.*

*Maître is a title, analogous to maestro in this sense, which is given to respected artists, writers, etc. -- Translator.

*Organisation de l'Armée Secrète -- Secret

The government fought the OAS single-handedly with its "special agents," but at the same time used clubs on those who yelled "OAS murderers!" It was even responsible for killing eight of them at the Charonne metro. All of Gaullism is expressed in this -- the leader has his ideas on Vietnam, he voices them in his speeches as the opportunity arises -- all the while adding that he can do nothing effective for the present -- but, above all, he does not want his view to take hold among the people, to receive their support; because that would bind him to them and that, basically, is what he dreads the most.

Now for the formal argument on which de Gaulle bases the second part of his reply, that we are setting ourselves up as a tribunal "in violation of the law." Here we come up against the Gaullist concept of justice. Justice, he writes in his letter, can only belong to "the state." In the beginning the state exists, which then creates institutions for itself and chooses the men to run them. Judges thus become representatives of the government, and the state can, as we have seen in the Ben Barka affair and in many others, exert direct pressure on them. This leads to complete subordination of the courts to the state.

Real justice must draw its force both from the state and the masses. This was the way it was conceived at the time of the French Revolution; the jury system was created to give citizens a part in the legal system.

But this isn't even the question; because we do not claim, although de Gaulle affects to believe it, to substitute ourselves for any existing courts. This would be the case if we met to try a private citizen who was guilty in our eyes of an ordinary crime when, in fact, there are courts to try him.

What we propose is something different. In the first place, we will not put on judicial trappings, even symbolic ones -- jurors, as de Gaulle should know -- do not do that. We will simply hold the sessions of a trial which should properly come before an international tribunal which does not exist. Up to now, the Western nations have done everything they could to prevent the creation of such a tribunal and today they deny our body the right to hear evidence -- without judges, without a verdict -- in the Vietnam war

Army Organization, the terrorist network set up by the French colonialists in Algeria which staged many bombings and other savage acts against those who favored withdrawing French troops from Algeria or even negotiating with the Algerian freedom fighters. -- Translator.

trial.

Why? Because these nations want to prevent their policies, at all cost, from being seen from the standpoint of law and criminality, which would permit the people to judge the acts of their governments according to criteria other than skill or ineptness, effectiveness or ineffectiveness. There was Nuremburg, of course, but after having applied the victors' law to the vanquished -- a just law for once -- they hastened to dissolve the tribunal for fear of finding themselves in the dock one day. During the Algerian war, for example, such a tribunal would have had its work cut out for it.

Why have we appointed ourselves? Precisely because no one has done it. Only governments or peoples could do that. But the governments want to continue to be able to commit war crimes without running the risk of being brought to the bar -- and they are not going to create an international body empowered to do that. As for the peoples, except in cases of revolutions, they appoint no tribunals; therefore, they could not appoint us.

Moreover, the tribunal has never considered passing judgment and it will not do so. It will limit itself to presenting the conclusions that it will draw from the testimony of witnesses and the reports of commissions of experts, some of whom have already been to north Vietnam. These conclusions will establish whether this or that action conducted by the American army constitutes a war crime according to existing international law and if it does will specify the penalties for the same sort of crime imposed at Nuremburg. The tribunal, moreover, will not judge solely in accordance with the laws applied at Nuremburg, which are insufficient. It will likewise refer to the Kellogg-Briand Pact and to the Geneva Convention, which the Americans are failing to respect in Vietnam. Even then, the scope of the law will remain insufficient. What is really necessary is for the jurists to meet and set up an international code -- embryonic for the time being -- without any intention of applying it to any particular war, and that a permanent international court be charged with applying this law on all occasions. The conclusions we reach will be of no interest if they remain the conclusions of a few persons. They will have to be endorsed by the masses and we will merely inform them with the maximum honesty.

Take the example of the "guava" bomb, the small bomb filled with pellets which cannot destroy any military or industrial installations or any structures being solely "antipersonnel" weapons. A commission from the tribunal went to conduct an on-the-spot investigation to ascertain what use the Americans are

making of such weapons. The press has already discussed this but in a vague way. The tribunal will not reveal anything to the public of which it is not already aware, but it will present a detailed and precise report which will further strengthen public opinion.

Our intention, therefore, is to inform public opinion at the same time we inform ourselves, with the hope that people will share our feelings regarding the use of napalm and fragmentation bombs and that they will draw the same conclusions as we.

Therefore, the reports of our commissions must be widely disseminated in order to have an impact on the masses, and the press can play a great role here. I know that some newspapers, including Le Nouvel Observateur will be on our side. But I also know that most of the others will only devote a few lines to the matter and then quickly let it drop. Thus we will have to carry out the publicity campaign ourselves. When we have collected all the testimony and the reports of the experts and drawn our own conclusions, we will publish a White Paper and, simultaneously, we will attempt, with all the means at our disposal, to promote demonstrations and trade-union and student mobilizations, and we will launch a petition campaign in the hope that our conclusions will gain endorsement. We will follow up our commitment to the limit and it is then that the tribunal's actions will acquire their real meaning.

But, once again, we are not substituting ourselves for any existing court, and we do not even claim to be the international tribunal which ought to exist. We are "private individuals," as de Gaulle says, who have taken a step on our own to remind the governments that the masses are the source of all justice, and who in informing ourselves inform others. Moreover, if de Gaulle forbids us to address ourselves to the masses, while maintaining that his position on Vietnam is "close" to ours, the real reason for this is that the source of his power does not reside in the people, because he does not draw his authority from the masses, as the last election -- in which he was in a minority -- proved.

De Gaulle affects to believe that we can do nothing more than bear witness with a certain weight because of our "moral credit." This is a joke. We cannot be satisfied, as he is, with a proclamation recommending withdrawal of American troops and the organization of talks among the Vietnamese. We must bring pressure to bear to have it declared straight out that there is only one party against whom aggression has been committed in this war and that is Ho Chi Minh.

N.O. What effective policy could a government not limiting itself to words, and which really wanted to act, conduct against the Vietnam war?

J-P.S. First of all, it would have to align itself resolutely with Ho Chi Minh and the FNL [Front National de Libération], and endorse those stipulations which they consider to be preconditions for any negotiations and which amount to nothing more than a summary of the Geneva accords.

Next, this government would have to convince the governments of other countries to adopt the same position and join with it in common action. Given what England, Germany, and Italy are today, I know that this would be difficult; but do not forget that a government is only strong when it has the support of the masses. If a left French government with the support of the masses took a forthright position in opposition to the American action in Vietnam, there is no doubt that the masses of the neighboring countries would be "infected" and would deal with their governments in the most effective way. At present, since there is no real democracy in Europe, one must deal government by government. In a genuinely democratic system, the masses would mediate between one government and another.

N.O. But do you think that the European masses today, and in particular the French masses, can be mobilized against the Vietnam War?

J-P.S. Much more than I imagined. It strikes me that the public temper has changed. Let us recognize the reality: this change is due in part to de Gaulle. But the people thought he would carry his condemnation all the way; and they took him seriously; although he was only trying to pose as the champion of the "third world." In my opinion, if a left government wanted to mobilize the masses today, it would succeed. Look at Great Britain -- even with Wilson, large demonstrations have taken place. Look at Japan, in spite of the American influence, a general strike was launched -- it was not a hundred percent success, but it took place nonetheless. We have not yet reached that point today in France but the people are beginning to move.

I would like to stress a point -- in banning our meeting, de Gaulle invoked, among other things, "the traditional friendship" binding us to the United States. This clearly shows, as I just told you, that as soon as a moral judgment is involved, the governments don't function. There is a general effort to eliminate the concept of morality from political life.

This strikes me all the more because in all the socialist countries I have visited since the beginning of the de-Stalin-

ization, the first problem that arose was how to reintroduce the element of morality into Marxism (and therefore into political life). It is quite evident that in the West there is no concern anywhere for this problem: there is nothing in political life here but pure utilitarianism and self-interest.

N.O. Is another country ready to receive you?

J-P.S. No. Several countries have already forbidden us to meet on their territory and I am afraid that we will meet with other refusals -- some governments will be only too happy to cite General de Gaulle's refusal to justify their own. Perhaps, we will finally even be forced to meet on a boat anchored outside

territorial waters, like the English pirate radio stations. In any case, without fail, we will meet.

Paradoxically, these obstacles put in our way, establish the legitimacy of our tribunal and, in addition, they prove one thing, they are afraid of us. Certainly not of Bertrand Russell, who is 94 years old, nor me at 62, nor our friends. If we were merely a dozen intellectual simpletons ridiculously presuming to set ourselves up as judges, they would let us go about our business in peace.

Why are they afraid of us? Because we are posing a problem that no Western government wants to see posed: the problem of war crimes, which I repeat, they all want to continue to be able to commit.

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S OPENING STATEMENT AT WAR CRIMES HEARING

[Continued from page 482.]

evidence we marshal will be undeniable. Let us rest confident in this mission. Let us repudiate the demand that we feign ignorance of the Lidices and Guernicas occurring daily in Vietnam.

Our enquiry is inspired by deep conviction. That is its strength. When brutal crimes are committed, conviction is a test of respect for facts and the courage to display that respect.

It is good that Sweden has received us. To our supporters we owe much gratitude. They deserve the credit for ensuring that the democratic achievements of Sweden are not submerged. This too is part of the struggle of our time. Weak men protect cruel men. Good men are the victims of both. When the Dewey Commission met in the United States no one used the absurd sanctity of a head of state to equate a brave historic enquiry by renowned men with insult. Politesse is not at issue. The right to criticise men of power should be inviolate even if governments are more culpable than any individual spokesmen for them. It is our historic duty to transform cruelty and cowardice by upholding values on which civilization has always depended.

We do not supplicate for the right to investigate the crimes of war committed by Western governments in Vietnam: we demand it. We do not hesitate about the connection between our knowledge of crimes and the necessity to test this knowledge in public enquiry: we proclaim it. Moral purpose cannot be separated from the concern for truth. The burning children of Vietnam are martyred by the

Western world. Their suffering, like that of the gassed Jews of Auschwitz, is a basic feature of the civilisation which we have built. There is, however, another part of our culture which has also been built and which has produced our own martyrs over the centuries. This Tribunal is in the tradition of that struggle and of that achievement: our art, our science, our music, our humanity.

It is our culture which is at stake. It is our barbarism which menaces it. It is not possible to organise society for plunder and mass murder without terrifying consequences. Our scientists and engineers, our chemists and researchers, our technology and economic system have been mobilised for murder.

In Vietnam we have done what Hitler did in Europe. We shall suffer the degradation of Nazi Germany unless we act. "Untermensch" is a word which lives again in the vocabulary of powerful men in Washington who speak of "yellow dwarfs" and "coonskins."

The pity is not in the suffering of Vietnam. Her people resist and are heroic. The pity is in the smug streets of Europe and the complacent cities of North America so debased as to be indifferent even as our own fate is enacted in Vietnam.

The International War Crimes Tribunal is a revolutionary tribunal. We have no armies and no gallows. We lack power, even the power of mass communication. It is overdue that those without power sit in judgement over those who have it. This test we must meet, alone if need be. We are responsible before history.

PICKETS IN NEW YORK DENOUNCE MILITARY COUP IN GREECE

On May 1 a picket line chanted slogans in front of the Greek consulate in New York denouncing the military coup d'état in Greece.

An unusual number of police formed in front of the consulate as well as in the entire area; but no incidents occurred and the pickets ended their demonstration on schedule to join the May Day gathering in Union Square.

One of the most interesting features of the action was its united front character. It was sponsored by a variety of groups, including the Socialist Workers party, the Communist party of the USA, the Young Socialist Alliance, the DuBois Clubs of America, Youth Against War and Fascism and the Movement for Puerto Rican Independence [MPI].

A joint delegation filed a statement with the consulate protesting the generals' seizure of power and their authoritarian decrees.

The statement pointed to the responsibility of "the U.S. State Depart-

ment, the Pentagon and the CIA" in the reactionary coup.

"Since 1947 when the U.S. intervened in the Greek civil war with money, arms and military 'advisors,'" said the statement, "Washington has backed the monarchists and militarists in Greece. Both Washington and the Greek elite fear the powerful upsurge of the Greek people aimed at ending monarchy and establishing a fully democratic regime.

"While Washington hypocritically claims to fight for 'freedom' in Vietnam," continued the statement, "it smiles benevolently at the erection of one more military government in the world."

The statement called for protests throughout the world. "The possibility of a horrible blood bath like the one that followed the military takeover in Indonesia must be prevented. Demand an end to military dictatorship, freedom for all political prisoners, hands off political parties, and students' and workers' organizations. Let the Greek people rule themselves."

GREEK WORKERS IN GERMANY DEMONSTRATE AGAINST ATHENS COUP

Frankfurt

Tens of thousands of Greek workers and students in West Germany participated in mass demonstrations against the military dictatorship set up in Greece.

May Day was a real day of international solidarity in Germany as Spanish workers, protesting against the Franco regime in their own country, marched side by side with their Greek comrades.

The demonstrations were impressive since there are more than 1,000,000 workers from abroad -- from Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey and many other countries -- who were the real source of the post-war German "economic miracle."

Many of them belong to the German trade unions, thus the labor bureaucrats were somewhat taken aback at the way the "foreign workers" stamped their mood on the marches in face of the usual efforts of the union leaders to turn May Day into a popular holiday given over to dancing and singing in folklore style.

The Greek workers concentrated on democratic slogans such as "Freedom and Democracy"; "Military Dictatorship -- Modern Slavery"; "Motherland of Democracy -- Under Military Dictatorship?" "Freedom for the Political Prisoners."

They also chanted for the release of Papandreou, the parliamentary leader whose temporizing policy with regard to the monarchy and the reactionary officer clique helped pave the way for the coup.

The Spanish workers tended to link up their democratic slogans with anticapitalist slogans. One of the main ones was "Long Live the Proletariat -- Down with Capitalism."

They also linked the events in Spain and Greece with what is happening in Vietnam and demanded that the "Yankees Get Out of Spain." They denounced the U.S. role in Vietnam.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, whose headquarters is in Brussels, condemned the military dictatorship in Greece and called for the restoration of democracy.

The official union paper Welt der Arbeit [Labor World] defended the cause of Greek democracy and the Metal Workers Union paper Metall, which has the largest circulation of any labor paper in the world [2,000,000] carried the Greek events on the front page with a photograph of Greek demonstrators making the appeal: "German People, Martyrs of Fascism, Be with Us!"

THE DOMINICAN LEFT DISCUSS PROBLEMS OF THEIR REVOLUTION

By Antonio Valdés

As repressions continue in the Dominican Republic so do the ideological discussions on the left in an effort to evaluate the experience of the Dominican revolution and find a new path forward.

While ultraleft Maoism is strong, reflected especially in its influence in the Revolutionary Movement of the 14th of June [1-J-4], there is also increased interest in Trotskyism. The widely read magazine *Ahora*, for example, found it expedient to print an article by the anti-Marxist Social Democrat Victor Alba which under guise of a historical review, twists and distorts the record of Trotsky and Trotskyism. Even in the pro-Moscow current, in the Dominican Communist party [PCD -- Partido Comunista Dominicana], there has been a symptomatic leftward shift of position.

The shift in the PCD is worth looking at because some of the recent PCD statements raise questions of importance, although their answers are inadequate.

Last October the party issued a manifesto stating their position on the Dominican political crisis. In it they declared that the present struggle of the Dominican people is geared toward the "restoration of the constitutionalist government of the April Revolution headed by Colonel Caamaño, based on the 1963 constitution, the democratic program of our people which constitutes their immediate task."

Such a government, said the manifesto, would unify "all the democratic and political sectors and all the classes interested in the defense of the national interest and the establishment of a revolutionary democracy." According to the PCD, such "unity" is the required premise for achieving "the ultimate socialist objectives," at which it is impossible to arrive without going through certain "transitional stages of struggle."

In January of this year, the PCD repeated the same position in a new manifesto. Among other things, they declared: "For the proletariat and its political party, the replacement of the Balaguer government by a nationalist and revolutionary government, such as that headed by Caamaño in April 1965, constitutes a tactical objective closely related to the strategic objectives (socialist) of the Dominican revolution. Such a change corresponds to the necessary carrying out of the democratic and anti-imperialist tasks, which because of the characteris-

tics of our historical development, precede the achievement of the supreme objectives of the proletariat: socialism and communism."

What is this but a subtle restatement of the two-stage theory of Menshevism, refuted not only in theory but by history in the Bolshevik revolution fifty years ago?

The January statement of the PCD was subjected to serious criticism in the Dominican left. For example, the 1-J-4 pointed out that the true tactical objective of the Dominican revolution is to "struggle for a revolutionary government led politically by the working class."

But rather than a separate stage, said the 1-J-4, the "achievement of this objective is closely linked with the socialist revolution, for a government of that type, achieved through an armed struggle that would defeat the oligarchy and the Yankees, would be nothing less than a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The 1-J-4 criticized the PCD for implying that the achievement of this objective would be easy. The 1-J-4 held that, on the contrary, it would require "a long process of armed struggle which would organize the forces and establish a United Front led politically by the working class and its party, which would take power by violently overthrowing the Yankee-led oligarchic power."

In response to this and similar criticism, the PCD in mid-March published a statement of clarification of its views. Most significantly, the party for the first time accepted, at least verbally, the notion of armed struggle.

"It is time to speak of a true revolution, to admit the new and superior forms of struggle, armed struggle, as inevitable." The statement went on to say that "the revolution has not failed; on the contrary, the central task of the proletariat is to carry through the anti-imperialist revolution."

But here, the previous line was restated. "The struggle for a revolutionary government like that of April" is a tactical phase of the anti-imperialist revolution.

Among the tactics which the PCD says are necessary are (1) the need to incorporate the liberal sectors of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie into the revolution; and (2) the need for

a national liberation government unifying all classes opposed to imperialism, which would "inevitably" lead to socialism.

Class collaboration and compromise it can be seen, are still at the heart of their program. This can be seen more clearly in their discussion of the role of "commando" groups in the April revolution.

The PCD's main assurance that a "national unity" government like that of Caamaño would lead to socialism is based on their analysis of the role of the commando groups, the fighting squads, of the constitutionalist uprising of April. Their stress on these armed groups also makes them sound militant and in favor of armed struggle.

They say that the establishment of workers and peasants "commandos" must be the "fundamental base" of a national liberation government, and they explain that the establishment of such organs would give the proletariat political hegemony in a national liberation government.

Looking back at the commandos of the April revolution, they claim that "in general they were not controlled by the bourgeoisie, and the changes in them were progressively in favor of the political position of the proletariat." This, claims the PCD, "limited the power of the bourgeoisie" and gave the Caamaño government its character as a "national liberation" government. The proletariat in arms would have been decisive, they say, in ultimately transforming the Caamaño regime into a dictatorship of the proletariat "once the democratic and anti-imperialist tasks had been realized and once the bourgeoisie had been defeated."

This sounds like an echo of "Defeat Franco first, then the revolution."

The role of the commando groups in the April revolution is indeed important; such formations could be decisive in any new advance of the Dominican revolution. But the PCD assertion that the commandos were not controlled by the bourgeoisie and increasingly favored the political positions of the proletariat completely overlooks the political role of Caamaño as the virtually unchallenged head of the revolutionary forces. Was there any clear-cut alternative put forward politically by the commandos to oppose Caamaño's; i.e., Bosch's and the PRD's policy of compromise with imperialism?

It is true that the armed masses wanted to continue struggling to the end, that they wanted to defeat imperialism. But they had no organized leadership that could counter that of Caamaño. There was a failure of revolutionary leadership. The commandos were indeed a strong social force in the revolution, but a strong

back without a will has been put to many an alien use in the long history of class warfare.

The power of the commandos was limited and disoriented by the lack of a political program and a political leadership voicing proletarian demands and needs. Allowing for the weaknesses of historical analogy, one might say that the incipient Soviets were there but the Bolshevik party was missing.

Likewise in Germany and Austria in 1918, the armed groups of the proletariat predominated socially, but Social Democracy with its strategy of sellout retained the helm politically.

Thus the determining factor in a future uprising will not be the establishment of commandos alone. The decisive question will be: Who will lead the commandos, the revolutionary Marxists or the liberal bourgeoisie?

The PCD is correct to call for organization of workers and peasants commandos. But with its call for unity of classes in a national liberation government it is denying the political hegemony to the proletariat in advance. The call for unity of classes whose fundamental social interests are diametrically opposed is sheer utopia. The lessons of modern times, from the massacre of workers in China in 1927 to the blood bath in Indonesia today, should have shown once and for all what disaster the "alliance" with the liberal bourgeoisie brings to the proletariat.

In short, the PCD still adheres to the classic Stalinist "mistake": an alliance with the liberal sectors of the class enemy to confront imperialism.

As Che Guevara says, in his message made public April 17, 1967:

"The indigenous bourgeoisies have lost all capacity to oppose imperialism, if they ever had any -- and constitute only a last trump. No other alternative exists -- it's either a socialist revolution or a caricature of a revolution."

The PCD reassures us, "The participation of the liberal bourgeoisie in the patriotic struggle is not under any circumstances decisive. Constantly it will swim in two waters... But it maintains democratic and nationalist positions which permit in certain circumstances concrete alliances."

Well, then, if they aren't decisive, and they're not always in our water, let us not change our program to accommodate them. Struggle for a workers and peasants government and a socialist revolution -- let them come swim in that water if they are willing.

JOHNSON'S "PACIFICATION" PROGRAM -- TO WIN BACK...OR MERELY TO KILL?

By Dick Roberts

The Guam "Summit" last March between Lyndon Johnson and his top allies in Saigon was no exception to a rule-of-thumb about the Vietnam war. This is that all high-level meetings announce big new strides which are about to be taken in the "pacification arena."

Thus New York Times Washington correspondent Max Frankel offered this analysis of Johnson's objectives in Guam:

"His main purpose...was to emphasize through his own comments and questions his overriding desire to win back, rather than merely to kill, Vietcong guerrillas;

"To seek genuinely free local and national elections in Vietnam in the months ahead; to preserve the national unity of south Vietnamese politicians and generals through the delicate election period;

"To obtain the highest priority for all projects that contribute to the pacification of the countryside."

More of the same? At first look that appears to be the case. Pacification has been a major theme of Washington propaganda from the beginning, going all the way back to the "advisers" and "strategic hamlets" of the Diem period.

But there is increasing evidence that a change is underway: not qualitatively, perhaps. But certainly quantitatively. A close reading of Frankel's analysis gives warnings. The main reason for the reshuffling of top U.S. command in Vietnam was to strengthen the pacification effort:

"The new men have been ordered to force the pace of the pacification program..."

"Much time at the Guam conference...was devoted by the President to discussions of how military resources could be provided for the pacification program in much larger degree without hindering major battlefield operations.

"Military men, machines and supplies are deemed to be the only resources present in the war zones in large enough quantities to make pacification a success."

Military men, machines and supplies do not come under categories often associated with "pacification" -- at least in the popular mind. In actual fact, they are the key to pacification

and this sentence in Frankel's article is the key to understanding the changes which are being undertaken.

The reality of pacification is that it amounts to military occupation of the areas which have been previously subjected to "search and destroy" campaigns. The latter are supposed to "flush out" the guerrillas.

A massive troop offensive is launched, supported by heavy artillery and saturation bombing. Villages are seized and burnt to the ground. Populations are removed to "refugee" concentration camps.

But what happens after the "search and destroy" campaign leaves the decimated area? The one thing it has failed to do is make contact with the guerrilla armies.

Bernard Fall turned his attention to this question in perhaps the last remarks he made before his death on a Vietnam battlefield in February. He was interviewed by a reporter named Bronson P. Clark.

Clark relates that, "'The one overwhelming fact about this situation,' Fall told me, 'which makes all considerations of ideology or politics pale, is the enormous might of American fire-power.'

"Operation Cedar Falls in the Iron Triangle [a big "search and destroy" campaign -- D.R.] was fresh on his mind:

"'It looked like giant steel claws had raked the jungle.' He spoke of the ground effect of fourteen consecutive B-52 raids which the triangle had received during the operation.

"'But remember, when it was all over the Vietcong struck again and from the Iron Triangle. That is the real story of this war. The Americans can destroy but they cannot pacify. They may 'win' the war but it will be the victory of the graveyard.'"

Fall's perturbations about the Pentagon's strategy have evidently been shared by the Pentagon itself. The big question is how to make pacification work and that means, how to prevent the guerrillas from coming back.

For months prior to the Guam meeting, U.S. generals have been putting heavy pressure on Washington for reinforcements in the pacification effort. And the essence of the change, apparently sealed at Guam, was to shift the bulk of the Saigon armies into the pacification arena.



"Search and destroy" will be reserved for the U.S. troops; military occupation for the Saigon forces.

This development was confirmed in detail by John Mecklin, a former Time-Life correspondent, writing in Fortune magazine in April. In an article entitled "The Struggle to Rescue the People," Mecklin states:

"In response to an American suggestion, the Ky government has agreed to assign at least half of the 321,000 men of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN, pronounced to rhyme with Marvin) to the job of pacification.

"These first-line troops will undertake the critical task, previously left to regional forces, of providing millions of peasants with true protection against Communist guerrilla bands."

Mecklin, like Fall, is unequivocal about the importance of pacification. The reality of the U.S. strategy is that pacification is not an incidental, nor secondary part of the invasion. It is the central aspect:

"Success in pacification," says Mecklin, "represents the only visible way for the U.S. to escape from Vietnam, except in defeat.

"For as long as the Vietcong remain in control of the countryside, withdrawal of U.S. forces would simply remove the last obstacle to Communist strangulation of the rest of the country.

"Nor would recourse to escalated bombing of the north offer an alternative solution; aside from other possible effects, it would be irrelevant to the control the Communists exercise in the south."

This kind of talk is pretty strong for a country that has been fed lies about the real nature of the pacification program since its inception. One must remember, however, that Fortune is directed almost exclusively to the corporation executive.

Mecklin bolsters his argument with a detailed history and analysis of the pacification strategy. From 1954 to 1956, he believes, pacification was on a good footing under the direction of CIA-man Edward G. Lansdale, "using techniques tried successfully against the Huks in the Philippines..."

"Then the policy changed. The U.S. deduced in 1956 that the main threat to the south was an overt invasion by conventional armies...American military advisers converted ARVN into a clanking, clumsy giant with tanks, heavy artillery, and thousands of trucks and jeeps. Pacification was turned over to woefully ineffective civilian workers, and control of the countryside was ceded to the Vietcong by default."

Mecklin then describes what is well known the world over: the disastrous defeats of the puppet army. "Today its ten divisions are little more than garrison keepers -- with a staggering 124,000 desertions in 1966."

As to the pacification scheme at this time, the roles were the reverse of the present. ARVN units fought the main battles. U.S. "advisors" were assigned to pacification:

"The U.S. Mission contributed tens of millions of dollars worth of equipment -- cement, radios, weapons, fertilizer, even ducklings and piglets. The number of hamlets labeled 'secure' became dazzling.

"Even so, it was all a crushing failure. After Diem's fall, the U.S. Mission discovered that thousands of supposedly 'secure' hamlets were really controlled secretly by the Vietcong, who often used them for supply and rest havens."

Mecklin then comes to the major point: "Diem had failed to provide the security he had promised, not so much because ARVN neglected its duty, but because totally inadequate provision was made for defense on the scale required by such an immense program...The major lesson: pacification can be made to work only if the people can be provided with believable assurances that the Vietcong will, in fact, be kept out of their communities forever." (Emphasis added.)

If Mecklin is confident about the lessons of past mistakes, it is worth noting that he is not so confident that the situation can be changed.

Above all, he distrusts the ability of the Saigon regime to carry its new assignment out.

"Ky himself has moderated his playboy activity, but it is common knowledge in Saigon that he has kept a table permanently reserved at Maxim's, an elegant Saigon nightclub owned by ARVN generals, where a single drink costs more (\$3) than a peasant earns in a week."

There is "a rapacious cynicism in Saigon -- a city filled with draft dodgers, some paying as much as 150,000 piasters (\$1,271) to ARVN officers to avoid duty, and a place where peasants bringing rice to market often must pay three or four bribes at police check points set up to spot VC movements along the approaches

to town."

"The shift is one of the most important undertakings ever attempted in Vietnam," Mecklin states, "...except that few Americans in Vietnam think it will work very well."

"There is no hope at all that everything will work out in practice in Vietnam the way it sounds on paper," Mecklin concludes his article. "But there is hope that enough may be achieved in the next few years -- say 10 or 15 percent of the objectives -- to get things moving at last."

If 10 or 15 percent of the pacification objectives will take the next few years -- the war could last the next 10 or 15 years.

The truth about pacification, even in its "new form," however, is that it never ends. Military occupation must last as long as the population is in revolt; it is necessary to add, the population is in revolt as long as it is militarily occupied.

One does not need a crystal ball to predict when this new imperialist plan will be junked for another one. It is the height of arrogance for Washington to hope that occupation can be carried out in the long run by the south Vietnamese armies.

These young men are already showing by their fantastic desertion rate exactly what they think of the Pentagon blueprints. It will not be any different when they are occupying; one can hardly think of a more thankless task.

They are pitted against the just forces of revolution; they are asked to occupy their own homes while a foreign aggressor crushes their brothers in the battlefield.

This plan will go by the boards too; and there is only one other plan that can eventually replace it. That is total U.S. occupation, and that is the inherent logic of the Vietnam war as it develops.

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITY DISPLEASES KY

Vu Tat Thang, a South Vietnamese youth who has been studying at the Tokyo University since April 1961 under a Japanese government scholarship, has been ordered by the Ky dictatorship to return to Saigon.

No reason was given by Ky's embassy in Tokyo for this arbitrary action

against the economics student. The only reason Vu Tat Thang can think of is that in February 1965 he took part in a demonstration in Tokyo against the U.S. bombing of the northern part of his country.

Tokyo University Students have lodged a protest with the diplomatic representatives of the Saigon regime.

DEUTSCHER'S "IRONIES OF HISTORY"

By Pierre Frank

IRONIES OF HISTORY, Essays on Contemporary Communism, by Isaac Deutscher. Oxford University Press, London. 1966. 278 pp. \$5.75.

The book which was recently published under this title is a collection of studies written by Isaac Deutscher between 1953 and 1965. Those who have already read these articles will find nothing new in the book. Nonetheless a collection of items composed as the events occurred facilitates a study in retrospect that is not without interest. It is well known how bewildering the phenomenon of Stalinism was during its rise, not only for those lacking social criteria by which to judge it but also for those who could find an orientation through the criteria advanced by Trotsky on the bureaucracy and the isolated workers state that suffered bureaucratic degeneration.

Today these criteria stand with Marxism in general -- even those who deny their validity cannot help but utilize them in their thinking when they deal with the Soviet Union.

But the disintegration of Stalinism in both the USSR and the official Communist movement now presents aspects that are not less unexpected and not less unforeseen and often bewildering. To reach a profound understanding of these requires "successive approximations." In such a context, going back over the ground, as Deutscher's book compels us to, is instructive. We can even say that it is precisely the points on which events have compelled a modification of the line of thought which are the most interesting.*

Deutscher's earliest articles in this collection were written at the time of Stalin's death. There were very few then who, like Deutscher, understood that

the bureaucratic regime could not, with or without Stalin, continue to resort to the methods of repression and terror without risk of provoking serious explosions. But what is striking in these articles is the great hopes which Deutscher placed in the rate and the outcome of de-Stalinization.

This is all the more noticeable in view of the fact that later, particularly after the ouster of Khrushchev, in dealing with its causes, Deutscher came very close to the Soviet reality. What "de-Stalinization" meant for the leaders of the Soviet Union, and the stages in this "de-Stalinization," is told in a few pithy sentences:

"They denounced after the event the rule of the single leader but see nothing wrong in the rule of the single faction, which in its turn was rooted in the rule of the single party." (Page 10.)

"Looking back upon the post-Stalin era, one can see that it falls into two distinct chapters; the first, covering the period from 1953 till 1959, was crowded with intense reformist activity and was alive with de-Stalinization; the second, extending over the remaining years of Khrushchev's government, was on the whole characterized by stagnation and even retrogression." (Page 124.)

"As a rule the reorganizations changed the modes in which control over the bureaucracy was to be exercised from above; they hardly ever created any opening for control from below." (Page 128.)

Deutscher does not have the least illusion about Khrushchev's successors; he sees them as men of only mediocre stature, without a future, because they are incapable of rising to the present needs of Soviet society, which he defines in these terms:

*The collection of writings goes even beyond the subtitle. It includes the notable and courageous speech made by the author at the "teach-in" in Washington in 1965 against the American escalation in Vietnam. Also included is a discussion of the philosophy of history held by E.H. Carr, the author of a fine history of the Soviet Union. In this review, we leave these aside.

We likewise leave aside other essays, particularly the portraits or sketches of Lenin, Trotsky, Plekhanov, and also those figures in the history of the Russian revolution, the Mensheviks, who were swept aside by events.

Nor will we deal with Deutscher's comments on Pasternak, showing that Doctor Zhivago is neither the great novel which the Western world has praised so highly nor the slanderous work seen by so many bureaucrats, who, like Pasternak but in a different way, have failed to understand the Russian revolution.

"What is at stake is no longer the 'right' of a Leader and a ruling group to terrorize the nation, but the very essence of their political monopoly, their right to speak for a people which is not allowed to speak for itself. The predicaments with which the Soviet Union is contending at present call not for a new dose of patriarchal-bureaucratic 'liberalism,' but for genuine liberty and a genuine advance to socialism." (Page 133.)

With regard to this, beginning on page 138, Deutscher in a searching way presents on the one hand the changes that have occurred in the relations between the top leadership and the bureaucracy as compared to Stalin's time, and on the other hand the lack of substantial changes between the bureaucracy and the masses. He emphasizes very strongly the contradictoriness of this situation and also its unhealthy consequences in Soviet society.

But how can this contradiction be resolved? "The opening, the unequivocal opening, of a truly new phase of the Russian -- and not only Russian -- revolution is long overdue." (Page 143, my emphasis.) With these words, Deutscher, at bottom, comes up against the problem of a political revolution in the Soviet Union.

* * *

With regard to the international policies of the Soviet authorities, Deutscher points forcefully to the fact that from Stalin to the present leaders, they have not aimed at subverting the capitalist world and that their attitude towards the revolutionary movements and towards the workers states is determined by "reasons of state" which at bottom signify trying to maintain the status quo in a world that is continually moving. It is all the more necessary to remember this inasmuch as working-class militants in their great majority have long been aware of this, although the capitalist leaders often act as if they were unaware of it.

In the articles dealing with the international crisis in the official Communist movement, the crisis of the international disintegration of Stalinism, Deutscher offers a very valuable contribution showing how the differences were born and how they developed under the apparent monolithism which masked them for such a long time. His contribution on Maoism is particularly interesting.

Nevertheless, he takes a certain analogy too far in his article "Three Currents in Communism." Without any doubt at the time he wrote the article, it was correct to put the spotlight on the differences that existed between a right wing (in which Tito and Togliatti could

be considered as the most representative figures), a center (around Khrushchev and the Soviet leadership), and a left wing (including the then apparently united Chinese leadership). Under these conditions the temptation was understandable of recalling the differences between the Left Opposition, the centrist bureaucratic faction and the Right Opposition into which the Bolshevik party and the International Communist movement was divided at one time.

But the analogy cannot be carried so far as to ask, in conclusion, as Deutscher does, if the Communist movement can regenerate itself. Underestimation of the bureaucratic degeneration, it appears to us, is involved in this. We do not doubt that there are still considerable revolutionary forces within the Communist parties and this has tactical implications in various countries. But the Communist parties are all deeply rotted organizations.

Since Deutscher wrote this article, that is, a little more than three years, several new developments have highlighted the extent and also the meaning of the disintegration of the movements having a Stalinist origin and leadership.

In the parties having mass influence, like those in France and Italy, the rightist orientation has become accentuated to such a degree that the differences with the Social Democracy are hardly noticeable in daily political activities and in theoretical questions, remaining solely in the tie with Moscow in the sense that these formations see the economic development of the USSR as the main factor in the march of humanity toward socialism.

The rightist evolution of the Soviet leaders is equally evident.

As for the Chinese leaders, the unfolding of the "cultural revolution" proves among other things that one cannot expect from them a return to free criticism, to discussion, to democratic methods.

On the other hand, genuinely progressive development is discernible in the Cuban leadership, the decisive sector of which did not originate in a movement that had been under a Stalinist leadership. There is material for a supplementary chapter on the role of the personality in history, as well as a chapter concerning the influence which the condition of being a small workers state in proximity to American imperialism has had on the politics of the leadership of that state.

If there is a real "irony of history," it is certainly in this surprising

development of a revolution at the very doorstep of imperialism which is today proving to be more combative and richer in ideas than movements having at their disposal much greater material means.

However slow and complex the beginnings may be along the road to the renewal of communism, it must not be forgotten that the progress made is one of the products of the colonial revolution,

and quite particularly today of the heroism of the Vietnamese people, who by holding the powerful American imperialism at bay are compelling the vanguard militants more and more to consider the biggest problems of strategy and tactics in the revolutionary movement in our time. In this way, too, the Vietnamese revolution merits the strongest support.

April 17, 1967

YOUTH CONFERENCE IN LONDON DISCUSSES ANTIWAR ACTIVITIES

London

More than 150 delegates at a conference sponsored by the Vietnam Solidarity Committee [VSC] April 22 discussed stepping up antiwar activities in Britain.

The gathering was essentially a caucus of VSC supporters in the Labour Party Young Socialists, the Young Communist League and various antiwar groups. Discussion centered around a resolution proposed by the Brussels March 11-12 international youth conference on Vietnam.

Fraternal greetings came from Pierre Rousset on behalf of the Jeunes Communistes Revolutionnaires in France, Guido Totte for the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes in Belgium. Fraternal delegate Rex Coghlan of the Irish Association

of Labour Students Organizations also gave greetings.

The one-day meeting was a first attempt at coordinating left-wing antiwar activity at the youth level.

The debate showed that many of the delegates are considerably behind their counterparts in the rest of Europe, who are now urging the mass Communist parties to form a united front in defense of the Vietnamese revolution. These delegates blocked passage of a paragraph in the main resolution on this point.

In response to an appeal from Arab students living in England, the conference wound up its session by demonstrating in front of the British Foreign Office to protest British policies in Aden.

5,500 QUEBEC WORKERS CALL FOR RELEASE OF HUGO BLANCO AND HIS COMRADES

By Art Young

Montréal

Some 5,500 Quebec workers have appealed for the release of Hugo Blanco and his imprisoned comrades.

More signatures are coming in daily as Quebec workers respond to the call of the Quebec Federation of Labour to support the case of Hugo Blanco.

This is the result of the work of a newly formed committee in this province which has already obtained support for the case among a large number of well-known Quebec figures.

The chairman of the "Committee for Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru" is Jean-Louis Roux, one of the most outstanding Quebec actors and directors. He is director of Le Théâtre du Nouveau Monde and well known across Canada for his role in the television series "The Plouffe Family."

The committee includes several of the leaders of both trade-union federations in Quebec.

It was due to the initiative of one of these leaders, Gérard Rancourt, secretary of the Quebec Federation of Labour [AFL-CIO-CLC], that the impressive number of signatures was obtained. Speaking in the name of the Quebec Federation of Labour, Rancourt appealed to all affiliated locals to circulate the petition and to get as many signatures as possible.

Rancourt's appeal pointed out that it was because of his efforts to unionize the Peruvian peasantry that Blanco faces a possible death sentence. He stated: "The trade-union movement is in solidarity with Blanco and his comrades.... We have always proclaimed our belief in the international solidarity of workers. Now is the time to prove it by signing the petition in favour of Hugo Blanco."

Among the responses was that of the

Association des Pompiers de Montréal [Fireman's Union], which returned the petition demanding the release of Blanco and his comrades with the notation: "4,000 firemen demand their freedom."

The committee has also obtained two opportunities to explain the case over the news media. Professor Andre Gun-der Frank, well-known specialist on Latin

America and a prominent supporter of the case, has spoken once on the radio and recorded another interview for a televi-sion broadcast.

The committee is planning to step up its activities, even as signatures con-tinue to come in from across the province. Its address is 54 Boulevard Guinn, Longu-euil, Quebec, Canada.

APPEAL SENT OUT BY QUEBEC FEDERATION OF LABOUR

[The following is the text of the appeal sent out to all affiliated locals and staff members by the Quebec Federa-tion of Labour in behalf of Hugo Blanco. The letter is dated April 6.

[In case unions wish to get in touch with the QFL concerning the case, their address is 3333 Metropolitain Boul. E., Suite 500, Montreal 38, P.Q.]

* * *

Dear Brother and Sister,

As you will quickly see from read-ing the two short documents attached, the life of the unionist Hugo Blanco is in danger in Peru, because of his peasant trade-union activity.

The whole world is alerted. The trade-union movement is in solidarity with Blanco and his comrades. The QFL and

its affiliates must do their part to pre-vent these unionists from the death sen-tence.

That is why we are asking you to sign the attached petition and to have it signed by your members. We want you to obtain the greatest possible number of signatures, using supplementary sheets of blank paper, and to send them back as soon as possible, using the return envelope en-closed.

We have always proclaimed our be-lief in the international solidarity of the workers. Now is the time to prove it by signing the petition in favour of Hugo Blanco.

Fraternally,

Gérard Rancourt,

Secretary General

TEXT OF PETITION SENT BY QUEBEC LABOUR TO PRESIDENT BELAUNDE

[The following is the text of the petition signed by 5,500 union members under the sponsorship of the Quebec Fed-eration of Labour and sent to Balaúnde Terry, the president of Peru.]

* * *

Mr. President,

In all countries, the fate of Hugo Blanco and his companions imprisoned with him is concerning all who are struggling for respect for the rights of man.

Canadian political, trade union, artistic, and university circles have fol-lowed with anxiety the unfolding of the trials of Hugo Blanco and his comrades.

What will be done to them will not fail to confirm or alter the image that the Canadian people will have of your coun-try and its government.

We ask you, Mr. President, to free and pardon Hugo Blanco and all the other political prisoners.

BULLETIN FROM CREDIBILITY GAP

Will Gen. Westmoreland's demand that the American troop total in Vietnam be raised to at least 600,000 by the end of the year be granted? Questioned by the press on May 3 about reports on this from

Saigon, President Johnson issued one of his typically reassuring flat denials: "I do not consider anything immediately imminent, in the next few days or even the next few weeks."

A MIGHTY ALLY IN THE PEOPLE OF THE USA

[Extracts from a speech by Fidel Castro]

[The following extracts are from a speech made by Fidel Castro in Havana on April 19 in commemorating the sixth anniversary of the defeat of U.S. imperialism at Playa Girón.

[Of special interest are Castro's observations on the giant antiwar demonstrations that occurred in the United States on April 15, his comments on new developments in the guerrilla struggles in Latin America and his remarks about Che Guevara.

[The translation is the official one which appeared in the April 30 issue of the English-language edition of Granma the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba.]

* * *

The population of Latin America is growing, but the economy is not; the population is growing, but food production is not. And imperialism is driven to increase its exploitation, to be even more avaricious as a result of its war policy, its aggression, its repression of the revolutionary movement, its economic situation, that is, the shrinkage of U.S. gold reserves and its unfavorable trade balance. As a result of its adventures, as a result of its policies, as a result, among other things, of its criminal war in Viet Nam, it has been forced to deplete Latin America's resources more and more. And it has been increasingly unable to give the slightest economic aid to those countries.

What is the inevitable outcome? What is the significance of the fact that, throughout a continent of 230 million inhabitants, the population is growing faster than food production? What will be the only outcome? What must the inevitable outcome be?

What will be the inevitable outcome of a situation in which misery and hunger lead year by year to more misery and hunger? Can there be any other outcome than that of revolution? And that is the specter; more than a specter, the reality, that haunts the shortsighted, the blind, those who believed that this situation of hunger and misery could be solved in cooperation with the imperialists, the exploiters, those who bear the main responsibility for that situation of misery.

Those are facts that cannot be concealed and that lead to the only possible outcome: revolution. And this revolution is the outcome of a historical

need, not the result of caprice or personal will. No one will be able to impose that revolution, as no one will be able to prevent it; for that revolution is the outcome of a vital necessity. It is the only path open to the peoples of Latin America.

And that is what our Revolution has declared since the first day; that is what our Revolution stated in the First Declaration of Havana, and in each of the statements made in the course of these years. We have said, and we have firmly believed and passionately defended the premise that this revolution, in the situation of present-day Latin America, can come only from the armed struggle of the peoples (LENGHTHY APPLAUSE).

And is it the people who voluntarily choose that road? Do the peoples have the alternative of choosing between one road and another? No!

It is imperialism, it is the bloody dictatorship of the oligarchs and exploiters who do not and will not calmly relinquish their privileges, who will not docilely hand over the reins of society to the exploited. Moreover, the exploiters dominate not only the economic resources; they dominate the armed institutions, they dominate the means of communications, they monopolize television, radio, printing presses, the immense majority of the newspapers, most educational and cultural institutions. And the revolutionary organizations are unarmed. What sort of arms can they rely on to try to gain revolutionary power by peaceful means, if the arms supposedly available in such a conflict are never within the reach of revolutionaries?

It is not only a question of repression. The oligarchies, the exploiting classes, create the conditions to keep the revolutionaries and the exploited from having access to power. And thus far history has shown us a single road -- our own history of today and yesterday and always, the history of the peoples who have made their revolutions. It has shown us that the peoples who have achieved any progress, any freedom, have not done so by humbling themselves, by placing their necks in the yoke. The peoples have found themselves forced to struggle; they have had to struggle (APPLAUSE). They have had to fight not because they like to spill blood, not because they like war, but because they are faced with the alternative of slavery or sacrifice; they are forced to pay for their freedom and justice with their blood and sacrifice.

Historically, this is the alternative that the exploiters have imposed upon

the exploited, the oppressors upon the oppressed, the slave masters upon the slaves; exploitation, oppression, slavery -- or sacrifice. The road is not chosen by the peoples, gentlemen; the peoples only follow the roads imposed upon them by their oppressors and exploiters. And to us it is clear. We have defended this viewpoint with conviction, with tenacity and even with passion; our peoples unfortunately have no other road to liberation than that of struggle.

And the facts increasingly show that we are right. Awareness of that truth is growing on this continent, awareness of that truth is becoming more palpable with every day that passes. The peoples begin to inspire fear when they begin to find out the truth, when they begin to discover the truth of their situation.

We too were inoffensive vassals, we too were among the defenseless and the oppressed. Our people were just that until they began to discover their road. Today it seems almost inexplicable to all of us how it was possible for all that savagery, all that injustice, all that heartless exploitation, to maintain itself for so long; how it was possible for that entire social order to exist defended by a mercenary army, defended by tiny squads of soldiers of rural guards. All of that was possible while the entire people believe in the myth that the prevailing force could not be overcome, that the prevailing force was invincible. That system was maintained more -- much more! -- by myth and lie than by the actual force that defended it.

And suppose our oldest comrades -- I don't mean old in years, but those with most experience in the guerrilla fighting -- suppose that our comrades who took part in that struggle were placed back on March 11, 1952, after the coup d'état, with all that they know today, with all their present understanding and knowledge, even if it were without a single bullet, without a single rifle. Suppose they were placed in that situation, which can only be utterly imaginary, of course, and were asked: how long do you think this situation will last? No one would feel that seven years of oppression and bloodshed would lie ahead. Only a few would doubt -- almost no one would doubt with what they know today -- that the revolutionary armed struggle in our country would have begun on March 12 if not on the eleventh or even on the tenth itself (APPLAUSE).

And it would have been sufficient -- yes, sufficient! -- to take away the rifles of a pair of those rural guards to begin the revolutionary struggle: just a pair!...They would have wiped out one of those hired killers by hitting him with a stone or giving him a good crack on the

neck. And I know, I have the conviction, that with what has been learned, with what is known and understood today, the struggle would have begun the next day.

However, we know all that now. What a long time it took us to find that out, what a long time it took us to understand that truth! A long time, that is, from a revolutionary standpoint. When the myth of the invincibility of that army fell away, when the lie was destroyed, the counterrevolutionaries then fell into another myth, into another lie. They were unable to distinguish between the power of exploitation and injustice and the power of the Revolution.

They went so far as to think that it could be just as easy to destroy a revolution as it had been to destroy exploitation and oppression. And then it took time, it took years to establish another truth: the truth that, just as it is possible to destroy a system of exploitation and injustice, it is absolutely impossible to destroy a revolution, no matter by what means (APPLAUSE).

The imperialists, the CIA, learned that lesson very well. They learned that gimmicks and mercenary bands are worthless against a revolution, that guerrilla tactics get absolutely nowhere against a revolution. For a revolution is defended by the people, a revolution is defended by armed workers and peasants. That's why the imperialists live in a constant state of trauma and see specters everywhere.

How is it possible that, with all their ultramodern weapons and resources and equipment, with the absolute impunity with which they have been able to carry out their crimes on a world scale, they are unable to get a counterrevolutionary movement going? And how is it, nevertheless, that revolutionary movements arise everywhere and the imperialists are unable to crush them (APPLAUSE).

And so a revolutionary movement arose in South Viet Nam (APPLAUSE). To crush it, they organized a huge mercenary army, a puppet army, with all kinds of modern weapons and equipment to crush the revolutionary movement of the peasant and workers of Viet Nam, to crush the guerrillas. But the more the counterrevolutionary army grew in numbers, the more the guerrilla movement grew in strength and power.

They came to have an army of 400,000 men, but it was insufficient; they began to send special troops, first a few hundred, then several thousand, but these were insufficient; then they began to send tens of thousands, but that was not enough either; they began to send hundreds of thousands of Yankee soldiers, but that was not enough either; they sent in mercenary

troops from half a dozen nations, but it wasn't enough; they have used tactical aviation, they have used strategic aviation against the South and against the North, and nevertheless, what have they achieved? Two years have already gone by since they began their massive bombings and what have they achieved?

That is a lesson the imperialists will have to learn, whether they like it or not.

We have said on other occasions, and we will have to repeat it many more times, that the people of Viet Nam have given the world, the revolutionaries, and also the imperialists, a supreme lesson, a lesson they cannot ignore.

The imperialists have seen that there are limits to their might; they have seen that despite their industrial and military resources they have been unable to crush the revolutionary movement in a country many times smaller than the United States. Not with mercenary troops nor with the complicity of the mercenary armies of several countries, nor with their own troops nor with their own sea and air power have they been able to crush the revolution; they have, it is true, caused much pain and sacrifice, they have spilled much blood, but they are farther than ever from defeating the revolutionary movement in Viet Nam.

The situation of the imperialist aggressors is worsening. The consequences in domestic politics, the moral and economic consequences, are increasingly difficult to ignore. One of these consequences is the resistance of the people of the United States itself, who just a few days ago staged one of the biggest demonstrations that has ever been seen there, precisely against the brutal and criminal war being waged by the imperialists in Viet Nam (APPLAUSE).

And one more ally -- a most estimable one at that -- is arising right there among the people of the United States. It is really interesting from a historic standpoint, from the point of view of the course of events nowadays, that there -- right in the heart of New York -- hundreds of thousands of citizens joined together under that watchword. The representatives of the movement against racial discrimination were present in considerable numbers with posters saying that the war being waged by the imperialists against the Vietnamese people is inspired in the same feelings that lead to the oppression of black people in the United States (APPLAUSE).

That is, the victims of exploitation and discrimination in the United States have realized that their own cause has an ally in the Vietnamese who are

fighting and dying for their homeland. It is really impressive to see hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens marching through New York, some of them with pictures of Ho Chi Minh, among others (APPLAUSE). And something even more enlightening: along with the picture of Ho Chi Minh and some of the martyrs in the civil-rights cause, the news dispatches reported that there were also pictures of Che Guevara (LENGHTY APPLAUSE).

This is an indication to us, to revolutionaries, that, sooner or later, among the exploited sectors of the United States, among those who suffer discrimination under that system, among the poor of the United States, among the students of the United States, and even among the progressive and intellectual sectors of the United States -- and there are many of these who are fully aware of the brutality of imperialist policies -- among the progressive sectors of the United States, and among the people themselves -- whose awareness will awaken more and more -- the world revolutionary movement, and in particular the Latin-American revolutionary movement, will have -- sooner or later -- a mighty ally.

Imperialist interests, the interests of the small minority of monopolists who rule the United States, attempt to persuade the people of that country that the liberating revolution of the peoples goes against their interests, but the people of the United States will come to see with increasing clarity who represent the most vital interests of the people of the U.S., whether the revolutionaries of the liberation movements or the imperialists who are spending nearly 100 thousand million dollars in warmongering adventures, who spend more all the time, because it is a fact that the U.S. war budget, already over 50 thousand million dollars several years ago, has grown considerably larger in recent years with the war in Viet Nam and its escalation.

Who pays for these expenditures? Who pays for these adventures? Where does the money come from? It is true that a part comes from the labor of the peoples exploited by the monopolists, but a large amount is also extracted from the sweat of U.S. workers.

Not only do the imperialists squander the fruits of the labor of the people of the United States on war adventures and brutal crimes; they divest the U.S. people of a good part of the fruits of their labor in order to augment their monopoly capital, and to foot bloody wars in defense of these monopoly interests. And they squander not only the money of the people of the United States, but also their blood, and they are threatening to cause greater bloodshed with each passing day.

This universal revolutionary and anti-imperialist awareness is growing, both outside the United States, and within.

This lesson, of course, has not been learned by the people of the United States from speeches or pamphlets. No! It has been a costly lesson; it has been a costly lesson for the peoples; it has cost the Vietnamese people much blood, it has cost Dominican blood, and, unfortunately, it will cost still more blood, of these peoples, and of others.

In other words, the peoples of the world have had to pay the cost of imperialist barbarity so that the people of the United States might open their eyes. And the people of the United States will open their eyes; they will open them more and more as the revolutionary struggle of the peoples grows, and as the imperialists become increasingly impotent and increasingly battered by the revolutionary movement, not only in Viet Nam, but, as Che said, in two, three, four, five, ad infinitum, Viet Nams (APPLAUSE).

The imperialist press has attempted to distort some of the ideas expressed in Che's splendid message to the peoples of the world, affirming that this message proposes the destruction of the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. The message very clearly expresses the idea that revolutionary strategy aims at the destruction, not of the United States, much less the people of the United States, but at the destruction of the imperialist domination of the United States of America.

Let the imperialists not attempt to confuse the people of the United States, the nation of the United States -- which is not composed of imperialists only -- with the imperialists themselves. And what is perfectly clear in the message of Major Ernesto Guevara is the proposition that revolutionary strategy be directed toward the destruction of imperialist domination.

This means that once imperialist domination is destroyed, and, above all, imperialist domination of Latin America, imperialism as a system will disappear. In other words, the liberation of Latin America will constitute a decisive step in the liberation of the world from its worst enemy: U.S. imperialism.

And it is a clear and evident fact that revolutionary awareness is growing in Latin America, and, as this awareness develops, events also develop and as events develop, revolutionary awareness develops. There is no longer one, nor two, nor three, but four guerrilla movements already developing with steadily increasing strength; four guerrilla

movements that the oligarchies are clearly unable to crush: the Guatemalan guerrilla movement in Central America (APPLAUSE), the guerrilla movements of Colombia and Venezuela (APPLAUSE) and the guerrilla movement of Bolivia (APPLAUSE), all in process of development, slowly at first, but with constantly increasing energy and momentum.

The combatants of the revolutionary movement of this contingent have been gaining experience, and the peoples have been opening their minds to the truth.

The pusillanimous, the weak-spirited, the pseudo revolutionaries who thought that the first setbacks meant that the Revolution had failed and that armed struggle was futile, must wake up anew to reality.

No blow, no setback has ever destroyed the faith, tenacity and firmness of true revolutionaries, nor will it ever, in any country. In some cases, development will be more accelerated than in others.

It is worthy of note that, in Colombia, for example, important actions are being carried out; the revolutionaries attack military convoys being carried on important railway lines, take towns, or engage in intense, hours-long combat in the mountains, victorious combat in which the repressive forces suffer numerous losses. The strength of the guerrilla movement in Colombia is apparent in equal measure in different regions of the country.

As to Venezuela, Sr. Leoni became a laughingstock recently at the Punta del Este Conference when he insisted that the Venezuelan guerrillas were little more than an invention of the press, that they really did not exist.

How often have they affirmed that the guerrillas have been wiped out? Yet, despite ironclad censorship of the press, everyone knows that the guerrilla movement is growing in Venezuela and that heavily armed detachments are inspiring fear in the regime, and fear in its soldiers. No matter how they try to hide it, they cannot deny that the guerrilla columns under the command of Douglas Bravo (APPLAUSE) have victoriously penetrated not only the Falcón zone, but the state of Lara as well, or that, despite offensive operations by the army, the guerrilla forces in El Bachiller are firmly holding their positions under the leadership of Américo Martín (APPLAUSE).

We learned recently through the news services that the army situated heavy artillery before El Bachiller mountains, from where it carried out an intense bombardment of the mountains.

There are enough old guerrilla fighters present here, and not only old guerrilla fighters, but also others who learned the

art of war while hunting down bands of counterrevolutionaries, to know, as anyone who has had guerrilla experience knows, that nothing is more ridiculous than firing a battery of cannons against mountains. If it is ridiculous to shoot from planes that can drop hundreds and thousands of bombs without even one falling anywhere near a guerrilla fighter, of what use is artillery against guerrillas?

And when one reads such news he asks himself, who are they trying to fool? Are they trying to fool Leoni? Or are the "Green Beret" advisers fooling the army? Are they all trying to fool each other? Or are they trying to fool the people? But who on earth are they going to make believe that this is anything other than an act of desperation, an absurdity, an incredible stupidity!

It is a sign of impotence, of inability to crush the guerrilla movement.

And, according to what can be deduced from the press dispatches of the news services, the guerrilla movement in Bolivia grows in strength and combativity. According to what we have read, in a matter of just a few weeks, the guerrillas, in a series of fulminating attacks have caused the repressive troops of the regime more than 40 losses including dead, wounded and prisoners -- despite the fact that specially trained "antiguerrilla" troops are being used against them.

The fact is that these specially trained troops are effective for repression of the people in the streets, for wholesale assassination of workers, for attacks on miners, but when they have to confront the guerrillas in the mountains, they are totally useless, perfectly inept, and their fate -- like that of the mercenaries in Viet Nam -- will be to die like insects (APPLAUSE).

Increasing numbers of "Green Berets" are being used in Guatemala, Colombia and Venezuela and, according to news from Bolivia, the imperialists have recently sent about a thousand "Green Berets" to that country. Airline travelers between Panama and Bolivia have told of flights on which as many as 50 Yankee tourists -- very odd tourists, who travel under "superiors" and are met at the different airports by others like themselves -- arrive and fill the hotels, while in the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Defense, the various repressive bodies, at Army Headquarters, etc., very little effort is made to conceal the presence of these special troops of the U.S. army.

The imperialists, of course, try to conceal the magnitude of their intervention in Bolivia. They speak of plane-loads of arms being sent and of military

instructors who are sent in accordance with agreements that existed before the upsurge of the guerrilla movement, but the fact is that armaments have been taken in by plane and close to a thousand specially trained troops have been sent via different routes to Bolivia.

This illustrates the panic, the desperation, the fear, and the dead-end road of the imperialists. Because, above and beyond the hundreds of thousands of soldiers they already have in Viet Nam and the thousands that still occupy Dominican territory, they are now obliged to mobilize more and more soldiers to send against the different guerrilla fronts in Latin America in a shameless intervention that is, it is logical to assume, the beginning of another imperialist adventure.

Of course, they won't have too many experts to send, because the Vietnamese have put many of the "Green Beret" experts out of commission (APPLAUSE). And if the imperialists send increasing numbers of "Green Berets" against the guerrilla movements, so much the worse for the "Green Berets!" Not only because the revolutionaries are going to settle accounts with them, but also because this will serve to accelerate and strengthen solidarity among the peoples of the world to fight at the side of the revolutionaries! (APPLAUSE.)

The internationalist scope and nature of this revolutionary struggle of all the peoples against the Yankee imperialist -- the enemy -- was superbly described by Che in his message.

Awareness grows. Revolutionary theses gain ground; they are gaining ever-increasing support and an ever-increasing number of adepts, while the conformist, reformist, submissive and pseudo-revolutionary theses are being increasingly rejected and grow steadily weaker.

We have not the shadow of a doubt that all of this is a simple matter of time, and that the vacillators, those who prefer to come to terms, and the pseudo revolutionaries, will be swept away in this struggle. As the truth of the peoples makes headway, there will be no one left who will heed any charlatan who advises him to bow his head and accept the yoke. This is clear. The peoples of this continent are becoming more and more aware of the reality of their situation.

To the worldwide revolutionary movement, to those who confront imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Major Che Guevara's (APPLAUSE) message has been one of far-reaching repercussions. To say nothing of us Cubans. No one here ever believed the fables, the intrigues of the imperialists. We know each other very well here and we know the truth, either because we hear about it or because we can guess it.

Throughout the entire world, the imperialists have made every attempt to sow confusion and spread lies. They reported Che as having appeared in various places and they "killed" him a dozen times. This document must have had a traumatic effect upon the imperialists. The presence of Che, his "resurrection," must have been profoundly discouraging and alarming to them. This Che -- shown both beardless and bearded -- with a beard that is impossible to describe as old or new -- (APPLAUSE) and wearing a beret that seems to symbolize something like a "Red Beret" (APPLAUSE) must have been the cause for great concern among the Yankee imperialists.

This Che, in excellent physical condition, filled with unequalled enthusiasm, and with even greater experience in guerrilla warfare, must certainly be cause for great concern among the imperialists and, conversely, equally the reason for an added stimulus among the revolutionaries.

"Where's Che?" the imperialists ask themselves. "Is he organizing liberation movements or perhaps fighting on one of the liberation fronts?" They certainly would like very much to know. But even if they did, they would only be satisfying their curiosity, because if they

really wish to preserve the lives of their "Green Berets" they had better see to it that they don't come up against Che (PROLONGED APPLAUSE).

Che's presence must have also been quite a lesson to those who tried to capitalize on his disappearance, to the schemers and liars who took advantage of Che's absence to heap all sorts of lies upon the Revolution. And these people -- well, why waste time talking about them? -- have already been punished by history, for it is history that settles accounts with schemers and liars.

That is the reason that the liars' perversity never bothered us, although we did feel a little hurt. We knew that once again history would clear up everything. And this is the punishment for all the schemers and liars who played the imperialists' game to the hilt during the new stage in Comrade Che Guevara's life that began two years ago.

Naturally, we do not know everything, but again let history take care of that. We have all welcomed this message with immense happiness and we do not have the slightest doubt that the following days, weeks, months and years will inevitably bring us more news about Che (PROLONGED APPLAUSE).

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
PHOTO: New York Pickets protest coup d'état in Greece	481
Bertrand Russell's Opening Statement at War Crimes Hearing	482
Text of de Gaulle's Letter Banning War Crimes Tribunal	483
Jean-Paul Sartre's Answer to de Gaulle	484
Pickets in New York Denounce Military Coup in Greece	489
Greek Workers in Germany Demonstrate Against Athens Coup	489
The Dominican Left Discuss Problems of Their Revolution -- by Antonio Valdés	490
Johnson's "Pacification" Program	
-- To Win Back...or Merely to Kill? -- by Dick Roberts	492
Extracurricular Activity Displeases Ky	494
Book Review:	
Deutscher's "Ironies of History" -- by Pierre Frank	495
Youth Conference in London Discusses Antiwar Activities	497
Hugo Blanco Case:	
5,500 Quebec Workers Call for Release	
of Hugo Blanco and His Comrades -- by Art Young	497
Appeal Sent Out by Quebec Federation of Labour	498
Text of Petition Sent by Quebec Labour to President Belaúnde	498
Bulletin from Credibility Gap	498
Documents:	
A Mighty Ally in the People of the USA [Excerpts from a Speech by Fidel Castro]	499