

*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. 20  
May 19, 1967

## U.S. Govt. Found Guilty By War Crimes Tribunal

### Verdict Reflects Moral Judgment of Entire World

The International War Crimes Tribunal, meeting in Stockholm, concluded nine days of deliberations on May 10. After hearing extensive testimony by investigation teams, jurists and Vietnamese victims of the war; the body of distinguished intellectuals found the United States guilty of the crimes of aggression and "widespread, deliberate and systematic" bombardment of civilian targets in Vietnam.

The tribunal, initiated by the eminent British philosopher Bertrand Russell, also found the U.S. guilty of violating the "neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia."

Australia, New Zealand and South Korea were found guilty of complicity in the war crimes.

Jean-Paul Sartre, the French philosopher and author, read the opinion of the body. Sartre is the executive president of the tribunal.

At future sessions the commission will take up the question of whether or not the United States has committed genocide in Vietnam.

U.S. crimes were defined as "crimes against peace and crimes against humanity." Specific violations of international law were cited under the Kellogg-Briand

[Please turn to next page.]



DANIEL PEREYRA, held in Lima, Peru, prison since April 1962 without trial. Together with 12 comrades, he is charged with holding up bank to get funds to aid guerrilla movement. Real issue is political views of the defendants. They seek support for their demand for a trial.

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.

Pact of 1928, the United Nations Charter, the Nuremberg declarations and the Geneva accords of 1954.

The verdict of the tribunal and the volumes of testimony presented at its sessions represent a big blow to American prestige. While the U.S. press has mounted a campaign of silence or slander against the Stockholm hearings, the evidence presented by the tribunal is having a significant impact in Europe.

Indicative of the importance Washington has attributed to the tribunal are the intensive efforts by Johnson to prevent the hearings from taking place at all.

U.S. blackmail succeeded in prompting de Gaulle to ban the tribunal from holding its sessions in France as originally planned.

Attempting to hound the tribunal from country to country, Johnson used the occasion of Adenauer's funeral to bring pressure on the Swedish government to refuse admission to the group.

The New York Times reported May 9 that Swedish Premier Tage Erlander had announced "that a White House aide had told him President Johnson 'considered it highly regrettable' that the so-called war crimes tribunal was holding sessions here [Stockholm]."

"Mr. Erlander said he was told this in Bonn on April 25 by Walt W. Rostow, a special assistant to the President...."

"Mr. Rostow developed President Johnson's regret with considerable sharpness," Mr. Erlander said."

Failing to prevent the tribunal from meeting, Washington and the U.S. press have pulled all stops in a drive to vilify and discredit the proceedings.

The usually sedate New York Times ran a column on May 12, the day after reporting the findings of the tribunal. Penned by C.L. Sulzberger, the Times foreign affairs expert, the article assails Bertrand Russell with a venom that the gutter press would find difficult to match.

Entitled "Corpse on Horseback," it describes the philosopher variously as a "relic," "totem," "zombie," "unthinking transmission belt for the most transparent Communist lies," "the wasted peer whose bodily endurance outpaced his brain," "human echo chamber," etc.

Sulzberger likens Russell to the "stiffened corpse" of a dead Moorish king led into battle by his followers. He concludes:

"Russell is no more accountable for the Stockholm farce enacted in his name than were the dead Moors accountable for battles they no longer understood but into which their swaying corpses were borne."

The tribunal itself, with the exception of Jean-Paul Sartre, is dismissed as "several mediocrities playing the role of yes men."

Nowhere is any attempt made to refute the evidence of the tribunal. The extreme embarrassment of the U.S. imperialist rulers at the findings of the tribunal couldn't be plainer than in this resort to the vilest slander and character assassination.

As to the actual mental state of the "wasted peer," this was testified to by the noted historian Isaac Deutscher during a recent visit to the United States. Deutscher (one of the members serving on the tribunal) commented:

"I can only hope that when I am his age I have half the intellectual vigor and keenness of mind that Lord Russell displays today to such a remarkable degree."

Jean-Paul Sartre responded to many of the charges raised against the tribunal by clarifying the body's aims in his opening address as executive president:

"What we wish is to maintain... a constant contact between ourselves and the masses who in all parts of the world are living and suffering the tragedy of Vietnam. We hope that they will learn as we learn, that they will discover together with us the reports, the documents, the testimony, that they will evaluate them and make up their minds about them day by day, together with us..."

"Yes, if the masses ratify our judgment, then it will become truth..."

"What a strange Tribunal: a jury and no judge!" It is true: we are only a jury, we have neither the power to condemn, nor the power to acquit, anybody..."

"We the jury, at the end of the session, will have to pronounce on these charges: are they well-founded or not? But the judges are everywhere; they are the peoples of the world, and in particular the American people. It is for them that we are working."

BARRIENTOS HOLDS REGIS DEBRAY INCOMMUNICADO

Official sources "close to the general staff" told the press in La Paz April 22 that a French citizen named Régis Debray had been killed two days previously when regular army forces engaged in a skirmish with some fifty "guerrillas" near Yacunday, about 650 kilometers southeast of Bolivia's capital. The dictator Barrientos reportedly confirmed the news himself during a press conference April 21.

The Paris daily Le Monde nevertheless indicated reservations as to the accuracy of the report. The 26-year-old Régis Debray was well-known in Paris, his mother being a city councillor.

A disciple of the Communist intellectual Louis Althusser, Debray had frequently visited Cuba since 1961 and had taken up residence there shortly before the Tricontinental Conference of January 1966. An article of his, "Castroism -- the Long March of Latin America," had been published by Les Temps Modernes, the magazine sponsored by Jean-Paul Sartre.

His book, Revolución en la Revolución, published in Havana in a Spanish translation and in Paris in French was said to have been read by Castro himself in the proofs.

Inquiries were at once instituted by various sources, including the French diplomatic service. The immediate result was a curtain of silence in La Paz.

On April 27, Le Monde reported Debray's family had received a telegram from La Paz stating that he had been wounded by the Bolivian armed forces and was being held prisoner in a small town or village in the southeast part of the country.

Strangely enough he had been captured along with two other journalists, one a British citizen, George Andrew Roth, the other an Argentine citizen, Carlos Alberto Fructuoso. Nevertheless, the Bolivian military authorities claimed they knew he had come to Bolivia several times, that he had given "conferences" at the University of Cochabamba and that he had been in "contact" with "guerrillas." They added that he had been dressed in civilian clothes when he was "arrested" and that the army had engaged in a skirmish in which six guerrillas had been killed.

The French government sought without success to obtain assurances from the Barrientos dictatorship that the rights of the prisoner would be respected.

Le Monde suggested that Debray be

brought to La Paz where his wounds, the nature of which had not been specified, could be taken care of, the press could see him, and, if the Bolivian authorities wished, charges could be pressed for what seemed to be no more than an "ideological offense."

The next bit of information came from Mexico. On April 29 the weekly magazine Sucesos sent an appeal to Barrientos, stating that Debray was one of their collaborators. Sucesos ran a series of articles last December and January on the guerrilla movement in Venezuela and its editor, Mario Menéndez, recently had trouble with the Colombian authorities when he tried to gain information about the guerrilla movement in that country.

Agence-France Presse reported from La Paz May 3 that Debray had been transferred to that city. It had also learned that he was to be tried by a military tribunal. In addition, Debray had not been taken by the army, but had been arrested by police inspectors when, accompanied by two journalists, one British, the other Argentine, he came to buy medicine in the small town of Muyupampa, 30 kilometers from Camiri.

On May 4 Mme Janine Alexandre-Debray, the prisoner's mother, flew to La Paz. She reported on her departure that the most energetic steps taken by the French ambassador to see her son had proved fruitless.

She also reported that Régis had entered Bolivia under his true name, and with official identification as a press correspondent.

The Bolivian authorities told the press at the same time that he had tried to buy military maps of the guerrilla zone and that an American employee in the Geographic Military Institute had turned him in. Also, according to the La Paz paper Presencia, members of the FBI, specialists in interrogating guerrillas, were coming to Bolivia to take up the Debray case.

Le Monde confirmed that the "United States is taking quite special interest in the arrest of the young French student and may have decided to exploit the affair to demonstrate 'the intervention of Castroism in Latin America.'"

On May 5 the Barrientos regime announced that Debray and the two other prisoners were regarded as "common criminals" and a woman claiming to be the widow of a soldier, Ruben Amezaga, killed by guerrillas last March 23, gave a very official sounding declaration to the press

calling Debray "the political commissar of the guerrillas."

This was the first indication of the nature of the charges that might be lodged against Debray, who was being held incommunicado, not being permitted to see a lawyer or even the judge that is normally placed in charge of cases.

The day after Régis' mother arrived, Barrientos himself denounced the prisoner, saying that he was an "adventurer who came to Bolivia to bring grief to Bolivian families. His adventures will end in Bolivia."

The most brutal touch was yet to come. On May 9 Barrientos told the press that he would "receive" Mme Alexandre-Debray...perhaps in the latter part of May...after he has handled some business in Paraguay.

But the mother has not yet been permitted to see her son! Nor has a lawyer seen him. Nor the French ambassador.

Upon this news, de Gaulle is said to have intervened personally; but the nature of his missive was not revealed.

Régis father, Georges Debray, said he had sent the following message to his wife in La Paz: "Régis Debray, after being captured, may have been tortured to such a degree that if he is still alive, he is not presentable. This may be the reason for the procrastination of President Barrientos. Solicit immediate denial in the name of humanity."

\* \* \*

The accounts about a new guerrilla

front in Bolivia have received sensational publicity. Coming on the very eve of the Punta del Este Conference, Barrientos utilized them to the utmost to press the Pentagon for jet planes, napalm and other war matériel -- with a request for more dollars one may suspect, not forgotten.

Washington has responded in a contradictory way. The State Department knows its man, Barrientos, and therefore one sees such statements, attributed to U.S. military experts (New York Times, May 3), concerning the reports about guerrillas: "Ninety-six per cent of what we are getting now is fanciful."

On the other hand, Washington wants to utilize the reports for propaganda purposes against Cuba and also to justify its own intervention in Bolivian affairs via military missions. Hence a step-up in sending arms and military "advisers" to La Paz.

But there is nothing "fanciful" about the witch-hunt Barrientos has been conducting. This did not begin with the reports about fresh guerrilla activities (small groups of guerrillas have been reported periodically active in Bolivia for some years); it began on a major scale last January with the arrest and exile of leaders and cadres of the political opposition ranging from followers of the former Vice-President Lechin to the Trotskyists. They have been exiled in remote jungle villages under circumstances that amount to a sentence of slow death.

On this the bourgeois press has been silent. It constitutes no sensation; in fact it constitutes scarcely news in a country ruled by a subservient agent of the State Department.

### SUPRANATIONALITY

[The acid-tongued Robert Escarpit had the following comments to offer in his column in the May 10 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde on the way the Bolivian government is handling the case of Régis Debray.]

\* \* \*

If Régis Debray intervened in an illegal way in the internal affairs of Bolivia, it is normal for Bolivia to demand that he be held accountable for the infraction, but is this any reason to refuse to grant him the most elementary rights, the same rights which the Bolivian government, in its devotion to principles, doubtless grants -- at least one would like to believe so -- to its own

citizens?

In a word, must the status of being a foreigner be considered to compound a political misdemeanor? A certain xenophobia inclines one in that direction, but reason goes against it, particularly in our century of collective security and supranationality.

Otherwise what penalties would be required against the CIA which for years -- sometimes without the knowledge of its partners, if they are to be believed, and for the good of humanity to believe the agency -- has been corrupting officials, buying influence, engaging in bribery and even crime, on a world scale?

TERROR MARKS SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. INVASION OF SANTO DOMINGO

Santo Domingo

On April 24 Dominicans commemorated the second anniversary of their revolution. On April 28 they commemorated the second anniversary of the U.S. imperialist invasion. The week was replete with terrorism, assassinations, police repression and rumors of a coup d'état.

Col. Francisco Alberto Caamaño, in exile in London with the post of military attaché, declared that his future activities are subject to the decisions of the Dominican people.

"I will do only what the people ask and demand of me," Caamaño said in response to questions on his future perspectives in public life.

Caamaño sharply criticized the military intervention of the United States which paralyzed the rebellion initiated with the toppling of the Triumvirate headed by Donald Read Cabral.

Speaking for the Partido Revolucionario Social Cristiano, of which he is secretary general, Caonabo Javier Castillo said, "The April revolution was a popular movement that aimed at winning the people's political rights which had been denied them since September 25, 1963."

The Partido Comunista de la República Dominicana, the Juventud Comunista Dominicana and the Movimiento Popular Dominicano, all pro-Peking in tendency, said that the April war demonstrated the impossibility of the liberal bourgeoisie "directing the democratic revolution in the epoch of imperialism."

The Partido Comunista Dominicano (pro-Moscow) held that the causes of the April revolution "remain active and accentuated and a new explosion will be necessary and inevitable."

For the PCD, the results of the war can be listed as follows:

- (1) Understanding of the imperialist enemy.
- (2) Understanding of the necessity of defeating this enemy militarily.
- (3) Experience in armed struggle.
- (4) Confidence in the possibility of defeating the national repressive machinery.
- (5) Understanding of the need to incorporate the broad oppressed masses in

the city and countryside in combats on a national level.

José Francisco Peña Gómez, general secretary of the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano, stated that "the police repression and disregard of human rights" are worse than during the regime of the Triumvirate.

Peña Gómez maintained that the major part of the causes that gave rise to the revolution "continue to bear down ever more ominously" on the democratic aspirations of the Dominican people.

The police banned a march projected by the PRD, the party of the former President Juan Bosch.

More than twenty persons were arrested by the police April 24. Many of them were beaten.

The Provincial Committee of La Romana, a sugar center east of Santo Domingo, charged April 22 that Carmen Tavárez and Rafaela Figueroa were arrested when they put up notices of the Federation of Dominican Women commemorating the April revolution.

"Both of them were beaten, kicked and handled as in the worst days of the Trujillo regime. The police threatened to rape Carmen Tavárez. They told her that the next woman they caught in La Romana carrying on agitation would be raped.

"Yesterday evening (April 27), after firing at him several times, the police arrested and brutally beat Julio Morales (Julín), a delegate of the night-watchmen of the Central Romana and the Sindicato Unido. He is at present in the hospital because of the beating.

"The jails are full of prisoners whose only offense is walking on the streets (of La Romana) after seven in the evening."

In Santiago, the second largest city in the country, two civilians were killed by the police April 23. The excuse was that they had resisted arrest.

The Movimiento Revolucionario 14 de Junio (1-J-4) charged the government with inciting violence and repression in order to block observance of the two significant actions in the April war.

According to the Movimiento, as a result of a "macabre plan" put into effect by the regime, "the activities of the repressive bodies have been expanding throughout the country."

The Movimiento charged that in San Pedro de Macoris (a sugar center 75 kilometers east of here) members of the 14 de Junio have been jailed or shot by the police.

During meetings on April 24, more than 24 persons were detained in Santo Domingo.

Various persons have reported that the police are carrying out a "harsh repression" against the youth of San Juan de la Maguana, a town located in the west of the country.

The PRD charged April 27 that a repressive campaign had been unleashed by sectors of the government.

The PRD stated that more than 40 leaders of subcommittees and other bodies had been detained in the capital and the

interior.

On April 28 unidentified assailants shot and killed the head of the maintenance men in the customs at Santo Domingo and also a member of the police. A U.S. teacher, Stewart James, was likewise killed with a grenade thrown from a motorbike.

The day before unknown persons also killed an agent of the police.

In addition, leaders of the Partido Reformista -- the government party -- charged that certain sectors were plotting to overthrow the government.

The journalist Radhamés Gómez, chief of the editorial board of El Nacional, stated in his newspaper that an "attempt is being made to overthrow the government."

#### ALREADY IN THE INITIAL PHASE OF WORLD WAR III?

At a luncheon gathering of United Nations correspondents May 11, Secretary General Thant voiced his foreboding that the war in Vietnam already constitutes the initial phase of World War III.

In response to a question about where the fighting in Vietnam might lead, Thant said: "In my view, if the present trend continues, I am afraid direct confrontation first of all between Washington and Peking is inevitable. I hope I am wrong. I am afraid we are witnessing today the initial phase of World War III.

"If you recall the series of events leading to World War I and World War II, you will realize that the prologues were quite long; what I mean is, the psychological climate, the creation of political attitudes, took some time and when conditions were ripe for some plausible excuse, then the global wars were triggered.

"In my view we are witnessing today similar conditions.

"I am really concerned about the potentialities of this war, knowing as I do the mood not only of the principal parties primarily involved but also some of the parties not directly involved at present.

"That is why I say that if the present trend continues, a direct confrontation between Washington and Peking is inevitable and I am afraid that we are witnessing today the initial phase of World War III.

"I must say in this context that

the mutual defense pact between Moscow and Peking is still in force."

Arthur J. Goldberg, Johnson's representative to the United Nations, at once issued a counterstatement, since it was taken in Washington that Thant's grim conclusion was directed mainly at the Johnson administration which has refused to meet his appeal to halt the bombing.

Goldberg asserted that "we do not share his current assessment of the situation in Vietnam." Then like the highly skilled attorney that he is, he talked fast and furiously about the peaceful aims of his government and its desire to engage in "negotiations."

The "current assessment" in the Pentagon is that they can get away with further escalation of the war in view of the "peaceful coexistence" attitude of the Kossygin-Brezhnev regime and the political crisis in China. Both powers will issue strong denunciations of the U.S. for the sake of the record, the Pentagon calculates, but will not really come to the aid of the Vietnamese in an effective way.

The Pentagon's assessment, which the generals have sought to test step by step, has led to more and more extensive commitment of U.S. troops until they are now engaged in a big war on the Asian mainland, with all signs pointing to deepening and spreading the conflict.

The question that Thant raises is, "Has the point of no return been reached?" His fear is that Johnson has already gone so far that now the logic of war is taking over as it did in World War I and World War II.

FOR ONCE JOHNSON TELLS THE TRUTH

According to a Washington dispatch published in the May 12 New York Post, President Johnson told his daughter, Luci, last June: "Your daddy may go down in history as having started World War III."

At a White House reception for members of the Supreme Court May 11, Johnson himself described how he happened to make his historic remark. He told one of

his guests that after a U.S. bombing foray over north Vietnam, his daughter remarked that he looked tired. He asked her to sit down and learn some history.

According to the account, Johnson did not offer his daughter a very inspiring vista of the future. Among other things he told her: "You may not wake up tomorrow."

ROME UNIVERSITY HOLDS ITS FIRST TEACH-IN

By Sirio Di Giuliomaria

Rome

The demonstrations here against Vice-president Humphrey [see World Outlook April 14, p. 390] proved to be only a prelude to other antiwar actions called in sympathy with the Spring Mobilization in the United States April 15.

A mass rally was held April 12. Among the official speakers was Lelio Basso, an Italian member of parliament participating in the International War Crimes Tribunal who recently returned from Vietnam.

After the meeting, a number of Communist youth, disregarding the admonitions of various Communist officials, led a large part of the audience in a street demonstration. Thus from 8 p.m. to 10 p.m., young antiwar fighters marched in the center of Rome, shouting "Ho Chi Minh," "Vietnam," and militant slogans supporting the Vietnamese revolution.

The police limited themselves to watching the crowd and trying to keep it under some control until the demonstrators reached the area of the American embassy, which for the Italian police is sacrosanct territory.

The police then charged the crowd. A number were beaten or injured by fire hoses; some were arrested and later put on trial.

On April 15, the same day that 500,000 persons were demonstrating in New York and San Francisco, the Association of Radical University Students of Rome (which includes in its membership Communists, Socialists and independent radical youth) succeeded in organizing a teach-in at the Rome University for the first time.

Sponsored by the professors of the faculty of physics, it turned out to be a

huge success. More than 500 persons packed the hall, while about 1,500 latecomers listened to loudspeakers outside.

The speeches were decidedly to the left of the official positions of the Italian Communist party and the leadership hesitated long before joining in. Aldo Natoli, a well-known Communist member of parliament who is generally viewed as being rather left-oriented, was finally sent down to represent the party.

Professor Veneventano, a physics teacher at the university, chaired the meeting.

The first report was made by Siliqu, a student who is chairman of the university chapter of the Association of Radical Students. His speech, a good one, was warmly applauded.

The speakers included Livio Maitan, who spoke as the representative of Bandiera Rossa [Red Flag], the bimonthly paper of the Italian Trotskyists; Lelio Basso; Dr. Arnold Krivine, a French physician who reported on a recent trip he made to Vietnam in connection with the work of the International War Crimes Tribunal; Giulio Savelli, on behalf of the monthly magazine La Sinistra [The Left]; Franco Russo, a leader of the Rome organization of the Communist youth; Luigi Nono, a well-known musician; a representative of the Catholic review Testimonianze; various foreign students, including a Chilean and a Greek student; a few members of pro-Chinese organizations; David Alexander, a Cuban journalist who has contributed articles for La Sinistra.

The warmest welcome was undoubtedly accorded the speech by Alexander. As soon as he came to the rostrum, the audience arose, applauding and chanting "Cuba! Cuba!" and "Che Guevara!" Even the

small pro-Chinese groups joined in the ovation to revolutionary Cuba.

During his speech, which was mostly devoted to explaining the strategy which Cuba proposes in order to provide Vietnam with the most effective possible defense, Alexander was interrupted by heavy applause, especially when he criticized the policy of "peaceful coexistence." Another ovation marked the close of his speech.

A warm reception was also given Savelli, especially when he warned about being taken in by the policies voiced by the Pope in connection with the war in Vietnam.

Lelio Basso's speech was very well received. However this was more in tribute to the personality of the old Socialist leader and to his work on the International War Crimes Tribunal than to the speech he made.

Natoli was heckled several times. He attacked those who had insinuated that no Communists were present at the pro-Vietnam demonstration.

"If another organization appears," said Natoli, "which is capable of organizing similar demonstrations, we shall all be happy; but as long as such an organization does not exist, only the Communists can organize mass demonstrations."

As a matter of fact, Natoli was right in saying that the Communists had organized the demonstrations. However, he left out the fact that it was done by left-wing Communists against the opposition of the party leadership. (Publicly the leadership sought to take credit for the demonstrations; inside the party it sharply attacked the Communist youth, accusing them of breaking discipline by organizing demonstrations in violation of party directives.)

Livio Maitan was among the last to speak. He explained the necessity for an international united front in solidarity

with the Vietnamese people and criticized both the sectarianism of the Chinese in refusing to cooperate with the Soviet Union in this, and the opportunism of the Soviet leadership which, while pretending to be in favor of a united front, nevertheless helps reactionary governments in Latin America and Asia.

Maitan pointed out that unfortunately the recent demonstrations were composed mainly of students. He proposed concentrating on the task of bringing the workers into joint action.

On the student front, he proposed that a united Vietnam committee be formed at the university. The proposal was listened to with interest and taken up by a PSIUP [Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity] student who spoke after him.

The experience of this first teaching in Rome was extremely positive. The speeches were militant. Only one person, a member of the editorial staff of Rinascita (the official Communist party weekly) attempted to defend the policy of the CP, and the attempt was a weak one. He soon became discouraged by the hostile reception.

When the representative of the Catholic review Testimonianze defended nonviolence, the audience started hissing.

A small group of Socialists and Communists indicated their approval of this pacifist position by applauding; whereupon the Catholic immediately said: "Those who are applauding must understand that if you are for nonviolence, then you must be against the present social system and refuse to try to change it from within."

Even left-wing Catholics take a more militant stand than supporters of the official line of the Italian Communist party!

#### "A NICE LITTLE WAR"

In an interview quoted May 4 in Newsday, U.S. Senator J.W. Fulbright said that some businessmen and government officials regard the Vietnam conflict as "a nice little war -- not too much killing but a big help to the economy."

He expressed fears about the influence in Washington of the "military-industrial complex" on U.S. policy in Vietnam. He mentioned that Richard B. Russell, Henry M. Jackson and L. Mendel Rivers, who hold powerful positions in

Congress, all come from areas where there are large defense [war] industries.

Fulbright also said that he "no longer believes statements on Vietnam by President Johnson, Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara."

When Fulbright's remarks were made public, he at once issued an apology, saying he had spoken "off the record" and that he had not meant to "impugn the motives" of his colleagues.



FRENCH-CANADIAN JOURNAL FEATURES HUGO BLANCO CASE

Montréal

The April 29 issue of La Presse, the biggest French-language daily newspaper in Canada, carried an article on Hugo Blanco that took up about a half page in the final section.

The article, an entirely favorable one, reports the sending of a petition, carrying 7,500 names, mostly unionists, to the Peruvian embassy in Ottawa, asking for the release of the famous class-war prisoner. The signatures were

collected in two weeks and more are still coming in.

The article reports the worldwide campaign of solidarity in behalf of Hugo Blanco, summarizing facts presented in many issues of World Outlook.

The author, Jogues Girard, also goes into the social and economic conditions in Peru that gave rise to the revolutionary peasant movement headed by the young Trotskyist.

QUEBEC YOUNG NEW DEMOCRATS APPEAL FOR HUGO BLANCO

Montréal

The Québec Young New Democrats, a provincial wing of Canada's labour party youth, has joined the growing number of Québec forces demanding amnesty for Hugo Blanco and his comrades. On May 8, the NYD convention resolved:

"WHEREAS we of the Young New Democrats of Québec recognize the justice of the struggle of Hugo Blanco for human rights, which are being denied to the people of Peru by their government; and,

"WHEREAS we recognize that he and his comrades symbolize the just struggle of the Latin-American peoples against

imperialism and oligarchy;

"BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Québec Young New Democrats demand immediate amnesty for Hugo Blanco and his comrades, and will notify President Belaúnde Terry of this fact."

Before the resolution was passed, the overwhelming majority of delegates to the convention had individually signed a petition to this effect. One of the most prominent signers was Michel Bissonet, candidate of the New Democratic party in a current Montréal bye-election. The convention elected him president of the Québec Young New Democrats.

SUPPORT FOR HUGO BLANCO MOUNTS IN URUGUAY

The Argentine weekly La Verdad, which carries a report in each issue on the solidarity work in behalf of Hugo Blanco, noted in a recent issue that some prominent figures in Uruguay have rallied to the cause.

Among the names listed are Vivian Trias, a writer and former deputy of the Socialist party; Dr. José Pedro Cardoso, another former deputy of the Socialist party; Carlos María Gutiérrez, a journalist; O.J. Maggiolo, rector of the university; Zelmar Michelini, a national sen-

ator and editor of Hechos; Hugo Batalla, a national deputy on List 99; Rodolfo V. Talice, dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Sciences; Luis Pedro Bonavita, a national deputy; Dr. Carlos Quijano, editor of Marcha; Ruben Monte de Oca, Marcos Gabay, Pedro G. Scaron, Raúl Acuña, Mario Trajtenberg, of the editorial staff of Marcha; Guillermo Chifflet, editor of Epoca; José d'Elia, president of the Central Nacional de Trabajadores; Enrique R. Erro, former minister of Industry and Labor; Ariel B. Collazo, a deputy.

KY DEMANDS MORE TROOPS FROM U.S.

Ky announced May 5 that he needs more troops "from the United States, Korea or other countries" to continue his war. At present he has at his disposal more than 1,000,000 men of which the U.S.

contingent is an admitted 440,000. Ky's announcement came just two days after Johnson denied reports that Gen. Westmoreland had been promised another big increase in U.S. troops.

CIA-FBI ACCUSED OF CONCEALING FACTS IN KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

By Arthur Maglin

It is now about three and a half years since President Kennedy was assassinated, yet the controversy over who killed him is more current than ever. The May 8 New York Post reported the latest development:

"District Attorney Jim Garrison plans to seek a full-scale Senate inquiry into the Central Intelligence Agency's role in the Warren Commission's investigation of the Kennedy assassination the New Orleans States-Item reported today.

"The New Orleans DA claims the CIA and the FBI cooperated in concealing facts behind the assassination of President Kennedy from both the Warren Commission and the American public.

"Garrison said he would take steps later that week to convince the Senate of the need for a full-scale investigation."

The article goes on later to say that "In an exclusive interview with Garrison, the States-Item quoted him as saying that the CIA knew all along that the Warren Commission's report was completely untrue in its conclusion that Kennedy was shot by Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone.

"Garrison's latest statement corroborated a States-Item report Friday [May 5] that his investigation had turned up mounting evidence of CIA involvement in Kennedy's death.

"He asserted that the intelligence agency duped the commission by flooding its members with a torrent of irrelevant information in order to obscure the truth.

"Garrison said Oswald was not a Communist, as he was depicted by the Warren Commission, but actually was an undercover man working closely with anti-Castro organizations in New Orleans and Dallas, using his Communist background as a cover for his real activities."

Very few people in the United States believe the official version of the assassination any more. The doubt that the American people had pretty generally felt all along did not take an acute form until last year. During 1966 a number of factors came together to sharpen this disbelief. Among these factors were:

(1) Beginning in the spring a number of well-documented books critical of the Warren Report were issued by major publishing houses. Previously, the subject had been considered too hot to handle.

(2) The appearance of a moderately favorable review of Edward Jay Epstein's Inquest written by Richard N. Goodwin in a summer issue of Book Week gave the critics of the Warren Report their first real taste of respectability. Richard Goodwin was an important aide to President Kennedy and is well known as an adviser to Senator Robert Kennedy.

(3) Perhaps the most important factor was the growing distrust of the Johnson administration and all its works, among which the Warren Commission figures prominently. This distrust of the government in power stems directly from the unpopularity of the war in Vietnam.

Once started, the controversy proved unstoppable. By the end of 1966 outright upholders of the conclusions of the Warren Commission were decidedly on the defensive. More and more bourgeois publications and personalities began calling for a reopening of the investigation. In January of this year the Gallup Poll reported that only 36 percent of the American people believed the main contention of the Warren Report, that Oswald had killed the President acting on his own.

The bourgeois press entered the controversy on the side of the critics with the apparent aim of containing the criticisms. Such publications as Life and The Saturday Evening Post found it far easier to believe that Oswald may have had help than to believe that Oswald may not have been guilty of shooting Kennedy. For if Oswald is innocent that means that the Warren Commission framed him, either purposely or accidentally. But after what was billed as the most extensive criminal investigation in the nation's history it wouldn't really matter too much whether they convicted the wrong man through bureaucratic blundering or moral bankruptcy. The exposure of either alternative would have the guaranteed effect of sharply reducing public confidence in the official investigative agencies, the official system of justice, and in the federal government generally. So, from a bourgeois point of view, if one must criticize the commission, it is a wiser course to limit oneself to criticizing it for not sufficiently probing into questions that leave open the possibility that Oswald may have had help.

It is quite clear what the real interest of the bourgeois press in calling for a new investigation was. It was often stated quite explicitly. They wanted public confidence to be restored and they wanted serious critics of the Warren Commission silenced.

On February 20 of this year a re-investigation of the assassination was announced, though not the federal one that leading sections of the bourgeois press had asked for. The announcement came from James Garrison, the now well-known district attorney of New Orleans. The bourgeois press has given extensive coverage to Garrison's probe, although with a uniform tone of skepticism.

The New Orleans developments bring up the important question of the inherent dangers for the American radical movement in any government-sponsored inquiry into the assassination. Many U.S. radicals have proceeded as if they thought that a new investigation held out no dangers for the left, but could only serve to expose the right. However, the bourgeoisie can never be relied upon to expose itself, nor can it be relied upon not to utilize a new investigation of the Kennedy case to launch an attack on the left. The capitalist class has, after all, had hundreds of years experience at inventing so-called "left-wing conspiracies." As a matter of fact, that appeared to be what

the ruling class had in mind immediately after Kennedy was assassinated. Fortunately, after a few days they reversed themselves and decided not to press a witch-hunt.

In any case, revolutionary socialists will not and cannot support any new government inquiry into the Kennedy case, because revolutionaries can place no confidence in the capitalist judicial system or the capitalist police. This applies to both the federal and local situations. Socialists demand that the federal government and all local officials open all the files and release all the facts so that the American people can get at the truth.

This simple demand, which the bourgeois critics of the official version of the Kennedy assassination have studiously avoided, centers on a simple undenied fact. Namely, that the U.S. government is suppressing a large amount of material admittedly relevant to the case. According to Earl Warren himself, some of this material might not be released until the year 2039.

#### FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA PICKETS HELP TORONTO BANK FIND ERROR

Partisans of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee helped the Toronto Dominion Bank to correct an error. The assist was provided by a picket line in front of the bank's downtown office April 21.

The bank had refused to honor checks submitted by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee if they originated in the United States.

Mrs. Myra Dickson, secretary-treasurer of the organization told the press April 13 that she had been informed by bank officials that due to pressure from affiliates of the bank in the United States, they were no longer able to accept checks drawn on American banks. The Roncevilles branch of the Dominion Bank where the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has an account even sent formal notice to Mrs. Dickson that instructions had been received from the Head Office not to take such checks. [See World Outlook April 28, p. 453.]

About a dozen placard-carrying pickets appeared in front of the still unfinished main tower of the new Toronto-Dominion Centre.

Plainclothes police and bank security guards were mobilized in force.

Nervous bank officials evidently feared that the pickets might expropriate the sacred institution forthwith.

Very shortly a bank official issued a statement declaring that it was all a mistake which had now been corrected.

Norman White, assistant general manager, public relations and advertising, said: "We do not follow instructions of the U.S. government in respect of our Canadian banking operations."

He stressed that the bank accepts deposits for remittance to Cuba.

As a test, some of the pickets went to the bank's Wellington and Church street's branch where they had previously had trouble. They said they wanted to open a new account and they presented a \$25 check drawn on a New York firm.

"This time the manager was quite friendly and smiling," said one of the demonstrators.

The Toronto press, which gave considerable publicity to the picket line, did not describe what kind of smile was on the bank manager's face.

Book Review

AN ILLUMINATING STUDY OF A CASE OF THE INFANTILE DISORDER

By Joseph Hansen

MARXISM VS. ULTRALEFTISM, Key Issues in Healy's Challenge to the Fourth International, by Ernest Germain. Published by the Fourth International, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France. 97 pp. US\$1 or 7 shillings or 5 francs.\*

If it were possible to place the polemical literature of Marxism in the scales and weigh its quantity, the amount devoted to centrist opportunism would far outbalance the writings on ultraleft sectarianism.

The reason for this is rather obvious. Centrism reflects the pressure of capitalism on the labor and socialist movement in a rather direct way and most often has affected the course of big mass parties involving hundreds of thousands of members and a range of influence far beyond them in the working class.

Ultraleft sectarianism reflects the same pressures in an indirect way, taking the deceptive form of an apparent intensification of devotion to revolutionary principles. It most often involves only narrow ingrown circles, little inclined to activity, exercising small influence and with no hope of substantial growth. Hence the rather limited concern of revolutionary Marxism with the "infantile disorder," as Lenin called it.

In the case of the Socialist Labour League, all this would seem applicable. Its strenuous activism, which boils down to a simplistic tactical prescription that can be put in two words: "Pick-et them!" is a very meager substitute for the genuine implementation of Marxist theory in political practice. Its leaders are singularly unoriginal and unproductive, having made no contributions whatsoever of their own to theory outside of the very dubious ones considered in this pamphlet.

It can be added that in Britain, where the leaders of the Socialist Labour League have gained some notoriety for their success in practicing the theory that socialism and epithet-mongering are identical, it may seem to many to be an utter waste of time to deal with the

views of such a bizarre sect.

This pamphlet, however, is proof of the fact that the nature of the object under examination does not necessarily preclude the elucidation of lessons of rather broad interest.

In fact Germain's analysis of the views of the SLL leadership turns out to be of general value; for it considers some key issues of the day such as the nature and development of the Cuban revolution, the nature of the Soviet state and where it stands today, the importance of the colonial revolution as in Algeria and Vietnam, the problem of coalition governments, and the very important question of building a revolutionary socialist party in England.

These questions are not unfamiliar ones. They come up repeatedly for analysis and discussion. However, insofar as polemics have been involved, it has generally been against the opportunists. To consider the issues in the light of the ultraleft approach offers a certain novelty that in this instance at least proves to be refreshing.

Especially in Britain, where "Healyism" has become identical with the wholesale use of venomous epithets, wild charges and obscure incidents involving allegations about "combining with the right wing" and "Transport House" and "calling the cops," it should prove a relief to read an analysis of the SLL that shuns these back alleys and considers only what is really important -- the theoretical positions and political policies that lie at the heart of the peculiar place of the SLL in the British radical movement.

Utilizing the Marxist method in his study, Germain considers the SLL positions in their development. Thus we are enabled to gain a rational understanding of the process by which this ultraleft group, which boasts of its orthodoxy in maintaining the principles of Trotskyism, eventually came to make sweeping -- if unacknowledged -- revisions of those principles.

As cases in point, Germain shows how by maintaining that Cuba is still a capitalist state, the SLL leaders were compelled to revise Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution; how their uncritical support of one wing of the nationalist movement in Algeria at an early stage and their subsequent abstentionism in the Algerian revolution compelled them to revise Trotsky's position on the colo-

---

\* Available in England from Pioneer Book Service, 8 Toynbee St., London, E.1; in Canada from Vanguard Book Store, 824 Yonge St., Toronto 5; in the U.S. from Merit Publishers, 5 East Third St., New York, N.Y., 10003.

nial revolution; and how their denunciation of the "black power" aspects of the Negro struggle in the United States has forced them in fact to reject Trotsky's position on this vital question in the development of the American revolution.

Most ironic of all, Germain points out how in their eagerness to club "Pabloism" to death, they themselves stumbled into what they would call "Pabloite" positions.

Since the pamphlet was written, the SLL leaders have espoused the cause of Maoism. This is scarcely due to any sudden desire on their part to reform themselves and undergo a cultural revolution such as passing a motion binding all members to carry the little red book of Mao's thought, the better to recite quotations to each other.

Two possibilities are involved that are not necessarily contradictory. One is the attractiveness to the SLL leaders of Mao's current ultraleft posture coupled with his antidemocratic attitude derived from training in the school of Stalinism. The other is the

hope of influencing and possibly winning over the few Maoists to be found in England.

One can wish them well in this turn and express the hope that they deepen and speed their application of Mao's thought. Healy, the national secretary of the SLL, is in particular to be congratulated for having finally found a goal worthy of his talents: to become the Enver Hoxha of Clapham High.

The new level reached by the SLL leadership fits in logically with the previous novelties they have advanced. In straining to maintain their identity as a sect, they end up by bidding for membership in a personality cult more extreme and revolting -- if that is possible -- than the one fostered by Stalin.

The Marxist explanation for such a seemingly surprising culmination is provided by Germain's study of the SLL.

We recommend it to students of Marxism in general and to connoisseurs of ultraleftism in particular.

#### TROTSKY'S COPENHAGEN SPEECH AVAILABLE IN FRENCH

Montréal

La Lutte Ouvrière [Workers Struggle], official organ of the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, has announced publication of two new French-language pamphlets -- Marx et Engels sur le Parti Ouvrier and La Révolution Russe, by Leon Trotsky.

These follow the recent publication of Dialectique de la Révolution Mondiale [Dynamics of World Revolution].

The first pamphlet consists of excerpts from the writings of Marx and Engels over a thirty-year period. They begin with statements about the struggle between capital and labour, explaining why every trade-union struggle is, in the final analysis, a political struggle, and how the issues at stake in the struggle can only be definitively resolved in a battle for power.

They go on to project how the struggle must progress from the conservative slogan of "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work" to the slogan of abolition of the capitalist system.

Marx and Engels give great emphasis to the critical necessity of independent class political action, explaining why the workers should run their own candidates even where "there is no prospect at all for their election."

In outlining his views on what the attitude of socialists should be to an emerging labour party formation, Engels, in a letter to an American socialist argues against those socialists who set themselves above the real working-class movement by adopting sectarian and doctrinaire positions.

He talks about how, instead, socialists must in the words of the Communist Manifesto "represent the future of the movement in the present of the movement."

The pamphlet is timely in present-day Québec, where the Parti Socialiste du Québec shows serious misunderstanding of the labour party concept and where the New Democratic party has not yet entered the provincial political arena.

La Révolution Russe, which appeared originally in the Quatrième Internationale, offers the text of Trotsky's speech to a student audience in Copenhagen in November 1932.

In this inspiring address, the co-leader of the Bolshevik Revolution and its greatest historian and defender, tells why the first breakthrough in the international working-class struggle took place in backward Russia, contrary to the classical Marxist projections.

He explains the roots of the degen-

eration of the revolution and the rise of the Stalinist bureaucracy. He analyzes the place of the revolution in our historical epoch and explains the groundwork for its revival, a forecast borne out in recent years by mounting antibureaucratic struggle in the workers states, exempli-

fied most notably by the Hungarian Revolution.

The pamphlets cost 30 cents each and can be ordered from La Lutte Ouvrière, 66 rue Guilbault O., Montreal 18, Québec, Canada.

#### GUEVARA'S MESSAGE A SENSATION IN JAPAN

One of our correspondents in Japan reports that the message sent by Comandante Ernesto "Che" Guevara to the Tri-continental magazine created a stir in Tokyo.

tions from Guevara's appeal for revolutionary struggle against American imperialism, was published as a main front-page story by the Nippon Dokusho Shimbun, the biggest book-review weekly in Japan (circulation about 100,000).

The first publication to reach Japan with the news that Che Guevara had broken his silence was World Outlook, which also provided an English translation of the full text of Guevara's revolutionary message.

The other newspapers in Japan had apparently decided on a conspiracy of silence, not a line appearing about Guevara's message even in Akahata.

An article based on the material in World Outlook, with extensive quota-

The article in Nippon Dokusho Shimbun thus created a considerable sensation.

#### ARTICLE ON CHINA BY NOVACK AND HANSEN PUBLISHED IN CUBA AND MEXICO

A certain deepening of revolutionary consciousness appears to be occurring in vanguard circles in Latin America. Various recent developments testify to this but none more directly than the publication in Cuba of an article on the "Cultural Revolution" presenting a frankly Trotskyist point of view on this subject.

sively to Trotsky's analysis of the rise of Stalinism.

This is done by the authors in polemicizing with the editors of Monthly Review, an independent New York socialist magazine, who have taken a favorable view of the "Cultural Revolution" in China and Mao's role in it.

While vigorously defending the Chinese Revolution and its great achievements, Novack and Hansen oppose Mao's bureaucratic rule and speak in behalf of a program of proletarian democracy.

As against the editors of Monthly Review, who tend to take the "Cultural Revolution" at its face value, the two Trotskyist authors analyze it as part of a bitter factional struggle, one of the principal aims of which is to keep the Mao faction in power and to bolster a cult highly reminiscent of the one fostered by Stalin.

Besides appearing in Cuba, the article by Novack and Hansen has just been published in Mexico City. El Día, a well-known leftist publication, began it in installments in its issue of May 2.

Merit Publishers in New York have announced that the article is included in a pamphlet containing other articles on recent events in China which should soon be off the press.

The article, "The Upheaval in China -- An Analysis of the Contending Forces," was written by George Novack and Joseph Hansen and published as a special supplement in the January 23 issue of The Militant, a New York revolutionary-socialist weekly that has been a consistently strong supporter of both the Cuban and Chinese revolutions as well as the Soviet Union and the other workers states.

The article, which is a rather long one, took up the entire March 16 issue of a bulletin issued by the Revolutionary Orientation Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba. The bulletin, published once a week, offers editorials and articles from the foreign press. Selections are made from journals and magazines of all kinds and publication of an item does not necessarily mean that the commission agrees with it.

It is of considerable interest, nonetheless, that this particular article was chosen, inasmuch as it refers exten-

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL OPENS DISCUSSION ON DEVELOPMENTS IN CHINESE REVOLUTION

[The International Executive Committee of the Fourth International decided at a recent meeting to open a discussion in the ranks of the world Trotskyist movement on the current developments in the Chinese Revolution.

[As a basis for discussion, the committee drew up the following statement. This is not intended as a finished resolution but simply as a document to open the discussion.

[The discussion will last until the next world congress scheduled for some time in 1968. At that gathering a final decision on the various questions involved will be made by the delegates.]

\* \* \*

The crisis which has shaken China without letup since November 1965 emerged first as a crisis in the leadership of the Chinese Communist party. This leadership, which was formed mainly during the war against Japan and in the revolution, retained its essential homogeneity in the ten years that followed the revolution. It disintegrated in face of the domestic and international problems posed from 1959 on and the new social tensions that arose as a result of these problems.

In the course of the violent struggle which resulted from this crisis of leadership, and in particular due to the forms taken by the "Great Cultural Revolution," the party, state, trade-union, youth apparatuses, etc., were upset from top to bottom. For the same reasons, the relationships among the leaders, the apparatuses, and the masses also underwent fundamental changes. For the first time since the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the masses, and in particular the proletarian masses of the large cities, were mobilized in a process the logical culmination of which is an antibureaucratic political revolution.

Any return to the situation prevailing prior to the "Cultural Revolution" is excluded. The reconstitution of a united leadership with an authority even slightly comparable to that which overthrew the Kuomintang regime and the reorganization of apparatuses with a strong grip on the masses have been made all the more difficult because a whole series of ideological themes were put forward in the course of these events which were taken seriously by the youth and worker masses. The use of repressive measures on a very large scale has likewise been rendered difficult by virtue of the fact that such measures would be possible only through extensive recourse

to the army, which itself has been deeply affected by the crisis, and whose capacity for action must be at least maintained in face of the danger of war posed by the American escalation in Vietnam.

The Different Phases of the Crisis

Let us recall the different phases of the crisis:

(a) A first phase extending from November 1965 to the end of April 1966. In this phase, the leading group seemed to be feeling its way, engaging in polemics that could seem of secondary importance to the uninitiated but which had as their target the intellectuals displaying the most critical attitude toward Mao. At the same time, without too much fanfare, a reorientation or a rectification in certain basic sectors (the army, industry).

(b) A second phase stretching from May to the end of July 1966. This phase was featured by an offensive against the Peking group (Peng Chen) and some prominent intellectuals, and their elimination, as well as by the first wave of the "Cultural Revolution."

(c) The August 1966 Central Committee plenum, whose length (twelve days) testified to the extent of the debate and to the resistance encountered in the top-level leadership. This plenum ended with the adoption of a 16-point resolution in which the Mao group's positions were formally ratified.

(d) However, immediately following the Central Committee plenum, new conflicts appeared in the upper echelons. A second wave of the "Cultural Revolution" was launched with the mobilization of university, high-school and primary-school students, and the formation of the Red Guards. The leaders most particularly under fire in this phase were Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao Ping.

In the period extending from the end of the plenum to the beginning of December 1966, the Mao group failed to achieve its goals and to resolve the crisis. Clashes occurred between Red Guard groups and groups of workers and peasants. Divisions occurred among the Red Guards themselves, some of whom went beyond the instructions handed down from above. A growing resistance to the Maoist attacks showed up in the state and party apparatuses. The Mao tendency itself wavered on several occasions and divisions began to develop in its ranks, as attested to by the varying fortunes of some figures.

The struggle became sharper and sharper, and it was probably at this time

when the first repressions, admitted later by official sources, took place. Mao could no longer be content with applying the line set at the August 1966 plenum; he had to resort to new measures.

(e) After some preparatory steps, the Mao group, which up until then had sought support mainly among the youth, decided to appeal directly to the worker and peasant masses; and also to prepare the army, despite its persistent divisions, to play a larger and more decisive role than in the preceding phases. At the same time, other factions in the bureaucracy likewise appealed to the masses.

To mobilize the masses, the Mao group put forward ideological themes identical to those which had served to mobilize the Red Guards. The workers were called upon to eliminate the "partisans of the capitalist road" who had infiltrated the political and economic apparatuses, to assert their desires and their aspirations, and to elect revolutionary committees on the model of the Paris Commune. The army was told that its duty was not to stand aside and that it must take part directly in the political struggle at a time when a major conflict was in progress. Certain factions sought to mobilize the masses around their own economic demands and around the aspirations of the workers for autonomy.

#### The Shanghai Events

In this phase, the events occurred which threw numerous cities and industrial centers, Shanghai among others, into turmoil. Disturbances were likewise seen in some peasant districts.

Any attempt to explain this period by means of the activities of reactionaries must be rejected as false. Moreover, in the midst of the crisis itself, the survivors of the former regime do not seem to have played the least role, even in the countryside.

The immediate cause of the events of January 1967 lay in the rupture in the leadership of the Chinese CP and in the growing disintegration of the party and state apparatus at all levels. A vacuum, a relative absence of power, was thus created. In these conditions, in which the appeals to the masses helped, the various social forces were set in motion, each impelled by its own needs and objectives. Thus a crisis which had begun as a crisis in the leadership, resulting from conflicts over domestic and international problems, probably affected also by a resurgence among the masses, was transformed into a social crisis in which, transcending the official slogans and tactical maneuvers of this or that group or faction in the leadership, all the fundamental tendencies arising in the

course of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism took form and confronted each other for the first time.

The workers' movement tended to develop rapidly on a much broader and more concrete basis than was the case with the Red Guards, with a relatively independent dynamism, its own objectives and its own content; and it tended to go far beyond the vague and general appeals of the disputing factions.

The workers' movement in Shanghai, the most industrialized city in China and the richest in revolutionary traditions, had an unquestionably antibureaucratic portent. This movement was unleashed against the persons whom the workers considered responsible for their material difficulties and for the lack of real proletarian democracy. The workers resorted to their traditional forms of struggle, from work stoppages to strikes in the full sense of the word, from street demonstrations to the occupation of official buildings, from electing representatives to sending them to the regional authorities, and even to the central authorities. According to the reports, their demands concerned both the level of wages and more general living conditions. The housing problem seemed to play a special role; since people -- who must have been poorly housed -- moved into some buildings and houses.

In the countryside, the movements have been much weaker and, in general, limited to those regions closest to the large working-class centers. The demands put forward where the peasants were mobilized called for a greater allocation of production to family consumption, the opportunity to devote more effort to private plots, lessening of the gap between conditions in the countryside and in the cities. On this last point, the hundreds of thousands who were forced to return to the country from the cities after the failures of the "Great Leap Forward" must have made themselves felt.

The group thrown on the defensive by this crisis, although its views, with regard to economic orientation in particular were reflected in the party, was the technicians, cadres, and economic specialists -- with the exception of very small groups engaged in high level research, particularly in the nuclear field. This stratum had already been the object of attacks at the time of the industrial conferences in the spring of 1966 and had been directly in the line of fire during the mass mobilizations. Although it is still handicapped by its numerical weakness, it will not fail to assert its own demands in the future.

#### The Present Phase

Since the end of January, unques-



tionably in reaction to the mass movements and their getting out of hand, Mao's leading group attempted to effect a turn, which found its expression in the theme of the "Triple Alliance." This formula meant forming new leading bodies of the "Cultural Revolution" composed of representatives of the "Revolutionary Rebels" (the Mao faction), the army, and cadres, which even if they have committed "errors," have not "broken faith" and accept "Mao's thought."

To be explained mainly by the fear that the masses would get out of control and by the strength of the resistance within the bureaucracy itself, this change in orientation had the obvious object of keeping the masses in bounds and of recuperating a large number of cadres and leaders by again assigning them an important role. At the same time it was confirmed that the army was intervening. The shift showed very clearly that Mao is aiming solely at reforming and not overthrowing the bureaucracy; his faction now maintains that ninety-five percent of the cadres must be maintained in place.

This new phase in which a relative normalization is sought was also imposed by a series of other pressing needs. Re-opening of the schools had to be assured, in order to avoid new delays in the training of cadres and specialists. Slowdowns in industrial production had to be avoided. Above all, it was necessary to avoid upsetting work in the fields during the spring planting season. The official documents are now emphasizing the necessity of intensifying work.

In this new phase, the use of the term "bodies of a Paris Commune type" to designate the leading bodies of Peking and Shanghai has been abandoned. The "Triple Alliance" was formed with the object of appointing the new leaderships at the various levels from above, which tends to suppress any direct expression of the mass movement.

#### The Tendencies in the Leadership of the Chinese CP

While pro-Moscow elements and even a pro-Moscow tendency very probably exist within the Chinese CP, and while the Chinese leadership could have considered this tendency particularly dangerous because of the international support it might receive, it seems more and more clear that the crisis developed mainly within a leadership which had been in basic agreement in past years on the line to be followed in the Sino-Soviet conflict, particularly when it took the acute form of an ideological clash between the two parties. The divergences within this leadership probably began to emerge over economic problems, on the attitude to take regarding the intellectu-

als; and they were probably more and more aggravated by the deterioration of the situation (in particular with the defeat in Indonesia) and by the problems posed by the American escalation in Vietnam (whether or not to engage in joint action with the Soviet Union in the defense of Vietnam).

The way the crisis developed indicates that the Mao group saw possible opposition only in certain specific strata in the army and the economic bureaucracy. As a result, it attacked some groups controlling important positions (Peng Chen's group in Peking), and in addition broad layers of the intellectuals. From this standpoint, the Mao group attacked in a particularly violent way, in pure Zhdanovist style, journalists, intellectuals, a section of the oldest Communist intelligentsia, who in the past had expressed criticisms coming closest to a consistent antibureaucratic opposition in their works. Some were even accused of wanting to create an opposition by means of a Chinese version of the "Petöfi circles."

Eventually, resistance to the Mao group appeared in a large part of the party and state apparatus and was reflected in the attitude of some of the most highly placed leaders like Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao Ping.

As indicated above, the group promoting the "Cultural Revolution" began to undergo differentiation in the period following the August 1966 Central Committee plenum and it underwent clear cleavages at the end of 1966 at the time when Mao launched his appeals to the workers and peasants and came out for intervention by the army.

From the documents themselves of the most hard-core Maoist faction, it seems clear that certain groups (certainly among the military) were against using the army, probably for fear of creating strained relations between the army and the masses and of weakening the army in a situation fraught with dangers for the country. Other groups, it seems, were opposed to extending a mass mobilization, citing the obstacles this would put in the way of production and fearing that things would get out of hand.

The divisions among the Maoists took their most spectacular forms at the time of the Shanghai events; and they occurred precisely in the local leadership and the editorial staff of the local newspaper, which had been Mao's principal props at the end of 1965 and from which the first attacks heralding the launching of the "Cultural Revolution" had originated. A part of the Shanghai apparatus gave way to pressure from below, accepted some of the workers' demands, and made concessions. Another section resisted and in return got the support of the central Mao group.

In the most recent phase, at the time of the "conquest of power" by the "Triple Alliance," the Mao group denounced tendencies which, instead of submitting to the bureaucratically constituted new leading bodies, wanted to carry the struggle against the apparatus and the old leaders to its conclusion.

Thus the overall developments of the crisis enable us to judge more concretely the nature of Mao's positions and his contradictions.

In his factional struggle he has not hesitated to appeal to certain sectors of the masses in order to gain their support against his adversaries. To this end, neither has he hesitated to put forward antibureaucratic, egalitarian slogans, to invoke the revolutionary democratic tradition of the Paris Commune, to broadly criticize the practices of the postrevolutionary period. However, as soon as the masses which were beginning to move went beyond the bounds of bureaucratic controls, advancing their own demands and introducing their own methods of struggle, the Mao group intervened harshly against them, resisting their demands, denying concessions, and even gains already granted to certain sectors (for example, denying the Shanghai workers the means to travel to Peking which had been accorded to the Red Guards), ordering the army to intervene, sometimes only politically, but also in full-scale repressive actions, slandering the masses in the customary way by presenting them as pawns in diabolic plots. In other words, despite its appeals to certain sections of the masses, the Mao faction has continually demonstrated its profoundly bureaucratic character and has never ceased using a whole series of bureaucratic and Stalinist methods against its adversaries.

#### Tasks and Perspectives

Since the Chinese crisis is far from ended, there can be no question of drawing up a balance sheet as yet. Nevertheless, we can clarify some of its most important results and draw up tasks and perspectives on this basis.

Internationally, the Chinese crisis has contributed, due among other things to the ultraleft policy of the Chinese CP leadership, to the degeneration of the Sino-Soviet conflict into a conflict between workers states, featured not only by some scandalous acts on both sides but, above all, by the lack of united-front action by the two large workers' states for the defense of the Vietnamese Revolution. The Fourth International reaffirms the necessity of establishing a united front of all the workers' states and all the workers' parties on a platform of consistent struggle

against the American aggression in Vietnam. While the Fourth International has severely criticized the Soviet bureaucracy for its major responsibility for this situation and considers that the distrust on the part of China can be explained by a whole series of acts by Moscow, and while it believes that the Soviet leadership must reaffirm its solidarity toward China and solemnly declare that a war against China would be considered an aggression against the Soviet Union, at the same time, the Fourth International condemns the Mao group's rejection of a united front.

Although the Soviet leaders have striven their utmost to profit from the errors and excesses committed by the Chinese (rejection of a united front for Vietnam, the Mao cult, etc.), the Moscow leadership continues to encounter considerable difficulties in calling an international congress of Communist parties intended to condemn the Chinese CP. The developments of the crisis in China exert an influence on broad circles because of some of the ideological themes which they advance; because of the light cast on the problems posed by the existence of a bureaucracy in the workers' states. The Fourth International underlines the fact that the Chinese crisis has, among other things, given new value to the Trotskyist definitions and political theories relating to the bureaucratic degeneration in the workers' states, to the specific nature of some of the forms of Stalinism in the degeneration of the first isolated workers' state, and to the necessary and possible political revolution against the bureaucracy.

On the other hand, while the events in China arouse strong interest and great sympathy for the Chinese Revolution, the Chinese leadership is incapable of rallying around itself political formations of even the slightest seriousness in the international workers' movement. Even the mass Communist parties of Asia, which backed Peking against Moscow in the preceding years, took their distance from the Chinese CP during the "Cultural Revolution." Here, too, there was no new edition of the grip of a state bureaucracy on the broad masses of the workers' movement of the world, even on the basis of a state as big as China.

In conclusion, the Fourth International restates the necessity for a critical examination of a whole series of experiences, in particular the tragic experience of Indonesia. The self-criticism of the Indonesian CP constitutes a step forward in this area, but this self-criticism has been carried out only halfway and leaves out the responsibility of the Chinese leadership in this tragic defeat.

At the national level, this situation takes the form of the disintegration of the leadership which assured the triumph

of the revolution, even if the turmoil in the apparatus and the interventions of the masses still play only a transient role as independent social forces. None of the groups which have issued from the leadership is able to offer a real solution to the current problems of the Chinese Revolution. Ideas have been put forward in the course of these events which cannot but leave an imprint on the most advanced sectors of the Chinese party members and the workers. Thus favorable conditions as a whole exist to build a new vanguard whose object would be to impel the mass movements in the direction of an antibureaucratic political revolution.

In the light of the available information, it can be gathered that elements or groups exist in China which express positions bordering on revolutionary Marxism and that sectors of the mobilized masses are inspired by demands and aspirations shared by the Fourth International. But the information is not sufficiently clear to permit the International to identify itself with any of the tendencies or factions in the Chinese CP now contending with each other. The lack of information is largely due to the Stalinist methods employed by the Mao faction against its opponents, which we energetically condemn. As for Mao's opponents, such as Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao Ping, who held and who still hold considerable means of making known their political line had they so desired, their silence on this subject compels us to be relatively cautious concerning the contents of their policies.

The Chinese revolutionary Marxists must support all mass movements, participating in all actions in which the masses can gain political understanding and act in the defense of their demands independent of any influence by bureaucratic groups. Such participation is mandatory even in cases in which some spontaneous demands are not entirely correct.

In order to develop the mass movements in the direction of an antibureaucratic political revolution, the revolutionary Marxists must strive to rally the most progressive elements in the various existing camps around a program based on the specific needs of the Chinese Revolution at the present stage and on the level of maturity attained by the masses or by their most advanced strata.

In addition to the international tasks mentioned above, such a program must include the following principal points in particular:

- The struggle for the broadest measure of democracy for the masses and the limitation and abolition of the bureaucracy's advantages and privileges. Around this arise the problems of the

democratic election of committees by the masses, organization of the state on the basis of such bodies, freedom of organization and the right of all proletarian tendencies to express themselves, the independence of the trade unions with respect to the state, the right of assembly, freedom of the press, freedom to demonstrate, the right to participate in elections, permanent control of elected representatives by the masses with the right to recall them at any time, along the lines of the Paris Commune. In the current crisis, this involves condemning slanderous methods and upholding the right of different factions and tendencies to express their positions themselves.

- The organization of a democratic type of planning by bodies elected democratically from top to bottom by the masses. The basic economic choices must be determined in this framework, in particular the rate of investment and the level of consumption, i.e., in the final analysis, the workers' wage rates and living conditions, and not by the decision of the bureaucratic upper echelons. The revolutionary Marxists will make the vital distinctions between the demands of the workers and those of the bureaucrats. If the criticisms aimed at "economism" are legitimate when they are directed against the bureaucratic and technocratic layers or against measures assuring privileged conditions for some categories, they must be energetically rejected in instances where they are directed against workers as in the case of the Shanghai workers who protested against the working conditions and living conditions imposed on them by bureaucratic groups.

- In the countryside, complete democratization of the life of the communes, which includes the right of the peasants to withdraw from them, should the occasion arise. Participation of the peasants in working out general economic policy.

- In the field of culture, the elimination of all Zhdanovist practices, freedom of expression and criticism, rejection of any leadership cult, free confrontation of ideas and tendencies.

The struggle against the ideologies of the past cannot be effectively conducted by means of administrative measures or by the imposition of slogans and norms, but by the independent development of the potentialities of the new society.

Only socialist democracy in all fields will enable the Chinese Revolution to evoke the enthusiasm and creative spirit of the masses, to improve the living conditions of the Chinese people, to aid in surmounting the backward conditions of the country, and to extend the prestige of the Chinese Revolution throughout the entire world.

FRENCH PCI DENOUNCES HOODLUM METHODS

[The Central Committee of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (French section of the Fourth International), after discussing an incident that occurred at a meeting of the Cercle Karl Marx (Karl Marx Circle) April 28 at the Mutualité Hall, issued the following declaration.]

\* \* \*

Discussions at the Karl Marx Circle have always been completely free. This is known to everyone who has ever had occasion to participate in them. Its sponsors have in general not even thought it necessary to have any stewards.

When, in face of this tradition, a group of around forty members of the OCI [Organisation Communiste Internationaliste] and the Révoltes group burst into the hall under the leadership of Stephane Just and Chisseray long before the time set for the meeting and took over the first rows of seats in the hall, this indicated deliberate intent to create a disturbance and to prevent the meeting from proceeding normally.

The speaker, Ernest Mandel, made an analysis of the developments in the "Cultural Revolution" in China which was followed with interest by the audience.

In the discussion period, Stephane Just, the second to take the floor, launched into a series of personal attacks, using foul and provocative language, accusing "Mister" Mandel and "Mister" Frank [Pierre Frank, one of the leaders of the Fourth International] of being traitors and renegades..

The lecture and the discussion were taken down on tape, we therefore have unassailable evidence of the provocative and foul language used by Stephane Just.

This tape is available to any organization or any militant who wishes to listen to it.

Just's remarks aroused the indignation of the audience which demanded that the chairman put a stop to a contribution which had nothing to do with the subject under discussion and which constituted an exhibition unworthy of a workers' meeting.

When Just had used up his time, the chairman told him to yield the floor. Just and his commandos tried to take the rostrum by assault.

After a few minutes, they were expelled from the hall and the meeting con-

tinued with an audience of around 350 persons until past midnight. The discussion was an interesting one without the least further incident.

It is not the purpose of this statement to go into the differences between the PCI and the OCI, nor to argue against the positions of the OCI. It is enough to point to the similarity between the conduct of the OCI and that of the Communist parties in the "third period."

In those days the leaders of the PC's made the accusation that the Trotskyists were linked to the imperialists by way of the Social Democracy and encouraged the employment of violence within the workers' movement.

For Just, there is at present a link between the imperialists and the members of the Fourth International by way of the bureaucracy in Moscow, Peking and elsewhere. With Trotskyists having different tactical concepts, or even with centrists or reformists, it is necessary to discuss politically. With traitors and renegades, young militants are instigated to commit aggressive actions. This is the outcome of his specious, ultraleft, infantile reasoning.

The Trotskyist movement, in accordance with the tradition of revolutionary currents in the workers movement, has always condemned in the most uncompromising way any recourse to violence within the workers movement, including against the most hardened reformists.

The employment of violence within the workers movement is either a reflection of the pressure of the class enemy or something which irresponsible elements resort to. The use of violence by Just, Chisseray and others in an attempt to sabotage the meeting of the Karl Marx Circle constitutes a complete break with the most firmly established tradition of Trotskyism with regard to proletarian democracy. Among other things, it weakens the struggle against these same methods when they are employed by the Stalinists, as they frequently are at present.

Resorting to such violence is, moreover, inconsistent on the part of the OCI which, a few weeks earlier, on the eve of the legislative elections, appealed to a certain number of militants beforehand to denounce any sabotage of their meetings by the Stalinists.

The incident at the Karl Marx Circle came on the heels of other incidents in which the same people or their political associates took part at Liège on October 15, 1966 and in London November 17,

1966.

We hold the OCI and the Révoltes group accountable. If they do not repudiate the actions of Just and Chisseray, who are members of their leadership, it will be necessary to consider these organizations as responsible for hooligan methods, unworthy of militant workers and involving the gravest injury to the Trotskyism which these organizations claim to uphold.

We are sending this statement to various French and international organizations, and to some militants, particularly those who signed the appeal to respect the meetings of the OCI, who have, like all of us, the greatest interest in seeing to it that the widest democracy is upheld in the workers movement. We are ready at any time to talk over this incident and the responsibility involved with these organizations and these militants.  
May 7, 1967

A VIETNAMESE PROFESSOR THANKS THE AMERICAN ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

[The following open letter "To American Professors and Students" was written before the giant demonstrations in New York, San Francisco and other cities in the United States April 15 opposing the role of the Johnson administration in the war in Vietnam. It indicates how appreciative the beleaguered Vietnamese people are for such expressions of solidarity with their struggle. The letter also offers striking proof of the moral stature of the Vietnamese in not succumbing to chauvinism despite the horrors inflicted on them by the American military colossus.

[The letter was published in the April 17 issue of the Vietnam Courier.]

\* \* \*

Dear Friends,

I am writing this letter to you at a time when you are fully engaged in your Spring Mobilization against the American dirty war in Vietnam. That is why the very first thing I want to tell you is: What you are doing is very important and very urgent, and is a great source of encouragement for the Vietnamese people as well as for all peace-loving people in the world.

President Johnson has just closed his Guam conference aimed at intensifying and expanding the war in Vietnam. He is making new and extremely dangerous steps in war escalation in both North and South Vietnam although the word "escalation" is being carefully avoided in all official documents. At the same time, he is launching a big, skilfully conducted propaganda and diplomatic campaign in which old tunes are being rehashed by British Premier Wilson, Australian Premier Holt and other old acquaintances.

The meaning of all this is that after suffering repeated setbacks on the battlefields of Vietnam over the past few months, Johnson is conducting a large-scale psychological offensive, the purpose of which is, first, to deceive

the American and world people and, second, to threaten our people and those of the other socialist countries, in the hope of driving us to the conference table and forcing us to negotiate on his own terms.

To prop up this scheme, he is rallying all his American and "allied" forces to launch even more destructive and barbarous attacks on our country and our people. This means that your G.I.'s will be guilty of even more odious crimes, but this also means that they shall suffer ever heavier losses.

That is why, now more than ever, you, Americans who are conscious of your historic responsibility in this war, and we, Vietnamese people, we should increase our cooperation and better coordinate our actions within the World Peoples' Front against the American war of aggression in Vietnam, so as to uncover and defeat this new and extremely dangerous plot of the Johnson administration.

In our joint effort to achieve this aim, we are benefiting from favourable conditions which we have never known before. Never, indeed, have the Americans and the Vietnamese people found themselves so close to each other.

In former times, you were a rich and distant nation, very distant from us, much more distant than one would judge from geographical maps. Cultured Americans did not even know the name of our country. In the period following World War II, on account of frantic anti-Communist propaganda and intense segregationist activities in the United States, a fairly large number of Americans were ready to give unreserved support to any hostile policy which their government would carry out against our country. The majority of the others might feel something like compassion for us. But convinced as they were that ours is a backward nation, whose existence could hardly have any bearing on the development of world events, they directed their attention towards other targets such as, say, the space race or the Cold War between East and West in

Europe...

Yet, even at that time, a number of Americans raised their voices to oppose the dangerous policy of intervention and aggression advocated by the U.S. government.

But since 1961, the situation has changed. The American warmongers have started a large-scale, brazen aggressive war upon our country. Running up against unexpectedly vigorous resistance, they have resorted to war means which even the Hitlerite fascists had shrunk from: poison gas, napalm, indiscriminate bombings by B-52's, etc. At the same time, they have sustained losses which they have found harder and harder to cover up, and have had to spend huge sums which could no longer be buried away in other chapters of the budget or carried over to the next fiscal year.

The ordinary American citizen has realized at last that we are a living reality, a patriotic people fighting for an ideal, something one could not very easily erase from the surface of this earth. A number of noble-minded Americans, the most outstanding of whom was Norman Morrison, and a fairly large number of professors, students, scientists and other intellectuals have begun to discover that they are in presence of a huge plot carried out by the Administration to hide from the American people the serious losses suffered, and worse still, the horrible crimes perpetrated by the American troops in Vietnam. They have raised their voices to protest, and have organized themselves to protest.

To uncover more completely the schemes and crimes of their rulers, a number of American citizens have sought every means to visit our country in defiance of their own government. They have conducted direct investigations on the spot, had talks with Vietnamese leaders and met Vietnamese people of all strata. This has given the Americans a better knowledge of the Vietnamese, and conversely we have come to know them better. However, more understanding is still needed, and for that purpose there should be more contacts and exchanges of views between us. I would like to make a few suggestions in this connection.

As far as I know, many of you American friends are sincerely concerned about what is happening to us, a small and weak nation which is obstinately resisting a great power with seemingly unlimited economic and military potential. Is it because of "inadequate" knowledge of science, technology and American psychology that we have "underestimated" the power and the sinister designs of the American imperialists?

We are grateful to you friends for this concern, which springs from humane feelings. For us, to form a correct estimate of our enemy's strength is something we must constantly bear in mind. Indeed, in waging our resistance war against American aggression, we have never permitted ourselves to lose sight of the fact that our country is still lagging behind in modern technology.

Conscious of our responsibility towards the world peoples as well as our own people, we are fully aware that we must fight and defeat the U.S. aggressors in a struggle which cannot be but a protracted and hard one. So we have to make very careful calculations. So far we have not made use of electronic computers as they do in the Pentagon, and yet all our predictions have come true whereas those of the White House have all miserably collapsed. It is no mere accident that over the past six years, not only have our Southern compatriots not been subdued but they have won repeated victories and are winning ever greater ones.

Likewise, it is not by accident that our Northern compatriots have shot down over 1,700 American aircraft, which are among the best in the world.

At present, the White House and the Pentagon are taking great liberties with facts and figures in an effort to present a falsely optimistic picture of the war to the American people. To falsify figures is indeed merely a routine matter with most Western military staffs. But the American Command in Vietnam has so far broken all records, outdoing the worst liars in military history.

We, on the contrary, publish only facts and figures which we know as being true, and indeed we cannot do otherwise. To win, we must see the truth clearly and tell it plainly. To try to deceive our own people and the other peoples is to deceive ourselves and to destroy the very source of our strength.

Whatever twisted arguments the White House may put forth, it cannot deny the fact that only after six years of aggression on our small country, U.S. economic and military potential has proved itself far from being limitless. On the contrary, in many aspects, if not in all, it has shown great limitations. In manpower, ammunition supplies, as well as in the number of planes and in logistical support, the American military machine, although a gigantic one, has failed to show full combat readiness. The very nature of material things is to have limitations, in Vietnam as well as in the United States. The key problem is how to use them, and what for.

American war expenditures in Vietnam have now reached 25 billion dollars in figures made public, i.e., 3% of the U.S. gross national product. This cannot fail to throw the American economy off balance and seriously hamper the realization of other important targets. This you know even better than we do. As a scientific worker, I cannot help noting that American investments for scientific research are also about 25 billion dollars, of which more than 60% are for military research, while only 2 billion are allotted to fundamental research.

It is clear that for the United States these are strategic investments, even more important than defence investments. The least cutback in those investments would cause unforeseeable disturbances in the development of American science as well as in the life and activities of American scientific workers. War escalation in Vietnam means de-escalation in American scientific research.

American friends often wish to know about the effect in Vietnam of the antiwar movement in the United States. As we have said repeatedly, we consider this movement as having a great significance and ever-increasing effect. The Vietnamese people warmly hail their American friends and are deeply grateful to them. In the last analysis, the aggressive war waged by President Johnson against our country is a war conducted in the name of the American people, at the expense of American wealth and blood.

That is why we fully approve of your efforts to make the American man in the street know clearly who is responsible for the war in Vietnam, who is making war criminals of American young men and who is driving them to shameful and unlamented death; hence to make him realize

that the only correct way to end the war in Vietnam is the following: whoever has sent American troops to Vietnam should withdraw them from there; whoever has ordered the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, an independent and sovereign nation which has done no harm to the United States, should put a definitive and unconditional end to such bombing, and should not use temporary pauses as bargaining assets for further criminal action; also to make it clear to him that it is up to the American people to defend the right of every nation to shape its own destiny.

In short, your struggle is a just one, for it is indispensable at present to make the American people love their American country, love their American youth, and take a resolute stand in defence of the fine traditions and the legitimate prestige of the American nation.

Naturally, the greater and nobler its aim, the harder and more protracted the struggle will be. And the more effective your struggle grows, the more the American authorities will increase their deceptive manoeuvres, threats and repression.

As for us, we promise to you that we shall do our part. First of all, as President Ho Chi Minh has said in his reply to President Johnson, we shall never negotiate under the threat of American bombs.

Best wishes of glorious success for your Spring Mobilization.

Ta Quang Buu  
Professor  
Vice-Chairman, State Committee of  
Sciences and Technology of Vietnam

#### PSYCHOLOGIST SAYS VIETNAMESE WILL FIGHT TO THE END

The people in north Vietnam are strongly united and determined to fight for their freedom to the end.

This was reported by Horace Champney, 61, a psychologist who visited north Vietnam with a group of pacifists who delivered \$10,000 worth of medical supplies to Haiphong in the 30-ton ketch, Phoenix.

Upon returning to Hiroshima, Champney told the press that the scale of U.S. bombing in north Vietnam was far greater than he had anticipated. Villages

near Hanoi, he said, had suffered great damage. In addition, the U.S. was dropping antipersonnel fragmentation bombs over the countryside.

He found the Vietnamese people friendly to Americans despite the horrors inflicted on them; but they have made up their minds to fight on against the U.S. aggression with whatever weapons they possess.

The United States, said Champney, should stop the war immediately.

12,000 POLITICAL PRISONERS IN GREECE

The Paris daily Le Monde reported in its issue of May 11 that three members of the French parliament, upon returning from a mission of inquiry in Athens, estimated May 3 that there are 12,000 political prisoners in the jails and concentration camps of Greece.

This figure appears to be conservative. On April 28 General Patakos declared that there were 5,421 persons under arrest, of whom 780 had been shipped to the island of Yaros.

But on May 9, the same General Patakos, who holds the post of minister of the interior and who is one of the key military men who plotted the April 21 coup d'état, gave a press conference the figure of 6,138 on Yaros alone.

"I just came from the island of Yaros," the general told the correspondents. "I went there in a helicopter with the minister of public order. At present on Yaros there are 6,138 detainees, of whom 235 are women. But I can state that more than half of these detainees will be released because there are many innocent people among them arrested without reason."

The "guilty" ones arrested "with reason" are, in actuality, guilty only of having political views different from those of the reactionary generals who toppled the government in order to block an election that would only have been won by an ordinary bourgeois party.

To sort out the "guilty" from the "nonguilty," an ad hoc commission has been set up, said General Patakos. Those whom the ad hoc commission decides to hold will be sorted out in various categories and sent to different islands.

The sorting out job is scheduled to be completed within ten days, the general added.

He did not reveal the names of the members of the Inquisition which will sit in judgment on the 6,138 detainees.

The general waxed eloquent about the conditions that have been provided for the political prisoners herded onto the island, a notorious hellhole under the Metaxas dictatorship, under the Nazi occupation and under the dictatorship fostered by the Truman Doctrine.

"The site is idyllic," said Gen. Patakos. "The detainees live in tents or little houses which need repairing. A dispensary assures them medical care. There are two military doctors who are helped by medical students among the detainees. At present there are fourteen sick people, all of them very well cared for."

The military junta have banned mini skirts and beards. The Western press is satiric about this, but is saying less and less on the tragedy of Greece again converted into a stifling prison. After all this is normal for a country ruled by an American satellite government.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
U.S. Government Found Guilty by War Crimes Tribunal .....	505
Barrientos Holds Régis Debray Incommunicado .....	507
Supranationality .....	508
Terror Marks Second Anniversary of U.S. Invasion of Santo Domingo .....	509
Already in the Initial Phase of World War III? .....	510
For Once Johnson Tells the Truth .....	511
Rome University Holds Its First Teach-in -- by Sirio Di Giuliomaria .....	511
"A Nice Little War" .....	512
Hugo Blanco Case:	
French-Canadian Journal Features Hugo Blanco Case .....	513
Québec Young New Democrats Appeal for Hugo Blanco .....	513
Support for Hugo Blanco Mounts in Uruguay .....	513
Ky Demands More Troops from U.S. ....	513
CIA-FBI Accused of Concealing Facts in Kennedy Assassination -- by Arthur Maglin .....	514
Fair Play for Cuba Pickets Help Toronto Bank Find Error .....	515
Book Reviews:	
An Illuminating Study of a Case of the Infantile Disorder -- by Joseph Hansen .....	516
Trotsky's Copenhagen Speech Available in French .....	517
Guevara's Message a Sensation in Japan .....	518
Article by Novack and Hansen Published in Cuba and Mexico .....	518
Documents:	
Fourth International Opens Discussions on Developments in Chinese Revolution .....	519
French PCI Denounces Hoodlum Methods .....	524
A Vietnamese Professor Thanks the American Antiwar Movement .....	525
Psychologist Says Vietnamese Will Fight to the End .....	527
12,000 Political Prisoners in Greece .....	528