

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. 30
September 8, 1967

Socialist Workers Party Sets U.S. Election Campaign for 1968



SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY PRESS CONFERENCE in New York, August 31, announced plans for 1968 election campaign. Fred Halstead (seated, facing cameras on the right) will be the presidential candidate and Paul Boutelle (seated, facing cameras on the left) will be the vice-presidential candidate.

Stokley Carmichael's Address to OLAS (Complete Text)

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.

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY LAUNCHES 1968 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

New York

AUGUST 31 -- The Socialist Workers party today outlined plans for its national campaign in 1968 at a press conference in the party headquarters.

Fred Halstead, the Socialist Workers party candidate for president and Paul Boutelle, the vice-presidential candidate, described a program focusing on bringing U.S. troops home from Vietnam and fighting for black control of black communities.

The growing interest in these issues was demonstrated by the unusually large press attendance. Four television networks, the major press services and a number of foreign newspapers covered the campaign announcement.

The TV coverage included two national networks, ABC and NBC, and two local New York channels, WOR and WNEW. The press services included AP, UPI, and AFP; and reporters were present from the New York Daily News, the New York Times and El Tiempo, a New York Spanish-language daily.

Jack Barnes, the national campaign manager, told reporters that the party intended to make this campaign the biggest one in its history. He stated that the party would attempt to get ballot status in twice the number of states as in previous campaigns.

(U.S. electoral laws are determined on a state-by-state basis. Not a few of the largest states, including California, Illinois and Ohio, have election laws which make it virtually impossible for minority parties to be on the ballots.)

Reporters pressed Paul Boutelle, an Afro-American known for his work in Harlem to build an independent black political party, to explain why he was running on the slate of a socialist organization.

Boutelle stated that his campaign for a socialist program did not in any way contradict his advocacy of black power. On the contrary, he saw the campaign as a way of publicizing and furthering the struggle for black power.

That struggle, he contended, is twofold. It is a struggle of blacks against white oppressors and also a struggle of black workers against capitalist bosses.

The reporters tried to get Halstead to say that the Socialist Workers

party was exploiting the black power agitation. "No," he said, "we socialists have always supported the black power struggle."

The more hostile reporters tried to pin Boutelle down on the question of advocating violence.

"The entire history of the United States, from slavery to the Civil War to the sending of troops to the ghettos, shows that violence always comes from the white ruling class, not the other way around," the Afro-American candidate explained, and he cited abundant evidence to prove his point.

Fred Halstead, a cloth-cutter by trade, has been active in many union-organizing drives. He participated in the GIs' "We Want to Go Home" movement following World War II, in the Far East.

He is widely recognized as a leader in the New York and national antiwar movements which he helped organize from the beginning.

Paul Boutelle is a member of the New York taxi-drivers' union. He has been active in defending the seventeen black nationalists framed on trumped-up charges in Philadelphia and he recently chaired a meeting in support of the SNCC leader H. Rap Brown.

In 1965 he was the candidate of the all-black Freedom Now party in Harlem.

Boutelle announced plans to make a speaking tour of the black communities and campuses in the South during September and early October.

Halstead stated he intends to be active in the antiwar movement to build the most massive mobilization against the war in Washington, October 21. He will then fill speaking engagements from coast to coast.

In a statement issued at the press conference Halstead declared, "The only way to end the war is to bring the U.S. troops home immediately. That is what the American people want and that's what the troops want. As recent polls show, on this issue, we speak for more Americans than the Republican or Democratic parties."

The fact that the Socialist Workers party will be the only one expressing the sentiments of the majority of Americans on the war issue promises to make this campaign the most important in its history.

ISAAC DEUTSCHER

By Pierre Frank

Paris

Isaac Deutscher's death is a heavy loss for revolutionary Marxism.

He was born 60 years ago in Chrzanow, near Cracow, in that part of Poland then incorporated into Austro-Hungary. He came from a highly orthodox Jewish environment. He repudiated his Talmudic molding, was won over by Marxism, and joined the Polish Communist party in 1926 at the age of 20. He soon became a "specialist" in Soviet problems within the party. As an opponent of the Stalinist "third period" policy which paralyzed the German proletariat confronted with the rise of Hitlerism, he participated in the formation of the Polish Trotskyist Opposition in 1932 and was expelled from the Communist party.

As a participant in the Trotskyist movement, he was against the formation of the Fourth International in 1938. After seeking refuge in London in 1939, he ceased functioning as a militant and thereafter devoted himself to journalism and to writing the works through which he became known to an ever-growing public.

His articles and essays on the Soviet Union had nothing in common -- is there any need to say so? -- with those of the official "Kremlinologists." The value of his writings, both in substance and style, came not only from his knowledge and talent; it is above all derived from the fact that the journalist and writer was deeply attached to Marxism as a method of thought and passionately dedicated to the international struggle of the masses for socialism.

Thus he carried on the struggle as an unaffiliated combatant in a manner suited to his gifts. A certain nostalgia for the life of a militant was expressed in an essay he wrote on the Polish communist movement which continued to be of concern to him. On this account, among others, he felt the need to write a letter to Gomulka in defense of the young Polish revolutionaries, K. Modzelewski and J. Kuron, who were expelled from the party and given prison terms for having maintained their antibureaucratic communist positions. The defense of Vietnam against American imperialism also induced him to resume a certain kind of militant political activity. This was exemplified by his courageous intervention in the university "teach-ins" in the United States and by his participation in the War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell.

The most important of his books, the one to which he devoted ten years of his life, is his biography of Leon Trotsky (the trilogy: The Prophet Armed, The Prophet Unarmed, The Prophet Outcast). This biography is incontestably a masterpiece worthy of the great revolutionary to whom it was dedicated.

It is impossible in a few lines to give an appreciation of a work in which not only are the facts scrupulously set forth in contrast with the colossal lies and calumnies heaped up by Stalinism and the essence of Trotsky's theories and views presented in the clearest and most striking way, but in which Deutscher, who did not know Trotsky in his lifetime, was able to paint so lifelike a portrait of that many-sided and complex personality.

He was likewise able to delineate the equally rich personality of Natalia, Leon Trotsky's companion, with much sensitivity.

Those who will write about Trotsky in the future -- and there will undoubtedly be many such people -- may perhaps be able to add some new elements and make judgments different from Deutscher's, but they will have to take his trilogy as a point of departure.

We had intended to publish various articles about this biography in a special issue of Quatrième Internationale written by members of the Trotskyist movement and other partisans of revolutionary Marxism in which a number of important questions posed by Deutscher's work would be discussed. He had promised to participate by replying to the criticisms that were brought forward. For reasons beyond our control there was a delay in carrying through this project. And we have not abandoned it. But now, unfortunately, it will remain incomplete.

Also regrettable is the fact that his death leaves unfinished the biography of Lenin upon which Deutscher spent the last few years. Since Lenin's life was much less colorful than Trotsky's, this biography would have largely been focused upon the formation and development of Lenin's ideas and in such a domain Deutscher would have made an outstanding contribution.

It is impossible for us to recall the memory of Isaac Deutscher without saying a few words about his disagreements with the Trotskyist movement, with the Fourth International. We are not thinking about those differences which can emerge

on the occasion of particular events; in fact, these were very slight in recent years. For example, we had very close agreement during the Middle East conflict. We refer rather to those divergences on important questions which sometimes provoked lively controversies -- without raising any obstacles to the existence of very friendly relations -- namely, those disagreements regarding the perspectives of the Soviet Union and the question of the Fourth International itself.

On the first issue, Isaac Deutscher counterposed the perspective of a quasi-gradual restoration of Soviet democracy to the necessity for a political revolution in the Soviet Union which is inscribed in our program. This difference became especially pronounced after Stalin's death. Though we both believed that Stalin's totalitarian and bloody methods had to be replaced by other methods of government, we did not attribute the same weight to the phenomenon of "de-Stalinization." In our opinion this process signified that the bureaucracy was making a defensive retreat. He reposed greater hopes in it and saw in it the justification for his perspective.

But Deutscher's thought was not static. He had already begun to place a question mark over this perspective in the third volume of Trotsky's biography. Without wishing to misinterpret his thought in any respect, we got the impression from all of his latest writings (some of those pieces republished in Ironies of History and The Unfinished Revolution) that, in the light of the development of the Soviet Union over the past ten years and of the domestic and international policies of Khrushchev and

his successors, our differences on this point were being reduced.

On the other hand, up to the very end he displayed an intractable obstinacy on the matter of the Fourth International. For years we had not been able to carry on any discussion, that is to say, a genuine dialogue on this question. This is not the place to dwell on this controversy in which we could not see any right on his side. Having said this, it is also necessary to add that his personality could not have easily unfolded its talents within the framework of an organization and very likely he was best able to serve the cause of the socialist revolution as a free-lance writer.

While deploring Deutscher's attitude, the Fourth International has to be faithful to its function which is to encourage and publicize every production of value for revolutionary Marxists, and Deutscher's activity occupies an eminent place in this domain. In particular, we cannot forget that it often served to introduce numerous young people to Trotskyist ideas which led to their political activity within the Trotskyist movement itself.

By continuing to popularize his writings in the future, we will not only remain true to ourselves but we will help the memory of Isaac Deutscher continue to participate in the world struggle for the socialist revolution.

We send the expression of our solidarity to his wife, Tamara, and his son, Mark, in the grievous ordeal they have experienced.

August 22, 1967

DEFENSE COMMITTEE FOR MEXICAN WITCH-HUNT VICTIMS

A committee has been founded to aid the political victims of the Mexican government. Its immediate concern is the case of the fourteen prisoners of the sensational government witch-hunt which began July 19.

[For further details on this case see pages 758-759, and World Outlook, August 11, 1967, pages 715-727.]

The founding of the Mexican Political Prisoners Defense Committee was announced on August 9 in the Hall of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the Autonomous University of Mexico. A provisional coordinating committee was elected at the same time.

Most of the participants in the committee at this time are students, since the immediate occasion for the com-

mittee's formation is the "Case of the Fourteen," nine of whom are students.

The committee's intent, however, is to extend its field of activity as widely as possible, involving many radical and progressive organizations. It will defend all political prisoners in Mexico regardless of their ideological convictions.

The committee is distributing a statement by the fourteen arrested in the guerrilla "plot" case with a description of their backgrounds and the treatment they have been getting in prison.

Until the committee has its own address, correspondence should be directed to Perspectiva Mundial, Apartado Postal 27-509, Mexico 7, D.F., with the note "para el Comité."

GUATEMALAN GUERRILLAS USE NEW METHODS

[The following interview with César Montes, one of the main leaders of the Guatemalan guerrilla movement, appeared in the July 30 issue of the Havana daily, El Mundo.

[One of the points of particular interest in Montes' discussion of the struggle against the ferocious repression which the government has mounted against all political opposition is the organization of the campesinos along trade-union lines. This is occurring parallel to the guerrilla struggle.

[The possibility and even the necessity of organizing the campesinos in mass formations, the main demands of which are economic demands, was developed in Peru by Hugo Blanco, the peasant leader now being held in the notorious El Frontón prison. It was held by many to be a "Trotskyist" innovation. That the same pattern is now developing at least to some degree in Guatemala shows that Hugo Blanco's contribution has possibilities of rather wide application in the Latin-American struggle for emancipation.]

* * *

MONTEVIDEO, July 29 (PL) -- The conditions facing the indigenous population and its growing sympathy for the guerrilla movement in Guatemala were delineated in an interview granted by the commander in chief of the Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes [FAR -- Armed Rebel Forces], César Montes, to the Uruguayan journalist Eduardo Galeano.

In his exclusive account for Prensa Latina, Galeano referred especially to the poverty of the indigenous Guatemalan population, noting that despite the opinion of certain American anthropologists who exhibit all the vices of electronic computers, "the Indians participate in the country's overall economy -- they participate as victims, but they participate."

In response to a question from the Uruguayan journalist on the means by which the FAR gets in contact with the Indians, Montes said:

"The struggle can develop in several ways. And not only through a guerrilla front like the one we have set up in Zacapa. These Indians have met our people who told them about the series of struggles which the campesinos south of San Marcos and in Suchitepequez, Retalhuleu, Escuintla and Santa Rosa were able to maintain.

"When the Indians become integrated into the economic life of these

places, they realize that there are new demands that can be won."

In this respect, Montes said that the campesinos in these areas are cheated. Offered a certain daily wage, they are paid less; offered so many days work, it turns out less.

"Trade unionism, here among the campesinos, is proscribed by the government. Everything is so backward in this country that any kind of union, organized to defend strictly economic rights, is labeled 'Communist,'" the Guatemalan guerrilla leader emphasized.

Galeano points out that throughout the interview, Montes repeated that "as the counterrevolution advances, the revolution develops."

"And in fact," said the Uruguayan journalist, "the military campaign of 'search and destroy' and the ferocious terrorism unleashed by the Army through its white guards has resulted in a tactical retreat by the guerrillas in their usual zones of operations and the extension of the struggle into new zones."

He added that along with this the guerrillas had put new methods into practice and had deepened their understanding of the characteristics of each region and sector of the population.

"Work in the purely Indian zones," he noted, has to be "patient work, careful work."

In connection with this, the commander in chief of the Guatemalan FAR listed the difficulties, spoke about the intervention of U.S. forces under the mask of the "Peace Corps" and the religious missions of various kinds that have been in the region a long time, warping the outlook of the Indians in order to keep them from engaging in political struggles.

Later the Uruguayan journalist noted in commenting on his interview with Montes that the Indians are obliged to leave their homes to perform military service.

"Many soldiers have deserted and joined the ranks of the opposition. Because, as Montes says, 'you can fool part of the people all the time, and all of the people part of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time.'"

In another part of his account, the reporter cited a number of statements by César Montes concerning the integration of the Indians into different facets of the national life.

CONTINUED HARASSMENT OF POLITICAL PRISONERS IN MEXICO

By Ricardo Ochoa

The Dantesque experience of Daniel Camejo Guanche's mother has provided yet another demonstration of how the harassment, humiliation and indignities to which political prisoners in Mexico are subjected, are extended even to those -- their families included -- who try to come to their aid.

[For full details on the arrest, imprisonment and torture of 13 victims in Mexico's new witch-hunt, see World Outlook, August 11, 1967.]

Mrs. Elvis Ratner, a citizen of the United States living in New York, came to Mexico to give whatever help she could to her son Daniel, who is a victim of a "plot" frame-up cooked up by the Mexican government in order to establish closer ties with the Johnson regime.

She arrived in Mexico City on Saturday, July 29. This was not exactly the most propitious time for her to start a bout with the bureaucratic Mexican authorities. Only the day before, they had committed another arbitrary and illegal act against one of her sons.

Peter Camejo, also a U.S. citizen, had come to Mexico to help his brother and was abruptly deported after a fruitless attempt to visit Daniel in prison [see World Outlook, August 11, 1967].

Mrs. Ratner was able to see Daniel and his companions the following Sunday. She was able to witness in flesh and blood the truth about the tortures to which they have been subjected.

Pablo Alvarado was recovering from wounds which the political police of the Dirección Federal de Seguridad [Federal Security Administration], an organization closely supervised by the CIA, had inflicted on his arms, back and shoulders with a hot iron after burning cigarettes had produced no effect.

She saw how bad the conditions are under which the prisoners are forced to live -- without beds, in cells without doors, open to the harsh climatic conditions of the Mexican plateau -- intense heat in the day and bone-chilling cold at night.

On leaving the prison, Mrs. Ratner asked permission to bring a bed for her son and it was granted. But the following day, the guards refused to let her put the bed in the cell. She argued to no avail that the warden himself had agreed to let her bring it.

Mrs. Ratner went back to the warden. He was upset at "the trouble the lady was causing." Trouble?! She had to wait until Wednesday to bring the bed.

But in the meantime she was to receive another demonstration of "courtesy" from Mexican authorities. On that Monday night, three agents of the Secretaría de Gobernación [Government Secretariat] tried to "interview" her.

Mrs. Ratner refused to open the door of her room because her son's experience had shown her that such "interviews" end in deportation. They didn't even let Peter Camejo go for his clothes and money and threatened to beat him up if he did not follow their orders to the letter.

With such past experience, Mrs. Ratner told them she would only speak with them in the United States Embassy. When she met them there the following day, they had no questions to ask her.

By the middle of the week, she had already gone through enough harassment to make her realize the difference between her country, where bourgeois legality is more respected, and the hell of the colonial and semicolonial countries.

In such countries, if bourgeois legality exists at all, it is only a pretext for demagogic speeches on fiesta days and is conspicuously absent from the day-to-day run of life. It is more than 7,000 kilometers from New York to Mexico City, but there is a thousand times greater distance between the bourgeois democracy of the U.S. and the "representative democracy" of Mexico.

Mrs. Ratner was to continue to be subjected to this painful difference. In order to accomplish anything, the prison police made her make many return trips and wait long hours. For instance, she had to wait four hours before they gave her the suit Daniel was wearing when he was arrested.

Finally, on the day of her departure for New York, she was not permitted to see Daniel because "he was being punished." They did not tell her the reason.

A few days later, a friend of Daniel's, one of his attorneys, tried to see him in accordance with his prerogatives as a lawyer. The authorities stopped him on the pretext he was not "on the list," exactly as they had done in the case of Peter's last attempt to see his brother.

RUSSELL ASKS FOR INQUIRY INTO MEXICAN WITCH-HUNT CASE

[The following statement on the current witch-hunt case in Mexico was released to the press by Bertrand Russell on August 2.]

* * *

London

Mexico's enduring resistance to foreign domination is unique in the Western Hemisphere. The names of Padre Hidalgo, Benito Juarez, Emiliano Zapata and Lázaro Cárdenas inspire profound feelings in all Latin Americans who aspire to national independence and the rectification of social injustice. With its long history of self-determination and civil liberty, Mexico should continue to set an example for all the Americas.

The recent arrest and imprisonment of Daniel Camejo Guanche and thirteen others seems to contravene Mexico's long-

established traditions. These men should not be persecuted for holding unorthodox political views.

The charges brought against them should be examined scrupulously and impartially by an independent international commission. This commission should also investigate the defendants' countercharges of abusive treatment and the coercion of forced confessions.

In the meantime all defendants should have the elementary right to be set free on payment of a reasonable sum as bail.

In those countries where the United States exercises its hegemony, political dissent is seldom tolerated. Latin America has become a continent of political prisoners. Mexico should not betray its own best traditions by conforming to this grim pattern.

MASS CHILEAN MEETING DEMANDS FREEDOM FOR BLANCO

The Central Unica de Trabajadores de Chile [CUT -- Chilean Trade Union Federation] and the Federación de Estudiantes [FECH -- Student Federation] held a mass meeting May 10 to demand Hugo Blanco's release.

Oscar Nuñez, secretary general of

CUT, declared "on this day of labor, the organized Chilean workers demand the freedom of the Peruvian fighter Hugo Blanco."

There were more than 10,000 persons in the meeting. CUT represents the majority of Chilean workers and peasant unions.

PEREYRA, MARTORELL, CANDELA RECEIVE ADDITIONAL SENTENCES

[The following article appeared in the August issue of Solidarité de Perou, the bulletin of the French Committee for Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru.]

* * *

The trial of 31 revolutionaries who are accused of having expropriated funds of several banks in 1963 in order to obtain money to finance revolution and to purchase arms ended July 18.

Since the trial had been continually adjourned -- although it began several times -- most of the defendants had already spent five years in jail.

Of the group, twenty-five were set free and eight were given additional sentences. Mantorell and Pereyra were given seven-year terms, meaning that they have two more years to serve before their re-

lease. It is assumed, however, that they will be set free soon because they have completed two-thirds of their sentences.

Candela, Hugo Blanco's chief lieutenant, was given two more years in addition to his prior sentence. He will be sent to the Sepa concentration camp in the Amazon region for 27 years.

Kreus, already sentenced to 17 years for the murder of the Colombian Uriel Ramirez, was given an additional seven years and will join Candela in Sepa.

José Fonken is still being held in prison since he is yet to be tried for another offense. Hernan Bosco was sentenced to 15 months. The trial lasted one month and four days.

Among those released were Raul Terzi, Felix Tello, Jorge Tamayo, Gorcki Tapia, and José Nuñez Marchand.

DEBRAY TRIAL ARBITRARILY POSTPONED

Régis Debray's trial is being arbitrarily postponed by the Bolivian military authorities, according to European reporters covering the sensational event. The young French journalist Debray has been imprisoned since April 21.

After stalling for several months, the Barrientos dictatorship announced that Debray would be tried in mid-August. It will now be mid-September at the earliest according to French and British correspondence.

One French reporter offered the opinion that the authorities "were trying to discourage the numerous observers and foreign journalists who have already waited several weeks" (Le Monde, August 22, 1967).

Another reason is suggested by the nature of the prosecution as it is developing. The military now intends to try Debray along with five other alleged members of the guerrilla force in the Nancahuazú region.

According to two British observers

covering the trial, two of the additional defendants "are deserters from the guerrillas and pawns of the Army. The others are men expelled from the combat zone for physical deficiencies by the guerrillas themselves."

[The full text of this British report, printed in the London Observer August 27, gives a vivid account of the background of the Debray case and will be published in a future issue of World Outlook.]

As if to verify this premonition one of the two "deserters," Vincente Rocabado, declared August 25 that he had seen Debray "carrying arms to the guerrilla encampment in Nancahuazú."

Meanwhile, at a press conference in Camiri where he is being tried, Debray told reporters August 16 that he had been tortured for the first two days of his capture. Debray reasserted that he had been asked to go to Bolivia to interview Che Guevara and that he had spent nearly a month with him.

A DEATH IN SUNNY MEXICO

[The following article, written by Armando Rojas Arevala, appeared in the July 24 issue of Novedades, a Mexico City daily.

[It is of interest in indicating the living conditions among the poor in the capital of Mexico. The translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

A hundred or so foul and hungry rats devoured a 45-day-old baby boy yesterday while its mother wandered through the streets of the city begging people for money to help her get food for her baby and its little brothers.

The tragedy occurred within a hut made of stones, adobe and pieces of cardboard at División del Norte 102, Colonia del Bosque.

Because her three children were crying for something to eat, the washerwoman, Carmen Flores Morales, 35, went out to get some money. She returned an hour later.

It was about 5 p.m. when Carmen reached her hovel with some seven pesos [U.S.\$.60).

As she neared, she heard the sobbing of her children and she ran, fearing something bad had happened.

With a horrible shock she saw that her baby had been devoured by the hungry rats which had come out of a drain pipe, while her two other sons -- Inocencio Flores, 5, and Jesús, 3 -- sobbed in a corner, panic-stricken.

The mother picked up a stick which she used to bar the door and fell furiously on the rats, which fled. She shouted for help from the neighbors but by the time they arrived the baby had died. The repellent animals had eaten away half its face and its stomach.

Carmen picked up the body of her son and brought it in her arms to the police station in Villa Obregon to ask them to help her so she could give the body a Christian burial.

The agent of the Ministerio Público sent the body to the Servicio Médico Forense and the authorities there decided to bury it in a common grave.

The washerwoman was almost out of her mind from the tragedy and the doctors at the Xoco hospital had to give her sedatives.

BLACK POWER AND THE THIRD WORLD

(Stokely Carmichael's Address to OLAS)

[The following is the text of the speech made by Stokely Carmichael at the OLAS (Organization of Latin-American Solidarity) Conference held in Havana July 31-August 10. (See World Outlook, August 25, 1967.)

[As a spokesman of the black power movement and a leading representative of the oppressed minorities in the United States, Stokely Carmichael was a center of attention throughout the conference. His contributions toward clarifying the issues involved in the freedom struggle in the U.S. were greatly appreciated by the OLAS delegates and the Cuban people.

[The text of the speech is the one provided by the secretarial service of the OLAS.]

* * *

We greet you as comrades because it becomes increasingly clear to us each day that we share with you a common struggle; we have a common enemy. Our enemy is white Western imperialist society. (Note that we use the term white Western society as opposed to white Western civilization. The West has never been civilized. It has no right to speak of itself as a civilization.) Our struggle is to overthrow this system which feeds itself and expands itself through the economic and cultural exploitation of nonwhite, non-Western peoples -- the THIRD WORLD.

We share with you also a common vision of the establishment of humanistic societies in the place of those now existing. We seek with you to change the power bases of the world, where mankind will share the resources of their nations, instead of having to give them up to foreign plunderers where civilizations can retain their cultural sovereignty instead of being forced to submit to foreign rulers who impose their own corrupt cultures on those civilizations they would dominate.

Anglo society has been nearly successful in keeping all of us -- the oppressed of the Third World -- separated and fragmented. They do this for their survival, because if we felt our unity we would know our strength. Especially here on this continent, where the Anglo is in the minority, he has for hundreds of years succeeded in keeping all of us who are oppressed from realizing our common plight. But the call of Che Guevara for a continental struggle against a common enemy would seem to ameliorate this fragmentation among those who would resist Western imperialism.

We speak with you, comrades, because we wish to make clear that we understand that our destinies are intertwined. Our world can only be the Third World; our only struggle, for the Third World; our only vision, of the Third World.

Until recently, most African-Americans thought that the best way to alleviate their oppression was through attempts at integration into the society. If we could enjoy public accommodations in the United States (motels, hotels, restaurants, etc.) our condition would be alleviated, many of us believed. This attitude was characteristic of the "civil rights movement" and clearly points up the bourgeois character of that "movement." Only the bourgeoisie are in a position to be concerned about public accommodations.

The African-American masses, on the other hand, do not have any jobs, any housing worthy of the name decent, nor the money to enjoy restaurants, hotels, motels, etc. The "civil rights movement" did not actively involve the masses, because it did not speak to the needs of the masses.

Nonetheless, the "civil rights movement" was a beginning and because its aims met resistance throughout the U.S.A., depths of racism heretofore unrecognized were laid bare. It had been thought that the aims of the "civil rights movement" would be easily realizable, because the United States Constitution supported them. But thousands of African-Americans were jailed, intimidated, beaten, and some murdered for agitating for those rights guaranteed by the Constitution, but only available to whites.

Eventually, the United States Congress passed a Civil Rights Bill and a Voting Rights Bill, assuring us of those rights for which we had been agitating. By this time, however, more and more of us were realizing that our problems would not be solved by the enacting of these laws.

In fact, these laws did not begin to speak to our problems. Our problems were an inherent part of the capitalist system and therefore could not be alleviated within that system.

The African-American masses had been outside the "civil rights movement." For four years they watched to see if any significant changes would come from the nonviolent demonstrations. It became clear to us that nothing would change and in the summer of 1964, only a couple of weeks after the Civil Rights Bill was passed,

the first of what is now over one hundred rebellions occurred. The following year, the same year that the Voting Rights Bill was enacted, one of the largest rebellions occurred in Watts.

These rebellions were violent uprisings in which African-Americans exchanged gunfire with policemen and army troops, burned down stores and took from the stores those commodities that are rightfully ours -- food and clothing -- and which we never had.

These rebellions are increasing with intensity and frequency each year until now practically every major city has seen us rise to say, "We will seize the day or be killed in the attempt."

The "civil rights movement" could never attract and hold the young bloods who clearly understood the savagery of white United States and who are ready to meet this savagery with armed resistance. It is the young bloods who contain especially the hatred Che Guevara speaks of when he says, "Hatred as an element of the struggle -- relentless hatred of the enemy that impels us over and beyond the natural limitations of man and transforms us into an effective, violent, selected and cold killing machine."

The black power movement has been the catalyst for the bringing together of these young bloods: the real revolutionary proletariat ready to fight by any means necessary for the liberation of our people. In exposing the extent of racism and exploitation which permeates all institutions in the United States, the black power movement has unique appeal to young black students on campuses across the country. These students have been deluded by the fiction that exists in white North America that if the black man would educate himself and behave himself he would be acceptable enough to leave the ranks of the oppressed and join white society.

This year, when provoked by savage white policemen, students on many campuses fought back, whereas before they had accepted these incidents without rebellion. As students are a part of these rebellions they begin to acquire a resistance consciousness. They begin to realize that white North America might let a very few of them escape one by one into the mainstream of her society, but as soon as blacks move in concert around their blackness, she will reply with a fury which reveals her true racist nature.

We are moving to control our African-American communities as you are moving to wrest control of your countries -- of the entire Latin continent -- from the hands of foreign imperialist powers. Therefore there is only one course open

to us. We must change North America so that the economy and politics of the country will be in the hands of the people. Our particular concern is our people -- African-Americans. But it is clear that a community based on the community ownership of all resources could not exist within the present capitalist framework. For the total transformation to take place, whites must see the struggle that we're engaged in as being their own struggle. At the present time, they do not. Even though the white worker is exploited, he sees his own best interest lying with the power structure. Because of the racist nature of this country, we cannot work in white communities, but have asked those whites who work with us to go into their own communities to begin propagandizing and organizing. When the white workers realize their true condition, then there will exist the possibilities for alliances between ourselves and them.

However, we cannot wait for this to happen, or despair if it does not happen.

The struggle we are engaged in is international. We well know what happens in Vietnam affects our struggle here and what we do affects the struggle of the Vietnamese people. This is even more apparent when we look at ourselves not as African-Americans of the United States, but as African-Americans of the Americas.

At the present moment, the power structure has sown the seeds of hate and discord between African-Americans and Spanish-speaking people in the large cities where they live. In the state of California, Mexican-Americans and Spanish-speaking people comprise almost 50 percent of the population, yet the two view each other with suspicion and sometimes, outright hostility. We recognize this as the old trick of "divide and conquer" and we are working to see that it does not succeed this time.

Last week Puerto Ricans and blacks took the streets together in New York City to fight against the police, which demonstrates success in this area. Our destiny cannot be separated from the destiny of the Spanish-speaking people in the United States and of the Americas. Our victory will not be achieved unless they celebrate their liberation side by side with us. For it is not their struggle, but our struggle.

We have already pledged ourselves to do what we are asked to aid the struggle for the independence of Puerto Rico, to free it from domination by United States business and military interests. And we look upon Cuba as a shining example of hope in our hemisphere. We do not view our struggle as being contained within the boundaries of the United States as they

are defined by present-day maps. Instead we look to the day when a true United States of America will extend from Tierra del Fuego to Alaska, when those formerly oppressed will stand together, a liberated people.

Our people are a colony within the United States; you are colonies outside the United States. It is more than a figure of speech to say that the black communities in America are the victims of white imperialism and colonial exploitation. This is in practical economic and political terms true.

There are over thirty million of us in the United States. For the most part we live in sharply defined areas in the rural black belt areas and shantytowns of the South, and more and more in the slums of the northern and western industrial cities. It is estimated that in another five to ten years, two-thirds of our thirty million will be in the ghettos -- in the heart of the cities. Joining us are the hundreds and thousands of Puerto Ricans, Mexican-American and American Indian populations. The American city is, in essence, populated by people of the Third World, while the white middle class flee the cities to the suburbs.

In these cities we do not control our resources. We do not control the land, the houses or the stores. These are owned by whites who live outside the community. These are very real colonies, as their capital and cheap labor are exploited by those who live outside the cities. White power makes the laws and enforces those laws with guns and nightsticks in the hands of white racist policemen and black mercenaries.

The capitalist system gave birth to these black enclaves and formally articulated the terms of their colonial and dependent status as was done, for example, by the apartheid government of Azania [South Africa], which the U.S. keeps alive by its support.

The struggle for black power in this country is the struggle to free these colonies from external domination. But we do not seek to create communities where in place of white rulers, black rulers control the lives of black masses and where black money goes into a few black pockets: we want to see it go into the communal pocket. The society we seek to build among black people is not an oppressive capitalist society -- for capitalism by its very nature cannot create structures free from exploitation. We are fighting for the redistribution of wealth and for the end of private property inside the United States.

The question that may be asked is how does the struggle to free these in-

ternal colonies relate to your struggle to destroy imperialism. We realistically survey our numbers and know that it is not possible for black people to take over the entire country militarily and hold large areas of land.

In a highly industrialized nation the struggle is different. The heart of production and the heart of commercial trade is in the cities. We are in the cities. With our rebellions we have become a disruptive force in the flow of services, goods and capital.

Since 1966, the cry of the rebellions has been "Black Power." In this cry, there was an ideology implied which the masses understood instinctively. It is because we are powerless that we are oppressed and it is only with power that we can make the decisions governing our lives and our communities. Those who have power have everything; those who are without power have nothing. Without power we have to beg for what is rightfully ours. With power we will take our birthright, because it was with power that our birthright was taken from us.

Black power is more than a slogan; it is a way of looking at our problems and the beginning of a solution to them. It attacks racism and exploitation, the horns of the bull that seek to gore us.

The United States is a racist country. From its very beginning it has built itself upon the subjugation of colored people. The Europeans who settled the United States systematically stole the land and destroyed the native population, the Indians, forcing them eventually onto reservations where they live today, a mere 0.3 percent of the total population. And at the same time the United States was waging genocide against the Indians, it was raping the African continent of its natives and bringing them to the Americas to work as slaves.

To enslave another human being, one needs a justification and the United States has always found this justification in proclaiming the superiority of whites and the inferiority of nonwhites. We are called "niggers"; Spanish-speaking people are called "spicks"; the Chinese, "chinks"; the Vietnamese, "gooks." By dehumanizing us and all others of color, it therefore becomes just, in the mind of the white man, that we should be enslaved, exploited and oppressed.

However, it becomes even easier to keep a man a slave when he himself can be convinced that he is inferior. How much easier it is to keep a man in chains by making him believe his own inferiority! As long as he does, he will keep himself in chains. As long as a slave allows himself to be defined as a slave by the master, he

will be a slave, even if the master dies.

This technique has been successfully practiced not only against us, but wherever people have been enslaved, oppressed and exploited. We can see it happening today in the schools of large U.S. cities where Puerto Rican and Mexican children are not allowed to speak Spanish and are taught nothing of their country and their history. It is apparent in many African countries, where one is not considered educated unless he has studied in France and speaks French.

Black power attacks this brainwashing by saying, WE WILL DEFINE OURSELVES. We will no longer accept the white man's definition of ourselves as ugly, ignorant and uncultured. We will recognize our own beauty and our own culture and will no longer be ashamed of ourselves, for a people ashamed of themselves cannot be free.

Because our color has been used as a weapon to oppress us, we must use our color as a weapon of liberation. This is the same as other people using their nationality as a weapon for their liberation.

This coming together around our race was an inevitable part of our struggle. We recognize, however, that this is not the totality, only the necessary beginning.

Black power recognizes that while we are made to feel inferior, this is only so that we may be more easily exploited. Even if we destroy racism, we would not necessarily destroy exploitation. Thus, we must constantly launch a two-pronged attack; we must constantly keep our eyes on both of the bull's horns.

Color and culture were and are key in our oppression. Therefore our analysis of history and our economic analysis are rooted in these concepts. Our historical analysis, for example, views the United States as being conceived in racism. Although the first settlers themselves were escaping from oppression, and although their armed uprising against their mother country was around the aggravations of colonialism -- "taxation without representation," etc. -- the white European settlers could not extend their lofty theories of democracy to the Indian, whom they systematically exterminated as they expanded into the interior of the country. Indeed, in that same town where the settlers set up their model of government based on the theory of representative democracy -- in that same town the first slaves were brought from Africa.

In our economic analysis our interpretation of Marx comes not only from his writings, but from how we see capitalism's

relationships to people of color.

The labor movement of the United States while in the beginning containing some great leaders in the struggle against the absolute control of the economy by the industrial lords, essentially fought only for more money. Those few who had the vision of extending the fight for workers control of production, never succeeded in transmitting their entire vision to the rank and file. This labor found itself asking the industrial lords not to give up their control but merely to pass out a few more of the fruits of this control. Unlike us, they do not raise questions of redistributing the wealth inside the U.S.

Thereby did the United States anticipate the prophecy of Marx and avoided the inevitable class struggle within the country by expanding into the Third World and exploiting the resources and slave labor of people of color.

U.S. capitalists never cut down on their domestic profits to share with the workers. Instead they expanded internationally and threw the bones of their profits to the American working class.

The American working class enjoys the fruits of the labors of the Third World workers. The proletariat has become the Third World; the bourgeoisie is white Western society.

The true potential revolutionaries in this country are the black youths of the ghettos; those who have developed insurgence in the cities are African-American and Latin communities where past rebellions have taught important lessons in dealing with the government's armed reaction to our uprisings.

These rebellions should not be taken lightly. In the past three years, there have been over one hundred uprisings in the internal colonies of the United States. These are no doubt reported to you as "minor disturbances initiated by a few malcontents." These are major rebellions with numbers of participants who are developing a consciousness of resistance.

It is with increasing concern that we see the United States will by any means necessary attempt to prevent the liberation struggles sweeping across the Third World. But in particular we know that the United States fears most the liberation struggle on this continent. In order to secure itself geographically, the United States must have Latin America, both economically, politically and culturally. It will not do for the Anglos to be isolated on a continent of hostiles.

Black power not only addresses itself to exploitation, but to the problem of cultural integrity.

Wherever imperialism has gone, she has imposed her culture by force on other peoples, forcing them to adopt her language and way of life. When African slaves were brought to this country, the Anglo saw that if he took away the language of the African, he broke one of the bonds which kept them united and struggling. Africans were forbidden to speak to each other in their own language. If they were found doing so, they were savagely beaten into silence.

Western society has always understood the importance of language to a people's cultural consciousness and integrity. When it moved into the Third World, it has moved to impose its own language. In Puerto Rico, where Yankee cultural imposition is at its height, English is taught in all high schools for three years, while Spanish is taught for two years.

Anglo society learned other valuable lessons from the enslavement of Africans in this country. If you separate a man's family, as was done to the slaves, you again weaken his resistance. But carry the separation further. Take a few of the weaker slaves and treat them as house pets -- the lighter skinned slaves (the offspring of the master's rape of the African woman) was preferred. Give him the crumbs from the master's table and cast-off clothing and soon he will fear to lose these small comforts. Then use his fears by getting him to report on the activities of the bad slaves, report the impending revolts and uprisings. Distrust and dissent is created among the Africans, and thus they will fight among themselves instead of uniting to fight their oppressors.

Today's descendants of African slaves brought to America have been separated from their cultural and national roots.

Black children are not taught of the glory of African civilization in the history of mankind; they are instead taught about Africa: the dark continent inhabited by man-eating savages. They are not taught of the thousands of black martyrs who died resisting the white slave masters. They are not taught of the numerous uprisings and revolts where hundreds of brave Africans refused to submit to slavery. Instead, their history books read of "happy slaves singing in their fields...content with their new lives." Those "few" slaves who did resist are called "troublemakers," "malcontents," "crazy."

Black children in North America grow up aspiring only to enter white society -- not only because white society eats better, is housed and clothed better and can make a better living -- but

also because they have been bombarded by the white-controlled communications media and educated by black teachers with white minds (our petty Yankees) that white IS better, white is beautiful. Anglo features, manner of speech and aspirations are to be acquired if one is to be successful, even WITHIN the black community.

The white man hardly needs to police his colonies within this country for he has plundered the cultures and enslaved the minds of the people of color until their resistance is paralyzed by self-hate.

An important fight in the Third World therefore is the fight for cultural integrity. Wherever Western society has gone, as Frantz Fanon tells us, she has imposed through force her culture.

Through force and bribery (the giving of a few crumbs to a few petty Yankees) the people of a conquered country begin to believe that Western culture is better than their own. The young people begin to put aside the richness of their native culture to take on the tinsel of Western culture. They become ashamed of their roots and inevitably can only be trapped in a life of self-hate and private pursuit for self-gain.

Thus does the West entrap whole peoples with little resistance.

One of our major battles is to root out corrupt Western values and our resistance cannot prevail unless our cultural integrity is restored and maintained.

It is from our people's history, therefore, that we know our struggles and your struggles are the same. We have difficulty getting the information we need on what is happening in your countries. In so many ways we are illiterate of your heroes, your battles and your victories.

We are working now to increase the consciousness of the African-American so it will extend internationally. The United States fears this more than anything else, not only because such a consciousness would destroy within black communities the minority complex so carefully cultivated by the Anglos, but because it knows that if the black man realizes that the counter-insurgency efforts of this country are directed against his brother, he will not go, he cannot go. Then it will become crystal clear to the world that the imperialist wars are racist wars.

During the past year we have instituted a black resistance to the draft movement, not only because we are against black men fighting their brothers in Vietnam, but also because we are certain that the next Vietnam will be on this continent. Perhaps Bolivia where there are now "spe-

cial forces advisors," perhaps Guatemala, Brazil, Peru or the Dominican Republic.

The African-American has tried for the past four hundred years to peacefully exist inside the country. It has been to no avail.

Our history demonstrates that the reward for trying to peacefully coexist has been physical and psychological murder of our peoples. We have been lynched, our houses have been bombed and our churches burned. We are now being shot down in the streets like dogs by white racist policemen and we can no longer accept this oppression without retribution. We must join those who are for armed struggle around the world.

We understand that as we expand our resistance and internationalize the consciousness of our people as our martyred brother Malcolm X taught us, retaliation from the government will come to us as it did to him.

As the resistance struggle escalates, we are well aware of the reality of Che Guevara's words that the "struggle will not be a mere street fight...but will be long and harsh." In the end our common brotherhood sustains us all, as we struggle for our liberation by any means necessary.

But black power means that we see ourselves as part of the Third World; that we see our struggle as closely related to liberation struggles around the world. We must hook up with these struggles. We must, for example, ask ourselves: When black people in Africa begin to storm Johannesburg, when Latin Americans revolt, what will be the role of the United States and that of African-Americans.

It seems inevitable that this nation will move to protect its financial interests in South Africa and Latin America which means protecting white rule in these countries. Black people in the United States then have the responsibility to oppose, at least, to neutralize, that effort by the United States.

This is but one example of many

such situations which have already arisen around the world -- with more to come.

There is only one place for black Americans in these struggles, and that is on the side of the Third World. Frantz Fanon, in The Wretched of the Earth, puts forth clearly the reasons for this and the relationship of the concept of a new force in the world:

"Let us decide not to imitate Europe; let us try to create the whole man, whom Europe has been incapable of bringing to triumphant birth.

"Two centuries ago, a former European colony decided to catch up with Europe. It succeeded so well that the United States of America became a monster, in which the taints, the sickness and the inhumanity of Europe have grown to appalling dimensions...

"The Third World today faces Europe like a colossal mass whose aim should be to try to resolve the problems to which Europe has not been able to find the answers..."

It is a question of the Third World starting a new history of man, a history which will have regard to the sometimes prodigious theses which Europe has put forward, but which will also not forget Europe's crimes of which the most horrible was committed in the heart of man, and consisted of the pathological tearing apart of his functions and the crumbling away of his unity.

No, there is no question of a return to nature. It is simply a very concrete question of not dragging men towards mutilation, of not imposing upon the brain rhythms which very quickly obliterate it and wreck it.

The pretext of catching up must not be used to push man around, to tear him away from himself or from his privacy, to break and kill him.

No, we do not want to catch up with anyone. What we want to do is go forward all the time, night and day, in the company of man, in the company of all men...

U.S. SOCIOLOGISTS OPPOSE VIETNAM WAR

The hitherto conservative American Sociological Society voted 8 to 1 in favor of U.S. unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam at its annual convention in San Francisco August 30.

Although the chairman of the academic gathering ruled a formal resolution

out of order the 1,000-member audience passed the antiwar motion as a "show of sentiment" overwhelmingly.

The New York Times reported that "the four-day convention has been seriously disrupted by anti-Vietnam war activities..."

THE MURDER OF BENNO OHNESORG AND STUDENT RADICALIZATION IN GERMANY

By Gisela Mandel

To understand the West German and West Berlin events of recent weeks as well as the progressive radicalization of students leading to the June 2 death of 26-year-old literature student Benno Ohnesorg, it is necessary to examine the development of a student group, the Sozialistischer Deutsche Studentenbund [SDS -- Socialist German Student Federation].

In 1959, at the infamous Godesberg party congress of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands [SPD -- Social Democratic party] where Marx was finally and definitively cast aside and Lasalle enthroned in his place, the long simmering ideological conflict between the SPD and its student organization, the SDS, broke out into the open.

Standpoint, the West Berlin organ of SDS, which till then had been financed by SPD, published as the title page of its last issue six pictures of Marx gradually disappearing into mist. The SPD cut off its student organization financially and formulated an "incompatibility declaration": anyone who chose to remain a member of SDS would be automatically expelled from SPD. The SPD concluded its side of the fight with the words: "We'll show them who is boss in Germany."

In place of the SDS, for the few students who stayed with the SPD, the party formed the Sozialdemokratischer Hochschulbund [SHB -- Social Democratic University Federation]. The new student organization first came to public attention a year ago when it came into ideological conflict with the ever rightward moving SPD and the SHB moved politically closer to the SDS. But the majority of students stayed in the SDS. In 1960, it constituted a political student group of approximately one thousand members with neither financial support nor any connection to a political party.

As early as 1961, two chief tendencies developed within SDS. One, dominant in the Frankfurt national leadership, favored integration into existing working-class movements by way of conducting workers' education in the Industrie-Gewerkschaft Metall [IG-Metall -- Metal Workers Union], at that time the furthest left union. The other, an extreme left-wing tendency, attempted to form a new party in Berlin on May 1, 1962, which was to bear the traditional name Unabhaengige Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands [USPD -- Independent Social Democratic party]. But this party never got beyond the founding convention at which, for the first time in years the Internationale was sung by several hundred people.

The organizationally inexperienced leaders of this second tendency were unable to cope with the extraordinary difficulties of attacks on the one hand by the West Berlin Kommunistischen Partei [Communist party] -- a group of old Communists artificially sustained by the German Democratic Republic [GDR] -- and, on the other, by the anticommunist population of West Berlin. Soon demoralized, they withdrew from political life and left the Berlin arena to a group of young comrades who confined their work wholly to the university and who attempted to recruit students by a variety of activities ranging from sponsorship of study groups on Marxist economics, psychology, and Marxism, to holding jazz concerts.

By 1964 the SDS had become the strongest political student group at the Berlin university and won the student-government elections. The first, "Frankfurt," tendency had won over the most conscious elements in Berlin also, and the political work of the SDS became divided into two more or less separate parts.

One group worked as teachers in trade-union education programs. It was, and still is, active in developing courses for workers' education, conducting weekly schools for shop stewards and weekend courses for members of IG-Metall and Industrie-Gewerkschaft Chemie [IG-Chemie -- Chemical Workers Union].

A large number, above all of the younger comrades, were not satisfied with this kind of work. They tried to work in a much more dangerous sphere -- for West Germany -- establishing closer relations with the GDR. It was not so much a question of importing the Stalinist GDR ideology into West Germany, but rather of slowly tearing down the hysterical anti-communism within the university and in parts of the West German petty bourgeoisie. In seminars and at public meetings they tried to explain the economic background of the Berlin wall, they distributed leaflets -- which were confiscated -- giving a positive impression of the GDR and they instituted seminars in cooperation with the GDR's Freie Deutsche Jugend [Free German Youth].

Soon, however, such activities were respectable enough to be taken over by other youth organizations, above all by the Christian youth, and the SDS comrades had to look around for other political activities.

The "economic miracle" was in full bloom on May 1, 1964, when, at the mass demonstration traditionally addressed by

the president of the Federal Republic, some workers beat up several comrades as "disrupters." Demoralized, the SDSers withdrew into theory; they read Freud, Marcuse and Fanon, and small groups in Munich and Berlin came to the conclusion that the working class doesn't deserve liberation and one must withdraw to the study of underdeveloped countries and the liberation of their peoples, or to the emancipation of students. Both themes were intensively pursued by two groups in the Munich and Berlin SDS and led to widespread discussions within SDS and in the West German daily press.

The imperialist escalation in Vietnam and the danger that the Bonn parliament would pass the "emergency laws" [denying constitutional rights under certain conditions], led to the consolidation of the entire SDS in cooperation with other student groups including the students of the liberal party [Free Demokratische Partei -- Free Democratic party -- FDP] and the rebellious students of the SPD behind extensive actions.

Opposition to the passage of the "emergency laws" is shared today by large sections of the West German population. In the autumn of 1966 the SDS planned a mass demonstration to take place in Frankfurt and to be preceded by a conference of educational workshops. During the preparations for this action -- if not earlier -- it became clear how untenable was the position of a left-wing student group whose activities are restricted by its charter to academic life and which is not associated with a political party.

Through connections with IG-Metall, SDS was able to prepare and carry out these actions, and 16,000 participated in the anti-emergency-law demonstration in Frankfurt. In a more hidden way, the IG-Metall placed a part of its apparatus at SDS's disposal for a large Vietnam demonstration in which about 6,000 people participated.

The deepest radicalization of student youth through SDS took place in West Berlin. It would lead far afield to investigate here the sociological background of student radicalization, above all at mass universities like the Free University in Berlin -- which was no exception.

Such a radicalization assumes sharpest form when it is countered in an authoritarian fashion. The initial unrest, which later leads through politically conscious, often small groups, to radicalization of great masses of youth, is certainly connected with dissatisfaction with existing conditions felt by those who are so condescendingly called "young people." But that still does not explain why, of all German universities, it was

precisely the Free University of Berlin that became a field of battle between students and authorities unlike anything in West Germany itself. One can indicate three reasons:

(1) Since August 13, 1961, politically interested students from all over Germany have come to West Berlin, where the "unsolved problem" of Germany led to the Berlin wall, and they came to a university where "political science" has become one of the most important departments (917 students).

(2) The constitutional structure of the Free University deviates from the traditional nonpolitical model of the German university in granting student participation in university government. Conflicts between students and authorities appear earlier and more sharply.

(3) As a consequence of the "island" position of the city, and because of the fear of "the nearness of communism," which has been cultivated for years, especially by the press, every political action from the left is met by especially sharp measures driving students into defensive actions and educating them politically. Small actions of small SDS groups have met with sharp countermeasures.

The London Observer declared: "Left-wing student groups refer to the university authorities as if the dictatorship had returned, and professors talk as if student criticism was already a form of treason."

On December 18, 1964, several hundred students assembled before the Schoenberg City Hall in a demonstration against the Berlin guest Moise Tshombe under the slogan, "Lumumba-Murderer." The reaction was limited to complaints and false accusations in Axel Springer's yellow press, the largest newspaper publisher in West Germany, that the demonstrations were controlled from the GDR.

On May 7, 1965, following the model of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, 600 students of the Free University demonstrated against the banning from the university of Erich Kuby, a left-liberal journalist who had expressed doubt about the freedom of the Free University. This demonstration, which extended in waves for several weeks, led to the demand for the rector's resignation and for a strike by the political science students.

February 5, 1966, the first great SDS-led demonstration against the war in Vietnam took place under the slogan: "Amis [Yankees] out of Vietnam." Six hundred demonstrators marched through the city center. When several students attempted to lower the flag in front of America House to half-mast, the police attacked with clubs for the first time.

June 22, 1966, 3,000 students, again following an American model, participated in a sit-in. They protested the refusal of the Academic Senate to allow students to continue to use university rooms for political activities.

The SDS instituted a division of labor. Organization of purely student actions within the university was left up to those comrades who were playing a leading role in the student government. The political demonstrations outside the university were conducted by SDS itself.

November 28, 1966, 1,500 students joined sympathetic nonstudents in a demonstration against the SPD-Christian Democrat coalition under the slogan "Who will free us? A new workers party."

December 10, 1966, 1,200 students participated in an unauthorized Vietnam demonstration on the Kurfuerstendamm, Berlin's main street. The police arrested 74 participants.

December 17, 1966, 200 SDSers staged a "promenade" demonstration on the Kurfuerstendamm under the slogan: "Keep the pot boiling." They distributed Christmas packages containing rags and tricks bearing political slogans. The rush-hour traffic was jammed by curious onlookers, and the police arrested 85 people, almost none of whom had anything to do with the action. The justification of the Berlin senate: "Berlin doesn't need any provos."

January 28, 1967, 1,600 students marched on the Kurfuerstendamm with police authorization and under police protection, to protest "police arbitrariness" and the imprisonment of their comrades during previous actions.

April 5, 1967, the police jailed eleven members of the SDS because, in the opinion of the police, "they had planned attacks on the life and health of U.S. Vice-President Humphrey" with stink bombs and pudding.

April 6, 1967, 2,500 students demonstrated in front of the Charlottenburg Castle and the skyscraper occupied by the Springer press against Hubert Humphrey's visit to Berlin and U.S.-Vietnam policy. They chanted: "Vice-killer." The police arrested 24 demonstrators.

Friction grew ever greater, political antagonisms ever clearer and the temper of the Berlin government ever shorter. The Springer press wrote: "Our patience is exhausted," and professors declared students "are violating the moral principles of Western civilization."

For political students, the struggle for the right to demonstrate on political questions, and above all, on Vietnam,

was finally a struggle for university reform. After SDS had mobilized the student body on Vietnam, it decided, at least in Berlin, to direct the energy so released toward university policy: "The most important battlefield for us at this time is the university." The SHB, the LSD [Liberaler Studentenbund Deutschlands -- Liberal Student Federation of Germany, student group of the FDP], the German-Israel Study Group, and the student group of the Humanist Union, a left-liberal, pacifist organization, rallied behind the basic student demands formulated by SDS. The demands were the following:

(1) Guarantees of continued student participation in governing the university and unrestricted right of political activity for students.

(2) An end of the restriction on the number of semesters within which a student must complete his work at the university.

(3) Scholarships for all students in order to guarantee that students and not their parents, will be able to choose their courses of study.

The professors were naturally unwilling to give up their power, and the students' program remained merely a program. The student functionaries learning that legal rights didn't help, decided to call for a student strike at the beginning of this summer semester. On April 19, the day of Konrad Adenauer's death, 2,000 students of the Free University for the first time challenged the authority of their rector inside the university.

On that day, the Academic Senate was considering disciplinary measures against the students who had been arrested on April 6 at the anti-Humphrey demonstration. On the floor below, 2,000 students sat in in protest. The guest speaker at the sit-in was the German-American writer Reinhard Lettau, who said: "Everyone in the world, except in West Berlin, knows that the press of this city is servile and a slave to the police." Since then, he has been deported from West Berlin as an alien.

The rector, in his younger years a member of the Communist party and, several years earlier, the teacher of a number of older SDSers in seminars on Marxism, ordered the students to clear the university. The students replied with boos and, for the first time in the history of the Free University, the rector called the police, commenting, "All hell's broken loose." To become master of this hell, the Academic Senate the following day adopted an emergency program with the following points:

(1) Consistent enforcement of disciplinary measures against the student ringleaders and barring from university

grounds nonmembers of the university community.

(2) State approved proceeding of the university against political student groups and the student government.

(3) Suspension of the university constitution and appointment of a state commissioner.

As an immediate example, five students, including the president of the student government, had disciplinary proceedings instituted against them and their scholarships cancelled.

The students were discouraged by their failure within the university, but they were not at all demoralized. They were awaiting the visit of the Shah of Iran, who, returning from Czechoslovakia, was to make a trip through West Germany to West Berlin.

In preparation for the visit of the Shah, SDS conducted an extensive information campaign on conditions in Iran, the failure of land reform, and, above all, the regime's treatment of its political opponents. A large number of Iranian students at the Free University who were in close contact with SDS participated in this campaign.

After an educational meeting the night before the Shah's arrival in Berlin, several hundred students marched to a demonstration before the Czechoslovakian military mission to protest the hearty welcome the Shah had received in Czechoslovakia. On the way to the mission they chanted: "Springer, Novotny and Shah -- now everything is clear."

On the same evening, 200 secret police, armed with steel rods, were flown directly from Iran to Berlin, in order to act against any demonstration.

On the afternoon of June 2, the Shah visited the Berlin city hall. Spectators, pro-Shah demonstrators, and anti-Shah demonstrators gathered in front of the city hall. The "pro" demonstrators were brought to the city hall by special buses and were armed with steel rods. Iranian students recognized several secret policemen among them. The "pro" demonstrators were stationed inside the police barriers, and after the guests entered the city hall, they began to tear down placards and swing wildly with steel rods and clubs among the "anti" demonstrators. The police did not intervene. A nonparticipant reported: "They had heavy clubs and arm-length leather thongs, and they went to work on the people with them."

The same evening, the Shah visited the Opera on Bismarck street. Mozart's Magic Flute was being performed. The Ber-

lin senate had bought up all the seats. Demonstrators greeted the official guests with the cry, "lackeys," and the Shah with "murderer." As soon as the state guests had entered the opera house, the police were ordered into action. The police chief, who gave the order, explained the tactic: "Let's say the demonstrators are a liver sausage, right, then you have to squash it in the middle so the ends will bust open."

The police began to strike arbitrarily at helpless spectators and demonstrators who were wedged together behind the barriers and could not escape; they dragged several out in front of the barriers and beat them with clubs and kicked them before the eyes of hundreds of spectators. Then the first tomatoes, handfuls of sand, and several stones began to fly, and a policeman was wounded in the head.

Now, the police began to exercise "police justice." They grabbed demonstrators indiscriminantly from behind the barriers -- three or four policemen for each demonstrator -- and dragged them to a backyard on a side street, where they beat them senseless, then let them stand up and run a short distance to a wall, where they seized them again and beat them some more. Two shots were heard in the yard, the despairing cry of a fatally wounded comrade, "please, don't shoot," and the reproachful cry of a policeman: "Man, are you crazy? You might have hit one of us."

Two and a half hours later, Comrade Ohnesorg died from a bullet wound in the neck.

His funeral became a demonstration of 20,000 people.

The SDS of the entire Federal Republic responded accordingly. In a declaration the national committee stated:

"The events in Berlin have demonstrated both the power and the impotence of the oppositional and student movements in the Federal Republic and West Berlin. They have shown the impotence of students when they encounter the organized violence of the system. The political strength of the students was born and was consolidated in the formulation of the protest against the aggressive action of the Berlin authorities. But the protest will not succeed until the politically engaged students, reflecting on the reasons for their defeat, carry their criticism beyond the sphere of the university.

"The struggle between the students on one side and the university and state bureaucracy on the other, is a result of the sharpening of the structural crisis of the university, of the consolidation of authoritarian positions of political power in the Federal Republic and West Berlin, and of international upheavals...The police

and psychological pressure to which the students are being subjected threatens all social and political groups which do not unresistingly conform to the demands and political compulsions of the capitalist system....

"The protests of the students will remain impotent until they succeed in gaining support in society at large and can contest the power positions of the

capitalist oligarchy in the economy, the media, and the state apparatus itself. The SDS calls students to solidarity with all those who protest and struggle against the economic, political and psychological oppression and exploitation of capitalism."

Today, the SDS has 2,000 active members, and in the past six months, through extensive actions in high schools, has founded an organization of high school students with an additional 1,500 members.

Book Review

THE CULT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

By Arthur Maglin

INSIDE THE FBI, by Norman Ollestad. Lyle Stuart, New York. 319 pp. \$5.95.

The image projected by the American mass media of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is that of an organization run with inexorable efficiency by selflessly idealistic young men of heroic caliber. Former FBI agent Norman Ollestad's book informs us that this image does not correspond to reality. The typical FBI man is neither efficient, idealistic, heroic or even young.

According to Ollestad, who was an FBI agent during President Kennedy's administration, the most significant fact about the internal organization of the FBI is that it is a thoroughly institutionalized cult of Director J. Edgar Hoover. FBI men, especially officials, quote him frequently even in trivial situations. They also dress like him.

FBI men are taught to think of themselves as "young businessmen" and the great bulk of them are more interested in climbing the rungs of the FBI bureaucracy than in fighting "communism" and crime. Ollestad, an anticommunist liberal, finds this unfortunate. Still, he thinks that the FBI is wasting its time in fighting the left. He believes that the FBI spends so much time harassing the left only in order to justify larger appropriations from Congress.

As far as crime-fighting goes, Ollestad says that the FBI is much more interested in statistics proving how successful it has been than in actually pursuing cases. The interest in statistics is so intense that it has become a common practice to juggle with numbers to make them appear more impressive.

As the finale of their training period, new agents are introduced to J. Edgar Hoover himself. Before being taken

into the presence of this Washington deity, they are specially briefed by the New Agents Class administrator on how to conduct themselves. Here is Ollestad's account of the briefing given his class.

"The greeting and handshake -- and in fact the entire meeting should not exceed thirty seconds per man, but while you're in there, there are three distinct dangers. First, as you enter you will encounter a thick carpet, so don't scuff your feet. And whatever you do don't look down. Occasionally, our Director enjoys standing on a little box when he greets people in his office. Of course, it's just a small one, only six inches high. Pretend you never even noticed it! Not long ago we had a new agent who for some reason just couldn't keep his eyes off it. He was fired."

"Our administrator proceeded to the next point. 'The second danger,' he announced with an ominous ring, 'is the Director's bathroom.'

"I was startled. Bruns smiled. That was a new one on us both.

"If the Director asks you a question, be sure and keep your wits about you; otherwise, move out of there as fast as you can -- take your leave and make sure you don't veer off course on your way out this door.' He pointed to a mark on the diagram that indicated a doorway. 'This door is fine; it leads to the outer hallway. But this one...' He indicated another doorway. 'Well it leads to the Director's private bathroom. Nobody else is allowed in there, and if one of you got in there by mistake...who knows what might happen? There's no way out except back through the office.' The threat of getting trapped in the Director's toilet shook him visibly."

The mere thought of it shook us.

THE IDEOLOGY OF THE MAOIST TENDENCY

By Livio Maitan

[This is the second and concluding part of the transcript of the report on the developments in China given by Livio Maitan to a recent plenum of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International. For the first part, see World Outlook, August 25, 1967.]

* * *

It is useful at this point to give some attention to the ideology of the Maoist tendency. Whatever its merits as an ideology, it exerts an influence on sectors of the Chinese masses and, most of all, on sectors of the militants and cadres. Moreover, it has an unquestionable attractive power for some vanguard elements (chiefly among the youth) which are close to the circles we work in in a number of countries.

It must be noted first of all that there is little that is new in the themes now being put forward by the Mao group, not only in relation to more recent propaganda but also in relation to the propaganda of earlier periods in the Chinese Communist party's history. It is no coincidence, moreover, that the Chinese press and documents constantly cite Mao's writings in support of current positions which go far back into the past and obviously refer to very different situations. Even the famous little book which has been the primary instrument for educating and mobilizing the Red Guards is very largely based on old quotations.

A characteristic of the present Maoist conceptions is a rather pessimistic view of the phase of transition from capitalism to socialism. Mao believes that this phase will extend over a rather long period, for decades and even centuries (see, for example, Pékin Information, No. 52, 1966, p. 27, and the article appearing in Liberation Daily, May 4, 1966). Furthermore, the danger of restorationist degeneration is denounced in terms which could lead one to believe that this is a very probable if not largely inevitable outcome.

The attempts made to point out the origins of this process of eventual degeneration are significant chiefly in the sense that they enable us to perceive a salient feature of current Maoist methodology: the primacy accorded to the subjective factor.

While the Maoists sometimes point out specific agents of degeneration, such as material stimuli which give rise to privileged positions in general, emphasis is not put on phenomena and tendencies in

the system itself which would favor capitalist restoration. Instead, they profess the view that this degeneration is bound up with a kind of moral degeneration in which egoistic motives gain ascendancy over heroic collectivist motives. Most of the documents which raise this question make it clear enough in the last analysis that moral and ideological degeneration produces the first breaches in the system, thereby opening the way for restorationist tendencies.

The means envisaged for struggling against this danger of degeneration are of a subjective and "moral" character: an ideological hard line taking classical sectarian forms which, in the cultural area, borders on Zhdanov-like dogmatism; rejection of material stimuli carried to an absurd extreme; criticism of "economism"; and glorification, first and foremost, of the spirit of sacrifice, which is the primary characteristic of all the positive heroes presented in day-to-day propaganda. It goes without saying that no one denies the merits of certain points pertaining to a collectivist society.

In fact, in the face of tendencies which have developed in the USSR and the European peoples democracies, and the ideological tendencies flowing from them, a reaffirmation of the underlying motifs of a communist outlook and mentality is in itself legitimate. However, the danger of degeneration has its roots primarily in the economic, social and political structures. The real reason that the Maoists pose this question in unrealistic terms is that they tend inevitably to try to conceal the paramount problem of the transitional phase which, as historical experience up till now has shown, is not capitalist restoration but bureaucratic degeneration.

Moreover, the Maoist propaganda reflects a tendency which is not new to the history of the Chinese Communist party: the tendency to attribute absolute theoretical validity to ideas and motifs justified in actuality by empirical considerations. For example, when the Peoples Communes were launched, instead of first and foremost explaining the concrete and immediate reasons for the turn (chiefly the need to make better use of underemployed manpower), the official propaganda presented the Communes as a realization of the norms of a communist society -- a bizarre identification of the relative equality of a primitive Spartan regime with the real equality which will mark a society based on incomparably more developed productive forces.

Recently, the Maoists have come up with a theory, uniquely transcending the division of labor, that it may be necessary for all effective forces to carry out an array of very diverse tasks together with military duties; this would have practical significance in the exceptional circumstances created by the immediate threat of an imperialist aggression and still more so in those created by an outbreak of war. More generally, one notes the tendency in official propaganda to exalt the standards and conduct during the heroic Yenan period, actually characterized by very special conditions, as the purest expression of communism and the collectivist mentality.(15)

Two opposite but equally incorrect attitudes must be avoided in regard to such ideological orientations: the attitude of those who reject the general formulas for their intrinsic weakness and disregard their practical import, and the outlook of those who also pay little attention to their origins and concrete import but content themselves with the abstract formulas alone.

The equalitarian theme in particular, one of the central motifs of Maoist propaganda in recent years, must be judged in accordance with this kind of criteria. It would be a mistake either to disregard its factionally heightened demagogic and propagandistic character or to regard it as pure and simple humbug: It would be wrong on the one hand to overlook the basis for such motifs (the Yenan period, the fact that the bureaucratic layers are not as hardened and fully developed in China) and, on the other hand, to disregard the import such propaganda may have regardless of the subjective intent of the leading groups (the experience of the crisis following August 1966 is quite revealing on this score).

Another side to the Maoist ideology which has held a certain attraction for young left circles is its glorification of the rebellious spirit, of renovating struggle against any sclerosis deriving from the past. Once again the distinction between the practical import of a point and its intrinsic ideological merits must be clearly noted. Obviously, the very fact that this praising of the rebellious spirit goes hand in hand with the most extreme cult of Mao, making the

leader's thought the supreme test of every idea and action, belies any such merits. A Red Guard notice which appeared at the University of Shanghai and which was widely taken up in the official publications expresses this underlying contradiction in a condensed and inadvertently paradoxical form: "In a word we will rebel against anyone who dares to oppose Chairman Mao and his thought." (Hsinhua, January 20, 1965, p. 13.)

In our polemics with student and intellectual groups with pro-Chinese leanings, we must draw special attention to the methods and conceptions which Mao and his supporters have reaffirmed in the cultural field. Here, we must note not only that a degeneration has occurred with respect to the best period of the so-called one hundred flowers campaign but that there has even been a step backward by comparison with a more recent period when polemics developed rather openly, even though, as we have already pointed out, specialized publications were the preferred media for this. Comparison with the methods and conceptions of Zhdanov is entirely proper: The whole classical repertoire of monstrous distortions and falsifications has been utilized to the fullest, especially in widely circulated articles aiming to discredit permanently persons like Chou Yang, Chen Po-tsa, or others. This was particularly apparent in the January 1967 polemics against Chou Yang, which Comrade Novack analyzed in an interesting article published in World Outlook [March 10, 1967].(16)

We have already pointed out elsewhere the reasons for this very severe barrage. Basically, what was involved was fear that a relatively homogeneous opposition nucleus with an all-embracing political program might develop in intellectual circles. The criticisms of Teng To for glorifying the role of miscellaneous scholars and wanting to stick his nose into everything are particularly instructive on this score.

The Opposition Groups and Our Arena of Work

I will not repeat the points made in the draft document. I will limit myself to noting again that since the fall of 1966 certain oppositionists have been more and more frequently characterized as "left opportunists" and that the supporters of the Shanghai strikes and demonstrations have been accused of trying to hide behind

(15) Recalling the heroic period is a strong point in Maoist propaganda, especially with war in prospect. But can the circumstances of that time be repeated? That is far from certain, especially if one accepts the possibility that sooner or later an imperialist war against China would be transformed into a worldwide conflict.

(16) It is important to note, however, that much more flexible methods have been employed in some scientific fields, for obvious reasons. Among other things, in these fields there has been no wholesale condemnation of the contributions of foreign countries, capitalist countries included.

left slogans and labels. Our press, moreover, has printed the report that a wall newspaper accused Kang Sheng of having defended a Trotskyist student [World Outlook, February 3, 1967].

All this is a reflection of a more general situation about which we know very little. It seems certain in any case that as the movement developed, groups of militants and cadres began to function as a revolutionary left tendency and to voice their own ideas and slogans.

In other words, my estimation is that there exists a whole gamut of left opposition elements and groups which developed at different times and which have played very different roles among themselves in the present crisis. The sectors foremost in formulating ideas, and even perspectives, were probably the political-intellectual groups which manifested themselves already in 1956-57, sometimes expressing positions which tended toward revolutionary Marxism. Some of them were in the party and state apparatus, even at rather high levels, and they seem to have carried on factional activity in accordance with a unified tactical scheme. In the mass movement, the tendencies most promising for the formation of a real revolutionary left probably emerged from supporters of the Mao group -- from those who acted in unorthodox ways in the effort to apply their own line, or their own interpretation of Mao's line, and most of all to give more precise content to some current propaganda slogans.

Revolutionary Marxists cannot pass over such an analysis in formulating a political platform and tactic. In particular, account must be taken of the level of understanding and political maturity of these layers, which are largely composed of youth, both in the choice of the most important themes to be advanced as well as in the formulas and terminology to be used.

The Chinese events have again confirmed a point which has not escaped our movement since the Revolution Betrayed and the "Transitional Program": the bureaucracy is not a homogeneous reactionary mass but rather is greatly differentiated, both vertically and horizontally. It can undergo profound divisions when crises occur, with some of its layers fighting ferociously to defend their positions while others seek to link up with the mass movement, whose success they can objectively facilitate. This is one of the lessons of the 1953 events in Berlin and East Germany, of the Hungarian Revolution, and the Polish October in 1956; it is a lesson of the Chinese crisis of 1966-67.

We are not going to restate the

fundamental causes of this phenomenon here. It is sufficient to recall that such tendencies are playing a much greater role in the case of China than elsewhere, both for historical reasons (the experience of the war against Japan and the civil war, the fact that the present leading group led the party during this experience, etc.) and for structural reasons having to do with the post-revolutionary period (the fact that the bureaucracy has developed to a much more limited extent in Chinese society than elsewhere).

Some Conclusions

What possibility is there that the present crisis can be overcome? At this juncture, a phase of relative détente is apparent: the Mao group is doing its best to reestablish some kind of equilibrium and get some kind of renovated apparatus going which could handle the situation. For the moment, as we have seen, the actual solution has been ever more extensive use of the army.

But whatever the vicissitudes in the short run, the tendency will be for these tensions and conflicts to continue, for, aside from the plethora of very general proclamations, no real solution of the problems at the root of the crisis has been undertaken.

We have not discussed the economic situation in our report. We are convinced, indeed, that while economic difficulties spurred the tensions of the 1959-62 period in a direct and immediate way, the same cannot be said for the 1964-65 period. It is not possible to get a complete picture for 1966, but many indications lead me to believe that it was a rather good year. Industrial production rose by 20 percent and the financial and market situations were generally positive. The figures for foreign trade reached record heights in almost all sectors.(16) In other words, the political crisis has probably not had harmful effects on the economy.(17) This does not exclude the possibility that such difficulties may develop over the long run and, in fact, concern over the tempo and

(16) Hsinhua, January 4, 1967, p. 3; and the account Le Monde gives of a press conference of a Chinese representative in Paris.

(17) Serious difficulties have shown up in transport as a result of the Red Guard migrations. As for the phenomena which occurred at Shanghai -- scarcity of certain goods and inflationary tendencies due to concessions made to the workers and a wave of buying by the apprehensive populace -- they could not have had an effect on the 1966 balance sheet (Hsinhua, January 20, 1965, p. 22).

level of production is now being voiced to a greater extent. There will certainly be difficulties and the intervention of the army in production cannot solve them.

I would also mention another area where tensions have already developed and may again arise, i.e., in relations with the national minorities. The international press has published sensationalist accounts, but in some regions the crisis has posed some very delicate problems. Moreover, problems had also developed in this regard in previous years.(18)

On international questions, the Mao group does not yet seem to have drawn the lessons from some very grave blows which it has suffered. Thus, the line for the countries involved in the colonial revolution has in no way been rectified as a result of the tragic defeat of the Indonesian Communist party. So far, it has preferred to hold its peace on this subject, going no further than the repetition of standard propaganda themes (it is significant that the documents on the PKI's [Partai Komunis Indonesia -- Indonesian Communist party] self-criticism were made public not by Peking but by Tirana). The Chinese have not changed their methods either with respect to the international workers movement (polemics in which epithets and insults prevail over arguments, crude retorts to dissenters -- as in the case of the Japanese Communist party, boundless and often grotesque magnification of small groups and personalities who represent absolutely nothing).

But the fundamental question is still the war in Vietnam. There is no need for us to go over again the failings and contradictions of the Chinese line on this question. Many months of "Cultural Revolution" have not helped to correct this line or to make it more concrete. Therefore, new discussions and conflicts on this question, which is absolutely vital for the future of China itself, are in prospect in the Chinese Communist party.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few observations on building a new vanguard, which is the prerequisite for resolving the crisis in both the short and long run. We cannot yet say what level has been reached because it cannot be known exactly to what extent the apparatus has come apart or to what extent it can be put back together. In addition to what has been previously stated, it may be noted here that there have been

very significant advances in this process, to an extent inconceivable a year and a half ago. On the side of objective conditions, the crisis of the bureaucratic system has led to the mobilization of revolutionary cadres and militants in mass activity neither planned nor controlled from above. Subjective conditions have also ripened. For the first time broad sections of the masses have moved into conflict with the bureaucratic leaders. Slogans and demands representative of the needs of the decisive social strata have been proclaimed and, last but not least, many workers and young students have gained organizational experience outside the traditional apparatus.

All this must be taken account of in the total balance sheet of the crisis.

Reply by the Reporter

Comrade Germain's contribution to the discussion may be considered in large part complementary to the report. The most interesting part dealt with the tensions at work in Chinese society and I agree with his points of correction on the factors which provoked the outbreaks among the workers.

I also concur with some of Germain's statements regarding the youth, which can serve to complement the analysis contained in this report.

On the other hand, his analysis of the situation among the peasants is not convincing -- at least, it does not justify immediate tensions. But my chief disagreement is over his interpretation of the mass mobilizations carried out concurrently by both the Mao tendency and the opposition around different themes. I point out that Comrade Germain has not adduced any concrete argument to support his interpretation and, moreover, that he himself has admitted that it probably does not hold true for the case of Shanghai, which indeed is by far the most important. Therefore, his conclusions on the way the differences which have arisen among the masses can be overcome seem to me to lie essentially in the realm of abstraction.

As for the remarks various comrades made on special questions, I note only that the report deliberately avoided some questions due to the prior existence of the United Secretariat document of November and the draft declaration. If the International Executive Committee decides to adopt a document of broader scope, I would have no objection to introducing ideas such as those suggested by the Greek comrade.

(18) For example, see the reference to a "counterrevolutionary" uprising in a report in 1962 by Chou En-lai, Peking Information, No. 1, 1965, p. 16.

Almost all the comrades who have taken part in the discussion have declared themselves in favor of explicitly accepting the concept of political revolution

against the bureaucracy in the case of China. I am in agreement on this fundamental point and, moreover, I note in this connection the following important passage from the United Secretariat declaration of November 1966:

"The struggle against such a leadership can only be brought to a close by bringing about a qualitative change in the political regime -- through a deep-going mobilization of the masses which can break up the structure of the bureaucratic system and through the activity

of a new revolutionary Marxist vanguard which can orient the mass movement toward the establishment of proletarian democracy."

But on the other hand, there is a document from the Reunification Congress which bears on this position and I do not consider it opportune to rectify it abruptly at this plenum without a prior discussion in the international as a whole.

March, 1967

AUSTRALIAN STUDENTS SUPPORT NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

There has been considerable controversy in the Australian press in August over the right of students to collect money to aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

In Melbourne University, students at a Union Night debate voted 500 to 40 in favor of the right of university Labor Clubs to collect money; a mass meeting of students at Monash University, Melbourne, voted 1,600 to 400 on the same issue.

Both meetings voted for the withdrawal of Australian troops from Vietnam -- a central point of debate in the Australian Labor party at the moment.

The Monash meeting had been organized by the right-wing Democratic Labor party in the hope of turning students against the Labor Clubs.

Just the reverse happened: the DLP lost control of its own meeting!

SUMMER SCHEDULE

World Outlook is now on its summer schedule. This means publication every other week on the average.

With the fall we will resume our regular weekly schedule.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
PHOTO: Socialist Workers Party Press Conference	753
Socialist Workers Party Launches 1968 Presidential Campaign	754
Isaac Deutscher -- by Pierre Frank	755
Defense Committee for Mexican Witch-Hunt Victims	756
Guatemalan Guerrillas Use New Methods	757
Continued Harassment of Political Prisoners in Mexico -- by Ricardo Ochoa	758
Russell Asks Inquiry into Mexican Witch-Hunt Case	759
Hugo Blanco Case:	
Mass Chilean Meeting Demands Freedom for Blanco	759
Pereyra, Martorell, Candela Receive Additional Sentences	759
Régis Debray Case:	
Debray Trial Arbitrarily Postponed	760
A Death in Sunny Mexico	760
Black Power and the Third World (Stokely Carmichael's Address to OLAS)	761
U.S. Sociologists Oppose Vietnam War	766
The Murder of Benno Ohnesorg and Student Radicalization in Germany -- by Gisela Mandel	767
Book Review:	
The Cult of J. Edgar Hoover -- by Arthur Maglin	771
Documents:	
The Ideology of the Maoist Tendency -- by Livio Maitan	772
Australian Students Support National Liberation Front	776