

WORLD OUTLOOK

a labor press service

Vol.6, No.2

January 19, 1968



ERNEST MANDEL:

The Dollar Crisis

In Defense of Stokely Carmichael

-- a Reply to the French CP

Camiri Oil Workers Plant Torch for Debray

Kremlin Finally Considers the Defeat in Indonesia

THE ENEMY

50¢

WASHINGTON PUTS THE SQUEEZE ON PRINCE SIHANOUK

President Johnson has sent Chester Bowles as his special envoy to Phnompenh, the capital of Cambodia, to persuade or pressure the country's leaders to fall in line with U.S. military operations against the Vietnamese. Since the escalation of American intervention in 1965, Prince Sihanouk has been trying to resist Washington's attempts to undermine his country's neutrality. In May 1965 he broke off diplomatic relations with the United States and has several times threatened to call in Chinese volunteers to help defend Cambodia if U.S. troops barged in.

Now American officials are pressing a gun against his ribs as the stage is being set for expanding the war into Cambodia and Laos. Under this menace Sihanouk has been leaning fitfully and fearfully now to one side, now to the other.

After taking an intransigent stand against any incursions into Cambodian territory, he has apparently sought accommodation with Washington. The prince declared that his government would not militarily oppose American forces chasing enemy units into unpopulated areas of his country, provided no Cambodians were hurt, but would limit itself to protests.

On the other hand, his son, Prince Norodan, sent a message to the International Cultural Congress meeting in Havana that Cambodia was prepared to follow "the example of our Vietnam brothers" against the threat of U.S. aggression. His message stated: "Why, after heroic Vietnam, has Cambodia been made the target of an arrogant country whose scientific and technical advances are at the service of barbarism? Our only crime is to stubbornly reject the domination which the United States seeks to impose upon us."

In any event, by ending his diplomatic boycott of Washington and meeting with the president's mission, Sihanouk has done Johnson a favor. At this point the Johnson administration faces the problem of making the Pentagon's contemplated steps to extend the field of military action outside Vietnam palatable to the American people. Washington is the arena of a tug-of-war between the advocates of "hot pursuit" and its congressional opponents.

After a White House conference, Senate Majority leader Mike Mansfield, who is trying to restrain the hawks, swore that the president did not intend to yield to their insistent pressures for immediate action to prevent Communist use of Cambodia as a sanctuary and supply

base. This does not mean that the policy of "hot pursuit" recommended by the generals has been shelved. If Sihanouk fails to comply with Washington's demands and the decision is made to violate his borders, Bowles' conference with the prince can be presented as evidence that efforts were made to seal off Cambodian territory by diplomatic means but that these efforts failed.

Sihanouk declared that the resumption of diplomatic relations with the United States hinges on American recognition of Cambodian frontiers and that the president's envoy assured him that the United States would not adopt a policy of "hot pursuit" into Cambodian territory. However, as the New York Times editors remarked on January 11: "Just how firm such assurances were seem to be in some doubt." In fact Bowles stopped short of any formal pledge that Westmoreland's and Ky's troops would in no case cross into Cambodia if forces of the National Liberation Front or North Vietnam were alleged to have taken refuge there.

The firmness of Sihanouk's resistance depends a great deal upon how much counterpressure will be forthcoming from China. Peking said on January 3 that it would be "closely watching" for American troops that entered Cambodia and warned that it "will not look on with folded arms" if they did so.

The next day the Chinese government dispatched eleven planes, including three MIG-17 jet fighters and several dozen anti-aircraft guns to Phnompenh. In accepting this aid, Prime Minister Son Sann said: "The important military aid that our friend China gives us has a great significance in the present circumstances. We see growing continuously the threat of American intervention against our independence, our neutrality and our territorial integrity, and it is not impossible that in the weeks or months to come, we will have to mobilize all our energies to resist the aggressor."

During a visit to Hanoi by the Cambodian foreign minister, the North Vietnamese foreign minister, Nguyen Duy Trinh, pledged that his country will help defend neutral Cambodia in the event of American attack.

Sihanouk is undoubtedly on the hot spot. The vacillations of this royal bourgeois nationalist leader indicate that, when the chips are down, his resistance to the imperialist aggressor may not be so resolute and vigorous as the valiant statements by his son and his prime minister promise.

THE DOLLAR CRISIS

By Ernest Mandel

A country's economic strength, in the last analysis, is always a function of its productive capacity and labor productivity, that is, of its potential for producing a given quantity of products with the smallest possible expenditure of labor. In a capitalist regime, this potential can be measured by the per capita value of production and by commodity prices relative to those of other countries (that is by the competitive capacity of industry and agriculture).

From this standpoint, the United States remains by far the most powerful and prosperous capitalist country in the world. Furthermore, the gap separating the U.S. from its principal competitors and from the USSR, which had tended to shrink between 1950 and 1960, has again widened in recent years.

How can the "dollar crisis" be explained under these circumstances? What is its basis? Does it reveal a structural weakness in the American economy, or does it, instead, show its strength?

How Is the "Dollar Crisis" Shown?

At first glance, the cause of the "dollar crisis" appears self-evident: it's the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

When a country has a deficit in its balance of payments, that means that the sum of the resources which it acquires in a year's time (commodity imports; services purchased abroad; purchase of stock or other foreign paper) exceeds the sum of the resources which it has sold in that year (commodity exports; sale of services abroad; sale of American stock or paper, etc.). The difference must then be balanced by the liquidation of a part of the country's reserves (gold and foreign currencies).

The balance of payments of the United States has been in deficit since the mid-1950's. As a consequence, the country's gold reserves fell from \$22.8 billion in 1950 to \$20.6 billion in 1958, then to \$13.2 billion in 1966 and to less than \$12 billion at present.

When the origins of this deficit in the U.S. balance of payments are examined, one finds the following:

(1) The trade balance is largely in surplus: the United States continues to export many more commodities than are imported.

(2) Private capital movements are in balance: net American capital exports

equal the net repatriation of profits on capital already invested abroad.

(3) The source of the deficit then lies exclusively in: (a) governmental aid to foreign countries, that is, the cost of maintaining the imperialist alliances; (b) the expenses of the American armed forces abroad, that is, the maintenance of military bases and the conduct of military operations abroad.

It would not be wrong to say that the increased deficit in the U.S. balance of payments in 1967 is due three-fourths to the Vietnam war. It should be added, however, that for the past twelve years this deficit takes in the expenses of NATO, SEATO, the operations of the Sixth and Seventh fleets, the landings in Lebanon and Santo Domingo, the antiguerilla operations in Latin America and Africa, the aid to the military dictatorship in Indonesia, the cost of maintaining the bloody puppet regimes in Taipeh, Seoul and Saigon -- all operations prior to or concurrent with the Vietnam war in the strict sense.

Is the Dollar "Threatened"?

Could the gold drain experienced by the United States for more than a decade bring on the "downfall" of the dollar and would this "downfall" threaten the American economy?

Let me note first of all that the most powerful capitalists have long had little fear of devaluations of their own currencies. The dollar was devalued on the heels of the economic crisis of 1929-32; that did not reduce but rather increased the profits of the capitalist monopolies. A devaluation of the dollar would not be an economic catastrophe for the United States. It would hit primarily the small foreign and American savers who keep their accumulations in bank deposits or in loans payable in dollars. It could hit the American workers inasmuch as it provokes price rises not compensated for by wage rises.

But the American economy would be scarcely shaken by it. On the contrary, a devaluation of the dollar would reduce the prices of American products abroad and increase U.S. exports. In fact, influential bourgeois economists like Paul Samuelson have continually advocated this.

If, nevertheless, the leaders of American capitalism have not taken this road -- at least for the present -- it is primarily for two reasons. They are afraid of the loss of prestige caused by such a

devaluation (or revaluation of the price of gold, which comes to the same thing). They want to prevent the big holders of gold (their West European competitors and the Soviet Union) from gaining by the stroke of a pen the ability to buy 20, 30 or 50 percent more dollars (or American commodities or stocks) with the same amount of gold.

Does "Weakening" of the Dollar Threaten the American Economy?

But if the dollar is not devalued for the time being and if the efforts of the Johnson administration do not halt the gold drain but at most succeed in slowing it down, will the United States be in danger of sliding toward bankruptcy?

No. If the United States continues to lose its gold it can take three successive measures: abolish the 25 percent gold cover (which is purely formal) for the American banknotes in circulation; forbid the export of gold; demonetize gold -- that is, refuse to accept gold in payment for any service or commodity purchased abroad and throw the whole gold stock of the U.S. on the market to penalize the speculators, the Soviet Union and the European central banks by causing a drop in the price of gold.

Some reply that there are more dollar claims in the hands of foreigners than there is gold in the United States and that such a demonetization of gold would provoke a rise rather than a drop in the price of the precious metal. This objection is not valid. The calculation takes into account only short-term claims (which do exceed the U.S. gold stock by 200 percent). It disregards the amount of foreign stocks and paper in the hands of U.S. citizens, which is more than double these dollar claims.

The United States is in debt to the rest of the world in the short term; the rest of the world is heavily in debt to the United States in the long term. If there were an across-the-board liquidation of debts, not only the Europeans, Japanese, etc., would demand payment in gold or currency for their "treasury notes" payable in dollars; American concerns would also sell their stock in European or Japanese companies and demand payment in dollars. This across-the-board exchange would result in a large deficit for Europe and not for the United States.

To put it differently: one of the sources of the present monetary crisis lies in the fact that the European capitalists are putting their short-term reserves in dollars, while the American capitalists are investing their long-term reserves in Europe. In the long run this system naturally benefits the Americans. To claim that it shows the "weakness" of

the dollar is obviously nonsense.

If this is so then why do the Americans worry so much about the persistent deficit in their balance of payments? Not because this deficit directly threatens their economy but because it threatens the functioning of the entire international monetary system and thus the expansion of world trade. And if the expansion of world trade is halted, American exports will eventually decline in their turn and the entire world economy will be in danger of being drawn into a real deflationary avalanche like 1929.

But precisely because this is American imperialism's principal fear it stubbornly rejects the return to the gold standard demanded by de Gaulle and his "mentor," Professor Rueff. This cure is worse than the sickness. It entails automatic monetary adjustment which would force the American government to practice a policy of deflation when recessions coincide with balance-of-payments deficits. But to practice a deflationary policy at such times means provoking an economic crisis of exceptional gravity as the Brüning government learned in Germany.

The American capitalists want a flexible money which can be used as a tool for fighting crises. That rules out a return to the gold standard. However, this means that ways must be sought to enlarge the "international liquidity system" by means of a "world money" such as the "right to print money" created by the International Monetary Fund.

Does This Mean That All Is for the Best in the Best of All Possible Worlds?

The "dollar crisis" and the search for means of international payment independent both of gold and "currency reserves" (dollars and pounds sterling) reflect clear recognition on the part of big international capital of a contradiction inherent in the present-day capitalist system: the contradiction between the dollar's role as an "international money," and its role as an instrument to assure the expansion of the American capitalist economy. To fulfill the first function, a stable money is needed. To fulfill the second function, a flexible money is necessary, i.e., an unstable one. There's the rub.

The dollar's real weakness lies not in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. It might even be claimed paradoxically that this deficit reflects the strength rather than the weakness of the American economy. The real weakness of the dollar rests in the enormous governmental and private indebtedness in the United States, without which the formidable American productive machine could no longer sell its flood of commodities.

The American private debt went from \$140 billion dollars in 1945 to \$753 billion in 1963. It came to 78 percent of U.S. gross private production in 1945; it went to 143 percent of this in 1963. In 1951 the average American paid out 14 percent of his disposable income on debts and interest. This now reaches almost 25 percent!

It is clear that this debt spiral, which is a genuine inflationary spiral, cannot continue indefinitely without threatening the underpinnings of the system. A devaluation of the dollar would clearly have the benefit of disadvantaging the creditors and favoring the debtors. But these creditors are the banks and a few big American monopolies; it is understandable that the system hesitates to apply this drastic remedy.

The dollar's weakness thus reflects

A "PLOT" IN SWITZERLAND AGAINST BARRIENTOS?

Maria Esther Selene Antelo Colim, a 23-year-old student, was arrested at the airport in Rio de Janeiro January 8 after she arrived by plane from Europe. She was charged with participating in an alleged plot to assassinate General René Barrientos, the Bolivian dictator, during his recent visit to Switzerland.

The only evidence for this, however, was a machine gun and twenty-six cartridges which were found in her baggage. Miss Antelo denied knowing anything about a "plot." She said that a person whose identity she did not know paid her \$3,000 to bring the arm to Rio where it

a weakness inherent in the capitalist system at the present time.

The amortization of crises of over-production through recessions has meant the emergence both of an ever greater surplus productive capacity and a more and more pronounced depreciation of money. Thus we again come to the old Marxist contradiction between the tendency of capital to expand the productive forces in an unlimited manner and the limitations which this same capital imposes on the expansion of the buying power of the "ultimate consumers."

And in the long run there is no solution to this contradiction -- not devaluation of the dollar nor return to the gold standard nor the creation of an "international money." The only solution is abolition of the capitalist mode of production itself.

would be picked up by someone else.

The Brazilian police claimed that the machine gun belonged to a group which had failed in an attempt to assassinate Barrientos in Switzerland.

Believing that Barrientos would return to Bolivia via Rio, they wanted to ship the gun on ahead for another try, according to the police.

The truth of the affair was difficult to make out. Barrientos is notorious for his cock-and-bull stories and the Brazilian police run him a close second.

"FLOWER" PLUCKED BY PACIFISTS

An alleged deserter from the U.S. army in Vietnam has been exposed as an agent of the British Secret service.

The undercover agent, who used the rather attractive alias of "Barry Flower," had sought to ferret out a secret British network for assisting U.S. antiwar deserters.

Peter Cadogan, secretary of the Committee of 100, a British peace group,

told reporters January 5 that "Flower" admitted his mission to the peace activists whom he had tried to hoodwink.

On being ejected from the secret refuge which had been provided for him, he called the nearest U.S. airforce base for a car to pick him up.

Cadogan did not reveal how the professional gumshoe had been unmasked. Perhaps the "flower" did not smell right.

GENERAL HERSHEY BEATS STRATEGIC RETREAT

General Lewis B. Hershey, director of the U.S. Selective Service system, had to make a strategic retreat January 12 in his war against opponents of the war in Vietnam. The doughty general, who has

ordered draft boards to move against antiwar protestors, canceled a speech before a group of Boy Scouts in a Philadelphia suburb for fear of an antiwar demonstration.

THE KREMLIN FINALLY CONSIDERS THE COUNTERREVOLUTION IN INDONESIA

By Ernest Germain

It has taken more than two years for the pro-Moscow tendency in the international Communist movement to express a general opinion on the counterrevolution in Indonesia. To do so the Kremlin had to manufacture a split-off -- a very small one evidently -- from the Communist Party of Indonesia called "The Marxist-Leninist Group of the Indonesian Communist Party." And in its issues of December 9 and 11, 1967, the French Communist party daily l'Humanité offers us the key passages of an "appeal" emanating from this "Group."

Were the PKI's Analysis and Strategy Correct?

The "Appeal of the Marxist-Leninist Group of the PKI [Partai Komunis Indonesia -- Communist Party of Indonesia]" states that at the time of its fifth and sixth congresses the PKI had "correctly defined Indonesian society in its present stage as a colonial and semi-feudal society" and that it was right to "adopt a tactic of developing the revolutionary struggle gradually and with circumspection." (l'Humanité, December 12, 1967.) It follows from this that according to this group the PKI leadership was correct in participating in the Sukarno government.

Basing themselves on such an analysis, they are obviously incapable of understanding the profound reasons for the PKI's defeat. If it was correct to characterize the Sukarno government as a national-bourgeois government not belonging to the counterrevolutionary camp, how should generals Suharto and Nasution have been judged, who participated in this same government alongside the Communist leaders they later murdered?

The "Appeal of the Marxist-Leninist Group" criticizes Aidit's policy, declaring that "we paid less and less attention to extending revolutionary mass action, we practiced close collaboration with the bourgeoisie and thereby we gradually lost our political independence." (l'Humanité, December 12, 1967.) Very good. But how was it possible at one and the same time to participate in the Sukarno government and not practice class collaboration with the so-called national bourgeoisie? How was it possible to seek to extend revolutionary mass action and at the same time to seek a united front with the national bourgeoisie which would not accept such actions at any price?

In fact, did not the PKI begin in 1964 to organize ever broader peasant mobilizations around land occupations and were not these mobilizations halted be-

cause Sukarno demanded it? Was not this the real turning point of the Indonesian revolution which divided its ascendant phase from its phase of decline?

The luckless authors of this "Appeal of the Marxist-Leninist Group" are in no position to trace the PKI's errors back to their source, for in so doing they would put in question not only Aidit and his companions in struggle and Mao and his group who endorsed their errors until the last, but also Khrushchev and the Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the new program of the CPSU and the whole Stalin-Khrushchev tradition of the "gradualist" "strategy of stages" for the revolution in the colonial and semicolonial countries.

For, after all the tragic error committed by the PKI leadership was not a new one. It was committed before by the leaders of the Brazilian CP. It was committed by the leaders of the Iraqi CP under Kassem. It was committed by the Chinese CP in 1927. The basis of this error is well known and has been denounced many times by the international Trotskyist movement: it is the concept that the historic tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution which is on the order of the day in these countries can be accomplished by forces other than the proletariat allied to the poor peasantry and led by its revolutionary party. It is the concept of a "bloc with the national bourgeoisie." It is the concept that there are "intermediate" kinds of state between a bourgeois state and a workers' state, a "national-democratic state," a state of dual nature, as the unfortunate Aidit said.

It was this concept which cost a half million Communists, workers and poor peasants in Indonesia their lives just as it previously cost hundreds of thousands of victims in the Arab countries, in Latin America and in China. But the Indonesian so-called Marxist-Leninists, who are prisoners of a Menshevik theory of "revolution by stages," dare not say a word about any of this. For the source of these catastrophic notions lies in the Kremlin, and it is impossible to denounce them without denouncing Stalin, Khrushchev and the program adopted at the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU.

Was the "Indonesian Tragedy" Caused by the Fact that the PKI Lined Up with Peking?

Since they dare not expose the theoretical and practical source of their defeats, the pro-Khrushchevist Indonesian

Communists obviously need a scapegoat and this appears in the person of the Peking leadership.

The authors of the "Appeal" are correct when they say that the "Chinese comrades were fully content to play on the positive and negative sides of President Sukarno." (l'Humanité, December 12, 1967.) It is true that the Chinese leadership took complete responsibility for Aidit's opportunist line and his systematic subordination of the PKI to the bourgeois leadership of Sukarno. If any more proof is needed of Mao Tse-tung's personal responsibility for this opportunistic support, it can be found in the message which Mao sent to the PKI Central Committee on May 20, 1965 (six months before the victory of the counterrevolution!) on the occasion of the party's forty-fifth anniversary.

In this message he declared that the "Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia, with Comrade D.N. Aidit at its head, have applied and developed Marxist-Leninism skillfully [sic] and creatively in the light of their own country's revolutionary experience," and that they have "determined their revolutionary line and policy in full independence, in conformity with the fundamental interests of the Indonesian people and are leading the revolutionary struggle in Indonesia from victory to victory [sic!]." He also proclaimed the revolutionary unity of the Chinese CP and the PKI and declared that he would stand "unflinchingly" at the side of the CC of the PKI. (Pekin-Information, Vol. 3, No. 22, May 31, 1965, p. 6.)

Those who emphatically proclaim that revolutionists must "completely submit" to Mao Tse-tung's thought, accept its "complete supremacy," "without reserve," will have some difficulty in claiming that the task of the Indonesian Communists in May 1965 was not to follow Mao's appeal. This appeal enjoins them in fact to enter on the road which led to a terrible disaster: the murder of 500,000 revolutionists and men of the people by the triumphant counterrevolution!

But this being said, if the Kremlin and its Indonesian spokesmen have an easy time in denouncing Peking's responsibility in the Indonesian defeat -- Peking endorsed Aidit's errors both to buy the alliance of the PKI against Moscow and for the purpose of "exploiting" Sukarno's demagogic sallies against the UN and British imperialism -- this denunciation serves as packaging for some more than defective merchandise.

Indeed, how did Peking influence the PKI leadership in a bad direction? Essentially as follows, if we are to believe the declaration of the Marxist-

Leninist Group. The "Indonesian revolution was made into the proving ground for this party's [the Chinese CP] adventurist policy...The subjective notion that the revolution would triumph only by the armed road exercised a hypnotic influence over us: we abruptly modified our revolutionary orientation in the wrong direction. This 'left' revisionist position became, so to speak, the theoretical prelude to the tragic adventure known under the name of the '30th of September Movement'" (l'Humanité, December 9, 1967).

In other words, the Chinese CP was responsible for the Indonesian defeat because it turned the PKI's policy to the left in an adventurist manner and in favor of armed struggle: such is the judgment of the Kremlin and its Indonesian spokesmen!

But what is the picture that emerges from the description of the events immediately preceding Lieutenant Colonel Untung's abortive attempt at insurrection? If we are to believe l'Humanité in its issue of December 11, 1967, the council of generals led by Nasution and Suharto had indeed set up a conspiracy to seize power. The economic crisis was deteriorating. "The revolutionary and progressive forces had more than once tried to find a solution but their efforts were in vain because of [sic] the sabotage of domestic reaction, the unprecedented increase in military credits, the waste of public funds, etc., etc." (ibid.) These "difficulties" aroused general discontent.

In other words, the shaky equilibrium among the classes on which Sukarno's Bonapartist government rested, with the aid and assistance of the PKI, was breaking up. The PKI leaders and their prompters in Moscow and Peking noted with consternation that the reactionaries within the country were sabotaging the revolution. (They doubtless expected that one day a revolution would triumph not in spite of the sabotage of domestic and foreign reaction but with its support!) Their policy had reached an impasse, and the reactionaries took advantage of it to overturn the Sukarno regime to their profit -- that is the meaning of the generals' plot.

Trapped in their policy of a united front with the "national bourgeoisie," Aidit and his friends saw too late that they were in danger of being crushed. They made a last minute turn toward a revolutionary mobilization of the masses (the appeals launched at the time of the celebration of the forty-fifth anniversary of the PKI and at the time of the Congress of Agricultural Labor Unions, which the Marxist-Leninist Group scarcely mentions). But while these appeals caught the attention of the masses and speeded up the

preparations for the counterrevolutionary coup d'état, they were not accompanied by any systematic preparation for an uprising or for armed struggle, not even with the object of self-defense.

That is why the progressive officers made a last desperate attempt -- which had no chance of success -- to retrieve the situation. That is why the PKI cadres let themselves be arrested and massacred by the thousands without resistance, creating immense demoralization among the rank and file.

The fundamental cause of this was the false theory of "the national-democratic state," and the lack of understanding of the nature of the Indonesian state and army, which completely paralyzed the proletariat and the poor peasantry at the decisive moment. "Adventurism" and "putschism" were but side effects of this fundamental course caused by desperation. And the authors of the "Appeal" of the Marxist-Leninist Group are scarcely in position to question this course, which was not primarily owing to the Chinese CP!

"There Was No Need
to Take Up Arms"

What is much worse, the authors of the "Appeal" of the Marxist-Leninist Group state that Suharto and Nasution's plot could have been foiled by "a common front of struggle against the council of generals, Indonesia would have seen immense political progress, the national progressive forces would have been consolidated and a government of cooperation [sic], the goal of a prolonged struggle, would have been formed." (l'Humanité, December 11, 1967.) It seems like a dream!

Here we have the generals, controlling the most hardened and best equipped divisions in the army, preparing a coup d'état for October 1-2, getting ready to arrest and no doubt murder the Communist and progressive leaders. How is this plot to be foiled? By a general mobilization and arming of the masses? No, reply the Indonesian Khrushchevists, this would exhibit "excessive revolutionary zeal [sic], a desire to win at the fastest rate, an unjustified attempt to force the advent of the revolution." (l'Humanité, December 11, 1967.)

No, it is better to establish a "front of struggle" -- peaceful, of course. With whom? With Sukarno and his confederates? But this "front" had existed for long years. The "government of cooperation" also was already in existence.

It was precisely because this "front" and this "government" were paralyzed and the masses were beginning to

turn away from them that the reactionaries ventured to prepare a coup d'état. The idea that a coup d'état can be foiled by "peaceful coexistence," by appeals for "cooperation," or by purely verbal violence is, as the entire history of class struggles teaches us, a utopia. The Nasution-Suharto plot could only have been foiled by the most extensive mobilization and arming of the masses, by audacious revolutionary initiative, by calling for land occupations and the desertion of the soldiers of the reactionary divisions. But that is just what Sukarno did not want. The Khrushchevists did not want it either. That is why their defeat was inevitable.

Incapable of drawing the lessons from this defeat, the Khrushchev rightists of the PKI declare even today that "the party must return to the right road, which is that of creating a front of national union. It is important to extend the party's influence throughout the masses of the people, using all forms of struggle, legal [sic] as well as illegal." (l'Humanité, December 11, 1967.) And what is their aim? Is it dividing up the land, agrarian revolution, which is the basic demand of the immense majority of the Indonesian population? No! It is the conquest of "democratic rights and social progress," it is fighting for Indonesia to remain [sic] in the anti-imperialist and peace camp and maintain [sic!] its good relations with the socialist countries. (l'Humanité, December 11, 1967.)

Here the ridiculous vies with the odious. I have seldom read such scandalous prose from the pen of "Communists." In reading these lines, one wonders what country they apply to: Is it perhaps that comfortable "neutral" little bourgeois-democratic land of Finland, where the CP has been collaborating in the government and has pushed through a devaluation lowering the living standard of the masses? But they do not apply to a country with a bourgeois-democratic regime, where such a line, while still ultracopportunist, reformist and class collaborationist in character, would retain an appearance of "realism" in the short run. No, they apply to Indonesia, a country groaning under a ferocious dictatorship, where 500,000 Communists have been massacred, where other hundreds of thousands are in prison, whose corrupt leaders, open and avowed agents of imperialism, junket around the world begging for capitalist investment and imperialist credits. They apply to a country where the best Communists have developed the only possible response to the ferocious terror, guerrilla warfare, with the political support of Peking (which confirms the fact that there is indeed a difference between the line of Peking and that of Moscow as regards their revolutionary potential in the concrete international reality of today -- whatever the major

weaknesses in the Maoist position). And this country must "remain" in the "anti-imperialist camp"?

The editors of l'Humanité seize avidly on this revolting document, suddenly seeing in it a weapon against the Cubans and OLAS [Organization of Latin-American Solidarity]. They conclude (l'Humanité, December 11, 1967) that the "use of armed forces is not by itself sufficient to guarantee success. Quite the contrary, inasmuch as it is not conformable with the conditions and circumstances of the different countries, it can lead to failure and setbacks. Such is [sic] the case of Indonesia."

The American weekly Newsweek (December 25, 1967), gives us a succinct and very impressive description of the case of this Indonesian regime with which it is necessary to "peacefully coexist" and

which it is necessary to "keep in the anti-imperialist camp." It published an account of a recent massacre of the Chinese population on the island of Kalimantan (Borneo) which described how the heads of murdered men, women and children lay everywhere.

Fifty thousand Chinese refugees are confined in concentration camps. They try to sell their children to the rare passers-by in order to save their lives. But the Kremlin sages tell us that only the "peaceful" road will be successful against these bloody monsters, as Hitler's example taught us all.

True, the same issue of Newsweek explains how the Indonesian army uses Soviet helicopters to support its anti-guerrilla activities. That doubtless explains it.

HERBERT MATTHEWS' INTERVIEW WITH FIDEL CASTRO

An important interview with Fidel Castro appeared in the December, 1967, issue of War/Peace, published in New York. It was granted in October to Herbert Matthews, veteran reporter, who recently retired from the New York Times. The discussion included Cuban agriculture, relations with the United States and the Soviet Union, and the death of Che Guevara.

Matthews was the first reporter to interview Castro in the Sierra Maestra, in 1957, during the revolution. They have met a number of times since. This time it was on a country road east of Havana. Matthews described Fidel:

"Castro's enthusiasm and sanguine nature are as fresh and strong as they were in his youth and the early stages of the revolution. He is in splendid shape -- literally -- no fat around his middle now, strong, straight, not a grey hair in his beard or on his head and not a sign of receding hair although he is now 41 years old."

Castro talked about the expansion of Cuban agriculture:

"We are planting coffee bushes and citrus trees everywhere....In the 1970's we are going to have so much coffee and fruit that we will give it free to people -- and sugar, too. Just because they get it free will not mean that they will consume much more than they need."

Matthews argued that money incentives were necessary to stimulate production. Fidel replied:

"It will take a long time, but we

do not believe in the materialistic concepts of capitalism or other types of communism in which money is the incentive. Men live for more things than money.... They must be given dignity, and in return must learn that their work is a contribution to the good of all the people and the state. This is true Marxism-Leninism as we see it, but it is not communism as it is practiced in Russia, Eastern Europe or China."

Matthews pointed to the fact that the Soviet Union and many of the Eastern European countries "were seeking commercial accords in Latin America."

"We consider this to be a lack of socialist solidarity," Castro said. "They should not be helping governments that are trying to destroy us."

Matthews continued:

"I remarked that this indicated that Russia and East Europe did not agree with Cuban policies in Latin America, especially the guerrilla campaigns.

"'Yes,' he answered wryly, 'it does indicate just that.'"

Che Guevara was killed while Matthews was in Cuba. He writes that "Guevara's death was a profound personal tragedy for Castro, who always had the greatest affection and admiration for Ché -- who, incidentally, reciprocated the feeling....they never quarreled and always kept closely in touch, within the limits possible in recent years while Ché was in Bolivia."

CAMIRI OIL WORKERS INDICATE SYMPATHY FOR REGIS DEBRAY

The January 5 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde reported that in the previous week Corrado Corghi, a national councillor of the Italian Christian Democratic party, who had been delegated by the League for the Rights of Man to go on a mission to Bolivia, visited Régis Debray in his cell at Camiri.

According to a previous report circulated in La Paz, Debray had been transferred to the military base at Choiretti. Corghi found, however, that Debray is still being held in a military "barracks" in Camiri.

Debray's morale is high, Corghi said, but he complained of being "cut off from the world" because "his mail is not delivered to him." Also, he feels that "his security is not guaranteed."

Corghi's mission was to study the conditions under which prisoners are held in Bolivia, sound out the Bolivian authorities on a possible exchange of foreigners like Debray with prisoners like Hubert Matos in Cuba, and solicit the Bolivian government to turn Guevara's body over to his family.

Besides Debray, Corghi managed to visit the Argentinian, Roberto Bustos, and four Bolivians, Choque Choque, Barrera Quintana, Rocabado Terrazas, and Tapia Aruni, who were acquitted in the Debray trial but who are still being held in prison.

Le Monde's correspondent, Marcel Niedergang, quoted Corghi as saying: "The comportment of the heads of the Bolivian army may seem paradoxical. They condemned Régis Debray to the maximum penalty but they are contemptuous of him and frequently reproach him with not being a 'genuine' guerrilla while they express the highest praise for Comandante Guevara, who was killed at Higuera October 9 in a way that has become public knowledge."

Although Debray's "relations with Colonel Reque Teran have recently improved," according to the prisoner himself, his life remains at the mercy of imponderables because of "the climate of

instability prevailing in Camiri as well as La Paz."

A number of officers have told Debray, "If we wanted to, we could have killed you ten times."

Some of them even added: "Keeping you imprisoned costs us more than a hundred Bolivian political prisoners."

But it seems that the strongest safeguard favoring the young French revolutionist is "the sympathy felt for him by part of the population in Camiri."

In a parade which they staged during a celebration held by the company, the Camiri oil workers set up a flaming torch in front of Debray's cell.

This sympathy is irritating to the military authorities. In Corghi's opinion it could cause them to either transfer him to a different place or to agree to negotiations to exchange him and his Argentinian companion.

"As long as Régis Debray remains in Camiri," Corghi said, "we need not feel too uneasy. The most ominous would be if the prisoners should be transferred to Choiretti, where there is a small fortress about forty kilometers from La Paz, or to a fortress in the Chaco, which is another possibility..."

Concerning a possible exchange of prisoners, Corghi gained the impression that this depended essentially on the way certain conflicts within the Bolivian government turn out. The regime is far from being stable. The recent contradictory accounts given out by generals Ovando and Barrientos concerning the final disposition of Guevara's body illustrated perfectly the "conflict of tendencies." And there are other instances.

On the other hand, Vice-President Siles Salinas told Corghi that the government was "greatly concerned about the safety of the prisoners" and had not excluded the possibility of an exchange despite the "great difficulties."

BEHIND BARRIENTOS' DOUBLE-TALK ABOUT EXCHANGING DEBRAY

General René Barrientos, the Bolivian dictator, was in Switzerland at the beginning of January for "health" reasons, according to the official story. Later it became known that he did some window-shopping for arms. It has not yet been confirmed whether he visited any banks to

make deposits of cash.

In Zurich January 5, he brought up the question of Régis Debray. "It is inexact to say that I officially offered to exchange the Frenchman Régis Debray for the Cuban Hubert Matos," he told the

press. "I did not speak expressly about an exchange proposal. On the spur of the moment, without any preparation, in reply to a question that was asked, I expressed a completely personal feeling about the matter."

"This personal feeling," the dictator added, "could constitute a point of departure. I don't know how long it would take the Bolivian people to agree with me. I repeat that it represents a beginning on my part. I did not make any offer, because in our regime I don't have any dictatorial powers."

The dictator also said, "I have felt this way since General de Gaulle interceded with me in April 1967 in behalf of Debray. Perhaps General de Gaulle could make the same gesture with Fidel Castro today to obtain the freedom of Mr. Matos.

"If Matos were freed, he would be welcomed in Bolivia with open arms and the right of asylum would obviously be granted to him. If the decision depended on the Cuban people, both those inside the country and those living abroad, Matos would be freed and thus Debray also."

Le Monde, which is known to have very good connections with the French government and, consequently, with sources of information not easily available to others, made the following editorial comment:

"This new retraction made by General Barrientos, who left Zurich Saturday to return to La Paz, after spending a few days in Switzerland, will surprise no one, especially the Bolivians, who are commenting with irritation, as was shown

by the La Paz newspaper Presencia on Saturday, on the unfortunate, contradictory declarations made at short intervals on the Debray affair by some of the leading personalities.

"General Barrientos repeated for several months and again in New York last week, that he was 'absolutely opposed to the idea of exchanging Régis Debray.' It is thus strange that the head of the Bolivian state should declare that his 'present personal feelings' coincide with the intervention made by General de Gaulle in the month of April 1967.

"After all, General Barrientos knows, as the chairman of the Supreme Court in La Paz has just indicated, that a possible exchange of Régis Debray could not be undertaken without amending the Constitution of Bolivia, which at present bars 'any remission of sentence when the accused is sentenced to a penalty of thirty years' (which is exactly the case with Régis Debray and the Argentinian Ciro Bustos, whose lawyer is going to file an appeal for amnesty).

"Many Bolivians hold that the 'personal' offer of General Barrientos is a product of domestic political considerations. The general, according to these Bolivians, is seeking to embarrass the heads of the army by presenting himself before international public opinion as a 'liberal.' In fact it is no secret to anyone in La Paz that the heads of the army are hostile to any projected release of Régis Debray and that some of them are preparing almost openly to succeed General Barrientos. It is held in La Paz that only the hesitation of the United States has caused this 'reshuffling of the government' to be deferred up to now."

CASTRO OFFERS 100 COUNTERREVOLUTIONARIES FOR GUEVARA'S BODY

If the Barrientos dictatorship and its backers in Washington thought that the maneuver to offer an exchange of Régis Debray for Hubert Matos would embarrass the leadership of the Cuban revolution, the reply given by Fidel Castro January 13 probably caught them by surprise. Evidently they had calculated that Havana would be reluctant to respond to the offer since it would imply admission of some kind of guilt in intervening in internal Bolivian affairs.

In a speech in the Chaplin Theater closing the International Cultural Congress, Castro offered to exchange 100 counterrevolutionaries for the body of Che Guevara. "The CIA and the Pentagon can pick the 100 counterrevolutionaries if they have the courage to return the re-

mains of Comandante Guevara," Castro said.

The offer was met with a standing ovation from the audience.

Castro said that he was sure that Régis Debray would not want to be exchanged for counterrevolutionaries held in Cuba.

Castro excoriated the Central Intelligence Agency, whose representatives were directly involved in the murder of the wounded Guevara last October 9.

The policies of U.S. imperialism, he said, were remindful of the policies of Hitler.

"The U.S. is the most barbarous aggressor in history," he charged.

GREEK JUNTA TAKE OFF UNIFORMS BUT KEEP PRISONS FILLED

By Les Evans

The military junta in Greece has been trying to change its image in the last month, to become less conspicuously dictatorial and therefore less of an embarrassment to the American government of whom they are "clients."

Lyndon Johnson maintained diplomatic recognition of the Greek regime after the April 21 coup brought the junta to power, arguing that preservation of the "anti-Communist" NATO alliance took precedence over such considerations as military dictatorships among the partners.

But the flight of King Constantine to Rome December 14 added another embarrassment for Johnson. Dean Rusk announced the following day that the U.S. would "wait for a while" before recognizing the now kingless junta. The American embassy in Athens, followed by the lesser emissaries of other nations, ceased communicating publicly with the Athenian upstarts.

Colonel Papadopoulos, seeing what was expected of him, moved to solve Rusk's problem. Shortly a miraculous transformation began to take place in the Greek regime.

On December 20 Colonel Papadopoulos converted himself and two other officers into civilians by resigning from the army.

Papadopoulos' next feat was to change himself into Santa Claus -- that, at any rate, was how the New York Times reported it.

The Times carried a dispatch from Athens December 24 which said, "The Greek junta declared a Christmas amnesty today for most of the 2,500 political prisoners currently being held in jails here and on three small islands in the Aegean."

Papadopoulos made the announcement, while making a great show of receiving a copy of a new constitution. The civilian leader, on whom a black suit looked strangely like a uniform, set no date for elections and spoke only of a plebiscite which would probably not be held until September, and then under martial law. He refused to lift the press censorship.

Nevertheless, the "amnesty" was given wide play in the American press. The New York Times in a front-page headline proclaimed, "Junta in Greece Pardons Most Political Prisoners" and the correspondent said that Papadopoulos at his news conference had wished all the reporters a merry Christmas "with the smile of a Santa Claus who has just finished giv-

ing out all the gifts in his satchel."

The "civilian" junta, no doubt feeling that it had earned its reward, appealed to Washington January 11 in an editorial in the Athens daily Estia:

"It is high time for this affair of the foreign Ambassadors to come to an end....As the smaller embassies will decide on their attitude in the light of what the American Embassy does, it is time to put an end to the anomalous situation."



COLONEL GEORGE PAPADOPOULOS, the head of Greece's military junta, decreed himself to be a civilian December 20. Thus who can honestly say a military dictatorship is in power in Greece?

The junta seems to have met Johnson's requirements. The New York Times reported from Athens January 12 that "'Informal' top-level diplomatic contacts between the United States Embassy in Athens and the new Greek Government were resumed this week."

But the great transformation was a fraud. The December 27 New York Times reported (not on the front page):

"Col. Ioannis Ladas, Secretary General for Public Order, said today that none of the 2,500 political prisoners identified as Communists and exiled on the Aegean islands of Leros and Gyaros, would benefit" from the amnesty (emphasis added).

As to how many the so-called amnesty would cover, Colonel Ladas said that only "about 300 would be set free." This means that the great majority of the political prisoners remain in jails and concentration camps.

Behind the democratic façade, Greece's military-capitalist rulers, backed by American imperialism, have established a chamber of horrors -- that is the only real transformation that has taken place.

A report by Grigor Praxis in the November 24 New Statesman describes some of the innovations of the Papadopoulos regime.

Some political prisoners, Praxis writes, "have been interrogated at considerable length but have never been physically maltreated, because they were designated for appearance in court. Others, beyond any doubt, have been tortured from the day that they were arrested."

Praxis describes the treatment of three women from well-to-do families who were accused of taking part in the political underground:

"Since being arrested, all have been kept in solitary confinement for periods ranging from 14 to 45 days. They have been ruthlessly beaten, interrogations have lasted for periods leading to collapse, and one girl has suffered acute haemorrhages. The most delicate of the

three has been subjected to repeated electric shock treatment. She now suffers from hallucinations and from continual trembling of a type reminiscent of Parkinson's disease.

"Interrogation is carried out by the security police. Thick basement walls insulate prisoners from the outside world. The airless cells below street level, absolutely dark round the clock, measure one metre by 1.90 by 1.20 [one metre = 39.37 inches]. Suffocatingly hot during the summer months, they are infested with fleas, bugs and lice -- deliberately, it is claimed....

"When first arrested, they are not let out at all for 72 hours; and they are allowed no food, water or cigarettes for that span of time. As soon as they fall asleep they are abruptly woken by the guards and hurried to an officer's room for interrogation. This can last for 10 hours or more.... Women have been stripped naked for questioning.

"In between the sessions of questioning, the prisoners are not left alone. They are beaten with truncheons on the face and head in the cells, and are also taken to the terraced roof of the building for 'special treatment.' This means beating with sticks or whips on the soles of the feet, alternating with karate chops on the arms and other sensitive spots. One released prisoner has described how policemen stubbed out lighted cigarettes on his chest and stomach."

For Johnson, none of this is any discredit to his new friends; after all, comparable things go on in Mississippi, and even in Newark and Detroit. Besides, Papadopoulos' helper has a ready explanation to reassure any doubters. Former colonel Patakos declared, as reported in the January 10 Le Monde:

"Our intention is to have as few people as possible in prison or detention. I would like all the prisoners to be free, but they themselves don't want that, because they don't want to give the impression that they aren't dangerous."

With practice this Patakos might become as good a conjurer as his master.

GUERRILLA FORCES REPORTED IN ZAMBEZI VALLEY

A report from Salisbury in the January 6 Johannesburg Rand Daily Mail said that more than 200 "terrorists" belonging to Rhodesian and South African nationalist organizations had appeared in the valley of the Zambezi river.

The guerrilla fighters were described in the dispatch as apparently heading for some unknown objective. The army and the police had been mobilized, according to the same report, and were moving into the region.

A NEW SITUATION FOR THE LEFT IN INDIA

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

The dismissal of the United Front ministry in West Bengal last November 21 and the installation of a minority government backed by the Congress party created a new situation in the political life of India. Not because the left components of the United Front, including the left-wing CPI(M) [the pro-Peking Communist Party of India (Marxist)], are pursuing a perspective of revolutionary struggle, but because the bourgeois state has begun an offensive against its own parliamentary traditions.

The positive intervention of the masses in protest against the dismissal of the United Front government introduced a further new element into the situation. There was a two-day general strike November 22-23.

The struggle has been continued by students in Calcutta with demonstrations against the new ministry. More than a dozen persons have been killed by the police since November 21 and scores have been injured. Hundreds have been detained under the Preventive Detention Act.

The tense situation in West Bengal took a dramatic turn November 29 when the Legislative Assembly met under the orders of the governor to enable Dr.P.C.Ghosh, the new chief minister, to seek a vote of confidence. The speaker, B.K.Banerjee, a nominee of the United Front, adjourned the House sine die after declaring that the Ghosh ministry was not legally constituted. The governor prorogued the legislature.

On November 30 another general strike was staged in the state in protest.

The political impasse has thus assumed the form of a constitutional wrangle although the Ghosh ministry continues in office with the support of the Congress party but without a formal mandate from the legislature.

The United Front, led by Ajoy Mukherjee, was based on a shaky foundation indeed. It was a fourteen-party coalition*

*The United Front was made up of the left-wing CPI(M), the Bangla Congress, the CPI [pro-Moscow Communist Party of India], the SSP [Samyukta Socialist party], PSP [Praja Socialist party], Socialist Unity Centre, RSPi [Revolutionary Socialist Party of India], Workers party, RCPI [Revolutionary Communist Party of India], Forward Bloc, Forward Bloc (Marxist), Lok

representing disparate class and political interests. A devout Gandhian, Ajoy Mukherjee has never been very happy with his coalition partners, particularly with the left-wing CPI(M) which dominated the United Front not only by its numerical strength, but also by the mass support it commanded outside the legislature.

The peasant uprising in Naxalbari and the growing resistance of workers in Calcutta and other industrial centres (the so-called Gherao movement launched by industrial workers) created an atmosphere in which Ajoy Mukherjee was finding it uncomfortable to continue as chief minister. In October, he conspired with the central government to resign his post and form a "non-Communist ministry" supported by the Congress government. The Centre was prepared to move in the army to take charge of the state administration.

But, sensing a mass uprising would occur, Mukherjee decided not to precipitate a crisis and did not submit his resignation. In a statement which he had prepared for the occasion (and which was released by the Congress party leader P.C.Sen after Mukherjee's ministry had been dismissed), Mukherjee said that his resignation was intended to forestall a move by the left Communists "to create a Vietnam in West Bengal and other eastern states of India, with Chinese assistance"!

The CPI(M), of course, assured Mukherjee that it would not undertake any step that would embarrass him. The party leadership expelled the Naxalbari "extremists" and called off the "Gherao" movement. They also sought an agreement with the employers. A class truce was declared. But that did not save the United Front ministry after all.

The resignation of Dr.P.C.Ghosh as food minister in the United Front ministry and the defection of seventeen legislators* from the United Front only continued the process initiated by Ajoy Muk-

Sevak Sangh, and two independent groupings. The Bangla Congress recently merged with the Bharatiya Kranti Dal, an All-India party formed by dissident Congressmen not long ago.

*The defectors were independents and some members of Ajoy Mukherjee's Bangla Congress and the Praja Socialist party. Dr. Ghosh was elected as an independent supported by the United Front.

herjee himself. The Congress leadership fully backed the defectors.

The defections significantly came at a time when the United Front government was planning to launch a vigorous food grain procurement drive at the end of the present harvesting season, reported to be quite good.

The United Front government was also compelled to act against the Jotedars [landlords] under the pressure of the peasant struggles in the districts. The Jotedars and rich peasants were naturally perturbed about the intentions of the United Front government and were anxious to get rid of it as quickly as possible.

The defections helped the central government to manoeuvre the dismissal of the United Front ministry through the instrument of the state governor, who gave the Assembly a chance to meet formally and decide whether Ajoy Mukherjee commanded a majority in the house.

The United Front government had the support of 153 members as against 127 Congress members in the Assembly. The defections reduced the United Front to a minority party in the 280-member House. The United Front government could have tested its strength immediately after the defections were announced instead of fixing the distant date of December 18 for the meeting. Obviously the United Front leaders were bidding for time under the illusion that some of the defectors might change their minds under popular pressure. This gave an additional pretext for Governor Dharma Vira, a ruthless bureaucrat, to act immediately on orders from New Delhi.

The left constituents of the United Front, including the CPI(M), are anxious, it would seem, to find a constitutional solution of the present situation. Their manoeuvre is to seek the removal of the P.C.Ghosh ministry and the promulgation of president's rule so as to compel the holding of midterm elections.

The CPI(M) demanded a midterm poll for some time but the other members of the United Front opposed this because of their fear that they might be reduced to nonentities in the balloting. Now that the central government has resolved their predicament, the United Front has announced a programme of "civil disobedience," beginning December 18 in support of the demand for a midterm poll.

The left parties in West Bengal who threatened a "blood bath" if the central government dismissed the United Front ministry appear to have become reconciled to the reality that the mass reaction to their general strike calls of-

ferred "no ground for complacence or self-congratulation."

"If anything," the left weekly Now of Calcutta, a critical supporter of the United Front ministry, wrote December 11, "The absence of an organised response should make them ashamed of their uncertain leadership."

It added: "The strike call last week did not go unheeded, but the pattern of response also showed the weakness of Leftist organisation among industrial labour and the rural people."

Now, in fact, blamed the CPI(M) for utilising the "instruments of parliamentary democracy" at the "expense of its mass base" and asked the left parties to give up their "barren and harmful exercise" of hatching united fronts with bourgeois parties.

But the left parties in West Bengal, more particularly the CPI(M), do not seem to have realised the folly of perpetrating multiclass coalitions.

Indeed, the CPI(M), the largest constituent of the United Front, was sharply split on its future course of action in West Bengal. The correspondent of the Times of India, Shankar Ghosh (a former member of the CPI), in a December 3 dispatch, made a revealing assessment of the developments inside the CPI(M) in the state.

During its nine months in office, he states, the CPI(M) trebled in size while its nearest rival, the Bangla Congress (now the Bharatiya Kranti Dal) "had practically been erased as a major political force." The only other party to have strengthened itself in this time was the Socialist Unity Centre led by the former Labour Minister Subodh Banerjee, again a close ally of the CPI(M).

About the inner party conflicts in the CPI(M), he reported: "The extremists had all along been opposed to the party's participation in the Ministry, and the record of the U.F. Government had only strengthened their case. But to break from the U.F. and come out of the Government for any reason would have been construed as surrender of the party leadership to the extremist rank and file. The dismissal of the Ministry came, therefore, as a deliverance to the CPI(M) leaders, though they had to simulate anger to remain in step with the other constituents of the U.F. The extremists were gaining ground rapidly in the party and the CPI(M)'s indefinite continuance in the U.F. Government would have soon threatened the present leadership."

(The so-called "extremists" are in themselves a heterogeneous group, an

important section of them being pro-Maoists who stress the need to develop armed struggle of the rural poor in accordance with Lin Piao's theory of "people's war." Some of them, expelled from the CPI(M), held an "all-India" conference at Calcutta early in November to explore the possibility of forming a new party, but they decided to postpone the decision in view of political differences among the participants.)

But, according to the Times of India correspondent, it is the inner conflict "which is holding back the leadership of the CPI(M) from getting intimately involved in agitated activities." The "extremists" are reportedly in control of the party's underground apparatus and the leadership is not sure that it would be available in the event of a serious clash with the government. The predicament of the CPI(M) in West Bengal, it would appear, was known to the authorities. In assessing the possible repercussions of dismissing the United Front ministry, they "ruled out prolonged disturbances on a large scale." Events since November 21, according to the same correspondent, have proved that the assessment was correct.

The ouster of the United Front ministry in West Bengal has also caused a major revolt among the second-rank leaders inside the pro-Moscow CPI. They are criticising the party's participation in "united fronts" with bourgeois parties in different states. A call was also made to change the present Dangeite leadership of the CPI.

A national conference of the party is scheduled to be held in February to discuss policy regarding "united fronts." Meanwhile the Dangeite leadership has secured majority support for its line in the Central Executive of the party.

The CPI has withdrawn its two ministers from the United Front government in Uttar Pradesh (dominated by dissident Congressmen and Jan Sangh) but is still participating in the coalition government in Bihar where the president of the Bha-

ratiya Kranti Dal is chief minister. The Bihar ministry also faces the prospect of being toppled because of defections from the ruling "United Front."

New Delhi's action in West Bengal was synchronised with the dissolution of the state legislature and imposition of president's rule in the state of Haryana (where a coalition government led by a dissident Congress leader had several defections from its ranks) and dismissal of another "United Front" government and installation of a minority ministry formed by defectors from the ruling party with the support of the Congress party in the state of Punjab. Thus, temporarily at least, the Congress party appears to be "regaining" its position, lost during and after the last general elections.

The dismissal of the United Front ministry in West Bengal assumed special significance because of the predominant role played by the traditional left parties in it. Although the ministry functioned as a loyal defender of private property within the bourgeois order, India's rulers were apprehensive that it might overstep the constitutional limits under pressure from the masses.

The Centre's action in West Bengal therefore serves to expose the parliamentary illusions of the traditional left parties. It also demonstrates once again that the bourgeois state will not hesitate to liquidate its own parliamentary institutions and traditions whenever the class rule of the capitalist state is threatened. The opportunist class collaborationist "united front" politics of the traditional left have greatly helped the bourgeois Centre to masquerade its antidemocratic action as a step to defend "parliamentary democracy."

The big question is whether the working-class parties -- particularly the CPI(M) -- will draw suitable lessons from the developments in West Bengal and embark upon a programme of militant mass action against the bourgeois state in India.

CRISIS IN UTTAR PRADESH

Another tense spot was pin-pointed on the crisis-ridden political map of India when five members of the coalition government in the state of Uttar Pradesh handed in their resignations January 5. The five belong to the Samyukta Socialist party. Despite the resignations, the party leaders continued to support Charan Singh, head of the state government and dissident member of the Congress party.

The Samyukta Socialist leaders warned Singh that if he persists in not

carrying out the electoral platform on which the coalition ran for office, they will turn against him. Whether Singh pays any attention to the ultimatum remains to be seen.

If the coalition collapses, as seems to be only a question of time, it is expected that the central government, run by the Congress party will take over. This, however, will not end the crisis in Uttar Pradesh but only serve to transfer it to a deeper level.

FARMERS NEAR TOKYO JOIN WITH STUDENTS IN OPPOSING SPREAD OF U.S. BASES

Farmers near Tokyo whose land lies in the path of planned extensions of U.S. air bases have begun to organize to save their farms, and have formed an alliance with radical students to help them in their fight.

One group of farmers in Sanrizuka, Chiba Prefecture, is opposing the construction of the projected New Tokyo International Airport on their land, and the other is against the extension of a runway of the U.S. Tachikawa Air Base outside Tokyo.

The farmers charge that the airport as well as the U.S. base will be used for war purposes. The farmers, like the students, are hostile to the extension of American air bases, their being used in the war in Vietnam and the threat that Japan will be drawn into a new war as a result of the ties of her government with American imperialism.

The Japan Times reported January 4 that the farmers are working with the radical Sampa Rengo (Three Faction Alliance) wing of the Zengakuren. The Sampa Rengo was the principal organizer of the massive demonstrations against Premier Sato's Far East tour in October and his visit to Washington in November.

The Times says the farmers "are friendly to the radical students because Sampa Rengo students give them the most unstinting support when trouble occurs. That is, the Sampa Rengo students are willing to fight the police on their behalf."

The clash the Times refers to took place October 10 when 2,000 riot cops stormed the village of Sanrizuka to guard airport officials who came to survey the land for the projected airport. That confrontation also marked a falling out between the militant farmers and the youth of the Communist party, with whom they had worked previously.

Issaku Tomura, the leader of the Sanrizuka farmers organization, the Unconditional Opposition League Against the New International Airport in Narita, publicly broke all ties between his organization and the Japan Communist party after the Communists attacked him for allowing Sampa Rengo students to participate in the October 10 demonstration. The Communists have a very sectarian attitude toward the Sampa Rengo students, refusing to work with them on the grounds that they are "Trotskyists."

The Times says that during the demonstration against the surveyors, Tomura "saw the JCP members give way meekly to the oncoming police...He resented it that the Communists 'deserted the poor farmers who tried to stop land surveying with the little power they had.'"

Tomura said of the projected land seizure, "You cannot just say to a farmer to pack his things up and move to another piece of land, because it's like telling a mother to throw away her own child."

At Sunagawa, north of Tachikawa, the farmers had worked with the JCP for twelve years. The Communists broke the alliance after the farmers began working with the Sampa Rengo in February of last year.

Ryokichi Aota, a leader of the Sunagawa farmers declared to the Times, "I don't care if the Sampa students are Trotskyists or not...I'm determined to do anything I can do to avoid war. Sampa students are eager to help us for the same cause."

Last July the Communists told the farmers not to associate with the Sampa Rengo students. Aota said, "We told them that's none of their business and not to bother to come back to our village again."

And they did not, he said.

BRAZILIAN CP CONDEMNS CHE GUEVARA AS "AN ADVENTURER"

"Revolutionary illusions" of leaders like Che Guevara were condemned by the Brazilian Communist party in a recent statement. Along with a blast against the armed-struggle line of the OLAS conference, the resolution of the December 1967 congress of the pro-Moscow Brazilian CP implicitly described the Cuban revolutionary hero as "an adventurer blinded by his own illusions." It accused such "zealots" of seeking to "revive in the new guise of guerrilla warfare a conception

of revolution based on insurrectionary hotbeds stirred up by adventurers totally isolated from the mass movement."

In this lengthy statement, which appeared in the conservative Rio de Janeiro paper Jornal do Brasil despite the military censorship in Brazil, the party reaffirmed its belief that the ultimate victory of socialism in Latin America was possible through legal and nonviolent means.

TEXT OF FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY ATTACK ON STOKELY CARMICHAEL

[The following is a translation made by World Outlook of an article directed against Stokely Carmichael which appeared in the December 18 issue of l'Humanité, the daily newspaper of the French Communist party, under the title, "Les Noirs américains pourront-ils trouver le salut dans l'organisation systématique de révoltes armées?" (Can the American blacks find salvation in the systematic organization of armed revolts?)

[The author of the attack is Thomas Buchanan, who is identified by the editors of l'Humanité as follows: "Thomas Buchanan is a progressive American journalist, well known in France. Author of the book, 'Who Killed Kennedy?', he was the first to criticize the conclusions of the official authorities and to demonstrate that the Dallas assassination was the result of an organized plot. After the second world war, Buchanan was the secretary of the 'Civil Rights Congress,' whose headquarters was in Washington."

[The article is of special interest as one of a series by various authors, which have appeared in publications of the pro-Moscow Communist parties, attacking the Cuban leaders and the basic revolutionary position taken by the Organization of Latin-American Solidarity (OLAS).*

[For a reply to Buchanan see the article by Joseph Hansen on page 45 of this issue of World Outlook.]

* * *

While leaving "wide open" the possibility of "new paths to freedom" now being sought by "courageous young leaders," a group of eighty black Marxists, who recently held a conference in New York, rejected appeals to "terrorism" in the

*For Fidel Castro's statement of the immediate issues that precipitated the public dispute, see the text of his speech, "Those Who Are Not Revolutionary Fighters Cannot Be Called Communists," in World Outlook, March 31, 1967, p. 330. For the opposing position, see the following articles in World Outlook in 1967: "Venezuelan CP Leaders Denounce Castro's Speech," April 7, p. 371; "French CP Attacks Revolutionary Line of OLAS Conference," September 22, p. 781; "Chilean CP Leader Joins Foes of OLAS," September 22, p. 800; "Brazilian CP Attacks OLAS Conference," October 20, p. 830; "Alas for the Canadian CP on OLAS," October 20, p. 831; "'Pravda' Sets the Line for CP Attack on OLAS," November 10, p. 912; "The Soviet Press Features a Venezuelan 'Authority' Against the Cubans," December 1, p. 985.

black ghettos of the United States. It was their judgment that the black people should seek alliances with the progressive forces and the working class based on practical demands:

1. The immediate adoption of a multibillion dollar program to meet the needs of black America.

2. Rapid elimination of white policemen and white officials in predominantly black communities.

3. U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam where a disproportionately high percentage of black troops are being used to fight against a colored people.

The conference implicitly rejected, among other things, Stokely Carmichael's thesis in favor of a kind of "guerrilla movement" in the black ghettos. This thesis has provoked sharp controversies among American black leaders since the rebellions of this past summer in more than 100 U.S. cities, which left 400 seriously wounded, 100 dead and caused damage estimated at more than 500 million dollars.

Should such uprisings be systematically organized with the political aim of destroying the capitalist system? Yes, replied Carmichael in Havana on August 2 in a statement which attracted the attention of world public opinion. As a speaker, Carmichael is the most dynamic young spokesman for the black people of the United States. But Martin Luther King, who also opposes the war in Vietnam, is by far the most respected leader for the majority of black people, as the most recent polls indicate.

Stokely Carmichael was invited by the Cuban government along with some other Americans as an observer to the OLAS conference where the principal subject of discussion was what strategy to adopt against the United States in the Western Hemisphere. The members of the press corps and the official representatives of twenty-seven delegations were gathered in a large room in the Havana Libre hotel (formerly the Hilton) to hear one of the main speakers of the conference, the representative of North Vietnam, when Carmichael invited the reporters up to his room on the twenty-sixth floor to hear a special statement on the situation inside the United States. There he told them that the black population was "moving into open guerrilla warfare in the United States...The only good thing about Vietnam is that the United States has taught us how to kill. Our brothers returning from Vietnam will put this training to use in the cities of the United States."

"Washington," he said, "will find itself put in a difficult situation in fighting rebellions in the black sections of our big cities. Inside the United States they will have to fight hand to hand. They won't be able to use napalm and bombs." He admitted that an isolated uprising could be defeated by military intervention but predicted that if there were fifteen rebellions on the same order in all the big cities and a corresponding number of "Vietnams" in other countries that that would mean the death of imperialism. "Guns," he told the journalists, "are the only way. We have no other alternative but to use aggressive violence in order to own the land, the houses and the stores in our communities and control the politics of these communities. We welcome all who are willing to take guns with us. Everything else is talk." Not only did Carmichael advocate guerrilla warfare in the United States but he said that there were good reasons to think that it would be successful. He told the journalists moreover that black militants are now preparing lists of official government figures who are to be assassinated if possible. One of them, he said, would be Lyndon Johnson. It will be recalled that Malcolm X, who with Fanon, has been Carmichael's principal mentor, was the only black leader who applauded the assassination of President Kennedy.

In the civil war (which he asserted is beginning), the 25-year-old former student said that the following groups must be rejected as allies:

1 The middle-class liberals and progressives. He described them as "enemies of the black people" because they are generally rich and profit from the imperialist system in the United States. Thus, he said, these liberals fight to maintain the system in the United States which he and his people are trying to destroy.

2 The white workers. He said that the U.S. working class is interested only in getting the highest possible wages and that it wants no change in the present social structure by which the black people is oppressed.

3 All the black leaders who, as racial integrationists, have sought to establish equal access without regard to skin color to hotels and other public places as well as to jobs. The objectives of the civil-rights movement reveal its bourgeois nature, Carmichael said. Only a small handful of black people have enough money to eat in expensive restaurants and sleep in deluxe hotels or have sufficient training to hold the jobs to which they are now legally entitled. Therefore, he said, the unskilled black workers and the unemployed will gain nothing from the desegregation program.

He concluded from this that in this summer's racial uprisings these groups were perfectly justified in smashing store windows and taking what they wanted, and he accused the Reverend Martin Luther King of being "against the black people of the United States" because King condemned such tactics.

4 The American Communists both black and white. He said that the U.S. Communist party has no working-class base and is "filled with rich people who enjoy the capitalist system. They have nice homes and servants and make a lot of money. They get along fine with the ruling class. If Marx and Lenin had gotten to know the American Communist party, they would have become capitalists."

5 The great majority of the international Communist movement who endorse and support the Soviet Union, the white workers and the left movements of all the European countries were called "racist" and "reactionary." They were accused of profiting from the exploitation of the world's predominantly colored population. There is no white proletariat according to Carmichael's definition.

On whom then can Carmichael count to march with him?

1. The masses of desperate young blacks who live in the urban centers, many of whom are unemployed...a revolution of the lumpenproletariat which has lost confidence in a proletariat judged too corrupted by the capitalist system.

2. The third world or at least the part of it which is already waging an armed struggle against American domination. The black people, Carmichael said a little later in Algeria after a visit to North Vietnam, have tried "peaceful coexistence" with the whites in the United States for 400 years. "The price of peaceful coexistence has been lynchings, arson and bombing attacks on the homes, schools and churches of black people. It is clear to us now that peaceful coexistence means no more than maintaining the status quo. That is why for us armed struggle is the only solution."

Coming at another time, Stokely Carmichael's impatient manifesto would have been completely ignored. He went to Havana as the former leader of a minority section of the black student movement largely originating from the black bourgeoisie, who, unlike most of the black population, have the means to send their children to universities like Harvard, where Carmichael went to school and from which he graduated.

His background is not typical of American blacks. Born in Trinidad in a mulatto family, he came to the United

States at the age of eleven and lived in New York with his parents. A cultured young man, he was socially accepted in this northern city by the white intellectuals with whom he associated; but he felt mainly condescension in this acceptance. His experience of the conditions in the struggle in the southern states has been limited to organizing a few "expeditions" which he undertook -- at the risk of his life -- during his stay at Harvard. It would have been easy for his Marxist adversaries in the United States to call him a "romantic" and "petty bourgeois." But in the context of the Vietnam war and the situation in the United States, Carmichael's opinions received respectful attention from the American Marxist leaders whom he however accused of leading an "easy life." One of them is Henry Winston, a black American born in the South. When Carmichael was only eight years old, Winston, along with ten other persons -- the entire national leadership of the Communist party of the United States -- was sentenced to five years in prison on the charge of having done what young Carmichael now proposes: "teaching and advocating the overthrow of the American government by force and violence." While in prison, Winston told the authorities that he was going blind and asked for surgical treatment. His request was refused and the young black Communist leader lost his sight.

Winston, who has now become the national chairman of the Communist party of the United States, was the principal spokesman of the group of eighty Marxists who have spent their lives in organizing the struggle of the black people in the racist South under conditions which Winston called "comparable to those faced in Hitler's Germany." And he observed that many Communists, black and white, "gave their lives in these hard first struggles."

Violence, Winston said, is "neither good in itself" nor "bad in itself" in the Communist interpretation. Communists, he said, support "the right of an oppressed people to violently overthrow an oppressive regime if the channels of democratic change are closed to them." The question of whether this right to revolt is to be exercised can only be determined by the historic conditions, the place and the circumstances and by a correct appraisal of the situation and the political conditions of the moment. Those who conclude, he said, that the present task is to give an organized character to the spontaneous uprisings which have occurred in the black ghettos are seriously mistaken both about the temper of the black communities and the relationship of forces which would result from such an organized revolt. The overwhelming majority of the American people, including the black peo-

ple, are not yet convinced that the system must be changed and much less that it is necessary to do so by force. Armed uprisings for these objectives cannot be successfully undertaken by the black communities alone, no matter how courageously they struggle. They need powerful allies, principally in the white and black working class. Communists, he said, think that actions of a terrorist or conspiratorial character which are not based on a program aimed at improving the living conditions of the masses and which do not receive broad popular support are adventurist and of a provocative character. To unleash such actions, he said, would demonstrate political irresponsibility and bring reprisals against the black communities.

Communists also think, he said, that terrorism within the black community against those called "collaborators" or "Uncle Toms" or others who refuse to go along with the tactics proposed by some is entirely out of place and harmful and cannot but divide the forces fighting for freedom. Winston's statement does not anywhere condemn Stokely Carmichael and his supporters by name. Certain of Carmichael's speeches, such as those he made in Paris, indicate that his contacts with the world revolutionary movement during his most recent trips have produced an ideological evolution in him and led him to a more correct position with regard to the allies of the black masses. The analysis made by Winston had predicted such an evolution and had left the door open: "We admit," Winston said, "that we have much to learn from the courageous young leaders who are seeking new roads to freedom in this period, that the door must remain wide open to all new forms of struggle which are effective and forged by the test of combat. The effectiveness of any form of struggle must be determined by the following criteria: Does it enhance the struggle or does it hinder it? Does it divide or unite the masses of black people? Does it help us win allies or does it isolate us? The courageous acts of isolated individuals have played and can play an important role in the present struggle for freedom but the power of this struggle lies in its capacity to inspire mass militancy. It can never replace this. Individual courage, however, can be synchronized with the forms of struggle which the forces of the black people are ready to accept."

As for the racial uprisings which occurred this year, Winston's group solidarized itself with them, while expressing some reservations: "Although we do not advocate a policy of looting and arson, it is clear that while ghetto uprisings were unable to end the unbearable conditions against which the spontaneous revolts were directed, they did achieve certain positive results. They made it painfully clear to many white Americans

that life in our great cities will be unbearable for all unless it is made bearable for the people of the black communities. Furthermore the uprisings have permitted the development of resistance to the unjust Vietnam war. They have helped to gain the acceptance of a larger part of the white communities for cooperation with the black communities." And the black leader concluded, "the uprisings in

the ghettos and many other heroic actions have shown that the black people are determined to fight for freedom now."

The task of black leaders, he said, is to seek in common the ways of best using the militancy of the black people: their duty, he said, is to keep this militancy from being turned against them by provocations.

IN DEFENSE OF STOKELY CARMICHAEL

By Joseph Hansen

Thomas Buchanan has departed from his own specialty, which is investigation of the contradictions of the Warren report on the assassination of President Kennedy, a field of research where he has gained a certain renown along with others, to inject himself into a dispute involving the strategy and tactics of the Latin-American revolution and the black liberation movement in the United States, the position of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara on armed struggle, and the momentous problem of how to break out of the capitalist system and open the way to socialism on a world scale.

The debate flared when Fidel Castro, in March, 1967, denounced the rightist leadership of the Communist party of Venezuela for betraying the revolution in that country. The debate spread, with currents in the international radical movement backing one side or the other, a notable feature being the way in which spokesmen of Communist parties under the influence of the Kremlin, as in the case of the French party, have felt compelled to wage a virtual campaign on the subject.

Since it is a public dispute, anyone, of course, is free to venture his opinion and show where his sympathies lie. To be considered seriously, however, a participant, particularly one whose contribution appears in a publication that claims to stand for Communism, ought to at least indicate what the central difference is and where he stands on it. Buchanan does not do this. Instead, he offers an exercise in sophistry.

No matter how honored it is by time and custom, sophistry still remains sophistry. Its purpose -- and in this Buchanan adheres faithfully to the ancient principles of the art -- is to divert attention from the real issue and to instill prejudice against those whose views he is subjecting to attack.

A virtually perfect example is his manipulation of Henry Winston's attack against the stand voiced by Stokely Carmichael at the conference of the Organi-

zation of Latin-American Solidarity [OLAS] in Havana last summer. Instead of attempting an objective examination of the ideological differences and the context in which they arose, Buchanan seeks to inveigle us into assuming an attitude toward the images of the two personalities -- as presented by Buchanan -- and into judging their arguments on this hazardous basis.

With a few favorable touches for the sake of the record, Buchanan pictures Stokely Carmichael as not yet dry behind the ears in either age or experience, as being foreign-born and having a background not typical of American blacks (the readers of l'Humanité must have savored this), a student at Harvard, socially acceptable among white intellectuals, knowing nothing of the struggle in the South save for a few "expeditions."

The venerable Henry Winston, in contrast, was sentenced ("when Carmichael was only eight years old"!) to five years in prison and went blind there when the authorities refused him medical attention. Winston, now the national chairman of the Communist party "was the principal spokesman of the group of eighty Marxists who have spent their lives in organizing the struggle of the black people in the racist South under conditions which Winston called 'comparable to those faced in Hitler's Germany.'"

Can there be any question as to which authority you would want to accept?

The flimsiness of such arguments can be demonstrated by a single question. How do the images of Stokely Carmichael and Henry Winston, whether drawn by Buchanan or anyone else, compare with the image increasingly in the minds of black liberation fighters in the United States today -- the image of Malcolm X, who was turning toward revolutionary socialism when he was assassinated?

The question is highly pertinent. It involves the pattern of the coming struggles in the United States, the kind of leaders required to win, and the kind

of leaders coming to the fore today. In short, does it speak in favor of Stokely Carmichael, or against him, that he is deliberately seeking to follow the path blazed by Malcolm X?

Buchanan mentions Malcolm X just once -- as "the only black leader who applauded the assassination of President Kennedy." Buchanan's brevity belongs in the camp of those who felt relieved at the assassination of Malcolm X.

In contrast, Buchanan hands Martin Luther King a bouquet. King's efforts to fashion an American facsimile of Gandhi's passive, class-collaborationist movement, in essence an attempt to divert the Afro-Americans from taking the road of socialist revolution, runs parallel to the line of "peaceful coexistence" with the "progressive" sector of the capitalist class which has been the stock-in-trade of the American Communist party since the height of the cult of the personality of Stalin.

That this is the basic position of the American Communist party can be shown without much effort.

In the 1949 witch-hunt trial of the leaders of the American Communist party, which Buchanan refers to since it included Henry Winston, the basic CP position was openly stated. Thus, on June 22, 1949, Gilbert Green, one of the defendants, testified: "We departed from the policy of class against class around 1935." Green specified further: "Socialism is not an immediate issue for the next period. The issues are to extend democracy, preserve peace, curb the monopolies and prevent fascism."

This program does not reach beyond the limited vision -- and narrow class interests -- of the liberal wing of the Democratic party. In the epoch of the death agony of capitalism, when the fate of humanity hinges on breaking out of this antiquated system and building socialism, the program indicated by Green spells disaster. The workers cannot even "extend democracy, preserve peace, curb the monopolies and prevent fascism" without struggling for socialism.

This lesson was written out in some of the bloodiest pages in history in Germany and Spain, where the "peaceful coexistence" policy of Stalinism paved the way for the triumph of fascism and the catastrophe of World War II.

Buchanan, of course, is well aware of the policies of the American Communist party and in particular its program as outlined in the 1949 trial, which has not changed to this day. As l'Humanité indicates, he served at that time as secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, the organization principally responsible for

rallying support for the defendants.*

This brings us to the heart of the dispute. Fidel Castro and Ernesto Che Guevara hold that under the conditions obtaining in Latin America, where military dictatorships backed by the imperialist United States have been set up from one end of the continent to the other, it is not possible for the people to establish governments representing their will except through armed struggle. They add

*The Civil Rights Congress failed miserably to win widespread support for the CP victims of the witch-hunt. There were two reasons for this. One was the low esteem in which the CP leaders were held among militants because of their support of the Roosevelt administration during the war, which included defending and upholding the wartime wage freeze, engaging in strikebreaking activities and sacrificing the black liberation struggle. A second reason was the sectarian way in which the defense was conducted.

At two conferences sponsored in the summer of 1949 by the Civil Rights Congress in hope of setting in motion a broad movement against the witch-hunt, spokesmen of the Civil Rights Congress and the Communist party rejected a resolution to support the case of James Kutcher, the legless veteran fired from a government job because of his admitted membership in the Socialist Workers party. They also rejected a resolution to support the campaign then being waged to win restoration of the civil rights of the leaders of the Socialist Workers party, who had been imprisoned as the first victims of the Smith "Gag" Act under which the CP leaders were being tried.

The grounds advanced by the CP to explain this stand was that these victims of the witch-hunt were "Trotskyists." The result was a public scandal that gravely hampered the struggle against the witch-hunt and greatly increased the difficulty in the following period of creating a united front against the scourge of McCarthyism. Years later, the CP recognized that their sectarian stand was an error.

It is worth noting that the Trotskyists, who remained faithful to the program of revolutionary socialism, succeeded in building widespread support for their cases. Organizations representing more than 5,000,000 members in the labor and civil-rights movement passed resolutions and gave donations to help the first victims of the Smith "Gag" Act. James Kutcher gained such broad and substantial support that he won his case, was reinstated on his job and granted full back pay for the years he had lost.

that experience shows that from here on out, revolutions in Latin America, if they are to achieve their goals, must necessarily be socialist in character.

Against this view, the leaderships of a number of Communist parties maintain that the "democratic" or "electoral" road still remains open, that success can be won through "peaceful coexistence," and that the "progressive" sector of the national bourgeoisie can be relied upon in this struggle. To win the national bourgeoisie, a broad front must be constructed and socialism is out as a program for such a front, since it is not acceptable to the national bourgeoisie.

In response to this, the Cuban leaders point to the real course of these exponents of "peaceful coexistence," which is to engage in the electoral arena as a mere pressure group, supporting one or another of the tendencies in the bourgeois parties. This, the Cubans say, and quite correctly, is a betrayal of the revolution.

The question was debated at the OLAS conference in Havana which Stokely Carmichael attended. The statements he made there cannot be properly understood unless they are placed in this context.

First of all, it is obvious that the Cubans and the delegates from Latin America who agreed with their position convinced Stokely Carmichael that they were right as against the advocates of "peaceful coexistence."

Second, Stokely Carmichael brought before the conference his conclusions concerning the experience of the Afro-Americans in seeking redressment of their long-standing grievances in American society. This was the first time many delegates had heard an unbiased account of the black power movement in the United States. Stokely Carmichael succeeded in removing many misunderstandings about this movement, some of which had been implanted by adherents of the Communist party.

Third, the dialogue between Latin-American revolutionists and a leading spokesman of the black liberation struggle in the United States was of considerable political significance. It was a concrete expression of internationalism, the recognition of common aims, and, on this occasion, solidarity in support of the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people.

That Stokely Carmichael used language that proved offensive to the ears of

a Buchanan and those like him was not altogether negative. It provided another gauge of the distance separating the bedraggled Communist party from the developing black liberation struggle. In its first phases, such a movement is bound to speak a violent language expressive of its anger and frustration and determination to resort to other means when peaceful appeals for justice are contemptuously brushed aside.

A deeper question than language is involved. Buchanan quotes Henry Winston as characterizing conditions in the South as "comparable to those faced in Hitler's Germany."

In the light of that characterization, it is obvious that Stokely Carmichael's suggested course of action conforms much closer to the reality than the "peaceful coexistence" line of Winston and Buchanan. For their line is equivalent to advising the blacks to bow their necks to the master race, while Carmichael urges resistance, whatever the cost. Carmichael is expressing a widespread sentiment among Afro-Americans. It has become almost a slogan: "We will not play a role like the Jews did in Germany."

Does this mean that there are no tactical questions? Does the formula "armed struggle" or "guerrilla war" settle everything? I would be the last to agree that this is the case. Many mistakes have been made and opportunities missed because of a simplistic approach which eliminated from calculation such things as the mood of the masses, ways and means of bringing to bear the immense power of Latin America's populous cities, transitional phases of struggle, party building, and so on. These subjects will undoubtedly come under intensive discussion in the coming period among revolutionists in Latin America and elsewhere, including the black liberation movement in the United States.

But it is quite pointless to discuss these things with people who are in disagreement on the most fundamental question; that is, the historic pattern of struggle in the period we are now living in. Is the pattern one of colonial uprisings and socialist revolutions or of "peaceful coexistence"?

To substitute questions of tactics and language for this question is to divert the discussion and make it meaningless, if not positively harmful. That is precisely what Buchanan tries to do. Fortunately he is not likely to succeed.

GUINEA FREEDOM FIGHTERS FORGE AHEAD AGAINST PORTUGUESE IMPERIALISM

"Napalm and phosphorous bombs marked 'Made in U.S.A.' have been dropped in African villages not far from here, according to numerous eyewitness reports and photographs which appear to be genuine," writes Russell Warren Howe from Conakry, Guinea, in the January 12 issue of The Christian Science Monitor.

The villages are held by nationalist forces that have liberated them from imperialist Portugal.

The arms have been supplied free by the U.S. as "NATO aid." The excuse given by the State Department for keeping dictator Salazar armed to the teeth is to defend the country from any "external aggression."

"The leader of the Portuguese Guinean nationalists, Amilcar Cabral, asserts that obtaining modern arms free in this way enables Portugal to fight the nationalists in Portuguese Guinea, Angola, and Mozambique," continues Howe. "If Portugal had to buy these arms, he affirms,

it would be forced to negotiate with the nationalists."

More than half of the colony is out of control, the Portuguese authorities concede, according to the Monitor's correspondent.

Against the freedom fighters, the Portuguese are using Fiat and Sabre jets and 35,000 troops. Despite this, Portuguese communiqués "indicate a slow retreat from the country, although it is never described as that."

"Statistics about his forces are elusive," declares Howe, "but Mr. Cabral [head of the African Independence Party for Guinea and Cape Verde] notes that his troops' gasoline consumption has risen in three years from 75 gallons monthly to 10,000 gallons. This reflects considerable mobility in a country which is hard on wheeled vehicles. The nationalists' recently acquired anti-aircraft guns shot down their first Portuguese jet in November."

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
Washington Puts the Squeeze on Prince Sihanouk	26
The Dollar Crisis -- by Ernest Mandel	27
A "Plot" in Switzerland Against Barrientos?	29
"Flower" Plucked by Pacifists	29
General Hershey Beats Strategic Retreat	29
The Kremlin Finally Considers the Counterrevolution in Indonesia -- by Ernest Germain	30
Herbert Matthews' Interview with Fidel Castro	33
Camiri Oil Workers Indicate Sympathy for Régis Debray	34
Behind Barrientos' Double-Talk About Exchanging Debray	34
Castro Offers 100 Counterrevolutionaries for Guevara's Body	35
Greek Junta Take Off Uniforms But Keep Prisons Filled -- by Les Evans	36
Guerrilla Forces Reported in Zambezi Valley	37
A New Situation for the Left in India -- by Kailas Chandra	38
Crisis in Uttar Pradesh	40
Farmers Near Tokyo Join with Students in Opposing Spread of U.S. Bases	41
Brazilian CP Condemns Che Guevara as "An Adventurer"	41
Text of French Communist Party Attack on Stokely Carmichael	42
In Defense of Stokely Carmichael -- by Joseph Hansen	45
Guinea Freedom Fighters Forge Ahead Against Portuguese Imperialism	48

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010



EDITOR: Joseph Hansen. CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, George Novack. WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for publications of the labor, socialist, colonial independence and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the view of the authors, which may

not necessarily coincide with those of World Outlook. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. TO SUBSCRIBE: For 26 issues send \$7.50 or 2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: World Outlook, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France.