

Unionists Call Antiwar Conference



LON NOL: Nixon announced May 25 that Cambodia's new dictator is to be given \$7,500,000 in free arms. This is the first installment in what promises to be a lucrative business for some and deadly for others—like Operation Escalation in Vietnam.

In U.S. Poll:

**54 Percent
Condemn the War**

**Auto Union Assails
Nixon on Violence**

Venezuelan Guerrilla Leader:

**Interview with
Douglas Bravo**

Peter Buch:

**Nahum Goldmann's
'Future of Israel'**

Wall Street Begins to Call It a 'Recession'

Real Wages Down

The unemployment rate in the United States jumped to 4.8 percent in April—an increase of 0.4 percent over the level for March.

The average level for all of 1969 was 3.5 percent. In the first four months of 1970, more than one million workers lost their jobs.

The rising rate of unemployment is the result of the deliberate policy of the Nixon administration, which claims that "cooling" the economy is necessary to halt inflation.

The administration has predicted an average unemployment rate of 4.3 percent for all of 1970. But with the figure at 4.8 percent already in April, the "cooling off" seems likely to go farther than the government's experts have predicted.

At the same time, the inflation has not been halted. Prices continue to rise even while joblessness is increasing.

A measure of the inflation, and of how hard it has hit the American workers, was indicated in figures released by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics on May 6. These are particularly interesting in view of the government's oft-repeated claim that higher wages are the chief cause of inflation.

The bureau's statistics revealed that in the past two years the "real spendable earnings" of the average factory production worker have declined \$3.30 per week.

The loss of buying power—3.9 percent over the two year period—is a consequence of the continued rise in the consumer price index, which now stands at 39.1 percent above the 1957-59 base period. Thus factory workers in the New York-Northeastern New Jersey region are now earning, in terms of buying power, 32 cents less per week than they did six years ago.

In New York City alone, gross earnings of production workers rose \$6.97 per week in the last twelve months, but real wages fell \$1.38.

In short, the Nixon administration, while leaving the war profits of the corporations untouched, is forcing the American workers to pay for the war through decreased income and increased unemployment.

In This Issue

		U. S. A.	
	538	Real Wages Down	
Les Evans	539	Wall Street Begins to Call It a 'Recession'	
	543	Auto Union Assails Nixon on Violence	
Lee Smith	544	Armed Attack on Los Angeles SWP Center	
		ANTIWAR	
	541	Unionists Call Conference to Plan Action	
	543	Memorial Day Marchers Protest War	
	545	Maoists Beat Up Delegates at National SMC Parley	
		CHINA	
Joseph Hansen	542	A Welcome Development	
		INDIA	
	545	2,000 in Bombay Antiwar March	
	556	Naxalites Turn to Urban Terrorism	
		AUSTRALIA	
	546	Protest Secrecy in Barring Mandel	
		VIETNAM	
	546	Saigon Students, Veterans Step Up Protest	
		CEYLON	
	547	Senanayake Government Ousted by Landslide Vote	
		ARGENTINA	
Livio Maitan	548	Call for Protest to Help Jailed Guerrillas	
		BOLIVIA	
	549	Political Prisoners Still Being Held	
		CANADA	
Carl Fleming	550	Maoists, Stalinists Vs. Antiwar Movement	
Arthur Young	558	Quebec Election Shows Nationalist Ferment on Rise	
		GUATEMALA	
	551	Mexican Report on Killing of Yon Sosa	
		CHILE	
	563	6 Guerrillas Arrested	
		ITALY	
	564	The Truth About the Bolivian Trotskyists	
	565	CP Puts Trotskyist Demonology on Shelf	
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	
Gerry Foley	568	Balaguer Declared Winner in Election	
		REVIEWS	
Peter Buch	560	Nahum Goldmann's Controversial 'Future of Israel'	
		DOCUMENTS	
	542	Text of Mao's Statement	
	552	Interview with Douglas Bravo	
	566	How Healyites Reported April 26 March in London	
		DRAWINGS	
Copain	537	Lon Nol; 553, Douglas Bravo; 568, Juan Bosch	

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square Station, N.Y. 10010.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.

TRANSLATIONS: Gerry Foley, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion,

unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York 10010. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U.S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright © 1970 by Intercontinental Press.

Wall Street Begins to Call It a 'Recession'

By Les Evans

The eighteen-month slide of the New York stock market turned into a plunge in the weeks following Nixon's invasion of Cambodia and the explosion of student antiwar protest at home. The May 24 *New York Times* reported that the Chase Manhattan Bank has calculated "that the market value of all securities has dropped by more than \$150-billion since the start of 1970—and by \$280-billion since President Nixon took office."

Even these figures were out of date by the time they were published. On May 25 the Dow Jones industrial average suffered the sharpest one-day decline since the death of President Kennedy, falling 20.81 points to a seven-and-a-half-year low of 641.36, down from a high of 985 in December 1968. The next day the averages dropped again to 631.16. More than one-third of the market value of the stocks of the thirty largest corporations has been wiped out since the 1968 peak. Smaller companies whose stock is traded in the over-the-counter market have taken an even greater beating, some selling at as little as 10 percent of their 1968 prices.

Financial circles have been making gloomy statements for some time, but few expected such a precipitous decline, and there is little agreement now on what to do. A big question is the extent to which the stock-market crash is an indicator of much deeper economic woes that have only begun to manifest themselves.

President Nixon and his advisers still insist that the runaway inflation has been curbed and that the economy will "turn up in the second half of the year." But last April 28 it was Nixon who told investors: "Frankly, if I had any money I'd be buying stocks right now." The Dow Jones average stood at 735 that morning. If Nixon had invested \$100,000 he would have already lost \$14,000 by May 26.

The major contributor to the inflationary spiral that touched off the current crisis has been the war in Vietnam.

Nixon, following the policies of the Johnson administration, has allowed interest rates to rise. The aim is to "cool" the "overheated" economy. The chief victims of this policy have been the workers. Real wages have continued to drop and unemployment has begun to rise.

Unemployment figures hit 4.8 percent in April, up from 3.2 percent when he took office in January 1969. This represents 4,000,000 people out of work. The unemployment rate for Blacks is more than double that for whites, standing at 8.7 percent compared to 4.3 percent for white workers. Layoffs have been particularly heavy in aero-space industry, which has affected the West Coast more than any other region. In Seattle the general unemployment rate is up to 7.5 percent.

But Nixon's policy hasn't accomplished what it was supposed to do even from the capitalists' standpoint. The business slowdown has already gone further than was hoped, yet the inflationary trend has not been stopped. *Business Week* magazine summed up the situation in its May 23 issue:

"The business news is overwhelmingly gloomy. Wherever you look, the statistics reflect an economy that is progressively slowing, with no upturn in sight.

"Business is drifting into something that is beginning to look suspiciously like recession. And to top it off, there is growing talk of some sort of wage-price moves.

"Unemployment has risen by more than a million in only four months; it seems sure to rise some more through the summer. Industrial production slipped in April, after registering a modest uptick in March. Manufacturing output has now been sluggish for nine months. . . .

"There is no new strength emerging in any major industrial sector; most industries are either cutting output or, at best, holding steady. . . .

"And corporate profits are coming down fast. In the first quarter, earn-

ings tumbled \$6.3-billion to an annual rate of \$85-billion. That's 11% less than in first-quarter 1969. The second quarter does not look any better, and it may be worse.

"And the third quarter? Without a revival in business, earnings could still be sliding."

Part of the crisis stems from a loss of confidence in the government's ability to handle the situation. There is little disposition on the part of businessmen to believe the Pollyanna assurances from Washington.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns, once pictured as a hard-headed realist, has created his own "credibility gap" in recent months. In reply to criticisms of the administration's economic policy by the AFL-CIO Executive Council early in May, Burns repeated the refrain he has been singing for a year: "We are traveling a narrow path between inflation and recession, and we do not intend to be diverted." *Newsweek* magazine called him to task in its May 25 issue:

"But many economists and a large part of the rest of the country concluded that Burns had already strayed off the path and in fact was whistling past the graveyard."

As *Newsweek* put it, "It was not yet officially baptized, but most consumers—and a sour consensus of businessmen, too—had no trouble finding a name. The name was recession."

Nixon characterized what was going on in the market merely as "slowing pains."

"This had no effect whatsoever on the securities markets," the May 24 *New York Times* said. "For investors are worried far less about a recession than about an economy which they fear is running out of control, with the budget sliding into deficit, aggravating the inflation and posing a threat for the indefinite future of tight money and very high interest rates—which are the death of bull markets.

"Assurances that inflation is slowing down have been issued by the Admin-

istration with virtually every batch of price data since it took office."

These assurances were repeated in April when the data for March became available, indicating a slight slowing down of the rate of increase in the consumer price index. But the official optimism was punctured when the April figures showed a jump of 0.6 percent in consumer prices—an annual rate of 7.2 percent, up from the 6 percent average for the first quarter of 1970.

Another blow was the May 19 announcement by the White House that the federal budget would go into the red some \$1,800,000 in 1970 and another \$1,300,000 in fiscal 1971. This meant that Nixon's forecast of a budget surplus, announced in February, proved to be completely off base. Administration apologists pointed out that the deficit amounted to only a small percentage of the \$200 billion federal budget. Financial circles were not impressed.

First, it was said, even to keep the deficit to the levels indicated depended on a number of highly speculative conjunctures. Included in the budget was some \$1.6 billion in revenue from a proposed tax on gasoline that has not been considered by Congress yet, and congressmen are in no mood to vote for unpopular taxes in an election year.

The deficit will be increased by the drop in tax revenues from corporations and from individuals. As layoffs continue and as corporations seek new tax write-offs to cover "profit losses," tax revenues will continue to decline below the present level.

As for the small size of the expected deficit, *Newsweek* pointed out May 18:

"The prospective deficit might, however, have quite an impact on the nation's straining credit markets. Indeed, many economists are seriously concerned that major new borrowings by the Treasury could touch off a 'liquidity crisis'—or, in plainer terms, an outright panic in the money markets."

One symptom of the economic downturn has been a sharp decline in the cash assets of major businesses. Faced with high interest rates when borrowing cash to meet current obligations, the danger of a money panic is increased. As *Newsweek* put it:

© "With the Fed [Federal Reserve Board] continuing its squeeze on the flow of new money into the economy,

the fear is that whole groups of businesses or even banks might not be able to meet their obligations, touching off a domino-like wave of bankruptcies and crashing values."

There is evidence that Wall Street takes this possibility very seriously. The governors of the New York Stock Exchange have approved a plan to more than double the exchange's special trust fund from \$25,000,000 to \$55,000,000 to pay off customers for losses due to brokerage failures. This move was clearly aimed at forestalling a panic if some of the investment houses begin to go under.

While shoring up safeguards at one point, the money manipulators are tearing them down at another in their efforts to stimulate stock purchases. One of the key arguments of bourgeois economists against the possibility of a repetition of the 1929 stock-market crash has been the higher margin of cash required for stock purchases today, reducing the ability of speculators to parlay a small amount of money into a large amount of stock. But under pressure of the tailspin in the market, the Federal Reserve Board at the beginning of May cut the "margin requirement"—the actual amount of cash an investor must put up to buy stock—from 80 percent to 65 percent.

But it is the question of what to do that has provoked the sharpest debate. The first "break" with Nixon's policy inside the administration came on May 18 when Federal Reserve chairman Burns openly called for an "incomes policy" to freeze prices and wages.

Paul McCracken, chairman of Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, at the same meeting of government and banking officials in Hot Springs, Virginia, rejected Burns's proposals.

Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy told the bankers: "I see no reason to expect or want wage or price controls." Then to make clear what the official position of the administration was, Attorney General John Mitchell, Nixon's chief adviser on all matters, told a group of Mississippi businessmen: "Wage and price controls are not now and never have been a part of our economic strategy. Forget about them."

In the meantime, however, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney made his own proposal for a version of an incomes policy.

Newsweek in its June 1 issue sug-

gested that Nixon was trying to play both games at once, pointing out that Burns's "close relationship with the President and his immense prestige gave his words the lift of a trial balloon."

European financiers have urged the U. S. to either get out of Vietnam or institute wartime price controls. Clyde H. Farnsworth reported from Paris in the May 25 *New York Times*:

"More and more the war in Southeast Asia is cited as the basic cause of the inflation in the United States. It follows, in this view, that only action on wartime controls would produce the desired results.

"'You are fighting a cost inflation,' said a Swiss banker, 'with the tools to fight a money inflation.'"

Senator Fred Harris (Democrat of Oklahoma) has introduced legislation for creation of a federal board with power to freeze wages and prices for six months.

New York's liberal Republican mayor John Lindsay on May 24 called for a mandatory six-month freeze on wages and prices.

David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, at a May 25 news conference in New York gave his support to some form of incomes policy, saying: "I would like to see the President indicate publicly his concern about wage and price increases and urge on business and labor a more responsible attitude."

The same day, David Rockefeller's brother Nelson, governor of New York, came out against controls.

The state of mind of the financial magnates was summed up in a May 27 panel discussion before hundreds of steel executives at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Beryl W. Sprinkel, senior vice-president of the Harris Trust and Savings Bank of Chicago, told the executives:

"Fiscal and monetary restraints are working. It would be disastrous to resort to the straitjacket of economic controls when success is close at hand."

Pierre A. Rinfret, president of Rinfret-Boston Associates, Inc., replied that Nixon's policies are "a living disaster" and that "the time has come to try controls."

Bureaucratic Privilege

The paper of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee has charged that government officials misuse forest preserves for private hunting parties.

Unionists Call Antiwar Conference to Plan Action

A Harris public opinion poll, published May 28, confirms what had already been revealed by the massive demonstrations that broke out spontaneously on the American campuses and on the streets of cities from coast to coast in the United States when Nixon announced the invasion of Cambodia—the American people are decidedly opposed to the Indochina war and want it stopped now.

Of those polled, 54 percent believe that it was not "proper and constitutional for the President to order troops into Cambodia without the consent of Congress." Only 37 percent approved Nixon's move.

In addition, 46 percent agreed with the statement that Nixon has "not been frank and straightforward about the war." Only 42 percent disagreed.

Furthermore, when given a choice between formally declaring war in Indochina to "legalize" the U. S. intervention or to simply "get out," 54 percent of those polled said the U. S. should get out. Only 25 percent wanted to see Congress declare war.

This mood is reflected in the mail pouring in to Congress, expressing, as the *New York Times* put it May 28, "a feeling of quiet anguish simmering in the big cities, the suburbs and the small towns across America."

"Congressional aides, whose job it is to read and answer the mail," the *Times* reported, "said they cannot remember a time when such a general feeling of unrest existed among constituents. And they sense that thousands of people are writing such letters now who never wrote in the past."

New outbreaks of dissent over the war have appeared in unlikely places almost daily. On May 21 Nixon's Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr., condemned the Cambodia invasion because of its "disastrous effect on the education of young people in this country."

On May 22 it was revealed that at least four members of the National Security Council staff were resigning. Not all gave reasons, but W. Anthony Lake, a personal aide to Henry A.

Kissinger, was reported to be quitting over Cambodia.

In New York more than 100 editorial employees of the strongly prowar *Daily News* submitted an advertisement to the newspaper condemning the government's actions in Indochina as "abhorrent" and "a source of daily atrocities." The *News* refused to accept the ad, but it appeared in the May 24 issue of the *New York Times*.

About 1,000 Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergymen arrived in Washington May 26 for "an emergency religious convocation on the war in Indochina."

A special meeting of the conservative Association of the Bar of the City of New York voted May 28 to adopt a resolution saying that the association "strongly opposes continued American intervention in Indochina and strongly urges immediate withdrawal of all American forces therefrom."

The rift in the labor bureaucracy over the war has continued to deepen as more union leaders have dissociated themselves from AFL-CIO president George Meany's support for Nixon. Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the 417,000-member Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, broke with Meany on May 24, releasing to the press the text of the keynote address he was to deliver the next day at the opening of his union's convention.

"Our members," he declared in his speech, "like all working people and like the majority of all Americans, want peace. And they want peace now, without delay, without further military adventures, without more killing."

Meany was also scheduled to address the convention on May 28, but he canceled his appearance without explanation. The May 27 *New York Times* said a spot check of convention delegates "indicated a general belief" that Meany was reacting to Potofsky's antiwar speech.

An important sector of the trade-union movement has agreed for the first time to join in the sponsorship of a national antiwar meeting. A call was issued in Detroit May 25 for

an Emergency National Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War to be held in Cleveland June 19-21. The announcement was made at a news conference at the Michigan AFL-CIO headquarters which was attended by August Scholle, state AFL-CIO president. Scholle told reporters that the labor movement must assume the responsibility of joining with the students in opposing the war.

Sponsors of the Cleveland conference who were present at the meeting with the press included attorney James Lafferty, chairman of the Detroit Coalition to End the War Now; David Mitchell, state representative of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Grady Glenn, president of Ford Local 600, Frame Unit, of the United Auto Workers; Father John Nowlan, director of the Human Rights Division, Detroit archdiocese, and David Chamberlain of the Student Mobilization Committee.

"In this historic crisis for humanity," the call to the Cleveland conference states, "it is imperative that the American antiwar movement be a beacon light for the tens of millions of Americans who will join the struggle to end the war if given leadership. . . ."

"The purpose of the Emergency Conference is simple and to the point: to plan antiwar demonstrations and other antiwar activities of the most massive kind centering on the crucial issue of withdrawal from the war and conducted in a peaceful and orderly fashion."

The conference "is not intended to solve or even necessarily to discuss all the problems of our crisis-ridden society. . . . It is a conference to organize massive opposition to the war. All those who want to see such opposition organized are welcome to participate, regardless of their political ideas or affiliation."

Not Much of a Secret

The secret of the South Korean economic boom, according to the May 12 *New York Times*, is "the willingness of South Korean workers to work long hours for little pay under harsh and sometimes dehumanizing conditions."

A Welcome Development

By Joseph Hansen

Mao Tsetung's statement May 20, the first he has made in a year, followed by a giant demonstration the next day in Peking and then a series of similar actions that "rolled across China like angry waves in a vast ocean" according to Peking Radio, is a welcome development. It indicates that the government of the People's Republic of China has decided on a substantial increase of material aid to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, and other forces in Indochina under attack from U. S. imperialism.

Up to now Peking, like Moscow, has doled out aid to the Vietnamese freedom fighters with an eyedropper. This "restraint" has been one of the key factors encouraging the Pentagon to plunge ever deeper into Indochina. The Washington "hawks" have interpreted the meagerness of aid as proof of fear in Moscow and Peking and such a strong desire for "peaceful coexistence" that the war could be escalated with impunity. If Mao's declaration signals a genuine turn, the situation in Indochina can change dramatically.

A significant omission in Mao's statement is any reference to collusion between Moscow and Washington. It is to be hoped that this moderate tone will be maintained and that the Chinese government will go ever further, taking the initiative in closing ranks with the Soviet Union. What is called for, whatever the political and theoretical differences, is a united front between the world's two most powerful workers states against the common foe.

Likewise to be welcomed is Mao's assurance that "The Chinese people firmly support the revolutionary struggle of the American people." International solidarity is a prime necessity in the struggle to end the war in Indochina.

Reservations must be expressed on one point in Mao's statement: "Nixon's fascist atrocities have kindled the raging flames of the revolutionary mass movement in the United States."

Mao's incorrect characterization of the Nixon administration as "fascist" can lead certain ultraleftists in the

United States and elsewhere to interpret this as a signal for small groups to engage in self-defeating actions separated from the masses.

Such a consequence would be most unfortunate, serving to weaken the antiwar movement precisely when it faces the greatest possibilities for gaining

Text of Mao's Statement

[The following is the text of a statement made by Mao Tsetung May 20.]

* * *

A new upsurge in the struggle against United States imperialism is now emerging throughout the world. Ever since World War II, United States imperialism and its followers have been continuously launching wars of aggression and the people in various countries have been continuously waging revolutionary wars to defeat the aggressors. The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today.

Unable to win in Vietnam and Laos, the United States aggressors treacherously engineered the reactionary coup d'etat by the Lon Nol-Sirik Matak clique, brazenly dispatched their troops to invade Cambodia and resumed the bombing of North Vietnam, and this has aroused the furious resistance of the three Indochinese peoples.

I warmly support the fighting spirit of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, chief of state of Cambodia, in opposing United States imperialism and its lackeys. I warmly support the joint declaration of the summit conference of the Indochinese peoples. I warmly support the establishment of the Royal Government of National Union under the leadership of the National Front of Kampuchea.

Strengthening their unity, supporting each other and persevering in a protracted peoples war, the three Indochinese peoples will certainly overcome all difficulties and win complete victory.

While massacring the people in other countries, United States imperialism is slaughtering white and black people in its own country. Nixon's fascist atrocities have kindled the raging flames of the revolutionary mass movement in the United States.

The Chinese people firmly support the revolutionary struggle of the American people. I am convinced that the American people who are fighting valiantly will ultimately win victory and that the fascist rule in the United States will inevitably be defeated.

The Nixon government is beset with troubles internally and externally, with

extraordinary momentum among the masses in a series of countries.

Aside from this, Mao's statement has already had impact in imperialist circles. The specialists on whom the State Department relies for evaluations describe the situation "as a wholly new ball game." They mean by this that Nixon's decision to escalate the war increased the pressure on China, causing Mao to react, and this new element immediately worsened the U. S. position in Indochina.

utter chaos at home and extreme isolation abroad. The mass movement of protest against United States aggression in Cambodia has swept the globe.

Less than ten days after its establishment, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia was recognized by nearly twenty countries. The situation is getting better and better in the war of resistance against United States aggression and for national salvation waged by the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

The revolutionary armed struggles of the people of Korea, Japan and other Asian countries against the revival of Japanese militarism by the United States and Japanese reactionaries, the struggles of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against the United States-Israeli aggressors, the national liberation struggles of the Asian, African and Latin-American peoples, and the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of North America, Europe and Oceania are all developing vigorously.

The Chinese people firmly support the people of the three Indochinese countries and of other countries of the world in their revolutionary struggles against United States imperialism and its lackeys.

United States imperialism, which looks like a huge monster, is in essence a paper tiger, now in the throes of its deathbed struggle. In the world of today, who actually fears whom? It is not the Vietnamese people, the Laotian people, the Cambodian people, the Palestinian people, the Arab people or the people of other countries who fear United States imperialism; it is United States imperialism that fears the people of the world. It becomes panic-stricken at the mere rustle of leaves in the wind. Innumerable facts prove that a just cause enjoys abundant support while an unjust cause finds little support.

A weak nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big nation. The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history.

People of the world, unite and defeat the United States aggressors and all their running dogs!

Memorial Day Marchers Protest Vietnam War

More than 10,000 people marched in New York City May 30 to protest Nixon's war in Indochina as part of Memorial Day antiwar actions held in a number of cities around the country. We have not yet received reports on the demonstrations in such cities as Cleveland, Chicago, San Francisco, Seattle, Atlanta, and Gainesville, Florida, where actions were scheduled. In Los Angeles about 1,500 persons participated in a rally.

In Manhattan the crowd assembled at 92nd Street and Fifth Avenue, then marched down the avenue to the Central Park bandshell at 72nd Street, where a rally was held. The May 31 *New York Times* estimated that 7,000 persons participated. Radio station WINS put the total as high as 25,000. A prowar Memorial Day parade held in another part of town was somewhat smaller.

The antiwar march was led by the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. Pallbearers carried five black body bags — used to transport slain GIs in Vietnam — labeled "Cambodia," "Jackson," "Augusta," "Vietnam," and "Kent."

Vietnam veteran Emanuel Rodriguez, who lost a leg in the war, was cheered when he told the crowd that he had tried to circulate antiwar petitions while a patient at the Veterans Administration Hospital in New York. Hospital officials told him he had no right to protest.

"You tell me I don't have the right to protest after having my leg shot off for my country. You are wrong," he said.

There were a number of reasons for the smaller turnout, compared with the actions immediately following the Cambodian invasion. Many campuses are closed for the summer or in the middle of final examinations. The spontaneous wave of outrage that brought hundreds of thousands into the street had already passed its peak. Antiwar sentiment has deepened immensely in the last weeks, but it could not be mobilized on short notice.

In New York, the May 30 action was called by a new coalition, including such groups as the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam and the Vietnam Moratorium

Committee (the local chapter did not dissolve when its national affiliate folded in April).

Given the financial resources and the amount of time available, the turnout was respectable and holds promise of more massive future actions. The next decisive step for the antiwar movement will be taken at the June 30 Emergency National Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War to be held in Cleveland during the weekend of June 19-21 (see page 541).

The ultralefts, particularly Youth

Against War and Fascism, attempted on May 30 to seize the speakers' platform and take over the rally as they succeeded in doing at a larger demonstration April 15. This time they failed because of the efficient marshaling and the hostility of the crowd to their disruptive efforts.

The prowar parade was made up of uniformed veterans' organizations, military school bands, and armed forces personnel. The *New York Times* described the participants as "mainly elderly."

Auto Union Assails Nixon on Violence

The International Executive Board of the United Automobile Workers Union issued a strong statement May 22 condemning the government's use of force against political dissenters. With more than 1,400,000 members, the UAW is the second largest union in the United States. The board declared:

"The terrible shame of violence by government has cast a grim and ominous shadow across our nation in recent weeks. It is a shadow that has dimmed the light of democratic rule in Kent, Ohio, in Jackson, Mississippi, and in Augusta, Ga.

"The senseless killings of American citizens, by American military and police are an outrage endangering the deepest foundations of the constitution of the United States. It is a national disgrace that has caused countless citizens to fear that governmental authorities may become destroyers rather than protectors of life and liberty.

"The dangerous military policies of the Nixon administration have driven the wedge of division in America even deeper and have dangerously alienated millions of American citizens of all ages and all walks of life. We cannot successfully preach nonviolence at home while we escalate mass violence abroad and at no time in the history of our free society have so many troops been sent to so many campuses to suppress the voice of protest by so many young Americans.

"Dissent instead of being regarded by government as the right of patriots is the subject of virulent attack as unpatriotic and even subversive.

"There must be an immediate end to the needless and inexcusable use of military force against American citizens exercising their constitutional right of protest. The vast majority of Americans, including our young people, reject violence in all its forms as morally repugnant and counterproductive. The irrational acts of a few must not be used to cloak irresponsible governmental action against the many.

"The UAW International Executive Board calls upon President Nixon to exercise leadership in policies assuring the life and liberties of American citizens will be protected from harm by any wrongdoer whether he be wearing the cloth of a citizen or the uniform of the government.

"We call upon Congress to investigate fully the tragedies at Kent State, Jackson State College and Augusta so that all the facts may be placed before the American people."

At the same meeting, Leonard Woodcock was named UAW president, succeeding Walter Reuther, who was killed in a plane crash May 9. Afterward, Woodcock flew to Atlanta, Georgia, where he participated in the May 23 rally of 10,000 persons protesting the slayings of Blacks in Augusta and Jackson.

Armed Attack on Los Angeles SWP Center

By Lee Smith

Los Angeles

MAY 30—Three days ago the Socialist Workers party's election campaign offices here were attacked in broad daylight by a group of more than a dozen men armed with whips, pistols, and what appeared to be sub-machine guns. The armed gang of thugs threatened the lives of four campaign workers present, forcing them to lie face down on the floor while they poured gasoline or some other flammable liquid on the walls and furniture. They set fire to the building as they left.

The thugs, from their appearance and their threats, seem to have been counterrevolutionary Cuban exiles.

This murderous attack took place at about 12:40 p.m., Wednesday, May 27. Four persons were present in the second-story offices of the Young Socialist Alliance, the Socialist Workers party, and the Socialist Workers Campaign Committee at 1702 East Fourth Street. They were Peter Seidman, Los Angeles SWP organizer; Carol Seidman, Los Angeles YSA organizer; Sally Whicker, a YSA member; and Tiby Alvin, a member of the SWP.

Peter Seidman was working alone in his office when he heard a shout and the sound of cocking guns coming from the YSA office. He looked up at the clock and then out of his office door, where he saw a young man with dark hair and a mustache pointing an automatic pistol at him.

The man motioned him to the rear of the building where Tiby Alvin was working. As he moved back, Seidman spotted a second man carrying a short, weighted, leather whip and a pistol moving in the same direction. The two men forced Alvin and Seidman to lie face down on the floor.

They told the pair, "You will die for Fidel!" and "We're going to kill you, you Commies!"

More men brought Carol Seidman and Sally Whicker to the back, where they were also forced to lie on the floor. Peter Seidman looked up at this

point and saw one of the men carrying what looked like a submachine gun. The thugs swore at the four socialists, again threatening their lives and telling them to keep their heads down.

The four heard some more men coming up the front stairway, followed by the sound of breaking furniture and splashing liquid. Then they felt heat from the flames, looked up, and saw that the offices were burning. Carol Seidman, Whicker, and Alvin left by the fire escape used by the attackers to escape from the building.

Peter Seidman at first tried to put out the fire with a fire extinguisher until he realized how extensive the blaze was. Then he followed the other three out of the building. The attack had lasted between ten and fifteen minutes.

A highway patrolman on a motorcycle arrived almost immediately and Peter Seidman heard a report on the patrolman's radio about armed men having been seen leaving a building in the seventeen hundred block of East Fourth Street.

The fire department arrived in a few minutes and it took them fifteen minutes to put out the blaze. The arson squad found four one-gallon jugs in the building and a laboratory investigation is being conducted to determine what liquid was used to ignite the fire.

The fire destroyed \$3,500 worth of literature, \$3,000 worth of equipment, and did several thousand dollars' worth of damage to the building itself.

At a news conference called by the California SWP election campaign committee the following day, SWP California gubernatorial candidate Herman Fagg linked the attack to the government's war in Southeast Asia and the oppression of Third World peoples in the United States.

"The vicious attempt by these right-wingers to intimidate the SWP and YSA was a failure," Fagg said. "Under no circumstances will we allow this attempted murder to deter us from

speaking and working against the violence made possible and encouraged by the rulers of the U. S."

The incident received front-page coverage in both the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner* on May 28.

The SWP and YSA have received statements of support and solidarity from scores of groups and individuals in the student, antiwar, and labor movements. These include Rose Cherrin of the Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights; Terry Alt of the Marin County American Civil Liberties Union; Paul Jacobs; the West Coast Regional National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the University of California at Los Angeles Asian-American Student Alliance; Carol Lipman, national executive secretary of the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; Malcolm Dobbs, president of the Los Angeles chapter of the Social Service union; Sisters in Struggle, a women's liberation group; John T. Williams, vice-president and business representative of Teamsters Local 208; and Arnold Kaufman, president of American Federation of Teachers Local 1990.

Protest at the outrage came from a broad political spectrum. Even a conservative student group, called Viva, at the California State College Los Angeles campus expressed its opposition to the armed attack.

Perhaps the most impressive source of support was the college antiwar strike committees. Statements came from committees at Los Angeles City College, California State at Long Beach, San Fernando Valley State College, Occidental, and other colleges in the area.

The police have been assembling mug shots of Cuban exiles with past records, collecting names of Cuban right-wing organizations, and contacting the FBI. YSAers who have combed the neighborhood around the headquarters have turned up two witnesses who saw the men enter and leave the offices. There were more than a dozen, according to these witnesses.

This incident, following the recent events in Kent, Augusta, and Jackson, marks a new high in such attacks in the Los Angeles area. These have been going on for ten years. In the past two years there have been five attacks on the YSA and the SWP in this city.

Maoists Beat Up Delegates at National SMC Parley

Some fifty or sixty ultraleftists attempted unsuccessfully to break up a national antiwar conference in Boston on May 24.

Members of the Maoist Progressive Labor party (PL) and the wing of SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) led by PL physically assaulted a national steering committee meeting of the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (SMC). After a brief but sharp fight in which at least one person was seriously injured, the Maoists were repulsed and the meeting was able to continue.

The SMC steering committee normally includes one representative of each campus and regional SMC which wishes to send a delegate, plus one representative of each national political group that works with the SMC. For the May 24 meeting representatives of campus strike committees were also invited.

Nine members of PL or SDS registered for the meeting. Although none of the nine were delegates from strike committees, and although both PL and SDS oppose the activities of the SMC rather than cooperating with it, all nine were admitted to the meeting, seven as observers and one each as a representative of PL and SDS.

Early in the meeting the Maoists attempted to provoke a fight. One of their members attempted to enter without registering. He was told by ushers at the door that he could not enter until he had registered as all the other participants had done.

At this point the nine Maoists already in the room rushed out and attempted to force a way through the ushers for their companion. When they were unable to accomplish this, the nine then asked to be readmitted to the meeting.

But the nearly 250 delegates and observers inside, after considering the Maoists' record—which in the last few weeks alone includes an assault on an antiwar meeting at Columbia University in New York, an attack on the speakers' platform during the April 15 demonstration in Boston, and the beating of a leading member of the

Boston SMC by eight members of PL and SDS on May 3—decided not to allow the ultralefts another opportunity to disrupt the meeting. They therefore voted to permit only the delegates to return to the meeting; the seven observers had to remain outside.

This arrangement would have permitted the Maoists to present their political views and defend them if they had wished to do so. But both PL and SDS have found in recent months that it is very difficult to win support for their ultraleft line by persuasion, and they therefore refused to accept the decision of the meeting.

Shortly after the afternoon session had begun, fifty-five to sixty members of PL and SDS were observed approaching in group formation. Because of the threat of physical attack, a defense guard, including members of a dozen different groups, had been organized. This guard met the Maoists outside the door to the hall. The delegate from Progressive Labor and John Pennington, the national secretary of SDS, were admitted to the meeting.

Pennington distributed a leaflet that claimed the Maoists had been "attacked" in the earlier incident. Having finished distributing the leaflet, he invited his goon squad to "come on in."

2,000 in Bombay Antiwar March

Bombay

More than 2,000 people marched to the U. S. consulate general at Bulabhai Desai Road here May 8 to protest the American military intervention in Vietnam and Cambodia. The procession began at Azad Midan, some four miles from "Lincoln House," the consulate building. The marchers were stopped a few metres from the building by a large group of police. A public meeting was held on the spot, interrupting vehicular traffic for several hours.

The demonstration was organized jointly by the various left parties, including the pro-Moscow Communist party of India [CPI]; the Communist party of India (Marxist) [CPI(M)]; the Socialist Workers party, the Indian section of the Fourth International; Revolutionary Socialist par-

The Maoists charged the defense guard and a fight erupted. During the battle, John McCann was dragged into the opposing line and severely beaten by six to eight people. McCann, who is statewide coordinator of Vietnam Referendum '70, a campaign to place an immediate withdrawal referendum on the ballot in Massachusetts this fall, was taken to the hospital. His injuries included severe bruises of the hands and head, a broken nose, and hemorrhaging of one eye.

After several minutes' fighting, it became clear that the Maoists would not be able to force their way into the meeting, and they withdrew.

When the meeting resumed, it immediately passed two motions. The first called for a nationwide campaign against the use of violence within the antiwar movement and in defense of the right of any group to hold its meetings without disruption. The second called on members of SDS and PL to repudiate the hooligan attack on the SMC meeting.

The steering committee then resumed consideration of the agenda, which included plans for building antiwar demonstrations on May 30 and for publicizing the national antiwar conference scheduled for June 19 and 20 in Cleveland.

ty [RSP], and the Lal Nishan party, in collaboration with the Solidarity with Vietnam Committee.

Members of the Bombay Students Union and antiwar activists from the Bombay University participated.

Speakers, who demanded unconditional U. S. withdrawal from Indochina, included S. Y. Kolhatkar, CPI(M); Vithal Choudhury, CPI; Pushpa Mehta, RSP; Yeshwant Chavan, of the Lal Nishan; Y. S. Rege and S. D. Nikam on behalf of the students; and Tara Reddy, of the National Democratic Women's Conference. S. B. Kolpe of the SWP presided over the rally.

The comrades of the SWP played a leading role in organizing the united action and prevented the CPI(M) and CPI—the two major left parties—from organizing separate demonstrations.

Protest Secrecy in Barring Mandel from Australia

The decision of the Australian government to prevent Belgian Marxist economist Ernest Mandel from speaking at a Socialist Scholars Conference in Sydney continues to draw fire from defenders of civil liberties.

On May 15 the Victorian Council for Civil Liberties attacked the government's refusal to grant Mandel a visa. John Bennetts, the council's secretary, called for amending the immigration laws to require the Minister for Immigration to reveal his reasons for refusing a visa.

Also on May 15 the newspaper *The Australian* printed the following editorial:

"Sometimes it is true, as the Minister for Immigration said this week, that the national interest demands that facts not be stated. But there are not nearly so many instances as most governments like to pretend.

"Mr. Lynch's comments on his department's refusal of an entry visa to Belgian economist Dr. Ernest Mandel may be consistent with previous, similar decisions, but only the minister and the department can know for certain. With visa policy as it has developed over the years, consistency is almost impossible to define.

"There can be no serious quarrel with the proposition that visa and passport issues should be confidential between the applicant and the immigration authorities. But this should surely mean that the applicant is entitled to know, even if nobody else is, the specific grounds for his exclusion from this country.

"Without breaching the confidence of the department's dealings with any individual it should also be possible to state the range of grounds used for rejecting visa applications. The public then would at least be able to form a judgment of the 'national interest' boundaries drawn by the Government.

"The decision in Dr. Mandel's case, said Mr. Lynch, was taken 'only after the most careful, complete and comprehensive consideration of all the factors by all the ministers concerned.'

"The statement suggests that national interest was unusually difficult to de-

fine in Dr. Mandel's case. Nevertheless, he joins that sizeable list of individuals branded 'security risks' or just 'undesirables' so far as Australia is concerned. The labels are as meaningless as they are pernicious.

"Australians do not need that sort of protection from unpopular or unconventional ideas and do not benefit from it. If the Government's reasons go beyond the power of ideas the laws of the land exist to provide all the protection necessary."

Reaction in New Zealand

Mandel was originally scheduled to speak in Sydney May 21-24, and then to speak in Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch, New Zealand, May 26-28. At the time Mandel was barred from Australia, the New Zealand government had not yet replied to his request for a visa to enter that country.

The Socialist Action League, which is sponsoring Mandel's tour of New

Zealand, reacted to the Australian ban by organizing picketing of the Australian embassy and consulate and by launching a campaign to ensure that the New Zealand government would not also deny a visa.

The New Zealand Council for Civil Liberties was contacted and immediately issued a statement signed by the group's chairman and by the president. Addressed to the Minister of Labour, who controls the granting of visas, the statement said in part:

"There is surely no possible justification for excluding Mandel even on grounds of the sheerest expediency. Let us hear what he has to say, and decide for ourselves what we think about it, like good democrats."

The Socialist Action League began making preparations to secure still wider backing from supporters of civil liberties, but on May 20 the government gave in.

After discussing the matter with the cabinet, the Minister of Labour publicly announced that Mandel would not be barred from New Zealand.

Saigon Students, Veterans Step Up Protest

Several thousand students in Saigon staged the biggest antigovernment demonstration in weeks May 29 during the state funeral of Phan Khac Suu, one of the defeated candidates in South Vietnam's 1967 "elections." The student protest has been mounting for more than two months.

Police used tear gas to disperse youths who marched on the presidential palace after the funeral shouting, "Down with the Militarist Regime of Nguyen Van Thieu." Six students were arrested.

The student demonstrations began in response to the slaughter of Vietnamese civilians in Cambodia. U. S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker also came under attack after he dismissed the students as "manipulated by the Communists."

On May 21 the Saigon police began a roundup of student leaders. Primary and secondary schools, closed since May 6, were to be reopened the next day and the government wanted the protest leaders safely in jail. Nguyen Van Thang, general secretary of the General Association of Saigon Students, and Doan Kinh, president of the Committee of Struggle, were the main figures picked up. According to the May 24-25 issue of the Paris daily

Le Monde, Doan Van Toai, vice-president of the student association, was able to avoid arrest by taking refuge in the offices of a newspaper that supports the parliamentary opposition.

Some 1,000 students from two high schools gathered to protest the arrests May 28, but were attacked by police. The students threw stones and firebombs at their attackers.

According to a May 28 Reuters dispatch, the students decided to join the funeral procession the next day in expectation that the police "would not dare to fire tear-gas grenades because many government leaders would also be in the procession."

Antigovernment demonstrations by veterans have also continued. A May 29 Associated Press dispatch reported from Saigon:

"Some 200 disabled veterans temporarily occupied offices of the Veterans' Ministry here today.

"After marching on the ministry demanding better treatment from the government, the veterans staged a sit-in and demanded to see the minister. After several scuffles and after the police fired tear gas, the veterans' minister agreed to talk with the men."

Senanayake Government Ousted by Landslide Vote

The government of Prime Minister Dudley Senanayake went down to a crushing defeat in Ceylon's May 27 parliamentary election which returned Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike to power after five years of United National party [UNP] rule.

Mrs. Bandaranaike's three-party coalition, dominated by the bourgeois Sri Lanka Freedom party [SLFP] which she heads, captured 115 seats out of 151 in the House of Representatives. The UNP lost 54 of its 71 seats; 11 of the 15 cabinet ministers failed to win reelection.

In the new House, the SLFP and its coalition partners, the Lanka Sama Samaja party [LSSP] and the pro-Moscow Communist party, command a two-thirds majority. This is sufficient to pass even constitutional amendments without support from any party outside the coalition.

Despite the UNP election propaganda warning that an SLFP victory amounted to a Communist revolution, the actual differences between the two parties were minimal. The UNP campaigned for "democratic socialism," while the SLFP coalition proposed "socialist democracy."

In an election manifesto that appeared in the May 7 issue of the Colombo weekly *Ceylon News*, the UNP explained that "democratic socialism" meant that "private ownership and management" must be "sensitive to its responsibilities for the welfare of the community."

Although the groups in the opposing coalition were pictured as "Marxists," the reality was somewhat different. The two "left" parties were politically and organizationally subordinate to the SLFP. This was reflected even in the number of seats won by the constituents of the coalition: 90 seats to the SLFP, 19 seats to the LSSP, and 6 to the CP.

The participation of Communist parties in bourgeois coalitions and governments is nothing new. Stalin revived this hoary policy of the reformist wing of the Social Democracy in his Popular Front of the thirties. The real "leftist" tinge of the Bandaranaike

formation comes from the LSSP, which the bourgeois press continues to refer to as "Trotskyist."

In fact the LSSP was expelled from the Fourth International, the world Trotskyist organization, in 1964 precisely because it abandoned the course of independent organization of the working class and joined the SLFP in a governmental coalition.

At that time a minority refused to follow the LSSP leaders in liquidating their party and program, and founded the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary), which is today the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International.

The LSSP(R) summed up Mrs. Bandaranaike's program in an election manifesto issued May 16:

"The Coalition Programme does not contemplate the abolition of capitalist private property. It does not even threaten any inroads upon existing capitalist property in the plantations, or in industry. All that the programme really envisages is increased control by the capitalist state in the sphere of banking and commerce, and increased state enterprise in certain industries, to sustain and assist in the development of the private sector."

While the bourgeois press in Ceylon demagogically denounced the coalition as a Communist conspiracy, more sober capitalist observers abroad made a very different estimate. Thus the May 28 issue of the Hong Kong weekly *Far Eastern Economic Review*, which reflects the views of British imperialism, had this to say on the differences in the election:

The debate between the UNP and the SLFP coalition "is no true reflection of serious programmatic differences or of realpolitik. . . .

"As for the 'socialism' of the opposing camp, the SLFP . . . is neither doctrinaire nor Marxist and in fact professes a sentimental 'social welfarism' which is also native to the grain. . . . If its alliance with the left, the Titoist LSSP . . . and the pro-Soviet CP (Communist Party), has made Mrs. Bandaranaike's SLFP party a shade

pinker, it would still be absurd to think that a Ceylon under such a government would turn into a Burma, Algeria, Cuba or North Korea.

"Ceylon's socialists are all respectable men of moderation: Leninists, if they ever were, lost to the cause of Parliament and the possibilities of social change and justice through that resilient institution."

The real issues in the election were more prosaic. Mrs. Bandaranaike promised to restore the weekly rice ration that was cut in half under Senanayake. She demanded "reconsideration"—not abrogation—of a government agreement with the World Bank that has been denounced as advantageous to American imperialism.

When the coalition was voted out of office in 1965 the cost of living index stood at 112.2. It is now over 137.

In addition, this was Ceylon's first election since the voting age was lowered to eighteen. More than 800,000 new young voters took part in this election out of a total electorate of 5,500,000. Most of these votes went to the opposition.

The only other issue which figured significantly in the campaign was the SLFP's call for the creation of "people's committees." The UNP professed to see in this a call for Soviets on the model of the Russian revolution. As the *Far Eastern Economic Review* pointed out:

"The Opposition, conscious of the dismay and confusion caused by the press and UNP propaganda, pleaded that these committees would be purely advisory. 'This proposal,' said an Opposition statement 'was in our 1965 election manifesto and in our common programme of 1967 and the UNP saw no menace then. In fact, in 1966 the UNP government itself appointed people's committees to report on price-fixing by unscrupulous traders.'"

"The bitter truth," said the LSSP(R) in its May 16 manifesto, ". . . is that whatever parliamentary regime may be established following the general election of 27th May, capitalist rule and capitalist exploitation will continue . . ."

Call for Protest to Help Jailed Guerrillas

By Livio Maitan

[In our issue of June 1, we published an account of the arrest of a group of guerrillas in Argentina. The following article contains additional details.]

* * *

The Argentinian dailies announced April 28 that a group of revolutionists had been arrested in the city of Rosario after carrying out an attack on a police station. From the outset the press talked about a "terrorist cell" named after Che Guevara, which was supposed to have participated previously in acts of urban armed struggle.

Another "cell" operated in different regions of the country, according to a dispatch from the Saporiti wire service published by *La Razón*, and was suspected of having organized the strike against the Campo de Mayo garrison. The campaign culminated May 7 with a press conference by Colonel Jorge Dotti, one of the heads of the federal police.

According to the newspaper accounts, the team of revolutionists attacked the Twentieth Police Precinct headquarters in Rosario. One of the attackers was in police uniform and armed with a machine gun. He pretended to be bringing a couple of youths in. As soon as the three were inside the police station, they ordered the cops present to line up against the wall and raise their hands. At the same time they yelled: "Don't move, stay quiet; we're not out to get you. We're after bigger fish, not poor slob. We belong to the Commando Che Guevara [Che Guevara Commando Group]."

Without wasting any time, the members of the team started carrying off police uniforms, weapons, and ammunition. They left the station ten minutes later, after cutting the telephone wires, taking everything they had collected. They left the inscription, "arms to the people" on the wall and distributed a tract, according to the report in *La Razón*.

The tract, signed by the revolution-

ary commander Luis Norberto Blanco, supposedly proclaimed the organization's responsibility for two smaller-scale attacks aimed at seizing guns from the police (one of the participants in these actions was arrested and reportedly admitted his involvement under torture).

After denouncing several cases of torture by a criminal investigation section of the police, the text concluded as follows: "The tide is beginning to turn and the time is not far off when it will run in favor of the oppressed, and they have a good memory. Every criminal, torturer, and corrupt official will have to make an accounting to an organized, armed, and firmly united people."

The attackers forgot to cut one wire, according to the police, and the cops were able to send out an alarm right away and mobilize a security squad in short order. Thus the commando team was caught while switching cars with all the material they had taken. A skirmish took place. But finally the group of revolutionists was captured, and others fell into the hands of the police later.

In the police press conference May 7, in which several heads of the federal police took part, Colonel Dotti declared that an investigation had established that the Rosario Commando team was linked to the PRT [Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores—Revolutionary Workers party], which he described as "affiliated to the Trotskyist Fourth International, which is centered in Brussels and has a Latin-American headquarters in Bolivia. In our country this party has a Central Committee which meets clandestinely; an executive committee; a military apparatus; and cells in the provinces of Salta, Tucumán, Córdoba, Rosario, and Buenos Aires. The last named cell takes in the capital city as well as the province of Buenos Aires."

The colonel was informed of the origins of the organization and its development. "The PRT," he said, "was the product of a fusion between the organization called the Partido Obrero

[Workers party], which was active in the national capital and Greater Buenos Aires; and the Frente Revolucionario Indoamericano [FRIP—Indian-American Revolutionary Front], which advocated the Trotskyist ideology brought up to date on the basis of the guerrilla tactics and theories developed in recent years by the Castroites and Maoists. . . .

"The objectives of the PRT are to destroy our traditional system of government by using force in all its forms, such as terrorism, personal attacks, armed robbery, implanting guerrilla groups, etc. Once in power its aim is to establish a dictatorship."

The colonel apparently forgot that the regime, of which he is an agent, originated in a military coup d'etat and maintains itself by overt force without worrying about any democratic camouflage. It leaves its opponents no alternative but revolutionary struggle under conditions of the strictest clandestinity.

The Argentine police did not miss the occasion to charge the arrested revolutionists with all sorts of "crimes," going as far as to accuse them—against all the evidence—of having acted for personal motives.

Dotti claimed that the group captured was responsible for the following crimes: (1) stealing arms in August 1969 from a shop on the Calle Felipe Moré in Rosario; (2) stealing a vehicle and assaulting a Rosario policeman in 1969; (3) attempted robbery of a policeman late last October at the corner of Tres de Febrero and Rodríguez streets in Rosario; (4) attempted robbery of a policeman at the corner of Catamarca and Callo streets also in Rosario; (5) attacking a pay train on March 30, 1970, on the way from Rosario to Venado Tuerto; (6) attacking Precinct No. 20 in Rosario April 27; (7) stealing automobiles in Rosario at the end of 1969; (8) attacking Precinct No. 8 in Rosario in March of this year; (9) attacking the Gendarmería [Special Riot Police] at the corner of Vera Mujica and Virasoro streets in Rosario."

La Razón wrote: "In these actions the criminals managed to seize the total sum of 41 million pesos, plus a large quantity of firearms and uniforms. Colonel Dotti pointed out later that the objectives of these crimes were to acquire the necessary economic resources for: (a) getting arms; (b) buy-

ing vehicles to transport the members of the commando teams; (c) paying the rent of houses to serve as refuges for the commandos and providing the means for subsistence for the party members, who, since they were operating underground, had no other occupation or jobs.

"Regarding the attacks on military units or security forces, Colonel Dotti said that they had a twofold purpose. The first aim was to acquire a greater quantity of arms for the future development of guerrilla warfare. The second was to produce a psychological impact on the public, demonstrating the vulnerability [sic!] of the military and security forces and the party's ability to directly challenge the forces of order.

"The documents captured," Colonel Dotti continued, "show that the organization had the aim of replacing the courts, which they call corrupt, with people's courts based on the decisions of their own organs. Among their other objectives were kidnapping managers of plants with union conflicts and solving the problems of strikers, where strikes stretch out over a long period of time, by means of stealing food and later distributing it." (*La Razón*, May 8.)

According to the official communiqué, sixteen revolutionists have been arrested. Their names are as follows: Elvira Alba Dentesano, alias Veca, twenty-six years old, a clerk by occupation; Manuel Justo Gaggero, thirty years old, a lawyer; Francisco René Santucho, alias El Negro, forty-five years old, a merchant; Pedro Oscar Yáñez, thirty-two years old, a doctor; Mario Emilio Delfino, alias Cacho Fuentes, twenty-eight years old, a technician; Manuel Indalecio Suarez, alias Pablo Herrera, thirty-nine years old, a bank clerk; Eden Gerardo Britos, alias Federico, twenty-seven years old; Rubén Oscar Suárez, alias Mario, twenty-three years old, metal worker; María del Huerto Figura de Caravantes, twenty-three years old, a philosophy student; Araceli Margarita Díaz, alias Silvia, twenty-six years old, lawyer; Emilia Susan Gaggero de Pujals, twenty-seven years old, a psychologist; José Mauricio Navarro, alias Chinchino, twenty-six years old, a bank clerk; Omar O. Electo Valderrama, twenty-five years old, a school teacher; Beatriz Pedernera, of Salta, a school teacher; Manuel Al-

berto Navarro, alias Felipe, twenty-nine years old, a bank clerk.

During questioning, as is now the tradition of the Argentinian dictatorship, the prisoners were brutally tortured. A new procedure, recently adopted, facilitates such methods from the "legal" standpoint.

"Doctor Gustavo T. Soler appealed to the investigating judge to bring Mario Emilio Delfino and Manuel Alberto Navarro before him at once, personally verify their physical condition, and order them examined immediately by a court doctor," according to a dispatch printed in *La Razón*.

A press conference was held in Buenos Aires May 8 by the CGT de los Argentinos [Confederación General del Trabajo de los Argentinos—the Argentinian General Confederation of Labor] * and several personalities.

* The sector of the Argentine labor movement headed by Raimundo Ongaro and

The torture of the prisoners was publicly denounced. The initiators of this defense effort hope that a campaign of solidarity with the torture victims, of denouncing these barbaric methods, and in support of basic legal guarantees will develop throughout the world.

Letters and telegrams can be sent to the Argentinian embassies in the various countries and in Argentina to the Ministry of the Interior, the Suprema Corte de Justicia, and to the following organizations, all of which are located in Buenos Aires: the CGT de los Argentinos, Paseo Colón 731; Comisión Reorganizadora de la CGT, Azopardo 802; and the Mesa Nacional de las 62 Organizaciones at the same address; the Colegio de Abogados; and the Sociedad Argentina de Escritores.

May 15.

generally considered more militant than the other segments of the divided CGT.

Bolivia

Political Prisoners Still Being Held

La Paz

The members of the ELN [Ejército de Liberación Nacional—National Liberation Army, the guerrilla force formerly commanded by Che Guevara] and the POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario—Revolutionary Workers party, the Bolivian section of the Fourth International] who were arrested in several Bolivian cities last year are still in prison, along with other activists arrested since 1967.

So far no trial has taken place and no date has been announced, which indicates that the authorities are having difficulty finding solid enough evidence from the legal standpoint. Only for a small number of activists did the judges decide a few months ago to grant bail. The charges, however, were not dropped.

General Ovando has suggested on several occasions that he has moved to extend clemency to Régis Debray—this was mentioned quite recently in the Rome weekly *Espresso* by the Italian writer Alberto Moravia who traveled to Bolivia last year and talked to the general. But so far there has been no practical result. In any

case, freeing Debray without taking a similar step for the Bolivian prisoners would only be a diversionary maneuver.

The Bolivian government must be made to realize that news of the fate of the prisoners rotting in its prisons is being published throughout the world. The immediate release of these prisoners must be demanded; demands must be made for their trial, trial in a civil court with all the basic legal guarantees, including the presence of an international panel of lawyers.

The activists still imprisoned are the following: Enrique Ortega Hinojosa, Julio Félix Melgar, Julio Dagnino Pacheco, Carlos Demiguel, Benigno Coronado, Oscar Edgar Busch, Antonio Moreno, Víctor Córdova, Tomás Chambí, Gerardo Bermudez, Jorge Pool Alvarez Plata, Felipe Vásquez, Luis Pérez Saucedo, Gonzalo Orosa Bellido, Juan Sánchez Rocado, Roberto Moreira Montecinos, Juan Rodríguez Guagama, Jurgens Schutt Mogro, Walter Pareja Fernández, Loyola Guzmán Lara, Terttu Tulikki de Oroza. May 1970.

Canadian Maoists, Stalinists, Vs. Antiwar Movement

By Carl Fleming

[The following article is from the May 18 issue of *Labor Challenge*, a revolutionary-socialist biweekly published in Toronto.]

* * *

Judging from much of the literature being sold and distributed at antiwar demonstrations across the country, you might get the impression that the enemy was not U. S. imperialism and its accomplices in aggression like the Canadian government, but . . . the Trotskyists of the League for Socialist Action [LSA].

In particular, the various Maoist sheets circulated around the April 18 antiwar mobilizations assailed the "Trotskyites" as "opportunists," "bankrupt," pacifists, liberals, believers in God, and even "counterrevolutionaries," "arch criminals and police agents." These "literary" attacks were coupled with, in the case of one tendency, a threat (which didn't materialize) to smash the mass Ottawa demonstration.

The Canadian Party of Labor, for example, accuse the Trotskyists, who participate in the leadership of the Vietnam Mobilization Committee, of capitulating to "liberalism." This charge arises from the fact that the VMC is open to all groups and individuals, ranging from revolutionaries to liberals, united in action against the war.

In an article in their paper *Canadian Worker* headlined "Trotskyite Prayers Fail to Stop War," CPL accused the Trotskyists of "opportunism" for even helping to organize a demonstration against the war: "The Trotskyite-front Vietnam Mobilization Committee was apparently hoping for a modern miracle when they attempted to resurrect the antiwar movement in Toronto on Sunday, March 29." Why? Because, it seems, the march ended in a rally which just happened to be held in a church. (One of the very few references to religion at the rally was when the CPLers rose and walked out swearing!)

To see the antiwar movement as a "front" for Trotskyists or any other political tendency illustrates a hopeless sectarianism and lack of understanding of what a mass movement really is.

The antiwar movement was not built by prayers. It was built, and will continue to grow, by bringing together the broadest possible forces around a single-issue program that can unite the movement, and clearly pose the correct solution.

Such a program is summed up in the demands "Withdraw U. S. Troops Now" and "End Canada's Complicity," which revolutionary socialists and other antiwar activists have fought for consistently. Although these demands have essentially anti-imperialist and anticapitalist implications, they have been embraced by wide layers of people newly radicalizing on the issue of the war, because they obviously correspond to the logic and needs of the movement.

CPL is not really attacking "liberalism" or "opportunism" at all, but the whole concept of building a mass movement. Anyone who is seriously interested in bringing masses of people into the struggle against the war must be willing to work with any and all forces who oppose the war. The struggle itself will help to overcome liberal illusions as people confront U. S. imperialism and the Canadian government.

Not content with attacking antiwar activists here in Canada, CPL also slanders the Vietnamese: "The revisionist leaders in Hanoi have gone along with the Soviets hand-in-glove while pretending to be neutral. . . ." The Vietnamese revolutionaries, who have continued their struggle for generations despite the pressures and maneuvers of Moscow and Peking, deserve active support from serious revolutionaries, not the ultraleft verbiage of CPL.

Carry CPL's lack of seriousness in building a mass movement—and its defeatism—to its logical conclusion, and you have the incredible ravings

of another Maoist sect, the Canadian Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist).

This group, doubtless fortified by readings of Mao Tsetung and Stalin thought, went beyond the literary attack to outright attacks on demonstrations. They declared in unmistakable terms that they were out to smash the protests, which they considered "fascist." "The holy alliance of the 'left' is the main force of the imperialists against the developing revolutionary initiative of the masses. They are the fifth column in the Canadian anti-imperialist revolution and are the present-day Judas," proclaimed their paper, *Mass Line*.

They accused march organizers (the Trotskyists, according to them) of "hiring security guards and off-duty policemen to attack the progressive people." Another article is headlined "Trotskyists Hire Goons from International Unions to Attack the Progressive People."

To translate this mock Peking language, one must understand that the "security guards" and "off-duty cops" refer to the Ottawa VMC's undertaking to pay the wages of guards at the Civic Center (as required by the officials) where an antiwar rock festival had been scheduled after the march. "International union goons" presumably refers to members of international trade unions—which the Maoists consider anathema—who served as marshals of the demonstration. These marshals were representative of the various tendencies which built the march and ensured that it was conducted without disruption by Maoists or right wingers.

The "Holy Alliance of the left" is the antiwar movement. The "progressive people" is the CCP (ML).

In the simple world of the CCP (ML), anyone who opposes their line—the "mass line" of course—is antipeople. Thus the antiwar demonstrations of April 18 were fascist, and should be smashed.

Balked by the effective well-organized marshaling of the VMC at Ot-

tawa, the CCP (ML) held their own action, an isolated confrontation with the cops massed in front of the U. S. embassy. This ludicrous adventure was easily smashed by the cops, who greatly outnumbered them. Yet according to subsequent issues of *Mass Line* which devoted pages of lurid prose to it, this action "struck terror into the hearts of the holy alliance and their defenders, the lackey police."

Other non-Maoists sects, too, attacked the Trotskyists at the April 18 march—some on other grounds. For example, some found fault with the LSA's sympathetic approach to the mass movement developing against U. S. economic domination of Canada, and the forces within the NDP [New Democratic party—the Canadian labor party] who reflect that view; while others criticized the LSA for its support of Québécois nationalism. But most tendencies centered their attacks on the Trotskyist concept of a mass all-inclusive antiwar movement.

Even the Communist party, which fully identified with the Ottawa march, created a deliberate split on the West Coast. CP forces in Vancouver refused to participate in the Vietnam Action Committee, a broad coalition of forces which include the British Columbia Federation of Labor and the NDP. The CP set up a phoney committee of its own which excluded Trotskyists and other antiwar fighters, and organized a counteraction the night before the April 18 mobilization—a candlelight procession with the single slogan "End the War Now."

This action represents a retreat from the clear demands put forward by the antiwar movement over the past few years. It said nothing about how to end the war, much less anything about the complicity of the government in Ottawa.

The Communist party is torn between adhering in some way to the antiwar movement which it can hardly avoid, and serving the interests of the Kremlin bureaucracy, to which it owes its political reason for being.

By its repeated advocacy of negotiations with the Washington war-makers rather than U. S. troop withdrawal as the basis for a "solution" in Vietnam, Moscow shows that in the interests of peaceful coexistence with U. S. imperialism, it is prepared to make a deal with Washington even at the expense of the Vietnamese revolution. Support of such policies has led

the Canadian CP to seek every possible opportunity to extract itself from allying with the militant wing of the movement that calls uncompromisingly for withdrawal. It also explains the virulent attacks and slanders of Trotskyists in the antiwar movement.

All these tendencies find themselves united in opposition to the Trotskyists, who have consistently built the broad

Guatemala

Mexican Report on Killing of Yon Sosa

The Mexican high command on May 19 released the official military report on the death of Guatemalan guerrilla leader Yon Sosa and two of his followers.

Excerpts from this account, written by Colonel Luis Barquera Trucios, commander of the army unit that allegedly killed Yon Sosa, were published in the May 20 issue of the Mexico City daily *Excelsior*.

Addressing his commanding officer Luis R. Casillas, chief of the Thirty-First Military Zone, Barquera Trucios wrote: "Permit me to inform you that on the 16th of this month in accordance with your verbal orders and with the personnel under my command I went in search of armed men in the area which includes the mouth of the River Lacantun, on the supposition that Guatemalan guerrillas had crossed over to the Mexican side.

"About a kilometer from the mouth of the Lacantun, on the left bank of the river, we were greeted by gunfire, which wounded Private Francisco Rodriguez Perez and killed the guide who was leading us, Fidel Lorenzo Lopez. Lopez's body was swept away by the current of the river and could not be recovered until early morning of Sunday May 17.

"Three of them (the guerrillas) were killed. The rest of the gang fled. Because of the denseness of the jungle, we could not ascertain the number. From the documents they were carrying, the dead men were identified as Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, Fidel Rexcaco Xitumul, and Enrique Cahueque Juarez."

Barquera Trucios noted that his troops had fired eighty rounds from M-1 and 7.62 automatic weapons in the course of the engagement.

The bodies of the three guerrillas, the report said, were deposited in the civilian hospital in Tuxtla Gutierrez, where the headquarters of the Thirty-First Corps is located.

Secretary of National Defense General Marcelino Garcia Barragan, who released the report to the press, admitted that the army had been "reinforcing" its garrison in this area for some time. But he energetically denied that the Mexican government was cooperating with the Guatemalan forces in antiguerrilla operations: "At no

antiwar movement for years. The use of violence against political opponents, the outpouring of lies and slanders against revolutionaries, the inability to work in any movement that is not a front for itself, are long-standing characteristics of Stalinist movements. The pro-China and pro-Soviet versions remain remarkably similar in their methods.

time," he said, "has the Guatemalan government made any special request of us with respect to the guerrillas."

Garcia Barragan claimed that Mexican troops would not have fired on the guerrillas if they had not shot first: "If guerrillas pursued by the Guatemalan forces had disarmed themselves and asked for help, it would have been possible to give them asylum. But nothing of this sort happened. To the contrary, the guerrillas attacked the Mexican military detachment. In these circumstances, our soldiers were not going to respond with flowers and kisses."

The Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores (Foreign Affairs Department) reportedly informed the Guatemalan embassy of the clash and advised them that the bodies of the dead guerrillas were at their disposal. Guatemalan diplomatic officials told the Mexican press that they would not comment on the matter until they received instructions.

The Mexican army report, however, left some questions unanswered. For example, the area where the clash is supposed to have taken place is described as an almost impenetrable jungle. General Garcia Barragan declared that civilians could travel back and forth across the border in this region "without difficulty." How, then, were the troops able to locate the guerrillas?

The circumstances of the reported clash suggest a counterinsurgency dragnet on both sides of the border.

It seems reasonable to assume that the Mexican government, which, despite everything, still seeks to maintain a certain image of independence in foreign affairs, would be reluctant to admit joining forces in counterrevolutionary warfare with the bloodstained Guatemalan regime whose first concern is safeguarding the holdings of the United Fruit Company.

Choby Yara, chief executive of the Ryukyu Islands, has demanded the immediate removal of American nerve gases from Okinawa. Plans to remove the gases by midspring were canceled when two U. S. governors sued to prevent transfer of the gases to the U. S.

Venezuelan Guerrilla Leader Assesses Experience

[Last January the press reported that Douglas Bravo, one of the best-known guerrilla leaders in Venezuela, had broken with Fidel Castro. This was followed by declarations from other guerrilla figures denouncing Douglas Bravo. (See *Intercontinental Press*, February 9, 1970, page 103.) Unfortunately, we have as yet been unable to obtain any of these documents.

[In early April, Humberto Solioni managed to reach one of the camps of the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional—Frente de Liberación Nacional (FALN-FLN, the National Liberation Armed Forces—National Liberation Front), which is headed by Douglas Bravo. Besides Bravo, Francisco Prada, Antonio Zamora, and Elegido ("Magoya") Cibada were present.

[Solioni interviewed Bravo, taking it down on tape. Later, he assembled Bravo's answers to his questions so that they read consecutively. The interview was then published in the May 15 issue of the Montevideo weekly *Marcha*, from which we have made the translation below.

[Among the points of special interest are Bravo's criticisms of Régis Debray's theories of guerrilla war, particularly Debray's exaggeration of the importance of "shooting" in the struggle, and his gross underestimation of the problem of organizing the working class and the peasantry.

[Likewise noteworthy is Bravo's emphasis, in contrast to Debray's dismissal, of the role of the revolutionary party as the most important instrument in the struggle for power.

[It should be observed, too, that Bravo makes a self-criticism, which applies to the whole guerrilla movement in Venezuela (and elsewhere in Latin America), over having abandoned organization of the popular masses. (This default enabled the Stalinists, who believe in and practice "peaceful coexistence" with the bourgeoisie, to stage a considerable comeback.

[Bravo says that having recognized this mistake, he and his comrades have rectified their line and are now

engaging in mass organizational work with favorable results.

[On a broader plane, a particularly instructive point is Bravo's recognition of how the very success of the Cuban revolution came to alter conditions in Latin America as a whole so that the pattern of the Cuban revolution could not be mechanically repeated. In his opinion, failure to recognize this, along with misunderstanding what had really happened in Cuba, led to a series of tragic defeats.

[Bravo charges the Cuban leadership with having failed to take up the reasons for the defeats and with having turned instead to preoccupation with economic problems in Cuba.

[It is true that the Cubans have not made a systematic analysis of the reasons for the defeats suffered by the guerrilla movement or what should be done by way of rectification. On the other hand, they have denied that they have given up the world revolution and have turned to trying to build socialism in one country. Fidel Castro made the point quite vigorously in his April 22 speech commemorating the centenary of Lenin's birth.

[The interview below begins with Bravo answering a question concerning the rumors and reports that he had broken with Fidel Castro.]

* * *

On the basis of statements I am supposed to have made, a whole fabric of comment has been built up in the Venezuelan and international press that in no way corresponds to the truth. I will take advantage of your question, since it relates to the Cuban revolution, to take time out from what can be a healthy polemic and acknowledge the contributions of those Cubans who have gone to help in national liberation struggles beyond their own borders. This has been our school, this has been our philosophy, and we cannot fail to recognize the merit of men like Comandante Guevara, who with a handful of Cubans went to contribute his life, his blood, and what is the most precious possession of any

man, his ideals, to the struggle against imperialism.

It is true, and we cannot hide it, that differences have developed between the comrades of the Cuban revolutionary leadership and our movement over the way of initiating the war for Latin America. But this is part of a necessary and logical process. These differences between us, the FLN-FALN, and the Cuban comrades also exist in other areas with other Venezuelan comrades. We polemicize and argue, we defend our points of view, and the others do the same.

These differences can be defined in more or less the following terms. The Cuban revolution occurred at a peculiar time, distinguished by special circumstances. It was fundamentally an antidictatorial struggle in its first stage. Therefore, the Cuban revolution had to have a completely different framework than the struggles that were to develop in the rest of the Latin-American countries after its triumph.

The Cuban movement was able to weld together men from the bourgeoisie, the working class, peasants and students, in an immense bloc, and it led them into a violent struggle. In its second stage after 1960, the Cuban revolution took on a new character, a socialist character. But the socialist nature of the Cuban revolution emerged after the revolution was in power. And that is precisely where the fundamental difference lies with the liberation movements that are now developing in Latin America.

From the moment they develop, these movements assume both a national liberation and a socialist character. In these circumstances the alliances, blocs, and classes involved have changed. This, then, is the essential source of our differences with the Cuban revolutionary leadership.

As a result of the publication of Régis Debray's book *Revolution in the Revolution*, our differences with the leadership of the Cuban revolution increased, inasmuch as the thesis of the book was shared fully by the Cuban comrades. The book itself did make an extraordinary contribution. It openly attacked what we might call

the old dogmatism, schematism, sectarianism.

But, unfortunately, because it was not based on an analysis of the Latin-American reality, because it was not based on an analysis that would enable revolutionists as a whole throughout Latin America and especially in the individual countries to draw important lessons, the book fell into another kind of dogmatism. It did not formulate profound analysis but little recipes, interpretations which were in large part of a dogmatic variety.

For example, Debray's book made a myth of small groups of men, legendary figures. He exaggerated the reality that does exist. He made the question of combat, of shooting, the central point of every struggle that is going to develop at this time, brushing aside, almost absurdly underestimating, the problem of organizing the working class and the peasants and those classes which must necessarily fulfill the historic role of destroying the oligarchy and imperialism in our countries.

Debray denied the role of a revolutionary party, of a Marxist-Leninist party as the most important instrument in the liberation struggle. He denied, moreover, the role of a liberation front, basing himself on some correct arguments but reaching false conclusions.

Thus the tactic proclaimed by the book became converted into what we might call a shortcut tactic, a tactic based on the belief that the revolution in the rest of the Latin-American countries was going to be made in the Cuban style and in the space of a few years. It was based on the idea that men in the mountains, paying no attention to the cities where the majority of the population is concentrated, paying no attention to other nuclei, would come down triumphant out of the hills in a few years and surround the cities.

In short, we can say that the tactic of Debrayism and of the Cuban comrades, who put it into practice in Latin America, is an incorrect tactic. It is a tactic of *foquismo*, of a shortcut, of underestimating the importance of organizing a party, a front, and of underestimating the importance of organizing the working class and the peasants.

And if we are realists we must say that things did not develop like that in Cuba, that this tactic is not the one that was applied in Cuba. It is a dis-



DOUGLAS BRAVO

tortion of the Cuban experience. And this distorted version of the Cuban tactic has unquestionably produced defeats of great magnitude in Latin America. These setbacks culminated with the destruction of the guerrilla nucleus in Bolivia and particularly the death of Comandante Ernesto Guevara, which caused dismay in Latin America and throughout the world as well as in Cuba.

But once this situation had developed, which was like the crowning defeat of a tactic, what road should be taken? What road should be followed? This is what all the revolutionists of the world have been discussing. And the revisionists were delighted, saying that the road of armed struggle had failed. But we said that this road had

not failed, that despite the errors that had been made, despite the incorrect, shortcut *foquista* tactic, it had been shown that the armed-struggle road was the right one for the liberation of the peoples. What had failed was a tactic, not a strategy. Therefore, what was needed was to correct the tactic in the process of the struggle itself.

We were surprised when, precisely in trying to correct this tactic, the Cuban comrades gave the impression that the turn was not going to be tactical but strategic. That is, instead of changing the forms of struggle, instead of changing the method of combat, a kind of cease-fire, truce, retreat, was being declared.

We think that what is called for is a tactical turn. We have begun this rectification already here in Venezuela and it has produced favorable results. It is very important to correct our methods of political organization, of organizing the working class and peasants, and to rectify our military line. This is important not only for us but for 270,000,000 Latin Americans.

Cuba had become an example for all self-sacrificing persons, for all those struggling for freedom. It had become a habit for the peasants and workers, the students, intellectuals, to listen to Radio Havana because the orientations and political lines were expressed in these broadcasts. A language was spoken which had not been heard since 1917, when Lenin and Trotsky addressed the peoples of the entire world with the language of the working class, with the new style of revolution. The language of Comandante Fidel Castro had a real impact on everyone in Latin America.

But after October 8 [1967], after the death of Comandante Ernesto Guevara, and a little before, a marked letdown occurred, which we noticed, which the whole world noticed. Radio Havana, Comandante Fidel Castro no longer addressed their people to inform them, to analyze, to engage in dialogue.

A letdown was natural when Comandante Guevara died. But it was also natural to expect that the man who was at the head of this army of the poor, this army of the humble, this continental army, this Bolivarian army, would say something to his troops, to the struggling people. Were we to continue on this path? Or rectify it? Or

come to a halt? He had to say something and he still must express his opinion.

To take up the thread again of what I was explaining, I must tell you some other things. We think that the historic period Latin America is going through now, of national liberation and socialism, has much in common with the past history of these nations. That is, we must present ourselves more as continuers of the struggle for the independence of these countries, the struggle started by San Martin, O'Higgins, Artigas, Bolivar, and all the great men who at that time declared war on the old conquerors.

We maintain that the Bolivarian conception is fully valid for this epoch, that most of its postulates are still applicable. But I am going to take up only one aspect, liberating a single country. When a country succeeds in expelling the oppressors from its territory, when a country succeeds in putting the revolutionary forces in power—I am referring to a Latin-American country—then it can be said that that country is in the vanguard of the rest of the army continuing the struggle. And, as the vanguard, it must march in step with the rest of the forces in the battle. This liberated country can in no way set up its own individual strategy within its own frontiers.

The liberated country must follow the strategy of the rest of the continent. Because this continent, divided up into more than twenty republics, is one single nation, which has been split up for the purpose of looting it, to make it easier to exploit it. This would be as if, in the concrete case of Venezuela, the comrades in the plains managed to liberate that area and then wanted to build socialism there, isolated from the eastern and central parts of the country, from Zulia and the Andes. Out of necessity the liberated area in the plains would have to be a base of operations for continuing the struggle.

This is true of Cuba, which has already been liberated. Liberated Cuba is only the first base of operations on the continent, from which the battle against imperialism and the oligarchies can spread more effectively. Therefore, we think, and this is what has worried us, that the line followed in practice since Comandante Fidel Castro's speech January 2, when he spoke of putting the emphasis on production, on what he called the Year of

Decisive Endeavor, is a line which is not related to the strategy of revolution, to the strategy of liberating this great nation of Latin America.

Obviously, we are not going to deny that Cuba needs to produce, that Cuba needs, and rightfully so, to achieve a little independence from international trade, have its own exchange, its own economic reserves in order to continue the struggle more forcefully. But what it must not do is call a halt in the struggle; it must advance the struggle simultaneously. How was Cuba able to obtain ten years of socialism? How could Cuba achieve the success which can be said to be much greater than that of other countries which have had fifteen or more years of socialism?

Comandante Fidel Castro indeed discussed important things in this January 2 speech. He talked about the aid the socialist camp, and especially the Soviet Union, has given him. That is true, that is obviously true. The existence of a powerful worldwide socialist camp is a guarantee that a small country can build socialism within its borders today. That is real. But also, comrade, it must be recognized that these ten years of socialism in Cuba were also possible because the entire population of Latin America, 270,000,000 people, gave their support to Comandante Fidel Castro.

The people of Latin America gave Comandante Castro their fervent support in all areas and in all forms. So in making his balance sheet of these ten years, Comandante Fidel Castro should have included somewhere the contribution of these Latin-American peoples, the contribution the guerrillas made with their lives, with their struggles. Because when a guerrilla dies in Guatemala, in Venezuela, in Brazil, or in Bolivia, he is not fighting for his own little country alone, for its small frontiers, he is fighting for all of Latin America.

To sum up, I would say that we have the highest appreciation of the contribution made by the Cuban revolution, as an example and as a contributor, with its men and with its resources, to the Latin-American revolution. I will say also that while these differences exist at the tactical level and while it is true, as you just told me, that the focus is shifting, these differences can logically be expected to subside. But as a revolutionary movement we cannot permit our theses and our ideas to be distorted for use

against the Cuban revolution or any socialist country. Because, if you think about it, with all the differences we have with its leaders, it is we in the rest of the continent, carrying guns, who are the best defenders of the Cuban revolution.

Therefore it grieves me very much if revolutionists in Latin America—I don't know about Cuba because I have heard no opinion—think that we are going to do anything to help the forces that are attacking Cuba, when these same forces are attacking us. The most important thing is this: who is doing most to weaken American imperialism, the No. 1 enemy of all humanity? Who is doing most to overthrow it and bury it and build a new society? Who is helping most concretely to defend the achievements of the Cuban revolution? Those who engage in dialogues, who talk, who make speeches, who theorize a lot, but who in practice make no concrete effort to overthrow this colossus? From this point of view, we consider ourselves to be among the foremost defenders of Cuba.

Question. Comandante, what is the perspective now for the struggle in Venezuela?

Answer. The last twenty years in Venezuela can be divided into ten years of police dictatorship and ten years of dictatorship under "representative democracy." There was a time when the people and the revolutionary movements took as their objective liberalizing, democratizing the state, and directed their struggles against the existing dictatorships. When a bourgeois-democratic government in the style of Prío, Figueres, Betancourt, Frei, Caldera, and many others, came along, it seemed to many to offer great hope.

Throughout the continent today it has been amply demonstrated that there is only one neocolonialist system of exploitation which organizes its looting of these countries both through police-military dictatorships or the dictatorship of representative democracy.

When Caldera took power in Venezuela, there had already been ten years of government by Acción Democrática [Democratic Action, the party of Romulo Betancourt]. As a result bourgeois democracy lost much of its luster and showed the people that it could not solve their great problems. The

vanguard groups developed that are leading the struggle today.

The Caldera government is weaker than the preceding ones, not because it does not have a disciplined party, a well-organized fascist party behind it, not because it does not have the aid of imperialism or the military high command, the clergy, and the intermediate, parasitic bourgeoisie. It is weaker because in these eight years of war, conditions have developed that have awakened the consciousness of many sectors of the population.

Doctor Caldera's government has great economic resources in an oil-producing and mining country where the dollar abounds. It has a modern and well-equipped army, it has the complicity—and this is the most deplorable—of all the reformist parties, including the Venezuelan Communist party. It has the complicity of a cowed bourgeoisie which was incapable of making a bourgeois-democratic revolution here in Venezuela. But (and this is decisive) the Caldera government cannot count on the enthusiasm of the popular masses.

At one time bourgeois democracy, representative democracy, the leaders who arose in 1926 and in 1936, could arouse the enthusiasm of broad sectors and attract them to their parties with nationalist rhetoric, with populist rhetoric, talking about national sovereignty, industrialization, agrarian reform.

But all these men, all these institutions, all these parties have been in power and have been transformed from advocates of these gains to their opposite, that is, they have become defenders of the imperialist oligarchic system, foes of agrarian reform, foes of industrialization, foes of liberation, allies of imperialism. That is why these bourgeois-democratic politicians have lost the enthusiasm of the people and we are gaining it.

With the enthusiasm of the people and their sympathy we will triumph in the long run, because obviously it will be a long war. But the prospects for the development and spread of this war are increasing. This is first of all because we have made a tactical turn that enables us to interpret the Venezuelan reality more precisely and not to copy foreign blueprints mechanically.

And there are other signs of great importance such as the development of a kind of protest movement on a na-

tional scale in 1969. This movement began with a small action in Río Caribe where the population seized the waterworks, the electric-light plant, the Municipal Council offices, confronting the marines, confronting the police.

What was the great lesson of this incident? The population ignored the traditional organizations, the union leaders, the political leaders, the political parties, everybody. It created its own instruments of struggle. And this little action in Río Caribe spread to the universities, where schools and universities were seized in open protest against all the institutions.

This was a rebel movement of a new type. It forced Doctor Caldera to send his troops into the streets; he sent his rangers; he occupied the universities, the high schools, the elementary schools, the factories. And the massive involvement of the armed forces in the political life of the country today has weakened him. Not even in the time of Acción Democrática did the army assume as much power as it has today under COPEI [Comité Organizado para Elecciones Independientes—Independent Political Action Committee, the Venezuelan Christian Democracy]. The country is being militarized at a rapid rate.

You can see this militarization clearly in the following facts: the involvement of the army in questions like the universities and the high schools; the presence of the army in the plants, in the factories, in the eastern part of the country, in the iron-mining region; control of all the police forces by the National Guard; army supervision of travel; army supervision of the highways; and unification of the Policía Nacional [National Police].

These are harbingers of an open and avowed dictatorship that looms nearer every day, which every day is increasingly undermining the ridiculous forms of representative democracy. No one believes in representative democracy any more except a little group of idle intellectuals in the cities who are not directly affected by the repression the way the great masses of peasants and workers and the poor people of the slums are.

The immediate perspectives are also based on a very important factor. We revolutionists think we are reaching a new stage. That is, first there was what might be called "the awakening of the Venezuelan people." That was January 23.* Then there was the de-

cision to begin the struggle. That was the battle in 1962, the armed struggle. Then came the period of the great crisis, the great crisis of the revolution. Afterwards came a period which we might call one of clarification; the seemingly revolutionary parties split to enable the real Marxist-Leninist forces to organize. And finally we are entering a period which we might call the period of genuine unification of the revolutionists.

Already the comrades of the Antonio José de Sucre Guerrilla Front, commanded by Carlos Betancourt, and our forces have united in the Comité de Integración Revolucionaria [Revolutionary Integration Committee], whose fundamental objective is to create a single army and a single party to make the revolution. And other forces are joining. We think that this is the most wholesome step we have been able to make in recent years. Now we can plan on a national basis and not fight isolated battles. This is one of the most important things.

I would add, also, that we have begun work in a serious manner to organize our movement in the working class. But we are organizing the workers and the marginal sectors for elections only for revolution, for national liberation. The great error of the past was that we abandoned much of the organizing of the popular sectors, who are the ones who are really going to make the revolution. Today we are organizing these sectors in a serious and disciplined way. It is in this area precisely that we think the greatest successes are going to be won.

Where can the guerrilla movement find nourishment if not from the working class? Where can it find nourishment if not from the peasants, if not from the marginal population, the numerous poor population concentrated in the shantytowns around Caracas?

This marginal population has no jobs, they are neither workers nor peasants. They are excluded from the process of production and even from any kind of political and cultural activity. But these sectors constitute an extraordinary revolutionary potential for the future and we are reaching out to them. These sectors will be

* On January 23, 1958, the Perez Jimenez dictatorship was overthrown by a popular movement led by Fabricio Ojeda and a group of officers headed by Admiral Wolfgang Larrazabal.

volcanos, they will be fighting bat- talions that will make a powerful con- tribution to defeating the government and the oligarchy in our country.

It is on these sectors that we place our greatest expectations. But this is

no isolated perspective. As I told you a while ago, Venezuela is not the only country that is struggling. We also base our outlook on the fact that there has been a rise in the struggle in Brazil, in Uruguay, in Guatemala, in Santo

Domingo, in Colombia. And still more — we base our perspective on the fact that the heroic struggle of the Vietname- se people is proceeding successfully and is the most magnificent example of resistance to American imperialism.

'Red Guards' in Calcutta

Naxalites Turn to Urban Terrorism

India's Maoists have apparently withdrawn many of their followers from the countryside in West Bengal, where they were attempting to orga- nize a peasant insurrection, and thrown them into a campaign of student terrorism in Calcutta, the state capital.

Known as "Naxalites" from their origin during a peasant uprising in the Naxalbari section of West Ben- gal's Darjeeling district in 1967, the main group of Maoists are current- ly organized in the Communist party of India (Marxist-Leninist) [CPI- (M-L)].

Previously disparaging students as "petty-bourgeois," the Naxalites have begun staging invasions of university libraries and bookstores where they have paid special attention to books of their political opponents. The April 11 Calcutta *Statesman* reported:

"A group of Naxalite students and some outsiders caused extensive dam- age to the Gandhi Study Centre and the Adult Education Centre of Jadav- pur University, on Friday afternoon [April 10], when they burnt about 500 books on Gandhism and wrecked fur- niture in the two centres. A portrait of Gandhiji, valued at about Rs2,000 [US\$266], was also burnt to ashes."

The Adult Education Centre was set up with the help of the World Uni- versity Service [WUS], which has been accused of having CIA connections. Not all radical students agreed with the tactics of the Naxalites, however. The *Statesman* reported:

"The general secretary of the Jadav- pur University Engineering College Students' Union said that though they considered the WUS a 'CIA organiza- tion,' they did not believe in such iso- lated violent activities. He felt such 'CIA activities' could be fought only by mass movements."

A similar incident took place at Cal- cutta University on April 16. The Cal- cutta *Statesman* reported the next day:

"For 15 minutes on Thursday after- noon, some Naxalite students, and their supporters went on the rampage in Calcutta University. . . .

"The Vice-Chancellor's room was ransacked and the Syndicate's meet- ing room, which was locked at the time, suffered damage in a bomb ex- plosion. Even the library in the Cen- tenary Building did not escape. A bon- fire of some American journals collect- ed from the Periodical Department of the library was made outside the Cen- tenary Building.

"Bombs were thrown both inside and outside the university campus, caus- ing panic among the students who ran for safety to the Ashutosh and Darb- hanga Buildings. . . .

"The Naxalite students also raided a bookshop on Shyamacharan De Street. They smashed showcases, took out books on Gandhiji and burnt them on the street."

The burning of books was not lim- ited to those dealing with American and Indian bourgeois thought. On April 17 Soviet government publica- tions were put to the torch as well. The April 18 *Statesman* reported:

"Naxalite youths raided the library and ransacked the Principal's room of the Jnan Chandra Ghosh Polytechnic in Ekbalpore, South Calcutta, on Fri- day and made a bonfire of some So- viet Government journals, magazines and some Communist party literature which bore portraits of Lenin and Marx and contained quotations from their works."

The raid was carried out in com- mando fashion by a small number of youths and was not part of any broader demonstration. The *States- man* gave this account:

"According to the polytechnic author- ities, a group of about 15 Naxalites, comprising both students of the insti- tute as well as outsiders, entered the main polytechnic building at 12-15 p. m. shouting pro-Mao slogans. The youths split into two groups, one head- ing for the library, the other going straight to the Principal's chamber. The Caretaker of the institute, who was attending to the work of the Principal in his absence, was abused. They picked up bottles of ink from the table and splattered the walls with ink. . . .

"Some of the youths drew portraits of Mao on the wall and scribbled slo- gans hailing the Naxalbari movement and denouncing the 'revisionist activi- ties' of the CPI(M) [Communist party of India (Marxist)—the formerly pro- Peking CP that has developed differ- ences with Mao]. . . .

"During the scuffle they squirted ink on the Caretaker's face and on his clothes. Throughout the operation, which lasted barely five minutes, one of the youths stood on a chair and read out quotations from Mao."

On April 18 a group of young men boarded a streetcar at the crossing of Mahatma Gandhi Road and Mirzapur Street in Calcutta. The passengers were forced to disembark at knife point, and the car was burned, while the youths shouted "Long live Mao Tsetung, Red Salute to You!"

The police have begun a manhunt for CPI(M-L) leaders, and members of the Maoist organization have reported- ly gone underground to avoid arrests. The state government has proposed reviving the discredited Preventive De- tention Act, abolished a few years ago on the national level after an intensive campaign against its provisions for detaining political dissidents without trial for long periods.

Various explanations have been ad- vanced for the turn toward indiscrim- inate violence by the Naxalite leaders.

The police claim that it is an attempt to attract recruits for the CPI(M-L)'s efforts to mount peasant guerrilla warfare in the countryside. Left-wing political groups do not agree, but see the turn as an attempt to outflank dissident Maoist tendencies that have remained outside the CPI(M-L). The April 19 *Hindusthan Standard* reported:

"It appears that the present spell of activities in Calcutta has been organised on the basis of latest instructions given to the party cadre by the CPI(M-L) leader, Mr. Charu Mazumdar. These have made it clear that the party will have to extend its area of operation, and achieve what Mr. Mazumdar calls 'greater victories' than those achieved through peasant revolution in Debra, Gopiballavpur and other States.

"The new phase of operation has accordingly been planned in areas where students have easy access. Moreover, according to the CPI(M-L) leadership, educational institutions have become the main centre of bourgeois culture, and these should be smashed during the process of carrying out a revolutionary programme. Students have also been told that reading of books will make one a big fool. . . .

"This programme is being worked out at a time when Communist revolutionaries [Maoists], who have ceased to associate themselves with the CPI(M-L), have tentatively agreed to organise a united front to propagate what they call the correct teachings of Mao, and to highlight the gross deviations of the CPI(M-L) line from Maoism. According to the non-CPI(M-L) groups, the present activities, directed against educational institutions, were nothing but romanticisation of bourgeois revolution. Such terrorist activities, they point out, will not help the people march towards revolution. On the other hand, such a programme would isolate some revolutionaries from the general mass of the people."

Since the formation of the CPI(M-L) in April 1969 the Chinese press has given it wide coverage and has not reported the existence of other Maoist groups.

The Naxalite campaign has continued in face of mobilization of the police by the state government. On April 20 one person was seriously injured when police fired into a group of youths who were allegedly attempting to set fire to three buses outside the Medical College and Hospital in north Calcutta. Hospital offices were

ransacked by the youths before the clash with police.

Thus far the Naxalites have issued no public statement on their actions. The press has publicized excerpts from what is claimed to be an internal circular of the CPI(M-L) explaining the campaign to its members. According to this document, the attacks on universities are the first step in a "cultural revolution and a revolt against the bourgeois-oriented educational system."

Sections of this document, reprinted in the April 28 *Calcutta Statesman*, called for the establishing of "small red guard units." "If necessary," it said, "the students should discontinue their studies in schools and colleges for the time being as the students in China did to accomplish the cultural revolution."

The circular called attention to a "guideline" for students written by Charu Mazumdar. He holds that a "people's liberation army" formed from "red guard units at the appropriate time, will march through the plains of Bengal by the end of this year or early next year."

The "guideline" reportedly rejected all common action with other groups that call themselves Maoist: "There is no question of formation of a united front of the CPI(M-L) and other groups led by Ngi Reddy and others."

The Communist party of India (Marxist), which until recently headed the class-collaborationist "United Front" government in West Bengal, has sharply criticized the current course of the Naxalites. At an April 23 meeting with newsmen in New Delhi, CPI(M) leader Harekrishna Konar denounced the Maoists as "frustrated young men of petit bourgeois class." According to the April 24 *Hindusthan Standard*, "Mr. Konar's analysis is that these extremist elements, who hail mainly from Calcutta, had returned to the city after their failure in rural areas, and shifted their centre of work to Calcutta."

(S. B. Kolpe, writing from Calcutta in the May 11 issue of *Intercontinental Press*, reported: "Naxalites, the Maoist dissidents from the CPI(M), who once posed a serious threat to the CPI(M) leadership in the rural areas of West Bengal, have lost their base in the villages, including in Naxalbari, their birthplace, once considered to be their stronghold. The CPI(M-L) finds the situation in the West Bengal villages so embarrassing that it has decided

to withdraw its isolated cadres into the cities.")

A major attack on the Naxalites appeared in the May 3 issue of the CPI(M) newspaper *People's Democracy* under the title "Playing Into the Enemy's Hands."

"For years now," *People's Democracy* said, "because of the strength of student protests and the force of democratic opinion among teachers and the public, the police had been prevented from entering educational institutions and vitiating the atmosphere there. Congress rulers and the reactionaries in the academic world have now got the pretext to bring back the police to violate the sanctity of educational institutions and break the heads of young students. . . .

"When the Central Government was forced to give up the Preventive Detention Act by the determined stand of the Opposition, the United Front Government of West Bengal was one of the State Governments which refused to enact a similar law on its own. Now the Congress rulers have taken the opportunity to bring back the P. D. Act. . . .

"Even that is not all.

"The West Bengal Government has already asked 'the Centre to despatch more battalions of the Central Reserve Police in view of the growing activities of the Naxalites.'

"'Growing activities of the Naxalites' is the pretext. The truth came out when Governor's Adviser M. M. Basu told the Press that the CRP reinforcements might be needed during the coming sowing season as well as in the general drive for restoring law and order.

"Read along with this another report which says: 'The West Bengal Government today (April 25) tentatively decided to take steps for restoring lands forcibly occupied during the United Front regime, to their rightful owners "under certain conditions" . . . It was decided to prevent by all means any further forcible occupation of land.' . . .

"At this moment, to organise violent acts with no relation to the developing mass movement, is to play into the hands of the class enemy. And that precisely are what the Naxalite leaders are guilty of."

Atheists Don't Make Good Killers

Admiral Thomas Moorer of the U. S. Joint Chiefs of Staff testified in the U. S. District Court in Washington April 28: "I don't think you will find an atheist who has reached the peak in the Armed Forces."

Quebec Election Shows Nationalist Ferment on Rise

By Arthur Young

Montreal

The election of a majority Liberal government headed by Robert Bourassa has sent the Canadian ruling class and its spokesmen into fits of glee.

The Toronto *Globe and Mail* exulted the next day: "Today this feels like a splendid country."

Prime Minister Trudeau hailed "the end to blackmailing" (by the Quebec government) and the victory for Canadian unity.

Certainly the Liberals scored a big victory on the parliamentary plane in the April 29 elections in Quebec, winning 72 seats in the 108-member National Assembly.

But Canada's rulers have little real reason to rejoice. The elections showed, in a distorted form, the tremendous pent-up discontent and anger of the Quebec masses, closely linked with a rising national consciousness and desire for national freedom. They also demonstrated in a striking fashion that the Québécois are prepared to strike out on new paths and try out new political programs and parties in place of the traditional ones.

The governing Union Nationale was crushed almost beyond repair. Its 55 seats were slashed to a mere 17. Its percentage of the popular vote was cut in half by an irate electorate. It was wiped out of the urban areas almost entirely and confined to some marginal rural areas. Cabinet ministers went down like bowling pins. This was the worst defeat in the party's 34-year history, and could even spell its disappearance.

The wave of popular discontent flowed towards the new political formations, the Parti Québécois and the Créditistes. The extreme right-wing, petty-bourgeois Créditistes, as expected, displayed most of their strength in certain rural areas, and in the Abitibi mining region. With little money or organization they capitalized on popular discontent to elect 12 candidates. They were favored by the electoral system, with its crass favoritism for the rural, sparsely populated ridings. Their relatively small popular vote

resulted in a big parliamentary delegation.

The big loser in this respect was the Parti Québécois. It won 23 percent of the popular vote, more than half of the Liberal total. But this resulted in only 7 seats, less than one-tenth of the number of Liberal seats. The top three leaders of the PQ—Lévesque, Parizeau and Grégoire—were all defeated. The PQ came second in popular vote but will have fewer seats than any of the other three parties.

The fact that 23 percent of the Québécois voted for the PQ is the most notable feature of the elections. This is the first time that a party demanding a separate, sovereign Quebec state has received a substantial portion of votes. In 1966, the independentist parties got only 9 percent of the vote.

The PQ built on popular feeling by carefully presenting a program which seemed to meet the sentiments of the masses of Québécois, who are fed up with unemployment, rotten wages, a growing housing crisis, progressive elimination of the French language in their own nation, and domination by foreign corporations and the Ottawa government which backs them. It succeeded impressively. It got significant support in both urban and rural Quebec, in all corners of the province, and from different social layers: students, workers, and the middle class. Not surprisingly, its strongest showing was in the urban French areas.

In Montreal, the PQ took not the more middle-class seats it was expecting to gain, but the most working-class ridings.

Several figures show the strength of the PQ support. The English minority voted massively for the Liberal party. Thus the PQ averaged 30 percent of the votes cast by French Québécois. In ridings in the French half of Montreal, the PQ got 40 percent or higher. This was where it took six of its seven seats.

During the election campaign, the PQ put on a high-powered, highly professional effort. While retaining its image as a "populist" party based on

the masses, it was able to compete with the major bourgeois parties in their own fields, and in some respects even surpass them. Its campaign funds were substantial (more than \$400,000) and supplemented by a veritable army of volunteer workers handling the door-to-door intensive campaign effort.

In the absence of any serious labor alternative, the Parti Québécois corralled the support of both the student movement and the organized labor movement. The labor brass, refusing to break with bourgeois politics, came out almost without exception for the PQ. This contributed substantially to the PQ's ability to pass itself off as the party of all the Québécois.

This desertion of the labor brass left the NDP [New Democratic party—Canada's labor party] high and dry, without any base of support. Its organization was reduced to a shell, capable of presenting only 14 candidates in the whole province. The NDP leadership compounded this terrible situation by projecting no perspective of serious struggle against the other parties, candidly avowing that the NDP didn't even hope to elect a single candidate. They set themselves against the rising militant nationalist mood of Quebec by their stand in favor of federalism and bilingualism. It was no surprise, then, that almost nobody viewed the NDP as a serious alternative, and that its candidates got only 4,500 votes, not even 1 percent of the total.

To meet the multiple crises of Quebec society and the growing popular discontent, René Lévesque and the PQ proposed "The Solution," as they entitled their program—that is, a sovereign Quebec. Here was the answer, they claimed, to the constant constitutional wrangles, to the Ottawa-Quebec fight over \$200 million, to the spending of Québécois tax dollars on the Canadian army, to the declining status of the French language and culture. A sovereign Quebec would mobilize all \$6 billion of Quebec tax monies and avoid the duplication and

inefficiency of two levels of government.

The Québécois, like all "normal" people, Lévesque repeated everywhere, need their own country. This is what the PQ stands for. But at the same time, for economic reasons, this sovereign Quebec would link itself to English Canada through a common market arrangement.

The PQ proposed an elaborate series of reforms which, it claims, a sovereign Quebec would carry through. The state would intervene in the economy to set economic priorities; the minimum wage would go up to \$2 an hour; there would be tax reforms; the state would "favor" trade unionism; there would be full medicare; French would become the working language; immigrants would have to learn French (the English, however, would keep their English-language schools); there would be an efficient, democratic system of government; Quebec would withdraw from NATO and NORAD [North American Air Defense Command treaty, binding the Canadian government to the Pentagon in the "defense" of North America from long-range bombing attack]; it would be represented at the United Nations, etc.

The PQ certainly benefited greatly from its ability to pose as the only alternative to the "old parties," so deeply discredited by their past policies. But demagoguery and promises of reforms if elected are the stock-in-trade of the bourgeois parties. Only the PQ stand for Quebec sovereignty distinguished it fundamentally from the Liberals and the Union Nationale.

Not that the PQ proposed a program that could actually bring about the national liberation of Quebec. It stood for continuing, if not deepening Quebec's dependence on the foreign monopolies which now completely dominate the nation and block any attempt at national self-determination. The PQ proposed that the *form*, and not the reality, of this oppression should be changed, so that instead of ruling through two levels of government, foreign capital would rule through a "sovereign" national state.

The common market it proposes with English Canada would maintain the facility with which English Canadian capital now enters Quebec and withdraws its profits.

Throughout the campaign the PQ sought to prove that it was not out to

attack capitalism or threaten its privileges in Quebec.

Its campaign newspaper *Pouvoir* claimed: "It is in Canada's interest to maintain its harmonious relations with Quebec. Of course some Canadian businessmen will let their emotions overrule their own interests, but surely not for long, otherwise their American competitors will quickly move to replace them in the Quebec market. As for the Americans, they are not interested in Quebec's political status. Their companies have learned to develop under an extraordinary variety of different political regimes. What they want, in the first place and above all other things, is the possibility of finding a 'valid spokesman,' that is, a strong government, which knows what it wants, and a clear and stable situation, rather than the current disorder and instability."

This and subsequent issues of the paper pointed with pride to statements by leading foreign capitalists that they did not care what kind of regime the Québécois chose, as long as it allowed them to continue their profit-gouging of the nation.

As for the alleged "radicalism" of the PQ, René Lévesque explained that the truth was quite the contrary—the party was an assurance against "anarchy," because it calmed and directed the energies of revolutionary-minded workers and youth into safe channels.

The big vote for the PQ was due not to its moderation, however, but to the fact that it, more than any other major party in the campaign, voiced the dissatisfaction and anger of the Québécois at their current status. The strong showing for the Créditistes, and the virtual smashing of the ruling Union Nationale reflect the same process. Of all the parties, the PQ benefited most because the social and national discontent are profoundly fused together.

The PQ vote represents an electoral breakthrough for nationalism. The RIN [Rassemblement pour l'Indépendance Nationale] vote in 1966 came nowhere near the PQ total of 1970. Even more important, the strongest PQ showing was among the decisive sector of the Quebec working class, in southeast Montreal. This confirms the rising tide of national consciousness which has been visible for several years and which has broken out in many forms, as in the October 1969 fight against Bill 63, and the

struggles in the unions for French unilingualism.

The capitalist press and many politicians have sought to dismiss this powerful nationalist rise by holding that the PQ vote was basically a protest against unemployment, housing, taxes, etc. This is wishful thinking on their part, denying what is becoming more and more clear to Québécois: that these conditions are closely tied up with Quebec's national oppression.

To what degree can we say that the PQ showing indicates a mass desire for a separate, sovereign Quebec state? This was certainly the central PQ demand, and those who voted for the party could hardly be unaware of it, or be strongly opposed to it. If some federalist-minded persons voted PQ, how many independentists voted for the other parties? These are important questions which will be examined in subsequent articles.

Whatever the wishes of the Parti Québécois, the election of a few PQers to the National Assembly is not going to calm down militant struggles in Quebec.

In the past it has denounced such struggles as fanatical and irresponsible. As a major party now, similar denunciations will be more remarked and cost the party dearly.

Inevitably the PQ must unmask itself, compelling the labor movement to move to the fore in the struggle for political power. And, as the current elections have shown, the Québécois will not be too charitable towards parties which have cruelly betrayed their trust.

Nixon Sent to Wrong Address

John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard professor of economics and former ambassador to India, takes a very gloomy view of the capacities of the men running the U. S. economy and government.

In an article in the London *Daily Mail* May 30, he declared:

"If any Harvard student had said in the past 10 years that it was possible to have serious inflation, a large increase in unemployment and a bad stock market crash combined with a severe housing depression all at the same time, we would have sent him home—most likely to see his psychiatrist."

Galbraith scored "tendencies to insanity" in the stock market and "obtuse management" by the Nixon administration.

Galbraith did not explain how it happens that in the U. S. a man like Nixon can be sent to the White House instead of to a psychiatrist.

Nahum Goldmann's Controversial 'Future of Israel'

By Peter Buch

"After more than 50 years of Zionist activities . . . I am beginning to have doubts as to whether the establishment of the state of Israel as it is today, a state like all other states in structure and form, was the fullest accomplishment of the Zionist idea. . ." So writes Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress since 1951, in an article that raises some "unthinkable" questions about the nature of the Israeli state and its big power alliances.

Dr. Goldmann formerly headed the World Zionist Organization and has been one of the most prominent figures of the Zionist movement in the past half century. His article, entitled "The Future of Israel," appeared in the April issue of *Foreign Affairs*, a scholarly American quarterly. It marked the second occasion within a month that Goldmann provoked consternation among Israeli and Zionist leaders.

Earlier in April he caused an international stir and drew official Israeli displeasure when he told the press he had received reports that President Abdel Gamal Nasser of Egypt wanted discussions with him, on condition that the Israeli government agreed and that the meetings were publicly announced. The Israeli cabinet's veto of Goldmann's attempt at "personal diplomacy" delivered a new blow to the image of Israeli leaders anxiously waiting for the phone to ring with a call from the Arabs to talk peace. The incident precipitated bitter criticism of the government by leading newspapers in Israel and spurred the largest, most militant demonstration against official policy in the last ten years on April 8 in Jerusalem.

The controversy around Dr. Goldmann erupted at a time of growing dissatisfaction, doubt, and open resistance by many Israelis, especially student youth, against Premier Golda Meir's "Government of National Unity." Mrs. Meir's broad coalition contains so many diverse political tendencies that it precludes agreement on any sort of "positive" peace plan that would hold out some hope for an

Israeli public weary of the constant war tension and grieved by the mounting casualty lists. For the same reason, the "National Unity" government remains all the more tied to its pursuit of the hateful "military solution," leading to more annexations, occupations, repression, and massive assaults, without an end in sight.

A second large demonstration occurred April 11 against the government's decision to settle 250 Jewish families in the occupied West Bank city of Hebron. Eight Jewish students were arrested, one of them reportedly a reserve major in the Israeli army, when they leaped into Golda Meir's garden.

Club-swinging mounted police attacked both demonstrations and dispersed the protesters with the help of water hoses. At least seventeen of the April 8 demonstrators were reported hospitalized, five of them in serious condition. Most noteworthy was the composition of the demonstrators, which included not only members of the still small anti-Zionist left groups—such as the Israeli Socialist Organization (often called *Matspen*, after its monthly paper) and the Communist party (Rakah)—but also popular entertainers, students, and faculty of Israeli universities, many of whom belong to a group called "The Israeli New Left."

This group is largely drawn from among dissident members of the kibbutzim (collective farms), especially those belonging to the Mapam (Mifleget Poalim Me'uchedet—United Workers party), the leading left-Zionist party in Mrs. Meir's coalition.

Mapam left no doubt as to its distress at this development within its ranks, according to the April 20 *Jerusalem Post* (Weekly Overseas Edition), when its secretariat denounced the first demonstration in a statement on April 13 as "an act of provocation" by a "fringe group . . . [which] undermines the struggle for peace and security in this country."

Goldmann, long a controversial fig-

ure in Israel, has often been at odds with Israeli government policy. He rejects the insistence on direct talks and signed peace treaties. He reportedly favors returning much of the occupied areas and even compromising on the status of Jerusalem, positions which are anathema to the Israeli leadership. In response to criticism against his presumption as a private Israeli citizen to represent the government position, Goldmann replied with characteristic frankness that so far as he knew, it had no position. "The Government is based on a decision not to decide," he is quoted as saying in the April 7 *New York Times*, "because the moment they do so, that's the end of the big coalition."

According to a recent disclosure by *Le Monde's* veteran Middle East journalist Eric Rouleau, who acted as one of the intermediaries for the proposed Cairo visit, Nasser had invited Goldmann to Egypt once before, in 1956 on the eve of the Israeli-French-British invasion of Suez. The attack aborted the mission and ruled out any hopes by Nasser that "doves" like Goldmann and former premier Moshe Sharet (now dead) could prevail in Israel to work out a suitable compromise with the Arab states.

Dr. Goldmann has rendered considerable services to the Zionist cause, taking a large hand in securing the 1947 UN partition plan that set up Israel, negotiating the West German reparations treaty, and carrying out unofficial diplomatic missions for Israel. Nevertheless, he is considered an outsider by the Israeli leadership, an "international citizen," who finally took out Israeli citizenship under pressure, but who maintains residences in Switzerland and the United States as well as in Israel. Wealthy and world famous, he is not dependent upon the Israeli establishment for his career or his influence. He does not share its narrow nationalist outlook; he resists the jingoist pressures of the military sector. Conversely, he is rather sensitive to the pressures of world pub-

lic opinion, to the interests of the big powers, and to the actualities of the Jewish problem as it exists for millions of Jews, East and West, who will never emigrate to Israel but who may well be caught in the crossfire of a major explosion in the future.

In his controversial article, Goldmann stipulates that he has "no doubt as to the historical justification and moral validity of Zionism."

"More and more, however," he says, "I am coming to the conclusion that Israel cannot be one of the more than a hundred so-called sovereign national states as they exist today and that, instead of relying primarily and exclusively on its military and political strength, it should be not merely accepted but guaranteed, *de jure* and *de facto*, by all the peoples of the world, including the Arabs, and put under the permanent protection of the whole of mankind. This neutralization would certainly be an exception to the normal forms of modern states but, as I indicated before, the Jewish people and the Jewish history are unique. Their singular character and ceaseless suffering—particularly during the Nazi catastrophe—allow the Jewish state to demand from the world the right to establish its own national center in its old homeland and to guarantee its existence."

Goldmann sees a slight precedent for this sort of status in the neutrality of Switzerland. He believes that Israel might have to leave the United Nations to keep itself outside of power politics and might even have to accept the stationing of a "permanent symbolic international force" inside its borders to signify that an attack on the Jewish state would amount to an attack on the world community. He hastens to add that "this does not signify the demilitarization of Israel and the abolition of its army" until the international guarantee is proved to be "effective."

In Goldmann's view, such neutralization of Israel, coupled with an appeal to the traditional generosity of the Arabs to join as its guarantors, could calm the "major and understandable fears" of the Arab world, namely, that of Israeli expansionism and obstructionism to the goal of Arab unity.

Two preconditions, he indicates, must be met to make the proposed solution workable — first, a peace agreement whose nature he doesn't specify, and

second, a basic settlement of the Arab refugee question.

On this he is more specific, calling for the resettlement of most of the refugees in Jordan, which he implies would be reunited with its West Bank now occupied by Israel. He also proposes "Israel's acceptance, even as a matter of principle, of a limited number of Arab refugees; and possibly . . . yielding the Gaza Strip to Israel, on condition that it integrate the 200,000 Arabs living there as equal citizens."

Goldmann rejects an idea he had previously advocated on behalf of the Zionist Executive to the Truman administration of establishing a confederation of Middle East states in which Israel as a member "would have to adapt its world policies to [the Arab majority's] desires." This is no longer practicable, Goldmann says, because Arab unity will take too long to achieve in view of the great cleavage he sees between "feudalistic" and "revolutionary" forces in the Arab world, and more importantly, even when such unity is brought about, "Israel as the only Jewish state in such a confederation would be overwhelmed by the enormous numerical superiority of the Arabs."

But these circumstances would have prevailed in 1945, too, when Goldmann proposed such a scheme to Washington. A more candid explanation for his rejecting it now might have much more to do with the intervening development of the Arab peoples into a more independent force in the seething Third World, not so manageable within an Israeli-American dominated confederation as they might have been in 1945 and deeply resentful after two decades of Israeli and imperialist mistreatment.

Goldmann also rejects two other solutions put forward by some Arab and Israeli groups envisioning either a democratic secular Palestinian state composed of both the present Israelis and the Palestinian Arabs or a separate Arab state of Palestine in the Jordanian West Bank, to be federated with Israel. The latter would be unacceptable to most Arabs, he maintains, because the technological and economic superiority of Israel would soon convert the federated Palestinian state into a mere satellite.

Of the former proposal Goldmann warns, with unusual candor, that "such

a unitarian Palestinian state would do away with the Jewish character of Israel. Had the purpose of Zionism been merely to save homeless and persecuted Jews, this concept might have been of value. But the Zionist ideal was to create a state which, beyond offering refuge to a number of suffering Jews, would be determined by its Jewish majority and would enable the Jewish people to maintain its traditions, develop its genius and contribute to world civilization. This aim could not be achieved by a binational Arab-Jewish Palestinian state, particularly in view of the higher birthrate of the Arab population, which would in a short while become the majority and do away with the Jewish character of this state—even if, as is the case in Lebanon, the equal position of both parts of the population, irrespective of their number, were to be guaranteed constitutionally. In addition, the Arab citizens of such a unitarian Palestinian state would, quite naturally, tend to side with the neighboring Arab states and would, consciously or unconsciously, constitute a 'fifth column' within the state."

What a frank paragraph! First, Goldmann brushes away the countless promises and proclamations from the highest Zionist authorities to the Arab Palestinians that the Jewish settlers had no intention of taking over and that Arab rights would be safeguarded. Then he confirms a woeful trait of Zionism that was long apparent in its official behavior during World War II. At that time the Zionists stayed aloof from the campaign to set aside the racist provisions barring Jewish refugees from the United States. Instead they quite calculatingly devoted themselves to securing Roosevelt's sponsorship of the Jewish state where the Jewish people, what remained of it, could "develop its genius" and where as a welcome by-product the Zionist establishment could get a little more established! Finally the racist consciousness which underlies even a Zionist "dove" like Goldmann emerges quite clearly at the end, where he speaks presumably of a binational state in which equal rights are guaranteed to all and no group dominates another but in which, it seems, "consciously or unconsciously," the Arab citizens still remain a foreign "fifth column." Once an Arab, always an Arab, you see!

Goldmann undoubtedly strikes a

responsive chord in the hearts of many Jews, inside and outside of Israel, when he asserts:

"I cannot imagine that the thousands of years of Jewish suffering, persecution, resistance and heroism should end with a small state like dozens of others today, living continuously in peril of its annihilation, bound to remain mobilized and armed to the teeth, and concentrating its major efforts on physical survival. Nor am I sure that the enthusiasm and loyalty of the Jewish people in the world will forever be secure for such a state. What I suggest here is something exceptional, and therefore the fitting outcome of the exceptional Jewish history."

The long-time Zionist leader is convinced that the big powers do not want war over the Mideast and that the Soviet Union now feels secure enough in the area to be ready for joint East-West agreements there.

He grants the validity of the Arab claim on Palestine, admitting that the Arab-Jewish conflict was a "clash between two rights," but he insists that the uniquely tragic history and circumstances of the Jewish people make their claim "morally and historically superior." Moreover, Goldmann advances the standard Zionist "rationalist" argument:

"The Arab peoples possess immense territories in which they are masters of their destiny, and their survival and future are in no way endangered by their renunciation of their claim to a very small part of their overall territorial expanse; whereas tiny Palestine is for the Jewish people the only means of survival and the sole guarantee of a creative future."

As if historical events, especially in a capitalist world, were logically arranged according to a rational outlook, or one people's needs could be considered "objectively" as superior to another's! We will shortly cite Goldmann's testimony itself as to the degree to which the Jewish people is the "master of its destiny" in a garrison state where they presumably find the "sole guarantee of a creative future." If the logical demands of history are not sufficiently convincing, Goldmann clinches the argument with scientific "proof" by majority vote:

"The fact that in a relatively short period of time most of the peoples of the world have recognized this claim and that, under the impact of the Nazi tragedy, more than two-thirds of the

United Nations approved the idea of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine—the Soviet as well as the Western bloc voting in favor—proves realistically the validity of the Jewish right as against the Arab one."

While his attitude toward the Arabs is patronizing, shallow, and as shown before, tinged with racism, Dr. Goldmann departs from the usual Zionist chauvinist tones:

". . . an appeal to [the Arabs] to be generous and magnanimous and accept the fait accompli of the existence of the tiny Jewish state and even be among its guarantors, could have a tremendous psychological impact on the Arabs who are a very emotional people, given to extremes, able to be cruel and brutal on the one hand, noble and large on the other. It is worthwhile to note here that in Jewish history, with its many encounters with countless peoples, states and civilizations, the Arab-Jewish rencontre was much more human and fair than the instances of Jewish-Christian relations. The great Arab-Jewish civilization in Spain, and the freedom of life and creativeness of Jewish communities in many Moslem countries in the past, may encourage the hope of a positive Arab reaction to this solution of the problem."

In retrospect, Goldmann admits: "As far as the relations with the Arab world are concerned, it was one of the shortcomings of the Zionist movement that, in its early years, it did not fully realize the gravity and importance of this problem." He insists that ". . . neither in ideology nor in practical political action Zionism ever thought of having to resort to an armed conflict with the Arab world in order to create the Jewish state. It was the—maybe naïve—hope and belief of the Zionist movement that it would be possible to get Arab consent to the creation of a Jewish homeland or a Jewish state by bringing the blessings of Western civilization into Palestine. . ."

As Goldmann would have it, it was the willful rejection by the Arabs of the 1947 UN decision to sanction the permanent implantation of these "blessings" in Palestine that unfortunately shattered the peaceful Zionist resolve. Against their will, then, the Zionist leaders of Israel have been forced to proceed from one reluctant military victory over the Arabs to another.

But Goldmann admonishes that

these victories have not brought peace closer, that the Arab states are more unreconciled than ever to Israel's existence, and that their determination to prevail against it is growing rather than diminishing. A peace imposed by Israel or the big powers cannot prove long-lasting, especially when the Arabs have such numerical preponderance and the certainty of eventual technological and military parity.

On the other hand, Goldmann fears the increasing isolation of Israel on a world scale:

"The only real and decisive political support of Israel at the moment is supplied by the United States and a few smaller West European countries. But the experience of the last twenty years has shown that American backing cannot be taken for granted . . ."

Adding to the melancholy picture, Goldmann points to another circumstance that deeply troubles many radical Jewish youth all over the world as well as in Israel:

"Another negative consequence of this permanent state of war is the change of image of the young state of Israel, which is more admired in the world today for its military brilliance than for its spiritual achievements. Although the world justly admires the strength and the courage, the resourcefulness and the unexpected talents of Israel's army, this is certainly nothing either unique or specific to the Jewish people, nor have other peoples and civilizations been admired and remembered in history primarily for their military accomplishments. It is furthermore not to be underestimated that in many parts of the world it is the reactionary, nationalistic groups which have become the sponsors and admirers of Israel, whereas large parts of the progressive world have become disappointed and antagonistic to Israel. In its classical days, Zionism was a movement favored and supported by liberal, progressive and radical groups all over the world. This has changed even considerably and may change even more if the present situation prevails."

With the diminution of anti-Semitic persecution and the decreasing hold of religious authority and tradition upon Jews, the two principal motivations for maintaining a Jewish identity are losing their impact, Goldmann asserts. Coupled with the unlikelihood that most Jews outside

Israel will emigrate there, this makes the role of Israel more vital than ever for him:

"The existence of Israel as the new center where Jewish civilization can be continued and where new ideas will be created, as a source of challenge and inspiration for Diaspora Jewry, is therefore much more essential for Jewish survival today than was even envisaged by Zionist ideologists before the Nazi period."

From this conception flow some of Dr. Goldmann's most novel observations. Both for the survival of the entire Jewish people as well as for Israel's future, he considers that "the number-one problem on which the success or failure of the Zionist solution . . . will finally depend" is Israel-Jewish relations. To be sure, everyone agrees with Goldmann that Israel's existence and remarkable development were made possible largely by the economic, financial, and political help of Jewish communities around the world. But Goldmann sees a *problem* here, where most of his Zionist colleagues complacently limit themselves to self-congratulation.

"The present character and structure of the state," he warns, ". . . endanger this basic precondition of Israel's survival." He goes on to list examples where Israeli policies, right or wrong, created difficulties for Jews living in countries opposed to those policies and considerably strained their attachment and solidarity with Israel. "All this means that a Jewish state which requires the solidarity and the coöperation of the great majority of the Jewish people for its survival must have a character which can claim the sympathy of Jewish communities wherever they live."

In Goldmann's vision, the attainment of such a character demands a neutralized Israel as described before, functioning as a major international cultural and religious center for many faiths, but playing a special role as the "spiritual center" of the Jewish people.

This forlorn hope of divesting the Jewish state as well as the Jewish problem of its political character, though based on the astute recognition of some bitter truths, is surely ironic. In the name of securing a state for the Jews, this state is to be deprived of the main attribute of statehood, namely, formal sovereignty over its policies, foreign and domestic, as well

as full participation in the world arena of national states.

The Jews of Israel are to be directed toward purely "cultural" pursuits divorced from any involvement in meaningful social struggles for fear that some section of world Jewry might be offended or jeopardized. In place of participating in the living contention of social forces, in which significant cultural achievements occur, Goldmann proposes an artificial cultural palace, where one can safely go through the motions of being Jewish.

The Israeli social structure is bound to world capitalism, which at one and the same time sustains and deforms its development. The outbreak of social conflict within Israel reflects not only Israeli but world conditions, and the direction of internal Israeli developments often affects the world scene, especially for Jews abroad.

The enviable neutrality of Switzerland, not so likely to be honored in a future continental war, was based on its very serviceability to the dominant international cartels as a counting house where profits were distributed undisturbed, even during quarrels among the principals. Israel cannot serve this function and it is hopelessly utopian to imagine that religious and cultural dedication can provide a neutral character when the high priests of western oil interests demand a bodyguard state and not temple votaries from the pro-American client regime in Israel.

Once the wards of wayward feudal princes, the Jews are to become in Goldmann's scheme the wards of the world's big powers, new princes whose capriciousness, treachery, and violence towards dependent peoples find no match in any previous age.

Such a proposal cannot possibly win the Jewish masses of Israel away from the influence of the current dead-end Zionist leadership. The record of the United Nations and the great powers cannot possibly inspire confidence among the Jews seeking genuine peace and fraternity with the other Mideast peoples. Moreover, Goldmann hardly even mentions the Palestinian national liberation movement which will have a decisive voice in the future of Palestine-Israel and without whose agreement all plans are worthless.

Dr. Goldmann's "practical" suggestions are obviously void of reality, bubbles that burst at the first touch.

He remains a prisoner of the Zionist program based on the utopia of a special shortcut for the Jewish people, a shortcut that led to the aggressive settler state of Israel whose character today so disturbs this Zionist veteran who devoted fifty years to its creation.

Goldmann's article was born of a futile attempt to meet the glaring contradiction between the claims and the realities of the Zionist scheme which this mercurial leader has the courage to confront openly. Therein lies the chief merit of this unusually candid essay, namely, that it has contributed much to the opening of public debate in Israel over some central questions previously held to be beyond discussion. The widened disagreement among the ruling bodies which has resulted will allow a greater public hearing than ever before for the ideas and program of revolutionary socialism. This program rejects an exclusively Jewish capitalist state as the salvation of the Jewish people and calls for mobilization of rank-and-file workers, farmers, students, women, both Jewish and Arab, to found a secular workers democracy in a socialist Middle East.

The recent events in Israel prove that the young adherents of the revolutionary Marxist program are already moving to reach more decisive strata of the population. They will find an independent road to the alliance of Arab and Jewish toilers which alone can ensure the joint liberation of both peoples.

6 Guerrillas Arrested in Chile

The Chilean minister of the interior Patricio Rojas has announced the arrest of six young revolutionists allegedly training for guerrilla warfare, the Paris daily *Le Monde* reported May 28.

Rojas claimed that the youths had a flag of the MIR (Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria — Movement of the Revolutionary Left) in their possession when they were captured. They were said to belong to a group calling itself "The Organized Vanguard of Popular Struggle."

The six youths, ranging in age from nineteen to twenty-one, were reportedly caught in a police operation in a forest near Valdivia, about 1,000 kilometers south of Santiago.

The police claim that they captured three carbines, a machine pistol, two Mauser rifles, three pistols, and three grenades in the raid. The youths fired at the cops closing in on them, according to Rojas.

The Truth About the Bolivian Trotskyists

[The following letter dated April 10 was sent by Livio Maitan, a leader of the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari (Revolutionary Communist Groups, the Italian section of the Fourth International), to the Italian magazine *Compagni* in answer to material slandering the Bolivian Trotskyists, which it published. The editor of *Compagni*, a mass-circulation periodical supported by the Feltrinelli publishing house, has promised to print Maitan's answer.

[The article to which Livio Maitan replied suggested that members of the POR (Partido Obrero Revolucionario — Revolutionary Workers party, the Bolivian section of the Fourth International) betrayed the ELN (Ejército de Liberación Nacional — National Liberation Army, the guerrilla force once led by Che Guevara) and were responsible for the arrest of a number of guerrillas in July 1969.

[The principal purveyors of this charge seem to be Latin-American Stalinists as well as some other elements on the left who oppose the revolutionary line of the POR.

[The Bolivian Trotskyists have likewise been slandered by Guillermo Lora, a well-known leftist figure in Bolivia. The slanders originating in his group have been repeated by two ultraleft sectarian publications in Europe, *Informations Ouvrières*, the organ of the followers of Pierre Lambert in France; and *Workers Press*, the publication of Gerry Healy in England. (See "Healyites and Lambertists in Strange Company," *Intercontinental Press*, March 2, 1970, page 183.)

* * *

To the Editor,

Following a letter by Edgardo Pellegrini, which to my knowledge has not been answered, I am writing in turn with regard to the article "Bolivia. Verso la riorganizzazione della lotta armata" [Bolivia: Reorganization of the Armed Struggle], which appeared in the first issue of *Compagni*.

This article contained allegations which, as a member of the Fourth International, I cannot leave unan-

swered. Silence would encourage the most damaging assumptions.

I do not know for what purposes these allegations were made, but there was certainly a method to them — the method of cheap slanderous insinuation, which should be banished from the workers movement and therefore must be resolutely combated.

According to your collaborator, the Bolivian repressive forces succeeded in planting agents in the ELN as a result of an agreement by which some members of the POR, the Bolivian section of the Fourth International, entered this organization on an individual basis. This is supposed to be the opinion of "many observers in La Paz." When questioned by [Carlos María] Gutiérrez, Chato Peredo is alleged to have replied that this is probably what gave the repressive forces their opportunity.

I think first of all that you would have been better advised to inform your readers that what you printed was excerpts from an interview that Gutiérrez published in the January 30 issue of *Marcha*. Perhaps, also, it would have been worthwhile to publish the entire interview.

In any case, account should have been taken of the context in which the interview was published. That is, it should have been considered that as a result of the Peruvian and Bolivian events of recent months, tendencies exist that are so impressed by these developments that they have called for abandoning the method of revolutionary struggle represented by guerrilla warfare. For this purpose, these tendencies have tried to present the attitudes of Velasco and Ovando in a favorable light, while at the same time attempting to show that the guerrillas are breaking up under the blows of the repression and as a result of internal dissension.

This is not the place to debate the question. But it must be made clear to the readers of *Compagni* that *Marcha* and Gutiérrez are operating in the way I have described. They have published "sensational" declarations on "socialism" by Ovando, for instance. And more relevant, the inter-

view from which you published excerpts ends with this statement: "If no rapid increase in foreign solidarity toward the Bolivian guerrillas occurs in 1970, it is impossible to see how the ELN can continue profitably a task which today is heroic but in a short time will be suicidal as well."

Since Gutiérrez knows better than we that the hypothetical increase in foreign solidarity cannot take place, the objective of his interview becomes crystal clear.

As for the specific allegation, *Compagni* should be good enough to point out who the "many observers in La Paz" are who so readily dispense opinions on such delicate matters. It is a bit too convenient to hide behind unknown persons who cannot be identified in any way! It is too conveniently forgotten also that even Chato Peredo cannot be considered an "authoritative source" because in the period when the events in question occurred he was not in Bolivia but in Chile. The fact remains, moreover, that when it came to naming names, Peredo could only mention Martínez, a member of the ELN and not of the POR.

I do know of one POR member who joined the ELN, a comrade who fell in a clash in one of the episodes cited by Gutiérrez in the section of his interview which you omitted.

But there was a graver fault than this, and here *Compagni* was directly responsible. The article mentioned the arrests in July but did not say that many POR members were among those arrested. These included Antonio Moreno and Víctor Córdova, who were arrested in Cochabamba the day after Víctor Guerra's arrest.

These arrests and the political affiliation of those arrested was amply reported in the international press, by *Bandiera Rossa* in Italy, as well as by various Cuban publications. Why did *Compagni* fail to say anything about this and instead uncritically and irresponsibly repeat the cheap insinuation that "many observers" are supposed to have passed on to Gutiérrez?

Why didn't you inform your readers that Hugo González (whom *Compagni* fancifully described as a "dissident"), the leader of the POR and a member of the Fourth International, is being hunted by the police and is considered by the regime — as is apparent from the press — to be one of its worst enemies?

I am very well aware that in under-

ground work and in guerrilla warfare there is always the possibility of infiltration by spies. But when spies are really discovered, what is done and what was done by the partisans, and in Italy, too, is to reveal their full names together with the charges. If only suspicions exist, the normal reaction is to conceal them and take measures to trap the spies, not to give interviews to newspapers!

When, to the contrary, no proofs are given and insinuations are made, the end is clearly a political one, an attempt to slander political opponents. And the consequences of this can be extremely serious. Throwing such accusations at people who are risking their necks is not the same as hurling some epithet in a university assembly.

While awaiting "proofs" of your accu-

sations, either from you or from Gutiérrez, I ask that you publish this letter.

Livio Maitan

P. S. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that your translator censored Gutiérrez's text in two not unimportant instances. What was the reason for this?

Italian CP Puts Trotskyist Demonology on Shelf

[A leading "theoretician" of the Italian Communist party, Luciano Gruppi, attempted to define his party's position toward Trotskyism in the May 3 issue of the main CP daily *l'Unità*. He was replying to a letter to the editor from a local party member.

[The Italian CP is oriented toward achieving a coalition with other "progressive forces." Of all the European CPs — with the exception of the Finnish — it seems to have the best chance of eventually being brought into the capitalist government.

[To achieve this goal the Italian CP has had to get rid of its "totalitarian" image. From the point of view of its potential Social Democratic and liberal allies, this has meant dumping the verbal affirmation of a revolutionary perspective and also replacing crude, dictatorial Stalinist methods of running the party with more subtle "democratic" ones.

[In order to clean up its image the Italian CP has had to quietly shelve a good deal of the mythology associated with Stalinism. The anti-Trotskyist demonology, the great frame-ups, and the frenzied glorification of the "Sun of the Peoples" have been given up as part of Operation Mop Up.

[In trying to execute this turn the central party leadership has come under fire from pro-Moscow loyalists and pro-Peking Stalinist fundamentalists. The following exchange of letters, which we have translated from *l'Unità*, indicates the difficulties encountered by the Italian CP leadership in cleaning up their image.

[However, it must be recognized that by at least partially disavowing the Stalinist heritage of the Italian CP in his answer to Rolando Martini, Lu-

ciano Gruppi has made a contribution to rational debate in the workers movement.]

* * *

Dear *Unità*,

As the result of an argument that arose among comrades I would like to know whether the description of Trotskyists as "a band of assassins and spies" which appeared in the November 7, 1942, issue of *l'Unità* still holds. Furthermore, can a sympathizer of Trotsky who characterizes thirty years' experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union under Stalin's guidance as a period of oppression and exploitation of the working class legitimately be a member of the PCI [Partito Comunista Italiano — Italian Communist party]?

Awaiting your reply in our paper, Communist greetings.

Rolando Martini

* * *

Dear Martini,

The characterization of Trotskyists you refer to belongs to a different era in the history of the Communist movement. At that time polemics were still bitter and were conducted in accordance with a method which our party has definitely put behind it.

The question of evaluating the Trotskyist movement is more complex. This movement has held diverse positions. Elements have been present in it or have infiltrated into it who have made attacking the USSR their principal objective (which Trotsky in general did not). Under the cover of anti-Soviet positions, provocateurs have

infiltrated the Trotskyist movement.

There have been and are, however, honest militants in the tiny Trotskyist movement whose ideas we must criticize but whose character we must respect.

That drastic degradation and extremely grave violations of Soviet democracy occurred in the Stalin period can no longer be doubted by anyone. We have denounced these deformations of socialism and continue to do so (seeking to understand their causes) more severely than others. We have never gone so far, and we do not think that it is correct to go so far, as to define the Stalin period as one of "oppression and exploitation of the working class."

The Russian working class did suffer because of this method of leadership (although the primary sufferers were the party and state cadres) in this period. On the other hand, it made great gains. The entire economy of the USSR was transformed. Despite its degeneration, the Stalin leadership in general had the active support of the working class. Without this, for example, the victory over Nazism would have been impossible. An impartial historical evaluation must be made today of Stalin also — we must see both the dark spots and the bright spots of his character.

As for the criterion for membership in our party, this is provided by the statutes. Membership in the PCI is open to anyone who accepts and actively supports the party program (as defined in the programmatic declaration of the Eighth Congress), fulfilling all the duties of membership. The rights of membership derive from this.

Cordially,

Luciano Gruppi

How Healyites Reported April 26 March in London

[A demonstration in solidarity with the April 15 demonstrations in the United States was held in London on April 26.

[The initiative in this was taken by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign (VSC) which called together an ad hoc committee to plan the action. The Socialist Labour League (SLL—a sectarian grouping which claims to be Trotskyist) was invited to join the ad hoc committee but ignored the invitation.

[A few days before April 26, it was learned that several Black Power organizations planned to protest on the same day against the threat of United States military intervention in Trinidad. After consultations between the Black Power groups and the ad hoc committee, it was decided to have a joint demonstration against U.S. aggression in Vietnam and Trinidad.

[At the offices of the Trinidad High Commission, there was a clash between demonstrators and police. The march then proceeded to the American embassy. Scuffles occurred here but no arrests were made. From the embassy the demonstrators marched to Hyde Park and then began to disperse.

[But as the crowd of about 1,500 was dispersing, the police launched a brutal attack, singling out Black marchers, many of whom were arrested.

[Below we reprint a number of documents concerned with the April 26 demonstration. First are excerpts from misleading accounts printed in the capitalist press.

[The second document is an April 27 release by the VSC which corrects the press distortions.

[Next is an account of the demonstration which appeared in *Workers Press*, the official organ of the SLL, on April 28, and which not only repeats some of the distortions of the capitalist press, but adds a few more designed to buttress the SLL's opposition to black nationalism.

[Finally, we reprint a statement by the International Marxist Group (IMG

—the British section of the Fourth International).]

From the April 27 Daily Express

"Four policemen were hurt yesterday when Black Power militants took over a protest march and charged a cordon guarding the U. S. Embassy in Grosvenor Square. . . . As the marchers began to disperse in the Square,* the militants charged police with sticks and bars."

From the April 27 Guardian

"Police arrested 20 people during violent clashes with Black Power demonstrators in London yesterday. One constable was hit on the head with a heavy bar and other officers pelted with bottles and stones. . . . The demonstrators—about 200 coloured men and women—repeatedly charged police lines at Speakers Corner chanting 'Black Power' and 'Hands Off Trinidad'. . . . Police 'snatch squads' moving into the crowd were punched and spat upon. . . ."

From the April 27 London Times

"Police arrested 20 demonstrators including two women, in a 30 minute battle at Speakers Corner Hyde Park yesterday after an attempted Black Power takeover of an anti Vietnam war rally. . . . The Black Power supporters joined the march and persuaded it to go to the Trinidad and Tobago High Commission. . . ."

* * *

April 27 Statement of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign

The Vietnam Solidarity Campaign would like to clear up some errors of fact in the press reports of the April 26th demonstration.

First, the demonstration was not

* The *Daily Express's* reporter apparently missed the demonstration. The actual police attack occurred as the marchers were dispersing from Speakers Corner in Hyde Park.

"taken over" by Black Panthers or "diverted" to the Trinidad High Commission. In fact the demonstration was a united action in solidarity with the Indo-Chinese and Trinidadian peoples and was supported by a number of groups including VSC and the Black Panthers. There were discussions prior to the demonstration in which the route, including the march to the Trinidad High Commission, was agreed.

Secondly, the hostility of the police towards the demonstration was evident from the start. At the rally prior to the march the Ad Hoc Committee was denied the right to use loudspeakers, and leafletting was arbitrarily prohibited.

Third, the main trouble with the police took place not in Belgrave or Grosvenor Squares, but at Speakers' Corner. Up to the time the march went to Speakers' Corner to disperse, the demonstration had been cohesive. But as the demonstrators were dispersing, the police moved in, using, as the *Guardian* uncritically but correctly put it, the technique of "snatch squads". It was here that people attempting to defend themselves from unprovoked police attacks were arrested.

The VSC is in full solidarity with the militants arrested on Sunday and with the black people's organisations and strongly condemns the brutality and racist behaviour of the police on the April 26th anti-imperialist demonstration.

* * *

From the April 28 Workers Press

'Black Power' takes over V. S. C. march

The political bankruptcy of the protest movement led by the revisionist International Marxist Group of Purdie and Jordan was more than matched last Sunday when the soul brothers of 'Black Power' took over the strictly segregated Vietnam march of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign.

They converted it into a display of petty-bourgeois exasperation and despair, which made even the antics of

the Maoists and Tariq Ali's 'action men' in March 1968 seem like small stuff.

Instead of trying to mobilize the working class against the hated regime of Eric Williams as well as the military help which Wilson and Nixon gives [sic] him, the 'Black Power' men combined their contempt for the working class with their hatred for the capitalist state in a symbolic punch-up outside the Trinidad High Commissioner's Office and followed it up with a heroic but futile charge at Speakers' Corner.

Arrests

The result: 20 demonstrators were arrested.

The march, which began at Speakers' Corner, went to the Trinidad High Commissioner's Office, then to Grosvenor Square where massive police contingents hemmed in the march.

Finally, the revisionists, their protest ritual finished, went home.

Battle

The 'Black Power' men went back to Speakers' Corner and a fierce battle ensued between the police and the demonstrators.

For the first time the police used a technique now familiar to Belfast workers—the 'snatch squad'.

After half an hour's fighting the crowd dispersed.

* * *

Statement by the International Marxist Group

A "report" in the *Workers Press*, organ of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League (28/7/70), reveals the depths of gutter journalism to which this organisation has sunk.

The article, an account of a VSC demonstration, is so full of lies and distortions that it is scarcely conceivable that it could have been written by anyone actually present. In fact, a comparison between the *Workers Press* account and the reports which appeared in the capitalist press suggests that the report was pieced together from that very source. One may ask how much of the rest of the *Workers Press* columns are similarly concocted? How much is honest first hand

reporting and how much simply filched from the yellow press?

The only original features of the article in question are the sneers directed at the organisers and against the black comrades who bore the brunt of police brutality; sneers against the "soul brothers of 'Black Power'" have a frankly racist overtone in the context of the attacks made by the police on the demonstration in general and the black comrades in particular. To suggest that the demonstration was in some way segregated is rather sickening. These outright lies can only discredit the leaders of the SLL: that at least is to the good for their political nakedness can now be seen by a wider audience than ever before.

This unfortunate piece of editing flows logically enough from the political positions held by the SLL, whose leadership has for some time now held that the concepts of Black Power and of Black Nationalism are but a variety of racialism, to be condemned and counterposed to the idea of black and white unity. What they choose to ignore is that the Black Power movement can play a role in mobilising a sector of the working class against the capitalist system.

Is it not true that black workers are the hardest hit by unemployment, that they are often consigned to the worst jobs and slums, that they suffer attacks from hooligans as well as from police brutality? It is this that has given the black movement its base of support in many parts of the USA and latterly in Trinidad.

In Britain the Black Power movement is in part a reflection of the more fully developed movements elsewhere; but it corresponds to the real needs of black workers who feel increasingly threatened by racialism in all its forms.

The issue of the *Workers Press* in question here also reports a meeting of 500 immigrant workers on the subject of racialism. The report completely overlooks the measures which many black workers are taking on this matter—the formation of defence guards. This development has caused "concern" to the authorities, but so far it seems has not penetrated the awareness of the editors of the *Workers Press*. Instead, these workers are treated to an abstract appeal for unity.

Considering that the working class as a whole in Britain has not yet lived up to its historic responsibilities to defend the interests of its comrades

in and from the former colonies, the duty of all socialists is to give every assistance to the measures which these workers are of necessity taking for their own protection. Nowhere in the *Workers Press* snide attacks on the April 26th demonstration is there a call for the extension of these measures, or for the defence of those victimised by the police.

The reason for the failure of the British workers to act decisively in support of victimised black workers is the role of reformist leaderships, who have capitulated to the pressure of imperialist ideology.

The role of Marxists today is to construct a new leadership which can fight to overcome this legacy. But this cannot be done by basing one's actions only on the level of the least advanced section. Calls for unity of all workers in this context imply that the black workers already in struggle must wait for the rest (including the SLL) to catch up.

The position of the International Marxist Group is clear—we are not content with idle phrasemongering. We demand active support for those in struggle, and seek to win new forces to their side.

Without a clear stand on this question, all the talk of building a revolutionary leadership which fills the columns of the *Workers Press* is so much idle chatter. The editors of the *Workers Press* deserve the widest condemnation. We demand that the article relating to the April 26th demonstration be retracted, and ask all members of the SLL to bring pressure to this end.

Correction

Owing to a bit of stuttering in our electronic typesetting machine, some errors appeared in the document "Varga's Secret Testament Condemning Stalinism" in last week's issue.

These errors are all on page 531. In column 1, "Tooaastill. . ." should read: "To a still. . ." In column 2, two paragraphs begin with ". . the . . ." In each instance, this should read "The. . ." The phrase "Offcourse. . ." should read "Of course. . ." And "Theparty. . ." should read "The party. . ."

Balaguer Declared Winner in Election

By Gerry Foley

Trujillo's former vice-president Joaquín Balaguer scored an unimpressive victory May 17 in the Dominican presidential elections, which were boycotted by the major opposition party, the PRD (Partido Revolucionario Dominicano — Dominican Revolutionary party) of Juan Bosch. More than fifty persons were reported killed in the dubious electoral contest.

Balaguer was officially credited with 607,717 votes as against the 769,265 counted for him in the 1966 elections, which he won with the protection and support of the American military forces then occupying the country. Thus the ex-Trujillista's vote was cut by 161,548 votes.

The lackluster electoral opposition, split into four parties, none of which was conceded the slightest chance of winning, was credited with about 45 percent of the vote.

Balaguer had reportedly originally agreed to withdraw after one term in favor of his vice-president Augusto Lora. When he failed to do this, Lora decided to run as the candidate of a splinter party, the Movimiento de Integración Nacionalista [Movement of Nationalist Unity], and won 240,557 votes.

The ultrarightist Quisqueyano Democrata party of General Wessin y Wessin got 153,591 votes. The general earned the name "Butcher of San Isidro" during the revolution of April 1965 when he ordered the machine-gunning of civilians. The San Isidro military base was the last redoubt where the defeated military government held out until relieved by U. S. marines.

The reformist Partido Revolucionario Social-Cristiano (Revolutionary Social Christian party) apparently failed to spark any enthusiasm. Its candidate Dr. Alfonso Moreno Martínez got 58,949 votes.

The weakest showing in the elections was made by the Movimiento de Conciliación Nacional [Movement of National Conciliation] of Héctor García Godoy. García Godoy was installed as interim president during the American occupation and set the stage



JUAN BOSCH

for the Balaguer takeover. He died last month. A stand-in candidate, Jaime Manuel Fernández, won 51,039 votes.

The total votes cast were 1,111,853, or 200,000 less than in 1966. The total electorate is estimated at around 2,000,000. "Independent observers," according to the May 19 issue of the conservative *Christian Science Monitor*, conceded that abstentions may have run as high as 800,000.

"This [the number of abstentions] is particularly significant in a country where the poor people get jobs, patronage and food dependent on their voting card being stamped," Georgie Anne Geyer wrote in the May 30 issue of the liberal weekly *The New Republic*.

The clearest lesson of the May 17 vote was that the proimperialist reactionary forces to whom the American army handed back power five years ago have been unable to develop a credible parliamentary or electoral system to serve as a buffer for popular unrest.

"The election returns reflect persisting divisions and political immaturity

in the tiny Caribbean republic," the *New York Times* commented in an editorial May 19. This sophisticated spokesman of American capital predicted that "the Dominican Republic may yet revert to one of these unhappy extremes of right or left unless President Balaguer's reformist party lives up to its name more in his second term than it has during his first four years in office."

The civil war that broke out in 1965 continues in latent form. "During this four-year period [1966-70] about 500 persons died mysteriously and not so mysteriously (one of Balaguer's top military officers recently machine-gunned a Boschist taxi-driver at noon on a busy street) in this country of about 4.5 million persons," Miss Geyer wrote. "All but about 30 of the dead come from the PRD and the farther Left. So it is well to remember, if one thinks that perhaps the Dominican Republic has had enough of civil war, that this is fully half of the 1000 people who died in 1965."

In these conditions, the modernist and nationalist elements of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie represented by Bosch have no hope of carrying out any reforms or winning concessions from imperialism except by taking the lead of a mass mobilization.

As a result, Bosch has rejected electoralism in the name of what he calls "dictatorship with popular backing," which would presumably be something like the radical bourgeois regime that emerged from the revolutionary period in Mexico. In this case, the incipient Mexican capitalist class was able to base itself on a workers and peasants revolution to achieve some of the prerequisites for industrial development.

Bosch's gamble, however, is a dangerous one. Leaders and organizations may develop in the struggle that will prevent him from harnessing the mass movement. Even in the absence of a revolutionary vanguard, he might not be able to control a popular mobilization. Conditions for socialist revolution are riper throughout the world than they were at the time of the Mexican revolution.

The question also remains, even after the proimperialist forces have shown their inability to stabilize the country, whether Washington will permit any dangerous experiments in its Caribbean backyard.