

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 22

June 11, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Johnson Gives the Green Light to His Generals	2
Chinese Army Abolishes System of Ranks	3
Cubans Announce Big Sugar Harvest	4
Bolivian Workers Resist Counterrevolution	5
Castro Calls for Revolutionary Defense Against Imperialism	8
Wilson's "Special Relationship"	11
Japanese Revolted by U.S. War in Vietnam	14
Havana Institute Cancels Tour of Canadians	15
Tshombe Named as Murderer of Lumumba	17
Head of Indonesian CP Attacks "Trotskyism"	18
Bosch Couldn't Deliver Lie Needed by Johnson	19
Cuban Government's Position in Economic Discussion	20
MPLA Spokesman Praises Mao	20
New Road to Peace	22
"The Most Discredited President"	22
The Vote for the Left in the Belgian Elections	
-- by Henri Valin	23
A Case Where Patience Is No Virtue	26
Trend Among U.S. Whites Is Away from Racism	27
Demonstrations in Chile Against U.S.	28
Italian CP Leaders Air Differences	
-- by Sirio Di Giuliomaria	29
French SP Faces Crisis of Perspective	
-- by Pierre Frank	32
Deutscher Describes "Teach-In" Movement	35
Suggest Volunteers to Aid Dominicans	37
Shastri's Trip to Moscow -- by Kailas Chandra	38
Dangeites Back Shastri Government -- by S.R.Singh	40
Fight for Civil Liberties in India	41
Eritreans Lose Arms Shipment	41
German Unions Block Authoritarian Legislation	42
Munich Marchers Protest U.S. Role in Vietnam	43
Guerrilla War Continues in Angola	44

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 22

June 11, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Johnson Gives the Green Light to His Generals	2
Chinese Army Abolishes System of Ranks	3
Cubans Announce Big Sugar Harvest	4
Bolivian Workers Resist Counterrevolution	5
Castro Calls for Revolutionary Defense Against Imperialism	8
Wilson's "Special Relationship"	11
Japanese Revolted by U.S. War in Vietnam	14
Havana Institute Cancels Tour of Canadians	15
Tshombe Named as Murderer of Lumumba	17
Head of Indonesian CP Attacks "Trotskyism"	18
Bosch Couldn't Deliver Lie Needed by Johnson	19
Cuban Government's Position in Economic Discussion	20
MPLA Spokesman Praises Mao	20
New Road to Peace	22
"The Most Discredited President"	22
The Vote for the Left in the Belgian Elections	
-- by Henri Valin	23
A Case Where Patience Is No Virtue	26
Trend Among U.S. Whites Is Away from Racism	27
Demonstrations in Chile Against U.S.	28
Italian CP Leaders Air Differences	
-- by Sirio Di Giuliomaria	29
French SP Faces Crisis of Perspective	
-- by Pierre Frank	32
Deutscher Describes "Teach-In" Movement	35
Suggest Volunteers to Aid Dominicans	37
Shastri's Trip to Moscow -- by Kailas Chandra	38
Dangeites Back Shastri Government -- by S.R.Singh	40
Fight for Civil Liberties in India	41
Eritreans Lose Arms Shipment	41
German Unions Block Authoritarian Legislation	42
Munich Marchers Protest U.S. Role in Vietnam	43
Guerrilla War Continues in Angola	44

JOHNSON GIVES THE GREEN LIGHT TO HIS GENERALS

On June 8 the American people were informed by Robert J. McCloskey, press officer of the U.S. State Department, that they were in a shooting war on the Asian mainland. It was not exactly news, since the whole world has known it for some time and the protests have been growing in volume and energy, including protests from wide sectors of the American people.

This, however, marks the end of the series of lying pretenses about American troops being in Vietnam solely as "advisers," as offering "logistic" support, as only "defending" themselves from "attack," as only engaging in "reprisals." McCloskey revealed that orders have been sent to the American commanders in Saigon that "American forces would be available for combat support together with Vietnamese forces as and when necessary."

This means that Johnson has increased the escalation by one more rung on the ladder leading to nuclear conflict. The step is an important one because it means the deployment of American forces on their own in the battle areas. They can now openly take the offensive. Johnson has crossed the threshold in his plan to convert the American intervention in the Vietnamese civil war into another Korea.

In the United States, the step can be expected to arouse a fresh wave of apprehension and dismay. Protests are bound to rise. Johnson, like Truman before him, has taken it upon himself to plunge the country into a dirty colonial war without consulting the people, without consulting congress, without even bothering to notify the American public, without UN cover, without Allied backing except for verbal assurances of such figures as Wilson and Erhard.

Some 51,000 American troops are now in Vietnam, with thousands more on the way. Within a few weeks it is expected that the figure will be between 75,000 and 100,000. Estimates on the eventual number range between 250,000 to 500,000. A question now under discussion in military circles is whether this large number of troops will not require mobilization of the United States and putting the country on a war footing.

On the other side, the policy of the Chinese, the big target aimed at by Johnson, is difficult to understand. In an interview in the Cairo Al Mussawar June 3, Chou En-lai issued the soothing assurance that the war in Vietnam would not lead to a world war. This flies in the face of the judgment of experts in all other countries, including those in the Pentagon.

Chou also implied that the Chinese government would not ask the Soviet Union for help even if the U.S. should attack China.

He did modify these statements, however, by saying that if necessary China would enter a war "in accordance with the treaties" between China and the Soviet Union and would enter a war "on the side of the Soviet Union."

Since February 7, when Johnson began bombing north Vietnam, the Chinese as well as the Soviet leaders have held back on mobilizing a powerful united resistance on a world scale against the American aggression. For months even material aid seemed to be reaching the Vietnamese freedom fighters in only limited quantities. The effect of this was to give an impression of letting things drift and failing to give the Vietnamese effective backing.

The main result has been to give the Johnson administration the feeling that it can act with impunity. Thus instead of considering the need to withdraw from an untenable position, the Pentagon has continued the build up. The difficulty of ousting the American troops as they become deeply entrenched rises accordingly and with it the danger of the conflict ending in a nuclear disaster.

At the same time the cost to the Vietnamese people in blood and suffering and destruction of their country is also rising. They are the ones who must pay most directly as a result of the steady build up in American troops.

CHINESE ARMY ABOLISHES SYSTEM OF RANKS

On June 1 an order issued by the State Council of China went into effect abolishing insignia indicating the various services, arms and branches. Only a red star will be worn on the collar and a red star on the hat. In a further order the form of address was modified so as to remove references to rank.

The order, announced May 24, said that ranks were to be abolished. However, the order, reported in the May 25 Hsinhua, emphasizes changes in uniform, stating, among other things, that "the western style of military dress worn by field grade officers and above, and the skirt and blouse style of dress worn by women, shall be abolished."

An editorial in the Liberation Army Daily May 25 also stated that "our army is a highly centralized and unified fighting collective which possesses strict organizational discipline....The lower levels submit to the higher levels and the fighters respect the cadres...."

It would thus seem that what has been abolished is the model imitating the armies of capitalist western Europe and the United

States. A simpler and more plebian model, much like that of the Cuban army, has replaced it.

The Liberation Army Daily states that "Our army had no system of military ranks during the protracted revolutionary wars of the past. This system came into effect from 1955 onwards, after victory throughout the country. Ten years of practice has proved that it is not in conformity with our army's glorious tradition with close relations between the officers and men, between the higher and lower levels and between the army and the people."

No explanation is offered as to why the system of ranks was introduced in 1955. No explanation is offered as to its defects, what was discovered in practice and why it is only now that a change has been made.

It would seem, however, that it was introduced in 1955 in imitation of the Soviet Army where the system of ranks was copied by Stalin from the models of capitalist armies. Perhaps, as in the Soviet Union, the system of ranks fostered the appearance of a hardened military caste seeking undue privileges.

If the abolition of ranks brings the Chinese army closer to the model of the Red Army of the USSR in the days when it was headed by Leon Trotsky, this would be a most significant step. Mao is scarcely likely to go this far, however, in flagrant contradiction of his current campaign for the rehabilitation of Stalin.

In addition, to hold up the model of the Red Army as it was in the days of Trotsky, would imply a further step, which would truly be of colossal significance not only for China but for the revolutionary movement throughout the world -- the election of officers.

There is no indication that this is contemplated. The hierarchical structure set up by Mao is exceptionally rigid.

What is most likely involved is a concession to widespread sentiment in the ranks against a certain growth of privileges in the armed forces. The concession is to be welcomed. It should help increase the fighting capacity of the army in face of the rising threat from American imperialism.

CUBANS ANNOUNCE BIG SUGAR HARVEST

Cuba's sugar production this year, it was announced June 8, reached 6,000,000 tons, the fourth largest since 1900 and the second largest since 1959. The figure represents an immense triumph for the Revolution, all the more so in view of the imperialist blockade and the innumerable U.S. predictions that the economy was about to collapse.

BOLIVIAN WORKERS RESIST COUNTERREVOLUTION

LA PAZ, May 30 -- The military government has gained a battle, but it is far from having won the war.

We are facing a most reactionary government which is going all out in its effort to destroy the trade-union organizations and revolutionary Marxist parties.

The strike action taken in protest over the exiling of Juan Lechin, which also had the aim of gaining a wage increase and defending trade-union rights, was met by the military junta with a declaration of war.

The workers districts in La Paz and other cities were occupied militarily in an unequal armed struggle. Then came the bombing of the Continental radio station owned by the Federación de Trabajadores Fabriles. They took the main buildings and factories of La Paz. Many workers were killed or wounded. The army employed modern equipment, including mortars, bazookas, pursuit planes and bombers.

They then invaded the mining centers. The Milluni district, seventy-five kilometers from La Paz, which has a population of some 5,000, was defended by 500 armed men supported by hundreds of peasants who were called in but who had no arms. The invaders numbered 3,000 fully equipped troops.

The air force machine-gunned the mine camp in advance and bombed the strongholds of the mine workers. The infantry and motorized units followed up in a ferocious butchery. With the defeat, sectors of the armed workers retreated to the nearest mountain, the 6,000-meter-high [19,685 feet], snow-covered Huayna Potosí. A plane was brought down by rifle fire.

Milluni fell into the hands of the military and a brutal repression was begun. Among those killed were Trotskyists. Some Trotskyists escaped. Others were jailed.

At the same time, the army attacked the mining district of Kami. Again the air force began with its butchery to be followed up by the army; and Kami fell.

The mining district of the South, with its center at Telamayu and Atocha was likewise attacked. Atocha is a few kilometers from Tupiza on the Argentine frontier where the international railway goes through. The battle lasted all day but the army was defeated, seventy prisoners falling into the hands of the workers. The army called for reinforcements.

The reply in La Paz to these criminal attacks launched by the

military was the formation of armed squads. In the El Alto district where the international airport and the military air base are located, fighting occurred on May 23, the day after the battle at Milluni. Armed workers' and people's groups fought the army forces. Planes moved in again to machine-gun and bomb these districts.

From El Alto the struggle moved into the populous areas of La Paz, the fighting continuing through May 24 and May 25. Every night since then squads of workers have fought with the army.

In the districts of Munaypata, Villa Victoria, Alto Lima, Nueva Potosí, Achachicala, which constitute the city's proletarian belt, the army has not been able to entrench itself and every house is a kind of barricade. Sharpshooters are to be found throughout these districts. The difference in armament and supplies of ammunition places the armed militia at a disadvantage.

In this situation of open civil war, of partial military victories by the government, the University students and teachers intervened in order to mediate and gain a truce. Differences appeared at this moment between the army under the command of Ovando Candia and the military junta headed by Barrientos. Ovando agreed to the truce on certain conditions, among them being that the army was not to enter the main mining centers like Colquiri, Huanuni, and the South sector where they were repulsed, and Catavi and Siglo XX. But these centers are encircled and there is resistance among the generals to withdrawing.

As a result of the truce, the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana] suspended the strike and on May 27 began normalizing activities in the plants and mines. Nevertheless, fighting is continuing in the cities with a tendency toward guerrilla war and acts of sabotage. The population, the factory workers and miners are moving spontaneously in this direction.

The government blames all this on what it calls an "international Communist rebellion" involving Juan Lechín's PRIN [Partido Revolucionario de Izquierda Nacionalista], the POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario] and the PCB [Partido Comunista Boliviana]. But in reality it is the result of a military provocation and preventive attack. The seizure and exiling of Lechín, the bombing of the workers' radio stations, and the arrest of other trade-union leaders were inspired by the United States as were the grave events in Santo Domingo. These provocations ended in the bloody happenings. The workers entered into conflict without adequate organization and preparation.

The country is now in a state of war, under military rule. The Supreme Court has been converted by decree into a tribunal of Military Justice. Trials are conducted in accordance with the military penal code.

The mines have been declared military zones under the command of military chiefs, although they have not yet succeeded in taking over. To accomplish this, the army will have to battle its way into the mines. In the name of rehabilitating the mines, wages have been slashed, mass firings have been initiated, and hiring of selected personnel under worse conditions has been ordered. The trade-union leaders have been ordered out of office by the government.

All these measures have been rejected by the mine workers. Workers assemblies have backed their leaders in open defiance of the government.

In the factories the leaders have likewise been backed. At SAID, the biggest textile plant, the leaders were given a unanimous vote of confidence in a general assembly. This included three who were exiled to Paraguay by the government. Similar actions have been taken in the other plants.

On the surface, things again appear tranquil, but it amounts to only a temporary truce and both sides know it.

The government is trying to win public opinion. It is turning to the church, holding masses against "Communism" attended by the whole cabinet. To assure the support of the church, bombs have been placed in buildings used by Acción Católica. These were attributed to "Communists" but constitute provocations.

The government put out an atrocity story, claiming that in the districts of Munaypata and Villa Victoria five soldiers and an army officer were taken prisoner and shot by the armed workers militia. They said that the execution was ordered by "Communist" leaders, naming Guillermo Lora [a well-known political figure of Trotskyist background], Hugo González M. [of the POR] and Máximo Nogales [of the PCB]. A hunt was opened to bring them into a military tribunal. Lora's home was raided and his library seized.

The three were threatened, if captured, with being executed in the main plaza as a warning to all "Communists."

More than 200 workers and labor figures have been imprisoned. Deaths are above 300 and the figure for the wounded is much higher.

A virtual censorship has been established over the press and radio.

The views of the military junta can be judged from the following. After the revolution of 1952, two murals were painted in the Palacio de Gobierno representing the basic conquests of the revolution (nationalization of the mines, the agrarian reform, etc.). Another one was painted in the Palacio Legislativo representing Bolivia's future. These murals were the work of Alandia Pantoja, a

former Trotskyist, who belonged to the school of Diego Rivera. The military junta ordered the destruction of these murals.

A hunt has been opened for books and pamphlets deemed to be "Communist."

People have been arrested for having pictures of Fidel Castro in their homes.

The "anti-Communist" hysteria among the generals has not exempted even the Christian Democrats from attack. Barrientos has already attacked Remo Di Natali, head of the Partido Demócrata Cristiano, because he has an Italian name.

After the truce signed between Ovando and the University people plus the COB, a shift occurred in the military junta. Ovando was elevated to the position of "co-president" with the same rank as Barrientos. Thus Bolivia has two presidents with co-rule. In this artificial way they are trying to adjust the internal crisis that arose in the army itself.

GASTRO CALLS FOR REVOLUTIONARY DEFENSE AGAINST IMPERIALISM

[The following extract from a speech given by Fidel Castro on May 1 has been translated by World Outlook. The passage is of unusual interest in showing the revolutionary basis on which the Cuban leaders stand in their appeal for a united defense in face of the aggressions of U.S. imperialism and the danger that these aggressions can take the world into a nuclear holocaust.]

* * *

The imperialists have become extremely aggressive. And they are aggressive, as I already said, because they are desperate and afraid. And we also know that by their very nature they are master blackmailers. In Vietnam they began with reprisals. They continued with systematic attacks and with sending troops to the South and with the bombing of Vietnam, etc.

Naturally this aggressive attitude of the imperialists worries people everywhere. In less than a year there was the intervention in the Congo, the aggression in Vietnam, the invasion of Santo Domingo -- a series of irresponsible, adventurous, dangerous actions. Mad with fear of revolution, shocked at the inevitable transformations occurring in the world, the United States is seeking to block the road to history in Asia, Africa, Latin America.

It is necessary to stop the imperialist aggressiveness. Cer-

tainly, the problem of peace preoccupies us. It would be senseless, irresponsible, not to understand the importance of peace. But the defense of peace cannot be passive. You can't preach for a peace like heaven. Peace at any price? No! The peoples' concern for peace does not involve and must never involve giving the imperialists the right to sacrifice peoples with impunity.

We believe, we sincerely believe, that this is not the road to peace. We are faced with the mentality of blackmailers, of exploiters, of calculators, the Yankee mentality, the mentality of the Yankee rulers.

First of all, this Mr. Johnson is a perfect actor. During his election campaign against Goldwater -- who put forth the aggressive theses of imperialism -- he presented himself as the defender of peaceful solutions, as the enemy of any military adventure. He did this to exploit the worry and uneasiness of the North American people and to take votes away from Goldwater. And then, elected president, he carries out the policy of the Pentagon "gorillas" [military strong men], the most reactionary circles of the United States -- a policy of blackmail, based on the theory of nuclear equilibrium. We believe that it is necessary to change this mentality, to show the imperialists that they are playing with fire. Otherwise the danger of war will increase.

Our people, and all the peoples of the world, all the peoples of the socialist camp, know that it is necessary to face this reality and the risks flowing from it. These are the risks imposed on us by history and by the epoch in which we are living. It is necessary to cut the claws of imperialism, in Vietnam and everywhere. In Vietnam, the USA is trying to create the necessary conditions for internationalizing the conflict and smothering the freedom movement.

It is necessary to spike their plans, to turn north Vietnam into a cemetery for Yankee planes. By all means -- with planes and anti-aircraft fire, with the aid and participation of the whole socialist camp. But this is not enough. It is also necessary to clearly tell the United States that internationalizing the war in south Vietnam means internationalizing the conflict in southeast Asia; to warn that the presence of South Korean and Australian troops authorizes the socialist camp to send its own volunteers to south Vietnam. Imperialism must be told that we are ready to face the necessary risks. And I am certain that they will then begin to think, while now they are attacking without thinking; they are killing and destroying without thinking. No one wants or can want war. People want to live in peace, to work in peace, to develop in peace, to seek their own happiness in peace. But happiness is a right that must be conquered with intelligence.

In face of a policy of aggression and intervention, a strategy is necessary, the strategy that must give an impulse to revolution

everywhere, on all fronts. In opposition to the strategy of aggression, of intervention -- the revolutionary strategy of the peoples, the revolutionary movements and the Communist parties of the entire world. Against the aggression of the "gringos," a revolutionary offensive on all fronts, an impulse to the revolution on all fronts! We want peace, but we will not pray for peace, we will not make angelic declarations in favor of peace. No one can accuse us of being bitter-enders; it's one thing to be bitter-enders and something else again to oppose the imperialists' blackmail. It's one thing to be bitter-enders and something else again to establish a scale of values; and in this scale of values in human consciousness, peace is important. However, there is something that stands above peace. We want peace for everyone; the conception of peace for us and war for the others is foreign to us. Peace for us while they drop phosphorous bombs and napalm on the Vietnamese? No! Peace for all peoples, and the right to use it in freedom. We face a dangerous enemy and we must meet him with intelligence and decisiveness. This enemy is a tiger, most certainly. If you turn your back, he will leap. But if you face him, he will not attack. The Yankee millionaires, the monopolists, enjoy living and don't want to die. It is likely that the peoples exploited and oppressed by the Yankee millionaires and monopolists are in a state of mind more favorable to facing death. When the millionaires and monopolists begin to understand that they too can die, despite their power, they will also begin to think differently.

As for us, we can draw our own conclusions from the events in Santo Domingo. We must prepare ourselves. Or, in other words, "when you see your neighbor's beard on fire; it's time to grease your gun." It is necessary in fact to oil our arms, to prepare well to show these imbeciles, this imbecilic Johnson, what they are in for. So that they can't say as they did the first day at Santo Domingo: "The marines landed without trouble...!" And the dead there will be counted by the thousands, by the tens of thousands, by the hundreds of thousands, and by the millions if necessary!

Our conclusion is the following: Let's prepare well, arm ourselves better, reinforce our defense by all means, make the enemy understand that if he sets foot here, the war will not end as long as a single one of us remains alive, or as long as a single "gringo" remains alive in our country! The people don't want to die; nobody wants to die. On the contrary, everybody looks to the future with enthusiasm, but with tranquility. We are struggling for a future without worries and without fear, and that is the basis of our tranquility. Nobody wants to die but everybody is ready to die. Nobody wants to die, but if they compel us to fight, our enemies will learn what it is to really fight! When they begin to massacre the citizens of our country, the enemy must also begin to learn what bullets are, and arms. Let the imperialists understand that they cannot destroy our arms by surprise! They will have to destroy them one by one, with a man shooting at them from each one! Each gun, each tank, each

cannon! Nobody can say we are a belligerent people or bitter-enders. We are a peaceful people, but don't touch us! In this country, the Yankees have created enough hate, enough disgust, enough contempt -- for all they have done to us and for all they have done to other peoples. And our hate has accumulated not only because of the aggression against Cuba! The aggressions in Vietnam, in the Congo, in Santo Domingo, and all the other countries only increase this mountain of hate against the imperialist enemy, only gives us more strength!

WILSON'S "SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP"

The capacity of Harold Wilson to say "me too" in all the aggressions, interventions and attacks launched by President Johnson against other countries is truly remarkable to behold. He seems hardly human.

And yet may not a limit be in sight to this fabulous inflexibility in sticking to a straight and narrow line? Will the worm, so to speak, turn after all?

From the beginning of Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam, Wilson has repeatedly dropped hints about working through secret diplomatic channels on "negotiations." No doubt Wilson did send out emissaries who rapped discreetly at certain doors. But nothing much came of it, except perhaps approving nods from the Dr. Strangeloves around the White House.

It may now be that secret diplomatic channels are being used to submit Wilson's loyalty to an acid test. Is it really true that not the slightest suspicion of un-Americanism is to be noted in his behaviour? Then let him send contingents of British troops to south Vietnam alongside the loyal South Koreans, the loyal Australians and the loyal New Zealanders. Let him rally loyally to the side of President Johnson in widening the international base of the conflict and putting the heat on other allies to participate more actively with the Great Society in the holy war against "Communism"!

Perhaps pressure of this kind explains the hints now appearing in the British press that Wilson is not altogether happy in his "special relationship" with Johnson. These hints, of course, may be intended as concessions to some of the figures in the British left to whom even de Gaulle looks like a giant-killer compared with Wilson.

In any case, Sir Patrick Dean, the British Ambassador to the United States, now finds it possible to drop hints about the unproductive nature of his Washington post. He leaked his impressions to

the special correspondent of the London Times and this very staid newspaper passed on the information to its readers in the May 21 issue. Sir Patrick Dean did this after calling on Secretary of State Rusk for information about U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic and discovering that the man didn't know.

How is such a startling ignorance to be explained?

First of all, and this is the voice of the British Ambassador to be heard briefing the Times correspondent, the United States has become a "super-power." "At present it is undiluted presidential power..." To this god-like force, foreign opinion, "official or public, is at best of marginal interest." It is taken into consideration "only after the decisions have been made." Thus, we are told, "Alliance and special relationship are becoming obsolescent words, without much practical meaning." What is expected from "lesser countries" is to "fall in line behind the United States."

As a consequence, none of the allies of the U.S. are consulted. In fact there is "little exchange of information." To put it bluntly, "even common diplomatic courtesy is now rather uncommon."

Secondly, there is the peculiar personality of Johnson. "It is not that he regards the allies as a bunch of 'wogs', 'frogs', 'krauts', or 'limeys'; they just do not enter into his calculations."

Johnson's strange "exclusiveness" and "secrecy" are known to every diplomatist and journalist in Washington. But these traits also enter into his relations with "senior officials" normally consulted in "decision-making."

"National security affairs remain the concern of the triumvirate who assisted President Kennedy, Mr. Dean Rusk, Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defence, and Mr. McGeorge Bundy, the special assistant for national security affairs."

This is the triumvirate that stood in grey eminence behind Kennedy. But not even this small camarilla are in on everything now. "Who shares Olympus with President Johnson is still very much a secret...nobody has identified a constant advisory group since Mr. Johnson came to power."

The British Ambassador, it appears, has been able to spot only one individual who appears to be really close to the great man. That personage is Thomas Mann, the "overly tough and hard-nosed" Under-Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

"This is the power structure confronting the embassies here and in turn their Governments -- nebulous, secretive, and exclusively concerned with what is regarded as the American interest."

Under the nebulous, secretive power concentrated in the hands of the enigmatic Johnson, "the Monroe Doctrine is being applied universally in the east-west dispute."

Since Johnson's brain, great as it is, is not quite up to all the tasks of his office, other brains are hired. "Super-power, provided by missiles, enormous fleets, and 16 active divisions are seen to make the doctrine universally applicable. The concepts of super-power, devised by an array of thinkers and tested on computers have revolutionized alliance diplomacy."

The answers to the most difficult problems come with super ease from the world's biggest, best, and most reliable electronic computers. If an ally does not pitch in loyally in "carrying the doctrine around the world" that ally has no right to be either consulted or informed. And if an ally does co-operate loyally "it does not have to be consulted or informed because agreement clearly exists."

All that is left after the decisions from the array of thinkers have been tested on banks of computers and digested for Johnson is "largely a public relations task."

What appears to have particularly raised the hackles of the British Ambassador was the resumption of bombing in north Vietnam. When the bombing was stopped, the State Department told some diplomatic representatives about it because they were expected to explain to Hanoi what it meant. The diplomats needed about two weeks, as they saw it, for their secret channels to produce results. "It is just possible that some advance could have been made, but the third countries concerned [London, Moscow?] were not even asked before the bombing was peremptorily resumed." No "negotiations"! Abysmal failure for Wilson's famous secret channels...Disaster for Wilson's "practical" approach to "peace" in Vietnam...

Thus Wilson's man in Washington feels compelled, by way of retaliation, to drop the hint that he does not know what the U.S. objective in Vietnam is. On top of that, he hints that he was not informed about the intervention in Santo Domingo, "and again nobody knows what the United States is willing to settle for in that unfortunate Caribbean island."

The British Ambassador ends up biting his nails in vexation over the problem faced by "the United States and its allies...of how to live together with some mutual advantage and dignity."

The trouble with this Colonel Blimp is that he can dish out the hints but he can't take them. The problem is already solved. Johnson gets the mutual advantage and dignity. Wilson is left with the rest. It's called a "special relationship."

JAPANESE REVOLTED BY U.S. WAR IN VIETNAM

"Top U.S. officials have been hard at work in Japan during the recent weeks in an effort to swing Japanese public opinion about the Vietnam war to the official American position," writes Kiyooki Murata in the May 20 Japan Times. "These officials included such figures as Walt W. Rostow, Henry Cabot Lodge and Marshall Green. Most recently Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer took the trouble of writing a lengthy commentary in rebuttal to the three letters selected out of 1,233 received by the weekly Shukan Asahi and sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"Despite such an endeavor, the average Japanese view on the war in Vietnam and how it should be brought to an end seems to be drifting farther away from what Washington wishes it to be."

Murata discusses the reasons for this trend in Japanese opinion. It is not the first time, he notes, that a "U.S. war in Asia has met criticisms in Japan." The Korean conflict was not popular among the Japanese. Nevertheless the criticism then was far less open.

An important difference now is that since the end of the occupation in 1952, the Japanese press is freer. It is not compelled to print the handouts of American military authorities.

Another difference is that Japanese reporters are in position to cover both sides in the conflict in Vietnam and thus to present the facts in a more objective way.

Besides accounts of the war, the mass media in Japan have also been able to provide photographs and documentary films. These have had big impact. Murata cites as an instance the documentary which was recently shown on television and which touched off violent protests throughout the country because of the gruesome scenes. The protest compelled cancellation of the series:

"Following the war against the Viet Cong with a South Vietnamese marine battalion, the camera showed, among other items, a 14-year-old boy, a Viet Cong, being lashed by a husky marine in one scene, followed by a closeup of a bloody gash on his head.

"Then there was the sequence of a 17-year-old Viet Cong, bound up, his execution and his beheading. A South Vietnamese marine carries the severed head along the road but throws it away as though it was too much of a burden. And the head bounces like a pumpkin.

"The TV camera crew claims it had to work under serious restrictions and the station says the broadcast film was only a

small portion of the entire footage filmed and that it was edited to mitigate the degree of brutality shown. One can well imagine what deleted parts would be like."

The controversy over this film was one of the "most heated" that has ever occurred in Japan. Some argued that it should be shown in order to demonstrate to the youth that war is neither "glorious nor fashionable but dirty and horrible." Others objected on the ground of taste, "not of the message it carried."

Discussing the Japanese reaction to the film, Murata says that to anyone over forty in Japan the idea of beheading or otherwise killing captured prisoners of war is not novel.

"What is found repugnant and shocking is the fact that such brutality is not a product of an abnormal battle-zone psychology but it is conducted with such nonchalance and that filming of these scenes was condoned by the South Vietnamese armed forces.

"All this suggests to the Japanese the level of the civilization of the people involved.

"If the U.S. needs the popular support of the Japanese for the prosecution of the Vietnam war at all, then it may be said that the mightiest opposition she faces is the nature of the war itself as portrayed by the mass media in Japan."

HAVANA INSTITUTE CANCELS TOUR OF CANADIANS

Toronto

Vernel Olson, National Chairman of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and chairman of the Directorate of the Student Tour to Cuba, announced June 3 that the tour of 100 Canadian university students will not take place this summer. Olson made a special trip to Cuba after receiving word of the cancellation of the tour. The tour was called off by Cuban authorities without an explanation, just two weeks before the first students were to leave Canada.

The tour was launched early in March after a firm commitment from ICAP [Cuban Institute for Friendship with the Peoples] was obtained through the Cuban Ambassador to Canada, Dr. Americo Cruz. On the basis of similar commitments last year a group of 45 Canadian students visited Cuba for eight weeks during July and August. The cancellation of this year's tour, while final preparations were being made, came as a complete surprise to those who have been active in the preparation of the tour. Students who were selected to go were stunned by the news and those contacted indicated deep disappointment at not having a chance to visit Cuba this summer.

At a joint meeting of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Student Tour to Cuba Directorate, a leading member of the Toronto Selection Committee, and two representatives of the students, a full report was given by Olson and the following statement was adopted unanimously:

"The cancellation of the student tour to Cuba after three months of intensive preparation, and just as the first students were getting ready to leave Canada, constitutes a grave blow to efforts of Canadians to establish the truth about Cuba and is a blow to the revolution itself. The organizers of the tour were deeply conscious of the importance of 100 Canadian youth visiting Cuba this summer, in view of the increasing isolation of the island and its people from the North American continent. The tour was doubly significant in view of the total isolation of Cuba from the United States due to the restrictive travel ban.

"The unprecedented response to the tour by students from coast to coast was a high point in over four years of activities by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and student campus committees. The Canadian Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been the only committee in the western capitalist world that has been able to establish real understanding of the Cuban revolution on a broad nonsectarian basis. The impressive response to this year's tour is testimony of the respect which the Committee has earned, and is living proof of the interest in the Cuban revolution which its activities have inspired. Further evidence of this respect and interest is the fact that over thirty eminent persons from Canadian universities participated in the selection process.

"It is a serious matter that the results of over four years' work in defence of the truth of the Cuban revolution has now been jeopardized, not by the external enemies of the revolution, but by the arbitrary action of an institution of the Revolutionary Government. We believe that the best interests of the Cuban people have not been served by this action. The widening interest among Canadians in the struggles of the Cuban people for a better life will undoubtedly be greatly retarded. The increasing interest of Canadian youth in the committees on Cuban and Latin-American affairs in the past year will inevitably suffer a serious setback.

"The withdrawal of previous commitments was a blow not only to the 100 students who gave up the remuneration of summer employment in order to witness the Cuban experiment first-hand, but was also a blow to at least 100 people from all parts of Canada who gave time, energy and money to assure the success of the tour in every respect.

"After serious consideration of all available information, we can only conclude that the student tour was the victim of sectarian forces within the revolution itself which have been measurably

strengthened in recent months as a result of the critical international situation. This problem is not new for the Cuban revolution. Only a few years ago Fidel Castro found it necessary to speak out against this danger when he attacked the methods of Anibal Escalante (former General Secretary of the United Party).

"The cancellation of the tour can be a source of satisfaction only to the sworn enemies of the Cuban revolution, or to hopeless sectarians. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been struck a harsh blow but our confidence in the Cuban people and their cause, and the pressing need to continue our activities in defence of the revolution, is unshaken. The real friends of Cuba will not diminish their efforts to bring the truth about the Cuban revolution to the Canadian people."

TSHOMBE NAMED AS MURDERER OF LUMUMBA

The Tunis weekly Jeune Afrique reproduced photostatic copies of documents in the June 13 issue bringing to light fresh evidence in the murder of Patrice Lumumba, the Congolese leader, and his two collaborators, Maurice Mpolo and Joseph Okito.

The most important is an order signed by Tshombe to carry out the execution of Lumumba, Mpolo and Okito "without delay." The reason given was "in the interests of the state."

The order was delivered to Captain Julien Gat, a Belgian mercenary in charge of the military guard holding the three prisoners. This man, Jeune Afrique reports, lives today in Antwerp and was recently decorated by the Belgian government.

In an editorial note, Jeune Afrique summarizes the facts since Lumumba was assassinated in Elisabethville January 17, 1961. The UN promised an investigation but did little. The Adoula government made a similar promise with similar results.

To clear his skirts just before taking power, Tshombe accused Adoula, Kasavubu and Bomboko of the crime. [See World Outlook February 7, 1964.] When he became prime minister, Tshombe began by laying a wreath at the monument erected in memory of Lumumba. Then he tried to draw a veil over the whole business.

Jeune Afrique reports that it carried on an investigation for twenty months and finally uncovered the documents and witnesses. It reports the details in a number of pages, together with photographs. The material is completely convincing. "If, to the shame of Africa," says Jeune Afrique, "no one acts, at least public opinion will know."

HEAD OF INDONESIAN CP ATTACKS "TROTSKYISM"

At the fourth plenum of the central committee of the Communist party of Indonesia, Chairman D.N.Aidit delivered a general report May 11 lasting seven hours and twenty-three minutes, according to Hsinhua, the Chinese News Agency [May 16]. One of the features of the report, according to the same source, was a sharp attack against "Trotskyism."

Hsinhua's account of this part of Aidit's report is as follows:

"The revolutionary offensive must also be directed at Trotskyism which has since long ago ceased to be a deviation from Marxism and which is nothing more than a gang of political bandits whose work it is to organise intrigues and political crimes. The Trotskyites don the cloak of Marxism to attack Marxism, they raise revolutionary and 'left' slogans to oppose the revolutionary movement, so that they can within limits win over the politically uneducated masses of the people. The Trotskyites are not forces of the left, nor are they middle-of-the-roaders; they are ultrarightists, consciously anti-Communist and anti-Nasakom. [Nasakom: Sukarno's platform of national unity of nationalists, religious believers and Communists.] Therefore it is out of the question to build unity with Nasakom as the axis unless action is taken against the Trotskyites, as President Sukarno and the Indonesian government have done."

In a following part of his report, Aidit is reported to have charged, during an attack against "bureaucrat-capitalists," that "they abuse state power in their hands in order to undermine and manipulate state wealth for their own enrichment" and that they are "striving to seize the state power through a conspiracy with the Trotskyites, the neo-colonialists, the colonialists and the imperialists, in order to turn it into a counter-revolutionary economic hierarchy of the bureaucrat-capitalists..."

In the mythology fostered by Stalin in the days of the "cult" of his famous personality, Leon Trotsky was pictured as the arch-devil standing in sulphurous contrast to the plaster-white image of Stalin. This mythology was irretrievably discredited long before Stalin's death as the dictator's true role in the mass murder of Lenin's collaborators, organization of purges and frame-ups, establishment of concentration camps and similar features of his authoritarian rule became widely known. Khrushchev's admissions at the famed Twentieth Congress of some of the crimes of Stalin only confirmed common knowledge among people interested in knowing the truth about Stalin's role in destroying the proletarian democracy that was the norm in the time of Lenin and Trotsky.

Besides serving as a mythology, the charge of "Trotskyism"

and "Trotskyist conspiracies" had a most utilitarian political purpose in Stalin's time. It corresponded in the Soviet Union to the charge of "Communism" and "Communist conspiracies" used in imperialist countries to mount a witch-hunt against political opposition.

In what way does this ancient rubbish serve the political purposes of the chairman of the central committee of the Communist party of Indonesia? The reasons cannot be gathered from the speech itself. But it is known that substantial left-wing sentiment does exist in Indonesia, including the ranks of the Communist party.

This opposition starts from the simple fact that the Communist party has more than 3,000,000 members and that the Communist youth organized in the People's Youth League, has almost 3,000,000 members. What is stopping this force of 6,000,000 militants, undoubtedly the most powerful political army in Indonesia, from assuming power and initiating the program of socialism which it proclaims?

The reason is clear enough. It is D.N.Aidit's lack of revolutionary will. His inclinations run in the groove of Khrushchevism.

Yet the pressures on him from the left are very powerful and he has displayed a certain suppleness in bowing to them. His ending up in the pro-Peking camp instead of the pro-Moscow camp, against his own obvious inclinations, was ascribed at the time as a concession to left-wing sentiment in his own party and those sectors of the population to which it is responsive.

One of the political advantages derived by Aidit in making this concession was the curious one of being able to revive with relative ease one of the staples of Stalinism -- the bogey of "Trotskyism." Aidit could do this because Mao, for his own reasons, is attempting to revive and refurbish the cult of Stalin's personality.

But the fact that a figure like Aidit is compelled to dip into this cesspool for his choice of political epithets testifies in its own way to the mounting revolutionary pressures among the increasingly impatient masses of Indonesia.

This is further indicated by the title chosen by Aidit for his report: "Step Up the Revolutionary Offensive in All Fields."

BOSCH COULDN'T DELIVER LIE NEEDED BY JOHNSON

Former Dominican President Juan D. Bosch revealed in a press interview June 8 that American Ambassador John Bartlow Martin asked him to say that "Communists" were in control of the "rebellion" in Santo Domingo. Bosch could not bring himself to telling such an enormous lie.

CUBAN GOVERNMENT'S POSITION IN ECONOMIC DISCUSSION

A debate has been going on in Cuba over economic issues that has had "international repercussions," Saverio Tutino reports from Havana in an article which appeared in the May 28 issue of Unità, the daily newspaper of the Italian Communist party.

Tutino notes that economists from other countries have participated in the discussion, including a polemic between Charles Bettelheim and Ernest Mandel, the editor of the Belgian weekly La Gauche.

"It now appears that the political leadership has made a decision in the dispute, at least provisionally," Tutino writes. "In a speech May 8, Dorticos took a line that seemed to hold that each side was partly right and partly wrong at the same time. In reality a choice was made that appears to be both realistic and theoretically correct. 'We are very pleased,' the president said, 'that it is the factor of morale that stimulates the efforts of the Ministry of Industry to the maximum. We know that it has been adopted by the Ministry and we applaud this doctrine. Our present and our future hinge fundamentally on our ideology and our revolutionary morale. This does not deny the cardinal principles that must regulate the return for labor in a socialist society; namely, to each according to his labor. In our opinion this principle is completely compatible and consistent with the principle that underlines the importance of the moral stimulants. To harmonize and synthesize these two factors, while maintaining the engagement to reinforce each day the importance and the involvement of the moral stimulants must be one of the objectives of our economic work.'"

Tutino added that "Ernesto Guevara, the Minister of Industry, was not present. After returning from his long trip to Africa and Asia at the end of March, Guevara has not appeared in public. His Ministry is being directed in the interim by Comrade Guzman. Perhaps reassignments in the leadership are in preparation."

MPLA SPOKESMAN PRAISES MAO

On May 16, Hsinhua, the Chinese News Agency, carried a dispatch from Algiers quoting Luis Almeida, "permanent representative in Algiers of the Angola People's Liberation Movement" [MPLA] on China's second nuclear test.

"I extend my congratulations to Chairman Mao, leader of the Chinese people, and all the Chinese scientists for their exploits in this field," he was quoted as saying.

"The Chinese people who have gone through sufferings will

never be bellicose," Almeida continued. "I am convinced that the means of defence which China has obtained by relying on its own efforts is also a means of defence for the oppressed peoples."

"We consider this bomb as ours," he said. "The Afro-Asian countries are a community with common destiny and China is our guarantee."

On May 17, Hsinhua carried another dispatch from Algiers quoting Almeida as praising a declaration by Mao Tse-tung denouncing U.S. aggression against the Dominican Republic and supporting the Dominican people.

"I fully agree with Chairman Mao's statement," Almeida was quoted as saying. "It is necessary for the masses of people to establish a front to make the imperialist gunboat policy impossible to revive."

"It is necessary to show our position against the U.S. imperialist aggressions against Vietnam, the Congo and now against Santo Domingo."

"To arrogate the right of 'international gendarme' to themselves, the U.S. imperialists exercise interventions everywhere. For them, order means the defence of their interests. Whenever their interests are in danger, they resort to intervention."

Hsinhua ended by stating that "Luis Almeida accused U.S. imperialism of trying to split the Angolan liberation movement."

Almeida's statements voice widespread sentiments in the colonial world. However, what is most interesting about these two dispatches is that they quote an official spokesman of the wing of the Angolan liberation movement which has been favored by Moscow up to this point. The Kremlin committed itself so heavily, in fact, as to have Pravda denounce the Holden Roberto wing as linked with Tshombe, a charge hotly denied as slanderous by the movement that has been doing most of the fighting in Angola.

Certain partisans of the MPLA, who have echoed Pravda's charges in their own way, considered the Kremlin's factionalism in this field to be an indication that Moscow was taking a "more revolutionary" line and stepping up material aid to the colonial revolution.

It would be interesting to know what the experience of Luis Almeida has been in this respect and whether or not the quantity of help forthcoming from Moscow has not induced the MPLA to try knocking at a different door.

NEW ROAD TO PEACE

A solution has finally been found to the problem of keeping four gorillas pacified in the Bronx Zoo, according to a June 4 dispatch in the New York Times.

Each winter the four primates are brought inside. "Bored, cranky, out of sorts, their nerves on edge, they took to bickering among themselves."

One of the staff members at the zoo, undoubtedly a humanist endowed with unusual empathy, discovered the solution. He set up a 16-inch television set in front of the bars. When the set was turned on, "the gorillas stared at the tube transfixed."

This was not a temporary effect. The "personalities" of the gorillas changed. "Petulant brawling ceased; so did other symptoms of ennui and frustration -- the pacing, the nervous thumb-twiddling, the yawning and stretching, the constant arguments."

A study of the programs (there are eight television channels in New York) revealed that the gorillas especially appreciated those showing "humanoid forms moving about rapidly." Cowboys, Indians, or just teen-agers doing a dance fascinated the four viewers. TV standards met their level perfectly.

It would thus appear that a breakthrough has finally been made on the world's No. 1 problem of reducing the tensions that lead to conflict and war. The question now is to extend the benefits of this scientific discovery to the areas where it will do the most good.

The papers have reported that three television sets are kept in President Johnson's study in the White House, so that the three national chains can be viewed simultaneously in line with American efficiency. Wouldn't it be possible for the staff members to keep at least one of these sets tuned to the kind of programs tested out so favorably in the Bronx?

"THE MOST DISCREDITED PRESIDENT"

"No president can lead this nation into a massive war in Asia and not go down in American history as totally discredited." This judgment was voiced by Senator Wayne Morse in scoring deepening U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Referring to Johnson, the Senator said: "He is going to go out of office as the most discredited president in American history."

THE VOTE FOR THE LEFT IN THE BELGIAN ELECTIONS

By Henri Valin

Brussels

The Belgian Social Democracy has just suffered the worst defeat in its history -- one Socialist voter out of four turned away from it in the May 23 legislative elections. This was the inevitable result of participating for four years in a bourgeois coalition government and systematically betraying all the hopes and aims of the general strike of December 1960-January 1961 (which in a certain sense brought the Socialists back into the government).

The years of betrayal had a dual outcome. The most politically conscious workers broke with the Social Democracy and voted for candidates to the left of the Belgian Socialist party [PSB]. Workers with less political understanding, showing the effect of the discouragement and demoralization caused by the Social Democracy, voted for the bourgeois opposition parties, the "Parti de la Liberté et du Progres" (the former Liberal party which has ambitions of assembling together all the conservative middle classes) and the Flemish nationalist "Volksunie."

Of the 470,000 votes lost by the PSB, it can be concluded that one-third went to the left and two-thirds to the right. On this basis, the outstanding feature of the elections was undoubtedly a shift to the right, the secondary tendency being crystallization of a radical labor current at the extreme left. Nevertheless, the overall figures give a somewhat distorted picture of the extent of the shift to the right. In Walloon, where slates to the left of the PSB appeared practically everywhere, giving voters a reasonable chance to make their votes "count," more than 50% of the votes lost by the PSB went to the left. In Antwerp, the only Flemish city with an analogous situation, more than 70% of the votes lost by the Social Democracy went to the left (in Liège, it was 65%). But in the rest of Flanders there was no genuine alternative for the workers. The Communist party is extremely weak there; it received no more than 1% or 2% of the votes and often less than 1%. No left socialist slate was put up. Thus more than 85% of the votes lost by the PSB went to the right, greatly affecting the national average. The truth of the matter is that Socialist voters leaving the Social Democracy voted for the left wherever they had the possibility of doing this in an effective way.

The slates to the left of the PSB doubled their electoral strength. In 1961 the Communist party won 160,000 votes. In the current election its slates taken together won close to 330,000. This proves beyond doubt the existence of a current of radicalization among the masses, even if it involves as yet only a minority (for the voters as a whole, the percentage of votes won by the

extreme left ran from 3% to 6%.

Nevertheless, the representation of the extreme left in parliament did not increase proportionately. In 1961 there were five Communist deputies and one Communist senator. As this is written the exact composition of the senate is not yet known, since part of the members are elected by indirect ballot, but the results appear to be as follows: five deputies for the Communist party, two deputies for the new left socialist party [Union de la Gauche Socialiste -Parti des Travailleurs Wallons], one deputy for the "front Wallon" (Robert Moreau, a former assistant national secretary of the Fédération Générale des Travailleurs de Belgique and lieutenant of the late André Renard), three senators for the Communist party and one senator for the UGS-PTW.

The UGS-PTW, founded a few months before the elections, faced insurmountable difficulties in participating effectively in the election campaign. It sought to meet these difficulties by forming an electoral bloc with the Khrushchevist Communist party everywhere except in the Liège and Verviers districts. (An appeal was made to the pro-Chinese Communist party to participate in the bloc but the appeal was turned down flat.)

In Liège and Verviers the vote for the new left socialist party was 24,000 votes as against 55,000 for the Communist party (which received 40,000 in 1961). It is rather difficult to estimate the number of votes cast for the left socialists in the rest of the country, due to the existence of the bloc. The only basis for calculation is the 1961 elections; but at that time the Communist party had not yet split into "Khrushchevists" and "pro-Chinese." It can be considered certain that all the ballots cast for the pro-Chinese in 1965 came from people who voted Communist in 1961. From this it can be concluded that even without the bloc with the left socialists, the Communist party would have gained votes in the 1965 elections, but to a variable degree on the regional level.

Carrying through rather complicated calculations, the conclusion is reached that the left socialists actually won 60,000 votes (including 24,000 in Liège, 13,000 in Brussels, 12,000 in Namur, 7,000 in Hainaut). The pro-Chinese Communist party won 24,000 votes in the country as a whole; the "Front Wallon" mentioned above likewise won 24,000; the Camille Huysmans slate in Antwerp got 16,000. Thus the Khrushchevist Communist party received a little less than 200,000 votes, an increase of 25% in relation to the elections of 1961.

An examination of the "preference votes" yields interesting results. A Belgian voter can cast his ballot in two ways -- either for the candidate heading the list, which signifies voting a straight ticket, or for individual candidates on the slate. [This could conceivably alter the "preference," putting a different candidate at the

head of the list.] The majority of Belgians vote for the candidate heading the list. In the elections in Brussels for the chamber of deputies, the bloc of the "Union de la Gauche Socialist-Parti Communiste" received 30,500 votes of which 23,500 were cast for the candidate heading the slate while 7,000 indicated "preferences." The latter were equally divided between the left-socialist and Communist party candidates, the leading left-socialist candidate Pierre Le Grève getting the highest number (2,300) and topping the former Communist deputy Moulin. The left-socialist candidates on the slates of the bloc in the other regions ran up thousands of votes, showing that in any case a considerable part of the votes for the bloc came from voters favoring the left socialists. (The head of the slate in Nivelles for the senate got 1,000 votes; in Charleroi the candidate in similar position got 2,000; the head of the slate in Namur for the chamber of deputies received 7,000; in Soignies it was 1,000, etc.)

The left socialists in general conducted their electoral campaign on class lines, and their program -- promulgated practically everywhere independently of the Communist party with which the bloc had been formed -- was by far the one furthest to the left in the election. In Brussels, Nivelles, Charleroi, Soignies, Thuin, the campaign was centered on the following ideas: "Against the bourgeois coalition government; for a workers government." "Nationalization of the coal mines, gas, electricity, oil, banks, insurance, the holdings of all the credit companies." "Workers control." "Let's get out of NATO." "Full support to the freedom struggle of the colonial peoples." "Get the American troops out of Vietnam and Santo Domingo." "For a national health service," and so on.

In the joint electoral publicity issued by the Communist party and the left socialists, the opposition between the two lines appearing in the same piece of literature was striking. Thus an election newspaper distributed among all the homes of Charleroi carried face to face an appeal of the Communist party and an appeal of the Parti Wallon des Travailleurs. The CP appeal carried the headline: "The Communist party poses the following questions to you." The other appeal carried the headline: "The Wallon Workers party appeals to the workers to go into action for the following..." The minimum program presented in common by the two parties was considerably radicalized on the insistence of the left socialists, the Communists finally including the formulas about a workers government, workers control, getting out of NATO, and anticapitalist structural reforms, formulas which they have opposed for years.

At the height of the election campaign, the question of a demonstration against the intervention of American imperialism in Vietnam was posed. The Khrushchevist Communist party accepted the idea of a joint demonstration of all the left forces (including the "pro-Chinese" Communist party), but wanted "supple" slogans like "Peace in Vietnam" or "Negotiations for Peace in Vietnam." The

slogans of the pro-Chinese Communist party were in general more correct and more militant ("Get the American Troops Out of Vietnam"), but they put up a sectarian opposition to any demonstration in common with the Khrushchevist Communist party. The left socialists upheld the idea of a united demonstration, but on correct anti-imperialist slogans. On April 24 the pro-Chinese went it alone, but could only mobilize 250 demonstrators. Finally on May 15 a demonstration took place on the correct line called for by the left socialists, the pro-Chinese Communist party being compelled to participate in it also. There were 1,500 demonstrators. No doubt the difference between the two figures was noted in Peking...

In general, the appearance of a new party to the left of the Khrushchevist Communist party, but following a nonsectarian line, has placed both the reformists and the pro-Chinese in an embarrassing position. They are trying to get out of it by calling the new party "Trotskyist."

"Things have reached the point," wrote Le Peuple, the daily newspaper of the PSB the day after the demonstration of solidarity with the Vietnamese people, "where the Khrushchevists and the pro-Chinese demonstrate under the leadership of the Trotskyists."

La Voix du Peuple, the weekly paper of the pro-Chinese Communist party, ran a front-page attack against the Khrushchevists for "having degenerated to the point where they are going to elect a Trotskyist deputy in Brussels." But a few pages farther on, they attacked the left socialists for having "formed an alliance for electoral reasons with the Khrushchevists with whom they are in disagreement."

The Liège federation of the new left socialist party, which is the strongest, having a considerable working-class base, underwent its first crisis during the election campaign. The leaders, including the new deputy François Perin, constituted an electoral alliance with the "Front Wallon" and other currents of the same kind whose propaganda is essentially Walloon nationalism, pushing the undisguised anticapitalist themes to the background. Part of the ranks of the PWT in Liège did not accept this opportunist turn and organized a tendency to fight for a return to the original anticapitalist program of the PWT. In any case, this is only the first phase of the crisis of the PSB and the regroupment of the forces of the left on an out-and-out anticapitalist program. New crises and further regroupments are sure to come.

A CASE WHERE PATIENCE IS NO VIRTUE

On returning from a trip in the Far East, Gordon Walker, a spokesman of the British Labour government said that Johnson "must not lose patience" in Vietnam. Is there anyone who has not lost patience with Gordon Walker?

TREND AMONG U.S. WHITES IS AWAY FROM RACISM

A recent Gallup poll in the United States reports that there has been a definite shift in white attitudes towards Negroes in the past two years. Two years ago Southern white parents, by a ratio of about three-to-two, said they would object to sending their children to a school which included several Negro children. The latest opinion poll shows that this ratio has now been reversed so that only two out of five Southern white parents would object to their children attending an integrated school.

The results of the latest poll are contrasted below with a similar sampling taken in May 1963:

Question asked: "If colored people came to live next door, would you move?"

	<u>1963</u>	<u>1965</u>
Yes, definitely	20%	13%
Yes, might	25%	22%
No	55%	65%

Question asked: "Would you move if colored people came to live in great numbers in your neighborhood?"

	<u>1963</u>	<u>1965</u>
Yes, definitely	49%	40%
Yes, might	29%	29%
No	22%	31%

These figures confirm the important findings made public by the Scientific American in July 1964 showing a very deep, long-range trend among the whites in the United States away from racism. The study reported by the Scientific American showed that the trend held not only in the North but in the South, including areas that had been scenes of violence. The trend had become so pronounced that this serious journal could report that an absolute majority of whites in the United States now are in favor of integration.

On the basis of this study, World Outlook called attention to the overestimation of the "white backlash" in the 1964 presidential campaign, an observation that was completely borne out. [See World Outlook September 11, 1964.]

Negro militants have often been warned to go slow on their drive for Freedom Now because their vigorous activities would alienate the white population, increase racial prejudice and erase gains already made. The classic argument has been: you can't legislate

hate, fear and ignorance out of the hearts of men; only a long, slow process of education can wipe out prejudice and discriminatory practices.

The militants' answers have been: Maybe we can't legislate what goes on in the human heart but we can legislate to protect our lives, our jobs and our civil rights -- and we can educate the white population by our daily battles to defend and extend our rights and our human dignity.

Scientific tests of shifts in sentiment among whites show the correctness of these arguments. The drive for racial equality has reached new heights during the past couple of years. The struggle has continued to press on and on, the participants refuse to be content with a few token crumbs. This unyielding, uncompromising perseverance has left a deep impression on the minds -- and hearts -- of all American citizens. Americans have been educated for hundreds of years by the slavemasters and the wage-slave bosses -- and racial prejudice and Jim Crow practices flourished. The Negro community is now providing some new textbooks, some new lessons, tens of thousands of new teachers -- and racial tolerance has taken a few steps forward.

The hypocrites in Congress and the White House are quick to take credit for any gains in the field of civil rights. It should be emphatically clear who deserves credit in this instance: the freedom fighters in the streets of the South and the ghettos of the North.

DEMONSTRATIONS IN CHILE AGAINST U.S.

Santiago de Chile

During May thousands of demonstrators marched through the streets here in support of the Dominican people.

On the fourth, the Federación de Estudiantes [FECH] held a mass meeting that ended in a parade to the North American embassy. Fighting broke out there between the carabineros and the demonstrators led by Clotario Blest. The workers and students moved into a nearby park from which they threw stones at the Yankee embassy.

The police attacked with tear gas and their trucks that launch high-pressure streams of water.

The demonstrators answered by setting fire to the dry leaves in the park, creating a great deal of smoke to the annoyance of the repressive forces.

Later the demonstrators blocked traffic. Columbia Pictures

was stoned and a number of Coca Cola neon signs were broken. The Ford Company suffered twenty-five shattered windows.

On the sixth, the Central Unica de Trabajadores de Chile [CUT] held another mass meeting of several thousand workers and students. The youth of the revolutionary groups of the extreme left (Partido Socialista Popular, Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista, Espartaco) played an active role in the subsequent actions. They burned a North American flag and headed a march through the streets to the center of the city.

When Harriman was sent by Johnson through Latin America to "explain" the invasion of the Dominican Republic, he was met here with shouts of "Murderer! Get Out, Yankee Thief!" Harriman required police protection from the angry people.

The Partido Socialista Popular and the Vanguardia Revolucionaria Marxista were in the forefront of the demonstrations. They put out 20,000 leaflets denouncing the Yankee aggression and calling for concrete measures in Chile against the imperialist companies such as nationalization of foreign holdings, withdrawal from the Organization of American States, etc.

On the ninth a meeting was held in the PSP headquarters to express solidarity with the Dominican people. Speakers included Clotario Blest, Martín Salas, Dr. Enrique Reyes and others.

New mass actions are being organized in view of the continued occupation of Santo Domingo by Yankee imperialism.

ITALIAN CP LEADERS AIR DIFFERENCES

By Sirio Di Giuliomaria

ROME, June 6 -- Deepening differences in the Italian Communist party broke out in a sharp rift in the central committee session of June 3-5. In place of receiving a unanimous vote, as is the custom, a resolution presented by General Secretary Luigi Longo passed by a mere majority, with four against and three abstentions.

Only one point was on the agenda: a report by Paolo Bufalini on "Unity Problems of the Italian Labor and Socialist Movement."

The question of a "united party" of the working class, first raised by right-wing leader Giorgio Amendola [see World Outlook January 1], had already been taken up by Longo at the April 21-23 session of the committee. Longo envisaged the unification of the PCI [Italian Communist party] with the PSIUP [the Italian Socialist

Party of Proletarian Unity which split from Nenni's Socialist party, the PSI] and a tendency in the PSI headed by Lombardi, Santi and Giolitti. The latter tendency, it has been expected, will split from the PSI if it unites with the PSDI [the Italian Social Democratic party], as may occur after its next congress. Since the Lombardi tendency does not favor joining the PSIUP, the PCI leaders appear to have hopes that they might join a "united party" if it is formed.

After the April session, the central committee appointed Longo, Amendola, Ingrao, G.C.Pajetta, Berlinguer, Bufalini, Occhetto, Rossanda, Secchia, Li Causi and Gerratana as a committee to bring in a draft resolution on the question of a united party. The document was submitted after a long dispute which compelled postponement of the central committee meeting for almost a month and which was introduced by Bufalini in his report.

Bufalini outlined the history of the question and took up the forces interested in it as an immediate goal. He was weakest on the proposed program for a united party. Concessions on this were clearly aimed at the Lombardi group.

Bufalini advocated a policy leading to expansion of the productive forces, full employment, increasing political weight for the working class and expansion of democracy. To achieve this, he proposed technological progress, higher productivity and the orientation of the "free enterprise drive" towards the public interest.

"The leading role of the working class," said Bufalini, "must be asserted through its capacity for programming." [Bufalini used the word "programmazione" which is currently employed in Italy to mean "planning" in a capitalist framework.]

Bufalini held that the working class should come to power along the democratic road and that minorities should be permitted to seek to become majorities in the socialist society.

As for foreign policy, Bufalini spoke for peaceful coexistence between states. World peace, he argued, can be maintained only in an international order based on peaceful coexistence in which the independence of all countries and their right to determine their own fate are respected.

Bufalini ended on the topic of internal democracy, conceding that the organization of tendencies may "in certain cases be a form of internal dialectics and democracy." He contended however that the organization of tendencies is not "the most favorable way to circulate and debate ideas."

The discussion that followed was perhaps the hottest the PCI has known since the days before it became bureaucratized. L'Unità, the party's daily paper, reproduced it without trying to tone down

the differences.

Bufalini came under fire from both the left and the right. The right wing insisted on the need to emphasize certain aspects of peaceful coexistence. Amendola himself was rather cautious, but once again advanced the idea that the united party should not bar the Social Democrats.

An unusual number of central committee members attacked from the left, openly stating that they rejected the report. A group of them centered around Pintor, a former supporter of Ingrao who was ousted from the editorial board of L'Unità where he had been co-editor. Pintor held that to vote on the document would place the forthcoming party congress before an accomplished fact. In view of the shape of internal democracy in the PCI, this fear could be said to be quite justified.

Pintor insisted that the content of the report was not acceptable. Instead of aiming at coming to the top in the left-center experiment, the PCI should seek to defeat it and reverse the tendency behind it. To do this a political platform based on antireformist concepts is needed. The class nature of the proposed united party should be clear and a thorough discussion should be held in the party on this.

With regard to foreign policy, Pintor said that the "close connection between peaceful coexistence and the anti-imperialist struggle should be so stated as to leave no room for a mere juridical conception of coexistence. Coexistence should mean a shrinking of the imperialist area and its war roots through the dynamics of the international class struggle and therefore of the freedom movements, of the anticapitalist struggle in the West, of a dynamic policy conducted by the socialist states."

Pintor concluded by raising the question of internal democracy, stressing the idea of a return by the central committee to Leninist norms and that the party congress should be the natural place to debate positions without limits imposed from above.

Others followed with leftist speeches, some referring directly to Pintor's positions. Among the speakers were Achille Occhetto, national secretary of the Communist Youth; Coppola, former editor of the Milan edition of L'Unità; and Aldo Natoli. Occhetto and Natoli were part of the delegation that was recently sent by the PCI to north Vietnam.

Another group of leftist opponents included old party members like Colombi, Secchia and Terracini. Colombi even attacked the idea that socialism can be won along the peaceful road, making a distinction between the desire to take power peacefully and the fact that Big Business will not allow it, as experience, even in Europe, has

shown.

Bufalini's summary was short, centering on the speeches of his leftist opponents. Another novelty was his specifically naming them and rejecting their positions.

The session ended the evening of June 5 with a speech by Longo and a motion to approve the general line of the document and Bufalini's report.

Pintor, Coppola, Occhetto and Milani voted against. Colombi, Luporini and Natoli abstained. All of them stood on leftist positions. The opposition vote might have been even larger had certain members remained. They had to leave for other cities where public meetings had been scheduled.

The June session of the central committee formally ended the monolithism of the Italian Communist party. The left wing will now enjoy more freedom to debate. Rumors have already been heard about counterresolutions at the next congress, due at the end of the year.

The left-wing tendency in the PCI has now found expression in the central committee itself. The next congress promises interesting developments as the process continues of assembling left-wing Communist militants and developing their capacity for revolutionary leadership.

FRENCH SP FACES CRISIS OF PERSPECTIVE

By Pierre Frank

Faced with a presidential election at the end of the year, the fifty-fifth congress of the SFIO [Section Française Internationale Ouvrière -- the French Social Democratic party], held at Clichy June 3-6, could only ratify the candidacy of Gaston Defferre, the mayor of Marseilles. ("To give up his candidacy would be a genuine catastrophe," General Secretary Guy Mollet declared.) No one had any alternative to propose. As for the future of the Socialist party and the possible "Democratic Socialist Federation" proposed by Defferre, the problem remains.

With Defferre as their candidate, something worse than a defeat awaits the opponents of de Gaulle. It is quite evident that the PCF [French Communist party] cannot play Defferre's game. The PCF leadership is under compulsion to run its own candidate, while trying to hold losses to the minimum. These will be due in particular to the fact that the numerous statements of the Communist leaders on the "positive aspects" of de Gaulle's foreign policy will serve him the

way similar statements served him in the plebiscite of September 28, 1958. As for Defferre, despite all the calculations of his "brain trust," not only will he take no votes away from the PCF, he will lose from his own left to the probable candidate of the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié] and there is no guarantee that he can compensate from the right with votes picked up from the MRP [Mouvement Républicain Populaire].

The presidential election will prove to be at bottom a plebiscite for de Gaulle. Some of Defferre's partisans say that he is looking ahead, to the succession to de Gaulle. For the most conscious politicians of French capitalism, the problem posed by the succession is maintenance of the "strong state," a presidential-type regime. But these same politicians are too shrewd to envisage carrying this out with men like...Defferre or Pompidou.

Actually a grave crisis in French society is maturing under the façade of political apathy presented by the Gaullist regime. To the right, much more dangerous than the agitation of the ultras will be the calculations and possible undertakings of the army, an army that has been more and more trimmed in the direction of a professional army. Along with this is the developing crisis in the Socialist party, the depth of which was shown at the Clichy congress.

The "Democratic Socialist Federation" proposed by Defferre is nothing less than the dissolution of the Socialist party, not even in exchange for a formation the program of which would be like that of the German Social Democracy, but a formation without any real structure at all. The envisaged Federation would be the "UNR"* of a Defferre! It was quite symptomatic that the main oratorical clash at the Clichy congress occurred between the Marseilles mayor and Augustin Laurent, the mayor of Lille. In Marseilles, Defferre wins his elections without a strong labor following. In Lille, Laurent is backed by the majority of the workers and has to defend this majority against the encroachment of a strong Communist minority. His language reflected this fact:

"I agree with the idea that a federation could go further, aiming at the organic unification of the Socialists, but I hope that the federation will be willing at that time to address all those who accept the grand idea of socialism, including the Communists. It will only be then that the millions of workers, whose power today is paralyzed, will understand that the genuine future of the socialist democracy in France goes along the road of labor unity. Why cover up this aspect of things? You know very well that our difficulties arise from the existence of the Communist party. I am against the Communists because they compelled us to take up responsibilities in

*The Union pour la Nouvelle République organized by Gen. de Gaulle as his personal party.

the defense of the Republic that prevented us from being ourselves. But a Socialist party must never say that it gives up the desire to some day unite the whole world of labor."

One can smile at Laurent's words about what the Communists "compelled" the Socialists to do (break strikes? conduct the war against Algeria? enter de Gaulle's government in 1958?), but it is quite clear that the Socialist party in France cannot carry out an operation such as Defferre proposes without repelling what remains of its own worker base, driving them toward the PCF despite the politics of that organization.

Since the Socialist congress was split down the middle and could not go back on Defferre's candidacy, it voted one hundred per cent, or close to it, for a document on which every one had his reservations.

For Defferre, the "movement" around his candidacy, the petty bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie associated with it, will serve to liquidate the old ideas and the old party. It is worth noting the numerous pessimistic statements made about the Socialist party by him and his partisans at the congress. (Defferre stressed the loss of members. A senator from Seine-et-Oise said, "We are suffering from leukemia.") On the other hand, his opponents count on the electoral defeat dealing a blow in the SFIO to Defferre's "Federation." The mayor of Lille talked about the "bursting of this soap bubble." Finally, Mollet stressed the changes occurring in the PCF.

Thus the Socialist party which was the axis of almost all the governmental combinations during the Fourth Republic and which suffered a split to the left after de Gaulle came to power, is now threatened with a deep division in which its existence as a workers party is at stake. The issue will not fail to flare up again after the election.

In the PCF, the leadership has refrained from publicly expressing the internal differences troubling the party. The continuation of Defferre's candidacy under the conditions approved by the Clichy congress extricates it from a quandary. But this does not end its deep difficulties within the framework of the international crisis of Stalinism due to the absence of policy and authoritative leadership since the death of Thorez.

Even the bureaucratic success chalked up less than three months ago in the Communist Student Union proved ephemeral, the new leadership of that organization having already divided politically.

In the corridors, the PCF leadership (or a part of it) appears to be moving toward the "Italian" position. But this will not solve the problem, since the PCF does not have the advantage currently enjoyed by the Italian Communist party; namely, of operating within

the framework of bourgeois democracy. The Gaullist regime does not make things easy for parties that want to live and to act as in the days of the Third and the Fourth Republic.

The die is cast for the next presidential election. An electoral defeat is inevitable. What is important is to draw lessons from this defeat that can serve to renovate the labor movement in order to avoid subsequent defeats of a kind much worse than those on the electoral level.

DEUTSCHER DESCRIBES "TEACH-IN" MOVEMENT

At the national "teach-in" held in Washington May 15 [see World Outlook May 28], a representative of the European intellectual community was invited to participate. The guest selected by the committee in charge of arrangements was, interestingly enough, Isaac Deutscher, the well-known biographer of Leon Trotsky.

He presented his views at the Washington meeting, which was televised across the United States to about 100 campuses making up an audience of 100,000. Deutscher then crossed the country, speaking at a number of universities, and participated in a giant debate at the University of California in Berkeley. From all the reports, he was very well received and drew heavy applause from the audiences of students and teachers.

The Tribune, a left-wing weekly of the British Labour movement, published the full text of the notes from which Deutscher prepared his speech [in two issues, May 21 and May 28]. The document offers a very good popular presentation of the revolutionary Marxist view of the broad lines of American and Soviet foreign policy since the end of World War II, ending in the present grave situation in Vietnam which may be the prelude to a nuclear conflict. [For anyone wishing these two issues of Tribune, the address is 222 The Strand, London, W.C.2, and the cost is two shillings -- \$.28.]

The Paris weekly Express [June 7] has published Deutscher's impressions of his trip. These are of considerable interest.

For the first time since the end of the war, Deutscher writes, a formidable clamor has arisen in the United States over foreign policy, specifically Johnson's policy in Vietnam and Latin America.

"The clamor is being stirred up by the young American generation. In almost all the universities, thousands of professors and hundreds of thousands of students are participating in the movement." It began in March and swept the entire country in a little more than a month.

Describing the "teach-in" in which he participated in Washington, Deutscher says: "It was not at all comparable with anything generally seen in the British demonstrations on nuclear disarmament: no prophets, no beatniks, no eccentrics. However, there was no doubt about the sentiments of the participants. They listened politely to the defenders of the government's policies but demonstrated their approval and their enthusiasm each time a critic of the government spoke."

A "still more radical" meeting was the debate organized at Berkeley. It was an open-air gathering that lasted thirty-six hours, including speeches, reports, political satires, folk songs, one after the other. "Among the speakers were leaders of the Negro civil-rights movement, organizers of antisegregationist marches in the South, professors, authors, a senator from Alaska, a Negro member of the California state assembly, etc." Deutscher found himself speaking after midnight in the cold breeze coming in from the Pacific. But the students, 15,000 of them, did not wish to go inside. Deutscher continued with his Marxist analysis. [He does not mention it, but other sources report that when he finished he was given a "standing ovation."]

Some yards away, "something extraordinary" impressed the historian. Volunteers were giving their blood for the victims of American bombings in Vietnam. One hundred litres were collected under the slogan: "Johnson is sending them napalm; we will send them our blood."

He heard a suggestion to organize a brigade to help the freedom fighters in Vietnam along the lines of the international brigades in the civil war in Spain.

"To those familiar with the political climate of America in the past decades, these meetings and these protests must appear, as they did to me -- fantastic innovations. And the way in which this clamor has found an echo in the written and spoken press, so often sunk in conformism, is a sign that times have changed."

In estimating the import of this new movement, Deutscher feels "a little skeptical" about the immediate effects it could have. Nevertheless, it serves as a brake on those pushing for escalation of the war.

The long-range effects, he feels, will prove much more important. "In my opinion, the awakening of the critical attitude in the United States is almost as important as the de-Stalinization in the USSR. In certain respects they resemble each other. A new left is being born that is sweeping away the corpse of the old traumatized left, worn out during the thirties and forties through its collusion with Stalinism, stunned by de-Stalinization and struck down by McCarthyism."

This new generation, now entering the political arena, "has

known neither Stalinism nor de-Stalinization. It has not been intimidated by McCarthyism. It is entering politics remorselessly, fearlessly. It is engaging in struggle with innocence and courage. It reacts vigorously against the anti-Communist clichés and the anti-Marxist dogmas. It no longer supports the cold-war indoctrination. The Pharisaism and self-conceit of the American ruling class appall it. Aware of the gaps in the general prosperity, the vast continuing 'pockets of poverty,' the 'structural employment' in the midst of full economic expansion, the oppression of the Negroes, it wants to indict the whole established order."

Deutscher is not prepared to predict how far this generation will go. It is too early. "But there is not the least doubt that Marxism will appear or reappear in the United States as an intellectual and moral force and that this force will appear much more attractive than ever before."

Deutscher ascribes the origin of this movement to the struggle opened by the Negroes against racial segregation. They broke the "magic vise" of American conformism and served as a catalyzer for the young radical intellectuals.

He ends by stating that the debates are the "first phase of the rebirth of an active social consciousness in the United States." The next phase cannot be foreseen. "When I left the United States, the organizers of the debates were discussing how to widen the basis of the movement. Whatever comes of it, there is no doubt that it has already transformed the politico-moral climate of the country."

SUGGEST VOLUNTEERS TO AID DOMINICANS

A plan under discussion in California university circles to send volunteers to help the Constitutionals against the counter-revolutionists and the invading U.S. forces, was reported in the May 23 Los Angeles Times.

In a dispatch from Berkeley, the Los Angeles daily quoted Timothy F. Harding, an assistant professor at California State College in Los Angeles, as stating that the purpose of the plan was "to make it known that there are Americans who feel differently from the U.S. government."

The plan would be launched by sending four students. If they needed help, it might be possible to arrange to send more.

The group has already begun to collect blood for the Constitutionals. This is sent through a contact at the United Nations.

A member of the Committee to End the War in Vietnam, Harding

was in Berkeley as a participant in a Vietnam teach-in protest.

"We are completely an ad hoc group," he told the special correspondent of the Times. "I am not a Communist, not a Socialist, and, to the best of my knowledge, neither is anybody else I am working with."

Harding is a specialist in Latin-American history and former assistant editor of Hispanic American Report. A recent study of his on the background of the rightist coup in Brazil appeared in the Fall 1964 issue of Studies on the Left.

SHASTRI'S TRIP TO MOSCOW

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

Coming in the wake of the cancellation of his projected trip to the United States, Prime Minister Shastri's eight-day visit to the USSR has been acclaimed as highly "successful." Premier Kosygin paid him the unique honour of accompanying him personally from the Soviet capital to Leningrad.

In a joint communiqué the two prime ministers took a common view on many subjects.

They expressed "great concern" over the Vietnam situation and demanded an immediate halt to the bombing of north Vietnam.

Among other things they called for the disbanding of military bases in foreign countries. This is of significance in the context of reports about U.S. moves to set up military bases in the "uninhabited islands" of the Indian Ocean.

The Indian prime minister no doubt sought the support of his Soviet hosts on India's border dispute with China and the new one with Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch. While the joint communiqué was silent on both topics, Shastri made it clear on his return to New Delhi that these questions were discussed in Moscow and that he had been assured of Soviet "sympathy and support in matters which directly concern us."

There has been considerable speculation in the Indian press whether the Shastri trip marks the beginning of a new shift in the foreign policy of the Indian government. Since the border war with China in 1962, New Delhi has more and more identified itself with the imperialist powers in return for military and economic aid. Even the pro-government press admits that India has been taken for granted by

Washington of late. The rude refusal of President Johnson to receive Shastri in June therefore came as a big shock to the policy-makers in New Delhi.

India is now seeking substantial aid from the Soviet Union, especially in the field of heavy industry (iron and steel, nonferrous metals, oil and power), during the Fourth Plan period. The Soviet government has responded with assurances of substantial aid. Imperialist countries have been reluctant to help the Indian bourgeoisie in the field of heavy industry.

The new border conflict with Pakistan, which started with the clashes in the Rann of Kutch, have assumed serious proportions. New Delhi has made capital out of the American weapons used by the Pakistani forces. The bourgeois regimes of both India and Pakistan are cleverly utilising the conflict to create chauvinistic hysteria in their respective countries to divert the attention of the people from their immediate economic and political problems. In some parts of India, communal and reactionary organisations have already fomented Hindu-Muslim riots.

Developments in India have crucial significance in the present world situation. The American imperialists know this. So does the Soviet bureaucracy. This explains the attention being paid to India by both Washington and Moscow. The Indian bourgeoisie on the other hand is prepared to pay any price to avert a revolutionary crisis within the country.

Open support of American imperialism would be very dangerous for the bourgeois leadership in India in the context of widespread protests against the rapacious intervention of Washington in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. The Shastri government requires an attractive cover and is trying to achieve this with the help of the Soviet bureaucracy.

The Kremlin, on the other hand, seeks an understanding with the Indian bourgeoisie as a diplomatic foil against Washington. In the process, of course, it will sacrifice the revolutionary struggles of the Indian masses in accordance with its policy of maintaining the status quo.

Shastri will use the prestige accruing from his Soviet visit to refurbish the image of his regime as truly nonaligned, strengthening the Indian hand in the forthcoming Afro-Asian conference in Algiers. The visit has also helped him to sidestep a serious threat to his own leadership in the ruling Congress party.

So far as the internal situation in India is concerned, the repressive policies of the government are not likely to be relaxed. The leaders of the pro-Peking Communist party are still in prison. The Kashmir leader, Sheikh Abdullah, who has just returned from a

world tour, has been interned because he sought a private interview with Chou En-lai in Algiers. The civil liberties of the people are being crushed in the name of the new "emergency" created by the Indo-Pak border confrontation. All strikes and mass demonstrations have been virtually banned. The pro-Moscow Communist party and the petty-bourgeois Socialist parties are contributing further to whipping up the chauvinistic atmosphere in the country in the name of fighting Pakistani "aggression."

DANGEITES BACK SHASTRI GOVERNMENT

By S.R.Singh

New Delhi

The pro-Moscow Communist party of India has openly identified itself with the Shastri government in the "patriotic war" against Pakistan. The general line of the party headed by S.A.Dange is to condemn the "Pakistani aggression on India" while pledging "full support to the measures to defend the country."

According to the Dangeites, the Anglo-American imperialists are behind Pakistan. The party has also "condemned the Chinese support for Pakistan." (According to reports in the Indian press, Peking has backed Karachi's border claims in the Rann of Kutch.)

While the pro-Moscow Communist party, the Samyukta Socialist party [SSP], the Praja Socialist party [PSP] and other petty-bourgeois parties are going so far as to demand an all-out war against Pakistan, the pro-Chinese Communist party has refused to commit itself on the Indo-Pakistan border dispute. E.M.S.Namboodiripad, one of the party's leaders, recently refused to sign a joint statement submitted by all the other parties calling for a public meeting in Trivandrum to condemn the "Pakistani aggression."

Trade-union leaders belonging to the pro-Moscow Communist party appeared on the same platform at a mass rally in Bombay May 23 with leaders of the Congress party, the Jan Sangh, the PSP and SSP to urge the industrial workers to donate a day's pay for a memorial fund to be built in honour of the late Nehru.

While the propaganda of some of these "left" parties can hardly be distinguished from the communal parties like the Jan Sangh and the Hindu Mahasabha in their war hysteria against Pakistan, others have taken advantage of this situation to don the mantle of an opposition. Thus "Sarvodaya" leaders like Jaya Prakash Narayan, who claim to stand above the classes, have been able to strengthen their prestige by protesting the Shastri government's questionable manoeuvres in the border disputes with both China and Pakistan.

FIGHT FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES IN INDIA

Bombay

In face of the Shastri government's policy of repression against the left forces in India in the name of a "national emergency," a country-wide campaign is being organised in defence of civil liberties of the people. Regional conferences to demand the release of the political prisoners have been held in different states.

A major civil-liberties convention is scheduled to be held in Bombay on June 12-13 under the presidentship of N.C.Chatterjee, M.P., who heads the All India Civil Liberties Union. An all-party preparatory committee has been set up to organise the convention. P.K.Atre, a leading Marathi literary figure and editor of the daily Maratha, is serving as chairman of the committee, and S.B.Kolpe, a Marxist journalist, is secretary.

The committee includes prominent lawyers, journalists, trade unionists and leaders of political parties including both the pro-Moscow and pro-Peking wings of the Communist party, the Samyukta Socialist party, the Praja Socialist party, the Revolutionary Socialist party, and the Trotskyist group.

A symposium on "Problems of Civil Liberties in India" has been scheduled for June 11. Speakers invited to participate include Indulal Yagnik, M.P., leader of the Mahagujarat Janata Parishad; S.M.Joshi, president of the Samyukta Socialist party; Bhupesh Gupta, M.P., leader of the rightist Communist party; Jyoti Basu, a prominent figure in the leftist Communist party and leader of the Opposition in the West Bengal Legislative Assembly; and Dr.A.R.Desai, a Marxist professor at the Bombay University.

Resolutions to be discussed at the convention will urge among other things that the "national emergency" be scrapped along with the so-called "Defence of India Rules." Demands will be raised for the release of political prisoners now under detention without trial, for unrestricted freedom of movement of citizens within the country and abroad, etc.

The Bombay convention will be a prelude to an all-India civil liberties conference planned for later at Nagpur.

ERITREANS LOSE ARMS SHIPMENT

The Eritrean freedom fighters lost a shipment of arms, Agence France Presse reported June 9. Two Syrian planes landed with the arms at Khartoum. A high official, who had promised to help forward them, revealed the plan to the authorities and the shipment was seized by the Sudanese government.

GERMAN UNIONS BLOCK AUTHORITARIAN LEGISLATION

Cologne

For the first time since the end of World War II, the trade unions held firm in a conflict with the leaders of the German Socialist party [SPD], winning at least a temporary victory.

The government sought passage of some vicious antilabor legislation. The measures would give the government the right to declare an "emergency" if it learned through "secret sources" that an attack was to be expected. The "emergency" could be declared "even if no generally recognizable tension exists." Under the "emergency," the government could:

- Set up a censorship.
- Outlaw meetings.
- Draft workers, thus wiping out the right to strike.
- Arbitrarily imprison people.
- Compel either evacuation or forced residence.
- Militarize the entire economy.
- Use the armed forces in domestic conflicts.

To pass the legislation, a two-thirds majority was required. This could not be obtained without support from the SPD. Although a congress of the German Federation of Unions strongly opposed the legislation, the SPD decided to vote for the legislation with some face-saving amendments.

The SPD leaders counted on the union bosses going along with their politics as they always have in the past. But as the vote neared in parliament, 250 eminent university professors petitioned the unions to oppose this reactionary legislation.

The chemical, metal, printing and public servants' unions responded by calling for an extraordinary meeting of the Trade Union Committee, the highest body between congresses. Several hundred trade-union secretaries signed petitions to the Executive Committee of the trade-union federation. Protest resolutions poured in, protest meetings were held.

Advised by their brain trust that a conflict between militant unionists and the SPD could prove damaging in the forthcoming elections, the Social Democratic leaders became frightened. They view the elections as a major chance to win cabinet posts which they have

not held for more than thirty years, when they helped prepare the capitulation to Hitler...

In an about-face, the SPD declared that the proposed legislation is not sufficiently well known to the public or well-enough prepared for passage. While "in principle" still in favor of the legislation, the SPD now favors considering it more closely and there is not time for this before the elections.

The unions have a right to feel proud over their victory. But they had better keep their guard up against new maneuvers after the election in favor of measures that would help pave the way for another authoritarian government in Germany.

MUNICH MARCHERS PROTEST U.S. ROLE IN VIETNAM

Some 500 demonstrators, protesting U.S. intervention in Vietnam, clashed with the police in Munich May 27.

The protest march was organized by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and scheduled to take place during German-American Friendship Week.

The authorities sought to ban the march on the grounds that the Americans at the America House in Munich might take measures of "self-defense." The case was taken to court and a partial legal victory was won. The march was approved but the marchers were forbidden to take a route passing the America House. (Since the beginning of May, members of the War Resisters League have held a permanent vigil there against the war in Vietnam.)

The march began after a meeting. Among the speakers was a secretary of the biggest union in the world, the two-million-strong German Metal Workers.

The demonstrators carried placards reading, "Vietnam to the Vietnamese"; "Vietnam -- Today Bombs and Gas; Tomorrow Atom Bombs?"; "Don't Bomb -- Negotiate!"; "Mr. Erhard, Don't Support U.S. Policies in Vietnam"; "No Vietnam in Germany -- No Emergency Laws!"

The demonstrators chanted, "Ami, Go Home!" and "Amis, Get Out of Vietnam." ["Amis" is the German slang for Americans.]

The clashes with the police occurred when some of the demonstrators veered from the prescribed route and headed in the direction of America House. Twenty were arrested. They were released after their names had been taken down.

The day before the demonstration, U.S. Ambassador George

McGhee spoke at the University of Munich on "Atlantic partnership and European unity." One of the students listened to Johnson's envoy attentively but with the precautionary measure of wearing a gas mask.

Others, less respectful, interrupted the speaker with shouts of "Santo Domingo" and "Vietnam."

GUERRILLA WAR CONTINUES IN ANGOLA

In a news release issued June 5, the ALNA [National Liberation Army for Angola] reported fresh activity in the freedom struggle against Portuguese imperialism.

In an encounter in the Quibala region, the Portuguese suffered five killed, and the freedom fighters six. At the Cabulo cataracts, a Portuguese patrol was virtually wiped out. A number of guns and hand grenades were captured.

Near the Onzo river, ALNA forces opened a bazooka attack, compelling the Portuguese troops to abandon a camp, leaving six dead. A radio transmitter and a grenade launcher were captured. In six other regions stiff fighting occurred.

At Serra de Golume, close to Quitexe, a Portuguese army convoy was ambushed. Eleven troops were killed, the ALNA losing seven, including an officer, Simão Quilango. A tank and two half-tracks were destroyed. On the Quissamano road, a Portuguese transport truck ran into a mine set by the partisans. The truck was blown up, all the occupants being killed.