

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Volume 3, No. 29

October 1, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Eisenhower Was Ready to Use Nuclear Weapons.....	1
Harriman Irritated over Campus Ferment against Vietnam War.....	3
Well-Known Trotskyist Tortured by Boumedienne Government.....	4
Roux Challenges Algerian Ambassador.....	7
Bolivians Answer Repression by Calling for Guerrillas.....	9
Unity Movement Reports Victimizations in South Africa.....	13
Rise in Number of Strikes in Britain.....	16
Textbooks Refurbish the Mikado.....	17
Living Costs Continue to Skyrocket in Brazil.....	18
Great Accomplishment of the "Great Society".....	19
U.S. Prosperity Hinged on Escalation in Vietnam.....	21
Fighters for Peace Whom I Met in a Washington Jail.....	22
Walloon Workers Party Holds Second Congress.....	25
Belgian Pro-Mao Communists Split.....	26
Peking Sends Gifts to Tibetan People.....	26
Contradictory Vote in Germany.....	27
Mitterrand -- The New Miracle Man of French Politics -- by Pierre Frank.....	28
CP Policy in Greece Leads to Setback.....	31
Inflation in Colombia.....	32
Japan's Depression -- An "Unwitting" Mistake.....	33
The British Trades Union Congress -- by Susan Williams.....	34
Labour's First Year -- Must It Be the Last?.....	36
First Work by Recabarren Appears in Chile.....	47
The Theses of the WFTU Congress -- by Livio Maitan.....	48

EISENHOWER WAS READY TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The Johnson administration got a very welcome assist from Eisenhower September 10 when the former president revealed that he had been prepared to use nuclear weapons against China on at least two occasions. These are recounted in the forthcoming second volume

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Volume 3, No. 29

October 1, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Eisenhower Was Ready to Use Nuclear Weapons.....	1
Harriman Irritated over Campus Ferment against Vietnam War.....	3
Well-Known Trotskyist Tortured by Boumedienne Government.....	4
Roux Challenges Algerian Ambassador.....	7
Bolivians Answer Repression by Calling for Guerrillas.....	9
Unity Movement Reports Victimizations in South Africa.....	13
Rise in Number of Strikes in Britain.....	16
Textbooks Refurbish the Mikado.....	17
Living Costs Continue to Skyrocket in Brazil.....	18
Great Accomplishment of the "Great Society".....	19
U.S. Prosperity Hinged on Escalation in Vietnam.....	21
Fighters for Peace Whom I Met in a Washington Jail.....	22
Walloon Workers Party Holds Second Congress.....	25
Belgian Pro-Mao Communists Split.....	26
Peking Sends Gifts to Tibetan People.....	26
Contradictory Vote in Germany.....	27
Mitterrand -- The New Miracle Man of French Politics -- by Pierre Frank.....	28
CP Policy in Greece Leads to Setback.....	31
Inflation in Colombia.....	32
Japan's Depression -- An "Unwitting" Mistake.....	33
The British Trades Union Congress -- by Susan Williams.....	34
Labour's First Year -- Must It Be the Last?.....	36
First Work by Recabarren Appears in Chile.....	47
The Theses of the WFTU Congress -- by Livio Maitan.....	48

EISENHOWER WAS READY TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The Johnson administration got a very welcome assist from Eisenhower September 10 when the former president revealed that he had been prepared to use nuclear weapons against China on at least two occasions. These are recounted in the forthcoming second volume

of Eisenhower's memoirs but were discussed by the general in advance of publication at a press conference in Gettysburg. The publicity was no doubt intended to help sell the book but also had a political purpose -- to show that the country's most eminent Republican sees eye-to-eye with the head of the Democrats on using nuclear weapons to exterminate Asians, thus helping to condition the American people to accepting nuclear weapons as a "standard" instrument of war.

Eisenhower's revelations about the secret war plots of his regime were given front-page treatment in the U.S. press. Here is how it was reported in the September 12 New York Times:

"'It never occurred to me,' he said, that the United States should not use atomic weapons if they would 'best serve' the interests of the country. In some conceivable situations, he asserted, atomic weapons would be the only ones that could stop aggressors.

"'Waging Peace' [the title of the forthcoming volume of memoirs] relates how the President and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, drafted a memorandum detailing the circumstances under which the United States might have to use atomic weapons against China. The memo was drawn up on Sept. 4, 1958, then studied and edited to avoid any misunderstanding. Communist [China] had resumed shelling the off-shore islands of Matsu and Quemoy and President Eisenhower writes that he wanted to make sure that the United States would be ready to react if the islands were invaded.

"The President and Mr. Dulles believed that the United States, to be successful, might 'face the necessity of using small-yield atomic weapons against hostile airfields.'

"The memo added that while there would be popular revulsion against the United States in most of the world, it might not last long if the bombs were exploded in the air, so that there would be no 'appreciable' fallout or large civilian casualties.

"Moreover, the memo stressed, adverse world reaction might not be so lasting or so serious as the loss of most of Asia, which could follow Peking's capture of Quemoy and Matsu."

The other occasion on which Eisenhower now admits he was prepared to use nuclear weapons was at the end of the Korean war.

Once before President Eisenhower had drawn up plans for the possible use of atomic weapons against the Chinese Communists," reports the New York Times.

"In 1953, he let word leak out that unless a satisfactory armistice could be arranged in Korea, the United States would use its nuclear power to gain full victory. Shortly thereafter the Communists agreed to armistice terms."

The most ominous part of these revelations, aside from their obvious timing, is the perfectly logical way in which they fit into Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam.

If Eisenhower was ready to use nuclear weapons in Korea in 1953, and again in 1958 to keep Quemoy and Matsu in the hands of Chiang Kai-shek, why shouldn't the Pentagon use them now to step up the escalation in Vietnam one more notch.

HARRIMAN IRRITATED OVER CAMPUS FERMENT AGAINST VIETNAM WAR

At a press conference in Detroit, Michigan, September 21, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large W. Averell Harriman expressed his irritation over the ferment on college campuses in the United States opposing the war in Vietnam.

The former governor of New York and ambassador to the Soviet Union, who is a member of America's inner ruling circle of sixty multibillionaire families, made it clear that he did not think a revolution is developing in the United States at present. In fact, he tried to brush aside the domestic political importance of the ferment. "I don't think," he said, "it has very serious implications internally, but it does abroad."

In the colossally wealthy ambassador's opinion, the campus ferment in the United States has encouraged and inspired the freedom fighters in Vietnam.

Their heightened morale has made them less willing to bow to Johnson's escalation of the war and to the massive use of high explosives, napalm and frightful new instruments of mass murder being tested out in Vietnam by the Pentagon.

"Harriman," reported the Detroit News, "said he talked to a veteran reporter who had interviewed a Viet Cong leader who was completely familiar with the status of campus opposition to the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war. Harriman indicated the Viet Cong leader felt the American people would not support a lengthy fight for Vietnam, citing the unrest among students and the academic community."

Exactly what this representative of America's ruling families proposes to do about campus unrest was not very clear. For the record he stated: "I'm the last one to ask that inhibitions be placed on free speech in this country."

Nevertheless his unhappiness over the results of student and teacher exercise of "free speech" was only too evident. When genuine defenders of democratic rights stretch hands across the sea, American imperialism only stands to lose.

WELL-KNOWN TROTSKYIST TORTURED BY BOUMEDIENNE GOVERNMENT

Paris

At a large press conference at the Maison du Mutualité September 27, Albert Roux, a well-known Trotskyist of French nationality, who was serving in Algeria as one of the country's badly needed technicians, described how he had been arbitrarily arrested by Boumedienne's political police, hauled to headquarters and there subjected to torture. When the police failed to get him to "confess" to working with the underground revolutionary-socialist opposition to the Boumedienne regime, he was taken to a villa on the outskirts of the city where he was submitted to increasingly severe degrees of torture in an attempt to break him down.

Immediately after being arrested, he said, he was taken down to the basement of the police headquarters. "I was stripped naked and beaten," he said. This beating was so severe that when a doctor was brought in to examine him some days later, he found the victim's torso still black and blue.

But this was only the beginning. "One of them told me," said Roux, "'You'll regret not cooperating.'"

At the villa he was again stripped naked. The first stage of the torture consisted of being forced to bend over, legs kept straight, one forefinger touching the floor, and then walking in a circle endlessly, keeping his finger all the time in touch with the floor. He was forced to keep this up until he dropped from exhaustion. Thereupon blows were not spared. The questioning was constant throughout the torture.

When this failed to produce the desired brain-washing, the next stage of torture began. "I was stretched, still naked, on my back, arms stretched out. A man stood on each of my hands. A third man then put a piece of rubber tire across my throat and pressed it down with his feet, cutting off my breath. Each time, I felt like I was dying.

"This was varied from time to time by something else. They grabbed my sex organs and twisted them."

The next attempt to force a "confession" from Roux was electric torture. Use of electricity by the French colonial forces during the Algerian war drew outraged protest from the entire world. Roux learned now exactly how it felt when applied by Boumedienne's police. Two electrodes were attached to his naked body, he was sloshed with water to increase the conductivity, and the switch was turned on repeatedly.

Finally came the worst siege of all. "I was placed naked, feet and hands tied together behind my back, in a shower stall. One

of the torturers held my undershirt over my face, while the other, using a water hose attached to the faucet, flooded my nose and mouth with water. While doing this, he pressed his foot into my stomach. It felt exactly like I was drowning. The electric shocks and the water hose were applied by turns during the whole night of Wednesday, September 1.

"I was then taken to meet Le Goff, and a young Algerian whom he had given refuge in his room, and Goasdoué and Mazière. I learned that both Mazière and Le Goff had been tortured in the same way.

"The next day I discovered that I could no longer hear out of my right ear. This deafness lasted for more than two weeks.

"I should make clear that I was arrested without a warrant, that my home was searched without a warrant and in my absence and that no listing was made of things seized at my home or which I had on me."

When Boumedienne's cops searched the apartment, Roux said, they tore down a Cuban flag on the wall, spit on it, trampled it underfoot, and did the same with portraits of Che Guevara and Fidel Castro.

Two other members of the Fourth International, Simonne Minguet and Pierre Meyers, also at the press conference, told how they had been arbitrarily arrested in Algiers. They were not tortured themselves but they said that they saw plenty of evidence of the torture of other French nationals.

A fourth supporter of the Algerian Revolution, Monique Laks, a school teacher, confirmed the accounts given by the other three. She was not a member of the Fourth International, she stated.

All four told of seeing many Algerians in the jails they were held in, all arrested on the same blanket charges of "collusion" with the underground opposition to the Boumedienne regime.

The Parti Communiste Internationaliste (French section of the Fourth International), issued a press release giving additional facts concerning the arrests.

"Four of the first people of French nationality to be arrested in Algeria beginning August 28 were Trotskyist militants of the Fourth International: Jean-Yves Le Goff, Albert Roux, Simonne Minguet and Pierre Meyers. At the same time, three other people of French nationality not belonging to our organization were arrested. After that, the arrests increased, involving in particular former members of the editorial board of Alger Républicain. An unknown but large number of Algerians have been arrested.

"On September 21, the Algerian Minister of Information Mr.

Bachir Boumaza, in the course of a press conference printed in the September 22 issue of El Moudjahid, accused these first prisoners of constituting the bulk of the membership of the Organisation de Résistance Populaire [ORP]. With their arrest and the arrest of Hocine Zahouane and Bachir Hadj Ali, former secretary of the Algerian Communist party, the ORP, he said, had been dismantled.

"The facts and the arguments suffice to show that these statements constitute nothing but a gross police amalgam, the aim of which is clear: (1) To try to discredit the ORP among the Algerian masses through 'proof' that this oppositional organization has a foreign origin. (2) To get rid of Europeans whose sympathy for independent Algeria is inseparable from their attachment to its socialist options, and thus suppress bothersome witnesses of the 'Thermidorian' course of the Boumedienne government."

The statement of the French Trotskyists continues, offering facts to expose the police amalgam and slanders.

"On August 28, Jean-Yves Le Goff, carrying out his military service as a 'cooperator' under the Plan [through which France makes it possible for French nationals to help out in Algeria]...was arrested. His crime? He had let a member of the youth of the FLN, whom he knew to be in opposition, sleep in his room overnight. There is no law that makes this a crime....Was he a member of the network supporting the ORP? No. He had on him a letter he had written to one of the leaders of our organization. El Moudjahid reproduces fragments from this message, but we have no way of knowing whether or not they were 'planted.' In any case, far from proving 'collusion,' this document, such of it as has been reproduced, shows reservations with regard to the ORP. It could constitute evidence only of a crime of opinion, at the maximum a crime of intention of engaging in 'collusion.' Nevertheless, Jean-Yves Le Goff was submitted to 'questioning.'

"On August 31, on leaving work, Albert Roux, a 'cooperator' in the Office des Céréales, was arrested in turn. Like the others, this was done in a completely illegal way, without a warrant.... Goasdoué was arrested the same day. A neighbor of Le Goff, he went to tell Roux about the latter's arrest. Having no political affiliation, this television technician escaped 'questioning' probably only because he is a cardiac case.

"On September 1, the school teachers Michel Mazière and Monique Laks, likewise without political affiliation, were arrested....

"On September 2 Simonne Minguet and Pierre Meyers were arrested in the street as they were returning home about eleven o'clock at night after seeing a show. Their shouts aroused the neighbors, who passed the information on to the French embassy.

"Neither on them nor at their homes could the police find any-

thing that might constitute 'evidence' of connection with an underground network. This did not prevent Minister Boumaza from claiming that through these arrests a 'network of adventurers seeking to foment trouble in Algeria' had been dismantled. At the time he said this, the police dossier on the first cases had been closed and he could not be unaware of the fact that it was empty."

The prisoners were held incommunicado. Not even the French embassy was permitted to communicate with them. For more than twenty days they were not permitted to see a lawyer or to know what the charges were.

As for the records of these people in the Algerian struggle for independence, the facts speak for themselves.

Albert Roux was the treasurer and one of the principal figures in the Committee of Solidarity with the Victims of the Repression Due to the Algerian War. Because of his outstanding role in helping the Algerian freedom struggle, he was among those singled out by the ultrareactionary OAS [the terrorist Organisation de l'Armée Secrète] for a bombing attack.

Simonne Minguet was the first French woman to be imprisoned in France on the charge of helping the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale]. Together with Albert Roux she was one of the signers of the famous "Manifesto of the 121" that denounced France's "dirty war" in Algeria.

Pierre Meyers was active throughout the Algerian war, helping the anticolonial fighters. When he returned to France September 24, after being deported like the others from Algeria by the Boumedienne government, he was at once picked up by the French police. He was still on their "wanted" list for having helped the FLN in 1960! He was jailed by the French authorities and it took two days to secure his release pending trial.

ROUX CHALLENGES ALGERIAN AMBASSADOR

In face of the wide publicity given in France to Albert Roux's account of how he was tortured while under arrest in Algiers on suspicion of "collusion" with an underground revolutionary political opposition, the police chose the classic course of cops in all countries in such situations. They denied that Roux was "maltreated." And Boumedienne's government has chosen to help them cover up their foul violation of human rights.

The Algerian embassy in Paris issued a formal statement, declaring that the arrests were "not arbitrary" and the accusations

were "true." Moreover, "The Algerian government formally denies the allegations according to which these persons suffered maltreatment." (Le Monde, September 29.)

In response to this, Albert Roux, addressed the following letter, dated September 29, to the Algerian ambassador:

"A communiqué, issued by your embassy yesterday, denies that my comrades and I suffered torture during the time we were detained.

"If you do not consider maltreatment like strangulation under a person's foot, twisting of one's sexual organs, electric shocks through one's wet and naked body, water from a hose directed over an undershirt held against your face up to the point of suffocation, to be maltreatment, then Mr. Ambassador, I am quite willing to agree that we did not suffer maltreatment.

"But permit me to make the observation that the designation for such treatment -- and in all languages -- is hardly anything except 'maltreatment' and 'torture.'

"Before describing this in Paris, we reported it in writing to Military Security during the time we were held by that service, telling how we were maltreated by the PRG [Central Intelligence]. The Military Security even assured us that measures would be taken. You know where to get the information, Mr. Ambassador.

"I will add that I have already consulted with an attorney in order to file a complaint, because I cannot agree to see men whom I considered my brothers dishonor the new Algeria, either by practicing torture or by covering up those who do.

"But if you prefer to submit the matter to an International Commission of Inquiry, I am personally prepared to help it, on condition of course that this Commission can conduct a thorough investigation and that it is granted full powers to secure information and testimony to establish the truth.

"I am ready, despite the revulsion I feel, to return to Algiers to identify my torturers and those among their colleagues who, without engaging in torture themselves, were accomplices.

"Your communiqué also says that our arrests were not arbitrary and that the accusation of violating the security of the state was true.

"Why, then, Mr. Ambassador, were we not brought to trial?

"Permit me to assure you, Mr. Ambassador, of my bitter disappointment."

BOLIVIANS ANSWER REPRESSION BY CALLING FOR GUERRILLAS

A new test of strength has been taking place in Bolivia between the miners and the ruling military junta. Action centered around the Siglo XX-Catavi mining area. In an attempt to crush the miners' movement headed by trade unionists now in the underground, the junta ordered assaults by government troops and announced September 22 that the mines would be closed down "indefinitely." (Colonel Juan Lechín Suarez announced the following day, however, that they would probably be reopened September 24.)

Violent battles occurred between the troops and the miners, with some thirty reported killed and hundreds wounded. The press headlined the news that three policemen, held hostage by the miners, had been hurled down mine shafts to their deaths. However, Agence France Press reported September 24 that all three had reappeared from inside the mine without having been injured.

As a new repressive measure, the junta singled out groups of miners suspected of being ringleaders and ordered them deported to isolated regions of the country.

Thus the course that began last May has continued along the indicated lines. The military junta could not "purge" the labor movement of its best known leaders and "reorganize" the mines (through massive layoffs and substantial wage cuts) and at the same time continue to play the game of "restoring democracy" after the downfall of Paz Estenssoro. A direct conflict with the miners was inevitable. The first round occurred last May. The second round, bloodier than the first, came four months later. The junta utilized the intervening period to hit at the labor movement through arrests, deportations and assassinations with the obvious aim of liquidating the most important leaders and cadres.

The murder of César Lora, a Trotskyist leader of the Siglo XX miners [see World Outlook September 17], was the most tragic episode of this repression. The killing of César Lora was followed by blows against other militants just before the most recent armed conflict at Siglo XX-Catavi.

On September 4, Hugo Gonzalez Moscoso, secretary of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario, the Bolivian Trotskyist organization, was arrested while on the way from La Paz to Oruro. He was held incommunicado.

Lucha Obrera, the official newspaper of the POR, immediately raised the alarm about the very real possibility that Moscoso might be placed before one of the junta's firing squads without so much as a mock trial. Students and teachers immediately organized a mass demonstration, marching in front of police headquarters and shouting that Moscoso be freed at once. The miners likewise registered strong

protests.

The junta and its police finally backed down in face of this pressure and Moscoso was released a few days after his arrest.

Lucha Obrera also reported the arrest of another revolutionist, Paulino Joaniquina. It was not known where the police were holding him.

Paulino Joaniquina was secretary of the miners' union at San José (Oruro). In November of last year, while General Barrientos was in San José, Joaniquina gave a courageous speech, voicing the demands of the miners and stating that they would never give up their arms as had been demanded by the junta. Last May he headed his comrades in their struggle against the junta and after they were defeated he went into the underground.

A number of revolutionists have been arrested, according to Lucha Obrera, and are being held under barbarous conditions. "In the foul, rat-infested cells of the police department, a number of revolutionary fighters are being treated in inhuman fashion. Among them are Enrique Valenzuela, Prudencio Meneses and Silvio Torrez, arrested for having taken the floor at a meeting where they voiced the interests of the miners. These militants are maintaining a courageous attitude in face of the butchers who beat them. Gaston Murillo and Guzman were arrested on the accusation of having fomented the students to struggle. The two university students were seriously injured under torture by the police. Two members of the POR, Marquez and Omonte, were arrested while distributing publications of the party. They were also subjected to torture, particularly Marquez who suffered a number of injuries."

The junta hopes to consolidate its dictatorial regime by severe repression such as that visited on the miners at Siglo XX-Catavi. But things could go contrary to the calculations of Barrientos and his crew. The very harshness of the repression and the direct attack on the standard of living, which was already at an utterly miserable level, can provoke new explosions. Even the poverty-stricken layers of the petty bourgeoisie in the towns are hostile to the regime as are the peasants who see the former wealthy landholders lifting their heads under the junta.

Recent reports would seem to indicate, in addition, that the struggle in Bolivia may extend into a new field. Some of the militants who have been blacklisted by the junta and forced to flee seem to be resorting to guerrilla struggle. In September the first issue of a small publication called Pueblo en Armas [The People in Arms], which lists itself as "Organo del Comando Nacional Guerrillero" [Organ of the National Guerrilla Command], was circulated in La Paz. It included some militant declarations.

One of them, under the title "Salvemos a Bolivia del Desastre con las Armas en la Mano" [Arms in Hand, Let Us Save Bolivia from

Disaster], read as follows:

"Our country is today undergoing the worst period in its history. We are practically an occupied country.

"To open the country to Yankee colonization, the military have had to destroy the unions, trample law underfoot, murder leaders of the workers. And to increase the profits of the companies, they have had to reduce wages and salaries. Bolivia today is a big concentration camp where insecurity and hunger reign.

"Bolivians! Let's rise against this macabre situation. Let's save Bolivia from perishing as a sovereign and independent nation. Let's defend freedom and democratic rights.

"Bolivians!

"The National Guerrilla Command has arisen to carry on this struggle. Today it calls on all Bolivians to organize themselves into armed squads in order to struggle face to face against the assassins! The time has come for armed action.

"We Bolivians prefer TO DIE RATHER THAN LIVE AS SLAVES! Long live the workers' and people's guerrilla fighters!"

[Nuestra patria vive hoy los peores dias de su historia. Practicamente somos un país ocupado.

[Para abrir el país a la colonización yanqui, los militares han tenido que destruir los sindicatos, pisotear las leyes, asesinar dirigentes obreros. Y para aumentar la ganancia de las empresas han tenido que rebajar salarios y sueldos. Bolivia es ahora un gran campo de concentración donde impera la inseguridad y el hambre.

[!Bolivianos! Levantémonos contra esta macábra situación. Salvemos a Bolivia de perecer como nación soberana e independiente. Salvemos al pueblo de morir de hambre. Defendamos las libertades y derechos democráticos.

[!Bolivianos!

[Para esta lucha ha nacido el Comando Nacional Guerrillero, que hoy llama a todos los bolivianos a organizarse en piquetes armados para dar la lucha frontal contra los masacradores! Ha llegado la hora de la acción armada.

[Los bolivianos preferimos MORIR ANTES QUE ESCLAVOS VIVIR!
!Vivan las Guerrillas obreras y populares!]

In another statement, entitled "Guerrilla Warfare is the Prolongation of the Mass Struggle" [La Guerrilla Es la Prolongación de la Lucha de Masas], the first number of Pueblo en Armas declared:

"Armed struggle, including guerrilla war, has been imposed on us by the way the military junta has acted. If we are taking up arms, it is because all legal roads for struggle have been closed. The military junta has broken the juridical framework and placed itself outside the law. The example of the miners, who trusted in deals and dialogues is a fresh one. Delegates and signers of petitions are imprisoned. The same thing has occurred in the cities. No one can offer criticism without danger of being sent to Puerto Rico for so-called brain-washing.

"The legal struggle and mobilization of the masses ran into violence and repression. The military junta has compelled us to resort to armed struggle, which is nothing more than the continuation of the mass struggle, but by other, more adequate means.

"This does not mean that union struggles and leadership of the workers' movement must be given up. Not at all. That form of struggle continues; but in face of the regime's brutality, it is complemented with armed action and guerrilla warfare. A close relation exists between them, or to put it better, armed action and the mass struggle are two facets of the general struggle for the national and social liberation of Bolivia.

"To accomplish this, it is necessary in every mine, factory, shop, field, to organize Union Defense Committees made up of the most audacious and courageous members. We want to throw out the military; not to replace them with another dictatorship, but to organize a popular government of workers, peasants and revolutionary men. Long live the guerrilla fighters! Down with the military boot!

"Let's struggle to make Bolivia a free and prosperous country that brings happiness to its children!

"Bolivians!

"Let's save the country from Yankee colonization and the people from persecution and hunger!"

[La lucha armada, y dentro de ella, la guerra de guerrillas, nos had sido impuesta por la conducta de la Junta Militar. Si tomamos las armas, es porque se han cerrado todos los caminos legales de lucha. La Junta Militar a roto el ordenamiento jurídico y se ha colocado fuera de la ley. Está fresco el ejemplo de los mineros, que confiaron en tratativas y diálogos. Delegados y firmantes de peticiones estan presos. En las ciudades la misma cosa. Nadie puede criticar sin peligro de ser confinado a Puerto Rico, al llamado lavado cerebral.

[La lucha legal y la movilización de masas chocan con la violencia y la represión. La Junta Militar nos obliga a pasar a la lucha armada, que es nada más que la continuación de la lucha de masas, pero por otros medios más adecuados.

[Esto no quiere decir que hay que abandonar la lucha sindical

y la dirección del movimiento obrero. Nada de eso. Esta forma de lucha continúa, pero ante la brutalidad del régimen, se complementa con la acción armada y la guerrilla. Existe una relación íntima entre ambas, o más bien, si se quiere, la acción armada y la lucha de masas, son dos facetas de la lucha general por la liberación nacional y social de Bolivia.

[Por eso, en cada mina, fábrica, taller, campo, hay que organizar Comités de Defensa Sindical, integrados con los más audaces y valientes. Queremos echar abajo a los militares, pero no para reemplazarlos por otra dictadura, sino para organizar un gobierno popular, de obreros, campesinos y hombres revolucionarios. ¡Vivan las guerrillas! Abajo la Bota!

[Luchamos para hacer de Bolivia una patria libre y próspera que de felicidad a sus hijos!

[¡Bolivianos!

[Salvemos a la patria de la colonización yanqui y al pueblo de la persecución y el hambre!]

UNITY MOVEMENT REPORTS VICTIMIZATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

[The following report, dated September 18, was received from the "Head Office in Exile" of the "All-African Convention" and the "Unity Movement of South Africa."

[It will be noted that the report ends with an appeal for financial assistance. The address is the Unity Movement of South Africa, P.O.Box 1850, Lusaka, Zambia, Africa.]

* * *

The persecution of the opponents of the apartheid regime has become part of the South African way of life. Always there is fresh and horrible evidence of this fact. Indeed the world has come to expect everyday to hear of new inroads upon human liberty in that land. In this regard the South African fascist regime is very consistent and its behaviour is predictable almost to the finest detail. Thus in the last few days we have seen further onslaughts upon human rights in South Africa, where it is the policy of the government to trample these underfoot. This is done with the collaboration and connivance of the ruling class as a whole. For, indeed, the history of South Africa for the past three hundred years of white domination has been a catalogue of crimes against humanity. Verwoerd has created no new mythology but has intensified the rigours of an oppressive system. His regime employs every means to demonstrate to the population beyond any shadow of doubt that this policy of the dictatorship

of the minority over the majority is sacrosanct and beyond criticism.

As a result of the intolerable persecution of the opponents of the Broederbond dictatorship, hundreds of members and officials of the All-African Convention and the Unity Movement of South Africa and of the affiliated organisations to these bodies have been subjected to bannings, house arrests, detention and imprisonment. This is done in order to decapitate the organisations and demoralise the broad mass of the membership.

P. Gcabashe

Early this year, we reported that P. Gcabashe, a stalwart of the Unity Movement and an elderly man of sixty had suffered victimisation and cruel persecution. On the eve of his pension, Gcabashe gave up his teaching job to become a full-time organiser of the Unity Movement and a member of the Head Unity Committee. He organised the people against removal from Northern Natal to Monalo. He himself refused to move even when others gave up resistance under pressure. The police never gave him rest. But he continued to organise the peasants in particular and brought them into the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa [APDUSA], an affiliate of the Unity Movement.

During December, 1964, the political police whisked him away from his home. Urgent appeals by his wife, herself Chairman of the Kingsly Branch of APDUSA, Natal, received no reply. In a letter which he secretly transmitted, Gcabashe revealed that he had been kidnapped by the Gestapo and lodged in a Bizana (Pondoland) jail under the emergency Proclamation 400, which, since 1960, has dispensed with the rule of law in the Transkei. He had been subjected by the police to all sorts of pressures -- from brute force to cajolery, inducements and promises of release should he agree to betray his colleagues. Gcabashe refused and treated the approach with contempt. As a result, after a long period of detention, he has been charged, prosecuted and jailed in terms of the tyrannical Proclamation 400. His family is now bereft of any form of support.

Sihlali and Mtshizana

L.L.Sihlali and L.L.Mtshizana, former President of the Unity Movement and former Chairman of the East London Branch of the Society of Young Africa [SOYA] respectively, have now been removed from the North End Jail, Port Elizabeth, to Robben Island. Both men were charged and found guilty of attempting to flee the country in addition to various charges of violation of the terms of banning orders issued against them.

Mtshizana was placed under a five-year banning order in July, 1963, and confined to the magisterial district of East London. He was banned from attending meetings and gatherings. Sihlali was served with a similar banning order in March, 1964; in addition he

was placed under house arrest, denied the right to receive visitors in his own house; prohibited from attending meetings and gatherings of any kind and confined to the magisterial district of Queenstown.

S. Nyamela

S. Nyamela, former Chairman of the Cape Town Branch of APDUSA, was recently served with three banning orders prohibiting him from attending meetings and gatherings for a period of five years, confining him to Kanye Location, Engcobo and compelling him to report regularly to the police. We reported earlier that Nyamela had been deported from Cape Town, where he worked and lived with his family. He was then sent to Engcobo, Transkei, a few miles from the notorious Chief Matanzima's home. He was thus uprooted from his place of employment, together with his family. Nyamela is also President of the Society of Young Africa, an organisation of youth affiliated to the All-African Convention.

S. Ngcukuva

S. Ngcukuva, one of the most active organisers of APDUSA in the Transkei, has been banned and confined to the magisterial district of Umtata for a period of five years. Towards the end of last year, Ngcukuva was detained under the 90-day law, then charged with holding unlawful meetings in the Transkei and convicted. Part of the sentence was suspended. As a result of these harassments, Ngcukuva has not been able to complete his studies at the University College of Fort Hare. While a student there, he was arrested and detained for questioning under the 90-day law. He was later charged with incitement, but after about five months of detention, the charge against him was withdrawn.

Z. K. Mzimba

In August we reported that Z.K.Mzimba, former General Secretary of the Cape African Teachers' Association (which is affiliated with the All-African Convention) had been in jail for a long time. His home had been invaded and raided by the political police several times. After furious interrogation by the police, he appeared in court on September 9 on a charge of being found in possession of banned literature, a charge that carries very heavy penalties in South Africa, including imprisonment.

Moloyi

One of the most influential leaders amongst the peasants in Zululand, Natal Province, is Moloyi, popularly known as "the one-eyed eagle." A most powerful speaker and orator, he enthralled his audience at the conferences of the All-African Convention and the Unity Movement. He organised and fought against the introduction of the rehabilitation scheme (land and cattle robbery by the government) in his area. For this he incurred the displeasure of officialdom. In

April this year he was arrested and has been in detention since that time. Reports from home say that various trumped-up charges are being laid against him, some of them dating back to 1960, that is, the time of the Pondoland peasant revolt.

Pondoland

A number of peasant leaders, members of the Unity Movement, have been arrested recently in Pondoland and charges of murder dating back to 1960 are being preferred against some of them. Others have to report to quisling Chief Botha Sigcau twice a week. Botha Sigcau is Paramount Chief of Eastern Pondoland, who, against the wishes of the people upon whom he has been foisted, supports the Transkei self-rule fraud. He is one of the strongest supporters of Kaiser Matanzima, the Tshombe of South Africa.

PAC Men Win Appeal

We are glad to report that six members of the Pan Africanist Congress, T. Letlaka and five others, who were charged with conspiring to overthrow the South African Government by revolution, using Basutoland as their base, have been acquitted on appeal. In allowing their appeal the presiding judge said that no sufficient evidence had been adduced by the Crown to show that they had in fact participated in the activities alleged. All that had been shown was that they had been involved in training for guerrilla warfare. This did not justify a conviction in terms of the law that applies. (It is an offence to organise or engage in "subversive" activities against a neighbouring state from any of the British protectorates abutting South Africa.) The PAC men were defended by W.M. Tsotsi, Vice-President of the Unity Movement, who is now in exile in Basutoland.

Appeal

In face of these new attacks upon our people and in view of the plight of the families affected, we have to appeal to our public-spirited friends and sympathetic organisations to make generous donations towards the legal defence of those victims of the Verwoerd regime, who, because of their resolution to end tyranny in that country, have to appear in South African courts. Their families are likewise in need of help. We are thankful for what has been done before in this regard but our problems are growing from day to day.

RISE IN NUMBER OF STRIKES IN BRITAIN

In the first seven months of this year, according to the Ministry of Labour 2,183,000 working days were lost due to strikes. For the same period last year the figure was 1,631,000. This represents a rise of more than 33%. The number of workers involved was 622,000 as compared with 593,400 the year before.

TEXTBOOKS REFURBISH THE MIKADO

The deepening opposition in Japan to Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam has opened up new perspectives for the growth of the revolutionary-socialist movement there. At the moment, the new current of opposition is sweeping mainly into the Socialist party; it may become the majority party in the not distant future.

A trend of quite different character has been making headway, too -- the ultra reactionary wing that was rescued, tolerated and fostered under the American occupation.

An authoritative indication of the kind of thinking going on in these circles is to be found in an article written by former Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi in the October issue of the U.S. magazine Foreign Affairs. In his opinion, "freedom of speech" in Japan "has run riot." This is an obvious reference to the outcry that has gone up from one end of the archipelago to the other against the danger that the conflict in Vietnam can precipitate an atomic war.

In an attack on the Socialist party, Kishi declares that "the most irresponsible and dangerous is the party's argument for and conception of neutrality for Japan as a means of guaranteeing the country's security in place of the security treaty with the United States." What Kishi is talking about, of course, is the "security" of Japanese capitalism.

Kishi comes out flatly in his article for revision of the Japanese constitution to permit deletion of the "no war" clause.

"I advocate," he declares, "...the revision of the clause of the Constitution that bars Japan from formally maintaining armed forces. This issue should be taken up not only as a means of uniting the Conservative forces, but also as a means of eradicating completely the consequences of Japan's defeat and of the American occupation."

To facilitate this course, which would end up with Japan again armed to the teeth and ready to plunge into any adventure signalled by the White House, Kishi urged Washington to exercise "restraint" in ruling Okinawa as an American-occupied military base.

The recent use of Okinawa as a base for B-52s in bombing raids on south Vietnam, touched off a storm of popular protest in Japan, to the embarrassment of the Japanese government.

Kishi voices the views of top ruling circles in Japan who have decided to link their destiny with that of capitalist America. Against the antiwar and prosocialist sentiments of the masses, he argues for continuation of the treaty with the U.S. and advocates indoctrinating the people to go along with this. Contending that there is a widespread desire in Japan to continue the treaty, he says: "It must be

the aim of the Conservative forces to deepen this feeling among the people. We must organize a systematic campaign and countermeasures against the arguments and actions of the opposition."

This is not idle talk. A huge effort is underway, for instance, to once again revise the history textbooks in Japan. The September 17 weekly Asahi notes that in one textbook, the name of Hideki Yukawa, who won the Nobel Prize for physics in 1949, has been replaced. Honor is now paid in the textbook to war criminal Hideki Tojo. Tojo is pictured as the "general cheering up children of fallen heroes."

Textbooks must be approved by the Education Ministry. In accordance with changes in government they have thus undergone drastic revision three times since 1947 (in 1951, 1955 and 1958). This is not an unprofitable matter for the textbook publishing companies, of course.

The present wholesale revision of textbooks is the most drastic of all. The main reason, according to Asahi, is that the "imperialistic historian," Jiro Murao, is now in control as the investigator of the Textbook Section of the Education Ministry. He has the power to vote approval of a textbook.

As a consequence, the mythology of prewar Japan is again on the rise in the history textbooks to the satisfaction of the Mikado and his supporters who thus see the divinity of the imperial family restored.

Asahi offers as an example of the revisions now being carried out, the version of Japan's role in World War II. From an account in the 1954 edition of a high school textbook that remained within the general area of the truth, the 1961 edition reverted to an account smacking of the official sloganeering of Tojo's time. In the 1965 edition, the "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere" -- the main slogan justifying the expansion of Japanese imperialism -- is pictured as helping to make the purpose of the war clear and to charm even those who were not enthusiastic about the war.

One of the impressions which the revised history textbooks now begin to give, says Asahi, is that the Japanese invasion and occupation of Vietnam -- at that time a French colony -- was justifiable.

This makes ironic reading as American imperialism today follows in the path blazed by the French and Japanese imperialists before them.

LIVING COSTS CONTINUE TO SKYROCKET IN BRAZIL

The cost of living in Brazil rose 34% in the first eight months of this year. The Castelo Branco dictatorship and its American imperialist backers find this "very encouraging." Last year in the same period the rise was 85%.

GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE "GREAT SOCIETY"

Among the many notable accomplishments of Johnson's "Great Society" is its extraordinary capacity to manipulate the news. This is well known among reporters since it is one of the conditions of their job. Only rarely, however, do they write about it.

A recent article on this subject, prepared by Alfred Krusenstiern, was sent out on the wires of the United Press International, appearing in newspapers dated September 19.

The U.S. government is in "good company" if it is "guilty" of manipulating the news," writes Krusenstiern, but this is not its distinguishing characteristic.

"What sets the U.S. Government apart, according to Washington reporters, is the arsenal of subtle and sophisticated tools it employs to shape and channel the flow of information."

This boils down to two basic methods. One is simply to withhold information. This is often practiced but not as much as by other governments that are less "sophisticated."

"The other method," says Krusenstiern, "works the opposite way. It aims at regulating the public's daily news diet by supplying newsmen with carefully measured doses of information that is part true, part doctored."

As an example, Krusenstiern cites the White House habit of issuing a list of appointments with Johnson. "But this list is by no means complete." While reporters are buttonholing the people on the list -- who are ushered through the White House West Wing lounge adjoining the press room -- others are brought to the president "through other entrances." Reporters are not aware of this.

"Thus, newsmen are often kept busy questioning minor callers, while more important and more newsworthy visitors come and go unnoticed."

This is but one of the mildest ways of manipulating the news. The more insidious devices are the press conference, briefing where an "authorized spokesman" takes up prearranged topics, the printed press release, the background briefing, and the interview. "All five can be doctored," declares the UPI correspondent. He cites a number of specific instances of how this is done.

On the handling of printed press releases, Krusenstiern offers the following examples:

"For instance, when the President spends a weekend out of town, his press secretary often takes along a batch of press releases to

be issued at intervals until the President returns to his desk in the White House.

"When Johnson spent the Sept. 4-5-6 Labor Day weekend at his Texas ranch, Moyers doled out 18 press releases on Saturday, and Laitin issued another 16 on Monday. Most of them had nothing to do with the President's weekend activities."

Krusenstiern's article is not actually an exposé of Washington's use of deliberately lying propaganda. In his entire report, for instance, he does not mention even once the way the Central Intelligence Agency doctors the news. Yet the CIA is so notorious that it is taken for granted it will deny as a routine matter actions of its own which even the State Department is forced to acknowledge, sometimes after issuing its own routine denial.

A case in point was the recent handling of an exposure of CIA activities in Singapore. On August 30, Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew revealed that in January 1961, the CIA had offered him a bribe of \$3,300,000 if he would keep his mouth shut about a CIA espionage operation in his government in 1960.

On August 31, the State Department "flatly denied the allegation." State Department press officer, Robert J. McCloskey, said: "With respect to allegations about the C.I.A., we deny that."

On the following day, September 1, Lee Kuan Yew revealed the contents of a letter of apology on the subject written to him by Dean Rusk on April 15, 1961. He threatened, in addition, to broadcast certain tape recordings.

McCloskey had no choice, in the face of such evidence, but to withdraw the denial, which he did with the hollow-sounding declaration that "Those who were consulted yesterday were not fully aware of the background of the incident..." The Washington press also said that the CIA had sent out routine misinformation to other departments of the government when questioned about the bribe attempt.

Krusenstiern's article itself is an example of manipulated news. It follows the formula of measuring out a dose of information that is partly true, while withholding essential facts that are necessary to form an accurate judgment on how the U.S. government distorts and twists the news.

In this way the UPI presents the best possible picture of the way news is handled in Washington and freshens up its own image as an honest, hard-working news agency in search of the truth.

U.S. PROSPERITY HINGED ON ESCALATION IN VIETNAM

[An unusually revealing article, illustrating how much the running of the capitalist economy in the United States now depends on war expenditures, appeared in the New York Times of September 24 (international edition). The title itself speaks volumes: "Vietnam War Fuels U.S. Growth -- Escalation Provided Lift for Expansion as It Faltered." Because of its interest, we are reproducing the full text below.

[The author, M.J. Rossant, refers in passing to the forebodings of Federal Reserve Chairman Williams McChesney Martin, Jr., last spring. This authoritative spokesman of the American banks said that the economy was showing signs of heading toward a crash like that of 1929, which ushered in the worst depression in the country's history. These forebodings were wrong, says Rossant, but so were the optimistic forecasts of the Johnson administration. It is now clear, according to Rossant, that the U.S. economy stood at the brink of a downturn -- but not a 1929-type crash -- at the time Johnson ordered the escalation in Vietnam.

[Rossant's assertion that Johnson's decision to escalate "had nothing to do with the state of the economy and was completely unexpected by the President's economic advisers," may be taken with a considerable pinch of salt. The truth is, in the light of the available evidence, that the decision to escalate had been taken at least a year before. Implementation was deferred until after the November 1964 election so that Johnson could campaign as the "peace" candidate against Goldwater. It may well be that the signs of sag in the American economy, which so alarmed Martin, were decisive in the timing of Johnson's order giving the green light for the long-prepared plunge into Vietnam.]

* * *

NEW YORK, Sept. 23 -- It was a close call. Little by little, it has become clear that the longest peacetime expansion in the nation's history was in danger of giving out until the escalation of the war in Vietnam gave it a new lease on life.

The Johnson Administration is not admitting that the boom came within a breath or two of expiring. But it has let slip a revealing hint or two. The latest batch of economic statistics confirms that activity had slowed down and that a prolonged pause, if not a serious decline, was in the making before Vietnam changed the situation.

The August figures, the latest available, show that after rising sharply in the first eight months of the year the Federal Reserve's index of industrial production leveled off. At the same time, housing starts and new orders of durable goods declined. Personal income rose, but the rate of increase was far below the heady pace recorded in the

spring.

Without the recent step-up in military spending, which also boosted business confidence, the slowdown in August would have been much more noticeable. It could have marked the beginning of the end of the expansion. Business spending, which is now climbing, could have slipped. And production might have fallen further as consumers curbed their appetites.

Even with the stimulus of additional spending, business activity will be advancing at a slower rate than it did earlier. But the pause in August now appears to be a catching of breath before going on, more leisurely, to new heights.

The pause emphasizes, however, that the Johnson Administration's confident predictions and careful plans were in jeopardy. Then came the decision to escalate, which had nothing to do with the state of the economy and was completely unexpected by the President's economic advisers. It provided just enough lift to business -- and to investor confidence -- to keep the expansion going.

The Vietnam build-up also makes clear that both sides in the celebrated economic debate that unnerved Wall Street and enlivened newspapers last spring were in the wrong.

Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., was off base in suggesting that the accelerating pace of the expansion was similar to the 1929 period and that an unsustainable boom might be followed by a bust. Clearly, the real peril was that the boom might simply fade away.

But the Johnson Administration was just as much at fault for insisting that things were good and would get better.

The Vietnamese escalation was timed perfectly. It permitted the Administration to apply the necessary stimulation without confessing its fallibility. It not only kept the economy from faltering, but salvaged the Johnson Administration's reputation.

FIGHTERS FOR PEACE WHOM I MET IN A WASHINGTON JAIL

[The rise inside the United States of political opposition to Johnson's escalation of U.S. intervention in the civil war in Vietnam has aroused the greatest interest throughout the world as one of the most hopeful developments in the recent period. This antiwar movement has centered up to now around the campuses, with repercussions in the civil-rights struggle of the Negro people and their allies. However, this developing opposition movement obviously has wide appeal among other sectors of the population in the United States. This is well illustrated in the following extract from an article in the October

issue of Liberation entitled "Escalation in the Peace Movement," a report on the "Washington Assembly of Unrepresented People" held last August in Washington, D.C. The author, Dave Dellinger, is a well-known figure in the civil-rights and pacifist movements.]

* * *

The heterogeneous composition of the participants in Washington gives some idea of the potential vitality of the movement, as evidenced by its ability to attract a wide variety of persons from different backgrounds, classes, and temperaments. This heterogeneity was evident all week end, but was particularly driven home to me when I was in jail. On the fourth day of our imprisonment, after most of the persons arrested had paid their fines, been bailed out, or completed three-day sentences, I found myself in a prison dormitory with fifteen other demonstrators, most of whom I had never met before. Here is a relevant summary of who they were:

A young Texan, who served a hitch in the navy and is now a staff member of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. He told me that he first began to have his eyes opened to the hypocrisy of American foreign policy when he was stationed at Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion. Among other things, he saw wounded Cubans, in G.I. coveralls, being unloaded from American planes at a time when the United States was denying all knowledge of what was going on. His commanding officer told the men to turn their backs, so that they would not see what was happening -- a purely technical cover-up, since there was no mistaking what was going on. (Incidentally, this reminded me of a man I met the last time I was in jail in Washington, who argued, rather convincingly, that he was a disillusioned former C.I.A. agent, who had killed, for the government, on assignments abroad, with everything from piano wire, poison, and his bare hands to the most modern weapons.)

Another navy veteran, who was one of 30 enlisted men quietly mustered out of the navy last February, for having held a brief protest meeting at Pearl Harbor against continued American participation in the Vietnamese war. He told me that one of the things that had upset these enlisted men was first-hand knowledge that the "retaliatory" bombing and shelling of North Vietnam, in August, 1964, had been planned and prepared at least three weeks in advance of the alleged incident that was supposed to have provoked it. He said that they had known what was up when they had taken part in loading extra bombs and shells onto an aircraft carrier, at Pearl Harbor, three weeks before the claimed provocation by North Vietnamese PT boats in the Gulf of Tonkin.

A college junior, with a hundred-dollar-a-week personal spending allowance, who had never taken part in a demonstration before. He read about the Assembly in a newspaper, the day beforehand, and was so fed up with American actions in Vietnam that he decided to travel several hundred miles to take part, even though he knew no one

involved. He said that when he took part in Monday's venture onto the Capitol grounds, he expected to be arrested, but was shocked at the police brutality. (Incidentally, when my lawyer visited me in prison, he said that there were numerous television shots of police clubbing and kicking demonstrators, but that the F.B.I. had issued word that they were not to be shown but should be surrendered to the F.B.I.)

Another college student, who likewise had never taken part in a demonstration or been associated with any peace group. His father is a career army officer, who was either in Vietnam or on his way there, at the time of the demonstration. The student had spent most of his childhood in American military enclaves abroad.

A 49-year-old, third-generation owner of a factory, who is an active member of the National Association of Manufacturers, owns a private yacht, and vigorously defended the American system of "free enterprise," in jail-house arguments. He believes that American foreign policy is suicidal and contrary to the best ideals and traditions of the country.

A native, white southerner, 22 or 23 years old, who has lived in Mississippi since he was fifteen, and has only recently come to believe in integration and disbelieve in America's role in world politics.

Another native-born white Southerner, a man from Louisiana who still has relatives living in Leander Perez' notorious Plaquemine Parish.

A black S.N.C.C. [Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee] worker from Washington, D.C., from an extremely limited economic and educational background.

Two northern white Catholics, formerly active in Young Catholics of America, and presently associated with a Catholic hospice in Detroit. Like many of the others, this was their first arrest.

A student at Duke University, in North Carolina, who recently left college to work in one of S.D.S.'s [Students for a Democratic Society] community projects in a city slum.

Three northern white college students (one of them from a poor, fundamentalist Baptist background and another from a wealthy and sophisticated Jewish home), all of whom are doing volunteer civil-rights work in Mississippi.

A lawyer's son, from Chicago, who had always been scornful of nonviolence, but felt that its use at the Assembly had been remarkably successful.

WALLOON WORKERS PARTY HOLDS SECOND CONGRESS

Brussels

The Walloon Workers party held its second congress on September 19 in La Louvière. The presiding committee consisted of Robert Nicolas of Charleroi; Dramaix, a worker of the Borinage; and Louis Goire, a well-known shop steward at the giant Cockerill-Ougrée steel works in Liège.

The main points on the agenda were adoption of party statutes (presented by Henri Vaume of Liège); consideration of two reports, one on the political situation, presented by Jean Rombaux of Centre, the other on the confederation of the Walloon, Brussels and Flemish left socialists, which was presented by Frans Legros of Nivelles; and the election of the party's central committee. Observers from Brussels included the left-socialist member of parliament Pierre Le Grève and Ernest Mandel, editor of the weekly La Gauche.

The congress, attended by some one hundred delegates, was proof enough that the split engineered by François Perin (a member of parliament from Liège who joined a former trade-union secretary, Robert Moreau, in setting up a nationalistic Walloon party) failed to draw away any of the essential forces of the Walloon Workers party. The working-class strongholds of Liège and Charleroi, for instance, showed that they had stayed practically unanimously with the Walloon Workers party.

The delegates approved the political line worked out at the founding conference of the party last February. This is centered around a program of anticapitalist structural reforms, workers control of industry, nationalization of the banks, insurance companies, credit organizations, coal mines, electrical plants, gas works, oil refineries, and socialization of building plots.

The party reiterated its support for federalism but stressed that only direct action by the working class can break the stranglehold of the centralized bourgeois state over the Walloon people.

The congress unanimously adopted a motion in favor of setting up a confederation to include all the Walloon, Flemish and Brussels left-wing socialists on the basis of a common program.

The founding congress of this projected Socialist Workers Confederation is scheduled to be held October 10 at Liège. It will bring together the Walloon Workers party, the Union of Brussels Left Socialists, and an organization of Flemish left socialists which is in process of formation, into a single party advocating a resolutely anticapitalist program.

The October 10 congress will provide a good measure of the consequences of the split in the Belgian Socialist party which the right-wing bureaucracy provoked at the end of 1964 by banning

La Gauche and the revolutionary socialists associated with it. The new party, it is expected, will begin with a membership of several thousand, most of them militant workers.

BELGIAN PRO-MAO COMMUNISTS SPLIT

The Belgian pro-Mao Communist party -- itself a splinter grouping from the somewhat larger pro-Khrushchev Communist party -- recently expelled its No. 2 leader, Maurice Massoz, without offering any public explanation.

Massoz is supported by the majority of the "Liège Federation" of the pro-Mao Communist party, but this is a small local, having at the most two dozen members.

Both the party leadership and Massoz are now vying in casting insulting epithets at each other in public. The party leadership dubs Massoz a "provocateur" in the service of imperialism. Massoz labels the party leaders "instruments and lackeys of the imperialist government."

A notable feature of this edifying prose -- which fills column after column in the party's weekly newspaper La Voix du Peuple and the mimeographed leaflets that Massoz distributes -- is that it contains not an iota of any accusations that could be described as political.

It is hard to determine the real reasons for the split. Probably some of the rank and file brought charges against Massoz because of excessively bureaucratic practices. Since he was No. 2 in the leadership, it was not easy for the Grippa group to give him the ax without injuring themselves. In the end they probably decided there was no other way of satisfying the demands of the membership.

Massoz was a member of the central committee and the political bureau. During the election campaign last May, he was one of the four leaders of the pro-Mao Communist party whose portraits were pasted up on walls and posts in virtually every town in Belgium.

PEKING SENDS GIFTS TO TIBETAN PEOPLE

As gifts to the Tibetan people, when Tibet was made an autonomous region at the beginning of September, Peking sent 200 hand butter churns, 2,180 transistor radios, 4,200 new-type plows, 10,000 combs for carding wool, 8,600 copies of the works of Mao Tse-tung translated into Tibetan, and 300,000 copies in color of a portrait of Mao Tse-tung.

CONTRADICTIONARY VOTE IN GERMANY

The German Social Democracy gained a new and significant advance at the polls in the general elections September 19. The party chalked up more than 12,000,000 votes, gaining 39.5% of the total. This compares with 30% in the 1949 and 1953 elections and is close to the highest it ever recorded -- 42.5% in the 1919 elections for the national assembly during a revolutionary situation.

At the same time, the top leadership and party cadres were deeply disappointed because the figures were lower than the goal set by the reformist bureaucracy. For more than four years the bureaucracy had feverishly prepared for the general election, dumping the remnants of the traditional program of the party, adapting itself even in choice of slogans to the ruling Christian Democrats, saying "me too" to that party's line on foreign policy and economics, all in hope of either becoming the strongest party or of winning so many votes as to force the Christian Democrats to invite them into a coalition government.

Neither of these hopes were realized. If the Social Democrats won a good slice of votes and 12 new seats, the Christian Democrats also increased their vote and number of seats and came within sight of conquering an absolute majority (lacking only four seats to achieve this). In view of these circumstances, it is scarcely likely that they will consider a "great coalition" with the Social Democrats to offer much attraction.

The most striking and, at the same time, paradoxical feature of the September 19 elections was the fact that at the very time the right-wing bureaucrats who head the German Social Democracy were proclaiming at the top of their lungs that they are no longer a working-class party and have become "a party of all the people," the party scored significant successes in the industrial working-class areas -- and only there!

Its main gains were registered in the industrial Ruhr where another 5.3% of the total shifted in its direction. Considerable gains were scored in the industrial towns of Duisburg (from 41% to 57% of the vote), Dortmund (from 51% to 57%), Mülheim (47% to 52%). In Cologne, the jump was from 34.5% to 42.7%. Equally important victories were scored in the industrial centers of the Saar, Ludwigshafen (big chemical plants), Nuremburg, etc.

The Christian Democrats gained especially at the expense of their bourgeois allies of the Free Democratic party (right-wing liberals). The main gainer in the 1961 elections, the same party was the main loser this year.

The total vote for the two bourgeois coalition parties dropped from 58.1% to 57.1%. The total vote for the Social Democrats and the DFU (a Communist party front organization) rose from 38.1% to 40.8%.

The rest of the vote -- some 2% -- went to various extreme right-wing groups.

These results were all the more significant in view of the fact that the Social Democrats offered no real choice to the voters, in fact repelling the potential opposition vote by advancing a platform practically identical to that of the Christian Democrats. It was likewise significant, however, that the attempt of the Stalinists, with the help of the pacifists, to attract a petty-bourgeois opposition vote on a platform centered around foreign policy and slogans based on "peace and coexistence" failed miserably. This campaign was waged around the German Peace Union which ordinarily draws the votes of the Communist or pro-Communist voters (the German Communist party was banned under a reactionary judiciary decree), and capitalism was not even questioned in the election material. Compared to 1961, votes for this formation actually dropped, declining from 1.9% to 1.3%.

The left wing had no significant candidate and no figure emerged in the elections capable of crystallizing the slowly mounting discontent among the workers and the youth. But the leadership's lack of perspective, coupled with the obvious failure of its petty-bourgeois "popular party" line, will open the first lines of differentiation inside the Social Democratic party.

The trade unions continue to oppose the most reactionary trends of the right-wing Social Democratic bureaucrats. At the recently held miners union congress, the delegates refused to adopt a proposal advanced by the right wing that went in the direction of abandoning the demand for nationalization of the mines.

And the metal workers at their last congress came out strongly against a proposed law with "state of emergency" provisions which would have enabled the government to suspend all constitutional guarantees and democratic freedoms under certain conditions. The Social Democratic leaders had agreed in principle to accept this reactionary piece of legislation!

MITTERRAND -- THE NEW MIRACLE MAN OF FRENCH POLITICS

By Pierre Frank

A miracle has occurred in French politics. At the very moment when it appeared absolutely hopeless, the "left" found a common candidate for the presidential elections next December 5. François Mitterrand won the backing of both the Socialist and Communist parties and various groups that classify themselves as in the "left."

How did it happen that whereas a similar attempt by Gaston Defferre ended in miserable failure, Mitterrand succeeded? To understand the miracle, we must take into account what is going on among

the politicians of the bourgeoisie and the Socialist party, on the one hand, and what is in the minds of the leadership of the French Communist party on the other.

The main operator among the politicians is the general secretary of the Socialist party, Guy Mollet. He began by being overwhelmed by Defferre's attempt. Defferre was able to get the Socialist party to accept his candidacy. But Defferre understood this to mean his investiture in a Gaullist-type regime, in which the old parties would be brushed aside in favor of a "democratic and Socialist federation" put together around his figure, including the Socialists, Radicals and Christian Democrats. To accept such a federation would have meant liquidation of the Socialist party. On this point, Mollet went to bat and Defferre resigned the nomination.

To maintain the equilibrium of his organization, Mollet could not then support anyone else from his own party. Consequently he turned to one of the bourgeois political figures standing somewhere between the Socialist and Radical parties. Mitterrand did not constitute an obstacle to the long-range calculations envisaging the period "after Gaullism." On this, Mollet seems to have a tacit understanding with former premier Antoine Pinay, a typical representative of the right, who, like Guy Mollet -- to their common sorrow today -- joined in hoisting de Gaulle to power in 1958. Both of them envisage restoring a democratic regime of a kind after de Gaulle passes from the scene. In supporting Mitterrand, Mollet did not hide the fact that he is ready to abandon him in favor of Pinay if the happy event should occur.

Mitterrand is the kind of politician that stops at nothing. He knows Mollet's views concerning him, but, while waiting, he has no compunction against moving into the spotlight. He knows that he can hardly expect to win votes from the Mouvement Républicain Populaire. If he wants to come out not too badly when the votes are counted, he must therefore seek the support of the French Communist party and achieve this without negotiating with its leadership and without offering the slightest concession in that direction. Unlike Defferre, however, he is not averse to making the few gestures required by the leadership of the French Communist party to be able to say that they are satisfied and that they will appeal to the voters to cast their ballots for him.

Let us turn to the attitude of the leaders of the French Communist party. They were aware that an agreement duly drawn up, signed and sealed, with the leaders of the Socialist party was excluded. They also knew that a part of the electorate that traditionally votes Communist would come out for de Gaulle in a presidential election and that a Communist candidate, or a candidate supported by only the Communist party, would result in a loss of votes for the party. For a long time they have sought a "left" candidate who would also be supported by the Socialist party and in such a way as to make it impossible to measure the decline in their electoral influence.

Defferre completely disregarded the French Communist party; consequently he was entirely unacceptable. When the Parti Socialiste Unifié for a time considered running a candidate, the Communist party leaders at once bared their teeth to that possibility. But when Mitterrand personally announced his candidacy on September 9, they said nothing. For them, as for Guy Mollet, the insignificance of the bourgeois organization to which Mitterrand belongs was an advantage. Feelers were at once sent out through the proper intermediaries.

On September 21, Mitterrand held a press conference. He did not present a platform but offered "options." He tipped his hat to the role of political parties, adding that it was not up to him to determine their mutual relations; however, he was against excluding anyone. At the end of the conference he announced that he had received a letter that very day from Waldeck Rochet, the general secretary of the French Communist party, and that he had utilized the press conference to answer the questions raised in that letter.

Two days later the central committee of the French Communist party met to hear a report by Waldeck Rochet, the gist of which could be stated as follows: Mitterrand sent us a stenogram of his press conference; he's for the North Atlantic treaty and for Europe, but that's not so bad; he's not exactly clear on the need to struggle against the monopolies, but he is against the "personal power" [de Gaulle]; and he does not exclude us from the left. Consequently we must vote for him and make him the candidate of the unity of the democratic forces and thus help forge this unity.

In the political bureau there were partisans, as everyone knows, for running Duclos or Frachon as a candidate; but since they stood on the same program as the others; namely, the establishment of a "renewed democracy," their opposition to Mitterrand did not last long. The political bureau presented a unanimous report to the central committee and the latter approved Mitterrand's candidacy almost without discussion.

* * *

It is still too early to say how all this will be received among the working masses. Parliamentary illusions, illusions about "unity" across class lines and without a program, favor support for Mitterrand. On the other hand, various feelings -- hostility among some to the former regime of the Fourth Republic which Mitterrand represents perfectly, instinctive hostility among others to a bourgeois candidate, or sympathy for the anti-Americanism of de Gaulle -- tell against Mitterrand, either to de Gaulle's advantage or in the direction of abstention.

But if one judges the situation on the basis of the means through which Mitterrand became a candidate, the following conclusions can be drawn:

(1) Mitterrand is a bourgeois candidate running on an anti-Gaullist slogan and utilizing the working class as a "basis of support" thanks to the policies of the two big workers parties.

(2) In maneuvering to get out of a divisive situation in his own party, Mollet advanced a candidate to whom he owes nothing and manipulated the course of that candidate to obtain Communist support without giving anything in return. In this business, Mollet displayed matchless trickiness.

(3) The leadership of the French Communist party signed a blank check. Instead of advancing unity of action, it committed the party to engage in a campaign it does not believe in, in which the enthusiasm that would have been engendered by a Communist candidate will be absent. Even though there will be no exact figures to go by, these leaders will not be able to conceal the decline of the French Communist party in the electoral field.

CP POLICY IN GREECE LEADS TO SETBACK

The political crisis in Greece is far from having ended although a stage has just been completed in which the most reactionary forces scored an advance. After two unsuccessful attempts, the king managed to win a vote of confidence from parliament for the cabinet of Stephanos Stephanopoulos on September 25 by the slim margin of 152 to 148.

This majority was put together through the usual means employed by bourgeois parties in such situations. Cabinet posts were promised to some, a better income to others, and ex-premier George Papandreu's Center Union party was whittled down like a salami during the 66-day crisis. There is not much point to shouting about the corruption, or to giving way to imprecations. Corruption is one of the constants in the politics of the Greek peninsula as in many other countries, although in Greece it can be said that there is little shame displayed over its rankness. The question that must be asked is why was it possible for the maneuvers of the court and the capitalist circles linked to it to finally succeed after 66 days?

Everyone was aware that more than one member of parliament resisted the "Circe of the palace" (to use one of Papandreu's expressions) out of fear of the popular masses, the street demonstrations in Athens and the vote of the peasants should new elections be held. But this fear gradually evaporated. In addition, the two cabinets set up by the king during this period, while they did not win a vote of confidence, were not inactive while they waited for the balloting in parliament. They went ahead with "purgings" in the army and the administration. Thus the forces of "law and order" were whipped into better shape to intervene with the club.

What did the other side do? The masses demonstrated vigorously and often. Their militancy was growing. They made the court hesitate about resorting to a military operation, and they prevented certain deputies from selling out too hastily. But the Greek Communist party -- which controls the majority of the proletariat -- told the masses to support Papandreou, who wanted to save the monarchy and the capitalist system no matter what the cost. In other words, the perspective given to the masses by the Greek Communist party was maintenance of the status quo; whereas the crisis originated in the impossibility of doing this. Moreover, due to this perspective, or rather the lack of a perspective, the struggle consisted of a succession of demonstrations, day after day, and not the development of a struggle, beginning with these demonstrations, that would have extended into a general strike aimed at kicking out the monarchy. In the absence of a perspective and a plan of battle, the mass movement was bound to lose impetus, to begin marking time, a development which the reaction counted on.

A four-vote majority. That is not much, but it was sufficient to provide a "legal" cover for the measures which Stephanopoulos will undertake. It was this legal aspect which Papandreou and his supporters in the leadership of the Greek Communist party considered to be so sacrosanct. It is certain that the monarchy and its tools will utilize this situation to the utmost to advance their positions in preparation for the next stages. Because the battle is not finished.

The Greek masses are emerging from years of suffering the consequences of the defeat that followed the postwar revolutionary upsurge. The skirmishes that have just taken place did not lead to an immediately successful outcome because of the policy of betrayal followed by their main leaders; but the tests of strength did not end in a crushing counterblow.

The main problem for the workers, consequently, is to draw the lessons of the experience they have just undergone in order to better prepare for the continuation of the battle.

During the crisis of the summer of 1965, the Trotskyist vanguard attracted youth who want to advance the struggle. Although the grip of the Communist party leadership is strong, it is not as strong as it was in the past. Thus favorable conditions exist for assembling a revolutionary vanguard capable of continuing the struggle with much stronger political and organizational capacities.

INFLATION IN COLOMBIA

In the two-week period at the end of August and beginning of September, the price of bread in Bogotá jumped 25% and the price of meat 33%. Prices of other basic necessities rose proportionately. Many civil servants have received no wages or pension payments for as long as five months.

JAPAN'S DEPRESSION -- AN "UNWITTING" MISTAKE

The bourgeois press in Japan continues to express worry over the country's economic depression and to seek for its causes, which they find to be puzzling after the years of unprecedented boom and lush profits.

A good example is a series of articles which Professor Ryokichi Minobe of the Tokyo University of Education has begun in Bungei Shunjun, attempting an analysis in depth. In the first article, appearing in the September issue, he offers some statistics that are not without interest:

"Japan's index of economic growth in 1963 was 325 against the 1950 standard of 100, far higher than those for West Germany, Italy and Austria, incidentally all vanquished nations, which exceeded the 200 mark in the world.

"As for the economic growth rate, its average for 1958-63 was 12.8 per cent for Japan, 6.3 per cent for Italy and 5 per cent or thereabouts for most of the nations in the West except the United States which registered 3.8 per cent. The average for 1950-63 was 16.1 per cent for Japan, 9.9 per cent for West Germany, 8 per cent for Italy, 7.2 per cent for Austria, 7.2 per cent for Switzerland.

"What crucifies the Japanese industry now is the heavy capital investment it has made. Its index in 1962 was 334 against the 1955 basis of 100, far more than Italy's 197, France's 181, West Germany's 169, England's 134 and the United States' 113. Japan now suffers from overequipment and an inflationary trend as a result.

"On the other hand, Japan's exports did not increase proportionately. The export quantitative index for the entire world in 1963 was 247 against 100 in 1938, and 298 for Europe and 310 for North America. Lagging far behind, Japan's index in 1963 was 191 against the 1934-36 average of 100.

"Basically what supported Japan's economic growth was capital investment. As in advanced nations, capital investment has brought about an inflation in Japan which has caused consumer prices to go increasingly higher.

"The consumer price indices in 1964 were 207 for France, 191 for Japan, 169 for England, 165 for Italy, 133 for West Germany and 129 for the United States, against 100 in 1959.

"Meanwhile, the domestic market has expanded primarily thanks to a rise in wages which was the highest in Japan of all nations. Real wages in 1963, however, were 147 for Japan, 242 for West Germany, 164 for France, 139 for the United States and 129 for England, all against the 1949 standard of 100."

Trying to interpret these conclusions for his own readers, Chugo Koito offers the following in the September 12 Japan Times:

"Japan, once the boy wonder in the field of economic rehabilitation, now suffers under the stifling pressure of a depression. While it still manages to keep up its pace of growth, its industry is struggling desperately to get out of the worsening fix in which it finds itself.

"Why the struggle? The reason seems rather simple. In its frantic effort to catch up with advanced nations in technology and productivity, the Japanese industry has committed a string of serious mistakes.

"For one thing, it unwittingly ignored the fundamental principle of economics -- demand and supply which never follows a set pattern of rise and fall. The cold fact is that the Japanese industry has overequipped itself for its own good."

These superficial observations boil down to little more than the statement that Japan's capitalists suddenly discovered that the country's productive capacity had expanded beyond the limits of the market. Unwitting or not, this periodic occurrence is one of the built-in features of the capitalist system -- and not only in Japan.

THE BRITISH TRADES UNION CONGRESS

By Susan Williams

London

Against a background of increasing unofficial strikes for higher pay or better conditions, the Trades Union Congress, representing some 8,750,000 workers in 172 unions, held its 97th annual congress at Brighton September 6-10. It is not surprising that the most controversial and important issue discussed was the prices and incomes policy.

The Labour party leadership set the atmosphere by putting great pressure on the general council (the top body of the TUC) to support the government's incomes policy. This policy is presented to the public as a means of solving the present economic problems by limiting the rate of profits and wages. In actual fact it is designed to enforce a wage restraint.

Minister of Economics George Brown wrangled with the TUC leaders for nine hours prior to the opening of the gathering in an attempt to line up the TUC behind the government's policies. Minister of Labour Ray Gunter pleaded to the delegates that time was an important factor and that the TUC should act responsibly and quickly to the government's plans. Failure to do so, he argued, would result in the

downfall of the government and the return of the Tories.

Despite this pressure, the vote on the incomes policy was only 5,251,000 for, as against 3,312,000 opposed. With a majority of only some 2,000,000 for the general council, it is dubious that the victory can be implemented.

A significant fact was the rise in the opposition vote. It was nearly double that cast at the conference of union executives last April.

More important, however, than the vote was the debate itself in which leaders of unions opposing the general council made it clear that the problems facing the Labour government could not be solved by wage restraint, whether secured voluntarily or by legislation.

Harry Nicolas, acting secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union -- Britain's largest trade union -- opposed the incomes policy in principle. He claimed that what had been projected as a programme for improving the standard of living was rapidly developing into a positive plan for wage limitation. Such legislation would give any future Tory government powers which it could never have obtained for itself from the trade-union movement, more powers, in fact, than were conceded in wartime.

Clive Jenkins, general secretary of the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians [ASSET], Britain's fastest growing union, attacked the general council's analysis of Britain's economic problem as being a "pathetically and thoroughly and dangerously wrong economic analysis." He pointed out that one way to tackle the deficit problem was to cut the bill for war preparations.

D. McGarvey of the Amalgamated Society of Boilermakers, Shipwrights, Blacksmiths, and Structural Workers declared, in opposing the incomes policy, that the boilermakers believed in planning. "But we believe in socialist planning."

He appealed to the delegates of the uncommitted unions to vote against the incomes policy. "If the General Council's recommendations are carried, your members will slaughter you when you return to say what you have done."

While the leaders of the TUC worried over how much they can get away with in vetoing wage claims, the leaders of the five white-collar unions,* which have put out a pamphlet arguing the case against the government's incomes policy, are planning to intensify their

*The five unions, with a total membership of nearly 160,000, are the Draughtsmen's and Allied Technicians' Association, the Association of Scientific Workers, the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians, the Society of Technical Civil Servants, and the Association of Ciné and Television Technicians.

campaign.

Apart from taking advertising space in left-wing weeklies, they are planning to hold a "teach-in" on the threat to collective bargaining which they say the government's legislative plans present. This is projected for the eve of the Labour party conference at the end of September. They also hope to carry the fight to the rostrum itself with an emergency motion on the government's plans.

On the final day, by another majority of just under 2,000,000 votes, the conference amended a resolution which called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Vietnam.

Ralph Bond of the Association of Ciné and Television Technicians introduced the motion. He said that the United States had introduced troops and military bases in defiance of the 1954 Geneva agreement. "The war in Vietnam is being fought by bombing, napalm and the use of poisonous chemicals dropped on the crops on the theory that if you cannot burn them to cinders or blow them to bits, you try to starve them into submission."

The amendment, which was carried, called for "negotiations" to achieve a settlement along the lines of the Geneva agreement.

The issues discussed at Brighton will be debated again at the Labour party annual conference to be held at Blackpool. The outcome of the TUC conference clearly indicates that the Labour party leadership will carry its policies on the incomes policy and on Vietnam. Ever mindful of the government's tiny majority and fearful of the return of a Tory government, many of the delegates will give the leadership their support at the Labour party conference.

The speeches and voting figures at Brighton reveal that a large section of the working class have no intention of accepting a wage freeze.

The government's attempt to solve its economic problems and to gain time for capitalism by legislation against the working class will meet with increased opposition from the organised workers.

LABOUR'S FIRST YEAR -- MUST IT BE THE LAST?

[The following article, taken from The Week, a publication specializing in news analysis for British socialists (54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham, England), is of special interest in our opinion. Written on the eve of the Labour party conference, it offers a perspicacious analysis of the bankruptcy of the Wilson leadership and the default of many well-known left-wing figures.

[To meet this situation, the author, Ken Coates, advances proposals of a transitional character for the consideration of the left wing of the Labour party. Discussion and action on proposals of this type are an essential step for the British vanguard if they are to find the socialist road out of the present impasse.]

* * *

The preparations for the Labour Party Conference at Blackpool this September are nearing their conclusion. The atmosphere is heavy-laden. After the cheers of last October died away, and after the warm, self-congratulatory mood of the December victory rally, which replaced the 1964 Conference, Labour's activists went home to their constituencies to meet a cooler mood among their supporters. This has not lifted; rather the gloom has intensified. As Labour's election pledges have been revoked, deferred, transmuted or forgotten, first in single apologetic announcements, then in clusters, curtly explained, and lately in wholesale bulk. So it has come home to the constituencies that their expectations for the future must be frigid, austere and possibly painful. No harvest festival, the Blackpool Conference will mourn lost hopes, console troubled consciences and prepare for dearth and discord.

Mikardo's Balance Sheet

The record is almost too dismal to bear recital. Few of Labour's major spokesmen have had the intellectual or political courage to assess it clearly. One who has is Ian Mikardo, perhaps the most significant Parliamentary figure who has been left to the left by recent events. Speaking at a conference of Labour students at the end of June, Mr. Mikardo was able to list three achievements on the credit side of the Government's performance. It had properly flouted the opinion of the bankers in order to augment pensions; it had laid out a commendable programme of legislation in the Queen's speech; and the Prime Minister had properly decided to govern as if he had a majority of fifty. But when the Government's pledges were compared with its actions, there were most serious deficiencies.

In at least thirty important sectors election promises had either not been sustained, or had actually been dishonoured. In the field of economic policy the failure to apply physical controls, even such obvious ones as exchange control, import controls, or effective regional development controls, forced the Government to rely upon fiscal manoeuvres, bribery and exhortation as its main "planning" weapons. Of course these are totally insufficient. No rational over-all fuel and energy policy was being elaborated. No transport plan was being counterposed to Beeching's measures. Taxes were not being used selectively. Concerning public ownership, no measures had yet been announced to take over water, and more important, the pledge to start new public enterprises on a competitive basis in growth areas of the economy was not yet being taken up. In the field of exports, the promised long-term contracts with Commonwealth territories, based on state trading, had not materialised. Neither had any significant

expansion of East-West trade. As for the question of incomes policy, no attempt whatever had been made to synchronise wage planning with over-all planning, which thus made Mr. Brown's policy quite unfeasible.

Concerning social policy, the balance sheet was no less unhappy. The minimum income guarantee was to be deferred until next session.* While this could be understood, it provided no reason at all for the deferment of action to rectify outstanding injustices. Many severe hardships existed which could be alleviated by administrative action which was not being taken. Educational expenditure was being curtailed. As for housing, which had been Mr. Wilson's central election issue, the pledge to repeal the Rent Act was being honoured by a measure which threatened to introduce a most dangerous element of decontrol in rents, while building was being thwarted by sky-high interest rates. A two-tier system of finance, or cheap money, was essential to the housing problem. In the field of equal pay, no steps were to be taken to ratify the ILO [International Labour Organisation] Convention on that question. The policies which had been expected on immigration had not materialised.

Lastly, in the foreign and defence policy sectors the picture was alarming. The defence estimates had not been subjected to serious over-all cuts, whilst the Polaris base and the British nuclear arm were both preserved in flat contradiction to party policy. If anything, Labour's foreign policy showed an even closer dependence on the USA than did that of Sir Alec. This had revealed itself in innumerable areas: apart from Vietnam, in Guiana, in the total abandonment of disengagement in Europe, and in the equivocation about the supply of war materials to South Africa, among many others.

Callaghan's Measures

Since Mr. Mikardo elaborated this most discouraging catalogue, conditions have deteriorated with malicious speed. Yet further draconian and debilitating economic measures have been brought forward by Mr. Callaghan. Far from getting Britain moving, the Government has moved round to a new and resounding stop phase in its economics. With usual candour, the Financial Times led its account of these savage new restraints with the headline: "The Pound Before

*Soon after Mr. Mikardo had spoken, it was, of course, deferred still further by Mr. Callaghan's measures. Mr. Callaghan had, it must be said, warned us in advance. He told a Fabian gathering at the 1963 T.U.C. [Trade Union Congress] that, "A Labour Government must not rush its fences...its first job is to get industry moving again. Then we can start paying ourselves a dividend." The Guardian reported that Mr. Callaghan felt this interval might be eighteen months. In this most dire case, which deals with Labour's pledge to the least fortunate, most penurious of its supporters, the time limit has now more than doubled and is still extending.

Politics." Small wonder that epithets like "Ramsay MacWilson" have begun to appear in the Economist, in columns by Malcolm Muggeridge, and among the maverick political commentators. Just how far before politics Mr. Callaghan has thrust the pound has scarcely begun to filter through to the understanding of Labour's rank and file, but it can clearly be discerned in extraordinary outcries of the liberal business press. The Economist reacted pugnaciously with a leader entitled "Labour Men -- Tory Measures" which speculated whether Mr. Wilson may be heading towards an October election on "what is virtually a National ticket." The weight of these measures falls on precisely the people who returned Labour to office. If anything, a Conservative administration would have moved with greater caution, and would have placed heavier burdens on the business community, because it would not have been labouring under the same drastic imperative to regain the lost confidence of the City. Hardest cut of all are the local Labour councillors, chafing at the reins of more than a decade of central restraint, and now, just as they thought the race was about to open out for them, savagely bridled in. The only truly astonishing thing about this raging mayhem of Labour's election pledges is the solemn quiet which has descended on the backbenches. The only substantial revolt which the Callaghan measures precipitated was the demand for cuts in military expenditure. To an outsider, it looks as if this upheaval was outmanoeuvred without a shot being fired. True, the Parliamentary Party accepted a motion, carefully filleted of any specific dates or figures, which demanded substantial cuts. The fate of this entirely proper decision will probably be found to turn upon the definition of "substance"; and Mr. Wilson is clearly capable of determining this in light of the needs of the pound.

While Mr. Callaghan was immobilising the production drive, Mr. Brown's attempts at acceleration in the control of incomes and prices were not abated. The fact that the members of his own union brusquely rejected the incomes policy, while neglecting to invite him to observe the event, was widely remarked. So was Mr. Cousins' flying visit to the conference of the T & GWU [Transport and General Workers Union], during which he received the ovation of a hero for discreetly congratulating his members on the stand they had taken. But the really ominous accompaniment to these events was the statement that Mr. Wilson made after the Callaghan measures had been revealed, that should the Prices and Incomes Board be found to fail in securing voluntary co-operation, it might quickly be given coercive legal teeth. Although in theory such sanctions might apply to refractory employers, the record of the Government does not encourage the hope that their main effect will tell in that direction. As one surveys the ruins of Labour policy, and the cautious and entirely orthodox pattern of Mr. Callaghan's economic policy, one cannot but conclude that Mr. Wilson's warnings are aimed preeminently at the unions. Such a confrontation would be the reductio ad absurdum of the Wilson strategy: if it were to begin, the last fig leaf would fall away, revealing that hoary old Adam, Ramsay Mac., naked in all the vigour of his National impotence.

Surrender to Smethwick

As significant as these unhappy portents is the blow which Mr. Bowden has administered, on the eve of the adjournment. From the principled opposition to the immigration controls of 1961 which had been evinced from Mr. Gaitskell, Labour had already slid, before the election, into postures of equivocation, dissembling and vagueness. But Mr. Bowden's White Paper on Immigration, far from remaining equivocal, unleashed a truly shattering blow. Immigration from all Commonwealth territories was restricted to a maximum of 8,500 a year, including the 1,000 quota which had been guaranteed to Malta. Worse: the White Paper established a fine and sharply screened double mesh through which would-be immigrants must filter. This imposed checks along both national and occupational lines, establishing a sharp class preference for skilled and professionally qualified labour.

Abroad, everything but the cost of Mr. Wilson's commitment East of Suez has been crumbling around him. His farcical and demagogic peace mission to Vietnam was exploded before he had finished the blueprints. Mr. Davies, who bravely put in jeopardy all his friendships in Hanoi in a loyal effort to voyage to the rescue, returned, chastened, home to the muzzle. Trouble in the Rann of Kutch has been transferred to Kashmir. Cruellest indignity of all, Malaysia, that most streamlined essay in neocolonialist intrigue, carefully assembled to the credit of the pound and as a fearful deterrent to Indonesian "bolshevism," suddenly and without warning blew up. Britain's autonomous imperial zone revealed its true crisis level of instability. Meanwhile, President Johnson intoned sympathetic dirges about the agonies of sterling, as he fortified the dollar by the slaughter of Vietnamese children.

In unrelieved gloom, this record may be left where it stands, incomplete and undocumented, because, partial though it is, it establishes beyond reasonable doubt the most important thing about the Government: its tendency -- the line of march, the main drift, which implies that unless there is a sharp reorientation, amounting to a complete reversal of policy, the Fourth Labour Government will be the most catastrophic ever. Later, socialists will have to itemise this balance sheet with miserly precision and analyse its every grey nuance. Now, the key question is not the charting of each isolated, broken pledge and shattered hope, but the appreciation of the wood rather than the leaves of the tree.

The Bankers' Way

Some socialist journals have already begun the labour of analysis and explanation which is urgently required. New Left Review, in the introduction to the July-August number, quite rightly indicating that "Few regimes have so immediately lost all credit or respect," went on to insist:

"The first task is...to try to understand the logic of the political experience we have witnessed since October, 1964. Why has

Labour administration performed so badly, even in its own terms? Why has it abandoned so much of its programme, so soon?...The Labour Party's abysmal record since October reveals much about its own character; but it has revealed, more clearly than ever before, the real secret of the impasse of British society today -- the at once indispensable and insupportable heritage of imperialism."

In elaborating and refining this insight, the article by Tom Nairn, "Labour Imperialism," makes some extremely telling points. Tracing the structural integration of industrial capital into the nexus of finance capital's interests, as all the major industrial giants like ICI, BMC, Unilever expand their networks of direct foreign investment and association, Nairn shows that this "annulment of old frontiers" leaves an insoluble dilemma: whereas Wilson had aligned himself with the dynamic soul of the industrial enterprise against the restrictive spirit of conservative rentiers and bankers, the two ghosts in fact inhabit one machine, and there in torment savage one another. This must lead direct to the question, succinctly posed by Nairn: is it possible for any government to "master the British dilemma in quite the way which seemed entailed by Wilson's original approach? May it not be too late for even a 'radical' solution of that kind, given the effective unity between financial and industrial capital? May it not be too late, in other words, for any solution to the problem which remains within the terms of the national capitalist system itself, in any of its form?"

Trade Union Independence

This is clearly a central question. Part of the answer, though, was offered years ago by Lenin, when he remarked that there were no "final crises" from which capitalism could not escape, its replacement was not at hand. And there are other contradictory features of British capitalism which need an examination as careful as that which Tom Nairn has begun to devote to the relationship between industrial and financial capital, if all the potentialities for capitalist survival are to be thoroughly evaluated. Principal among these is the prolonged and apparently inexhaustible intractability of the British trade unions, which are proving markedly defiant about the degree of integration into neocapitalism which Mr. Brown is attempting to secure with the Prices and Incomes Board. In most European countries the trade unions have been far more effectively assimilated into the structure of neocapitalism than their British equivalents. It is true that with the exception of the Germans, European workers are cursed with sectarian and political fragmentation in their unions. It is equally true that there are repeated resurgences of militancy in the labour movements of practically every Common Market nation. But if we are to search out the basic distinction between labour in Britain and Europe, it is not to be found in the hallmark of sturdy independence which is branded on every British buttock. Careful examination of the appropriate limbs of Sir William Carron or Mr. Jack Cooper would be likely to reveal a quite cosmopolitan clarity of skin complexion on their part. The basic reason why British capitalism has shown a marked inability to

restrain and contain the appetites of its labour force is that it has had no long-term counterweight to full employment. Wage drift has thus constantly pushed to take up the diminishing slack that an ailing economy had to offer. In Italy, large-scale unemployment with a declining rural population have produced effective disciplinary force during much of that nation's postwar history. Before Herr Ulbricht's wall intervened, the Federal German Republic had abundant labour quarries in the East. Since, it has threshed about for substitutes as far afield as Greece and Spain, but without effectively replacing the East as goad and stimulant to a loaded labour market. De Gaulle, too, in his agrarian rationalisations, and later with the pied noirs (the returned colons from Algeria) has found easement for labour shortage. In the United States, the depressed Negro population has provided its reserves of labour. But in Britain, only limited immigration has taken place, and that counterbalanced by a constant outflow. As Labour has been forced to abort its housing programme, the pressure of a strident minority of xenophobic electors has brought it in a shamefully misguided way to staunch even that limited trickle to the large discomfort of George Brown and the business press, whose liberal sympathies may not be large, but whose appreciations of the labour shortage in Britain are certainly realistic. Each stop that has been imposed on British economic growth has produced its momentary growth of unemployment, but the check to that growth has not been administered simply by renewed expansionist opportunities: rather it has flowed from the inevitable and sharp recoil that an independent and undefeated labour movement can administer in the political field.*

The work of rationalisation could not proceed uninterruptedly in such a context. Capital found itself confronted by persons who not only claimed rights, but were able to punish their violation. It was surely for this reason that successive governments were forced to tread into the most dangerous terrain of a search for a political solution to the problem of labour costs and wage-control. And Mr. Wilson's usefulness to capital can scarcely be appreciated outside this field. What is most noteworthy in the record of this administration is the valiant way in which its opponents have striven to keep it alive. Tory chairmen who cast their votes in chivalry; Tory MPs who with touching gentility lose themselves between the bars and the lobbies when the fatigue of Government supporters proves greater than the will to rule; these remarkable phenomena scarcely signal a return to the sporting traditions of British parliamentarism. They do appear to make sense in a context in which the opposition does not wish to prevail, until the Government has performed the role which has been allotted to it. As more and more of the unions' teeth are drawn, as the Prices and Incomes Board recruits first whips, then scorpions to its armoury, and as usual, all the while, the unions are disarmed by Mr. Wilson's rhetoric, so the opposition can begin to flex its muscles and prepare for the resumption of control. Is this not a natural way for Mr. Heath to think? Meantime, the Government

*These points have been elaborated in detail in a paper which has been written by Pat Jordan, to which I am much indebted.

continues to develop all the rationalisations of Dr. Beeching on the railways, and to drive through the explosive reorientation of the mining industry, as if its one object in life were to establish the truth of this pessimistic view of its role. (It is even rumoured that, in order to secure the complicity of the railway trade unions' leadership in the creeping denationalisation involved in the liner train scheme, Mr. Wilson has promised extensive new nationalisations after the election. Alas: Mr. Heath need have no sleepless nights on this matter.)

Incomes policy, cuts, rationalisations: all these amount to the classic solution which capital, itself sick, prescribes for labour as well. I am too ill; here, you take my pill...all that is new in this situation is the ministering physician. And what is astonishing is the way in which Mr. Wilson plays the role. Malicious gossips even claim that he enjoys it....

Where Is the Left?

Yet this is not all that is strange. Perhaps the most truly amazing thing about the post-October situation is to be found in the becalmed tranquility of Labour's back benches. After the storms of the unilateralist campaign perhaps the largest left intake into any Parliament since 1945 has appeared, only to discover that discretion is rather the more responsible part of valour. This strange event has staggered the Economist, which returns week after week to discuss the reason why, half in malice, half in pique. The leaders of the traditional left, Anthony Greenwood, for instance, were wisely co-opted by Mr. Wilson into peripheral complicity in his arrangement. Their behaviour has been scandalous. Whether Mr. Greenwood has gained a final victory over the schoolchildren he gassed in Bahrein, as they threatened to undermine the East of Suez design, it is too early to say. What does, however, appear quite clear is that he has finally routed and liquidated his own conscience. Perhaps this is the most significant political victory Mr. Wilson has scored: he has benumbed, confused, and outwitted the left in a manner that outbids the most bizarre predictions of the most hostile opponents of that grouping. Perhaps the fact that the Government had its own left cover has given other members of Parliament pause. With very few honourable exceptions, the Parliamentary left has bought every dud Peace Mission, every hoax and placebo that has been offered. The flight of Steel Nationalisation through the lobbies is a significant case in point. If Mr. Gaitskell had attempted such manoeuvres as those which Mr. Brown (and presumably Mr. Wilson) have accomplished, he would have been denounced from every platform in the land. Instead of raising hell, the left has melted into the landscape.

The significance of this must not be underestimated. Had the left spoken out, the constituencies would by now be in a turmoil. The unions are already full of bewildered, often bitterly disappointed men. At the local level, the party preserves its peace, because loyalty is the first rationality of one who knows rightly that unity

is strength. Monolithic in its piety, the traditional left leadership defers to that peace, as if it were the ultimate in political wisdom. In fact it is the reverse. If there were any hope for Mr. Wilson, it would lie in an outcry from the Labour movement.* Only the strongest pressures from his supporters could prevail over the ruthlessly implacable logic of the bankers, which grows more persuasive each day as the vacuum left by its application yawns wider through the party. If anyone had spoken earlier, perhaps the first fatal steps might have been turned aside. But if is no answer: the problem of the left was not shortage of force, lack of numbers, or even lack of faith or goodwill. What the left lacked was any sense of programme, any notion of the direction of events, any first faint beginning of a strategy. It fenced, in the foggy lobbies of the politics of previous decades, bound by the imagined supremacy of institutions which were in fact at their last gasp,** while the real rulers enmeshed its

*On August 6, Michael Foot wrote in Tribune about this question. He spoke of the potentially dangerous gulf between leaders and led, and called for sustained left pressure. "Sustain the left pressure and sustain the Government." This in itself is not an objectionable call: nobody would suggest that "the Government should be torn to pieces by the actions of the left inside the party," as Mr. Foot puts it. What the left should do is move towards an integrated focus both in terms of policy and organisation. What the sundering of the left into sectarian fragments, which is a present fact, not, as Mr. Foot seems to think, a future possibility, involves is the continued fostering of the illusion that there is no alternative to Wilson's policies. The left must look to its own problems: it must continually hammer out its own suggestions, and then promote them. This is the only realistic way of "putting pressure" on the Government, and until it happens, the incidental outbursts of resentment at this or that intolerably reactionary measure will all be met and deflected by Mr. Wilson, without occasioning him the need for any significant change of policy.

**Parliamentary cretinism is a polite term compared to that which is necessary to characterise most of today's left. Not the slightest attempt has been made by the overwhelming majority of M.P.'s to do anything at all to mobilise external pressure on the Government. For years more and more of Parliament's prerogatives have passed away from it: to the hands of banks and oligarchies, to the executive, to the international organisations, and of course through them to Washington. Parliament no longer knits the bourgeoisie into a coherent grouping: the concentration of economic power does this outside its confines. In a world in which their leaders were hemmed in and surrounded by such hostile forces, one would have thought that M.P.'s would have sensed the need to mobilise some effective countervailing power at the grass roots. Not so. The only significant demonstration of socialist activists, that on Vietnam, was carefully handed over to Mr. Wilson by its parliamentary spokesmen almost as a thanks offering for his piddling peace mission.

protectors and champions in their own completely alien objects. Recriminations are the very last thoughts that this sad history should inspire: there but for the grace of the polls goes every last fundamentalist red sectarian also. What does emerge is the paramount need for a strategy of socialist advance which rests on solid theoretical foundations, and which lives in the present world.

A New Programme

The work of elaborating a programme is not one which can be passed across to three part-time research workers. It involves a whole protracted labour of discussion and education within a very wide area of the Labour movement. Precisely what has gone wrong with the fourth Labour Government has been this old, elitist conception of programme. Policy is left to the wise, to the ones who know.* Everyone else knocks doors. In the event, the knowledge of the wise was insufficient: what they needed was no longer an insight into the wickedness of the world, but the social understanding and the political staff with which to assault that wickedness. This can only be created in painstaking political discussion and organisation, starting from the fundamental premise that the richest source of socialist potential is the self-confidence and self-activity of the workers themselves.

The natural tendency which will emerge from the accumulating disillusionment of Labour's activists will be to seek immediate, partial solutions to what are global problems. There is diminishing scope for effective, purely local, trade-union militancy though. Labour needs a socialist perspective, designed for practical application. To those who see the impossibility of piecemeal solutions, there may arise the alternative of self-immolation in a purely abstract and doctrinal socialism. The failure of labour to meet its immediate, bread and butter commitments may impel many on the left to reject all bread and butter demands as a deluding distraction, and to seek in their place to elevate a purified and spiritualised vision of commonweal as the motivating goal of socialist activity.

While it is acutely important to discuss the idea of socialism, and to widen constantly the circle of people for whom its problems are already a living reality, this can never be a sufficient answer to the difficulties in which we find ourselves today. It will not help the railwaymen to be told that "socialism is the only answer to

*They haven't known anyhow. The complete mental laziness of empirical British socialism was sharply revealed by Emanuel Shinwell in his autobiography, when he wrote that in 1945 he arrived at his desk in the Ministry of Fuel and Power, with a mandate to nationalise coal, electricity and gas, expecting to find detailed plans all ready. They were not. He had to start from scratch. Under this Government, despite all the noise about an integrated transport system, the new ministers have carried on in the grooves established by their predecessors, witness: rails and mines.

Doctor Beeching," true though that aphorism may be. Unless we can offer some practical immediate steps to socialism, our railwayman is likely to choose either to belt hell out of someone in the union, or, more probably, to look for another job. Even slogans which in themselves could contribute to the growth of an explicitly socialist awareness, like the demand for an integrated transport policy, need to be linked inseparably with a whole series of complimentary conceptions, which taken together can form the mental bridge over which the workers may pass from capitalist to socialist forms of reasoning and action. Simple reiteration of demands for nationalisation alone do not form such a bridge.

The programme which we need to elaborate, neither maximalist and entirely abstract, nor minimalist and blind, needs to lead from the particular ills of capitalism, as it is, to the general solution we have to offer, and from the partial, schizoid outlooks which are fostered by capital to a fully socialist world view. Such a programme must attack, not only the organisational failures, but the feel of capitalism, of subordination: it must expose its alienating effects plainly, so that they are devoid of mystery and terror. Clearly, in the fight against alienation which the workers suffer as producers, the major answering socialist response is the demand for workers' control. This becomes increasingly urgent as neocapitalist rationalisations gather force. Workers' control of job organisation, the speed of work, retooling, is no mere panacea. It can very well be understood by shop stewards and local union officers as fitting present needs. But neocapitalist reorganisation extends from new practices in the shops up to the attempt to elaborate a comprehensive policy for incomes: and so too can the fight for workers' control, as it takes up the demand for complete and democratic accountability, the opening of the books, and the abolition of business secrets. All the work of elaborating a detailed campaign on such lines can only be done in the creation of a movement for industrial democracy: no amount of blueprints will replace its living agents in the factories. At the same time, the struggle for self-management in the nationalised sector can feed and inspire such a movement. This already began to shape up in the steel industry in the discussions around the new Bill: and its embryos can be clearly seen in the mines, the railways, and, among the white-collar staffs in particular, in the other nationalised industries.

Outside the sphere of production, the New Left has frequently documented the manipulation of men as consumers. Here too, the socialist movement has a traditional answering response: the transition to welfare forms of distribution. Free public transport, free housing; these are no more utopian in modern Britain than the National Health Service or free compulsory schools. To a nation embarking on the structural change from capitalist to socialist organisation, they would not be frills, but essential means of obtaining a human focus on the inherited economic difficulties. If the Bow Group can put forward the notion that the roads be metered as a counter to the fact that rail computes its costs comprehensively while roads do not, can-

not we respond by demanding the opposite kind of parity? Here surely is a real answer to Beeching, which would enable some true picture of the travelling needs of Britain to be compiled.

In a context of public welfare, norms of consumption, the pressure for extended public control of industry becomes enormous. Arising out of the pioneer movement of a fight for more welfare and a fight for workers' control at every level, the arguments about the need for more nationalisation cease to be ritual incantation, and take on a more and more immediate necessity. Around the central core of such a programme as this, there are many issues to be resolved. But if someone speaks out, to say that socialist options are possible and practical, then there will be an answering call from very many people in the unions and the workshops. Only if the left is silent is there danger, for then each worker feels alone, his doubts his own, his conscience an isolate, and therefore, his will paralyzed. Voices must be found to enunciate the new socialism. The left must organise.

FIRST WORK BY RECARBARREN APPEARS IN CHILE

The first volume of the Obras Escogidas [selected works] of Luis Emilio Recabarren, founder of the Federación Obrera de Chile [Chilean Workers Federation] and the Partido Socialista Obrero [Socialist Workers party], was recently issued in Santiago de Chile.

As the main figure in the successful work of establishing a section of the Third International in Chile, the Chilean Communist party still hails Recabarren as of historical importance; however, the Chilean CP has never published his works. The reason is that Recabarren, like Mariátegui and Ponce, helped establish Latin-American Marxism. His words therefore sound like a condemnation of the present-day policies of the Communist party.

In one of Recabarren's pamphlets, included in the first volume of Obras Escogidas, the following appears: "The (Russian) Communist party did not believe that it could win power by electoral means, by legal means as the Social Democratic parties, the parties of so-called order, continually urge us, since by means of the legal use of the vote, the election of parliamentarians, the working class will never succeed in taking power and abolishing the capitalist system of exploitation and oppression."

Another source of embarrassment to the present-day leaders of the Chilean CP is Recabarren's attitude toward certain leaders of the Russian Revolution. After founding the Chilean CP in 1922, Recabarren visited Russia the following year. Upon his return, he published a small book of 96 pages entitled Workers and Peasants Russia which has been included in the present collection. He failed to mention Stalin

once. On the other hand, he had some glowing things to say about Leon Trotsky, and cited long extracts from Trotsky's report to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International. Recabarren described the organization of the Red Army and the outstanding role Trotsky played together with Lenin.

The editors of the collection are Jorge Barría, Julio C. Jobet and Luis Vitale. In presenting the first volume, Luis Vitale observes:

"An abyss of almost three decades separates the previous revolutionary generation from the new one, a long period of political retrogression in which the original thought of the genuine socialist fighters was systematically buried. The linking up of the previous generation -- which responded with exhilaration to the appearance of the first socialist revolution in Russia -- with the new generation that arose after the Cuban Revolution, was a prolonged and often cruel period for the handful of fighters who sought to maintain the genuine Marxist tradition in face of the brutal ideological terrorism of contemporary history. But the laws of history once again proved to be stronger than all the power of the bureaucratic machines; and today we are witnessing the restoration of the truth, promoted by the new generation which is seeking its natural connection with the heritage of its ideological forefathers. To the rediscovery and publication of the works of Ponce and Mariátegui, we now wish to add the theoretical legacy of a Chilean thinker: Luis E. Recabarren, whose selected works we present for the first time after the laborious work of bringing together his pamphlets, many of them mutilated, deliberately hidden, or mysteriously removed from the big libraries. Recabarren was not only the founder of the Chilean workers movement and of the CP but was Chile's first revolutionary Marxist thinker and one of the outstanding social thinkers of Latin America, a precursor of Ponce and Mariátegui."

THE THESES OF THE WFTU CONGRESS

By Livio Maitan

The "theses" which the outgoing executive committee of the World Federation of Trade Unions [WFTU] adopted for consideration at the Warsaw congress, scheduled to be held October 8-22, offers nothing new that could claim the attention of trade-union militants or observers. What is involved, in short, are routine documents presenting a series of generalities, confirming concepts and orientations that have been explained many times, which cannot be said to have been put into practice,* repeating many banal things in a stereotyped style. When allusion is made to specific problems or to particular cases, a quite prudent eclecticism is adopted or recourse is had to vague cir-

*For example, the hypocritical reaffirmation of the independence of the unions in relation to political parties and governments.

cumlocutions; and the estimates that should in principle refer to concrete situations offer in reality only a conventional optimism.

The first of the two documents -- bearing the interminable title of "Theses on the Examination and Application of the Program of Trade Union Action and the Unifying Initiatives of the WFTU, the Evolution and Present Development of the World Trade Union Movement, the New Possibilities for Unity, Solidarity and International Trade Union Relations" -- repeats the well-known things about war and coexistence, with some minimum concessions in the "Chinese" direction while remaining essentially on a line that could be called moderate Khrushchevism. The only concrete position taken in the document is with regard to Vietnam, support being offered to the demands of the Front for National Liberation and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

On the international economic tendencies and the characterization of the Common Market we quote verbatim:

"The West European Common Market is one of the fields where this struggle [competition among the capitalist countries] is unfolding. It is tending to reinforce the position of the West German monopolies at the same time as the American monopolies are obtaining a preponderant place there through massive investments." (Paragraph 18.)

This characterization of the Common Market, which has displeased certain rightist currents (particularly those represented by the Italian Socialists), must be criticized, not because it is false, but because it is put in such a banal way. The objection, moreover, should be lodged against its absolutely unilateral estimate as to the beneficiaries of the Common Market -- who belong in reality to the capitalist sectors of all the European countries -- and the clear exaggeration of the role of American capitalism at this stage which cannot be correctly characterized as "preponderant."

Another point has troubled the rightists (including those in the Italian Communist party, to judge by the declaration made by Lama, a leader of the CGIL [Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro]). This is a paragraph that mentions planning in a capitalist society: "The attempts at planning undertaken by the monopolies are nothing but attempts on the one hand to overcome their own contradictions and on the other hand to intensify the exploitation of the workers." (Paragraph 22.) Once again, the statement is a little summary but not false.

In addition, the whole section of the document dealing with the situation in the advanced capitalist countries is confined to generalities and platitudes. The impression one gets is that the authors preferred to beg the question rather than make a real analysis. The result is that even where things are stated that are not false, a whole series of problems that cannot be ignored in the West European countries and the United States, are evaded. We would wager that not a single Social Democrat would be led to doubt his ideas and

options reading such stuff. It can be added that when the document broaches an analysis of a situation in the workers movement, it is limited to summarily hailing a series of strikes and struggles, all stuffed into the same sack and given evaluations that correspond very little to the reality.*

In setting their objectives, the theses of the outgoing executive committee again run along well-known grooves. "The working class and its organizations, in face of the supremacist and antidemocratic policies of the monopolies, propose the democratic and antimonopolist alternative which, on the basis of the present economic and social needs of the broad layers of the population, tend to provide satisfaction for those needs, while reducing the political and economic power of the monopolies." (Paragraph 26.) At the same time, the theme is again sounded about the need to establish an alliance with the non-proletarian social layers, victimized by the monopolies.

The section on the workers states is still worse. The problems arising in the transition phase are not even touched on. All the themes advanced by the bureaucracy since the days of Stalin are repeated on the role of the unions. In fact these paragraphs are nothing but an insipid résumé of the official propaganda of the various parties and governments. Here the rightist tendency, in which the CGIL has already been mentioned, unquestionably scored some points in their polemics.

For the colonial countries, or those that have recently gained their independence, the WFTU made a special effort, by adopting -- in addition to more than a section in the first document -- a special document. Nonetheless the results are not any more remarkable. With regard to countries still under direct colonial rule and those in the grip of neocolonialism, completely banal affirmations are again repeated in a style discouraging to the most patient readers. When the crucial problem of methods of struggle is considered, the main preoccupation is not to displease anyone and not to risk being given the lie by this or that possible development: "the workers struggle has forms, methods and procedures that are very diverse and which go from strikes and mass demonstrations up to armed insurrection" (paragraph 6 of the second document) and the same thing is repeated in the specific case of Latin America (paragraph 12). The effort to characterize the evolution of certain Asian and African countries is certainly not an excessive one: "Algeria, Egypt, Guinea, Mali, Ghana, Indonesia, etc., are countries that have carried out an active mobilization of resources and domestic forces in the struggle against neo-

*Paragraph 23 states: "Currents favorable to a consistent attitude in the class struggle are growing stronger in all the capitalist countries, even those where the unions have had a contrary attitude." In paragraph 46, one reads: "In all the capitalist countries, the workers are affirming their desire for unity and their support is growing for the efforts of the organizations working for its realization."

colonialism, for national independence and social progress. A number of these countries have already openly attained a stage of social transformation." (Paragraph 25.)

The tasks indicated for this sector of the world are defined as mainly bourgeois-democratic and the well-known formulas are offered on the role of the so-called national bourgeoisie. (Paragraph 12.) In line with certain recent Soviet generalizations, the "noncapitalist" road is spoken of in addition, but it emerges rather clearly that the "noncapitalist" road does not necessarily mean the "socialist" road.* Thus once more we are served with arbitrary schemas, which, in the final analysis, are of Stalinist origin.

A single hasty allusion seems to introduce an interesting note in the "anti-Fanonist" sense. "The working class," it is said in paragraph 31, "not only is the main enemy of all oppression, but it is also the least contaminated by the disintegrating influence of the reactionary feudal forces." However, the real problem is evaded. It is clear that the working class suffers much less than any other social layer from the influence of the "reactionary feudal forces." But the question which some, like Frantz Fanon, pose is whether in the context of a colonial or semicolonial country the working class, if only relatively, is not a privileged layer compared to the broad peasant masses and the plebian masses of the towns. To this question, the theses of the WFTU offer no answer.

Let us stress finally that the judgment on the recent regional conferences of the African and Latin-American trade unions, and the affirmation concerning "the end of the split in the trade-union movement on the basis of a program of unity and anti-imperialism" in these sectors of the world are also marked by undue optimism.

We do not as yet know the attitude of the Chinese trade unions with regard to the theses. For several years they have attacked the majority pro-Moscow leadership of the WFTU from the left.

As to the rightist current represented by the Italian unions, to which we have already alluded, we can add a few words. The Italian members of the Executive Committee voted against the theses and the Socialists even utilized them to open a new round in their battle to take the CGIL out of the WFTU.

Now if, as we have said, the Italian criticisms on the section concerning the workers states are well founded (abstraction made of the viewpoint they express, particularly that of the Socialists), and if it is true that the documents offer an extremely summary and schematic picture of the reality in the advanced capitalist countries,

*"A number of them [freed colonial countries] are hastening their march along the road of noncapitalist development. Some of them have taken a road that is actually socialist." (Paragraph 31 of the first document.)

it cannot be overlooked on the other hand that the Italians, including the leaders of the Communist tendency, do not accept a characterization of capitalist planning which nonetheless is considered a matter of course among Marxists. Even more unacceptable is the remark made by Lama and Mosca (Lama is also one of the leaders of the Italian Communist party) about the picture presented by the theses on the world situation.

This "analytic" picture, according to them, advanced "on many points an a priori ideological choice." Even the language speaks volumes. Are these bureaucrats making an "a priori ideological choice" in lining up with the workers states against imperialism and capitalism? Would they prefer to take a neutral attitude or play the role of fair-weather friends in the struggle?

At bottom, neither the Italian Socialists nor the Communists are very much interested in the WFTU, its theses and its congress. Both currents would like to utilize the occasion to move away on different levels from the workers states and the organizations linked with them in order later on to come out for "independence" and "autonomy," the better to apply their national rightist policies.*

*We would like to point out, particularly to those who do not hide their enthusiasm for "democratizing" the Italian unions, that the CGIL determined its attitude toward the WFTU theses without consulting the membership or cadres in any way. They did not even have a chance to read the documents which were nonetheless rejected in their name. The Italian translation appeared only on the eve of the opening of the congress in Warsaw.