

a labor press service

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢


*Un service de presse ouvrier*

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 5, No. 25  
June 30, 1967

HANDS OFF THE  
ARAB REVOLUTION



PETER BUCH, at Militant Labor Forum in New York June 16, denounces Israeli government aggression in the Middle East. Formerly active in the Hashomer Hatzair, a socialist Zionist youth group, Peter Buch expressed the views of the Socialist Workers party at the well-attended forum.

## **Kosygin Substitutes UN Talk for Action in Mideast**

## **True Story Emerges of Egypt's Casualties**

## **Bertrand Russell Scores Israel as Aggressor**

## **Fourth International Calls for Support to Arab Cause**

## **China's H-bomb -- a Deterrent to War**

**An Underground Document**

## ***Guerrillas Serve Notice on Guatemalan Butchers***

## **Canadian Labor Backs Vietnam Antiwar Rally**

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010.

a labor press service

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 5, No. 25  
June 30, 1967

HANDS OFF THE  
ARAB REVOLUTION



PETER BUCH, at Militant Labor Forum in New York June 16, denounces Israeli government aggression in the Middle East. Formerly active in the Hashomer Hatzair, a socialist Zionist youth group, Peter Buch expressed the views of the Socialist Workers party at the well-attended forum.

## **Kosygin Substitutes UN Talk for Action in Mideast**

•  
**True Story Emerges  
of Egypt's Casualties**

•  
**Bertrand Russell Scores  
Israel as Aggressor**

•  
**Fourth International Calls  
for Support to Arab Cause**

•  
**China's H-bomb --  
a Deterrent to War**

**An Underground Document**

***Guerrillas Serve Notice  
on Guatemalan Butchers***

## **Canadian Labor Backs Vietnam Antiwar Rally**

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010.

KOSYGIN SUBSTITUTES UN TALK FOR ACTION IN MIDEAST

Kosygin's ploy at the United Nations proved to be a tragicomic business. Tragic because the Soviet Union, the strongest workers state and the world's second power, once again displayed such woeful weakness in leadership and followed policies so inimical to the interests of the world revolution and to the defense of the USSR; comic because of the way in which the aims of the Kremlin bureaucrats showed through their clumsy maneuvers. Washington, for certain, was taken in least of all.

Kosygin's objective was to repair the damage to Soviet prestige in the Middle East by loud denunciations of U.S. imperialism and its Israeli partner and by eloquent oratory in behalf of the Arab victims of the Israeli blitzkrieg. What was lost in substance by the failure to act in the decisive moments of the Middle East crisis, Kosygin hoped to recover -- at least on a surface level -- by verbal fireworks.

But the State Department refused to offer even the few conciliatory, demagogic phrases about favoring an Israeli pullback which the Kremlin needed to picture its UN maneuver as a success.

In fact, Johnson utilized the visit of the head of the Soviet government to New York for a Texas-style joke -- he invited this cackling goose to a "summit conference" in the very den of the Washington foxes.

Kosygin was wary, however. He understood the importance of collaborating in "keeping up appearances" and the need for meeting with Johnson to accomplish this; but couldn't this meeting be arranged elsewhere than in Washington? Say around Manhattan?

After this response to the impudent White House invitation, it was a matter of utter indifference whether Kosygin spent the rest of his time rubbernecking at the skyscrapers or inspecting such attractions as New York's subway system. He had defaulted even on utilizing the UN sounding board to give Johnson a public brush-off.

The Texas con man decided to give the Soviet sucker a break. He offered to meet him "half way." Kosygin accepted. And so came the famous "spirit of Glassboro" conference June 23 in the small town not far from one of America's greatest egg-laying centers. It was a fitting finale to Kosygin's UN performance.

The damage dealt the Soviet Union by the failure of the Kremlin leaders to come to the aid of the Arab countries

after the Israeli government pulled its version of a "Pearl Harbor" was much greater than is still generally realized. It compounded the damage done by the catastrophic policy of failing to rally adequately to the cause of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Political commentators in Washington at once began talking in terms of an altered relationship of forces on a world scale between the West and the Soviet bloc.

While this is an undoubted exaggeration, it does reflect the mounting self-confidence of the war hawks in Washington and the resulting increase in the danger of a U.S. "preemptive strike," say in the direction of China's nuclear installations.

In the Middle East, Soviet prestige sank to such a low that even the Kremlin must have become worried. The reaction to the Soviet failure was well indicated by the observation reportedly made by Nasser to the Soviet ambassador when the latter called on him in Cairo a few hours before his "resignation":

"Your attitude has convinced me that the United States rules the world. I cannot fight all alone against the universe. As for the Soviet Union, after our capitulation, it will be nothing more than a fourth-rate power." [Quoted in Le Monde, June 20.]

Further food for thought was provided Kosygin by the fact that while he was reading his prepared speech at the United Nations, the People's Republic of China announced the successful testing of a hydrogen bomb.

This feat was estimated by experts in the West as indicating that by 1970 China will have a most formidable stockpile of nuclear weapons, thus emerging, on the "deterrent" level at least, as the world's third power.

Khrushchev repeatedly boasted that under his guidance the Soviet Union would overtake the United States in its standard of living by 1970. This boast, if not sheer demagogy, was at least an illusion. But it does appear that by 1970 China will catch up with the Soviet Union in its capacity to offer a modern military reply to any aggression by U.S. imperialism. This also signifies a formidable challenge to Soviet pretensions to leadership among the underdeveloped countries. The challenge is all the more real in view of the political bankruptcy of the Kremlin.

The explosion of China's H-bomb made Kosygin's fireworks at the UN sound like a wet sputter.

CHINA'S H-BOMB -- A DETERRENT TO WAR

China's successful explosion of an H-bomb June 17 caused great dismay in Washington. The first outstanding consequence may well be to slow down the current mad course of the imperialist warmongers toward a nuclear conflagration.

Some of the war hawks may be arguing right now in the Pentagon that a "preemptive strike" should be undertaken at once by the U.S. However, the calculation that China may already have a stockpile of twenty or more nuclear weapons which could be "delivered" in the Vietnamese war, in Japan, or even in coastal cities of the United States (possibly by a few submarines), should deter the "preemptive strikers."

China's achievement testifies to the inherent capacities of economic planning to advance a country in giant strides from the most primitive levels. This is how the success will be judged, and correctly so, throughout the colonial world.

In this respect as in others, China offers the most striking contrast to the stagnation and decay blighting India, the country that stood nearest to China at the time of the revolutionary victory in 1949 in both population and resources. China's achievement was made possible, of course, by Soviet aid -- until this was withdrawn. But India has enjoyed the aid of both British and American imperialism, with these two powers well aware of the fact that India and China constituted competing show windows.

The development of the nuclear field in China has furnished the Western powers with surprise after surprise. The first one was the speed with which the initial atomic device was produced -- the test date being October 16, 1964. The second surprise was that not plutonium, but enriched uranium was utilized in this device.

The implication was that the Chinese scientists had made new technical discoveries, putting them ahead of the processes worked out in the West.

The jump from an atomic bomb to a hydrogen bomb in such a brief span of time again shocked the Western nuclear experts, leading them to speculate over other Chinese breakthroughs in the field of technology. To manufacture an atom bomb is now considered to be well within the capacity of even a small country. It has been frequently rumored, for instance, that the Israeli government is moving toward this goal. But an H-bomb offers such formidable difficulties that up to now only the major powers have been considered able to accomplish it.

A third- or fourth-rate power like France has found it extremely difficult to solve the complex and costly problems.

One of the most significant aspects of the Chinese triumph is what it reveals about the level of the sciences in China. Thus Nicolas Vichney, commenting in the June 20 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde on France's failure as yet to produce an H-bomb despite years of effort, states that "the analysis of the problems associated with thermonuclear devices has been blocked up to now in France by difficulties due in particular, it seems, to the impossibility of making an appeal for the indispensable brains."

In China, on the contrary, the government appealed to all the specialists who had studied abroad. "There was a general mobilization," notes Vichney, "and the consequences of it are now apparent."

China's successful explosion of an H-bomb entails a series of political conclusions.

The first one is that the "cultural revolution," whatever its ravages in other areas, did not disrupt, or at least did not greatly disrupt work in the nuclear field. The Mao regime seems to have carried out in practice the line laid down in point No. 12 of the August 8, 1966, Central Committee decision concerning the "great proletarian cultural revolution." This was not to go beyond criticizing scientists, technicians and ordinary members of working staffs "as long as they are patriotic, work energetically, are not against the Party and socialism, and maintain no illicit relations with any foreign country..." As the point calls for, "special care" really seems to have been taken of these categories.

This was a correct policy that has obviously proved fruitful for the Chinese workers state.

On a world scale, the very bad blows dealt to Chinese prestige by the cult of Mao Tse-tung will be offset to a certain degree by the explosion of the H-bomb. This will be especially noticeable in the colonial world but will also be observable in Western circles, particularly around such issues as membership in the United Nations and the question of a U.S.-Soviet treaty against proliferation of nuclear weapons.

As for the Moscow-Peking dispute, it remains to be seen how this will be affected by China's abrupt entrance into the thermonuclear club. The Kremlin's first reaction was to play the event down, giving it only five lines on page five of

Pravda.

It was reported in the corridors of the United Nations that the Soviet delegation considered the timing of the explosion to be a deliberate factional move designed to take the spotlight away from the General Assembly and Kosygin playing the role of orator.

This reaction itself, however, savored of factionalism. It certainly represented no considered judgment of the meaning of China's achievement either on a world scale or in the relations between

the two big workers states.

As for the repercussions inside China, little can be said about this in view of the tight censorship and the muzzling of free expression of opinion.

The Mao faction, of course, are ascribing the victory to "Mao's thought." It should really be ascribed to the immense power of economic planning and to the new perspectives which the Chinese revolution opened for the working masses and intellectuals of that country.

TRUE STORY EMERGES OF EGYPT'S CASUALTIES

With the announcement by Israeli military authorities in Tel Aviv June 19 that the number of Arab soldiers killed in the Sinai desert was around 20,000 instead of the figure of 7,000 or 8,000 originally announced, the true story began to emerge of some of the horrors of the Israeli blitzkrieg.

The figure of 20,000 refers to those killed; total casualties, which includes wounded and missing, were far higher.

In the June 20 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, Eric Rouleau estimates the number of wounded in the hospitals of the United Arab Republic may reach as high as 30,000.

In two hospitals alone, in the suburbs of Cairo, there are some 3,000 wounded. Rouleau visited these two establishments and talked with many of the soldiers under treatment.

Dr. Mansour, the chief of staff, told him: "We received more wounded than we expected. More than 75 percent of them were suffering from napalm burns, to such an extent that I and my colleagues estimate that less than 50 percent will survive."

In one of the modern rooms of the Helmieh hospital Rouleau saw Lt. Mustapha El Khodari, a doomed man. All the features of his face were burned away. His body was a charred mass. In the neighboring bed, Col. Kamal El Roubi, his body wrapped like a mummy, lay paralyzed from head to foot from napalm. He could barely whisper. On June 6, he said, Israeli Mirages pursued his unit as it fled and dumped devastating flames on them.

Lt. Choukry Hanna, writhing with pain, recounted his experience. "I am the only survivor of a company of infantry that was composed of a hundred men. On June 5, the first day of hostilities, an Israeli reconnaissance plane flew over

our trenches at Oum Koutaief in the Ogueila area. A little later other planes appeared and showered us with napalm. My comrades burned like torches. Only one of them escaped with me. We were going on foot to the Suez when a Bedouin offered to take us on his camel. An Israeli plane spotted us the next morning. He machine-gunned us. The camel was killed, but once again we miraculously escaped death. When we reached the Suez, my comrade died from his burns. As for me, I managed to reach an Egyptian town."

Rouleau reports hearing of many cases in which the Israelis used torture.

"At the Meadi hospital, Corporal Souweilam Abdel Rassoul Gadallah, 22, a member of a tank unit, stated that he had been submitted to torture by members of the Israeli intelligence service. His body riddled with bullets, immobile, with an expression of terror on his face, his voice breaking, he replied in monosyllables to the questions of the journalists. Captured at Rafah, when he attempted to escape he was taken to an isolated spot behind a dune where a kind of gallows had been set up. He was bound with chains, he said, hung up by the feet and beaten with a rifle butt while the Israeli officers questioned him. When he refused to talk, bursts of machine-gun fire were aimed in his direction, the shots striking his feet, his legs, his arm (it had to be amputated later). He was given nothing to eat or drink for 62 hours. Not far from him a canvas water bag leaked water drop by drop..."

Mohamed Moutawan died on the operating table, doctors told the journalists, when his two legs were amputated for gangrene. After walking 50 kilometers to the Suez, he was picked up by the Israelis and returned to his point of departure. He made it to the Suez again only to meet with the same treatment again. After a few more repetitions, his feet were so bad that gangrene had set in. The Israelis then let him go.

GUERRILLAS SERVE NOTICE ON GUATEMALAN BUTCHERS

[The following statement was issued May 15 by the Centro de Dirección Revolucionaria de las Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes (Center of Revolutionary Leadership of the Rebel Armed Forces), the Guatemalan guerrilla group headed by César Montes. It has been translated by World Outlook from the May issue of FAR, the group's underground publication. The sub-headings appear in the original.]

\* \* \*

Since the downfall of the democratic regime of Arbenz, the succeeding reactionary governments have utilized prisons, torture and assassination as the principal means to stifle the signs of popular discontent. Castillo Armas did this, murdering hundreds of workers and peasants; Ydígoras Fuentes did the same, savagely repressing the people; Peralta Azurdia similarly murdered, used torture and caused the "disappearance" forever of hundreds of Guatemalans; and now it is being done by Julio César Méndez Montenegro.

The present government, with the aim of drawing together the administrative apparatus of the state, did not hesitate at reaching a compromise with those who had murdered during the Peralta dictatorship, accepting an agreement to bow to the army. By this attitude, the Partido Revolucionario [the government party] demonstrated that as representative of the wealthy classes it could not carry out any of the economic and social reforms necessary to solve the problems of the people originating in the exploitation which the majority of Guatemalans suffer.

As a class instrument, the Méndez Montenegro government has no other recourse than application of the same counterrevolutionary measures utilized by the reaction during the past thirteen years. The official repression, carried out through the "Mano Blanca" [White Hand] and the "Noa," groups which the army guides and fosters, has already gone beyond the crimes committed by Peralta Azurdia.

In face of the militant popular attitude, the enemies of the people have resorted to new methods in seeking to break their will and muzzle their protests. Thus they went to great lengths to make the Méndez Montenegro regime appear like a democratic government. This maneuver failed so that the reaction was left with no other means but counterrevolutionary terror.

And the government has pursued this course unconcerned about striking

against broad sectors of the population, unconcerned about plunging hundreds of humble Guatemalan homes into grief and despair, unconcerned about committing acts as criminal and abysmal as decapitating people, both men and women, and inflicting savage torture on prisoners. Among other cases we can cite the school mistress Oaxaca de Mejía, brutally decapitated in Santa Rosa, the Pineda Longo brothers, the body of one of them being found castrated, the peasant assassinated in Salamá, whose eyes were pierced with pins, and the mass murders in Chiquimula, the nine peasants in the La Máquina land division and the eleven members of the Partido Revolucionario in Sanarate, without mentioning the use of napalm in the northeast.

Objective of the Indiscriminate Terror

This entire campaign of unrestrained terror, of sowing fear, panic, confusion, aims not only at neutralizing the popular struggle, but is also an effort mounted by local reaction and imperialism to provoke the rebel armed forces and make them fall into the error of replying by seeking "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," causing them to become sidetracked from their essential political objectives.

The FAR has not fallen and will not fall into such a trap. It denounced the maneuvers of the army and the government in time, pointing to the bodies involved and even naming some of the henchmen in the wave of terror raging in the country. Despite the criminal activities of the reaction, the FAR did not move, did not respond to the provocation.

This correct attitude has already proved fruitful. The reaction, intoxicated with the blood bath it unleashed, has completely lost sight of political struggle and civilized combat, becoming converted into something genuinely monstrous, killing, torturing, without reason, simply out of criminal impulse and the aim of intimidating the people.

The popular masses have understood this and have proved able to differentiate between the responsible revolutionary activities of the FAR and the murderous actions of the government and its army.

The official terror has not gained its objectives. The people have not been intimidated nor given up sympathy and support for the FAR. Just the opposite -- the will to struggle and the hate which the people feel for their oppressors have greatly increased. It can already be said that this second phase of the imperialist plan to end the armed revolutionary struggle has been defeated. The maneuver of depicting the Méndez Montenegro government

as democratic has failed and the maneuver of turning to indiscriminate terror in order to isolate the FAR from the popular masses has begun to fail.

#### Some Leaders of the Noa and the Mano

It is known that the Noa and the Mano are nothing more than army and government bodies. These same terrorist groups enabled the people to grasp their role as government instruments by publishing information available only to the judicial police or other government and army bodies.

It appears that those who created these criminal bands have lost control over them and that they are beginning to operate on their own account. At least this appears to be indicated by such political stupidity, such slaughter of innocent people, such unlimited savagery.

While the army conducts its repressive measures through the Noa, the government operates through the National Police which is utilizing a group of policemen in plain clothes for seizing, kidnapping, torturing and murdering hundreds of patriots. The plainclothesmen, along with other elements, form the organization known as the Mano Blanco. Recently, especially since the head of the National Police was changed, this police organization has engaged in competing in shedding blood with the civilian organization acting under the direct orders of the Ministry of Defense, the "Noa."

The joint work of the civilian and military machines of the regime is clearly exemplified in the organization operating in the northeast of the country. In that area, the army team applying the repression is as follows: Colonel Carlos Arana, first chief of the military zone of Zacapa; Carlos Thompson, an Izabal landowner who holds a military commission; Mariano Sánchez, a native of Gualán and head of the commissioned officers, under whose orders the following group heads are serving: Francisco Aguirre, Pedro Sosa, Carlos Oliverio Castañeda Paíz and Edgar Cruz, alias "El Gitano" [the gypsy]. These group heads direct various henchmen, among whom we can name Rolando Cruz and Benjamín Cruz, respectively the brother and the father of "El Gitano."

These repressive groups use various houses and places for their misdeeds like the Santa Cruz toll booth, which is also an information and control center for all those traveling in this area; the military headquarters in the town of La Palma, the home of Benjamín Cruz, the service station of Ovidio Morales, alias "El Chato" [pug nose]. At the military headquarters in La Palma the most terrible tortures have been inflicted and hundreds of murders have been committed;

the bodies of hundreds of citizens massacred in this place have later been thrown into the Motagua river. In Benjamín Cruz's home in Río Hondo they plot seizures, tortures and murders; and in Ovidio Morales' service station they hold a kind of tribunal in which they decide the fate of prisoners. In addition they use the place as a jail and a center for preliminary interrogations.

In the municipality of Río Hondo and other villages and towns there are other plainclothesmen, well armed, who prowl the streets and sidewalks with instructions to shoot anyone who looks suspicious. These repressive gangs are attached to the Dirección General of the National Police and the central group has its general headquarters in the complaints section of this institution.

In addition to this gang, in the second corps, in the Florida station and other police stations, there are plainclothesmen designated to seize Guatemalans, to torture and murder them. Almost all of these agents are justice men who formerly belonged to the special section of the justice department or the criminal investigation section of the National Police. Many of them participated in the murder of the twenty-eight citizens who "disappeared" in the dark days of Peralta Azurdia.

The central nucleus of this gang of thugs is composed of the following persons: Germán de León Orellana, alias "Zacatón" [hay, used in a sense like hayseed], Aníbal Hermosilla, Herlindo Fernández Pozuelos, alias "Pellejos" [skin, but can mean drunkard or prostitute], and Nazario Cruz. Their misdeeds are committed in the quarters of the first corps of the National Police, the cells of the second corps (the 400) and in private homes, which they use as centers for applying torture and committing murder.

To cite instances of the many murders committed by "Zacatón" and his squad, it is sufficient to recall the names of Jorge Ampié Montenegro, Alberto García León, Alberto Cardona, whose bodies were found in the municipality of Chuarrancho with obvious signs of having been submitted to the most savage torture; the 61-year-old Felipe González and Buenaventura, found in Salamá.

#### Methods Used in Killing

The ways in which these organizations seize people are as follows: generally they try to pick them up when no one is around so that there are no witnesses; in other cases they openly arrest people in their homes, using police cars, and later the authorities deny they have been taken. Since on many occasions the official license plates have been taken down, the officials say that they have no record of any such plates and know nothing about the

automobiles that were used.

All interrogations are carried out by beating the prisoners savagely until they lose consciousness. Death by asphyxia is applied by wrapping a thin hose around the neck of the prisoner. The two ends are then drawn tight until the thyroids and pharynx are crushed, causing the death of the victim. Some persons lose their voice and ability to eat, and suffer an even more painful death. They then take out the bodies and when they leave them somewhere they fire a few shots into them. Others have been burned alive, as in the case of some who have fallen into the hands of the army gangs. To cite names it is sufficient to recall the young school teacher Nora Paiz and the battler Gabriel Mejía.

The principal torturers and murderers in the direct pay of the army, who continue to commit all kinds of crimes in the eastern part of the country and the capital in the name of the Noa are Carlos Oliverio Castañeda Paiz, who serves as head of the gang; the brothers Luis, Gonzalo, Tomás and Ramiro Orellana; Romeo Vargas, alias "Furgón" [boxcar, also last card in the pack], Edgar Cruz, alias "El Gitano," Carlos Estrada, Carlos Vargas, Julio Orellana, Gustavo Orellana, Adalberto Orellana and others. Oliverio Castañeda's gang dedicates itself with special enthusiasm to hunting revolutionaries or "suspects" in the streets of the capital, being guilty of numerous assassinations like those of the brothers Oliva and Carlos Enrique Herrarte and similar cases.

The government and the army foster and cover up the activities of such repressive groups, which are guided by high military chiefs and some officials of lower rank, whose names and addresses we know perfectly.

#### Punishment of These Agents

The FAR has not responded to the provocations of the government, the army and Yankee imperialism, but we do not view the suffering of the people with indifference. We declare that we are not going to stand arms folded, watching the Méndez Montenegro dictatorship murder a defenseless population. We are going to

act in order to deter the reactionary terror and are going to do so consciously, carefully, so that the people understand our revolutionary objectives and the character of our struggle while at the same time exposing the criminal and reactionary nature of the government and its army.

The FAR repeats categorically that in no case will it retaliate against relatives of the agents, torturers and assassins, linked with them merely through family ties. No matter what the atrocities committed by a "Zacatón," by an Oliverio Castañeda Paiz, we, as revolutionary patriots, will not take vengeance on women, old people, children and men who have nothing to do with the criminal actions of such gangsters. The FAR will act directly against the real assassins, criminals and torturers, who, along with their military and civilian chiefs will receive the punishment they merit. In these cases we will apply popular justice without hesitation.

In making this declaration, we appeal to upright men in the military and police not to stain their hands with the blood of their compatriots. We always know how to distinguish between those in the military and police who limit themselves to carrying out functions proper to their work and the uniformed assassins who dedicate themselves to massacring Guatemalans.

The oppressing classes have applied violence against the people and are continuing their policy of attempting through unrestrained terror to beat down the popular resistance. But the reactionary violence can be defeated only by means of revolutionary violence, which the Rebel Armed Forces are inspiring as the most vigorous demonstration of the militant will of the Guatemalan people.

Guilt for the present blood bath lies with the government of Méndez Montenegro, which, abetted by Yankee imperialism, is venting its fury on the popular majority; but the Guatemalan people will emerge from the wave of reactionary terror fortified, with a stronger decision and more reasons to struggle either TO WIN OR DIE FOR GUATEMALA.

#### IT'S OFFICIAL -- BREATHING CAN KILL YOU

The Japan Times reported June 17 the death of a man in the industrial city of Yokkaichi officially attributed to polluted air. Shoichiro Sugimoto "was officially recognized as a victim of the polluted air by the Yokkaichi municipal office in last October, and had since

been receiving financial aid from the office."

Four recognized victims of polluted air have died since 1965, although Sugimoto is the first where the air was the sole cause of death.



MRS. WINNIE MANDELA IN COURT

[The following item is reprinted from the May issue of Anti-Apartheid News. Besides the report about Mrs. Winnie Mandela, a reference to Dr. Neville Alexander will be noted. World Outlook does not have any information beyond this concerning the present situation of the noted intellectual who is now serving a ten-year sentence in the notorious Robben Island prison for political opposition to the fascist-like government of South Africa.]

\* \* \*

Mrs Winnie Mandela, wife of Nelson Mandela, the Rivonia trialist serving a term of life imprisonment, appeared briefly before a Johannesburg magistrate last month charged with an offence allegedly committed nine months ago.

Mr J. Carlson, applying for Mrs Mandela's release on her own recognisances, said she was well known in Orlando West where she had lived for the last ten years. He said Mrs Mandela was a banned person and was required to report weekly to the Orlando police. He said she had carried out this duty faithfully for the past three years.

Mr Carlson said he was surprised at the conduct of the police in arresting Mrs Mandela at all. She could have been

warned to appear in court. The State did not oppose the application and Mrs Mandela was released on her own recognisances until May 1.

She appeared on a charge under the suppression of Communism Act of failing to give her full name and address to a police officer when requested to do so. The alleged offence was committed in the Cape Town area on the night of July 9, 1966. She was also charged with resisting arrest.

Nelson Mandela, Dr Neville Alexander and Eddie Daniels, all prisoners on Robben Island, were due to appear on the island at enquiries under the Prisons Act last month.

Messrs Mandela and Daniels were charged under the same section of the prison regulations with being "idle, careless or negligent in their work," or refusing to work.

The allegations relate to an incident on the island's lime quarry on January 25 this year. Dr Alexander was charged under the same section but this relates to work while loading a truck on November 14 last year. The charges against all three men were withdrawn two days before Mr Mandela was due to appear before a Cape Town magistrate.

BOLIVIAN TROTSKYIST LEADER EXILED IN AMAZON JUNGLE

Hugo González Moscoso, one of the main Trotskyist leaders in Bolivia, is still alive, World Outlook has learned. Dr. González was arrested by the secret political police on April 13 in Santa Cruz, a town located in the general area where guerrilla activities have been reported in recent months.

The Trotskyist leader was there because of poor health. However, the political police claimed that he was "directing" the guerrillas in the vicinity. As "proof" they pointed to the Marxist literature they found in his home as well as manuscripts he was working on.

The arrest of Dr. González occurred exactly one week before the arrest of Régis Debray at Muyupampa, which is not far from Santa Cruz.

It was feared that the Barrientos regime might have Dr. González killed at once as in the case of César Lora, another Trotskyist leader accused of engaging in guerrilla activities.

It has now been learned that Barrientos decided to exile the Trotskyist

leader to a remote jungle camp called Ascensión de Guarayos in a region inhabited only by primitive tribes.

Dr. González thus shares the fate of other Trotskyist leaders like Guillermo Lora and most of the prominent figures of the left in Bolivia. Last January, Barrientos launched a new sweeping witch-hunt, the worst since he seized power. In raids in the main centers of Bolivia, leftists of all tendencies were seized by the political police and held incommunicado. Some were tortured.

Then, on the grounds of their political views, they were flown to remote military posts and left without food, without jobs, without resources, without medical care. To many of the deportees, the sentence signifies slow death.

This witch-hunt, which has been ignored by the capitalist press and many leftist journals, constituted the background for the arrest of Régis Debray and two other journalists, a case which has gained international attention because of the sensation it made in France where Debray's mother is a well-known political figure.

RUSSELL JOINS REGIS DEBRAY SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN

Bertrand Russell, world-famous philosopher and initiator of the International War Crimes Tribunal, has added his voice to the worldwide list of figures condemning the Barrientos dictatorship in Bolivia for its treatment of Régis Debray, the young French journalist who has been held incommunicado since April.

In a statement issued June 10, Bertrand Russell declared:

"No information is more vital to us in the West than intimate knowledge of the struggles in the Third World. Since the Second World War, the unfolding of these struggles in the arduous process of decolonisation has singularly transformed social, economic and political realities on a world scale. One Western journalist who has made an important contribution to our understanding of revolutionary change is now in serious danger because of his courageous attempt to observe at first hand the current resistance movement in Bolivia.

"I speak of Professor Régis Debray, author of Revolución en la Revolución, and an accredited representative of the Mexican periodical Sucesos."

Russell outlines some of the features of Debray's arrest and confinement that indicate a frame-up by the Bolivian dictatorship:

"Professor Debray entered Bolivia in the usual manner, travelling on his French passport and showing his credentials as a journalist. He has been captured by the Bolivian armed forces and charged with an improper 'association' with the guerrilla forces which oppose the Barrientos dictatorship.

BOLIVIAN MINERS PROCLAIM "FREE TERRITORY"

According to a June 20 Agence France-Presse dispatch from La Paz, Bolivia's tin miners are becoming increasingly restive.

At Oruro and Huanuni, the miners have issued a proclamation stating that the region from now on is "free territory."

As yet the Barrientos regime has given no indication that it has noticed the proclamation; but the technicians in the mines have decided to stop work until they receive "adequate guarantees" as to their personal safety.

While their absence has slowed down production, the mines are continuing

"Professor Debray's whereabouts are, at present, undisclosed by his captors. His mother has been denied access to him; he has so far been refused legal counsel. Formal enquiries from the French Government, including those from General de Gaulle, have elicited nothing."

As for the public statements by Bolivian authorities, Russell comments:

"The Commander-in-Chief of the Bolivian Army, General Alfredo Ovando, has stated that Professor Debray will receive a fair trial, in accordance with the Bolivian Constitution. Vice-President Siles Salinas has given the solemn assurance that capital punishment has long been abolished in Bolivia. These words are intended to conceal the arbitrary and harsh treatment which Professor Debray has received to date.

"They are, likewise, a feeble contradiction of President Barrientos' own frank and cynical statement that Professor Debray is 'an adventurer who came to Bolivia to bring grief to Bolivian families. His adventures will end in Bolivia.'"

Summing up the general significance of this case, Bertrand Russell pointed out that:

"When we defend Professor Debray's right to discover the grim reality of oppression among the peasant guerrillas of Latin America, we are doing nothing more than protecting our own interests. We must uphold our right to learn the truth. Our support for Régis Debray is a minimum contribution toward the preservation of 'unmanaged' news and an informed world opinion."

to operate under the management of the miners themselves.

Minister of Interior Antonio Arguedas attributes the unrest among the miners to their union and to "extremists." He added that if the movement disturbs the public order and helps the guerrillas, the leaders will be arrested.

In an editorial note, Le Monde held June 21 that the action of the miners constitutes a grave challenge to the Barrientos regime, coming at the same time as the opening of a guerrilla front. Barrientos' personal position is becoming more and more difficult, Le Monde adds, and there are rumors that a section of the army is preparing to move against him.

ANOTHER "LONG HOT SUMMER" BEGINS IN THE U.S.

By Evelyn Sell

"You can name any major metropolitan area in this country and I'm saying that it is in danger of blowing up." This April 10 statement by Wilfred Ussery, associate national chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality, was typical of many predicting racial explosions in America's black ghettos during the summer of 1967.

The predictions were denounced by various government and conservative Negro leaders as contributing to racial tensions. When the Detroit Commission on Community Relations warned of possible civil unrest and called for government and private help in warding off trouble, Council President Ed Carey told Commission Director Richard Marks, "I think you are generating unrest where it does not now exist." In the June issue of the FBI's law enforcement bulletin, Director J. Edgar Hoover stated:

"To publicly pinpoint certain cities where riots and violence may occur seems to be inconsistent with the doctrine of nonviolence. Rather, it is more like an open invitation to hotheads and rabble rousers in those areas to move into action on cue. It puts them on notice that they are expected to riot."

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had pinpointed Cleveland and Stokeley Carmichael had cited Washington, D.C., as potentially explosive spots. After having given the back of his hand to King and Carmichael, Hoover called on state and local officials to "speak out and let everyone know that law and order must prevail."

In the "Hoover spirit," Chicago Mayor Richard Daley gave civil-rights activists notice that he would not allow militant marches or demonstrations this summer.

Despite the denunciations of Hoover and his like, the predictions of trouble continued because it was generally recognized that the conditions which had produced the explosions of 1964, 1965 and 1966 not only still remained but had actually worsened. The high rates of unemployment among black workers and youth, discrimination in schools and other institutions, unrelenting police brutality and the frustrations inherent within big city slums continue to force ghetto residents to rebel.

In addition, the glittering promises of Johnson's War on Poverty have not come true so that the high hopes raised have now turned into bitterness. The recent ouster of Harlem congressman Adam

Clayton Powell further deepened this bitterness.

A Chicago social worker who counsels street-gang members explained, "We had pointed to Adam as someone who had joined the mainstream, rose to the top and as a symbol of what every Negro could do. Now our youngsters -- some of them -- are telling us that a 'nigger's just a nigger as far as the power structure is concerned' and what's worse is that they are feeling there's no need to try to make it."

All year long nationally and locally prominent government figures have been announcing special programs designed to keep the summer "cool" despite the sizzling hot ingredients within the major urban ghettos. In March, President Johnson appointed Vice-President Humphrey as chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. "The President's Council," Humphrey explained to the National League of Cities legislative conference, "will give special emphasis to summer programs which contribute to the sound development of youth through special education, employment, recreation and health services."

He told the assembled municipal officials that it was cheaper to provide such facilities than to replace "broken windows and burned-out buildings." He cautioned the city officials to keep the youth busy playing and studying this summer.

In April, Secretary of Labor Wirtz announced a "concentrated" program for the hard-core unemployed in the slums of major U.S. cities.

Census figures showed that the non-white unemployment figure was about three times the white unemployment rate in eight major U.S. areas. The worst unemployment is among fourteen- to nineteen-year-old nonwhites.

At the same time this program was announced at a national level, the Michigan Civil Rights Commission initiated a program to secure jobs for all Detroit high-school students graduated in June. Called "Jobs for Detroit Workbound High School Graduates," the program was designed to "relieve community tension."

In New York, Mayor Lindsay appointed a Summer Task Force of top city officials to coordinate recreation and community-developed programs.

In May, Roy Wilkins, the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, stated,

"Thousands of young Negroes will be turned loose from schools this summer with muscles in their arms and mischief in their minds. We must find jobs for them or we are going to have trouble." (The negative sentiments expressed about black youth explain why militants are antagonistic towards Wilkins.) He urged cooperation at all levels of government and business to make jobs available on a massive scale to Negro youth.

There have been increasing pleas towards big business to play a major role in funding programs to "cool-off" the summers. It was announced earlier this year that congressional cutbacks on funds meant there would be less money available for the special summer "antiriot" programs. In his role as chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, Vice-President Humphrey has attempted to get business, industry and organized labor to provide jobs and open up play areas for 2,000,000 youths across the country. In May, Humphrey announced that out of 900,000 requests he had succeeded in getting commitments from 28,813 employers for 221,615 jobs. Several congressmen have proposed "pre-apprenticeship" categories for young workers so that they could be paid below union scales -- poverty program benefits for youths breaking into jobs!

In New York, key elements of the business community joined the city administration in a fine-sounding seventeen-point program to combat ghetto explosions. The Kinney System Rent-A-Car pledged \$8,920 to provide 1,000 sprinkler caps which would transform fire hydrants into play showers for ghetto children. Restaurant Associates has guaranteed 500 summer jobs for underprivileged youths plus \$10,000 worth of food for summer outings. The New York Telephone Co. set up a special training and job program for 100 boys and also plans to underwrite the costs of supplying all-day supervised recreation and cultural activities in a ghetto block.

On June 3 President Johnson appointed an eighteen-member committee to survey how the resources of private business and labor can be mobilized for a broad attack on city slums. The committee is headed by Edgar Kaiser, president of Kaiser Industries, and includes leaders of labor unions, local government and the civil-rights movement.

Ghetto residents have not waited, however, to find out the results of surveys (they've made their own life-long surveys). Nor have they waited to be fooled again by antipoverty programs which sound wonderful but always turn out to be too little and too late.

The predicted eruptions had already begun, weeks before the calendar officially proclaimed summer. As early as the first week of April black students in the South rebelled. Struggles against police were reported at Fisk University, Meharry College and Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial in Nashville. Later in the month, other outbursts occurred at Texas Southern University in Houston, Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and Jackson State College in Mississippi and Howard University in Washington, D.C.

On June 2 a silent vigil by fifty women in a Boston welfare office sparked an explosion in that city. The group, called Mothers for Adequate Welfare [MAW] were objecting to "hostile social workers" and to having their welfare checks cut off "without warning or investigation."

When welfare employees attempted to get the women to leave and lock up for the weekend, the group insisted on seeing welfare director Daniel Cronin. MAW fastened bicycle chains to inside doors thus effectively preventing people from leaving or entering the office.

The police were called and tried to gain access through a window but a group of youth outside the building began a chant to stop them and the officers halted their efforts to get inside. However, one group of police succeeded in cutting through the chains on the front doors and burst in, clubs swinging. Mothers were hit and arrested.

This was the spark which led to a full-scale fiery outburst. Rocks and bottles were thrown at police, stores were looted, fires broke out in buildings and a home-made bomb injured one man during an almost week-long series of incidents. Police roamed the area armed with sub-machine guns, bayonets and dogs.

The Commission on Church and Race in Massachusetts criticized police tactics and the Rev. Virgil A. Wood, director of the Blue Hill Christian Center, stated, "Literally, war was declared on the black people by the police force last night and in all likelihood this will happen again until the whole attitude of the administration changes."

The long hot summer (referred to as LHS now because it has become a part of the American scene) has begun. There will be more LHS "until the whole attitude of the administration (national, state and local) changes." And that attitude won't change and has never changed in the past except when change was forced upon America's rulers by mass actions of the working people.

BERTRAND RUSSELL SCORES ISRAEL AS AGGRESSOR

[The following statement on the Israeli attack in the Middle East was released by Bertrand Russell on June 12.]

\* \* \*

Israel's attack on Syria, which has continued despite universal demand for ceasefire and assurance by Israeli leaders that they intend to advance no further, should be condemned as aggression. In this policy, Israel has proceeded with the unstated approval of Western governments which desire the overthrow of the Syrian regime because it challenges their customary exploitation of the resources of the Arab world.

Israeli spokesmen have indicated that Israel will not automatically relinquish its newly captured territory, which is three times the size of Israel itself.

This, too, is aggression in the Israeli pattern of earlier years: it seizes what it can and holds on until this becomes the "status quo." Israel should respect ceasefire arrangements, cooperate with any agency which supervises them and recall all its troops within its borders.

The demands of the governments of the United States and of Britain for the unfettered flow of oil from Arab land are demands that the exploitation of these lands continue unhindered. The Arab world must be permitted to own and develop its own natural resources.

Those who rightly sympathize with Jewish victims of Hitler's aggression in



BERTRAND RUSSELL

Europe should not equate Israel's survival with its policy of territorial conquest. Aggression is unjustifiable, the more so when perpetrated by those who know its full meaning.

ISRAELI COMMUNIST PARTY BACKS ISRAEL'S AGGRESSION

A dispatch from Jerusalem carried in the June 20 Le Monde reports that "In a declaration on the Middle East crisis, Mr. Moshe Sneh, leader of the Communist party of Israel, unambiguously accuses the Arab countries of the responsibility for the war."

The Communist spokesman declared:

"Contrary to the Arab leaders, who had declared their intention to annihilate Israel, the aim of this country in the war which was imposed upon us against our will, was not to deprive any of our neighbors of anything at all. Certainly we did not aim to threaten the sovereignty or the existence of, nor to intervene in the affairs of any Arab state.


"The aim of Israel was to eliminate the permanent threat of her annihilation; to wipe out the threat resulting from the nonrecognition of any right at all of the Jewish people to any part of this country...

"This is why we have said that the military confrontation of last week was fundamentally a continuation of the liberation of 1948. Then as now the Arab leaders...absolutely and fundamentally rejected the right of our people to national and political existence....

"This is why we say that justice is on the side of Israel in the struggle of 1967 as it was in the struggle of 1948."



BERTRAND RUSSELL



BERTRAND RUSSELL

TEN-YEAR RECORD OF MAOIST "DEMOCRACY"

The following data on the practice of "intensive democracy" in the Communist party of China over the past decade indicates some grounds for skepticism about Mao's promises of instituting "extensive democracy" outside the party through the "great proletarian cultural revolution."

\* \* \*

According to the party statutes, the supreme organ is the National Party Congress which is to be reelected every five years. It is supposed to meet at least once a year to discuss outstanding questions. These stipulations have been disregarded for a long time.

The last National Party Congress, designated as the eighth, was held in September 1956. Since then the elected delegates have met only once, in May 1958. There have been no new elections for more than ten years and no recent mention of convening the Ninth Party Congress.

The failure of the Mao leadership to abide by the provisions of the party statutes is all the more impermissible in view of the fact that at the Eighth Party Congress in 1956 the statutes were amended with the specific purpose of initiating regular mandatory meetings.

In his speech motivating the amendment, the party's general secretary Teng Hsiao-ping told the congress that "the principles of internal party democracy can only be kept alive if the congress meets regularly and exercises to the full the functions assigned to it." If this rule was ignored, he went on, the consequence would inevitably be detrimental to "democratic centralism."

(With Liu Shao-chi, Teng now heads the list of "the counterrevolutionary revisionists who are in authority and are taking the capitalist road.")

According to the statutes, the Central Committee of the CCP is empowered to make any necessary decisions in the intervals between meetings of the Party Congress. But the Central Committee has met only spasmodically and not even the prescribed minimum of "at least two plenary sessions a year" has been kept up since the Communists came to power.

Thus the Central Committee did not meet at all during the critical year of 1960 and only once in 1961. The penultimate official plenary session was the tenth in September 1962. Reference has occasionally been made to an unofficial Central Committee gathering in September 1965 but the nature of its deliberations and decisions have not been divulged.



TENG HSIAO-PING

The eighth Central Committee held its eleventh plenary session in Peking from August 1 to 12, 1966. It was presided over by Mao Tse-tung and adopted the 16-point declaration concerning the "great proletarian cultural revolution." Point 9 states: "It is necessary to institute a system of general elections, like that of the Paris Commune, for electing members to the cultural revolutionary groups and committees and delegates to the cultural revolutionary congresses."

Up to now these promised elections remain in the same state of limbo as the constitutional elections to the congress and Central Committee of the CCP over the past ten years.

GOVERNOR OF TOKYO WARNS AGAINST RISE OF FASCISM IN JAPAN

The Japan Times Weekly reported June 17 that Ryokichi Minobe, the first Socialist governor of Tokyo, warned recently that "Japan is gradually becoming fascist in its thinking."

Minobe said the economic situation in Japan today is similar to that between 1925 and 1930, just before the world depression leading to the militarists' rise to power.





TENG HSIAO-PING



TENG HSIAO-PING

ITALIAN CP LEADER ATTACKS CUBAN POSITIONS

By Livio Maitan

[The following article has been translated from the June 1 issue of Bandiera Rossa the newspaper of the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari, the Italian section of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

The mid-May meeting of the Central Committee of the PCI [Partito Comunista d'Italia -- Communist party of Italy] has shed rather more light than previous sessions on the current preoccupations, orientation, and contradictions of the party's leading group.

For at least two reasons it was inevitable that the Vietnam war would become the focal point of discussion: first of all, because objectively, it is the key question with which all others are bound up; and, secondly, because the party's policy as regards questions closer to home like trade-union struggles or the attitude to be taken toward programming\* is presently too vague to be likely to stir much activity or even any new discussion (except a discussion arising from a radical criticism of this policy).

Even on the question of the fight for Vietnam, the PCI's position presents some difficulties. On the one hand, the leading group is trying to bring pressure to bear on the government through the socialists, or a part of them, and through some Christian Democratic groups; and thus tends to adapt its organizational methods and even its slogans to this end. On the other hand, however, it is forced to undertake more thorough-going actions, particularly as the escalation mounts and creates a more and more tense situation, and also to avoid getting into difficulties with the masses which might be set in motion in this phase.

With Amendola's speech, the final motion, and a series of comments voiced at this session, the Central Committee has indicated quite clearly along what lines the party's activity will develop in the immediate future.

First of all, the PCI, reaffirming its total rejection of the Chinese, is beginning to polemicize against some of the basic ideas of Fidel Castro and the Cuban CP. This polemic had already been underway for sometime in the form of a

conspiracy of silence or a rigorous censorship -- it is sufficient to recall how little space the party publications devoted to Fidel's speech of March 13 and the summary reports of Che Guevara's message, to which l'Unità gave not a tenth the space it gave a message shortly preceding it -- Pope Paul VI's Populorum progressio.

With Amendola's speech, this polemic became overt, despite the fact that it was launched formally against "some groups" (but can anyone be unaware of the fact that the strategy of three or four Vietnams was not invented by "our armchair strategists," but by the leader of the Cuban Revolution?)

Still more serious is the fact that in a report and in a discussion on the international situation, there was no mention whatever of the development of guerrilla warfare in Latin America! Such an omission needs no comment and says more than the entire report of the session published in l'Unità. Nor is there any validity to the speaker's vulgar rejoinder ("for these strategists it is always others who must act"). It is a matter, in fact, not of ignoring the tasks confronting us today in Italy, but of realizing that right now it is possible to deal more direct and effective blows against imperialism in other sectors of the world and that in Latin America guerrilla warfare is one of the essential means to that end.

The second feature to be noted is that the group in control of the PCI will attempt to increase its activities on all levels in the campaign for Vietnam in the immediate coming period. (This, moreover, occurred during and after the CC session, following the imperialist intervention in the demilitarized zone). This came about not only for obvious objective reasons but also to avoid the danger that the actions of others would fill the vacuum. (Some speakers at the Central Committee session did not fail to note that the "extremists" had also gained ground due to gaps in the party's activity).

Finally, perhaps an even more revealing note struck by this Central Committee, and certainly a new one, was the sharp attack delivered against so-called alien groups -- our movement among them -- and the fact that in some remarks this designation was extended to the PSIUP [Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity] or a part of it.

The reporter himself gave the signal and numerous speakers took up the theme, some in a more political form, others in the language of bureaucratic bigotry. The epithets "provocateurs,"

---

\*Programmazione -- The bourgeois substitute for socialist planning. [Translator.]

"defeatists," "venomous enemies of the Party," etc., were felicitously intertwined, demonstrating the methods with which people of basically Stalinist schooling -- a schooling unaffected by the surface veneer of "renovation" -- propose to conduct a political polemic in the workers movement.

Pietro Ingrao [the leader of the official left wing] also added his voice to the chorus. He is quick to play the role of "hard cop" against the "extremists"; but he takes a much broader view when it comes to the Social Democrats or various figures -- including professional anti-Communists -- whom he seeks to engage in dialogue in the most diverse places.

We have noted elsewhere that for at least some of those at the session, "firmness" in dealing with "extremists" means hoodlum attacks.

The fact remains, however, that such sharp attacks, voiced by so many, is an indication of deep concern -- some "extremist" criticisms are finding a more and more responsive echo (some of the speakers said as much) and constitute a still greater danger to the opportunist bureaucrats since criticisms advanced by important sections of the international Communist movement can bolster them.

All the Central Committee's efforts to clarify the party's leadership will not, however, eliminate these difficulties nor the real, inherent contradictions, to which we referred at the outset.

In the first place, the principal slogans chosen will certainly not help to lend concreteness to the short-term perspectives and still less generate the spirit and enthusiasm necessary for the longer range prospects. The familiar theme of new relationships between the majority and the opposition, which has always seemed vague to the party membership, is not much clarified nor made any more concrete by virtue of the fact that it is now incorporated in a demand for a government defined only as a peace government (made up of whom? with what program?). The precedent claimed is a formula put forward more than fifteen years ago, which moreover was not followed up.

As for what ought to be the central objective today, that is, the immediate withdrawal of NATO from Italy under conditions and circumstances such as to plunge that organization into a crisis, despite veiled statements by some of the speakers which revealed pressures operating in this direction, they preferred to hold on to the tired formula of nonrenewal in 1969, thus depriving the

issue of any immediacy. We will not discuss the reaffirmation of a strategy which still seeks an alliance with bourgeois groupings against American imperialism, which was voiced in some speeches in particular, including a speech by Ingrao.

These proposals, which, we repeat, are in essence by no means new, threaten to prove even more sterile than in the past, since the international situation can be expected to remain critical and may even worsen. This may produce an impetus to radicalization despite the perspectives and plans of the leading group in the PCI.

Moreover, as we already pointed out, an intensification of the mobilizations has undoubtedly come about through official party decision, and for the first time even the trade unions have moved in a serious way. If this movement continues and new reports from Vietnam provoke new waves of indignation against the imperialist aggressors, it will be difficult to organize demonstrations under moderate slogans, and they will probably tend to become more militant and vociferous.

The hard attitude which they decided to take in dealing with "extremist" groups cannot easily be put into practice. First of all, the influence of these groups is considerable among the students, and no effective mobilization for Vietnam is possible without their participation and without them making their influence felt.

Even in demonstrations of a broader character, up until now vanguard groups and elements have had an incontestable weight and it will not be easy for any bureaucratic leadership to radically alter this situation, even with the most heavy-handed intervention.

There can be no question then of overcoming the phenomenon which is at the root of the lamentations and denunciations of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist party, that is, the growing alienation of ever broader sectors of the youth from the party's policy and methods. The resumption of a bigoted attitude toward the left, in conjunction with generous concessions to the Social Democrats, will inevitably increase this alienation, and still more so if the goon squads continue their activities.

The line which prevailed on international questions, then, points to a collision sooner or later with the Cubans. Many ultras probably even wish for it. But if it occurs, the difficulties they are trying to overcome by means of the guidelines they have indicated will increase considerably. The influence of a Fidel

Castro or a Guevara is not eliminated by refusal to publish their writings or by

calling the youth who look up to them provocateurs.

### BRITISH YCL DEBATE VIETNAM WAR ISSUE

By Fiona Campbell

London

The current upsurge of radicalism among British youth was reflected in the twenty-sixth annual conference of the Young Communist League at Skegness held May 27-29.

More than 750 youth were present, of whom 350 were delegates.

From the opening of the conference the opposition to the platform was fairly wide, if unorganized. Most of the pro-Chinese tendencies have been expelled or have left. In the last year a number of branches have been dissolved. The motion to accept the National Committee's standing orders for the running of the conference passed by only 110 votes to 90.

The most important debate centered around Vietnam, on the draft resolution of the outgoing National Committee, entitled: "The Political Situation and Unity." Officials were obviously sensitive to criticisms raised during the past year of the YCL's policy of immersing itself in peace formations whose central demands are for "negotiations" in Vietnam, as opposed to the demand for the unconditional withdrawal of American troops.

Barney Davis, national secretary, in opening the debate argued that the YCL did not wish to go further than the National Liberation Front. We should not, he said, force the NLF to fight for military victory, when in fact the NLF itself wants negotiations.

He called for a broad "unity of the left" on Vietnam, in essence a "popular front." According to him this would have been possible, but the Conservatives had been unwilling to come into it.

He chose not to mention the YCL's support for the positions of the Pope and U Thant, positions that have been rejected by the North Vietnamese.

Other delegates, not so sophisticated as the YCL leaders in giving a radical cover to right-wing positions, spelled out what this would mean in concrete terms.

"Yes," a delegate from Leeds stated, "we must support the YCL attitude to the Youth for Peace in Vietnam. We are for the victory of the Vietnamese, but

this means forcing the United States to the negotiating table -- and our main slogan must be: Stop the bombing!" We want a position that will give us the widest possible support, he said.

The opposition has argued for solidarity with the Vietnamese. You cannot, they have told the YCL leaders, accept positions that cut across and negate the right of the Vietnamese to self-determination.

The sharpest criticisms of the leadership came from a Northolt delegate. Standing at the mike, holding up Che Guevara's recent statement on Vietnam, he asked how it was possible for the YCL leaders to reconcile their policy to those of "one of the greatest revolutionary leaders, who says we must open up two or three Vietnams and that this will be the best way to help the Vietnamese."

The Northolt delegate criticized the USSR and China. "The Soviet Union," he said, "is not giving enough aid to Vietnam -- we must call for the unity of the socialist countries to aid the Vietnamese. We must follow the lead of Cuba, North Korea and North Vietnam."

Amidst booing and heckling, he accused the YCL leadership of having a crawling, sniveling attitude to the question of Vietnam.

Obviously stung by these remarks, Barney Davis in his summary stated that the Soviet Union is giving the Vietnamese the aid they are asking for. In this he reechoed the comments of a fraternal delegate from the Soviet Union.

The Soviet delegate had taken up the question of Soviet aid to Vietnam in his speech. He had also made an issue of Trotskyism, saying that "the Trotskyites have to be purged from our midst." There were also fraternal delegates from most of the Eastern European countries, but none from China or Cuba.

Barney Davis, referring to Che Guevara, said, "We are humanitarians and we do not want another two or three Vietnams; we don't want to see more children napalmed -- we don't want any more Vietnams. We must prevent a Third World War." It should be pointed out that this is a malicious distortion of the Cuban attitude.

It was a well organized conference -- and well controlled by the leadership. An extremely adroit chairman ignored speakers who were critical, and at times he would not be so adroit in shouting recalcitrant delegates down. The microphone from which the delegates spoke was situated on the platform and could only be reached by sending the appropriate committee, well in advance, a note asking for permission to speak.

Points of order and comments from the floor were virtually inaudible to the large majority of delegates. In addition, delegates were deluged by vast quantities of paper. There were 143 amendments from the branches to the main NC resolution and it was difficult to know which of them were before the delegates at a given moment.

Many "difficult" amendments were gotten rid of in the resolutions committee which seemed to have an inordinate amount of power in determining whether amendments reached the floor for discussion.

#### MEETING HELD FOR HUGO BLANCO IN LONDON

News of the physical attack on Hugo Blanco\* has stirred the Committee for Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru into renewed activity.

Strengthened by the agreement of Bertrand Russell to become Honorary President of the committee, the organization is now embarking on a series of activities to draw the attention of the British Labour movement to the repressive conditions in Peru and especially to the fate of Hugo Blanco and his comrades.

The committee has the support of many prominent individuals, including Mrs. Harold Laski, Isaac Deutscher, Bill Molloy, M.P., Syd Bidwell, M.P., Hamza Halevi and Ernie Roberts of the Amalgamated Engineering Union (in his personal capacity).

The campaign was launched at a well-attended meeting in London's Caxton Hall, with Roger Protz, editor of Labour Worker, in the chair. The principal speaker was Bill Molloy, Labour M.P. for Ealing North, who has been very active in

This committee continually asked the various branches to withdraw their resolutions.

Trotskyism still presents them with a problem. One resolution from Huddersfield stated: "We move the British Communist movement should call on the world Communist movement to make a Marxist re-assessment of the significance of Leon Trotsky in the interests of historical accuracy in order to establish his true position in the development of modern Marxist-Leninist thinking; weighing up his positive action against his negative action."

When the Huddersfield delegate refused to withdraw this resolution after the repeated demands of the platform, they simply refused to allow it onto the floor.

The conference reveals that the YCL is today the most dynamic section of the Communist movement and the potential for the growth of an effective opposition would seem to be high.

the cause of Hugo Blanco and who has had several interviews with the Peruvian ambassador on his behalf.

Other speakers included Pat Jordan of The Week and Edward Crawford of Socialist Current.

The most conspicuous absentee from the Hugo Blanco campaign is the Healyite Socialist Labour League, which has confined activities so far on behalf of the imprisoned Peruvian Trotskyist to passing a resolution at their annual conference.

A feature of the meeting was the sale of a pamphlet Land or Death -- the Case of Hugo Blanco, and red-and-gold badges with the words, "FREE -- LIBRE -- HUGO BLANCO."

Bundle orders for the pamphlet at 5 shillings for 12 (to sell at 6d each) and for the badges at 9 pence each should be sent to the treasurer:

Mrs. M. van Gelderen,  
6 Aycliffe Road,  
London, W.12,  
England.

\* For details about the assault committed by prison guards see World Outlook, May 5, p. 457.

It would be appreciated if a small amount could be included for postage.

KURON RELEASED -- MODZELEWSKI STILL IN PRISON

Gomulka's political prisoner, the young Polish Communist Jacek Kuron, was released from confinement in May. A graduate student at Warsaw University, he was jailed in July 1965 together with Karol Modzelewski for openly expressing disagreement with the Communist party bureaucrats and advocating a revolutionary Marxist line. Kuron had served more than two thirds of his three-year sentence.

Modzelewski, who was given a three-and-a-half-year sentence, remains behind bars. It is a mystery why Gomulka's judges handed out different terms to the defendants unless they wished to pretend that the punishments were somehow justified. Both were well-known members of the Socialist Youth Union at Warsaw University and shared the same views which they set forth in an Open Letter to the Party. (This remarkable document will soon be published in an English edition by Merit Publishers, New York.)

The condemnation aimed, not to prevent the spread of nonconformist ideas among the youth -- Gomulka is too realistic for that -- but rather to nip in the bud any attempt to elaborate a platform which might serve as a program for an organized Communist Left Opposition. Such a Marxist and revolutionary program would deprive the Polish bureaucracy of any ideological defense. Hence the repressions.

The young oppositionists were punished in the hope of stopping the movement. Instead, their victimization broadened and deepened resistance among the intellectuals.

The following chain of events took place (see: "Polish Intellectuals Agitated by Kolakowski's Expulsion" by George Novack, World Outlook, December 23, 1966): The celebrated philosopher, Leszek Kolakowski, was ousted from the party for his outspoken lecture under the auspices of the Socialist Youth Union on October 21, 1966, which criticized the shortcomings of the Communist regime. He had previously

protested the persecution of Kuron and Modzelewski.

Thereupon a number of well-known authors who belonged to the CP sent a letter to the authorities along the lines of Kolakowski's criticisms and were themselves excluded from the party.

The Warsaw University students were in the forefront of the protest actions. On March 23, one of them, Adam Michnik, who had spoken up against Kolakowski's expulsion, was suspended from his studies for a year on misconduct charges. He was one of six suspended for their part in the protest meetings. The other five have since been reinstated.

Seventy-one fellow students who came to Michnik's defense were also expelled from the university branch of the Socialist Youth Union. They were among the more than 1,000 students and 150 professors who requested the Warsaw University authorities to show leniency toward those who had spoken up at the meetings. All the protesters among the Socialist Youth Union members were subjected to heavy pressure and asked to withdraw their signatures. Few complied.

According to a notice posted by the Socialist Youth Union, Michnik was formally accused, not of defending Kolakowski, but of trying to disrupt last year's May Day parade in Warsaw by displaying "incorrect slogans." During the parade a group of students chanted a number of slogans before party leader Gomulka, protesting the disbanding of the philosophical faculty and the imprisonment of Modzelewski, a former lecturer at the university. They also demanded a return to the ideas of "October" and workers' democracy.

Even though the Polish bureaucracy can keep Modzelewski in prison, the suppression of revolutionary ideas and their proponents only serves to expose its own ideological and political nakedness and thereby makes more obvious the necessity for the antibureaucratic revolution championed by the two young Communists.

20,000 KOREAN STUDENTS PROTEST PHONY ELECTION

More than 600 students were arrested in Seoul June 15 for demonstrating against the rigged election just held by South Korean dictator Chung Hee Park. The Japan Times reported June 17 that 20,000 students took part in the demonstration.

The Asahi Evening News in Tokyo commented June 16 on the election itself that "In one location, the odd phenomenon

appeared of 101 per cent of the electorate voting, while in another, evidence was reportedly found that votes for Opposition party candidates had been burned."

Asahi reported that "...the question of deployment of troops to Vietnam -- and sending even more troops is expected soon -- has also created dissension among the people."

SOLZHENITSYN APPEALS FOR AN END TO THE SOVIET CENSORSHIP

By George Saunders

Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the Soviet writer whose novel about Stalin's prison camps created a sensation in 1962, has again rocked the Soviet literary and political worlds. What he did was to circulate several hundred copies of a sharply worded open letter to the delegates of the Fourth Congress of Soviet Writers, held in late May.

The letter called on the congress to demand an end to literary censorship and to commit the writers' organization to defend members against persecution by the regime. It also gave details of a campaign of harassment directed against Solzhenitsyn himself by the secret police and certain official circles. The harassment is apparently in retribution for his prison camp book, One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, and several antibureaucratic short works he has published since 1962.

"My work has been smothered, gagged and slandered," charges Solzhenitsyn, referring to this official campaign.

Many prominent Soviet writers have endorsed the open letter, according to news reports. Among them were said to be the poet Yevtushenko, the young novelist Vasily Aksenov, the elderly fighter against the bureaucrats Konstantin Paustovsky, and the novelist Veniamin Kaverin. All these men, like Solzhenitsyn, represent the current in Soviet public life which wishes to probe deeper into the causes of Stalinism and to root out its vestiges still remaining.

Yevtushenko and Aksenov, for example, are on the editorial board of the youth magazine Yunost, which just published a defiant poem by Alexander Tvardovsky. Tvardovsky is editor of Novy Mir, the other leading organ of the anti-Stalinists.

Recent attacks on Novy Mir had seemed to augur hard days for this tendency, but these latest events show that it is continuing to fight back. [See "The Battle Around 'Novy Mir,'" in World Outlook April 7, p. 376.]

The Fourth Writers Congress, in fact, was prepared in a spirit of conformity with official slogans of patriotic reaffirmation. Unlike the last such congress in 1959, its sessions had a cut-and-dried, stage-managed quality. Any shadings of differences were to be drowned in the chorus hailing the "glorious achievements" of Soviet literature in the half century

since the revolution.

Solzhenitsyn's letter, and the support given it by more "rebellious" elements, effectively pricked this overinflated balloon. It told the truth about literature under "socialist realism."

The author of Ivan Denisovich, who is incidentally one of the few Soviet writers to grapple with the real problems of Soviet society,\* begins his open letter with a blunt accusation: "Censorship under the obscuring label of Glavlit [Main Administration for Literary Affairs and Publishing], not provided for by the Constitution and therefore illegal and nowhere publicly labeled as such, is imposing a yoke on our literature and gives people who are unversed in literature arbitrary control over writers."

Putting his finger on a striking instance of uneven and combined development -- of a feudal institution persisting in a workers' state -- he observes: "Censorship, a survival of the Middle Ages, manages in Methusaleh-like fashion to drag out its existence almost to the twenty-first century."

Because of the censorship, he charges, Soviet writers are unable "to explain in their own way the social problems or the historical experience that has been so deeply felt in our country."

"Works that might have expressed the thoughts matured among the people, that might have had a timely and salutary influence on the realm of the spirit or on the development of a social conscience are prohibited or distorted by censorship on the basis of considerations that are, from the point of view of the people at large, petty, egotistic, and short-sighted." That is a fitting description of the bureaucratic outlook that sent Sinyavsky and Daniel to jail.

Censorship causes great artistic and social losses, asserts this former in-

---

\*Besides Ivan Denisovich, an almost scientific dissection of the social forces operating in the prison camp, with the parasites and the exploited both impelled by extreme scarcity, a microcosm of Stalin's Russia, Solzhenitsyn has also grappled with the problem of how bureaucracy kills labor initiative and promotes alienation and rebellion in the youth. See For the Good of the Cause. Praeger: New York, 1964.



mate of Stalin's camps. He mentions writers in the 1920's "who called attention at a very early stage to the beginnings of the cult and the particular traits of Stalin's character; however, they were destroyed and silenced instead of being listened to."

Of course, not only writers warned; the Left Oppositionists fought and fell victim to the tendency that culminated in the Great Purges. If Solzhenitsyn's principles were now to prevail, open social criticism of the rulers and their policies would reappear. And that would not remain purely "literary" for long.

That is precisely why the bureaucracy so stubbornly resists any pressure to abandon censorship, why its relaxations of literary controls from time to time are so stingy and short-lived. It fears the criticism and exposure of its own role that an unfettered literature would bring.

But Solzhenitsyn makes a reasoned plea for the advantages literary freedom would bring, and a damaging comment on the present state of official literature. "Literature that is not the air of its contemporary society, that dares not pass on to society its pains and fears, that does not warn in time against threatening moral and social dangers, such literature does not deserve the name of literature; it is only a façade. Such literature loses the confidence of its own people, and its published works are used as waste paper instead of being read."

This recalls Che Guevara's warning on "socialist realism" in his article Socialism and Man: "Let us not attempt, from the pontifical throne of realism-at-any-cost, to condemn all the art forms which have evolved since the first half of the nineteenth century, for we would then fall into the Proudhonian mistake of returning to the past, of putting a straitjacket on the artistic expression of the man who is being born and is in the process of making himself."

Solzhenitsyn points to the decline in influence and prestige of Russian literature. It has lost the "leading role" it had in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and even "the brilliance of experimentation" it had in the 1920's.

But, he argues, this need not be the case. "To the entire world the literary life of our country now appears as something infinitely poorer, flatter, and lower than it actually is, than it would appear if it were not restricted, hemmed in.

"The losers are both our country, in world public opinion, and world liter-

ature itself." We would add that the cause of world socialism also suffers. As Che also said in the article mentioned, "A common argument from the mouths of capitalist spokesmen, in the ideological struggle against socialism, is that socialism, or the period of building socialism into which we have entered, is characterized by the subordination of the individual to the state."

They cite state domination and stifling of cultural affairs in the workers' states as an alleged proof of this, and the Stalinist experience seems to confirm it on the surface. Of course, Cuba has demonstrated that this need not be so. And the effort of the best intellectuals in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and also in the Asian workers' states, is beginning to help refute this lie.

The existence of quite a rich and varied "underground" literature in the Soviet Union (circulated from person to person in manuscript form) is now well known. This is what Solzhenitsyn means when he says Soviet literary activity appears duller than it really is.

The works of Sinyavsky and Daniel were examples of this rich reservoir, and their fate represents the bureaucracy's attitude toward this phenomenon. But Solzhenitsyn's own Ivan Denisovich, as well as Yevtushenko's Stalin's Heirs, and many other unimprisoned writers' works were "underground" works at one time, circulating widely in manuscript long before being approved for publication.

The author of Ivan Denisovich has plenty of grounds for it when he says: "If the world had access to all the uninhibited fruits of our literature, if it were enriched by our own spiritual experience, the whole artistic evolution of the world would move along in a different way, acquiring a new stability and attaining even a new artistic threshold."

There is every reason to expect that in a society where the competitive madness and class control of capitalism has been abolished, a great flowering of creative cultural forces would take place. An inkling of what Soviet society could do along this line, once the yoke was off, can be gained from the often surprising literary developments during the ups and downs of de-Stalinization.

Toward this worthy end, Solzhenitsyn urged the congress to adopt a resolution that would demand "abolition of all censorship, overt or hidden, of all fictional writing and release publishing houses from the obligation of obtaining authorization for the publication of every printed page."

The second part of the open letter,

which called on the Writers Union to defend members from persecution, reviewed its sorry past record in this regard. Writers publicly slandered and abused had no chance to defend themselves and were not aided by the organization.

Worse still, "The leadership of the union cowardly abandoned to their distress those for whom persecution ended in exile, camps, and death....We learned after the Twentieth Congress of the party that there were more than 600 writers whom the union had obediently handed over to their fate in prisons and camps."

Solzhenitsyn adds a veiled call for the ouster from the organization's leadership of all those sharing complicity for the persecution of writers under Stalin: "There is no historical necessity for the newly elected leadership of the union to share with preceding leaderships responsibility for the past."

Concluding this part, the open letter calls for "guarantees for the defense of union members who are subjected to slander and unjust persecution so that past illegalities will not be repeated."

Such a resolution would apply directly to Solzhenitsyn's own case, which the third part of the letter describes. A whole series of harassments directed against him by the secret police and "people holding official positions" are outlined.

For example, Solzhenitsyn charges that the manuscript of one of his novels was taken by the secret police and "has been 'published' in an unnatural 'closed' edition for reading by a selected unidentified circle." It is available to literary officials but not for discussion by other writers.

The secret police also seized his archives, including works not intended for publication. "Now tendentious excerpts from these files have also been covertly 'published' and are being circulated within the same circles. The play 'Feast of the Victors' which I wrote from memory in the camp, where I figured under four serial numbers (at a time when, condemned to die by starvation, we were forgotten by society and no one outside the camps came out against repressions), this play, now left far behind, is being ascribed to me as my very latest work."

While he dates overt police acts against him from 1965, he states that since 1964 a campaign of slander has been aimed at him. (It was early in that year that he failed to receive the Lenin Prize for Ivan Denisovich, having been nominated by Novy Mir. Received favorably by all sections at first, even praised in World Marxist Review, the novel, by late

1963 and early 1964 had become the object of a subtle campaign of disparagement. Since 1964 it is a fact that Solzhenitsyn has been rarely published in the Soviet Union.)

Far from being any kind of procapitalist restorationist, the author of the open letter was an artillery commander against Hitler's forces and was decorated for his service. Beginning in 1945, he spent 11 years in the prison camps because of a private letter in which he criticized Stalin's conduct of the war.

Now, Solzhenitsyn says, his years in prison camps are being used slanderously. "It is being said that I served time as a criminal, or surrendered to the enemy (I was never a prisoner of war), that I 'betrayed' my country, 'served the Germans.'"

This slander is being spread, he asserts, "in secret instructions and meetings by people holding official positions." Solzhenitsyn's charge rings true. At the Twenty-third Congress several official party delegates denounced Solzhenitsyn and his works from the country's highest rostrum. The open letter refers to this too:

"I tried vainly to stop the slander by appealing to the board of the Writers Union of the Russian Republic and to the press. The board did not even react and not a single paper printed my reply to the slanderers. On the contrary, slander against me from rostrums has intensified and become more vicious within the last year, making use of distorted material from my confiscated files, and I have no way of replying."

He then recounts a number of cases of works that he cannot get published or whose publication has been indefinitely delayed. He has even been prevented from reading his works in public: "In November 1966, nine out of eleven scheduled meetings were canceled at the last moment."

With irony he observes: "Even the simple act of giving a manuscript away for 'reading and copying' has now become a criminal act, and even the ancient scribes of Russia were allowed to do that." This is an apparent reference to the strengthening last summer of the law against "anti-Soviet" agitation and propaganda, the law under which Sinyavsky and Daniel were jailed. The same law now prohibits strikes and demonstrations as well.

In appealing to the Fourth Writers Congress to defend him, he points out that the issue affects not only him. It is a matter "not without importance for the literary future of several delegates."

It is also a matter of importance for all forces in the Soviet Union seeking

to revive the workers democracy of Lenin's day; for it is precisely the writers that express the grievances of the masses over bureaucratic practices who are being "smothered, gagged, and slandered" by the "selected unidentified circles."

Solzhenitsyn closes his letter with a declaration of rare courage. "I am, of course, confident that I will fulfill my duty as a writer under all circumstances, from the grave even more successfully and more unchallenged than in my lifetime. No one can bar the road to the truth, and to advance its cause, I am prepared to accept even death. But, maybe, many lessons will finally teach us not to stop the writer's pen during his lifetime. At no time has this ennobled our history."

The tone of the intellectuals' resistance has been growing sharper, more desperate. A mood similar to that of Solzhenitsyn's letter was expressed in the letter by Lidiya Chukovskaya protesting Sholokhov's speech at the Twenty-third Congress. [See World Outlook, December 9, 1966.]

Solzhenitsyn's open letter marks a new intensity in the intellectuals' opposition to their bureaucratic overlords. There is no record of writers expressing such intransigence in Stalin's heyday. And even during the "thaw," even at the high point of ferment in 1956, such an open and clearly stated demand (for an end to censorship and solidarity against the regime) did not appear.

The explanation lies not just in the subsiding of the policy of terror and purges. Above all, it must be that the intellectuals feel a popular sympathy for their demands -- at least potential, if not actual. This gives them the feeling of legitimacy in spite of the official stand

of the party.

Will there be a new break, a new relaxing of controls? Or will the Solzhenitsyns be increasingly gagged? A trend toward "re-Stalinization" has been in evidence, though hesitant and encountering resistance, since Khrushchev's ouster.

The international situation, with the series of setbacks of the colonial revolution, especially the Vietnam escalation since early 1965, has given the bureaucracy pretexts to tighten the screws. Significantly it was after the summer of 1965 that a series of steps against the anti-Stalinist intellectuals began: the arrest and trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel; the Twenty-third Congress with its partial moves to rehabilitate Stalin; the military-patriotic campaign; and, most recently, the moves against Novy Mir.

Curiously, Solzhenitsyn's first work, Ivan Denisovich, marked a peak and at the same time a turning point in de-Stalinization. In reaction to the floodgates it opened came the campaign against "abstract art," quickly extended against all antibureaucratic modes of expression. At the time, Khrushchev complained that magazines and publishing houses were "flooded with manuscripts about the life of people in exile, in prisons, and in camps."

The campaign against rebel intellectuals never really abated. Rather, with various pauses, it gradually intensified in subsequent years. The point has now been reached where a new work by Solzhenitsyn -- the open letter -- seems to mark a low point in the fortunes of the anti-Stalinists (though an advance in consciousness and bitterness of tone). Whether this work, too, will prove to be a turning point remains to be seen.

#### CANADIAN LABOR BACKS MOBILIZATION AGAINST VIETNAM WAR

The entire labor movement in Québec has thrown its weight behind plans for a massive demonstration against the war in Vietnam slated to take place at Expo 67 on July 1, the day of Canada's centennial celebration.

The Fédération de Travail du Québec, affiliated to the Canadian Labour Congress; and the independent Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux have both endorsed the July 1 call issued by the Toronto Coordinating Committee to End the War.

Also supporting the demonstration are the entire Montréal region of the independent Rassemblement pour l'Indépen-

dence Nationale, and the influential journal of the Dominican Order, Maintenant.

Canadians from all parts of the country are expected to rally in Montréal July 1 in response to the call to "Take Vietnam to Expo." Fourteen buses are scheduled to bring in demonstrators from Toronto and a "Train to Expo" is planned for the 3,000-mile trip from Vancouver.

The mobilization is being organized around the demands "End Canadian Complicity Now," and "Self-determination for Vietnam." Expo 67, devoted ostensibly to "Man and His World," has maintained a hypocritical silence in regard to Vietnam.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CALLS FOR SUPPORT TO ARAB CAUSE

[The following statement was issued June 12 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.]

\* \* \*

For the third time in less than twenty years, the Middle East has been convulsed by war. The cease-fire imposed by the United Nations, sanctioning the conquests Israel gained by aggression, is only another extremely fragile truce. The diplomatic negotiations and political confrontations now opening can be cut off by a fresh outbreak of armed conflict.

The imbroglio in the Middle East was created by imperialism and it has been the only one to benefit from it. In the first world war, British imperialism made contradictory promises to the Arabs and to the Jews. During the second world war, the "democratic" imperialist powers did nothing to prevent or stop Hitler's genocidal actions toward the Jews. Following the war, the survivors of the Nazi camps were barred from the rich countries by immigration quotas and diverted to Palestine where they installed themselves by force in a poverty-stricken area and at the expense of the Arab masses, who were stripped and left in despair.

The State of Israel, inspired by Zionism, has since then played a reactionary role in the Middle East in the service of imperialism and against the freedom movement of the Arab masses.

This role was concretized in particular in the 1956 crisis when Israel, taking advantage of an international conjuncture which appeared to favor its designs, unleashed -- in alliance with French and British imperialism -- an attack against Egypt which was "guilty" of having nationalized the Suez Canal a few months previously. Eleven years later, once again estimating that conditions were favorable, Israel opened a new offensive and, still in agreement with imperialism, organized provocations against Syria which they wished to strike at due to the progressive policies adopted by the Syrian government.

Egypt's inevitable reply to the threats against her ally, along with the attitude adopted by other Arab countries, became the pretext to unleash an international campaign against the revolutionary Arab nationalist movement, a shrewdly conducted campaign in which the participation of reactionaries throughout the world stood out, including former fascists in certain countries guilty of the most atrocious crimes against the Jews.

It was during this campaign that the extremists of the Dayan type entered the Israel government, indicating that the war had become inevitable and was close at hand.

In the conflict which the Zionists provoked and which is far from having been concluded, even if military operations have been halted, the Fourth International holds that it is the duty of the international workers movement to reject in the most emphatic way any equivocal or eclectic position. We do not underestimate the complexity of the problems involved, particularly the problem of the fate of the Jewish masses settled in this area of the world, who are not at all responsible for the crimes of imperialism and the Zionist state. But while all these problems must be carefully examined in working out solutions, in the opening phase of the struggle and its pursuit, the revolutionary movement is resolutely on the side of the Arab countries and their anti-imperialist revolution, against the State of Israel.

If there were any need of confirming the character of this state and its policies, it was provided beyond any possibility of doubt by the enthusiasm with which the spokesmen of imperialism throughout the world hailed Dayan's military success and by the spirit of revenge whipped up in recent weeks against the Arabs and other peoples engaged in carrying out the colonial revolution. Israel is the keystone in the imperialist system in the Middle East and represents a major obstacle to the victory of the Arab revolution.

On the military plane, Egypt and the other Arab countries have unquestionably suffered a very severe defeat, the immediate and longer range causes of which must be probed to the bottom in the interests of the future development of the revolution in the Middle East. But Dayan's victory is far from being able to assure a stable solution. The State of Israel itself, despite its momentary expansion, has achieved no guarantees whatever for the future. On the political plane it must meet onerous confrontations even in the immediate future.

In addition, the balance sheet of the entire operation does not add up to a plus for the imperialists although they obviously made gains. In the field of political combat now opening, Egypt and the other Arab countries have sharp weapons available in reality such as control of the Suez Canal and the oil of the whole region.

But it is particularly the mounting hate of the Arab peoples, who have once again seen where their true enemy is, that

visibly reduces the margin of maneuver for the imperialist powers, and makes their presence in the Middle East more and more precarious and increasingly challenged. This holds all the more in view of the fact that the military defeat did not involve either a demobilization or demoralization of the revolutionary Arab nationalist movement which is undergoing fresh radicalization in a series of countries. The most palpable demonstration of this was the mass movement touched off by the resignation of Nasser, who quickly resumed power under the pressure of a popular mobilization without precedent in the Egyptian revolution.

The events in the Middle East will likewise have grave consequences for the bureaucratic leadership of the Soviet Union which proved incapable of providing real help for its allies and even went so far as to join with the representatives of the United States in drawing up the June 7 UN resolution sanctioning Israel's military success.

This quite properly met with an indignant reaction among the Arab peoples, perceptibly diminishing the prestige of the Soviet Union among all the countries involved in the colonial revolution.

Under the pressure of certain peoples democracies that wondered what their own possible fate might be in view of the passive attitude of the USSR in Vietnam and then in the Middle East, a Moscow summit meeting was called. This gave the impression of a firmer attitude, but under the test of events the threats contained in the resolution adopted at that gather-

ing proved to be limited essentially to the field of propaganda and diplomatic maneuvers.

The task of the revolutionary Arab organizations is to seek, in agreement with the Israeli vanguard circles who reject Zionism, a valid solution to the question of Israel, a solution that in any case involves an end to Zionist colonization, the expulsion of imperialism from this part of the world, and the establishment -- through the collaboration of the Arab and Israeli masses -- of political structures that would permit taking the road to the construction of socialism. The revolutionary Arab vanguard must undertake to analyze the reasons for the military defeat and to draw all the necessary political lessons in order to facilitate mobilizing the masses in the struggles under preparation, eliminating false allies of the Hussein type, and setting socialism as the perspective.

The task of the international workers movement is to form a bloc with the Arab peoples in their revolutionary struggle against the State of Israel and its imperialist masters in this difficult stage of their fight for freedom. It is the duty of the workers states to express their solidarity through concrete actions and not by empty phrases having no other objective but to cover up an attitude of genuine capitulation.

Long live the Arab revolution! Long live the revolutionary conquests of Syria and Egypt! Down with the Zionist State of Israel and its imperialist partners and allies!

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
Kosygin Substitutes UN Talk for Action in Mideast .....	634
China's H-bomb -- a Deterrent to War .....	635
True Story Emerges of Egypt's Casualties .....	636
Guerrillas Serve Notice on Guatemalan Butchers .....	637
It's Official -- Breathing Can Kill You .....	639
Mrs. Winnie Mandela in Court .....	640
Bolivian Trotskyist Leader Exiled in Amazon Jungle .....	640
Régis Debray Case:	
Russell Joins Régis Debray Solidarity Campaign .....	641
Bolivian Miners Proclaim "Free Territory" .....	641
Another Long Hot Summer Begins in the U.S. -- by Evelyn Sell .....	642
Bertrand Russell Scores Israel as Aggressor .....	644
Israeli Communist Party Backs Israel's Aggression .....	644
Ten-Year Record of Maoist "Democracy" .....	645
Governor of Tokyo Warns Against Rise of Fascism in Japan .....	645
Italian CP Leader Attacks Cuban Positions -- by Livio Maitan .....	646
British YCL Debate Vietnam War Issue -- by Fiona Campbell .....	648
Hugo Blanco Case:	
Meeting Held for Hugo Blanco in London .....	649
Kuron Released -- Modzelewski Still in Prison .....	650
20,000 Korean Students Protest Phony Election .....	650
Solzhenitsyn Appeals for an End to the Soviet Censorship -- by George Saunders .....	651
Canadian Labor Backs Mobilization Against Vietnam War .....	654
Documents:	
Fourth International Calls for Support to Arab Cause .....	655