

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 7

February 19, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Crisis in Washington -- by Joseph Hansen	1
In Their Hearts They Know They're Doomed	5
But the Golden Days of World Capitalism Are Gone Forever -- by Ernest Germain	7
Waldeck Rochet Opens Fight against Communist Intellectuals -- by Pierre Frank	11
Tshombe Bars Holden Roberto from Visiting Zambia	14
Is Still Another Law Needed? -- by Evelyn Sell	15
Algiers Weekly Defends Chinese	17
Alexander Case Stirs Wide Response	18
New Student Demonstration in Madrid	19
Documents:	
Fourth International Backs Vietnamese Revolution	20
African Movements Protest American Aggression in Vietnam	24
Anti-Imperialist Platform of Manila Demonstrators	25
French CP Intellectuals Demand Free Discussion	29

CRISIS IN WASHINGTON

By Joseph Hansen

February 17 -- Having rushed to the brink of nuclear war, Johnson now stands at the edge, wildly flailing his arms, trying to recover his balance. Will he manage it? Or will he go over the edge, taking the United States and all of humanity with him?

Last week end, not even the authoritative New York Times, which for decades has had the best pipe lines into all the top circles in Washington, was certain about just who was in charge at the White House. Here is how Times correspondent Max Frankel put it February 14 in describing the "rare air of anxiety and torment" dominating the capital of the world's mightiest power:

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 7

February 19, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Crisis in Washington -- by Joseph Hansen.....	1
In Their Hearts They Know They're Doomed.....	5
But the Golden Days of World Capitalism Are Gone Forever -- by Ernest Germain.....	7
Waldeck Rochet Opens Fight against Communist Intellectuals -- by Pierre Frank.....	11
Tshombe Bars Holden Roberto from Visiting Zambia.....	14
Is Still Another Law Needed? -- by Evelyn Sell.....	15
Algiers Weekly Defends Chinese.....	17
Alexander Case Stirs Wide Response.....	18
New Student Demonstration in Madrid.....	19
Documents:	
Fourth International Backs Vietnamese Revolution.....	20
African Movements Protest American Aggression in Vietnam.....	24
Anti-Imperialist Platform of Manila Demonstrators.....	25
French CP Intellectuals Demand Free Discussion.....	29

CRISIS IN WASHINGTON

By Joseph Hansen

February 17 -- Having rushed to the brink of nuclear war, Johnson now stands at the edge, wildly flailing his arms, trying to recover his balance. Will he manage it? Or will he go over the edge, taking the United States and all of humanity with him?

Last week end, not even the authoritative New York Times, which for decades has had the best pipe lines into all the top circles in Washington, was certain about just who was in charge at the White House. Here is how Times correspondent Max Frankel put it February 14 in describing the "rare air of anxiety and torment" dominating the capital of the world's mightiest power:

"There is an awareness of tense debate among the President's closest advisers, involving bitter dispute of the morality and effectiveness of various courses of action.

"And outside the inner circle of decision-makers, there is a desperate maneuvering by normally influential officials to discover who is giving what advice and to affect the course of the discussion."

This means that not even the powerful Eastern circle of capitalists, for whom the New York Times generally speaks, are in full control. Johnson, reports Frankel, "is said to be getting some very belligerent advice from very intimate quarters."

Who are these "intimate quarters"?

"At the Defense Department it is an open-secret," continues Frankel, "that leading military advisers are seeking permission to continue to bomb North Vietnam. . . ."

This indicates that the Pentagon has its hand on the steering wheel. But who in the Pentagon?

"One source reports that the civilian leaders at the Pentagon have submitted to the President a list of alternate targets in North Vietnam, including power stations and industrial installations, which they would like to see destroyed in future raids."

At the head of the "civilian leaders" stands Robert S. McNamara.

From another source, we learn another extraordinary fact. Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, writing from Saigon in the February 16 issue of the New York Herald Tribune (European edition), report that when McGeorge Bundy, Johnson's national security assistant arrived in Saigon, "at the insistence of Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor," he was inveigled into making a most fateful decision. Taylor calculated that Bundy's personal impressions would tilt the balance.

When the guerrilla fighters attacked Pleiku, Bundy's "reaction was immediate and instant -- neither the South Vietnamese government nor the United States could risk inaction in the face of such a bold and open insult. . . ."

"He and Taylor decided to recommend an immediate counter-strike north of the 17th Parallel (as Taylor had repeatedly recommended before). Now Bundy was here to make the recommendation himself.

"As the proposal was being framed for Washington, Bundy permitted himself a sardonic smile and an audible hope that 'those so-and-sos in Washington' would grasp the situation as he had grasped

it in Saigon.

"Washington reacted promptly. The war entered a new stage long overdue."

From such evidence, Nicolas Chatelain, Washington correspondent of the Paris daily Le Figaro was able to state in his dispatch of February 16 that "three men" hold responsibility for U.S. policy in the war in Vietnam and its further course. "These three are first of all Johnson himself, Mr. McNamara, his Secretary of Defense, and Mr. McGeorge Bundy, who has the well-established reputation of being the most intelligent, the most intellectual adviser in the White House."

Chatelain describes Bundy as being more devious "than the Chinese themselves"; McNamara as being a "virtuoso in technology and the use of electronic computers"; Johnson, "it is taken for granted, has no ideas of his own. . . ."

The fate of the world thus seems to rest with a cretin in the White House; and two Dr. Strangeloves each having an arm around his shoulders.

The immense danger that American militarism now represents for all of civilization can be judged from the ironic fact that at the moment everything appears to hinge on whether the New York Times and the capitalist block of the Eastern seaboard can break through the court camarilla and gain the ear of the Texas wonder in the White House.

All these accidental factors, of course, fit within a broader framework. Repeatedly since 1945, the rulers of the United States have faced the alternative of plunging ahead into World War III in hope of smashing the planned economies of the workers states and re-opening them to capitalism. Repeatedly they have drawn back, judging the gamble to be too desperate. Their alternative has been to prepare a firmer military base. For almost twenty years, now, they have been pouring some fifty billion dollars annually into this enterprise.

Meanwhile the workers states have grown immensely stronger. Besides the swift recovery of the Soviet Union from the devastation inflicted by the imperialist armies of Germany, the Chinese people won the greatest revolutionary victory since 1917, and along the spiral of the colonial revolution, a whole succession of peoples have won political independence and established workers states in North Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba. The tide is running against capitalism.

But cutting across this development came the Sino-Soviet dispute. This could have provided a wedge for an adroit imperialist statesman and it might have been expected that Johnson, recalling

the tactics of Franklin D. Roosevelt on the international scene, might have initiated a new foreign policy, hoping to gain a stronger position for American imperialism by maneuvering between the two sides and playing Moscow and Peking against each other..

Instead, going against the wishes of a powerful sector of the American capitalist class, he has indicated by his course of bombing North Vietnam that his policy is nothing more than a mere extension of the "brinkmanship" of Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy -- with the variant that it is left in the hands of the Pentagon, thereby increasing still further the risk of a nuclear holocaust.

This perspective has caused the greatest alarm in sectors of the American capitalist class. Hence the crisis in Washington. If Johnson now proceeds, he will begin a war with domestic opinion divided as it has never before been divided on the eve of a foreign conflict.

Moreover, in a few brief days Johnson has succeeded to a most impressive degree in helping to close the breach between Moscow and Peking. For this he deserves congratulations from the revolutionary forces throughout the world.

One of the most encouraging developments in this period of tense crisis was the display in the Peking press of pictures of Mao Tse-tung and Kosygin in friendly conversation.

To their obvious great reluctance, the heirs of Khrushchev have even felt it necessary to grant a considerable concession to Peking in the ideological sphere. At Pyongyang, the capital of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Kosygin said: "Experience has shown that peaceful coexistence and revolutionary struggle are not contradictory. On the contrary. The attempts at coexistence offer the most favorable opportunities for the struggle of the workers in the capitalist countries for their rights and interests, for the struggle of oppressed peoples against their oppressors and the construction of socialism and communism." All this was within the framework of Khrushchev's famous theses, condemned by both the Chinese and revolutionary socialists the world over for their inconsistency and their real content, which was to give up the class struggle.

Then Kosygin introduced a significant shift toward Peking's position: "There can be no peaceful coexistence between oppressors and oppressed, between aggressors and victims of an aggression. . . The Soviet Union will try to live in peace with all peoples, but those who think that ties can be developed with the Soviet Union while conducting an aggression against other socialist states are mistaken. . . "

In Washington, this is still being read as a mere verbal concession. Perhaps so. But it is at least a verbal concession that has helped Peking and Moscow to begin putting up a common front

against the common enemy, and it will soon be seen whether vastly increased material aid will not be forthcoming to North Vietnam.

After Kosygin returned to Moscow, Pravda picked up a major Chinese thesis; namely, that the American aggression against Vietnam "is a provocation against the socialist camp as a whole."

And Red Star declared in an editorial: "The insolent and brazen aggressors carried out their bandit raids at the very time when the Soviet delegation was in the Asian countries. They tried to drive a wedge between the socialist countries. But they overestimated their forces and underestimated ours."

"The present situation compels the socialist countries to take the necessary measures to reinforce the defensive strength of the socialist camp."

Of course, an immense gap remains between this and the initiation of an active revolutionary socialist policy on a world scale, which alone can end the agonizing standing threat emanating from the continued existence of American imperialism. But that is another problem.

The rapprochement between Moscow and Peking in face of the common danger is a most favorable development. It is to be hoped that it will give pause to the odd president who thinks that the most appropriate way to celebrate his electoral victory is to act like the defeated Goldwater.

IN THEIR HEARTS THEY KNOW THEY'RE DOOMED

If the capacity to kill is any measure of strength, American imperialism is mightier than any other power on earth. It is capable of exterminating all of humanity at least seventy-five times over.

From another viewpoint, the United States is also the mightiest, for it possesses the world's biggest productive system. It can produce goods in an unimaginable flood, and its farms are still capable of producing such crops that the main problem is to keep from growing too much.

Yet this giant looks at the rest of the world with gnawing fear, for it is also the most hated power in all of human history.

And despite all its frenzied efforts to display ruthless confidence, at heart it sees no enduring hope for its capitalist system or its boasted "way of life."

This has been repeated many times by revolutionary social-

ists who have been led to see the true situation through Marxist analysis of the class structure of American society and close observation of its development. Not often, however, does direct evidence become available of the real views of America's masters of destiny. Last week was an exception. During the crisis paralyzing Washington over what to do next following the bombing of villages in North Vietnam, a most interesting revelation was made by Arthur Krock, the dean of correspondents in Washington.

In the New York Times of February 16 [International edition], he reported a conversation he had with President John F. Kennedy on May 5, 1961: ". . . the President said General MacArthur had prophesied to him that eventually Southeast Asia in general would go Communist by popular choice but, whether or not that was true, Mr. Kennedy was firm in the statement that United States policy must be to avoid a positive formal withdrawal and help protect the area as long as its governments and people wanted this protection.

"The President quoted General MacArthur as also remarking to him: 'Our chickens are all coming home to roost, and you are in the chicken house.' Now President Johnson is in the chicken house. But the chickens have multiplied, and fighting gamecocks compete to rule the roost."

MacArthur, it should be recalled, was a great hero among the most reactionary circles in the United States. He it was who took American armed forces beyond the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea and who wanted to go beyond the Yalu in a war against China. If this "gamecock" was convinced that all of Southeast Asia would go Communist "by popular choice" what must be the real opinions of the top figures in Washington today as they see precisely that happening in South Vietnam today?

The truth is that Washington sees no genuine hope of saving its position in South Vietnam. It knows that if its military support is removed, the puppet Saigon regime will crash over night.

Moreover Washington is aware that its military position is becoming desperate. Using mainly arms seized from the Saigon forces, bearing the label "Made in the USA," the freedom fighters have steadily built up their contingents until now they are not far from the qualitative point where they will be able to drive the Americans into the sea.

The Pentagon finds itself incapable of containing the rising revolution except through all-out war. But can it win a conflict inevitably involving China and the Soviet Union? To use nuclear arms would mean suicide; not to use them would mean defeat by revolution. The tide of the future is with communism "by popular choice" on a world scale. In their hearts, the American generals know it. They simply can't bring themselves to admit it -- publicly.

De Gaulle Doesn't Know It

BUT THE GOLDEN DAYS OF WORLD CAPITALISM ARE GONE FOREVER

By Ernest Germain

On Thursday, February 4, General de Gaulle made a proposal that created a minor sensation in the stock exchanges and editorial staffs of the big daily papers throughout the world. He suggested that the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, West Germany, Japan, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden -- that is, the main imperialist centers -- should go back to the gold standard. And a few days later, on Saturday, February 13, he topped this proposal by a unilateral decision to put France back on the gold standard; i.e., to make up its deficit in the balance of payments with all capitalist countries in gold and only gold.

Most bourgeois economists and the main central banks of the capitalist world didn't take de Gaulle's proposal very seriously. In fact, only Pravda declared with a straight face that it sounded "reasonable."

Under the gold standard, any debt which one country finds itself owing another as a result of current exchanges (in goods, tourist trade, capital imports and exports, etc.) must be paid in gold. Any deficit in the current balance of payments leads, therefore, to an outflow of gold. But the same system also means that currency must be exchangeable in gold. An outflow of gold therefore automatically involves a reduction in the existing volume of money inside the country. Bourgeois economists and capitalist governments have known since 1929 -- they learned it the hard way! -- that to reduce the volume of money circulation means reducing the volume of aggregate demand for goods and services in a country; i.e., reducing the volume of employment, income and production -- that is, precipitating a depression.

To demand going back to the old standard means in fact to demand going back to the laissez-faire economy of liberal capitalism in which market forces adjust supply and demand in the long run through the mechanism of prices, in which the inflow and outflow of gold distributes gold reserves among the different countries in the long run more or less in proportion to their productive capacity or wealth. These "adjustments" are brought about automatically. This is what admirers of the gold standard like Jacques Rueff, de Gaulle's adviser in monetary matters, consider to be so excellent.

However, the adjustments are not brought about in a "gradual," harmonious way, but through sharp breaks and discontinuities in the system. Before demand "readjusts" to a new level of supply, the phenomenon called "overproduction" appears. And before the outflow

of gold "readjusts" the balance of payments, the phenomenon known as "deflation" occurs. Both have the unfortunate tendency of creating more and more unemployment, sharper and sharper cuts in production, and greater and greater social crises in a world where capitalism has ceased to expand as a global system, where it finds itself instead in continual struggle with revolutions, workers states and masses of people who openly challenge the merits of the system and who want to replace it with a system in which conscious planning takes the place of the "blind man's cane" of the market forces.

Because of this, there is not the slightest chance that de Gaulle's proposal will be taken up. It would be suicide for capitalism to return to a rigid system of money and credit controlled automatically by the supply of gold. Such a system could lead only to a major depression.

Those who advocate returning to the gold standard score a good point when they argue that the present monetary system leads to increasing inflation. This is completely correct. But increasing inflation is the only means by which a capitalist economy can convert grave depressions into "minor" recessions. What capitalist government in the United States, for instance, would risk having fifteen or twenty million unemployed for the sake of "fighting inflation" or "going back to the gold standard"?

There are many supplementary reasons showing how irrational it would be to return to the classic gold standard in the present world situation. The two main gold-producing countries are South Africa and the Soviet Union. To return to the gold standard would mean opening the most delicately complex and explosive segment of the present world capitalist economy -- the international monetary system -- to the manipulations of Hendryk Verwoerd and Brezhnev-Kosygin, none of whom are exactly respected figures in banking circles. Consequently de Gaulle's proposal strikes the average bourgeois economist or capitalist politician as nothing but a joke of the sick variety.

For many years the annual increase in gold production has lagged behind the increase in the volume of world trade and world production of manufactured goods. Even a sharp increase in the price of gold, say doubling or tripling it, would not fundamentally change that situation, although it would represent a handsome gift of many billions of dollars to the Soviet Union which could then double or triple purchases in the capitalist countries on the basis of current gold production. A permanent crisis of international liquidity would ensue, bringing great unhappiness throughout the capitalist world -- with the exception of the hoarders of gold. Indeed Rueff's (and de Gaulle's) wisdom in this field comes closer to the prejudices of the classical French peasant (who finds it a comfort to sleep on a mattress in which a few pieces of gold are hidden) than to the views of academic economists, let alone Marxist economic science (notwithstanding Pravda's approving comments).

But if de Gaulle's proposal has no chance whatsoever of being accepted, it has nonetheless caused great uneasiness and worry among central banks, especially in New York and London. And if it hasn't brought about much of a rise in the price of South African gold mine stocks and bonds, it has certainly increased the general's nuisance value in the eyes of the rather nervous and harassed Johnson administration.

For it is a fact that the present monetary system of the capitalist world -- the so-called "gold exchange standard" -- is at present experiencing a severe crisis. Under this system, a central bank can cover its currency in either of two ways: in gold or in certain "privileged" currencies like dollars and pounds. This means that when the USA owes money to another country (shows a deficit in its balance of payments with that country), it need not make up the balance in gold; it can pay in dollars. But this also means that the dollars accumulating in central (and private) banks everywhere in the world "because they are as good as gold," must be exchangeable for gold at any time at the American central bank, the Federal Reserve System.

The "gold exchange standard" could function perfectly well as long as all capitalist countries outside the USA were dollar hungry due to the shortage of goods and capital in the postwar period which only the USA could supply, and as long as these countries had adverse balances of payment with the USA. But these "golden days" of the dollar empire, following the "golden days" of unmanipulated currencies governed solely by market forces are gone forever. They came to an end in the middle fifties when the great boom in Western Europe and Japan started, when these areas began to build up large dollar balances, and when the USA found itself running into a continual deficit in its balance of payments, thereby opening up the flow of gold from Fort Knox in their direction.

The deficit in the American balance of payments is a complex phenomenon. At one and the same time it expresses both the increasing strength of the competitors of the U.S. and the still great superiority of the U.S. over these competitors. For the final cause of this deficit in the balance of payments is the increasing export of U.S. capital to other countries where the rate of profit is higher than in the U.S. due to the fact that the organic composition of capital remains lower (i.e., automation is less advanced) and the rate of exploitation of labor higher (i.e., wages are lower).

The export of American capital to the Common Market countries constituted America's "secret weapon," with which Wall Street neutralized the advantages which the European capitalists sought to gain for themselves by building up this preference zone for their goods. As a matter of fact, what de Gaulle is really aiming at is to stop this continual flow of American capital into Europe which has now reached the point where key plants in most European countries have already been taken over by American monopolies. (On the European continent

every significant capitalist company in the vital computer-production sector is controlled by U.S. interests.)

Because of the export of U.S. capital and the constant outflow of gold from the USA, the balance between the remaining stock of gold at Fort Knox and the current deficits favoring other countries has become quite delicate. In fact, total U.S. obligations to private and public institutions in other countries are higher today than the total gold stock in the U.S. This means that if all foreign central and private banks were at one and the same time to demand payment, and payment in gold only, not dollars, the U.S. would lose all its gold and the dollar would collapse.

Of course, this will not happen. Most of the central banks involved must defend currencies bound as tightly to the dollar and its fate as their capitalism is to U.S. capitalism and its prosperity. But it would be sufficient for some creditors to demand payment in gold instead of dollars to have a quite undue influence on the present very unstable balance on which the dollar sits. And since de Gaulle's France holds precisely this position of a minor creditor, it is able to that degree to make a nuisance of itself, blackmailing Washington into paying ransom in fields as distant as the Multilateral Force, nuclear secrets and the setting up of a "NATO directorate."

The dollar is vulnerable not only because of the current deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. In fact, under the "gold exchange standard," this deficit is merely a way of spreading credit inflation from the U.S. to other capitalist countries, thereby "exporting" American "prosperity," including its shaky foundation of increasing indebtedness.

The dollar is also vulnerable because of the constant erosion of its purchasing power in the U.S. itself. Inflation in the U.S. is not "imported" through the gold exchange standard; it is rooted in the huge volume of public debt and unproductive expenses (twenty-five years of uninterrupted "boom" based on military expenditures!) as well as in a staggering amount of private indebtedness. To destroy these roots would mean destroying the very factor which up to now has prevented a new depression of the 1929 type.

Thus President Johnson recently solemnly pledged that if the threat of a new recession appears in 1965, he will immediately make new tax cuts; i.e., increase government "deficit financing" and "deficit spending" (fancy names for inflation).

To impose the gold standard would have the effect of suppressing the deficit in the balance of payments and rooting up domestic inflation. But the price would be the utter ruination of American and world capitalism today. That's why the world capitalist structure can't afford to return to a "stable" currency and the "golden" days of its youth. Those days are gone forever.

WALDECK ROCHET OPENS FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNIST INTELLECTUALS

By Pierre Frank

PARIS, Feb. 17 -- During the Algerian war, the Union des Etudiants Communistes [Union of Communist Students], a formally independent organization, began to take a critical attitude and to develop differences with the French Communist party [PCF] in view of its notorious stand favoring the imperialist side. The majority opposed the PCF leadership but divided into right and left tendencies. Last year at its March congress, the UEC compelled the PCF leadership to back down and accept a compromise.

The conflict between the leaderships of the PCF and the UEC has now flared up again as preparations were being made for the coming UEC congress. In a "letter from the National Bureau of the Central Committee" which was published in Clarté, the Communist student organ, the UEC denounced all the maneuvers and bureaucratic measures of which it had been made victim. The letter also contained a series of considerations that are close to constituting a political platform opposed to that of the PCF. The general drift of this platform corresponds to the line of Togliatti's "testament." [See World Outlook September 18, 1964.]

Within the UEC the discussion is in full swing. Different documents have been submitted voicing the positions of the different currents existing in the Communist movement, whether official or not.

The PCF leadership displayed its hand through open attacks against the "antiparty" forces, the "factionalists," etc. The entire PCF press echoed this campaign while carefully refraining from publishing a word representing the opposing positions in the UEC. The PCF leadership hoped to win in the UEC by mobilizing its apparatus, organizing a faction in the UEC and providing it with considerable material means, working away among new members unaware of what happened a few years ago.

But the conflict between the leadership of the PCF and the UEC could not fail to affect a section of the members of the party, a section that is numerically weak but politically significant -- members of the teaching profession [universitaires].

A hundred odd Communists in this category (heads of departments, assistants, researchers, etc.) sent a letter to the general secretary of the PCF concerning the conflict. (See page 29 for full text.) Among the signers appeared the names of figures like Vigier, Dresch, Schatzman, Vernant, Zazzo. . . well known as Communists and as men highly qualified in their specialties.

This letter alarmed the PCF leadership. It was in the hands of General Secretary Waldeck Rochet for several days before its

existence became publicly known and cited in the whole French press on February 16. On the following day, l'Humanité, the central organ of the French Communist party, devoted more than half a page to the subject, one column for the text of the letter and four columns for a reply in the form of a "letter from the Political Bureau to the organizations of the party." The publication of the letter was something new. However, the leadership deserves no credit for this. It was constrained to publish it because the rank and file of the party now refuse to take a position on a document they are asked to condemn unless they can read it.

What are the contents of the Political Bureau's letter? First of all, it is to be noted that l'Humanité does not publish the name of a single one of the signers. The Political Bureau says: "A certain number of teachers [universitaires] belonging to different cells, sections and federations, sent a letter to Comrade Waldeck Rochet, general secretary of the party. Some of the signers are members of your organization. That is why we present you with a copy of this letter, accompanying it with the first remarks from us which it calls for."

A certain number! To say a hundred would mean saying that it was a lot more than that, that this hundred expresses what the overwhelming majority of the intellectuals in the PCF think.

Half of the Political Bureau's reply consists of saying: but everything is going along fine; the Seventeenth Congress of the party [1964] provided answers to the cultural problems, the question of the place of the intellectuals, etc. The policy of the party, defined in its congress, provided "valuable answers to the big problems of the day concerning the character of our epoch, peace and war, the struggle for democracy, the road to socialism, the unity of the working class and the union of the democratic forces, the unity and the cohesion of the international Communist movement."

If everything is going along fine, what is the meaning of this move taken by the university personnel? The Political Bureau offers the following explanation:

"Their move is objectively equivalent to putting in question the policy democratically decided on by the Congress. . . . In stating that they make no claim 'at weighing responsibilities or offering a judgment as to what is at the bottom of the issues in dispute' [in the UEC] and in selecting this moment to address a collective letter to the leadership of the party, the signers, whether they wished to or not, lent support to a group in open struggle against the party."

In other words, here are party members who are not in agreement with the party's policies, who do not believe that the congresses have offered "valuable answers." But they have committed, in the view of the leadership, a still greater crime; not only are they in disagreement, they have mutinied. Because this is the most important

part of the Political Bureau's letter, it is worth quoting at length:

"Outside of the bodies to which they belong and while being members of the party in different sections and federations, their collective letter presupposes activities of a factional nature which could be accepted by the party only at the cost of undermining its unity and compromising its effectiveness in action. . . .

"Unable to put across their erroneous positions in the bodies of which they are officially members, they met together without the knowledge of their units. They carried out factional work that would lead to the organization of tendencies and factions contrary to the principles of the party. They are trying to drag other comrades into this activity. These concepts were rejected in 1920, when the majority of the Socialist party, drawing the lessons of the bankruptcy of the Second International in 1914, decided to adhere to the organizational principles based on democratic centralism. . . .

"The move of the signers of the letter is inadmissible. We have deemed it necessary to inform you and to couple these appreciations of the party leadership with the copy of the letter so that you can examine the questions raised and adopt decisions in conformity with the policies and interests of the party. In any case, we believe that it is up to each cell to meet with those involved in order to ask them for the necessary explanations, to reject this enterprise of a factional nature and to obtain from them an engagement to renounce all activity against the rules of the party."

The idea that the Communist party was created because of the bankruptcy of the Social Democracy in the organizational field can be appreciated for what it is worth. It leaves out such issues as the patriotism of the Social Democracy and its participation in the "sacred union," its giving up the revolutionary struggle for power.

The leadership of the PCF has sensed the danger -- if the intellectuals are permitted to start a discussion, there will be tendencies and even factions, and what will remain then of the authority of the leadership and its apparatus? Thus we come to what the Communist intellectuals, through their occupation, have been frequently led to rediscover. In the view of the PCF leadership, they have the right to discuss all kinds of questions among themselves except those relating to the policies of the party to which they belong. The reply of the Political Bureau and its appendages to the sections and federations is that you are free, you are free. . . but you are going to serve notice, each of you in your place, on the signers belonging to your jurisdiction to renounce their ideas.

Thus the leadership of the PCF moves into battle, seeking to smash those who dared to write a letter to the great leader Waldeck Rochet. The leadership counts, perhaps, on getting renunciations from some and breaking others whom it considers to be incurable.

But it is probable that this battle will have repercussions among the writers and artists first and then among other sectors and other bodies of the PCF. The leadership wants to cut off a discussion that concerns the whole Communist movement. They risk precipitating a crisis in the French Communist party.

TSHOMBE BARS HOLDEN ROBERTO FROM VISITING ZAMBIA

An accusation published by Pravda that the GRAE [Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile] is linked with American imperialism and with Tshombe has been vigorously denied by the leaders of the Angolan guerrilla movement. In a statement issued February 3 in Algiers, where it has an office, the GRAE scored the charge as a slander.

"The GRAE repeats, once again, that the only reason it has remained in Congo-Léopoldville is because of the logistic advantages offered by the frontier between Congo-Léopoldville and Angola, and also the presence in Congo-Léopoldville of nearly a million Angolans. . . .

"The Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile which, in addition, has never rejected the possibility of transferring its headquarters to other neighboring countries of Africa, thanks all those who, despite the slanders and defamatory propaganda, have not wavered for a single moment nor ceased to offer their support and aid to the revolutionary Angolan movement."

The statement declares that "all those who are really the friends, not of figures, but of the Angolan people, condemn without equivocation the vile designs of Tshombe with regard to the popular Angolan revolution."

The same statement reveals that Holden Roberto, the head of Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile, sought to go to Lusaka, Zambia, on January 25 in response to an invitation from President Kenneth Kaunda. He was formally forbidden by Tshombe's secret police from leaving Congolese territory.

"The GRAE," says the statement, "which lodged an energetic protest with the Congolese 'authorities' against this despotic measure, is compelled to bring these facts (which could lead to disastrous consequences in the progress of the freedom struggle of the Angolan people) to the knowledge of all those devoted to freedom and justice." According to Agence France-Presse (February 2) Tshombe fears that the leaders of the GRAE might go abroad in order to contact Congolese insurgents fighting Tshombe. "The latter, according to a reliable source, is not unaware of GRAE sympathies for the National Liberation Committee and for Mr. Antoine Gizenga. . . ."

IS STILL ANOTHER LAW NEEDED?

By Evelyn Sell

At the beginning of January, the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., warned Alabama officials that Negroes would conduct a massive voter registration drive and break down segregated facilities in the state. On January 18 King arrived in Selma to personally lead the campaign there. Selma is a city of 28,000 where Negroes outnumber whites and could hold the balance of power if they gained voting rights. Selma has long been a hard core of resistance to integration efforts but last October a racial moderate, Joe Smitherman, was elected mayor. Smitherman has publicly stated, "I am a segregationist. . . The people of Selma will never accept any integration except what legally is forced on them." (This defines "a moderate" in the south.)

Legal force arrived in Selma in the form of the new civil-rights law and when King announced his plans to come to Selma the city's white leaders announced that they had decided to comply with the public accommodations section of the civil-rights law and maintain peace. This statement was quickly followed by peaceful integration of a hotel and seven restaurants and the prompt arrest and sentencing of a member of the National States Rights party who punched and kicked Rev. King.

The "peaceful" proceedings were abruptly shattered when the county sheriff James Clark began harassing and jailing Negroes lined up to register to vote. Sheriff Clark is presently a defendant in Justice Department suits which charge him with using his office to prevent compliance with the public accommodations section of the civil-rights law. The sheriff has jurisdiction over the county courthouse area where voter registration takes place; and at first his rough tactics with Negroes disturbed local officials who were trying to project a good image of their fair city. City police soon joined the arrest-happy sheriff; on January 21 they arrested six Negroes trying to integrate a lunch counter.

On January 22 over 100 Negro school teachers demonstrated on the courthouse steps demanding that the Board of Registrars set aside one day a week for employees of the public schools to register to vote. Sheriff Clark and deputies used electric prods to force the teachers away from the courthouse steps. This was the first time public school teachers had participated on an organized basis in the southern civil-rights movement. In most cases, teachers are in the power of white school boards who demand that their employees steer clear of civil-rights activities.

While these events were going on in Selma, facilities in other Alabama cities were being integrated and a Justice Department suit was filed against the state because of discriminatory voter registration tests. These literacy tests are purposely designed to deny Negroes the vote. A northern newspaper, the Detroit News in

Michigan, conducted a survey to see if highly educated persons could pass the literacy test demanded of Alabama Negroes denied adequate education. The results of the Detroit News survey: among those who failed the test were seven circuit court judges, eight federal judges, various city and county officials, three law school professors. Two people passed the test: the chairman of the Wayne State University history department and the county elections director. This literacy test was voided by a federal judge during the Selma campaign.

The campaign reached new heights of intensity after King was jailed on February 1. On that day he deliberately violated a city ordinance against parades which he had observed up to this point. He was arrested along with 767 Negroes who were with him. The following days' demonstrations were marked by the participation of hundreds of Selma's Negro school children. The "childrens' crusade" spread to nearby Marion and thousands of youths ranging from 10 years to 18 were arrested and sent to work camps in the area. The young people complained of being herded 50 to 100 in a room with no lights, heat or beds and poor food.

On February 4 a federal judge ordered changes in the voter registration procedure and President Johnson pledged that the right to vote would be secured for all Americans (a right guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution which the president is sworn to uphold). King sent word from his jail cell that Negroes should stop demonstrating and "hold what we've got." Further courthouse marches were accordingly called off.

On February 5 fifteen U.S. congressmen from northern and western states arrived in Selma to informally investigate the situation. Most of them later promised to seek new federal laws safeguarding Negro voting rights in the south. King finally allowed someone to post bond for him and he left jail with the announcement that he would fly to Washington to discuss new legislation with President Johnson. Johnson issued an executive order creating a cabinet-level Council on Equal Opportunity to be headed by Vice-President Humphrey. The Council is to coordinate all civil-rights work by federal agencies. It was also reported that Johnson would ask congress for new legislation to eliminate barriers to the right to vote.

The most significant aspect of the current voter registration drive is this request for additional legislation to protect voting rights of Negroes. The protection of voting rights was precisely what the 1964 Civil Rights Law was supposed to accomplish. A bare seven months after the bill was signed into law its greatest verbal supporters are admitting that new laws are needed. President Johnson called passage of the bill "a major step toward equal opportunities for all Americans." All the respectable Negro leaders hailed the bill, a new day had supposedly dawned for the American Negro. Yet -- voter registration drives in the south still run up against the brick wall of force, reprisal and legal subterfuge. The great cry last

year was, "We need the civil rights bill!" The civil-rights bill was passed. The great cry this year is, "We need more laws, new laws!"

The truth of the matter has been: there are more than enough laws on the books already to protect life, equal opportunity and the right to vote. The question is: who will enforce the laws already existing?

ALGIERS WEEKLY DEFENDS CHINESE

The Algiers weekly Révolution Africaine took up the cudgels in its February 13 issue in behalf of the People's Republic of China, particularly over Burundi's breaking diplomatic relations with Peking. Said Révolution Africaine:

"Among the many forces seeking to wield influence in Africa, one has been vigorously denounced for several days. Is it the Americans? No. U.S. interventions are distinguished by a certain 'morality.' The same goes for other pressure systems. The scapegoat today is China.

"That this country possesses hardly any interests between the Mediterranean and the Cape of Good Hope does not constitute a genuine argument against the present hue and cry. The danger, it could be said, lies right there -- when a country becomes interested in places where it has nothing to defend, it can only be cause for suspicion. If it possesses nothing, it wants to acquire something. Deprived of material goods, it seeks to export its doctrines.

"Israel can well increase its embassies and plethoric missions throughout the continent; no one sees anything wrong in it. Only the rich are granted loans and pardons. An adage of that kind belongs to the common fund denominated "wisdom of the people." And when it is not the rich, you can have confidence in their attorneys or figureheads. But a gift from the poor remains suspect. What witchcraft permits such a strange attitude? 'After all, let them take care of themselves first,' is the idea.

"This is why Burundi is breaking diplomatic relations with Peking today. We are not to see any political significance in this gesture. Any more than we see in the replacement of the Prime Minister of this country, a replacement that followed the assassination of a newly promoted person, an assassination perpetrated, it has been disclosed, by a person having close ties with the American embassy... It is being now whispered that it involves a Chinese agent who infiltrated the ranks of the CIA. . . . "

Révolution Africaine ridicules the propaganda in Africa about

a "yellow peril," taking as an object lesson in this an assertion by Félix Houphouët-Boigny, president of the Republic of the Ivory Coast, who said: "Even if the Chinese peril is not immediate, it is of Historic extent. Those who push the Chinese toward Africa are making a bad calculation, because with the help of our riches, they (the Chinese) will pour out like a flood and sweep down Europe like a blade of straw."

Nevertheless, Révolution Africaine notes, Tshombe has just expelled Soviet journalists from the Congo and picked up the old colonialist theme of two Africas -- the white and the black. "So many colors," concludes the Algiers weekly, "makes quite a dark picture in the final analysis. Has freedom really been promised by this rainbow?"

ALEXANDER CASE STIRS WIDE RESPONSE

The Alexander Defence Committee of West Germany, which has been waging an international campaign in behalf of Dr. Neville Alexander and ten co-defendants, now serving sentences ranging from five to ten years as political prisoners in South Africa, reports a wide response to its efforts. It has been collecting funds for an appeal which will be heard March 2.

While most of the contributions have come from West Germany where Dr. Alexander is widely known for his brilliant work at Tübingen University, sizeable sums have come from England, and Norway. An excellent beginning has been made in the United States, and places as distant as Japan have been heard from.

The Committee reports that it has been able to meet the immediate costs of legal preparations for the appeal and that it is now turning its attention to the needs of the families of the victims who are in dire circumstances.

The appeal is scheduled to open March 2 and may run for several weeks. It is based on gross irregularities in the trial even under the Nazi-like code of Verwoerd's apartheid government.

Considerable significance is attached to the outcome of the hearing. Just as the Alexander case established a precedent for the subsequent handling of the Nelson Mandela trial, so a victory in the Alexander case could open the way for contests in other convictions of this kind. There is no doubt that the prosecution will fight tooth and nail for a decision upholding the convictions.

Dr. Alexander, who is one of South Africa's outstanding intellectuals, was charged, together with ten co-defendants, including four women, with "plotting" to commit "sabotage." Held under the

infamous 90-day law, some of them suffered torture.

They were convicted April 15, 1964, and sentenced to prison for terms ranging from five to ten years.

The men were sent to Robben Island, South Africa's version of a Nazi concentration camp. There they have suffered abominable indignities. Assaulted by a warder, Dr. Alexander was reported to have sustained an injury to his ear drum.

Most of the political prisoners held in this hell hole are put to work in the rock quarries and returned at night to confinement in chill, concrete-lined cells. In a report smuggled out of Robben Island [see World Outlook February 12], the food is described as "pig's diet." According to the same source, some of them, including Nelson Mandela and Neville Alexander, are kept in isolation like "wild animals."

The report said the rumor among the inmates is that these internationally known figures are compelled to break stones "which are brought by lorries."

Financial contributions can be sent to the British Alexander Defence Committee. The committee's secretary is Mrs. Connie Kirkby, 27 Thursley House, Holmewood Gardens, London, S.W.2.

NEW STUDENT DEMONSTRATION IN MADRID

Some 2,500 students staged a demonstration in Madrid February 12. For more than an hour and a half the big crowd of youth stood their ground in Quevedo Plaza.

They shouted, "Long live free trade unions!" This has been a growing demand throughout Spain among both workers and students for some time. The students also voiced opposition to the government and distributed leaflets.

Police blockaded the plaza with their cars and moved in against the students. They used clubs to disperse the assemblage and made some twenty arrests, according to the special correspondent of the Paris daily Le Figaro.

A few priests were noted among the demonstrators. Certain sectors of the Church are worried that the rigidity of Franco's regime may contribute to a violent social explosion and they are anxious to exercise a restraining influence on what in Spain are considered to be rebellious and "delinquent" youth.

The Crisis over South Vietnam

HANDS OFF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM!

HANDS OFF THE VIETNAMESE REVOLUTION!

[The following statement on the latest military attacks by American imperialism against the Vietnamese people was issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International on February 16.]

* * *

Repeating the pattern of military aggression last August, when it bombed North Vietnam sites in "reprisal" for alleged attacks on naval craft in the Gulf of Tonkin, American imperialism, in combination with its puppet South Vietnam forces, launched two air assaults on villages of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on February 7-8.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International condemns these bombings with the deepest indignation as acts of the most barbarous aggression aimed at intimidating the Vietnamese people in their struggle for freedom and social emancipation. The attempt to intimidate the Vietnamese people has no chance whatever to succeed. But it threatens to take humanity, through "escalation," over the brink into a world nuclear holocaust.

The American imperialist aggression comes at a time when the counterrevolutionary forces in South Vietnam are suffering defeat after defeat and when their regime is in a state of complete disintegration. Already in control of three-fourths of the territory of South Vietnam, moving in bigger and bigger formations, the heroic guerrilla fighters of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam have for some months been directly attacking the American military bases set up on South Vietnam territory under guise of centers for military "advisers." In reality these centers are bases for 23,000 officers and soldiers of the American armed forces, who are involved in a direct and savage way, with the employment of immense military equipment, against the guerrilla forces of the Vietnamese people.

It is possible that in their blind arrogance, the heads of the Pentagon really think it sufficient to bomb North Vietnam territory to convince Hanoi and Peking to "put a stop" to the South Vietnamese guerrilla operations against the American bases and to leave the Pentagon free to crush the revolutionary struggle at its leisure. Such a belief merely reveals how little the American rulers understand the real feelings of the anti-imperialist forces in Southeast Asia and how abysmally ignorant they are of what has happened in South Vietnam.

It is not a question of a "conspiracy," the strings of which are skillfully "manipulated" by the "aggressive Communists" of Peking and their Hanoi "allies." What is involved is a genuine mass revolution. In fact, the uprising of the South Vietnamese peasants after the Geneva conference of 1954 against the bloody Diem regime and against the confiscation of peasant land holdings in favor of the feudalistic landlords, occurred before the formation of the National Liberation Front. A new stage has now opened in the Vietnamese revolution. This is marked by the movement of the urban masses, Buddhist demonstrations, workers' strikes, and student actions. These began spontaneously, before the National Liberation Front launched action slogans in the cities. Even if the Kremlin and Peking wanted to sacrifice South Vietnam for the sake of an over-all deal with Washington, they are powerless to stop the revolution.

It is the popular base of this revolution, which includes the immense majority of the inhabitants of the country, that makes the South Vietnamese revolution invincible. It is the militancy and the revolutionary audacity of the young guerrillas -- and not "instructions" from Peking -- that is behind the attacks on the American military bases. Against the power of the revolutionary masses, American imperialism, including its military "advisers" and its bomber pilots, is impotent. They can massacre thousands of innocent victims in inhuman "reprisals" that recall the Nazi reprisals against Lidice and Oradour; they cannot destroy the revolution. French imperialism found this out in the case of Algeria. In reprisal for Tunisia's aid to the guerrilla fighters, the French bombed Bizerte and Sakiet, but these bloody acts of vengeance did not stop the Algerian freedom fighters from winning political freedom for their country. In truth, the American bombings of North Vietnam villages are self-defeating. The more barbarous and inhuman the American militarists become, the greater the indignation of the masses grows and along with it their support to the revolution.

The bombing of the North Vietnam villages only expresses the dilemma faced by American imperialism in Southeast Asia.

If it "hardens" its positions, "escalating" the policy of intervening in the civil war into a policy of waging war on North Vietnam and even China, the Asian workers states will quite understandably increase their support to the South Vietnamese revolution by more and more radical means, including a massive build up of volunteers. Imperialism will then be confronted with the perspective of an immediate defeat on the scene in South Vietnam unless, in turn, it increases its armed forces there, including infantry. But this would mean a new "Korean-type" war in South Vietnam in which imperialism would become more and more bogged down, draining its forces without the slightest perspective of victory. Under these circumstances, the Soviet bureaucracy, which up to now has maintained an attitude of criminal passivity in face of the imperialist aggression -- particularly last August -- a passivity which in fact en-

couraged imperialism to do whatever it felt like and to step up its aggression, would be obliged on its side to furnish diplomatic, economic and military support to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the South Vietnam revolution, still further reducing the chances for an imperialist victory in that part of the world.

This "hard" line, which is advocated by certain influential circles in the United States, fits in with the strategy of seeking a military showdown with China before it can become a nuclear power of major importance. One of the objectives would be to bomb the Chinese nuclear center in the Taklamakan desert. That this is seriously under consideration in White House circles is shown by the anxiety of the best-informed American newspapers, which, in contrast to the complacent attitude of the European press, particularly in Britain, act as if the Johnson administration is on the verge of irreparable decisions.

If American imperialism does not follow this course, but, on the contrary, recognizes the impossibility of consolidating the beachhead it seized in South Vietnam and utilizes the crisis touched off by its bombings in North Vietnam as a shield behind which to reach a "peaceful understanding" on the Vietnamese question, then fateful consequences of a different kind can occur. Through the transitional stage of a "broad national government" and a "neutralist regime," the South Vietnam revolution can continue its march toward the complete destruction of the semifeudal vestiges and the power of imperialism and native capitalism, opening the way for achievement of a socialist Vietnam. In this case, imperialism would "lose" Laos and Cambodia in the immediate future. The announcement that a National Liberation Front has been set up in Thailand to coordinate the activities of the guerrillas already widely active there is the handwriting on the wall for imperialism. Just as the revolution in South Vietnam followed the victory of the revolution in North Vietnam and the 1954 Geneva agreement, so the Thailand revolution will be touched off by the victory of the revolution in South Vietnam and this will unsettle Malaysia, the last solid imperialist position in Southeast Asia.

From the point of view of the interests of the revolution and of all humanity, it would be clearly preferable for American imperialism to choose as quickly as possible the road of retreat and withdrawal, even if by stages. But it would be a delusion and self-deception to believe that such a decision is certain, that "reason" will lead American imperialism to back down rather than opt for an immediate catastrophic outcome. The fact is that the latest imperialist aggression against North Vietnam, like that of last August and the imperialist aggression against Cuba in October 1962, shows that the first reaction of American imperialism, above all the heads of the Pentagon, is to strike without the least regard for either national or international law. Only the vigorous reaction of the revolutionary masses in the colonial world, the governments of the

workers states, international public opinion and popular reaction in the United States itself can make it hesitate and draw back temporarily.

The latest imperialist aggression against North Vietnam, which could prove to be the opening move toward direct military confrontation between imperialism and the People's Republic of China, and then the USSR, underlines the warning repeatedly made by the Fourth International: The need to overturn the power of imperialism in the United States, of creating a socialist America, has become a problem of life or death for all of humanity. As long as American imperialism holds enormous economic and technical power, capable of destroying mankind in a nuclear holocaust, the threat remains suspended over humanity. The struggle for the world victory of socialism is not only a struggle for a better society today. It has become literally a struggle for the physical survival of mankind.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International appeals to the workers of all countries to show in an energetic way, through action, their condemnation of the imperialist aggression against North Vietnam and their solidarity with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the heroic masses fighting in the South Vietnamese revolution.

We appeal to the governments of the workers states to set up an unbreakable United Front against imperialism and for the defense of the Vietnamese revolution. Divisions in the anti-imperialist front can only encourage and facilitate the aggressions of the Pentagon.

We appeal to the British workers to protest vigorously against the criminal stand of the Wilson Labour government which has become an accomplice in the imperialist aggression against the Vietnamese people.

We appeal to the workers of the United States to oppose the irresponsible military clique who have deprived even Congress, the traditional body of bourgeois democracy, from deciding the country's foreign policy and who are ready, in brazen violation of the rejection of "Goldwaterism" in the last election, to precipitate the United States into a nuclear war. Let the American people themselves decide whether they want war or peace! Let the American people set up a new political and governmental framework capable of carrying out their will!

For international solidarity with the Vietnamese revolution!

For the world victory of socialism!

AFRICAN MOVEMENTS PROTEST AMERICAN AGGRESSION IN VIETNAM

[The following declaration, published in the February 13 issue of the Algiers weekly Révolution Africaine, can be taken to represent the consensus among the freedom-seeking peoples of Africa on the military assaults committed by American imperialism against North Vietnam. The signers include two governments in exile, the ZAPU -- Zimbabwe African People's Union (Southern Rhodesia); the GRAE -- Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile; four guerrilla movements (in addition to the GRAE): the FRELIMO -- Mozambique Liberation Front; MPLA -- Movement for the Liberation of Angola; PAIGC -- African Party for the Independence of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands; UPC -- Union of the Populations of the Cameroun; and a propaganda formation, SWAPO -- South West African People's Organization. It is worth noting that both the GRAE and the MPLA joined in putting their names to the declaration although they are separated by bitter factional differences. The declaration is entitled: "National liberation movements protest the American aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam."]

* * *

Once again, the American imperialists have just committed a new aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by bombing the village of Dong Hoï, the province of Vinh and the island of Con Co on the seventh and eighth of February 1965.

This attack comes after the defeat of the American army at Pleiku, where the patriotic forces of the FNL [Front National de Libération] destroyed or damaged 26 planes, entailing eight deaths and 108 wounded among the ranks of the American aggressors.

Thus, after many successive setbacks in South Vietnam, persisting in their policy of aggression, the American imperialists are trying to extend the war to North Vietnam in flagrant violation of the sovereignty of this state. This constitutes a very grave precedent for the sovereignty of all countries and threatens world peace. The American imperialists are already conducting a war against the Congolese (Léopoldville) people, in Mozambique, in Angola, in so-called "Portuguese" Guinea, in Kameroun through NATO. In Latin America they continue to extend their plans of enslavement by supporting puppet regimes and they have not given up their aim of smothering Cuba.

We, the representatives in Algiers of the revolutionary African and Asian movements:

(1) Strongly denounce and condemn the aggression of the American imperialists against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. This demonstrates once again that the American imperialists in particular are the enemies of all the peoples.

(2) Reaffirm our unconditional support to the Vietnamese people in their heroic struggle against the American aggressors.

(3) We congratulate the North Vietnam armed forces for their quick and precise reply, which on this occasion brought down 13 American war planes and damaged 10 others.

(4) We congratulate the patriots under the guidance of the FNL for their success in their struggle against the American puppets and for the freedom and unification of Vietnam.

We are absolutely convinced that our common struggle against the common enemy and for the realization of the fundamental aspirations of our peoples will succeed, no matter what the cost, in overcoming the reactionary imperialist forces.

Down with Colonialism.

Down with Neocolonialism.

Down with Imperialism.

Long Live the Friendship and Solidarity of the Peoples.

FRELIMO
ZAPU
MPLA
PAIGC
UPC
GRAE
SWAPO

Algiers, February 10, 1965

ANTI-IMPERIALIST PLATFORM OF MANILA DEMONSTRATORS

[On January 25 a mass demonstration was held in Manila to protest the role of U.S. imperialism in the Philippines and to call attention to domestic problems linked with American domination. In conjunction with the demonstration the National Co-ordinating Committee issued a manifesto, which we reproduce below. The text is taken from the February 5 issue of Laging Una, published in Los Angeles, California.

[At the January 25 demonstration, a crowd of some 5,000 gathered before the American embassy where they burned an effigy of "imperialist Uncle Sam." The demonstrators also placed 32 black-draped coffins before the embassy to represent the 32 Filipinos

slain by guards on U.S. military bases in the past twenty years.]

* * *

Workers led by Lapiang Manggagawa, youth led by Kabataang Makabayan, students led by the National Students' League, peasants led by Malayang Samahang Magsasaka, the unemployed led by AKSIUN, individual businessmen belonging to the Philippine Chamber of Industries and the Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines, and diverse individuals and groups of individuals united in the spirit of nationalism, will congregate in front of Congress in the afternoon of January 25th, on the occasion of the Opening of Congress, and thereafter march to the U.S. Embassy, to demonstrate their common will and aspirations for national freedom, for greater civil liberties and for social upliftment.

The January 25th demonstration will be fully representative of the major national forces in Philippine society and will, therefore, assume the patriotic duty of expressing the long-repressed demands of the entire Filipino people.

The January 25th demonstration will make the following concrete and specific demands:

FIRST, the Parity Amendment should be immediately abrogated in order to stop once and for all the alienation of our national patrimony by our bankrupt and subservient national leaders in our conservative parties, and the Laurel-Langley Agreement should likewise be immediately abrogated in order to erase the anomalous parity rights of American citizens in all businesses and to stop preferential trade with one industrial power, the United States, which has kept our economy agrarian and colonial in character and direction.

This first demand is made in order to liberate the Philippine economy from alien domination and to make possible the establishment of a stable basis for a Filipino-controlled industrial development. Such a stable economic basis shall serve to support the independent political development of a modern nation-state. No state is politically free that is not economically free. The Philippines, by being traditionally a mere source of raw materials and a dumping ground for American surplus products and surplus capital, has been unable to grow under the oppressive weight of neo-colonialism.

SECOND, the US-RP Military Bases Agreement should be immediately abrogated in order to effectively assert once and for all the sovereignty of the Filipino people over their own territory and to put an end to the coercive influence of such foreign military bases against our own people and government.

Even during this period of peace and friendship with the United States, American servicemen have killed in cold blood our Filipino brothers and abused their extra-territorial rights in so

many ways. These military bases, which have long been rendered obsolescent by the development of modern missilery, are at present nothing more than the continued institutionalization of American violence and aggression against our sovereignty. The Filipino people should now protect themselves from those who pretend to be their protectors.

THIRD, the Retail Trade Nationalization Act should be fully implemented in the form and substance it has been passed by Congress, signed by the President and declared as constitutionally valid by the Supreme Court.

In answer to the neo-colonialist pressures and demands for watering down the term "retail" and making more loopholes in the law, the Philippine Congress should now take the next logical step in pushing forward the cause of Filipino business by passing a law nationalizing the wholesale trade.

FOURTH, the Agricultural Land Reform Code should be fully implemented for the benefit of Filipino peasants and, in this regard, the Philippine Congress should pass a law prohibiting land monopolization, especially by foreign plantation corporations.

The Filipino peasantry, composed of small landowners, the landless tenants, the displaced tenants, the settlers and agricultural workers, still remain unsatisfied. If their problems are not radically met by our national leaders, there is no stability for the peace and order that has been so far achieved through police measures and palliatives.

FIFTH, the American advisory system imposed by the U.S. Government on the Philippine military and civil service within the framework of the JUSMAG and AID should be immediately eliminated by abrogating the US-RP Military Assistance Pact and the Quirino-Foster Agreement, in order to stop once and for all the infiltration of undue American influence in our administrative system and prevent the manipulation of our limited and precious resources to further American, as distinguished from Filipino, policy.

By allowing American advisers to dictate our military and civil leaders and institutions, we cannot truly say that we are independent administrators of our own government. American puppetry has been maintained through this advisory system in so many parts of the world.

SIXTH, proper respect for the civil liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution should be made by all branches of our government.

The government should encourage the widest possible political discussion to enlighten the masses on the true meaning of democracy.

The government should see to it that none of its agencies, especially the CAFA and the police, is manipulated by foreign agencies like the American Embassy, JUSMAG, CIA, USIS, Asian Foundation, and the like to undermine the civil liberties of Filipino citizens.

SEVENTH, the right to work should be made a constitutional right of every Filipino citizen.

In this connection, all measures towards the creation of jobs for productive and industrial purposes be taken by the government in order to stave off the fast rising unemployment and discontent of the Filipino youth.

EIGHTH, the amended Minimum Wage raising to P6.00 [\$1.54] the daily wage to alleviate the workers' financial difficulties caused by skyrocketing prices generated by the neo-colonial policy of decontrol and "free enterprise" should immediately be passed. By virtue of the same reason, the salaries of government employees should also be raised in pursuance of the standards already set by the WAPCO.

NINTH, the tight credit squeeze against Filipino businessmen should be put to a stop and fresh sources of funds should be opened by seeking credit from all sources which are sympathetic to the cause of Filipino nationalist industrialization.

The tight credit squeeze against our businessmen is the direct result of the neo-colonial policy of decontrol which has been designed and implemented without safeguards in order to starve our Filipino entrepreneurs and deliver them to the selfish terms of American financing institutions which are out to maintain American supremacy over our economy.

TENTH, the Philippine government should widen its diplomatic and commercial relations with all countries in place of its narrow and neo-colonial "special relationship" with the U.S. government.

This step should be taken in relation to the abrogation of the treaties which bind us subserviently to American power; and it should be taken with the view of forestalling American blackmail and retaliation in the process of the assertion of our own freedom as a nation.

All these demands are made in pursuance of the objective of Filipino nationalist forces to liberate the nation from the oppressive chains of American neo-colonialism.

National Coordinating Committee
January 25th Demonstration

FRENCH CP INTELLECTUALS DEMAND FREE DISCUSSION

[Nearly one hundred prominent intellectuals belonging to the French Communist party addressed a letter to Waldeck Rochet, general secretary of the party, on the situation within the Union des Etudiants Communistes (Union of Communist Students). In view of the importance of their demand for a free discussion of the issues in dispute, we have translated the letter in full below. The text is taken from the February 17 issue of l'Humanité, central organ of the French Communist party.]

* * *

Dear Comrade,

The situation within the Union des Etudiants Communistes, the differences that have appeared there, the polemic that has now become public cannot leave any Communist indifferent.

Through our occupation, we come into close contact with the student body; it is our responsibility to transmit to them not only technical knowledge but a general culture; through this, as well as through our participation in the ideological activities of the party, we contribute to the diffusion of Marxism among them and to their theoretical and political education. This means that in problems which concern them we feel involved both as Communists and as intellectuals, bearing special responsibility as Communist intellectuals.

We are not empowered to intervene in the debate developing within the Union, and between the Union and official party bodies. We make no claim at weighing responsibilities or offering a judgment as to what is at the bottom of the issues in dispute. Our initiative is concerned with something else. We consider it our duty and in the interests of the party to let you know our feelings about an essential point.

It is clear that the crisis which has broken out within the Union goes beyond purely student affairs. In its present form, it certainly concerns conditions pertaining to this organization; but it could not have arisen and developed outside a more general context: the difficulties which the international Communist movement has experienced, the persistent discussions since the Twentieth Congress, the way in which these problems have been made public and presented in various fashions in the various Communist parties. In this sense, the crisis in the Union appears to us to be the expression, among the students, of the malaise which the French Communist intellectuals as a whole have felt for several years and to which some of us have already called the attention of the party leadership in asking it to take the initiative and open a wide discussion on the problem of relations between the party and the intellectuals: what is the proper role, the specific share of the Communist intellectuals in the deepening of Marxist theory, what is their place in

the necessary work of inquiry, of research, of collective thinking, whether it concerns the various aspects of the ideological battle or the political struggle; what are their duties and their responsibilities with regard to the working class and the party; what does the party have a right to demand from them, what do they have a right to expect from the party so that their participation in the general combat of the working class can be most efficacious and so that, correlatively, the action of the party among the intellectuals, the artists, scientists, cadres, technicians can be conducted under conditions enabling them to be won, in their great majority, to the cause of Communism. If this discussion had been started, by the party and in the party, some of the current difficulties would doubtlessly have been avoided.

The problems that have been posed are real; they concern, certainly, party work among the students and intellectuals in the first place; but they also involve, in analyzing French society, the place of intellectuals and the role they play, our political perspectives, both immediate and long range, some of the theoretical bases of the present strategy of the workers movement. No administrative measure can replace a discussion the necessity of which appears to us more urgent than ever.

To avoid a confrontation, to label the intellectuals as good or bad according to their position in the discussion instead of according to their devotion to the cause of Communism, would have grave consequences not only among the students where such an attitude would risk bringing about a noticeable decline in our influence and forces, but also among the intellectuals where it would provoke confusion, disorder, bitterness in our ranks, distrust and disillusionment among our sympathizers, and great joy to our adversaries.

Generally, in our relations with other formations and with the masses, it would make more difficult the united action of our party and its policy of rallying the people against the personal power [de Gaulle] and for genuine democracy, for socialism.

The situation thus appears serious to us. To obviate the dangers it implies, it seems to us necessary to organize study sessions of Communist intellectuals where the questions we have raised could be discussed.

With fraternal greetings,

[Signatures not listed by l'Humanité.]