

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

Volume 3, No. 30

October 15, 1965

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
And Roosevelt Was Ready to Atom-Bomb Germany	2
American Youth Seek to Evade Fighting in Vietnam	3
The Military Takeover in Indonesia	4
The British Try to Hang on to Aden	8
Use of Noxious Gas Resumed in Vietnam	9
"A New Field of Battle" for Che Guevara	
-- by Joseph Hansen	10
Election Disappoints Brazilian Dictatorship	15
Asylum Sought for Francisco Julião	16
Job Hunting Difficult for Women in Japan	16
Just Plain "Korea," Please	17
Argentine Students Move toward United Organization	18
General Strike in Uruguay	18
Socialist Workers Confederation Formed in Belgium	
-- by Henri Vallin	19
Swedes Overwhelmingly Opposed to Dirty War in Vietnam	20
Oil Interests Hit a Gusher in Ceylonese Rupees	
-- by V. Karalasingham	21
Police in Japan Told to Gird for Mass Rallies	23
The Blackpool Conference	24
The Newsletter Exposes a Case of "Insincerity"	
-- by Peter Kork	28
The Economics of Neocapitalism	30
In the Aftermath of Watts	33
Civil-Rights Fighters Make It Another Long Hot Summer	
-- by Evelyn Sell	34
Something New to Worry About	37
Documents:	
How Trotsky Defense Committee Was Organized	38
Appeal for Struggle Against Greek Monarchy	43

*a labor press service*

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

Volume 3, No. 30

October 15, 1965

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
And Roosevelt Was Ready to Atom-Bomb Germany.....	2
American Youth Seek to Evade Fighting in Vietnam.....	3
The Military Takeover in Indonesia.....	4
The British Try to Hang on to Aden.....	8
Use of Noxious Gas Resumed in Vietnam.....	9
"A New Field of Battle" for Che Guevará -- by Joseph Hansen.....	10
Election Disappoints Brazilian Dictatorship.....	15
Asylum Sought for Francisco Julião.....	16
Job Hunting Difficult for Women in Japan.....	16
Just Plain "Korea," Please.....	17
Argentine Students Move toward United Organization.....	18
General Strike in Uruguay.....	18
Socialist Workers Confederation Formed in Belgium -- by Henri Vallin.....	19
Swedes Overwhelmingly Opposed to Dirty War in Vietnam.....	20
Oil Interests Hit a Gusher in Ceylonese Rupees -- by V. Karalasingham.....	21
Police in Japan Told to Gird for Mass Rallies.....	23
The Blackpool Conference.....	24
The Newsletter Exposes a Case of "Insincerity" -- by Peter Kork.....	28
The Economics of Neocapitalism.....	30
In the Aftermath of Watts.....	33
Civil-Rights Fighters Make It Another Long Hot Summer -- by Evelyn Sell.....	34
Something New to Worry About.....	37
Documents:	
How Trotsky Defense Committee Was Organized.....	38
Appeal for Struggle Against Greek Monarchy.....	43

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE - Hebdomadaire

Abonnement, 26 numéros : 37,50 F, à Pierre FRANK, 21, rue d'Aboukir, Paris (2<sup>e</sup>).

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 dollars 7.50 or 2/15 s. or 37,50 francs to : Pierre Frank, 21, rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2<sup>e</sup>, France.

AND ROOSEVELT WAS READY TO ATOM-BOMB GERMANY

The Pentagon is persistently continuing its propaganda aimed at getting American public opinion accustomed to the idea of using nuclear weapons in a further escalation of the war in Vietnam. On September 10 Eisenhower revealed that he had been prepared to use nuclear weapons against China on at least two occasions.

This has now been followed up with the report that Roosevelt was actively considering use of the atom bomb on Germany. In an interview October 7, Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves said that Roosevelt called him on the morning of December 31, 1944, to discuss the question. Groves was head of the secret Manhattan Project which developed the bomb.

The conference, according to Groves, included Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson besides himself and Roosevelt.

"Roosevelt asked very definitely if the atom bomb could be used against Germany," said Groves.

"I demurred at first and gave the president a number of reasons why it was less feasible to use the bomb against Germany than against Japan.

"But it may be necessary, Roosevelt told me. He suggested that, if the Battle of the Bulge continued to go against us, 'I should be prepared to use it against Germany.'

"I replied: 'If it is necessary then we can do it, Mr. President.'"

When news came of an allied victory in the Ardennes a few days later, Roosevelt dropped the topic.

The implications of this revelation in the current situation are obvious. If a man as sane as Roosevelt was prepared to use nuclear weapons on a country with a white population like Germany, who could call it an act of insanity to use them today against Asians?

In his column of October 13, Walter Lippmann indicates the framework of this propaganda. In his opinion, in the next few months Johnson will face another crisis in his conduct of the war in Vietnam. The tremendous increase in the number of American troops in Vietnam has succeeded only in scattering the Vietnamese freedom fighters and forcing them back into a continuation of guerrilla warfare. But the American public has been led to expect a victory.

"If and when no victory comes of all this and the war goes on," declares Lippmann, "the president will be exhorted to put an end to the war by some really decisive blows. The propaganda for

this new escalation is already being tried out." [Emphasis added.]

"Toward the end of the year" Johnson will have to decide "whether to engage in a total war in Vietnam or to work for a tentative and precarious peace." But it will be argued that he can win a "glorious victory" by using professional troops. "Such a prospect would have enormous attraction for Lyndon Johnson."

Since Johnson first started escalating the war in Vietnam, it has been completely clear that it pointed toward a nuclear conflict. This is not just the blind logic of the course started by Johnson. It was clearly part of the Pentagon's original blueprint -- and what is grimmest of all, these Dr. Strangeloves have been deliberately pressing to bring it about.

#### AMERICAN YOUTH SEEK TO EVADE FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

The unpopularity of the war in Vietnam is shown by a most significant development in the United States. Never in the entire past one hundred years, according to Selective Service officials, has "draft dodging" been so bad.

"Not only are more men neglecting to register, ignoring official correspondence, refusing to report for their physicals and tearing up their draft cards, but the threat of military service has scared thousands into premature marriages, unplanned schooling and unwanted jobs," according to Jack Anderson, a Washington correspondent, in the September 27 New York Post.

Young men caught trying to evade the draft are subject to five years in prison and a fine of \$10,000. Thus ingenious means are tried to get deferment by legal means. "Congressmen have been bombarding local boards with requests for deferments. Prominent people have brought pressure on the boards to exempt their sons. Employers have claimed that the most unlikely young workers are essential to the home front."

"Patriotism" was never at a lower ebb. "Those who must put on a uniform are more pitied than praised."

The ruses used to beat the draft range "from deliberately 'flunking' tests to 'instant' fatherhood. People with masters' degrees have miraculously failed their educational tests. And more than one illegitimate child has been given a name because his father sought to duck the draft."

Some youth actually commit minor crimes in order to get arrested and be found "morally unfit" to serve in the army.

## THE MILITARY TAKEOVER IN INDONESIA

The Indonesian revolution has suffered a grave setback. The bourgeois army, while still maintaining Sukarno in nominal power, has taken over control and launched a nationwide witch-hunt. Communist party members are being hounded and arrested. Communist party papers are being suppressed, its leaders forced underground.

The brunt of this stinging defeat has been suffered by the biggest Communist party in the capitalist world. It claims 3,000,000 regular members, a People's Youth wing of 3,000,000, and a following of 20,000,000 in mass organizations of the workers, peasants, women, students and people working for the government. How could such a massive political force undergo a mauling at the hands of armed forces totaling 350,000?

It is due to the strategic line of "revolution by stages," of forming blocs and coalitions with the "national bourgeoisie." The Stalinist-educated leadership of the Communist movement in the colonial and semicolonial countries has applied this line again and again since the second Chinese revolution of 1925-27, notwithstanding its tragic results.

In Indonesia, the masses have surged forward repeatedly. Industrial and agricultural wage earners and poor peasants have occupied factories and plantations, seized the holdings of the big landowners, and poured into the streets in great throngs urging a decisive struggle against inflation, exploitation and imperialism. Several times the situation has been propitious for a government of the workers and poor peasants to take power.

But each time, the leadership of the Indonesian Communist party, headed by the group of Chairman D.N.Aidit, has put the brakes on the mass movement and held the masses prisoner to "Nasakom" -- the "national front" of the three main political groupings, the Sukarno Nationalists, the Religious Teachers, a Moslem group, and the Communist party.

Each time the masses surged forward, the Communist party sought to channel their militancy against the single target of foreign imperialism, failing to organize systematic, nationwide struggles against the semifeudal landowners, the money lenders, rich merchants, and corrupt administrators of enterprises that serve as seed beds of a new industrialist bourgeois class.

In this way the fighting energy of the masses was not concentrated on the central task of winning power, but was split up and dispersed into numerous partial actions.

Meanwhile the bourgeois army, the center of the counterrevolutionary forces, quietly strengthened by American imperialism and

beefed up with shipments of armaments sent by the Soviet bureaucracy, sought to increase its popularity and its political standing by staging easy "successes" against imperialism, as in West Irian and North Kalimantan, biding its time to turn against the revolutionary mass movement.

It is true that in recent months the Aidit leadership made a shift to the left, radicalizing its orientation somewhat. Aidit even called for arming of the workers and peasants.

But he did not call upon the masses to arm themselves. He asked Sukarno to arm them. Sukarno, of course, gave this appeal the brush off.

Finally, on September 25, only a few days before the attempted coup of the "September 30 Movement" which precipitated the present situation, Aidit told the masses to act boldly against the "bureaucratic capitalists," and to take control of the former imperialist enterprises which had been confiscated or nationalized.

The shift came too late. "Bung (Brother) Karno" cannot be praised day in and day out without sowing immense confusion among the masses and disorienting them in the problem of winning power. It is impossible to remain silent year after year about the reactionary danger represented by the army without paving the way for the masses to be taken by surprise when the reactionary generals finally decide that the time has come to strike.

The hesitant and wavering attitude of the Aidit leadership stood out starkly during the decisive week of the army coup. Not a single appeal, not a single indication of what to do, not a single list of slogans of action was issued by the Indonesian Communist party to the masses of workers and peasants. They were left leaderless in face of the enemy. Confused by the contradictions in past policies, abandoned by their leaders in the hour of greatest peril, they stood stunned as the generals brought the sword down.

The role played by the left-wing army officers under Lt. Col. Untung is not yet clear. It is possible that these officers, informed about the impending coup being prepared by the reactionary generals, sought desperately to throw it off balance by striking first. It is also possible that they actually tried to topple the Sukarno regime through a purely military conspiracy which General Abdul Haris Nasution then seized as a pretext for his own coup.

If the latter hypothesis proves to be the correct one, then it must be listed as a putschist adventure in which a handful of resolute men attempted to substitute for the power of the masses. It is quite wrong to think that an attempted coup d'état by reactionary generals cannot be blocked by a strong mass movement; or that putschists can succeed whereas the masses are doomed to failure. There are many examples in history where powerful mass mobilization, sup-

ported by relatively weak popular military formations, have successfully blocked reactionary army circles from taking over a country. This occurred at the time of the attempted Kapp putsch in Germany in 1920. It happened again in Spain in July 1936. The latest instance was in the Dominican Republic.

The best response is a powerful general strike which paralyzes the enemy, throws him into confusion, forces him to divide and dissipate his forces, giving the labor movement a breathing spell in which to arm the workers and peasants and thereby prepare a truly effective counterblow against the reactionary threat.

But the responsibility for the Untung putsch -- if it turns out to have been a putsch -- must be laid squarely on the Aidit leadership. It is the old pattern: opportunism breeds adventurism. It is probable that inside the Indonesian Communist party, a left wing became more and more impatient with the wavering, opportunist policies of the Aidit leadership. Under pressure of the constantly rising tension between classes and political forces in recent months, certain elements in this left wing might very well have thought of turning to direct action as a possible way out. Feeling that a reactionary coup d'état could occur at any time, they might have despaired of convincing the party cadres and members of the danger before it was too late. Miseducated as to the real potential of mass action, lacking confidence in their capacity to mobilize the masses -- if necessary against the Aidit leadership -- they might have thought that the situation could be saved through some kind of short cut.

Whatever the facts -- and these are not easy to determine as yet -- the opportunism of the Aidit leadership stands at the center of the setback dealt to the Indonesian revolution. And the leadership of the Chinese Communist party and the pro-Mao tendency in the world Communist movement likewise bear heavy co-responsibility.

In several documents, the Chinese Communist party leadership has correctly criticized the opportunist policy of the Thorez and Togliatti leaderships in the French and Italian Communist parties, the servile subservience to the "national" bourgeoisie which led the Iraqi Communist party and the Dange leadership of the Indian Communist party to heavy defeats.

But in gross contradiction to these criticisms, the Mao leadership placed a rubberstamp of approval on the opportunist policies of the Aidit group inside the Indonesian Communist party.

This course was linked to the diplomatic maneuvers with which the Chinese government sought to counter the blockade of American imperialism and the hostile moves of the Soviet bureaucracy against the Chinese revolution. To seek friendly relations with bourgeois governments like those headed by Sukarno or Ayub Khan in Pakistan is not at all wrong in and of itself. A workers state has a perfect

right and even duty to seek to maneuver among its bourgeois enemies and to take advantage of their differences. The Soviet government in the days of Lenin and Trotsky did this at the time of the Rapallo treaty.

What is impermissible -- it is one of the products of Stalinist miseducation and degeneration -- is to identify the needs and prerogatives of the government of a workers state with the political needs of the world revolution which are expressed on a party level. To confuse the two, converts the party into a mere instrument of the government with its passing diplomatic needs and tears the heart and brains out of Marxist political policy. Even Marxist theory becomes reduced to the role of apologizing for each twist and turn in the field of governmental diplomacy.

Thus when the Soviet government in the time of Lenin and Trotsky signed a temporary pact at Rapallo with German imperialism against "Allied" imperialism, the Communist International did not stop calling for and seeking to help organize the overthrow of German imperialism through a proletarian revolution. The Communist International did not stop calling the rulers of Germany what they actually were -- ferocious capitalist exploiters of their own workers.

But in Mao's deals with Sukarno and Ayub Khan, all the radical words about "uninterrupted revolution" are forgotten. These representatives of exploiting classes and butchers of striking workers are pictured as "progressive national leaders." A veil is drawn over the class nature of their regimes; debilitating illusions are sown about the possibility of creating a "bloc of newly emerging forces" against world imperialism.

This opportunist policy is not fundamentally different from the treacherous, revisionist line of Khrushchevism in the colonial and semicolonial countries with its gross illusions about "peaceful evolution," "national democratic states" and "noncapitalist forms of development" that still cannot be said to be moving in a socialist direction.

In Indonesia, Aidit appears only as a "left" variant of Khrushchevist opportunism. The Chinese Communist party leaders, who have covered up for all his opportunism and invested him with all the tremendous authority they have among the Asian workers and poor peasants as a result of the victory of the Chinese revolution, today share the responsibility for the defeat in Indonesia.

The defeat in Indonesia will not prove to be an enduring one. An important battle was lost but reaction is not definitively in the saddle. Experience since the end of the second world war has proved that the revolutionary movement in the colonial and semicolonial countries has been able to quite rapidly forge again to the forefront after suffering partial defeats.



This recuperative power is due primarily to the objective conditions; i.e., the incapacity of neocolonialism and the national bourgeoisie to assure even temporary improvements in the abysmal living conditions of the millions upon millions of exploited colonial slaves.

These slaves are learning the power of revolt; and it takes more than a temporary defeat to force them back into numbed acceptance of an intolerable existence.

The 3,000,000 adult Communists, 3,000,000 Communist youth and 20,000,000 members of mass organizations in Indonesia have not been crushed. They are only temporarily thrown off balance and left leaderless. They are certain to rally, resume their struggle and compel reaction to retreat.

Their struggle will continue until the most conscious and critical Communist militants, united with the Indonesian Trotskyist cadres, forge a revolutionary party capable of leading the working class and peasantry upon the only road to victory -- the road to the conquest of power, the establishment of a workers and farmers government, the road of Fidel Castro, of Lenin and Trotsky, the road of the permanent revolution.

#### THE BRITISH TRY TO HANG ON TO ADEN

The British Labour government is following a colonial policy lifted from the Tory book with not a comma altered. A perfect example is provided by the case of Aden.

On September 25 the imperialist metropolis dismissed Chief Minister Abdul Qawee Mackawee, suspended Aden's Legislative Council and turned Aden formally back into a British Crown Colony ruled directly by High Commissioner Sir Richard Turnbull.

The reason for the move was indicated by Dana Adams Schmidt in a London dispatch to the September 27 New York Times: "The move had been under consideration since Mr. Mackawee and a trade-union leader Abdullah Asnag, deliberately brought about the failure of a conference that met in London early last month to prepare a constitutional conference."

The constitutional conference, however, was a gimmick fostered by Arthur Greenwood, a member of Wilson's cabinet, which met with virtually solid opposition among the Adenis. It would have bound Aden to the South Arabian Federation, a creation of the British imperialists. The Adenis consider themselves part of Yemen. A union between Aden and Yemen would lead to the liberation of the whole of Southern Arabia.

In conjunction with the decision to revert to direct imperialist rule over the colony, the British Labour government moved another piece on the international chessboard. It sent Minister of State George Thomson to Cairo to see President Gamal Abdel Nasser. The obvious hope was to get Nasser to withdraw the support of the United Arab Republic from such formations as the National Liberation Front in Aden which have been fighting for freedom from British imperialism.

But Nasser announced that he would not receive the envoy of the British Labour government.

In reporting the news, the Cairo daily Al Ahram explained September 27 that the British arranged to have Thomson in Cairo at the precise time it suspended Aden's constitution in order to create the impression that Nasser was willing to reach an understanding with London at the expense of the nationalists in South Arabia.

A few hours after Al Ahram appeared in the streets, Thomson caught an outbound plane.

Nasser, of course, could hardly play such a flagrantly open game with Harold Wilson. Cairo is not London or Washington where the rulers feel free to trample on the feelings of the colonial peoples. Nasser is keenly sensitive to Arab public opinion which knows from bitter experience the propensity of British imperialism to slide knives into people's backs.

In Aden, meanwhile, the reaction was immediate to the British decision to impose open imperialist rule. The National Liberation Front called for a 24-hour general strike. The Trades Union Congress supported the call.

On October 2 tools were downed in the colony. Demonstrations broke out and violence flared between the British imperialist troops and the masses.

In reprisal, the British jailed hundreds and deported hundreds of others.

Aden is clearly entering another period of bitter conflict with the British overlords and their unctuous Labourite butlers.

#### USE OF NOXIOUS GAS RESUMED IN VIETNAM

When there was a world outcry over the use of noxious gas by the American troops in Vietnam last March, the White House claimed Johnson didn't know about it. The pretense that it was a "mistake" ended October 8 when paratroopers resumed its use, averring that it was "merciful" and would "save American lives."

"A NEW FIELD OF BATTLE" FOR CHE GUEVARA

By Joseph Hansen

At a public presentation of the new central committee of Cuba's Communist party, Fidel Castro announced that Ernesto "Che" Guevara was no longer in the country. He had left earlier in the year for "a new field of battle in the struggle against imperialism."

Castro read a letter from Guevara which he said had been given him on April 1. The international press reported part of the letter, which was datelined Havana, as follows:

"I feel I have completed the duty which the Cuban revolution gave me. I say farewell to you. I give up all my posts as minister in the party, as a major and as a Cuban citizen."

"My only fault has been that I did not understand more fully your great qualities. I am proud of having followed you..."

"Other nations require my services and I must leave you. I leave behind my dearest memories and my most loved ones. I will take the spirit you inculcated in new fields of battle...in the fight against imperialism..."

"I free Cuba of all responsibility. Should my end come elsewhere I will take with me your example..."

Castro did not say why he chose to make the announcement at this particular time. But it was clear enough he could no longer delay it. Only the day before the news had been released that the top leadership of the Cuban Revolution had been reorganized and Guevara's name was not on the list.

Among the significant changes was the name of the party. Formerly the United Party of the Socialist Revolution, it is now the Cuban Communist party. That this is not a reedition of the old Communist party of Stalinist days is clear from the further downgrading of former Stalinist officials, a process that has been going on for some three years. The Political Bureau is solidly Castroite, including Fidel Castro, Raúl Castro, Osvaldo Dorticós, Juan Almeida, Ramiro Valdés, Guillermo García, Sergio del Valle, and Armando Hart.

Leaders of the old Communist party still occupy prominent positions, however. Blas Roca, for instance, is included in the party secretariat. A considerable concession in this direction was the appointment of Isidoro Malmierca as director of Granma, a new daily paper representing a merger of Revolución and Hoy (former Communist party organ).

Malmierca was head of state security throughout the Aníbal

Escalante period. He was one of the most important figures to be removed from office at the time Escalante was ousted because of his systematic efforts to build a personal bureaucratic machine in the party and government. As head of the police, Malmierca joined with Escalante in this effort and hundreds of illegal acts, including arbitrary arrests, were charged against him.

This appointment should serve to assure the Kremlin ideologists that tight control will be maintained over the critical propensities of Cuban journalists, particularly as they might concern Kosygin-Brezhnev.

The overall balance of the reorganization and renaming of the party, however, further emphasizes its independence from the old Stalinist machine, its identity with the activists who carried out the Cuban Revolution, and its commitment to the ideology of revolutionary Marxism.

Where does Che Guevara fit in with all this? There is no really reliable information available. The Cuban government has maintained tight security on this secret.

The bourgeois press, of course, has indulged in considerable speculation about the whereabouts since last April of the man generally regarded up to now as being among the three top leaders of the Cuban Revolution. In recent days it has reported Guevara twice arrested, once in Argentina and once in Peru, only as quickly to kill the rumors as unfounded.

Of the more serious papers, the Paris Le Monde offered the opinion in an October 5 editorial, that it was a case of "revolutionary romanticism"; that Che Guevara "felt ill at ease in a regime that had accepted, more out of calculation than conviction, the principle of peaceful coexistence" and that he simply decided "to seek new fields of struggle."

The New York Times (October 9-10 international edition) was rather staggered, feeling that of the dozen men who survived the Granma landing and got up into the Sierra Maestra with Castro, "he is the first...to desert the leader of the revolution." Adds the Times editorial writer: "To those who knew him, he was the last to be expected to break away." The Times means a personal break with Castro in which Guevara "has now conjured himself away to some still mysterious ultima Thule of revolution somewhere in the world."

The Times continues: "Possibly it is due simply to the fact that his extreme Marxist ideas of the Cuban economy had failed and had been abandoned or changed whenever possible. A further explanation could be that whereas Premier Castro's economic and military needs have forced him into close relations with Moscow, Guevara's leaning was to Peking."

As to that last guess, it is clear that the Times editorial writer has not been doing his home work on the voluminous material coming out of Peking. Guevara has been as conspicuously absent from Peking publicity as all the other top leaders of the Cuban Revolution for a long time. The truth is that the Cuban revolutionists have done their utmost to indicate that within the general framework of revolutionary Marxism, their policy is an independent one, bowing to neither Moscow nor Peking.

In speculating on Guevara's departure for "a new field of battle," four outstanding facts call for consideration. They may offer a clue to the mystery.

The first one is the lengths to which Guevara went in dissociating himself from Cuba. He gave up his government posts, his army connection, his party standing, even his Cuban citizenship. As if this were not enough, he added: "I free Cuba of all responsibility."

It is evident that Guevara is projecting a political course that requires the Cuban government to be demonstrably and even ostentatiously free of all responsibility for his actions. Since it is agreed by all who know him, including his bitterest foes, that whatever he does it will be as a dedicated revolutionist who puts the cause even above his most intimate family ties, why should he have to publicly dissociate himself at all? Shouldn't the Cuban government be proud of being connected with the further revolutionary activities of Che Guevara, one of its principal founders?

The second fact is the line of the declarations made by Guevara during his tour in Africa last spring. These were all designed to advance the colonial revolution, to forge bonds of solidarity between the Latin-American, African and Asian revolutions, and...he struck a few critical notes that evidently caused some fluttering in the doves in Moscow. He spoke about the duty of "the socialist countries" to underwrite the revolution in the underdeveloped countries, not to profit in trade with these countries by taking advantage of their vulnerability on the world market where they must compete with industrially advanced countries, and he advocated handing out arms freely to those who need them in revolutionary struggles.

The third fact is very simple. Upon returning to Cuba after gaining world-wide publicity for his declarations, Guevara did not make another public statement.

It would seem justifiable to surmise that the Kosygin-Brezhnev team lodged a stiff protest in Havana over Guevara's revolutionary declarations in Africa and certain criticisms that had come to their attention.

It would also seem justifiable to conclude that it was decided to make a concession to the Kosygin-Brezhnev team in this matter, for

Cuba is extremely vulnerable under the enormous pressure of the North American imperialist colossus, only ninety miles away, and there is no other source of large-scale and effective material support except the Soviet Union. In relation to this, Castro has followed a most circumspect policy, evidently calculating that if there is to be an error it must be on the side of caution. The security of the Cuban fortress through maintenance of the best possible relations with the Soviet Union has, in fact, been the main axis of his foreign policy.

What happened between Castro and Guevara, we, of course, do not know. The top Cuban revolutionists, in their inner circle, have spoken frankly and often heatedly since they first constituted their team on every problem they faced. This occasion was most likely no exception.

But the incident may have brought out more clearly than ever before, the excruciating dilemma the Cuban revolutionists face. They have no choice but to do everything they can, including making painful concessions, to keep solid ties with the Soviet Union. On the other hand they are well aware that Moscow's policy of "peaceful coexistence" constitutes a grave and standing danger to their revolution. The Cuban Revolution must receive fresh support from other revolutions, above all in the Western Hemisphere, linking up with them within a certain time limit if it is not to suffer eventual defeat. This fundamental need has constituted the frame of reference of Cuban policy in relation to the rest of Latin America. Thus from the very beginning, Havana has appealed without let up to the peoples of Latin America to follow the Cuban example.

Guevara's name has been associated most intimately with the specific Cuban pattern -- guerrilla warfare -- not because his views on this are any different from those of the others, but because he took time to write a manual about it and to picture the Cuban example in detail as a practical way to achieve similar success in other countries where conditions might be propitious. His manual has been absorbed down to the last phrase in more than one guerrilla camp in the great cordillera running from Mexico down through the Andes.

And yet five years have gone by with no new victory. In fact a very grave defeat was suffered through the counterrevolutionary coup d'état that brought Gen. Castelo Branco to power in Brazil in April 1964.

Let us now fit in the fourth fact. This is Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam which began February 7, reaching a bloody crescendo precisely as Guevara returned to Cuba from his Afro-Asian tour. Havana's reaction to the escalation of the Vietnam war was quite different from either Moscow's or Peking's.

The Kosygin-Brezhnev team crawled under the bed. Its protests have not gone an inch beyond permitting students to stage a demonstration in front of the American embassy in Moscow, breaking a few win-

dows. This, along with the hackneyed verbal protests that might be used in protesting the buzzing of a Soviet trawler, were discounted in advance by the Pentagon. In fact, the Kremlin bureaucrats have displayed such an ignominious attitude that the State Department has good grounds for presenting them as having a "common interest" in the escalation of the aggression.

Peking has done better, at least in displaying capacity to scream. Yet Peking, too, has failed to this day to undertake vigorous counteraction. And if it is correct for Mao to bear in mind the vulnerability of China to a nuclear attack in the absence of strong support from Moscow, he has still assiduously refrained from carrying out even the repeated promise to send volunteers -- if needed.

Havana, in contrast, came out very quickly with a suggested course of action calling for the firmest response as the only realistic way to stem the North American imperialist aggression and turn it back. These proposals were advanced by Castro himself in several public declarations; and the Cubans indicated their seriousness by earmarking material aid (shiploads of sugar) for the struggle.

The Cubans realize that not only is the defense of their country involved in Vietnam but that of the whole colonial revolution and all the workers states. Moreover, they can see what is likewise clear to millions of people throughout the world -- Johnson's escalation of the war threatens to end in a nuclear conflict. In brief, the White House has placed the fate of humanity at stake.

To Guevara, above all, it must therefore seem that extraordinary efforts must be made to overcome the setbacks, to reverse the effect of the defeat in Brazil, to move more energetically than ever before to achieve another victory, to bolster the defense of the Cuban Revolution by advancing the world socialist revolution at any point where an opportunity might be found or created.

Is it so extraordinary to conceive a revolutionist like Guevara dedicating himself to personal responsibility in such a course? There is nothing of "revolutionary romanticism" in it at all. It is the same dedication to a great cause that made him a socialist in the first place and which gives meaning to existence for every revolutionary socialist in the world today. Besides, Guevara has taken some of the toughest assignments in the Cuban Revolution, serving as a kind of "troubleshooter" from the start.

Such a decision on his part would automatically require his complete dissociation from the Cuban government, which must of course "coexist" with other governments, including those of completely opposite class character. In particular his activities could not be permitted to endanger relations with Moscow. If our surmise is correct, Guevara's "new field of battle in the struggle against imperialism" is something primarily on the level of revolutionary Marxist party politics, which is internationalist to the core and flatly in

opposition to the dangerously subservient line of the Kremlin and the unimpressive performance of Peking.

It is pointless, in the absence of definite information, to discuss whether this was the best possible move for Guevara --- whether whatever he can do in his new role is not more than offset by the harm of his dropping from public view.

In any case the central political problem facing the Cuban revolutionists, and Guevara's involvement in it, is clear enough. As partisans of their revolution, we can only wish the Cubans well in their heroic efforts to safeguard its conquests and to strengthen their beleaguered fortress; and we hope that Guevara is able to do something effective to counter the passivity of Moscow and Peking, to help make up for the defeats and setbacks of the recent period, to break out of the encirclement and open up the possibility of reversing the headlong plunge taken by North American imperialism toward a nuclear catastrophe.

#### ELECTION DISAPPOINTS BRAZILIAN DICTATORSHIP

The October 3 elections in Brazil, which were carefully staged by the Castelo Branco dictatorship to put a coat of democratic paint on the regime, ended in a decided disappointment for the generals who are running the country. Although all the candidates with a public image that smacked of liberalism were barred from running, the vote was so heavily in favor of the presumed "opposition" candidates who were permitted to run that the results were considered to be proof of complete public repudiation of the regime.

Army circles at once met to consider rolling out the tanks and cancelling the verdict of the polls. Cooler heads prevailed, however, and the candidates for governorships in some of the key states will be permitted to take office, according to the latest word from Castelo Branco.

Despite ferocious witch-hunting and the use of terror on a wide scale, the Castelo Branco regime is finding it hard to achieve stability. It is not difficult to locate the main reason for this.

In the first eight months of this year, the cost of living rose 34%. While this is not as steep as the 85% rate of increase last year, it is sufficient to keep the masses aware of the fact that they are not living in the best of all possible worlds.

A completely new set of union leaders, "elected" under the regulations set up by the generals, have found it necessary to submit wage demands. In a September 11 memorandum to Castelo Branco they said that the costs of the government's anti-inflation program "are



falling exclusively on the economically weakest sector," i.e., the workers.

The metal workers and bank clerks recently announced that they need wage increases of 110% and 75% respectively to meet the jump in the cost of living since the last adjustment.

The national minimum wage scale was recently set at 66,000 cruzeiros (\$35) a month.

#### ASYLUM SOUGHT FOR FRANCISCO JULIAO

Efforts are being made to secure political asylum for Francisco Julião, the leader of the peasant leagues in northeast Brazil, who was temporarily released from prison on a writ of habeas corpus September 27.

Arrested in June 1964 during the nationwide witch-hunt conducted by the Castelo Branco dictatorship, he was held in chains and repeatedly tortured, according to an editorial in the September 4 Paris Le Monde.

The well-known peasant leader is now broken in health and his friends are trying to get him abroad. If they do not succeed, he faces a possible 26-year prison term aside from what might be added to this in several trials he still faces.

Negotiations are now being conducted with Chile, Indonesia and Algeria, according to a dispatch in the October 13 Le Monde.

#### JOB HUNTING DIFFICULT FOR WOMEN IN JAPAN

Women college graduates in Japan face dismal job prospects, according to official reports. Approximately 68,000 coeds and students of women's colleges will graduate next year and 50,000 of them plan to hunt for jobs.

But the prospective number of jobs open to college graduates next year is expected to be only one-half of the present year, a figure already seriously affected by the depression. Of next year's jobs, only about one per cent will be open to women.

Kyoto University, Osaka University and Osaka City University, each of which have about 100 coeds, report that none of them have had jobs promised to them.

Of the 70 coeds at Kansai University, only two are sure of jobs next spring when they graduate.

At Waseda University less than 20 out of 800 coeds have secured promises of jobs after they graduate.

In Tokyo, a publishing firm gave examinations to 1,100 students, including 300 coeds, but only six or seven were accepted for jobs. Of these only one was a woman.

Business firms give various shamefaced reasons for not wanting to hire graduating women students. But a woman employed by an insurance firm indicated the real reason:

"Feudalism is still deep-rooted in the minds of employers here. Even if they find women competent, they still refuse to give them promotion and equal chance with men."

But women in Japan are turning toward new methods of struggle. Home Affairs Minister Tadanori Nagayama reported to the cabinet, for instance, that at the giant demonstration staged in Harumi against the Japan-South Korea treaty September 12, out of the 100,000 people who assembled, as many as 40% were women.

### JUST PLAIN "KOREA," PLEASE

An increasing number of Koreans, resident in Japan, are seeking to have their registration changed from citizens of South Korea to just plain "Korea." The Japanese government is resisting on the grounds that no such country exists.

The move of the Koreans began last March when it became clear that Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam might suck the entire area into a new major conflict. This coincided with the conclusion of a treaty between Japan and South Korea "normalizing" relations. For the Koreans in Japan, this meant they were subjects of the South Korean government, which most of them regard as a puppet creation of the United States.

If they could be listed as citizens of "Korea," however, as was the case before the country was artificially divided in half, they could escape the clutches of the South Korean government. In case of trouble they could always go to North Korea.

The movement spread rapidly when it was widely reported that the South Korean government had decided to send troops to join the American invaders in Vietnam. It was learned that two Korean youths in Japan received draft papers. This stiffened the determination to get out of the South Korean citizenship trap.

## ARGENTINE STUDENTS MOVE TOWARD UNITED ORGANIZATION

The student movement of Argentina took a big step forward when it held the first national meeting of Anti-imperialist and Revolutionary Students [Estudiantes Antiimperialistas y Revolucionarios] in Buenos Aires September 17-19. Thirty-seven different student organizations from colleges throughout the country were represented.

The meeting was called by a coordinating committee set up by student groups in Buenos Aires and La Plata.

The coordinating committee had already begun the work of organizing action in response to the appeal of the Berkeley, California, "Vietnam Day Committee" to stage international demonstrations on October 15-16. This work was given a big boost by the national gathering.

A document on the national situation in Argentina was adopted that outlined the student role in relation to revolutionary activities and the struggle against imperialism. As against the trade-union bureaucracy, the document calls on students to solidarize with the new class-struggle tendencies among the workers and the revolutionary regroupment of forces.

Agreement was reached on starting a discussion concerning differences among the ranks over various questions.

The organization was formally established but it was agreed that for the time being it will serve only to coordinate activities.

Some of the delegates, particularly members of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores [Revolutionary Workers party] favored establishing a permanent organization immediately on the basis of resolutions adopted by majority vote.

Others, however, were evidently not yet ready to take this step. It was agreed therefore to defer this until after further discussion and preparations.

## GENERAL STRIKE IN URUGUAY

A declaration of a "state of siege" by the Uruguayan government October 7 failed to halt a projected 24-hour general strike. The workers went out solidly on a nationwide scale October 13, although they maintained essential services with skeleton crews. The strike was intended to give force to the demand for a general wage increase in the public services of 48%. If this sounds high, the workers are only trying to catch up with prices which rocketed 50% during the first nine months of this year.

SOCIALIST WORKERS CONFEDERATION FORMED IN BELGIUM

By Henri Vallin

Three hundred and fifty delegates, representing all the main cities and industrial areas of Belgium, met in Liège October 10 at the founding congress of the Socialist Workers Confederation. They represented the three organizations -- the Walloon Workers party, the Left Socialist Movement of Brussels, and the Flemish Socialist Movement -- which decided to unite their forces in the struggle for a socialist Belgium on a federal basis that would grant self-determination to the two nationalities living in the country.

The first action of the congress was to respond favorably to an appeal from the Berkeley, California, "Vietnam Day Committee" to join in an international demonstration on October 16 against the U.S. imperialist war in Vietnam.

The great majority of the delegates consisted of youth and factory workers, among them well-known shop stewards and trade-union militants from the Liège metal works, the Charleroi metal and gas plants, the Antwerp and Ostend shipyards, the railway workers and the teachers union.

The presiding committee consisted of Robert Nicolas, of Charleroi, Pierre Le Grève, the Brussels left socialist member of parliament, and Frans Vrancks, chairman of the Louvain federation of the Young Socialists and shop steward at Sabena, the Belgian air lines. Vrancks represented the Flemish wing of the movement.

The main reports were as follows: Marcel Slangen (of the Walloon wing of the confederation) on internal policy and federalism, Van der Borgh (Flemish wing) on foreign policy, and Ernest Mandel, editor of La Gauche on social and economic policy.

The congress adopted a programmatic resolution stating the goal of the party is to overthrow capitalism, replacing it with collective ownership of all the means of production and workers management of all the plants and factories in the framework of a democratically planned economy. The resolution states that this goal cannot be reached except through conquest of power by the working class, international solidarity among the workers, and the international victory of socialism.

The immediate program of action of the Socialist Workers Confederation calls for federalism and anticapitalist structural reforms; namely, nationalization of the banks, insurance companies, all credit outfits, the mines, power plants, oil refineries and gas works, all of these to be placed under workers control.

The program calls for workers control over all important

factories and collective ownership of land used for buildings.

It advocates the 40-hour week with no reduction in weekly pay, four-weeks vacation with double pay, a free national health service, large increases in pensions and social benefits, and so on.

It also demands that Belgium leave NATO and radically reduce military expenditures.

Solidarity is expressed with all the colonial peoples fighting for their freedom as well as with the struggle of the Negro people in the United States for equal rights.

The Belgian daily press, radio and television gave extensive coverage to the congress, handling it as a major political event in the country.

The veteran of Belgian socialism, 94-year-old Camille Huysmans, sent a letter of sympathy to the new confederation and declared his readiness to join it. Huysmans, a Social Democrat all his life, started to move left a few years ago, especially under the impact of the Chinese revolution and in opposition to the rearmament of Germany. He had recently made an extensive tour of China. In his message of sympathy to the congress, he strongly condemned Foreign Minister Spaak for complicity in the war of aggression which U.S. imperialism is waging against the Vietnamese people, and took a firm stand in favor of the Vietnamese and Chinese revolutions.

The October 16 demonstration against the war in Vietnam, which the delegates decided to help organize, is being backed by a number of left-wing organizations. Among them are the Brussels railway workers union, the gas and electricity workers union, the teachers union, the Committee for Struggle against Neocolonialism and Fascism, the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes, the Communist Youth, the Socialist Students, the Communist Students and the Committee for the Antinuclear Demonstration.

The Khrushchevist Communist party, which is participating in the demonstration, wanted to give it a mere pacifist orientation. However, the organizing committee, mainly under the influence of militants belonging to the Socialist Workers Confederation, adopted a radical line and slogans so as to clearly express solidarity with the opponents of the Vietnam war in the United States and with the Vietnamese revolution itself.

#### SWEDES OVERWHELMINGLY OPPOSED TO DIRTY WAR IN VIETNAM

Seven out of eight Swedes are opposed to U.S. policy in Vietnam, the impartial Swedish Institute of Opinion Research announced October 1 after querying 1,056 people representing a cross-section of the society.

OIL INTERESTS HIT A GUSHER IN CEYLONESE RUPEES

By V. Karalasingham

The Petroleum Corporation Act, passed by the Sri Lanka Freedom party [SLFP] government in 1962, vested in the state a monopoly in purchasing, distributing and marketing petroleum. This had previously been the prerogative of three powerful cartels of western imperialism -- Shell, Caltex and Esso.

The law setting up the Corporation also provided machinery for payment of compensation, manner of assessment, mode of payment, etc., to these private enterprises.

In a bill now before parliament, the United National party [UNP] government which succeeded the SLFP government that was headed by Mrs. Bandaranaike, seeks to amend with retroactive effect the clauses relating to the payment of compensation.

It is well known that an important bone of contention between Ceylon and the American and British governments that back the three oil companies was the question of compensation. The law provided for compensation, but the U.S. government opposed the provisions and withdrew its aid program as an act of retaliation.

The oil companies in fact refused to cooperate in carrying out the law, for the simple reason that under its provisions they could not get the fantastic sums claimed by them. They therefore sought a political solution. They adopted dilatory tactics in hope of being able to deal with a government more to their liking. The UNP met the oil company specifications.

No sooner did the UNP take office following its victory in the elections last March, than the oil companies opened direct negotiations to circumvent the law. In a matter of weeks they made a deal on the amount to be paid. But the law remained a stumbling block, since the deal violated its provisions. It is to legalize this shady transaction that the UNP is now seeking to amend the law.

In the case involving an attempted coup d'état in 1962, the UNP made a tremendous noise about the retroactive legislation under which the plotters were condemned last April [see World Outlook April 30]. A few reactionary high army and police officers were involved in that case. This one is different -- the retroactive legislation involves public funds. The amendment would authorize payment of 55,000,000 rupees, which is the equivalent of 80,000,000 rupees [\$16,800,000] if the taxes due are taken into consideration. This would represent a considerable drain on the country's foreign exchange.

This sum was not fixed in relation to the market value of the

assets but arbitrarily by the oil companies, backed by the U.S. government, in negotiation with the UNP government. It was a clear case of the UNP government meeting the dictates of Washington. This is evident both in the size of the compensation and in the failure of the UNP to invoke the provisions of the law. A self-respecting government would have referred the imperialists to the law, but the UNP government, acting as an agent of imperialism, itself nullified the law and now seeks to legalize this illegal act.

The new amendment marks an important breach in the original Petroleum Act. As yet the UNP cannot go as far as it and its patrons, the foreign imperialists, would like. They would certainly desire to give back to foreign private capital the rights which they enjoyed. But political realities in Ceylon compel imperialism to act cautiously for the present. Having made the first breach in the law, they will await a favorable turn of events to press other claims, including "freedom" to sell their oil in Ceylon.

At first this may take the form of selling oil to the Petroleum Corporation, or taking a share in the proposed oil refinery, or the project might be cancelled outright.

The oil companies are interested in Ceylon. High profits are guaranteed. No one knows what the profits were in the years before the holdings of the companies were taken over, but it is now known that the Ceylon Petroleum Corporation made over 30,000,000 rupees last year. That is the bare minimum annual loss to imperialism since the Petroleum Corporation was set up. They will do everything they can to win back this market and the UNP will serve as their agency for reconquering it.

The difference in attitudes between the UNP and the SLFP on this subject expresses the different interests which these parties serve. The UNP is the political party of that section of property owners directly and immediately dependent on imperialism -- land-owners, tea and rubber plantation owners, big merchants representing foreign manufacturing interests. The SLFP represents the capitalists having interests, not mainly in land and plantations, but in the development of a native industry. This necessitates the SLFP playing an oppositional role to imperialism. One manifestation of this oppositional role of the national liberal bourgeoisie was its decision to take over the foreign oil interests.

Ceylon is not the only example of this. One need only to recall the decision of Mossadeq in Iran to nationalise the Anglo-Iranian Petroleum Company or of Nasser in Egypt to nationalise the Suez Canal to realise that the liberal capitalist class of backward countries which bases itself on incipient industrial interest is compelled to take specific measures against specific imperialist interests.

While a Mossadeq or Nasser or Mrs. Bandaranaike can, in cer-

tain conditions, come into isolated conflict with an imperialist power, it would be idle to expect either the Shah, or King Farouk or Mr. Dudley Senanayake to do the same.

### POLICE IN JAPAN TOLD TO GIRD FOR MASS RALLIES

Signs of increasing tension on the Japanese political scene, due to the escalation of the war in Vietnam and an economic depression, continue to mount.

On October 1, for instance, Hiroshi Arai, chief of the country's police, instructed prefectural police chiefs at a national conference in Tokyo to step up their preparations to meet mass rallies being planned in the campaign of unions and radical political parties against ratification of the Japan-South Korea "normalization" treaty.

Depending on developments in Vietnam and the annual drive this fall for wage increases, the head cop said, the antiratification campaigners may incorporate strike action in their drive.

He instructed the local police chiefs to strengthen their stoolpigeon networks and to work out plans to quell all "unlawful" actions in the campaign against ratification of the treaty.

The police chief was particularly alarmed about the tendency of the Socialist party, the Communist party and the giant General Council of Trade Unions of Japan [SOHYO] to unite in common actions. This was occurring, he said, not only against the Japan-South Korea treaty but against the efforts to revise Japan's constitution so as to make it legal to build a modern army and declare war. This showed a growth of Communist "influence," in his opinion, requiring "serious attention."

Meanwhile, on September 30, the powerful Japan Socialist party decided to press for the downfall of the government headed by Prime Minister Eisaku Sato as part of the campaign against the infamous treaty. The central committee of the party also called for dissolution of the Diet.

Chairman Kozo Sasaki told the assembled leadership that the party must make the struggle as broad as possible. It would be necessary, he said, to take up slogans ranging from opposition to the war in Vietnam to advocacy of higher wages and opposition to price hikes.

The proposal was also made to initiate a series of rallies, to begin on October 12.



## THE BLACKPOOL CONFERENCE

London

The annual conference of the British Labour party has no parallel in the labour movement elsewhere in the world. It is a kind of parliament of labour, reflecting a wide cross section of the views, anxieties, disappointments and hopes of the working men and women of Great Britain. Dominated numerically by the trade unions, it is nevertheless the constituency parties which set its political tone. Bureaucratically controlled from the platform, the voice of socialism still speaks from the rostrum and finds echoes in the applause from delegates and visitors.

At the five-day Blackpool conference this year [September 27 to October 1], the delegates faced a real dilemma. For the first time in thirteen years they were meeting under a Labour government. It holds office by the most precarious of majorities, a Labour government whose very existence was threatened almost at birth by an economic crisis inherited from the Tories. The government had survived this, along with the dark threats of international finance capital. But at what cost? It threw overboard much of the programme on which it had won the election. Now the assembled delegates from the trade unions and the Labour parties had to give their verdict on the government's record. They had to approve or disapprove. Disapproval shown in strength would mean a vote of no confidence in the Labour government. It might precipitate a general election, the defeat of Labour and the return to power of the hated Tories. This was the dilemma which faced the delegates.

Harold Wilson and his fellows on the platform were only too well aware of this and they made full use of the situation to fasten their grip on the conference. On the very first day, Chairman Ray Gunter appealed to the traditional loyalties of the movement, sure of receiving the response he wanted. With the platform dominating speaking time, and able to make a judicious selection of speakers to the rostrum, Gunter made sure that the left-wing case received only the minimum opportunity to be presented.

One of the main issues which the conference had to face up to was the relationship between the party and the government. Not for thirteen years had the movement been compelled to face this issue urgently, though there were substantial straws in the wind during the great debates on Unilateral Nuclear Disarmament when the late Hugh Gaitskell claimed autonomy for the Parliamentary Labour party and insisted that it was not bound by conference decisions. This was contested at the time by none other than the present prime minister, who actually fought Gaitskell for the party leadership on this very issue.

Chairman Gunter set the tone when he insisted that while there could be criticism and he even "welcomed this," it must be quite clear that the party could not tell the government what to do.

The full implications of this can be seen when the composition of the national executive committee is examined. Eleven members of the new executive are either members of Wilson's cabinet or else hold other government positions. By the peculiarities of the British constitution, which is governed by convention as much as by law, the rule of unanimity among the members of the government is sacrosanct. Although elected by the conference as the representatives of the rank and file on the highest body of the party, these eleven will actually sit there in a solid bloc, defending every action of the government, no matter how contrary to the will of the conference.

The danger in this is that if Labour has a prolonged term of office, conference will be transformed from a parliament into a sounding board for the views of the government. Delegates will come only to applaud. Annual conference will simply be a massive national rally of the faithful instead of a forum where policy is hammered out and debated.

Four out of the seven elected to the constituency section of the national executive committee owed their places more to their past than to their present. Anthony Greenwood, now presiding as colonial secretary over the bloody suppression of the national liberation movement in Aden; Barbara Castle, doling out relief to the underdeveloped countries as minister of Overseas Development; Richard Crossman and Wedgwood Benn, all received their big support from the constituencies because traditionally they are associated with the left.

There was very real anxiety in the constituencies that if they did not vote for these left-posturing individuals, more hardened right wingers would be elected.

What is significant is that Frank Allaun, a member of parliament and staunch critic of the leadership from the left, running for the national executive committee for the first time, collected 239,000 votes.

Most delegates came to the conference with mandates from their parties on whom to vote for. Given a free hand, the results might have been somewhat different.

The three most important debates at the conference, involving main issues of principle, occurred on the government's income policy, immigration and Vietnam.

One issue which was not debated but which occupied the minds of many delegates was re-nationalisation of the steel industry. Promised in the election programme and again in the Queen's speech at the opening of the last parliament, this was a pointed omission from Wilson's 70-minute review of the government's record.

On the government's income policy, the main discussion took place round the resolution moved by Clive Jenkins on behalf of the

Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians [ASSET]:  
"This Conference disapproves of the proposed legislation to enforce compulsory advance notification of union claims to improve wages, salaries and conditions."

The much more fundamental resolution from the Nottingham West constituency party was not put to the conference. Through a manoeuvre the platform succeeded in shunting it aside. The resolution is nonetheless interesting as a reflection of views in the left wing of the Labour party. The resolution read was as follows:

"This Conference cannot effectively support the Government's present Incomes Policy for the following reasons:

"(a) It does not adequately provide for the badly underpaid sections of the community, and serves only to freeze the existing injustices. Before any beginning is made on the planning of incomes, certain basic principles must be applied, particularly those of equal pay for equal work by women and youths, and the establishment of a guaranteed minimum wage.

"(b) It does not provide for redistribution between social sectors of incomes. A pre-condition of any acceptable incomes policy must be that it takes away from the sector of rentier incomes, and adds to that of wages and salaries.

"(c) It is not underpinned by an adequate level of social welfare provisions. Pensions still need considerable augmentation, in spite of the recent increases.

"(d) It does not adequately control property incomes. Taxation is an inadequate weapon for preventing cheating by employers. Only the complete accountability of every firm to its workpeople can ensure that the policy is being applied to property incomes. Workpeople must, as of right, have access to all their employers' account books, and to such professional aid as is necessary to interpret the data. Wages are already publicly known and administered by the employers and the Inland Revenue, and equity requires that profits be placed in a corresponding position.

"(e) It does not adequately control prices. Conference believes that machinery should be set up to determine prices, as opposed to the present Prices and Incomes Board policy of reviewing decisions already taken unilaterally by business. Such machinery must ensure effective workers' and consumers' participation in the determination of prices.

"(f) Conference is concerned that the incomes policy is not founded on a strategic national plan for the development of planned, publicly owned and democratically administered industry. It will thus tend to benefit private interests rather than thrust forward and defend public priorities.

"In rejecting the incomes policy as it stands, Conference urges the Government to open immediate negotiations with the unions, so that a viable policy can be formulated to meet these objections. If this is done quickly, it may possibly save the Government from a costly and demoralising defeat, and contribute to the rallying of the Labour movement around the Socialist objectives outlined in Clause IV of the Party Constitution."

The ASSET resolution was moved as an emergency resolution in reply to the government's threat to pass legislation which would compel unions to give advance notification of wage claims. As Clive Jenkins pointed out, there was no mention of dividends in the government's proposals. These were an attempt to fetter the trade unions to the state machine.

Although the conference rejected the emergency resolution on a card vote by 3,654,000 to 2,540,000, the fact that Britain's largest union, the 1,750,000-strong Transport and General Workers', as well as the Amalgamated Engineering Union voted against the government on this issue will cause them to think twice before passing such legislation. It could lead to an open conflict between the industrial and political wings of the movement.

But the approval of Wilson's income policy will serve a future Tory government, which will not hesitate to use the precedent in an effort to draw the teeth of the unions.

The left fought strongly against the government's new policy on immigration, a policy of imposing restrictions on coloured immigrants into Britain in direct opposition to Labour's traditional policy on this issue. Although the conference gave its approval to the government's policy, this flouting of the most basic socialist principles is not being lightly accepted by the left.

In the debate, at least one member of the government, Bob Mellish, did not hesitate to appeal to the lowest prejudices; and even some of the supporters of the racist immigrant policy were ashamed at this naked exposure of their hidden motives. Immediately after the debate, a group of members of parliament, led by Reginald Freeson for Willesden East, a constituency with a large immigrant population, issued a statement that they will continue the fight to prevent this shameful piece of legislation becoming law.

Similarly on Vietnam, the platform managed to get a substantial majority in favour of its pro-American line up. But 2,284,000 votes were cast against the government's foreign policy (4,065,000 in favour) and on the side of the freedom fighters in the jungles of Vietnam. A militant stand was taken on this issue by left-wing delegates, Ken Coates of Nottingham making a particularly forceful declaration. The size of the anti-imperialist vote shows a potential force to be reckoned with inside the Labour party. The conference, in fact, was the scene of one more battle in the long-drawn-out fight for a socialist

foreign policy that would ally the great British Labour movement with the freedom movements of Africa, Asia and Latin America instead of the war machine of the Pentagon.

Many delegates left Blackpool with a feeling of frustration. Their old signposts, Greenwood, Castle, Wilson himself, they feel, tricked them into voting for things they do not believe in. They have a Labour government, but a Labour government pursuing, on many issues, the self-same policy as their Tory predecessors. This was not what they had been working for in the constituencies during the thirteen hard years of Tory rule.

This conference revealed the weakness of the left. It was fragmented, disoriented, scattered. But the very impact of the defeats has shown as never before the imperative necessity for the left to reorientate itself. The forces of the left are weak because in the constituencies, trade unions, parliament and in intellectual circles, they are out of touch with each other. They are fighting different battles and in different ways. The left must now unite, select the issues on which it will fight, and organise the fight on a nationwide basis throughout the Labour party and the trade unions.

Wilson and his cabinet colleagues want to go on acting as the executive committee of the ruling class. The left thus has no choice but to replace them with new leaders, leaders who will take the party on the road to socialism. For this the left must now organise so that they are represented in strength when the Labour conference meets again next year.

#### THE NEWSLETTER EXPOSES A CASE OF "INSINCERITY"

By Peter Kork

Reporting the Labour party conference at Blackpool, the October 2 issue of the Newsletter, weekly organ of the Socialist Labour League, revealed a surprising modesty. On a number of key issues, the British Labour movement was sharply divided. It had to face the racial discrimination of the recent White Paper on Immigration Control, the ominous new attacks on trade-union independence which have been bruited by Messrs Wilson, Brown and Gunter, and the quite shocking subordination of Wilson's government to its patrons in Washington, nowhere more clearly revealed than in its scandalous policy in Vietnam.

On all these key issues the British workers found militant spokesmen; and significant minority votes were piled up against the platform of the conference. On Vietnam, 2,284,000 votes were cast against Wilson's endorsement of American policy, the vote in favor being 4,065,000. On the other issues, except for the rights of the

Labour Party Young Socialists, the opposition vote never fell below 1,500,000. The Newsletter reports some of these results, with its usual mixture of shrill self-righteousness and sectarian spleen against other left-wing groupings.

On the question of Vietnam, for instance, much of the opposition to the platform was crystallised around a group of delegates from Nottingham. These left-wing centrists are characterised by the Newsletter as having exposed their "insincerity" in that one of them "congratulated Woodrow Wyatt on his courage." Wyatt is a spokesman of the right, even to Wilson's right in one matter, that he favours a formal alignment with the rump of the once-significant British Liberal party.

Here is what the Newsletter wrote:

"In the debate on the government's record Peter Price (Nottingham) thought fit to congratulate Wyatt for his 'courage', thus rightly raising in everyone's mind just how much 'courage', and resolution lay behind Price's constituency's motion against the war in Vietnam." (Page 4, column 3.)

If one checks the record, one finds, of course, that the Nottingham speaker, Peter Price, said no such thing as that attributed to him. What he actually did was to note Wyatt's courage in a short speech regretting the lack of courage of the former left-wing members of the cabinet, who were allowing themselves to be compromised by supporting totally insupportable policies.

But the Newsletter reveals its love of truth when, in a story in an adjoining column, it indicates that Wilson's road was not altogether smooth in dealing with the Vietnam debate:

"Wilson, replying to the debate, ignored the description of the bloody war by the movers of the resolution, and ignored the question from a Nottingham delegate:

"If you and Stewart were in Vietnam, would you be on the side of the Vietnamese people, or of a South Vietnam prime minister [Cao Ky], who is a great admirer of Adolf Hitler?" (Page 4, columns 5-6.)

What the Newsletter does not say is that the delegate who put this question, scarcely a compromising one, was the same Price who is tendentiously misreported earlier on the same page.

Another important speech was made in the same debate. It was that of the seconder of the critical Vietnam motion, Ken Coates. This speech was a trenchant attack on the American war, defending the fighters of the National Front for Liberation, and showing their affinities with the traditions of the British trade-union and labour movement.

One other newspaper maintained a discreet silence about this speech, which was widely described as the most sharply critical utterance at the conference. It was the Daily Worker, published by the Communist party.

Why was the Newsletter silent on this matter? Was it full of accounts of the interventions of its own supporters at the conference? It was not, for none were made.

If the Socialist Labour League had any delegates present, they maintained a complete and cowardly silence, not only on the issue of Vietnam, but on all other questions of concern to the left as well.

When the SLL was singled out by the right wing for expulsions, Gerry Healy, general secretary of the organization, announced that he would send ten persons back into the Labour party for every one expelled by the bureaucrats. If he did, there would be a lot of his followers at this crucial Blackpool conference.

Why were they so quiet? What subtle opportunist course were they pursuing? Is not the "sincerity" of the SLL's ultraleft ranting gravely questioned by this unseemly docility?

### THE ECONOMICS OF NEOCAPITALISM

[The following article, reviewing an essay by Ernest Mandel published in Cuba, appeared in two parts in Revolución, the daily Havana newspaper which was recently combined with Hoy in a new publication, Granma. The first part was published September 25, the second September 29. The author of the article is Raúl Roa Kouri.]

\* \* \*

#### I.

The critics of capitalism -- and still more so the Marxists -- cannot fail to note the high economic level it reached in the decade from 1954 to 1964, and particularly among the countries of Western Europe and Japan. Ernest Mandel, a well-known Belgian socialist, author of numerous essays and books on Marxist economics, analyzes the phenomenon in an essay entitled, "La economía del neo-capitalismo."

The growth of the capitalist economy since the second world war, declares Mandel, cannot be explained solely on the basis of reconstruction activities, although these were an important base of the industrial boom in Western Europe. From the point of view of the history of "economic cycles," we are undergoing a new "Kondratiev," i.e., a long-term wave which includes various normal cycles.

Today it appears -- contrary to what many economists assumed in the thirties and forties -- that after the long-range cycle of stagnation that began in 1913 and ended in 1939, world capitalism entered a new cycle of accelerated growth in 1940, which will probably last until the end of the sixties, according to Mandel.

On the other hand, one of the salient features of contemporary capitalism is the existence of a movement of technical innovations -- generally known under the name of the "third industrial revolution" -- which has a tendency to be permanent, something without precedent in the history of capitalism. Its origin is precisely in the armaments race.

Traditionally, a technological innovation does not immediately follow a technological invention; on the contrary, many inventions are not utilized until the complete exhaustion of the current technological processes and the investments in fixed capital which they involve. However, the armaments race has reduced the interval between the time of a technological invention and its industrial application. The acceleration in the use of technological innovations has likewise reduced the duration of the economic cycle from 8-10 years to 4-5 years. For Marx, the length of the economic cycle depended mainly on the time utilized to renew the investment in fixed capital. With the growing utilization of technological innovations, the time has been reduced to almost half.

In the opposite direction, if the rate of technological innovations should diminish, as a result of partial disarmament, for example, the "life" of investments in fixed capital would tend to be prolonged and the economic cycles would slow down. According to Mandel, there are indications -- not fully confirmed -- that this has actually happened in the United States since the economic recession of 1960-61.

If the history of capitalism has always been dominated by the law of unequal development between countries, regions within the same country, and between industry and agriculture, today it is necessary to center attention on the unequal development of the various branches of industry in each country. In the case of the U.S. this appears in the weak growth of the traditional sectors (steel, coal, textiles) and the enormous expansion of such sectors as chemicals, electronics and electricity. It is precisely the demand generated by the industries of a high rate of development that explains the high level of expansion in the majority of the imperialist countries.

## II.

Neocapitalism, according to Ernest Mandel, is the new modus operandi of the capitalist system, the distinctive features of which flow from the organic necessities of capital itself, as well as the attempts made by the system to counteract the world development of the anticapitalist forces of the socialist camp and the national



freedom revolutions.

These can be summarized in four fundamental characteristics: (1) The growth of technological innovations and the shortening of the "life" of investments in fixed capital impose the need to carry out exact calculations on depreciation and obsolescence, as well as better planning of long-range costs. (2) The "third industrial revolution" produces greater disparity between productive capacity and effective demand in the "market," thereby inducing a constant rise in sales costs which reduces surplus-value.\* (3) The need to prevent a crisis like that of 1929 has resulted in greater state intervention in the capitalist economy -- the state now guaranteeing the profits of private enterprises, directly or indirectly, through more or less disguised subsidies going so far as "nationalization of the losses." (4) The combination of these factors leads to the gradual introduction of "planning" (or, better, programming) in capitalist economy, serving in a certain sense to "rationalize" the investment of capital.

Although the majority of these "plans" contain considerable errors in forecasting and have not prevented the creation of excess capacity on a big scale, it would be futile, according to Mandel, to deny its usefulness to the big monopolies. If the successes of neocapitalism appear brilliant, to judge by the results of the last decade, its internal contradictions -- which are superimposed on the general contradictions of the capitalist mode of production -- are already giving trouble.

In the first place, as neocapitalism generates a higher rate of growth, in such a way as to amortize fixed capital more rapidly, it also tends to reduce the industrial reserve army and to create conditions of full employment. Thus it destroys one of the basic mechanisms of the capitalist system, creating a growing contradiction between the needs of neocapitalist programming and the pressure of the working class for constant wage increases.

To resolve this contradiction, neocapitalism has practiced two kinds of economic and political solutions: (a) the massive application of automation in order to reconstitute the industrial reserve army, and (b) the imposition of restrictions on the working class, such as the suppression\*\* of the right to strike (Taft-Hartley Act in the U.S.; antistrike laws in France; fines, etc.).

---

\*The Cuban author makes a theoretical mistake here. A rise in sales costs does not reduce the amount of surplus-value, but only the amount of industrial profits. -- Editor.

\*\*This again is a mistake by the Cuban author. The correct term should be "limitation of the right to strike." -- Editor.

This policy, declares Mandel, despite its favorable short-run effects, tends to be self-defeating for the system.

A massive increase in fixed equipment, financed by means of a considerable increase in profits, cannot help but result in an extraordinary growth in the productive capacity of society, including consumer goods, which, in the long-run, comes into conflict with a reduction in buying power due to the stagnation in wage levels and jobs.

These contradictions indicate, in addition, that the present rate of capitalist growth cannot be kept up after the present decade.

### IN THE AFTERMATH OF WATTS

The revolt in the Watts ghetto of Los Angeles last August continues to reverberate in the United States. Most surprising to many people -- although it is not at all surprising to revolutionary socialists -- is the new sense of human dignity which it has given those who participated in it.

Bobbi Hollon, a young sociologist working for the Westminster Neighborhood Association in Watts, described this to Dick Schaap of the New York Herald Tribune [October 2-3 European edition]:

"People here used to be ashamed to say they came from Watts. They used to mumble it. Now they say it with pride. This started during the riots."

In her opinion, "The riots are one of the best things that ever happened in Watts." They helped create a "real sense of human dignity."

Miss Hollon said she is against "instigating violence, but I'm not for turning the other cheek either...that whole Christian bit has been used against Negro people too long....The people here tried legal means of getting help, and they got nothing. They begged the white people to listen to them, and nobody listened. Now the whole world is listening to Watts. I'm glad the riots happened. I'm glad to see anything happen that can make this whole thing better. And people are making a serious mistake if they think the riots are over."

Miss Hollon, who grew up in Harlem, said: "I'll do anything I can to help here, with the kids, with their mothers, anything to give them some pride. I'll be fine and foxy if I have to be. Or I'll be articulate. Or I'll wear pants and bloody sneakers. I'll be any one I have to be. But I won't forget who I am -- I'm just a little black girl."

CIVIL-RIGHTS FIGHTERS MAKE IT ANOTHER LONG HOT SUMMER

By Evelyn Sell

Another long hot summer of civil-rights crises in the United States is now over. With the coming of the cooler winds of fall, it is possible to more fully assess the failure of the Johnson administration's attempts to avert civil-rights explosions. We can, also, better understand the current demonstrations which had their beginnings during the long hot summer of 1965.

The Johnson administration frantically tried to dampen the fires of the continuing Freedom Now struggle by throwing out some crumbs to the black masses: the Civil Rights Act of 1965, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, free classes for preschool-age children from the Northern and Southern ghettos, special employment programs for Negro youth, "War on Poverty" projects designed to lull people into sitting back and keeping quiet and letting the federal government run things.

The capitalist newspapers did their part to aid the administration's campaign. News of civil-rights activities were greatly played down and lying stories about "progress" and "easing of tensions" were played up. For example, the August 4 Detroit Free Press printed an article by Edwin A. Lahey, chief of the paper's Washington bureau, which started: "Six-and-a-half weeks of a thirteen week season are behind us. And if the roof doesn't fall in while this article is in transmission, the racial tension in the summer of 1965 is certainly much less than it was a year ago...The Community Relations Service, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and headed by former Gov. Collins of Florida until he became Undersecretary of Commerce, has done heroic work behind the scenes to break down the barriers of prejudice, and to head off tension before it develops."

The plain truth, however, was that tensions were building up and exploding across the nation throughout the summer. The Freedom Now activities and the police brutality in Americus, Georgia, for example, were duplicated in many Southern areas during the long hot months of June, July and August. A brief description of what happened in Americus gives some idea of the summer's activities -- despite all the Johnson administration could do.

On July 20 four Negro women attempted to vote and were arrested because they were standing in a "whites only" line. Hundreds of Negroes marched through the streets of Americus in protest against these arrests. Daily protest demonstrations and an all-night vigil in front of the county courthouse were a part of the mounting Negro offensive against all forms of segregation and inequality. A 24-hour moratorium on demonstrations was called on July 28 when a white youth was shot and killed by gunfire from a passing car. Two Negroes, Eddie Will Lamar and Charlie Lee Hopkins, were arrested for the fatal

shooting.

Riot-trained state troopers were brought in to enforce the suspension of civil-rights demonstrations. When Negroes had complained of whites throwing bottles and rocks at them, the state troopers were not brought in; but as soon as a white was hurt, Southern "respect for law and order" suddenly came to the surface!

On July 30 the four Negro women, whose arrests had touched off the almost continuous demonstrations, were released from jail. That day demonstrations began again in celebration of the release of the women. Further concessions were demanded from local officials. The next day, July 31, whites attacked Negro and white civil-rights demonstrators picketing a supermarket. State troopers stood by and watched while civil-rights workers were being beaten. One Negro boy was helped away from the picket line with blood spurting from his head. One of the Negro girls shouted at the state troopers, "Are you going to stand by and just watch this brutality?" After a while the troopers did intervene -- not against the white toughs, however. The troopers escorted the demonstrators back into the Negro district.

The situation became more critical with each passing day. County Ordinary (judge) Eugene Horne reported that 30 permits to carry pistols had been issued to whites and then added, "People here are going to defend themselves and their rights." On August 2 the police arrested 23 civil-rights workers on "trespassing" charges when they picketed a grocery store. Georgia Governor Carl Sanders appealed to the demonstrators to halt their activities.

"I am asking them publicly," said the governor, "that they allow the whole question of violation of rights to be determined by local officials and local citizens." The same local officials and citizens who had been involved in the arrests and beatings, no doubt.

On August 3 a grand jury indicted the two Negroes charged with shooting of the white youth. That night some 300 civil-rights demonstrators marched to the courthouse and held an outdoor rally. Judson Ford, an official of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference [SCLC], spoke to the cheering crowd. "You know what they call us in Savannah (Georgia)? White folks straighteners," Ford said. When a group of hostile whites made a move toward the audience, Ford called out, "You better think twice or maybe three times; because we're ready."

The next day Negro and white civil-rights workers staged a sing-in on the lawn of the county courthouse to reinforce their demands for a biracial committee to work on local segregation problems. County Attorney Warren C. Fortson began to organize such a biracial committee -- and because of this very moderate action he and his family were hounded out of Americus by racists. The Fortsons received threats against their lives; white townspeople refused to have any social contact with them; Fortson was ousted from his posi-

tion of Sunday school teacher at the First Methodist Church and the county hired another law firm to handle its legal work.

After 17 days of almost continuous demonstrations, the civil-rights forces were able to claim a small victory in one area. On August 6 the chairman of the County Board of Registrars named three Negro voting clerks and immediately registered 97 Negro voters. Some white leaders told reporters privately that the move was due to the new federal voting law and "the desire to get this thing [the city's racial crisis] over." "This thing" was far from over, however.

On August 8 police arrested 22 Negroes and whites who were trying to integrate two churches. Later that same day about 700 Ku Klux Klansmen and their sympathizers staged a march and rally in downtown Americus. The Klan's top official, Imperial Wizard Robert Shelton, told the rally, "It's the white man against the Negro." Several hours later more than 300 civil-rights marchers held a rally at the courthouse. Negro leader Willie Bolden told the crowd, "As of now we're not pleading for freedom, we're gonna take it."

It was situations like this in Americus that gave weight to Martin Luther King's warnings during the latter part of the summer. On August 4 King summed up his tour of major Northern cities by saying that Negroes forced to live in slums with poor schools and no jobs feel they have nothing to lose. "These are the people who will riot," King warned. "They see life as a long and desolate corridor with no exit sign." He stated that "Chicago is the most ghettoized city in this country."

And the situation in Chicago was boiling furiously toward an explosion all summer long. While the nation's newspapers were exulting over "the massive desegregation" of Southern schools brought about by the 1964 Civil Rights Act, civil-rights demonstrators in Chicago were protesting de facto segregation in a school system which had been legally desegregated for many years. During May civil-rights workers called a five-day boycott of the city's public schools in order to protest the reappointment of School Superintendent Benjamin C. Willis. Willis had been under long and heavy attack because of the discriminatory policies within the Chicago school system. Successful school boycotts had already been held involving 250,000 children in 1963 and 172,000 in 1964.

The new boycott and a large march on city hall took place on June 10. During the first six days of the series of protests there were three rallies, one prayer meeting, four marches on city hall and a total of 525 persons arrested. Albert A. Raby, head of the Coordinating Committee of Community Organizations which was organizing the protests, stated: "We're demonstrating for the same reason in Chicago as they are in Jackson, Mississippi -- against the basic injustice of our society."

Chicago's Mayor Daley was a special target of the civil-rights

forces. The mayor's home was picketed a number of times and when he arrived in Detroit for the National League of Cities Convention he was greeted by four carloads of pickets from Chicago reinforced by civil-rights activists in Detroit. Inside Detroit's Cobo Hall, Mayor Daley sat and listened to reports about "the peaceful summer" created by biracial committees. He heard fellow mayors cheerfully say that "improved communications in big cities was the main reason the long hot summer of racial strife has not materialized."

Both Mayor Daley and Los Angeles Mayor Samuel Yorty left the cheerful reports at the convention to face grim reality in the streets of Chicago and the Watts district. On August 13 the tense situation in Chicago was set ablaze when a Negro woman was accidentally struck and killed by a fire truck. What followed was described as "the worst racial rioting here in 13 years." The targets of the Negroes' fists, bottles and stones were: the hated police whose brutality has claimed many black victims, the stores of white businessmen who have long exploited the residents of the ghetto, and the fire station which served as an ever-present symbol of Jim Crow practices because it was manned by an all-white crew in the heart of a black residential district.

The three-day explosion in Chicago was far over-shadowed by the week-long rebellion in the Los Angeles ghetto of Watts. The events in Chicago and Los Angeles were the exclamation points to a whole summer of intense civil-rights activity marked by violence and death. The carefully planted articles about "the peaceful summer" and "the easing of racial tensions" were clearly and definitively halted by the residents of Watts who shouted so loud the whole world could hear, "This is the Negro revolution, we want the world to know."

The summer-long conspiracy of cheerfulness was shattered. The failure of the Johnson administration's gimmicks was exposed. Although the progress of the Freedom Now struggle is uneven, now rising and now falling, and the victories are offset by the stratagems of the racists, the struggle continues and the demands reach farther and farther into the heart of the capitalist system which breeds inequality and violence. The heat of the long hot summer of 1965 is giving a fever headache to the insecure rulers of the United States.

#### SOMETHING NEW TO WORRY ABOUT

Worldwide contamination of the environment by lead from motor gasoline is reported by the National Science Foundation to have reached "alarming" proportions. The level of the poisonous metal in the blood of the average American has risen to half that required to produce obvious symptoms such as disruption of the central nervous system. More subtle effects at current levels might be "impairment of thought processes." This appears to have already become quite general among ruling circles in a lot of countries besides the U.S.

HOW TROTSKY DEFENSE COMMITTEE WAS ORGANIZED

[The following hitherto unpublished correspondence between George Novack, who was National Secretary of the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky, and A.V.N. van Woerden, at present the administrator of the International Review of Social History, published in Amsterdam, is of unusual interest because of the new facts it brings to light concerning the organization of the defense of Trotsky against the infamous charges levelled against him by Stalin in the Moscow frame-up trials of the thirties. The correspondence also shows how difficult it is even at this late date to get a fair hearing for Trotsky in publications that are presumably dedicated to ascertaining the truth about past events.]

\* \* \*

July 10, 1965

Editorial Secretary  
International Review of Social History  
Amsterdam, Holland

Dear Sir:

My attention has been called, somewhat belatedly, to the article by Dr. M.S.Venkataramani on "Leon Trotsky's Adventure in American Radical Politics, 1935-7" published in Vol. IX-1964-Part 1 of the International Review of Social History.

As National Secretary of the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky during those years, I should like to bring forward some facts based on my recollections which contravene the version of these events advanced by the author.

His thesis may be summarized as follows: Trotsky wanted support from American liberals, and above all from Norman Thomas, the head of the Socialist Party, to expose the Moscow Trial frameups. He urged James P. Cannon, the U.S. Trotskyist leader, to effect entry of his forces into the Socialist Party "as a deliberate, cold-blooded maneuver to bring into existence an international commission for the investigation of Stalin's charges." Cannon carried through this scheme at Trotsky's behest and under his directives. Thomas was instrumental in obtaining asylum for Trotsky in Mexico and forming the Dewey Commission of Inquiry which later found Trotsky and his son Sedov innocent. This mission accomplished, Trotsky then ordered Cannon to wreck and quit the Socialist Party which Cannon dutifully did.

Apart from its implausible political and psychological assumptions, this misinterpretation disregards some fundamental facts connected with the problems of securing a safe refuge for the Russian revolutionist and the origins of the Dewey Commission. Since I played

a pivotal role in these two developments, I feel obliged to set the historical record straight in regard to them.

In the eleven years between his expulsion from the Soviet Union in 1929 and his assassination in 1940, Trotsky lived in constant insecurity and peril. The most accurate and authoritative account of this period is given by Isaac Deutscher in The Prophet Outcast which was published after Dr. Venkataramani's paper was completed.

Trotsky's situation became highly precarious when he was forced to live incognito and move from place to place in the crisis-torn France of 1934-35. This caused considerable concern to his followers and admirers. The organ of the American Trotskyists, the Militant, on April 21, 1934, stated that a chorus of Russian White Guards, French fascists and Stalinists was demanding Trotsky's deportation by the French government and it called for launching a campaign to secure his asylum in the United States.

In accord with this appeal and in agreement with the leadership of the newly-formed Workers Party to which I belonged, early in 1934 I took the initiative in organizing a committee of prominent intellectuals to work for the admission of the hounded exile into the United States. Quincy Howe, then editor of The Living Age and today editor of Atlas magazine, was chairman and the most active liberal member of this American Committee for Asylum for Trotsky. I cannot now recall whether or not Norman Thomas joined its list of sponsors.

Through Morris Ernst, General Counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union and a friend of the Roosevelt family, we sought to sound out President Roosevelt on the chances of White House approval for an application for a Trotsky visa. Roosevelt turned down our overture, presumably, among other reasons, because his State Department did not care to disturb the diplomatic honeymoon with Moscow following Washington's recognition of the Soviet Union. Thereupon our Committee tried without success to get some other country in the Western hemisphere to open its doors to Trotsky.

The American Committee was discontinued and remained dormant after the newly-installed Labor government admitted Trotsky to Norway in 1935. It was reactivated and reorganized following the first Moscow Trial and execution of Zinoviev and Kamenev in August 1936 when Trotsky was interned and refused a renewal of his stay by the Norwegian government under pressure from the Kremlin's ambassador.

In addition to seeking a new asylum for the jailed and gagged Trotsky, the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky assumed the second aim of joining with similar forces in other countries, such as France and England, to set up an international commission of inquiry into the charges against Trotsky in the Moscow Trials. This would enable the principal accused to answer the accusations against him and present evidence refuting them.



The activity of both committees was carried on without any special reference to or dependence upon Norman Thomas or the Socialist Party. This does not mean that the attitude of the Socialist Party or its most prominent figure was a matter of indifference to the organizers or officers of the Committee. They were eager to secure cooperation from these quarters.

I recall that some members of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party were reluctant, for various reasons (among them pressure from Communist Party elements) to endorse the purposes of the Trotsky Defense Committee. In November 1936 Max Shachtman, James Burnham and I went as a delegation to the N.E.C. meeting in Philadelphia to press for its official endorsement of our Committee. This was voted with some dissenting voices.

During these months Norman Thomas did assist the Committee, though not in any leading capacity. The negotiations with President Cardenas which resulted in the granting of a Mexican visa to Trotsky were initiated by the well-known writer Anita Brenner, a member of our Committee, and concluded by Diego Rivera who made a special trip into the interior of Mexico to persuade Cardenas to approve Trotsky's admission to his country.

The telegram signed and sent by Norman Thomas and others to the Mexican President was part of our Committee's effort to spur action by his government. It proved effective and the Norwegian government hustled the Trotskys aboard a tanker which arrived in Tampico on January 9, 1937. There Max Shachtman and I met the exiles who were free, for the first time in six months, to speak to the world.

Although we discussed the project at length with Trotsky after his arrival, very little was done to organize an International Commission of Inquiry even after the Second Moscow Trial of Piatakov, Radek and others January 23-30, 1937. Trotsky became very impatient at the inertia of the American Committee and in March sent a vehement letter to New York insisting that the Commission be established without further delay. Under his prodding the executives of the American Committee intensified their efforts to assemble the personnel, raise the finances, and organize a subcommittee to go to Mexico to hear Trotsky's testimony.

At this critical juncture the principal liberal and left figures involved were not Norman Thomas, as Dr. Venkataramani pictures it, but the philosopher John Dewey and Professor Sidney Hook. We had asked Charles Beard, the foremost American liberal historian, to serve on the Commission but he declined. Dewey at first demurred but reconsidered. After an intervention by Sidney Hook and an interview with James Cannon and me, he agreed to serve as Chairman of the Commission and leave early in April for Mexico City. This despite his family's objections due to his age.

If any individuals are to be singled out at this point, a far more important part in helping to organize the Commission was played by Sidney Hook than by Norman Thomas. Prof. Hook was an intermediary in the fusion of the American Workers Party with the Trotskyist Communist League in 1934, in the entry of the Workers Party into the Socialist Party in 1936, and in persuading Dewey to undertake his key role on the International Commission of Inquiry in 1937.

I do not wish to derogate the honorable role that Norman Thomas did play throughout this period in cooperating with others to get at the truth about Stalin's monstrous frameups. However, it was not the central and crucial role assigned him by Dr. Venkataramani. This may be necessitated to buttress his erroneous thesis that "an American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky had been established and Norman Thomas' active membership in it was deemed vitally important by the Trotskyists." But that does not correspond to the actual circumstances in the case.

The American Committee had been set up in 1934 long before Trotsky or Cannon had any thought or plan of entering the Socialist Party. And while those responsible for the Committee's operations welcomed and received support from the Socialist Party and its leader, they were not at any time guided by the consideration that this was so "vitally important" as to shape and direct its work.

The tasks of establishing the truth about Stalin's frameups undertaken by the Trotsky Committee, and the Commission of Inquiry it helped bring into being, were of immense political and historical importance and have been thoroughly vindicated by the passage of time. They could not have been, and were not, inspired by petty factional motives and maneuvers as Dr. Venkataramani would have us believe.

\* \* \*

September 6, 1965

Mr. George Novack

Sir:

Thank you very much for your interesting letter of July 10. As the post of Editorial Secretary of the "International Review of Social History" was abolished on July 1, 1964, I shall have to answer you.

The contents of your letter are very interesting indeed, and we should be glad to communicate them to the readers of our journal, if Dr. Venkataramani's paper had not been published so long ago.

In any case, the Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis will file your letter into their archives as an essen-

tial contribution to the study of Trotsky and Trotskyism.

Sincerely yours,

A.V.N. van Woerden

Administrator,  
"International Review of  
Social History"

\* \* \*

September 21, 1965

Mr. A.V.N. van Woerden, Administrator  
International Review of Social History

Dear Sir:

I must protest your refusal to publish my letter of July 10, 1965, correcting the distorted version of the motives for forming the Dewey International Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials given by Dr. Venkataramani in your journal.

As Secretary of the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky from 1935 to 1938, I was perhaps better situated than any other living person to know the real facts in this matter. However Dr. Venkataramani did not communicate with me to obtain them while he undertook his research for his article in the United States. I therefore feel as equally obligated to defend Trotsky's role and reputation from deformation in this case after his death as during his lifetime.

I am surprised that the International Review of Social History should file away my corrected account of the real situation on the pretext that Dr. Venkataramani's paper was published so long ago. As its name indicates, your publication is not a newspaper but an historical review seeking the whole truth about past events.

Your esteemed journal has the reputation of treating the most disputed historical events in the labor and socialist movement fairly and impartially. Your decision to withhold my testimony, after publishing Dr. Venkataramani's opinion, is completely inconsistent with your policy.

I therefore hope you will reconsider your refusal and find space in a forthcoming issue for my brief contribution to the clarification of one of the most important episodes in contemporary revolutionary history.

Sincerely yours,

George Novack

\* \* \*

Sept. 23, 1965

Mr. George Novack

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your letter. I regret that the editorial board of the "International Review of Social History" cannot go back from its decision not to publish your letter. I think the decision as to what is consistent with our editorial policy should be better left to us; anyhow, it has never been our custom to publish highly political criticisms two years after date.

I trust that your criticism will be inserted in some American periodical, with or without an additional criticism of our policy, but I do hope that by looking into the previous volumes of the "International Review of Social History" you will better realize what a scholarly journal is like and what not.

Sincerely yours,

A.V.N. van Woerden,  
Administrator,  
"International Review  
of History"

APPEAL FOR STRUGGLE AGAINST GREEK MONARCHY

[The following is a translation of a declaration issued and distributed by the International Communist Party (Trotskyists), the Greek section of the Fourth International, during the recent turbulent events in Greece.]

\* \* \*

To the Workers, Peasants, Students  
To All Working People

Brothers,

Our party hails the superb struggle of the popular masses and our invincible youth against the united front of reaction headed by the palace which threatens the most elemental democratic rights of the people and the semifreedom won in the political and trade-union fields.

After two previous royal cabinets were toppled, the court circle of social parasites and enemies of the people is now trying for the third time with its antidemocratic, provocative Stephano-

poulos cabinet. It counts on some windbag deputies of the Center Union, willing to sell their souls for a cabinet post.

Representing the palace, big capital and American imperialism, the new government obviously aims at the following:

- To undertake dictatorial, fascist measures in order to throttle mass struggles, and liquidate the last vestiges of the trade-union and political freedoms of the working people.
- To lower the standard of living of the masses through starvation wages.
- To impose the junta of Makris and his henchmen on the trade unions in order to tighten the bonds on the working class.
- To crush the democratic political organizations of the people and the youth, particularly the Lambrakis movement.
- To overthrow the Makarios government in Cyprus and impose the NATO solution to the Cypriot problem.
- To send troops to participate in the dirty war in Vietnam and to recruit more for the imperialist warfronts of tomorrow.
- To suppress and enslave the Greek people by setting up a neofascist police regime and setting in motion the gangs of fascists and followers of ERE [National Radical Union].
- To reinstate in power the hated ERE, which was condemned by the people's votes, maneuvering it in through the back door. In parliament the ERE will support the center-right Stephanopoulos "government" until the ERE is ready to take over again either through a "royal decree" or elections of the 1961 Dovas' kind.

The main lever of the conspiracy against the people is the THRONE, the most feudalistic, reactionary, degenerate institution of bourgeois rule in Greece. The THRONE was formerly the most faithful servant of British and German imperialism; today its allegiance is to American imperialism. In prewar days the THRONE backed the Metaxas fascist dictatorship. Now, after the phony referendum of 1946, it has become the symbol of the counterrevolution.

The Greece of the working people, the suppressed and exploited masses and the militant, progressive youth understands the reactionary role of the palace and the king today. Hence the growing strength of the battle cry, "Down with the monarchy! Referendum!"

The "democratic" supporters of the throne seek to counteract this growing antiroyalist feeling among the broad masses. Although the throne ousts elected governments, the bourgeois democratic politicians like Papandreou and Co. claim that it is not the fault of the

king and the royal institution. They lay the blame on the king's "bad counselors." They demand improvement of the "Royal Democracy." In this way they help bolster the court, which hates and fears the people and bans freedoms "guaranteed" by the constitution.

This policy seeks to spread confusion among the masses by getting them to argue, "Who is guilty, the king or his counselors?" The leadership of the EDA [United Democratic Left] has fallen in with this game, demanding of all things, "Democratize the Palace!" The Greek dynasty has resisted being democratized for 130 years; will it listen now to the sage advice of Papandreou and Iliou? Today when peoples all over the world are overthrowing the thrones and regimes that exploit them?

But the masses are wiser than their thick-headed leaders. Through class instinct and experience they understand how false it is to demand, "Democratize the Palace!" In their meetings and demonstrations they seek an end to the monarchy.

We, the Greek revolutionists, the Greek Trotskyists, have been saying from the beginning: We are with the big majority of the working people who are struggling against the king and shouting, "Down with the monarchy! Referendum!"

The working class, the poor peasants, all the exploited people in the towns and countryside, above all the working and student youth, are struggling intransigently against the throne. In this way they face the traditional mass leaderships with a crucial issue: Either with the king against the people; or with the people against the throne and with their demand, REFERENDUM.

\* \* \*

Workers, Peasants, Students!

No political maneuver can succeed in changing the situation. The degeneration is too deep. It extends to the very base of the regime. Only firm, unyielding and continuous struggle by the masses for political and trade-union freedom, for economic demands, can open the road to victory over the reactionary front of the palace, the neofascist right, big capital, the military clique and American imperialism. Join in an invincible UNITED FRONT of the working people of the towns and countryside. Participate in every popular movement, meeting, demonstration against the royal government of Stephanopoulos, against the ERE and the throne. Oppose the compromises and political maneuvers of the bourgeois democratic politicians. Condemn the opportunism of the EDA leadership. Defend democracy in your meetings. Build your own organs of struggle: Combat Committees in the shipyards, workers areas, in the villages.

Only the continuous and united struggle of all the working people to improve our standard of living can overcome misery and

enslavement.

Only intransigent, united and continuous struggle for our trade-union and political freedoms (systematically curtailed by all the bourgeois "democratic" governments and under threat of liquidation by the royal government) can overcome the danger of a royal authoritarian dictatorship with or without a "parliamentary façade."

Long live our unyielding militant people!

Down with the monarchy!

Free Elections! Referendum! Constituent Assembly!

Oust the trade-union junta!

Demand a 30% increase in workers wages!

Hands off our Lambrakis youth!

Long live the united front of workers, peasants, students!