

a labor press service

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 8

March 25, 1966

In this issue

Page

Johnson's Favorite Puppet in Trouble . . . . .	1
Frei Attacks Castro Over Strikes in Chile . . . . .	3
Castro Again Scores Mao Tse-tung . . . . .	4
Underground Revolutionary Publication in the USSR . . . . .	6
Stalin's Role Debated on Eve of Congress . . . . .	7
Nerve Gas Shakes Colorado Rockies . . . . .	9
No Imperialist Strings Attached? . . . . .	10
Wilson Expected to Win Despite His Record . . . . .	
-- by John Walters . . . . .	11
Boumedienne Tells Algerian Women They Have Already Won . . . . .	13
Algerian Trade Unions Uneasy about Bourgeois Forces . . . . .	14
Iranian Socialists Call for Protests in Teheran Case . . . . .	16
Iranians Appeal Sentences . . . . .	18
In Lagos During the Coup d'Etat . . . . .	18
Pierre Frank Speaks in London . . . . .	
-- by Brian Gormley . . . . .	21
West Germany Underwrites Steel Mill for China . . . . .	22
In the Soup . . . . .	23
Student Youth Rebel Against French CP Bureaucrats . . . . .	23
Students Demonstrate Against Brazilian Dictator . . . . .	25
Deep-Going Changes in Zanzibar . . . . .	26
Socialist Youth in U.S. Report Encouraging Growth . . . . .	27
Documents:	
An Appeal to the American Soldiers in Vietnam . . . . .	29

## JOHNSON'S FAVORITE PUPPET IN TROUBLE

President Johnson's favorite puppet, the sleek, oily, Hitler-loving General Ky, succeeded in providing fresh evidence of the instability and weakness of his regime when he tried to jerk the rug from under Lieut. Gen. Nguyen Chang Thi on March 10. If the operation was not directly inspired by Ky's "advisers," including the very top

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

# WORLD OUTLOOK

## PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 8

March 25, 1966

In this issue

Page

Johnson's Favorite Puppet in Trouble . . . . .	1
Frei Attacks Castro Over Strikes in Chile . . . . .	3
Castro Again Scores Mao Tse-tung . . . . .	4
Underground Revolutionary Publication in the USSR . . . . .	6
Stalin's Role Debated on Eve of Congress . . . . .	7
Nerve Gas Shakes Colorado Rockies . . . . .	9
No Imperialist Strings Attached? . . . . .	10
Wilson Expected to Win Despite His Record -- by John Walters . . . . .	11
Boumedienne Tells Algerian Women They Have Already Won . . . . .	13
Algerian Trade Unions Uneasy about Bourgeois Forces . . . . .	14
Iranian Socialists Call for Protests in Teheran Case . . . . .	16
Iranians Appeal Sentences . . . . .	18
In Lagos During the Coup d'Etat . . . . .	18
Pierre Frank Speaks in London -- by Brian Gormley . . . . .	21
West Germany Underwrites Steel Mill for China . . . . .	22
In the Soup . . . . .	23
Student Youth Rebel Against French CP Bureaucrats . . . . .	23
Students Demonstrate Against Brazilian Dictator . . . . .	25
Deep-Going Changes in Zanzibar . . . . .	26
Socialist Youth in U.S. Report Encouraging Growth . . . . .	27
Documents: An Appeal to the American Soldiers in Vietnam . . . . .	29

JOHNSON'S FAVORITE PUPPET IN TROUBLE

President Johnson's favorite puppet, the sleek, oily, Hitler-loving General Ky, succeeded in providing fresh evidence of the instability and weakness of his regime when he tried to jerk the rug from under Lieut. Gen. Nguyen Chang Thi on March 10. If the operation was not directly inspired by Ky's "advisers," including the very top

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

bracket in Washington, it at least had their blessing. As the New York Times put it [March 20], "At the time it seemed like a good gamble and one which had to be taken. General Thi had been an effective military and political leader and probably had more personnel support than any other general on the directory. However, he symbolized the regional autonomy which had greatly hampered the ability of the central Government [Gen. Ky] to rule."

Before it was over, the "good gamble," while perhaps still taking place in a gambling den, looked very much like Siamese twins working each other over, razors in hand.

General Thi's followers in Hue and Danang, in the northern part of south Vietnam, called for demonstrations. There was an immediate response to this. It is not likely that the big turnout was due to any personal popularity won by General Ky's twin. The masses seized the opening, the apparent rift in the ruling circle, to press forward. What was demonstrated was the high unpopularity of the Saigon regime and the readiness of the masses to move against it given any kind of lead.

The first plan in removing General Thi as a possible rival to Johnson's favorite puppet, was to send him to the United States, either as Saigon's diplomatic representative or for treatment of a "sinus condition." Once in the United States, the ambitious general might not find it so easy to return.

Ky, however, proved incapable of getting the masses out of the streets of Hue and Danang and back into their homes. In fact, it appeared that the chances were rather high that the demonstrations might touch off similar actions in other areas, including Saigon. For the people in south Vietnam to express their true feelings about the Saigon regime and the Johnson administration in such a dramatic way would, of course, be a disaster of the first magnitude to the Pentagon, State Department and White House. There was no choice but to reconsider what to do with General Thi.

The result was another gamble. General Thi was given the assignment of assuaging the masses in Danang and Hue. He was provided with an armed guard of such size that it was hard to determine whether it was meant to protect him or just to make sure he returned to Saigon, and he was flown to Danang.

There Ky's twin received an enthusiastic welcome that was not diminished by the sly references he made to the Americans and their more abject lackeys. These could only be interpreted in Washington as smacking of un-Americanism and requiring a still bigger question mark to be placed over the "anti-Communist" qualifications of this general.

Meanwhile in Saigon, the leaders of the Buddhist religion took advantage of Ky's temporary loss of face to press demands for an end to dictatorial military rule and the installation of a civilian regime. This appeal for at least a semblance of democratic trappings naturally caused consternation throughout the Johnson adminis-

tration. What could it signify if not the danger that General Ky might be sent bouncing, tail over end, in the gutter? And Washington was long ago scraping the bottom of the barrel for suitable puppets to set up as the Saigon government.

However, having exacted some concessions about speeding up the application of at least a little democratic whitewash, the Buddhist leaders drew back again, disclaiming any attention whatsoever to overthrow anybody. The sigh of relief in the Johnson administration was audible around the earth.

But the ten days that shook Johnson's favorite puppet provided fresh proof, if any were needed, that the Saigon government dangles on very weak threads and that it is becoming increasingly difficult for Washington to strengthen them.

#### FREI ATTACKS CASTRO OVER STRIKES IN CHILE

Eduardo Frei Montalva, Christian Democrat president of Chile, has accused Fidel Castro of being behind the strike wave that has closed many of the country's copper mines. Frei's attack was made in the form of a "reply" to references made by Castro in a speech March 13 to efforts of the Chilean government to repress the strikers instead of granting their just demands.

The text of Castro's remarks are not yet available in the United States. They came, however, on the eve of a general strike called for March 15 by the Chilean Workers Central Union to protest the murder March 11 of seven demonstrators, including two women, by police at the Anaconda Copper Company's El Salvador mine. (A policeman was likewise killed in the bloody attack on the unionists.)

The capitalist press has pictured the hastily called 48-hour general protest strike as a dismal failure. However, some 35,000 workers reportedly responded out of a total of 300,000 organized in unions.

In describing the strike action, Juan de Onis, special correspondent of the New York Times, said that "The Moscow-oriented Communist party seemed to be just going through the motions of striking, while the radical Socialists, who have affinities with Peking, did the shouting."

On March 14 Frei called the protest strike "a systematic attempt at destruction of the authority of the state." He said that at the Tricontinental Conference held in Havana last January, "subversive" plans were drawn up. "In Havana, a political declaration was formulated that said that guerrilla warfare in Chile would take on special forms that called for strikes, invasion of rural estates, collective demands and revolutionary violence."

The strikes in the imperialist-owned copper mines did not

have to be fomented by foreign agitators, however, as Frei asserts in the hoary tradition of all strike-breaking governments. The Chilean miners have legitimate grievances, the main one being the remorseless inflation that has cut down their purchasing power. They require a seventy per cent wage increase merely to balance the family budget. When Braden offered thirty per cent to the El Teniente miners they went out on strike January 3. (The Tricontinental Conference closed January 15.)

Since then, without any speeches from Castro on the topic of the copper mine strikes in Chile, Frei arrested a score of union leaders, declared some of the strikes illegal, sent carabineers to put down the sympathy demonstration at El Salvador and ordered carabineers to occupy Anaconda's Salvador and Potrerillos mines.

Salvador Allende, who ran against Frei in the September 4, 1964, election for the presidency, stated at the Tricontinental Conference that it was becoming increasingly evident that socialism could not win in Chile along the electoral road. Frei, it would seem, has done much to confirm the accuracy of Allende's declaration.

For revolutionary Marxists the current struggles in Chile are of exceptional interest. Aside from the exposure of Frei's demagoguery only sixteen months after he assumed office, the strikes have offered a testing ground as to the sincerity of the Chilean delegation at the Tricontinental Conference in declaring that a peaceful road to socialism had been barred in Chile. The sincerity of the Cubans in orienting the Tricontinental Conference toward affirmation of "armed struggle" as the road to successful revolutions in Latin America was also being tested in Chile. While the picture is as yet far from complete, it would seem that the evidence up to this point is favorable.

#### CASTRO AGAIN SCORES MAO TSE-TUNG

[In a four-and-a-half-hour speech at the University of Havana March 13, Fidel Castro took up a number of topics that have been but scantily reported in the press outside Cuba. Headlined in the March 14 Havana press, the text has not yet become available in either Paris or New York.

[Castro talked about evidences of corruption reaching into high circles of the Cuban government, ascribing this to the imperialists, their embassies and such agencies as the CIA. He indicated that vigorous measures were being undertaken against this corruption.

[Castro also defended the strikers in the copper mines of Chile, scoring the decision of the Frei government to repress them.

[Among the items of outstanding interest touched on by Castro was relations with the government of the People's Republic of China. The following account of this part of the speech was reported by the

March 15 Le Monde as follows on the basis of dispatches from various wire services. The translation from Le Monde is by World Outlook.]

\* \* \*

Mr. Fidel Castro, prime minister of Cuba, in a speech Sunday evening to the students at the University of Havana, uttered a violent diatribe against the leaders of Peking, thus renewing his attacks, but in a still more bitter tone.

Mr. Fidel Castro accused the Peking leaders of "felony" and of "betrayal" and stated that "the coryphees of People's China are shoddy revolutionists."

He accused People's China of "launching an imperialist-type campaign against Cuba" and of having replied only with a "brief letter of insults" to his demand for an explanation on the halting of Chinese rice exports to Cuba. He added: "It is sad and humiliating that in the middle of the battle being conducted by our people against imperialism, we must utilize part of our forces to reply to those we considered to be sincere allies."

He dwelt on news reported by Latin-American delegations in China according to which Peking "ridiculed" his revolution in "infamous articles," thus committing a "historic error," because, he said, "one must be blind not to understand the importance which the Cuban Revolution will assume in the world in the years to come."

"Mao Tse-tung," he continued, "is deifying himself. Someday the Chinese people will settle accounts with its leaders on the subject of what we have done. Historically, a lie cannot endure, and someday the truth will be known. To seek to picture us as revisionists is ridiculous. It is the New China Agency that transmits all these slanders against the Cuban Revolution. These are the same as the ones likewise spread by the Associated Press, United Press and the worst elements of Trotskyism... [The sentence is broken off in this way in Le Monde.] It is a real felony, real blackmail, a real betrayal of the international working class to deprive us of almost half of our rice at a time of great difficulty for us. Only cretins and madmen trading with other cretins and madmen could resort to such procedures.

"When the Havana conference ended," he concluded, "they spoke in China of the big victory scored by China, thus falsifying the situation. All the participants, including the Chinese representatives, know that the conference was a victory for the revolutionary movements, not the big but the little ones."

UNDERGROUND REVOLUTIONARY PUBLICATION IN THE USSR

Brief references have appeared in the European bourgeois press about a trial in the Soviet Union involving a group in Leningrad who were charged with printing a clandestine magazine politically hostile to the Kosygin-Brezhnev regime.

We have just received more detailed information, indicating that those active in the group were evidently left oppositionists following a Marxist orientation.

The title of the magazine echoed an old revolutionary Russian tradition: Kolokol [the Bell]. Three issues appeared. The number of copies of each issue was considerable -- almost 1,000. The declared aim of the magazine was to work for a revolutionary revival in the country.

The group associated with the underground publication was composed of two or three hundred persons, most of them chemists or students of chemistry. It should be noted particularly that the group was headed by Komsomol leaders and that their work of political criticism began on the basis of a much smaller study group which called itself the "Circle of Communards" and which studied Lenin's State and Revolution.

The organization appeared in Leningrad, spreading to other cities, including Ivanovo-Voznesensk and other important centers such as Omsk and Novosibirsk.

This is the first time in decades that an oppositionist organization has appeared in the USSR, extending to different cities. It demonstrates that the long process out of which a new Soviet revolutionary leadership will appear has already begun.

As the newspapers have indicated, the trial involved dozens of defendants. They displayed various attitudes in court. Some of them openly stated that they considered the ideas they were fighting for to be correct, while admitting that they were probably wrong in resorting to the methods of underground struggle.

A young girl, questioned by the judges on the aims of the organization, replied: "The first thing is to send all of you to work."

All the accused were given sentences ranging from two to seven years in so-called re-education camps.

Not less significant is an item concerning representatives of the older generation. On March 4 in Moscow's Red Square, some Old Bolsheviks, most of them survivors of the Stalinist concentration camps, staged a protest demonstration. Close to two hundred persons, people of ripe age, demonstrated in front of Lenin's mausoleum against a return to the methods of the "personality cult," a return which a sector of the bureaucracy seem to have in mind.

Inasmuch as news of the demonstration was known in advance, the GUM department store was packed and people watched the demonstrators through the windows with astonishment and sympathy while the Square was packed with thousands of uniformed police and plain-clothesmen, who did not seem to have received clear orders as to what to do.

STALIN'S ROLE DEBATED ON EVE OF CONGRESS

Rome

The March 9 l'Unità, daily newspaper of the Italian Communist party, carried an interesting article by Augusto Pancaldi, its Moscow correspondent, on the preparatory discussion for the twenty-third congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

A big political and ideological discussion is going on at all levels, Pancaldi reports, involving "a sharp confrontation of positions on one of the most crucial phases of the country's life, one that has so far been skirted -- the role and importance of Stalin in the construction of socialism in the USSR."

"The Soviet press, Pravda included," says Pancaldi, "is reverting more and more to the problem of the 'personality cult.' The aspects under consideration, sometimes contrasting to each other, bear witness almost daily to a process now going on, the length and outcome of which no one can predict since it is not known to what extent and in what way it will be brought up at the twenty-third congress."

Aside from the long-standing objective reasons impelling discussion on this problem, two new ones have arisen, the Moscow correspondent of l'Unità points out. First, the twenty-third congress is taking place exactly ten years after the twentieth, and this calls for a balance sheet. Secondly, the coming celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution will raise the problem of explaining the complex reality of the past thirty-five years -- which is not easily done if Stalin and Khrushchev after him are eliminated from consideration.

"The terms of the debate," Pancaldi declares, "start essentially from objective acknowledgment that a vacuum exists in historical research; that is, one cannot consider the period dominated by Stalin's figure without mentioning his name, as has been done until recently. From this at least three different positions emerge, each having different means of expression:

"The first position calls for historical and political study of the period of the personality cult and of the causes that generated it. The position is reflected in the work underway on various literary and historical projects, or in the fight against vestiges of the cult being carried on by magazines like Novy Mir and Junost, or on the stages of some Moscow theaters.



"The second tendency believes that all that needs to be said about that period has already been said and to go on speaking about it does nobody any good, and that the solution is to let bygones be bygones and to go forward.

"The third one, which has more say than the others, after declaring that the consequences of the 'cult' must be viewed as totally overcome thanks to the twentieth and twenty-second congresses, says that it is now necessary to re-evaluate that historical period and along with it even certain aspects of Stalin's work." Some writings by Stalin like Questions of Leninism or The National Question could be reissued "for they have retained their validity."

Pancaldi cites some recent significant occurrences. Last October 8, Pravda published the summary of a report delivered by Trapeznikov, the head of the scientific sector of the Central Committee's "Ideological Committee." In accordance with the current schema that "neither the cult nor its consequences could be generated by a socialist regime, for they are alien to its nature," Trapeznikov sharply criticized those historians and writers who have the deplorable habit of viewing that historical period "from the angle of the personality cult." The report concluded by referring to a group of young historians who had completed a study project on errors in collectivization and by declaring that the period of "socialist" transformation in the countryside and accelerated industrialization should be considered among the most glorious in the "history of building socialism in the USSR."

At the end of January, Pravda published an article signed by the historians Yuknov, Trokanovski and Schunkov, in which the expression "period of the personality cult" was condemned as "anti-Marxist, subjective and deeply erroneous," for it "denies the greatness of a whole period of Soviet history."

Recently, at the end of a lecture by Rumiantzev about "how to apply economic laws," a student asked whether it is still possible to use Stalin's book Economic Problems of Socialism in economic studies, or whether this would be an error.

The former editor of Pravda replied: "It is clear that it would be an error. That work does not correctly handle the problems of a socialist economy. There are very many errors in it like the statement that the kolkhoz hindered the planned development of socialist economy. In this work Stalin took a number of erroneous positions; it is therefore not to be recommended as a reference."

In his report to the Moscow party organizational conference, Secretary Yegorisev took up Trapeznikov's ideas and criticized those cinema people, historians, writers, artists, who, while dealing with the theme of the personality cult, end up by obscuring a "glorious period" and giving the public, especially the youth, "a falsified delineation of the past." After all, Pancaldi declares, the school textbooks this year appeared with the chapter on the personality cult modified and attenuated along this line.

"The confrontation of positions," Pancaldi concludes, "is continuing and sooner or later is bound to end in a decision on Stalin's role in building socialism. As the problem is not only historical but political, the nature of the decision will have its influence on other aspects of the life of the country. The twenty-third congress, which will begin its deliberations in Moscow on March 29, could provide an orientation with respect to this."

### NERVE GAS SHAKES COLORADO ROCKIES

Occasional stories have filtered into the press about the ultrapoisonous nature of the "G" gas being manufactured and stored by the U.S. army in the Denver, Colorado, area. The descriptions of the deadliness of the nerve toxins which the U.S. is stockpiling in defense of the "free" world were evidently not exaggerations. The waste products, pumped down a specially bored two-mile shaft for underground disposal, have set off persistent earthquakes in the area.

Two members of the Colorado House of Representatives, Roy McVicker and Byron Rogers, both Democrats and therefore as unquestionable in their loyalty to the capitalist system as President Johnson himself, have demanded to know what the army intends to do about it. Army officials are not talking.

The United States Geological Survey, which began an investigation last December, reported March 18 that the great increase in minor earthquakes in the area "probably are related" to the disposal of the highly contaminated wastes in the well dug at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal.

The quakes have ranged from minimal to 3.7 on the Richter scale. An earthquake of 3.7 intensity can damage homes.

Geologists from various Colorado universities, who made a collective survey, said that the ground center of the quakes clustered around the well. In addition, the region had experienced no earthquakes since 1882. When the well went into operation in 1962, the area began getting as many as twenty tremors a day.

The army reduced the pressure in pumping the wastes into the mountain roots and the earthquakes subsided in intensity. The disposal system was then reduced to gravity flow and finally, last February 20, use of the well was discontinued entirely.

It now remains to be seen whether this will terminate the dangerous cycle of earthquakes.

Meanwhile the army is faced with the problem of disposing of the deadly waste products. As to the stockpile of pure "G" gas there is no problem in disposing of that. It is intended for eventual use on human beings whose tremors will hardly register on the Richter scale.

NO IMPERIALIST STRINGS ATTACHED?

Does the U.S. State Department employ American surplus food shipments as blackmail in dealing with the governments of impoverished countries? To suggest the charge is generally sufficient to win a most indignant denial plus the countercharge that the accusation is "just Communist propaganda."

In a March 19 dispatch from Washington, however, New York Times correspondent John W. Finney reports that "One United States condition for the resumption of surplus food aid to the United Arab Republic was restrictions on the production of Egyptian cotton..."

Finney was told about the "secret condition" by "Congressional sources," who said it was one of the steps taken "to curb the accelerating arms race in the Middle East."

According to this propaganda, the Egyptian government was selling a good part of its cotton crop to the Soviet Union and buying in exchange large shipments of arms. As a result, certain unnamed congressmen objected to sending surplus food to Egypt to relieve hunger and distress. They renewed their "criticism" when a new agreement was recently signed by the Johnson administration to provide another \$55,000,000 worth of surplus food.

"To help allay the criticism," continues Finney, "the Administration has privately informed some key Congressmen that President Nasser agreed that there would be no increase in cotton acreage in the 1966-67 season over the previous year."

Finney reveals that "similar but looser restrictions on production have been included in past surplus-food agreements with the Egyptians. The terms of the new agreement were understood to be stiffer and more explicit; there was some surprise in American circles when President Nasser accepted them without objection."

To curb the arms race in the Middle East is no doubt a highly commendable objective. It is to be noted, however, that the U.S. government has been participating in this arms build up -- but on the side of Israel. Moreover if the Egyptian government can be weakened militarily, it should be still easier to subject it to further imperialist pressure.

Last but not least, as the phrase goes, the unnamed congressmen, who doubtlessly all voted unanimously for the U.S. war budget in the biggest arms race in history, were probably not displeased with any agreement that could be wrung out of the Egyptian government to reduce the acreage of cotton production. If the unnamed congressmen were to be named, would they turn out to be from the cotton-producing areas in the United States?

WILSON EXPECTED TO WIN DESPITE HIS RECORD

By John Walters

London

The general election called for March 31 by Prime Minister Harold Wilson is of major importance for the British working class and the work of British revolutionary Marxists. Since the election of October 1964, the Wilson government has steadily moved to the right, faster than most observers thought that it would.

The last seventeen months have been an object lesson to all those in the British Labour movement who thought that Wilson could be pushed into a left policy. Such illusions were speedily dispelled by his capitulation to the bankers at home and overseas. This initial move has since been shown to be the first of a series of policy actions that can leave no doubt as to the real nature of this government.

Most serious commentators knew of the grave crisis in the economy which the fourth Labour government inherited. Because of the major effort of world capitalism, led by U.S. imperialism, a rescue operation of British capitalism took place in the form of loans to bolster up sterling. In return Wilson was supposed to superintend the "modernization" of the British economy, putting it on a more competitive basis, etc. The key question here was the introduction of an "incomes policy." Since the war, Britain, along with most other capitalist countries has suffered from creeping inflation, which -- whatever its basic causes -- has been laid at the feet of the workers as being wage inflation. Therefore an incomes policy -- which is a polite way of saying the limitation of wage increases -- has become a major necessity for British capitalism if it is to maintain its profits and continue its accumulation.

So far Wilson has not succeeded in achieving this policy completely. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, despite various deflationary measures adopted -- high bank rate, credit squeeze, cuts in government expenditure, new taxes -- unemployment has continued to fall, it being at its lowest point for nearly ten years; i.e., 1.5 per cent. Secondly, although the Trade Union Congress [TUC] and most of the trade-union bureaucrats have agreed to the imposition of an incomes policy, there is a section of the trade-union bureaucracy -- notably the T&GWU [Transport and General Workers' Union], the Railway men, and the white-collar unions -- who have opposed this. However, so far this opposition has not stirred large sections of the rank and file, precisely because this policy has not yet been effective. But there have been signs in the last few months that rank-and-file opposition will grow.

Wilson has recently brought before Parliament a bill which will make the incomes policy legally enforceable; and which sets out penalties -- fines or imprisonment -- for infringements. Infringements would include such things as strikes while the Prices and Incomes Board considers claims. This again was accepted by the TUC,

but with a larger number of union bureaucrats dissenting this time -- the bill starts to cut into their freedom and security. With the dissolution of Parliament for the election, this bill has now fallen through; but Wilson has made it plain that he intends to push it through the next Parliament if he and his party are re-elected.

On the question of re-election, there seems little serious doubt that Labour will win the coming election, holding a 13 per cent lead in the opinion polls at the moment. Most serious commentators are discussing the size of Labour's majority, not if they will win. Despite Wilson's throwing overboard all the radical aspects of Labour's previous election promises, despite his proposed antiunion legislation, support for the U.S. in Vietnam, and stinking record on immigration, the bulk of the working class still support and have illusions in Wilson. The parliamentary "lefts" have shown themselves to be weak, spineless and completely disoriented. Only a section of the nonparliamentary left, mainly intellectuals and some sections of the working class (notably Scottish and Welsh miners and the railwaymen plus elements in the T&GWU) have put forward strong criticisms of the government. The main critics of the government in the Labour party have been the centrists around such journals as The Week and Union Voice. It is around these journals, and one or two like them, that we can expect opposition to crystallize in the coming period, providing they are able to overcome their present theoretical confusion and arrive at a consistent Marxist standpoint.

Certainly there is no immediate prospect for building an opposition to Wilson outside the Labour movement. The recent debacle of the Radical Alliance candidate, Richard Gott, at the North Hull parliamentary by-election bears witness to this. This body, composed in the main of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, ran Gott against the official Labour candidate. His platform had only one plank, that of opposition to Wilson's Vietnam policy, and then mainly on grounds of conscience. The fact that he received a sympathetic hearing from the Labour rank and file did not prevent him from losing his deposit, collecting only 245 votes. Significantly, the official Labour candidate increased the majority considerably.

This episode is very instructive, since the Labour Left in Hull ran a public campaign criticizing the Labour government while at the same time supporting the Labour candidate. This is a new phenomenon on the British scene, and one that has implications for the future. What it does emphasize is that the Labour rank and file are not prepared to allow the Tories back into power despite their misgivings about this or that aspect of Labour policy, but neither are they prepared to remain silent.

This then is the situation as the general election approaches. It is clear that a postponement of the solution of the present crisis of British capitalism cannot continue. We seem set fair for a return of Wilson and Co. to office. They will be faced with the need to impose the neocapitalist solutions mapped out for them by big business. However, all the signs are that this is not going to be any easy ride for them. Just as Johnson's "consensus" society is crumbling under the impact of reality, so will Wilson's. There is ahead

a very real possibility of a major clash between the next Labour government and a section of the trade-union bureaucracy, and wide layers of the working class. When the incomes policy begins to "bite," the shop-floor militants will begin to react in a vigorous way, for it should be remembered that the British working class has not suffered a major defeat since the last war, and therefore it is still self-confident.

The crucial problem now is that of regrouping the Labour Left based upon the unions and the rank-and-file committees. It is to such work that British revolutionary Marxists should address themselves in the coming period.

### BOUMEDIENNE TELLS ALGERIAN WOMEN THEY HAVE ALREADY WON

#### Algiers

On March 8, a year after the huge demonstration of women organized in Algiers under Ben Bella, the "Council of the Revolution" and the Algerian government sought to duplicate the success. The speech given by the chairman, Boumedienne, made the content slightly different -- to say the least. The official newspaper El Moudjahid [March 9] provided a French translation of the speech, which was given in Arabic.

The Algerian women were told that they need not demand any more rights, the question of equality being "resolved." In fact the chairman said, "Women who 'demand' their rights are mistaken, because the women of Algeria did not wait for 1962 to gain these rights by filing a 'claim' but moved in and took these very rights in action."

From this he drew the conclusion: "Thus I think that the question of women's rights has been resolved, because the women of Algeria gained these rights by participating in an effective way in the struggle for liberation."

However, some "problems" still remain, because "if we have not succeeded in employing all our sisters, this does not at all mean that there is a deliberate desire and a policy aiming at preventing women from working. Nevertheless the problem of unemployment remains. When a job is open, should it be given to a man or a woman? Must the man be left at home and the woman permitted to work? That's the problem!"

In addition, "The development of the women of Algeria and enjoyment of their rights must be inscribed in the framework of the morals of our society."

This enables us to better understand Colonel Boumedienne's promise in connection with the new family law now in the works: "The law about to be enacted preserves the rights of the women and the Algerian family."

The official press did not report the incidents that graced the ceremonies on International Woman's Day. Groups of women tried to leave the hall during Boumedienne's speech. They were violently shoved back by the police.

A few days before the celebration, the trade-union newspaper Révolution et Travail [Revolution and Labor] published an article denouncing "a reactionary attitude, hostile on the one hand to advancing women, and on the other to bringing women into the economic life of the nation."

Against whom was this timid protest directed? For those who had not already guessed, Boumedienne's speech made it clear enough.

### ALGERIAN TRADE UNIONS UNEASY ABOUT BOURGEOIS FORCES

#### Algiers

The Algerian trade unions are uneasy about the advance of bourgeois forces under the protective shield of Colonel Boumedienne's regime. This is rather clearly indicated by material appearing in Révolution et Travail [Revolution and Labor]. In the March 3 issue, for instance, there is a speech given by Mouloud Oumeziane, the secretary general of the Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens [General Union of the Algerian Workers], February 24 on the tenth anniversary of the founding of the union. It was published under the title, "Struggle against the underhand actions of the bourgeois forces." Here is an important section:

"Throughout the country we have all seen the direct or underhand actions, both here and abroad, of those reactionary forces whose obvious aim has been and still is on the one hand to drive the June 19 regime into turning the helm in the direction sought for and on the other hand to drive the workers in an intransigent way into extreme positions in order to bring about a complete divorce between the state and the people.

"If the maneuver has been partially blocked -- and for proof of that we need only look at the case of Messageries Hachette and the way it turned out, it remains nonetheless necessary to continue to struggle and to remain vigilant, because the bourgeoisie and the enemies of the Algerian Revolution are not ready to disarm and to accept the verdict of history without a fight.

"That is why we must persist in explaining to the workers and those around us the meaning of June 19 and its aims, just as we must continue to struggle to contribute to building the party, a vanguard party alone capable of defending and bringing to victory the cause for which more than a million and a half fighters made the supreme sacrifice. To defend the spirit of June 19 and to bring success to its aims, to build a party of revolutionary content and action, to work for the betterment of our country, this demands from the workers a sustained, constant action within the national frame-

work that belongs to them.

"This action must draw its principles and its aims particularly from the Tripoli program, from the Algiers Charter and the union charter. It must undertake:

" -- To reinforce the union organization and to furnish it with cadres of the required quantity and quality.

" -- To defend workers self-management by struggling against the failures, the insufficiencies and negative methods of those responsible. By doing this we will be better armed to defend it against its enemies and gravediggers. We will also be in better position to extend it and to open up new stages for it.

" -- To contribute to improving production and to influence the producers in an intelligent way to always produce more and better.

" -- To contribute to improving the output and efficiency of our administrations and public services."

An editorial in the same issue follows the same line of struggling against the bourgeois forces: "In face of this pressing danger, the regroupment of the genuine revolutionary forces, the only ones capable of guiding the socialist revolution to success, is required in order to combat its declared or camouflaged enemies and to end their power."

In addition an article calls for workers control in the enterprises of the nationalized sector that are not under workers self-management:

"Often one sees the bureaucratic cadres, which El Djeich describes very well in its editorial, flouting the March decrees outright, and even worse without understanding the economic conditions of the moment! Then they talk about 'returning the enterprises to their owners'! They are nostalgic for the time when the enterprises were run by the bosses! It cannot be forgotten who these men often were and the fury which some of them displayed against our people!

"Self-management is not a fetish. But the main thing is taking the principal means of production in hand, with the corollary that it is impossible for a caste to take the place of the former colonizers.

"In relation with this irreversible option, and the present realities of Algeria, we hold that a formula of 'national enterprise' is not to be rejected, that it is often desirable, and in a certain number of cases necessary.

"National enterprise conforms to the spirit of our option, since it places in the hands of Algeria as a whole, of the nation, the ownership of an industrial activity, for example like the national steel company. But this is not sufficient.



"In brief, a state enterprise can be managed in various ways. It can be done in the capitalist fashion; that is, by placing the enterprises in the hands of the state bourgeoisie; this is what happened in France and other countries of the West where the popular masses demanded nationalization of certain companies and banks. Nationalization occurred, but management was left out." [Emphasis in original.]

The March 3 issue of Révolution et Travail, the central organ of the unions, indicates rather well the status of the Algerian unions today -- both a safety valve for the June 19 regime and a center for the possible regroupment of working-class and revolutionary opposition, despite the opportunism of its centrist leadership.

### IRANIAN SOCIALISTS APPEAL FOR PROTESTS IN TEHERAN CASE

[The following is a translation of a statement issued in Cologne, Germany, by the European branch of the League of Iranian Socialists.]

\* \* \*

In April 1965, world opinion was shocked by the arrest of a number of students in Teheran. They were accused of complicity in an attempt to assassinate the Shah.

The students were tried before a military court in proceedings that lasted from October to December. The prosecutor demanded the death penalty for four of the defendants. The court condemned two of them to die, and the Shah granted "clemency," commuting their sentences to life imprisonment.

The fact that death sentences were not pronounced on all four students and that those who were condemned were not executed was due to the world-wide protest movement which included many progressive and humanistic figures, committees and organizations. Among those who protested were Jean-Paul Sartre, Bertrand Russell, Fenner Brockway, West German Attorney General Fritz Bauer, Cannon Niemöller, etc. In Britain seventy-five Labour members of Parliament participated in the protest. In Italy, under the leadership of Lelio Basso, members of Parliament likewise protested, introducing a parliamentary motion that the Iranian government had violated the Charter of Human Rights by planning a judicial murder.

Dr. Heldman of Munich, Germany, attended the trial as an observer for "International Amnesty." He reported in Die Zeit [West German liberal weekly] that the accusation was based on no facts whatsoever and that the accused students had been tortured by the police and the prosecutor's staff.

Now the Shah's government is undertaking fresh terror measures. In the February 3 Cologne daily Stad-Anzeiger and the

February 9 Vorwärts [Social Democratic weekly] it is reported that a new trial of the same kind was to be organized by the Teheran military court. This time the blows of the Shah's "justice" were aimed against leaders and members of the League of Iranian Socialists.

On August 16, 1965, at 6 a.m., the Iranian secret police arrested three members of the Central Committee of the League of Iranian Socialists -- the building trades worker, A. Shansi; the bank employee, H. Sarshar; and R. Shaian, a functionary in the Ministry of Labor. In addition they arrested a former member of the Central Committee, K. Maleki, formerly a teacher.

These four have been accused of high treason and charged with attempting to organize a party in opposition to the "constitutional" monarchy. The arrested Socialists have been held in solitary confinement and were refused the right to receive any visitors whatsoever.

K. Maleki suffered from a heart condition and was due shortly to be operated on for a cataract in one of his eyes. The military trial began on February 5, the sessions being secret. After the court decided that the case was within its jurisdiction it had to adjourn February 9, due, as the Iranian press officially admitted, to Maleki's grave condition which made further continuation of the trial impossible for the time being.

We have been informed that Maleki's health is now so bad that his life is in danger. The jurisdiction of the military court is very questionable. Iranian law provides that political accusations shall be handled by ordinary civil courts with a jury and in open session.

It should be added that Maleki is charged with an act committed thirty-two years ago (!) and for which he was already condemned to seven years at hard labor in 1934. He was freed when Allied troops occupied the country during the second world war. If the present charges are upheld, Maleki will have been tried and sentenced twice for the same alleged crime.

Maleki and his comrades are in grave danger. The trial against them could be resumed at any time. It is necessary to act in order to prevent murderous verdicts in this case, too. The prosecutor has already demanded ten years at hard labor for each of the accused Socialists.

World public opinion, humanistic and progressive persons and organizations must again raise their voices in protest.

Freedom for Maleki, Shansi, Sarshar and Shaian!

Let them be tried before an ordinary civil court in a completely public trial!

The League of Iranian Socialists in Europe calls on all progressive organizations and figures to send protests to the Iranian embassies in their respective countries, to the Iranian Ministry of Justice in Teheran, and to send copies of these protests to the

League of Iranian Socialists in Europe, c/o Sozialistische Politik,  
Post Box 1451, Cologne 1, Germany.

IRANIANS APPEAL SENTENCES

[The following dispatch from a special correspondent appeared in the March 16 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde. The translation is by World Outlook.]

\* \* \*

TEHERAN, March 15 -- Mr. Khalil Maleki, Iranian Socialist leader and theoretician, has just been condemned by a Teheran military court to three years in a prison farm. Two others accused with him, Reza Shaian and Alidjan Shansi, were condemned by the same court to eighteen months, while a third, Mir Hossein Sarshar, was given twelve months. The four defendants filed an appeal.

The prosecutor accused the defendants, particularly Mr. Maleki of having collaborated with the Communists from 1930 to 1940 and since then with the National Front. Mr. Maleki replied that such an accusation was illegal in view of the number of years that had elapsed and that in any case, even at the time of his adherence to the Tudeh party, he had organized a Socialist wing before resigning to form a genuine party of the left.

Mr. Maleki added that his collaboration with the National Front of Dr. Mossadegh did not constitute a crime, since neither the Front nor the League of Socialists had ever been made illegal. Moreover, his organization was not antimonarchical and had never engaged in underground activities.

The representatives of the French press, including the representative of Le Monde, were barred from attending the trial. On the other hand, the local press published substantial reports of the arguments, although with some delay.

IN LAGOS DURING THE COUP D'ETAT

[The following is an eyewitness account of events in Nigeria at the time of General Ironsi's coup d'état.]

\* \* \*

We were in a Lagos court on the morning of January 15 waiting for the prosecutors and magistrates to show up for continuation of a trial in which we were accused of political crimes. No magistrate was in court. No prosecutor either. We were to wait in vain, for the same thing was happening in all the other many courts in Lagos Island.

The chief justice of the Federation, Chief Sir Ademola had gone into hiding. By midmorning, senior police officers came to announce tearfully to the lawyers that "The soldier bastards drove us out of our Lion Buildings."

Lion Buildings is the Lagos headquarters of the Nigeria police, sold to the federal government by former Minister of Health Chief Dr. Majekodunmi for half a million pounds.

Also seized was the headquarters of the criminal investigation department where in any ordinary emergency 200 plainclothesmen would receive a lecture before mingling with the masses at a demonstration.

The headquarters of the political police, named simply Obalende HQ was ransacked by the "soldier bastards" all Saturday and Sunday. The arms, equipment and vehicles of all these bastions of the capitalist police were seized.

It took hours to realize that a coup d'état had already taken place in the early morning. Prime Minister Alhaji Sir Abubakar and the millionaire Minister of Finance Chief Okotie-Eboh had already been arrested, later to be killed and dumped on the highway in the forest.

The premier of the North had faced a unit of the First Northern Field Battery; and the Sardauna of Sokoto Sir Alhaji Bello had perished as grenades reduced his palace, the Nasarawa Residence, to debris.

The premier of the West, Chief Akintola, had his bullet-proof jacket torn up with an army knife. He was then riddled with sixteen bullets and exhibited at the public mortuary to the amusement and joy of Ibadan townsmen.

Mid-West Premier Chief Osadebay was later allowed to escape to his Country House on the banks of the Niger river which he built within eighteen months of taking office, at a cost of one-third of a million pounds.

Eastern Premier Dr. Okpara also retired to his luxurious Country Hospital, built while in office.

The coup d'état came as a surprise even to the political vanguard of the Nigerian working class.

It was thought that the Nigerian government, as a bastion of world imperialism, was firmly entrenched.

The army officers did not appear to be concerned about politics. They lived in luxury during the day and relaxed in the evening at lavish parties, guarded by troops with fixed bayonets, where the "cream of society" did everything but go to bed with each other amongst the champagne bottles.

But the coup took place. After an all-night battle at the Nasarawa fortress and an all-day military consolidation of gains, a Major "Kaduna" Nzegwu, who appeared to be the leader of "the five," took the microphone of the seized Northern Broadcasting Station and proclaimed the erection of a "Revolutionary Government of the Army." He attacked the rulers of yesterday as corrupt gangsters, ten per-centers (always demanding ten per cent interest from the foreign contractor on every development project), rapists who had been sucking the blood of the Nigerian toilers, etc. He announced that the tribal-torn country was one, from the River Niger to the River Benue. He decreed death penalties for all acts of arson, black marketeering, sabotage, corruption, etc., and he ordered martial music on the Northern Radio Kaduna to be interspersed with indoctrination symposiums. He placed his territory under martial law.

Among the beer parlors, the palm wine sheds, the rickety mammy wagon transports, in the stinking but lively market places there was general rejoicing at the downfall of the government. By Monday, 2,000 "men of substance" -- leaders and hirelings of the old regime -- had escaped to the neighboring Republic of Dahomey. Many a minister (there were eighty in Lagos alone and more than 300 in the entire Federation) was caught in a car trunk, or disguised as a woman, made up with lipstick, a wig and other gadgets -- trying to escape in their big American cars.

In Lagos, Major General Ironsi held meetings with one or two former ministers and the British ambassador.

All the regions were in the hands of the "rebels." Lagos had been captured militarily though not politically. Thus Ironsi announced on Saturday that a mutinous sector of the army had "kidnapped" the prime minister. But on Sunday he changed his tune, announcing that the army had been handed state power. He was undoubtedly influenced by (a) the British ambassador, (b) the threat of Kaduna to march on Lagos, (c) the expressions of support for Kaduna shown by all sectors of the population but the ruling elite.

That was how a Neguib became the head of the new military government. Ironsi symbolizes a ruling-class reformist coup seeking mass support to entrench its positions.

The general discontent in the country was such that the mere destruction of the old regime met with loud approval. The rigged Western elections had already stirred up such violence that Lagos was seething.

The military government is now seeking to popularize itself. The masses are celebrating the downfall of their former oppressors and hope that the new military government will solve their problems.

All the old parties are ineffective and silent and their leaders live in fear of what may befall them. They write flattering letters of adulation and support for Ironsi.

The small revolutionary Marxist forces are now assessing the new situation that has opened up. They are gearing for persistent struggles that will eventually open up the road for the toilers to take power and create a workers state.

### PIERRE FRANK SPEAKS IN LONDON

By Brian Gormley

Londoners recently had an opportunity to hear Pierre Frank, a leader of the French Trotskyist movement and a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. He addressed several meetings in England on an invitational basis and on March 4 gave a public lecture on the topic, "The Havana Tricontinental Conference and the World Congress of the Fourth International."

Analyzing the world situation, the speaker pointed to the escalation of the war in Vietnam and the number of military coups in various countries recently as evidence of the increasing lack of inhibition in the drive of American imperialism to contain and push back the colonial revolution. It follows from this, he maintained, that the revolutionary movement in each country must have an international strategy, a world approach to the solution of its tasks.

He cited statements made by the Cuban revolutionists to the effect that if uprisings occurred in other countries, American imperialism would not be able to do what it is doing in Vietnam. Such declarations at the Tricontinental Conference, he held, indicated the need for a world outlook.

The basic weakness of the conference in Havana, Frank told the audience, lay in the fact that many of the delegations, instead of representing independent revolutionary movements, came from workers states or states that have won a measure of political independence from imperialism, thus being limited by the conservative bureaucratic outlook or passing diplomatic needs of the ruling layers of these countries. Consequently, despite its many positive achievements, the Tricontinental Conference was unable to work out a consistent world strategy of revolutionary struggle.

Castro's attack on Trotskyism, which came at the end of the Tricontinental Conference, was considered at length by Pierre Frank. He cited the points made in reply by the United Secretariat in an Open Letter to Fidel Castro.

Turning to the recent world congress held by the Fourth International, the second since the International Secretariat and International Committee joined forces at the Reunification Congress in 1963 and the eighth congress since the founding of the Fourth International in 1938, Frank stressed its differences from a gathering like the one held in Havana.

The delegates at the congress of the Fourth International had no government ties but were linked directly to the masses and political opposition movements in a number of countries, including the workers states. Because of this, they could expand and develop their ideas in a free and democratic atmosphere.

He described the long preparatory discussion in the International on the basis of five documents submitted by the United Secretariat. The culmination of this discussion was a debate at the congress in which delegates were free to alter the documents or bring in new ones as they saw fit. He called special attention to the document on the African revolution as an example of the effort of the Fourth International to consider and to find answers to some very complex problems in the continent of Africa.

The audience, which was composed in good part of representatives of colonial freedom movements living in London, engaged in a lively discussion with the speaker following his presentation.

#### WEST GERMANY UNDERWRITES STEEL MILL FOR CHINA

The West German government announced March 17 that it has agreed to underwrite a credit of \$87,500,000 on a \$150,000,000 steel mill for the People's Republic of China. The complex of hot and cold rolling mills as well as steel rail and tube production facilities is described as the biggest single industrial plant ever agreed upon in a deal between the West and new China.

A number of German companies as well as French, British, Italian and Swiss companies are participating in the venture.

China has gained a reputation of paying promptly and in full in dealings with West German industry. As a result West German companies have been seeking to intensify trade with China.

The big obstacle has been the attitude of the U.S. government, which has sought to maintain an economic blockade of the world's most populous country. Over the years, however, the State Department has been compelled to retreat from its untenable position. There was much grinding of teeth in Washington when London, for instance, announced a trade plan with China during the Eisenhower administration. Gradually the State Department condoned some trade between "allies" of the U.S. and China. A still further shake-up came when de Gaulle recognized China and sought expanded trade relations with the rising new power.

Obviously the West German government did not act without first feeling out Washington's reaction. They got at least a pale green light. Just the same there were evidences of heartburn among profit-hungry American businessmen. The New York Times thought that the Germans ought to have at least waited "until there was some lessening of tension between China and the United States."

IN THE SOUP

[When the American ambassador to Spain went swimming near Palomares with the Spanish Minister of Information just to prove that the water there is quite safe even if four H-bombs were accidentally dropped nearby and the search was still going on for one of them right offshore, the event did not escape the attention of the mordant Robert Escarpit. He devoted his column to the subject in the March 11 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, from which we have made the following translation. The title in the original is "Dans le Bain." This obviously refers to the ambassador's bathing or swimming ("bain") but there is also a slang connotation like "In the Soup."]

\* \* \*

The ambassador of the United States bathing at Palomares is better than a demonstration; it's a symbol.

If it was done only to prove that the water in the sea there is not radioactive, a Geiger counter would have been sufficient. But it was done to prove to the world that the great do not shrink from the dangers created for ordinary humanity by their greatness; that they are, in short, in the soup with us.

It is to be regretted only that the United States was content to send an ambassador to go bathing with the Spanish peasants. How much stronger the symbol would have been if the president of the United States, or at least the Secretary of State, had gone to square himself with the Vietnamese peasants!

STUDENT YOUTH REBEL AGAINST FRENCH CP BUREAUCRATS

[The following article has been translated from the February issue of La Quatrième Internationale, official journal of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste, French section of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

After a year of outward calm, the UEC [Union des Etudiants Communistes -- Communist Students Union] is undergoing its most serious crisis since it was founded in 1956.

As a matter of fact, at the last National Committee meeting, January 16, it was decided to liquidate the bastion of revolutionary opposition -- the Paris Liberal Arts section. This unusual measure, which is in violation of the statutes of the UEC, reflects the total failure of the French Communist party leadership to regain control of the organization. Dissolution of this unit of 400 members (the entire UEC numbers only about 2,000!) was decided on by the Political Bureau of the Communist party after meeting with the secre-



tary-general of the UEC. It shows that the Communist party prefers to liquidate its student organization outright rather than allow a left opposition to develop which might prove dangerous as the party increasingly grows in resemblance to a Social Democratic organization.

Coming after the expulsion of almost fifty leftist members at Lyon, the decision of the National Committee, far from ending the crisis, will obviously only sharpen it.

The time is over when a mere nod from the leadership of the Communist party was sufficient to expel the slightest opposition. The old "conformist" majority of the Eighth Congress has in fact just blown up. Eighteen of the sixty members comprising the National Committee have resigned. Among them are six members of the National Bureau. The driving force in this new "critical" tendency, consisting entirely of former "pro-party" people, is Communist students at the Teachers College Graduate School on Ulm Street.

Its characteristics are still vague insofar as it refuses, probably out of tactical and political considerations, to concretize its line. In general, the tendency is a combination of both "pro-party" youth shocked by the methods of the party leadership and somewhat disoriented by its rightist course, together with members who are leaving Stalinism in rapid evolution toward the positions of the Chinese Communist party. Refusing to face up to the problem of Stalinism, they take refuge in a "theoretical formation" in which they lump together the leadership of the Communist party and that of the Liberal Arts section, labeling them "leftist, Trotskyist, anti-Leninist." For the present the Communist party avoids taking any action against this tendency, preferring to see its members occupied with compiling excerpts from Capital rather than taking positions on current political problems.

However, this tendency, which enjoys a temporarily comfortable position as arbiter, has decided to intervene, since it understands that its own position would be undermined without the buttress of a left wing in the national organization.

Under their guidance (they consider themselves to be the sole spokesmen for the Eighth Congress majority), a Parisian leadership of the UEC was established which is independent of the National Bureau. The "collective" comprises seven out of the eight sections or faculties, among the Liberal Arts section, which is the only Communist organization recognized at the Sorbonne.

After having lost de facto control of the UEC, the present leadership has now lost its hold throughout Paris.

Disoriented by this unexpected counterblow, the Stalinists have been brought to a halt, pending further developments. They are trying to form a new group at the Sorbonne as against the Liberal Arts section, but the latter continues its normal activities with no more concern about being "liquidated" than those kings of old who were "deposed" by remote and impotent Popes.

In this period before the Ninth Congress, which will open March 30, all the Communist students of Paris are engaged in a test of strength in behalf of reintegrating the Liberal Arts section. Many circles in the provinces are joining the struggle. Caen has declared its solidarity with the Liberal Arts section.

It is obvious, however, that the Communist party leadership will not tolerate this situation very long. For the time being, it is trying to regain its former majority by all sorts of promises, with the objective of isolating the "leftists." In case of failure, that is to say, if the Teachers College Graduate School (Ulm) tendency refuses to submit, and stays away from the Ninth Congress together with the Liberal Arts section, then the Communist party leadership will have no choice but to liquidate the UEC and re-establish a single organization of the Communist Youth, including the students, under new statutes and under the direct leadership of federations of the Communist Youth.

In the meantime, the revolutionary left is organizing. At their last special general meeting, the militants of the Liberal Arts section decided to keep the section and its activities going and to fight for reintegration with the other Paris sections, without making any concessions in its political line or mass work.

It is engaged in a most difficult struggle, demanding the clearest leadership from the revolutionary militants at its head, so that the entire membership will understand the dynamics of the situation and its meaning. The left can develop the acquisitions of three years of struggle, no matter what happens, only if it strengthens its ties with the mass of students through increased activity, especially against the war in Vietnam. At the same time it must pay attention to educating its members politically so as to reduce to a minimum the danger of discouragement among its followers.

The essential problem up for discussion today is the perspective for rebuilding the revolutionary party, a perspective linked to a correct analysis of Stalinism. All future possibilities depend on correctly understanding this problem.

The Liberal Arts section of the UEC is no longer isolated. A great number of youth are watching its struggle. For the first time in France, the Communist party leadership has become aware that it can no longer liquidate its opponents as it did in the past. It is now up to the Liberal Arts section of the UEC to demonstrate that not only do the young revolutionary militants refuse to submit but they are capable of organizing the youth for socialism.

#### STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST BRAZILIAN DICTATOR

Some 2,000 students recently demonstrated in Belo Horizonte against the Castelo Branco dictatorship. Three hundred police attacked them with clubs and tear-gas grenades. The university council was reported to be considering a protest strike.

## DEEP-GOING CHANGES IN ZANZIBAR

The union established between Zanzibar and Tanganyika in April, 1964, to constitute the country of Tanzania, did not prevent Zanzibar from continuing further down the road of the revolution begun two years ago. "Today," writes a special correspondent of the London Economist in the March 12 issue, "Zanzibar strikes the visitor less as a 'spearhead of Chinese infiltration' (though Chinese there are on the islands) than as a country that has made fundamental changes in its social and economic structure -- changes that are implicit in most African party programmes, but in practice are soft-pedalled for fear of losing foreign investment and aid."

"Zanzibar has declared that it does not want foreign private investment," explains the Economist's correspondent. "Public utilities, schools and factories have been nationalized without compensation. The economy is effectively in the government's hands. It is too early to tell whether this has brought faster economic growth or not. But the regime has certainly achieved something in the field of social welfare. Primary and secondary education, although not yet widely available, are free, and so are medical services. A United Nations expert is advising on the establishment of a social insurance scheme."

The world's leading producer of cloves and clove oil, the emphasis in Zanzibar is still on agriculture. "The expected state and co-operative farms are being established but much of the confiscated farmland is being distributed to smallholders in three-acre plots. It is hoped to make the country self-sufficient in grains within three years. The Chinese aid mission is experimenting with growing two rice crops a year. Youth-brigade farms are being set up with Ghanaian assistance, and all school children will be obliged to spend part of their holidays working on the land."

Most of the foreign aid is coming from China and the German Democratic Republic. "Fortunately," says the correspondent, "little of the aid seems to be going towards prestige projects. The Chinese are training the army (the only Russian aid now received is also military); they have also provided doctors and technical advisers in water development and agriculture. East German aid pretty well runs the whole gamut -- planning, financial and banking advisers, teachers, nurses and help with housing, radio, newspaper, fishing and fruit canning projects. Each east German project has a built-in training scheme, and the establishment of the canning industry includes a guaranteed market."

"The political picture is less clear-cut," the account continues. "The Afro-Shirazi party (the ASP) has been established as the single political party and theoretically the supreme authority. But the 32-member revolutionary council holds the real power, and rules by decree. Although the council includes former trade union and Umma party members, some senior ASP leaders are not members of the council -- among them the party's secretary-general. The party is being reorganized, and some of the present anomalies may be

cleared up if and when it is merged with Tanu, the single party in mainland Tanzania. But the merger has been indefinitely delayed."

The Economist notes that "in theory" the Zanzibar regime "professes its belief in a purely socialist economy"; but "in practice Zanzibar has not been rigidly doctrinaire." The evidence for this is that some of the "confiscated land has been distributed to individuals, and a central bank designed to shape financial policy for the whole Tanzanian union has been accepted."

Evidently the Economist still has strong hopes that the socialist-oriented economy of the small country, with a population of only 300,000, will be structurally assimilated by the much larger capitalist economy of Tanganyika.

It is a remarkable testimonial to the revolutionary mood of the times that Zanzibar has been able to hold out as long as it has and even to make progress in an anticapitalist direction.

#### SOCIALIST YOUTH IN U.S. REPORT ENCOURAGING GROWTH

The Young Socialist Alliance held the largest national convention in its history in Chicago over the week end of March 4-6. It was the YSA's fifth national convention in the seven years since its founding in June 1960. The political level of the reports and discussion reflected the continuing growth and consolidation of the YSA, the only national revolutionary-socialist youth organization in the United States.

The convention discussion focused on the antiwar movement and the continuing radicalization of American youth. This was first taken up in a report by Lew Jones on the Political Resolution. He discussed the contradictory nature of American politics today in which there is a radicalization among the youth in the midst of a period of relative quiescence in the working class. The coalition of workers, Negroes and capitalists within the Democratic party remains essentially intact and the new radicals have no mass labor or socialist party to look to. The thrust of the antiwar movement on the other hand has been away from coalitionism and liberalism. Much of the discussion on the Political Resolution was devoted to the need for the antiwar protest and Negro movements to develop a perspective for action independent of the capitalist parties.

The report on the antiwar movement by Doug Jenness reviewed the record of the YSA as a force in initiating and building the movement. He stressed the need to continue building the antiwar movement around the slogan, "Bring the Troops Home Now." The "Bring the Troops Home Newsletter," a national biweekly anti-Vietnam war newsletter was pointed to as the best organizer for the wing of the antiwar movement which stands for self-determination for Vietnam. The discussion on the antiwar movement reflected the many experiences of YSAers in building the antiwar movement in all the different regions of the

United States.

Two minority resolutions were submitted -- one on the Negro struggle and one on the antiwar movement. The antiwar minority resolution submitted by a YSAer from the Seattle local criticized the role of the YSA in the antiwar movement. The document asserted that "The U.S. is heading into a pre-revolutionary situation," and said that the YSA's policies in the antiwar movement flowed from the "inability of the present YSA leadership to make an adequate conjunctural analysis of the crisis of American capitalism and the coming American revolution." The minority resolution on the Negro struggle, submitted by two Seattle YSAers, opposed the YSA's support of black nationalism. The minority resolutions were criticized by many delegates as being totally out of touch with reality and both were unanimously rejected.

Time was set aside for a report and discussion on a new YSA draft constitution. The new constitution corrected many of the inadequacies of the original constitution passed in 1960 which reflected the inexperience of the movement at that time.

The Organizational Report by Elizabeth Barnes described the large-scale expansion of YSA activities. This has been reflected in more national speaking tours and public meetings, larger fund drives, increased sales of the Young Socialist and the publication of four new pamphlets. More than 20,000 copies of the two YSA pamphlets on Vietnam have been sold. Some 1,900 copies have been sold of the YSA pamphlet, Malcolm X Talks to Young People. The publication of more pamphlets was projected for the future and the delegates voted for a \$6,700 fund drive to meet the costs of YSA activities in the coming months. The Organizational Report put great stress on the education of YSAers; and YSA summer schools for socialist education were projected for all the larger locals.

There were two very fruitful panel discussions at the convention, one on the Negro struggle and another on civil liberties. Discussion on the Negro struggle centered around the organization of Afro-American Committees against the war in Vietnam and recent developments in the South, particularly the growth of the Black Panther party in Alabama which is running a slate of Negro candidates in opposition to the Democratic and Republican parties. A report was made on a petition sponsored by several campus organizations to include Negro history courses in the curriculum at Wayne State University in Detroit.

The civil-liberties panel discussed the general state of civil liberties today as well as a number of particular cases such as that of Lt. Howe, the soldier who is being persecuted for expressing his opposition to the war in Vietnam. There were special reports on the case of Joseph Johnson, a Socialist Workers party organizer whom the government is trying to deport, and the case of the three YSAers under indictment in Bloomington, Indiana.

During the convention the delegates got the news of Attorney General Katzenbach's request that the Subversive Activities Control

Board order the DuBois Clubs to register as a Communist front group. A telegram was immediately sent to the DuBois Clubs from the convention supporting them in their fight against the order.

John Riddell, editor of the Canadian socialist magazine, the Young Socialist Forum, reported to the convention on developments in the Canadian New Democratic party and union movement. He also reported the growth of an antiwar movement in Canada inspired by the antiwar movement in the U.S.

The two resolutions and the constitution were passed unanimously after good discussions. Much of the discussion was led by new members and activists in the antiwar movement. It is also significant that over a third of the speakers were women, with women making up a third of the new national committee.

A number of YSAers left the Young Socialist Alliance for work in the adult revolutionary-socialist movement at the time of the convention. Among these was Jack Barnes, former national chairman of the YSA. The national committee elected Lew Jones as the new national chairman and Elizabeth Barnes as national secretary.

#### AN APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN VIETNAM

[While visiting north Vietnam in the latter part of February, Ralph Schoenman, secretary of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, was invited to speak over Radio Hanoi. He took advantage of the opportunity to address his remarks to the American soldiers who might be listening in. The following is the text of Schoenman's speech as released in London.]

\* \* \*

I speak to you today from Hanoi as one American to another. Like you I love my country and like you I believe in justice and human freedom.

Brothers, you know what kind of war we are fighting against the people of Vietnam. It is barbaric. It is an aggressive war of conquest that all of us hate and few of us understand.

When we fought for our own independence and freedom, no one had to tell us what it was about or draft us to make us fight. And we didn't have to go 10,000 miles. We fought in our revolutionary war against foreign troops, mercenaries and Benedict Arnold. We had only pitchforks and muskets; and we hid in forests and fields. We were ragtag and the occupiers were the strongest army of that day. We were hungry and poor. We fought them house by house and farm by farm. That war was our war of liberation.

They said we were terrorists. We, Americans, in our own villages and towns! And they, the colonial occupier, they were the ones

calling us rebels and rabble.

What did Nathan Hale say when he was caught trying to ambush the British? "My only regret is that I have but one life to give my country."

And Patrick Henry: "Is life so sweet or peace so dear that we would remain slaves to have them? I know not what other men may say, but as for me: Give me liberty or give me death."

Those words still ring in our hearts after two hundred years. We still repeat them.

Who then is the Nathan Hale and the Patrick Henry in Vietnam? It isn't the U.S. army, not us. And we know it. Who came thousands of miles over the sea to kill and destroy? The British did it to us and we are doing it to the Vietnamese. Who shows that heroism, that love of country, that deep belief in freedom and justice which is more powerful than any weapon ever made? We did in 1776; the people of Vietnam do today. We are fighting the same war against them that the Nazis fought against the people and for the same reasons. Let me quote from the New York Times of February 12, 1950:

"Indo-China is a prize worth a large gamble. In the North are exportable tin, tungsten, manganese, coal, lumber and rice; rubber, tea, pepper and hides. Even before World War II Indo-China yielded dividends estimated at 300 million dollars per year."

Our own State Department told us what this war is about as clearly as anyone could wish only one year later:

"We have only partially exploited Southeast Asia's resources. Nevertheless Southeast Asia supplied 90% of the world's crude rubber, 60% of its tin and 80% of its copra and coconut oil. It has sizable quantities of sugar, tea, coffee, tobacco, sisal, fruits, spices, natural resins and gums, petroleum, iron ore and bauxite."

And Eisenhower said it in 1953: "Now let us assume we lost Indo-China. If Indo-China goes, the tin and tungsten we so greatly value would cease coming. We are after the cheapest way to prevent the occurrence of something terrible -- the loss of our ability to get what we want from the riches of the Indo-Chinese territory and from Southeast Asia."

So we are the cannon fodder. We are the ones they deceive into killing Vietnamese, attacking, occupying, using gas and chemicals, bombing their schools and hospitals -- all this horror to protect the empire of our rich men.

Yes, our rich men. They own sixty per cent of the world's resources. That's the real and only reason we pour out \$60,000,000,000 on arms. That's why we occupy countries everywhere and keep over 3,000 bases on other peoples' soil and invade every country which tries to free itself as we did in 1776.

We invade Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, the Congo and set up our stooges everywhere. The men who sit in the Pentagon and push the buttons -- they're the ones who sit on the boards of directors and sign those military contracts -- for themselves. They send us out here as company cops to protect their stolen property.

And what about our country? What about our cities with our slums taking up one-third of New York and Chicago and Los Angeles? And what about freedom in Watts and Harlem, in Georgia? -- where those who really fight for freedom, the kind that means something, they get shot down in our streets by our cops.

The people of Vietnam have fought for twenty-five years against the Japanese, the French (we paid for the French war) and now us. We're doing the same job Tojo did and for the same reason and the same financial interests.

I've traveled all through north Vietnam while the bombs were falling. Let me tell you this: We're bombing hospitals and sanatoriums, schools, churches. I've seen the people who were strafed running out of the hospitals, the old-age homes, on crutches. Red Cross flags were flying on the buildings. We're using "lazy dogs" which slice up kids in villages from one end of the country to the other. We're using poisons. We're using gas and that gas is poison and we know it. It kills our own soldiers even when they wear gas masks. And we're using chemicals which kill people as well as destroy their food.

And those tin-pot Hitlers in Saigon have put millions of people in concentration camps under our orders. They torture and mutilate every patriot they can get their hands on. Washington is making us war criminals. Like the SS. The difference between the Gestapo and us is not noticeable to the people of Vietnam. In our hearts we know that they see us as the occupation army we are.

The brass hats and the money boys at home have made us their victims. These new Hitlers use us to carry out every war crime in the book. That's the truth. But the Vietnamese fight to the last man, woman and child just as we would if it were our country.

Brothers: If our people were invaded and occupied for twenty-five years; if sixty per cent of our people were in concentration camps; if our cities were burned to the ground with jelly gasoline, if our farms and crops and water and children were poisoned with chemicals and gassed in their homes, what would we say to demands from the criminals, who had done all this, that we talk peace while their army stayed and the traitors who served them were called our government? Brothers, we'd fight!

We carry on our conscience these crimes against the Vietnamese. That is what our American protest movement is about. That is the real struggle for democracy, for American democracy. That is the real battle front for freedom -- the fight against our rulers who exploit us and degrade us in the name of our own country.

We have as much right to our country as those in Washington



who have stolen it and who make our name stink in the nostrils of decent people all over the world. Let Johnson and McNamara come here in their underwear and fight their own battle if they want to. The people of Vietnam will deal with them. But we must go home. We must stop murdering these heroic people. Our battle is in Washington against the men who sent us to kill and torment the Vietnamese. If we resist we can redeem our country.

It is not the evil which is new nor is it the crisis which has changed. It is simply that we stand today where the Germans stood in the nineteen thirties, because the tyranny and cruelty is done by our government in our name. And so in the name of all we value, let us refuse to fight this unjust war. Resistance begins with the question: When, if not now; and who, if not I?

Remember that you are not alone. Thousands of Americans are marching in every city. Every university rings with the sound of our American resistance. We are rising together with the most articulate of our fellow Americans: our poets, our playwrights, our professors, our students -- with the very heart of the American nation. No force can stop us. No prison can hold us and no weapon can kill our spirit. There is no power capable of bringing us to our knees. We are struggling for an America free of murderous production and free of war criminals.

You American soldiers have seen with your own eyes the pitiless horror of our war against the people of Vietnam. Help us free our country from the shame and burden of such wars. We were born free men. The choice and responsibility is ours.