

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. 21

June 24, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Will Continue to Step Up War in Vietnam, Says Johnson	2
U.S. Escalates Military Activities in Thailand	3
-- by Dick Roberts	5
Mississippi Marchers Discuss Self-Defense	6
The Political Purge in China Widens	6
-- by George Novack	10
TUC Stabs British Seamen in the Back	12
-- by John Walters	12
Iranian Court Hears Hekmatdjou's Appeal	13
A Shift in Japan's Policy toward China?	13
-- by Joseph Hansen	16
The Buddhist Opposition Is Weighed and Found Wanting	18
-- by Dick Lemaire	19
"Ban the Bomb" Trial Postponed in Greece	20
SPD Approves Talks with SED	21
American Officers Argue over Vietnam	21
Joan Baez Sings for Wolf Biermann	21
Japanese Workers Refuse to Film Dirty War	22
Indian Trotskyists Organize Gujarat Unit	23
-- by Kailas Chandra	24
Japanese Trotskyists Protest Murder of Leo Bernard	24
Suzanne Zakine Still Held in Prison by Boumedienne	24
Japanese Businessmen Feted in Peking	25
What Mao's Thought Can Do for You:	25
Get the Mail Delivered on Time	26
Keep Perishable Goods without Refrigeration	28
Give the Vatican a Run for Its Money	29
The More You Read, the More You Want	31
A Radiant Sun, Telescope and Microscope Combined	31
Documents:	32
To the People of Vietnam	32
To the American Soldiers in South Vietnam	32

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. 21

June 24, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Will Continue to Step Up War in Vietnam, Says Johnson	2
U.S. Escalates Military Activities in Thailand	
-- by Dick Roberts	3
Mississippi Marchers Discuss Self-Defense	5
The Political Purge in China Widens	
-- by George Novack	6
TUC Stabs British Seamen in the Back	
-- by John Walters	10
Iranian Court Hears Hekmatdjou's Appeal	12
A Shift in Japan's Policy toward China?	
-- by Joseph Hansen	13
The Buddhist Opposition Is Weighed and Found Wanting	
-- by Dick Lemaire	16
"Ban the Bomb" Trial Postponed in Greece	18
SPD Approves Talks with SED	19
American Officers Argue over Vietnam	20
Joan Baez Sings for Wolf Biermann	21
Japanese Workers Refuse to Film Dirty War	21
Indian Trotskyists Organize Gujarat Unit	
-- by Kailas Chandra	22
Japanese Trotskyists Protest Murder of Leo Bernard	23
Suzanne Zakine Still Held in Prison by Boumedienne	24
Japanese Businessmen Feted in Peking	24
What Mao's Thought Can Do for You:	
Get the Mail Delivered on Time	25
Keep Perishable Goods without Refrigeration	26
Give the Vatican a Run for Its Money	28
The More You Read, the More You Want	29
A Radiant Sun, Telescope and Microscope Combined	31
Documents:	
To the People of Vietnam	32
To the American Soldiers in South Vietnam	32

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WILL CONTINUE TO STEP UP WAR IN VIETNAM, SAYS JOHNSON

As Ky's troops reduced the points of resistance in Hué, he told the press June 18: "As far as I am concerned, it's all over. We are over the hump."

What the premier meant was that both Danang and Hué, the strongholds of Buddhist political opposition to his regime, are now occupied cities. To all intents and purposes they are now equal in status to the rest of south Vietnam.

Ky's military victory, however, by no means signifies that he is "over the hump" politically. In fact the military victory was a substitute for political victory and only served to further emphasize the isolation of the Ky regime from the very forces it claims to represent.

Without political support, Ky is now even less able than before to conduct a military struggle. Part of his forces must be detailed to maintain control in his main base of operations.

It is quite clear that still more of the actual fighting in south Vietnam will now devolve on the American troops and the auxiliaries brought in from South Korea, Australia and New Zealand.

This appears to have been realized by Johnson. At a press conference June 18, he stated: "In the light of the full information available to the President of the United States, we sincerely feel that the national interest required that we persist in our present policy. That policy is to bring to bear the ground, naval and air strength required to achieve our objectives. I must observe that this does not mean that we shall not increase our forces or our operations."

Johnson admitted that American public opinion is divided over his policy in Vietnam and that "A minority of our people, it is true, are willing now to pull out." He sought to balance this off by claiming that another minority wants the U.S. to "use our total power" while others agree with his policy.

He also noted that in the primaries held by the Democratic party not a single candidate who opposed Johnson's policy in Vietnam was able to win. The vote in the primaries is confined to registered members of the Democratic party, of course, and this outcome was expected. Voting for Democratic candidates who wear the mantle of peace is scarcely an effective way of winning peace -- as the 1964 presidential elections proved rather decisively.

Johnson's insistence on carrying on the escalation of the war is absolutely certain to stir up an antiwar movement such as the United States has never seen before. Ky's "victories" in Danang and Hué will turn out to have helped this process along.

U.S. ESCALATES MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN THAILAND

By Dick Roberts

An increasingly ominous side effect of the Vietnamese war is the expansion of U.S. military activity in Thailand. In the earlier stages of the war, it was well known that Washington was using Thailand as a base for its air attacks against both north and south Vietnam.

Hanson W. Baldwin, the New York Times military specialist, reported on January 23 that "several hundred United States aircraft and more than 13,000 American servicemen are now stationed in Thailand, and the number of men is expected to more than double if the war continues."

Baldwin stated that there were five U.S. air bases in Thailand already. However he also explained that the U.S. army was "engaged on a major road construction program." One army engineer battalion, according to Baldwin, had been in Thailand since 1962. It had completed a "61-mile, two lane, hard-surfaced road."

Two facts are worth noting in this description: First, the extensive nature of the military construction, including major roads, supply depots and ports as well as air bases; and second, the fact that Washington began this construction in 1962 -- three years before the actual escalation of the Vietnamese war to include large-scale U.S. bombing of Vietnam from foreign bases. Both facts suggest, although they do not prove, that more is involved in this operation than simply the construction of air bases, for the purposes of bombing Vietnam.

Thailand, like the artificial entity of "South" Vietnam, was included in the 1954 Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. This far-sighted military pact was undertaken by the Eisenhower government to lay the groundwork for precisely the kind of development that has subsequently taken place in south Vietnam -- namely, a revolution against the U.S.-supported ruling classes in Southeast Asia.

Like south Vietnam in 1954, Thailand was ruled by a "constitutional" monarchy. Its king, Phumipol Adulyadej, Rama IX, dates his family back to the thirteenth century. Even today, although he has relinquished actual power to the prime minister, Phumipol lives in fabulous luxury, along with the other members of his feudal clique. On the other hand, 90 percent of Thailand's population of nearly 30,000,000 are peasants who live in abject poverty.

These objective conditions, and Thailand's proximity both to China and Vietnam were sufficient reasons for the Pentagon to consider establishing a military framework there long before the specific development of the Vietnamese war in its present phase.

Furthermore, the war in Vietnam has undoubtedly had an impact on the Thai population. The U.S. bases have been used day after day to pound their Vietnamese brothers.

Thus it is not at all surprising to see more and more evidence that the beginnings of an armed struggle against the Bangkok regime and the U.S. aggressors has begun to take shape in Thailand -- precisely, no doubt, as John Foster Dulles expected in 1954. Several underground radio stations are known to be broadcasting revolutionary appeals to the Thai peasants [see World Outlook, June 3]; and there are signs that guerrilla attacks have been launched in certain areas.

All speculations about Washington's intentions in Thailand, however, were completely set aside by the publication last month of long excerpts from the January 8, February 4 and 8 hearings of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in which various officials of the Democratic Administration testified.

The excerpts were published in book form by Greenleaf Classics under the title The Truth About Vietnam, edited by Frank M. Robinson and Earl Kemp. The book has an introduction by Senator Wayne Morse and a foreward by Senator J.W. Fulbright.

Although the subject of Thailand occupies only a small part of the testimony included in The Truth About Vietnam, practically every time it was mentioned, new light was shed on Washington's policy.

In his original statement to the Senate committee, January 28, Secretary of State Dean Rusk noted that out of a \$275 million supplemental appropriation bill for the Agency for International Development [AID], some \$7.5 million was allocated for expense in Thailand.

On February 4, David Bell, AID chief administrator, went into further detail on the reasons for spending money in Thailand.

"In Thailand," Bell stated, "as the committee knows, there was an announcement from Peiping [Peking] a few months ago, that the same kind of attack which was launched several years ago in Vietnam, will be launched in the present year in Thailand. We have been anticipating this for the last 2 or 3 years and the American economic assistance program has been helping the Thai Government develop a program for security and progress in the rural areas, particularly in northeast and northern Thailand. That program has made some headway."

Bell continued, "I had the opportunity to visit there a month ago, and was well impressed. The problem is very serious; there are beginnings of the same kind of guerrilla attacks, sneak attacks, assassinations of civilian officials and policemen in northeast Thailand which have been so characteristic of the difficulties in Vietnam. The problem in Thailand is an increasing one and we are helping the Thai step up their efforts to meet it."

Later in the cross-questioning before the committee members, Bell had occasion to elucidate on the "guerrilla attacks." "When I was in Thailand in the first week in January," he stated, "there was an attack on a police post in which some six Thai policemen were murdered by an organized gang from a jungle base, and which is organized into some sort of -- what they would call, I suppose -- a liberation front of the same kind that exists in South Vietnam."

The senators were so horrified that they asked Bell if \$7.5 million would be sufficient to "throttle" the "danger." The Democratic administrator then explained that the \$7.5 million appropriation was actually only a supplement to a total program of \$32 million. It included: "greatly strengthening the police forces" and "investment in all kinds of equipment, training efforts, police equipment..."

Thailand was mentioned one other time in the course of the hearings excerpted in The Truth About Vietnam. This was when Lt. Gen. James Gavin, the proponent of the so-called enclave theory of military strategy, mentioned what the U.S. was doing in Thailand as a good example of the extension of his theory:

"We now have logistical deployment in Thailand," Gavin explained, "in anticipation of troubles there of a very serious order of magnitude, harbors, bridges, highways, which are always the forerunner of a proper and efficient deployment of troops that will follow..."

MISSISSIPPI MARCHERS DISCUSS SELF-DEFENSE

As the Meredith civil-rights march moved deeper into Mississippi, the question of self-defense grew more acute. Police harassed some of the marchers; the Ku Klux Klan burned crosses.

In face of these threats, Ernest Thomas, chief organizer of the Deacons for Defense and Justice, brought a contingent of followers. They have guarded the nightly campsites "with pistols, rifles and shotguns." They have also provided armed escorts for any marchers who travel at night to the airport at Memphis.

Self-defense is under hot discussion among the marchers. Some of them hold that self-defense is inconsistent with a belief in nonviolence. Bishop Charles Ewbank Tucker of the African Methodist Church voiced the opposite view in an earthy way. Arriving June 13, he blessed the marchers, saying: "Any Negro or white has the right to defend himself with arms. Any man who didn't ought to take off his pants and wear skirts."

And on a nationwide TV program June 19, Stokely Carmichael, one of the leaders of the march, stood up under some very provocative questioning to stoutly defend the right of an oppressed people to use whatever means they find necessary to win their freedom.

THE POLITICAL PURGE IN CHINA WIDENS

By George Novack

The dragnet of the preventive political purge within the high echelons of the Chinese Communist party is being cast far and wide. It has spread southward from the capital at Peking, where it was initiated, to Shanghai and Canton and now covers most of the principal provinces. Party branches, newspaper staffs and cultural organizations have gone through big shake-ups in many parts of the country.

The highest official thus far implicated is Peking's mayor, Peng Chen, member of the Politbureau and one of the top ten in the party hierarchy. He has been dismissed as first secretary of the party's Peking Municipal Committee. With him went Lu Ping, president of Peking University, and two other officials of the country's leading educational institution, who were accused of protecting disgraced intellectuals guilty of bourgeois and revisionist heresies.

The entire editorial boards of the Peking Daily, and Peking Evening News and the fortnightly magazine Front Line were cashiered for publishing articles by men who, though holding top party posts, had committed "heinous antiparty and anti-Socialist crimes." All staffs had compounded their guilt by not showing enough repentance when caught red-handed, it was said.

An unnamed director in the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee who is most probably the noted author, Chou Yang, was accused of encouraging the production of an allegorical opera by a "gangster's den" of the arts in Shanghai which was really intended to urge party leaders to give up office in favor of the revisionists. Since 1951 Chou has served as vice-minister of Cultural Affairs and vice-chairman of the All-China Federation of Literary and Art Circles. He is a well-known exponent of official views in philosophy. Lu Ting-yi, director of the Propaganda Department, has not been seen in Peking since the end of February.

If official statements are taken at face value, the situation is grave. A June 4 editorial in Jenmin Jih Pao, the Communist party's central newspaper, declared that even the oldest and topmost leaders would be removed if they opposed Mao's policies. "Anyone who opposes Chairman Mao Tse-tung, opposes Mao Tse-tung's thoughts, opposes the party central leadership, opposes the proletariat's dictatorship, opposes the correct way of socialism, whoever that may be, however high may be the position and however old his standing, he will be struck down by the entire party and by the entire people," the editorial said.

The party magazine Hung Chi warned June 10 against the risk of a bourgeois counterrevolution and asserted there would be bloodshed unless steps were taken to stop it. The editorial called

on the Chinese people to guard against a "counterrevolutionary" uprising on the 1956 Hungarian model. It said bourgeois elements in China remain unreconciled and "there may be a spontaneous outburst of bourgeois strength" at any moment. It declared that those who wanted to disrupt the party from within would have to be crushed "because the danger in disguise is the most serious danger."

Such ominous statements indicate that the ruling group around Mao, and very likely the army chief, Defense Minister Lin Piao, are resolved to eliminate all those dissidents within the party and its high command who have any question about its current course or the wisdom and authority of the infallible premier.

Recent reverses in the foreign field extending from the Sino-Soviet dispute to Indonesia would seem to call for an "agonizing reappraisal" of Peking's international orientation. Changes at home are also projected.

According to the usually well-informed Toronto Star correspondent, Mark Gayn, a fierce dispute is in progress over agrarian policy, the most sensitive of domestic issues. Dissidents have suggested that the peasants be allowed to sell in the open market the produce grown on their tiny private plots. He writes that the government plans to introduce some unpopular measures in the next two months, involving the socialization of the peasant plots, which may in good years provide up to half a family's income, and revisions in the system of payment for work done in the commune fields.

Whatever is contemplated in the rural economy, it is obvious that the repressive measures against the intellectuals is the regime's reply to the desire for more freedom of thought and expression among writers, dramatists, moviemakers, historians, philosophers and journalists. This is the darkest hour for China's literati since the crackdown following the short-lived "hundred flowers bloom episode" in 1957. They are so far the chief sacrificial victims to the idolatrous cult of Mao's omniscience.

If the Peking regime was democratic and scrupulously internationalist in outlook, it would, as Castro and his associates have so often done on similar occasions, have come before the nation and stated what problems were involved, what the essential divergences were, and why the course adopted was preferable and necessary.

If the Chinese Communist party operated on the principles of democratic centralism along Leninist lines, its members would be fully informed about the contending views and arguments so they would be able to discuss, criticize, and decide upon them. In this way party democracy and the control of the ranks over the leaders would be exercised and guaranteed.

What prevails is quite different. Instead of a dialogue between the government and people and a give-and-take discussion

within the party, a screeching, deafening monologue is blared out upon the country like martial music from a loudspeaker. Only the line of the officialdom which is conducting the purge is heard.

Yet no clear and comprehensible explanation of the areas or issues in dispute is given. They hurl far-fetched accusations, imprecations, threats, and other kinds of verbal violence as morally broken individuals engage in humiliating recantations and self-criticism which dishonor the regime that requires them and discredit the name of socialism.

Instead of reasoned debate, noisy demonstrations of students take place in front of professors' offices. Culprits are stigmatized in the press as "rattlesnakes" and as class enemies who are no better than counterrevolutionary landlords and capitalists. And there are no means of verifying the charges.

* * *

Despite their disagreements on other matters, the Chinese Communist leaders show themselves to be the same as their Soviet counterparts in their manner of dealing with divergences in their own circles. When Khrushchev ousted the Molotov-Kaganovich team in 1957, they were not allowed to utter a word in public or to the party in their defense nor have they attended any subsequent party congresses, despite their long tenure in the leadership.

When Khrushchev was thrown out overnight in 1964, he, too, was given no chance to answer his opponents. He abruptly became, like Stalin, a political and historical "unperson." Hailed as the illustrious herald of the coming Communism at the twenty-second party congress, he was not present at the recent twenty-third congress, or even mentioned by name in its proceedings. Who among the present luminaries, we may ask, will get similar treatment at the next congress?

In their polemics during the Sino-Soviet controversy, the Chinese Communists averred, in defiance of Stalinist custom, that the majority could be wrong and the minority right. Yet they refuse to admit or apply this excellent axiom to their own party life today.

Isn't it possible that certain persons in the minority may be right, at least on certain points, against the present positions of the ruling cadre and shouldn't that be taken into account in the conduct of the controversy? This possibility was one of the major reasons for Lenin's organizational method of democratic centralism.

However, no one can be right against the sagacity of Mao. This is so all-sufficient that the Chinese CP has not had to hold a national congress in at least eight years. Its record is worse than that of the Soviet Communist party. Since it lost Stalin, the CPUSSR has held congresses much more often, even though these have

been largely bureaucratic parades of cut-and-dried policy decisions.

Outside of the top bureaucratic circles, the rank and file of the party and friends and allies in other countries have no way of knowing the score. They are reduced to groping in the dark for clues and hints of what is at issue in the ruling summits.

Such monolithism is a baneful heritage of Stalinism. It is the mode of operation favored by irremovable bureaucrats who grow accustomed to working out their policies and arriving at decisions without prior submission to the judgment of their own ranks and rectification by them.

* * *

The Soviet authorities have yet to comment on the internal conflict in China. We do not know the reasons for this restraint. But if they were genuine disciples of Lenin, and not of Stalin, they would be suffering a case of bad conscience.

One of the main points of controversy in the party and army is reported to revolve around relations with the USSR. This is a complex problem from Peking's vantage point.

Moscow has carefully refrained from giving an unequivocal pledge to Peking or letting Washington and the world understand that, in case of attack by the U.S., it is ready to come to China's defense. Peking has observed how sluggishly the Kremlin reacted against Johnson's bombings of north Vietnam.

The Mao leadership is wrong in refusing to participate in a united front with other workers states against U.S. imperialist intervention because of its differences with the Soviet revisionists. But it has cause to suspect Moscow's good faith and intentions and accusing it of collusion with Washington against the People's Republic of China.

At this juncture of peril to Vietnam and China, it is imperative that the Soviet government, which has the military might to make its promise "credible," make it plain that it would not and could not stand aside if China is attacked. On the other side, Peking should alter its intransigent attitude and enter into the broadest united front of workers states to strengthen the defense of the revolution in southeast Asia. These should be twin pillars of a correct internationalist policy in the present critical situation for world peace.

* * *

One further consideration might be brought to the attention of Mao's mind and its interpreters. The National Liberation Front, Hanoi and Peking have all expressed appreciation of the American antiwar movement and recognized the role it can play in deterring or halting Johnson's war drive.

The impermissible methods employed by the Mao regime against its Communist critics inside the party makes a very unfavorable impression upon the best elements among the antiwar forces. These young rebels value truth, honesty, plain dealing above all else. That has been one of the sources of Castro's magnetism for them.

They detest lies and equivocation by political leaders of any type and consciously reject the deceitful policies of Stalinism, as the American CP leaders have found out. Monolithism is anti-pathetic to the democratic spirit of their radicalism and idealism.

They not only spark the expanding "bring the troops home now" movement which is unprecedented in twentieth century American experience. They have been foremost in demanding U.S. diplomatic recognition of China, an end to the boycott and blockade, and admission of China into the United Nations.

As the firmest partisans of revolutionary China and the Vietnamese freedom fights, they occupy within the bastion of imperialism a decisively important sector of the anti-imperialist and antiwar front. Bureaucratic methods of dealing with political dissenters depresses these militants and makes their task of defending China and the colonial revolution more difficult.

Isn't their situation worth taking into account by the Maoists for the sake of the security of China itself against further aggressions by the U.S. imperialists?

TUC STABS BRITISH SEAMEN IN THE BACK

By John Walters

London

A standard move by any British government in an important industrial dispute is to have the Ministry of Labour set up a court of enquiry. True to form, the Wilson government did this. The court reported its findings June 8 and, as was expected, came up with the usual compromise in favor of the employers.

The court recommended that the seamen should be granted a 48-hour week this year and a 40-hour week next year.

It also condemned the National Union of Seamen for calling the strike: "In our view the Executive Council were not justified in using the strike weapon without further attempts to resolve the position....The owners stood firm on their last offer. In our view this was in the circumstances not an unreasonable attitude."

The statement caused great resentment amongst the seamen, and exposes the court as being fundamentally an instrument of the employers, who naturally jumped at the offer of a compromise in their favor.

Another source of anger for the seamen was the fact that this year's chairman of the TUC [Trades Union Congress], Joe O'Hagen, was a member of the court of enquiry.

The report emphasizes the good sense of the NUS in turning down all the attempts made to get it to call off the strike while the court of enquiry was sitting.

In a meeting June 8, the executive of the NUS rejected the report unanimously, thus dashing hopes voiced in the capitalist press of a split on the question. They stuck to their demand for a 40-hour week now.

The NUS appealed to the TUC for its official support in the strike. On June 9 the General Purposes Committee of the TUC met with the NUS executive to discuss this and the court of enquiry report.

The meeting is reported to have been a stormy one. Joe O'Hagen was in the chair. The seamen immediately objected as they consider him to be biased. However this was smoothed over and the meeting began.

It turned out that far from giving the seamen support, the TUC tried to talk them into accepting the findings of the report. After several hours, it became apparent that the NUS would not give way, being firmly resolved to stick it out for their original demands. After the meeting, it was announced that the TUC was not recommending support for the seamen to its affiliated members.

This is a severe blow to the seamen and will certainly weaken their position. However, despite the attitude of the TUC, it still remains for the individual unions concerned to make up their own minds concerning support. The TUC position will nevertheless weigh heavily in coming to a decision. It remains to be seen how the unions most involved; e.g., the Transport and General Workers Union, will react. At the moment they are rather noncommittal.

What the TUC really decided was to let the NUS face the government and the employers alone. It gave the government a club for use if it should turn to the navy to break the strike, as it appears to be preparing to do.

Seeking to avoid a head-on clash with the unions, Wilson maneuvered to split them, and no doubt hopes to isolate the seamen.

The right-wing bureaucrats are pleased over the excuse not to support the seamen; some of the "leftists" are relieved at not having been called on to demonstrate their leftism in practice. However, there is powerful rank-and-file support for the seamen throughout the country, and any movement of ships by the navy will provoke militant action by the dockers and others.

The NUS have appealed to the International Transport Workers Federation to list all British ships throughout the world as "un-

fair." At the time of writing, the decision of the ITWF is not known, but it will probably be affected by the TUC decision.

Messages of support have been coming to the NUS from all over the world, but most of the unions are waiting for the meeting of the ITWF before applying a wholesale boycott of British shipping. It should be noted, however, that the ITWF has already given its backing to the NUS in the strike so far. Also the Transport affiliate of the World Federation of Trade Unions has called on all its members not to load or unload British ships.

The British seamen now face a much longer and harder struggle than would have been necessary had the TUC expressed solidarity with the strikers. It now remains to be seen how well the NUS is able to obtain and keep the support of the rank and file in other British unions and the overseas unions. There is every reason to believe that if they stand firm they will win their whole claim.

If they do win, the Wilson government will be faced with a spectacular crisis. The pound has been under heavy pressure in the money market and a victory for the seamen opens up the possibility of devaluation of the pound. This in turn would place in question the stability of the dollar.

Already there are rumors in the press that the government intends to impose a wage freeze in the second half of the year. If it does, this will force even those who are standing to the side in the seamen's strike to take up cudgels against the government. This is why so much depends on how the seamen's strike goes.

IRANIAN COURT HEARS HEKMATDJOU'S APPEAL

The appeals of Parviz Hekmatdjou and Ali Khavari from the death sentence because of their political views were considered by a Teheran court in hearings that began June 13.

On the second day, according to the Paris daily Le Monde, the court listened to the military prosecution and to Mr. Bahrevar, the attorney for the main defendant, Hekmatdjou.

The prosecutor demanded that the death sentence be upheld. He also sought to have the eighteen-month sentences passed against five other defendants increased to seven years.

For the first time, it was learned that part of the "evidence" of espionage alleged by the prosecution was a report sent to leaders of the Tudeh (Communist) party in East Berlin in which violence and the organization of peasant militia were advocated. The defense noted that the alleged report was not included in the prosecution dossier and that in any case such a report did not constitute "espionage."

A SHIFT IN JAPAN'S POLICY TOWARD CHINA?

By Joseph Hansen

What went wrong at the nine-power conference held in Seoul June 14-16? Instead of ending up with a strong endorsement of Johnson's war in Vietnam, as projected, the gathering came out with an equivocal statement; and while, as planned, it condemned nuclear tests in the Pacific, it refrained from naming either France or the People's Republic of China, the two countries involved.

The conference was carefully managed from the wings by the State Department. Washington did not even take credit for initiating it. Lee Tong Won, the foreign minister of the puppet South Korean government, was said to have thought it up.

All the participants -- South Korea, South Vietnam, Chiang Kai-shek's "China," the Philippines, Malaysia, New Zealand, Australia, Thailand and Japan -- have already sent troops to Vietnam or taken a public stand backing Johnson's escalation of the war.

"To avoid compromising its [the conference's] integrity," as Robert Trumbull put it in the New York Times of June 14, the State Department "declined an invitation to send a team of observers from the United States Embassy, headed by Ambassador Winthrop G. Brown." And to spare "everyone considerable embarrassment," Nguyen Cao Ky cancelled his scheduled appearance at the parley.

Everything was thus skillfully arranged to give maximum weight to an endorsement of Johnson's policies in Vietnam.

Yet the strongest thing achieved by the conference appears to have been an agreement to meet annually, to set up a standing committee and to name the new association the "Asian and Pacific Council" or ASPAC -- "an attractive name with a masculine sound," according to Thanat Khoman, the foreign minister of Thailand.

The stumbling block was Japan. Reporting from Seoul June 16, Robert Trumbull indicated this rather clearly:

"Japan's Foreign Minister, Etsusaburo Shiina, took what conference sources called a soft stand -- because, it was said, of heavy political pressure on the Tokyo Government to broaden contacts with Communist China. The war in Vietnam is also not popular in Japan, although Premier Eisaku Sato's Government supports the United States position."

A Japanese diplomat said, according to Trumbull: "We can support American policy on Vietnam, but to take a stand on our own responsibility is more difficult."

In other words, without the physical presence of an American representative to ride herd, not even this gathering of puppets and

satellite powers could be trusted to carry out the belligerent line laid down for them by Johnson.

The unexpected outcome of the Seoul conference apparently irritated the Johnson administration. As a result a two-day meeting was called for June 19-20 at Sengokuhara, a resort at the foot of Mount Fuji. Washington will be represented by a ten-man policy planning team, headed by Samuel D. Berger, Assistant Secretary of State, and Edwin O. Reischauer. Nobuhiko Ushiba, vice-minister of foreign affairs, will head counterparts from the Tokyo Foreign Office.

The secret talks "may be complicated by Japan's confusing role in the diplomacy of the Asian and Pacific region, as demonstrated this week at the nine-nation conference in Seoul," Trumbull explained, reporting this time from Japan in the June 19 New York Times. After the talks, "the Americans expect to have a clearer idea of Japan's new Asian diplomacy."

It would thus seem that the State Department came to the conclusion, on the basis of what happened in Seoul, that Japan has already made a considerable shift in its foreign policy.

"The effect of Japan's position in the Seoul conference," according to Trumbull, "was to prevent the formation of a strong regional organization of countries opposed to Communism...."

"Etsusaburo Shiina, the Japanese Foreign Minister, said on his return to Tokyo yesterday that he regretted the use of the term 'council' in the title of the new group. He added that he had really won the point anyway because, in his view, the establishment of an ambassadorial committee and the agreement to meet again did not constitute an organization...."

"Above the confusion produced at Seoul was the clear indication that from now on Japan will exercise a governing voice, if not decisive leadership, in any international deliberations among the non-Communist states of Asia and the Pacific.

"The talks in Seoul showed that Japan is emerging from two decades of diplomatic seclusion following her defeat in World War II."

What happened at Seoul becomes even clearer when it is placed against the background of developments during the previous three weeks in Japan.

On May 24 Kenzo Matsumura, the 83-year-old elder statesman of the ruling Liberal-Democratic party, returned from his fourth post-war trip to Peking. A spokesman of the more liberal wing of the party, credited with negotiating the Liao-Takasaki trade agreement with China, Matsumura has long advocated a positive policy toward the People's Republic of China. Up to this point, however, he had gone along with working for it within the framework of the restraints imposed by Washington which bar the Japanese government from acting independently.

Upon arriving in Tokyo, Matsumura came out for a change in this policy. He called on the Sato government to make a strong friendly move in the direction of Peking. "The Government and Liberal-Democratic Party should open their eyes wider and act with boldness," he said. He even went so far as to indicate that the question was so important that a split in the Liberal-Democratic party would be justified if the Sato administration failed to act.

Whether it was done strictly on his own initiative or in accordance with a behind-the-scenes understanding with the right wing of the party, Matsumura's stand created a sensation. On June 7 the top leaders of the party held a secret session attended by Prime Minister Eisaku Sato, Shojiro Kawashima, the vice-president of the LDP, three key party officers and Chief Cabinet Secretary Tomisaburo Hashimoto. All that was reported about the discussion, however, was an agreement to bring the government and the party "into line" on Japan's policy toward China.

In a series of meetings with party figures, academicians and businessmen, Matsumura continued his campaign. A persistent suggestion in his talks was that Japan should reconsider its present "gradual approach" to Peking and start thinking about steps toward restoring full ties with China.

That Matsumura met with a favorable response can be judged by the observation of Junichiro Susuki in the June 9 Japan Times: "Now nobody disputes Matsumura's counsel that Conservative politicians need not be frightened at the Chinese communism and that they look into the developments in the mainland with an open mind."

The big question, Susuki declares, is what would be the "consequences" -- obviously in Washington -- of a "reversal in Japan's nonrecognition policy...?"

In the Diet June 9 Foreign Minister Shiina said: "It is not so easy as Matsumura would have us believe for the Government to scrap the current 'accumulation formula,' that is, a gradual approach in favor of a bold move to 'normalize relations once and for all.'" But Shiina also said, "We have not arrived at any conclusion on the question since we intend to base our ultimate decision on the trend of international opinion." (This is a diplomatic way of saying the trend of opinion in Washington.)

The domestic political situation is also a strong element in Matsumura's calculations, it appears. Kazuo Kuroda observes in the June 11 Japan Times: "He is firmly convinced that the conservative-minded Japanese should not let the Socialists and the Communists monopolize the matter of closer relations with mainland China and this motivation of his may deserve appreciation."

What remains unknown is whether or not on the eve of the Seoul conference a decision was made to utilize the occasion to bring Washington's "nonrecognition" policy a bit closer to the toppling point. That, probably, is the main question the American contingent wants answered at the quiet lake resort at the foot of Mount Fuji.

THE BUDDHIST OPPOSITION IS WEIGHED AND FOUND WANTING

By Dick Lemaire

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

* * *

In comparing the events in central Vietnam with the events around the fall of Diem in 1963, one cannot help but be struck by the difference in the results. The uprisings in Hué and Danang in the last two months brought an enormous power to bear which disrupted all of the plans of Washington and the Pentagon. Never, perhaps, has a mass uprising of such magnitude been directed against a government as shaky as that of Ky. Nonetheless, Ky emerged triumphant in both places.

Obviously the Americans drew a lesson from the fall of Diem -- they no longer have any room for maneuver in Vietnam. They will support their bloody puppet to the bitter end because he is their last card and they know that any compromise would be the first step toward admitting defeat -- a defeat that has already occurred and which they are trying to cover up by committing genocide in the pattern of Hitlerism.

But this is not enough to explain the defeat of the people in central Vietnam. All of Ky's so crude ruses and his double-talk about elections and yet remaining in power; and, finally, his surprise attack on Danang could not have succeeded without the betrayal of the masses by the Buddhists and their allies in the military command.

It is well known that there can be no "third force" in a social revolution at its culminating point, yet the liberals throughout the world hoped for the miracle of a "Buddhist way." In fact, the "resistance" of the bonzes was probably a flash in the pan. Put to the test, they demonstrated their political and military inconsistency, and, like all conciliators, they became the architects of defeat for the forces that placed confidence in them.

Whereas in April, Ky had to give up the idea of a test of strength with a populace which was prepared to repel any attack, this time he was able to crush Danang and to enter Hué without encountering the effective resistance that had been expected. The fact is that no serious defense organization existed. The masses were unprepared to respond, even in a political sense. In one month, their leadership changed its position vis-à-vis the government three times. After having called for an insurrection against the "Thien-Ky clique," Tri Quang returned to Danang to demand a return to

calm and "legality." When he moved once again to take up arms, it is scarcely surprising that there was no immediate response.

This lack of military preparedness, this political hesitation were neither accidents nor the results of personal failings; they were the logical outcome of the conciliatory attitude of the Buddhists who, this time, not only prevented victory, but caused a defeat.

The Buddhists do not intend to break definitively with the government of the imperialists and the landlords. They seek only concessions.

But as the struggle sharpens, there is less and less room for such a "reformist" position. The desire of the masses is to end the war forced on them by the USA and the government in the pay of the Americans. In one month, in all the cities, anti-Americanism attained a violence hitherto unknown.

In order to maintain their popular support, the Buddhists had to follow the people's lead and "demand" that the Americans cease to support Ky. But these verbal protests could not conceal their own refusal to break decisively with imperialism in practice.

In this sense, the fall of central Vietnam, while a blow against the development of the struggle in the cities, will at least permit a new gain in consciousness by the masses by showing them in practice where the permanent balancing act of the Buddhists leads.

Distrust is growing steadily with respect to the methods and the political line of the Buddhists, who are more and more losing their leadership role to the FNL [Front National de Libération].

It has become apparent that the ultimatums and spectacular suicides cannot move an enemy who understands only force. The only possible reply to such an enemy is an armed struggle such as is being carried on by the FNL.

Also, the position of the Buddhist leaders -- "neither the Communists, nor the Americans" -- reveals their true role: to serve as a guarantee and a safety valve for the Saigon government. This shows the Front to be the only consistently anti-imperialist organization.

These lessons will be drawn all the more quickly since the Front has taken an authentically revolutionary attitude toward the crisis -- proposing a united front to drive out the U.S. aggressor. Put on the spot, the Buddhist leaders were forced to reveal themselves. While indulging in every kind of compromise with Saigon, they vowed that they would never accept an accord with the Communists.

They still hesitate to appeal to the mass movements which they control less and less. And their influence is crumbling.

The Vietnamese dilemma is again growing more acute for the United States.

Militarily, their activity is handicapped -- they cannot count on the puppet army which is deserting to the "Vietcong" en masse or which went over to the Buddhist rebellion by whole units. It reached the point where Ky had to forbid his generals to get mixed up in politics (sic!) and to confine the Vietnamese soldiers to barracks outside the cities.

It is also apparent that the Wheeler plan which proposed to cut Vietnam in half at the center has become unworkable and impracticable, at least for a long time.

But the most serious for the USA is the political defeat. In Vietnam itself, this means increased isolation for the occupying forces in the midst of a hostility which has shown itself to be stronger than the corruption of which Robert Guillain gave a striking picture in Le Monde.

The anguished conscience of the Americans is shown by events like the panic on May 10 when American military police fired wildly in all directions for forty-five minutes after a Viet Cong terrorist attack, cutting down their own compatriots.

But above all, the rebellion in the cities has caused the growth of defeatism in the United States: "Why should we continue the war," more and more Americans ask themselves, "if no one wants us there?" The anti-Communist crusade is showing its real nature -- a contemptible pretext and a lie.

A recent poll shows that fifty percent of the American citizens are for withdrawing the troops no matter what the situation is. This is disturbing for Johnson, coming as it does, in an election year.

It is only the world situation -- the series of defeats suffered by the revolutionary movement in the past year and more for which the USSR provides the requiem of peaceful coexistence -- that gives the American government the assurance it needs to pursue its escalation of the war.

The Vietnamese revolution is now the sole bastion of the resistance. This is what gives it its exceptional international importance.

"BAN THE BOMB" TRIAL POSTPONED IN GREECE

An Athens military court on June 17 postponed indefinitely the trial of army conscript Michael Peristeraki. The sole prosecution witness could not confirm the charge that the young president of the "Ban-the-Bomb Bertrand Russell Association of Greece" had engaged in "seditious talk."

SPD APPROVES TALKS WITH SED

Frankfurt

The congress of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands [SPD -- the Social Democratic party of Germany], which was held in Dortmund June 1-5, placed its stamp of approval on the "new look" designed for it by Willy Brandt, mayor of West Berlin and the party's leader.

To everyone's surprise, the SPD agreed to the proposal of the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands [SED -- the Socialist Unity (Communist) party of East Germany] to exchange views at a public round table. In July -- if all goes well -- the three top SPD leaders will sit down with the SED leaders in the Karl Marx Stadt and later the SED leaders will return the visit, coming to Hanover, one of the SPD strongholds in West Germany.

The new turn has undoubtedly helped allay unrest among the rank and file caused by the defeat in the 1965 elections and the puncturing of the illusion that the SPD could win power along the electoral road from the governing Christian Democratic and Liberal coalition. A good deal of disappointment was evident, particularly among those who thought that power could be won in Germany by eliminating every hint of the party's socialist past and reshaping the party in the pattern of the American two-party system -- offering a social-welfare capitalist government as an alternative to a conservative capitalist government.

The initiative taken by the SPD in foreign policy and in the direction of East Germany seemed to open a new perspective. And so criticism has died down. But what is the real content of the new turn?

All those seeking to win concessions for the Germans in East Germany through direct -- even if very timid -- contact with the East German regime have been stirred by recent events. They fear that an extended period of "peaceful coexistence" between the Soviet Union and the United States will isolate Germany. They fear that tensions in Europe might drop and that with the pressure off, Moscow will not grant concessions with regard to the German problem.

On the other side of the border, the Communists in East Germany look hopefully at any opportunity to break out of their isolation on the chance that this might end with international recognition of their government.

Washington is interested in stabilizing the situation in western Europe in order to free its hands in Asia, particularly in Vietnam. The SPD has lined up with this policy emanating in Washington even though it contradicts the previous policy enunciated by John Foster Dulles; namely, rolling back "Communism," especially in East Germany.

The SPD, which gave up the fight years ago against German

rearmament, even approving joint nuclear armaments in the name of "equality," has now officially declared that nuclear arms are not desirable for Germany. The switch is intended to help Washington get an agreement with Moscow against the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

A small but vigorous opposition at the congress wanted to expand the "talks" between the Social Democrats of West Germany and the Communists of East Germany, including people below the top leadership level.

Willy Brandt did not like this. He said he does not intend to "ride the tiger of the people's front."

It would certainly be incorrect to call this a "left turn." But the new look, which is also marked by a somewhat more liberal climate in the party might open up opportunities for the forces in the left wing which have had to maintain silence or face expulsion (as has happened to socialist students and many intellectuals).

One of the openings may well occur around the pressure mounted by the unions against projected antilabor "emergency" laws which the SPD leadership has approved with some embarrassment.

AMERICAN OFFICERS ARGUE OVER VIETNAM

Frankfurt

Two well-known German reporters, Gordian Troeller and Claude Deffarge, were sent to Vietnam by the illustrated Stern (circulation 1,700,000). Arriving in Danang just as the "war within a war" started, they wrote a vivid description of the demonstrations against the Ky government and the rise in anti-American sentiment.

They reported hearing an American major shout at his fellow officers in an off-duty bull session. "Have you lost your mind? This is genocide and we're helping it."

"We're soldiers," an officer replied. "We're professionals. We're here to kill Vietcongs. What goes on between the others is their own business."

The major began to lose his temper. "Don't you see? We're helping fascists kill their own people. Are you all blind?"

"We're only doing our damned duty," another one said.

"And damned well," said still another.

After Danang capitulated, Troeller went to Saigon, reaching there in time to see the demonstrations put down by Ky's forces with tear gas.

"They say it's not poison gas," he wrote. "I've seen kids

who were left unconscious for two days. I'm writing this from my hotel room where I've been in bed for a couple of days recovering from the stuff."

A few days before sending his article, he cabled Stern: "If I ever had a soul, I lost it vomiting from the tear gas I got in front of the Saigon pagoda."

JOAN BAEZ SINGS FOR WOLF BIERMANN

Frankfurt

Wolf Biermann, the East German folk singer who has been in hot water with the authorities of the German Democratic Republic along with Professor Havemann, got a pleasant surprise when Joan Baez, the American folk singer, paid him an unexpected visit.

Biermann, an avowed Communist, has been cut off from the West German youth, too, although they are as enthusiastic about him as the youth in East Germany.

In one of his songs, he declares: "Once you were not afraid of machine guns; now you are afraid of my guitar...Would you rather die of thirst than drink the bitter draft of truth? Break the cords of fear!...Fill your lungs and raise your voice freely!"

In a song addressed to "the old comrades," he says: "Don't be impatient with my impatience, old men. To me patience is a friend to indolence, a whore to cowardice, beckoning to the bed of crime. But you are stuffed with patience. End things up right; make way for us and the new beginning."

In an East Berlin cabaret where she had been invited to put on a TV show, Joan Baez told the audience: "I'm sorry that Biermann isn't permitted to perform in East Berlin. I believe that a man of his talent should be permitted to perform anywhere. I'd like to invite him to come to America to sing and recite his poems."

When Joan Baez said, "Now I'm going to sing something for Wolf Biermann whom I visited today," her words were not translated into German for the audience.

The evening before she had had a similar experience in West Berlin. At a gathering sponsored by the Confederation of Trade Unions, she spoke out against the war in Vietnam. Her words were very sharp; and the translator suddenly seemed to lose his sense of hearing!

JAPANESE WORKERS REFUSE TO FILM DIRTY WAR

The Tokyo Broadcasting System workers have refused to make a TV film on U.S. air force activities in south Vietnam for CBS, an American TV chain. Their main reason was that it would lead to supporting U.S. escalation policy in the Vietnam war.

INDIAN TROTSKYISTS ORGANIZE GUJARAT UNIT

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

A conference of delegates from different parts of Gujarat, held in Ahmedabad June 4-5, decided to constitute a Gujarat State Unit of the Socialist Workers party of India. The SWPI, the Indian section of the Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky, was formed at a conference of Indian Trotskyists held in Bombay in August 1965. The SWPI publishes Marxist Outlook, an English-language monthly, and has built up units in various states, including Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Andhra and Kerala.

The Gujarat conference elected a State Organizing Committee of five members with Magan Desai of Baroda as its secretary. Other members are Chandrakant Bhatt (Ahmedabad), Sharad Jhaveri (Jamnagar), Ranchhodbhai Dalal (Kalol) and Himmat Khatsuria (Bhavnagar). Headquarters will be in Baroda.

In a statement to the press June 6, the Organizing Committee at Ahmedabad said that the SWPI, as a Marxist-Leninist party, is "pledged to achieve the goal of a socialist revolution and the establishment of a Workers and Peasants government in India."

It said that the SWPI disagreed with the "Stalinist politics" of the Right and the Left Communist parties, both of which "are still subservient to the diplomatic needs of either the Soviet or the Chinese bureaucracies."

A resolution adopted by the conference said that the SWPI in Gujarat will support the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad as a "united front of different left and progressive forces in the common struggle against the capitalist-landlord government headed by the Congress."

The bourgeois press in Gujarat, considered to be a stronghold of Gandhism, has taken a serious view on the emergence of a "Trotskyist party" in the state.

A group of Communist workers associated with Magan Desai and Ranchhodbhai Dalal recently resigned from the Left CPI as a protest against the "Stalinist" methods of its leadership. They joined the SWPI.

Magan Desai sent a lengthy letter of resignation to the CPI leadership. The 35-year-old former member of the State Council of the Gujarat CPI outlined the Marxist-Leninist alternative presented by the Fourth International to the opportunist policies of the Stalinist parties all over the world.

Ranchhodbhai Dalal, a veteran trade-union leader with considerable following among the tribal people of central Gujarat, was detained under the Defence of India Rules and only recently released

along with other Left CPI leaders.

The adherence of these well-known figures to the SWPI has aroused a great deal of interest in the Trotskyist movement among the ranks of both the Right and Left CPI's in western India.

In conjunction with the Gujarat conference, a two-day seminar was organized by the SWPI to discuss current political problems. Nearly fifty activists belonging to various parties and tendencies participated.

C.G. Shah, a veteran Marxist author and intellectual, spoke on "A Socialist Revolution and Its Prerequisites." Dr. A.R. Desai, a Marxist academician on the staff of Bombay University, dealt with "The Political Situation in India." Sharah Jhaveri, a writer and leading member of the SWPI, took up the "Agrarian Problem in India." S.B. Kolpe, a prominent journalist and leading member of the SWPI, spoke on "Tactics of the United Front." C.K. Bhatt, a writer and prominent figure in the CPI in Gujarat before it split, talked on "Marxism and History."

Other prominent participants in the seminar included Dr. A.A. Carvalho, an outstanding physician and a prominent figure in the Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad [MGJP] and Rasikh Bhatt, a leader of the Revolutionary Communist party of India.

It was the first time in many years that a left political seminar of this kind was organized in the capital of Gujarat.

The municipal corporation of Ahmedabad is presently controlled by the MGJP; and Dinkar Mehta, a leader of the Left CPI has been elected mayor of the city for the current year.

JAPANESE TROTSKYISTS PROTEST MURDER OF LEO BERNARD

The Japanese Trotskyists were shocked when they read in the daily press about the murder of Leo Bernard and the wounding of Jan Garrett and Walter Graham in the headquarters of the Detroit local of the Socialist Workers party [see World Outlook May 27]. They viewed it as fresh evidence of the reactionary consequences of America's counterrevolutionary course.

The Kyoto University cell of the Japan Revolutionary Communist League drew up a leaflet explaining the political meaning of the assault and calling for protest.

The headline read: "Protest Against the Murder of Our American Comrade!!"

The leaflet called attention to the rise of the Negro free-

dom struggle in the United States and the violent way in which it has been resisted, including the murder of a leader of the caliber of Malcolm X.

The antiwar movement is now challenging the counterrevolutionary policies of American imperialism, the leaflet continued. One of the most active tendencies in this movement is the Socialist Workers party with its program of revolutionary socialism. It is thus a target for the blows of reaction.

The leaflet ended with the following slogans: "Withdraw the American Army from Vietnam! Let the Vietnamese People Constitute Their Own United Government! Down with the Sato Government! China and the USSR Should Give Full Support to the Vietnamese People! Support the Workers and Peasants Struggles in the Dominican Republic, India and South Korea! Unite under the Banner of the World Proletarian Revolution in the Fourth International!"

SUZANNE ZAKINE STILL HELD IN PRISON BY BOUMEDIENNE

In a dispatch from Algiers dated June 14, Agence France Presse reported it had learned from reliable sources that the three European women arrested there on May 9 have been charged with "associating with criminals."

"One of them, Mlle Marguerite Lourdin, who was released May 24, was arrested again three days ago and, together with Mme Suzanne Zakine and Mlle Claudia Bobillier, is being held in the El Harrach prison. In response to questioning about it, Mlle Bobillier's attorney, M. Yves Jouffa, of the Paris bar, would only say that he had received permission to talk with his client, that he had been able to see her Monday afternoon and that it did not involve the ordinary criminal laws."

The truth is that Colonel Boumedienne is proceeding in this case as he does with all political prisoners. They were arrested secretly and held without charges until the news appeared in the Paris press.

The main victim is Suzanne Zakine, the widow of a well-known Trotskyist leader who died in Algiers last November from a heart condition. [See World Outlook June 17.]

It is not known as yet whether these political prisoners like the others held by Boumedienne have been tortured.

JAPANESE BUSINESSMEN FETED IN PEKING

Some 200 Japanese businessmen were banqueted in Peking after attending a Chinese export commodities fair in Canton. One of them responded to a toast by congratulating China on its recent nuclear test and the success of the Canton fair.

What Mao's Thought Can Do For You

GET THE MAIL DELIVERED ON TIME

Countries that are having trouble with their postal service could do worse than order a set of the works of Mao Tse-tung for each and every one of the employees. The books would soon pay for themselves as is proved by the example and testimony of the 19-year-old Tibetan peasant Zungla, the first one in the village of Shigatse to take on the job of postman.

Life was hard for Zungla as the son of a poor serf under the old regime. With the 1959 "democratic reform," as it is called in Peking, new perspectives opened up. He was able to go to school. Then in the spring of 1965 he was selected to be postman.

"On his first trip he spoiled some newspapers," reports the May 13 Hsinhua. "He felt sorry because he had done his job badly."

The aim of doing his job well was laudable, but his horizon remained narrow. There was something behind it all which he couldn't grasp. "The question came to him: 'Why is it that the people greet me with such warmth just because I have brought them some letters or newspapers? I worked just as hard in the old days, and I yet never once heard a single kind word.'"

People told him: "Today you are serving the people."

"Zungla read the article Mao Tse-tung wrote on this idea," reports Hsinhua, "and came to understand how many had given their lives to liberate him, to serve him, a Tibetan serf boy, and his people. As he thought about this in relation to his present task of bringing letters, information, culture and knowledge to the village people for the first time in their lives, Zungla felt a strong urge to link his work with the whole cause of revolution."

The results were truly magical.

"In 1965, he spent more than 100 days on the road, walked a distance of 2,500 kilometers, made not a single mistake in delivery, and was prompt for every shift. His route involved crossing seven icy rivers, and two mountain ranges, 5,000 meters above sea level. Neither the wild bears and wolves, nor snowstorms could hold him up. In the rain or snow, he held the postbag close against his chest, underneath his coat."

Zungla had one advantage which Hsinhua fails to mention. Unlike an American postman, for instance, he did not have to carry any "junk" mail. No circulars, no advertisements, no greeting cards, no bulky newspapers or magazines; no packages from mail-order houses. Just important stuff like personal correspondence, party directives, party publications and so on. That was why he could get it all under

his coat. Still it was no easy job. With no tame bears or wolves on his side, he really needed Mao's thought.

"Last November, Zungla ran into a severe snowstorm while he was on the mountain. The snow was soon knee-high and as he ploughed along his shoes, soaked from his crossing of the river, were frozen stiff and dragged at his feet.

"He could have sheltered until the storm was over, but that would have delayed his arrival at the county town and made him miss the shift.

"With 'serve the people' in mind, he wrenched off his shoes and climbed on his way barefoot. He reached the office on time, and there was at once met with appreciation and concern. The district Communist party secretary gave him his own new shoes to wear, and plied him with piping hot tea. Zungla, whose childhood memories of days under serfdom were still vivid, felt the warmth of the Communist party and the people whom he served. 'Whenever I think about this,' he later said, 'I feel I could move mountains.'"

No doubt he also chuckled about this neat way of prying a new pair of shoes out of the party apparatus. Unless, of course, he had to give them back when his own dried out, or after the story was written up.

What Mao's Thought Can Do For You

KEEP PERISHABLE GOODS WITHOUT REFRIGERATION

"A warehouse-keeper who has consistently and successfully applied Mao Tse-tung's philosophical ideas in his daily work," according to the June 11 Hshinhua, recently gave a testimonial at a meeting in southwest China of more than 800 official representatives "from the county level up who had gathered to discuss questions relating to the study of Mao Tse-tung's works."

The 32-year-old Fan Kuang-jung is the son of a poor peasant and had little education. With bitter memories of childhood poverty, he was "deeply thankful for what the Chinese Communist party had done for him and his family." So in the early post-liberation years, he resolved to work hard out of gratitude and in the hope that good work would bring him better food and clothing.

"Fan Kuang-jung began studying Mao Tse-tung's writings in 1956. Since that time, he has read all the four standard volumes of Mao Tse-tung's selected works, running to over a million characters, and come back to many of the articles again and again."

When reading one of Mao Tse-tung's articles, "Serve the People," he realized that "formerly oppressed people like himself ought to be

working heart and soul for the revolution." To merely work hard, as he had been doing, was not enough. "He suddenly felt ashamed of having such a low level of political awareness." He began to pay attention "to the class struggle in the sphere of his own ideology." A crucial experience was his realization one day that he was responsible for the spoilage of some bamboo shoots. Instead of letting another comrade take the rap, he made a public self-criticism. That paved the way for another great step forward in mastering the thought of Mao Tse-tung.

"From the moment he resolved to work as one of the masters of the new society, Fan Kuang-jung began to use as a guide the following passage from Chairman Mao's philosophical work, 'On Practice':

"If a man wants to succeed in his work, that is, to achieve the anticipated results, he must bring his ideas into correspondence with the laws of the objective world; if they do not correspond, he will fail in his practice. After he fails, he draws his lessons, corrects his ideas to make them correspond to the laws of the external world, and can thus turn failure into success; this is what is meant by failure is the mother of success, and a fall into the pit, a gain in your wit.'

"Fan Kuang-jung set himself to investigate the laws governing the deterioration of different goods. He conducted a series of scientific experiments in the warehouse and gradually he evolved a whole series of methods to prevent rotting, moth and insect damage and other forms of deterioration in more than a hundred kinds of foodstuffs. In this way, he managed to change a passive situation into an active one.

"He recalled how he got inspiration from the works of Mao Tse-tung when he was trying to prevent the crystallized sugar coating on dried tangerines from becoming sticky. He came across these words: 'It is well known that when you do anything, unless you understand its actual circumstances, its nature and its relations to other things, you will not know the laws governing it, or know how to do it, or be able to do it well' in the article 'Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War.' He began to think that to make the melted sugar coating recrystallize he would have to create conditions in which crystallization could take place. To absorb the excess moisture, he first tried to pack the stock in lime. When he found that lime affected the taste of the fruit, he tried rice bran and was successful.

"One day he fell ill and was taken to a hospital. When the nurse took his temperature, an idea suddenly came to him: 'Why not get a thermometer to check the temperature of the goods so as to prevent fermentation?'

"When Fang Kuang-jung got back to work, he enlisted the cooperation of his comrades and some technicians and made a special

thermometer for the warehouse. Later he improved the device by linking it up with an alarm-bell in the office so that it could give prompt warning of any dangerous rise in the temperature of the goods. Then he added an electric fan to the thermometer, so that when the goods reached a critical temperature, the electric fan would automatically begin working to cool them down, and when the temperature dropped to a safe level, the electric circuit would be broken and the fan would stop.

"As his knowledge of the laws governing the deterioration of commodities in the warehouse grew, Fang Kuang-jung designed many pieces of equipment to improve the storage processes, such as an automatic piling machine, an automatic counting machine and an infra-red drier.

"When he first started reading Mao Tse-tung's books, he could not finish even a short article without consulting a dictionary. By dint of hard work, he has now read more than a hundred books on chemistry, entomology, climatology, and other sciences related to the successful handling of goods in storage."

Today a deputy political instructor at the storage depot, Fang Kuang-jung summed up the benefits to be derived from deep study of the thought of Mao Tse-tung: "When you listen to the chairman, things will listen to you."

What Mao's Thought Can Do For You

GIVE THE VATICAN A RUN FOR ITS MONEY

The Chinese pavilion at the 1966 International Fair in Budapest was a huge success, according to the May 31 daily bulletin of the Hsinhua News Agency.

Every day large numbers of visitors made entries in the visitors' book or spoke to the Chinese personnel "to voice their love for the Chinese Communist party and Chairman Mao Tse-tung and to praise the correct line of the Chinese Communist party."

"Many visitors expressed great admiration for Chairman Mao's infallible leadership," continues the Peking news agency. "An old house-painter said: 'You are truly engaged in revolution; Mao Tse-tung's leadership is infallible...all Marxist Leninists of the world pin their hopes on China.'"

"Several Greeks wrote in the visitors' book that 'the (Chinese) pavilion is very brilliant, but the most brilliant is not the pavilion but the political line of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung. Without Mao Tse-tung's political line, the pavilion could never be so brilliant.'"

What Mao's Thought Can Do For You

THE MORE YOU READ, THE MORE YOU WANT

The following dispatch appeared in the June 10 Daily News Release of the Hsinhua News Agency. Struck by the evidence it offers on the popularity of the thought of Mao Tse-tung, and influenced by Chairman Mao's article, "Serve the People," previous thoughts seemed to slip from our mind and we found ourselves lining up. In short, we joined the crowd and as our first contribution we decided to add emphasis to the most important words in the article, thus making it easier to find the outstanding passages. We hope that this will help in a modest way to hold high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

[The original title of the article is "Liberated Laotian People Love to Read Mao Tse-tung's Works."]

* * *

KHANG KHAY, Laos, June 9 (Hsinhua) -- People in the liberated army in Laos treasure Chairman Mao Tse-tung's writings very much and have deep respect for the great leader of the Chinese people.

They said that what Chairman Mao wrote is truth and that Mao Tse-tung's thought is the beacon light for the people of the world in their advance.

One of the leading members of the Xieng Khouang provincial committee of the Neo Lao Haksat said: "Mao Tse-tung's thought is truth that guides the oppressed nations and people in their struggle. His writings warm one's heart and enlighten one's mind. Every sentence Chairman Mao said shines like truth. The more I read, the more I want to read; I've never read such fine works before."

The commander of the Xieng Khouang district command of the Laotian People's Liberation Army told Hsinhua: "I love to read Chairman Mao's 'Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War against Japan,' and the article, 'Long Live the Victory of People's War!' which embodies Mao Tse-tung's thought. The two articles are of practical importance for our current revolutionary struggle. Chairman Mao Tse-tung's concept of people's war considerably heightens our confidence in defeating U.S. imperialism."

He went on to say that "Chairman Mao's works meet our need as if he wrote for us. When we have questions unclear in our mind, we turn to his works for an answer. We study his works with our particular problems in mind."

Commenting on Mao Tse-tung's "Talk with the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong" which he had studied, the commander of an anti-aircraft unit in the advance positions on Mount Phou

Khouth said: "Chairman Mao pointed out 20 years ago that all reactionaries are paper tigers; this brilliant judgment is absolutely right."

Pointing at the mountain, he said to this correspondent: "Look, the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys have poured thousands of tons of bombs and artillery shells on this mountain and made it two meters lower. Yet it still towers here in the hands of our heroic people. Does not this prove that man is the primary factor, as Chairman Mao said? Is it not that the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not weapons?"

Somvang Semesathith, governor of Xieng Khouang province, who had visited China last year, told this correspondent: "I had the pleasure to see for myself the great successes the Chinese people had won in building socialism under the leadership of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, when they celebrated their national day last year." The radical change that had taken place in new China under Chairman Mao Tse-tung's leadership in the 16 years after its liberation "represent a great victory for Mao Tse-tung's thought," he said.

Recalling his visit to Ta Chai, once a poor mountain village in Shansi province and now a famous model in self-reliance and determined hard work, the governor said that "The Ta Chai people have succeeded in carving away mountain slopes and building up terraced fields and finally emerging from backwardness with flying colors. They were able to do so because they have mastered and applied Mao Tse-tung's thought to their work. I'm sure that if the Laotian people, too, master this thought, they will be able to achieve similar successes."

Pot Pung, the chief editor of the Khang Khay's newspaper, "The People's Liberation Army," who had just finished the translation into the Laotian language of Mao Tse-tung's "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society," said: "In the past, we were not too clear about class struggle. Chairman Mao's article has opened our eyes, and we are now analyzing the position of the various classes in Laos by applying Chairman Mao's method of class analysis, so as to see who are our friends and who are our enemies."

The Laotian author Souvanthone said: "I like to read books about the Chinese Revolution; but I like Mao Tse-tung's works most. I can hardly lay his works down until I've finished them. I have read 'Talks at the Yen-an Forum in Literature and Art' three times."

He added, "These talks of Chairman Mao's are a great inspiration to me. Every word of his touched my heart. Chairman Mao teaches the literary and art workers that they should serve the workers, peasants and soldiers and should engage in literary and artistic creation in the heat of the struggle. This is one hundred percent true."

He said, "In my career as a writer I have made many failures. I am living in embattled Laos, but my works have not profoundly reflected the heroic struggles of the Laotian people, because I

have not gone deep into the heat of the struggle."

"This article of Chairman Mao's makes me see the light. I have now found where my problem lies," the writer said.

The Laotian people ardently love Chairman Mao's works and warmly love Chairman Mao. Many Laotian People's Liberation Army fighters, youth, women and graybeards told this correspondent with great emotion: "Chairman Mao, we love you!"

Somsi, commander of a unit on the Mount Phou Khouth front, told Hsinhua: "The army and people on the Mount Phou Khouth front have boundless respect for Chairman Mao Tse-tung. They shout, 'Long live Chairman Mao,' whenever they hear the name of Mao Tse-tung mentioned over the radio or in a speech."

The commander added: "The Chinese people are determined to follow Mao Tse-tung's thought forever. We Laotian people are also determined to follow Mao Tse-tung's thought forever."

A company commander said: "Chairman Mao Tse-tung's thought has inspired us with determination in struggle and strengthened our confidence in victory. We are sure to win final victory."

Three combat heroes of a certain unit defending a position on the Mount Phou Khouth front, pointing at the shining badges of Chairman Mao pinned on their breast pockets, told the correspondent: "These Chairman Mao badges are a most precious gift. Even in the thick of combat we try our best to protect them. We'll never allow anything to stain the great Mao Tse-tung."

A commander told Hsinhua a very moving story. After a battle people found a notebook among things left behind by a comrade who gave his life with honor for the country. On the first page of the notebook was pasted a portrait of Chairman Mao cut out from the pages of a pictorial magazine. He wrote the following words on the back of the portrait: "Chairman Mao, we love you!"

Whenever men and women and militiamen who were transporting grain in the Mount Phou Khouth front area came across the Hsinhua correspondent, they raised their thumbs and said in Laotian: "Long live Chairman Mao Tse-tung!" A woman highway repair worker told this correspondent with emotion: "Chairman Mao is very great indeed. We wish Chairman Mao long life from the bottom of our hearts."

An old man raised both arms and shouted, "Long live Chairman Mao!"

A RADIANT SUN, TELESCOPE AND MICROSCOPE COMBINED

In a June 7 editorial praising Mao Tse-tung as "the radiant sun lighting our minds," the Liberation Army Daily said: "Mao Tse-tung's thought is our political orientation, the highest instruction for our actions; it is our ideological and political telescope and microscope for observing and analyzing all things."

TO THE PEOPLE OF VIETNAM

[The following is the text of a message to the people of Vietnam broadcast over Radio Hanoi and released May 24 by Bertrand Russell, the well-known philosopher and pacifist.]

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

* * *

I greet you, the people of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, from Hanoi.

I know that as I speak, American bombs are falling on hospitals and schools and helpless women and children are dying. I know that napalm and fragmentation bombs and enormous half-ton explosives are saturating the beautiful valleys and forests of your country.

These crimes weigh heavily on our consciences. They fill us with determination to resist, in every way available to us, the brutal rulers of the United States and their puppets in Britain.

Above all, I pay tribute to the heroism you have shown. The mighty air force of the United States has suffered great losses because of the astonishing determination of the people of the Democratic Republic.

Along with others, I am preparing a War Crimes Tribunal to bring to justice those responsible for these crimes. Johnson, McNamara and Rusk stand condemned before the world. The day is not far off when the people of the United States themselves will deal with them.

I extend my warm regard and full solidarity for President Ho Chi Minh and for the people of Vietnam. I convey my great wish that the day may not be far off when a united and liberated Vietnam will celebrate its victory in a free Saigon.

TO THE AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

[The following is the text of a speech made by Bertrand Russell, the well-known philosopher and pacifist, which was taped in England and broadcast over the radio of the National Liberation Front in south Vietnam. The text was released by the Russell Peace Foundation May 24.]

* * *

This is Bertrand Russell speaking to you on the radio of the forces of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. I am speaking to you American soldiers, in order to explain how your Government has abused your rights in sending you to occupy a country

whose people are united in their hatred of the United States as a foreign aggressor.

It is not difficult to understand why it is that the Vietnamese hate Americans. The people of Vietnam have been fighting for 25 years to secure their independence. They first fought against the Japanese, who were very cruel, and later against the French, who had set up guillotines in villages throughout Vietnam and who beheaded all those suspected of being opposed to foreign occupation.

Not many of you may know that the United States government financed more than 80 percent of the cost of the French war and supplied France with all modern weapons, in order to assist France in her evil task of killing and subduing the people of Vietnam.

When the United States first began to intervene militarily in south Vietnam, the pretense was made that the United States was merely helping a government in Saigon put down subversion from outside. But you American soldiers have seen for yourselves what kind of governments have existed in Saigon. They are brutal, corrupt, dictatorial and completely despised by the people.

Why is it that these governments have been able to continue, one after another, in Saigon, despite the fact that the students, the women, the villagers, everyone risks life itself to overthrow them? The sole answer is that the United States is using its enormous military force to impose on the people of Vietnam puppet governments which do not represent them.

Let us now consider together why the U.S. government does this. The excuse that they are protecting the Vietnamese against the Vietcong or the north Vietnamese can be seen by all of you to be the disgusting lie it is. Vietnam is one country. Even the Geneva agreements acknowledge that it is one country. The north Vietnamese and the south Vietnamese are not merely the same people, but the wives and children of men living in the north are in the south and many of those who live in the south were born in the north.

You may not know that between 1954 and 1960 more Vietnamese died than since 1960. Think hard about that. The Vietcong had not taken up arms until 1960, and yet more Vietnamese died in the six years before that time than since the National Liberation Front began to struggle.

The reason is simple. The government of Ngo Dinh Diem killed, tortured, imprisoned and mutilated hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese and was able to do this solely because of the military support and direction of the United States. Can any of you forget the brutality of Ngo Dinh Diem, which moved Buddhist priests to burn themselves in protest? It ought to be clear that the National Liberation Front, which you know as the Vietcong, took up arms to defend their people against a tyranny more brutal than the Japanese occupation itself,

for more died under Diem than under the Japanese. This is the responsibility of the United States government.

In 1950, The New York Times stated in an editorial:

"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."

One year later, an adviser to the United States State Department said the following:

"We have only partially exploited Southeast Asia's resources. Nevertheless, Southeast Asia supplied 90 per cent of the world's crude rubber, 60 per cent of its tin and 80 per cent 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 in 1953, while the French were still in Vietnam fighting with American backing, President Eisenhower said:

"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 you see, the reason why you American soldiers are in Vietnam is to suppress the people of Vietnam, who are trying to free themselves from economic strangulation and foreign military rule. You are sent to protect the riches of a few men in the United States.

Do you know that the United States controls 60 percent of the resources of the world, but only has 6 percent of the world's population, and yet one out of three Americans live in poverty?

Do you know that the United States has over 3,300 military bases in the world, almost all of which are used against the population of the country in which the bases exist? The U.S. rulers have built an economic empire which is being resisted from the Dominican Republic to the Congo, and especially in Vietnam.

Could you imagine yourselves voting for Cao Ky? If a foreign power occupied the United States to steal American resources for itself and if a traitor government were established by force, would you feel it was your government?

Worse than this, because the Vietnamese people are so determined and show such fantastic heroism that the greatest military power on earth has found it impossible to conquer them, you American soldiers are trained to use every modern weapon of war.

Your Air Force is flying 650 sorties a week in the north and the tonnages used in the south are higher than those used during the Second World War or the Korean War. You are using napalm, which burns everything it touches. You are using phosphorus, which eats like an acid into those who are in its path. You are using fragmentation bombs and lazy dogs, which cut up in pieces and lacerate women and children in the villages, hit without discrimination. You are using poison chemicals which cause blindness, affect the nervous system and paralyze. You are using poison gases which are listed in army manuals of World War II as poisons, and other gases which are so deadly that even soldiers with gas masks have been killed by their own gas.

When you return from battle, ask yourselves, who are these people you are killing? How many women and children died at your hands today? What would you feel if these things were happening in the United States to your wives, parents and children? How can you bear the thought of what is taking place around you, day after day and week after week?

I ask these questions of you because you bear the responsibility and within your hands lies the choice of whether this criminal war is to continue.

When Britain occupied the United States in the eighteenth century, American farmers fought with pitchforks in their bare hands, although they were hungry and in rags. They fought for eight years and they defeated the British empire in their own country.

Do you know that in the United States today, 66 million people are living in poverty? Do you know that in the United States today the unemployed equal the population of 35 individual states?

You are being used to enrich the few industrialists whose profits depend on taking the natural resources from other countries, and this is why the world is rising against this brutal war waged by the United States government.

You know that the Geneva Convention outlaws gas, chemicals, torture and mutilation and you also know that American special forces are trained in techniques used at Auschwitz and the other concentration camps. Don Duncan has revealed the truth about the films showing Nazi tortures which were used for instruction of American servicemen. And you yourselves know from your daily experience what happens to villagers who are suspected of being Vietcong and who are captured.

You know also that the strategic hamlets are little more than concentration camps, where forced labor, torture and starvation occur. These things were the reason for the hatred the world had for the Nazis. These things led to the trials at Nuremberg, in which the Nazis leaders were hanged as war criminals.

I know that most of you came to Vietnam not because you

wished to but because you were sent. I know that most of you have been told that you were defending helpless people against a stronger neighbor. But you have been lied to and no one knows it better than yourselves.

You must not think that you are alone, for throughout the United States people are opposing this war. When 100,000 people meet in New York City alone and tens of thousands meet in other cities across the United States, it should be clear that the American people have seen through this war and want it ended.

Why else has the government been unable even to make a declaration of war?

Have you been present when an officer has attached electrodes to the genitals of a woman or a child?

Have you been one of those who, out of fear or nervousness, pulled the trigger on an automatic rifle, releasing so many hundreds of bullets in an instant that, before you knew what had happened, women and children lay dead before you?

Along with world famous figures, Nobel prize-winners, novelists, philosophers, mathematicians, I am forming a War Crimes Tribunal in order to pass judgment, in most solemn terms and with the most respected international figures, upon the crimes being committed by the United States government against the people of Vietnam.

I appeal to you to end your participation in this barbarous and criminal war of conquest. I appeal to you to inform the War Crimes Tribunal of the truth about this war and to place before it the evidence of your own eyes. I appeal to you as a human being to human beings. Remember your humanity and forget the rest.

If you can do this, you will perform a courageous service to mankind. If you cannot, you will allow your rulers to continue to degrade your country and cause its name to be hated by decent people the world over.

Join us, Americans, Englishmen, West Europeans, Latin Americans, Asians, Africans, people from every walk of life, in our determination to defeat those in the United States responsible for the suffering and horror which you American soldiers have seen and for which you have responsibility.

Refuse to fight any longer in this unjust war. Demand to be transferred anywhere but Vietnam.

Make known that you will make public your opposition to this war and the way in which it is fought. There are too many people ready to support you for reprisals to take place.

It is no use postponing your decision. The moment of trial is always. Now is the appointed time.