

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 5, No. 27
July 28, 1967



Photo by Randy Abbott

U.S. MILITARY OCCUPATION OF NEWARK. Tanks roll into ghetto of riot-torn Newark to "pacify" Afro-American rebellion.

After Watts --Newark

U.S. Students Call Mass Protest Against Viet War

Denounces
Kremlin's Foreign Policy

Peasant Uprising
in West Bengal

General Westmoreland's
«Truce»
with the White House

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

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

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 5, No. 27
July 28, 1967



Photo by Randy Abbott

U.S. MILITARY OCCUPATION OF NEWARK. Tanks roll into ghetto of riot-torn Newark to "pacify" Afro-American rebellion.

After Watts --Newark

U.S. Students Call Mass Protest Against Viet War

Denounces

Kremlin's Foreign Policy

Peasant Uprising
in West Bengal

General Westmoreland's
«Truce»
with the White House

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

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

AFTER WATTS -- NEWARK

By Elizabeth Barnes

It took 5,000 national guardsmen, plus Newark city and New Jersey state police, to put down the Newark ghetto rebellion which raged for five days from July 13-17.

The area involved in the rebellion included over half the city. Before it was subdued, 26 people had been killed, 1,300 arrested, 1,200 injured, and over \$15 million worth of property damaged.

The Newark uprising was the biggest and fiercest ghetto revolt in two years. It was exceeded only by the famous Watts rebellion of 1965.

Newark in the East, Watts in the West -- these have become the twin centers of large-scale mass resistance in the sharpening struggle of Afro-Americans for freedom and equality.

Throughout the spring and summer of this year, a series of conflicts between the white supremacist authorities and black dissidents has erupted in cities from one end of the country to the other.

The larger revolts have occurred in the ghettos of Boston, Mass.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Buffalo, N.Y.; Plainfield, N.J.; Dayton, Ohio; and Tampa, Florida. In each case hundreds of police and/or guardsmen have had to be moved in before the area was pacified.

In addition, there have been numerous instances of lesser gun battles and rock and bottle throwing confrontations between cops and black people in other cities and towns. These are now so common that they often receive little or no coverage by the press.

Almost without exception, the ghetto eruptions in the last three years have been spearheaded by young people; and the poorest youths -- the dropouts and unemployed -- take the lead.

A new feature of the rebellions this spring is that black students have been involved in large-scale confrontations with the cops.

Before his assassination, Malcolm X repeatedly predicted that massive black revolts were coming. In April 1964, before the first big outburst in Harlem, Malcolm X told a Militant Labor Forum audience in New York:

"1964 will be America's hottest year; her hottest year yet; a year of

much racial violence and much racial bloodshed...

"A couple of weeks ago in Jacksonville, Florida, a young teenage Negro was throwing Molotov cocktails. Well, Negroes didn't do this ten years ago. But what you should learn from this is that they are waking up.

"It was stoned yesterday, Molotov cocktails today; it will be hand grenades tomorrow and whatever else is available the next day...

"There are 22 million Afro-Americans who are ready to fight for independence right here. When I say fight for independence right here, I don't mean any non-violent fight, or turn-the-other-cheek fight. Those days are gone. Those days are over."

In 1964 Malcolm X was called a hater and racial fanatic for such foresighted utterances. Today, only three years later, some of the most conservative black leaders, who condemned Malcolm at that time for "preaching violence," are saying that violence will increase unless the intolerable conditions of black people are considerably changed.

Even such a moderate as Senator Brooke, a Negro Republican who supports the Vietnam war, has called the failure of the government to do anything "an invitation to violence."

The scope of the rebellion, which saw thousands of black people pitted against cops and guardsmen, induced a number of commentators to bemoan the prospect of fighting two wars at once -- in Vietnam and in the ghettos at home.

This danger to the ruling class comes from the fact that the ghettos are strategically located in the centers of most major cities.

In Plainfield, New Jersey, not far from Newark, black people armed themselves with 46 semiautomatic rifles taken from a nearby weapons factory. The possession of these weapons was sufficient to prevent state troopers from entering the West End ghetto of Plainfield for days.

Columnist Murray Kempton of the New York Post characterized the local situation as one of a short-lived "dual power."

He wrote on July 19: "There are two governments, on one side, the city

of Plainfield and the state of New Jersey, on the other the government of the 46 carbines."

John Harvard, the "nonviolent" black head of the Plainfield antipoverty program, told Kempton: "Look...This is something I could not say to these people. But if they've really got those guns, they'd better hang on to them a little while. Not to use them. But just to bargain with them, and not to give them up until they've got something real in return."

Many of the techniques used by the authorities to put down the ghetto revolts resemble those in Vietnam. In Newark, troops opened fire indiscriminately on apartment buildings filled with people, and armored troop-carrying tanks rumbled through the streets.

In Plainfield, there was a house-to-house search for weapons, where soldiers in some cases wrecked the property of the ghetto residents.

A first-hand report by a resident of the Newark ghetto in the July 24 Militant tells how guardsmen smashed the windows of stores owned by black "soul brothers" which had been left untouched by the rebels.

The need to bring in pacification forces à la Vietnam was justified in one sentence by the New York Times: "A ghetto will not fit into a jail house." This is certainly true of the Newark ghetto which includes over half of the city's population and land area.

Despite the large numbers of black people involved in the ghetto revolts, most city and state officials refused to acknowledge that the revolts were anything but "criminal disorders" which had to be promptly and ruthlessly crushed.

Throughout the Newark events, Governor Hughes of New Jersey insisted that the revolt had "nothing to do with civil rights" and that the "decent" black people deplored the acts of the "criminal" minority.

A survey of areas previously convulsed by revolts shows that little or nothing had been done to improve conditions after they were over.

In Watts the unemployment rate is still 13 percent compared to 4.2 percent for all of Los Angeles County. Thirty-one percent of all the residents receive some kind of welfare aid. Police brutality continues without one cop being disciplined in the past year.

Now black people have added a new grievance to the list -- the Vietnam war.

Among other reasons, officials in Plainfield attributed the outbreak to the heavy drafting of black youth there for the army.

The war budget has cut into the meager funds planned for Johnson's popgun "war on poverty."

While officials offer excuses and soft soap about rectifying ghetto conditions, they are acting to mobilize the federal and state machinery of repression against the rebels.

Police forces are being beefed up and trained in "riot control." In Cleveland, Ohio, the scene of black resistance last summer, the authorities announced a "pacification plan" which included floodlight equipped helicopters for nighttime surveillance over ghetto areas.

The policy of repression rather than concession and conciliation is being promoted on the national legislative level. On July 19 the House of Representatives passed a bill by a 347 to 70 vote making it a federal crime to use interstate facilities or cross state lines to incite a riot.

This weapon was so crassly unconstitutional and so discriminatory against the black population that it stirred Representative Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, to object:

"This bill will not allay his [the Afro-American's] anger and frustrations... Instead it will arouse his anger and frustration more deeply. His leaders ask for better housing for their fellows. You offer them jails.

"His leaders ask for better facilities for education. You read them a riot act. They ask for decent living. You feed them a drastic statute. They ask for more employment. You give jobs in prison garb."

The fury of the irrepressible outbursts from coast to coast -- and there are more to come -- indicates that more and more Afro-Americans are willing to risk their lives in the fight for a better life.

However, their struggles are localized and spasmodic. They lack unification, coordination, leadership and a program of clear objectives.

The popular slogan of black power has been the keynote theme of the current struggles. But this demand has yet to be implemented by any form of independent black political action and organization. This remains the major weakness of the present phase of the Afro-American freedom movement.

U.S. STUDENTS CALL MASS PROTEST AGAINST VIETNAM WAR

New York

The Student Mobilization Committee issued a call here July 19 for a massive demonstration against American intervention in Vietnam to be held in Washington, D.C., October 21.

Headlined "Confrontation, Washington, D.C.," the two-color printed brochure demanded "Support Our Boys in Vietnam -- Bring Them Home Now."

The Student Mobilization Committee is the largest student antiwar organization in the U.S. It was a key organizer of the mammoth April 15 demonstrations called by the Spring Mobilization Committee in New York and San Francisco that brought out 500,000 people.

The new action hopes to top even that massive number and aims "to bring the youth of the United States to Washington on October 21."

JOINT INTERNATIONAL DEMONSTRATIONS CALLED FOR OCTOBER 21

[The following is an appeal for international demonstrations against U.S. aggression in Vietnam, to coincide with the massive march on Washington, D.C., scheduled for October 21. The appeal was issued by the Student Mobilization Committee.]

[This appeal was sent to antiwar committees, trade unions, student federations and political organizations throughout the world. Groups undertaking to build demonstrations on October 21 were urged to communicate with the Student Mobilization Committee at 17 East 17th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003.]

* * *

Today's newspapers, like yesterday's and those of the day before, contain news of continued United States escalation of the war in Vietnam. At the risk of starting a third world war the U.S. leaders callously proclaim and display their "determination to win." Invasion of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam seems just around the corner.

Throughout the world, and in the United States especially, opposition to the war is growing. The Student Mobilization Committee (national organization of U.S. students who oppose the war) seeks to join with antiwar forces around the world in escalating our struggle against the Vietnam war.

The National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (formerly the Spring Mobilization Committee -- the group which built the massive April 15 demonstrations in New York and San Francisco) has set October 21, 1967, as the date for the largest demonstration yet against the war. Work has begun to bring hundreds of thousands of Americans to Washington, D.C., on that date to protest the war at the government's doorstep.

The National Mobilization Committee has issued an international call for

worldwide demonstrations on October 21. We will be working to make this the largest, most united, and most visible international outpouring of opposition to this war ever.

As before, the Student Mobilization Committee is playing a leading role in building the demonstration. Within the U.S. we will be coordinating the varied student activities which will build the October 21 action. We will also work closely with the National Mobilization Committee in its effort to broaden and strengthen the participation of the people of this country in the antiwar movement.

Fighting in the heart of the country which is waging this cruel war, the U.S. antiwar movement especially looks to and appreciates the activities of those in other countries who are working to end the war.

We want to help our friends around the world build protest actions this fall. This letter is not only an appeal to you to plan demonstrations in your area to coincide with the October 21 mobilization, but an offer to help you in whatever way we can from the United States. We will be working to coordinate these actions on an international scale.

We who seek to end this war have a difficult, challenging job before us -- and a big responsibility. We believe that we can succeed only if we work together, learning from one another and strengthening the antiwar forces around the world.

We are looking forward to hearing from you and to working with you to build a really international movement against the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Larry Bilick, Alex Chernowitz,
Kipp Dawson, Phyllis Kalb, Patti Miller
and Linda Morse -- National Coordinators.

AGITATION MOUNTS AROUND REGIS DEBRAY CASE

The worldwide protests against the imprisonment of Régis Debray have nettled the Barrientos dictatorship in Bolivia and rendered more difficult its plans to frame the young French journalist. Debray, Professor of Philosophy at Havana University and author of the recently published Revolución en la Revolución, was seized April 20 with seven others by the Bolivian police, accused of leading a guerrilla band, held incommunicado for weeks, and faces trial by a military tribunal.

After two months of waiting, Mme Alexandre-Debray was permitted to see her son July 10 for a half hour. Debray notified his mother that he had dismissed his lawyer. "This proceeding is a farce," he told her. "I have been condemned in advance. My lawyer, Walter Flores Torrico, whom I saw for only five minutes, has betrayed me." Debray stated he expected to receive the maximum penalty of thirty years imprisonment.

Debray later wrote in a letter to his parents from the barracks at Camiri where he is being held that, unless he could have a defense lawyer with whom he could properly prepare his defense, he would prefer to defend himself. He denied rumors spread by an American press agency that he had betrayed some Latin-American leftists and declared that he would reply to these malicious reports in the manner they deserved. "I regard this as a matter of political and personal honor which is much more important to me than the holding of the trial," he wrote.

François Maspero, Debray's French publisher, was expelled from Bolivia after being questioned for four hours about alleged connections between Debray and "Che" Guevara. The police pressed Maspero to admit that he knew "Che" was in Bolivia and had instructed Debray to join him. The publisher insisted that he had simply commissioned Debray to write some books on Latin America.

In solidarity with Maspero, two members of the French Defense Committee for Régis Debray, Roger Lallemand of the League for the Rights of Man and M. Vigneron of the National Teachers Union, left La Paz for Paris. The Defense Committee issued a statement protesting the mistreatment of its representatives and said it confirmed the widespread suspicions regarding Bolivian justice. It urged other organizations to back its demand that French and foreign observers be present during the trial. (The French ambassador has not been allowed to see Debray.) The Bertrand Russell Foundation is planning to send a delegation to investigate the situation.

The British journalist George Andrew Roth, who was arrested with Debray, was suddenly released July 8 and authorized to leave the country after giving depositions that the prosecution intends to use in the trial. Lallemand said at a press interview in Paris July 14 that the absence of so important a witness would deprive the defense of the possibility of verifying the truth of his statements while giving the prosecution every chance to exploit them. This is only one of the many irregularities that have attended this affair from the beginning.

Bolivian President Barrientos, who had cynically declared that Debray is "an adventurer" whose "adventures will end in Bolivia," replied to his defenders by announcing that "any new interference in our affairs can only intensify our determination to defend our sovereignty." He said that outside pressures only complicated the situation and repeated the false accusation that Debray had been captured in the course of an armed action.

Le Monde [July 13] pointed out that this assertion was unconvincing because, according to the Bolivian authorities themselves, Debray, when apprehended, was unarmed, in civilian dress and with two other journalists. It said that the Bolivian military has not yet come up with a single concrete piece of evidence confirming Debray's guilt.

The date of his trial has been postponed, pending further "inquiry" by the army's juridical department. It appears that Barrientos and his "gorillas" are having difficulties in preparing the frame-up.

Since March the army has had little success in combating the guerrillas in the Nancahuazú region. One hundred guerrillas entered Samapaita July 5 in buses "requisitioned" on the road to Cochabamba, bought provisions and medical supplies and addressed the inhabitants. One soldier was killed during the fray. According to the mayor and police chief of the town who were captured and then freed by the guerrillas, "Che" led the rebel band. Despite similar rumors, Guevara's presence in Bolivia has not been substantiated.

The expansion of the guerrilla movement has caused the Argentine government to send heavy reinforcements into the border regions and military supplies to its neighbor.

The strike of the Bolivian miners and students against the regime's brutality ended July 10. It was launched June 24 following bloody encounters between the

army and the people in which 21 were killed and 75 wounded.

The agreement concluded between the tin miners strike committee and the mining administration at Catavi, where 4,900 miners are employed, prohibited all political activity within the mine in-

stallations, promised restoration of the union headquarters occupied by the army, payment of indemnities to the families of the victims and rehiring of arrested miners who are found innocent.

The universities opened their doors after having been closed for a month.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF ENRIQUE AMAYA QUINTANA

[The following is a statement from the Peruvian Movement of the Revolutionary Left on the arrest and subsequent disappearance of Peruvian revolutionary leader Enrique Amaya Quintana, which appeared in the Uruguayan weekly, Marcha.

[It is followed by a statement from the Peruvian Defense Committee of Human Rights dated June 12 denouncing this incident.]

* * *

On April 25, Enrique Amaya Quintana, a national leader of the Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionario [MIR -- Movement of the Revolutionary Left] was arrested in the Province of Paucartambo, Department of Cuzco, along with several peasants.

Thereafter, he was separated from the other prisoners and disappeared.

In view of these alarming facts, we appeal to the revolutionary and peoples organizations and representative organizations which defend civil liberties to demand that the authorities extend Enrique Amaya all the guarantees accorded all citizens equally by the constitution and the laws.

Enrique Amaya, the son of a rural working-class family from Trujillo, and a law student in the universities of Trujillo and Cuzco, distinguished himself by his defense of the peoples' rights.

He was a founder of APRA Rebelde [Rebel APRA, a grouping which split from APRA, the pro-American party of Haya de la Torre], and continued his political activities in MIR.

He gave guidance to the peasants' struggles and is a revolutionary leader with extraordinary qualities of integrity, decisiveness, and unqualified devotion to the cause of national liberation.

He fought in the southern guerrilla struggle in the "Pachacutec" group at the side of Luis de la Puente.

We demand that Enrique Amaya be produced! Defend the lives of the politi-

cal prisoners!

* * *

Lima
June 12, 1967

Open Letter To the Ministry of Government

Last April 25, the lawyer and ex-university director Enrique Amaya Quintana was seized in Paucartambo, a department of Cuzco. Since then, he has mysteriously disappeared. There are indications that he has been assassinated as were other revolutionary youths in previous cases.

Not even his own relatives were able to obtain any official information on Amaya's situation, due to the intense police investigations and similar steps that continue to go on in Cuzco, as in Lima and Trujillo.

Because of this fact which shows, once again, the ferocity with which the repression against the people is applied, gross violations of the constitutional and legal norms on the part of those who claim to be the public defenders, the stingy politicians of Lima, in unanimous form and most energetically, we denounce before national and international public opinion the repressive measures of the Servicio de Inteligencia Militar [Military Intelligence Service] and of the División de Seguridad [Security Division] of the PIP [Peruvian Intelligence Service] -- organizations implicated directly in this case -- and we demand that the Minister of the government give a public reply to this open letter.

We want to make clear that the public denunciations made by the National Defense Committee of Human Rights, the Asociación de Control de la Universidad Nacional Ingeniería [Association of the Centers of the National University of Engineering], La Federación Universitaria de San Marcos [The University Federation of San Marcos], and other organizations and individuals, in the course of the last few weeks, have not been answered at all by the authorities.

AMNESTY FOR HUGO BLANCO PRESSED IN UNITED STATES

Defense work in the United States for imprisoned Peruvian peasant leader Hugo Blanco was marked by meetings in Detroit and Cleveland, July 14 and 17, respectively.

The key speaker at the Detroit meeting was Halma Perry, a young Peruvian writer associated with the liberation struggle in Latin America.

She described the rising new generation of freedom fighters committed to total struggle against the system oppressing them.

James Griffin, of the Young Social-

ist Alliance, spoke on recent developments in the Régis Debray case.

He also discussed the situation of the Bolivian revolutionaries who have been rounded up in recent mass arrests and are now being held in disease-infested jungle concentration camps (see World Outlook, June 30).

The meeting in Cleveland was addressed by Ralph Levitt, with over 40 people in attendance. Copies of a letter demanding that Blanco be spared a death sentence were sent to Belaúnde, the Supreme Military Council, and to Blanco's lawyer.

FORTUNATO VARGAS ARRESTED

[The March 15-31 issue of Revolución Peruana, the organ of FIR (Frente de la Izquierda Revolucionaria -- Front of the Revolutionary Left, the Peruvian section of the Fourth International) reports another incident in the wave of police terror against the revolutionary left in Peru.]

* * *

Free the peasant leader Fortunato Vargas!

We have heard from Cuzco that Comrade Fortunato Vargas, a leader of the Chaupimayo Peasant Union has been arbitrarily arrested by civil guardsmen!

Comrade Fortunato Vargas was a fighting leader of the Federación Provincial de Campesinos de Convención [the

Convención Provincial Peasant Federation] when Comrade Hugo Blanco was leading the fabulous mass upsurge of the previous years.

He was the founding leader of the Federación Departamental de Campesinos de Cuzco.

He endured long years in prison because of the accusations of the overseer Romainville. He was tried [in absentia] in connection with the La Convención events and subsequently captured in May 1964.

The state's demand for a 22-year prison sentence for him hung over his head. He was set free in Tacna in September 1966. We demand his immediate release.

DEMAND FOR RELEASE OF AMERICO MARTIN

The U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners sent a letter to President Raul Leoni of Venezuela July 5 protesting the arrest of Venezuelan guerrilla leaders Américo Martín and Félix Leonet.

Richard Garza, assistant executive secretary of the USIA Justice Committee, called attention to the "grave apprehensions" raised by the frequent "suicides" of political prisoners in Venezuela.

In particular he pointed to the death in prison of Fabricio Ojeda, guerrilla leader and former member of parliament, June 21, 1966; and the announcement

June 2 of the death of the Cuban, Pedro Cabrera Torres, captured last month helping Venezuelan revolutionaries to return to their country.

Américo Martín is the general secretary of the Movement of the Revolutionary Left and head of the Ezequiel Zamora Guerrilla Front.

He and Leonet, who is second in command of the front, were captured aboard the Spanish vessel Satrustegui. Martín and Leonet boarded the Europe-bound vessel in Colombia and were arrested at a stop in the Venezuelan port of La Guaira.

DOMINICAN COMMUNIST PARTY DENOUNCES KREMLIN'S FOREIGN POLICY

[The enormous default of the Soviet leadership in the Middle East crisis, coming on top of a series of imperialist victories in the past few years and the ominous escalation in Vietnam, has caused considerable discussion about the nature of Kremlin tactics.

[Below we reprint an editorial that appeared in the June 28 issue of El Popular, organ of the Dominican Communist party (PCD). To our knowledge, it is the first case of a pro-Moscow party in Latin America criticizing the Soviet stand in the Middle East.

[The PCD itself has no great record to point to. It did not distinguish itself in exposing the misleadership of Caamaño in the armed struggle in Santo Domingo in 1965. It gave uncritical support to the liberal candidacy of Juan Bosch in the elections staged by the occupying imperialist forces in 1966. As recently as January of this year, it still called for class collaboration in restoring a constitutionalist, i.e., liberal bourgeois, government.

[The significance of this editorial is that it is a symptom of the crisis of the Soviet "peaceful coexistence" policy, even within the ranks of pro-Moscow parties.

[In the text that follows, the subheads are reprinted as in the original.]

* * *

Stop the Imperialist Offensive!

"When we analyze the isolation of the Vietnamese, we feel anguish over the illogicality of this moment for humanity.

"...the Middle East is boiling, and no one can forecast what the cold war will lead to between the progressive countries of this zone and Israel, which is backed by the imperialists. It is one more rumbling volcano in the world today." -- Che Guevara.

Imperialism has succeeded in striking another blow against progressive humanity.

In recent times the forces of world reaction, in spite of the historical decadence of their social and economic relations, have gained important victories. This is the result of the lack of an internationalist attitude on the part of the socialist camp, which everywhere faces the armed might of counterrevolutionary imperialism, intervening in every country where its domination is threatened by the peoples in struggle. And it is the result of the ideological, political,

economic, and military fragmentation of the world communist movement.

World imperialism, headed by North America, has achieved a number of gains:

- The gathering together of all the dispersed economic forces of old Europe in the Common Market, which by its potential for development, has opened up perspectives of continued existence for economies fenced in by their saturated consumer markets.

- Open and increasing military intervention in Vietnam; systematic bombardment of North Vietnam, a socialist country.

- A military coup and the mass murder of a million Communists in Indonesia.

- Five coups d'état in Africa.

- The mercenary invasion in the Congo.

- The strengthening of the racist states of South Africa and Rhodesia.

- The coup d'état in Greece.

- The shooting down of the Panamanian population.

- The crushing of the Dominican revolution through the intervention of North American imperialist troops.

- The resounding defeat of Arab forces by the troops of Israel, supported directly by the imperialist naval forces of the U.S. and England, in a war that was expected for a long time.

The Middle East War

The events that have taken place in the Middle East have preoccupied all revolutionary sectors in our country and around the world. Comments on this theme are welling up out of the ranks of the revolutionaries, and large sections of the public display their anxiety over the significance of this problem.

In the interest of ideological clarification of the working class and of the laboring masses, our central committee considers it necessary to establish its position with clarity.

1. Yankee Imperialism -- the Main Aggressor Against Peoples

North American imperialism, through Israel, which it has strengthened militarily, unleashed an offensive against the Arab peoples, destined to preserve or con-

quer important economic and military positions in the Middle East. The military superiority of Israel, built up by the British and North Americans, has made important gains for world reaction.

2. A Disorienting Cease-Fire

These events have unfolded without any decisive action on the part of the socialist camp, particularly the Soviet Union, which has been strongly criticized by a world which had previously applauded its radical declarations of support to the Arab peoples and the movement of its naval units toward the Mediterranean.

Upon the unleashing of the Israeli aggression, the USSR chose the path of calling for a cease-fire, at first with the demand for the return of all troops to their original positions, and then an unconditional cease-fire.

At the same time that Egypt, Syria, Algeria, and other countries were opposing the cease-fire, the Soviets in the UN Security Council signed the unanimous declaration calling for the unconditional suspension of hostilities, which favored only the aggressors who had already conquered vast and important territories.

It is not an internationalist position to call for a cease-fire when peoples who total a hundred million have suffered an initial defeat at the hands of those who number less than three million. The correct stand was to give more material aid to continue the war and defeat the aggressors.

What would have been the reply of the Soviet people if in the face of Nazi troops at Stalingrad there had been a call for a cease-fire and acceptance of the German conquests? NEVER! And thus it was; only after the taking of Berlin was a cease-fire called.

The aggressors always make the first gains in war. The Arab peoples at that moment needed more planes, more arms of all types, more food, better military strategists, but not a disorienting cease-fire.

3. Fulfill Internationalist Tasks

The reality of today's world, tragically verified by events, is that while the imperialists render all-out aid to the various bourgeoisies and reactionary governments of the world, the progressive forces, the Soviet Union in particular, follow a very particular interpretation of the Leninist thesis, namely that peaceful coexistence means to avoid combat or confrontation with imperialism, which each day occupies more and more positions in the world.

In Santo Domingo the puppet army of Wessin could not stand up against the assault of the masses; before it could be smashed for good, the imperialist troops made their appearance to fulfill their international duty of oppressing the peoples, their duty as head of world reaction.

In Vietnam the number of North American troops will soon reach a million; war spending is already at the level of billions each year.

Simply to call for peace without adequate responses to the escalating attacks of imperialist aggression will not avoid war, but will encourage and confirm Yankee imperialism in its plans to reconquer what it has lost.

Our party is far from proposing that the socialist camp unleash thermonuclear war. But we understand that the road which has been taken to avoid it, besides being ineffective, actually facilitates the aims of imperialist domination. The only way to impose peace is to answer the warmongers with force, stopping their aggression, defeating them.

Our party considers proletarian internationalism to be more than just a slogan; we consider it above all a materialist conception of the relations between the proletariat of all countries, of the common struggle that links all peoples, which forces the countries of the socialist camp and principally the most developed state of that camp to stop imperialism from cracking its whip over all seas and frontiers.

The insolence of the imperialists requires that its fingers be burned in its every attempt to unleash aggression. THIS IS THE ONLY WAY TO AVOID WORLD WAR. Along the road of escalation, failing an adequate response, in the course of aggression imperialism will come to the Soviet Union itself. This is precisely what is happening.

The application of the thesis on peaceful coexistence approved at the conference of Communist parties in 1960, which in itself constituted a revision of what is most essential in the Leninist position on this very question, is today producing practical results that are extremely negative for the world revolutionary movement.

The attitude assumed by the socialist camp, primarily by the country which has the major economic and military power, in the face of the interventionist and warlike policy of imperialism (which is expressed most dramatically today in Vietnam and the Middle East) does not correspond to the principle of proletarian internationalism, clearly laid down in the tra-

dition of Marxism-Leninism.

4. Great Confusion

The question being asked by the peoples in struggle is the following: WHO WILL HELP US? WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO CUBA? This is at a time when imperialism is proclaiming and exercising its right to intervene wherever it wishes.

The ideological crisis, the lack of coordination of the efforts of the socialist countries, and the lack of solidarity have been blatantly manifested.

We speak of the Soviet Union at length because it is the major power and the one which for years committed itself to act in support of the Arab countries, but we cannot remain silent about the others.

People's China, the second military power of the socialist camp, has limited itself to simple declarations of solidarity with the Arab peoples and strident condemnations of the Soviet position, without giving concrete aid, without pointing out what is the only internationalist attitude demanded by the situation.

All the European socialist countries limited themselves to making declarations of solidarity.

Rumania, at the extreme of conciliation, assumed a position in the diplomatic field identical to that of Israel, which calls for direct negotiations with the Arab countries as a way of winning recognition and acceptance.

Cuba and Vietnam provide a welcome contrast within this panorama of insufficient solidarity.

Vietnam makes its great contribution to the world revolution from its heroic trenches.

Cuba does not fear risking its revolution for international solidarity, but Cuba does not have enough military force to stop imperialist aggression outside its borders. But despite its limitations, it stands out as an example of solidarity, placing its men and arms in the mountains of America in order to undermine the imperialist aggressor's bases of support.

CHINA CELEBRATES MAO'S SWIM

July 16 marked the first anniversary of Mao Tse-tung's celebrated nine-mile swim in the Yangtze River at age 72.

Among many accomplishments since last July, Peking recently noted that

5. What Has Been Lost in War Cannot Be Won Back in Peace

"The truth is always revolutionary." -- Lenin.

Our central committee considers it necessary for all revolutionaries and communists of the world to criticize the inadequate solidarity displayed by the great majority of the socialist-camp countries and to place the responsibility where it belongs for the criminal advances made by world counterrevolution, headed by North American imperialism.

This is not a time for meetings and declarations, for verbal support and demands for withdrawal, for condemnations. In Vietnam and the Middle East the cause of the oppressed peoples is at stake and words are not enough for their defense.

It is necessary to respond to imperialism with the same coin. It is necessary to cut off its claws before it has become so powerful, fattened by its plundering of the whole world, that it may strike the first blow in a war which because of its technological features may well be the last.

The Arab peoples, who today have acquired a greater anti-imperialist consciousness, who have come to know the oppressive and criminal policies of world capitalism through their own experience, have not been definitively defeated.

The Arab countries, if rearmed and aided, are in a position to recuperate what they have lost. But to believe that the territory lost in the Sinai Desert can be regained at the United Nations is nothing but an illusion that has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. By being idealist it denies the objectivity of material facts; by being romantic it provokes scorn from the more ferocious agents of imperialism.

Those who consummate aggression under the very noses of Soviet naval units will with much greater facility bring together a mechanical majority of votes in the face of the weak words of Kosygin.

If those ships were only diplomatic pressure, the presence in the UN is nothing but a confused attempt to repair the damage by the very same erroneous procedure.

"more than 29 million sets of [Mao's] Selected Works...came off the press in the first five months of this year."

This was more than twice the total published in the 15 preceding years.

TITO-KREMLIN DISPUTE REPORTED ON MIDEAST WAR

By Les Evans

A bitter assessment of the withering away of Soviet support for the Arabs at the height of the war with Israel appears to be taking place among the Soviet and Eastern European Communist parties.

K.S. Karol, writing in the June 16 New Statesman, claims inside information on the discussions that took place June 9 between Soviet and East European Communist party chiefs.

"A group of 18 angry men," says Karol, "met secretly last Friday [June 9] in the Kremlin. All the leaders of the European communist countries, except Albania, were there. Even President Tito... was present."

One of the major points at issue was how the Arabs had been caught by surprise by the Israeli air strike. Tito reportedly presented Nasser's case:

"Nasser claimed that he had foreseen this attack, and to forestall it had planned a preemptive strike on Israeli airfields; but that first the Americans and then, in the middle of the night, the Russians had dissuaded him; from this joint intervention he had concluded that the Israeli attack would not take place."

Karol indicates that there is some reason to question whether the Russian advice to Nasser was inspired by naïveté as to Israeli intentions:

"The Poles reported that their Washington embassy had forecast an Israeli attack 24 hours before it took place, and that this information had been promptly passed on to the Russians."

How, then, were the Russians taken by surprise?

"The Russians," says Karol, "themselves astounded by the turn of events, had no reply to make: they had foreseen nothing.... They... felt that all they had to do was to restrain the Egyptians, while the U.S. put similar pressure on the Israelis. But, they complained, President Johnson had not carried out his part of the bargain by doing all in his power to stop the Israeli hawks."

This show of collusion with Johnson, compounded by the Soviets plumping for the cease-fire, seems to have set some bureaucratic teeth on edge:

"Faced with such apparent treachery, the other communist states thought Moscow had struck a secret bargain; but in the two days which followed it became

clear they had got nothing in return. The Americans had asked nothing more from the Israelis than to stop fighting; it was this which led the other communist leaders to insist on a full collective discussion of the debacle, to take place in the Kremlin. It was extremely bitter, lasted over 12 hours and covered the whole range of communist-bloc foreign policy."

According to Karol's information, it was the Yugoslavs who emerged as the critics of Soviet conciliationism:

"The Yugoslavs say that Tito took the role of public prosecutor. He told the Soviet leaders, in effect: 'Your policy of secret dialogue with the Americans has led to the liquidation of the concept of the uncommitted world. It has led to the overthrow of Third World leaders like Nkrumah, Sukarno and today [Friday, June 9] Nasser. It has strengthened the US grip on India, which sooner or later will move entirely into the Western camp.'"

If this report of the well-known commentator in the New Statesman is correct it still marks no fundamental shift on the part of the Yugoslavs. Their concern is for the preservation of the "uncommitted world," that is, those bourgeois regimes in the underdeveloped world which have taken an anti-imperialist stance.

While such regimes certainly deserve to be defended from the depredations of imperialism, they are inherently unstable and repressive toward their own working class; incapable of solving the fundamental problems confronting the underdeveloped countries.

The Kremlin bureaucrats have made no small contribution to the series of imperialist victories in the colonial world. The support of the Sukarnos, however, was precisely the road to defeat for the working class. The real alternative, that does not occur to the bureaucrats, is that pointed out by the Cuban revolution -- of a socialist revolution.

The attempt to take up the cudgels of defense against imperialism, even from the standpoint of the bureaucrats, seems to have yielded very little: Following the Kremlin gathering came Kosygin's visit to Johnson.

Rather than a break with their policy of accommodation with imperialism, the "spirit of Glassboro" spelled out the promise of more of the same to come.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S "TRUCE" WITH THE WHITE HOUSE

By Dick Roberts

On July 13, Lyndon Johnson held a Washington news conference with the top U.S. military commanders in Vietnam.

The New York Times reported that "As the President spoke, he looked across from his arm chair to a sofa on which Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara sat with Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of American forces in Vietnam."

The following conversation took place:

"The troops that General Westmoreland needs and requests, as we feel it necessary, will be supplied. Is that not true, General Westmoreland?"

"Yes, sir."

"General Wheeler?"

"Yes, sir."

"Secretary McNamara?"

"Yes, sir."

The New York Times did not report the respectful intonations which must certainly have accompanied the "Yes, sirs" in this historic meeting. But according to all observers, the conversation ended months of disagreement between the White House and the U.S. military command in Vietnam.

Instead of the 100,000 to 200,000 troop reinforcements which the generals have sought, there would only be about 30,000 in the near future. The reserves would not be called up. Draft levels would not be significantly increased.

The significant thing about this "agreement," however, was not the implication that Washington has no need of additional troops to gain its objectives in Vietnam.

All the evidence produced in the course of debate prior to Johnson's decision points to exactly the opposite conclusion.

At best, U.S. military forces are deadlocked in Vietnam. More likely, they are beginning to lose ground to the revolutionary National Liberation Front.

What the White House agreement really points up is the powerful domestic pressure on Johnson to slow down the escalation of the war, and if possible, to

bring it to an end.

There can be little doubt that the U.S. commanders in Vietnam do want reinforcements and have been asking for more troops for a considerable period of time.

U.S. News and World Report, a magazine which closely reflects the military viewpoint, editorialized on the war in the July 17 issue:

"Gen. William C. Westmoreland assured Mr. McNamara on July 7 that the war 'is not a stalemate' -- but the physical evidence argued against him.

"The initiative now is more on the Communist side. The U.S. effort has become largely a 'holding action.'"

"One discouraging report from U.S. commanders on the scene: During the past few months, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have not only been able to absorb the impact of the massive U.S. buildup in 1966, but have increased their manpower and firepower capabilities."

"Says a senior U.S. officer: 'The situation is not as bad as in 1964-65 when we were moving from an advisory role to an active military role with troops in Vietnam. But the situation is by no means as favorable today as it was in 1966.'"

U.S. News and World Report has its own ominous reasons for stressing this assessment. Further in the article one reads:

"'North Vietnam is ripe for an Inchon-type landing,' [according to one military source]. It was at Inchon in Korea that Gen. Douglas MacArthur landed troops behind enemy lines, changing the pattern of the war.

"A U.S. invasion of North Vietnam would be one solution to the problem of infiltration."

Nevertheless, the impression that Washington is confronted with a military stalemate is by no means limited to pro-Pentagon sources. The liberal Washington Post carried an even more pessimistic appraisal, June 4.

Ward Just, a reporter who had recently returned from an 18-month tour of duty in Vietnam, declared:

"This war is not being won, and by any reasonable estimate, it is not going to be won in the foreseeable future. It may be unwinnable."

"The middle class [Vietnamese] see the country being torn apart by a war machine fitted not to counter insurgency but for what Gen. William C. Westmoreland correctly calls a war of attrition. To Vietnamese, it seems a case of killing a man in an auto accident to save him from cancer.

"Among Americans, what is missing is a sense of purpose and a sense of priorities. No one can agree on what the situation in Vietnam is, except that it is surely unsatisfactory.

"No one can say with any certainty that the Allies are a quarter or a half or three-quarters down the road. No one can say whether it is the end of the beginning or the beginning of the end, or indeed, whether units of time have relevance in Vietnam."

The gloomy outlook about U.S. prospects in Vietnam comes, moreover, at a time when Washington has assumed the main burden of combat.

The July 18 New York Times states: "Since the first of May, 2,427 Americans have been killed, compared with 2,010 South Vietnamese. Since June 4, when the Saigon government began announcing figures on those wounded in action, 5,838 Americans have been wounded as compared with 2,231 South Vietnamese."

Besides taking over the job of frontline fighting, the U.S. military also has to play an increasing role in the occupation of territory already seized from the guerrillas. This was supposed to be taken care of by the Saigon army.

But Ky's regime is not inspiring sufficient combativeness among its own troops.

The July 17 Wall Street Journal carried an article on its editorial page entitled: "Wanted: South Vietnam Army Heroes." The author, Fredrick Taylor, reports:

"...as the U.S. troop commitment continues to mount, Americans will get the impression that the South Vietnamese army is doing little to defend its own country."

Taylor feels, however, this is somewhat of an exaggeration. "Only about 80 percent of the entire South Vietnamese army is ineffective."!!!

The hard realities of Washington's military situation in Vietnam, coupled with the Johnson administration's stubborn pretense that all is going well, is causing a new wave of criticism in the ranks of Democratic and Republican party

politicians.

Perhaps the sharpest attack on Johnson's policies in the recent course of the war came from New Jersey Republican Senator Clifford Case, July 10.

"The attention of the public," Case declared, "and of the critics has been diverted from the serious inadequacies and



shortfalls in the administration's operations in Vietnam.

"These inadequacies and shortfalls are the direct responsibility of President Johnson. Unless they are corrected there is grave danger that the whole effort in South Vietnam will collapse."

"Overall, progress in the revolutionary development program [pacification] is scarcely noticeable.

"A highly respected American who had been working in the program and its predecessors for years....ventured, with great hesitancy, that at the present rate of progress it might perhaps be done in 10 years."

Case also lambasted the Saigon regime for its failure to carry out Washington's assignment. He added:

"There are many reasons for this failure: weakness of motivation, inadequate and wrongly directed training, too



Copaint

few good leaders at every level of command, a tradition of corruption."

Case's speech is indicative of the fast-developing moderate Republican stand "slightly to the left of Johnson." On July 10, eight Republicans in the House of Representatives issued a statement calling for gradual de-escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

George Romney, a potential Republican presidential candidate for 1968, called for a "rein" on bombings, July 11.

But the Democrats are by no means willing to give the Republicans a monopoly on phony peace propaganda in the pre-election period. The day after Case's senate speech, Democratic majority leader Mike Mansfield rose in the senate to give his version of attacking the Johnson administration.

"The fact is," Mansfield claimed, "that reports of progress are strewn, like burned out tanks, all along the road which has led this nation ever more deeply into Vietnam...."

"It has been present, this promise of progress, as the casualties in our forces in dead and wounded have increased from less than 10 a year, to 10 a month, to 10 a week, to 10 a day, to 10 an hour of every hour of every day."

A measure of the depth of dissatisfaction with Johnson's handling of the war is the fact that the Wall Street Journal editorially praised Mansfield's speech.

"The longer the war goes on," the Journal declared July 14, "and the wider it gets, the greater the danger that it may work against, rather than for, U.S. interests."

"The nation may be depleting its human and material resources out of all proportion to any conceivable gain, while the real enemy, Red China, sits on the sidelines. The U.S. may be weakening, instead of strengthening, itself against the day when perhaps greater efforts may be demanded of it."

However, the Wall Street Journal also made explicit the stand that is shared by the other criticisms:

"The truth is we Americans are involved in an ugly land, jungle and swamp war 10,000 miles distant in an area of no importance whatever to the defense of the United States. It is the most unpopular war our nation ever fought and it is becoming more unpopular day by day. From the letters I receive...I know that citizens who considered my views 100 percent wrong 18 months ago no longer are critical." -- Senator Stephen Young, July 13, 1967.

"No more than anyone else do we see how the U.S., by now so deeply involved, can abandon the battle or otherwise end the war in the face of continuing Communist intransigence. Nor do we rule out the possibility, remote though it seems, that some military breakthrough in America's favor might be in the making: that would indeed be progress."

What really concerns these politicians at this juncture is the impending 1968 election. The Vietnam war is bitterly unpopular in America today and it is growing more so week by week.

July 13, Democratic Senator Young declared: "My mail from Ohio citizens now shows that the rank and file of American men and women now are beginning to realize we are engaged in the wrong war in the wrong place, and that this is the most unpopular war our nation has engaged in at any time during the past 191 years. It has become a great American tragedy."

The politicians want a little leeway. Like Johnson, they have every intention of prosecuting the U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

But they would like to disassociate themselves, at least in rhetoric, from the Johnson line during the pre-election period.

The same motivation lies behind Johnson's temporary truce with the generals. The White House knows just as well as the Pentagon what the real score is on the Vietnam battlefield.

Unlike the Pentagon, Johnson has to get re-elected in 1968. That is why he is reluctant to send more troops right now -- and it is the only reason.

But Johnson's has done this before. He campaigned for peace in 1964, and undertook the first major war-escalation three months later. He talked peace in 1966 for the benefit of his Democratic party colleagues in the off-year election. And he followed this by nearly doubling the level of troops.

Other things being equal, that is what Lyndon Johnson will do next year.

THE CUBANS DEVELOP THEIR POSITION ON THE MIDDLE EAST

[With the success of the Israeli blitzkrieg, U.S. imperialism dealt a heavy defeat to the colonial revolution. The blow was all the worse, coming as it did in the train of other defeats such as the catastrophe in Indonesia. Bitterest of all, instead of a heartening victory to give them encouragement, the Vietnamese were served by their allies with a debacle that must have deeply disappointed them with its display of ineptitude, weakness, stupidity and downright treachery.

[Who was responsible for this defeat? What policies paved the way for it? What line must be followed to overcome the setback and to open the road to victory? These and related questions are now being intensively discussed in vanguard circles on an international scale.

[Where do the Cuban leaders stand in this? As yet they have not presented a rounded analysis of the complex crisis and the roles played by the various participants. It is clear nonetheless that they are greatly concerned about the defeat and that they have definite views on it and what to do about it.

[The document below, indicating their thinking at this stage, is of considerable interest, we believe. It is an editorial published by Granma, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Cuba.

[Much of the editorial will undoubtedly meet with the approval of revolutionary Marxists everywhere. On two points, however, some observations are in order.

[The editorial indicates a shift in attitude toward Boumedienne, the head of the Algerian government. The Cubans recall their critical attitude toward the coup through which Boumedienne seized power. At the time, they left open the possibility that the new regime might demonstrate through action its adherence to the program of advancing the Algerian and world revolutions. In the current crisis in the Middle East, the editorial maintains, the Boumedienne regime has conducted itself in such a way as to pass the acid test on this.

[Boumedienne has indeed opted for a line of strong opposition to the aggression of imperialism in the Middle East as deployed through the State of Israel. But is this enough to meet the criticisms expressed by the Cuban leaders themselves at the time of Boumedienne's coup d'état? What about the political prisoners behind bars in Algeria -- Ben Bella in the first place?

[So long as Ben Bella and many other revolutionists remain in prison solely because of their political views it would seem obvious that the "methods" used by Boumedienne in the process of assuming power are still in force. Before placing a blanket seal of approval on his regime it would seem in order to require at least the release of all political prisoners and recognition of their right to resume functioning in the vanguard of the revolution which they helped win by their role in the most difficult stages of the struggle.

[The second point is a possible misunderstanding of the editorial's argument that "It was fear of fascism and cowardice in the face of Hitler's threats that caused the Second World War."

[If the reference is to Stalin's policy of coexisting peacefully with imperialism and building socialism in one country for the benefit of a parasitic bureaucracy, there is substance to the point. An analogy can indeed be drawn between Stalin's line, with its disastrous consequences, and the current line of the Kremlin which plays into the hands of imperialism and helps pave the way to a third world war.

[It should be noted, however, that it is inaccurate to state that Stalin's policies "caused" the second world war. His line of peaceful coexistence and policy of blocking and betraying revolutionary struggles wherever he could only facilitated the invasion of the USSR by German imperialism, after having helped pave the way for Hitler's ascension to power. The causes of the war, however, lay in the dynamics of capitalism, particularly the capitalism of the Western powers, including the U.S.

[The Granma editorial, for whatever reasons, does not draw this parallel in a clear and specific way; and thus it lends itself to being interpreted as referring to Chamberlain's "Munich" policy, in which British imperialism sought to reach a deal with German imperialism at the expense primarily of the Soviet Union. This, however, is rather beside the point in the current crisis in the Middle East.

[The translation of the editorial is the official one provided by the June 25 English edition of Granma. The title of the editorial is "The Correct Revolutionary Position of the Government of Algeria." The subheads appear in the original.]

* * *

In 1962 the Algerian people's struggle for liberation was crowned with victory

over colonialism, which was cause for rejoicing in Cuba. Our own guerrilla epic had been climaxed with a people's victory only a few years before, on January 1, 1959.

The Algerian and Cuban revolutions, each with its own distinctive circumstances and conditions, signified tremendous victories for the underdeveloped peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They brought the world dramatically closer to the coming downfall of the colonial and neocolonial worlds. Subsequent to the victory of the Algerian patriots, the revolutionary leaders of Cuba and Algeria reacted similarly to important international events. Their community of ideas was instrumental in forging close bonds of friendship between the two peoples.

In June 1965 Colonel Boumedienne assumed power in Algeria. Our Revolution, represented by Fidel Castro, took a critical stand as to the methods used in this process. These criticisms became known by revolutionaries and others throughout the world, including the Algerian leaders. At that time Fidel Castro stated: "If they demonstrate with their acts that their hearts are with the Algerian Revolution and that they are heart and soul with the revolution of the oppressed of the world, then we will not deny them our aid; we will not withhold our indorsement."

Immediately afterwards, he explained: "And if, some day, the imperialists turn against them and threaten Algeria for being revolutionary, we will give them our moral support; we will shed our blood for their struggle, for the Algerian Revolution, for the revolution of the Algerian people. Because with whom do we stand, now and in the future? With the Algerian people and with those who interpret their revolutionary will!"

Today the Arab peoples have been made victims of aggression launched by the imperialists and their confederates in the Middle East. In the eyes of our Party, the position taken by the Algerian Government regarding these happenings is one worthy of examination and evaluation in all its aspects.

Faced with the Middle East crisis, a situation of the greatest consequence for the revolutionary movement of the Arab peoples and of great importance, as well, for the worldwide struggle against imperialism, the Algerian Government has stated its decision to reject the compromising and shameful decision of the Security Council.

This position may be most completely appreciated if we consider what it means in the face of the brutal and treacherous blow that the revolutionary

movement has suffered in the Arab countries.

The stand taken by the Algerian Government has singular value because it is the only revolutionary position that can be adopted in the face of imperialist aggression.

In the development of the crisis in the Middle East, the armed forces of the Israeli Government were clearly the first to move, staging surprise bombing raids on Egyptian airports and launching a Nazi-type operation against the territory of the United Arab Republic. The Israeli Government clearly showed that it had been intensively preparing the attack against the Arab peoples, which originally was to have been directed primarily against the revolutionary State of Syria. This was opportunely denounced by the governments of the United Arab Republic and Syria in the days prior to the attack.

They Call for a Cease-fire
without Condemning the
Perpetrators of the Aggression

These acts constitute a gross and flagrant violation of peace and of the principles of international law. But what did the United Nations, acting through the Security Council, do in the face of this crime? After the armed forces of the Israeli Government initiated the aggression and penetrated deep into Egyptian territory, the UN Security Council adopted the shameful position of calling for an unconditional cease-fire.

The cease-fire resolution placed the Arab peoples in an impossible and absurd position.

To call for a cease-fire without condemning the aggressors, or even demanding the withdrawal of the invading troops, which, encouraged by such a resolution, stepped up their attack, is tantamount to condoning the crime and dealing an overwhelming moral and political blow against the Arab peoples. The resolution showed that the United Nations -- just as in the Congo and in all other similar situations in the past -- was manipulated to serve Yankee interests. The Security Council catered to those interests. The Israeli Government's armed forces, apparently encouraged by the resolution and acting in full cooperation with imperialism, took the Sinai Peninsula for all practical intents and purposes, won an important part of Jordanian territory, and in the midst of the cease-fire launched its armored units against Syria, which, in the face of the overwhelming numbers of planes and tanks with which the imperialists had equipped the Israeli army, had no other recourse than to face the aggressors with the heroism

of a practically unarmed people.

These events took place openly and with complete impunity, to the applause and satisfaction of the imperialists and the Pentagon warmongers. Now the aggressors cynically announce their intention of remaining in the occupied territories indefinitely, showing the true motive behind the war.

The Path of Concessions
Led to the Second World War
Thirty Years Ago

The imperialists, in line with their reactionary policies, gave full support to the Israeli Government. The government of the United States has given complete political and military support to its allies in the Middle East.

Events that followed show once again that making concessions to the imperialists encourages them and leads to new acts of war, obliging the peoples to respond to aggression with heroic resistance and revolutionary war.

The path of concessions led to the Second World War thirty years ago. It is a path that poses grave dangers for the peoples. It was fear of fascism and cowardice in the face of Hitler's threats that caused the Second World War.

Events in the Middle East confirm that concessions, far from detaining the imperialists, encourage them in their criminal attacks and their shameless aggressions. Those who, out of fear of war, make concessions to the imperialists, far from preventing war, cause new and even more serious aggressions.

These Acts of Aggression
Can Only Be Counteracted
by Struggle and Revolution

This situation has involved the Arab peoples in a dramatic and complex dilemma. It is a decisive and difficult moment for the revolutionary movement among the Arab peoples. In the face of these aggressions there is no other decision than that of resistance and struggle. Only struggle and revolution lie ahead. This is the only revolutionary policy. In view of the conditions that exist in the Middle East, the only revolutionary position is to resist and to convert the war of conquest unleashed by the aggressors into a people's revolutionary war.

"In the face of imperialism," stated our Central Committee a few weeks ago, "there are two alternatives: to capitulate or to resist and fight, to resist and fight means running the risks that are involved in such a position. And capitulation simply means capitulation."

The Algerian Government declared:

"...If we have suffered the blows of the enemy in our Arab East -- in Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Palestine -- and if we have experienced momentary reverses owing to the extraordinary measures employed by our enemies, this in no way affects our will or our firm determination to continue advancing toward the destruction of the bastions of evil and of aggression, toward the elimination of imperialism..."

"The battlefield is not limited to the Suez Canal or the Sinai Peninsula. It includes the entire Arab world. It involves a general struggle which has not yet ended and which will only end with our victory over imperialism..."

"Frankness impels us to state that tomorrow no one will be able to hide behind the excuse of neutrality. There can be no neutrality between justice and injustice, between aggression and defense against aggression, between slavery and liberty, between tolerance and racism."

"The war will go on. We will only lay down our weapons with the re-establishment of right, the elimination of abnormal situations and the elimination of the aftermaths of aggression. The Arab nation is solidly united. It has behind it a giant human and moral force: the justice-loving peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America."

The Algerian Government has thus declared the need to resist and fight the aggressors and to place the struggle of the Arab peoples within the framework of the broader struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism.

This revolutionary position adopted by the Algerian Government is entirely correct and reflects the interests of the Arab peoples and all the peoples of the underdeveloped countries of the world. This position reflects a profoundly anti-imperialist and revolutionary position. Therefore, revolutionaries throughout the world have the binding duty to support, with all forces at their command, the position of the Algerian Government. We have this duty because the Algerian Government has refused to accept "the existing situation."

It refuses to accept the criminal aggression perpetrated by the imperialists and what is tantamount to acceptance of it by the UN Security Council.

Our Party Supports the Positions
Expressed by the Algerian Government

Our Party completely supports the position of the Algerian Government and urges all the peoples of the world to

unite in favor of this line and attitude. The Algerian Government's position on questions of the Arab world is a key point by which to differentiate revolutionaries and pseudo-revolutionaries and the enemies of the peoples. Our people call on revolutionaries throughout the world, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the workers of all countries to stand by the line and the position that the Algerian Government has bravely and firmly adopted.

The Arab peoples have our support

and our militant solidarity. We offer them our aid and solidarity because we support the sacred cause of the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, because we hold high the banner of revolution and because our position is based on principles.

We declare to the Algerian Government and people that we stand by them in defense of their Revolution and of their inalienable right to territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence.

PEASANT UPRISING IN WEST BENGAL

[The following article is an editorial prepared for the July 1967 issue of Marxist Outlook, monthly journal of the Socialist Workers party, Indian section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

Bombay

According to all accounts published in the capitalist press in India, garbled or otherwise, a miniature peasant movement is building up in the green woodlands of Naxalbari, in the Darjeeling district of West Bengal at the foothills of the Himalayas. It has attracted world attention.

Under the previous Congress rule, a movement of this nature would have been suppressed quietly in a conspiracy of silence by the ruling class. Since West Bengal is administered now by a "United Front" government supposedly dominated by "leftists," Naxalbari has assumed a special significance. Bourgeois rulers are inclined to view it as a challenge to the existing pattern of ownership not only of farm land but also the tea plantation industry in that region.

There is virtual panic among sections of bourgeois politicians who seem to discover a second Telangana in Naxalbari. Others have called it a "Vietnam" made to order, as it were, by Radio Peking. There is also a clamour for a central intervention and imposition of a president's rule in West Bengal. The far-sighted among the bourgeois politicians, however, recognise that such a course would only spell disaster, rousing unprecedented wrath of the masses of West Bengal against the bourgeois state as a whole.

For the present at any rate the strategy of the Congress government at the centre is to let the United Front government do the dirty job of suppressing the isolated uprising of semitribal

Santhal peasants in Naxalbari and prevent it from spreading to other districts. Chief Minister Ajoy Mukherjee is quite willing to undertake the job with the cooperation of his "leftist" coalition partners.

Naxalbari is no doubt considered a challenge to existing property relations. But the bourgeois rulers seem to realise, in the words of a special correspondent of the Times of India that "Potentially such situations exist in other parts of the State; unless attended to now a few more Naxalbaries will come out in rashes in scattered areas of West Bengal. An inevitable development with the leftists in power; the sharecroppers who have not yet been assured of their rights by the 'Bhagchash boards' expect the Communist parties and the fellow travellers to do them justice." (Times of India, June 29.)

That is the secret behind the present hue and cry raised about Naxalbari. Only eighteen months ago there was a popular uprising in West Bengal which almost toppled the then Congress government because of its failure to solve the food problem facing the people.

The electoral defeat of the Congress in the last general elections and installation of a "United Front" government headed by a dissident Congress leader, Ajoy Mukherjee, with all the major left parties including the Left Communist party of India [Left CPI], Right Communist party of India [Right CPI], Revolutionary Socialist party [RSP], Samyukta Socialist party [SSP], Praja Socialist party [PSP], Socialist Unity Centre [SUC], etc., participating in it, have roused popular expectations about a "new deal" under the "new setup."

The gherao* movement among the

*Gherao, or siege, is a tactic of Indian workers that is carried out by surrounding employers, demanding an immediate decision

workers and a series of demonstrations of students and the rural poor are only their outward manifestations. But the failure of the United Front to bring any substantial relief to the masses has disillusioned the masses. The mass discontent, kept under check for awhile, is erupting into the open once again.

There is however one essential difference between February-March 1966 and now. Whereas the masses in West Bengal then had to face repressive measures resorted to by a Congress regime, recognised by the masses as a regime of the capitalist-landlord exploiters, today they have to face a bourgeois state apparatus wielded by the so-called progressives and leftists, equally ruthless and repressive, but talking the hypocritical language of "political solutions" to cover their real intentions of defending bourgeois property.

Indeed the masses in West Bengal are learning through bitter experience that the United Front government is as vigorous a defender of capitalist-landlord property relations as was the previous Congress government. This has led to a new process of political differentiation and splits in traditional CPI(Marxist), Right CPI, SSP, RSP, etc., with sections of the rank and file openly revolting against the opportunist policies of their leaderships.

The Naxalbari peasant resistance is, for example, being led by dissidents from the CPI(M) in open defiance of their leadership. The Left CPI leadership has taken disciplinary action against several militants who have been leading isolated mass struggles in West Bengal and has expelled at least nineteen of them who have been vocal in their opposition to the leadership.

The Left CPI as the major partner in the United Front has to face an embarrassing situation because of the revolt from the ranks. It is obvious that the Left CPI, like the "revisionist" Right CPI, has entered the United Front coalition in pursuance of its present policy of alliance with the "national bourgeoisie" and the rich peasantry in the so-called "peoples democratic front" as conceived by it.

The class collaborationist policies and the coalition politics of the CPIs have their own logic. They must perforce play the role of executioners of the workers and peasants (whom they claim to represent) struggling against their

exploiters.

The Stalinist leaders of the two CPIs are adept in the art of rationalisation. Now that they are in multiclass coalitions their trick is to persuade their followers not to develop independent struggles of workers and peasants lest their bourgeois coalition partners are disturbed.

Any member who questions the present policy of the bureaucratic leadership is dubbed a traitor, an agent provocateur, an adventurist or even a CIA agent, and therefore needs to be thrown out of the party. Such is the logic behind the expulsions of militant cadres from the West Bengal unit of the CPI(M). The leadership is not prepared to answer the questions raised by the ranks as to why it is not able to implement its own election promises to the people. It is trying to gag the militant elements who think for themselves by all organisational means.

One of the reasons why Naxalbari and adjacent areas of about 280 square miles where the present peasant movement has gained momentum, have acquired such a "notoriety" is perhaps their proximity to borders of Nepal and East Pakistan. It is a strategic military area with a strong army base.

The Terai areas, as the foothills are called -- all dense forests infested with wild animals -- were cleared by the British planters with the help of indentured labour. Violence is a way of life with the tribals-turned-peasants in the area who have to fight wild animals still marauding the area, with their primitive weapons of bows and arrows, in the struggle for sheer survival.

These peasants have been ruthlessly exploited by jotedars [landlords] and tea plantation owners for generations. Records show that thousands of acres of uncharted land reclaimed from the forests by the peasants have been illegally grabbed by jotedars who have successfully evaded the provisions of the land-ceiling laws enacted by the former Congress government.

Jotedars are backed by the local officials in their illegal eviction drive against their sharecroppers. They are organised. Each jotedar is supplied with a gun licence.

The present movement started early in March after the United Front ministry assumed office with some Left CPI militants in the vanguard. It has gathered strength since. The technique adopted by the local Kisan Sabha [peasants union] was to organise marches of evicted peasants through various villages to establish their rights to lands held by jote-

on workers' demands. Owners and managers are confined in their offices or are followed by workers when they go to pay business and social calls. -- W.O.

dars. There were instances where jotedars' houses were surrounded by peasants to de-hoard cornered rice and paddy stocks. There were some clashes resulting in casualties on both sides. But the United Front government showed indifference toward the movement initially.

The outside world came to know of Naxalbari only after a police inspector was killed in a clash early in June between sharecroppers and a police party which went to evict them from land occupied by them. In retaliation the police opened fire and shot down seven Santhal women and two children the very next day. Only then did the West Bengal government realize the gravity of the situation.

At first the Left CPI ministers (who happened to be leaders of the Kisan Sabha) tried to pacify the leaders of the agitation. A ministerial team was sent to meet the local leaders who had gone underground fearing police reprisals. By this time the peasants in the area had become so suspicious of the intention of the government that they refused to meet the ministers.

The state government now is supposed to be pursuing a policy of tough police action coupled with a "political solution" of the problem. Warrants for the arrest of the underground leaders have been issued. An attempt is being made to split the movement by offering fallow land to evicted sharecroppers.

The jotedars who wield considerable influence over the United Front government through the Bangla Congress, the SSP and other constituent parties are not going to yield to the persuasion of the Left ministers to forego their ill-gotten possessions. In fact they are on the offensive.

Despite tall talks of a "political solution" the government cannot satisfy the land-hungry peasantry of Naxalbari. It cannot find a satisfactory solution to the jotedar-peasant conflict in the present capitalist framework. It might be that the isolated peasant uprising in Naxalbari will be suppressed by the government with the wily tactics pursued by the "Left" ministers. That is not, however, an end of the struggle.

As revolutionary Marxists, we wholeheartedly support the legitimate struggles of the peasants and sharecroppers in Naxalbari and other parts of West Bengal. We would, however, warn the Left CPI militants leading the Naxalbari movement that an isolated peasant struggle cannot succeed unless it links with the movements of the working class in the neighbouring plantations and in the urban areas.

The immediate necessity for them is to break decisively with the hypocritical class collaborationist politics of their leaders. Every effort must be made to extend the scope of the struggle to other parts of West Bengal while in the process of trying to forge a united front of workers and peasants in their common struggle against the bourgeois state. Joint committees of peasants and agricultural workers should be set up in every village to support the Naxalbari movement.

We also demand from the West Bengal government the immediate withdrawal of police cases and warrants against peasants and their leaders, adequate compensation for peasants killed in the police firing, confiscation of all land illegally grabbed by the jotedars and its re-distribution through elected councils of poor peasants and agricultural workers.

LIFE IN CALCUTTA -- FESTERING SORE BREEDS REVOLT IN INDIA

Some idea of the incredible poverty and degradation of life in West Bengal where the current peasant struggles are going on can be gathered from a report by John Hatch in the June 30 New Statesman.

He recounts a visit to Dhappa, a slum on the outskirts of Calcutta, the teeming capital of West Bengal:

"The road into Dhappa crosses the river over an iron-girded bridge....The river is an open sewer. Over its banks hang lath latrines consisting of a single holed board....[Dhappa's] inhabitants are divided into two: the lepers and the beggars. The division usually doesn't last very long....

"The homes are also divided into

two groups; those built of sunburned mud and dung bricks, and those of mud aloneThey consist of a single room, furnished with a trestle bed. I measured one; it was nine feet square; 20 people lived in it, sleeping in shifts."

In the heart of Calcutta itself where the broken sidewalks are "stained with bloody spittle, human excrement and cow dung," Hatch goes on to say, "over 30,000 human beings sleep on these pavements every night...."

Some pertinent statistics from Hatch's report: Unemployment in Calcutta stands at 12.6 percent. In the past five years numbers of children not attending school have risen from 242,000 to 260,000. Only 54 percent of Calcutta is sewered.

ARGENTINE REVOLUTIONARIES HOLD HISTORIC CONGRESS

[The following article on the "Third Congress of the Revolutionary Workers Party of Argentina," was translated from the July 3 issue of La Verdad.]

* * *

Our Third Congress was held 15 days ago in Uruguay (for obvious security reasons). Not wanting to fall into the commonplaces which inevitably occur after one has carried out an affair of this sort, we think it much better to reprint here a part of one of the documents discussed at the Congress; in our opinion, it places this event, which was of the utmost importance not only for us but for the Argentine revolutionary movement as a whole, in the best context.

The First Congress of the PRT [Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores -- Revolutionary Workers party, the Argentine section of the Fourth International] in 1965 signified, on the one hand, the construction of the programmatic and organizational bases of our party. But, on the other side, it signified something far more profound: the definitive resolution of a deep-going crisis of leadership in the Palabra Obrera organization (which provided the fundamental base of support for the new party). This was simply a reflection of the crisis experienced by almost the whole revolutionary left with the impact of Castroism.

To sum up: the First Congress in 1965 meant, on the one hand, the beginning of something new (the PRT, with solid organizational and political bases), and, on the other, the triumph and enrichment of an organization and leadership which had been hard hit and had gone into crisis as a result of the phenomenon signified by Castroism.

Two important intimately related circumstances made the unification of two revolutionary organizations like FRIP [Frente Revolucionario Indoamericanista Popular -- Indo-American Revolutionary Front] and Palabra Obrera possible. First of all, there was the beginning of success in overcoming our difficulties, the consistent work among workers (overcoming previous adventurist and opportunistic deviations), the fundamental axis of which was Palabra Obrera's penetration at the factory level, and the extension of this to the national scale thanks to the unification itself. Moreover, the unification of these two organizations made it possible to formulate a complete revolutionary program for the country as a whole, which for the first time brought together in a harmonious synthesis the general features of the class struggle, not just in Greater Buenos Aires but in

its dialectical relation to the other regions and other sections of the working class throughout the country. These two phenomena (the new penetration into the workers movement and the formulation of the program) were the two essential bases of the PRT at its founding.

The Second Congress

The Second Congress last year was historic for many reasons and we have defined it as THE CONGRESS WHICH CONSOLIDATED A REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST PARTY IN THIS COUNTRY FOR THE FIRST TIME in 30 years. It was a small party, but a nationwide one, with a predominant influence over the workers and student vanguard in all the basic arenas of the class struggle and for all levels (worldwide, Latin American, and national). Before the Second Congress of the PRT we could say that more or less strong revolutionary groups had existed and that some, like Palabra, had possessed important features of a national party, although they had a great weakness in that they had not brought together or synthesized the various aspects of an overall campaign of revolutionary activity for the country as a whole.

With the PRT, however, a small party emerged which was a national party in structure, program, and activity.

In fact, the Second Congress of the PRT marked THE OPENING UP OF THE THIRD HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY SO FAR IN THIS CENTURY TO GIVE THE ARGENTINIAN PROLETARIAT LEADERSHIP AND A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY. Up until 1930, the anarchists had this opportunity; afterward (during the Infamous Decade) it was the Stalinists. The loss of both these opportunities prevented the emergence of a revolutionary party with mass influence which would seriously endeavor to take power and to bring about the defeat of the bourgeoisie, the oligarchy, and imperialism.

This does not mean that the Second Congress of our party transformed it into a powerful party with mass influence. Quite the contrary, we stress again, the Second Congress revealed a national party, the first nationwide revolutionary party on the scene in several decades, since Peronism. But, at the same time, it showed a weak party, whose influence and sphere of work remained limited to sections of the worker and student vanguard.

This was the result of profound historical causes which cannot be reiterated too often: first, the fundamental failure of the Stalinist leadership which converted itself from an incipient revolutionary leadership without mass influence into a powerful opportunist and re-

formist leadership collaborating with the enemy class but with great mass influence and control of the largest industrial unions.

Adding to this historical factor have been profound objective causes unfavorable to the development and strengthening of a revolutionary leadership such as Palabra Obrera. These factors are Peronism, the economic structure, and the evolution of the country's capitalist economy, which have made it possible to give important concessions to the workers movement at the price, however, of its becoming ensnared in a reformist and class collaborationist policy. This policy has prevented the workers from gaining revolutionary experience. The workers movement has had its great mobilizations, but these have always culminated in reformist gains which could be absorbed by the bourgeois structures in our (relatively advanced capitalist) country.

Both the Peronist and the Liberation stages permitted this margin for class collaboration which offered the workers and the labor bureaucracy some opportunity to improve their situation and hold their own.

Nonetheless, the Second Congress was a historic event because it succeeded in welding together a party with real national scope. This fact is being registered in slow but sure progress because it involves the subjective maturing of an ideological revolution in the consciousness of the worker and student vanguard, a process enabling it to draw the most important conclusions from the great defensive battles of the workers and the students.

It is precisely from these experiences and these conclusions that our party is winning the support and respect of the best elements of the workers and the students. This ideological revolution is the objective factor which has permitted us to transform ourselves into a national party in spite of the fact that the workers movement has undergone no massive struggles.

The Third Congress

The purpose of an introduction dealing with our first congresses was to define this Third Congress, which we have just held after one year of the new political regime of the Argentinian bourgeoisie (which we call the "Onganiato" [after Onganía, the present military dictator]).

Our party's performance under the new regime (which is the factor that determines the character of its activity) was summed up in this Congress and in the entire year's activity, and we can say that there are several essential aspects

to it: the first and most important has been the party's political and theoretical assimilation of the new phenomenon.

On the subject of the new military government, analysis of it, its perspectives, and a program to confront it, we can note that after an intense and rich exchange of opinions among the leaders and all the cadres, our party arrived at a definitive analysis of the new government's characteristics, its dynamic, and the form of confronting it. This was summed up in one of the most important party documents in the entire history of the PRT and of the organizations which formed it, "The Struggle Recently Begun." It is the only overall statement which not only gives a correct analysis but an exhaustive program to confront the new regime and the new period opening up with the fall of the Illia government [the coup which brought General Onganía to power].

But the party did not merely analyze the new situation and give a correct program for it but it intervened fully (and this is what has characterized it) in all the great struggles of the workers and students against the military dictatorship.

We not only intervened fully, but by playing an indisputably leading role we demonstrated our capacity as a national party of the vanguard workers and students. Our party was in the forefront of virtually every union or factory struggle fought by the working class or the student movement, except for Junin [railroad strike].

We played a primary leadership role, not merely an important part, in the three great battles of national scope waged against the government. This is the other side of our correct programmatic analysis.

That is, after the great experiences of 1956-58 [the first period after Peron's overthrow], we have proved once again, on a higher level, that we are unquestionably the party which leads the worker and student vanguard in struggle. And we say that we proved this on a higher level because almost all the new rank-and-file and leadership cadres got their first experience in leading struggles in this process; it was not the old rank-and-file and leadership cadres who played this foremost role in any of these conflicts but the new party cadres.

After 20 years (i.e., after the great struggles in the meat industry in 1945 and those accompanying them, which gave rise to the Peronist union movement), a new leadership of the workers movement is emerging and is getting its baptism of fire in strikes in which our older comrades are playing no direct leadership role.

The three great conflicts in which our party played the leadership role were

the student strike in Cordoba, the dock strike, and the great battles of the mill workers in Tucuman. We might also cite other interventions by the party in isolated battles of a major or minor importance; we would also not neglect to note that the party was unable to intervene to the fullest extent in such an important strike as the railroad strike in Junin. But all this is secondary because the essential thing is that the party intervened and played a leadership role in the three great battles fought against the military government.

Our Failings

It would be a grave error to think that this fundamentally correct, and in many ways brilliant, performance has meant that the party had no serious failings throughout the period we are analyzing.

Of the party's failings in this period, four are most important, and they are intimately linked to one another: the first has been the lack of intensive propaganda work aimed at other political groupings in the attempt to reach all elements at a critical stage of conflict with opportunist or sectarian leaderships, and fundamentally, to exploit the crisis of Stalinism to the fullest in aiding us to develop our revolutionary party.

It is clear that, in comparison with the vast number of revolutionary and opportunist groups in crisis and in need of a correct orientation, our party has done only sporadic work with other political groupings.

The second failing has been the meager increase in the circulation of our paper [La Verdad], a failing which is intimately linked to the other phenomena: the party has not increased the paper's circulation in accordance with its improvement in form and content.

The party's third basic failing in this stage has been the lack of a division of labor within the party. Our party came to this Third Congress without having changed the organization or the basic objective of its work as regards the party members as a whole.

Basically, we are a party engrossed in, and tormented by, work. And we are all, in our entirety, specialized in pure trade-union and factory work. All other tasks have this as the basic objective and are subordinated to it. Almost all the party members and leaders are

specialists in factory contact work and in the development and formulation of programs for this activity.

This serious weakness in the party is also our strength because, obviously, the party's primary activity for this period is, and must continue to be, trade-union activity. But because this is a weakness does not mean that specialization does not improve our work. What we consider to be a serious weakness is that the party has specialists in this work alone.

And the fourth deficiency, which is intimately bound up with the others, is that the party leadership has been incapable of leading the party by instituting a division of labor, injecting dynamism, or imposing overall formulations arising out of the division of labor itself. That is, the party as a whole is unevenly developed and the leadership is not in the vanguard of the party but in many cases in its rear guard. The leadership shows a pronounced slowness in its action and its formulations, in relation to the party's needs and its development.

In spite of the efforts made during the year to overcome this situation, we must recognize that we came to this congress without having accomplished it.

These failings come in the context of enormous progress scored by the party and its leadership. The most conclusive proof of this progress is the form and content of La Verdad [the weekly eight-page newspaper of the PRT] which is published clandestinely. We are the only leadership and the only revolutionary party which has been able to put out a weekly publication that confronts the dictatorial regime as we do. This striking fact augments the others which we have already mentioned and therefore will not repeat.

That is, none of these failings, which we are the first to point out, ought to obscure the fact that the weapons necessary to prepare the way for, and to lead, the Argentinian revolution are being forged in the crucible of the day-to-day struggle itself.

The existence of the Revolutionary Workers party and the emergence of a leadership with close ties to the struggles of the workers and the people are the best assurances for all steadfastly revolutionary young workers and students who want to join in the process, not as mere spectators but as real participants in the action.

Our doors are open.

TERRORISM IN GUATEMALA

A further report of the campaign of savage, right-wing terror in Guatemala appeared in the May 24 Toronto Daily Star.

"On Feb. 4 in the town of Ipala," writes Norman Gall from Guatemala City, "in the mountains east of this Central American capital, a dog emerged from the forest dragging a human hand in his mouth.

"When local authorities investigated, they found a common grave with 13 corpses, most of them of high school and university students still wearing graduation rings -- victims of the White Hand."

The reporter for the commercial press testifies to the semiofficial status of this murderous gang:

"The White Hand is a right-wing terrorist group working closely with the Guatemalan army, which has the endorsement of the United States mission here."

Gall describes the discovery and opening of the mass grave:

"On March 27, the Guatemalan army announced the deaths in a 'battle' of 15

guerrillas in the village of Los Achiotetes.

"The relatives of several persons who had disappeared in previous weeks obtained, after long delays, a presidential order to open the mass grave....

"A scar on one identified the corpse of Otto Rene Castillo, a well-known Marxist poet."

Victims were spared nothing because they were women:

"Another body was identified as that of a 22-year-old schoolteacher, Nora Illeala Paiz Carcamo, sister of a female guerrilla known as 'Rosa Maria.'

"Nora's body was missing an arm and an eye and her skull was crushed.... her breasts and feet showed signs of severe burns.

"In this manner, between 500 and 700 Guatemalans have died in recent months, according to anti-Communist sources interested in minimizing the extent of the slaughter still raging."

The June 10 London Economist estimated the total dead at 2,000.

SUMMER SCHEDULE

World Outlook is now on its summer schedule. This means publication every other week on the average.

With the fall we will resume our regular weekly schedule.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
PHOTO: U.S. Military Occupation of Newark	681
After Watts -- Newark -- by Elizabeth Barnes	682
U.S. Students Call Mass Protest Against Vietnam War	684
Joint International Demonstrations Called for October 21	684
Régis Debray Case:	
Agitation Mounts Around Régis Debray Case	685
The Disappearance of Enrique Amaya Quintana	686
Hugo Blanco Case:	
Amnesty for Hugo Blanco Pressed in United States	687
Fortunato Vargas Arrested	687
Demand for Release of Américo Martín	687
Dominican Communist Party Denounces Kremlin's Foreign Policy	688
China Celebrates Mao's Swim	690
Tito-Kremlin Dispute Reported on Mideast War -- by Les Evans	691
General Westmoreland's "Truce" with the White House -- by Dick Roberts	692
The Cubans Develop Their Position on the Middle East	695
Peasant Uprising in West Bengal	698
Life in Calcutta -- Festering Sore Breeds Revolt in India	700
Argentine Revolutionaries Hold Historic Congress	701
Terrorism in Guatemala	704