

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 36

November 18, 1966

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
Hugo Blanco's Life Again at Stake	1
U.S. Committee Issues Appeal for Hugo Blanco	2
Committee Reminds Peruvian President of Petition for Hugo Blanco	3
USLA Justice Committee States Its Aims	3
The American Elections	4
"Pacification" of the Mekong Delta? -- by Dick Roberts	6
Afro-Americans Speak Out Against War in Vietnam -- by Evelyn Sell	8
Canadian Students Ready Protest Actions Against War in Vietnam	10
Problem of Succession to Mao Greatly Exaggerated	10
Exhibition in England Helps Publicize Tribunal -- by Antonio Farien	11
New Mood in Irish Labour Party -- by Sean Ried	12
U.S. Ultraright Group Caught with Ton of Arms	13
Healy's United Front Against Revolutionary Socialists -- by Henri Valin	14
Modelewski and Kuron -- Defenders of the Gains in Poland -- by Joseph Hansen	17
Bertrand Russell Refutes Philip Toynbee on Vietnam War Crimes Tribunal	20
Documents:	
Text of Joint Korean-Cuban Statement on Vietnam	21
You Can Take McNamara's Word for It	24

HUGO BLANCO'S LIFE AGAIN AT STAKE

Hugo Blanco has once again been placed under threat of execution. The sudden turn in the case of the Peruvian peasant leader, who was sentenced September 8 to twenty-five years in prison, to be served in the grim island fortress of El Frontón, came November 4 when the Lima papers announced the new move by the prosecution.

The defense had appealed the savage sentence passed by a military tribunal in Tacna. The appeal is now before the Supreme Council of Military Justice [Consejo de Justicia Militar]. This body of military officers was to review the Tacna court record between November 7 and 12 and then render its verdict. The date for this was not announced.

The prosecution answered the legal moves of the defense by demanding that the appeals body sentence Hugo Blanco to death, alleging that he was guilty of "premeditated murder" [homicidio calificado]. In the trial at Tacna, where the military police acted as both prosecution and judge, the prosecuting attorney did not ask for death but for twenty-five years in prison. A consulting judge [auditor] at the Tacna trial, Fernández Hernani, recommended the death penalty, but the court did not follow his advice in view of the widespread support Hugo Blanco was receiving on an international scale. The prosecution hinged its arguments on the fact that three policemen were killed during efforts of the Peruvian military to repress the peasant movement headed by Hugo Blanco. Actually, Hugo Blanco is the main political prisoner in the hands of the Bela-

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 36

November 18, 1966

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
Hugo Blanco's Life Again at Stake	1
U.S. Committee Issues Appeal for Hugo Blanco	2
Committee Reminds Peruvian President of Petition for Hugo Blanco	3
USLA Justice Committee States Its Aims	3
The American Elections	4
"Pacification" of the Mekong Delta? -- by Dick Roberts	6
Afro-Americans Speak Out Against War in Vietnam -- by Evelyn Sell	8
Canadian Students Ready Protest Actions Against War in Vietnam	10
Problem of Succession to Mao Greatly Exaggerated	10
Exhibition in England Helps Publicize Tribunal -- by Antonio Farien	11
New Mood in Irish Labour Party -- by Sean Ried	12
U.S. Ultraright Group Caught with Tor of Arms	13
Healy's United Front Against Revolutionary Socialists -- by Henri Valin	14
Modelewski and Kuron -- Defenders of the Gains in Poland -- by Joseph Hansen	17
Bertrand Russell Refutes Philip Toynbee on Vietnam War Crimes Tribunal	20
Documents:	
Text of Joint Korean-Cuban Statement on Vietnam	21
You Can Take McNamara's Word for It	24

HUGO BLANCO'S LIFE AGAIN AT STAKE

Hugo Blanco has once again been placed under threat of execution. The sudden turn in the case of the Peruvian peasant leader, who was sentenced September 8 to twenty-five years in prison, to be served in the grim island fortress of El Frontón, came November 4 when the Lima papers announced the new move by the prosecution.

The defense had appealed the savage sentence passed by a military tribunal in Tacna. The appeal is now before the Supreme Council of Military Justice [Consejo de Justicia Militar]. This body of military officers was to review the Tacna court record between November 7 and 12 and then render its verdict. The date for this was not announced.

The prosecution answered the legal moves of the defense by demanding that the appeals body sentence Hugo Blanco to death, alleging that he was guilty of "premeditated murder" [homicidio calificado]. In the trial at Tacna, where the military police acted as both prosecution and judge, the prosecuting attorney did not ask for death but for twenty-five years in prison. A consulting judge [auditor] at the Tacna trial, Fernández Hernani, recommended the death penalty, but the court did not follow his advice in view of the widespread support Hugo Blanco was receiving on an international scale. The prosecution hinged its arguments on the fact that three policemen were killed during efforts of the Peruvian military to repress the peasant movement headed by Hugo Blanco. Actually, Hugo Blanco is the main political prisoner in the hands of the Bela-

Reba Hansen, Business Manager.

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

únde government. He and twenty-eight others were held in prison at Arequipa without charges for more than three years until the authorities felt that the political atmosphere in Peru made it possible to dispose of this courageous political opponent without touching off a major upheaval.

The danger for Hugo Blanco is now even graver than at the opening of the Tacna trial. Under Peru's former military code, an unjust decision by the Supreme Council of Military Justice could be appealed to the Supreme Court. Last year, however, during a rabid McCarthy-type witch-hunt, the parliament enacted a new code. This bars any appeal from the decisions handed down by the Supreme Council.

To save Hugo Blanco an immediate mobilization of international support is required. Student organizations and sectors of the labor movement in Peru will do what they can on a national scale; but they face a big obstacle in the witch-hunt atmosphere still prevailing in the country. In addition, the defense is seriously hampered by lack of funds.

The National Executive Committee of the Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario [Left Revolutionary Front], the organization headed by Hugo Blanco, has appealed for demonstrations of solidarity. Declarations protesting the new threat to Hugo Blanco's life and asking that he be granted an immediate amnesty should be cabled to the Consejo Supremo de Justicia, Lima, Peru. Similar cables should be sent to Presidente Fernando Belaúnde Terry, Lima, Peru. Copies of these should be airmailed to Hugo Blanco's attorney, Dr. Alfredo Battilana, Av. Nicola de Pierola, 966; Oficina 215, Lima, Peru.

Similar protests and appeals for an immediate amnesty should be lodged with consulates and embassies of the Peruvian government in every possible area. Maximum publicity should be sought for these protests through accompanying demonstrations.

Persons who rallied to the support of Hugo Blanco at the time of the Tacna trial should be asked to renew their appeals and to do whatever they can to widen public knowledge and indignation over this fresh threat to Hugo Blanco's life.

U.S. COMMITTEE ISSUES APPEAL FOR HUGO BLANCO

[The U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners issued the following press release in New York November 11.]

* * *

In 1963, the wife and daughter of a peasant organizer were raped by the local landowner and a reign of terror was unleashed against those who protested. Blanco and a commission of 25 men were authorized by the union to investigate. Attacked by local police when they entered the town, the men defended themselves and three rural police were killed.

In jail for three years without trial, Blanco, a civilian, was tried before a military tribunal and sentenced to 25 years in the notorious El Frontón prison on September 8, 1966. This week, November 12, the Supreme Council of Military Justice in Lima, Peru, the only and last court of appeal, will rehear his case. The prosecution is demanding the death penalty, because despite Blanco's three years in jail his case has substantial popular support.

The case has attracted the attention of intellectuals in France and the United States. From France, Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, the actress Simone Signoret, and the late André Breton were among the signers of a clemency petition in Blanco's behalf. In the United States over 400 scholars at a socialist conference in New York signed a petition asking President Belaúnde Terry to grant amnesty. Among the signers were Albert Schweitzer, Professor of Humanities at N.Y.U.; Harvey Swados, author; Isaac Deutscher; and Conner Cruise O'Brien.

The U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners has sent telegrams to President Terry and to the Supreme Council reminding them of the recent concern shown for Blanco in the United States and France. The Committee urges individuals and groups concerned with civil liberties to send letters and wires of protest to President Belaúnde Terry and to the Consejo Supremo de Justicia Militar in Lima, Peru. Copies should be sent to Hugo Blanco's attorney, Dr. Alfredo Battilana, Av. Nicola de Pierola, 966; Oficina 215; Lima, Peru.

COMMITTEE REMINDS PERUVIAN PRESIDENT OF PETITION FOR HUGO BLANCO

[The following is the text of a cable sent November 11 to the president of Peru by the U. S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners.]

* * *

To: President Fernando Belaúnde Terry
Lima, Peru

Dear Mr. President:

We would like to remind you of the recent petition sent by 400 scholars from New York City asking clemency for Hugo Blanco. In addition we know that other messages were sent from Europe, Canada and Asia all concerned about Hugo Blanco and his companions.

Therefore when we hear that the Supreme Council of Military Justice is being asked to reinstate the death penalty we are shocked. Blanco was not a military man and should have been tried before a civil court. That is how things are done in most civilized nations. In addition it is plain that the death of Blanco will not stop social change in Peru. His death however would brand his executioners as bereft of humanity and sanity. Only fear would drive anyone to the insane conclusion that Blanco's death will halt social movement in Peru. Do not allow Peru to be disgraced by the wanton murder of a man who has desired only that justice be done the people of Peru.

Free Hugo Blanco and his companions.

Felix J. McGowan
Executive Secretary
U.S. Committee for Justice to
Latin American Political Prisoners

USLA JUSTICE COMMITTEE STATES ITS AIMS

The U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners was organized after 400 scholars at a Socialist Scholars Conference signed a petition of amnesty for Hugo Blanco, Peru's peasant-union organizer.

When Adolfo Gilly, the Latin American political writer, along with some professors at the University of Mexico were arrested in April 1966, concern rose among Latin Americans and civil libertarians in the U.S. that a witch-hunt was being unleashed by Latin America's "constitutional" regimes against all critics of the horrible conditions of the majority of people south of the Rio Grande.

A short time later Víctor Rico Galán, another well-known Mexican political writer and some of his friends were also arrested. Almost simultaneously in Peru, Hugo Blanco and 27 peasant leaders went on trial.

Convinced that these incidents indicated the steady deterioration of civil liberties in the so-called democratic regimes of Latin American countries, some of the participants at the conference and others interested in Latin America concluded that North Americans must do something about ensuring justice for Latin American political prisoners.

Members of the organization believe that U.S. citizens have a special responsibility to demonstrate their distaste and disapproval of violations of elementary justice and law. They feel that cases like those of Gilly, Blanco, Galán and João Firmino, the inspirer of the Brazilian Peasant Leagues, must be brought before the people of the U.S. Once acquainted with the facts about these cases and the many others like them, Americans can be decisive in securing justice for these victims of political reaction.

The committee has already had speakers at a teach-in at Trinity College in Connecticut, and at the recent conference of Latin Americanists in Chicago. At a meeting in New York sponsored by the Militant Labor Forum close to \$200 was raised to help the committee get established.

In addition, the Committee to Free Adolfo Gilly voted to dissolve into the

broader committee and placed its resources at the disposal of the USLA Justice Committee.

The officers elected were Dave Dellinger and Paul Sweezy, cochairmen; John Gerassi, vice-chairman; Felix McGowan, executive secretary; Richard Garza, assistant executive secretary; and Nell Salm, treasurer.

The committee issued the following statement of aims:

- (1) To aid in defending victims of political persecution and injustice in the countries of Latin America, regardless of their particular beliefs, affiliations or associations, and to provide whatever assistance is possible for their families.
- (2) To organize such actions as may be possible within the United States to put pressure on reactionary Latin American governments to stop restrictions on the rights of free speech and free association, to respect the role of law in all political cases, to ameliorate the harsh conditions under which political prisoners are held, and to work for their amnesty and release.
- (3) To inform and arouse public opinion in the United States on the repressive policies pursued by military, authoritarian and even constitutional regimes in Latin America which trample on elementary civil and political liberties, and to call attention to any complicity of the U.S. government and its open and secret agencies in aiding and abetting such violations of democratic rights.
- (4) To cooperate with organizations in Latin American and other countries which have similar purposes.

The abbreviation, USLA Justice Committee, which stands for United States Latin American Justice Committee, was selected by the administrative committee in order to make it easier for contributors to address checks and mail.

Among the first projects the committee envisages is publicity about the most recent cases in Mexico and Peru.

The USLA Justice Committee deserves widespread backing. Correspondence can be addressed as follows:

USLA Justice Committee -- Attention Felix McGowan
% Catholic Worker
175 Chrystie St.
New York, New York 10002

THE AMERICAN ELECTIONS

A year and a half ago, just two months after Johnson began escalating the war in Vietnam, World Outlook printed the following observation by one of its contributors: "Johnson's War can rapidly prove to be the most unpopular ever engaged in by American imperialism; and Johnson himself can become the most hated and despised president." [World Outlook, April 9, 1965, p. 3.]

The November 8 elections in the United States bore witness to the accuracy of this forecast. Only two years after receiving the greatest majority in the history of the country, Johnson's popularity had eroded so far that the Republican party -- dealt a staggering defeat in 1964 when it ran Goldwater as its candidate -- was able to register a comeback that astounded its own chieftains and gave them good grounds for believing that they might even take the White House in 1968.

How is this shift to be explained? One pundit, Tom Wicker of the New York Times, declared it was because the Republicans, "by and large," offered the electorate "better candidates"! Others ascribed it to the inherent stability of the two-party system.

Some, seeking a more realistic explanation, pointed to rising concern among the American voters over inflation, a white "backlash" against "riots" in the ghettos, frustration over the war in Vietnam, dissatisfaction with the administration's "credibility gap," the "midterm swing," and local grievances -- in about that order.

The truth of it is that the two-party system is not designed to provide a direct reflection of the moods and wishes of the electorate, differentiated according to class

or a sector of a class. It serves the more important function of blocking the formation of new political tendencies, particularly those bearing promise of transcending capitalism. Despite factional differences that can often appear quite sharp, all the protagonists of capitalism have a united front on this, extending from the Birchers to the labor bureaucrats. Elections in the United States can thus prove quite deceptive as to the molecular processes going on in the class struggle in the country.

On the surface the November 8 elections gave good cause for the elation evident in the more conservative circles. On the parliamentary level, the shift was in their direction. And their feelings were well indicated by the cheerful note in the Wall Street Journal: "The stock market sprang to life in the wake of Tuesday's elections." Both the Republican and Democratic high commands asserted that the two-party system had again proved its worth.

Left unexplained was the extreme way in which the vote is oscillating in the two-party framework. In 1964, the boat tilted heavily to one side as the passengers moved away from Goldwater in horror. In 1966, the same passengers, now moving away from Johnson with almost the same emotion, appear to have brought things into better equilibrium from the capitalist viewpoint, even providing the boat with a favorable trim to the right. But is this the end of the matter? Will they now stop in dead center, or a bit to one side or the other?

The fact is that the American people feel insecure and deeply uneasy and the prime generator of this feeling at the moment is the escalation of American involvement in a war on the mainland of Asia. The two-party system blocks them from giving this clear expression on the electoral level. The sentiment exists nonetheless, giving rise to some curious anomalies as they seek inside the election booth to find a way to indicate their exasperation.

The inflationary process, heightened by the enormous spending for the war in Vietnam, is another source of the bitter distaste for Johnson. The inability of the people to find adequate means of expressing this within the two-party system was shown rather eloquently during the final weeks of the campaign when housewives from coast to coast, instead of preparing to line up in angry battalions at the ballot boxes, began picketing the big chain stores, brandishing placards denouncing high prices.

White racist prejudice, hypocritically described by the mass media and the politicians of the twin parties as "backlash," turned out -- as in the previous election -- to be not nearly so predominant as had been direly predicted (in hope of frightening and cowing the Negro people and turning them away from militant action and a struggle for "black power"). Nevertheless, white racist prejudice was there, registering its presence in such ugly ways as voting down a "civilian review board" for the New York police department, although the board amounted to mere window dressing.

A bright spot in this otherwise drab scene was the campaign of the Socialist Workers party. In New York, in particular, the campaign caught the attention of rather wide circles of the radical movement, winning endorsements from a number of prominent socialist-minded figures. The National Guardian came out forthrightly for the slate headed by Judy White, the SWP candidate for governor, as did Paul M. Sweezy of Monthly Review, Edward M. Keating of Ramparts magazine, and Chris Kearns and Felix J. McGowan of the Catholic Worker. A roundup published by The Militant November 14 makes impressive reading. A big vote for the SWP candidates is, of course, not expected. The campaign, however, did serve to publicize the program of revolutionary socialism in the very heart of the imperialist U.S. and to win new recruits for the movement.

For the coming period, two things can be confidently forecast for the American political scene: (1) Johnson will continue to deepen American involvement in Southeast Asia and the Republicans will back him in this despite the factional advantages they will try to derive from the unpopularity he is winning by his course. The day after the election, for instance, Richard ("Slippery Dick") Nixon, while claiming that the voters had repudiated Johnson, said very pointedly that it was not over Vietnam. (2) The underlying crisis affecting American imperialism in a world that has outlived capitalism and is struggling to break out of its confining shell, will continue to find increasing expression outside the ballot box and in the arena of action.

Demonstrations against the war, battles on the civil-rights front, strikes in defense of living standards like the ones conducted by the New York subway workers and the air-line mechanics, housewives picketing supermarkets -- struggles on this level, with whatever ups and downs, can be expected to widen and to deepen in the immediate period ahead, giving to American politics a new dimension that will eventually register in the minds of the workers as an imperative need to break out of the two-party prison.

"PACIFICATION" OF THE MEKONG DELTA?

By Dick Roberts

Where and how is Johnson going to strike next in Vietnam? That question is being raised by opponents of the war all over the world who have become all too familiar with Washington's pattern of escalation. There was one immediate obstacle in Johnson's path: the U.S. elections. With these "out of the way," the Democrats feel free to get on with the war plans agreed upon in Manila. The only question is, when and where?

The most likely arena of expansion appears to be the "de-militarized zone" which divides Vietnam. Not only has there been a major build-up of U.S. forces in that area, but there have been increased saturation-bombing raids, and the off-shore U.S. naval fleet began shelling the coast immediately north of the zone November 2, the day Johnson returned from his Far East tour.

A less-talked about, but according to the Wall Street Journal, an equally likely zone of escalation, is the Mekong Delta. This is the rice-growing region south of Saigon, occupied by nearly 40 percent of south Vietnam's population, which has been under virtual National Liberation Front rule from the early period of revolution. It has been the frequent target of U.S. bombing; but it has not been an arena in which the Pentagon has felt safe to launch the "search and destroy" operations conducted in the central and northern regions. The Wall Street Journal's opinion on this subject was expressed in a November 10 article written from Saigon by Journal staff reporter, Selwyn Feinstein.

"Now that Washington is no longer preoccupied with American political campaigning," Feinstein writes, "it is going to have to decide what to do about a fat sheaf of 'contingency' plans, drawn up by Gen. William C. Westmoreland and his staff, that call for a major new entanglement of American combat units in the Vietnam war. These plans would send U.S. fighting forces plunging into the marshy, rice-rich, Vietcong-infested Mekong River Delta..."

Although the final "go-ahead" has not been received from Washington, according to Feinstein, preparatory steps for a Mekong Delta invasion are already underway: "The U.S. Army is busily constructing a base big enough to handle a brigade (roughly 5,000 men) at the provincial capital of My Tho, along one of the Mekong's main tributaries about 35 miles south of Saigon. Meanwhile, a U.S. Army battalion is operating on the edge of the Delta, halfway between Saigon and My Tho in Long An province, and its performance in the words of one U.S. official, 'is being closely watched.'"

Nevertheless, Feinstein holds, there are reasons for continued reservation on the part of the Pentagon about the likely success of a full-scale attack on the Mekong region. The argument against it is significant, because it does not concern the Mekong Delta region alone, but the whole U.S. strategy in Vietnam.

At issue is not so much the question of invading the region, as of holding it after the advancing troops have moved on to new arenas of combat. In Washington parlance, this concept is often referred to as "pacification" and, to put it another way, the question now being raised by some generals in respect to attacking the Mekong Delta is: If pacification is going badly elsewhere in Vietnam, how likely is it to succeed in the most securely held of all NLF territory?

On paper, the strategy of pacification can be summarized in a few sentences. The July 9 Economist states: "While the regular government forces pursue the main units of the enemy elsewhere, the police field force, backed by the regional and local armed forces, will carry out mopping-up operations against the corresponding local Vietcong elements who have been left behind by the sweep. The police will operate in groups of battalion strength based on district towns....The field force must on no account move on until it is certainly safe for ordinary police to take over -- until the village copper has rather better than a good chance of survival."

In practice, it has not worked out. The Economist suggested one reason at the time: "The police field force now stands at a little over 3,000 men....Sadly, an embarrassing number of the national police in the north joined up with the rebels. Little more than a thousand police have yet been allocated to a village police work (South Vietnam has 2,560 villages and 13,650 hamlets) against the 1970 [sic] target of 20,000."

A more devastating appraisal was provided two months later by New York Times reporter Neil Sheehan: "Once a battle has ended, the American and South Vietnamese troops withdraw. The theoretical follow-up by South Vietnamese territorial forces,

police and administrators to pacify the region does not materialize except in a very limited number of instances; and the Vietcong guerrillas and their North Vietnamese allies move in again. The Americans eventually return and the same region is thus fought over repeatedly." (October 9.)

After almost two years of bloody campaigning, countless thousands of deaths, horrendous bombing, it is little to say for the "war effort" that the same region is thus fought over -- repeatedly. Such considerations must prove worrisome to the military, for it belies their glib propaganda and confirms the charge "that the 'war of liberation,' far from being cheap, safe, and disavowable is costly, dangerous, and doomed to failure." (General Maxwell D. Taylor, February 17, 1966.) According to the Wall Street Journal's Feinstein, the situation is reinforcing a significantly modified conception of pacification in Washington:

"Even as U.S. and Saigon planners talk of handing more and more of this effort over to the South Vietnamese army, while U.S. troops concentrate on battling the enemy's 'main force' units, an on-the-spot check of 'pacification' progress finds performance spotty at best. The ARVN (Army of the Republic of Vietnam) is only occasionally effective in providing and maintaining security for villagers on its own. Partly for this reason, follow-up efforts of the Saigon government to win the allegiance of the populace are more often than not inept or nonexistent.

"The clear conclusion: 'Pacification' works best when local security is reinforced, at least in the early stages, by the presence of U.S. (or in one notable case, Korean) combat troops." (Emphasis added.)

If "pacification" is to work in the Mekong Delta, or anywhere in Vietnam for that matter, a significant section of the military now feels that the second holding stage must also be conducted by U.S. troops. The implications for this position are clear enough in terms of the gigantic escalation of troop commitment that would be required. It "could drastically alter the rosy projections, offered by Defense Secretary McNamara just before Election Day, of a marked decline in the rate of the U.S. troop buildup," Feinstein adds. It takes a considerable number of forces to conduct a successful occupation.

Feinstein gives the example of what Washington considers an effective case of pacification: "One 'bamboo shoot' of progress can be seen in Binh Dinh province, about 265 miles north of Saigon, where 53,000 U.S., South Korean, and South Vietnamese troops and militiamen have erected an effective security screen against some 9,000 North Vietnamese regulars and 17,500 Vietcong based in nearby hills. Behind this barrier 18 'revolutionary development' teams are helping to build a better life for thousands of farmers and fishermen who earlier this year saw their homes turned into a battle zone."

Their success, Feinstein holds, is symbolized by this anecdote of patriotic heroism: "One father stoically reported to a local cadre leader that three Vietcong agents would be harassing a hamlet one night. He knew, he said, because one was his son. Under the cadre's instruction, hamlet residents set up an ambush and all three Vietcong were killed."

In facts and figures, the success is not quite so clear cut: "Even in Binh Dinh," Feinstein concedes, "progress is slow. Of 675 hamlets in the province only 122 are considered secure and 212 more are in some stage of clearing. That still leaves more than half of Binh Dinh's hamlets subject to encroachments by the Vietcong."

"One veteran in the program thinks it may take three more years to pacify Binh Dinh..." The Economist's 1970 projection may prove to be on the short side.

In reality, the intrinsic logic of Washington's invasion of Vietnam was evident long before the military ponderations over attacking the Mekong Delta reported in the Wall Street Journal. The Saigon puppet regime is hopelessly incapable of rallying any lasting support from the south Vietnamese populace, let alone sufficient strength to enforce police-state occupation of a territory once ruled by the National Liberation Front. In order to destroy the revolution, and that is what pacification means, it will be necessary for U.S. forces, and U.S. forces alone, to do the vast part of the dirty and long-term job of occupying the country.

Whatever the actual next stage or stages of escalation may be, one thing is absolutely certain about Johnson's plans. So long as the Democratic party and the ruling class which it represents is bent on teaching the south Vietnamese the lesson Maxwell Taylor had in mind, it will mean more war, more fighting, more deaths. After nearly five years of fighting in Vietnam, after nearly 6,000 American soldiers have been killed, the end is nowhere in sight.

AFRO-AMERICANS SPEAK OUT AGAINST WAR IN VIETNAM

By Evelyn Sell

There is a significant new development in the antiwar movement in Detroit which is indicative of a growing tendency among black militants in the United States to speak out vigorously and consistently against the war in Vietnam. The Afro-American Unity Movement [AAUM], which has solidarized itself with the ideas of Malcolm X and the slogans of the "black power" movement, has issued a call to "all black organizations and individuals in Detroit to join...in a protest march against the racist war in Vietnam." This march was intended as an advance move to help the four-day mobilization across the country November 5-8 which reached a high point in New York with 20,000 participants.

A group of Afro-Americans Against the War in Vietnam (no longer active) participated in the March International Days of Protest earlier this year. However, this was the first time that a black organization sought to mobilize Afro-Americans on such a wide basis.

The AAUM call listed a number of arguments against the war which have been expressed over and over by blacks throughout the country. The call ran as follows:

"We Resent:

"1. The 'freedom' myth that we are supposed to protect people 10,000 miles away when the only one who will protect us from brutal cops and racists at home is ourselves.

"2. The mass murder of our colored brothers and sisters of Vietnam by U.S. soldiers.

"3. The murder of our black men to protect America's big money interests abroad. If black men number up to 70% of the G.I.'s on the front lines, that means more black men than whites are dying in this racist war.

"4. The discrimination of the all white draft boards. Because our men cannot get apprenticeships or go to college, we are forced to serve as the cannon-fodder of this war.

"5. The use of Afro-Americans who are struggling at home to decide the course of our fight to deny self determination to the Vietnamese who want to decide their own fate, too."

One point made by Negroes, not listed in the AAUM call, is that the billions of dollars used for death and destruction overseas be rechanneled to meet the needs of the deprived millions for homes, schools, hospital care and expanded job opportunities.

The antiwar statement of the AAUM were not a sudden or unexpected development. During the early part of 1965 there were sporadic signs of Afro-American involvement in the opposition to the war. During the nationwide protests against racist police actions against Negroes in Selma, Alabama, one picket-line sign in Detroit read: "Send Marines to Alabama Not Vietnam." In April, 1965, a small delegation of Negroes from the South participated in the Easter March on Washington, carrying a banner, "Our War Isn't In Vietnam But In America." About ten percent of the marchers were Negroes and one of the speakers at the rally was Robert Parris, a leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC].

The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. spoke out against the war on a number of occasions during 1965. On April 23 King expressed antiwar sentiments at a press conference and urged other civil-rights leaders to follow his lead. In a July 2 speech at Virginia State University, King warned that if the Johnson administration didn't get the hostilities to the bargaining table, he might adapt his organization to teach-ins and peace rallies.

Some antiwar sentiments were expressed by other groups and individuals. The Negro American Labor Council (made up of black members of the AFL-CIO) announced opposition to continuation of the war. A "Declaration of Conscience Against U.S. Policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic" was signed by nationally known Negroes such as A. Philip Randolph, Bayard Rustin and SNCC leaders Julian Bond and John Lewis.

However, many prominent black leaders followed the line of Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP]. Wilkins told reporters, "We think we have Vietnam in Alabama. I feel that when you mix Vietnam and civil rights, you confuse the issue." James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] used Wilkins' argument at the July, 1965, CORE convention. The convention had passed a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Farmer insisted that CORE should stay out of the peace movement and concentrate its efforts on civil rights. Farmer was able to persuade the delegates to reverse their previous vote and the convention ended up taking no position on the war.

However, the Farmer victory was a very temporary one and the attitude of the ranks of the organization prevailed when, only five months later, Farmer was pressured into becoming a sponsor of the Thanksgiving March on Washington to protest the war.

Shortly after the Thanksgiving March, the SNCC executive committee approved a policy statement on Vietnam and the draft. When this statement was issued publicly on January 6, 1966, it aroused anti-SNCC newspaper editorials across the country and played a major role in preventing Julian Bond, SNCC publicity director, from taking his seat in the Georgia legislature. The Georgia general assembly refused to allow Bond to serve his term as legislator although he had won his seat by an overwhelming vote.

The anti-SNCC hue and cry was raised because in its policy statement it said: "We are in sympathy with and support the men in this country who are unwilling to respond to the military draft which would compel them to contribute their lives to U.S. aggression in the name of the 'freedom' we find so false in this country...We take note of the fact that 16 percent of the draftees from this country are Negro, called on to stifle the liberation of Vietnam, to preserve a 'democracy' which does not exist for them at home...We therefore encourage those Americans who prefer to use their energy in building democratic forms within the country. We believe that work in the civil rights movement and other human relations organizations is a valid alternative to the draft. We urge all Americans to seek this alternative, knowing full well that it may cost them their lives, as painfully as in Vietnam."

In 1966 there was a change in leadership in both SNCC and CORE. Antiwar declarations rose in intensity and frequency. In February the new national director of CORE, Floyd McKissick, spoke in Detroit and said he approved of peace demonstrations and asked that the funds for the Vietnam war be spent on poverty programs and a massive public-works project. In June McKissick led the opposition forces at the White House Conference on Civil Rights. They introduced resolutions calling for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam and focussed attention on the war question despite all the administration's plans to keep the conference under its own thumb.

Meredith's March through Mississippi in July thrust Stokely Carmichael, new national chairman of SNCC, into national prominence. It was on that march that "black power" became the rallying cry for the new level of struggle on the civil-rights front. Carmichael continually hammers away at black opposition to the war in Vietnam. Addressing a cheering crowd of 12,000 on the University of California campus on October 29, Carmichael urged the Negro and white students in the audience to say, "hell, no" to their draft boards.

In his speeches across the country, Carmichael links the anticolonial struggle with the struggle of Afro-Americans and blasts the idea of black Americans shooting their colored brothers in Vietnam. Carmichael, along with other militants, thus carries forward the ideas expressed by the murdered Malcolm X.

Two residents of the Watts ghetto resisted the draft by arguing that their status as "colonial subjects" entitles them to refuse to take up arms against other nonwhites. U.S. District Judge Leon Yankwich denied their petition. Many black youths across the country are protesting and resisting the draft. The most well-known one at this date is 20-year-old Pfc. James Johnson, one of the trio of soldiers who have refused to go to Vietnam and who have become known as the Fort Hood Three. Support to the three was stated by Lincoln Lynch, associate national director of CORE, who said, "Our nation has become a nation of hypocrites. CORE wholeheartedly supports these three men. We call upon all black soldiers and all black people to bring an end to this war by any and all means necessary."

"SNCC wholeheartedly supports the action of these men," said Carmichael.

Since the armed forces depend so heavily on Negro draftees, such statements and

actions inject an explosive force into the antiwar movement. Students still remain the backbone of the antiwar forces but the weight of Afro-American opposition is being felt increasingly and provides fresh vigor and militancy.

CANADIAN STUDENTS READY PROTEST ACTIONS AGAINST WAR IN VIETNAM

Toronto

NOV. 5 -- The Student Days of Protest, scheduled for November 11-12, give every promise of marking the first truly Canada-wide campus demonstrations against the war in Vietnam. From progress reports issued by the initiating University of Toronto Committee to End the War in Vietnam, it is already apparent that virtually every campus in the country will witness activities of one kind or another.

The major campus action is taking place at the time of the traditional Remembrance ceremonies for the fallen of World War I and World War II. The idea of genuinely honoring those who died in the two world wars by staging effective demonstrations against Washington's murderous war against the Vietnamese freedom struggle has also been picked up by many other organizations opposed to the war in Vietnam.

In Edmonton, a march has been projected along the same route as the one selected for the Canadian Legion parade on November 12. The big plaza of Toronto's new city hall has been chosen for a ceremony sponsored jointly by all the antiwar forces in the city. The University of Toronto Committee to End the War in Vietnam (which had been excluded from the old Toronto Coordinating Committee) took the initiative in mobilizing the common action

The Toronto committee has announced that a special guest speaker has been invited to address the gathering -- John Gerassi, a representative of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation which sponsored the International War Crimes Tribunal.

A leaflet is being distributed throughout the metropolitan area of Toronto, calling for popular opposition to the Canadian government's complicity in the U.S. war of aggression against the people of Vietnam. It carries the following dramatic headlines:

MEMORIAL

FOR THE WAR DEAD OF WORLD WAR I AND II

FOR THOSE DYING IN THE WAR IN VIETNAM

which threatens to involve Canadians and the people
everywhere in a third world war

The University of Toronto committee has called an Eastern activists conference for November 12 to evaluate the actions of the previous day, to discuss and prepare further actions, and to consolidate forces.

Among the leading participants will be Joe Young of the York University Committee to End the War in Vietnam, who attended the international antiwar rally staged in Liège, Belgium, on October 15.

PROBLEM OF SUCCESSION TO MAO GREATLY EXAGGERATED

Speculation by Western experts over the succession to Mao was definitively refuted by Anna Louise Strong in her October 20 Letter from China. Such speculation, she says, "is plain nonsense for Mao personally will be running the show in China as long as most of those 'experts' live." She observed at the National Day festivities that Mao "had a good memory to recognize people and did not need any glasses, either for distance or for reading." "I marvelled at the length of time Chairman Mao stood in the hot sunlight and at the energy with which he continued to wave to the passing crowds." He also seemed immune to "hot klieg lights." At the end of this exhausting day she asked Mao, as he autographed his portrait for her, if he was not "very tired" and he said, "No, I'm not tired." In her opinion, "Mao himself seems likely to plan and lead the anti-imperialist struggle for decades. I think he may really outlast it. Even through a nuclear war."

EXHIBITION IN ENGLAND HELPS PUBLICIZE TRIBUNAL

By Antonio Farien

London

An exhibition of some 200 photographs, maps and diagrams dealing with the war in Vietnam is being toured through England.

Prepared by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, it portrays something of the history and nature of the struggle instead of being a mere catalogue of horrors, as one might have imagined it would be. The result is an indictment of the U.S. role in Vietnam and a tribute to the National Liberation Front. At the annual trade union conference in Blackpool, where it was sponsored by twenty unions, it received a very good response.

Geoff Coggan, who put the exhibition together, explained that its purpose is to help publicize the investigation projected by the International War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell. Cards quoting the International War Crimes Statutes and Justice Jackson of the U.S. Supreme Court are posted throughout the exhibition. Before leaving, people are asked to sign a book which says at the top: "We, the undersigned, support the call for an International War Crimes Tribunal to examine charges of War Crimes against the United States of America."

The exhibition is made up of several sections, each dealing with a particular aspect of the war.

The first section deals with the Geneva conference and how the U.S. became involved in Vietnam.

The next deals with the growth of the resistance of the Vietnamese people and shows some of their ingenious methods of struggle against an overwhelmingly superior technological power.

The character of the national resistance is next displayed with photographs of student and Buddhist demonstrations, the execution of Nguyen Van Troi and self-immolation committed by Buddhist monks as a means of protest.

The Effects of Napalm, Life in Liberated Areas, On the Battlefield and The Occupied City -- Saigon are the titles of the following sections.

Probably the most horrifying is the next section, The Arrogance of Power. Here the photographs display NLF captives as well as women and children being tortured by Saigon and U.S. troops. The different methods of torture constitute an educational series.

Towards a Third World War deals with the escalation of the war. It shows the ruins of hospitals and schools in north Vietnam, the result of U.S. bombings.

Then comes a series showing the worldwide reaction in the form of huge demonstrations that have taken place in many different countries against the U.S. and the war in Vietnam.

The closing section has no title. It merely starts with a photograph of Johnson delivering a speech. The caption quotes him: "Unless the United States has unchallengeable air power, we shall be hostage to every yellow dwarf with a pocket knife."

Then come photographs of the most moving kind -- a child behind barbed wire, a woman with her naked child, two refugee children and an old man blindfolded, bound and labelled.

Above this is the inscription from the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor: "Give me your tired, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore, send the homeless tempest-tossed, to me: I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The final photograph shows a weeping GI. The caption reads: "An American soldier in Vietnam has cause to despair."

NEW MOOD IN IRISH LABOUR PARTY

By Sean Ried

The Irish Labour party has begun to look like a real live political movement. For too long it looked like -- and saw itself as -- the workers' lobby in the bosses' parliament. Now, as the recent party conference held at Liberty Hall, Dublin, on October 14-16 clearly indicated, it has declared frontal political war on Southern Ireland's twin Tory parties, Fianna Fail and Fina Gael, and at last expressed unequivocal opposition to the concept of coalition or "cooperative" government with either.

The most encouraging feature of the conference was the emergence of a strong, determined left wing among the rank and file. It was this which sent the leadership back-peddling furiously towards the left.

In his address, party leader Brendan Corish deferred to the resurgent radicalism on the floor and as many of his shafts were aimed at right-wingers within the parliamentary party as at the Tories. In particular, his declaration that Labour will put forward two candidates in constituencies where it already has a sitting member will alarm many old servitors who fear lest a running mate draw off some of their first-preference votes. It is up to the rank and file to ensure by continued pressure that the parliamentary party is not allowed to emulate its British counterpart in ignoring conference decisions once they are taken.

In dominating the conference, the left revealed its strength; it also revealed its most dangerous weakness -- an almost complete lack of theoretical underpinning. Thus, while many delegates were sincerely attempting to find socialist solutions to the problems facing Ireland, there was widespread confusion as to how they should go about it. This was most obvious during discussion on a motion that the party should send a delegation to Brussels to study the efforts on Ireland entering the Common Market. There was general recognition that the EEC [European Economic Community] is a device of modern capitalism and as such to be opposed. But no one had any idea what concrete form such opposition should take.

Des Geraghty suggested that the party should turn towards the emerging nations and Eastern Europe, forgetting that many of the emerging nations are themselves seeking association with the EEC and that there should be no question of aligning the Irish economy to those of Eastern Europe while Ireland remains capitalist.

Prionnsius Mac Aonghush suggested as an alternative that the delegation be sent to the Second International, overlooking the fact that the Second International is itself in favour of the EEC.

The most explicit statement came from Mrs. Mary Sheehan, who asserted: "The Common Market is simply monopoly capitalism." But she posed no specific alternative.

No delegates raised the theoretical possibility of a Socialist United States of Europe in which Ireland would be a free and equal participant, because no one had a long-term perspective within the context of which the Common Market issue could be seen. It was this confusion which underlay the passing of the motion.

The conference agreed to affiliate to the Socialist International Federation (the Second International) with only one dissident voice, that of Rayner Lysaght, who correctly estimated that diseased shell as "a cold war institution." Yet it is fair to say that delegates voted for affiliation out of a desire to express their internationalist instincts organizationally, not out of any conscious commitment to the SIF as such. (Few, indeed, seemed to know what the SIF is.)

They didn't have to go through this experience, but having decided to they have provided themselves with a mirror in which they can see the degeneration of European Social Democracy, a degeneration which shall overtake themselves if they do not note and avoid the mistakes of the other parties. Militants must ensure that the lessons are not lost.

The most significant debates of the conference were those on Lemass's antiunion laws. The parliamentary party had been less than forthright when the measures were before the Dail. Now, in contrast, there was total opposition. Dr. Noel Browne, proposing a motion (passed unanimously) calling for the abolition of the Electricity (Special Provisions) Act, 1966, declared that it was no part of Lofoge's duty to help preserve Irish capitalism. Referring to the platform's frequent invocation of James Connolly [executed by the English military in 1916], he reminded them that the Irish

labour and trade-union movement had rejected the teaching of Connolly for the last fifty years. Connolly, he said, was never a gradualist, never believed that a workers republic could be achieved through parliamentary maneuvering. This, placed alongside Corish's linking of Connolly's name to those of Johnston and Norton, fairly indicated the gap between the left and the leadership. It was significant that Dr. Browne received a standing ovation; significant, too, that half the platform remained seated.

Other debates, on education for example, and on the setting up of an all-Ireland Council of Labour, revealed the same desire to guide the party back onto the lines of Connolly's thought. But left-wing militants will have to realize that Connolly's political philosophy did not consist of a series of unrelated "left" attitudes. He was a scientific socialist whose tactics and strategy were based on a scientific analysis of the objective situation with which he was faced. He would have been the first to point out that without socialist theory there can be no socialist politics. In forums, discussion groups and education classes, the Irish left must get down to the problem of remedying this deficiency.

The conference was a very definite advance for socialism in Ireland. It was not an end -- conferences, in the nature of things, never are. But if it is used as the starting point of a determined thrust forward, then it might be a very good beginning indeed.

U.S. ULTRARIGHT GROUP CAUGHT WITH TON OF ARMS

At the Kansas City, Missouri, trial of Robert P. DePugh, national coordinator of the Minutemen, and two co-defendants, charged with violating the National Firearms Act, the cross-examination of witnesses has made for sensational headlines. Jerry Brooks, a former member who is testifying for the state, said November 9 that the group discussed putting cyanide in the air-conditioning unit of the United Nations building and also assassinating Senator J.W. Fulbright, who has questioned the tactical advisability of committing American armed forces to a war on the mainland of Asia.

Meanwhile in New York, nineteen other members of the protofascist, storm-trooper organization, charged with conspiracy to commit arson with firebombs, are out on bail ranging from \$1,000 to \$7,500 each. According to the police, who had penetrated the organization, three squads had been set up to attack four targets on October 30. Queens District Attorney Nat H. Hentel identified these as the former Camp Unity at Wingdale, N.Y.; Camp Midvale, near the Wanaque Reservoir in New Jersey; a "pacifist camp" at Voluntown, Connecticut, and the Brooklyn campaign headquarters of Herbert Aptheker, the well-known Communist party leader who was running for Congress in New York. Under guise of going on a hunting trip, the squads planned to raid the left-wing camps and raze them.

Shortly before dawn on October 30, the police carried out statewide raids. These netted more than a ton of weapons and explosives. The list included 125 rifles; 10 pipe bombs; five mortars; a dozen 30-caliber machine guns; 25 hand guns; 20 brass-knuckled knives; 220 knives of all kinds (hunting, throwing, cleaver and machete); one bazooka; three grenade launchers; six hand grenades; 50 80-millimeter mortar shells; 1,000,000 rounds of ammunition; first-aid equipment; chemicals for preparing bomb detonators, including picric acid; a great deal of radio equipment, including 30 walkie-talkies; short-wave equipment able to intercept police bands; transmitters with a 30-mile radius; 50 camouflage suits with boots and steel helmets; some crossbows and garroting nooses.

Attorneys for the defendants claimed variously that their clients did not belong to the paramilitary organization or were "gun collectors."

It was revealed that the Minutemen had excellent connections in the New York police. This is typical of such groups, as has been seen over and over again in both Europe and the United States.

In the stockpile of weapons, the detectives found firebombs of the kind used in attacks on the headquarters of the Socialist Workers party, the Communist party and other organizations in the past period.

There are no signs at present of a resurgence of fascism in the United States. However, the atmosphere created by the Johnson administration in escalating the war in Vietnam serves to encourage and incite vermin of this kind, fostering outrages like attacks on the headquarters of groups in opposition to the war and the murder of anti-war fighters and revolutionary socialists like Leo Bernard in Detroit.

HEALY'S UNITED FRONT AGAINST REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS

By Henri Valin

The Liège demonstration of October 15, sponsored by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes [the Belgian Young Guard Socialists] to protest against the American imperialist war of aggression in Vietnam and against the imperialist NATO alliance, was a huge success. [See World Outlook November 4.] With 4,000 participants, it was the biggest demonstration to date in Belgium against the Pentagon's escalation of the war. At the same time, it was the first truly international antiwar demonstration in Europe, bringing together a large number of foreign participants from Britain, France, Germany, Denmark, Italy, Spain and Sweden. Representatives of the American and Canadian antiwar movements were likewise present.

The Belgian bourgeoisie didn't like that demonstration at all. Two busloads of Dutch demonstrators -- more than a hundred in all -- were stopped at a small town near the border and turned back by the gendarmes because one of the buses was carrying banners against NATO.

At Liège itself, the police tried to prevent the demonstration from starting out on the flimsy pretext that some of the banners carried by the demonstrators did not correspond with those that had been registered in advance.

The bourgeois press, which was compelled to grudgingly admit that the demonstration was a significant one -- the police gave 3,000 as the official number of participants -- tried to discredit it by depicting it as a "violent Communist demonstration," a "violent anti-American demonstration," and a "demonstration of Beatniks and Beatles."

The Belgian Social Democrats, who expelled the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes and who, since then, have been unable to assemble under their own banners more than a few dozen sons and daughters of the top party bureaucrats, sought to ignore the demonstration. Then, caught by surprise by the size of the demonstration, they tried to brush it off as composed of "various kinds of pro-Soviet, pro-Chinese and pro-Trotsky Communists."

The truth is that the latter characterization is not far from the truth. The Liège march was conceived and called as a broad united-front demonstration without excluding any youth organization willing to rally in behalf of two objectives: for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam; against the imperialist NATO alliance.

These two objectives were not chosen in an arbitrary way. Defense of the Vietnamese revolution is the central burning issue today for revolutionary socialists the world over. They must demonstrate in practice that they are the best and most effective defenders of the Vietnamese revolution. The Belgian revolutionary socialists have tried to do this. With this in mind, they called the Liège demonstration on as broad a basis as possible, scoring a considerable success.

Revolutionary socialists do not view the united front as an operation in which participants slur over the political differences they have with each other. But they do conceive the united front as a genuine means of struggling for a common goal -- political differentiation and clarification being achieved above all through discussion around the strategy and tactics to be followed in order to best achieve that common goal.

This does not hold, of course, with sectarians. For them a common goal does not exist at all; it is only a pretext for affirming and reaffirming what the sect is interested in separate and apart from the united front. They turn out for common demonstrations only in order to...denounce the other participants and to try to drive them away. For them victory lies not in achieving a common aim but in driving away the other participants in the united front.

The classical example of this sectarian concept of the united front was provided by "third period" Stalinism in Germany. Verbally the Stalinist leaders of the German Communist party were not opposed to a united front with the Social Democratic workers against Hitler. But they insisted on their inalienable right in such united front demonstrations to denounce the Social Democratic leaders as agents of the bourgeoisie guilty of the murder of Communist workers.

These characterizations were completely correct in a historical sense. But by

throwing them at Social Democratic workers who thought otherwise, and at the very moment when the most burning issue of the day was a common struggle by both Social Democratic and Communist workers against fascism, the Stalinist leaders systematically drove the Social Democratic workers away from the united front.

As a result, a real united front of common struggle against fascism could not be achieved between the two main sections of the German working class. The consequence of this failure to undertake joint action was Hitler's victory. Mankind paid the heaviest possible price for Stalin's abysmal crime -- more than 100,000,000 dead.

To this day Healy, the head of the Socialist Labour League in England, has failed to understand the elementary lessons of that experience, explained by Leon Trotsky and the world Trotskyist movement again and again. Healy still conceives of the united front as a means of "denouncing" other participants and splitting the mass of militants. So when the British and French youth organizations under allegiance to him were invited to participate in the Liège demonstration, he carefully instructed them to proceed in such a way as to break up the united action. Defense of the Hungarian revolution of 1956 should be included in the banners, according to this line, since it would be certain to drive out all participants in the demonstration who have a different appraisal of that revolution than the one held by revolutionary Marxists. It would be especially resented by members and sympathizers of the Communist party.

Of course it is as correct and honorable today in 1966 to defend the Hungarian revolution of 1956 as it was in 1932 to defend Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg against the murderer Noske. But to carry banners on the Hungarian revolution in a united front demonstration for the defense of the Vietnamese revolution has exactly the same effect in 1966 as it had in 1932 to carry banners denouncing the "murderer Noske" and the "little murderer Zoergiebel" in united front demonstrations against the Nazis. It splits the united front, thereby endangering success in the struggle against the main immediate enemy on the main issue of world revolution today -- the Vietnamese revolution.

Healy's provocation was successful in 1966, just as Stalin's were in 1932. Under heavy pressure from their rank and file, the Belgian Communist Youth decided, in face of great reluctance on the part of the central leadership of the party, to participate in the Liège demonstration. Several hundred members of the Communist Youth showed up at the main rallying center. In Denmark and Germany, left socialist youth organizations succeeded in mobilizing dozens of Communist youth as participants in the first international demonstration in defense of the Vietnamese revolution. These youth were convinced, not without reason, that the official Communist parties are doing much too little in fighting against the dirty war conducted by U.S. imperialism against the Vietnamese people.

When these CPers saw Healy's English and French banners in defense of the Hungarian revolution of 1956, they thought they had been tricked. After all, they had come to a united front demonstration on Vietnam, not a Trotskyist demonstration in solidarity with Hungary. So most of them left.

The October 22 Newsletter, published by Healy, true to its fundamentally sectarian nature, happily applauded it as a great victory that these contingents left and that the first international united front demonstration in defense of Vietnam was thus partially broken up.

But The Newsletter did not limit itself to that. It moved another notch in its escalation towards outright acceptance of the political and organizational methods of Stalinism by printing an outrageously falsified report of the Liège events.

On page 1 of the October 22 Newsletter we find the following paragraph:

"When the [British] Young Socialists who were carrying them [the banners commemorating the Hungarian revolution] refused to take them down, Germain's rather elderly young socialists called upon the assistance of the Belgian police to haul the Hungarian banner down."

And this "report" is followed by the following political conclusions:

"The Pabloites today are nothing more than the conscious agents of these bureaucracies, who, in turn, are tied hand and foot to the big capitalists.

"Since the police are the direct servants of capital, it was perfectly normal for the Pabloites to enlist their aid in the fight against revolutionary youth."

This leads to the final point in this chain of reasoning: "Mandel, Frank and the SWP [Socialist Workers party] were exposed in Liège as handmaidens of imperialism..."

Now all the participants in the Liège demonstration heard the explanation, given publicly over the sound system by the leaders of the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes before the demonstration started out. This explanation made the following crystal clear:

- (1) That the leaders of the Communist Youth objected to the above-mentioned banners and had asked the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes to have them removed, since they did not conform with the stated objectives of the demonstration.
- (2) That the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes had asked the British and French Healyites to remove these banners in order not to break up the united front character of a demonstration in defense of the Vietnamese revolution.
- (3) That when these attempts proved unsuccessful, due to the incurably sectarian character of the Healyites, the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes agreed to leave the banners even if this meant that the Communist Youth would withdraw (which they promptly did).
- (4) That when the police tried to intervene at this point, in order to play the role of "arbiter" in the dispute, they were firmly told by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes to mind their own business and not to interfere in an internal dispute among the demonstrators that was none of their business.
- (5) That the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes then demanded of the police to permit the demonstration to proceed normally, with all the banners present, including those that had been placed in dispute.
- (6) That the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes had stated publicly -- a statement that was later repeated by the National Committee and published in the October 22 issue of La Gauche [The Left] that they would never agree to the police or anyone else forcefully removing any slogans in favor of the Hungarian revolution, slogans which they approved as to content but considered ill-advised in this specific united front demonstration.

To transform this clear record into the outrageous statement that the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes sought to enlist the help of the police in order to remove the banners favoring the Hungarian revolution is an outright lie and political fraud.

But there is worse to come.

In the whole history of the labor movement, the most bitter opponents of revolutionary socialism never fell so low as to call their political foes police agents or collaborators with the police. It was Stalinism, and Stalinism alone, that introduced these poisonous methods into the labor movement, using frame-ups, frauds, falsifications and where it had the power to do so, kangaroo trials, to uphold these monstrous accusations.

Healy is now openly staking his claim as heir to these Stalinist methods by advancing the criminal falsifications indicated above, by utilizing such vulgar smears as agents and collaborators of the police, handmaidens of imperialism, to denounce his political opponents.

In this, of course, he is not alone. There are avowed admirers and followers of Stalin who still continue to use the same method today. The Belgian weekly La Voix du Peuple [The Voice of the People], published by that self-acknowledged admirer of Stalin, Jacques Grippa, leader of the pro-Mao Communist party in Belgium, printed a whole page in its October 21 issue on the Liège demonstration, picturing it as an "anti-Communist" demonstration organized by a "united front of Trotskyists, fascists and policemen." And in order to support this preposterous allegation, they featured a crudely forged photograph on the same page!

The forger Grippa is an avowed Stalinist; the falsifier Healy is a self-styled "Trotskyist," who imitates Stalinist policies and Stalinist methods more and more. The Liège business exposes him in his true colors -- part of a united front of slanderers against revolutionary socialists fighting for a united front in defense of the Vietnamese revolution.

The use of such methods reveals complete political bankruptcy. Only people without the slightest confidence in their political arguments could stoop to using such methods as a substitute.

This sordid affair is not without a comic note. The editors of The Newsletter dabble on the same front page of their October 22 issue with statistics. They put the number of participants at the Liège demonstration at 3,000, the same as the police, who are notorious in such evaluations. (The organizers estimated 4,000 participants.) The number of British and French Healyites who participated is set at 458 and 400 respectively. (The true figure for the French Healyites was 350.) Yet the editors of The Newsletter present the combined total of the two contingents as "half" and in another place "over half" of the demonstrators. (In reality they constituted hardly more than 20 percent.) It is not surprising that Healy, who has declared his own guerrilla war against any kind of objective truth, from the most elementary to the most scientific, should resolutely turn his back on simple arithmetic.

Healy concludes his article about the Liège demonstration by stating that "Trotsky, the most authoritative student of bureaucracy, would have been proud of Liege." For once we agree with him. Trotsky would have been proud of his followers, who succeeded in organizing the first international united front demonstration in Europe in defense of the Vietnamese revolution, and who rallied 4,000 youth behind that objective.

As for the petty forgers who seek to smuggle Stalinist methods into the working-class movement under cover of a label of "Trotskyism," thereby discrediting and besmirching its good name, Trotsky would have advised his followers to handle them with the contempt they deserve.

MODELEWSKI AND KURON -- DEFENDERS OF THE GAINS IN POLAND

By Joseph Hansen

The summer issue of Partisan Review, the well-known American literary quarterly, published a communication from Michael Shute, organizer of the ad-hoc committee of Polish Political Freedom at the University of California, on the views of Karol Modzelewski, Jacek Kuron and Ludwik Hass, who were imprisoned in Poland last year because of their oppositionist political views.

Although Modzelewski and Kuron were the defendants in one trial, and Hass in another, and the prosecution, from all accounts, made no attempt to link the cases together organizationally, Shute identifies them as constituting a single group.

"After thirty-five years," Shute declares, "Trotskyism is being given new life in the Communist world by a small but highly serious group of revolutionary activists. One of their leaders is Ludwik Hass, an 'old' Polish Trotskyist who has spent almost twenty years in Soviet forced labor camps. Hass and four younger members of the opposition have been imprisoned by the Polish government on charges of 'possessing and distributing pamphlets...detrimental to the interests of the Polish state and dealing with political and social relations in Poland.' Two trials were held; testifying at the first, Hass affirmed his Trotskyism, and defended revolutionary socialism."

Since Shute sent his communication to Partisan Review, Hass has been released. Modzelewski and Kuron, however, are still being held in prison. They were the authors of an "Open Letter" to members of the Communist party in which they explained the views they had advocated in the party and which had brought about their expulsion. The "Open Letter" was used in court as the major piece of "evidence" against them.

Shute does not distinguish between Hass on the one hand and Modzelewski-Kuron on the other, but appears to assume that the three belong to a single group and that their views are identical. The available evidence is not sufficient to judge the accuracy of this assumption.

In any case, Shute appears to assume that the "Open Letter" is a common programmatic document, representing the views of all three of these revolutionists although it bears the signatures of only Modzelewski and Kuron. Shute continues:

"The pamphlet which provoked the arrests is a 128-page manifesto which argues that the Polish Communist state does not represent a socialist order, but rather a new ruling class; and characterizes the regime as a 'dictatorship of the bureaucracy' which has arrogated to itself the 'workers' property.' The writers of the manifesto distinguish themselves from Titoists by rejecting the claims of the so-called workers councils of Yugoslavia to democratically represent the will of the Yugoslavian workers.

They call for a 'return to proletarian internationalism' and attack the Polish clergy for what they term a 'reactionary' role."

Shute recounts Hass's remarkable history as a long-time opponent of Stalinism, the many years he spent in the labor camps and the courage with which he again put forward his Trotskyist views publicly upon finally being released and repatriated to Poland in 1957.

We then come to an expression of Shute's own opinions concerning the position presented by the "Open Letter." Shute declares:

"The Hass group's Trotskyism is Trotskyism considerably updated, a Trotskyism which views the Communist states as no longer progressive in any sense of the word. Hass is familiar with the earlier 'new class' theorists, and they have clearly had their impact. But Hass and his group utilize the past selectively, with a discrimination shaped by the needs of their struggles. For new class theory corresponds to their experience in attempting to create a new beginning for a struggle against the Communist state. During the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, the Hungarian working class seized control of the means of production, replacing Communist factory managers with democratically elected workers councils. The first real revolution against Communism transferred the means of production from the hands of one class, the bureaucracy, to those of another, the working class. And the idea that the bureaucracy constitutes a new social class which own the means of production through its political control of the state is the core of the new Polish Trotskyism....The efforts of Hass and his comrades are a milestone in the socialist revolution against Communism, for this group has at least begun to educate a cadre of socialists to a realistic view of Polish society in particular and the Communist bloc in general."

Again it should be noted that it is not at all clear why Shute identifies Hass so closely with the "Open Letter" signed by Modelzewski and Kuron, but leaving this aside and considering merely the document itself, Shute's conclusions appear to suffer from some exaggerations that are not helpful to the cause of Polish Trotskyism.

The text of the "Open Letter" is unfortunately not yet available in English. [Merit Publishers have announced that they are bringing out a translation.] A French translation is available however.* Study of this document fails to reveal any statement that could legitimately be construed as maintaining that "the Communist states" are "no longer progressive in any sense of the word."

The point is crucial since it determines the stand taken by the authors of the "Open Letter" in relation to the defense of Poland against imperialism. Trotsky was very clear and firm on this question. More than once differences over the question of defending the Soviet Union led to splits, for Trotsky was adamant in sticking to "unconditional defense"; i.e., defense regardless of the attitude, line or actions of the bureaucracy.

Despite the growth of Stalinism, Trotsky considered the Soviet Union completely progressive in the sense of being superior to capitalism. In fact his views on Stalinism cannot really be grasped if his opinion on the progressive nature of the Soviet Union and the need to defend it against imperialism is not understood. Trotsky distinguished between the Soviet state, which he considered to be highly progressive, and the Soviet bureaucracy which he regarded as a parasitic formation. Thus he held that what was required was not a social overturn (which would have meant demolition of the state) but a political revolution, a cleansing operation that would actually strengthen the existing Soviet state by replacing the arbitrary bureaucratic regime with a better alternative, a regime based on proletarian democracy. This position has been maintained by the Fourth International which was founded by Leon Trotsky. It is a position distinctive of genuine Trotskyism.

On this question, the "Open Letter" written by Modelewski and Kuron does not speak as clearly as Trotsky. But if it errs, it would seem to be on the side of granting too much credit to the bureaucracy.

This emerges most markedly when the authors speak of the progressive role played by the bureaucracy in industrializing the country. The "new power," they say, "carried out this objective despite the particular interests of the other classes and layers; hence, to a certain degree, against them." They declare again: "Under these

* Lettre ouverte aux membres des sections de l'université de Varsovie du Parti ouvrier unifié polonais et de l'Union des jeunes socialistes. Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France. 100 pp. US\$1.

conditions, the relations of production founded on bureaucratic property, assured a rapid development of the economy, thanks to which possibilities were opened up for the other classes and social layers for progress and an improvement in living conditions, a perspective of expanding within the very framework of the bureaucratic system."

The achievements made possible in Poland after the overturn of capitalism are further indicated by Modelewski and Kuron:

"Industrialization opened up for the broad masses of the underdeveloped country a road toward an improvement in living conditions through a massive shift of the classes and layers least favored materially, socially and culturally, toward the classes and layers standing at a higher level -- from the countryside into the ranks of the technical cadres, white-collar workers, intellectuals and technicians -- all this thanks to the expansion of education on all levels. The social advancement of the masses, the liquidation of overpopulation in the countryside and of unemployment, were accompanied by a growth in the cultural level of the population, medical aid, social services, education, etc. Thanks to this, and despite the terror and the constraint, the bureaucracy met with wide and enthusiastic support in all circles of society."

Let us note: "despite the terror and constraint..." But then the advances were not made through the terror and constraint. They were made by other means. It takes no genius to discover what these were. The means consisted of state planning instituted after the shattering of capitalist property forms -- state planning basically proletarian in character however far removed from the democratic norms that would have lent it maximum efficiency. The progress, in short, was made possible by a type of state superior to the old capitalist state. To credit the bureaucracy for the progress made instead of the state is a mistake rooted in failure to distinguish between the basic economic institutions and those in charge of them (or the methods or political institutions through which they are selected). What is primary is mixed up with what is secondary. This kind of error is common enough, unfortunately.

It is true that Modelewski and Kuron find that the bureaucracy, which they credit with having advanced Poland along the road of industrialization, has exhausted its progressive role. Thus, insofar as they do not distinguish between the state and the bureaucracy, their position is open to misinterpretation. However, taken in conjunction with their platform which calls for a political revolution, it does not seem to be an accurate estimate to say that they consider the degenerated or deformed workers states -- to use the right term -- to be "no longer progressive in any sense of the word."

Study of the "Open Letter" also indicates that the position taken by Modelewski and Kuron is much more nuanced than Shute indicates. The "Open Letter" distinguishes between the technocratic layers of the bureaucracy and the central political command. They apply the label "class" to the latter sector. They do not, it is true, compare their position with the one argued for by certain tendencies in the West, who consider that a "managerial class" or some variant thereof has developed in the Soviet Union and the other workers states. But, again, their political conclusions, as well as the distinctions they draw between sectors of the bureaucracy indicate that their views have little in common with those of the theoreticians of the "managerial society" and its variants.

A final observation should be made concerning the loaded epithets employed by Shute. The Trotskyism of the Hass group, he says, is "Trotskyism considerably updated..." It is a "new" Polish Trotskyism. It offers a "realistic" view... An updated, new, realistic theory is, of course, much to be preferred to an outdated, old, unrealistic one. The trouble is that the "new class" theorists really offer nothing new. Their views are so old, in fact, that all their main propositions were well known to Trotsky and he considered their lack of validity on various occasions. His arguments against the "new class" position have never been refuted. To my knowledge the "new class" theorists have never even considered them in an objective way.

Before pinning the label of "updated" on any variation of the "new class" theory it would seem to be in order to first update the consideration of Trotsky's observations on this question.

This criticism, it is to be hoped, will not be misinterpreted as directed in any way at Michael Shute's efforts to defend the Polish oppositionists. He supports them because they are revolutionists and internationalists opposed to all oppression and striving for a society run by the people themselves. This is the basis for the demands seeking their immediate release that have been directed to the Polish government by a wide spectrum of socialists and antiwar fighters on an international scale.

A united front on this basis is completely legitimate. Socialists should not permit differences over questions like the class nature of the state in Poland and the role of the bureaucracy to stand in the way of further efforts to win the release of all those imprisoned in Poland because of their political views.

BERTRAND RUSSELL REFUTES PHILIP TOYNBEE ON VIETNAM WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

[The British weekly New Statesman published a letter from Philip Toynbee in its October 14 issue questioning the validity of the War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell. A letter from Bertrand Russell replying to Toynbee was published in the next issue, October 21. The text of the two letters follows, the captions (the same in each instance) being supplied by the New Statesman.]

* * *

Vietnam Guilt

Sir, Wherever the initial responsibility may lie for the present situation in Vietnam -- and I believe myself that it lies far more heavily with the Americans than with anybody else -- it is surely clear that the tragedy continues because both sides would see the whole country destroyed rather than let it fall into the hands of the other. Because of their absurd anti-communist ideology, because American face must be saved, because of the personal vanity of Lyndon Johnson, the Americans are ready to pulverise villages and inflict the torture of napalm on men, women and children. Because of their absurd communist ideology, because North Vietnamese and Vietcong face must be saved, because of the personal vanity of the 'hawks' of Hanoi, the communist forces refuse to offer any but totally unacceptable terms to the invading Americans.

It is true that both sides have a case -- a case which has been put over and over again by professional anti-communists and professional fellow-travellers respectively. But surely the case against both sides is far heavier than any case that can be made for either of them. If the Americans have killed more people -- and therefore been guilty of more 'war crimes' -- this is only because their criminal instruments are the more effective. The other side has certainly done its level best to match the horrors inflicted by their enemies. And in the light of this situation Lord Russell's war crimes tribunal is at best an irrelevance; at worst yet another attempt by the partisans of one side to simplify the issue -- and therefore to confuse it.

Philip Toynbee

Barn House
Brockweir, Nr Chepstow

Vietnam Guilt

Sir, Mr Philip Toynbee, in his letter last week, exemplifies the group of intellectuals who gave full support to Stalin during the ugliest and most morally vile period of his rule and, consequently, have occupied themselves ever since with discovering such propensities in others. In one sense, I can sympathise with Mr Toynbee's fear to identify himself with a cause again as he was so terrifyingly wrong before. But that same insensitivity which led such people to identify the revolution and socialism with Stalinism now permits Mr Toynbee to decry the unequivocal support given by me to the Vietnamese.

Mr Toynbee says there must be two sides to this war. Why? Why should we equivocate about the monstrous injustice involved in the US crime against a small people? Why should the Jews shovelled into gas chambers suffer also the disgraceful moral ambivalence of those who sought justification for Nazi barbarism? There are not two sides in Vietnam. Jose Marti said: 'He who witnesses a crime in silence, commits it.' 'We,' said Eichmann, 'only provided the lorries'. Marti and Eichmann man the barricades of a moral divide, and between them such even as Mr Philip Toynbee must choose. Vietnam is an acid test for this generation of Western intellectuals.

Bertrand Russell

Penrhyndeudraeth
Merioneth

TEXT OF JOINT KOREAN-CUBAN STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

[The following is the full text of the joint statement issued by top officials of the governments of Cuba and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea after conversations held in Korea from October 26 to October 29.

[Of particular interest in the joint statement is the appeal to the "socialist countries, the communist and workers parties, all the anti-imperialist forces in the world" to unite and actively assist the Vietnamese people. The concrete proposals are that the "socialist countries should dispatch international contingents of volunteers to aid the fighting Vietnamese people"; and that the struggle against U.S. imperialism should be "waged in a more organized manner and escalated on a world scale." In addition the statement appeals for "international anti-imperialist joint action" and the formation of an "anti-imperialist united front."

[The English text is the one issued by the November 2 issue of The People's Korea published in Tokyo.]

* * *

At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a party and government delegation of the Republic of Cuba led by Comrade Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado, President of the Republic of Cuba, paid a goodwill visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from October 26 to 29, 1966.

During its stay in Korea the party and government delegation of the Republic of Cuba held talks with the leaders of the Korean Workers' Party and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Present at the talks on behalf of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were Comrade Kim Il Sung, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party and Premier of the Cabinet of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; Comrade Choi Yong Kun, Member of the Political Committee and its Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the KWP and President of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Assembly of the DPRK; Comrade Kim Il, Member of the Political Committee and its Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the KWP and First Vice-premier of the Cabinet; Comrade Pak Keum Chul, Member of the Political Committee and its Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the KWP; Comrade Li Hyo Soon, Member of the Political Committee and its Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the KWP; Comrade Kim Kwang Hyup, Member of the Political Committee and its Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the KWP and Vice-premier of the Cabinet; Comrade Kim Chang Bong, Member of the Political Committee of the Central Committee of the KWP and Vice-premier of the Cabinet and Minister of National Defense; Comrade Pak Sung Chul, Member of the Political Committee of the Central Committee of the KWP and Vice-premier of the Cabinet and Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Comrade Pak Yong Kook, Candidate Member of the Political Committee and Secretary of the Central Committee of the KWP.

Present at the talks on behalf of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party and the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba were Comrade Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party and President of the Republic of Cuba, and Comrade Raul Castro Ruz, Member of the Political Bureau and Second Secretary of the Central Committee of the CP of Cuba and Vice-premier and Minister of Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Revolutionary Government; and Comrade Sergio Del Valle, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP of Cuba and Vice-minister of Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Revolutionary Government.

The talks proceeded in a friendly comradely atmosphere.

At the talks views were exchanged on the current situation and questions arising in the international communist movement, questions on strengthening friendship and solidarity of the peoples of the two countries and other questions of common concern.

The two sides reached complete identity of views on the questions discussed.

In face of the growth of the revolutionary movement of the peoples and forces of socialism, the imperialists headed by U.S. imperialism are aggravating the international situation to the extreme by desperately trying to find a way out of their imminent doom in aggression and war.

The two delegations are of the unanimous view that the policies drawn up by the two countries to cope with the development of the current international situation are correct.

The Cuban delegation pays high tribute to the successes the Korean people have scored in socialist revolution and socialist construction under the leadership of the Korean Workers' Party headed by Comrade Kim Il Sung. The Korean people have converted their once backward country into a developed socialist industrial-agricultural state through the Chullima movement.

In face of the situation created in recent years, the Korean Workers' Party is further consolidating, politically, economically and militarily, the revolutionary base in the northern half of the country by carrying on economic construction in parallel with defense upbuilding.

The military line of the Party, the main content of which is to place the entire people under arms, turn the whole land into a fortress, train the army into an army of cadres and modernize it, is being pushed through successfully.

The Cuban delegation considers that all this constitutes a solid material guarantee for the self-dependent unification of Korea and makes the eastern post of the socialist camp an impregnable fortress.

The Cuban delegation denounces the U.S. imperialists who, usurping the signboard of the United Nations, are occupying South Korea and pursuing a policy of converting it into a colony and military base and are preparing a new war against the Korean people, and fully supports the struggle of the Korean people for the self-dependent unification of the country.

The U.S. troops must be withdrawn from South Korea without delay, the United Nations must dissolve the so-called "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" and the question of Korea's unification should be solved by the Korean people themselves by peaceful means on a democratic basis, without any interference from outside.

The Korean delegation highly praises the Cuban people who, under the leadership of the Cuban Communist Party headed by Comrade Fidel Castro, are defending the gains of revolution and building socialism with success, standing face to face with U.S. imperialism and courageously repelling its ceaseless aggression and subversive manoeuvres of all forms, with a rifle in one hand and a hammer and sickle in the other.

The victory of the Cuban revolution was the first victory of socialist revolution in Latin America. As the continuation of the Great October Revolution in Latin America, it was a historical event marking a new turn in the revolutionary struggle of the people there.

The Republic of Cuba is the advance post of the socialist camp in the Western Hemisphere.

Frightened by the victory of the Cuban revolution and its support to the liberation movement of the Latin-American people, the U.S. imperialists are persisting in their vicious machinations to strangle the Cuban revolution.

Under such condition, the Korean delegation regards it a sacred internationalist obligation of all the socialist countries and the Latin-American peoples to defend the Cuban revolution. To defend the Cuban revolution is to defend the socialist camp, develop the revolutionary movement in Latin America and defend the interests of the world revolution.

Today the Cuban people, all armed and united as one, are ready to smash resolutely any aggression of the imperialists, holding high the banner of revolution and under the slogan, "Motherland or death! We will win!"

The Korean delegation sternly denounces the uninterrupted aggressive manoeuvres of the U.S. imperialists against Cuba and actively supports the just struggle of the Cuban people. The U.S. imperialists must discontinue at once all their aggressive moves against Cuba.

Both delegations consider that the struggle against U.S. imperialism is the main international task of all the progressive people of the world at the present juncture. The U.S. imperialists are perpetrating aggression and subversive activities against the socialist countries and national independent countries, brutally suppressing the revolu-

tionary struggle of the Asian, African and Latin-American peoples and harassing peace everywhere in the world.

While escalating the war in Vietnam stage by stage, the U.S. imperialists are hard at work to expand the flames of war to the vast area of Asia.

The struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialist aggression is the focus of the anti-imperialist struggle at present. The U.S. imperialists' aggression not only against the Vietnamese people but also against the entire socialist camp, a challenge to the national liberation struggle of the Asian, African and Latin-American peoples and a menace to world peace.

Both sides consider that the socialist countries, the communist and workers' parties, all the anti-imperialist forces in the world should unite and actively assist the Vietnamese people in their war of resistance against U.S. imperialism for national salvation and shatter the imperialist aggression.

The war of resistance against U.S. imperialism for national salvation waged heroically by the Vietnamese people is an example for the world people in the struggle for peace, national independence and socialism.

Both delegations express full, militant solidarity with the fraternal North and South Vietnamese people who are winning brilliant victories and displaying unexampled heroism in the sacred struggle against U.S. imperialists' aggression and once again declare their firm determination to send volunteers at any time the Vietnamese people request it.

The Vietnam question must be solved only on the basis of the four-point demand of the Government of the Vietnam Democratic Republic and the five-point principle of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation. The U.S. imperialists must stop at once the war of aggression in South Vietnam and the bombing of the Vietnam Democratic Republic and withdraw forthwith the U.S. troops and the troops of their satellite countries and the South Korean puppet troops as well as all their weapons. The Vietnam question must be solved by the Vietnamese people themselves.

The two sides condemn the U.S. imperialists who have recently called their satellite countries and puppets to Manila and hatched a plot to further escalate the Vietnam war under the deceptive slogan of "peaceful negotiations."

The two delegations consider that under the condition in which the U.S. imperialists are escalating the war of aggression in Vietnam stage by stage, the struggle against U.S. imperialism and for assisting the Vietnamese people should likewise be waged in a more organized manner and escalated on a world scale.

The two delegations unanimously hold that for this it is necessary, first of all, to achieve international anti-imperialist joint action and form an anti-imperialist united front.

To preserve peace and ensure the victory of the cause of national independence and socialism, we must deal blows at the U.S. imperialists everywhere they are in the world and on all fronts and bind them hand and foot so that they cannot ride roughshod.

When the U.S. imperialists are thus dealt decisive blows, their fate will be like the sun setting in the west and the revolutionary movements will upsurge further in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the rest of the world.

The two delegations express firm solidarity with the Asian, African and Latin-American peoples fighting against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and for national liberation.

The two sides support the struggle of the Japanese people against U.S. imperialism and the monopoly forces of Japan and back the peoples of Laos and Cambodia in the struggle against the aggression and intervention of U.S. imperialism and its stooges.

Both sides strongly condemn the Indonesian right wing reactionary forces who, under the instigation of U.S. imperialism, are suppressing and massacring communists and democratic forces of Indonesia, and express solidarity with the struggle of the progressive forces including the Indonesian communists for national independence and the democratic development of the country.

The two sides express support to and solidarity with the armed struggles and revolutionary movements now being waged in many countries of Latin America including

Venezuela, Guatemala and Colombia.

The two sides express support to and solidarity with the national liberation struggles of the African people including those of Portuguese Guinea and Angola.

The two sides consider that for safeguarding world peace, struggle must be waged against the allies of U.S. imperialism, particularly against the regeneration of Japanese and West German militarism into hotbeds of new war in Asia and Europe, along with the struggle against U.S. imperialism, number one enemy of the world people.

The two delegations consider that it is important at the present juncture to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the cohesion of the international communist movement.

Only when united and consolidated, can the socialist camp and the international communist movement effectively check the imperialist policies of aggression and war and give a powerful impetus to the acceleration of the world revolutionary movement.

The unity of the socialist camp and the solidarity of the international communist movement must be based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

All parties should abide by the norms governing the mutual relations among the fraternal parties and fraternal countries, which were laid down in the Declaration and Statement of the 1957 and 1960 Meetings of Representatives of Various Communist and Workers' Parties. These norms governing the mutual relations among the parties must be based on the independency of each party.

The Parties and Governments of Korea and Cuba have always adhered to the norms of the mutual relations among the fraternal parties and fraternal countries and have striven and are striving for the unity of the socialist camp and the solidarity of the international communist movement.

The Korean Workers' Party and the Cuban Communist Party will continue to abide by the principle of seeking solidarity, firmly upholding independency in the relations with the fraternal parties and fraternal countries.

The two parties will resolutely fight for upholding the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

The two delegations express satisfaction with the fact that the relations between the parties, governments and peoples of Korea and Cuba formed in the struggle against U.S. imperialism, the common enemy, are excellent and are daily strengthening and developing on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The visit of the party and government delegation of the Republic of Cuba to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has greatly contributed to further strengthening the fraternal friendship and solidarity between the two Parties, two Governments and two peoples.

The two delegations are convinced that the result of the talks between the two delegations will contribute not only to developing the friendly relations between the peoples of Korea and Cuba who are fighting against imperialism and for the common revolutionary cause but also to consolidating the unity of the socialist camp and cohesion of the international communist movement.

The Cuban delegation, in the name of the Government and Communist Party of Cuba, invited Comrade Kim Il Sung and Comrade Choi Yong Kun to visit Cuba. The invitation was extended also in the name of Comrade Fidel Castro.

Comrade Kim Il Sung and Comrade Choi Yong Kun accepted the invitation with thanks.

YOU CAN TAKE McNAMARA'S WORD FOR IT

On November 5, three days before the U.S. elections, McNamara announced from Johnson's Texas ranch that "Today a slowdown in our rate of troop deployments to that country [Vietnam] is planned." On November 8 the Pentagon "clarified" McNamara's soothing announcement: "The statement does not necessarily rule out a figure as high as 500,000 for the end of calendar year 1967." Different day, different plan.