

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 15

April 16, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

The Meaning of Johnson's "Carrot" Speech	1
Algerian Role in Attempted Vietnam Negotiations	3
Is Johnson Following in Footsteps of Mikado?	4
Framed Up Chinese Freed in Brazil	6
On the Guerrilla Struggle in Venezuela	7
Interview with Comandante Yong Sosa	9
Guerrilla Front Active in Peru	15
"Izvestia" Censors Sartre	17
Fight Continues to Free Alexander Eleven	18
Committee of Nine Scored on Use of Funds	19
Sihlali-Mtshizana Trial Begins	20
The Zaca, Zulu and Nyakeni Cases	21
Secret Arrest of Gcabashe	22
"A Girl Just Like Me" -- by Evelyn Sell	23
Clash with Fascists in Streets of Vienna	25
Ben Bella Commutes Ait Ahmed Death Sentence	26
Once Again -- The SLL and Vietnam -- by Joseph Hansen	27
Documents: Open Letter to the Comrades of the LSSP (Reformist)	35

THE MEANING OF JOHNSON'S "CARROT" SPEECH

President Johnson's April 7 speech, delivered two months to the day after American planes on his orders began bombing North Vietnam and escalating the war in the direction of a nuclear culmination, was received with extravagant praise and thanksgiving by all his friends, supporters, well-wishers and cringing bootlickers, from the august New York Times to the ineffable Harold Wilson. In common chorus they eulogized this great "carrot" speech by the great leader of the "Great Society" as having offered a "way out" from the increasingly ominous situation created by the military aggression of Ameri-

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 15

April 16, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

The Meaning of Johnson's "Carrot" Speech	1
Algerian Role in Attempted Vietnam Negotiations	3
Is Johnson Following in Footsteps of Mikado?	4
Framed Up Chinese Freed in Brazil	6
On the Guerrilla Struggle in Venezuela	7
Interview with Comandante Yong Sosa	9
Guerrilla Front Active in Peru	15
"Izvestia" Censors Sartre	17
Fight Continues to Free Alexander Eleven	18
Committee of Nine Scored on Use of Funds	19
Sihlali-Mtshizana Trial Begins	20
The Zaca, Zulu and Nyakeni Cases	21
Secret Arrest of Gcabashe	22
"A Girl Just Like Me" -- by Evelyn Sell	23
Clash with Fascists in Streets of Vienna	25
Ben Bella Commutes Ait Ahmed Death Sentence	26
Once Again -- The SLL and Vietnam -- by Joseph Hansen	27
Documents:	
Open Letter to the Comrades of the LSSP (Reformist)	35

THE MEANING OF JOHNSON'S "CARROT" SPEECH

President Johnson's April 7 speech, delivered two months to the day after American planes on his orders began bombing North Vietnam and escalating the war in the direction of a nuclear culmination, was received with extravagant praise and thanksgiving by all his friends, supporters, well-wishers and cringing bootlickers, from the august New York Times to the ineffable Harold Wilson. In common chorus they eulogized this great "carrot" speech by the great leader of the "Great Society" as having offered a "way out" from the increasingly ominous situation created by the military aggression of Ameri-

can imperialism. But what did this capitalist statesman actually offer in the way of "carrots"?

He said he was prepared to engage in "unconditional discussions." He said that if a settlement was achieved that met undisclosed specifications, the United States would provide \$1,000,000,000 for the development of the "countries of Southeast Asia." The number of years over which this would be stretched was not indicated, nor which countries would benefit most, nor whether it would be in loans or gifts, nor the proportion of "private investment," nor the strings attached to the dollars.

The offer about "unconditional" discussions was just as counterfeit as the billion-dollar bill dangled by the president. The discussions must be only with the "governments concerned." Johnson made no reference to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, whose heroic fighters are backed by at least eighty per cent of the population, and which constitutes their real government. Other spokesmen of the White House clarified this point by stating that the National Liberation Front was specifically excluded from the "unconditional" offer made by Johnson.

Johnson's "generosity" would be comparable to George III proffering "unconditional discussions" with the "governments concerned" when he had lost his war against the thirteen American colonies, while excluding Sam Adams, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and any other subject in rebellion against His Majesty's government.

Johnson got the answer he deserved from Hanoi and Peking. They called his speech what it was -- a fraud.

Meanwhile, on the level of action, Johnson continued to escalate the war as if his speech meant no more than his election propaganda. American bombers continued their "measured" dumping of napalm and high explosives on the villages of North Vietnam. Fresh contingents of Marines were landed, bringing the total number of American military "advisers" in South Vietnam to some 32,000.

What then was the essential meaning of Johnson's speech? It was war propaganda...a belated attempt to justify the military assault. Up to now, warmongers have considered it an essential part of the preparations for war to brain-wash the public in advance. Johnson apparently believed that world opinion, including American public opinion, could be flagrantly and contemptuously disregarded. The H-bomb more than outweighs what the world might think!

The result was a crisis. Allies as faithful as Wilson had nothing to sell. The American press was caught just as short. Even a sector of the American capitalist class had grave doubts. That was why, two months after launching the war, Johnson had to reconsider and at least make a propagandistic gesture of favoring peace.

ALGERIAN ROLE IN ATTEMPTED VIETNAM NEGOTIATIONS

[The following editorial, indicating the position of the Algerian government in relation to the crisis precipitated by the U.S. attack on North Vietnam, appeared in the April 8 issue of the Algiers daily Le Peuple. The editorial is of unusual interest because of its revelations concerning U Thant's efforts to open negotiations with Peking and Hanoi, using Algiers as an intermediary. The original title is "La contribution de l'Algérie pour un retour à la paix au Vietnam" (Algeria's contribution toward restoring peace in Vietnam). The translation is by World Outlook.]

* * *

On April 1, the Algerian chargé d'affaires at the UN, Hadj Benabdelkader Azzout, met Mr. Thant, secretary general of the United Nations. Although both of them maintained complete silence about the subject of their discussion, it was believed to be linked with Chou En-lai's trip to Algeria at the time and to the latest developments in the American aggression against Vietnam.

Tuesday [April 6], Mr. Bouattoura, the Algerian ambassador to the United Nations relayed a message from President Ben Bella to the secretary general of the United Nations and confirmed in a press release that Algeria had played the role of intermediary between China and U Thant, who is seeking to arrange a conference of all the interested parties in the problem of Vietnam.

Mr. Bouattoura, who held two conferences with the UN secretary general before leaving for Algeria, refused to reveal any details about the conferences.

President Ben Bella's message to the secretary general of the United Nations provided particularly important clarifications and specifications on the position of People's China with regard to the war being conducted by the USA against the Vietnamese people and on the means by which this conflict might be settled. The press and journalists have speculated considerably about the nature of President Ben Bella's message. Much of this lacks any foundation and some of it is obviously inspired by subjective considerations. As in the case of the firm and energetic position adopted by the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] during the national revolution [in Algeria], the government of People's China holds that the basic problem in Vietnam is clear and unmistakable.

In Vietnam a colonial war is being waged by the USA against a people who are seeking only to exercise their right to political and economic independence.

If the USA really wants to bring the war to an end, only one road is open: to negotiate with the Vietnamese revolutionists who

are fighting arms in hand.

No other power and no other country has any right to negotiate their fate except the Vietnamese people themselves.

Observers at the United Nations believe that Mr. Thant asked Mr. Bouattoura, before leaving for Algiers, to talk with the Chinese prime minister, to sound out what possibilities for success there might be in his taking a trip to the Far East, particularly to Peking and Hanoi.

But it was felt that it would be useless for the secretary general of the United Nations to undertake a trip to Peking and Hanoi. Because the solution to the problem of Vietnam is not to be found in either Peking or Hanoi but in Saigon; that is, between the Vietnamese people represented by the FNL [Front National de Libération] and the imperialist power combatting them.

The Vietnamese people have the right to ask, as a precondition, that their rights be recognized, that their revolutionary leaders be recognized as their representatives, and that the colonial nature of the problem and its meaning be recognized, and that any settlement of the war must necessarily be made with them.

The fact that revolutionary Algeria was chosen by the secretary general and People's China to undertake a responsibility that no other country of the third world was in position to assume, is to be noted.

Just as the Algerian people made recognition of their right to self-determination a condition "sine qua non" before any negotiations with France, so the Vietnamese have the right to do the same with the USA. It is now up to the USA to accept this and to enter into direct negotiations with the genuine representatives of the Vietnamese people, that is the FNL.

IS JOHNSON FOLLOWING IN FOOTSTEPS OF MIKADO?

[Owen Lattimore, at present a professor of Chinese studies at the University of Leeds in England, wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times (international edition of April 10-11), giving his views on the current situation in Vietnam. The letter, written the day after President Johnson's April 7 speech on the reasons for his war on North Vietnam is of interest as a sample of enlightened liberal opinion.

[Lattimore, one of America's outstanding authorities on China and Outer Mongolia, was singled out by the late Senator McCarthy as

one of his main targets in the great witch-hunt of the fifties. As a result, this intellectual, whose writings are of high order, although not Marxist, was driven into semiretirement and his name, once often seen in the U.S. press in relation to problems of Asia, now appears but rarely.

[Evidently as a precaution against the McCarthyites in the U.S., the editor of the New York Times, in publishing Lattimore's observations, identified him as "a former adviser to Chiang Kai-shek" but without specifying when this was. The text of Lattimore's letter follows.]

* * *

TO THE EDITOR:

The tragedy deepens. President Johnson's generosity and humanity carry conviction. But he has accepted the distorted policy of previous Administrations. Not a word to show that the people of North and South Vietnam are one people, fighting a civil war, though other nations are involved on both sides.

Instead we are told once more that Hanoi manipulates the Vietcong and Peking manipulates Hanoi. China is presented as the great menace looming behind Vietnam, as Japan once depicted Russia as the great menace looming behind China. Most fatal of all, America is exhorted to accept the mission, once claimed by Japan, to impose order in China.

Our march toward doom recalls that of Japan in the 1930's. Then Japan's slogan was the co-prosperity sphere -- and co-prosperity was to be whatever Japan said it was. Today we proclaim a free world -- and free is to be whatever we say is free.

Then Japan had set up in Manchuria a regime without popular support (though it fielded an army, under Japanese advisers), which Japan said represented the "kingly way." Today we act from behind a Government in South Vietnam which is without popular support, though it can line up some collaborators and can keep an army in the field, under American advisers. We say it represents the free world.

Then Japan would not permit reunion between Manchuria and the rest of China because Nanking was "not sincere" -- which meant that it would not knuckle under. Today we will not permit union between North and South Vietnam because Hanoi has not acknowledged that it has "got the message" -- the message to knuckle under.

Then Japan was consolidating Chinese nationalism under a pressure that made sure that, in the end, nationalism under Communist leadership would triumph over nationalism without Communism. We are doing the same thing.

Then it was essential to the Japanese calculation that China and Russia would not be able to compose their differences. Today we have made that our own calculation.

Then the Japanese Government, armed forces and university experts had more hard-fact information about China than any other country. They kept assuring the world that they knew what they were doing, that they were saving not only China but the rest of Asia from Communism (the domino theory of those days), and that other countries ought to accept Japan's judgment. But though the Japanese based their analysis on more known, tested, catalogued facts than anyone else could cite, they misunderstood what was going on and misjudged the essentials that make history.

It is the same with us today. We know the facts, we pile up the facts, we cite the facts, we turn on Kremlinologists and Pekinologists to expound the facts -- and yet we don't realize what's going on, we don't know what the score is. We are misjudging what goes into the making of history.

In the end, goaded by the failure of their creeping barrage of bombing and terror to numb the "lesser breeds without the law," the Japanese advanced to the final escalation. They bombed another country. Is that to be the end, or the beginning of the end, for America too?

Is the next Pearl Harbor to be an American bombing of China? Is that the meaning of the smooth, cold, authoritative, hypnotically evasive voices of McGeorge Bundy, Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara, and the imperfectly civilianized Gen. Maxwell Taylor?

One difference between Japan then and America now is that we are more free to protest. We must use that freedom. Between here and the Pacific Coast I have heard and read enough to know that many have been ahead of me in raising their voices and many of them are more influential than I.

But unless we all unite in a great outcry of horror, repudiating this obsessed policy of doom, we shall not waken from the nightmare in time.

OWEN LATTIMORE
New York, April 8, 1965

FRAMED UP CHINESE FREED IN BRAZIL

The frame-up of nine Chinese victims in the nation-wide witch-hunt following the counterrevolutionary coup d'état in Brazil a year ago finally blew up when all of them were ordered freed April 7. They had been given ten-year sentences last December.

ON THE GUERRILLA STRUGGLE IN VENEZUELA

[The Leoni government has reported many times that the guerrilla movement in Venezuela has been successfully liquidated. The reports have proved to be considerably exaggerated. The guerrilla fighters continue to struggle on and are even able to report some gains.

[They face many difficult problems, however, which they have been discussing for some time. We have provided reports and translations of some positions and hope to continue to be able to do so.

[The following document is a translation of an article by Comandante Alfredo Maneiro, head of the "Manuel Ponte Rodriguez" guerrilla front. Maneiro is a well-known former student leader. His article appeared in the March 7 issue of Tribuna Popular, an underground publication of the Venezuelan Communist party, under the title, "Reflexiones Sobre Nuestra Lucha Guerrillera" (Reflections on Our Guerrilla Struggle).

* * *

Our war has been going on for some time and we can judge it now with more seriousness. At the beginning, and for a certain time, our attitude encountered lack of understanding, indifference and even hostility among vast sectors of the people whose active friendship is indispensable to us. This conflict also occurred within our party. Naturally, on being called to account, no one ventured or would still venture to question the road which the Venezuelan Revolution is compelled to take.

The illusion that revolutionary changes can be won without using the revolutionary means needed to impose them on such an obstinate enemy, never won any advocates. They discussed other things. They doubted that it was the opportune time to reply with arms to the official violence, they doubted that conditions were ripe; and they brought up in particular whether we really had the capacity to resort to this road.

This was the atmosphere in which our war was born. It was not born as a war of the masses. It came from a decision of the vanguard and we know that not everyone dedicated himself with the energy and enthusiasm that a decision of this kind demands.

At the time, in their audacity and steadfastness, those who saw most clearly posed the political problem as one of convincing the party and the people of the need for an armed struggle and of transforming our decision to fight into a mass movement. This political and ideological struggle had to be backed with actions and combats.

The military problem was posed as the need to form commands and fighters, to create the organizations to conduct war, and particularly to maintain ourselves and to survive once guerrilla actions were initiated. This military struggle had to be based on political clarification, on struggle against illusions and discouragement, and on the development of the popular movement (development of popular experience and consciousness).

In general the balance sheet of these efforts is positive. Things turned out well. Our capacity to maintain ourselves on this road and to survive has been proved. The question as to whether or not revolutionary conditions exist can now be considered from the position that our road is a good one, certain to bring these conditions closer in a country where absolutely only force can give a positive outcome to the conditions when they arise. The Venezuelan Revolution is now a practical problem.

If all this is correct, it must still be said that while these objectives have been achieved to a certain extent, they continue to be insufficient. To win the party and the people to the war has been accomplished. Now no revolutionist is satisfied with noting our capacity to survive or our steadfastness. Victory over encirclement cannot indefinitely be the lack of victory of the encirclement. Since the decision of the party and the people has been given and the capacity of the party and the people to struggle has been proved, it is now necessary to convince the party and the people of the need for victory. We cannot, and it is necessary to make this clear, reconcile an affirmation (which I believe in) that the guerrilla movement has gained a new dimension and that the war has risen to a higher level with the fact of the small advance in our combat capacity, with the backwardness and extreme limitation of our resources and equipment, with our extremely low technical level.

The problem is no longer one of making war. War is made with a duplicating machine and a rifle. The problem now is to win the war. And the war is won with broadcasting sets, thousands of rifles and many other arms.

From the viewpoint of a guerrilla fighter, it is sufficient in conducting the fight (and surviving for a long time in it) to know a zone, possess minimum equipment, maintain friendly relations with the population of the zone and have a certain capacity for tactical decisions. From the military point of view, to win the war it is necessary to know many zones, possess maximum equipment, bring the population into the battle, and have a certain capacity for strategic decisions.

The guerrilla struggle can create the situation but it cannot resolve the situation. Only when the guerrilla forces are transformed into their opposite, an army, does the perspective of struggle become converted into a perspective of victory. If this

is not understood, the danger exists of the guerrilla struggle not only stagnating but subsiding.

There are those who say that the enemy has the arms. This formula holds for the process as a whole; but to get the arms away from the enemy, you need something to get them with. A number of peasants, more than all the combatants on this front, are ready to join up and there is neither arms nor equipment for them. Recently a revolutionary leader of the trade-union movement was warning about the danger of the vanguard becoming separated from the masses, of posing things that were incomprehensible to them, of standing too far above their present level of consciousness. I don't believe that this is a danger, still less the situation. On the contrary, the problem of the popular movement in Venezuela is that of a vanguard, insufficient and incapable of satisfying the wishes and will for struggle of the masses. I am not sure if I am correct in this, but I understand that we would have no problem in finding capable hands at short notice to receive a considerable amount of arms. The same situation holds for the unfulfilled need for cadres and resources, etc.

I am convinced that our struggle is proceeding from a special impulsion that will bring us up to the level of the conditions that we have created or helped to create. And I believe that the fundamental part of this impulsion cannot be given from the field. It has to be resolved at the level of the national leadership. Special measures of a political, military and strategic character, of equipment and cadres, are necessary that can only be taken at that level. Only by mobilizing all our resources can we move ahead.

There is much today that has to change. We have to spur and shake up the party and the other revolutionary forces more vigorously even than when we decided to take the road of armed struggle. If we re-examine the distribution of cadres, the utilization of relations and conditions and the allotment of resources in the light of the necessity and possibility of victory, there is undoubtedly much that will have to be changed. And I hope that this will soon be done.

INTERVIEW WITH COMANDANTE YONG SOSA

[The following interview between a journalist and Comandante Yong Sosa, a guerrilla leader and head of the "Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre" (MR-13 de Noviembre -- Revolutionary Movement of November 13) was recorded in the Las Minas mountains of Guatemala. It was published in the March-April number of the Mexico City magazine Economía, from which we have translated it.]

* * *

Question: Is more than one group of guerrilla fighters being organized at present?

Answer: We have various groups in action at present. You will understand that we can't give you their exact location for obvious reasons. However, I can tell you that we have five guerrilla groups in different parts of the Republic, although some of them give the appearance of not being active. But it is in the department of Izábal that the guerrilla groups are the strongest.

Q: What happened in the town of Guacamayo?

A: It was something that happened August 27 at seven in the evening, approximately. It was an action -- like those I will tell you about later -- which the government has tried hard to keep from the public. In this action, we can inform you that the enemy suffered eighteen killed. This information is from a source that is completely trustworthy, since it was given by a person who is in direct touch with the army. In addition they suffered five seriously wounded and some with light wounds.

Q: Comandante Yong Sosa, could you tell us about how many casualties, both killed and wounded, the Movement and the army have suffered during the thirty months of guerrilla struggle?

A: On our side we have had seventeen killed and three seriously wounded. On the army side there have been 142 killed and 25 seriously wounded that we know about.

Q: In thirty months of struggle?

A: Yes, in thirty months. The figures have been verified through information coming from ambulance drivers, sentries, hospital workers, etc. It could be that the figure is higher. Among the casualties are chiefs, officers and soldiers of the army as well as of various repressive bodies.

Q: What can you tell us about the encounter at Mixco?

A: Things at Mixco [Izábal], happened like this. A group of thugs came up here. The government had recruited them from the worst levels, thieves and murderers. They tried to make their way up the mountain, but they didn't succeed. One of our comrades let them have a shot and that was enough to set them running. There were about thirty of them. However, they passed the information on to the army, telling them about where they could find us. The army came up the mountain, looking for us, with modern equipment: automatic rifles, grenade launchers, submachine guns, light machine guns and mortars. We discussed what to do about this and decided to meet them. It was a contingent of approximately one hundred men. The combat was one of the longest we have experienced, lasting about three hours. I don't think there was so much shooting since the

invasion of Europe...but we went on firing away... (Yong Sosa turns to one of the guerrilla fighters). What time did the shooting begin? At two? No. In Mixco, when the army came up.

A guerrilla fighter: It began at three and ended about five thirty.

Comandante Yong Sosa: Then it was approximately two hours. In this encounter the army had five killed. But we weren't able to discover what they did with the bodies. They took their equipment back, but we don't know if they buried the bodies, threw them in the river or what they did to get rid of them.

In this operation an army major was wounded in the arm and another important thing was that when the combat began, approximately half of the soldiers refused to advance. They retreated. This proves that the soldiers didn't believe in fighting against the rebels. We believe -- to put it better, we are positively certain that they knew perfectly well that the struggle we are committed to is directly in their favor, because the soldiers are peasants. We don't mean that the soldiers didn't fight because of cowardice. No, by no means. But they knew that they were fighting against their own interests.

Q: Comandante, according to that, you would conclude that every peasant ought to be a guerrilla fighter.

A: That's what we're doing; we want to mobilize the masses of the whole country; we want, in other words, the masses of the whole country to participate directly in the revolutionary process. We must be clear about this. It's not a struggle of guerrilla fighters against the government but a struggle of the entire people of Guatemala against the existing social system.

Q: Comandante, I would like to ask you: in case the government decreed an amnesty, a complete pardon, especially for you, would you be willing to accept it?

A: On repeated occasions I have said that we cannot at all accept any kind of amnesty, since we are not struggling for personal advancement, but are struggling to transform nothing less than society. And we know that to transform society requires a struggle to the death against the social system reigning in Guatemala.

Q: Comandante, recently a series of terrorist acts that have occurred in the capital have been attributed to you. Did you have anything to do with these?

A: The truth is that none of our people have carried out any terrorist acts. That's not because we are against terrorism, but because we reject terrorism without a concrete political aim; that is, for example, unaccompanied by mass action, strikes, etc. We

know that terrorism is not the best way to give an impulse to the revolution; terrorism in itself is not going to change the situation. Unless terrorism has a political aim, in place of being supported by the people, it is disapproved and repudiated.

Q: Are there any differences at present between the MR-13 and the PGT [Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo]?

A: We have some differences with the Communist party, but principles are at the bottom of the quarrel that has arisen. Perhaps you've read an open letter that our friends of the PGT sent us. The problem is that we are not in agreement on what kind of revolution must be made in Guatemala. The PGT advocates a national democratic revolution and the MR-13 de Noviembre is convinced that conditions do not exist for a national democratic revolution; that is that workers and peasants should be represented in the government along with the bourgeoisie. Because you can't put a dog and a cat in the same box. They won't get along. How could a government like that function? That is, it would be a coalition between the workers, the peasants and the bourgeoisie.

Q: Comandante, you said a national democratic revolution.

A: That's what they say, the PGT.

Q: That's what the letter said, then. Right?

A: The letter, all their documents, like Nuestras Ideas (Our Ideas), and their journals Verdad (Truth), El Militante (The Militant), Vanguardia Obrera (Workers' Vanguard). In all of them they say the same thing. We believe that in these circumstances the bourgeoisie can no longer play any role (pause). Imagine a case like this: if the Padilla brothers were revolutionists -- let's say of the PNR 44 -- and as a real joke they were given representation in the Frente Unico de Resistencia [FUR] which would be in charge of all the politics of the struggle, and we here would have to adjust ourselves to the Padillas against the peasants. This is a concrete case to bring out the thesis that the bourgeoisie...

Q: Cannot play any role.

A: Exactly.

Q: In a workers and peasants government, what role would the army play?

A: As an institution the army would have to disappear. That's logical.

Q: Total abolition. Right?

A: I believe that this question can make the army jump out

of its skin. We have to bring some clarity into this, because that's the way it's going to be. I know that when I answer that question, the high command is going to get out a circular with copies for all the officers. "Look, they're going to kill you; they're going to liquidate all of you." So we have to clear it up.

Q: They're going to exploit this in their way, certainly.

A: It has to be cleared up so that the enemy can't exploit it. For example, to answer the question, we must first examine the role played by the army in Guatemala. I can remember when they said here that the army existed to defend our "territorial integrity" and to defend our "legally constituted government." And they repeated this every day in the barracks. Does the army carry out this role? It does not. Fifty years have passed without a war with anyone, and the possibilities for a small country to wage war are constantly diminishing. There's no reason to believe there'll be wars with Central America and still less with Latin America. In addition, imagine the case of an international war. It won't be the army that will do the fighting. What they'll do is decree general mobilization and it will be the peasants, the workers and the students who will really be sent to the front.

Q: They will recruit people. Right?

A: That's right. In addition the army injures the country's economy, taking men away from the fields to put them in barracks. To defend the country and to defend the government, it is sufficient to have workers and peasants militia. Consequently we won't try to liquidate the army physically, but as an institution, with the aim of saving the millions of quetzales that are spent in the national defense budget and using the money in a better way, for schools, highways, public health, etc. In order to definitively resolve Guatemala's problems, we must clearly understand that the present army must be demobilized, so it can disappear as an institution. Because what would happen in the event of genuinely free elections? Why the president would remain as president and would stop ending up as a refugee (general laughter). I would also like to say this, since we're talking about the army: that every soldier, every officer, and every chief should start thinking over the fact that what is developing in Guatemala is not a military struggle, but a social struggle, and we don't believe that we're going to defeat them only with guerrillas. No. The guerrilla fighters are only a kind of exponent of the mobilization of the masses, of the workers and peasants.

Q: Is there sympathy in the army for the Movement?

A: Among the young officers there is a certain uneasiness and I am sure that we will win them as individuals to the Movement. A lot of uneasiness has been noted among them. I wouldn't say that about the soldiers, since it's the families of the soldiers who are

sending them all the news about how the Movement is doing and raising their consciousness. We are already organizing soldiers' committees. The organization of soldiers' committees is not a move to take over the barracks. It's to raise the consciousness of the soldiers themselves.

Q: Apropos of that, I'd like to ask another question about what we were discussing last night on the support of the population. You referred to support by the families?

A: I would be interested -- I would very much like to have you hear the tapes we have taken at meetings with the peasants in many villages that we have visited.

Q: That would be interesting!

A: You're going to hear the discussions. All that we have talked about here is on tape. It's the same, the proposals about struggle, etc.

Q: That you have to take power to make radical changes, to transform the economic and social life of the country?

A: Yes, that's right. Because if you don't make radical changes it's better not to do anything.

Q: Is this a struggle for a caudillo [leader]?

A: It has nothing to do with advancing any single man. We are trying to form a homogeneous team as the basis for a government and the organs of dual power of the workers and peasants, like we speak about in our program. This is the aim. Also that the peasants themselves, the workers themselves, should govern -- govern themselves. Is this clear about the government? You asked me if it was for a caudillo? That doesn't work. Perhaps forty or fifty years ago this business of one man might have worked. Today it's a question of a team.

Q: What do you think of the candidate of the URD Pancho Villagrán Kramer?

A: Look, he's my friend. But I don't think ten Panchos could resolve the problems the way things are. In case he did win out, Villagrán Kramer would try very courageously to resolve the problems, and the next day he would be in Costa Rica. They would throw him out of the country.

Q: And if he gets the right group to support him?

A: That's the way those who are for the legal road think. It won't solve anything. For example, perhaps no one has ever come to the presidency with as much popular support as Juan Bosch in

Santo Domingo. Overnight, they gave him the boot -- the same as Goulart. He had good intentions and he tried to solve the problems, but he couldn't. He ran up against the interests of imperialism and imperialism said, "Give this devil a kick," and, wham! It was to Puerto Rico I believe they expelled him. Goulart, in Brazil, carried out some agrarian reforms and then this Castello Branco in the army gave him the boot. In short, you can't settle anything with elections.

Q: A socialist regime is needed, then?

A: Yes, that's it exactly.

GUERRILLA FRONT ACTIVE IN PERU

LIMA -- In the first part of March, the oligarchy's daily papers reported some news that was partly accurate. It dealt with the existence of a revolutionary center in the zone of La Convención, located in a strategic place called "Mesa Pelada" in the district of Echarate.

The truth is that this zone, known among the revolutionists as Illary Chasca ("Estrella del Amanecer"), is held by the first real guerrilla group to appear in the country. It has taken the name of "Guerrilla Pachacutec."

It is composed of some dozens of men, most of them peasant, student and workers' leaders, headed by Luis de la Puente Uceda, general secretary of the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario -- Left Revolutionary Movement].

A 38-year-old lawyer, Luis de la Puente is a well-known leader of the revolutionary movement who left the APRA [Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana] when it became an ally of the oligarchy and a faithful servant of imperialism.

For about a year, Luis de la Puente and the leaders collaborating with him have been in this zone, organizing a revolutionary base which now has strong influence throughout La Convención and the adjoining areas like Lares, Ocobamba, Lucumayo, Urubamba and even the departments of Puno and Apurimac. In this center of revolutionary work, peasant union leaders receive political as well as military training.

The development of the organization was made possible thanks to the support of the peasants in the area. They have had enough of promises to solve the agrarian problem. They have learned through direct experience that a genuine agrarian reform can be accomplished

only by the peasants themselves. Having experienced continual police violence, the perversion of justice, the farce of Popular Cooperation and the colonial nature of the infamous Peace Corps, they understand clearly that armed struggle, beginning with guerrilla fighters, is the only road to definitively eradicating the exploitation and misery which are constantly growing worse in the highlands of the country.

Some months ago one of the hacendados [big landholders] of the region reported the continual transit of men and equipment toward the zone. The Guardia Civil, the PIP [Policía de Investigaciones Peruanas], and the Servicio de Inteligencia then launched investigations. On two occasions they sent patrols to reconnoiter, but they did not discover a trace of the revolutionists. The topography of the zone is wild and covered with vegetation, permitting those who know it to hide out, change location and cover up their tracks in this region where even the paths are difficult to follow.

Despite the previous failures, a company of the Guardia Civil is again trying to penetrate the "Illary Chasca." About one hundred men of the Cuerpos Especiales [Special Bodies] of the Guardia Civil are engaged in this operation. They are carrying the most modern equipment in anticipation of any kind of emergency.

During their investigations in the area, the repressive forces subjected the inhabitants to all kinds of pressure, including prison and torture, in their efforts to compel the peasants to help them liquidate the revolutionary group. But the peasants refused to be intimidated. They have suffered brutal police repression on previous occasions and still remember with bitterness the massacre at the Chaulay bridge in which dozens of peasants were murdered and their bodies thrown into the river. (It is still not known how many were killed on that fateful afternoon in December 1962.) Participation in union struggles by the peasants of La Convención still means prison sentences, continual attacks, requisitions and police persecution.

Many of the leaders sought by the police are now part of the Guerrilla Pachacutec. The main collaborators of Luis de la Puente, they are intimately linked with the peasantry of the valley who recognize them as the men who have sacrificed everything for the liberation of their brothers. Because of all this, the Guerrilla Pachacutec can count on the solidarity, the sympathy and hopes of thousands of peasants in the region.

The police have converted the whole area into a military zone. The Cuzco-Huadquiña-Quillabamba road is closely guarded as are all possible routes leading to the Mesa Pelada. The objective is to encircle the zone and at the same time launch a main attack force and liquidate the guerrilla fighters militarily.

But the guerrilla forces are able to follow the troop move-

ments perfectly and are prepared to confront the repressive forces with the advantage offered by the wildness of the region they hold.

Meanwhile the social crisis engendered by the failure to solve the agrarian problem is constantly growing sharper. The big peasant movement around economic demands which shook the region two years ago, is again stirring. This time it has armed backing such as it has not had before.

Cuzco, and particularly La Convención, are again becoming the axis of the social revolution in Peru.

"IZVESTIA" CENSORS SARTRE

The process of "de-Stalinization," introduced in the Soviet Union by Khrushchev, has led to many welcome changes from the viewpoint of the working class. But the rule of the bureaucratic caste remains basically unchanged, and many of the revolting customs of Stalin's day have undergone but little modification.

One of these is censorship -- a censorship that even extends to loyal friends and defenders of the Soviet Union. A current example is provided by the handling of Jean-Paul Sartre's explanation of why he cancelled an opportunity to make a tour of the United States. Sartre's explanation contains strong denunciation of the American aggression in North Vietnam. [See World Outlook April 9.]

It was translated and printed in the April 6 issue of Izvestia -- but with an amputation. This was the first paragraph of Sartre's answer to the question: "Certain newspapers say that you are more willing to condemn the Americans than the Soviets."

"In view of the facts, that's a straight lie," responded Sartre. "Together with Merleau-Ponty, in my magazine Les Temps Modernes, I condemned the Stalinist labor camps when their existence was proved. I violently condemned the Soviet intervention in Budapest in an interview in Express of which the gist was reproduced in most dailies."

Sartre then went on to explain that despite his criticisms, he did not equate the two camps of "the East and the West." "It is necessary to know which side you are on," he said, "without losing sight of the critical judgment that is an intellectual's duty."

All of Sartre's statement supporting "the East" was printed in Izvestia, except the paragraph recalling his condemnation of the Stalinist labor camps and Khrushchev's intervention in Budapest. "De-Stalinization" is a good thing -- but even Sartre should watch that tongue of his.

FIGHT CONTINUES TO FREE ALEXANDER ELEVEN

LONDON, April 7 -- The British Alexander Defence Committee met last night to consider its further course in light of the rejection by the South African court of the appeal of Dr. Neville Alexander and his ten co-defendants against the miscarriage of justice in their case.

The eleven political opponents of the apartheid system, including four women, were sentenced to terms up to ten years for their views, since no overt act was charged against them. They are now serving their sentences in the dungeons of South Africa. The seven men are confined in the notorious Robben Island prison where more than 1,000 political prisoners are reportedly being held.

The British Alexander Defence Committee came to the conclusion that the decision of the court rejecting the appeal of Dr. Alexander is unacceptable. It therefore passed a motion unanimously to keep up the fight to free the Alexander Eleven and to extend the work to include other victims of the apartheid system.

The means which the committee proposes to use were listed in their resolution as follows:

- (1) Continuing to publicise as widely as possible the case of Dr. Alexander and his colleagues who are serving long prison sentences under the notorious "Sabotage Law."
- (2) Exploring new legal avenues for their appeal and providing funds for their defence and the support of their families, as long as they are unable to do so.
- (3) Assisting the prisoners in any way possible to continue their studies.
- (4) Organising such actions as we are able, to compel the government of the Republic of South Africa to renounce its apartheid policies, to amnesty all political prisoners and ameliorate the unspeakable conditions under which political prisoners are held.
- (5) To assist, where possible, other victims of apartheid whose needs are brought to the attention of the committee.
- (6) To co-operate as closely as possible with all organisations in Britain and abroad who have similar aims.

This action by the British committee follows a similar decision by the Alexander Defense Committee in the United States.

The address of the British Alexander Defence Committee is as follows: Mrs. C. Kirkby, 27 Thursley House, Holmewood Gardens, London, S.W.2.

COMMITTEE OF NINE SCORED ON USE OF FUNDS

In a lengthy letter published in the March 11 issue of The Nationalist, an English-language daily printed in Dar es Salaam, L. Jipula of the Unity Movement, a federation of South African organizations, offers searching criticism of the Liberation Committee of Nine. This is the subcommittee set up by the Organisation of African Unity [OAU] to channel material aid to national liberation movements throughout the continent.

Jipula charges that only negligible aid is actually reaching those most in need of it.

"Having recently come from South Africa," he states, "I have an idea of the negligible trickle that has never reached that country apart from moneys that went to lawyers and this only in those cases that have received maximum publicity. I know for a fact of hundreds of freedom fighters who belong to organisations that have received assistance from Africa, Europe and elsewhere who were unable to have legal defence for lack of funds -- all because their cases did not hit the headlines of the enemy press. I am in a position to know this because I was myself directly involved in the defence of hundreds of these victims of tyranny in South Africa."

This has led "to cynicism on the part of the population there," continues Jipula, "which can only have adverse effects on the struggle as a whole. The attitude of the people towards the leaders outside South Africa is summed up in the words of one man who said, 'Every time the police here shoot down innocent people, moneys flow into the pockets of the leaders abroad. Money never comes home.'"

Jipula thinks that it is high time an investigation were begun:

"Indeed there is sufficient evidence to warrant an investigation into the activities of certain leaders; and the Committee of Nine, being an agency of the OAU, has both the means and the authority to do so. They are in a position, for instance, to be able to find out how much money each leader has received from Africa, Europe and elsewhere and how this money has been spent. This is possible because most of the money received is banked in one or other of the banks in various states in Africa. Through the banks it is possible to know how much of these moneys went to the place or origin of these leaders and how much has been banked in personal accounts."

Jipula notes the "anomaly" that one of the members of the Liberation Committee of Nine "is a very good friend of the South African fascist regime. I refer to Congo (Leopoldville). It is a notorious fact that members of Verwoerd's army, masquerading as mercenaries, have been seconded to go and fight side by side with

Tshombe's forces in their determination to crush the spirit of freedom in that unhappy country."

"It is this same Tshombe," observes Jipula, "who has to sit in judgment over the freedom fighters of South Africa. Is it a wonder then, that the major organisations in that country united under the Unity Movement and the All-African Convention have been refused assistance by the Committee of Nine! Let it be stated that from its inception in 1943, the Unity Movement earned the unbridled hatred of the imperialist as well as the herrenvolk press at home. For the first time in the 300 years of white domination, all the major progressive organisations, African, Coloured and Indian came together under one leadership and staked their claim to full political rights in the land of their forbears. They declared a policy of noncollaboration with the oppressor, which meant a complete rejection of all institutions created for an inferior race."

As a result of such figures as Tshombe sitting in the Committee of Nine, the hearings of this body have become available to the foes of Africa's freedom fighters. "It might surprise even some of the members of the Committee," declares Jipula, "to know that Verwoerd has printed in Afrikaans the minutes of the Liberation Committee of Nine. All the chiefs of the Special Branch have copies. When the officials and members of the organisations affiliated to the Unity Movement were interrogated under detention, they were confronted with these Minutes. The most painful thing worthy of mention here, is the devilish and cunning way the gendarmes used these minutes. They were not only able to confront our men with the precise utterances of their leaders before the Committee of Nine in order to extract from them further information concerning the plans of the organisation but could, with telling effect, jeer at them for being repudiated by those whom they have hitherto considered as their brothers in the struggle. This was calculated to produce the maximum state of demoralisation."

SIHLALI-MTSHIZANA TRIAL BEGINS

LUSAKA, Zambia -- News has been received here that the trial for Leo L. Sihlali, former president of the Unity Movement, and Louis L. Mtshizana, former chairman of the East London branch of the Society of Young Africa, was set for April 5 and has presumably begun. It was scheduled in the Regional Magistrate's Court in Port Elizabeth, a distance of several hundred miles from their homes.

Both men face charges of attempting to flee from their country.

In addition they are charged with leaving the magisterial

districts of Queenstown and East London respectively without authority, thus violating their banning orders which restrict them in freedom of movement, thought and association.

Mtshizana was placed under a five-year banning order in July, 1963, and confined to the magisterial district of East London. Sihlali was served with a similar banning order in March 1964. In addition, he was placed under house arrest, denied the right to receive visitors in his house, and confined to the magisterial district of Queenstown.

The two African leaders were arrested February 22 and have been held in prison since then. Bail of £500 posted by Mtshizana in a case pending appeal was estreated. The case followed his serving as an attorney for school boys charged under the Anti-Communist Act.

The local magistrate sentenced him to two years for his temerity in appearing as defense counsel.

THE ZACA, ZULU AND NYAKENI CASES

LUSAKA, Zambia -- The fascist government of South Africa is continuing to persecute members of organisations affiliated to the Unity Movement. The leaders are served with bannings, house arrests, detention and imprisonment. Rank-and-file members are similarly made to feel the cruel hand of the Verwoerd machine.

Three recent cases involve members of the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa [APDUSA], one of the affiliates of the Unity Movement. Last January, to gain temporary relief from persecution, they went to Basutoland, but were soon thrown in jail in Maseru. They were brought into court March 16 and their cases are still pending. The three are Mr. Zaca, Mr. Zulu and Mr. Benedict Nyakeni. Their backgrounds are as follows:

Zaca: A worker holding membership in the Durban branch executive of APDUSA. He was very active in opposing the implementation of apartheid measures in the town locations, including the order to remove 10,000 people from Magaba township near Isipingo to Durban, Natal Province. His political activities included organisational work among the peasants in the Matatiele and Umtata districts of the Transkei which he toured on behalf of APDUSA.

Zulu: A peasant from Pondoland, arrested and imprisoned during the peasant revolt in 1960. In September 1964 he was again arrested, detained and subjected with four others to police terror in Bizana (Pondoland).

Benedict Nyakeni: A member of the executive of the Durban branch of APDUSA. A worker for fifteen years in Durban, he was an active organiser in Matatiele, working in close collaboration with Mr. Zaca.

SECRET ARREST OF GCABASHE

LUSAKA, Zambia -- The whereabouts of P. Gcabashe have finally been learned. He was secretly arrested by the political police of the Verwoerd government and is now presumably in a Grahamstown jail.

A full-time organiser of the Unity Movement and a member of the Head Unity Committee, he was visited by agents of the Special Branch last December. A little later he disappeared.

Frantic pleas to the police by his wife, who is the chairman of the Kingsly branch of the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa [APDUSA], an affiliate of the Unity Movement, were not given even the courtesy of a reply.

Gcabashe finally managed to get word out that he had been taken by the Special Branch and locked up in a Bizana (Pondoland) jail under Proclamation 400 (an emergency measure that does away with the rule of law in the Transkei). He had been told that he was to be transferred to a Grahamstown jail.

An elderly teacher of great courage, Gcabashe played an important role in opposing the diabolical system of Bantu Education. The Native Affairs Department, which controls education for Africans, retaliated by making it impossible for him to work any longer as a teacher. He had but two years to go before his pension.

Gcabashe then devoted himself completely to the struggle for liberation. He helped organise the people against removal from Northern Natal to Monalo. When others finally gave up under the fearful pressure, he refused to move. Despite police terror and intimidation, he continued to work with Dr. A. I. Limbada, treasurer of the Unity Movement now in exile, until Dr. Limbada was banned, gagged and confined.

The political police have subjected Gcabashe to all sorts of pressure, from brute force to inducements and promises of release if he will agree to betray his comrades. He has remained steadfast and unyielding.

"A GIRL JUST LIKE ME"

By Evelyn Sell

America's advertising apartheid has been dented in the last several years. For many years some soft-drink and tobacco companies used Negro models in Negro-oriented media. Negro magazines, newspapers and posters in Negro neighborhoods have used Negro models also. The startling innovation during the last few years has been the use of Negro models in the white-oriented media of national television commercials and magazines. Some local newspapers have begun using Negro models in clothing advertisements directed toward the general public.

In 1963 some of the large soap producers began using Negro models in television commercials boosting soap products and personal care items. In 1964, for the first time, fifty to sixty department stores across the country used mannequins with Negro coloring and features in window displays. Some government agencies like the Peace Corps, city police departments, corporations and non-profit charitable agencies have used Negroes in posters and brochures designed to recruit personnel and indicate equal employment practices.

Negro models are being increasingly used in promotional campaigns and in major fashion shows. Negro models were featured in a recent cultural exchange program that sent American models and merchandise to Russia. Many of the large fashion houses of the United States and Europe are beginning to use Negro mannequins. There were Negro fashion models in the annual fashion show staged by DuPont recently for more than 200 fashion editors.

These departures from the traditional "whites only" world of national advertising was termed a "quiet aspect of America's racial revolution" by the Michigan Chronicle, the largest Negro newspaper in the state. In an October 24, 1964, article the Chronicle noted, "White reaction has been small to the new innovation, and mostly favorable.

"It just seems accepted," according to Henry J. Kaufman, an independent ad man. "It creates a better degree of naturalness... and besides, a Negro, like everybody else, wants to see how he'll look in a suit of clothes or behind the wheel of his car."

In this last remark, the independent ad man reveals one of the major factors involved in the new use of Negro models -- the growing power of the Negro market. John H. Johnson, Negro president of the Johnson Publishing Company, listed some important facts in a speech before some 500 magazine circulation executives [reported in the February 28, 1965, New York Times]. Mr. Johnson told his audience, "At this very moment there are more than 20 million American

Negroes who control more than \$25 billion a year in consumer purchasing power."

Mr. Johnson compared this statistic on the expanding Negro market to other rich sources of American profits and concluded that the Negro market represents a growth potential equal to the whole of Western Europe. He pointed out that without a "real confrontation" with the Negro market, maximum profit is impossible for American business. A weighty point with America's profit-hungry companies.

In his talk Mr. Johnson stated that both American advertisers and the Negro market had been victimized by misconceptions about the character and needs of Negro consumers. But these misconceptions were "rapidly dissolving in the crucible of cash-register sales."

"What we call the American market," Mr. Johnson pointed out, "is, in reality, two major markets -- separated, unfortunately, and, we hope, temporarily, by caste-like barriers of race." It is now time for American advertisers to show those qualities "we think of as peculiarly American -- openness of heart and mind, inventiveness, ingenuity, and above all, a willingness to confront new elements of a changing situation and to move with the grain of the times. . ." (!)

He urged the advertisers, "In order to sell the customers in this market, we must revamp our entire advertising approaches and enter imaginatively into their lives. Above all else, we must approach them as human beings with human hopes and dreams and aspirations."

Equality in being fleeced by the smart advertising operators -- that's what is being offered the Negro market by the men who have their eyes on the cash-register sales.

Civil-rights organizations have taken advantage of American business greed in order to push for more opportunities for Negroes. The Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] has threatened to call up nation-wide boycotts of various products if Negroes are not reflected in general audience commercial advertising. During 1963 CORE was negotiating with thirty-six different companies and was able to make agreements for integrated advertising with fourteen of them. These fourteen companies represented an annual \$350,000,000 in television advertising.

A CORE representative stated, "Originally we had been prepared to use selective purchasing as a weapon in our campaign but when several companies integrated their advertising without being approached, we knew it would not be necessary."

Although advertising apartheid has been dented, it has not been conquered by any means. It still strikes the American eye as something a little unusual to see Negro models in television, news-

papers, magazines and posters. The following incident, reported in the Michigan Chronicle article cited above, is still a sad-but-true commentary on the use of Negro models in national and local advertising media:

"One of the effects of the use of the Negro in advertising is illustrated by the Negro housewife. She said she rushed into her living room when her daughter screamed, 'Mommy, Mommy, come quick! Look, Mama, there's a little girl just like me.' She was pointing to a Negro child appearing in a toothpaste commercial."

There will have to be a lot more pressure and a lot more changes before that little Negro girl will not be surprised by the sight of a "girl just like me."

CLASH WITH FASCISTS IN STREETS OF VIENNA

VIENNA -- For the first time since the end of Nazi rule in 1945, Austrian fascists were in the streets here March 31 in a mob of 1,000, out to break up an antifascist demonstration. Armed with knives, tear-gas, stink bombs, bicycle chains and even explosives, they wounded several demonstrators and killed a 67-year-old working-class functionary, Ernst Kirchweger, a member of the Communist party of Austria.

The origin of the street battle is significant. For some time antifascist groups have been campaigning for the ouster of one Professor Taras Boradajkewycz from the Vienna College for World Trade. The 62-year-old professor, a self-avowed former member of the Nazi's, the SA and the SS, has been openly propagandizing for the Nazi regime, sounding many fascist and anti-Semitic themes in his classes.

The Social Christian minister of education procrastinated. The Austrian Resistance Movement, an antifascist organization with a following of left-socialist trade unionists, Socialist youth, Communist workers and radical-minded students, organized several protest demonstrations. The March 31 rally was the second one. Between 4,000 and 5,000 people participated in it.

A neofascist student organization, inspired by former members of the SA and SS, decided to organize a counterdemonstration under excuse of defending "academic freedom." The real nature of this assemblage was clear from the slogans alone. For the first time in twenty years, the streets of Vienna echoed to shouts of "Death to the Jews," and "Puppets of the Jews." Some of the armed neo-Nazis even shouted, "Long live Auschwitz!" [one of Hitler's extermination camps].

The police did little, many of the officers indicating sympathy with the neofascists.

The murder of Ernst Kirchweger, the first working-class militant to be killed by Austrian fascists since the Nazi regime was toppled, aroused deep feelings among the Austrian working class.

The left wing of the Socialist party has called for protest strikes and for the formation of an antifascist workers' self-defense organization. These proposals are now being discussed in the plants and in the Socialist party.

So high did indignation mount that the reformist leadership of the Austrian Trade Union Federation proclaimed a general strike April 5 to protest the murder of Ernst Kirchweger. They showed their stripe, however, by limiting the strike to five minutes!

The reformist leadership of the Austrian Social Democracy is caught between the pressure of workers in favor of energetic reaction against the neofascists, and some miserable electoral maneuvers. Jonas, the Social Democratic mayor of Vienna, is scheduled to run against a Social Christian candidate in the coming presidential elections. The electoral strength of both parties is about the same. The brain trust in the Socialist party headquarters fear that the neofascists might vote against Jonas if stiff action should be taken against them. The Social Christians, moreover, are openly wooing the neo-Nazis. Fascist Professor Boradajkewycz, who triggered off the present crisis, boasts of protection in the "highest circles" of the Social Christian party.

On the other hand, feelings are running so high among the workers that a vigorous campaign in favor of self-defense guards in the factories and working-class districts would prove attractive to many Catholic workers, drawing them toward the Socialists.

But such a course is not to be expected from the class-collaborationist, ultra-reformist leaders of the present Austrian Socialist party. In comparison to them, even the centrist Austro-Marxist leaders of the pre-1934 Socialist party look like ultra-lefts.

BEN BELLA COMMUTES AIT AHMED DEATH SENTENCE

On April 12, just two days after a revolutionary court had condemned Hocine Ait Ahmed and Mohammed Ben Ahmed to death for an attempted counterrevolution which cost a number of deaths in the Kabylie, Ben Bella exercised executive clemency and commuted the sentences to life imprisonment. Ait Ahmed was an early leader of the Algerian revolution imprisoned with Ben Bella for six years. The decision was taken as proof of the strength of Ben Bella's regime.

ONCE AGAIN -- THE SLL AND VIETNAM

By Joseph Hansen

In a previous article [see World Outlook March 26], I called attention to the sluggish way in which the leadership of the Socialist Labour League reacted to the opening of the war on North Vietnam by U.S. imperialism, and suggested that this was a second case in recent months of the SLL yielding to imperialist pressure. One of the leaders of this generally ultraleftist British organization, Cliff Slaughter,* has attempted an answer in the April 3 issue of The Newsletter.

The reply is of abysmal mediocrity. The author makes no attempt to consider the issues. He seeks, instead, to evade them, to cover up the facts and to deafen the audience by shouting "outrageous lies and slanders." He even entitled his article, "HANSEN'S BIG LIE."

To begin with, let me recall that I expressed the hope that under criticism the leaders of the SLL would correct their course. I stated: "Even at this late date, we should be most happy to see them open up a campaign against American aggression in North Vietnam, with particular attention to the real role of the Wilson government."

They appear now to be making the effort. In the March 26 issue, The Newsletter elevated the U.S. war against North Vietnam from a routine minor place to a central position in the news of the week. The April 3 issue announced that they succeeded in getting together "over 300 Young Socialists" from "London, the Midlands, Yorkshire and South Wales" to join "2,000 members of the Indian Workers Association" who were marching in London against the jailing of Communists in India and in favor of "the restoration of civil rights" in that country. After participating in the march of the Indians and attending a meeting protesting the violation of civil liberties in India, the Young Socialists went to an SLL meeting to protest the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. While the report in The Newsletter indicates that the parade of 2,000 members of the

*A brief biography of Slaughter appeared in the January 2, 1965, Newsletter under the headline, "Cliff Slaughter to work full-time for SLL." We are told that besides remaining in the Communist party from an early age until after the Hungarian events of 1956, when he began to move in the direction of Trotskyism, he is a Cambridge man who became a Leeds University lecturer, a post he is now leaving. We utilize the occasion to offer our congratulations to Slaughter for his decision to join the ranks of full-time revolutionists, although we must say that the headline about it in The Newsletter is something of a journalistic curiosity like: "48-YEAR-OLD MAID GETS MARRIED."

Indian Workers Association was aimed at pressuring the Congress government in India to release the more than 1,000 political prisoners in dungeons there, the headline over the article reads, "3,000 MARCH AGAINST VIETNAM WAR and imprisonment of Indian Communists." (The difference in type face appears in the original.)

What led the leaders of the SLL to decide to try to break out of their rut and have The Newsletter give the Vietnam events the special prominence they deserve is not clear, since if any self-criticism was made, they have kept it to themselves. Perhaps the use of gas by the Pentagon shocked them, as it did others in Britain, to realization of the importance of the situation; or perhaps they suddenly became concerned over the possibility of being outflanked from the left on this issue by figures like Bertrand Russell, who saw the need to speak out and go into action; or, in their own way, they may have responded to criticism from some source or other. Whatever the reasons, we repeat that we are glad to see the SLL make an attempt to join the rest of the international socialist and radical movement in placing the struggle against American aggression in North Vietnam at the top of the agenda where it belongs. Let us hope that this is not a mere spasmodic action. There is every reason to close ranks in face of the common enemy in this grave crisis.

The Qualitative Turn in Vietnam

Let us turn now to Slaughter's apologia. It was the position of the Fourth International from the time it happened that the bombings of North Vietnam, carried out February 7 and 8 under orders from President Johnson, marked a qualitative turn in the long, bloody intervention of American imperialism in the civil war in South Vietnam. This conclusion was reached by many others who saw that the American move toward the north was aimed not only at the Democratic Republic of Vietnam but at the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union, Cuba, and, indeed, the freedom struggle throughout the world; and that it posed the clear threat of ending in the catastrophe of nuclear war.

The SLL leaders, however, gave no evidence of a similar assessment. They continued as if they had failed to recognize a qualitative change in the situation.

What little they did print in their press about the war in Vietnam was not basically wrong -- there was no conscious betrayal. But the articles on this topic declined and even vanished from the official organ of the SLL precisely as the American bombers extended and increased their forays, the "escalation" rose, and the world crisis deepened. This sag and collapse in propaganda constituted a grave default in leadership, occurring as it did at a crucial time. It was this that I called attention to and sought to explain as due to acceptance of Wilson's estimate of the lack of gravity of the

situation despite the SLL's opposition to Wilson's policies.*

Didn't Omit "All Mention"

In trying to answer, Slaughter follows a curious procedure. He goes down the list of facts I cited from successive issues of The Newsletter, showing the way the handling of Vietnam was subordinated to other topics and the way the world crisis was played down, and displays astonishment that there should be any criticism. In the March 6 and 13 issues, where not a single article on the Vietnam crisis appeared, Slaughter seeks to apologize by pointing to the fact that mention of Vietnam could be found by carefully searching other articles. (He says it is a "lie that we omitted all mention of the struggle in Vietnam"; but I didn't say "mention." I called attention to the absence of articles.) In other words, instead of admitting how wrong The Newsletter was in losing its usually strident voice in face of the flare-up of perhaps the greatest crisis since the end of World War II, he finds nothing wrong with the judgment of the editors in curtailing their handling of the war in Vietnam

*Slaughter shows little restraint in distorting what I said. On this particular point the distortion is particularly bad. "Our readers," says Slaughter, "will be amazed to learn that The Newsletter and the Socialist Labour League have capitulated to imperialism over the war in Vietnam, and that, in particular, we 'accept Wilson's view of the reality as not inaccurate. . . ." The phrase ascribed to me is torn from the following: "By depreciating the colonial revolution, they are led to concede greater possibilities than are open to Peking and Moscow in meeting the demands of American imperialism. By believing it is possible for the two bureaucracies to get away with a crass sell-out in Vietnam -- and that this will satisfy the ravenous appetite of U.S. imperialism! -- they come to the position that the danger of a chain reaction in Vietnam, leading to another world war, is not too great. In brief, their course of action shows that they accept Wilson's view of the reality as not inaccurate, whatever they may think of his policies, and that they therefore believe the whole question of American aggression in Vietnam is not as important as, say, the struggle for immediate higher, back-dated old-age pensions in Britain. Ultraleftism thus displays its opposite side, opportunism."

Instead of attempting to answer this argumentation based on the hard evidence of what had (and had not) appeared in The Newsletter, Slaughter chose to distort what I said, tearing a single phrase out of context and making me appear to accuse the SLL leaders of committing something worse than is indicated in my carefully weighed statement. He did not learn such methods in the school of Trotskyism!

and tries to brazen it out by shouting, "Liar!" at their critic.*

Slaughter inadvertently reveals that he is perfectly aware of the lapse of the SLL press in the Vietnam situation:

"We understand very well that the kind of politics engaged in by Hansen and his friends measures everything in terms of column inches; but we must inform him that The Newsletter is not just a weekly commentary, it is an organiser of thousands of workers and it will be judged by the success of that active movement."

Slaughter says again: "His [Hansen's] 'fight' on Vietnam is entirely a question of writing articles, but for us it is above all a question of building the real movement to smash the imperialist governments which carry through the colonial wars."

In plain language, The Newsletter did not have many column inches or many articles on Vietnam in the most crucial weeks; this topic was admittedly pushed out of the center of attention and even reduced to merely passing mention; but this default was all right because The Newsletter, you see, is "an organiser of thousands of workers"! It is only peculiar to the "kind of politics engaged in by Hansen and his friends" to expect something better.

Pigeonhole Thinking

Slaughter thus drives a wedge between propaganda and organization, and downgrades revolutionary-socialist propaganda as if it were in contradiction to organizing workers. This may be what Slaughter learned in practical experience at Leeds University, at Cambridge and in his formative years in the Communist party before 1956. But such a vulgar empiricist concept has nothing in common with the school of Trotskyism. Slaughter, unfortunately, still displays all too many vestiges of his training under bad teachers.

It is true that in our times we have seen instances where revolutionary movements have moved ahead and even won power despite propaganda that was in contradiction to the inherent logic and ultimate aims of the mass struggle. The victories in Yugoslavia and China are outstanding examples. The latest one, a most impressive

*In another instance, Slaughter says that Hansen "omits to mention that this same front-page article [in the March 20 issue of The Newsletter] puts the same demands which he called 'correct' a month earlier." Slaughter is blinded by his eagerness to prove me a liar. I not only stated specifically that "The article ends with a paragraph repeating the slogans issued by the 'International Committee!"; I added that "The author, Robert James, is to be congratulated for his diligence in getting them in the same order as the official statement." Is Slaughter as careless as this about the facts in all his writings, or was his misrepresentation deliberate?

instance, is Cuba although this case is considerably different since the leadership was an honest one and moved toward revolutionary-socialist positions during the course of the revolution itself. But it is a gross departure from the concepts of revolutionary socialism to either advocate or justify conducting propaganda in contradiction to revolutionary action.

The reason for this is the enormous role which political consciousness plays in a socialist revolution. The higher the level of consciousness among the revolutionists and the vanguard of the working masses, the easier becomes the revolutionary victory. The written and spoken word are intimately linked with organization and action, the two sides of the process being bound up with the aims established in successive stages of the revolutionary process.

That is why Trotsky, for one, put such stress on correct and effective propaganda, particularly at crucial turns in the world situation. He taught us that a few days at a moment like the opening of a war can outweigh years of ordinary events in the life and development of a revolutionary party. Such moments test the capacities of a revolutionary leadership, above all its independence and its ability to judge reality correctly in the heat of the class struggle.

Is it so difficult to understand what is involved? Let us take a case. It is Slaughter's boast that The Newsletter is "the organiser of thousands of workers." Good. On what issues is it organizing these thousands of workers? On the issues featured in the columns of The Newsletter. The editors, if they are to live up to revolutionary socialist principles, have no choice but to single out those issues that are of crucial importance to the working class.

It is true that considerable flexibility is demanded to meet the current level of consciousness of the workers -- on this the Trotskyist movement has much to offer, as is evidenced by the Transition Program and its development. Nevertheless, the duty to speak out and campaign in appropriate form on the substance of the crucial issues remains.

The opening of the U.S. war on North Vietnam was such an issue. It was an imperialist aggression against a colonial country; it was an imperialist attack aimed at the workers states; it offered the clear threat of escalating into a nuclear war, thereby involving the fate of all of humanity in the most literal sense. To this should be added the fear, horror, revulsion and indignation that swept the world, making the task of mobilizing the opposition easier. Even in Britain a cry of alarm was raised by such figures as Bertrand Russell. Yet in the face of this, The Newsletter acted as if it were paralyzed, incapable of responding to the events. Obviously it was time for someone to build a fire under the editor's chair.

Lots of Inches, Well Displayed

Having sought to justify giving only passing mention to Vietnam while the rest of the world shuddered at the prospect of going over the brink into a nuclear catastrophe, our newly fledged full-time leader of the SLL offers us a variant. The Newsletter was a bit short in column inches and articles for five crucial weeks? So what! You should see the March 27 issue "with its front page almost entirely devoted to the Vietnam war and notice of a public rally on the question in London."

To this we respond, as indicated above: Excellent! A most welcome change! We congratulate the editors, including Slaughter, for giving signs of life; and now that they are awake we hope they stay awake, although their erratic behavior leaves room for doubt that this will be the case. But what then becomes of the previous argument? Is the number of column inches and the number of articles and the way they are featured of importance after all? Then why the nonsense about its being a mark of a different "kind of politics" to judge the quantity of material and its placement as indicative of how a leadership sizes up a situation? Has Slaughter suddenly switched and gone over to that kind of politics? Or is it simply that any argument is good, no matter how contradictory, so long as Slaughter is the one who runs it through his typewriter?

The new argument about the lots of inches, well displayed, does not save the day for this attorney. He has simply escalated himself into new difficulties. In case he hasn't noticed, we call Slaughter's attention to the fact that once again the point of qualitative change rears its ugly head. What caused the editors of The Newsletter to suddenly switch and decide to give central place to the war in Vietnam after giving it merely passing mention? When did the qualitative point of change in the war occur that is reflected in this qualitative change in the amount and placement of propaganda?

Was it when the Pentagon began bombing North Vietnam; or, say, when the U.S. admitted using gas; or when Bertrand Russell made his eloquent denunciation of the Wilson government; or, perhaps, when the editor discovered flames arising around the seat of his chair?

If the qualitative point was February 7, then The Newsletter was wrong in the way it handled its propaganda at the outbreak of the crisis. This could only be due to an incorrect estimate of the situation, which must then be explained. If it was some other date, then the SLL leaders are guilty of failing to offer the revolutionary-socialist movement the correct date. They are guilty at the same time of failing to make public the analysis through which they arrived at that date, although the analysis is all the more important in view of the widespread conclusion, particularly outside of Britain, that it was the earlier date of February 7.

Now we come to the most devastating argument of all. Only a man with a Cambridge degree and much experience as a university lecturer could have thought it up. In response to our criticisms, he says, "You're another!"

Against our analysis of the reasons behind The Newsletter's yielding to imperialist pressure, Slaughter refers to accusations levelled by the SLL leaders against the Socialist Workers party which, he claims, show that it has "betrayed." The accusations really reflect the ultraleft position of the SLL leadership; but let us suppose that there were substance to them -- does this then justify the SLL yielding to imperialist pressure? It would seem wiser, and certainly much closer to Leninism, for the SLL leaders to seek the source of their own error in order to avoid repeating it again, instead of responding with a high-pitched scream: "So what, you're another!"

The Error in the Congo Crisis

As I indicated in my previous article, the SLL was guilty only a short time ago of yielding to imperialist pressure on a different occasion -- when the American and Belgian imperialists, with the aid of the Wilson government, attacked Stanleyville. An article in The Newsletter echoed the imperialist propoganda about the Congo freedom fighters shooting "helpless white and coloured women and children."

Ernest Germain drew attention to this shameful yielding to imperialist pressure. A small rectification then appeared in The Newsletter, blame for the error being pinned on the hapless author of the offending article. But no lessons were drawn on how it was possible for something as monstrous as that to have appeared in The Newsletter. It was simply swept under the rug; and a campaign was hastily opened against Germain. And, of course, since Germain is regarded as a main enemy of some concern from the ultraleft viewpoint of the SLL leaders, who look at the outside world as a reactionary mass with little to distinguish one part from another, they spared neither articles nor column inches on this foe even though much else of importance to the British working class had to go by the board.

When a second error occurred, this time in relation to Vietnam, another colonial area under attack from imperialism, it was legitimate to ask if there were not some relationship between the two errors. In the final analysis they would seem to have a common origin in the basic SLL position of minimizing the importance of the colonial revolution, the position that led them to split from the International Committee, to set up a rump committee composed of two sections of the International Committee, and to refuse to join in unifying the world Trotskyist movement. Is this right or wrong? Slaughter does not take up the question.

In fact, far from discussing the relation between the two errors, he denies there was any error in The Newsletter's handling of Vietnam and remains tight-lipped about the SLL yielding to imperialist pressure during the Congo crisis. By shouting about unrelated matters, he no doubt hopes to divert attention from the unsavory lapse that occurred during the Congo events. A full-time official in the SLL has his share of pettifogging duties it seems.

And the Other Half of the "International Committee"?

The SLL leadership, as we have seen, finally came around to the conclusion that it would be costly to continue relegating the war in Vietnam to such a low place in priorities as merely passing mention. But the SLL constitutes only half of the rump "International Committee," the other half being the Verité group in France.

In my previous article, I called attention to the strange silence of this half of the "International Committee" on the war in Vietnam. Does this group agree with the declaration on this subject published in the February 27 issue of The Newsletter under the name of the "International Committee"? Do they disagree? Why don't they translate it and print it in France? Are they ashamed of it?

Perhaps the French half of the "International Committee" is publishing hundreds of column centimeters, or distributing leaflets, or organizing rallies and making speeches about the situation in Vietnam. If so, why didn't Slaughter include this information among his boasts? Is he ashamed of what they're writing or saying or doing?

Unfortunately, there may be good reason for Slaughter's silence. He may not be hiding anything. He may just have nothing to report. Out of interest in the subject, we initiated inquiries but were unable to locate a single item on Vietnam produced by the French half of the "International Committee" since February 7, not even a translation of the passing "mention" featured in The Newsletter.

We would like very much to see these colleagues and collaborators of the SLL also come to life, even if still more belatedly than their British co-thinkers, and join in actively opposing the dirty colonial war being waged by American imperialism in Vietnam.

Can the British half of the "International Committee" get its French half slapped awake around this issue? We hope so, as it would be strange indeed if a paper that is "an organiser of thousands of workers" and which is "rapidly becoming the recognised spokesman of revolutionary Marxism in the international Trotskyist movement," as Slaughter boasts, could not even prod its colleagues across the Channel to stand up and mumble something in face of the threat of nuclear war.

We are waiting, Slaughter, for your report on this. Just give us the facts about the activities of the Verité group; no embellishments, please, about "outrageous lies and slanders." The subject is not without interest, for if the British half of the "International Committee" is able to organize thousands of workers by failing to recognize the importance of a world crisis until it is necessary to run to catch up with the crowd, the French half, by maintaining a graveyard silence, may be organizing them by the tens of thousands. Shouldn't a tactical discovery as revolutionary as this be passed on, even if it has to be demeaned by being put in the form of an article, thereby becoming subject to measurement in column inches?

OPEN LETTER TO THE COMRADES OF THE LSSP (REFORMIST)

[The following is a translation of an Open Letter published in the April 8 issue of Sama Samajaya, the Sinhalese weekly of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary), to the reformist LSSP whose leaders participated in the coalition defeated in the recent elections in Ceylon. The letter is signed by Edmund Samarakoddy, as secretary of the LSSP(R).]

* * *

Dear Comrades,

This letter is addressed to you in the hope that you will reflect on the matters mentioned herein and adopt the course of action that is consistent with a revolutionary orientation of your party.

It is about nine months since you the majority of comrades of the LSSP took the decision to enter the SLFP [Sri Lanka Freedom party] government led by Sirimavo Bandaranaike and to form an SLFP-LSSP coalition government. When you made that decision, we of the minority who stood categorically opposed to your view continued on the basis of the programme of the LSSP adopted at the Unity Congress of 1951 and we have functioned since then as the LSSP (Revolutionary). Shortly afterwards you were aware that the LSSP(R) was recognised by the governing bodies of the Fourth International as the Ceylon section of the Fourth International.

In pursuance of your decision to form a coalition government with the SLFP, three members of your party became ministers of the SLFP-LSSP coalition government. It was your perspective that on the basis of a "14-point programme" and with your three ministers in the cabinet you would be able through parliament to oppose and gradually eliminate the capitalists and the imperialists and lay the founda-

tions of socialism. You are aware that the coalition government functioned for six months, from June to December, 1964. It is true that six months is too short a period for achievements. But six months was more than sufficient for your party and the allies of your party to have won over the confidence of the majority of the workers, peasants and the toilers that a coalition government with the SLFP led by Sirimavo Bandaranaike was the road to progress and socialism.

After the defeat in parliament of the coalition government on December 3, 1964, you and the SLFP in your wisdom decided to go to the polls and dissolved Parliament on December 17. The general elections have come and gone but the SLFP-LSSP coalition is not back in office. The UNP [United National party] and their allies have formed a government in parliament. The SLFP and your party are now opposition parties in Parliament. With the victory of the UNP and its allies you have now come to a halt on the road of socialism through a coalition government with the SLFP. As the coalition government does not now exist, the road through coalition with the SLFP remains closed. You have now two possible courses of action in this predicament. The one is to continue your alliance with the SLFP and together with the SLFP seek to win mass support for the SLFP-LSSP-CP front in the perspective of winning a parliamentary majority in the next elections. The other course of action is to abandon all hopes of achieving socialism through a coalition in parliament and adopt the road of irreconcilable class struggle against the capitalist class and against the capitalist government. The question of looking forward for a second coalition with the SLFP in the next elections must be on the basis of a searching inquiry and proper assessment of the consequences of the last coalition of your party and to the working-class movement.

As you had faith in parliamentary elections, it is not improper to refer to the fact of the defeat of the coalition government in the general elections. The election results show that a considerable section of the workers, poor peasants and toilers turned away from you. These sections had lost confidence in you and the SLFP. The failure and inability of your coalition government to take any positive steps to solve the pressing problems of the people generally is the reason for these sections of the working people turning against you. Many thousands of teen-age voters turned against you and voted for the UNP as they found no prospect of finding avenues of employment through the coalition. These teen-age voters have of course been deceived by the UNP that jobs would be available under the government. You are aware that the plantation workers of Indian origin turned away from you. This is not a matter for surprise. Your party abandoned the struggle for the rights of the plantation workers and supported Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike's conspiracy with the prime minister of India to forcibly tear them from their homes in Ceylon and take them to India. These workers rightly treated you as their enemy. You are also aware that the Tamil minority and other racial minorities like Muslims, Burgh-

ers, etc., had quite openly decided not to support you. Your party abandoned the fight against the oppression of the minorities and supported the SLFP policies of discrimination against them and of denying them their rights. The religious minorities, the Hindus, Christians, Catholics also opposed you, as you and the SLFP were openly discriminating against them by your unashamed support of Buddhist clericalism. Owing to discrimination also practiced against certain minority castes, thousands in such castes ceased to support the coalition government.

It is not merely the question of the defeat of the coalition government that should be your concern. You have lost much more than ministerial positions in a bourgeois government. Your search for a new road through coalition with a bourgeois party has led you to abandon the struggle for socialism and your party became a mere agency of the capitalist class, and what is more you were and remain linked to capitalist reaction through your support for Sinhala racialism and Buddhist clericalism. Your complete abandonment of all that you stood for and fought for is proved by the fact that when your election campaign began you ceased publishing the Samasamajaya, your Sinhalese weekly and you substituted for it an openly vote-catching and disgusting publication called the Jana Mathaya [Public Opinion] catering for Sinhala racialism and Buddhist clericalism. Nothing more was required to prove the complete and total degeneration of the leadership of your party than their behaviour in the elections. In a situation where a conscious anti-Marxist reactionary movement led by the forces of capitalist reaction were campaigning against the revolutionary socialist movement the answer of your leaders was to indulge in eulogising the so-called Bandaranaike principles and the public worship of the bourgeois leader Mrs. Bandaranaike, and also by displaying their devotion to Buddhism.

The deeds and misdeeds of the SLFP-LSSP coalition government in office should convince you that your party and the toiling people moved further away from the goal of socialism as a result of this coalition and that the forces of reaction were strengthened. The leadership of your party turned away from the working class and disrupted the developing movement for the struggle for the 21 demands. Your party in coalition permitted the continued enforcement of the wage-freeze policy of the SLFP. The leadership of your party connived at and tolerated the use of the police to break up legitimate strikes of workers. Police assaults on workers took place under the very eyes of your leaders. Thus the interests of the capitalists and imperialists were protected by your coalition government. The policy of class collaboration practiced by your leadership helped the employers to further exploit the wage earners. The forces of capitalist reaction were strengthened through the coalition. Do you think that you are moving towards the socialist goal when you strengthen the forces of capitalist reaction? You will admit that the opposite is the case. If the goal of socialism is still dear to you, you must here and now break with the bourgeois SLFP and

forge your links with the workers and toilers and all the oppressed on the basis of identifying yourselves in the struggle against capitalist exploitation in all its forms and against the capitalist system.

The control of the bourgeois parliament is now in the hands of the UNP and its allies. You are opposed to the UNP and you will no doubt seek to fight the UNP government. The UNP government is a capitalist government and if you mean to undertake seriously the fight against the UNP it is necessary to mobilise all the anticapitalist forces -- the workers, wage earners, poor peasants, the suffering middle classes and the oppressed racial and religious and other minorities. The SLFP is a bourgeois party and you cannot hope to fight the forces of capitalism, while you have as an ally a capitalist party. To fight and defeat the UNP government and the capitalist class you must break with the bourgeois SLFP. To fight and defeat the UNP, you must support the class struggle of the workers against the employers. To mobilise all the oppressed racial and religious groups, you must break with the Sinhala chauvinism and Buddhist clericalism of the SLFP. All this means the imperative need for you to break with the policies you followed since coalition and to return to revolutionary politics. Many of you have no doubt a desire to return to the programme of the revolutionary party. But your leaders stand in the way. Your leaders who have degenerated beyond recognition will not and cannot change and are not ready to break with their bourgeois allies -- the SLFP. To take the only road leading to socialism you must leave the leaders where they wish to remain. The unsoiled banner of the revolution is in the custody of the LSSP (Revolutionary). All of you who desire to build the revolutionary movement and the party must today decide to take the road back to the party -- the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary); the Ceylon section of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

Yours fraternally,

Edmund Samarakkody

NEXT WEEK

A report from Algiers: "The Algerian Revolution Again in Movement," by Henri Dumoulin.

Imprimerie: 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2 (imprimé par les soins de
Directeur-Gérant: Pierre FRANK. l'éditeur).