

WORLD OUTLOOK

a labor press service

Vol. 6, No. 15

April 19, 1968

Mary-Alice Waters:

**When I Met
Rudi Dutschke**

Racist Officials Aim New Blows at Black Leaders

**The Triple Crisis
Faced by America's Rulers**

**Johnson Once Again
Breaks Troop 'Ceiling'**

**The Small Farmers
in Cuba**



H. Rap Brown

What Stokely Carmichael Really Said

50c

WORLD OUTLOOK

a labor press service

Vol. 6, No. 15

April 19, 1968



H. Rap Brown

Mary-Alice Waters:

**When I Met
Rudi Dutschke**

Racist Officials Aim New Blows at Black Leaders

**The Triple Crisis
Faced by America's Rulers**

**Johnson Once Again
Breaks Troop 'Ceiling'**

**The Small Farmers
in Cuba**

What Stokely Carmichael Really Said

50c



H. Rap Brown



H. Rap Brown

THE TRIPLE CRISIS FACED BY AMERICA'S RULERS

By George Novack

Those sedated and shortsighted folk with faith in the impregnable solidity of American capitalism (and there are almost as many such "true believers" in some parts of the "socialist camp" as in the enemy camp nowadays) should ponder on what has been happening to the world's paramount power these past few weeks.

The rulers of the United States have been reeling from the shocks of three convergent crises: the setback in Vietnam, the weakness of the dollar, and, closest to home, the outbreaks in over a hundred cities following the Rev. Martin Luther King's assassination.

The toppling of an incumbent wartime president from office is an event without precedent in American political history. It was produced by the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese freedom fighters and the mounting domestic opposition to the war. Johnson decided to withdraw from the presidential race because the majority of Congress and his own party as well as the majority of the American people had withdrawn their confidence in his administration and policies.

This loss of confidence was especially pronounced in view of the overwhelming vote the president received four years ago. Whereas in the cabinet form of parliamentary democracy, a discredited and crippled head of government would have submitted his resignation, in the U.S. political system the president could only refuse renomination.

But the political significance of the action is the same. An unpopular statesman and his policies have been repudiated. He has been tried, found wanting, and compelled to acknowledge it in the terms of the American two-party system.

Johnson's refusal to run again does more than recognize that the country is no longer in sympathy with his course. It defers to demands from influential sectors of the ruling class that something more be done without delay to get out of the military mess in Vietnam.

By stepping aside he clears the way for a new helmsman, who can keep the ship of state from listing too much or going aground. By initiating discussions with Hanoi he makes possible a shift in Washington's tactics. The results of the parleys will show how much ground, if any, Johnson himself is willing to cede at this juncture.

* * *

As General Giap lifted the siege of Khesanh in connection with the pending discussions, Washington came under direct siege from the Afro-Americans aroused by King's murder. The president could see and smell smoke from buildings burning two blocks from the White House. Federal troops ringed the Capitol and took over the city like an occupation army.

Similar scenes were enacted in 125 U.S. centers of population. Some 65,000 federal troops -- the largest muster of domestic force since the Civil War -- were called out, in addition to state troops and local police, to subdue the insurgency.

Federal, state and local authorities feared that the nation trembled on the edge of mass insurrection and that overzealous repressions might provoke an uncontrollable showdown of the opposing forces. Although they hoped to cool the situation without large-scale battles, the amount of force they applied against the black communities was not inconsiderable. There were 20,000 arrests and 43 killed in the week following the murder of King.

As a rule, the outbursts were most intense in those areas which had been quietest last year. Washington was one of those places. Here is one small fact to account for the venting of such vehement anger in the nation's capital after the assassination of the preacher of nonviolence.

In Washington, 37 percent of the 1967 graduating class at Eastern High School is unemployed. "Eastern is primarily a black man's school," observed Ward Just, reporter of the Washington Post, "and it seems a reasonable presumption that some of the youngsters participating in the current unpleasantness are some of the jobless.

"Of course, through the largesse of the District school system many Eastern students know how to use weapons. Under the cadet program, the students are handed rifles and taught how to use them. Johnnie may not know how to read, but he surely will know how to aim."

What do the possessors of power and property propose to do to rectify the wrongs and alleviate the conditions of the poor that Dr. King was fighting against in his fashion?

"Until Thursday night (the time Dr. King was killed)," according to the



-- Blankito in the Montevideo weekly *Marcha*

"Tiny" Dracula Pérez says, "But what a queer person this Johnson is!...He even let's the good news fall like a bomb!"

The headline on the paper reads: "Johnson: 'I am suspending the bombing and I am going to negotiate peace.'"

April 7, 1968, *New York Times*, "President Johnson had shown not the slightest indication of acting on or really even listening to Dr. King's demands, in his planned spring and summer poor people's campaign in Washington for 'jobs or income now' for the nation's underclass."

The furor following the assassination finally forced Congress to pass a civil-rights bill to decrease racial discrimination in housing and other areas. But Congress will not appropriate funds to provide adequate low-cost housing for black people or create jobs to help poor families pay the rent. And the civil-rights bill itself contains provisions for punitive measures against militant black leaders.

As highly placed officials marched behind the mule-drawn casket at King's funeral in Atlanta April 9, they voiced doubts that his death would lead to substantial reforms. Listen to this account by the *New York Post* columnist Jimmy Breslin:

"Once, John Doar put up his life in Southern towns as a Justice Dept. civil rights man. Last year, the Civil Rights Division became a domestic troop deployment agency and John Doar quit. And yesterday he walked behind his old friend Martin Luther King, and he was saying, 'I can't see anything good coming of it. We gained six inches and people thought we gained six miles and they

wanted us to stop. I don't think we'll see any good come out of this man's death....'

"Burke Marshall was walking next to Doar. Marshall was in charge of civil rights for the Justice Dept. Now he is an attorney in New York. 'Nothing has happened before and I can't see anything happening out of this now,' he said. 'I'm not the least bit optimistic.'

"Ahead of them, walking with his wife, was John Lindsay of New York. [He is both mayor of the largest city and vice-chairman of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.] He was tired and irritated. 'If they want to do something, then take the recommendations in the report on civil disorders and turn them into laws,' he said. 'Let's do something realistic instead of a one-day show of conscience. But nothing'll happen. Did it ever?'"


* * *

The third problem besetting the U.S. capitalist class -- its financial troubles -- looms as an insurmountable block to Congress. It promises to prevent all the sorrowful rhetoric and proposals for improvements which have gushed from liberal lips the past week from being translated into performance.

The prospects for any remedial action, let alone reformist solutions, are

DRACULITA
PEREZ

¡PERO QUÉ
TIPO ESTE
JOHNSON!...



¡HASTA LAS
BUENAS NOTICIAS
LAS HACE CAER
COMO UNA
BOMBA!



very slim. By capitalist standards it is far more important to provide \$30 billion a year for the war in Vietnam and billions more to police the world for imperialism -- even if that keeps unbalancing the budget -- than to spend money for new social programs which cater to the needs of the poor.

This was bluntly stated on April 9 by Tom Wicker, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times: "Congress will not tax [the nation] heavily enough to finance both a war and a social revolution without a deterioration of the dollar. Therefore, the President might as well save the words he is being asked to say to Congress, particularly since the need now is so clearly for something that speaks louder than words."

In fact, the tax increase passed by the Senate stipulates a reduction of \$6 billion in social-welfare expenditures which are already being cut back in one black community after another.

* * *

WHAT STOKELY CARMICHAEL REALLY SAID ABOUT SLAYING OF DR. KING

[A couple of statements made by Stokely Carmichael at a press conference held at the Washington headquarters of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee April 5 have been widely quoted by TV, radio and press commentators, but in such a way as to give them an invidious meaning intended to help provide an excuse for whipping up a hue and cry against the most militant black leaders.

[The following is the transcribed text of the press conference, slightly abridged, as provided by the Liberation News Service. The speakers at the conference were Lester McKinnie, Washington SNCC coordinator, and Stokely Carmichael.]

* * *

McKinnie: This press conference will be for only five minutes and as soon as the press conference is over you gentlemen will not leave anything here.... Your films, your cigarette butts, you take them with you. You waste any water, you will have to clean it up. We have a few questions. SNCC... Right here, immediately right, is Stokely Carmichael, who will start here in Washington, D.C., and to my left Winkie Hall, who is also a member of the staff of Washington. Carmichael will speak to you five minutes.

Carmichael: You may or may not know that this press conference was called before Dr. King's murder. We called it then

In the deluge of comments on Dr. King's martyrdom, the sympathizers with his methods and goals generally agreed that "this country is sick." They would usually hasten to add that it was not "sick unto death." They kept insisting that something could, should and would be done to prevent Dr. King's dream of equality and emancipation for all from turning into "a nightmare."

The liberals, moderates and pacifists continue to expect -- or to hope -- that the sources of protest will be eliminated from above by the representatives of the rich who receive such munificent privileges from exploiting the millions of oppressed Afro-Americans. What an illusion!

Those who own and control America cannot be persuaded -- either for their own good or the good of others -- to desist from the disastrous courses they must follow at home or abroad. In order to bring about the desired fundamental changes in our society they will have to be removed by mass action from below.

to deal with Brother Rap Brown because we were very upset. Brother Rap Brown had been in jail for 41 days and Gov. Agnew of Maryland still seems to persist with his nonsensical charges so the Brother can't get out of jail and we want the Brother out of jail next week when he comes to trial.

As for Dr. King's murder, I think white America made its biggest mistake when she killed Dr. King last night because when she killed Dr. King last night, she killed all reasonable hope. When she killed Dr. King last night, she killed the one man of our race that this country's older generations, the militants and the revolutionaries and the masses of black people would still listen to. Even though sometimes he did not agree with them, they would still listen to him.

When white America killed Dr. King she opened the eyes of every black man in this country. When white America got rid of Marcus Garvey, she did it and said he was an extremist, that he was crazy. When they got rid of Brother Malcolm X, they said he was preaching hate, that he deserved what he got.

When they got rid of Brother Martin Luther King, they had absolutely no reason to do so. He was the one man in our race who was trying to teach our people to have love, compassion and mercy for what white people had done. When white

America killed Dr. King last night, she declared war on us. There will be no crying and there will be no funeral.

The rebellions that have been occurring around these cities and this country is just light stuff to what is about to happen.

We have to retaliate for the deaths of our leaders. The execution for those deaths will not be in the courtrooms. They're going to be in the streets of the United States of America.

The kind of man that killed Dr. King last night made it a whole lot easier for a whole lot of black people today. There no longer needs to be intellectual discussion. Black people know that they have to get guns. White America will live to cry since she killed Dr. King last night. It would have been better if she killed Rap Brown and/or Stokely Carmichael. But when she killed Dr. King, she lost it.

Question: We want a statement from the organization.

McKinnie: We, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee wish to extend our condolences to the family of the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who was brutally murdered in Memphis, Tenn. This is a lesson which white America has taught us many times before. This lesson was clear in the murder of our four brothers in Orangeburg. This lesson was clear in the murder of the 16-year-old Larry Payne in Memphis. This lesson was clear in the day-to-day torture of black people by white people in America and throughout the world.

It was to end this torture that Dr. King bravely faced death many times -- nonviolent. Dr. King was a brother who dedicated his life to liberating his people through nonviolence. Dr. King was a symbol of nonviolence and white America shot him down.

Question: Mr. Carmichael, don't you believe that the vast majority of Americans feel just as badly as you do about what happened to Dr. King?

Carmichael: The honky [white], from honky Lyndon Johnson to honky Bobby Kennedy, will not co-opt Dr. Martin Luther King -- Dr. Martin Luther King or black people. It was not but four weeks ago when Johnson told King that if he came marching into the District he'd need a voice because he should bring his troubles to him and now tonight he's trying to make as if Dr. King was his hero.

He fooled no one. Bobby Kennedy pulled that trigger just as well as anybody else, because when Dr. King was down

south, Bobby Kennedy was attorney general.

Every time a black person got killed Kennedy wouldn't move because he wanted votes, so he is just as guilty as all of white America who killed Dr. King. And those who feel sorry ought to feel sorry.

Question: Mr. Carmichael, what do you intend to do? What action do you intend to take relative to Rap Brown?

Carmichael: We decided at our central committee meeting that if Maryland persists with this nonsensical charge, even though the reports said Rap did not incite any riot in Cambridge -- well, then, Gov. Agnew -- he ain't seen nothing if he thinks he's done something on that Bowie State thing.

We will take our troops back into Maryland and all of us veterans from Cambridge, Md., and from Baltimore, Md., and we will turn that state inside out and upside down, and we've got Louisiana to get.

We've got some brothers working in Florida. We've got some brothers working in Ohio and we're going to get Richmond, Va.

Question: Mr. Carmichael, what do you think will happen to the Poor People's Campaign?

Carmichael: I understand that the Southern Christian Leadership Conference will carry it on, and, as we said before, we will be glad to give them any support. Whatever the Southern Christian Leadership Conference asks for today we will give to them, except our tears. We will give no more tears for any black man killed.

Question: Mr. Carmichael, do you see anybody replacing Dr. King as a non-violent leader?

Carmichael: NO! That's why America lost when she shot him down last night.

Question: (Inaudible.)

Carmichael: We're waiting for what the SCLC wants to do.

Question: What do you say to black people who have to die to do what you say?

Carmichael: That they take as many white people with them as they can. We die every day. We die in Vietnam for the honkies. Why don't we come home and die in the streets for our people? We die every day. We die cutting and fighting each other inside our own communities. We cut and fight and kill each other off. Let's kill off the real enemies!

Black people are not afraid to die. We die all the time. We die in your jails. We die in your ghettos. We die in your rat-infested homes. We die a thousand deaths every day. We're not afraid to die, because now we're gonna die for our people.

McKinnie: On Monday our chairman, Rap Brown, will be in Richmond, Va., according to the honky Federal Government. And there will be a car caravan to Richmond, Va., on Monday morning. We're urging all our black brothers and sisters to come to Richmond.

Question: Mr. Carmichael, what's the alternative to this kind of retribution in the streets that you are talking about? Is there any way to stop it?

Carmichael: I don't think so; I do not think so. I think white America is incapable of dealing with the problem.

Question: How will Dr. King's death affect the leadership?

Carmichael: Dr. King's death will not affect our leadership. He will affect the black man, for he was my brother, flesh of my flesh, blood of my blood.

You see, the mistake they made when they shot Dr. King was, even though Dr. King felt about nonviolence, he was always in the streets ready to lead a demonstration.

All the other so-called leaders who talk about nonviolence are not on the streets with their people. Many people respected Dr. King, even though they didn't agree with his philosophy, because at least he was in the streets. But now there's really no one else to respect who talks about nonviolence. The people who talk about nonviolence are not in the streets.

Question: Mr. Carmichael, are you declaring war on white America?

Carmichael: White America has declared war on black people. She did so when she stole the first black man from Africa. The black man has been...patient, has been resisting -- and today the final showdown is coming.

That is clear. That is crystal clear. And black people are going to have to find ways to survive. The only way to survive is to get some guns. Because that's the only way white America keeps us in check, because she's got the guns.

Question: What do you see this ultimately leading to? A blood bath in which nobody wins?

Carmichael: First, my name is Mr. Carmichael, and secondly black people will survive the blood bath. Last question.

Question: What accomplishments or objectives do you visualize from the encounter? What do you think you will accomplish?

Carmichael: The black man can't do nothing in this country. Then we're going to stand up on our feet and die like men. If that's our only act of manhood, then Goddammit we're going to die. We're tired of living on our stomachs.

Question: One last question: Do you fear for your life?

Carmichael: The hell with my life! You should fear for yours. I know I'm going to die. I know I'm leaving. (Very loud and long applause.)

McKinnie: There will be a just fight throughout the United States, so that black brothers and sisters can take off that day as slaves working for the master and think about, realize what the honky is doing to the black people in this country and perhaps then something can be done. That's the end of the press conference.

RACIST OFFICIALS AIM NEW BLOWS AT BLACK LEADERS

By Les Evans

America's racist rulers are seeking to utilize the spontaneous outbursts of anger in the black communities that followed the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King as a pretext for new repressive blows aimed at militant black leaders.

On April 6, two days after King's death, when the wave of uprisings was building to a climax, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee succeeded in

posting the exorbitant \$30,000 bail required to free their imprisoned chairman H. Rap Brown. Brown had been held in a Louisiana prison on a trumped-up charge since February 21.

As soon as Brown was released, however, he was rearrested by federal authorities and secretly moved to the federal reformatory in Petersburg, Virginia, where he is now being held for extradition to Maryland, to be tried for "inciting to

riot" during the ghetto rebellion in Cambridge last July.

Brown is the victim of a complicated series of federal and state persecutions and frame-ups. Johnson's Commission on Civil Disorders, the so-called Riot Commission, admitted in an unofficial supplementary report that the Cambridge events of last summer were spontaneous and that Brown's presence was coincidental, yet Maryland officials refuse to drop the charges and federal authorities are assisting them in keeping Brown jailed during the long pretrial legal maneuvers.

Brown must also return to New Orleans for trial May 13 for allegedly transporting a rifle on a plane, an obscure and presumably minor charge for which he had been held for weeks under \$100,000 bail, only recently reduced to the still unreasonable \$30,000.

The capitalist press has been carrying on a sustained campaign against Brown, Stokely Carmichael, and other militant black leaders, since the new wave of ghetto rebellions began. They have canonized Martin Luther King the better to stress the virtues of nonviolence -- for black people. King's name is invoked to brand the SNCC leaders as "subversive" instigators of violence and enemies of the cause King stood for.

This unctious propaganda has little in common with the reality. While King and the SNCC leadership had sharp differences over the efficacy of nonviolence as a strategy or tactic for the achievement of black freedom in the U.S., each recognized the other as participants in the same struggle. The capitalist rulers, and the newspapers that speak for them, are not interested in black freedom at all, but invoke King's name as a means of pacifying black people and diverting them from their just demands.

Martin Luther King's real attitude toward Rap Brown and the government's "case" against him is indicated by a strong statement which he and several other civil-rights and black-freedom spokesmen issued in defense of Brown shortly before the assassination.

King and the others called upon "all Americans who believe in the Constitution of the United States to defend the right of free speech now being denied to H. Rap Brown....Specifically, we demand that Attorney General Ramsey Clark stop the present prosecution of Brown and secure his immediate release from prison."

In the midst of all their eulogies of Martin Luther King and denunciations of Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael the capitalist press has not seen fit to reprint

this forthright statement by Dr. King.

"The conclusion is inescapable," King and the others declared, "that the government is making a special case of Rap Brown -- that it wants to keep him in jail, although he has been convicted of no crime, that it wants to keep him from speaking, and that it has violated the most basic tenets of our Bill of Rights to accomplish this.

"Brown is symbolic of the militant black spokesmen who are now challenging this country's racism....

"Today the brunt of the attack on freedom in America is Rap Brown. We take our stand in resistance to the attack on his rights. We are convinced that at this moment our own future hangs on his fate. We call again on all Americans who value their own freedom to stand with us in this resistance."

Stokely Carmichael has also become the target of opprobrium. Currently working for SNCC in Washington, D.C., he spoke at a press conference there April 5, the day after King's murder. The conference had originally been called to protest the continued imprisonment of H. Rap Brown, but it became a forum for the first public statement by SNCC leaders on the assassination of Martin Luther King. [The text of the press conference appears on page 340 of this issue of World Outlook.]

In a strongly worded statement, Carmichael said, "When white America killed Dr. King last night, she declared war on us."

Carmichael urged black people to make use of their constitutional right of self-defense. He said, "Black people know that they have to get guns."

The usually staid New York Times said in an April 6 editorial, "The twisted mind of the white criminal who murdered Dr. King is matched by the psychotic reaction of Stokely Carmichael who publicly urges murder in the streets."

In this monstrous amalgam the racist murderer and his victim's friend and defender are pictured as the same!

This line of slander was pushed still further by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in their April 8 syndicated column. Posted apparently at two keyholes in Carmichael's room, they report his immediate reaction to the news of King's death: "... the usually decisive Stokely Carmichael was in a momentary state of confusion and inaction -- until he received a mysterious telephone call from an unknown source."

The two peeping toms offer additional bits of inside dope: "The mobiliza-

tion of Carmichael by a single phone call reinforces suspicions of Negro leaders who believe he is guided through his otherwise inexplicable shifts of strategy by unseen -- and undetermined -- forces."

The innuendo in this red-baiting attack is, of course, that Stokely Carmichael is a puppet, dangling on strings, or a telephone cord, of the "international Communist conspiracy."

On April 9 Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson in their syndicated column said that "the Justice Dept. is preparing to move against Stokely Carmichael on charges of sedition because of his role in the Washington riots."

What did the "sedition" consist of? Carmichael's statements at the April 5 press conference?

In Oakland, California, a police attack on members of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense April 8 left one black militant dead and two wounded. An account in the April 15 Militant said the victims "were sitting in a parked car when the police attack began. They ran to a nearby house, and the cops called in three dozen reinforcements for the ensuing battle."

Bobby James Hutton, 22, was shot. Warren Wells and Eldridge Cleaver, minister of information for the Black Panther party, were wounded by the cops. Cleaver is the author of Soul on Ice, and a contributor to Ramparts magazine.

A joint statement issued by the Black Panther party and the Peace and Freedom party declared, "...the articulate, young, and militant leadership is being systematically attacked in an attempt to destroy it; this, under the cover of pleas for nonviolence (for the blacks, that is), by the power structure, from the White House on down to the police departments of L.A., San Francisco and Oakland...."

"Word has gotten out that the San Francisco and Oakland police intend to destroy the Black Panthers. Last Saturday night following a two minute gun battle, the details of which will come out later, ten Panthers were surrounded by over sixty cops in the black ghetto of Oakland. The police riddled the house with hundreds of bullets and dozens of tear-gas cannisters, and the Oakland Fire Department finally threw a fire bomb under the house. The Panthers, after negotiating their personal safety and the safety of the family of the house, laid down their arms and walked out with their hands up.

"Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information of the Black Panther Party, had been wounded and, therefore, young Bobby

Hutton walked out, unarmed, and with his hands in the air. He moved slowly and into the glare of many searchlights which made the entire area as bright or brighter than daylight. He made it for over twenty feet, almost to the sidewalk, and there he was gunned down to death."

After treatment at a hospital, Eldridge Cleaver was taken to San Quentin Prison, and then moved to another jail at Vacaville, sixty miles away. Cleaver had been on parole after spending nine years in prison on a charge of assault. The authorities revoked his parole.

Ramparts magazine said in a statement in New York: "We cannot assume that Mr. Cleaver will be given fair treatment in jail or in the courts, given the climate that exists in Oakland and the open hostility of the Oakland police for black militants."

Frank E. Taylor, editor-in-chief of the trade division of McGraw Hill, the large publishing house, said, "He must be assured of every protection for his person and his rights."

A group of eleven writers and editors in New York said the Oakland cops "have made no secret of their plans for extermination of the Panthers should they get their hands on them." Signers included Susan Sontag, poet Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Warren Hinckle III, publisher of Ramparts, and Christopher Lehmann-Haupt.

Peter Camejo, Socialist Workers party candidate for U.S. Senate in California, said in a statement to the press, "It is very clear that Bobby James Hutton was assassinated by the Oakland cops. This is a case of out-and-out murder, just like Dr. King's murder in Memphis, only in this case it was done by the cops.

"Hutton's murder clearly demonstrates the immediate need to remove all cops from the ghettos and to replace them with democratically controlled, deputized ghetto residents, who would protect instead of brutalize Afro-Americans."

Charles Garry, attorney for Cleaver and other imprisoned Black Panther leaders, has announced that he will ask that murder charges be filed against the Oakland police in the death of Hutton.

In Los Angeles local police broke into the office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee April 5, arresting three SNCC members there on phony charges. The cops reportedly wrecked the office, breaking mimeograph machines, smashing doors and windows, and smearing mimeograph ink on the floor. The organization's mailing list was missing following the police attack.

MEXICAN INTELLECTUALS APPEAL FOR SOLIDARITY WITH DEMETRIO VALLEJO

Mexico City

APRIL 7 -- The solidarity campaign in behalf of Demetrio Vallejo is beginning to have repercussions in Mexico.

Widespread sympathy is felt for the leader of the nation's railway workers, who has spent nine years behind bars because of his militant role in the 1959 railway strike and who has now gone on a hunger strike to dramatize his demand for "confinamiento" -- the right to be restricted to a small area outside of prison. This is a right granted by law in Mexico after a prisoner has served a certain proportion of his sentence.

Vallejo applied for this right some time ago. As yet the authorities have not seen fit to reply.

Vallejo began his hunger strike on March 29. Within a few days a group of students at the National University of Mexico joined him in a solidarity hunger strike, maintaining a vigil in the gardens of the Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales.

It has now been announced that a collective hunger strike will be conducted by the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras and the Escuela de San Carlos.

Similar moves are reported to be under consideration among students at the Instituto Politécnico Nacional and the Normal de Maestros.

Student squads are also circulating throughout the city to spread the facts about Vallejo's hunger strike and the solidarity campaign as widely as possible.

A significant development was the decision of 197 Mexican intellectuals, most of them professors at the National University of Mexico, to publish a large advertisement in the April 6 Excelsior, a leading daily, appealing to the public to rally behind Vallejo's demand. They expressed their preoccupation over the growing number of political prisoners in Mexico, "many of whom are progressive persons who have not committed any crime whatsoever, being persecuted because of their ideas, for participating in public meetings which no law prohibits, or who have been accused under suspicious circumstances of alleged crimes or of causing damages that in reality injured no one."

From his prison, Demetrio Vallejo said to the students:

"Thanks for the determination you have shown in expressing solidarity with my hunger strike. After nine years of being imprisoned unjustly, arbitrarily and unconstitutionally, I felt compelled to make this supreme decision in order to demand the legal right that has been denied me, the last one remaining to political prisoners: confinamiento.

"To continue to hold me in prison without any legal justification is a juridical crime. In one way or another, it must be exposed as a historic lesson.

"I am satisfied because I consider that my decision was a first skirmish in the legal battle. And you young ones will bring it to a conclusion in the future, victoriously. With your revolutionary support and solidarity, we will also win the first skirmish. My decision is irrevocable because it is based on justice and law. With warm greetings and good luck to everyone."

WHEN I MET RUDI DUTSCHKE IN BERLIN

By Mary-Alice Waters

On the evening of April 11 the news was broadcast from Berlin that Rudi Dutschke, leader of the left wing of the German SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- German Socialist Student Federation] had been shot and critically wounded.

According to the report, he was attacked by an as yet unidentified man in his mid-twenties who had been waiting for him outside the Berlin SDS headquarters. As Dutschke started home about 4:30 in the afternoon the assailant pulled him from his bicycle and fired three shots at him

as he lay on the ground.

Dutschke was taken to a hospital where he underwent emergency surgery. Three bullets were reported to have struck him, one in the chest, another in the face, and still another in the back of the head, the bullet lodging in his brain.

The gunman was apprehended after a battle with the police in which he, too, was critically injured. He was reported to have said he had been "inspired" by the assassination of Martin Luther King.

The description of the assassination attempt seemed all too vivid to me, as I had just recently visited the SDS headquarters in Berlin.

I met Rudi Dutschke last February 17, the weekend of the giant Vietnam conference and demonstration that brought together in Berlin 20,000 youth from all over Western Europe.

During the three days of activities, he was everywhere, chairing sessions of the conference, talking with foreign delegations, speaking on the platform, and leading the most politically advanced youth of Western Europe through the streets of Berlin to demonstrate their support for the Vietnamese revolution. But that was wholly in character for him.

As the acknowledged leader of the left wing of the German SDS, as its chief spokesman and leading theorist, his presence, advice, and leadership have been constantly in demand, not only in West Berlin and other cities of West Germany but all over Europe.

SDS is an organization of some two to three thousand university students in West Germany. Until 1959 it was the official student organization of the SPD [Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands -- Social Democratic party of Germany], but as the SPD moved further and further to the right it found the criticisms of its youth organization too embarrassing. SDS was financially cut off and an "incompatibility resolution" was formulated, making membership in the SDS sufficient reason for expulsion from the SPD. Most of the youth, however, stayed with the SDS.

In a country where the Communist party, the Fourth International, and all other left-wing political parties are banned, the German SDS has been a home for radical youth of all political affinities; it has also played an important political role in West Germany as a whole, often being described as the "extraparliamentary opposition."

Between 1959 and the mid-1960's the SDS grew fairly steadily and engaged in



RUDI DUTSCHKE [center, in plaid shirt], leader of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund, at conference held as part

of February 17 weekend Vietnam antiwar demonstration in Berlin involving 20,000 participants from all over Europe.



RUDI DUTSCHKE [center, in plaid shirt], leader of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund, at conference held as part

of February 17 weekend Vietnam antiwar demonstration in Berlin involving 20,000 participants from all over Europe.



RUDI DUTSCHKE [center, in plaid shirt], leader of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund, at conference held as part

of February 17 weekend Vietnam antiwar demonstration in Berlin involving 20,000 participants from all over Europe.

many political campaigns, such as giving classes and seminars on the economic reasons for the "Berlin Wall," leading activities against American aggression in Vietnam, and fighting for more control by students over university conditions.

The SDS came into the spotlight of international news last June with a demonstration against the West Berlin city government's hospitality to the notoriously reactionary Shah of Iran. The demonstration was attacked by the West Berlin police, who shot and killed one of the students, Benno Ohnesorg.

The reaction among the West Berlin population was so strong that the ruling Social Democratic party had to make a scapegoat of the mayor, who was removed from office.

As the most articulate spokesman of the left wing in SDS, Rudi Dutschke became known all over Europe. His picture began appearing on the front pages of mass-circulation magazines and newspapers, as well as left-wing political journals of all types. The reactionary Springer press, which publishes 70 percent of the mass-circulation newspapers in Germany and has been a target of many SDS demonstrations, mounted a red-baiting campaign against SDS and Dutschke in particular.

The atmosphere that developed in West Berlin around the time of the Vietnam conference weekend in February provides a good example of the kind of hate campaign that was built up against SDS, with the assistance of the Social Democratic party city fathers.

While the Springer press ranted about violent, destructive minorities, the neo-Nazi paper, National and Soldaten Zeitung [National and Soldiers' Journal], ran a banner headline: "Stop Dutschke's Red Terror!"

The Social Democratic West Berlin government organized a counterdemonstration, supported by the trade unions, ostensibly to prove that Berliners are for "freedom and peace" and against violence in the streets. More than twenty bystanders were beaten up by goon squads at the official demonstration, and frequent cries of "Send them (SDS) to the gas chamber!" were heard in the Berlin streets. To foster such a lynch campaign places heavy responsibility on the West Berlin government for creating an atmosphere conducive to the attempt on Rudi's life.

He had been threatened many times in recent months. He moved from one room to another every month or two and let few people know his address.

While I was in Berlin, Rudi agreed to give me an interview to be published

in the Young Socialist* and arranged for me to meet him at his apartment at 7:00 p.m. When I arrived, his American wife Gretchen, and his five-week-old son Hosea Che, and several friends were also waiting for him to return -- with visible anxiety. He had gone out an hour earlier and planned to return in a few minutes.

As we waited until 8:00, then 9:00, and then 10:00, the concern grew.

Gretchen recounted several recent incidents of threatening notes in their mailbox and smoke bombs left on their stairway.

Then at 10:30 Rudi returned, unharmed but tired, after getting caught in a series of urgent meetings at the SDS headquarters.

We talked for more than three hours, discussing everything from German Social Democracy to Cuba, from prospects for the world socialist revolution to the history of the Third International. He spoke slowly but clearly and humorously, in English, with Gretchen occasionally providing translations for such terms as "gross national product."

When we finished at about 2:00 a.m., they insisted I sleep on an extra mattress in their one-room apartment rather than leave at that late hour. The next morning Rudi was up and off at 8:30 in order to fly to Amsterdam to speak there at an anti-war rally.

As a person, Rudi exudes genuine warmth and concern for individuals, coupled with a searching intelligence and ready sense of humor. There is a dynamism about him that everyone finds attractive.

His political evolution in recent months has been quite striking, moving from a position reflecting Herbert Marcuse's disdain for the working class as a force for social change to a more nearly Marxist understanding of the class nature of society and the necessity of fighting for a socialist transformation of the capitalist countries.

In a poll taken last February in West Germany, 25 percent of German youth said they agreed with, and approved of, Rudi Dutschke. Such statistics have struck well-founded fear into the hearts of West Germany's rulers, who now cry out hypocritically against the gunman whose bullets they helped direct at Rudi Dutschke.

* The monthly of the American Young Socialist Alliance. The interview is scheduled for the May issue.

BERTRAND RUSSELL SEES COMPLETE DEFEAT FOR U.S. IN VIETNAM

[The following statement by Bertrand Russell was read at the demonstration of some 30,000 persons in Trafalgar Square March 17, who assembled to voice their opposition to the role of U.S. imperialism in the Vietnam war.

[The huge crowd later marched to the U.S. embassy to call the attention of the American ambassador to their views. London police sought to block the marchers from getting near the building; and violence flared. (See World Outlook, March 29, p. 274, and April 5, p. 296.)

[The militant demonstration was held under the auspices of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign of which Lord Russell is honorary chairman.]

* * *

The United States of America is floundering towards the complete defeat of all its declared objectives in Vietnam. The Vietnamese people, with a minimum of help from the outside world, have once again thwarted their colonial masters. This striking achievement gives new hope to the world. It opens the way to the collapse of the systematic exploitation of the majority of the world's peoples by a small, wealthy elite in the West. The United States considers itself "world policeman." In fact it is brutal guardian of the spoils gained by vast corporations whose tentacles extend through five continents. This role is being denied to Washington not in the council chambers but on the battlefield. Having flouted its promises at Geneva to respect settlements in both Vietnam and Laos, the United States is learning the hard way that its word is not trusted. Its calls for what it describes as "unconditional negotiations" are recognised as fraudulent and irrelevant. The resistance of the Vietnamese people to American barbarism will undoubtedly go down in history as not only remarkably courageous, but astonishingly effective.

It is encouraging to see in Western Europe signs of support for the Vietnamese people. We should not delude ourselves, however, into thinking that our own role has been in any way heroic. The failure to build a movement of support in Britain over the past five years for the

gallant people of Vietnam has been monumental, and I am convinced that we shall pay a heavy price for this failure in future years. Unless a significant section of our own community comes to understand the nature of the fraud which the United States has attempted to perpetrate through its propaganda machines in Washington and Saigon, we shall fail to understand the next round in the struggle of the third world to liberate itself from the theft of its raw materials and the indiscriminate destruction of its peoples when they resist.

In all this sordid story, the role of our own Government defies description. I cannot remember a single government throughout my lifetime which has so debased the British people. Mr. Wilson has been compared to Ramsay Macdonald, but such a comparison flatters our Prime Minister. He has tried to stuff all his election promises down the memory hole, and those who recall the promises of 1964 are told that they are wasting the tax-payers' money! Our Government, opportunistic as never before, staggers from crisis to crisis. On each occasion the Prime Minister uses two criteria to judge events: "What must I do to stay in power?" and "What will the Americans think?" It is not the promised land that Wilson leads us towards, but the American graveyard in Vietnam.

This weekend I have published in the New Statesman an article appealing for a new look at America's war by the people of Western Europe. As junior members of NATO, we are the hosts and accomplices of war criminals. It is high time that we in Western Europe resolutely ejected the United States from Europe. The North Atlantic Treaty is due for renewal early next year, and I earnestly hope that throughout Europe there will be a ferment of opposition to this. If Wilson renews NATO membership, Britain will be without an independent foreign policy for a further ten or twenty years; if we reject this ignoble alliance, we have the opportunity at last to repay our debt to the Vietnamese people by weakening the power of the American Empire in Europe. NATO is the heart of Wilson's foreign policy. Let us sever in our nation the chains which bind us to the greed and brutality of the American Empire.

VENEZUELAN PASTOR, FRIENDLY TO GUERRILLAS, ASSASSINATED

A Venezuelan Protestant pastor, Juan Bautista Arenas, accused of collaborating with guerrilla leader Douglas Bravo, was shot by an unknown assailant

April 8 as he left his church in Cumarebo in the state of Falcón. He had already been sentenced to two years in prison for "subversive activities."

JOHNSON ONCE AGAIN BREAKS TROOP "CEILING" IN VIETNAM



Secretary of State Dean Rusk, head of the Chiefs of Staff Gen. William C. Westmoreland, President Johnson, and their new mentor, Secretary of Defense Clark M. Clifford, put their heads together in a discussion before TV cameras at the White House on strategy in Vietnam. Westmoreland told the press April 7 that "militarily, we have never been in a better relative position in South Vietnam."

The quadrumvirate, who are running the imperialist aggression in Vietnam, decided to break the most recent ceiling of 525,000 U.S. troops to be maintained there. In telling the press, April 11, what they had decided on by way of a new "ceiling," Clifford said that 24,500 reservists had been called up to active duty, of whom 10,000 had been earmarked for Vietnam. This is on top of the 10,500 additional men ordered to Vietnam by Johnson only last February 13.

The smooth-talking new head of the war department was very diplomatic at his press conference as he sought to convey the impression that the Saigon puppet

forces would be able to take over eventually from the Americans.

"It seems to me," he said, "that it is the ultimate aim that we have for a final determination there -- that is, work ourselves into a posture where the South Vietnamese will take over the war."

"That is part and parcel, I believe, of the President's decision to place a limitation at this time upon our troop level at a point not exceeding 550,000." To make sure that no one misunderstood his "belief" that it was the "intention" of Johnson "at this time" not to exceed the new ceiling, Clifford stressed the point with his usual reassuring frankness: "It is the President's intention at this time not to increase those forces."

As to how firm the new ceiling is, it might be recalled that on January 1, 1967, Johnson had put 380,000 GI's in Vietnam. As recently as last July 13, when he announced one of his customary "modest" increases, he set the ceiling at 480,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam.

JOHNSON ONCE AGAIN BREAKS TROOP "CEILING" IN VIETNAM



JOHNSON ONCE AGAIN BREAKS TROOP "CEILING" IN VIETNAM



"WHILE WINNING JOHNSON'S WAR"

[A good gauge of the attitude of the people toward a war is the songs they sing about it. Yankee-Doodle, for instance, still lingers in the popular mind as an expression of the feeling of the American colonies in their struggle for national liberation.

[In the war in Vietnam, very few songs have been heard in praise of Johnson and the Pentagon. The professional song writers seem to find the subject unattractive. Perhaps because "love" rhymes with "dove." On the other hand, the folk singers have voiced the feeling of opposition in pungent verses.

[The following song appears to have risen spontaneously among the ranks of the American conscripts. Now being sung in Vietnam, it is reported to have been composed by an unnamed soldier in the Fourth Division to the tune of Auld Lang Syne.]

* * *

1.

Should all the troopers who have died
while winning Johnson's war,
Should all the troops who "won" before
be followed up by more?

Chorus: (All join.)

We're "winning now," we're told each year,
we're winning Lyndon's war,
For Ky and Thieu and rich landlords
and for their Saigon whores.

2.

We saved the rich landlords before
in nineteen-sixty-three.
But after Diem we had to save them
once again for Ky.

Chorus: (All join.)

3.

The troopers fall, a few a day,
it really isn't much.
We like to die for freedom's sake
and Ky and whores and such.

Chorus: (All join.)

4.

They're living good in old Saigon,
we must protect them well.
If that means U.S. troopers die,
well, brother, War is Hell.

Chorus: (All join.)

5.

It's hard to know, why LBJ
gives rich landlords and Ky

More U.S. dollars while we die,
but that's democracy.

Chorus: (All join.)

6.

Adolph Hitler is the hero
of dear Marshall Ky.
Our fathers thought that Hitler stunk
but Lyndon don't agree.

Chorus: (All join.)

7.

Ky had elections, casting votes,
to see what people thought,
And sure enough, Ky's ballot box
showed Ky and Thieu were bought.

Chorus: (All join.)

8.

The ballot boxes were secure,
the whole election fair.
The winners all were picked, you know,
by Nguyen Cao Ky with care.

Chorus: (All join.)

9.

And so we have democracy
for Ky in old Saigon;
And Bunker says that this will bring
domestic peace and calm.

Chorus: (All join.)

10.

But still our troopers seem to die
a score or two each day,
Because the folks of Vietnam
don't count up votes Ky's way.

Chorus: (All join.)

11.

We're saving them from what they think
the vote should really be.
And thus we save them from themselves,
and for democracy.

Chorus: (All join.)

12.

Ky freedom means they're free to do
what Marshall Ky ordains.
Dissenters take the choice of getting
slaughtered for their pains.

Chorus: (All join.)

13.

Our troops die for democracy,
to make Vietnam free,
To free it from Vietnamese
who disagree with Ky.

Chorus: (All join.)

14.

The body count of those we've freed
keeps climbing by the score.
In sixty years we'd ought to save
some thirty million more.

Chorus: (All join.)

15.

And when we've finished up the job,
we'll give Vietnam to Ky
Without a living soul to share
in his democracy.

(Return to repeat first verse.
Then final chorus as follows:)

We're here because we're here because
we're here because we're here,
We're here because we're here because
we're here because we're here.

(Ad infinitum, fading into dis-
tant echo, and out.)

ZENGAKUREN LEADS NEW DEMONSTRATIONS AT ARMY HOSPITAL AND AIRPORT

Japanese students are maintaining the offensive in their struggle against Japan's involvement in the war in Vietnam. Members of the militant Sampa Rengo [Three Faction Alliance] group of the Zengakuren [National Federation of Student Self-Government Associations] staged new demonstrations against the opening of an American army hospital in Tokyo March 28, and at the site of the projected New Tokyo International Airport in Narita March 31. The students, allied with radical farmers and unionists, charge that the airport will be used for U.S. military flights to Vietnam. There were sharp clashes between students and police at both places less than three weeks earlier. [See World Outlook, April 5, p. 304.]

On March 28, 140 students were arrested of a group reported at 400 near the U.S. army hospital at Camp Oji in Tokyo. The students were met by 2,500 police when they marched to the hospital after attending a rally at Hosei University.

The Mainichi Daily News reported March 29 that a group of about 100 students battled the police while "some 49 actually entered the hospital and its garden." The police, Mainichi said, were "armed with clubs and aluminum shields. The police also wore heavy arm-length gloves which...enabled them to handle barbwire used to ward off the surging students."

The demonstrations at the hospital resulted in at least a partial victory for the students: Foreign Minister Takeo Miki told the Diet the same day that the issue of the army hospital would be discussed at U.S.-Japan joint committee meetings "on the premise that the hospital will be moved to a suburban area of Tokyo in the future." The Sato government had

previously given its assurances that the hospital would not be moved.

U.S. military authorities announced March 30 that twenty-eight GI's who had been wounded in Vietnam had been moved to the Camp Oji hospital. This touched off two further demonstrations, one that afternoon by about 300 high school students who held a rally in Yanagida Park in Oji, and a second action that evening by about 250 people, mainly housewives.

At Narita the alliance of the Sampa Rengo students with local farmers was further consolidated in the March 31 demonstration. The Mainichi Daily News estimated April 1 that 1,000 students and 1,400 farmers and unionists took part. More than 4,600 police were mobilized against the demonstrators.

The major clash took place in front of the Narita branch office of the New Tokyo International Airport Construction Corporation. The students and farmers marched to the office after holding a rally at Sanrizuka Park five miles away.

The Japan Times said April 1, "On their way to the corporation office, they rained stones on a newly completed dormitory building for Narita police officers, shattered 30 windowpanes and made a shambles of a dormitory room.

"Climbing to the rooftop, some students hoisted Sampa flags."

The Times added that "About 800 of the student ralliers stayed overnight at local farmers' houses Saturday."

Mainichi said that twenty-two police, sixteen students and a newsman were injured in the March 31 clash.

THE SOCIALISM ANTONI ZAMBROWSKI WANTS FOR POLAND

[Among the young people who have been mentioned as leading figures in the current Polish student rebellion, the name of Antoni Zambrowski, 32, has appeared along with those of Jacek Kuron, Karol Modzelewski, and Adam Michnik. All four have reportedly been arrested since the student demonstrations broke out.

[Kuron and Modzelewski are better known as the former Warsaw University instructors who were first jailed in 1965 for circulating a document calling for a revolution to establish workers democracy based on workers councils. They also called for a revolutionary anti-imperialist foreign policy and spoke favorably of the creative example of revolutionary Cuba. They were released in 1967, only to be rearrested in the present crisis.

[Young Zambrowski was a member of the Warsaw University teaching staff also. In the summer of 1966 his critical communist opinions came to the attention of the bureaucratic party leadership, apparently as a result of a May Day article he had written. He was asked to present his views to the party Control Commission in writing, which he did. Because of this document he was expelled from the party, fired from his job at the university, and given a job in an engineering concern.

[Zambrowski's background is similar to that of Kuron and Modzelewski in another respect. The fathers of all three held important posts in the party regime. The father of Zambrowski, Roman Zambrowski, has long been a prominent government figure, both in the Stalin era and under Gomulka. During the present disturbances, the elder Zambrowski was ousted from his post as a reprisal for his son's indiscretions. The Zambrowskis are also of Jewish origin, which did not help the father's fortunes once Gomulka and company began their virulent campaign against "Zionists, old Stalinists, and revisionists." Roman Zambrowski was one of the first victims of the ugly purge now sweeping the Polish party.

[The text of Antoni Zambrowski's 1966 statement to the Control Commission has become available. We reprint it below, from the version in the March 22 London Times.

[What is most interesting about Zambrowski's statement is the indications it gives of fresh currents of socialist thought stirring among young people in postcapitalist Poland. He mentions several opposition groupings within the Polish party, and seems to represent a distinct point of view himself.

[Zambrowski declares himself clos-

est to the standpoint of the Italian Communists, so far as the permitting of internal discussion within the party goes, and to the Yugoslavs, in regard to permitting a greater degree of democratization in public life. He is not free of certain illusions over the extent of democracy in either the Italian CP or in Yugoslav society, but he is primarily using these as Communist examples that definitely improve on the Polish and Soviet models.

[Quite interesting also is Zambrowski's discussion of the views of Kuron and Modzelewski, who in their emphatic opposition to the bureaucratic government of the Polish workers state, wrongly call it a "new class" that must be overthrown by proletarian revolution.

[Marxists are careful to distinguish between the form of the governing apparatus and the class nature of the state. The governing bureaucracy, corrupt as it is, has no independent roots in property forms of its own; it is a privileged caste only, a parasitic growth upon socialized property forms. It is not rooted in the very economic and social system as classes historically have been.

[Zambrowski is right in regarding "the bureaucratic deformation of revolutionary power as a transitory phase," which arises "from the political superstructure and not from the foundations."

[It is not clear how firmly Kuron and Modzelewski are wedded to their mistake in theory, however. If there were freedom of discussion in "People's" Poland perhaps they would correct themselves in the light of criticism from persons like Zambrowski, or perhaps from revolutionary Marxists in the West.

[On one point, however, there is agreement all around. As Zambrowski put it, "depriving them of liberty has brought great political harm to our country as well as to Poland's reputation in the world." And that goes for the bureaucrats' treatment of Zambrowski and all the other young rebels as well.]

* * *

I am a Marxist and communist, and for this reason I am a member of our party. For me, joining the party was a simple consequence of my way of life. As a 13-year-old boy I distributed pamphlets for the Polish Workers' (Communist) Party at the 1947 elections. In that same year I joined the Young Communists' League. But I must confess that, while accepting the ideological foundations of our party, I have a mass of reservations with respect

to its current policy. I feel more sympathy with the standpoint of such communist parties as the Italian Communist Party (PCI) or the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia (SKJ). In my view, if we applied the policies of the PCI or the SKJ in Poland, we should have less political difficulties and considerably more influence in society.

The most valuable part of the Yugoslav party's programme seems to me to be their different interpretation of the party's role in the exercising of power. At present our party apparatus provides, in the words of Comrade Gomulka, "a specific, centralized authority...steering a direct course and regulating the life of the whole country." This leads to "an identification of the party with the apparatus of people's power" and to "the duplication of the work of the state apparatus." Another important element of the Yugoslav party's policy is the system of Workers' Councils and social self-administration which is extended to all levels of economic and administrative power. Two consequences of this are the autonomy of the trade unions, which do not belong to the state system but are its partner, defending the interest of the working man, and the independent role of parliament towards government, thanks to which parliament genuinely is the highest organ of the state. The role of the SELPJ, the equivalent of our Front of National Unity, is also extremely valuable since it serves as a socialist tribunal of discussion. I approve of the Yugoslav party's policy of a consistent and systematic development of democracy inside both party and state.

Successive Stages

I think that the process of overcoming the consequences of Stalin's autocracy was begun but not concluded by the twentieth and twenty-second Congresses of the Soviet Communist Party. I fully support the view of Comrade Togliatti expressed in his Yalta testament criticizing the policies of these communist parties which now hold power. It is a question of, in his words, "removing the system introduced by Stalin whereby democratic freedoms and personal liberties were restricted and choked." The problem is that "the return to the Leninist norm, which ensured both inside and outside the party a broad freedom of speech and discussion in culture, art and also politics, is a slow process which is meeting some resistance. This slowness and resistance are incomprehensible to us."

I think the party should embark on a far-reaching programme for democratizing public life. This would entail successive stages in the controlled development of socialist democracy:

(1) the development of democracy inside the party by bringing back all the Leninist norms of party life, for instance, the right of individual members to organize different platforms at party conferences and congresses, and to put these platforms to the vote.

(2) the granting of independence to social organizations such as trade unions and youth organizations.

(3) a change in the voting regulations, beginning with the lowest organs of the state and leading up by successive stages of power to elections to the Sejm (Parliament). These new regulations would foresee elections to one-seat constituencies with several competing candidates from the Front of National Unity, perhaps representing the same parties now existing in Poland -- the United Workers' Party, the Peasants' Party and the Democratic Front. This would follow the example of the United Arab Republic and Tanzania.

(4) and only in the more distant future, a change to a political system which allowed a legal opposition, a party based on socialist principles and in accordance with the constitution of the Polish People's Republic.

The adoption of this programme, or one similar to it, which would gradually democratize our public life, would go a long way to relax the political tensions in our country. It would give our party the support of the broad masses of society.

My view on the case of Jacek Kuron and Karol Modzelewski is as follows: Kuron and Modzelewski embarked on their activities through their impatience at the halting of the process of destalinization in Poland. Examples of this are the closing of the discussion club at the University of Warsaw, and the repressive measures taken against those who signed the letter of the 34 to the Prime Minister. These obstacles to consistent destalinization were taken by them as an expression of the class interest of a "power elite," which is supposed to be building a new class to exploit the proletariat. Taking this view of the situation, they decided upon the historical inevitability of a social revolution of the proletariat. The victory of this revolution would open the way to the true building of socialism. The programme and tactics of this revolution were to be an exact copy of those of the Communist International, of which before the war the Communist Party of Poland formed part.

Transitory Phase

I do not support their point of view since I consider the changes begun by the October revolution of 1917 to be

socialist changes. I review the bureaucratic deformation of revolutionary power as a transitory phase, peculiar to the period of construction of socialism -- a disease which can be diagnosed and effectively cured by applying Marxist theory. It arises from the political superstructure and not from the foundations. This is why social revolution is not now inevitable. The problem is to repair socialism, not to bring it about by a violent agitation of the present state. The fight against the bureaucratic distortions of revolutionary power must be carried on so as not to endanger the achievements of socialism and, above all, socialist power.

While I reject the opinions of Kuron and Modzelewski, I still think that depriving them of liberty has brought great political harm to our country as well as to Poland's reputation in the world. The worst aspect of the affair has been the use of the Shorter Criminal Code against this communist opposition, a Code which was introduced just after the war during a period of national reconstruction, and was aimed against such reactionary underground organizations as the "Freedom and Independence" and "National Armed Forces" movements. I can see no justification in treating opposition groups within our party -- such as the groups of Kuron and Modzelewski, of Badowski and Hass, or of Kazimierz Mijal -- in the same way that the "National Armed Forces" bandits were treated. One is reminded of the type of behaviour that was outlined to us by Comrade Gomulka in his criticism of the methods used by Stalin to fight opposition within the Bolshevik

movement.

My view on the conflict with the Church hierarchy is as follows: We cannot consolidate the achievements of socialism without the firm support of the whole of the working class. But unfortunately the vast majority of the members of our working class are believers. Our dialogue with Roman Catholics is designed to ensure for our party the support of the working masses. We cannot allow the quarrel with Cardinal Wyszynski to be treated by the Catholic masses as a "Kulturkampf" against the Church, since this would isolate us for an important part of the society. Unfortunately the events of past years have combined with the present confrontation with the episcopate to give rise to such suspicions. Catholics have taken great exception to the difficulties they encounter in building new churches and religious schools, to the refusal to allow the Pope to come to Poland, as well as to "sacrilegious" acts of the People's Militia against a vehicle carrying an image of the Virgin Mary. All this is grist to the mill of reactionary clerics.

In reference to my May 1 article, I can only say that the most questioned part of my article does contain ideas which are widespread among modern Marxists. What is more, these ideas are a simple continuation of the ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, which were silenced during the Stalinist period and brought into the daylight after the twentieth congress of the Soviet Communist Party -- or earlier by the Yugoslav communists.

WIDESPREAD SYMPATHY IN BRAZIL FOR STUDENT DEMONSTRATORS

In the aftermath of three days of violent, massive clashes between Brazilian police and demonstrating students -- which began when a student demonstrator was shot to death by police on March 28 -- a wide range of public opinion in Brazil has united in condemnation of the police actions and against threats of stepped-up repression.

The archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, Mgr. José de Castro Pinto, declared, as quoted in Le Monde of April 9, that "the violence and arbitrariness of the police were such that many asked themselves if the policemen were not under the influence of excitant drugs." Fifty clergymen in the state of Guanabara issued an appeal to the authorities to "substitute dialogue for violence and justice for arbitrariness."

The final tally scored by the police assault on the students showed five persons dead, one hundred wounded, and

roughly five hundred arrested. The total cost to the Brazilian economy of this repression is estimated at the equivalent of \$50 million.

It is rumored that the government intends to exile the alleged leaders of the dissident students in the forbidding Amazonian back country. Threats of broad repressive measures have also been made by spokesmen for the military dictatorship. However, despite these threats the government is reportedly reluctant to chance imposing a state of siege or wholesale political repressions.

Irenée Guimaraes, Le Monde's special correspondent in Rio, noted in the April 9 issue of that paper that the student unrest in Brazil had revealed serious weaknesses in the regime: dissension in the government and total lack of any program for education in a country with a population of more than forty million under twenty years of age and an illiteracy rate of 60 percent.

KOSYGIN-BREZHNEV THREATEN DISSENTERS IN USSR WITH POLICE CLUB

By George Saunders

As protests by Soviet intellectuals over the recent trials of young rebels and dissenters broaden in scope, the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime has felt called upon to intensify its counterpressures.

This was evident in the major speech by General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev on March 29, warning that protesters "cannot go unpunished." The April 9-10 meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union [CPSU] also reflected the regime's concern over growing rank-and-file defiance at a time of turmoil in neighboring Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Previous to these events, the main literary paper, Literaturnaya Gazeta, on March 27, ran a big article by its chief editor, Aleksandr Chakovsky, who is also an official of the Soviet Writers Union. Chakovsky polemicized at length against some of the recent protest statements by intellectuals such as Pavel Litvinov. Among authors and signers of these statements have been many leading writers and scientists and other prominent persons. However, the Soviet press has not printed their statements. Ironically, Chakovsky gave considerable space to quotes from letters of a different kind -- written by apologists for the trials, all previously unknown figures.

Among Chakovsky's more benevolent suggestions was that the young people recently jailed might better have been exiled and denied Soviet citizenship.

A similar line was pursued in an article by Sergei Mikhalkov, another bureaucrat of the Writers Union. Writing in the March 30 Komsomolskaya Pravda, the Young Communist League paper, he demanded closer ideological supervision for writers who are party members, and complained that some prominent writers were still defying warnings and agitating against the trials.

The Moscow party organization has held a series of meetings to denounce dissidents. Two well-known writers, Stepan Shchipachev and Aleksei Surkov, gave speeches at such a meeting, blasting "those who sign letters which provide nourishment for imperialist propaganda."

The positions taken by Surkov and Shchipachev are symptomatic of the pressure being applied by the regime now. Neither was ever an outstanding anti-Stalinist or "liberalizer," although in recent years both have gone along with the majority of the writers community in favoring relaxation of literary controls.

Both were among the great number criticized during Khrushchev's campaign against "abstract art" in 1963. And in 1966, Surkov was one of the signers of a petition opposing a possible rehabilitation of Stalin at the Twenty-third Congress of the CPSU.

That these two figures have now crumbled before the regime's pressure shows that a drive is on to break away the weaker wills, the more bureaucratic elements. A strong spirit of solidarity among the writers has been a limiting factor on the regime for several years, and the intention seems to be to break up this solidarity.

But pressure, intimidation, and police action will not necessarily work. Such methods have been greatly intensified in the last three years, but have only aroused greater protests. Further intensification may have the same effect.

A good description of the atmosphere of resistance among Soviet intellectuals appeared in an article by Patricia Blake in the March 24, 1968, New York Times Magazine. Written from the point of view of a bourgeois student of Soviet letters, the article shows Miss Blake's close knowledge of and good feel for the Soviet literary scene, but it naturally falls short of a clear understanding of the significance of the intellectuals' struggle.

Miss Blake does not see that this is part of the broader movement toward the regeneration of the Russian socialist revolution and the revival of workers democracy in the spirit of Lenin's State and Revolution. She imagines perhaps that the protesting youth and intellectuals are fighting for "freedom" as enjoyed by American writers and scholars. But they are probably less naive on that subject than she.

Nevertheless, her description of the Soviet intellectual dissent is an accurate and useful one: "The simple fact is," she writes, "that the Russian intellectual has, by and large, ceased to be afraid. The old, fearful sense of isolation from which writers and readers, teachers and students, scholars, scientists and artists suffered under Stalin has gradually been replaced by a sense of community that now gives them the courage to risk prison for the sake of commonly shared principle. This change seems very nearly miraculous when one considers how intellectually, artistically and morally stupefying was Stalin's terror.... [Emphasis added.]

"Today intellectuals of all ages are openly calling, not only for greater intellectual and artistic freedom, but, increasingly, for fundamental changes in Soviet society.* They are fighting for their beliefs from the prisoner's dock, on the streets, in underground books and magazines and, indeed, on any tribune they can find -- including the foreign press. They throw flowers on paddy wagons, demonstrate outside courtrooms, and assemble in public squares carrying placards calling for adherence to the Constitution. They hold illegal press conferences for Western newsmen where they accuse Soviet newspapers of slander, and threaten to sue. They draft letters, signed by a who's who of Soviet literature, science, and scholarship, demanding an end to violations of the law, and address them to Brezhnev and Kosygin, the Politburo, the Supreme Court, Pravda and Izvestia, and circulate them all over Moscow. In short, the liberal intelligentsia is confronting the Soviet leadership with its own myths."

One of the recent protest statements that Miss Blake quotes in her article is especially interesting. It was drafted by Pyotr Yakir, son of Maj. Gen. Iona Yakir, one of the top Red Army officers shot on Stalin's orders in 1937. Gen. Yakir was rehabilitated after Stalin's death; Pyotr, the son, spent seventeen years in Stalin's prison camps, and now works as a historian.

Pyotr Yakir's statement denounced the January trial of young rebels in Moscow in sharp terms: "Even Andrei Vyshinsky would have envied the organization of this trial," Yakir wrote, adding: "The inhuman punishment of members of the intelligentsia is a logical extension of

* Miss Blake no doubt thinks the Soviet rebels favor restoration of capitalism, but there is no evidence that they advocate anything but greater democracy within the postcapitalist framework. The establishment of democratic workers control over the government and economy would be a "fundamental change" in the present political structure, which is characterized by exclusive bureaucratic command from above. But that change would not alter the basic social and economic foundations -- planned economy and public ownership of all major means of production and distribution.

the atmosphere of public life in recent years. The process of the restoration of Stalinism is going on -- slowly but remorselessly."

The "naive hopes" raised by the denunciation of Stalin at the twentieth and twenty-second CPSU congresses, he pointed out, had not been realized. "The name of Stalin is being pronounced from the highest platforms in an entirely positive context."

Yakir pointed to the publication of many works praising Stalin, while those critical of the "great genius" were suppressed. The same point was made by literary historian Lev Kopelev, who together with five others was recently expelled from the CPSU for signing protest statements. (See World Outlook, April 5, pp. 300-302.)

Yakir contrasted the trend toward rehabilitating Stalin with the continued negative evaluation of Trotsky's role in Soviet history.

Yakir's statement closed with an appeal to Soviet citizens to "raise your voices against the impending danger of new Stalins and Yezhovs...We remind you that people who dared to think are now languishing in harsh forced-labor camps. Every time you are silent, another stepping-stone is added, leading to new trials of a Daniel or a Ginzburg. Little by little, with your acquiescence, a new 1937 may come upon us."

Yakir's mention of Trotsky was not accidental. A number of Soviet "historical" articles in the past three years have painted Stalin favorably -- precisely in connection with his role in defeating "Trotskyism." In fact, the March 1968 issue of the monthly journal Problems of CPSU History [Voprosy Istorii KPSS] ran just such an article, entitled "The Party's Struggle with Trotskyism in 1928-1930."

Aside from being a rehash of stale old falsifications of history, the article included the following subtle but revealing passage: "The Sixteenth Congress [of the CPSU] summed up the struggle with Trotskyism for the period following the Fifteenth Congress. The reports of J.V. Stalin and G.K. Ordjonokidze, as well as the speeches of I.M. Vareikis, I.D. Kabakov, P.P. Postyshev, Ya.E. Rudzutak, R.I. Eikhe, E.M. Yaroslavsky, and others, laid out a clear picture of this struggle."

THE SMALL FARMERS IN CUBA

[The following article is the first in a series of three which appeared in the English edition of PEL (Panorama Economico Latinoamericano), a weekly bulletin of Prensa Latina, the Cuban news service. It was published in No. 221 of PEL under the title, "A Well-Defined Status." We will print the rest of the series in coming issues of World Outlook.]

* * *

I.

Eight years have passed since the revolutionary government decreed the first Agrarian Reform Law (May 1959) and scarcely four years have gone by since the Second Agrarian Reform (October 1963).

During these years two different elements were defined: the first was the structure of land tenure, and second, the level of socioeconomic organization in both the state and private sectors.

It was natural that the profound socioeconomic transformation carried out in the rural areas of Cuba had repercussions on the organizational forms of work and resulted in a certain amount of instability in the agricultural-livestock sector.

From the political viewpoint, the private sector definitely consolidated its position once the Second Agrarian Reform had gone into effect, which meant that landowners could not hold more than 67 hectares (the first Reform Law had been more than generous in allowing private owners up to 402.6 hectares of land).

Thus the second Law eliminated an element of political instability, even of counterrevolution. The country could then begin to rely on an authentic mass of small farmers who worked the land themselves, organized themselves rapidly, voluntarily adopting different forms of association and participating completely in the revolutionary process.

The fact was that the class interests of landowners with more than 67 hectares inevitably drove them to fight against the revolution. This antagonism between the land-owning bourgeoisie and the new socialist process was expressed in different ways. Most important of all, it became an instrument of internal counterrevolution; in many cases, the large landowners directly combated the revolution, or at least gave shelter, economic aid, and information to counterrevolutionary CIA-supported bands. Many of them tried to lead the small farmers into counterrevolutionary activities, spreading rumors and intrigue, sowing in them doubts

as to their future. In general, the rural bourgeoisie undertook direct sabotage of production, left its lands in a progressive state of abandonment, hampered production, etc. It was all too evident that this situation could not continue and thus the Second Agrarian Reform was born. This measure, of an eminently political character, was in a certain sense a defensive act of the revolution, as well as a historical necessity.

The economic power of the rural bourgeoisie on the eve of the Second Agrarian Reform was considerable: this sector owned approximately 1,744,626 hectares, [one hectare = nearly 2.5 acres], that is, more than 20% of the country's arable land; more than 1,000 million arrobas of sugarcane (equivalent to more than 1.4 million tons of sugar) planted over 295,200 hectares of land; and a decisive part of the national herd, particularly the pastures for cattle breeding and fattening.

Meanwhile the process of consolidating the agricultural-livestock sector, although it was progressing well, had to be delayed for a considerable period of time until the present when close and specific cooperation is beginning between the private sector (organized in the National Association of Small Farmers -- ANAP) and the state sector.

On many occasions, the Revolutionary Government has explained to the small farmers the scope of their rights and what their future role will be within the Revolution.

This process is expressed in the speech given by Prime Minister Fidel Castro at the time of the passage of the Second Agrarian Reform (October 1963). He explained such important matters as the continued existence of small private farmers for an indefinite period of time, stating: "There are two pillars: the nationalized land owned and managed by the state farms and the lands belonging to the small farmers. These two sectors can advance together and contribute extraordinarily to the development of the economy, as allies of the working class; the revolution will always respect the feelings of the small farmers who want to farm their own land, and will respect the way in which they want to farm their land." Earlier Fidel had expressed the same idea: "The Revolution thinks of future development as being based on two elements: state production and the production of the small farmers who may feel absolutely secure -- absolutely secure -- and you all know that the Revolution's word is its honor."

Today all over the world agrarian reforms no longer constitute spooks haunt-

ing the landowner. Ideas on agrarian reform are now being broadly interpreted and frequently these reforms are adopted and converted into instruments which actually defend the bourgeoisie itself or ensure the continued existence of the landowner. Examples of this "flexibility" can be counted by the dozens: from the simple expropriation of private land with rapid and "appropriate" indemnification for distribution in tiny parcels to the peasants, thus worsening another aspect of feudalism -- the minifundium; to the distribution of state lands among peasants to give them the illusion of a progressive regime, thus placating the popular demands for truly structural reforms.

Instead of a true agrarian reform, legal ownership of Conucos, Huasipungos, etc., is sanctioned. These are slave-like systems of exploitation, that is, the use of parcels of land in exchange for work. Such was, for example, the publicized agrarian reform of Ecuador's military dictatorship which was overthrown last year, a victim of its own incapacity and political poverty.

But all these forms of manipulating agrarian reforms are well-known reactionary maneuvers which prosper in the atmosphere of the much touted "representative democracies" maintained by precisely the same bourgeoisie that with subtle methods seeks to escape the sweep of revolutionary currents.

However even within a truly revolutionary process there is a great diversity of criteria on agrarian reform, depending on the prevailing socioeconomic conditions in each case.

The Road of Cuba

What did the Cuban Revolution do in the field of agrarian reform? We will quote some of Prime Minister Castro's comments on this subject:*

"Even up to that moment (the time of the agrarian reform law) the most common concept in the country of how to make an agrarian reform was the concept of land distribution. But today we can see clearly that this is an idea which would have been perfectly suitable for a capitalist society, it is impossible, from all points of view, to do with the land from a technical and productive standpoint what could be done with it when all the nation's resources are used for this purpose."

"In the beginning, it would have

been the easiest of all agrarian reforms: so many thousands of hectares of farm land, so many landless peasants or agricultural workers. How would the land be distributed? Thirteen hectares per person? The land would never stretch that far. There were hundreds of thousands of persons living or working in the rural zones who wanted land. Six hectares? The land would still not be enough. Three hectares? One and a half hectares?"

"...If we had distributed the land at one and a half hectares per person... this revolution would have become chaos. And obviously, since we were not going to let that happen then we would have...had to begin to reunite all those one and a half hectares, because when the time came to use a machine, a combine...a hydraulic project or an airplane to cropdust or fertilize, it would have been impossible from every standpoint."

"What solution did the Revolution seek? The peasantry, working the land for years, accustomed to this type of work and this form of production, paying rent, or a third of their crops, or a half, all these forms of exploitation of the peasant...accustomed to this type of work... who likes this form of work...Let us leave this peasant there, let us exempt him from paying rent, that is, from exploitation. Let us begin to give him all possible services -- education, medical assistance, credits, communications -- in short, everything within our power to give."

"But why convert an agricultural worker, why convert a worker who one day could till the soil with the aid of machines and technology, into an owner of a minifundium?"

"This is why the Revolution decided not to break up and distribute the latifundia. This was not an easy task; it was not easy to understand. The bourgeoisie said: 'Look, the State is seizing all the land; look, now you're going to be wage earners for the State.' Later, since there were farmers who owned different-sized parcels, they tried to implant fear as they always do in the case of agrarian reform."

"Naturally it was absolutely necessary to make a second reform. Why was it necessary? Because of the large number of landowners with 200, 300 or 400 hectares, an immense majority had a virtual attitude of sabotage towards production. We had to make another agrarian reform. What did they do then? They began to say: 'No, after this it will be your turn.' Then the Revolution declared -- and this Revolution has always been remarkable because it has always kept all its promises; it has been notable for its seriousness and

* Excerpts from the speech given by Major Fidel Castro on May 19, 1967, at the closing session of the Third ANAP Congress.

for its honesty -- the Revolution declared that there will be NO more agrarian reforms! And simply, the process of law and agrarian reforms lasted up to that moment."

"The bourgeoisie in general and the landowners used many...arguments. They would say to the small farmers: 'This is socialism and because it is socialism they are going to take away your land.' We came and told the small farmers: 'This is socialism and because it is socialism we are not going to nationalize your land.' And since the impoverished and exploited farmer is an ally of the working class, we must treat him as a revolutionary, as a comrade, a friend, with all the political considerations that he deserves."

"Especially in our revolution, the small farmer played a very important role because the first guerrilla groups began to form precisely in the mountains, among them."

"We believe that the solution given by the revolution was a very good one, in that it decided not to break up the latifundia and to respect the traditional means of production of the poor peasants and in that it never attempted to 'socialize' the small farmers."

"Of course, no one can doubt that a large piece of land will raise production and productivity."

"However, we said: 'It doesn't matter. The latifundia have enough land full of marabu, of brushwood, producing almost nothing, so that we can increase production extraordinarily, even if we don't increase productivity in the same manner among the small farmers due to the parceling out of land.'"

"Today, we see clearly that this was the most correct policy that we could have chosen. Does this mean that we believe in the minifundium? No. We do not believe in the minifundium. Does this mean that we believe we can reach maximum yields and maximum productivity by distribution of small parcels of land? No. It does not mean this. It means that the revolution is really following a policy based on reality, that the revolution is on the right road. And it also means that when a revolution follows a realistic policy, it is based on the realities of a country, it is based on the situation existing in a certain country."

"We believe that the most rational -- the most productive -- form of land tenure and labor is not the small parcel. Nevertheless, our policy was that of maintaining these parcels, our policy was that of not promoting the unification of these lands, our policy was one of patience, of struggling to introduce technology -- al-

though this is still not sufficiently widespread -- within the manner of production that the small farmer was accustomed to, in the form that he liked."

The above is a summary of the status of the private sector within the Revolution. It is a perfectly well-defined and permanent status, therefore both the State and the small farmer know what is expected from them.

Now then, what is, in fact, the economic power of the peasantry? Perhaps, as few socialist revolutions have done, the Cuban state has managed to consolidate an important position within the agricultural-economic aggregate of the country. In spite of everything the private sector has an important position.

According to a partial count taken at the time of the 1961 livestock census, there were 4.45 million hectares of land in farms owned by the private sector, or 59.8 percent of the land area calculated for that year.*

Table No. 1 shows the distribution of these lands, according to size and number of farms.

Table No. 1

Land Distribution in the Private Sector, According to Size of Farms (1961)

<u>Size of Farms</u>	<u>No. of Farms</u>	<u>Thousands of Hectares</u>
Up to 67 hectares	154,703	2,348.1
From 67 to 134 hectares	6,062	607.5
From 134 to 268 "	3,105	610.3
From 268 to 402 "	1,456	507.6
Over 402 hectares	592	377.5
Total	165,918	4,451.0

Thus in 1961 the amount of land owned by the private sector was significant. However, this ownership was not a definite one chiefly because of political reasons as explained in the beginning of this article.

Apart from this, Table No. 1 clearly reveals, on the basis of farm size, the class content that emerged after May 1959, once the first Agrarian Reform Law had been put into effect.

The vast majority of farmers had less than 67 hectares of land each, among these no less than 120,000 owned less than 26.4 hectares each, of the latter some

* According to the last census taken before the revolution, there were approximately 159,000 farms with a total of 9.08 million hectares.

60,000 owned less than 13.4 hectares each, including the more than 25,000 whose holdings were no larger than 6.5 hectares.

This sector of small farmers was what would later be known as the private agricultural sector. The other landowners with more than 67 hectares would tend to disappear by a spontaneous process of abandoning their land (when they chose self-exile) and later by virtue of the Second Agrarian Reform.

Thus the state sector owned only 40 percent of the land partially calculated in 1961, that is, almost three million hectares which placed it in an inferior position compared to the private sector in regard to the available land area, its quality, the volume of manpower and the experience and organization needed for production.

This was the first phase of Cuba's agrarian reform. Up to the beginning of 1963 the situation changed considerably in favor of the state sector. In effect, the state sector then owned a total of

3.9 million hectares, and had approximately 334,000 workers.

The Second Agrarian Reform was decreed in October 1963, and allowed landholdings no larger than 67 hectares. With this the Revolution concluded its agrarian reform regarding land tenure and land structure. The agrarian reform, naturally, continues and must still go a long way in the direction of agricultural-livestock development, the application of advanced techniques, unlimited cooperation with the private sector until this sector disappears naturally.

The Second Agrarian Reform gave the state sector approximately 70 percent of the nation's total land, with the private sector holding the remaining 30 percent.

Nevertheless, this proportion is somewhat different if we only consider net agricultural lands, in this case more than 60 percent is owned by the state and less than 40 percent by the private sector.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
The Triple Crisis Faced by America's Rulers -- by George Novack	338
What Stokely Carmichael Really Said About Slaying of Dr. King	340
Racist Officials Aim New Blows at Black Leaders -- by Les Evans	342
Mexican Intellectuals Appeal for Solidarity with Demetrio Vallejo	345
When I met Rudi Dutschke in Berlin -- by Mary-Alice Waters	345
PHOTO: Rudi Dutschke	346
Bertrand Russell Sees Complete Defeat for U.S. in Vietnam	348
Venezuelan Pastor, Friendly to Guerrillas, Assassinated	348
Johnson Once Again Breaks Troop "Ceiling" in Vietnam	349
DRAWING: Rusk, Westmoreland, Johnson, Clifford	349
"While Winning Johnson's War"	350
Zengakuren Leads New Demonstrations at Army Hospital and Airport	351
The Socialism Antoni Zambrowski Wants for Poland	352
Widespread Sympathy in Brazil for Student Demonstrators	354
Kosygin-Brezhnev Threaten Dissenters in USSR with Police Club	
-- by George Saunders	355
The Small Farmers in Cuba	357

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010



EDITOR: Joseph Hansen. CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, George Novack. WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for publications of the labor, socialist, colonial independence and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the view of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of World Outlook. Insofar as it re-

flects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. TO SUBSCRIBE: For 26 issues send \$7.50 or £3.2.6d or 37.50 francs to: World Outlook, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on airmail or first-class subscriptions. PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.