

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 16

May 20, 1966

In this issue

Page

Ky's "Act of Treachery"	1
American Troops Panicked in Saigon	3
China Tests Thermonuclear Materials	4
Japanese Transport Workers Win Wage Boost	6
U.S. Draft Tests "Reminiscent of Hitler"	7
Students Protest Undemocratic U.S. Draft Test	8
Pacifist Wing Declines in U.S. Antiwar Movement	8
Antiwar Sentiment Begins to Affect Union Bureaucrats	9
Abram Fischer Given Life Sentence	10
Danger of a Coup d'Etat Rises in Argentina	11
Shift in Attitude of the ORP toward Boumedienne	16
Harsh Disciplinary Measures at Waseda	17
Indian Government Releases Political Prisoners	18
-- by Kailas Chandra	18
Ranadive's Views on Political Situation in India	20
"Famine"? Not If You Know Your Semantics!	22
Where Is the "Tashkent Spirit"?	23
A Letter from Isaac Camacho	25
Co-eds on the Increase in Japan	26
Documents:	
Blas Roca's Defense of the Slanders	
against Trotskyism	27

KY'S "ACT OF TREACHERY"

Ky's blitzkrieg attack on Danang May 16 was aimed at stabilizing his own precarious position as dictator. It was a desperate gamble, however, for it risked setting off new demonstrations. The Buddhist leaders in Saigon called it an "act of treachery" designed to block the holding of elections. It could lead to "civil war."

Did Ky's gamble have Johnson's approval? After an emergency "secret" meeting that included Johnson, Lodge, Rusk, McNamara and

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

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

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

Vol. 4, No. 16

May 20, 1966

In this issue

Page

Ky's "Act of Treachery"	1
American Troops Panicked in Saigon	3
China Tests Thermonuclear Materials	4
Japanese Transport Workers Win Wage Boost	6
U.S. Draft Tests "Reminiscent of Hitler"	7
Students Protest Undemocratic U.S. Draft Test	8
Pacifist Wing Declines in U.S. Antiwar Movement	8
Antiwar Sentiment Begins to Affect Union Bureaucrats	9
Abram Fischer Given Life Sentence	10
Danger of a Coup d'Etat Rises in Argentina	11
Shift in Attitude of the ORP toward Boumedienne	16
Harsh Disciplinary Measures at Waseda	17
Indian Government Releases Political Prisoners	18
-- by Kailas Chandra	18
Ranadive's Views on Political Situation in India	20
"Famine"? Not If You Know Your Semantics!	22
Where Is the "Tashkent Spirit"?	23
A Letter from Isaac Camacho	25
Co-eds on the Increase in Japan	26
Documents:	
Blas Roca's Defense of the Slanders	
against Trotskyism	27

KY'S "ACT OF TREACHERY"

Ky's blitzkrieg attack on Danang May 16 was aimed at stabilizing his own precarious position as dictator. It was a desperate gamble, however, for it risked setting off new demonstrations. The Buddhist leaders in Saigon called it an "act of treachery" designed to block the holding of elections. It could lead to "civil war."

Did Ky's gamble have Johnson's approval? After an emergency "secret" meeting that included Johnson, Lodge, Rusk, McNamara and

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

other high officials, the State Department said that Ky acted without consultation. U.S. officials in Saigon were told, according to the same source, to do their best to persuade south Vietnam officials to do their best to "resolve their differences." Thus Johnson sought to maneuver into position to disclaim any responsibility if Ky failed or to embrace him if he succeeded.

Ky's promise to the Buddhist leaders to hold elections embarrassed the Johnson administration. Elections would be an inconvenient diversion from all-out pursuit of the war. Yet it was difficult to come out openly against them.

Lodge and Rusk even felt obliged to cover up for Ky when he blurted out that he intended to stay in power for at least "a year" -- even if elections were held. Rusk said that Ky had been misinterpreted. In Saigon the press on the day following Ky's statement came out with white spaces where the censor had pencilled out the reports which the Americans had found embarrassing.

What the censors cut out in Saigon also appears to have been kept out of the reports in the American press. However, the May 12 New York Post printed the following extract from the verbatim transcript of the interview Ky granted to CBS correspondent Ron Nessen:

"Nessen: If in the election of an assembly the government seems to be neutralist or Communist and to be moving towards peace with the Viet Cong, what would you and your military associates do?

"Ky: We will stand and fight.

"Nessen: You will fight the elected government?

"Ky: If they are Communists, I don't care if they are elected or not.

"Nessen: And if they are neutralists?

"Ky: Also.

"Nessen: You will fight the government and try to throw them out?

"Ky: But I am sure it will not happen, because I firmly believe that the majority of our people are anti-Communist and anti-neutralist."

When Ky granted this interview, his plans to attack Danang were nearing completion. If the attack succeeded, in one blow he would strengthen his own position and end the embarrassing business about elections.

Would Ky make such a move without an understanding with his imperialist masters? It is not very likely. No doubt, however, they indicated they would have to disclaim responsibility. His understanding smile can easily be visualized.

AMERICAN TROOPS PANICKED IN SAIGON

[The Johnson administration has been very apologetic about the "incident" May 10 when American troops in Saigon, thinking they were under attack, began firing indiscriminately, killing and wounding people in the streets. The American press at first printed the official story about the troops being under a real attack. They then indicated some "mistake" had been made. Next came intimations of a "tragic error." Finally the apologies of official Washington spokesmen. And all of it given less and less prominence until the affair finally vanished under the rug as just one of those "unfortunate" items "to be expected in any war."

[For a more accurate version of what happened, we have translated the following account from the May 11 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde.]

The explosion of a mine attached by the Vietcong to a bicycle near an American barracks in Saigon Tuesday touched off genuine panic among the American military police, who began shooting indiscriminately in all directions for forty-five minutes.

Two American buses were sprayed with bullets. A truck loaded with twenty-five Vietnamese was converted into a target -- three women were killed and twenty-two others wounded.

Two hundred meters away, the French hospital was also taken as a target. A Vietnamese visiting a patient was killed.

Ten Americans, some of whom were on their way to work on motorbikes were hit by bullets.

In other parts of the city, American sentries also began firing, particularly at a jeep.

Altogether there were five dead and twenty-eight wounded.

The American police intervened with great brutality, arresting passersby and searching homes long after the mine went off. The population in the surrounding area appears to have resented these methods.

The American mission recognized its responsibility and has undertaken measures to compensate the victims and their families insofar as is possible.

The affair has raised the question of moving the American troops outside the city. A project to set up new camps is under consideration.

CHINA TESTS THERMONUCLEAR MATERIALS

While the protracted and inconclusive disarmament conference at Geneva has again adjourned and U.S. fighter planes fly ever closer to China's borders, the Chinese government has staged its third nuclear explosion. This experiment involved thermonuclear materials.

Among other hypotheses, American experts believe that this test is a long step toward China's development of the most powerful H-bomb, the triple-stage "fission-fusion-fission" device, first achieved by the United States about a decade ago and thereafter utilized by Soviet scientists to produce weapons with 100 megaton yields.

In any case, American officials have obviously underestimated China's capacity to develop a hydrogen bomb just as they did earlier with the Soviet Union. After the first Chinese test in October 1964, they calculated that it would take five years before China would have a thermonuclear device.

With this third test China has blasted down the door to the exclusive thermonuclear club dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union. Both of these superpowers did what they could to exclude China from membership. Moscow tore up its 1957 treaty to aid Peking's nuclear development. In 1963 Washington and Moscow concluded a partial test-ban treaty without consulting China and then tried to impose its provisions without success upon that country.

Since then, both powers, who had already carried out adequate atmospheric experiments and now possess an overkill nuclear arsenal, have continued with underground tests.

What will Washington do in the face of China's progress in the nuclear arena? The New York Times urges that the People's Republic of China be invited to enter the United Nations and participate in the Geneva disarmament talks when they resume.

At the moment familiar cries are being raised from New Delhi to Washington about the increased threat to peace in Asia issuing from China's emergence as a thermonuclear power. Two incidents of the past week show how hollow and hypocritical such anti-Chinese propaganda is.

Premier Chou En-lai stated that, after its first nuclear explosion in October 1964, China made a specific proposal to the United States in Warsaw, where their representatives have periodic diplomatic contacts, that the two nations pledge that neither would be the first to use atomic weapons against the other. The United States rejected this proposal.

This was the first that the American public has heard about

Peking's offer. Such news would have marred the official caricature of China as a Hitlerite aggressor straining to use its prospective nuclear arsenal for purposes of conquest.

The State Department has now acknowledged that the Chinese offer was made and rejected on the formal ground that its terms did not provide sufficient safeguard of enforcement.

However, the May 12 New York Times reported that "an underlying reason for the rejection, according to officials, is a reluctance to get the United States into a position where it appears to foreclose on the use of a weapon that is viewed as a deterrent to Communist aggression." In plain words, the president and the Pentagon do not intend to scrap their nuclear bombs or give up their intention to drop them when and where they please.

This position was made clear by a State Department spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, who said that the Chinese want to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons, while the United States "attitude is that we should ban aggression in any form and get on with verified disarmament on a balanced basis and in a manner consistent with the security interests of all countries."

The New York Times correspondent pressed Mr. McCloskey "to explain how controls could be devised to enforce a pledge that a nation would not be the first to use nuclear weapons. He provided no explanation. Instead, reading from a 'position paper,' he went on to contend that China had shown no 'constructive interest' in disarmament steps involving controls and verification.

"For example, he said, the Chinese have refused to sign the treaty forbidding nuclear tests in the air, in space or under water. Nor, he said, have the Chinese shown any interest in the disarmament discussions being held at Geneva. In response to a question, he acknowledged that China had not been invited to participate in that conference."

Thus, Peking wants to outlaw the use of atomic weapons while Washington prefers endless discussions on gradual disarmament which, as the futile proceedings at Geneva demonstrate, get nowhere.

President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia correctly stated May 12 that China should not be condemned for testing nuclear devices when stronger nations were "raining" bombs on Vietnam near her borders. Indeed, the U.S. war hawks appear to be going beyond this to a more perilous point.

According to a spokesman of the Chinese Ministry of National Defense May 13, five United States fighter planes intruded on China's airspace over Yunnan Province and shot down one of its military aircraft with guided missiles. Peking denounced the attack as "an extremely grave incident, a deliberate, systematic act of war provoked by the Johnson Administration."

The "clear and present" danger of a conflict which could escalate into a nuclear war comes from such increasingly aggressive acts of the U.S. military machine in Southeast Asia, and not at all from the Communist leadership in Peking.

In an interview given to a Pakistani correspondent in April and made public after the air attack, Premier Chou En-lai warned that some U.S. strategists were eager to bomb China, relying on their air and naval superiority. He said that "China will not take the initiative to provoke war with the U.S." but that "once the war breaks out, it will have no boundaries."

JAPANESE TRANSPORT WORKERS WIN WAGE BOOST

Two widespread strikes in Japan, one on April 26 and another four days later, won a significant wage increase for the country's transport workers. The April 26 strike affected 10,160,000 persons on railways and another 10,300,000 on buses. The follow-up strike was less paralyzing, since management conceded the minimum wage demands a few hours after the action got under way and the unions thereupon called off the walkout.

The unions began by demanding a monthly increase of 8,000 yen [362 yen = \$1] to make up for a 7.4 percent hike in the cost of living in 1965. Management offered only 2,100 yen. On the eve of the strikes, they came up to 3,300 yen, but the union leaders held out for 3,500. It was reported in the press that they would be "repudiated by the rank and file" if they accepted less. The point was pressed home by the strike and the settlement was for 3,500 yen -- a record high figure.

One of the outstanding features of the strike was the united action taken by the many unions in both the private and public sectors of the industry. In Japan it is illegal for a worker in government service to go on strike. However, the members of the government-run railways disregarded the restrictions written into law. When the unions in the private sector downed tools on April 26, the unions in the public sector joined them. In case they were hauled into court they were prepared to argue that it would have been "unsafe" to continue work that day; however, the view not only in management circles but among the unions was that the action violated the law.

The real situation, of course, is that the law is unworkable. Directed against the workers, it cannot be enforced in face of massive resistance.

The government itself recognized realities by announcing the evening before the April 26 strike that it would adjust wages, bearing in mind whatever agreement was reached in the private sector.

DRAFT DEFERRALS: DRAFT TESTS "REMINISCENT OF HITLER"

The conscription of adolescents for service in the armed forces under highly undemocratic regulations has been an irritant to the American people since the practice was instituted in 1940 and then made permanent in 1948. The deferment provisions on the basis of scholastic performance have recently been singled out for special attack.

A series of nationwide tests, the first on May 14, the others May 21, June 3 and the end of June, were scheduled by the Selective Service System of the U.S. government. The grades made by those taking the tests are to be utilized by draft boards as one of the elements in deciding on who goes into the army and who is left free to continue school.

Adam Clayton Powell, a Democratic congressman from Manhattan, attacked the tests on May 10 as "reminiscent of Hitler," as the foundation for a "racial aristocracy" and a device to send a disproportionate number of Negroes to the "Vietnam slaughterhouse."

Powell made his comments at a news conference in the committee room of the House Education and Labor Committee, of which he is chairman. His main point was that the tests penalize unfairly the poorly schooled Negro, and thus "bring the history of racial discrimination full cycle."

"First we provide an inferior education for black students," he continued. "Next we give them a series of tests which many will flunk because of an inferior education. Then, we pack these academic failures off to Vietnam to be killed."

"Implicit in the draft deferment tests," said Powell, "is the theory of a race of Aryan supermen and the belief that rare great minds alone are fit to direct the destinies of a nation and to dispose of the lives of its untutored masses."

"Instead of a social democracy where equality is encouraged to flourish, these draft deferment tests lay the foundation for a racial aristocracy. These tests are reminiscent of Hitler's twin system of eugenics and education -- weed out the intellectually deprived or socially undesirables by conscripting them for cannon fodder."

Scoring the war in Vietnam, Powell said that a "higher percentage of black soldiers is already dying in what is ingloriously being referred to in many areas of the black communities as a 'white man's war' against a brown people."

The country's Negroes, Mexican-Americans and other minority groups are "confused" about U.S. aims in Vietnam, Powell declared. He held that the Vietnamese people should be permitted to choose their own political system through free elections as soon as possible.

STUDENTS PROTEST UNDEMOCRATIC U.S. DRAFT DEFERMENT TEST

Groups of students throughout the United States were involved in protest actions against the undemocratic draft deferment tests held May 14 under government sponsorship. The main organization behind the actions was the Students for a Democratic Society.

Besides picket lines, sit-ins were staged at some universities and some 400 students occupied the administration building at the University of Chicago.

In New York, Tom Hayden, one of the leaders of the SDS, told reporters: "These tests invite students to escape the draft and let Negroes, working and poor people who cannot afford college to go fight this war. It invites students to compete with each other to decide who will study and who will die."

In many universities, professors have expressed sympathy with the demonstrators. At Columbia University in New York, a group of professors held a press conference at which they urged "as radical a separation of the activities of the Selective Service administration from the educational enterprise as possible."

Even the New York Times felt compelled to say something about the undemocratic nature of the tests. In an editorial May 14, the powerful daily declared: "Deferment of college students places most of the burden of military service on the shoulders of the very poor or the academically untalented. This smacks of a caste system, in which prolonged education can readily turn deferment into exemption."

Michael Klare, a student antiwar leader at Columbia University, pointed to another side of the reaction to the tests: "We feel that each of the students taking the test is protesting against the war by trying to get out of it."

PACIFIST WING DECLINES IN U.S. ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

An antiwar march in Washington May 15, sponsored by SANE [National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy] and Women's Strike for Peace, was a fiasco compared to the giant parade of 30,000 last November. Sanford Gottlieb, coordinator of the drive, said on the eve of the demonstration that maybe 10,000 would participate, "mostly adults." The actual turnout was "from 7,000 to 12,000."

The reason for the lack of enthusiasm and the poor response was the absence of militancy, which in turn was related to the aim of the sponsors to use the demonstration to advance "peace" candidates of the Democratic party in the coming elections.

One of the main projected slogans of the demonstration was

to back such candidates of the very capitalist party that decided to escalate U.S. intervention in Vietnam into a Korean-type war.

Said the National Guardian, a progressive weekly published in New York: "Because of what some consider the excessive moderation of the peace pledge drive, significant sections of the new peace movement -- while not opposing it -- are not supporting the Washington demonstration. Except for the DuBois clubs, few student groups are enthusiastic about the voters protest. Neither do many of the pacifist, radical-left nor independent antiwar committees actively support the drive."

The truth is that the rising opposition among the American people to Johnson's escalation of the war has greatly increased the popularity of slogans and aims much to the left of such staid pacifist groups as SANE, with the strong ties among its leaders to the Democratic party. The key slogan reflecting this new mood is "Withdraw U.S. Troops Now!"

If the Washington march had been organized around this theme or one close to it, the demonstration would undoubtedly have greatly surpassed last November's march.

ANTIWAR SENTIMENT BEGINS TO AFFECT UNION BUREAUCRATS IN U.S.

The official policy of the AFL-CIO bureaucracy headed by George Meany is to stand to the right of the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers in supporting Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam.

This ultrareactionary attitude in the face of rising opposition to the war among the American people has led to restiveness in a sector of the bureaucracy, according to James A. Wechsler, writing in the May 11 issue of the liberal New York Post.

At a meeting of some 200 officials of locals affiliated with 38 international unions, which was held in New York recently, a motion was passed to establish a Trade Union Division of the Sane Nuclear Policy Committee. Informal conferences have been held since then in Chicago and San Francisco at which Johnson's belligerent foreign policy was discussed.

"Most of the names associated with the ferment belong to the second and third echelons of the labor movement," said Wechsler; "few are headline figures. But this can hardly be dismissed as a 'far-out' expedition. There is reason to believe that its emergence reflects growing restiveness in many labor sectors over the monolithic militancy (or meekness) that has characterized the AFL-CIO role in a great national debate."

Wechsler even detects a "certain defiance" that is "symptomatic of a frustration and unrest that many observers detected beneath the surface of the last AFL-CIO convention." No discussion of foreign policy occurred at that gathering. In fact efforts were made to pass a resolution that would have gone beyond Johnson's position and "identified the AFL-CIO with the American Legion in reckless clamor for larger military measures."

At the moment, the "dissidents," as Wechsler calls them, do not project any sharp struggle. They merely seek a free discussion and "an end to the silence that is broken only by periodic statements of labor's fealty to the President."

"In the small beginning of insurgence now at hand," Wechsler comments, "there may be the glimpse of an overdue debate. The sons of union men are perishing in Viet Nam, along with other Americans."

Up to now, the development of the antiwar movement has followed a rather classic pattern. The first voices of protest and "insurgence" came from the revolutionary-socialist movement. Then it was the turn of intellectuals. The first mass protests appeared on the campus in the form of teach-ins, rallies and picket lines. These broadened into marches involving tens of thousands of people. But up to this point the working class, headed by an extremely conservative bureaucracy, has remained quiescent.

The significance of the moves reported by Wechsler is that the workers are becoming disturbed over Johnson's war and are beginning to put pressure on the bureaucrats. The first to respond are minor officials, and the response, as expected, has been timid up to now.

However, this may portend the gathering of massive phalanxes. If the American working class begins participating in the antiwar movement, as it will inevitably at one point or another if Johnson continues his warmongering foreign policy, then the entire political scene will be shaken -- and rapidly.

ABRAM FISCHER GIVEN LIFE SENTENCE

South Africa's fascist government added one more brutal crime to its long list when it sentenced the 59-year-old Abram Fischer to a life sentence May 9 for alleged "conspiracy to commit sabotage" and "furthering" the aims of the Communist party. One of South Africa's outstanding barristers, Fischer's real "crime" was serving as attorney for the defense in the famous Rivonia trial in 1964 in which Nelson Mandela and other freedom fighters were given life sentences. When he was sentenced, Fischer turned to the packed public gallery in the courtroom, smiled broadly and gave the salute of the banned African National Congress -- a raised clenched fist with thumb pointing upward.

DANGER OF A COUP D'ETAT RISES IN ARGENTINA

[The following article has been translated by World Outlook from the March 28 issue of the Buenos Aires La Verdad, the weekly newspaper of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (Workers Revolutionary party).]

* * *

In the past three weeks, items in various journals, the comments by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on "the sectors that are fomenting subversion of our institutions," the declarations of Balbín [Ricardo Balbín of the UCR -- Unión Cívica Radical del Pueblo] along the same lines (although intended to deny the possibility of a coup d'état), and a whole series of incidents and gossip, have given substance to the rumors about the perspective of an abrupt change in the present administration.

We should like to go beyond the rumors and determine just what the chances are for such a turn.

In our opinion a coup d'état is now being considered. In contrast to the situation two or three months ago when we last discussed the possibility and came to the conclusion that it was not posed in an immediate way, today an analysis of the situation leads us to admit that it is possible, although we do not believe it is the most probable variant. Let us see if we can clear things up somewhat.

It is not news that the country is suffering from a chronic crisis involving every sphere: from the economic level to the political, including the social and institutional. The economic crisis has dragged on since 1930. From that time up to now no success has been achieved in bringing up the country's basic area of production -- agriculture. The figures today stand below those of the years preceding the celebrated crisis that initiated the so-called "infamous decade." No increase in the number of cattle, no increase in the production of wheat, corn or flax, no increase in the sale of wool, and the same goes for the other branches.

In the political field, despite the relative stability of the past two years, we must recognize that this relative equilibrium is extraordinarily delicate. The very fact that we should have to evaluate the possibility of a coup d'état testifies to this.

To get an idea of the depth of the social crisis it is only necessary to skim a daily paper and note the number of problems irritating the country -- from Tucumán where the newspapers report soup kitchens to alleviate hunger among the people in San Antonio, to conflicts initiated by the transport workers and numerous strikes involving various unions, we have a gamut of facts indicating the gravity of the crisis.

In the institutional field, the successive divisions within the different political parties, the threats of intervention in different provinces, and the conflicts involving the authorities that have occurred in Jujuy, Santa Cruz, Chubut and Tucumán constitute additional signs of what we are talking about.

All these phenomena form a background for the permanent possibility of a coup in Argentina. But in the past two years the relatively high business level (due to the price of meat abroad and good harvests), have attenuated the threat. Whenever the economic situation has improved, the possibility has been weakened.

But at present, we are of the opinion that the possibility of a coup d'état has been placed on the agenda in advance of the deepening of the recession that has begun to be felt in the economic field.

Any conjunctural event, without involving the structure, can precipitate a coup. And at the present time there is a conjunctural event -- the 1967 elections, which will bring the tensions and contradictions among the various forces at work in the country to a maximum pitch.

On this foundation of bankruptcy, of permanent crisis which we have indicated, an incidental occurrence, like the elections, and the differences among the various forces or interests at work in the country, can set off an explosion that will completely upset the unstable equilibrium.

The various sectors which feel they are not represented by the present government, and which constitute a big majority, are piling up ammunition to win the government or a greater voice in it. And if any of them are issuing warnings that the possibilities are narrowing or being blocked, they are or could be elements inclined to take a road that is not specifically electoral.

The Azules [partisans of General Onganía] in their different variants; the Integrationist sectors; the UCRists whom we noted earlier; Aramburism itself which already sees a decline in the electoral following it needs to continue playing the role of arbiter in national politics; the attitude of the military chiefs, who after ten years have again established contacts with Peronism through a banquet staged by the Light and Power union for an army officer; the declaration of the Conservatives accusing the government of having violated the constitution; the attack launched by the industrial sector linked to automobile production, alleging that the government is constantly injuring its interests; the Colorado opposition which also has its plans for a coup d'état; and the refusal of the army and air forces to reestablish a dialogue with Peronism -- all constitute elements that have sharpened current tensions and increased the possibility of a coup.

We do not claim that a coup is inevitable. Still more -- we believe that this possibility is not the most probable variant, but

in contrast to the situation of two or three months ago, we believe that the tensions have become so great that it is now posed concretely.

The difference then is that we now believe -- in contrast to a few months ago -- that a coup is possible; that is, circumstances exist that favor it; although, we repeat, this outcome is not the most probable among others that are also posed -- elections with "guarantees" against Peronism, or sectors of it, or a coalition government that would institute a change in course economically in a cold way, etc., etc.

The statement is well known about the bosses in their opposition to the workers movement always having the possibility of finding a solution to a crisis. Today the various boss sectors are posing their respective "solutions." Among these solutions, we hold that two or three remain posed for an entire stage. In relation with this we note in our analysis several items involving the possibility of a coup; the utilization of the elections by various boss sectors and the path indicated at present by Perón, and, as a corollary, what the working class should do in face of the various alternatives of a capitalist nature offered up to now.

The banquet staged last Friday by the Light and Power union for Colonel Leal was one of the most notorious events in the current scene. For the first time since the downfall of Perón, the top leaders of the Vandorist sector and a prominent leader of the Alonsist sector, Pepe, sat down together with a delegation of high officials headed by the general of Alejandro Lanusse's division at a not very proletarian table (from red salmon and caviar up to ten kinds of cakes sprinkled with fine wines, champagne and whiskey).

The Monday edition of La Razón tried to picture this meeting as a big dinner reestablishing diplomatic contacts and nothing more; but the magazine Primera Plana cast doubt on this.

We have our own interpretation. Since Peronism turned over a "new leaf" in the Chamber of Deputies, we have been warning of the possibility at the present stage of a reedition of the National and Popular Front headed by Solano Lima and Bagnis and have indicated the different variants that could occur, among others the one of Onganía running as the main candidate for the elections in 1967.

The Friday dinner at which Vandor, Izzetta, Cavalli, Donaires, Rosendo García and Niembro were present besides the heads of the Light and Power union, was to us not a mere national get-together. Independently of the observations of La Razón about the army officers declaring that "the Armed Forces would view with great disfavor the union movement, consciously or unconsciously, permitting anyone to infiltrate it with speculative, ideological or political aims," this dinner had a much deeper significance. It was the public launching of an ideological and political front integrating the trade-union leaderships and sectors of the army.

No one should be fooled. In politics naïveté is usually costly. To be on guard concerning the possibility of such a front is insurance against being taken in. If Vandorism did not have concrete plans with regard to the future, it would not adopt a public position that is to its disadvantage in the internal struggle for party control. This dinner, in our opinion, was a giveaway. Vandorism is "playing" with the idea of a Front with the participation of the army.

Who is going to control this Front? We are unable to say, but we do not doubt that this is what Frondizi and Frigerio are working for. This does not mean that the Front has already been set up and that it is dominated by Frigerism. The Front can be wider than is now envisioned and include sectors without any perspective like the UCRI [Unión Cívica Radical Intransigente] and Udelpa.

But what must be noted is that Vandorism is leaving out the possibility of taking the class road in its factional struggle in the Peronist movement and is deciding to continue the boss politics followed by the united movement. A National Front with the army and the church is not a road favoring the workers movement. It is a repetition of attempts already made to remain within the structures created by the bourgeoisie, by the bosses, in order to prevent the workers movement from taking an independent road. The Vandorists did not sit down to dinner Friday evening solely to eat salmon.

We cannot be sure, we repeat, that such a Front will actually be formed. Among other things it can be proscribed, or blocked by a coup d'état, but we do not doubt that the army and the Vandorist leadership of Peronism are working toward this perspective. And just as we critically favored the Vandorist positions involving leadership of the Peronist movement, so today we do not hesitate in the least in denouncing once again what we have already denounced before. The policy of integrating the leadership of the Vandorist movement with the army is not the road required by the workers movement. This boss politics must be repudiated by the whole workers movement.

No one doubts that Perón decided to provoke the present division in the Peronist movement. But why did he decide to precipitate a rupture at the present moment? We have already explained why. The bureaucratic trade-union structure is now at its weakest, thanks to a policy of systematic capitulation. When he was in power Perón had his own apparatus and big sectors of the bourgeoisie that served him as a counterweight to the influence of the workers movement which was brought into the state at the time through the CGT [Confederación General del Trabajo]. When a bureaucrat like Cipiano Reyes tried to move out and follow a more or less independent policy, Perón blocked him. In exile, Perón today does not have this control over the movement or over its leaders and he has lost part of the support which was formerly given him by the well-to-do and pro-industrialist bourgeoisie. As a consequence, Perón more than ever requires a monolithic movement that can be maneuvered. Vandorism, with its independent line, constituted an obstacle to this game.

Consequently Perón utilized the most opportune moment -- the decline of the workers movement, as evidenced by its bureaucratization -- to provoke a fissure within the Peronist movement and the workers movement as a whole.

But the question that must be asked is whether or not the split is progressive. Is it favorable to the workers movement and the popular sectors?

Our answer is no. Perón did not break with Vandor in order to give the Peronist and workers movement a further impulsion toward the left, not to speak of a revolutionary direction. The split involves control of the party but in order to continue the politics of integration with the regime, of parliamentary opposition and nothing more -- not to resume the road initiated in 1955 when the "Liberation" placed the movement before the alternative of resisting or disappearing, or the decade before that in 1945 when it faced the entire oligarchy bound up with imperialism under the slogan of Braden or Perón.

We have said before, various times, particularly in reference to some sectors of the left who have recently "discovered" Peronism that we seek to avoid drawing conclusions from personal impressions or false sentimentalism; we are guided by the interests of the workers movement. Those who think that these are identified with Alonsism, do not see the contradictory character of the phenomenon. Perón did not split the Peronist movement in order to prevent it from falling into popular frontism, since that policy began with Cooke and with his complete agreement. And the position of Perón himself favoring Frondizi is well known. Consequently, painful as it may be, it is necessary to call a spade a spade. Perón's present policies similarly do not aid the workers movement. Perón proposes to maintain the Peronist party without its being able to organize and retain for itself, or whomever it designates, the exclusive privilege of determining what policies it should follow. That is, he wants to maintain the policy followed up to now -- the leadership decides and the masses must obey.

We are saying this not for the first time. Since 1955 and with greater emphasis since 1958, when confidence began to be placed in Frondizi, we have been saying: to measure up to the requirements of the situation the Peronist movement must change its methods and deepen its program. It has not done this and it is not going to do it.

In our opinion, there is only one road for the workers and that is the independent organization of the working class, a road which at present necessitates reconquering the unity that has been lost.

We are aware of the difficulties but clarity is required. The working class must act independently on the union front and in the political field, applying a class program, so that if today a step backward has been taken, provoking a new division, the slogan of

the workers movement cannot be anything except to regain unity. The winning of unity is also the best way of assuring independent political action, whether through opposing the coup d'état, which can be done by preparing a line of action aimed at defeating the present government, or by defeating the variation of a front that seeks to tie the workers movement to the army.

Let us guarantee the unity of the workers movement as the best way of assuring that the entire working class expresses itself in an independent way through its own party.

SHIFT IN ATTITUDE OF THE ORP TOWARD BOUMEDIENNE

A perceptible shift has recently occurred in the attitude of the Algerian underground opposition movement, the Organisation de la Résistance Populaire [People's Resistance Organization], toward the Boumedienne government. The Organisation de la Résistance Populaire was founded immediately after the coup d'état of June 19, 1965, which overthrew Ben Bella. Its goal was to organize an underground struggle. Boumedienne, however, succeeded in quickly decapitating it by arresting its most well-known leaders, Mohamed Harbi and Hocine Zahouane.

The ORP has now distributed a declaration in Algiers that indicates a change in perspective. If the ORP neglected the legal struggle in the beginning -- through the trade unions, the UGTA [Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens], for example -- its position is now quite different. It is beginning to go overboard in the opposite direction. In its communiqué, "How We Can Unify the Revolutionary Forces," it approves certain positions of President Boumedienne for the first time. Far from speaking of fascism (as it did rather irresponsibly last July), it now says that "In the recent period several declarations by Boumedienne have implicitly taken account of the class struggle, for the first time, as the evitable basis of social progress and the socialist revolution." But the communiqué adds carefully, "These declarations do not constitute by any means the position of the entire Revolutionary Council or the government."

The ORP proposes, therefore, to base its calculation for future activity on the contradictions in the ruling group.

A document which it distributed in January in Algiers favoring a "peaceful solution" to the crisis that began June 19 seemed to prepare the way for this turn.

Is the turn a result of the change in attitude of the Soviet government towards the Algerian regime? This hypothesis merits consideration since the turn came after Boumedienne's trip to Moscow and the improvement of relations -- frankly bad in the beginning -- between the USSR and Algeria, between the Front National de Libéra-

tion and the Communist party of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the relative weight of members of the apparatus of the former Algerian Communist party in the ORP became considerable following the arrest of Harbi and Zahouane. Representatives of the government were invited to Havana, but not the ORP.

The pretext for the change in attitude of the ORP was declarations made by Boumediene during his trip to the Constantine area at the beginning of March. Does it involve declarations offering something new? No, although Boumediene said he was for socialism (as he had said previously) and for "harmony and coordination between the government and the rank and file" (never for a government of the rank and file!).

Does this mean that in our opinion there are no contradictions at the top, in the government and the Revolutionary Council? The very nature of their policy implies contradictions since it attempts to maintain the status quo between the Algerian masses, imperialist investors, and the different layers of Algerian society. Some incline towards concessions to the masses, others reject concessions. But is supporting one faction against another and placing one's hopes in it the best way to bring these contradictions to a head for the benefit of the masses?

The ORP seems to be falling into the same errors that were previously committed under Ben Bella by its founders -- errors that led to self-criticism in the beginning -- neglecting work among the rank and file for work at the top.

HARSH DISCIPLINARY MEASURES AT WASEDA

While demonstrations were still continuing at Japan's big and prestigious Waseda University at the end of April, they were definitely on the decline. The students leading the actions apparently lacked a solid enough organization to carry through their intransigent stand to a full victory and they refused to accept any compromise whatsoever from the authorities of the private school on the question of higher tuition fees.

Nine of them were expelled April 28 and only 150 students attended a campus rally the following day to protest the expulsions. Some 300 turned out for a "Singing Festival" at the auditorium to support the boycott of classes.

The university authorities were involved in further repressive measures. On April 30 Takeshi Fukuda and Yoichiro were indicted by Tokyo district prosecutors on charges of organizing an "illegal" demonstration eleven days previously to protest the term examination for students of the school of political-economic science.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT RELEASES POLITICAL PRISONERS

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

During recent weeks the central government and the various state governments in India have ordered the release of almost all the leaders of the left (pro-Peking) Communist party of India, who were detained without trial under the so-called DIR [Defence of India Rules]. Some had been held since the outbreak of the Sino-Indian border conflict in October 1962 and others since the left CPI was formally inaugurated in September 1963 following a break with the official pro-Moscow Dangeite leadership of the CPI.

At present only about sixty leaders of the left CPI, mostly in West Bengal -- among them are leaders like Promode Dasgupta and Konar, whom the government describes as diehard Peking supporters -- are still being held in jail.

Among those released are B.I. Ranadive, top theoretician of the left CPI, A.K. Gopalan, leader of the Communist group in Parliament, E.M.S. Namboodiripad and P. Sundarayya, general secretary of the party.

Namboodiripad, first arrested in 1962, was released later and then rearrested in November 1965, following demonstrations over the lack of food in Kerala. Sundarayya was conditionally released on "parole" last year to facilitate a trip to Moscow for an abdominal operation. Now his detention has been formally cancelled.

During his stay in Moscow, Sundarayya, according to press reports, held talks with leaders of the Communist party of the Soviet Union concerning the prospects of "Communist unity" in India. It was later denied that such talks were held.

The government has also withdrawn warrants of arrest issued against some of the left CPI leaders who went "underground." The concession is believed to be part of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's strategy for the elections of February 1967. It is thought that she will make the gesture of "restoring" civil liberties on the eve of the elections. But the central government has refused to withdraw the state of emergency and annul the DIR under which it has unlimited powers to arrest and detain citizens without trial, since the government's actions are beyond the jurisdiction of law courts.

It would appear that the central government is under heavy pressure from the chief ministers of various states not to lift the emergency and the DIR in view of the popular movements on food and other questions.

Home Minister Nanda "assured" Parliament April 27 that the provisions of the DIR would be enforced only in the "border states" like Kashmir, Nagaland and Assam (Mizo district) whereas in the rest of the country the government would utilize merely the ordinary

law of the land.

All sections of the press in India and most of the political parties (including a section of the ruling Congress party) have criticized the government for continuing the emergency and have demanded scrapping of the DIR. But the Congress government evidently feels unsafe without these vicious measures.

The Kashmiri leaders Sheikh Abdullah, Mirza Afzal Beg and Manlana Masoodi are still detained without trial under the DIR. So are hundreds of leaders of the Naga and Mizo tribal people.

With the release of most of their leaders, the ranks are now discussing the role of the party in the emerging mass struggles in different states.

The left CPI is far from being homogeneous in its political perspectives, although in its split from the parent body, it took along the most active and militant cadres. In fact, it is known that three or four distinct tendencies exist inside the party. The right-wing CPI is also divided into two or three conflicting tendencies.

Among the main tendencies inside the left CPI, there is a hard core of uncritical supporters of Peking's positions, including the organizational methods of the Stalin period. Some prominent leaders, however, seem prepared to make a critical evaluation of the Chinese positions as well as those of the Soviet Union -- especially after the tragic developments in Indonesia.

Then there is an influential group of centrists like Namboodiripad and Jyoti Basu (West Bengal), who support the Soviet positions in the international Sino-Soviet dispute but who go along with the "left" leadership on domestic issues.

A fourth tendency consists of younger elements in the leadership who reject the concepts of a "four-class bloc" and a "people's democratic revolution" in alliance with the national bourgeoisie and project the slogan of a "socialist revolution" in India. Some of these elements, including a few figures in the jails of some states like Gujarat and Maharashtra who have been labelled "Trotskyists," have faced disciplinary action in recent months.

Magan Desai, a prominent leader of the left CPI in Baroda (Gujarat), who has been released from jail, resigned from the party, openly repudiating the Stalinist organizational practices of the left CPI. In his fifty-page letter of resignation (which is being published by the Gujarat unit of the Socialist Workers party), Desai upholds the struggle put up by the Trotskyists and the Fourth International throughout the world against the distortions of Marxism-Leninism committed by the Stalinist CP's.

The leaders of the left CPI appear to be aware of their predicament and their inability to meet the aspirations of their followers. For the present they are engaged in the task of setting

their own house in order.

With the general elections approaching, a big section of the leadership appears to be more concerned with seeking electoral adjustments with other "democratic forces" to defeat the Congress party at the polls than with the necessity of a revolutionary socialist perspective in the emerging mass struggles in the country.

RANADIVE'S VIEWS ON POLITICAL SITUATION IN INDIA

[B.I. Ranadive, the main theoretician of the left-wing, pro-Peking Communist party of India, was recently released from prison. In Bombay, he was interviewed by the Free Press Journal (May 4 issue). The following is the text of the interview.]

Shri B.T. Ranadive, top theoretician of the Left Communist Party of India on Tuesday in Bombay ruled out the possibility of "unity" between his party and the "revisionist" Right CPI led by Shri S.A. Dange.

Discounting newspaper reports about a likely rapprochement between the two CPIs, Shri Ranadive, who was released from jail last week-end after 3½ years of detention under the DIR [Defence of India Rules], said in an exclusive interview:

"There is absolutely no chance of unity between our party and the revisionists because the differences between us are basic." "Differences," he elaborated, "relate to the very character of the present Government, necessity of mass struggles, conception of united front and the role of the working class."

Shri Ranadive is leaving for Calcutta this week-end to attend a policy reviewing meeting of the Polit-Bureau, the highest decision-making body of the Left CPI. He gave an idea of how the Left Communists viewed the contemporary political situation in the country since their mass arrests in 1962-63. He was replying to questions.

In a strongly worded condemnation of his erstwhile colleagues of the CPI Shri Ranadive said that "those who consider that the leadership of the bourgeoisie is also necessary for the development of the Indian revolution have nothing in common with us. Those who hold such a view are not a party of the working class but another division of the capitalist class engaged in corrupting the Marxist-Leninist outlook of the working class."

The Left Communists call for the creation of a "four-class bloc" called the "Peoples Democratic Front" under the leadership

of the working class whereas the Right Communists call for the creation of a "National Democratic Front" supposedly under the leadership of the "national bourgeoisie" in what is considered in communist jargon as a "democratic struggle against imperialism, feudalism and monopoly capitalism."

Shri Ranadive denied that there had been any talks between Shri P. Sundarayya, General Secretary of the Left CPI (while he was in Moscow recently for an abdominal operation) with leaders of the Soviet Communist Party on the question of Communist unity in India. Nor was he aware of any move by his comrades to seek "recognition of the CPSU" for the Left CPI.

He, however, said that despite political differences, his party would like to keep unity in bodies like the AITUC [All-India Trade Union Congress], the trade-union front of the communists, "unimpaired on the basis of a common policy and a fighting line."

Explaining the election strategy of his party he said: "It will be our aim to organise as big and as wide a common front as possible of different democratic forces to give an electoral defeat to the Congress and weaken its monopoly of power. All those parties which honestly consider the rule of the Congress a menace to our economic and political emancipation will have a place in this front."

While he included the Right CPI, SSP [Samyukta Socialist party] and other left parties in the proposed electoral front, he was not prepared to consider the rightist parties like the Jan Sangh among the "democratic forces." About the Muslim League in Kerala he said the Left CPI sought electoral adjustments and not a "united front" with it in the last mid-term elections while at the same time fighting it in several constituencies. He could not say what exact type of electoral adjustments would be sought by his party with the Muslim League in Kerala in the coming general elections.

Shri Ranadive termed the political situation in the country as "a dangerous one" as the economic policies of the Government were leading to a "growing penetration of foreign capital, especially of American influence." He strongly criticised the fertiliser deal, the Indo-American Foundation and World Bank's "pressure on our policies." He added: "I am afraid that any day an anti-national deal might take place."

An eminent Marxist economist himself, Shri Ranadive said that the "internal economic situation has brought the country to virtual ruin which is expressing in mass movements of unprecedented dimensions reminiscent of the last days of British rule."

About India's foreign policy he said that "it is only in name a policy of non-alignment, while in fact we are being drawn into the American net of containment of communism in Asia." He said that "unprecedented mass agitations" would have to be resorted to in the coming period to solve the problems of food and livelihood as well as "to guard the economic independence of the country."

Shri Ranadive said that the India-China conflict was a "screen in which the shift in our policy is taking place" and, therefore, it was necessary to "make the people aware that peaceful settlement of our border problems with China is a condition precedent to a successful struggle against the growing danger of economic and political freedom at the hands of American imperialists."

Among the issues of domestic and foreign policies that must occupy the attention of the people, he said, "the total withdrawal of the emergency and of the DIR should occupy a prominent place." He added: "Fortunately almost all political parties in the country and the entire press have demanded the withdrawal of emergency and criticised the Government's attempts to continue them under false pretexts. If the pressure continues, the Government and the clique of Chief Ministers will not succeed in continuing the draconian legislation."

Shri Ranadive declined to discuss his attitude to international problems like the Sino-Soviet ideological conflict and developments in the USSR since the ouster of Khrushchev on the plea that the party leadership was considering these questions. He, however, said on some basic issues like peaceful co-existence, etc., the party as a whole was in agreement with the stand taken by the Chinese CP.

"FAMINE"? NOT IF YOU KNOW YOUR SEMANTICS!

During the spring, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi expressed displeasure on several occasions over the reports in the press of other countries about impending famine in India. The reports were greatly exaggerated, she said. In any case, the word "famine" was singularly inappropriate since all that is ever involved nowadays in India in the event of food shortages is a pinched diet, but most certainly not famine!

Last March 13, for instance, an Associated Press dispatch quoted her as saying: "There was a time when famine meant people falling down and dying like flies. If this is the meaning, then we don't have famine. If it means that there will be a period of considerable hardship, there is one now, and it is likely to worsen in a couple of months."

As a further contribution to this interesting dispute over the meaning of words we call attention to the following May 6 Reuters dispatch from New Delhi:

"Some members of the opposition stated Thursday in the Indian Parliament that in the regions affected by famine, the inhabitants were eating the bark of trees, leaves and the waste products found in cow dung.

"These declarations were made after Mr. Subramaniam, the minister of food and agriculture made public a telegram from the Orissa government denying an allegation of the opposition that nineteen persons had reportedly died from hunger in that state in the east of India.

"A deputy of the opposition then brandished an album of photographs which he had taken in the state, showing hunger-stricken people selling their children.

"Another deputy declared that in the state of Uttar Pradesh he had seen people gathering the kernels to be found in cow dung and human excrement. He likewise stated that mothers were in prison for having killed their hunger-stricken children. He said that he knew of a case where a father had poisoned his wife and three children in order not to see them die of hunger."

* * *

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's concern about not using a dirty word like "famine" to label what is merely a "considerable hardship" stems largely from the unfavorable comparison with China that is conjured up. Since China joined the noncapitalist world, famine has become a thing of the past. Although the country does not have abundance, the worst inequities of the capitalist past have been ended and the people are now assured of at least food and clothing.

The answer of India's ruling class to the challenge of revolutionary China is truly ingenious. If the specter of famine cannot be exorcised, the word can at least be banished from the country's 845 different languages and dialects. And if there's no such word as "famine" in all of India, then that blocks the development of a revolutionary movement to put an end to it!

However, these experts in semantics might begin pondering the following question: Haven't "considerable hardships" been known to touch off a revolution?

WHERE IS THE "TASHKENT SPIRIT"?

[The following article has been taken from the May issue of Marxist Outlook, the monthly magazine of the Socialist Workers party of India. A one-year subscription to Marxist Outlook can be obtained by sending \$4.50 to the business manager at 414 Cleveland Road, Worli, Bombay 18, India.]

* * *

All talk of a "Tashkent Spirit" between India and Pakistan appears to have suddenly ended and a "new" atmosphere in favour of military confrontation between the two countries is sought to be

created in the entire subcontinent. No longer do the statesmen in New Delhi and Rawalpindi refer to the provision about renunciation of the use of force and settlement of mutual disputes through negotiations. The bourgeois press both in India and Pakistan is full of reports about border violations, etc., by either side.

What has happened during the last few months to bring about such strained relations between the two countries? Perhaps the state visit of the Chinese President Liu Shao-chi to Pakistan has caused some alarm to the Indian ruling class about a possible Peking-Pindi détente against New Delhi. The Chinese bureaucracy is playing an opportunist game of wooing the Pakistani bourgeoisie against the Indian bourgeoisie without the least consideration of the repercussions of its move on the international working-class movement.

Perhaps the Soviet bureaucracy is trying unsuccessfully to woo the Indian and Pakistani rulers simultaneously.

But a possible Sino-Pak détente is not the only cause for the present belligerent utterances from New Delhi. For it is more than obvious that President Ayub Khan is utilising his "friendship" with Peking to bargain for more aid from U.S. imperialists. The Indian bourgeoisie, as much as the ruling class in Pakistan, would like to keep the relations between the two countries strained as far as possible as a safety valve to channel out internal discontent into a jingoistic war of attrition between the two countries in an emergency. If there are growing mass movements against the Congress government in India, President Ayub Khan is not having a cosy time with his people at the present moment.

Kashmir is indeed the real source of trouble between India and Pakistan but the capitalist governments of both the countries do not want to find a rational political solution of the problem, a problem of their own creation and which has been inherited from the communal partition of the subcontinent.

Both governments are playing an ostrich-like game of not facing realities. New Delhi has, for example, refused to release the Kashmiri leaders like Sheikh Abdullah, Mirza Afzal Beg and Maulana Masoodi. We endorse the demand made by the Sarvodaya leader, Jaya Prakash Naragaan (while we reject his supraclass humanism in favour of internationalist humanism of the proletariat) for the release of Sheikh Abdullah and his colleagues.

We also believe that India should take the initiative to find a mutually acceptable solution of the disputes between the two countries; but the bourgeois rulers of either country cannot be relied upon to preserve peace in the subcontinent. The people of the two countries, therefore, must be vigilant to ensure that the tragic events of September 1965 are not repeated once again.

Further, an effective solution of the Kashmir problem and the Indo-Pak disputes cannot be found unless the Indian government also takes the initiative to bring about a settlement of its border dis-

pute with China. Here again the Congress government cannot be "cajoled" into talking peace with China; it has to be compelled to do so by a powerful and vigilant mass movement in the country.

A LETTER FROM ISAAC CAMACHO

[The following letter from a prominent Bolivian Trotskyist and mine workers leader, has been translated by World Outlook from the April issue of Masas, the La Paz newspaper of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario Unificado (United Revolutionary Workers party).]

* * *

To the compañeros miners and students of Potosí:

My wife, who is stoically bearing the consequences of my political and trade-union activities, has written me that the compañeros of Siglo XX have turned over some money to her by way of material help and that it came from voluntary contributions from the workers. Included in it was a part -- certainly small -- of the contribution sent by the Student Federation of Potosí to the Miners Union for the benefit of the victims of the latest massacres [May and September 1965].

I wish to publicly express my appreciation for such an action and consider it my duty to call attention to the fine spirit of class solidarity which you have demonstrated. It is my duty as a member of the POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario -- Revolutionary Workers party] to fight disinterestedly, shoulder to shoulder with the workers, without any hope of reward, without stopping to consider my personal welfare. Therefore, I felt touched by the fact that my co-workers considered it necessary to display solidarity with a person who is, for the moment, imprisoned.

I take the opportunity to recommend maintaining your class unity and putting all your enthusiasm into making the union a genuine instrument for the defense and advancement of the struggle of the exploited. The rank and file must remain vigilant in everything concerning the leading cadres to keep them from prostituting themselves or selling themselves to the government as has happened so many times. United and fraternal struggle will enable you to repel all the excesses of the generals, all of the antilabor measures inspired by the higher-ups of Comibol [Corporación Minera de Bolivia].

We miners have been put in a difficult situation by the native reaction and American imperialism. Not only have the unions been destroyed by armed force, not only have we been crushed by the military boot, not only have we been forced underground, but the evil government is trying to denationalize the mines and hand them over to the big trusts and strangle the revolutionary process once

and for all. The peasants are being driven from the plots they make fertile by their labor and the Corporación Boliviana de Fomento [Bolivian Development Corporation] has proceeded to hand over the enterprises under its direction to private owners. It is against this tremendous danger that we must fight.

In the mines, fascism has reduced the wages and the number of workers. A father has no recourse but to wear himself out working to even get half rations for his desperate family. The well-paid military call this monstrous state of affairs rehabilitation of the mining industry. Our slogan continues to be to fight for the restoration of salary cuts, social benefits, bonuses and working conditions that were in force up to May 1965. Yet this conquest will only be the first step toward gaining a general wage increase.

Compañero workers and students, I send revolutionary and fraternal greetings. Do not forget that tomorrow will be the day of our victory over the fascist murderers.

CO-EDS ON THE INCREASE IN JAPAN

There has been a steady increase in recent years in the number of young women in Japan determined to get a college education. As was to be expected, some of the more backward members of the opposite sex take a dim view of this.

For instance, Takeshi Yanagimoto, president of Kumamoto University, told a press conference that he thinks something ought to be done about it. Just what, he is not certain. But he revealed that a new "enrollment plan" is to be discussed at an entrance examination committee meeting this fall.

Out of a total enrollment of 1,286 students at Kumamoto, he reported, 330 or almost 26 percent are co-eds. They account for 74 and 51 percent, respectively, of the registration in the schools of pharmacy and education, and more than 20 percent in the colleges of liberal arts and medicine.

The worried professor was quoted by the May 2 Japan Times as admitting that "There is nothing wrong with the increase of co-eds." In fact it should be "a matter of congratulation from the viewpoint of the principle of equal educational opportunities to all."

But, he argued rather lamely, very few co-eds continue to the postgraduate school and then on to faculty staffs. Thus there might finally be "a drain on our faculty staff." The "dire shortage" of scholars would in turn seriously affect research programs.

The university president didn't say whether lack of equal opportunity in the postgraduate field and faculty openings might be at the bottom of the possible "drain."

BLAS ROCA'S DEFENSE OF THE SLANDERS AGAINST TROTSKYISM

[In successive issues, World Outlook has sought to provide as complete a documentation as possible on the dispute touched off by Fidel Castro in his January 15 speech closing the Tricontinental Conference in which he attacked "Trotskyism" in terms reminiscent of the frame-up charges in the infamous Moscow trials of the thirties. We published the full text of Castro's speech itself, plus various replies, including one made by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and an editorial by the Monthly Review.

[We also published the only attempted rebuttal we were aware of up to the end of April -- one by Gus Hall, the main spokesman of the American Communist party. This, together with a reply by Joseph Hansen, appeared in our issue of May 6.

[Below we have published another attempted defense of Fidel Castro's revival of the old Stalinist slanders. The author of this attempt is an old hand at this game. He is Blas Roca, the secretary general of the Cuban Communist party in the thirties in the heyday of Stalinism and the secretary general of its continuation in the form of the Partido Socialista Popular. Today Blas Roca is a member of the Secretariat of the newly organized Communist party of Cuba. The title of his article is "The Trotskyist Slanders Cannot Tarnish the Cuban Revolution" ("Las Calumnias Trotskistas No Pueden Manchar a la Revolución Cubana").

[We do not know, as yet, whether Blas Roca's article was published in Cuba, although we assume that it was. Since we do not have at hand an official English version, we have provided a translation from the text published in the May 1 issue of the Mexico City semimonthly magazine Política.

[In our next issue we will publish a reply by Joseph Hansen, the editor of The Militant and former secretary to Leon Trotsky.]

* * *

The vigorous and illuminating denunciation of the anti-Cuban propaganda of the Trotskyists which Compañero Fidel Castro made in his speech closing the Tricontinental Conference, was indispensable.

Not of course because of any significance ascribable to the Trotskyists in themselves, but because of the relation their propagandistic campaign has to the action Yankee imperialism is developing against the Cuban Revolution and because of the damage which, under the circumstances created by the differences involving various socialist states in the international Communist movement, their confusionist campaign could cause in some incipient sector of the rising revolutionary movement in Latin America.

Trotskyism is, in itself, in its politics and its theory, a corpse. Extended internationally in opposition to Leninism and the

Leninist thesis of the possibility of the triumph of socialism in one country, historic experience defeated all its major theses and reduced it to small groups isolated from the masses, whose principal function remained limited to combating the Soviet Union and the Communist parties.

The Yankee imperialists have found in the Trotskyists very active auxiliary forces in their efforts to destroy in the eyes of the Latin-American peoples the prestige of the Cuban Revolution by utilizing slanders and confusionist propaganda. These efforts are part of the imperialist campaign against Cuba: they complement the attacks by military means, the actions of infiltrated agents -- sabotage, crime, espionage -- the economic blockade, the breaking of diplomatic relations by the Latin-American countries, etc.

On the one hand, directly and in the name of its widely known agencies, the Yankee imperialists carry out an intense campaign in Latin America to convince the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois sectors that Cuba, and not the United States, constitutes a danger to the independence of their countries; that Cuba and not the United States, is the interventionist power in the continent; that Cuba and not the conditions of national humiliation, underdevelopment, backwardness, unhealthy conditions, lack of culture, reactionary coups d'état, repression and persecution, conditions created, reinforced or maintained through the intervention and domination of North American neocolonialism, is the cause of the uprisings, guerrillas, protests and struggles of the Latin-American peoples.

On the other hand, through channels that are not easily identifiable as imperialist and groups that employ a superrevolutionary language, they carry out a campaign to confuse the intellectual, student, worker and peasant sectors, spreading among them slanders such as that the Cuban Revolution is a failure, that it is not socialist, that it is not granting the aid or solidarity due the Latin-American peoples, that its leaders have been "purged" by tortuous means, that it is being consumed in internal quarrels between men and factions fighting for power, that Cuba has been converted into a satellite of the Soviet Union, that Cuba's actions are determined by Soviet pressure, etc.

While the direct North American propaganda "justifies" its intervention in Santo Domingo with the pretended danger of a coup by "Communists trained in Cuba," the indirect propaganda by way of the Trotskyists accuses Cuba of not having given active solidarity to the Dominican revolution. While the OAS condemns Cuba "for sending arms to the Venezuelan guerrillas," supposedly revolutionary propaganda is circulated throughout the continent accusing Cuba of "turning its back to the Latin-American revolution."

This is the dual aspect of the propaganda war which the Yankee imperialists are developing against Cuba. In this war, Johnson, Rusk, McNamara, the CIA, the counterrevolutionary groups and grouplets are given the task, with the help of the AP and the UPI, of

presenting Cuba as a revolutionary danger to the continent which must be smashed; while the Trotskyists and other pseudorevolutionary elements undertake the dirty task of promulgating that the revolutionary power in Cuba is not revolutionary nor undertaking its duties of solidarity with the peoples, etc.; that is, the task of promulgating those things that help the imperialists in their effort to destroy the prestige and authority of the Cuban Revolution. The firm and unconditional defense of the anti-imperialist and socialist revolution, triumphant in Cuba, is a duty for every honest revolutionary, whatever his party affiliation.

This defense must be mounted whether it involves a military attack, an economic attack or an ideological and political attack of the enemies of the Revolution. This defense is not only a duty of solidarity, but in the direct interest of the movement for the revolution, for the sovereignty and independence of every country, for progress and socialism.

When Yankee imperialism seeks to destroy the prestige and authority of the Cuban Revolution in the eyes of the Latin-American peoples, it does not do so with the sole aim of weakening and isolating Cuba in preparation for a military attack. It does it also to weaken the resistance of any Latin-American country to its claims to domination and imposition of its will in order to weaken the revolutionary movement for national and social liberation in all the Latin-American countries, to weaken the faith of their peoples in revolution, in the final outcome of their combats and sacrifices.

The Trotskyists and other elements of like stripe, while they speak an ultrarevolutionary language, instead of conducting a struggle in honest defense of the revolution, collaborate with imperialism in the campaign to undermine its prestige and authority in the eyes of the masses.

All this is one more proof that, as Compañero Fidel said, Trotskyism became a vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction. With citations from declarations and writings of Trotskyist individuals and publications he showed convincingly that the campaign they are conducting is that of agents of imperialism.

Well, are the individuals and publications Trotskyist as was said in the speech of the first secretary of our party before the delegates of the First Conference of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America?

Strange as it may seem, it is necessary to answer this question, since Trotskyism is a medley of such confusion, of groups and sub-groups, that some Trotskyists deny that other Trotskyists are Trotskyists. This, for example, is what The Militant, the newspaper of the North American Trotskyists does, when it tries to puncture the denunciation of Trotskyism made by Compañero Fidel Castro through the very simple device of claiming that the Trotskyists cited by him are not Trotskyists.

According to this newspaper, neither the review Marcha of Montevideo, nor Il Nuovo Mondo of Rome, nor the Monthly Review of New York are Trotskyist, so that it considers that "the proofs cited by Castro to prove his assertions (against the Trotskyists) are flimsy."

The Newsletter, on the other hand, says that the review Marcha is an organ of the Posadas group, although it considers the latter not to be genuinely Trotskyist.

Independently of what The Newsletter, organ of the English Trotskyists, says, the allegation of The Militant is pure sophistry, since, in the first place, Compañero Fidel did not say that the reviews mentioned were Trotskyist, but that they had published articles and reports of known Trotskyists and, in the second place, it is more than evident that the said publications systematically diffuse Trotskyist propaganda.

The English Trotskyists as well as the North Americans deny that Felipe Albaguante is Trotskyist. On J. Posadas, who is the head of the Latin-American Bureau of the Fourth International (Trotskyist), The Newsletter says the following:

"The Posadas group, in particular, is 'Trotskyist' only in name. In Great Britain, its most prominent leader when the group was founded has openly supported the right-wing witch-hunt against Young Socialists and councillors, while calling for world revolution! (Such political chameleons, it seems, can only be found in Posadas' menagerie.)" And The Militant itself, although it accuses Posadas and his groups of holding to stupidities like nuclear war being inevitable and that the atomic bombing of Moscow will signify the rebirth of the world proletariat, asserts that "to say that they constitute a vulgar instrument of imperialism and reaction is, however, a slander."

What the Trotskyist groups -- including those of The Militant and The Newsletter -- are spreading with respect to the Cuban Revolution are slanders, and very obvious ones. And that these slanders serve only the Yankee imperialists in their propaganda war against Cuba there is not the slightest doubt. And this labor did not begin now, but from the time they became convinced that they could not infiltrate into the Cuban Revolution, as they tried, in order to carry out from within their work of provocation, confusionism and conspiracy in favor of the aggressive plans of North American imperialism.

In the mimeographed newspaper which was printed in Cuba by an organized Trotskyist group after the triumph of the Revolution with the assistance of Posadas and Adolfo Gilly -- the latter was in Cuba in 1963 advising this Trotskyist group -- the direct and open attacks on the Cuban Revolution and its leadership became general beginning in 1963. For example, in number 34 of the said newspaper, corresponding to the first part of September 1963, in an editorial

entitled: Cuba must support the Chinese line of world revolution, it is brazenly asserted: "There is an enormous contradiction between the critical and alert revolutionary consciousness of the masses and the 'sea wave' which the leadership of the Revolutionary Government has been following between these pressures, from the international to the economic line."

And in number 43, corresponding to the first part of February 1964, they likewise posed editorially things like this: "In spite of the conciliatory and counterrevolutionary line of peaceful coexistence with imperialism which the Fidel Castro leadership has posed, the masses continue pressing against this line and go much beyond it."

In other words, as before, at the same time as the United States was giving a new impulsion to its aggressive policy against Cuba, with the piratical action of seizing the four Cuban fishing boats and detaining their crews, the Trotskyists carried out their counterrevolutionary mission of trying, with their slanders, to undermine the prestige and authority of the Cuban Revolution.

In the newspaper Frente Obrero, organ of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Trotskista) of Uruguay, corresponding to September 11, 1963, in a long, extremely confused and at times incomprehensible article or report by J. Posadas entitled The discussions on architecture in Cuba, based on the development of the present social struggles and preparation of the atomic war which imperialism is preparing, systematic defamation of the Cuban Revolution is carried on.

The article or report refers to the position which the Trotskyists had to take at the Seventh International Congress of Architects held in Cuba from September 29 to October 3 in that year. The fundamental point in this position seems to be to object to constructing homes or to subordinate constructing homes due to the fact that "when war comes it will destroy them" as can be seen in this confused paragraph which we have transcribed as follows:

"No congress of architecture can be posed without posing the war. It is insanity. It is an effort that is going to ask the Cuban population and the rest of Latin America and the world to do something that is going to be knocked down a few years later." The position, however, is the least of it. What is important is that throughout the whole article or report, slanders are inserted as baseless as this one which, by way of example, we have transcribed as follows:

"The congresses which they (the Cubans) hold are genuinely shameful. For example, many youth are attracted to them with women and dances. It was this way in '60. The meetings are simply an excuse. They will do the same with the architects and teachers."

And as always, these attacks of Trotskyist propaganda coincide with the intensification of the attacks of the imperialists, who in the month of September 1963 had, with their pirate planes, dropped bombs on the Brasil sugar mill and near the city of Santa Clara, and the month before, in August, with their pirate launches, had machine-gunned Puerto de Casilda and the sulfametal plant in Santa Lucía.

We could multiply the quotations and show, with them, how on the basis of slanders and sophistry, the Trotskyists have oriented their propaganda, from the beginning, to pit the masses against the leadership of our socialist state, to pit Che against Fidel, to sow division and disunity among the revolutionary forces united firmly in our country under the guidance of Compañero Fidel Castro. This is the campaign which they are continuing today, to the profit of imperialism, as vulgar instruments of imperialism and reaction, since more than ever this expression arouses the ire of the Trotskyists of The Militant and The Newsletter. The Newsletter, the organ of the English Trotskyists, which denies that Posadas or Alaguante are Trotskyists, hurls epithets and slanders against the Cuban Revolution not less venomous and false than theirs. They go to the extreme of brazenly calling for the overthrow of the revolutionary power in Cuba. With the typical phraseology of Trotskyism, they call Compañero Fidel Castro "head of a capitalist state machine" and "prime minister of a Bonapartist government."

"So long as the Cuban state," they write, "rests on capitalist foundations, our opposition to Castro will remain fundamental and implacable. We shall support every attempt, successful or abortive, to replace the Bonapartist dictatorship of Castro with the power of the working class, with democratically elected Soviets led by a revolutionary Trotskyist Party."

This is clear. The slander of the Revolution, the denial of the socialist character of the Cuban state, is followed by the proclamation that they will support every attempt to overturn the revolutionary government. The bit about replacing it with Soviets led by a Trotskyist party is a laughable excuse. The whole world knows that the only attempts -- frustrated by the heroism and the will of the Cuban people closely united around their revolutionary government -- to replace the socialist power in Cuba are those of the Yankee imperialists. "This does not," they add, "in any way, cut across the principled defense of Cuba from imperialist attack. On the contrary, the best defence we can provide to Cuba is to assist the Cuban workers to defend themselves militarily and politically from the attacks of their own ruling class."

This is even clearer...and more repugnant. The principled "defense" of Cuba against the imperialist attacks consists in organizing political and military attacks against the revolutionary power. This explains the coincidence between the most brazen attacks of Trotskyist propaganda with the piratical aggressions of the Yankee imperialists against Cuba. That is, the propaganda attacks against Cuba is the "defense" of Cuba carried out by the Trotskyists. The

Yankee imperialists and their mercenaries likewise say that their crimes against the people of Cuba have the objective of "freeing them" from the Communist tyranny. In cynicism, the Trotskyists do not concede an inch to the imperialists.

The Newsletter and The Militant defend Adolfo Malvagni Gilly and are enraged, like him, over what Compañero Fidel Castro said concerning Yon Sosa and the labor of the Trotskyists in Guatemala. It seems strange that they should defend Gilly, a coreligionist and subordinate of J. Posadas, while they denigrate him and his group, considered by The Newsletter to be a "menagerie" and by The Militant as upholding "stupidities." But this is in perfect harmony with the fundamentally confusionist and provocative role of Trotskyism.

Nevertheless, The Militant is compelled to confess that: "A complicating factor in the Guatemalan situation is the role of representatives of the Posadas group. This is a split-off from the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky. The Posadas group calls itself 'Trotskyist' and even makes out that it constitutes the 'Fourth International'... Posadas happens to have a few followers in both Cuba and Guatemala whose ultraleft stupidities do isolate them from the masses." Precisely this is the crime of the Trotskyists who infiltrated the guerrilla front of Yon Sosa in Guatemala.

With ultraleft slogans and calls for the immediate realization of the socialist revolution, they isolate this movement from the masses, they cut their road of development. With no little frequency they point to socialist Cuba; but in 1958 the Rebel Army did not proclaim the socialist revolution, but united the people in the practical struggle to overthrow Batista's tyranny and to destroy his mercenary army which served to support him and which was the instrument of neocolonialism and all the reactionary social forces.

The Trotskyists like to say that the measures of socialist transformation were taken in Cuba under the pressure of the masses; what they are not even capable of understanding is that the revolutionary leadership under the guidance of Compañero Fidel Castro prepared each step and took it in consonance with the same state of consciousness which they had created in the masses. In 1959 the proclamation of socialism would have divided the country; in April 1961 the masses unanimously supported the declaration of Compañero Fidel Castro on the socialist character of our revolution and carried it to victory, with their blood, on the beaches of Playa Girón.

In Guatemala, on infiltrating into Yon Sosa's movement, the Trotskyist elements, if with regard to program they do something like put the cart before the horse, politically they promote disunity and antagonisms among the revolutionary forces and isolate the guerrilla fighters, imposing the program of the Fourth International on them.

"What the Fourth International thus committed," said Compañero Fidel, "was a true crime against the revolutionary movement, to

isolate it from the masses, by corrupting it with stupidities, the discredit and the repugnant and nauseating thing that is Trotskyism today within the field of politics." In the replies attempted by the Trotskyists to the denunciation by Compañero Fidel of their venomous activity, they once more repeat the slanderous speculations on the absence from Cuba of Compañero Ernesto Che Guevara. This is logical if one keeps in mind the interest of the Yankee imperialists in the question. The Yankee imperialists were, naturally, the first to speculate over the absence of Compañero Guevara from Cuba. They, above all, wanted to know where he was to be found. No sooner did they kill him in Santo Domingo, than they had him traveling through Central America, gravely ill in a hospital bed or they put him in the heart of the Peruvian jungles.

At the same time, as was already their custom, they made up and spread all kinds of macabre stories of their own pure invention: Castro had killed Guevara; Che was a prisoner or proscribed; there was a division among the Cuban leaders around the Chinese-Soviet differences; the Soviet Union had demanded Guevara's retirement, etc., etc. The letter from Compañero Ernesto Che Guevara to Fidel, written at the time of his leaving Cuba and read by the latter on presenting to the people the recently constituted Central Committee of the Communist party, the first of October last year, was a crushing blow to all the tales woven by imperialism.

For the genuine revolutionaries, the words that Fidel said on the subject on that occasion, and the moving and profoundly revolutionary letter from Che, were definitive: they explained the absence of the stout and beloved comandante of our revolutionary war until it became necessary and possible to explain it. For the Yankee imperialists and for the Trotskyists no. They needed to continue the tales about "the mysterious disappearance," in order to continue the campaign to discredit the Cuban Revolution.

It is by no means accidental that the declarations of the Trotskyist elements and newspapers which Fidel mentioned in his speech, were made after the first of October; that is, when the letter from Che was fully known throughout the world. The Militant, in replying now, dwells on the theme and holds that what Castro ought to have done in face of the Trotskyist slanders is send a message to Che so that he, in a letter, might quash the rumor of his death. But in view of the facts, of what use would it have been? If before, with the last letter from Che, read by Fidel himself, the slanders and malicious speculations of these elements not only did not cease but multiplied, wouldn't they have responded in the same way to a new letter?

The Newsletter, with greater cynicism, repeats the slanders. "Guevara," it says, "was killed or incarcerated in a special prison in Cuba or, and this seems more likely, he was exiled and his wife and children held as hostages in case he decided to do something rash -- like speaking to the press or writing his memoirs. That Castro's fear of Guevara is real," it adds, "was demonstrated recently when the Cuban government decided to disarm the militia

on the flimsy pretext that the guns were not being maintained properly."

The slanders of The Newsletter are repeated by Gilly: "The vertiginous political evolution of the Cuban leadership in recent months," he writes, "confirms the opinion that it is true that they have either assassinated Guevara or that they are restraining him by some means or other from expressing himself politically."

For them the Tricontinental Conference was prepared bureaucratically, it was only a rostrum for Cheddi Jagan and Allende or it was a failure. In all their slanders against Cuba their innate hatred for the Soviet Union stands out.

All the Trotskyist slanders now being repeated have as one of their aims to discover, for the benefit of the North American imperialists, the place where Compañero Ernesto Che Guevara is and, therefore, the concrete revolutionary activities which he is carrying on in accordance with his unshakable revolutionary vocation and his conviction as an anti-imperialist and socialist combatant. Along with this is the aim of serving, once more, the imperialist campaign to discredit the Cuban Revolution. Today this is one of their principal tasks inasmuch as Cuba represents the example, stimulous and support of peoples orienting toward a revolution against imperialism and its lackeys, servants and puppets.

Of course, their slanders will not get very far. Their tricks and divisionist intrigues can cause damage in countries like Guatemala and confuse sectors like those under the command of Marco Antonio Yon Sosa. But neither will they prosper there for very long. The practical results of their tricks will show the masses and honest revolutionaries what they really are.

There is no slander, whether from the imperialists or from the Trotskyists or anyone else that can change the facts or destroy the prestige of a Revolution like the one in Cuba, made by dint of heroism and carried forward to its ultimate and necessary consequences.

The dignity, the firmness and the honesty of the leadership of the Cuban Revolution stand above any miserable slanderer. Faithfulness to proletarian internationalism, unlimited solidarity with the peoples struggling against imperialism, repeated a thousand and one times, have been proved by Cuba under all circumstances and before all the revolutionaries.

National sovereignty, seized in a revolutionary way from the Yankee neocolonialists who preempted it, has been maintained in a dignified way by Cuba, as the very reason for its struggle, as a banner for the peoples still subjugated, as the beginning of relations in the rising world of the new society without exploiters or exploited, in which countries, holding equal rights, are related fraternally with mutual respect and mutual collaboration.

There is no slander against the reality of our socialist revolution, which stands at the very doors of Yankee imperialism, of the reality of our successes and advances in the construction of socialism, of the reality of the unity of our people around the working class and the unbreakable confidence which it has in our Marxist-Leninist party, in its Central Committee and in its chief and guide, Compañero Fidel Castro. There is no slander that can tarnish the revolutionary call of the Second Declaration of Havana nor diminish the revolutionary importance of the resolutions of the First Conference of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In one word, there is no slander that can extinguish in the eyes of the masses of Latin America the burning flame of the inspiring example of the Cuban Revolution, victorious in face of all the aggressions, attacks and difficulties.