

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. ~~3~~⁴, No. ~~21~~²²

July 1, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Defense Problem Grows Acute for Meredith Marchers	1
Gallup Poll Shows Sharp Rise in Antiwar Sentiment in U.S.	3
Morse Comments on Gallup Poll and Johnson's Course	4
Farbstein Finds It Difficult to Evade War Issue	6
Vietnamese Freedom Groups Appeal to American People	7
Saigon Construction Workers Strike for More Pay	7
Matsumura's Case for Ending Blockade of China	8
Japanese Socialists Demand Recognition of China	11
Peking Suspends Admission of New Students to Universities -- by George Novack	12
Rising Competition from China in Far Eastern Markets	18
Devaluation Upsets Indian Price Structure	20
Her Peace Paint Was Not Smear Proof	21
Wilson Sees "Red Plot" in Seamen's Strike -- by John Walters	22
Fabricio Ojeda "Found" Hanged in Caracas Jail Cell	24
Court Turns Down Appeals of Hekmatdjou and Kharvi	25
AFL-CIO Ends Boycott of ILO	25
Documents:	
An Appeal to the American Conscience -- by Bertrand Russell	26

DEFENSE PROBLEM GROWS ACUTE FOR MEREDITH MARCHERS

The Meredith March in Mississippi and its central problem -- how to defend the Negro freedom movement from physical attack from its vicious and depraved opponents, including local police, state troopers and other instruments of the capitalist government -- continues to hold the spotlight in the United States. Accompanied by television crews and correspondents from all the main news agencies, the march has remained on the front pages of the press and is one

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. ~~3~~⁴, No. ~~21~~²²

July 1, 1966

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Defense Problem Grows Acute for Meredith Marchers	1
Gallup Poll Shows Sharp Rise in Antiwar Sentiment in U.S.	3
Morse Comments on Gallup Poll and Johnson's Course	4
Farbstein Finds It Difficult to Evade War Issue	6
Vietnamese Freedom Groups Appeal to American People	7
Saigon Construction Workers Strike for More Pay	7
Matsumura's Case for Ending Blockade of China	8
Japanese Socialists Demand Recognition of China	11
Peking Suspends Admission of New Students to Universities -- by George Novack	12
Rising Competition from China in Far Eastern Markets	18
Devaluation Upsets Indian Price Structure	20
Her Peace Paint Was Not Smear Proof	21
Wilson Sees "Red Plot" in Seamen's Strike -- by John Walters	22
Fabricio Ojeda "Found" Hanged in Caracas Jail Cell	24
Court Turns Down Appeals of Hekmatdjou and Kharvi	25
AFL-CIO Ends Boycott of ILO	25
Documents: An Appeal to the American Conscience -- by Bertrand Russell	26

DEFENSE PROBLEM GROWS ACUTE FOR MEREDITH MARCHERS

The Meredith March in Mississippi and its central problem -- how to defend the Negro freedom movement from physical attack from its vicious and depraved opponents, including local police, state troopers and other instruments of the capitalist government -- continues to hold the spotlight in the United States. Accompanied by television crews and correspondents from all the main news agencies, the march has remained on the front pages of the press and is one

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

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

New York, N.Y. 10010

of the first items reported on the daily newscasts coming over America's 246,000,000 radio and television sets.

The column, which at times grew to as many as 1,000 marchers, was under constant harrassment. The difficulty of providing food and nightly shelter in hostile territory for the large group was formidable enough, particularly since the action was not planned in advance but grew spontaneously in response to the shotgun blasts that brought James Meredith down. But the big problem is what to do about the violence.

As against armed whites itching to punctuate their heckling with gunfire, the Deacons for Defense and Justice have brought in the wholesome deterrent of an immediate response in the same language, the only language the average Southern racist respects.

The problem of violence took on new dimensions June 23 at Canton when 200 marchers reached the town. In a rally, the crowd built up to 3,500. When the time came to pitch the tents for the marchers, local authorities intervened. They barred use of the grounds of the segregated school and offered no other site. The marchers went ahead despite the order; and state troopers went into action.

They waited until the tents were up and then, fixing gas masks, they lobbed volley after volley of tear and irritating gas into the crowd under and around the tents.

The scenes as people were trampled or dragged away by the troopers or kicked by them could have been taken in Saigon. If anything, the white supremacists were more vicious than Ky's troops.

An unidentified white girl who was with the marchers rushed up crying to twenty sheriff's deputies and city policemen. "Can't you see I'm a human being, just like you?" she was reported as asking. "Can't you see it? Can't you see it?"

"I couldn't see it friend, I couldn't see it," came the response of a city policeman as the girl stumbled away.

A graphic example of the ineffectiveness of pacifist reasoning in face of reflexes conditioned like those of a police dog!

Asked by a TV reporter if this experience had changed his views about always meeting violence with nonviolence, the Rev. Martin Luther King said, "Not at all."

Stokeley Carmichael's response was different. He acknowledged that in the particular case, the marchers were not prepared to meet the assault, but he pointed to the overall solution: "black power." By this he meant that the Negro people must organize on the political field -- independently of both the Republicans and Democrats -- and strive to win power commensurate with their inherent strength. In view of the time and circumstances, the idea obviously had tremendous impact.

GALLUP POLL SHOWS SHARP RISE IN ANTIWAR SENTIMENT IN U.S.

The latest Gallup poll, released June 19, reveals an impressive rise in sentiment among the American people against Johnson's war in Vietnam.

"If the American people today were given two alternatives -- continuing the war in Vietnam or withdrawing our troops during the next few months -- their vote would be 4-to-3 to continue," reports George Gallup.

Only a year ago, in June 1965, presented with a comparable alternative, the vote would have been 7-to-2 in favor of continuing the war.

The survey questions and the results in percentages were as follows:

"Suppose you were asked to vote on the question of continuing the war in Vietnam or withdrawing our troops during the next few months -- how would you vote?"

Continue	48%
Withdraw	35%
No opinion	17%

The comparable question last year was: "Should the U.S. continue its present efforts, or should we pull our forces out?"

Continue	66%
Pull out	20%
No opinion	14%

Among the other interesting results reported by the pollsters were the following:

"1. Only one person in six anticipates an all-out victory in Vietnam. A majority think the conflict will end in a compromise peace settlement.

"2. Hopes for an early end to the fighting are dwindling.

"3. The public is about evenly divided in their opinion as to whether the South Vietnamese want the U.S. to stay in their country.

"4. About half the U.S. adults think we should pull our troops out of Vietnam if a majority of the South Vietnamese want us to do so; one in three say we should not."

The poll did not indicate the class composition of those queried or what the variations of opinion were among the various classes. Not even occupations were mentioned. Gallup merely said

that the "Democrats tend to favor continuing the war," the Republicans are "about evenly divided," more men than women favor staying in Vietnam, and "education" is a factor, "with the better-educated more inclined to favor continuing the war."

The major question posed by the pollsters was not without its irony. The voters are not being asked to vote on whether they want the U.S. to stay in Vietnam or to withdraw the troops. They were not permitted to vote on whether or not they favored going into Vietnam in the first place. And in the 1964 presidential elections they cast a landslide vote for Johnson on the basis of his campaign promises in which he made out that he was the "peace" candidate in opposition to the warmongering Goldwater. After he won the election, Johnson carried out the major planks in Goldwater's platform.

MORSE COMMENTS ON GALLUP POLL AND JOHNSON'S COURSE

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon had some pungent things to say in the U.S. Senate June 21 concerning Johnson's intimations at a press conference June 18 [see World Outlook June 24] that he intends to take the escalation of the war in Vietnam up another notch despite the sharp rise in antiwar feeling among the American people as indicated by the latest Gallup poll.

"The President warned of increased air raids on North Vietnam and enlarged ground action in South Vietnam" as a concession to the sector that wants a bigger military effort in Vietnam, said Morse.

"The President could have pointed out to these people that even in March, the tonnage of bombs dropped was exceeding the monthly rate of tonnage dropped in all of Europe in World War II.

"This is no small war. From the standpoint of the use of American air power and bombing power it already is a massive war.

"Bombing Vietnam with more bombs than we dropped all across the face of Europe is hardly a policy of military restraint....

"In the sense of our air bombing, this is total war. Far from forcing the enemy to negotiate, it has not even prevented them from increasing their assistance to the Vietcong."

This should be evidence enough, continued Morse, that something is basically wrong with the policy being followed by the Pentagon, the State Department and the White House.

"It should be evident by now that the administration believes the only thing wrong with its policy is that it has not yet used enough force in southeast Asia to bring a peace settle-

ment on our terms. How much force will be enough, Mr. President, I ask you? It appears that the world is going to find out soon from the President, if he carries out the announcement made at his most unfortunate press conference last Saturday.

"A part of the picture which the President did not fill in will be the increasing takeover of the war in the South by the United States. General Ky has been compelled to use his military forces to institute a police state totalitarianism. If this is what is meant by 'pacification,' his troops will do more fighting against the Buddhists and students than they did against the Vietcong.

"Mr. President, this is one of the sad things about this war, that we are killing American boys in Vietnam while the Vietnamese themselves are engaged in a religious war. We find this under the leadership of the little tyrant, Ky, who never fought the French. In fact, we find that the military dictatorship which the Johnson administration is supporting in Vietnam is composed of a majority of military officers who never fought the French. A good many of them were on the side of the French against their own people, as a matter of fact. That is the record of the unconscionable course of U.S. outlawry in South Vietnam.

"Of course, this fact is generally known in many parts of the world but not by enough Americans. I say most respectfully that I am satisfied when the American people do come to know and to understand, the Johnson administration will find an even greater dip in the polls in support of the President of the United States."

So long as the buildup of forces continues in Vietnam, Morse said, there will be no peace. And without peace, U.S. troops will be maintained in Vietnam.

"When I read the Gallup poll, which reports that a rising proportion of public opinion is ready to pull out of Vietnam altogether -- and which I happen to believe would be a mistake -- I have a hunch that the American people recognize that the type of war being fought in Vietnam is not going to permit any withdrawal of the half million American troops it will take to suppress the enemy. We are not fighting a foreign invader; we are going to become the occupation force because we are the invader. We, the United States, are the aggressor. While we can maintain that position in South Vietnam, we will never be able to create a strong and stable enough government to enable us to leave. Indeed, as the economic and military strength of China grows over the years, the necessity for continuous U.S. occupation of Vietnam to maintain a pro-U.S. Government will probably grow with it."

Johnson's policy offers no way out, in Morse's opinion. "For we see no end to this road if we continue to follow the road down which the administration is leading us. We see no end but continued occupation of this part of Asia and probably larger areas of Asia as we become more and more involved in a larger and larger war there.

"As more and more of our people come to appreciate the consequences of the military buildup, more and more are going to conclude that orderly withdrawal is preferable to eternal occupation of a country 8,000 miles away."

Morse stated that in "my judgment, the continuation of the President's war -- and it has now become the President's war in southeast Asia -- will involve more and more men, more and more casualties, more and more costs and finally, more and more danger of our leading mankind into a third world war."

While saying many true things, Morse's position is not at all a revolutionary one. He reveals the bourgeois limitations of his opposition to Johnson by indicating once again that his differences are purely tactical. He in fact advocates a policy of maintaining U.S. troops in Vietnam but of keeping them in "enclaves" as proposed by General Ridgway, General Gavin and George Kennan.

The dangerous and even insane character of Johnson's policy is well enough indicated by the fact that a sector of the American ruling class is very fearful of the final consequences of Johnson's course. It is these fears that are reflected in Morse's position.

The antiwar movement should not allow itself to be misled by figures like Morse but it should not hesitate in the least to broadcast the true things they may say about Johnson's war in Vietnam.

FARBSTEIN FINDS IT DIFFICULT TO EVADE WAR ISSUE

Even the conservative Democrats -- the most ardent admirers of Johnson and his policies -- are being compelled to admit the unpopularity of the war in Vietnam. A good example is the following opening paragraph in a campaign letter sent out June 16 by Leonard Farbstein of the 19th Congressional District in Manhattan:

"There is no getting away from the unpleasant fact that over the current session of Congress hangs the bitter presence of the war in Vietnam. Apart from a few wild men of the Goldwater stripe, no one favors the war. Everyone opposes it. But a divisive dispute exists over how to get out of it. Some say we should simply drop all our commitments and go home. Others say we must bomb the enemy into submission, so that we can go home victorious. I, personally, cannot subscribe to either of these extremes. I do not believe that we can renege on our commitments; on the other hand, I regard it as pointless to try to gain the allegiance of a small nation by reducing it to rubble. Somewhere we must find a sensible middle ground. I am firmly opposed to escalating the war, particularly in view of the discord within the camp of our South Vietnamese ally. What I believe we must do is to search constantly for the means of negotiating a settlement either through the United Nations or with

the help of friendly countries. Some means of communications must be found between South and North Vietnam so that peace can be obtained."

That's quite a mouthful of mush. Farbstain does his utmost to avoid mentioning that the wild man of the Goldwater stripe who took the U.S. into this undeclared war which everyone opposes was no one less than his own party leader, Lyndon B. Johnson! But Farbstain's unhappy acknowledgment about the impossibility of getting away from the war issue is strong testimony as to how deep the opposition to the war is running among the American people.

VIETNAMESE FREEDOM GROUPS APPEAL TO AMERICAN PEOPLE

The freedom fighters of the National Liberation Front in south Vietnam have appealed to the American people to increase their struggle against the war.

As reported by the June 15 issue of the Hsinhua news bulletin, Phung Van Cung, president of the South Vietnam Peace Committee, sent a letter June 6 to the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam calling attention to the dangerous game which the Johnson administration is playing "in prolonging and expanding its losing aggressive war in south Vietnam."

According to Hsinhua, "The letter called on the American people, particularly the families of the U.S. troops in Vietnam to strengthen the antiwar movement."

Nguyen Thi Dinh, chairman of the South Vietnam Women's Union for Liberation, sent a letter to a U.S. women's organization (which Hsinhua does not name) on May 31, saying that the current struggle of the American people had greatly inspired the south Vietnamese people.

"We hope that you will spread the antiwar movement to the whole of the United States so as to prevent your menfolk from being sent to south Vietnam as cannon fodder," the letter said. "We demand that the Johnson administration stop its unjust war against Vietnam and withdraw all the U.S. and its satellites' troops."

SAIGON CONSTRUCTION WORKERS STRIKE FOR MORE PAY

Almost all the 13,000 Vietnamese workers constructing new American military installations in the Saigon area went on strike June 24. They are demanding an increase in pay. A jet bomber runway, a photo reconnaissance laboratory, and an intelligence center were among the "top priority" projects affected.

MATSUMURA'S CASE FOR ENDING BLOCKADE OF CHINA

[In recent months, under the encouragement of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, a number of critical voices in American ruling circles have pointed to the need to take a fresh look at Washington's policy of blockading the People's Republic of China. The gist of the criticisms is that it is high time to at least recognize the existence of a government that speaks for a quarter of the world's population. Against this view, warmongers mainly around the Pentagon (and the "China lobby" inspired by Chiang Kai-shek and his American admirers) who have come to be labeled as the "hawks," favor escalating the war in Vietnam until it embroils China and opens the way for a nuclear strike against Peking in what would then become World War III.]

[This debate has found an echo in Japan. In part it directly reflects the controversy in Washington, since the State Department has been steadily stepping up the pressure on the Sato government to come out more and more openly as an ally of Johnson in his belligerent policy in Vietnam. Indirectly, however, the debate in Washington has aroused fear in some sectors of the Japanese ruling circles that imperialist Japan could be left out on a limb if a switch should occur in American policy. These more far-sighted sectors are mulling over ways and means to anticipate and circumvent such an outcome.]

[This is the background to the new proposals of Kenzo Matsumura that the Japanese government should engage in a "bold" policy, break out of the present strait jacket and normalize relations with the People's Republic of China. The 83-year-old Matsumura belongs to the less conservative wing of the ruling Liberal-Democratic party and is considered to be an elder statesman. He has long favored closer relations with China, but upon returning from a trip there recently he spoke up with fresh urgency.]

[He presented his views in an article published by the Nihon Keisai Shimbun. An English translation was published in the June 14 issue of The Japan Times. Because of its interest in the current situation revolving around the war in Vietnam and the clear threat from the Johnson administration to China, we have made the full text available below.]

* * *

The time has come for Japan to make bold decisions to improve its relations with China.

The so-called "accumulation formula," by which is meant the accumulation of faits accomplis leading to the eventual establishment of full relations, is reaching its limits. I hope Prime Minister Eisaku Sato will see China with an open mind and carry out what ought to be done.

It is my belief that public opinion in Japan calls for better relations with China. Of course, Japan already has intimate relations -- historical, geographical and cultural -- with China, and this China is now undergoing great changes. In the context of the present international situation there is no reason why Sino-Japanese relations should remain as they are now.

I am afraid the government and the Liberal-Democratic party do not understand China properly; their basic attitude toward China betrays that. The cat shuts its eyes while it steals the cream, as the saying goes. It seems to me that their present China policy has something in common with this saying.

China has a population of over 700 million and covers a vast area of 9,590,000 square kilometers. And the China of today is different from what it once was. Its people have a fervent sense of nationalism, and its industry, agriculture and commerce are being modernized. A new China is emerging as our next door neighbor.

This fact must be fully recognized in dealing with China. Japan's correct understanding of China is the first prerequisite to improving our relations with that country. I hope that China and its problems will be studied with a new sense of purpose.

As a step in this direction, it is important that more Conservative Party dietmen should visit China; it is also important that they should see China with their own eyes and freely exchange views with its leaders.

Of course, their visits will be meaningless if they listen uncritically to the Chinese, as do Socialist and Communist dietmen. They should speak out on what is right and point out what is wrong. Only through such open-minded discussion will they be able to chart Japan's correct course of action.

Otherwise, Japan may make a big mistake. There are many contradictions in what China does. Japanese politicians visiting China should analyze such contradictions on the spot and think what should be done to achieve peace in the world.

China leaves its door open to Japan. With similar ethnic and cultural backgrounds, Japan and China should have no trouble exchanging people. What should be remembered is that visitors, whether Japanese or Chinese, should refrain from doing or saying anything that could cause misunderstanding on each other's part.

China has misconceptions about Japan, while Japan appears to be irritating China on purpose. I told Chinese leaders that as Japan must respect public opinion, so also must China.

I explained to them that Japan is a peace-loving nation and harbors no feeling of hostility toward China. I told them not to speak ill of the Sato government because Sato will have to follow public opinion.

And I said that many influential Japanese dailies had editorially supported and encouraged my visit to China because they believe that something must be done to ease tensions and improve relations between the two countries.

Chinese leaders understood me, in principle. Yet it seems to me that the "accumulation" approach has reached its limits. I mean that the time is near at hand when Japan must make bold decisions aimed at normalizing its relations with China.

It was agreed to extend the so-called Liao-Takasaki trade agreement, and of course this is part of the efforts being made on the basis of the "accumulation" approach. Kaheita Takasaki, president of All Nippon Airways, will go to China next spring to discuss details of the agreement. I do not expect that the negotiations will be too difficult.

China is Japan's fifth largest trading partner after the U.S., Australia, Canada and the Philippines. And there is still much room for growth only if Japan makes an effort in that direction. There is that controversial document called the "Yoshida letter" which prohibits Japan from using long-term Export-Import Bank credits in the export of Japanese industrial plants to China.

I hope Prime Minister Sato will modify his attitude a little on this point, and the sooner this is done, the better. Both semi-governmental trade and private trade through Chinese-designated agents will continue to grow if Japan alters its China policy.

The question of Chinese representation in the United Nations, and the formula of designating China's U.N. membership as an "important question" -- a step designed to keep China out of the world body -- will become ineffective after the General Assembly has met one or two more times.

Suppose Japan, in collaboration with the U.S., is defeated in a vote on China's admission into the U.N. That could result in a double suicide with America. That would be a miserable thing for Japan. There must be something Japan can do in order to forestall such an eventuality.

Communist China might not agree to join the U.N. even if that organization decides to give it a seat. Japan should see to it that this does not happen. But, I am afraid, this is not possible within the present framework of Japan's China policy.

The biggest stumbling block is the question of Taiwan. Chen Yi, deputy premier of China, once said that China would use for the improvement of its people's life the cost required for the military emancipation of Taiwan. If China chooses to do so, he said, in 10 or 15 years from now Taiwan will come asking for China's company.

I might suggest here that Sino-American cooperation might be

possible if the Taiwan question is dealt with by setting a certain time limit. Close attention should be paid to Sino-American talks in Warsaw. If constructive efforts are not made through such talks, the U.S. cannot expect to promote trade and technical cooperation with China.

In parallel to the solution of these fundamental problems, Japan should, for the present, conclude a civil air agreement and promote technical interchange with China. An air route, if only between Nagasaki and Shanghai, would be quite practicable.

But if Tokyo can be linked with Peking or Shanghai, one will be able to take a jet flight from Japan to China in a few hours. If this route is joined directly with Europe by a route over the Silk Road, it will make a very convenient connection.

A technical interchange program may include improvement of the quality of cotton. In prewar years, Japan developed unique varieties of cotton in China by blending long-fiber cotton of Egyptian origin with Chinese short-fiber cotton. Since the war, however, it is said that progress in this field has slowed down with the introduction of Soviet technology.

Chinese say that the Russians cooperated with them on paper, but the Japanese gave them unstinted, down-to-earth cooperation. Other areas in which Japan could provide cooperation include improving Chinese wool and constructing a hydroelectric power station on the Yangtze.

In summary, Sino-Japanese relations must be improved on a broader basis and fundamentally. I do not think we can afford to wait until the table is set for an ambassadorial meeting or something like that.

JAPANESE SOCIALISTS DEMAND RECOGNITION OF CHINA

The Japanese Socialist party announced June 23 that it is opening a nationwide drive for recognition of the People's Republic of China. According to the June 24 New York Times this will include: (1) a drive for 30,000,000 signatures on petitions demanding recognition of Peking; (2) pressure on local government assemblies to adopt resolutions along the same line; (3) large-scale teach-ins to bring out the facts; (4) continual demands on the government for permission to admit Chinese Communist youth and women's groups on goodwill missions.

In accordance with foreign policy laid down by Washington, Tokyo has maintained recognition of the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Taiwan and refused to acknowledge the existence of the government put into power in 1949 by the revolution. Trade with China has, however, been growing in recent years.

PEKING SUSPENDS ADMISSION OF NEW STUDENTS TO UNIVERSITIES

By George Novack

The admission of all students to universities and secondary schools has been suspended for six months by decision of the Central Committee of the Communist party and the government of China, Radio-Peking announced June 18. This decision has been taken to permit revision of entrance requirements into the higher educational system. According to the authorities, the present setup is too bourgeois and discriminates against workers, peasants, soldiers and young revolutionists.

This means, according to the June 19-20 Le Monde, that about half a million young people who would normally have entered the university this September will have to wait until next January when the new regulations will be published and put into effect.

Such an arbitrary interruption of the educational process appears on its face to be injurious to the welfare of the nation. In the fast-moving twentieth century, the progress of technology, science, industry, communications and even agriculture vitally depend upon developing higher educational qualifications among the young generation. This upgrading is all the more imperative for the People's Republic of China which has to modernize itself under forced draft amidst extremely adverse circumstances.

A government guided by socialist standards and aims would strive, as the Chinese Communists have done so well over the past sixteen years, to keep on lifting the level of education and culture. In so backward and densely populated a country, this cannot be achieved evenly or all at once but only in stages and by leaps.

Granted that the children of the poor should be given equal and even preferential access to educational facilities. How is this aim promoted by closing entry into the upper grades for everyone for six months?

* * *

This stern measure fits into the pattern of maltreating the intellectuals called "hsiafang" in China, which means "to go down." This practice was instituted by a law passed August 17, 1957, after the dissidence displayed by intellectuals and students in the principal cities and universities during the "hundred flowers bloom" period. The law stipulated that intellectuals had to perform a year's work in the country and a month's manual labor at home every year.

Under this policy intellectuals, regardless of age, health, sex, special skills, functions and circumstances, have been obligated to go and work on menial tasks in the rural areas for from

six months to five years. They are thereby supposed to experience the redemptive virtues of hard manual labor.

This edict has been stringently applied in the past few years. In Peking alone, by October 1964, 125,000 people, including architects, doctors, musicians, lawyers, chemists, had marched off to till the land. According to Peking Information on July 19, 1965, millions of students are sent to the country every year to become peasants "of a new sort." It is doubtful that they went with much joy and willingness.

They serve in obedience to one of the mandates of Mao's philosophy that manual labor in and by itself purifies and ennobles. For example, Hu Yao-pang, addressing the Young Communist League of China on June 11, 1964, said: "As fast as science and technology progresses, as the size of the conquest of nature grows, in certain spheres and certain sectors of production, hard manual labor will reappear...It is an extremely important condition, enabling us to transform our ideology and escape degeneration."

Whereas the founders of scientific socialism viewed the development and diversification of the social division of labor on a national and international scale as one of the mainsprings of progress, and the reduction of back-breaking physical labor as one of its most valuable results, the Mao regime seeks to get around and efface by arbitrary methods the inescapable differentiation of social, economic and cultural functions at this stage of China's evolution and to justify this by exalting the role of hard manual labor.

In a series published in The Guardian May 24-26, Marcel Marien, a Belgian writer who recently returned from China after working for 18 months in Peking, mostly for the Propaganda Ministry of the Chinese government, described some examples of this policy which he had observed. "A professor of philosophy...is put in charge of raising chickens and pigs in a suburb of Peking. As he doesn't know a thing about it, the fowl die and the pigs don't fatten...A translator is sent into a printing house to become a printer, while the man he is replacing will rebuild a wall or plant trees."

"Among my closest colleagues, one stuck on stamps for the post office, another exercised children on holiday, a third moved house for a family of peasants, and a fourth helped builders to shift bricks."

Most peasants do not welcome these compulsory and incompetent supplementary laborers but resent their presence. This irrational use of both intellectual and physical labor is economically disruptive. It comes from an authoritarian and unrealistic attempt to skip over necessary stages in the social and historical development imposed on China by its inherited backwardness and isolation.

This maltreatment of the intellectuals is justified by the official doctrine of "revolutionary proletarian culture," a false

theory which was rejected and condemned by Lenin as un-Marxist in the days of the original ultraleft "proletcult" immediately after the Russian Revolution. It was subsequently taken up under Stalin and Zhdanov, who are now being surpassed in this field by their disciple, Mao.

* * *

The projected educational reform is directly linked with the vaunted "high tide of the great proletarian cultural revolution" which "has been unfolding vigorously throughout China for several months, in response to the great call of the Central Committee of the Chinese CP and Chairman Mao Tse-tung." According to a Hsinhua dispatch from Peking June 11, "the magnitude, impact, intensity and strength of this great proletarian cultural revolution are without precedent in history. The whole of China is a vast scene of seething revolution."

Along with a companion editorial from Red Flag of the same date, this piece tells how the enemy is being unmasked and vanquished through this campaign. "Hundreds of millions of workers, peasants, and soldiers...armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought, have been writing articles, holding discussions, and putting up posters written in big characters to sweep away the ogres of all kinds entrenched in ideological and cultural positions...Those who echo the imperialists and the reactionary bourgeois 'specialists,' 'scholars' and 'authorities' have been routed, one group after another, with every bit of their prestige swept into the dust. The reactionary strongholds controlled by members of the sinister anti-party and anti-socialist gangs have been breached, one after another."

Their conspiracy covered every sector of the ideological and cultural front. The "bourgeois representatives wrapped in red flags" had built bases in the fields of philosophy, economics, history, literature and art, the drama, education, journalism and publishing.

"The most reactionary and fanatical element in this adverse current," writes Red Flag, "was the anti-party 'three-family village' gang." They consisted of Professor Wu Han, deputy mayor of Peking, Teng To, secretary of the Peking municipal party committee and former chief editor of Jenmin Jih Pao, the foremost Communist newspaper, and Liao Mo-sha, former departmental director of the Peking party committee.

These prominent Communists are really "bourgeois rightists." Such nefarious forces have been carrying on their clandestine activities for the past ten years. Hsinhua and Red Flag trace their first sallies back to 1957 during the "hundred flowers bloom" days.

These elements resumed their offensive between 1959 and 1962, emboldened by the "temporary difficulties resulting from sabotage by the Khrushchev revisionists and serious natural calamities in

China." To preserve Mao's reputation for infallibility, there is no mention of any wrong or reckless decisions made under his leadership in connection with the mishaps of the Great Leap Forward.

Wu Han headed the pack of the revisionist rascals. He wrote a series of articles and plays allegedly satirizing and criticizing the regime in veiled symbolic terms. He thus "served U.S. imperialism as a cultural servant...He was personally groomed by the reactionary politician Hu Shih...and was pro-Chiang Kai-shek and anti-Communist. He wormed his way into the revolutionary ranks on the eve of the country's liberation and later became vice-mayor of Peking. Posing as revolutionary cadre while engaged in counter-revolutionary dealings, Wu Han is in fact a lackey of U.S. imperialism."

"The current upsurge of the great cultural revolution" started early in November shortly after the military take-over and the beginning of the wholesale butchery of the Communists in Indonesia. Was this mere coincidence -- or could one of the motives behind the campaign have been to distract attention from the terrible blow at Peking's prestige delivered by the Indonesian debacle and to shut off domestic criticism of its course in South-east Asia?

In any event, the campaign went into high gear this May with the unmasking of the "three-family village" and their removal early in June from the Peking party committee. This committee and the party committee of Peking University were reorganized on June 3.

"The counter-revolutionary clique" was stigmatized on that date as "an instrument of the bourgeoisie to exercise dictatorship over the proletariat." They were accused of waving the black bourgeois banner of "liberty, equality and fraternity."

"Thrown into utter confusion," these careerists "hurriedly invoked five 'talismans' to support and shelter the bourgeois rightists and suppress and attack the proletarian left." These "talismans" were (1) fake liberalization which argued that otherwise "people would not dare to speak up"; (2) "construction before destruction" when "it is precisely destruction that we want to come first"; (3) condemnation of the Left as "crude" and "acting like a cudgel" and pretending to be "meticulous" and "profound" when they are really "big-party tyrants" and "big-scholar tyrants"; (4) upholding "purely academic discussion"; (5) insisting that "in the face of truth everybody is equal," "everyone has his share of mistaken views," and "it is all a muddle." (We sympathize with this last point.)

Red Flag admits abstractly that "the revolutionary left wing may commit one error or another" but refrains from pinpointing any specific mistake made under Mao's administration.

In one breath the editors declare that the conspirators are only "paper tigers," no more than "a handful of evil men," repudiated by the entire worker and peasant population. In the next

breath they say "they still have great strength. They have money, they have extensive social contacts and international links and they have counter-revolutionary experience. In particular, the ideology of the exploiting classes still has a considerable market. Some unsteady elements in the revolutionary ranks are prone to be corrupted by this ideology and consequently become counter-revolutionaries. Moreover, the spontaneous influence of the petty-bourgeoisie ceaselessly engenders capitalism. Having seized political power, the proletariat still faces the danger of losing it. After being established, the socialist system still faces the danger of a capitalist restoration."

The plotters who were preparing to stage a coup had two prototypes before them. One was the "blatant counter-revolutionary molding of public opinion by the Khrushchev revisionist group which, soon after, staged a 'palace' coup and usurped party, military and government power, subverting the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The other was the 1956 Hungarian political revolution where "the counter-revolutionaries also prepared public opinion before they took to the streets to create disturbances and stage riots. This counter-revolutionary incident was engineered by imperialism and started by a group of anti-Communist intellectuals of the People Club [Petöfi Circle]. Imre Nagy, who at that time still wore the badge of a Communist, was 'fitted out with a king's robe' and became the chieftain of the counter-revolution."

It is true that both right and left-wing Communists were involved in the Hungarian uprising. But, since the Maoists lump dissidents of all stripes together under the single label of "counter-revolutionary bourgeois," it is impossible to tell one from the other in the present situation.

It is nonetheless clear from the citation of these fresh political precedents that Mao's directorate is highly apprehensive that the criticisms of the intellectuals and those higher up may set off explosions among the masses. This would explain why they are so adamant against any relaxation of the strict regimentation of thought.

They are equally fearful of "corruption of the youth." The purge has been extended to the Communist Youth League of Peking whose leading officials were ousted on June 15. The news of their dismissal was reported to have had "an electrifying impact" on the capital and touched off demonstrations of tens of thousands of youth. It is unclear what they were demonstrating for or against. The ring of purge victims was accused of using Peking University, the intellectual center of the country, as a base to win over the younger generation to their ideas.

Meanwhile 6,000 students and intellectuals were ordered back from farms and factories to reinforce the ranks of the party on Peking University's campus.

Not all categories of intellectuals are threatened. Red Flag promises that "ordinary bourgeois scholars" will be provided with suitable conditions of work and given time to remold their world outlook. But the regime will have no mercy on "the bourgeois representatives who sneaked into our party, set up their clamor about 'everyone has his share of mistaken views' and 'it is all a muddle' with no other aim than of tying the Left up in knots..." and "opposing the red banner while waving red banners."

How are these disguised villains in the Communist ranks and leadership to be detected? Red Flag gives a simple test. "Read Chairman Mao's words, follow his teachings and act on his instruction." Otherwise....

Mao's though, it holds, is "the greatest truth since time immemorial." "The theory and practice of comrade Mao Tse-tung may be likened to the ceaseless movement in the skies of the sun and moon and the endless flow of the rivers and streams on earth."

Such panegyrics outstrip the homage paid to Stalin at the height of his despotism. They may have been appropriate to the worship of an Asiatic god-emperor by superstitious subjects. But they are wholly out of place in an enlightened society permeated with socialist teachings and scientific attitudes.

* * *

The editorial writers warn the watching world not to be misled -- "an excellent situation without parallel" prevails in China. However, the nervousness evidenced by the purge and in the press indicate the opposite of the reassurance. The regime seems to be passing through its most severe internal political crisis since the conquest of power in 1949 or at least since the "hundred flowers bloom" disturbance of 1957.

The ferocious campaign against the most outstanding Communist intellectuals is the outward sign of a deep malaise in the very heart of the regime. Otherwise, why should the People's Daily explicitly direct warnings against unnamed individuals who are still in the highest positions? The paper said in a leading article: "We shall smash anyone who tries to oppose the party... no matter what his 'authority,' no matter how high his post, the whole nation and the whole party will rise to denounce him." Similar warnings have been repeated in other publications in recent weeks.

Since it would take more than intellectuals or even Peking party officials to attempt a take-over, these remarks must be addressed to more powerful personages in the army or government. Who might they be?

A Yugoslav correspondent in Peking, the New Statesmen, and Victor Zorza of The Guardian have all pointed to no less a figure than the Prime Minister Chou En-lai, now visiting Rumania. This

is sheer speculation. While in Rumania, Chou vigorously defended the "great cultural revolution" shaking China and asserted that its edge was "turned against a handful of bad elements that are waging dirty anti-Communist activity under the cover of a false Communism."

It remains unknown who the heads of the opposition are, what issues they have raised and what positions they defend, and who the ultimate targets of the purge will be.

How long will it be until these factors in the internal conflict break into the open?

RIISING COMPETITION FROM CHINA IN FAR EASTERN MARKETS

In an article in the June 12 issue of The Asia Magazine, M.P. Gopalan notes the rising importance of the People's Republic of China as a competitor in markets of the Far East. Unexpectedly, perhaps, China's bid is in the field of consumer goods. This, Gopalan points out, is due to the order of priorities adopted by the Chinese government following the drastic revision that took place after the debacle of the Great Leap Forward. The priorities became agriculture, light industry and heavy industry, in that order.

Thus the surpluses from agriculture compelled light industry to turn its attention to disposing of them most profitably. "Surplus foods must be tinned; animal products processed; the blooms of the cotton fields turned to cloth." The finished products are shipped abroad in order to win foreign exchange.

"Along the Queen's Road on Hong Kong's central shopping district," writes Gopalan, "stands the newest and biggest of the Colony's department stores dealing exclusively in Communist Chinese goods. Its four storeys contain a wide variety of products -- from oyster sauce to costume jewellery, from synthetic suiting material to chocolates, from chopsticks to radios. Goods are of uneven quality. The common denominator is their bargain-basement price: often as low as 50 percent of going rates for equivalent goods of Japanese, Western or even Hong Kong origin.

"Textiles, shoes, tinned foods are particular bargains. Clothing material -- cotton, wool, synthetics -- goes for half the price of British fabrics. Shoes are of adequate quality; sell for as low as US \$4.50. Styling is surprisingly varied. A few are designed in the sharply pointed, sleek manner beloved of Hong Kong ah-fei or 'teddy boys.'"

"Packaging," reports the author, "is bright and unabashedly derivative. There is, for instance, a type of toothpaste that is packaged like Colgate's; chocolates that look like Rowntree's or Black Magic's [well-known British brands]; malt-sprayed crackers

packed like Jacob's. A reflex camera called Shanghai -- patterned after the Japanese Yashica and the German Rolleiflex -- sells for US \$20; has already penetrated the market in Singapore as well as Hong Kong. Its Japanese equivalent would sell for double, and its German prototype four times its price. There is a Parker pen imitation called Hero, which sells for one-fifth the cost of the American original; and imitations of Japanese electric fans and sewing machines that sell for half their competition. An export beer called Tsingtao, bottled in the Shantung seaport, is cutting in on the Hong Kong market."

"How can the Communist Chinese undersell nearly every other national manufacturer?" asks Gopalan. "Low prices are in some -- but not all -- cases simply the results of lower standards, and even some occasional, old-fashioned sharp practice. Trouser zippers are often faulty and the trouser seats themselves none too trusty. Some of the Red Chinese chocolates, for instance, have strip-paper stuffing, instead of the usual second layer of sweets. But some expert opinion, for instance, concedes that the quality of the Communist Chinese merchandise, generally speaking, exceeds that of Japanese goods during a comparable period of industrialization.

"Labour costs in the mainland, of course, are much more depressed than elsewhere, not only from state policy but also from the plentiful supply of manpower. Most of Hong Kong's department stores handling the communist goods are financed by Overseas Chinese capital -- and approved stores obtain their consignments on liberal 45-day credits at no interest.

"Outright dumping and price manipulation by communist traders have almost driven farmers and husbandmen of Hong Kong's New Territories -- as well as Taiwan exporters -- out of Hong Kong's market in poultry, vegetables and livestock. Even if the Communist Chinese do not go to such extremes in the Southeast Asian light-industry trade, their early start in the market makes them a formidable competition not so much for Japan -- whose real league must now be that of the Western manufacturers -- but for the new industries of the developing countries. Where political barriers are not raised against them, they could easily overwhelm local competition by sheer economy of state. Even in the case of a closed market like the Philippines, smuggling and to some extent re-packing and re-exports from Hong Kong sneak their products in. (Thailand also requires a type of certificate of origin for imports from Hong Kong.)"

"Peking publishes no figures on her foreign trade," Gopalan concludes. "The latest available estimate (for 1964), from the statistics of partner-countries, places her total exports at US \$1,610 million. Exports to Hong Kong -- Mainland China's single best customer -- have been rising at a level of over 30 percent these past two years. A great portion of this gain has been due to the export drive in textiles, garments and footwear. On the whole, Communist China's light-industrial exports have been doing

pretty well all over the region. Peking is now the third largest supplier of the Singapore market, after Japan and Britain. It supplies Cambodia with one-eighth of its total exports: bicycles made in China compete with French Peugeots on Phnom Penh's streets. In Nepal -- according to the Far Eastern Economic Review -- Communist Chinese consumer goods already operate under an agreement similar to the American PL-480 deals: Nepal utilizes their sale proceeds to meet the local costs of Peking-aided development projects."

DEVALUATION UPSETS INDIAN PRICE STRUCTURE

[On June 5 the Indian government announced a 36.5% devaluation of the rupee. Against the previous quotation of 4.76 rupees for \$1, the new quotation is 7.5. The immediate repercussions in India of this measure were reported by the news agency, Hsinhua, in a June 8 Peking dispatch as follows:]

* * *

The Indian government's announcement on the devaluation of the rupee under U.S. pressure has led to soaring prices, a buying spree and market chaos everywhere in India, according to press reports from New Delhi.

The Times of India reported today that prices registered an increase of 50 percent since June 4 in New Delhi and prices of consumer goods continued to rise yesterday. Soap and toothpaste and other goods increased by 30 percent. Vegetable oils, electric appliances and rubber goods also went up.

The Patriot reported today that almost all essential commodities have shot up by 10 to 20 percent in Bihar. Since June 4, the fine variety of rice has gone up 18 rupees a quintal (100 kilograms) and the coarse variety 24 rupees a quintal.

Yesterday's Hindustan Times Bombay dispatch reported: "Prices of consumer goods, particularly tinned foods, were 30 to 40 percent higher in Calcutta." Large departmental stores stayed shut, while others refused to sell foods like oats. Shops dealing in motor car accessories and spares did practically no business.

The Patriot reported yesterday that the prices of imported items went up sharply and the stock-exchange authorities in Delhi were forced to suspend business. Stocks of radios, watches and other imported goods have gone underground or were quoted at higher prices.

It said that although trading activity in the bullion market came almost to a standstill as sellers had completely disappeared

from the market, prices of gold and silver spurted to new heights on account of a rush of buyers.

Yesterday's Hindustan Times in a Bombay dispatch reported that unofficial prices of the pound sterling and American dollar rose to new high levels on June 6 as a result of the devaluation of the rupee. Pound sterling, so far available unofficially for 27 rupees and 30 rupees each, was being quoted on June 6 at 40 rupees, while an American dollar, available unofficially for 12 to 15 rupees, went up to 17 to 20 rupees. The gold price in Bombay also shot up to a record level of 160 rupees per 10 grams of primary gold while it was quoted at 134 rupees on June 4.

The Financial Express in its editorial has expressed strong dissatisfaction about the devaluation. It said that by devaluing the rupee, the Indian government had "not only admitted its incompetence to manage the economy but also endorsed the verdict of smugglers, black marketeers and currency racketeers on the true value of the rupee."

"It implies helplessness of a borrower on the verge of bankruptcy," it said.

HER PEACE PAINT WAS NOT SMEAR PROOF

Nadine Jensen of Sydney, Australia, ran into trouble with the police June 8 because she wanted to register a dramatic protest against Australian troops being used in the dirty war in Vietnam. Daubing herself liberally with fresh red paint, the 21-year-old girl moved onto George Street as the troops paraded by. Each time she bumped into one of them, she left her mark on their uniforms.

Hauled into court, she explained that she had nothing against the individual soldiers, since they were "only instruments of authority." But, she said, "Australians are too complacent and apathetic about Vietnam." What they should do is show "intellectual and moral bravery by examining the situation we are involved in in Vietnam"

She said she belonged to no political party although she could be called a pacifist "with reservations." She wished "to declare a personal revolt against the pressure of compelling unquestioned drives." The judge fined her \$6 or six days in jail and placed her on a \$100 good-behavior bond for 12 months. Miss Nadine paid the fine out of her pocketbook.

The Daily Mirror gave the beautiful girl a five-column portrait on the front page with a full report of her views. Her long auburn hair still matted with peace paint, she was an obvious leading contender for pin-up girl of the year among the troops in Vietnam who think they ought to be brought back home.

WILSON SEES "RED PLOT" IN SEAMEN'S STRIKE

By John Walters

London

Prime Minister Wilson is becoming rather desperate in face of the absolutely solid front that the striking British seamen have shown to all blandishments, promises and threats. In a statement in the House of Commons June 20 he startled his audience by alleging that some sort of sinister influence is preventing settlement of the dispute.

Wilson said, "It has been apparent for some time -- and I do not say this without having good reason for saying it -- that since the Court of Enquiry's report, a few individuals have brought pressure to bear on a select few on the Executive Council of the NUS, who in turn have been able to dominate the majority of that otherwise sturdy union...this tightly knit group of politically motivated men who, as the last general election showed, utterly failed to secure acceptance of their views by the British electorate, but who now are determined to exercise backstage pressures forcing great hardship on the members of the union and their families, and endangering the security of the industry and the economic welfare of the nation."

When pressed to reveal who these men were, Wilson refused, retreating into dark hints that "all" would be revealed at the appropriate time. Naturally his remarks have been taken as implying that the National Union of Seamen is being manipulated by members of the Communist party. It is true that one or two members of the CP are involved in the leadership of the strike, but it is pure fantasy to suggest that in some mysterious way the whole body of British seamen are unconscious puppets in a red plot.

The British Communist party in fact has played an ambiguous role, to say the least, in the seamen's strike. While its paper, the Morning Star (formerly the Daily Worker), has given support to the seamen and full coverage to the dispute, its leading militant on the docks, Jack Dash, at a meeting of dockers which he called did not put the question of sympathetic action to the vote. He merely said that he would leave it to the conscience of the dockers present. This was in spite of a clear call by the NUS for the blacking of all British ships. Dash thus betrayed the seamen, because the dockers had been ready to respond to a call to action. They were disoriented by the move, leaving the meeting not knowing if there had been a decision or not.

Wilson hinted in his speech that the NUS Executive Council had been willing to compromise when he talked to them June 17. The implication was that after this, the "reds" intervened. Yet the fact remains that he met the Executive Council at 2:55 p.m.; they left Downing Street at 3:40 p.m. and at 6:50 p.m. issued a statement rejecting any promises. This was adopted unanimously. To

believe Wilson, the "hidden hand gang" were extraordinarily efficient, brainwashing forty-eight men in so short a time.

The alternative is that Wilson misrepresented what happened at the meeting. This is by far the most likely. Wilson's reputation has gained many dimensions since he took office, not least being that for dishonesty.

Perhaps the best indication of the real situation among the seamen is the votes being taken up and down the country at the ports. The press and the Tories have been agitating for a secret ballot amongst the seamen on the question of the Court of Enquiry's report. On June 20 they, and Wilson, received their answer; the South Shields branch of the NUS did take a secret ballot, the result being 609 votes in favor of the Executive Council's decision, and only 43 against. Meetings held at Liverpool, Hull, Glasgow and Southampton were all well attended and each went on record as being solidly behind the Executive Council and its unanimous stand for their original demand of a 40-hour week now. The firmness of the ranks must have been clear to Wilson; he turned to red-baiting to see if this would split the solid front.

Having tried, with the help of George Woodcock, the general secretary of the Trades Union Council, and other top union brass, to isolate the seamen from the rest of the trade-union movement, Wilson now tries his splitting tactics on the NUS. Commenting on Wilson's statement, Jim Worthington of the NUS Executive Council said, "I am not a member of any party, clique or group. I owe no allegiance to anyone but the National Union of Seamen and the Merseyside seamen in particular." He went on to say that the prime minister and Mr. Ford Geddes (the employers spokesman) were speaking with the same voice.

As a first move to promote strikebreaking activity, the government is to use the Royal Navy to regularly supply Scottish islands; and the Royal Air Force is to help maintain parcel post to Northern Ireland. Also the RAF are to begin flying out certain items for export that have to meet delivery dates. This is obviously the beginning. British ports are near to clogged with idle vessels. No doubt we can expect to see the navy start moving ships in an effort to keep the docks open.

The seamen are now facing the bitterest phase of their struggle, having been deserted by the top brass of the official union movement. Under constant press attacks, they now face attempted disruption in their own ranks -- attempts that seem to be failing at the moment.

Their main hope for sympathetic action now lies with the International Federation of Transport Workers whose support would prove decisive in the effort to tie up all British ships.

Lastly they have to find a way of activating the support and sympathy that they have among the rank and file of the British

unions. This support is present, as is witnessed by the donations that are coming in to the strike fund from all over the British Isles. The problem facing the seamen is to get this support translated into action.

This should be the concern of all revolutionary Marxists as well, for the seamen's struggle is of the greatest significance to the pattern that will be set for the coming period in Britain.

FABRICIO OJEDA "FOUND" HANGED IN CARACAS JAIL CELL

Fabricio Ojeda, one of the main leaders of the Venezuelan guerrilla front, was captured by government forces June 17. Four days later the Leoni regime announced that he had hanged himself that day in his cell in San Carlos prison. According to the authorities, he had used the cord of a venetian blind.

The government story was met with complete disbelief throughout the country. Ojeda was well known for his militancy. He became a legendary figure when, after being given a 19-year sentence three years ago for guerrilla activities, he bided his time for a year and then staged a daring and successful prison break.

Ojeda's friends believe that the Leoni regime did not want to take any more chances with the courageous fighter and they also wanted to make an example. Recently Leoni has been releasing political opponents who have advocated giving up guerrilla war. Jesús Faria, secretary general of the Venezuelan Communist party, as well as Domingo Rangel, former head of the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria], who changed their positions on guerrilla war and began arguing against it, were released and went into exile. By murdering Ojeda, the regime not only rid itself of a determined political opponent but sought to demoralize the fighters who have upheld guerrilla war as a correct tactical course in seeking freedom for their country from imperialist domination and capitalist-landlord rule.

A journalist, Fabricio Ojeda was one of the main leaders in the uprising that toppled dictator Pérez Jiménez. The Cuban Revolution exercised a powerful influence on his political views and he moved from the bourgeois Unión Republicana Democrática to the tendency that was to form the MIR. In 1963 he resigned from Congress and joined the guerrilla fighters in the west of Venezuela.

The anger and bitterness of the guerrilla fighters over the fate of Ojeda can be judged from the fact that the day after the authorities announced that he had committed "suicide," two youths opened up with machine guns on a patrol car near Central University in Caracas, killing two policemen.

COURT TURNS DOWN APPEALS OF HEKMATDJOU AND KHARVI

As was expected, the second military appeals court in Teheran handed down a decision June 21 upholding the death sentences passed by a lower military court against Parviz Hekmatdjou and Ali Kharvi.

The defendants were accused of belonging to the Tudeh [Communist] party, of violating the security of the state and "espionage." The latter charge was based on the prosecution's interpretation of a report sent by Hekmatdjou to Tudeh party leaders in exile in East Germany.

Hekmatdjou was also accused of undermining army morale. For this, he was given a second death sentence.

The two defendants immediately asked that they be granted the right to appeal their cases to a higher court. This requires approval from the shah.

If the shah grants permission and the higher court should confirm the verdicts of the lower tribunals, the only legal recourse left open would be an appeal to the shah for clemency; i.e., the reduction of the death penalties to life imprisonment.

Jules Chomé, head of the Belgian section of the International Association of Democratic Jurists and representative of the Belgian League for the Rights of Man, who was admitted to the court sessions as an observer, sent a personal appeal to the shah to intervene positively in the case.

Protests, demanding the immediate release of the political prisoners in Iran, should be addressed to the shah in Teheran. Protests should also be addressed to ambassadors and consuls of the shah in other countries.

AFL-CIO ENDS BOYCOTT OF ILO

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations [AFL-CIO] decided June 22 to end a three-week boycott of the International Labor Organization [ILO] of the United Nations. The boycott reflected AFL-CIO President George Meany's reactionary foreign policy. Meany was incensed when the ILO elected a Communist, Leon Chajm of Poland, as its president.

Walter P. Reuther, head of the United Automobile Workers, got into a sharp clash with Meany over the boycott. Reuther does not differ with Meany on fundamental policy; he merely objects to tactics that are so obviously stupid as to be self-defeating. The matter was of concern to the U.S. State Department which utilizes the AFL-CIO in advancing its policies in labor movements abroad.

AN APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE

By Bertrand Russell

[The following is the full text of an appeal issued June 18 by the well-known mathematician, philosopher and pacifist.]

* * *

I appeal to you, citizens of America, as a person concerned with liberty and social justice.

Many of you will feel that your country has served these ideals; and, indeed, the United States possesses a revolutionary tradition which, in its origins, was true to the struggle for human liberty and for social equality. It is this tradition which has been traduced by the few who rule the United States today.

Many of you may not be fully aware of the extent to which your country is controlled by industrialists who depend for their power partly upon great economic holdings in all parts of the world. The United States today controls over sixty percent of the world's natural resources, although it contains only six percent of the world's population. The minerals and produce of vast areas of the planet are possessed by a handful of men.

I ask you to consider the words of your own leaders, who sometimes reveal the exploitation they have practised. The New York Times of February 12, 1950 said:

"Indo-China is a prize worth a large gamble. In the North are exportable tin, tungsten, manganese, coal, lumber and rice; rubber, tea, pepper and hides. Even before World War II Indo-China yielded dividends estimated at 300 million dollars per year."

One year later, an adviser to the United States State Department said the following:

"We have only partially exploited Southeast Asia's resources. Nevertheless, Southeast Asia supplied 90 percent of the world's crude rubber, 60 per cent of its tin and 80 per cent of its copra and coconut oil. It has sizable quantities of sugar, tea, coffee, tobacco, sisal, fruits, spices, natural resins and gums, petroleum, iron ore and bauxite."

And in 1953, while the French were still in Vietnam fighting with American backing, President Eisenhower stated:

"Now let us assume that we lost Indo-China. If Indo-China goes, the tin and tungsten we so greatly value would cease coming."

We are after the cheapest way to prevent the occurrence of something terrible -- the loss of our ability to get what we want from the riches of the Indo-Chinese territory and from Southeast Asia."

This makes clear that the war in Vietnam is a war like that waged by the Germans in Eastern Europe. It is a war designed to protect the continued control over the wealth of the region by American capitalists. When we consider that the fantastic sums of money spent on armament are awarded in contracts to the industries on whose boards of directors sit the generals who demand the weapons, we can see that the military and large industry have formed an interlocking alliance for their own profit.

The truth is that the Vietnamese popular resistance is just like the American revolutionary resistance to the British, who controlled the economic and political life of the American colonies in the eighteenth century. Vietnamese resistance is like the resistance of the French maquis, the Yugoslav partisans and the guerrillas of Norway and Denmark to the Nazi occupation. That is why a small peasant people is able to hold down a vast army of the most powerful industrial nation on earth

I appeal to you to consider what has been done to the people of Vietnam by the United States government. Can you, in your hearts, justify the use of poison chemicals and gas, the saturation bombing of the entire country with jelly-gasoline and phosphorus? Although the American press lies about this, the documentary evidence concerning the nature of these gases and chemicals is overwhelming. They are poisonous and they are fatal. Napalm and phosphorus burn until the victim is reduced to a bubbling mass. The United States has also used weapons like the lazy dog, which is a bomb containing ten thousand slivers of razor-sharp steel. These razor darts slice to ribbons the villagers upon whom these weapons of sheer evil are constantly used. In one province of north Vietnam, the most densely populated, one hundred million slivers of razor-sharp steel have fallen in a period of thirteen months.

It is even more revealing and terrible that more Vietnamese died during the reign of Diem, from 1954 to 1960, than since 1960, when the Vietnamese partisans took up armed resistance to the American occupation in the south. What the papers have called the "Vietcong" is, in fact, a broad alliance, like the popular fronts of Europe, including all political views ranging from Catholics to Communists. The National Liberation Front has the most ardent support of the people and only the wilfully blind will fail to see this.

Do you know that eight million Vietnamese were placed in interment camps under conditions of forced labor, with barbed wire and armed patrols? Do you know that this was done on the direction of the United States government and that torture and brutal murder were a continuous feature of life in these camps? Are you aware

that the gases and chemicals which have been used for five years in Vietnam blind, paralyze, asphyxiate, cause convulsions and result in unbearable death?

Try to imagine what it would mean if an enemy were bombing the United States and occupied it for twelve years. How would you feel if a foreign power had saturated New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, St. Louis, San Francisco and Miami with jelly-gasoline, phosphorus and lazy dogs? What would you do if an occupying army used these toxic gases and chemicals in every town and hamlet they entered? Can you really think that the American people would welcome so savage an aggressor? The fact is that everywhere in the world people have come to see the men who control the United States government as brutal bullies, acting in their own economic interests and exterminating any people foolhardy enough to struggle against the naked exploitation and aggression.

When the United States began its war against the Vietnamese, after having paid for all of the French war against the same people, the U.S. Defense Department owned property valued at 160 billion dollars. This value has since doubled. The U.S. Defense Department is the world's largest organization, owning 32 million acres in the United States and millions more in foreign countries. By now, more than 75 cents out of every hundred are spent on present wars and preparation for future war. Billions of dollars are placed in the pockets of the U.S. military, thereby giving the Pentagon economic power affecting every facet of American life.

Military assets in the United States are three times as great as the combined assets of U.S. Steel, Metropolitan Life Insurance, American Telephone and Telegraph, General Motors and Standard Oil. The Defense Department employs three times the number of people working in all these great world corporations. The billions of dollars in military contracts are provided by the Pentagon and fulfilled by large industry. By 1960, 21 billion dollars were spent on military goods. Of this colossal sum, 7½ billion were divided amongst ten corporations and five corporations received nearly one billion dollars each. I ask you to consider carefully that in the executive offices of these same corporations there are 1,400 army officers, including 261 generals and officers of flag rank. General Dynamics has 187 officers, 27 generals and admirals and the former Secretary of the Army on its payroll. This is a ruling caste, which stays in power no matter who is elected to nominal public office, and every president finds himself obliged to serve the interests of this all-powerful group. Thus, American democracy has been emptied of life and meaning because the people cannot remove the real men who rule them.

It is this concentration of power which makes it necessary for the Pentagon and big industry to continue the arms race for its own sake. The subcontracts they award to smaller industries and war contractors involve every American city and, thus, affect the jobs of millions of people. Four million work for the Defense Department.

Its payroll is 12 billion dollars, twice that of the U.S. automobile industry. A further four million work directly in arms industries. In many cities military production accounts for as much as 80 percent of all manufacturing jobs. Over 50 percent of the gross national product of the United States is devoted to military spending.

This vast military system covers the world with over 3,000 military bases, for the simple purpose of protecting the same empire which was described so clearly in the statements of President Eisenhower, the State Department adviser and the New York Times which I mentioned earlier to you. From Vietnam to the Dominican Republic, from the Middle East to the Congo, the economic interests of a few big corporations linked to the arms industry and the military itself determine what happens to American lives. It is on their orders that the United States invades and oppresses starving and helpless people.

Yet, despite the immense wealth of the United States, despite the fact that with only six percent of the world's people, approaching two thirds of the world's resources are in its possession, despite the control over the world's oil, cobalt, tungsten, iron ore, rubber and other vital resources, despite the vast billions of profits that are gained by a few American corporations at the cost of mass starvation amongst the peoples of the world, despite all this, 66 million American live at poverty level. The cities of America are covered in slums. The poor carry the burden of taxation and the fighting of colonial and aggressive wars.

I am asking all of you to make an intellectual connection between events which occur daily around you, to try to see clearly the system which has taken control of the United States and perverted its institutional life into a grotesque arsenal for a world empire. It is the vast military machine, the great industrial combines and their intelligence agencies which are regarded by the people of three whole continents as their main enemy in life and the source of their misery and hunger. If we examine the governments which depend for their existence upon American military force, we shall always find regimes which support the rich, the landlords and the big capitalists. This is true in Brazil, in Peru, in Venezuela, in Thailand, in South Korea, in Japan. It is true the world over.

The result of this is that in order to suppress a national revolution, such as the great historic uprising of the Vietnamese people, the United States is obliged to behave as the Japanese behaved in Southeast Asia and the Nazis behaved in Eastern Europe. This is literally true. The concentration camps to which I have referred, and which held nearly sixty percent of the rural population of south Vietnam, were scenes of torture, massacre and mass burial. The special experimental weapons, like the gas and chemicals and jelly-gasoline, are as horrible as anything used by the Nazis during the Second World War. It is true that the Nazis systematically exterminated the Jews and the United States has not yet done anything comparable in Vietnam. With the exception of the

extermination of the Jews, however, everything that the Germans did in Eastern Europe has been repeated by the United States in Vietnam on a scale which is larger and with an efficiency which is more terrible and more complete.

In violation of solemn international agreements signed by American presidents and ratified by the American Congress, this Johnson government has committed war crimes, crimes against humanity and crimes against the peace. It has committed these crimes because the Johnson government exists to preserve the economic exploitation and the military domination of subject peoples by U.S. industrial magnates and their military arm.

The Central Intelligence Agency, which has a budget fifteen times larger than all the diplomatic activity of the United States, is involved in the assassination of heads of state, and plots against independent governments. This sinister activity is designed to destroy the leadership and the organization of peoples who are struggling to free themselves from the stranglehold of American economic and political domination. (United States militarism is inseparable from that same predatory capitalism which reduced the American people themselves to poverty within the living memory of this generation. The same essential motives have led to barbarous and atrocious crimes on a great scale in Vietnam.

I have called on intellectuals and eminent independent men and women from all parts of the world to join in an international War Crimes Tribunal which will hear evidence concerning the crimes of the U.S. government in Vietnam. You will remember that Germans were considered guilty if they acquiesced in and accepted the crimes of their government. Nobody considered it a sufficient excuse for Germans to say that they knew about the gas chambers and the concentration camps, the torture and the mutilation, but were unable to stop it.

I appeal to you as a human being to human beings. Remember your humanity and your own self-respect. The war against the people of Vietnam is barbaric. It is an aggressive war of conquest.

During the American War of Independence, no one had to tell Americans the purpose of their struggle or conscript them against their will. Nor was it necessary for American soldiers to go ten thousand miles to another country. In the American revolutionary war against foreign troops Americans fought in fields and forests although they were in rags and the occupying army was the strongest of the day. Americans fought the occupier, although they were hungry and poor, and they fought them house by house. In that war of liberation, the American revolutionaries were called terrorists and the colonial power was the one labelling them rebels and rabble.

American national heroes responded with words such as Nathan Hale's and Patrick Henry's. The sentiment, "Give me liberty or give me death," inspired their struggle, just as it inspires the

Vietnamese resistance to United States aggression and occupation. The Nathan Hales and Patrick Henrys of Vietnam are not the United States army. Those who display heroism, love of country and that deep belief in freedom and justice which inspired the American people in 1776 are today the people of Vietnam, fighting under the revolutionary leadership of their National Liberation Front.

And so the American people are to be used as cannon fodder by those who exploit not only the Vietnamese but the people of the United States themselves. It is Americans who have been killing Vietnamese, attacking villages, occupying cities, using gas and chemicals, bombing their schools and hospitals -- all this to protect the profits of American capitalism. The men who conscript the soldiers are the same men who sign the military contracts in their own benefit. They are the same men who send American soldiers to Vietnam as company cops, protecting stolen property.

So it is that the real struggle for freedom and democracy is inside the United States itself, against the usurpers of American society. I have no doubt that the American people would respond just as the Vietnamese have responded if the United States were invaded and subjected to the atrocities and tortures which the United States army and government have inflicted on the Vietnamese.

The American protest movement, which has inspired people all over the world, is the only true spokesman for American concerns for individual liberty and social justice. The battlefield for freedom is in Washington, in the struggle against the war criminals -- Johnson, Rusk and McNamara -- who have degraded the United States and its citizens. Indeed, they have stolen the United States from its people and made the name of a great country stink in the nostrils of people the world over.

This is the harsh truth, and it is a truth which is affecting the daily lives of Americans irrevocably and increasingly. There is no looking the other way. There is no pretending that the war crimes are not occurring, that the gas and chemicals do not exist, that the torture and napalm have not been used, that the Vietnamese have not been slaughtered by American soldiers and American bombs. There is no dignity without the courage to examine this evil and oppose it. There is no solution for the American crisis short of the emancipation of the American people themselves from these barbarous men who speak in their name and defile a great people by doing so.

The American people, however, are becoming alert and are showing that same determination and courage which the Vietnamese have so movingly displayed. The Negro struggle in Harlem, Watts and the American South, the resistance of the American students, the increasing distaste for this war shown by the American people at large, give hope to all mankind that the day when greedy and brutal men can deceive and abuse the American nation is drawing to a close.

My appeal to Americans is made with full awareness that the rulers of the United States have spared no device in propaganda to hide from the American people the ugly face of their rulers and the truth about their behavior. Abraham Lincoln gave expression to the hope that a people, once aroused, can be deceived no longer. All Americans who know from their own experience and from that of their closest relatives what has been done in Vietnam should come forward now. Speak the truth and take your stand alongside your brothers throughout the world. Struggle for an America free of murderous production, free of war criminals, free of exploitation and free of the hatred of subject peoples. These peoples look to the ordinary people of the United States to understand their plight and to answer their struggle with an American resistance capable of making the United States again a citadel of individual liberty and social justice. The international War Crimes Tribunal is itself an appeal to the conscience of the American people, our allies in a common cause.

The War Crimes Tribunal is under urgent preparation now. I am approaching eminent jurists, literary figures and men of public affairs in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the United States itself. Vietnamese victims of this war will give evidence. Full scientific data concerning the chemicals used, their properties and their effects will be documented. Eyewitnesses will describe what they have seen and scientists will be invited to examine the exhibits in the possession of the Tribunal. The proceedings will be tape-recorded and the full evidence will be published. There will be documentary film material concerning the witnesses and their evidence. We aim to provide the most exhaustive portrayal of what has happened to the people of Vietnam.

We intend that the peoples of the world shall be aroused as never before, the better to prevent the repetition of this tragedy elsewhere. Just as in the case of Spain, Vietnam is a barbarous rehearsal.

It is our intention that neither the bona fides nor the authenticity of this Tribunal will be susceptible to challenge from those who have so much to hide. President Johnson, Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara, Henry Cabot Lodge, General Westmoreland and their fellow criminals will be brought before a wider justice than they recognize and a more profound condemnation than they are equipped to understand.

SUMMER SCHEDULE

During July and August World Outlook will appear on a reduced schedule. No issues will be skipped, but we will shift over to approximately a biweekly basis, resuming weekly publication in September.