

JULY, 1968



POLITICAL
AFFAIRS

WHAT HAPPENED IN FRANCE
Interview With Carl Winter

**VIETNAM: NUMBER ONE FRONT AGAINST
IMPERIALISM**
James E. Jackson

U.S. IMPERIALISM IN LATIN AMERICA
Longino Becerra

FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM: THE CYPRUS CHAPTER
Herbert Aptheker

50c

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

VOL. XLVII, NO. 7

JULY, 1968

Betty Gannett, Editor Hyman Lumer, Associate Editor

<i>Interview With Carl Winter</i> What Happened in France	1
<i>James E. Jackson</i> Vietnam: The Number One Front Against Imperialism	13
<i>Longino Becerra</i> U.S. Imperialism in Latin America	18
<i>Herbert Aptheker</i> For Peace and Freedom: The Cyprus Chapter	30
<i>Vasily Solodovnikov</i> The Soviet Union and the African Nations	41
COMMUNICATIONS	
<i>Joseph Felshin</i> Martin Luther King and Communism	54
<i>Arley Woodrow</i> The Johnson Withdrawal	59
<i>Bernard E. Galitz</i> New Opportunities to Build the C.P.	59
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>Hyman Lumer</i> The Road to Freedom: A Marxist View	61

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 799 Broadway, Room 618, New York, N. Y. 10003, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$8.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

What Happened in France

An Interview With Carl Winter*

How would you characterize the present political situation in France?

The recent events—the student sit-ins and the general strike—were the outgrowth of a long accumulation of grievances on the part of the workers, both in the cities and the countryside, and among the students and intellectuals. These were aggravated by the domestic policies of the de Gaulle regime, which were increasingly marked by the bypassing of popular needs and demands, by the imposition of personal rule and growing repression against expressions of popular discontent. De Gaulle himself had been compelled repeatedly to take note of the widespread dissatisfaction, and had repeatedly promised improvements in living standards and in the educational system if only the people would leave things to him.

All this created an explosive situation. However, the elements of a revolutionary situation were not yet present—a situation in which the ruling class cannot continue to rule in the old way and in which there is widespread determination to change the system among the people. While I was in France I visited shops and talked to workers. I walked the streets, read posters and talked to people. I spoke to people on the staff of *l'Humanité* who had participated in important editorial and Party conferences. And all that I learned seems to me to bear out completely that there is not a revolutionary situation in France today, that these classical requirements are not present. Of course, such a situation may be created as a result of further events. But that's another matter.

What led to the sit-ins at the Sorbonne? What were the aims and demands of those who took part in them?

The French educational system is among the most antiquated in Western Europe. The universities are governed by a traditional professorial system with no participation by the instructors or students. The examination system is designed not to test but to weed out students. After spending years of their lives in the university, many are flunked out. Having used up their resources at the university, they are

*Carl Winter was on the scene in France as a correspondent for *The Worker*.

then unable to enter a profession and are at an age when it is already difficult to enter a trade.

It should also be known that only 10 per cent of the university students come from working-class families. Even though tuition is free, many can't afford to spend their time that way. They have to supplement the family income, or they are deterred by the high cost of living and textbooks and by the various fees they must pay.

A movement developed among teachers and students for the modernization and democratization of the university structure. They called for democratic participation in shaping the curriculum and in the selection of instructors, for the abolition of the examination system and its replacement by a system of tests as ongoing checks of student progress, and for a system of loans and scholarships.

After repressive police actions against student demonstrations in early May, a fresh wave of meetings and demands took place. Finally, after numerous police beatings of students on the campus the Sorbonne sit-in was launched, followed by the similar occupation of universities around the country. These student strikes, which called for a revolutionary transformation of the educational system, captured the imagination of great numbers of people throughout the country.

At this point the various Leftist elements entered the picture, using the occasion to equate the sit-ins with social revolution, which they saw as taking place within the halls of the universities. Their demands were vague and abstract, and were couched in terms of "revolution." They had nothing specific to say about reorganization or concrete changes in the educational system. They did speak of giving students a voice in selection of instructors and content of the curriculum, but they made it clear they considered these subordinate questions. Their main attack was centered on what they called the "society of consumption," at whose door they laid all the evils of the educational system.

It was these groupings which were chiefly involved in the outdoor demonstrations and the clashes with the police. And it was their actions, not those of the major body of the students, which were given the most prominent attention in the press in this country.

Then there were, in effect, two distinct sets of actions taking place?

Yes, and the contrast was very striking. I visited the Sorbonne, and on going into the inner court of the university I was struck by the utter chaos there. Even outside, the walls of the university were plastered with all kinds of posters in an extremely destructive fashion. These were put up as if their intention was not to convey a message

but to deface the walls, to display contempt for the institution. Not only were posters pasted helter-skelter on top of one another, but there were also slogans in red paint that are undoubtedly not removable and will remain to deface those walls for years to come. Remembering that this is an ancient center of learning in which all of Western Europe has taken pride for centuries, I must confess that I found it quite a blow to look at that scene.

Inside the courtyard, ranged around the walls, were numerous tables on which were displayed posters, leaflets and pamphlets of the various political tendencies. At one table I saw a sign "Communist." On closer inspection it was "Young Communist (Revolutionary)," a designation used by the Trotskyites. Another table bore the designation "Action Committee." Behind it was a huge black flag. These were the Anarchists. Then there were varieties of Trotskyites with other names, and various committees with different names but the same address on their literature. On the tables the writings of Kropotkin, Mao and Rosa Luxemburg were especially prominent.

All of their propaganda was addressed primarily to "revolution," to calls for fundamental transformation of the system, for freedom—all in high-sounding and flamboyant language. There was an air of carnival, with everybody roaming about to see what's new, to hear what everyone else has to say, and with extreme chaos reigning over the whole scene. But this was the least significant feature of what was going on in the university.

For example, I went into a lecture hall and saw some 400 students packed into it. There wasn't a place to stand. On the platform was a group of students and professors, carrying on an easy-going discussion with the audience. As I entered a professor was discussing the next year's history curriculum, examining critically the way history had been taught and how its teaching had to be changed. He was constantly being interrupted in a friendly fashion, his audience joining in discussion with him and he listening to what they had to say. One felt these 400 students meant business, that they really wanted to change the educational system and were trying to get the help of the professors and other experienced people in their efforts.

This kind of thing was going on all over the university building, and these students weren't paying much attention to the performance out in the courtyard. I saw more of this when I went to the new Faculty of Science just outside the Latin Quarter. There I sat in on a seminar or commission meeting, as they called it. There were about 75 high school teachers, all young people, together with 4 or 5 middle-aged people who appeared to be professors. A young philosophy

professor was conducting the seminar. The question under discussion was: Can you change the educational system without changing the social base?

The philosophy professor sounded very much like a well-grounded Marxist, and he conducted the discussion in a free and easy manner. I learned that this was part of a long, continuing program that had gone on every day during the sit-in strike. And this was not just a casual exercise. They were working up a program to present to the Ministry of Education.

In short, what one saw here was on the one hand a certain amount of froth designating itself as *the* genuine revolution, and on the other hand very serious work by people who were really making a revolution in a constructive way. At these meetings I got the feeling that this was almost like the revolutionary estates which met during the French Revolution—that the people were declaring themselves a law-making power and were writing new statutes of which they considered themselves the future executors.

How did the general strike of the workers originate? What were the demands for which they struck?

It all started with stoppages in protest against the extreme police brutality, against the wholesale clubbing and tear-gassing of the students and their supporters. The Renault auto plant was first, then others responded. Then the workers came forward with their own long-standing demands and the general strike was launched.

It was truly a general strike, extending to all basic industries, to all forms of transportation, to radio and television, to the newspapers, to the big department stores—to every kind of enterprise. In the main these were occupied by the strikers and all were effectively shut down.

At this point, I think a word about the structure of French unions would be useful. Union membership is not compulsory. The unions make a point of not insisting on dues checkoff, emphasizing the voluntary enrollment of workers. They conduct constant propaganda for enrollment in the plants. In this there is competition between three large national federations. The first, the CGT (General Confederation of Labor), which is mainly Communist-led, is the largest of them. The second, called the Democratic Federation of Labor, is Catholic-led. The third, the Socialist-led Force Ouvriere, is the smallest of the three.

In a given plant, all three federations may be represented. When elections take place for committee members, stewards or other posts, all workers, whether union members or not, vote for their choice among

the three tickets put in the running by the respective unions affiliated with each of the federations. Because of its larger membership, the CGT consequently exerts a predominant influence in many of the larger and most decisive plants.

The union demands began with a call for substantial wage increases and the institution of a minimum wage of 600 francs per month. The wages of most workers (with the notable exception of the Renault plant) were below this minimum, including youth and women workers. Other demands were reduction of the retirement age to 60 and reduction of the work week from 45-48 hours a week to as low as 40, with no reduction in pay. Then there were a number of demands for trade union rights and security, among them the right to carry on trade union work without fine or dismissal, the right of the union to collect dues and assessments in the plant, the right to put notices on plant bulletin boards, the allocation of a certain number of hours per month for union meetings on company time and company property, and the allocation of time for union committeemen to transact union business and present grievances. There were also special demands for protection of the rights of youth to qualify for better-paying jobs, for adjustment of wage inequities and for equal pay for equal work, especially for women and youth.

At the Citroen plant I saw many posters, placards and slogans on the walls, presenting the demands of the workers. Among them were some in Arabic and Portuguese. I learned that many workers come from Algeria and Portugal to do the dirtiest and lowest-paid work in French industry. Many of these are active in the union, particularly the CGT, which gives special attention to their problems.

But the demands were not only economic. In every contact that I made with workers or their literature, I found also political demands. On gates, on walls, in leaflets, there was always the demand for ending the government of personal power of de Gaulle. "Ten Years Is Enough" and "We Want a People's Government of Democratic Unity" were popular slogans. In many instances they called for unity of all forces of the Left to guarantee such a government. In all cases that I witnessed, this was under the initiative of the CGT.

The press in this country has described the demands of the workers, in contrast to those of the students, as essentially conservative, that is, non-revolutionary. It also described the union leadership and the Communist Party as having been dragged into the struggle, as tailing after the workers, and as trying to impose inadequate settlements on

them. And in the Left here some have attacked the union leadership and the Party for not continuing the strikes longer, and have charged them with selling out the workers. Is there any truth to such assertions?

No, they are entirely false. The Communist Party and the CGT were in the forefront of the struggle and had the initiative throughout. This was clearly evident in the reporting on the strikes by radio and television commentators and in the press.

Here I might note that the reporting was done by agreement with the striking workers. When the strikers occupied the radio and television stations, the commentators were permitted to continue broadcasting for the purpose, as they announced, of guaranteeing complete and impartial coverage of the news. And while the workers occupied the newspaper plants, they continued to produce the newspapers, though much curtailed in size, for the purpose of keeping the public informed on the progress of events.

Furthermore, the CGT did not propose at the outset that the workers return to work. What happened was that the representatives of the CGT met with the employers and received their proposals for settlement. They told the employers that they would convey the proposals to the workers, who would have the final say about acceptance or rejection. They went to the workers and said: "This is what management offers." They did not propose that the offer be accepted, though they noted that it contained many concessions. The workers discussed it and democratically rejected it. The CGT went back and said: "You'll have to do better." And they continued to negotiate until they came up with better settlements which the workers accepted.

Now, a word about the situation in the Renault plant, which I understand became a big issue in the newspapers here. Though the government made substantial concessions to gas and electric workers, postal workers and all civil servants, it held out bitterly in the nationalized sector of the metal-working industry and was especially stubborn in its attitude toward the Renault workers. The fact is that these workers have the highest pay, the strongest union conditions and the most powerful, militant union among French industrial workers. The employers and the government were determined to use this situation to try to split the workers, to weaken the position of the Renault workers, and to discourage more militant struggles in the future. But these workers remained very firm and refused to accept anything less than what had been given to others. In this they had the full support of the leadership.

The final settlements were in general remarkable. They included a wage increase ranging from 10 to 12 per cent and up for most of the workers in basic industry, going as high as 35 per cent in some cases. For the lowest-paid workers, wage increases of 50 per cent or more were won. In fact, the demands were heavily weighted in the direction of bringing up the wage level of the lowest-paid. In almost all cases there were reductions in the work week without reduction in pay. These were, however, staggered over a period of two to three years, the workers getting part of the reduction the first year, another part the second, and so on. The workers also won substantial gains in union rights and security.

One very interesting feature of many settlements was that the workers were paid for all the time lost in the strike, something I have never heard of before. This was so strongly insisted upon, that in several cases where the companies agreed to pay half of the time lost, the workers rejected the whole settlement unless they got all of it. In many cases they won it before they returned to work.

It was on the basis of the achievement of such gains as these that the strikes were ended, by the decision of the workers themselves. To illustrate the point, at a railroad yard which I visited I happened to hear a conversation between the secretary of the union local and a worker who came to ask if it was true, as he had heard on the radio, that they were going back to work. He was very indignant about it. He said, "I thought we were in this strike to stay. What's the idea of going back?" The secretary answered him calmly: "You should have been at the union meeting. Nobody decided for the workers that they should go back. We discussed all the proposals and everybody had a chance to have his say about them. We voted on them and almost everybody voted to accept the settlement. This isn't the end of the fight, but we've made a lot of important gains, and now we'll go back and we'll know what to do after that. If you had any disagreement, your duty was to state it at the meeting."

In addition to the gains won in the settlements, the CGT recruited some 350,000 new members and established about 5,000 new locals in the course of the strike. This was in itself a major advance.

The workers feel tremendous strength as a result of the gains they have achieved. They have a new confidence and are ready for whatever form of struggle is next on the order of the day. And they feel that it is under Communist leadership that these gains were made. As of the time that I left France, the Communist Party had announced the enrollment of some 15,000 new members and the formation of innumerable new Party clubs. The Party press listed these by dis-

tricts. It announced, for example, that its general secretary, Waldeck Rochet, had spoken at a meeting in North Paris and 74 workers had joined the Party at that meeting. Another Party leader had spoken at the Renault plant gates and more than 100 workers had joined. And so on.

What was the particular position of the Communist Party in these struggles?

The Communist Party and its youth organization gave full and active support from the outset to the demands of the students. Thus, a full page from *l'Humanité* carrying a list of these demands was widely posted at the Sorbonne and elsewhere. Similarly the Party was fully behind the demands of the striking workers and linked these demands with those of the students, calling for unity of the workers with the students and teachers.

Both the Communist Party and the CGT kept linking the economic demands with the idea of unity for a people's government of democratic unity. Party posters everywhere carried such slogans as "An End to Personal Power," "De Gaulle, Ten Years Is More Than Enough," and "For a People's Government of Democratic Unity."

The Party's assessment was that a revolutionary situation did not then exist, and it placed its emphasis on the workers' initiative and the winning of the basic economic demands of the trade unions, as a condition for the strengthening of unity for the big political struggles ahead. It sees these struggles, and particularly the achievement of a people's government of democratic unity, as opening the way to socialism.

In constantly putting forward the call for such a government, the Party always adds the formulation "in which the Communists will participate as is their due." By this it means that it will not allow Mitterand and other leaders of the non-Communist Left simply to discount the Party and say "you don't matter" whereas actually the Party has the greater numerical strength. The Party does not demand a Communist government or excessive domination in any coalition, only participation in proportion to its strength. It sees a Left-led broad popular democratic movement, laying the foundations for an electoral victory to oust the de Gaulle regime and to replace personal power with representative popular government. It sees this as bringing about a social change which will strengthen the power of the people, bar the way to reaction and "open the way toward the socialist solution of the problems in France."

Such an outlook is completely rejected, however, by the Anarchist,

Trotskyite and other "Leftist" groups among the students. When the general strike began they claimed that the workers had been dragged into the struggle, then denounced their demands as motivated by "self-interest" and preservation of the "society of consumption." They engaged in constant vituperation not only against the Party and the CGT but against the workers in general, condemning the putting forward of economic demands or dealing with the trade unions as being grossly materialistic and anti-revolutionary.

They wanted a head-in "revolutionary confrontation" and sought to impose this idea on the strikers. Thus, a large number of them went to the Renault plant at Flins, a suburb outside of Paris. They went to tell the workers, who were discussing the proposed settlement, not to settle. The Party and the CGT called on the workers to keep cool and warned of the danger of provocation in this action, of giving de Gaulle the excuse to precipitate violent conflicts in the streets and as an excuse for the use of the armed forces. And sure enough, it did take the form of a provocation.

The police turned out at the plant gates and sought to bar the students from entering. Certainly the workers had issued no call for the students to come in; in fact they had made some public statements saying it was no affair of the students. Some of the leaders of the student band then proceeded to set fire to a number of hayricks and to put up barricades on the road. Serious battles with the police broke out. The police were extremely brutal and the students were badly beaten. The students then made this a *cause celebre*, calling upon the entire country to rally behind the revolutionary students who were being suppressed by the police. There was in fact a deep resentment and outcry against the police brutality. The CGT, even though it had condemned the student action as provocative, called for a one-hour protest strike after other such brutal police treatment of student demonstrators.

But this and other such attempted actions were unrelated to the demands or interests of the workers. They were imposed from the outside by these "Leftist" student leaders who had simply appointed themselves guardians of the revolution.

When de Gaulle, forced to abandon his plan for a referendum, called instead for elections, these "Leftists" leaped to the attack, charging that "elections are treason." The Communist Party's support of unity in the elections was denounced as a "break in the Left."

In a situation in which it was necessary to unify the Left and mobilize non-Left support, the actions of the "Leftists" tended to alienate such support. They tended to help de Gaulle to pose as the

savior of stability and order, and they also sowed confusion in the ranks of the Left. Furthermore, in singling out the Communists for attack, they found themselves joining hands with de Gaulle, who also singled out the Communists as "the main danger."

You speak of unity of the Left as a key question. What are the obstacles to such unity and how do they express themselves in relation to the coming elections?

As you may know, in the initial French elections a candidate must obtain an absolute majority to be elected. Where no candidate obtains such a majority a run-off election is held a week later with those eliminated who got less than 10 per cent of the vote. The Communist Party proposed an agreement with other parties of the Left whereby each party would run its own candidates in the first race but all would unite behind the Left candidate having the best chance of election in the run-offs in each district.

In the governmental crisis the center political forces had tried to take advantage of the situation by putting forward people of somewhat Left or independent reputation in order to rally the opposition to de Gaulle behind themselves and divert it from genuine Left influence. First an attempt was made to project Mendes-France as leader of the anti-de Gaulle movement. Francois Mitterand, head of the so-called Federation of the Democratic and Socialist Left, tried to work out an agreement with Mendes-France as the basis of a Left-center coalition which would exclude the Communists. But his effort was quickly exposed and proved sterile. Mendes-France evaporated from the scene and Mitterand was left without a figurehead for his "non-Communist Left" opposition.

The Communist Party then made its proposal for a joint campaign in the run-offs. Mitterand countered by proposing a united slate in the initial elections. But this would deprive the Party of its true electoral strength. It is the stronger of the two forces, claiming at least one-fourth of the electorate, and could succeed in electing its candidates in many districts without a run-off. The Party said that it would nevertheless accept a united ticket if there could be agreement on a common platform, on a program for a people's government of democratic unity. This was also rejected by the Mitterand forces.

Finally the Party nominated its own candidates for the initial elections and reached agreement with the others on mutual support for one another's candidates in the run-offs, with the weaker candidate withdrawing to throw his strength to the stronger. In addition an eight-point social and economic emergency plan was agreed on as the

basis for such mutual support.

The problem, clearly, is the unwillingness of the Mitterand forces to accept the idea of a government of democratic unity including the Communists and to enter into a clear-cut alliance on that basis. This, of course, can only weaken the Left in the elections.

How would you sum up the results of these struggles? What was actually gained by them?

That ten million workers struck is itself unprecedented. It showed that here is the class which holds the fate of the nation in its hands, the class which is capable of transforming society. Further, as I have already pointed out, the unprecedented settlements won by the workers and the growth in membership and organizations of both the CGT and the Communist Party have greatly strengthened the position of the working class and given it a sense of great confidence. The whole struggle has been raised to a new level and is bound to continue in new forms after the elections. Unity of the Left and all democratic forces acquires ever greater importance.

AN EDITORIAL POSTSCRIPT

Since the foregoing interview the French elections have been held, resulting in an unprecedented parliamentary majority for the de Gaullists. The American press has sought to picture this as a smashing repudiation of the Communist Party, the CGT and the Left generally.

It is too early to attempt a full analysis of the elections, but even a preliminary examination is enough to show the falsity of such a conclusion. To be sure, the magnitude of the de Gaullist victory is a matter for serious concern; it is by no means, however, as overwhelming as it is made to appear.

Thus, while the de Gaullist candidates won a large majority of the seats, they won only the barest majority of the popular vote. This discrepancy is the product of the undemocratic election laws imposed by the de Gaulle regime. But it is important that de Gaulle does not have the support of any substantial majority of the voters.

Second, the outcome reflects also the disunity in the Left, against whose injurious consequences the Communist Party never tired of warning. This disunity became very destructive in the elections, with the Federation of the Left devoting itself to intensive Red-baiting in the opening round. In this they were at one with the de Gaullists and gave grist to their mill. In the runoffs, it is clear that in many

districts united support to Communist candidates was much less than enthusiastic. Moreover, in the face of a clear-cut program advanced by the de Gaullists, the absence of any joint program of the Left parties proved to be seriously damaging.

Third, the "revolutionary" activities of the "Left" student groupings served to alienate the middle strata and were used very effectively by the de Gaulle forces for that purpose. Of this, too, the Communist Party repeatedly warned.

Finally, it is most important not to forget that 10 million workers did go on strike, that they won tremendous gains, that they emerged with greatly enhanced confidence and as a much more powerful force in the life of the country. The election results have not altered this; indeed, it is generally recognized that the de Gaulle government faces a very troublesome situation and will find it extremely difficult to make its reactionary policies prevail.

And as the workers continue to learn the lesson of political unity, as they have that of unity in their economic struggles, the days of the de Gaulle regime will prove to be numbered.

YOU CAN HELP

In a letter from Dr. Cheddi Jagan of the Guyana People's Progressive Party, he writes, in part, as follows:

"I have been in receipt of *Political Affairs* for many years. I wish to congratulate you for the excellent work which you are doing.

"It is a great pity that because of the high cost, made more prohibitive by our unfavorable exchange rate (\$1 US - \$2 Guyana), more of our leading comrades and activists cannot be regular subscribers. Is it likely that there can be a special price for Guyana?"

We are anxious to oblige Dr. Jagan by sending to his party a number of gift subscriptions. Will you help make this possible by contributing what you can. Send in a dollar, two, or five—and indicate you want it applied to these gift subscriptions.

Vietnam: The Number One Front Against Imperialism

There is nothing ahead for the expeditionary force of United States imperialism in Vietnam but death for its soldiers by the tens of thousands.

Already the United States ruling circles has suffered an irreparable defeat. Its sinister design to crush with military might the social emancipation and national liberation movement, to establish South Vietnam as a new-type U.S. colony and a strategic base from which it could rest the lever of its military power for domination of the whole of Southeast Asia, has failed.

Its neo-colonialist puppet government in Saigon is now utterly without authority or resources. As this is written, the range of its control is limited to a few main boulevards during daylight hours in the capital city of Saigon. And Saigon, itself, is under continuous fire by the Peoples Liberation Armed Forces (PLAF). Admitting that no place in South Vietnam is completely safe any more, and that no military position can be said to be permanently secured, on the day of his retirement after 4½ years as commander of the forces of U.S. aggression in Vietnam, General William C. Westmoreland admitted to a conclusion that "classic victory" in Vietnam is "beyond our grasp." In other words, the U.S. has failed to make South Vietnam politically "secure" by imposing a neo-colonialist regime and destroying the patriotic liberation movement in order to make the country into a vast U.S. military base.

Today, after 4½ years of escalation of the war under Commander-in-Chief Lyndon Johnson, and 11 years of American military presence and large scale aid to various puppet regimes in Saigon, the Peoples Liberation Armed Forces of South Vietnam are everywhere on the offensive. The United States command with 550,000 American troops, the whole Seventh Fleet and what is left of 5,000 planes, plus an additional 700,000 Saigon puppet troops, is staggering from defeat to defeat.

The U.S. expeditionary army has suffered a loss of some 85,000 casualties, including over 10,000 deaths, during the first 15 days of the PLAF general offensive, which began on May 5 of this year and continues without pause.

In the last week of May some anti-aircraft gun crews became national patriotic heroes or heroines of great "collective exploit"—for, in that week the 3,000th U.S. plane was shot down over North Vietnam.

The current casualty rate of Americans in Vietnam is in the neighborhood of 400 dead and 4,000 wounded a week. This will mean that some 20,000 American men will be killed in Vietnam, and another 120,000 will be wounded, in the current year alone.

Increasingly American soldiers and officers are asking the question: "Why are we here? For whom and for what are we wallowing in this mud with the explosion of death thundering in our ears?" These are the questions behind the greatest demonstrations of militant opposition to Washington's war policies that the world has ever seen. On such questions the consciousness and the conscience of the nation has been focused during the campaigns of such peace candidates as Senator Eugene McCarthy for Presidential nominee, and candidate for election to the Senate, Paul O'Dwyer of New York.

The always "hawkish" *U.S. News & World Report* was compelled to devote an article in its June 24th issue to the "mood of Americans in Vietnam." It found the "mood" below the top echelon of officers to be bitter, cynical, pessimistic. The magazine states that enlisted men and lower echelon officers refer to the U.S. effort in Vietnam "openly and frankly as a lost cause . . . the career soldiers are looking for the diplomats in Paris to end America's agony in Vietnam. They are almost cheering them on to find some solution."

Yet, while chief war-hawk Westmoreland discloses his conclusion that there is no win possible in Vietnam for the United States, despite the disclosure that the morale of the U.S. troops in the field is at an all-time low, and in defiance of manifestations of the sentiments and appeals for an end to the bombing and for withdrawing the troops on the part of millions of Americans and tens of millions of peoples around the world, President Johnson and the Pentagon persist in their war of aggression and destruction against the people and populated places in Vietnam, North and South.

I have just returned from a 21-day intensive tour of North Vietnam—the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—and I bear witness that the government of the United States, with unconscionable motive of vengefulness for the frustration and defeat of its war aims, is bending every effort to accomplish the *genocidal obliteration* of a sovereign state, an independent people and their distinctive social system—that is, to *physically destroy the DRV*, before the American people can replace LBJ's government by another, and before world public

opinion compels it to cease its aggression and withdraw its armed forces.

In its *war of aggression* in the South, and its savage *war of destruction* in the North, the U.S. imperialist ruling class has plumbed a new depth in infamy. North and South, its bombers fly and its tanks roll forward, under the injunction to "burn all; destroy all; kill all."

I have seen their handiwork, not only in Hanoi's suburbs and Haiphong harbor's factory districts, but in rural Thanh Hoa province—in the ruins of hospitals, workers' new housing-blocks, in the crater pock-marked school yards of bomb-fractured dormitories. Where are the graceful lacework of the hundreds of bridges which once arched across this land of rivers from one end to the other? And the American bombers have blown up a thousand miles of railroad tracks.

But as the American invaders have descended to a new depth in bestial behavior against their fellow men in this war against the Vietnamese, the Vietnam fighter-citizens have added a new stature and grandeur to the name and glory of man. With a sustained valor and heroism, against odds unprecedented, this people—the Vietnamese—have fought, and yet fight on, with unconquerable will and confidence in the certainty of their victory.

In the South, the general offensive which was launched on May 5th by the PLAF, support and inspire popular uprisings in the rear and in the center of the "positions of strength" of Saigon's puppet rulers and U.S. military bases. All cities are now battlegrounds in the South. Recruits are flocking to the Peoples Liberation Armed Forces. At the same time, as the *U.S. News & World Report* article previously referred to admits: "The desertion rate among South Vietnamese soldiers, always an indicator of troop morale, has shot up—while the defection rate among Communist soldiers has plummeted . . ."

The Vietnamese refer to the North as "the great rear base of the South." The people of the North of course will render every possible aid to their embattled kinsmen of the South, so long as a single alien boot remains on its soil. The war of national liberation which their brothers to the South are waging against the U.S. armies of aggression and their puppets, is in the common cause of reunification and national salvation.

However, the role of the North in the struggle against the expeditionary forces of U.S. imperialism is much more than that of a fraternal source of solidarity. U.S. imperialism is waging the most savage air and naval *war of destruction* against the sovereign Democratic Republic of Vietnam. And the entire people of the DRV have risen like one man to fight back against the invaders.

Under the compulsion of defending their country against the merciless invaders, and relying upon the material-technical aid rendered by members of the commonwealth of socialist countries—especially the Soviet Union—the DRV people have built a formidable up-to-date armed power, capable of confronting and defeating any attack upon its territory from any direction. Already, its military excellence has been proven in the air war: Three thousand of the five thousand planes sent against her have been shot down; their pilots killed or captured. The principle of peoples' war, as elaborated by Ho Chi Minh and General Giap, are based upon a total involvement of the whole people. The army regulars have the regional militia as organized auxiliaries and reserves. These in turn are able to rely upon locally organized but nationally integrated guerrillas and irregular units. All who work, also train to fight and are organized to do so effectively. All who study, also learn to fight. Even old folk and children organize themselves to aid the national defense and attend to the needs of the victims of aggression.

The armed forces of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have been supplied with the most modern weapons and in abundant quantity. This army of peasants have become masters of the most complicated arts of rocketry!

While every Vietnamese keeps his eye sharp on his gun, neither the people nor their government are neglecting the vital work of construction and development of the socialist economy. In industry, in agriculture, in transportation, in public health services, in mass and higher education and in culture—in all of these—expansion has outpaced the destruction wrought by the U.S. bombers. The heart-breaking problems posed by the wide-ranging bombing destruction have been met with brilliant improvisations, creativeness and astounding feats of organization. What miracles of organization lie behind the matter-of-fact statement which Minister of Transportation Phan Trong Tue made to me in the course of an interview:

McNamara boasted that he would destroy communications in North Vietnam in six months. In respect to the amount of destruction his bombers caused he did not exaggerate, but our people coped with the problems of miles of bombed roads, railroads and hundreds of downed bridges. We have kept the transportation moving. We are now transporting at least double the amount we were moving before the war. This in the face of continuing bombardment—last year 36,000 air attacks were made upon our roads and bridges and trains; some 660,000 tons of bombs were dropped.

For every bridge they have destroyed we have built two. For

every mile of railroad they have obliterated we have built seven. When transport goes well all other branches of economy does well.

The extraordinary feats of organization in bridge and road repairing; in dismantling and resettling factories, hospitals and schools; in covering the country with a network of district hospitals and first-aid stations; in the construction of 20 million air raid shelters; in liquidating malaria and reducing to a fraction the cases of smallpox and other former mass killer-diseases—all these accomplishments attest to the solidity of the bonds of the people with their government.

The unity of the Vietnamese people with the leadership and the Vietnam Workers Party, is mirrored in the high morale of the people. It is attested to in the exploits of its rank-and-file fighters, workers and peasants. One reads almost a joyfulness in the faces of these unbeatable men and women as they go about their daily chores amidst battered and bombed buildings.

The women, the youth and the old folk—in their special organizations—join the workers, peasants and intellectuals in the often expressed national resolution of President Ho Chi Minh that the aggressors can destroy their cities but not their will; that “we shall never bend nor bow before you, and we shall win the victory in the end.”

The struggle between the world's progressive, democratic and revolutionary forces and the global gangsterism of U.S. imperialism, is joined in the war in Vietnam. No one of conscience, or who entertains a progressive social outlook for any section of humanity, can afford not to be involved in active support to the noble struggle which the Vietnam patriots are waging in the interest of all who honor peace and freedom.

Americans in great mass actions have manifested their abhorrence of the criminal war which the government wages against the Vietnam people in their name. This pressure has left some mark upon some officials. Yet, it has not brought about a serious diminution of the bombing nor an end of the acts of war against the DRV nor the Liberation Forces in the South. But the fact that Washington had to maneuver to the extent of agreeing to the Paris talks, and Johnson felt the anger of the people over his disastrous escalation of the war to the extent that he felt compelled to announce his abstention from seeking reelection as President in the fall; all this suggests that with even greater exertion of the pressure of public opinion, the government can be compelled to put an end not only to the bombing but the war itself.

(Continued on page 40)

U.S. Imperialism in Latin America

I

The class struggle in the countries of Latin America is becoming increasingly explosive. New sections of the exploited and oppressed are joining forces with the fighters for freedom, democracy and progress. The revolutionary vanguard of the continent, represented first and foremost by the Communist parties, is consolidating its ranks in the process of sharpening social clashes and is advancing towards the goals set in the concrete conditions of the respective countries. Our continent is experiencing a period of ferment and popular actions compelling not only classes and parties, but also individuals to adopt a definite attitude. The alternative posed by the present situation—to support the old or the new—calls for an explicit answer. The struggle reflects the diversity of the militant effort which is acquiring definite forms, depending on the country and the specific conditions in it (legal or illegal forms, parliamentary or extra-parliamentary struggle, armed struggle or peaceful). In short, the hour of the revolutionary awakening of the peoples of Latin America has struck.

This situation has not arisen overnight. As Lenin wrote, "There are no miracles in nature or history." It is clear that the revolutionary ferment we are presently witnessing on the continent in the most diverse forms is part of the great process of social reconstruction now taking place, whose distinctive feature is the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. The growing might of the socialist world and the enhanced prestige of the socialist system which is resolving man's fundamental problems, are everywhere destroying fetishism and opening new vistas for the idea of peace, democracy and social progress. The exploited and oppressed are feeling the attraction of the socialist countries. Under the impact of their impressive achievements ever broader sections of the population are siding with the revolutionary struggle. We can repeat with good reason Romain Rolland's words about the Bolsheviks: "To a decrepit humanity enveloped in a cold and desolate gloom filled with horrible nightmares, you bring the light of a new day. . . ."

* This article was published in the *World Marxist Review*, May, 1968. Longino Becerra is a Honduras publicist.

The Cuban revolution, which took place in the course of this world revolutionary upsurge, is a concrete manifestation in Latin America of the change in the balance of world forces in favor of socialism, democracy and peace. Carried out only 90 miles from the citadel of American imperialism, this revolution is proof that contemporary history is no longer being made in the conditions of the undivided sway of capitalism. Thanks to the struggle of the Cuban people, to the solidarity of the world's most progressive forces, headed by the socialist countries, the heroic island is able to pursue its constructive effort at the very doorstep of the main enemy of the peoples. This, naturally, has brought home to the masses of Latin America the true value of the struggle being waged on the continent by its progressive organizations and people. The victory of one country in the fight against the United States, the leading imperialist power, formerly widely regarded as utopian, has become a reality.

With the triumph of the Cuban revolution the class struggle in Latin America—determined essentially by the internal processes—became more acute. The decisive measures taken by the revolutionary government of Cuba with respect to landed property and the enterprises belonging to U.S. monopolies, exerted a tremendous influence on subsequent developments in the rest of the continent and reinforced the aspirations of our peoples for radical change. The Cuban example kindled the flames of struggle on the continent where the discontent of the masses—the object of imperialist plunder—is spreading. Clearly, Cuba's impact on Latin America is not to the liking of Washington, and the valiant island has, therefore, to contend with constant danger. The existence of revolutionary Cuba, its significance for the revolutionary movement in Latin America make it incumbent on revolutionaries all over the world to defend the Cuban revolution.

The upswing of the world revolutionary movement is making the imperialists desperate. Their defeats in different parts of the world make it pretty clear that their sphere of domination is steadily shrinking. Sensing their inevitable doom, they are resorting to all kinds of brutal actions to intimidate the peoples and arrest their victorious advance. Threats, reprisals, even war—such are the means with which the exploiters are trying to perpetuate their vicious system. U.S. imperialism's actions against the people of Vietnam and other peoples of the world, are a glaring example of the terrible crimes committed by the imperialists, when the sources of plunder are at stake. But far from reversing the course of history, these actions are but adding to the growth of the progressive trends. The reactionary offensive mounted by the imperialists to prevent the peoples becoming the

masters of their destiny is, therefore, objectively, in the present conditions, the outcome of their fear and desperation at the scope of the revolutionary struggle.

II

In the light of this policy, the American imperialists cannot afford to remain indifferent to the upsurge of the popular struggle on the continent. Accustomed to regarding our continent as their "backyard," from which they draw cheap raw materials and labor power, the U.S. imperialists are plotting to prevent the emergence of a new Cuba, as President Johnson put it. With \$11,400 million directly invested in the countries of the continent, the monopolies will of course try to prevent, by fire and sword, the spread of the Latin-American national liberation movement, especially considering that these investments yielded a gigantic profit of \$40,000 million between 1945 and 1961. In addition, the continent is pumped of its material wealth; it has to supply at least 20 different kinds of the raw materials needed to keep U.S. production going and to ensure the expansion of the aggressors. Thus, American industry obtains from the continent 99.5 per cent of its tin, 39 per cent of its iron, 44.1 per cent of its copper, and 60.6 per cent of its zinc requirements. To this should be added the vast quantities of agricultural raw materials purchased on our continent at very low prices.

U.S. policy in respect to the countries of Latin America has always been based on direct interference in their internal affairs, and on dictatorial regimes. The Monroe Doctrine, *America for the Americans*, interpreted as meaning that "Americans" are those who live north of the Rio Grande, has since 1823 served as the backbone of this interventionist policy.

It should be noted, however, that the nature of the actions taken to preserve the continent's economic and political status quo depends, apart from other factors, on the prevailing policy of the top U.S. government officials and on the adroitness displayed by the chief executive in the White House. The history of U.S.-Latin American relations, therefore, contains facts relating either to the practical application of the policy known in its time as the "big stick," or of the line known as the "good neighbor policy." Clearly, the main purpose of both the one and the other, was to prevent or delay changes which could in any way affect the monopoly control of the United States over the continent's riches. In complex political situations Washington has had to combine the two policies.

The second method prevailed in the general policy of the Kennedy administration. To a certain extent Kennedy was able to view the

contemporary world objectively and to realize, consequently, that naked force would hardly yield results in our day and age. Therefore, instead of bayonets, he hoped to solve the anti-historical mission of protecting imperialism's interests, by means of a policy in which the false promise of "reform" played an important part. And so it came about that in March 1961, Latin America witnessed the birth of the neo-colonialist *Alliance for Progress* which for demagogic purposes exploited the aspirations of the Latin-American people to free themselves from the semi-feudal survivals retarding the development of their national economies and the internal cause of the misery on our continent—in some countries greater, in others less. But this maneuver, which showed Kennedy to be an astute politician, encountered the opposition of diehards in the Pentagon, who considered this policy dangerous by analogy with the contagious example of Cuba. The concrete result of these differences was the application of both policies simultaneously: on the one hand, promises to carry out reforms and, on the other, engineering military coups. Thus, between January 1961 and November 1963 eight military coups* were staged against governments of representative democracy or regimes of bourgeois semi-legality. But since these actions sharply contrasted with the Alliance for Progress policy, President Kennedy, although he made concessions to the die-hard extremists, continued to follow a demagogic concept of "reforms" not only in Latin America, but in other parts of the world as well.

Developments in the years since Kennedy's assassination, show that the principal instruments of state power in the United States have passed into the hands of fascist-like politicians, for whom the best parliaments are those established with the help of tanks and guns. Latin America is a case in point. The features of diplomacy characteristic of Kennedy's administration have been replaced by crude military force, particularly in those areas of the continent most shaken by the mass struggle. The old methods of vandalism are being re-introduced on a wide scale and in somewhat different forms through a new doctrine, the reverse of the one known as the Kennedy doctrine. This new doctrine was elaborated by Thomas Mann, an associate of the CIA, and notorious for his ultra-Right activities when he was a diplomat in Mexico in 1961-1963. As Assistant Secretary of State for

* Military coups took place in the following countries: El Salvador on January 25, 1961; Ecuador on November 7, 1961; Argentina on March 28, 1962; Peru on July 18, 1962; Guatemala on March 31, 1963; Ecuador on June 11, 1963; the Dominican Republic on September 25, 1963; Honduras on October 3, 1963.

Inter-American Affairs, to which post he was appointed in December 1963, he expounded his "doctrine" at a secret meeting of U.S. ambassadors in Latin America, in March, 1964. Stripped of its verbiage, the Mann doctrine confirmed the need for U.S. imperialism to use force to prevent the advance of the democratic movement in Latin America.

Since U.S. imperialism could not ignore outright a political line which to some extent recognized the legal framework of "representative democracy," it did so immediately after the assassination of Kennedy. After the Mann doctrine was proclaimed events moved fast on the continent. Openly called the "hard line," this policy was first put to the test in Brazil. In August, 1961, militarists in Brazil, acting on CIA orders, tried to seize power but had to retreat as a result of the solid mobilization of the masses. Machinations continued in 1962 and 1963, but again without result, since President Kennedy preferred to achieve the same objectives, not through a military coup, but by reaching an agreement with Joao Goulart. However, on April 1, 1964, the supporters of the "big stick" achieved their basic aim: political power in Brazil was seized by the army. The Mann doctrine had passed its first test. The way was now clear for other more brazen actions.

True, long before the Mann doctrine, Washington had used the "big stick" in our countries. Thus, for example, on the pretext of "protecting U.S. interests in the Canal Zone," aggression was carried out against the people of Panama in January, 1964. In the past, when students and patriots belonging to different social strata held meetings and demonstrations, demanding the restoration of the country's sovereignty over that part of Panamanian territory controlled by the imperialists, the occupation troops never acted with such naked brutality against the people as they did in 1964. U.S. marines and their local allies opened fire on the people. The blood of Panamanians dyed the waters of the Canal making vivid its comparison to a "big gaping wound on the body of a small sister country."

In April, 1965, the people in the Dominican Republic rose against the military dictatorship installed after the ultra-reactionary coup which overthrew President Juan Bosch. The people sought to restore the liberal constitution of 1963 and continue the democratic process, that had set in with the ending of the Trujillo dictatorship. The imperialists, however, thought otherwise. Washington, exasperated by the existence of socialist Cuba and the sweep of the popular movement on the continent, refused to accept the democratic victory of the Dominican people, and decided to interfere in their affairs as they had repeatedly done in the past. Some 40,000 American soldiers

rapidly occupied this small country in the Caribbean and drowned in blood the people's aspirations to establish representative democracy. As a result, Kennedy's ideas of reform were buried, while the Mann doctrine was supplemented by the Johnson doctrine. President Johnson declared that his government had every right to prevent the emergence of another Cuba on the continent. A month later, in September 1965, the U.S. House of Representatives adopted resolution No. 560, ratifying the "right" of the United States to use its armed forces in any country of the Western Hemisphere to prevent "subversive" activity. In this way the Alliance for Progress, as the program of an essential neo-colonialist policy in Latin America, was completely discarded and replaced by the "big stick," cleaned of the layers of dust that had accumulated on it over the years.

III.

However, a return to the old positions-of-strength policy is not so easy in the conditions of today. In the past, U.S. imperialism could commit its crimes against the Latin-American peoples relatively easily: all it had to do was send its warships to the shores of any one of the countries, or have its marines land in the area of conflict. Today, the situation has changed. A return to the "big stick" requires a military and semi-military program containing a wide range of alternatives that could be used against our peoples. The determination of the Latin-American people to fight, compels Washington to resort to all kinds of means to make its policy effective. A study of the imperialists' actions in our countries that shows the preliminary structure that has been set up, employing all kinds of methods and technical means, is designed to achieve the aforementioned strategic aim. This, of course, only further complicates matters.

The alarming development of militarism, the establishment of supra-national institutions, the spread of ultra-reactionary organizations, of the espionage system, direct control of the organs of repression, the constant perfecting of technical means to control the people—such are some of the elements of the widespread net of restraints the U.S. imperialists have cast over Latin-America. Although some of these means existed before the current political line of the United States, they have now become the backbone of its strategic line against our peoples.

The swift militarization of most Latin-American countries is obvious. Under the influence of the Pentagon, the armies of the continent are growing in disproportion to the material capacities of the countries

concerned. The purpose, of this unwarranted excessive expansion of the Latin-American armed forces, is to eventually convert them into a dominant factor which, in addition to acting as a permanent occupation force in the service of foreign interests, will also control national policy. The systematic implementation of this policy has made for increasing interference by the military, in recent years, in political and government affairs. Even more. In Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Haiti, the armed forces now hold all the reins of power and decide the main direction of state activity. On April 28, 1965, for example, Agence France-Press quoted the then Brazilian Defense Minister, Costa e Silva, as saying after a meeting of military leaders with the then President Castelo Branco: "Any candidate in the 1966 gubernatorial or presidential elections will be officially recognized only with the approval of the armed forces." A U.S. Senate report published in October, 1967, classified our countries as follows: *with naked military dictatorships*—Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Haiti, Nicaragua, El Salvador and Honduras; *with civilian regimes behind which stand the military*: Peru, Venezuela, Ecuador, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic; *with governments in which the army does not play a leading political role*: Mexico, Costa Rica, Uruguay, Panama, Colombia and Chile. Although this classification is by no means exact, it bears out in many respects what has been said earlier.

But there are also other important aspects of this process. The Latin-American armies, for example, constitute a force of approximately 800,000 men, excluding the so-called security service. According to a report circulated in January, 1968, by the U.S. Disarmament and Arms Control Agency, \$1,731 million, or approximately 13 per cent of the national budgets, were spent in 1965 on the continent's armed forces. The same report noted, that in that same year, Latin America used 2.1 per cent of the gross national product for military needs (arms purchases and the upkeep of the armies), which means that, taking into account the Economic Commission for Latin America data regarding the gross national product for the entire continent, actual expenditures in 1965 reached the vast sum of more than \$2,000 million.

The United States has a special budget for its military program in the Latin-American armed forces. The journal *Vision*, organ of imperialist propaganda in Latin-America, reported in April, 1965, that between 1952 and 1964, the United States had earmarked \$800 million for military programs in the Latin-American republics. This money is spent on the upkeep of "special" missions operating in all the countries (with the exception of Cuba and Mexico) and which maintain

absolute control over the activity of the armies. According to the *Washington Post*, the United States has special troops in 17 Latin-American countries. When journalists asked a White House top official about this he refused to confirm the figure, but admitted the presence of "green berets" in Panama, Bolivia, Venezuela, Colombia and Guatemala, adding that the numerical composition of these troops was a "military secret."

The Latin-American armies are equipped with arms sold to our countries under plans drawn up in Washington. A large part of this military equipment consists of World War II weapons. Modern arms go mainly to the so-called tactical units organized in all the armies of the continent to suppress popular movements. The argument advanced by the American imperialists in support of their policy of military aid is that it is *the responsibility of the Latin-American armies to cover the internal front since a war between the countries of the continent is excluded. The United States will prevent this from happening, and if it does will regard it as its own war.* Hence all deliveries of military materials are essentially intended for suppression of the popular struggle. David Lindsay, President of the Covalier Aircraft Corporation, declared on February 8, 1968 that in view of the considerable guerrilla activity in Guatemala, and because of the El Salvador government's concern about the possible spread of such activity, he had been given permission by the State Department to sell the El Salvador government a number of 51-C jet fighters.

Whenever a Latin-American country wants to purchase military equipment in Europe, thus deviating from the "internal front" principle, Washington resorts to all kinds of maneuvers to prevent such purchase. In November 1967 even such an ultra-reactionary as Carlos Lacerda declared that Washington was exerting pressure to prevent Brazil obtaining 15 supersonic "Mirage" planes in France. What better proof than Lacerda's statement of Washington's policy in these matters!

The United States is also supervising the training of officers for the Latin-American armies. In 1962 an "Inter-American Defense College" was opened at the Fort McNair military base to train officers ranking from colonel and higher. After the Cuban revolution special schools were opened in the United States and also in some Latin-American countries to train anti-guerrilla units. Large numbers of officers have been trained in the Caribbean school at Fort Gullick in the Panama Canal zone. The instructors are Fort Bragg graduates or veterans of the Vietnam war. There is also a special school at Fort Davis, in the Canal Zone, for training police agents for operations

in the revolutionary movement, and an Academy of the Inter-American Air Forces, where army pilots are instructed in the latest methods of mass destruction. Graduates of these schools receive a special diploma which places them in a privileged position in their units. Needless to say, their training is essentially oriented on the so-called fight "against Communism," the driving force of which is hatred for everything associated with freedom and democracy.

One of the objectives of imperialism, at present, is to coordinate as much as possible the repressive activity of these special troops so as to be able to employ multi-national units against a definite country of the continent. Since this objective runs counter to the Latin-American political tradition of sovereignty, and the right of nations to self-determination, the Hawks in the Pentagon are expounding the "theory" that, the concept of independence is being replaced by the concept of *interdependence* and that, accordingly, only *ideological* and not geographical frontiers are recognized. They urge pooling economic, political and military resources for a common goal, which is, firstly, to protect the interests of the imperialists and, secondly—since it is a question of the governments belonging to "one ideological community," to quote Johnson—to justify the dispatch of the troops of one country to another, to bolster the pro-American oligarchies, which are in danger of being overthrown by the people.

This global concept is materialized in a series of economic and military supranational bodies and what might be described as an integrated system of repression. The Inter-American Defense Council, established in 1942, the Central American Defense Council established in December 1962, the Inter-American Peace Force, the creation of which is encountering difficulties—these are the organizational embodiment of Washington's efforts to put through its policy.

Formation of the Inter-American Peace Force is the No. 1 priority. Using an organization of this kind against the peoples of the continent, so Washington reckons, is less likely to compromise its political interests than a direct landing of American troops in one or another area of Latin America. Furthermore, such an organization offers more possibilities for maneuvering. The Pentagon strategists say *let Latin-Americans fight Latin-Americans* and, anticipating the advantages of the prospect, they seek a solution, within the framework of the OAS, that would enable them to create a continental army, and they persist in this despite repeated failures. In view of these very obvious defeats, Washington has elaborated new tactics and is applying them with utmost zeal. These tactics are to create regional "gorilla" blocs as a step towards forming a supra-national armed force. The U.S. govern-

ment has secured agreements between the military regimes of Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay. A similar plan is being put into effect in the countries of Central America, ruled by military regimes similar to the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua. In January, it was reported, that the Central American Defense Council had decided to form a combined army to fight the guerrilla detachments in Guatemala. Somoza is an active spokesman for this plan.

The arsenal of this police policy, which aims at unleashing reprisals against popular movements, includes a more despicable means to which U.S. imperialists resort in their drive to retard the revolution in our countries. We have in mind the systematic support of gangs set up with the express purpose of assassinating democratic leaders. Operating under the protection of dictatorial regimes, killers are active in many countries, ready to be used at crucial moments of the class struggle. An idea of their actions is provided by the record of terror in Guatemala by such organizations as NOA (New Anti-Communist Organization), MANO (Authentic National Organized Movement) and CADEG (Anti-Communist Council of Guatemala). A statement issued by the Guatemalan Party of Labor in March says: "More than 3,000 have been murdered since the Mendez Montenegro regime took over. The victims come from diverse social and age groups. The wave of terror continues to take a heavy toll of revolutionary patriots." Reports in the Guatemalan and world press say that these fascist-type gangs are trained by CIA instructors and cooperate closely with the security service.

Obviously, these activities, ranging from outright aggression to assassination, necessitate a ramified intelligence service. And since U.S. imperialism is prepared to go to any length and stoop to any methods in suppressing the peoples, it has not hesitated to set up and direct such a service and, it should be said, not without success. All U.S. diplomatic missions in Latin-American run "technical aid" offices, which serve as a cover for the CIA and its farflung espionage operations. Members of the Peace Corps likewise provide information for the U.S. secret service. There are more than 4,500 U.S. agents of this type operating in our countries. And last, but not least, mention should be made of a less blatant intervention project, the celebrated "sociological studies." Their purpose is to exploit Latin-American universities for gathering strategic intelligence that might facilitate repressions in one or other country. The best known of these projects, and one that aroused worldwide protests, was the Camelot Plan, which the Americans tried to put through in Chile in 1965.

Economic integration is to provide the material basis for this super-

structure. And integration is being carried out at a continental level under U.S. sponsorship and protection. The Punta del Este summit statement says: "The President of the Latin-American republics have agreed, beginning with 1970, gradually to create a Latin-American common market to begin functioning, in the main, within 15 years." This was followed by the bland statement that "the President of the United States of America pledges full support for this promising Latin-American initiative." That pledge goes beyond U.S. cooperation in operating the plan. What we have is an open invitation to the North American monopolies to share in the project. And this is already being done in the Central-American Common Market. This, and the Latin-American Free Trade Association, are the foundation of the plan drawn up at Punta del Este. It will therefore be reasonable to predict that the results will be as indicated above. Mexico's Foreign Minister, Antonio Carrillo Flores, stated last July, that though the Punta del Este statement emphasized the "Latin-American" nature of the common market, this is unacceptable "if its sole purpose is to open the flood-gates to big foreign concerns." This is indicative of the concern felt, but is not a true reflection of reality. For the Latin-American common market—and this is confirmed by all experience—is expressive of U.S. imperialism's design to impose its economic control on the continent, and to retain—with all the advantage offered by integration—the present economic pattern of our countries as appendages to the U.S. imperialist economy.

IV.

This survey leads to the conclusion that the struggle is against an enemy prepared to employ the most dastardly methods to prevent the victory of the Latin-American peoples. Difficult battles are ahead for our continent. And the duty and responsibility of everyone fighting for economic and political independence is correctly to appraise the enemy's strength, not to underestimate his ability to resist, nor to overestimate his ability to reverse the tide of history. As we advance towards our goal we must always be able realistically to assess the developments, something the imperialists cannot do, because they are doomed by history. A correct and realistic assessment of the situation is, then, the earnest of fresh success on every sector of the front and provides a firm basis for final victory. "Experience," Comrade Brezhnev said in his address on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, "shows that to defeat such a strong and perfidious enemy as imperialism, we must oppose to him, besides firmness and self-sacrificing readiness to fight, sober political analysis, coolness and tenacity."

That is fully confirmed by recent experience in Latin America and it must be taken into account in assessing present and future revolutionary opportunities.

The fight against the U.S. imperialist machinery of repression requires mobilization and deployment of all the popular forces. Defeated on other fronts, notably in Vietnam, the aggressors are preparing, and already carrying out, preventive measures in all parts of Latin America. They are using the most barbarous means in an attempt to crush the popular movements. Hence, unity of the anti-imperialist forces, on a national and continental scale, is today a vital need. Isolated forces are an easy prey for the enemy, and the enemy knows that. That is why he is working so methodically to split the ranks of the popular vanguard. We, in Latin-America, know from experience, that imperialism is quick to exploit every opportunity offered by those who sow disunity. Marx wrote: "An army in which the soldiers quarrel less will defeat its adversary." This is all the more valid today in the hard-fought revolutionary battles now unfolding in Latin America.

And Latin America will not be led into the morass of defeatism, whatever imperialist propaganda may say or do. The masses are fighting for their economic and political demands. The U.S. government, no matter what method it employs, cannot stop the revolutionary ferment in Latin America. The exploiters and freebooters want to bully our people into compliance so as to make it all the easier to drain the life-blood of our countries. But that is a dream. It will never be a reality, for as the imperialists multiply their crimes and escalate their wars, whether in Latin America or in other parts of the world, the forces facing them will grow, and the battle will grow in intensity. The process is inexorable; it is present in every contest between those who want the triumph of the new and those who want to perpetuate the old. And in these battles the masses are being steeled; from them they draw inspiration and faith in the final triumph of their cause.

HERBERT APTHEKER

For Peace and Freedom: The Cyprus Chapter

From June 6-8, the World Council for Peace held an emergency meeting in Nicosia, capital of the beautiful island-Republic of Cyprus. Here a people whose four-year war was crowned with independence in 1960 made us welcome; and this at a time when—after the near catastrophe of November, 1967, with Turkish and Greek aspirations concerning Cyprus almost producing war—there were peaceful negotiations going forward, in Beirut, between representatives of the majority Greek-Cypriot and the minority Turkish-Cypriot peoples. That the Cypriot government itself is committed to a policy of neutrality, peace and anti-colonialism was made clear by Archbishop Makarios, President of the Republic, during the audience he granted the delegates to our Meeting.*

The urgent matters that brought us together were in the first place, the Vietnamese war and the Paris discussions between representatives of the United States and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; of pressing and immediate concern, also, were the threat of renewed war in the Mid-East and the intensifying danger of worldwide conflict arising from the repression in the African colonies of Portugal and in Southern Africa.

Sixty-five men and women from thirty-five nations in every part of the world participated in the discussions; plenary and/or commission meetings commenced at 9 a.m. and adjourned at midnight during the first two days. Unanimity having been achieved, it was possible for the Meeting to adjourn rather early in the evening of June 8; awaiting us was a fine dinner highlighted by folk-singing and dancing offered by Cypriot youth.

It would almost be easier to say from whence we did not come: we gathered from India, Japan, Mongolia, and Australia, from North Korea and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, from the Soviet Union, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and France, from Italy, Britain and

* See, E. Papaioannou, "New Phase in the Struggle of the Cypriot People," *World Marxist Review*, May, 1968, pp. 48-50.

Spain, from Mexico, Chile, Argentina, and Canada, from Sudan, Nigeria, Angola, and South Africa, and—with particular strength—from the lands of the Mid-East, including Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, the United Arab Republic, Algeria, and Israel. From the United States we were three: Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett, physician, newspaper publisher, public figure from California and a member of the Council's Presidium, Robert Greenblatt, invited from the National Mobilization Committee, and this writer.

On Vietnam

Representing the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam was Mr. Dinh Ba Thi, a characteristically mild-mannered, soft-spoken and strikingly young statesman. In a rather brief opening speech, Dinh Ba Thi remarked that "the whole world had come to realize, in the past fourteen years, what the U.S. Government's desire for peace in Vietnam really is and how that Government respects the Vietnamese people's right to sovereignty and national independence." He added:

Since time immemorial, the Vietnamese people have lived in their country which is situated more than ten thousand kilometers away from the United States. Our people have never touched an inch of the territory of the United States. They have never launched one bomb nor fired one bullet on to the soil of the United States. It is therefore obvious that our people have done nothing that could interfere with the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the United States, nor have they done anything that could harm the security and peace of the United States.

Dinh Ba Thi emphasized that a new stage in the struggle in his country had been reached. "Revolutionary power has been established," he said, "in thousands of villages and even in certain county towns and districts." He stressed the significance of the fact that "the Alliance of National Democratic and Peace Forces has been formed," that this united "many prominent public figures, intellectuals, writers, students, business people, civil servants and officials from puppet administrative and military bodies of different political trends, organizations, religions and parties"; it represented, he said, "the great development of new forces engaged in the struggle against the United States and the Thieu-Ky clique." The National Liberation Front, he continued, places "great value on the foundation of the Alliance," support its action program "and is ready to cooperate with the Alliance in the struggle against the American aggressors for national salvation."

Dinh Ba Thi paid the warmest possible tribute to the support ren-

dered the people of Vietnam in their just struggle; he noted in particular the indispensable aid from the socialist countries and spoke glowingly of the massive anti-war movement in the United States. Urging that peace forces maintain and intensify their pressures—especially now with the Paris discussions under way—he emphasized, in his conclusion, developments in the United States. Indeed, in a manner peculiarly moving to those of us from the United States, this fighter from the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, stressed at the end of his talk, the need:

To give active support and join in the struggle of American intellectuals, students, youth, women, workers, churchmen and the Negro people against the war waged by their government in Vietnam, combined with the struggle against poverty and the struggle against racial discrimination in the United States.

The present writer was given the opportunity to speak on the question of Vietnam; having ten minutes at his disposal, he chose to concentrate upon the Paris talks, and said:

"Vice-President Humphrey and former Vice-President Nixon, presently the front-runners for the Democratic and Republican nominations for President of the United States, have both been urging that, in view of the Paris negotiations, the war in Vietnam not be discussed; that a policy of watchful silence prevail.

"It is our opinion that this advice is precisely the opposite of what is needed—if peace is the objective. A policy of watchful silence in the U.S. will help induce the total collapse of the Paris talks. Only the heroic and growingly successful resistance of the Vietnamese people, plus the tidal wave of opposition to U.S. aggression throughout the world, plus the massive anti-war movement in the United States—especially, in this connection, the merging of the peace and freedom movements—forced President Johnson's withdrawal from the Presidential race, the agreement to negotiate at all, and the transformation of the political picture at home.

"It is mass pressure which was decisively important in bringing about discussions; it will be the intensification of mass pressure which will help determine a successful outcome to those discussions.

"The commencement of the talks was saturated with demagoguery and provocation by Washington: on the site for the meeting; geographically limiting the bombing but logistically intensifying it; appropriating additional billions specifically for the aggression against Vietnam; sending additional troops to South Vietnam. And then at the discussion's start, having the brazenness to demand 'reciprocal' action from

the D.R.V. and getting it—the only possible reciprocal action—a guarantee from the D.R.V. that it will not bomb the United States!

"No, with the election campaign, rather than a relaxation of the anti-war movement, it must be intensified and *must become, in fact, that election campaign*. As of this moment [June 6] it appears likely that it will be Humphrey vs. Nixon in November—by no means certain, but likely. To change that dismal choice or, at least, to make its consequences less fatal, it is necessary to achieve a break-through in the Paris discussions before the summer ends—preferably before the August nominating conventions. On what basis? On the complete and unconditional cessation of the bombing of the D.R.V. by the U.S. With this accomplished, then actual peace negotiations can commence and here the National Liberation Front as the authentic voice of the South Vietnamese people must play its decisive part; there must then be agreement on the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Vietnam and there must be re-affirmation of the essence of Geneva, namely, recognition of the independence, unity, integrity, and sovereignty of Vietnam.

"The hawks and the ultra-Right speak of their growing impatience; they insist there is no sense in talking and demand that the talking stop and that the U.S. devote *all* its resources and use *all* its weapons against Vietnam.

"The looney-birds and the ultra-Left speak of their fear of 'betrayal' and insist that there is no sense in talking. They say only the gun must decide and only the gun can decide and that the need is not conferring but killing.

"Once again—as so often in history—despite different words, ultra-Left and ultra-Right agree in substance; both want the collapse of the discussions and the continued crucifixion of the Vietnamese people with the clear threat of World War III. If their line were adopted it is altogether likely that fascism would triumph in the United States; when this happened in Germany it meant disaster, but should it happen in the U.S. it will mean catastrophe.

"No; an end to this aggression by the U.S. can be forced politically and diplomatically. The anti-war movement already has transformed the political picture in the U.S.; it can *force* a change in the tactics of U.S. foreign policy. This means more, not less, pressure; more, not less mass activity, everywhere in the world, against U.S. aggression in Vietnam and for an end to the killing.

"Contrary to Nixon and Humphrey, this is not the time for silence on Vietnam; rather the times call for such loud, insistent and organized demands for peace that Washington will be compelled to end the

bombing of the DRV altogether and then seriously commence, on the basis of Geneva, a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

"Finally, Mr. Chairman, permit me another moment to convey a piece of information. This coming October there is to convene a Hemispheric Conference to End the War in Vietnam in Montreal, Canada. Mass delegations are desired; from the United States will come black and white people, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American and American Indian peoples. Surely massive representation will be present from Canada and from Latin America. It is also to be hoped that the World Council of Peace will give its full support to this significant effort to occur one month before the U.S. presidential election.*

"Thank you."

The Cyprus meeting was not devoid of comment tending to play down the consequence of the Paris discussions. However, a phone call to the W.C.P. secretariat from the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris calling for support and urging that a delegation be sent by the W.C.P. to Paris terminated such expressions. A commission was established to draft a special Appeal on this matter; the present writer was empowered by that commission to draft the Appeal and it was adopted unanimously by the W.C.P. (Its text is very similar to the speech above quoted).

The Mid-East

As I have said, the strength of the delegation from the countries of the Mid-East was a notable feature of the Cyprus meeting; the strength consisted not only in its greater representativeness—above all, in the presence of a delegate from Israel—but also in a greater confidence as well as realism.

The report on behalf of the Arab delegates was delivered by Mohei el Din Khaled of the United Arab Republic—a Member of the Presidium of the WCP. He reiterated the points made at the Leningrad meeting of the Presidium (October, 1967) and at the New Delhi Conference in Support of Arab Peoples (November, 1967):** aggression must never profit the aggressor; occupied territories must be evacuated; the rights of the refugee peoples must be upheld; the existence of all

*Those interested in the Montreal conference should write to: Edward M. Sloan, 220 Chemin de la Cote Ste. Catherine, Montreal 8, Quebec, Canada. The WCP promised at the Cyprus meeting its full support; the delegation from Latin America in particular took note of the event.

**This writer participated in both events and reported on them in *Political Affairs*, January, 1968.

States in the Mid-East, including that of Israel, is not in question; all forms of chauvinism—whether directed against Arab or Jewish peoples—are abominable. He added, what had been accomplished since the New Delhi Meeting, that agreement with and enforcement of the UN Resolution, adopted unanimously by the Security Council on November 22, 1967, represented a firm and just basis for the establishment of peace in the Mid-East and the achievement of security by all peoples and nations therein.

Notable in this report was the extensive and warm tribute paid Jewish and Arab peoples inside Israel who had raised their voices in opposition to the concepts of "preventive war," to the persistence in occupying territories of other States and who denounced the expansionist policies of the Israeli government.

Particularly notable was the address made by the heroic Tawfiq Toubi, a member of the Israeli Knesset. Toubi reiterated that, "We defend, of course, the just rights of the people of Israel, the right of Israel's existence which was formed as an expression of self-determination and in accordance with the decisions of the UNO 1947 resolution"; he pointed out, that while he said this now and has always said this and said this during the madness just preceding and accompanying the "Six-Days War," he added then and adds now:

While upholding and defending this right of the people of Israel, we told them, however, the truth that the war had nothing to do with defending this right, but it is an adventure against the neighboring Arab countries which can never bring Israel and her people nearer to security and peace, it would never solve problems, but on the contrary it can only complicate relations, deepen the trenches between Israel and the Arab countries and create new dangers to the security of the people of Israel.

Tawfiq Toubi reported that doubts as to the wisdom—not to say justice—of the war were spreading in Israel; it had not brought peace; it had resulted in higher taxes and prices; it meant conscription now for three years rather than 2½; it meant war expenditures of \$800,000,000 per year, or 43 per cent of the total state budget for weapons! It had meant a definite turn to the Right in Israeli politics as well as mounting international isolation.

Toubi emphasized the growing opposition to repression and expansion within Israel, mentioning especially youth, students and intelligentsia. As a recent example, he cited the open letter of Professor Yeshayahu Leibovitz, of Hebrew University in Jerusalem, published in the daily paper, *Yediot Aharnot* (April 12): "Annexation is a tragedy; it means destruction of the state, annihilation of a people,

breaking up of social structure, and the demoralizing of men. . . . What then is the alternative? To get out from ruling one and a half million Arabs, to return to the status quo of June 5 . . . I do not see in the territorial gains of the Six-Days War any lever for positive development. Some speak about federation. Federation is imposing colonialism, imposing a rule of quislings; this is worse than annexation—it is occupation with hypocrisy.”

Toubi stressed the great importance of the “clear and unambiguous declarations made by the Foreign Minister of the UAR concerning the readiness of his government to implement in full the UN security resolution and to adhere to a prescribed time-table for the implementation of all its parts. Two central paragraphs in Toubi’s speech were:

While always opposing and struggling against the pro-imperialist, predatory and militarist policy of the Israeli ruling circles who refused to recognize any right of the Palestine Arab people and thus blocked the way to a settlement, we, at the same time, opposed adventurous and reactionary nationalist Arab positions heard in the past and still being heard in certain circles, falsely interpreting the just rights of the Palestine Arab people as meaning the liquidation of the State of Israel. Such adventurous positions still find expression in refusal to cooperate with the UN for the implementation of the UN Security Council resolution, to the detriment of the cause of struggle for eliminating the consequences of the last June war and to the detriment of peace.

Experience shows that the more clear and striking is the position of the anti-imperialist forces in the Arab countries in favor of a just and peaceful settlement to the Palestine problem based on the mutual recognition of the rights of both peoples—the Arab peoples and the peoples of Israel—the more difficult it will be for the imperialist and reactionary forces to exploit the Arab-Israeli dispute against the interests of all peoples of the region and against the anti-imperialist Arab national movement and the easier it will be to mobilize forces in the world and even in Israel itself for the peaceful and just settlement of the present crisis, for the liquidation of aggression and for ensuring the just rights of all peoples concerned.

Toubi concluded by reiterating the need to implement the UN Resolution, and by emphasizing that the security of Israel’s future lay “not in being in the imperialist front against the Arab peoples but with the Arab peoples against imperialism.”

It was the Arab friends at the Cyprus meeting who drew up and circulated for signature there—and for signature by peoples everywhere in the world, including the United States—a statement urging

“speedy and effective steps to secure full implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the UN Security Council on November 22, 1967.”

Basic to that Resolution, of course, was its denunciation of “the acquisition of territory by war” and its demand that such acquisition be terminated. Since in the United States this essential matter is minimized and—frequently—omitted* it will be in order to publish its full text (reminding the reader that this *full* text was an integral part of the petition originating with the Arab delegates at Cyprus and now in process of world-wide circulation at Arab initiative):

RESOLUTION 242 (1967)

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter, [which affirms the sovereign equality of all Members and the obligation of all Members to settle their disputes only by peaceful means and to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity of any Member]

1. *Affirms* that the fulfilment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:
 - i) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;
 - ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

* Two striking examples of this despicable piece of distortion are the half-page ad, paid for by the Sun Ray Drug Co., in the *New York Times*, June 16, signed by about 50 University professors, deans and presidents, calling for “peace in the Mid-East,” citing and quoting extensively from the UN Resolution but never once mentioning its denunciation of territorial expansion and its insistence that that be terminated. Michael Arnon, Consul General of Israel, does exactly the same thing in a letter in the *Times*, June 17. Bracketed material is added by me.

2. *Affirms further* the necessity
 - a) For guaranteed freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;
 - b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;
 - c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;
3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to designate a Special Representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles of this resolution;
4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the efforts of the Special Representative as soon as possible.

On this basis, it was unanimously agreed at the Cyprus Meeting, a just and lasting peace can be built in the Middle East. The Meeting endorsed the proposal to hold the Second International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples, in Cairo, sometime in November-December, 1968. The objective of a broad conference devoted to ways of securing an end to aggression and occupation in the Middle East and the mutual recognition of the sovereignty of all States in the region also was enthusiastically endorsed.

On Africa

Consequential is the fact that during the past year a very close working relationship has developed between the World Council for Peace and the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization; this manifested itself clearly in the New Delhi Conference last November and was marked at the Cyprus Meeting.

While many problems relating to peace and Africa—including the Nigerian tragedy—were dealt with, the main concentration was upon the developing struggles for national liberation in the Republic of South Africa, in other areas of southern Africa and in the Portuguese-held colonies in Africa. A young activist from South Africa, Duma Nokwe, representing J. B. Marks of the African National Congress (a member of the W.C.P.'s Presidium), spoke on behalf of the African delegates. He defined the Smith-Salazar-Vorster axis now dominating South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies as an "unholy alliance" which is "based on a common ideology—the maintenance of colonialism, racism and fascism." "It has," Duma Nokwe continued,

"a common economic objective—the ruthless exploitation of the peoples of Southern Africa and their resources. It also has a common political and military objective—to stem the spread of the African Revolution and to subvert it where it has already been successful."

The speaker emphasized that the South African regime had very close ties with the West German government; he warned that both Governments are moving towards the development of nuclear weaponry to be based in South Africa. Four organizations of African peoples are now actively struggling—arms in hand—against the Smith-Salazar-Vorster axis; all have friendly relations but a new phase of the struggle commenced in August, 1967 when the African Peoples Congress, fighting against Vorster and the Zimbabwe African Peoples Unity (ZAPU), opposing Smith, joined forces in a military alliance.

This national liberation struggle is—as all such struggles are—simultaneously a struggle to prevent world war. This is so because as the speaker stressed: "Imperialism and fascism are using South Africa as their base and springboard for launching a counter-revolutionary offensive in Africa. The aggressive nature of these forces constitutes a direct threat to peace and independence not only in Africa, but also in the rest of the world."

Paying, "with humility," homage to the peoples of Vietnam, drawing inspiration from the valiant struggles of all peoples, this South African fighter pledged unending battle "to destroy racialism, colonialism and fascism" and asked for the solidarity of the progressive forces in the world. Since the United States is the main economic and military bastion of the racist and colonialist forces in Africa and since in the United States there live twenty-two millions descended to one degree or another from Africans—and oppressed by racism—from none more than from the peoples of the United States must such solidarity come.

At this Cyprus Meeting final arrangements went forward for a Conference in Support of African Liberation to be held probably in the Sudan during November-December 1968; this is to be jointly sponsored by the World Council for Peace and by the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization.

* * *

In the above pages only certain of the highlights of the Cyprus Meeting have been sketched; whole areas discussed there at length—as European Security, Latin-American developments, questions relating to the Korean and Japanese peoples—have had to be omitted for lack of space. The main thing is that, particularly since the Stock-

holm Meeting on Vietnam (July, 1967),* in which the W.C.P. was one of several sponsors, the international meetings on problems of peace and war have grown more and more all-inclusive, more and more realistic—and more and more effective. They have been important instrumentalities of the theory of peaceful co-existence and have helped put that theory into practice. On the success of that practice depends the survival of human life; the Cyprus meeting of the World Council of Peace was an important moment in the implementation of that practice.

June 17, 1968

(Continued from page 17)

What is required is a powerful new and tougher anti-Vietnam war opposition of a mass character and focused at the point of production of the material for war—at the factories and docks. What is required is for everyone who has ever before acted out a demand for the ending of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam to do so again and again in company with new millions who have not spoken or acted for peace heretofore. Above all, it means carrying the message to the trade unionists, that they will join in fully with the Negro people in seeing that their special class and material self-interest can best be served by doing all that is called for to force an end to the anti-human war which Washington wages against Vietnam.

*Reported on by the present writer in *Political Affairs*, August 1967.

The Soviet Union and the African Nations

The struggle of the African people against the colonizers began when the first invaders appeared in the middle of the 19th century. In the early stages the peoples often gained temporary victories in spite of the clear technical and military superiority of their oppressors. Lacking, however, any political leadership in the form of parties or movements that could instill anti-imperialist consciousness, they fought separately against the powerful imperialist enemy who took advantage of their tribal differences to subjugate them.

The victory of the Russian Revolution aided the spread of socialist and Communist ideas among the advanced workers and the best sections of the African intelligentsia. They began to realize that colonialism could be defeated; that to do it, it was necessary to prepare the anti-imperialist forces ideologically and organizationally.

The October Revolution thus laid the basis for the first stage of revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Africa against national and colonial oppression. In several countries Communist parties were created. At the beginning of the twenties Communist parties appeared in Egypt and the Union of South Africa. In Algeria, Tunis and Morocco sections of the French Communist Party were created in 1920. They became independent parties: in Algeria in 1936, in Tunis in 1937 and in Morocco in 1943.

Impact of October Revolution on National Liberation

The influence of October was reflected in the unfolding of the national liberation struggles on the African continent. In 1919 and 1921 there were armed uprisings in Egypt against English rule, which forced the British Government to abolish its protectorate over Egypt in 1922. During the uprising the fellaheen formed Soviets in the villages.

In 1921, Moorish tribes revolted against Spanish colonial domination in Morocco and this resulted in the formation of the Moroccan

*Vasily Solodovnikov is a Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. This lecture was delivered at the Scientific Conference on The Great October Socialist Revolution and the National Liberation Movement in the Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, held in Baku, September 19-21, 1967. It is reprinted in slightly abridged form.

Republic, later that same year. Led by the famous leader Abdul-Kerim, it lasted five years.

In 1918-19, there were peasant uprisings in Nigeria, Gambia and Sierra Leone. In 1922, there were demonstrations in the city of Puerto Nuevo (Dahomey), the Cameroons and Togo.

During the period of the world economic crisis (1929-33), the conditions of the colonial masses worsened. A wave of peasant disturbances spread in the Congo, the Upper Volta, Dahomey, on the Gold Coast and in Sierra Leone. In many countries the African workers began strike struggles for improvement of their conditions.

In the thirties, Italian and German fascism became the main enemy of the national liberation movement of the African peoples. Taking advantage of the impotence of the League of Nations, Mussolini started war against Ethiopia in the fall of 1935, and by May 1936 he declared it to be a colony of Italy.

The Soviet Union was the only great power which came out determinedly for Ethiopia and exposed the policies of Italian fascism. On November 22, 1935, it sent a note to the League of Nations, declaring: "The Soviet Government considers it impermissible that Ethiopia should constitute an exception to the rules applied by the League of Nations to all its other members. In the opinion of the Soviet Government, all members of the League are entitled to equal rights in the event of an attack, regardless of race or creed," and called for sanctions against Italy.*

At a reception in the Kremlin in 1959, Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia recalled that only the Soviet Union "... supported the cause of Ethiopia in the League of Nations and refused to recognize the seizure of Ethiopia by the fascists."** The policy of defending the equal rights of all nations in the struggle against aggression was and remains the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet government.

Representing an even greater threat to the African peoples, the Hitlerite fascists demanded the "return" of "their" colonies, i.e., those belonging to the German imperialists up to World War I. After subjugating the West European nations, the Hitlerites openly proclaimed as their goal the conquest of all of Africa, and its conversion into a source of cheap raw materials.

For this reason the war of the USSR against fascist Germany was

**Vneshnaya Politika USSR (Foreign Policy of the USSR)*, Collected Documents, Vol. IV, Moscow, 1946, p. 74.

***Pravda*, July 12, 1959.

simultaneously a war against the colonial seizure of Africa by the Germans.

Even while the war was going on, the Soviet government came out with an important declaration on the postwar world arrangement: "The Soviet Union in its foreign policy maintains the high principle of the sovereignty rights of nations. [It] is guided by the principle of self-determination of nations . . . champions the right of each nation to independent government and territorial integrity of its land, the right to establish whatever social system and to elect whatever form of government it deems suitable and necessary to secure its economic and cultural growth."* This declaration corresponded to the aspirations of the revolutionary forces in the colonies and inspired them in their struggle against the colonialists.

The historical victories over fascism in World War II constituted a weakening of the imperialist system as a whole.

The liquidation of colonialism after World War II began in Asia, where at that time the contradictions between the peoples and the colonialists reached the boiling point. The colonizers were in no condition to cope with the national liberation movement in that area. They were compelled in many instances to retreat before the people and agree to independence.

The imperialist powers at first hoped that, having made concessions in Asia, they would succeed in maintaining intact the colonial system in Africa. The national liberation movement in Algeria (1945) and in Madagascar (1947) was drowned in blood.

Soviet Support of National Liberation Struggles

The Soviet Union unmasked the plans of the colonial powers to perpetuate the oppression of the African nations and supported them in their just demands. In 1946, the representatives of the Soviet Union in the UN Security Council supported the demand of the Egyptians and Sudanese for removal of British troops from their territories. The USSR supported the granting of independence to Libya, Morocco and Tunisia. In 1954, the heroic armed struggle of the Algerian people for freedom and independence unfolded. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries rendered political, diplomatic and military aid to the Algerian people who, in an eight-year struggle, achieved the freedom of their country. The struggle of the Algerian people

**The USSR and the Countries of Africa*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1963, page III, Russian edition.

became an important landmark in the national liberation struggles of the African peoples.

The determined support by the USSR of the national liberation war in Algeria, and wherever else such wars were fought, showed that the USSR always supported, and will continue to support, the just national liberation wars of the oppressed peoples. Therein lies the essence of the proletarian internationalism of the CPSU. This fact does not contradict the statements of the CPSU and of the Soviet Government that they have always stood for peaceful coexistence with countries having different social-economic systems. One cannot impose a social system by force or war on any country. The changing of a social order is the internal affair of each nation.

At all stages of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Africa against their colonizers, the USSR has always been on the side of the revolutionary forces. It is well known that, having unleashed the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression in the fall of 1956 against Egypt, the imperialist powers hoped not only to crush the national liberation movement within that leading Arab country, but to put the brakes on the development of such a movement in the whole world and, first of all, in Africa.

The determined help given by the Soviet Union to the people of Egypt played a major role in the failure of these plans. Imperialism was compelled to retreat.

Turning Point in Battle for Independence in Africa

The failure of the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression was a turning point in the movement of the African peoples for political independence. These events showed that there exists a new alignment of forces in the international arena which strengthens the struggles of the African peoples for independence.

The position of the USSR on the national liberation struggle of the African nations is demonstrated by the fact that it was on the initiative of the Soviet Union that, in 1960, the General Assembly of the United Nations issued a Declaration of Independence for Colonial Lands and Peoples.

Within a short period 39 African countries gained political independence. In the mid-sixties the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution in Africa was in the main completed. With the liquidation of colonialism an entire stage in the history of the peoples of Africa ended. The peoples of that continent entered the road of independent political development and for the first time in history started to play an important role in the world arena. We must at the same time remember

that in a number of African countries colonialism still rules, and in its most virulent form—racism. For this reason, the struggle of the revolutionary forces against colonialism and racism still continues. The Soviet Union, together with all the revolutionary forces of Africa, struggle hard and persistently against the racist regimes established in South Africa and Rhodesia. The USSR has broken off all relations with these countries, including commercial relations.

Our country also calls for the liberation of Southwest Africa from the domination of fascist South Africa. "We," declared the representative of the USSR at the 21st session of the UN General Assembly, "fully support the demand of the African governments that the South African Republic be deprived of the mandate to rule Southwest Africa." He declared further: "We share the opinion that in the event the South African Republic refuses to fulfill the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations, it is necessary immediately to recommend to the Security Council the application of appropriate sanctions."

The Soviet Union also insists that Portugal should, without further delay, grant independence to its colonies, cease its repressions against the African people and accede to their lawful demands.

The struggle against colonialism and racism in Africa has always been one of the revolutionary Leninist principles of Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Union has always been on the side of the people struggling for their independence. As has been correctly noted in the progressive press everywhere, the successes of the national liberation movement have come about as the result of true unity of the socialist countries, the world Communist movement and the national liberation movement. In our opinion, this is one of the historic lessons to be learned from the struggles of the revolutionary peoples against colonialism and imperialism in general.

Neo-Colonialism in Africa

In the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution, direct political domination by the colonial powers was done away with in most of the colonies, but imperialist exploitation and economic dependence were not destroyed. Instead of the classic form of colonialism with the "mother country" openly depriving the peoples of the colonies of their political rights, there is now neo-colonialism, whereby a country remains formally independent but, in reality, is so stifled by economic and financial dependence, that it cannot utilize its political independence.

How strongly dependent the African countries are economically on international imperialism is illustrated by the character of their

foreign trade. In 1964, about 84 per cent of the state exports from the African countries went to the developed capitalist countries, at a time when the comparable figures for exports from all the developing countries taken together was 72.7 per cent. The imperialist powers, through the world capitalist market, to this day maintain and exploit the monocultural character of production in the African states. Ninety per cent of the exports of the independent countries of Africa consist of raw materials. These countries suffer systematic worsening of trade relations with the imperialist countries. The president of Senegal, analyzing the status of the African countries on the world market, said with good reason that "the more we work, the less we earn." Neo-colonialism has led to a tremendous overflow of wealth from Africa into the coffers of the imperialist powers in the form of profits, interest, and dividends to private foreign investors.

Neo-colonialism, that of the United States in particular, utilizes all means and methods—from financial economic dependence to open intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states and, finally, direct aggression—in order to retain the developing countries within the orbit of imperialism. They want these countries as economic appendages and as military strategic reserves in the struggle for world domination.

Another grave consequence of colonial rule is the political fragmentation of the continent into small countries, many of which cannot exist as independent economic entities, and thus cannot attain independent development without outside help. From the start, one of the immediate urgent tasks which confronted the African nations, was to find the path toward political and economic collaboration on a regional or subregional basis. Without this there can be no future for Africa. A long stride in this direction was the creation of the Organization of African Unity, the role of which, however, has to a considerable extent been nullified through the activities of the imperialist powers. The recent session of the heads of government of the OAU gave rise to a more optimistic outlook for the strengthening of the unity of the African countries.

After the attainment of political independence there arose before the African nations, in all its gravity, the problems of doing away with the medieval living conditions and the aftermath of colonial rule, especially economic backwardness.

The African countries desperately needed a radical change in the economic and social structure they inherited from colonialism. This system is distinguished by the diversity of their economies and undeveloped class relations. In the African countries, particularly in

tropical Africa, the dominant sector is the single-commodity and even the natural economy. In a number of countries foreign capital predominates. As a rule, national capital is weak. In most African countries the state sector is the best developed.

The problems of the transition period about which we speak arise, on the one hand, from the incompleteness of the anti-imperialist revolution and, on the other, from the policies of neo-colonialism.

The Non-Capitalist Path of Development

The anti-imperialist revolution in Africa has entered its second stage with the struggle for economic independence, for a choice of paths toward socio-economic development, for methods of overcoming economic backwardness. The complexity of these problems, and the necessity of determining the class approach to them, has given rise to a sharpened internal political struggle to determine the political orientation of these countries. These factors, in our opinion, lie at the basis of the many military coups in Africa.

The impact of the October Revolution on the fate of the peoples of Africa was far-reaching: the very existence of a powerful bloc of socialist countries and their strong support in opposition to imperialism, helped to accelerate the historic conditions for the transition to, and the construction of, a socialist society in a number of African countries, thereby bypassing capitalism.

Already at the present time, two basic groups of states have been formed in Africa. Some of these are attempting to overcome their economic backwardness by choosing the capitalist road of development. Other African countries have declared their ultimate goal to be the construction of a socialist society, and are introducing socio-economic measures in that direction. A third group have not yet decided what path to follow.

The struggle for a non-capitalist path of development is the most characteristic phenomenon of present-day Africa. This specific path toward socialism stems from the concrete historical conditions obtaining in these countries, where the struggle is not only against capitalism, which is poorly developed, but mainly against medieval conditions. Lenin, addressing the delegates at the Second Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, said:

In this respect you are confronted with a task which has not previously confronted the Communists of the world: relying upon the general theory and practice of Communism, you must adapt yourselves to specific conditions such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to

conditions in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not against capitalism. . . . You must find specific forms for this alliance of the foremost proletarians of the world with the laboring and exploited masses of the East whose conditions are in many cases medieval. . . ." (Collected Works, Vol. 30, P. 161.)

It is the search for these new forms of struggle for socialism, under the backward conditions of Africa, that constitutes the main content of the ideological struggle of Marxism-Leninism in Africa. The Marxist-Leninist concepts of the non-capitalist path of development, industrialization, planning, etc., constitute state policy in many African countries. In Africa one hears less and less the assertion that Marxism is inapplicable to African countries. The influence of the Communist parties is becoming stronger. In the South African Republic the Communist Party, which has been driven underground, constitutes the basic force leading the heroic struggle against the policies of the racist government. The Communists of the Sudan played a leading role in the overthrow of the reactionary military dictatorship. Today, too, in spite of having been outlawed, Sudan's Communist Party remains in the front rank of the fighters for the democratization of their country. More and more the foremost activists of the national liberation movement in Africa are turning to the basic works of Marxism-Leninism. African Marxists took an active part in the organization and work of two theoretical seminars dedicated to a discussion of urgent problems of the continent—in Cairo in October, 1966, and in Algeria in May, 1967.

The Transition to Socialism

The non-capitalist road of development, advocated by the revolutionary democrats, is characterized by the introduction of measures to limit private enterprise and the economic and political rights of the feudalists and other privileged groups. Government control is being introduced over the activities of foreign capital and, in some instances, has led to its nationalization. There is also strong emphasis on the development of the state sector and the realization of far-reaching social and democratic transformation. The final aim of the non-capitalist path of development is to create the material-technical base and the socio-political conditions for the transition to socialism.

The group of countries, which have declared their final aim to be the building of socialism and the realization of definite measures in that direction, includes Algeria, Guinea, Congo (Brazzaville), Mali, the

United Arab Republic and Tanzania. This is where the political parties and their leaders see the only solution to the problems. The method of struggle for socialism in each of these countries is determined by its historic peculiarities.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that each nation takes its own road to socialism. Different countries will require different periods of time to make the transition. But in the final result, the essence of socialism is the same for all countries: the elimination of private ownership of the means of production and their transfer into the hands of the people. In spite of its socio-economic backwardness, Africa is going through a period of ideological and political struggle characteristic of the whole contemporary world.

Under these conditions, the progressive forces in the African countries carry on a struggle not only against foreign imperialism and neo-colonialism, but also against internal reaction, which has a stake in the perpetuation of foreign domination.

Reactionaries—the feudal lords, the big capitalists and the middle bourgeoisie, and in the first place the merchants—lead the struggle against the opponents of capitalism within their own countries as well as against the governments that stand for the non-capitalist path of development. The feudal lords and the bourgeoisie see in the socialist orientation a threat to their class interests, to their privileged position.

The second stage of the anti-imperialist revolution is taking place under conditions where the imperialist powers—England, France, Belgium and other countries, with the U.S. imperialists in the lead—are attempting to smash the progressive regimes in the African countries and to split the unity of the African nations to assert their domination over the continent. Such an imperialist course inevitably leads to the sharpening of contradictions between the imperialist powers and the developing countries. All the developing countries, regardless of which socio-economic path of development they chose, suffer equally from imperialism through exploitation on the world market and the export of capital.

The struggle for economic independence, against interference by the imperialists in their internal affairs, against super-exploitation by the monopolies, are the burning issues of the day for the majority of the developing countries of Africa.

Under these conditions, the alliance of the socialist countries, the world Communist movement and the national liberation movement constitutes the vital force which is in a position to defeat the policy of neo-colonialism. The Soviet Union and the other socialist lands are directing all their efforts toward strengthening that unity and are also

doing everything possible to help improve conditions in the African states.

The Maoist Theory of "Have" and "Have Not" Nations

In relation to this, it is impossible not to mention the harm done to the national liberation movement and to the unity of all revolutionary forces by the Mao Tse-tung anti-party group. Setting forth the thesis that so long as the USSR and the other socialist countries follow a policy of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, the main contradiction today is not the struggle between socialism and capitalism, but the struggle between the "rich" and the "poor" nations, between "the world of the cities" and "the world of the countryside." This concept is thrown in by the Maoists in the hope of isolating the USSR and the other socialist countries from the national liberation movement.

In reality this would-be theoretical concept does not hold water. The actual course of historic events refute it. World history since 1917, bears witness to the fact that the main struggle at all its stages has been between socialism and capitalism, and that the socialist countries have always been on the side of the national liberation movement, regarding it as an organic part of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism on a world scale. The USSR and the other socialist countries, while advocating peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems, have supported and continue to support the national liberation movement against the oppressors, against the colonizers.

The essential weakness of this so-called theory—that divides the world into "have" and "have-not" nations—ignores the main character of the ownership of the means of production. The complete bankruptcy of such thinking is revealed when one realizes that it equates the imperialist countries, whose wealth was accumulated not only as a result of the exploitation of their own people but also the super-exploitation and outright plunder of the colonial and dependent peoples, with the socialist countries, where economies were developed by the efforts of their own citizens and which never exploited other nations. In reality, this is a bourgeois theory which has as its aim the splitting of the international unity of the revolutionary forces. This is to be accomplished, on the one hand, by weakening the anti-imperialist character of the national liberation movement and directing it against the socialist countries and, on the other hand, by removing historic responsibility from the imperialist powers for the economic exploitation of the colonial and dependent nations over a prolonged historic period.

The prominent English economist Jack Woddis, in his article "The Old and New Style of British Imperialism," published in the World Marxist Review brought out the shocking facts about the tribute which British imperialism exacted from the colonial people. For 165 years, beginning with the year 1800, England's total import *surpassed its total export 159 times*. The difference was covered by the inflow of super-profits from the colonies and other overseas investments. This is why the pro-imperialist propagandists have fastened on to this "theory" and continue to spread it far and wide.

Its social significance lies in the fact that it both helps the imperialist powers disclaim their historic responsibility for the colonial oppression and masks the continuing exploitation of the developing countries by private foreign capital. We have already discussed the fact that super-exploitation by foreign imperialist companies has resulted in a colossal outflow of wealth from Africa and other regions. The volume of this outflow, according to the most moderate estimate, is about \$10 billion a year, with \$1.5 billion squeezed annually out of Africa alone. The result is a sharp increase in foreign indebtedness, a lowering of the tempo of development and a growing new indebtedness. That is why it is urgent to raise the question of putting an end to imperialist exploitation of the developing countries, and not to shift this responsibility onto the socialist countries, as is done by the sorry theoreticians of China. No matter how paradoxical it may seem, this "theory" of the Maoists in reality defends the actions of neo-colonialism in the developing countries.

Soviet economists, in opposition to this "theory," have put forward a plan for the liquidation of the outflow of wealth from the developing countries. The essence of the plan is that the governments of the imperialist countries should create a so-called "compensation fund" from the entire sum of super-profits extracted from the developing countries by private foreign investments, in order to finance the economic development of the "third world." Another proposal made by the Soviet economists is to conclude an international compensatory mercantile agreement, which would establish a fair level of prices for the raw materials taken out, that would secure the growth of the export of these commodities from the developing countries.

Relations of Soviet Union With African Nations

What, in reality, are the relations between the USSR and the independent African countries, with all the revolutionary movements which carry on the struggle against the remnants of colonialism and racism in the South of the continent?

The USSR, which maintains diplomatic relations with the majority of the independent African countries, is developing economic and commercial relations with them on the basis of equality. Such international economic relations are possible only with socialist countries, where the socio-economic order does not seek to exploit, either within their own countries or on the world market.

At the present time the Soviet Union carries on trade with 28 African countries and has direct trade relations with 24. The Soviet Union imports the traditional goods from these countries and exports chiefly machine equipment and rolled steel products, that is, products which are essential to the creation of a national industry. Beside trade, the Soviet Union is extending its technical, scientific and cultural collaboration with the countries of Africa. The Soviet Union has concluded agreements on economic and technical cooperation with 16 African countries.

The total sum of long-term credits extended by the USSR to the countries of Africa exceeds \$1.5 billion. This provides for the equipping and expansion of 330 enterprises, and other facilities of which 118 are already under construction. As of November, 1966, 5,121 persons from 16 African countries studied in the higher and middle educational institutions in the USSR. Even now one may speak of the wholesome influence on the development of the African countries of the economic help rendered by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The expansion of economic cooperation on a basis of equality has led to breaking the monopoly formerly held by the imperialist powers in regard to the supply of equipment, credit and loans to Africa.

The socialist countries recognize the unequal status of the new independent countries on the capitalist market, where relations between the contracting parties are determined on the basis of economic power and where laws of competition and exploitation predominate. The socialist countries support the legitimate demands of the developing countries to protect their interests.

The cooperation of the USSR with African nations, as is known, is not limited to the economic sphere. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, with all the means at their disposal, support the heroic struggle of the peoples of Africa against the colonial and racist domination maintained in South Africa, Rhodesia, Southwest Africa, in Angola and Mozambique, in Portuguese Guinea and other countries. The resistance of the colonizers and racists has compelled the people of these countries to take up arms. Under the existing conditions, we believe that the armed struggle is legally justified and the entire blame

for the unleashing of such a struggle falls on the colonizers and the racists.

The Soviet Union has always given moral, political and material aid to the African peoples struggling for national liberation, and resolutely opposes the intervention of the imperialists in the internal affairs of the African countries. This is underscored by the firm and consistent position of the USSR in regard to Israeli aggression against the Arab countries, aggression which is receiving support from the imperialists of the USA, Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany. The USSR and the other socialist countries were decisively on the side of the Arab countries against this aggression.

* * *

The achievements of the October Revolution and the policy of the Soviet Union, which firmly follows the path of socialism, are fully recognized by the peoples of the African lands. "The Great October Revolution brought with it the solution of the problem of the future of our Africa," said the president of Mali, Modibo Keita, in an address in Moscow on May 30, 1962, and "we must recognize that the Soviet people have opened the path to freedom for the colonial nations." "The October Revolution," said the president of Guinea, Sekori Toure, "has exerted a decisive influence on the development of contemporary history. Since October, 1917, not only has the zone of freedom been broadened and strengthened, but the struggle against imperialism and the faith of the nations of the world in the ability to crush imperialism has also grown immeasurably."

... The realization of the historical task confronting the peoples who have cast off the fetters of colonialism—abolition of age-old poverty and backwardness—cannot be achieved on the road to capitalism. A break with capitalism in the name of progressive development is the principal task of the new phase of the national democratic revolution. In our epoch it oversteps bourgeois-democratic limits. The deep social and economic changes in the former colonies will lead them eventually on the road of struggle for socialist development.

—*World Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class*,
Progress Publishers, Moscow, p. 372.

COMMUNICATIONS

JOSEPH FELSHIN

Martin Luther King and Communism

In the leading editorial of *Political Affairs* for May, devoted to a memorial tribute to the late Rev. Martin Luther King, the editors venture to characterize Dr. King as "a consistent democrat" but "not a Marxist." This is too limited, too doctrinaire an appraisal of the man who, for more than a decade, was acknowledged to be the foremost leader and most authoritative spokesman of black America in a period of the most intensive upsurge of struggle for Negro freedom since Reconstruction.

If, in terms of the individual's role in history, the greatness of a leader and the measure of his influence is conditioned above all not by his personal talents and abilities but by whether these talents and abilities are in step with the forward march of human progress, whether they are dedicated and devoted to the advancement of his people, then it can truly be said that no one in this turbulent decade, more than Dr. King, so fully expressed the black people's aspirations and will for full equality. By this gauge, the characterization "a consistent democrat" but "not a Marxist" is not only inadequate, it tends to

blur, to diminish both the personal character and historical role of Martin Luther King. It is a static, not a dialectical estimate.

It fails to take into account the tempo of his development as a great people's leader, especially in the months before his assassination, the fact that if he was "not a Marxist" the needs of the struggle increasingly compelled him to approach—and seriously and respectfully to weigh—the class concepts and world view of Marxism-Leninism.

Not six weeks before his death, and despite the staggering burden of his responsibilities as leader of the black freedom fight, Dr. King travelled a thousand miles to honor the life and work of a world-renowned Communist, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois. At the centennial celebration of that revered leader's birthday, February 23rd, sponsored by *Freedomways* magazine, he described Dr. Du Bois as "a radical all his life." He chided those who "would like to ignore the fact that he was a Communist," insisting that "It is time to cease muting the fact that Dr. Du Bois was a genius and chose to be a Communist."

As if consciously to make a point

COMMUNICATIONS

55

of the connection between Dr. Du Bois being a genius and a Communist, Dr. King went out of his way to remind his listeners that "Sean O'Casey was a literary giant of the twentieth century and a Communist," and further that "Pablo Neruda is generally considered the greatest living poet though he also served in the Chilean Senate as a Communist." He went on to denounce "our irrational, obsessive anti-Communism."

That Dr. King's advanced views toward the end profoundly influenced his closest associates was evidenced in the fact that on the very morrow of his assassination, at the massive Memphis demonstration in support of the striking garbage men, his acknowledged heir and successor, Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy, declared before an audience of 50,000: "Poverty is created by *capitalist society*, a society that would deny food to the masses but give luxury to the classes." (My emphasis—J.F.)

From the same platform, on the same momentous occasion, the noted artist Harry Belafonte, a close friend and supporter of Dr. King, described how as a boy in Harlem he sought for leaders who could illuminate for him the road ahead, show him what the future held for a black lad with talent and imagination. He told how first he found Dr. Du Bois, then Paul Robeson, "both of whom," he declared, "*the system* tried to silence by methods other than assassination. Now it has turned to murder." (My emphasis—J.F.)

Murder indeed! But even more

ominous overtones surrounded this reference to "the system" which "turned to murder" when, just two weeks before the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, Drew Pearson, in his syndicated column, "Washington Merry-Go-Round," made the charge that Kennedy, while U.S. Attorney General, had "ordered a wiretap put on the phone" of Martin Luther King. Kennedy's then press spokesman, Pierre Salinger, without denying the charge, replied that the wiretap procedure was authorized only "in cases involving national security and on written request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

How then, and by what stretch of whose imagination, could the acts and utterances of the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize be connected with so awesome a matter as our "national security"?

It seems that "King," according to Drew Pearson (*N.Y. Times*, May 25), "was in touch with various Communists and was being influenced by them."

This, then, was the monstrous crime—to the FBI and the powers that direct and control it the most intolerable crime of all—to "be influenced" by Communists! Could that be the meaning of Belafonte's reference to "murder" in Memphis? And, if so, can one help wondering: What was Kennedy's crime which, so soon after Martin Luther King, attracted still another assassin's bullet?

It is an imperative of the political struggle today, while avoiding exaggeration or underestimation of their importance, to note

these recurring evidences of the radicalization of the Negro people as a whole, their increasing awareness of *class* as a decisive factor in the struggle for freedom and equality, against poverty—a consciousness far more advanced at the present stage than that of the labor movement.

Only recently, speaking to a packed church meeting in Reconstruction City, just before it was torn down by Washington police and Federal troops, the Rev. Jesse Jackson, a leader of the Poor People's Campaign declared that "Some time before the night is over we are going to talk not just about jobs, but we are going to talk about capitalism itself. For a long time people did not talk about capitalism because of the McCarthyism.

"People have been afraid of using the word because the alternative is supposed to be communism. Whether or not that is the alternative, capitalism is a bad system."

To the overwhelming majority of black Americans today, capitalism is not only "a bad system"—it is a murder system, a killer system. They may not be ready to accept Socialism, but no segment of the population is so ripe for it. It is the Party's task to launch a major effort to teach them how and why Socialism is, indeed, what Rev. Jackson called "the alternative."

Further developing his associate's theme, James Bevel, another prominent Poor People's Campaign leader, probed to the very roots of racism when he noted

at the same meeting that "There are a lot of people who would like the question to remain one of racism, because they would like to keep us away from the economic issue."

In this context, the N.Y. *Times* (May 18) carried a brief report that Richard G. Hatcher, Mayor of Gary, Indiana, at a dinner sponsored by the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, "had high praise for Malcolm X, W.E.B. Du Bois and Paul Robeson." That was all. The *Times* apparently did not consider Mayor Hatcher's speech "fit to print." Fortunately, this remarkable speech, which gives a measure of the stature of the leadership which outstanding Afro-American personalities are giving today not only to their own people but to the entire nation, was found by at least one American newspaper to be sufficiently important to be printed—*The Worker*, now our *Daily World*.

In it, according to *The Worker*, Hatcher sharply rebuked the NAACP for having many years before fired the great DuBois—"whose voice from the grave still speaks in tones more cogent and powerful than those of most of our leadership today"—and even removed his picture from the walls of the very organization he had helped to found—all on the specious charge that he was a "pro-Soviet agent."

Hatcher reminded his listeners that "When Paul Robeson turned his magnificent basso-baritone to more profound issues, he too was scorned." Liberals, he charged, "helped to silence Robeson's voice,

helped hound him out of the country under the guise of helping to protect the country from the communist menace."

Yet, Mayor Hatcher declared, "In 1949, when Robeson said in Paris, 'Hell no, we won't go,' he was saying what black young men are chanting today in Harlem and Watts and on college campuses up and down the land."

His speech included a masterful exposition of the radical view that "the present system cannot be humanized and must therefore be transformed." And again and again Hatcher noted the deep-going radical ferment among black youth as a development of major political significance.

A measure of the depth of these ideological stirrings was reflected in a recent story by *Worker* reporter Ken Bailey covering a school boycott in a largely black community in Brooklyn. Bailey interviewed Terry Prince, a young volunteer teacher at the temporary school set up in the local Baptist church, who explained why the people of his community were dissatisfied with the Board of Education curriculum.

"The reason the man doesn't want us to control our schools," Prince said, "is because we want to teach our kids about Imperialism and Colonialism. And if we did that he would be signing his death warrant in the world because the man that keeps you in poverty here is the same that keeps people in poverty in Latin America, and in Asia, and in Africa. Neo-colonialism and the evils of racist capitalism are subjects

usually omitted from the classroom."

Such instances, which multiply from day to day, give clear evidence that the pioneering work of our Party over a span of many decades in the fight for equality has not been lost. Sometimes, even if in a negative and distorted form, the great and growing influence of Marxism among the black masses finds expression. Thus, Stokely Carmichael, who has been drifting deeper and deeper into the swamp of narrow nationalism, found it possible to sneer at Karl Marx as "a honkie" (white man). "Black people," he insisted, "should never look up to a white man, *no matter who he is.*" (My emphasis—J.F.) An unintended but nevertheless towering tribute to Marx and Marxism!

The designation that someone "is" or "is not" a Marxist is, to say the least, unilluminating. What and who is a Marxist? Is there a fixed dividing line? Was W. E. B. Du Bois, who joined the Socialist Party back in 1911, "not a Marxist" until the day of October 1, 1961 when, in his application to join the Communist Party, he wrote: "Capitalism cannot reform itself; it is doomed to self-destruction. . . . Communism, the effort to give all men what they need and to ask of each the best they can contribute—this is the only way of human life"? Is there not a constant process of the deepening and enrichment of the world outlook that we call Marxism, taking its point of departure in the class struggle, but embracing

all of the phenomena of life? Is not this process continuous, never-ending, the seed taking root somewhere in the soil of youthful experience, the fruit flowering—in some more quickly than in others—in the heart and mind, growing sturdier with each class battle, even to the grave?

When so revered a world figure and leader of the black people as W. E. B. Du Bois joined the Communist Party, it sent a shudder through the Establishment from which it has never fully recovered. It was an act which no black leader could fail to note—and to ponder.

Indeed, at the time Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, hailed it as “an invitation and a challenge . . . to the Negro masses and their outstanding leaders both here and abroad, to avail themselves of the social science of Marxism-Leninism and the fraternity of the Communist Parties to give new wings to their cause and their works.” U.S. imperialism could not sustain the risk of other great black leaders, men like Martin Luther King and Malcolm X, moving toward Marxism along the path travelled by W.E.B. Du Bois. Perhaps therein lay the true meaning of Harry Belafonte’s reference to murder in Memphis.

Toward the conclusion of its memorial tribute to Dr. King, the *Political Affairs* editorial states that “The fight for economic, political and social equality is a fight

that can be won under capitalism.”

Since the sentence does not specifically say *partial* equality, it must be assumed that the editors mean *full* equality. And the reference to capitalism can only mean U.S. imperialism.

Martin Luther King would probably have been the first to concede that reforms could be achieved, advances, perhaps very substantial advances made, important concessions won under capitalism. But I doubt that Dr. King, who understood the dialectical interconnection between the struggle for Negro freedom at home and the fight for peace in Vietnam, and who recognized that anti-Communism was an “irrational obsession,” but who nevertheless was “not a Marxist,” would accept this statement.

Martin Luther King may have started as “a consistent democrat” but the hard realities of the struggles he led for jobs, freedom and peace, which brought him into ever sharper battle against the state-monopoly power of U.S. imperialism—culminating in an assassin’s bullet—were driving him, as it did W.E.B. DuBois before him, inexorably to the Communist world view—to Marxism-Leninism.

Just as no power on earth can reverse the course of world history, so no force can arrest the mighty surge of the heroic black people of America not only toward freedom and equality, but toward socialism and communism.

The Johnson Withdrawal

Some people, myself included, do not take Johnson’s withdrawal at its face value. It can be a continuation of the chicanery of the Administration that has been based on deceit from its inception.

A correspondent expresses his apprehension in the following:

. . . I suspect that at the psychological moment he will (as Commander-in-Chief of the Army) declare a state of emergency, disband Congress, close all publications he dislikes, draft all sheriffs, their deputies and all city police into the army and station one or more of them at every point he considers worthy.

You will recall that at the AFL-CIO meeting at Bal Harbour, Florida, on December 12, 1967, Mr. Johnson said:

I am going to continue down the center of the road, doing my duty as I see it for the best of my country, regardless of any polls and *regard-*

less of the election. (My emphasis—A.W.)

I heard that statement on the radio, and at the time, it sounded ominous of intentional wrongdoing. The press did not report the statement so far as I have found. Representative Leonor Sullivan was good enough to furnish me with a copy of the speech.

This question has been in my mind, and obviously in the minds of others, referring to the statement of my correspondent, namely “Will Mr. Johnson step down if not elected, in the coming contests?”

It should be remembered that Congress gave Mr. Johnson unbridled power to wage war upon the false information about the Bay of Tonkin, and without debate. A similar illegal act of Congress could perpetuate the president in power. What do others think?

BERNARD E. GALITZ

New Opportunities to Build the C.P.

A new opportunity for building the Communist Party and converting the people of America from a population filled with anti-Communist shibboleths to a people ready to strike against monopoly, in all its aspects, both domestic and international, is beginning to open up. In the mainstream of the labor movement, there are now the first significant stirrings of a

mood which seems to signal a growing readiness to break away from the Meany-Lovestone domination, that has tied the hands of American labor since the onset of the McCarthy period.

Walter Reuther seems to have made up his mind that meaningful change is impossible within the Meany-Lovestone dominated AFL-CIO. It appears that Reuther is

about to build something like a "new CIO." He is not doing this as a socialist—the threads of socialism deep in his past seem to be lost—but he has retained enough of a realistic outlook to see that to continue to follow Meany and Lovestone is to go down to defeat with them when the rank and file repudiate their line, as they will. Indeed, it is the pressure from the restive workers, who demand change or else, that is making Reuther move. And that is the good thing about the present situation. It is not motivated from above, but is an irrepressible, almost spontaneous, upsurge of the mainstream masses, of the rank and file workers from below.

When a new labor organization is built, Communists must do their duty to see it is truly the *workers'* labor organization. Let us not forget what Communists did in organizing the CIO. Communists can do that now, for this is the kind of work that fits into the work-style of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party has a long history, often highly successful, of working within the mainstream. That is where it prefers to work, and its work habits have all coalesced into a form consistent with that kind of work. The Communist Party can shine in this kind of work, where it has been a little uncomfortable with the New Left and the various anarchistic, utopian, somewhat elitist and anti-mainstream—even to some extent anti-working class —formations. This struggle is a struggle that Communists can move in like a fish in a sea of water. In a political sense, the working-class strug-

gle is the original "guerrilla" struggle, the workers are the original sea of water, and the Communist Party members and their supporters are the original fish that swim within it, to use the language of our valiant Vietnamese comrades.

The vast difference that this would make in the fate of America and the world is clearly illustrated in the difference between the aftermath of the American student uprising at Columbia University and the French student uprising at the Sorbonne. Each student uprising was essentially the same: students siezed some university buildings, occupied them for a number of days, declared a free university, fought off scabs. The American episode ended there, for the time being at least. The American workers were not yet ready to follow the initiative of Left formations; the police reoccupied the campus and the status quo was essentially restored.

But in France the workers were organized, full of anti-monopoly and, in many cases, socialist consciousness, and ready. The students said: "We could only supply the initiative; the workers are the only ones with the power to make the revolution." What if the American students understood this! What if the American workers understood this! What if the American masses did this to Johnson! What a difference it would make to the fate of America and of the world. It is the task, the responsibility, and the privilege of the Communist Party to make this so. On this history will measure us.

BOOK REVIEWS

HYMAN LUMER

The Road to Freedom: A Marxist View

Black America is like a ball of fire. Its revolts spread over the land leaving hardly any Northern city unscathed, and the end is nowhere in sight. Starting out as civil rights struggles, the movement now takes on the aspects of a social revolution, a black revolution, a revolt of the poor.

Where is this revolt heading?
How can its goals be obtained?

With these words Claude Lightfoot opens his newly published book *Ghetto Rebellion to Black Liberation*:* The book seeks to answer these questions, to present, in the author's words, "a Marxist view of the path ahead." The answers it gives merit the most serious study by all who are concerned with such questions, for few are better equipped than he for such an undertaking.

Claude Lightfoot is widely known as a leading Negro Communist and a veteran of many years' standing in the battles for freedom and socialism. He is known, too, as a serious student of the economic, social and political aspects of the struggle for black liberation. All this is re-

flected in the content of his book.

He begins with an examination of the roots of the ghetto revolts. The black revolt, he writes, "rests on four principal developments. It is occasioned by the necessity for black people to have a substantial share of power over decisions affecting their welfare. It is an outgrowth of the terrible conditions in the ghettos. It is aggravated by the problems in the rural areas of the South. It is compounded by the intensification of racism in the white community." (P. 13.)

The first of these is embodied in the "black power" concept, whose emergence is seen as marking the end of one era and the beginning of another. Though "black power" has many meanings, at bottom it reflects the need for a greater share of economic and political power, a need which becomes more insistent as enforcement of already existing laws becomes increasingly a prime aspect of struggle.

The intolerable conditions of the black ghetto are graphically described, with its many-sided exploitation arising on the base of the superexploitation of the Negro by capitalism. A similar picture is presented of the worsening lot of black farmers and

* Claude M. Lightfoot, *Ghetto Rebellion to Black Liberation*, International Publishers, New York, 1968, 192 pp. Cloth \$5.95, paperback \$1.95.

sharecroppers in the rural South, leading to a mass exodus from the countryside to the urban ghettos.

Of special interest is Lightfoot's treatment of the rise of racism among white Americans in recent years and the consequent upsurge of black nationalism. He touches on the varied elements in the background of the former, beginning with the presidential campaign of Alabama's racist governor George Wallace in 1964, designed to foment a "white backlash," and the desertion of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party by white liberals at the Democratic Convention in that same year. The latter, he notes, is symptomatic of a general desertion among white liberals as the demands of the freedom movement shifted to more fundamental issues. He speaks also of the encouragement of racism by big business and some corrupt labor officials as automation creates growing economic insecurity and job competition.

All these developments serve to create a growing rift between black and white. Black nationalism mounts, spurred in part by a feeling of rejection by the white community, in part by the discovery by Negroes of their proud African heritage. It finds its exponents among the more recent immigrants from the South, among the youth, and the ranks of Negro business. Its main content, however, is not escapism or separatism. "At present the main content of black nationalism is of a progressive character. It does not exclude Negro and white

unity, but it demands that such unity be meaningful and between equal partners." (P. 46.)

This poses new tasks for white progressives and radicals. They must seek to learn why the poison of racism can be so easily spread among white masses, and on this basis launch an all-out fight against it. And they must learn to unite with their black brothers on a basis of true equality. Failure to move in these directions can have disastrous results.

A second part of the book deals with the theme "We Can Overcome." Starting with a review of the crisis in foreign policy, the growing fascist danger and the sickness of our society, the author proceeds to the question of what can be won through struggle within the limits of such a society. He rejects the position of those who maintain that within the capitalist framework nothing more than token gains have already been won, even though in an over-all sense the advances remain minimal. He takes issue with those who, having concluded that only changing the system will solve the problem of racial oppression, develop a "revolutionary" impatience and call for resort to arms, casting aside struggle in the electoral arena and other fields as worthless.

The right of the Negro people to defend themselves must be fully supported, and the violent actions in the ghettos have been of a defensive nature. But armed revolt is a course of suicidal futility. Nor is it true that there is no

alternative. "It is wrong to conclude, as some do," says Lightfoot, "that the channels for advance have been closed, even though racist and reactionary forces are seeking to close them. The latter notwithstanding, not only have the doors not been closed but the Negro people have been opening them wider every day." (P. 93.)

In support of this he cites the impressive gains in Negro representation won in recent years and the potentiality of other gains if black workers use their power to stop work and close down production, as well as their ability to vote as a block. And this power will be multiplied to the extent that whites in general and labor in particular are effectively won to join in the struggle.

On these grounds he presents the elements of a program of struggle within capitalism. It includes the fight for a genuine anti-poverty program, costing in the neighborhood of \$15-18 billion a year. Basic is a fight to raise wages and secure jobs for black workers, to organize the unorganized, to make organized labor serve the needs of the Negro people. The program involves also the use of the power of the Negro as a consumer to force concessions. Of special importance is the fight for training and jobs for black youth. And hand in hand with these economic struggles goes the continued struggle for representation in government.

Such struggles, says Lightfoot, can bring significant gains. But they cannot eliminate inequality.

Only a socialist reorganization of American life, he contends, can make this possible. Hence the need, while seeking partial gains within capitalism, to conduct the fight for socialism. It is to the question of socialism and black liberation that the second half of the book is devoted.

It opens with a discussion of the growing role of socialist ideology in the newly liberated countries of Africa. Having gained political independence they have found themselves plunged into a struggle against neo-colonialism and for the securing of their economic independence. In this struggle there has emerged a growing tendency to seek a non-capitalist path of economic development, leading to socialism.

The Afro-American, if he would secure his freedom, is likewise impelled to think in terms of socialism. But the condition of black America cannot be equated with that of Africa. It is not geographically separate but exists in the heart of the American nation. The fight for socialism cannot, therefore, be conducted separately and in terms of a black-led republic but only in conjunction with the struggle of the entire American working class for socialism. Even the African countries cannot conduct their struggles in a vacuum but only as part of a larger world, with the help of the already existing socialist countries. How much more true is this of black America!

White America, Lightfoot insists, cannot be treated as a monolith. The United States is a class

society marked by a class struggle. True, the Negro people must seek an independent power base, but they can effectively do so only together with the struggle of the white masses for an independent alternative. "If the Negro is to be equal," he notes, "he must have some ownership, some voice and vote, over the basic means of production in our society." And he adds: "The 300-year differential can be wiped out only in the context of a situation in which the dispossessed white workers, together with their black brothers, take full control of our country, establishing a system of socialist public ownership." (P. 132.)

Racism, he shows, is specifically a product of capitalist society, and with the advent of socialism it will be eliminated. But, it is asked, how can Negroes be sure that they might not be betrayed under socialism? What guarantee is there that something so deep-rooted as racism in this country can actually be abolished? In reply to this, he argues that the fight for socialism can only be successful if it is based on a fight against racism. But to this he adds another, most powerful answer—the evidence of experience in those countries where socialism has already triumphed.

In an impressive chapter, Lightfoot describes the remarkable achievements of the Soviet Union in abolishing national oppression and bringing formerly backward nations to a par with the most advanced. He pictures graphically the astounding achievements of a country like

Uzbekistan, which he visited in the course of a trip to the Soviet Union.

No less impressive is the achievement of Cuba in which, in a remarkably short time, oppression of black Cubans has been completely eliminated. Of this, Lightfoot presents incontrovertible evidence, based again on a personal visit to that country. To be sure, as he shows, there are important differences between the history of black people in Cuba and in the United States. But the unquestionable fact remains: socialism ended oppression and discrimination.

A concluding chapter is entitled "Black Liberation Impossible Without Communists." Here the author depicts the pioneering contributions of American Communists, as well as the international role of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the fight against national oppression. Today the Communist Party is that conscious force in the struggle which can give clear answers to questions and lasting power to victories. He concludes: "The path to black liberation involves not only a program for the immediate period but also for a long range program for socialism. Both are unattainable without the participation of Communists." (P. 192.)

The foregoing should serve to give an idea of the richness of the book's content. Particularly valuable, in this reviewer's opinion, is its treatment of the relation between the struggle for black liberation and the struggle for so-

COMMUNICATIONS

cialism, both nationally and on a world scale. In keeping with this is its constant focus on the common interests of black and white workers, even while giving due recognition to the special problems and needs of the former.

But if the book emphasizes the close tie between the struggle for black liberation and that of the American working people as a whole for social progress, by the same token it emphasizes the inescapable dependence of the struggle for progress on the fight to end Negro oppression. For that oppression, as Gus Hall notes in his preface, is a "national roadblock to progress . . . fed by an

ideology of racism that poisons our national bloodstream." (P. 6). There can be no real progress for the American nation, no real advance for the American working class, without concerted action to end this oppression and to remove this poison. The problems which Lightfoot discusses, therefore, are not those of the Negro people alone; they are crucial problems for *all* Americans, white as well as black.

In his book he has presented us with a truly Marxist analysis and has made a most valuable contribution to the fight for peace, freedom and socialism. It is a book which deserves the widest possible audience—black *and* white.

Dear Reader:

Many thanks to all who have responded to our financial appeal. This has eased our situation—but we are still not out of the woods. The summer months are tough sledding—and we do need your help. If you have not sent in your contribution will you do so now.

A considerable number of our subscribers have begun to introduce the magazine to new readers. As a result new subs have been coming in at a faster rate than heretofore. Other readers have been ordering single copies of particular issues to be sent to friends, relatives, shopmates or neighbors. Will you do likewise.

Remember the price of a yearly subscription goes up to \$6.00 in September. Take advantage of the \$5.00 rate. Help to get a new subscriber this month. And, if you have not as yet subscribed—do so NOW.

THE EDITORS

READY NOW!
GHETTO REBELLION
TO BLACK LIBERATION

by Claude M. Lightfoot

•

A leading Afro-American Communist presents his views on black power and the ghetto revolts, the right of armed self-defense and the dangers of calls for "guerrilla warfare," the nature of the increasingly violent and genocidal white racism, the positive features of black nationalism and the pitfalls of black separatism.

The author sees possibilities for some reforms of the present economic structure, but views a fundamental transformation of society as necessary for the achievement of full liberation. His observations from recent trips to Cuba, the Soviet Union, Ghana and Mali help provide indications of what must be done to save America.

This first full-length Marxist contribution to the critical national debate arising from the black revolt against racial oppression is must reading as the "long, hot" spring enters summer.

\$1.95 papeprback; \$5.95 cloth

•



at your bookshop or from

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Avenue South, New York, N. Y. 10016