

Is There a U.S.-USSR Alliance Against China?

By SAM MARCY

Premier Kosygin's visit to Britain is likely to go down in history not so much for what it signified about the Vietnam war or the relations between Britain and the Soviet Union, but rather for what it revealed about the Soviet leadership's orientation toward the Chinese People's Republic. One can search far and wide for a parallel to the unprecedented attack levelled by Kosygin against the revolutionary leadership of a socialist country while on a diplomatic mission to an imperialist power.

"We are aware there are today in China," said Kosygin, "in the Communist Party of China, and in the Chinese Government, people who are struggling against the dictatorial regime of Mao Tse-tung."

And then he added: "We sympathize with them..."

Carefully deliberated statement

This was no polemical sally made during the course of a speech at a Soviet Party Conference. Nor was it an off-the-cuff remark made at an unguarded moment. On the contrary, it was a premeditated and carefully deliberated statement of political position. The imperialist press could scarcely contain its delight. The New York Times in an editorial on February 11th gleefully pointed out the critical import of Kosygin's assault on China.

"Mr. Kosygin spoke in his capacity as Premier of the Soviet Union while in the capital of a 'capitalist' nation." And then the Times went on to explain: "His point could scarcely have been registered in more arresting fashion if he had said the same thing in front of the White House with President Johnson at his side." Indeed! To the bourgeoisie the world over, what Kosygin said was music to their ears.

Counter-revolutionary rebellion

His remarks constituted nothing less than an open and brazen call for a counter-revolutionary rebellion against the revolutionary government of China. They were also a clear and unambiguous appeal for collaboration with the imperialists against China. Here was the spectacle of a Premier of the Soviet Union on a visit to an imperialist capital, where he is supposed to achieve a united front against aggression in Vietnam, but instead makes an appeal for a united front against China.

This must have come as sobering medicine for those who have for a considerable period attacked the Chinese CP for its alleged failure to take up the Soviet leadership on its offer for a united front against U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam.

Can there be a China-Soviet United front on Vietnam?

A unified and coordinated effort, especially on Vietnam, is most desirable. There could scarcely be any doubt about it even among the most hidebound sectarians. A united front ought by all means to encompass as many diverse elements with as many divergent points of view as possible as long as it is bound together by a common objective. But it is precisely the Soviet objective which is now called into question. There is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the objective of the Chinese leadership is to get the U.S. out of Vietnam and thereby also off the southern tier of its own territory. The objective of the Soviet leadership, however, in view of Kosygin's open appeal to the U.S. to join it in the struggle to overthrow the revolutionary leadership of China, is obviously different. This appeal makes a mockery of its proclaimed desire to unite with China to stop U.S. aggression in Vietnam!

Kosygin's attack, both in spirit and content, was that of a bourgeois statesman, and not of a leader of a socialist country.

Neo-bourgeois "internationalism"!

The "sympathy" which he expressed for "those struggling" against the revolutionary leaders of China is not based upon abstract sentiment. It is based on the existence of long established ties between the revisionist neo-bourgeois social stratum in the USSR and its counterpart in the privileged officialdom of People's China.

In the eyes of China's leaders this is not only rank and outrageous interference in their internal affairs but by now an outright attempt at political subversion.

Kosygin's appeal to the imperialist powers against China is in line with an earlier one made by Andrei Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the USSR. This happened when he was in this country to confer with President Johnson and Secretary Rusk during the latter part of last November. At that time, it was reported in the press that the Soviet Foreign Minister had "repeatedly stressed his nation's concern over a China armed with a growing arsenal of nuclear weapons." (N.Y. Times, Nov. 22, 1966)

U. S. chimes in with Kosygin

What invests Kosygin's London attack on China's leaders with such ominous significance is that it was followed a mere two days later with a similar attack launched by the U.S. Ambassador to Japan, U. Alexis Johnson. The latter's attack came during the course of an address delivered in Tokyo at the Asian Affairs Research Council and was reported in the World Journal Tribune, Feb. 11.

"I would hope and expect," he said, "that those forces in China which want to move from a reliance on outworn shibboleths and doctrines... will ultimately prevail."

Johnson did not identify "those forces" he referred to in China but the press report conveniently did it for him.

Then the Ambassador added, "When their day comes, I can assure you that they will find the United States responsive. Indeed, this is our goal."

U. Alexis Johnson has been a top foreign policy official in the U.S. government for many years and a principal adviser to the President. He also participated as a member of the U.S. delegation at the 1954 Geneva Conference. His speech, it is important to note, was cleared by the White House before delivery, according to the WJT dispatch quoted above.

While the statement of the U.S. Ambassador is more guarded than that of Kosygin, it is nonetheless basically similar in content. What is most striking about it is its timing — it was made while Kosygin was still in London.

A united front of the wrong kind!

It is not, however, necessary to believe the Kosygin-Johnson pronouncements were deliberately coordinated and timed. That matters little. What the Kosygin-Johnson pronouncements do however, is to bring to the surface what has long been a more or less concealed form of collaboration against the People's Republic of China.

The launching of this bilateral attack puts a new face on the actual constellation of reactionary forces that are arrayed against the Chinese People's Republic. It gives weight to the growing body of evidence that has been accumulating over the years, that Washington and Moscow now have an implied if not publicly expressed alliance against China.

Startling as this may be, it should not make it incumbent on us to draw extreme and unwarranted sociological conclusions. These, especially if made in

haste, could have the effect of clouding rather than clarifying existing political as well as class relations.

Politics of "divide and conquer"

We only have to ask ourselves: What has been the principal content of U.S. foreign policy towards China and the USSR? It has been to exploit the profound differences in their fundamental policy for the purpose of weakening both the USSR and China — and if and when possible, to effectuate their common destruction. At no time has the U.S. lost sight of this goal. This has been the unchanging objective of the U.S. government regardless as to which administration has been in power.

There was a time when a majority of progressive mankind understood this well enough. The changes that have occurred in the relations between the USSR and China have not altered the basic strategy of the ruling circles of U.S. finance capital. They have merely brought about a new tactical approach made necessary by new conditions.

It is only proper to recall the very early days immediately following the victory of the Chinese Revolution when the U.S. foreign policy makers tried desperately to wean away the newly formed People's Republic from friendly collaboration with the Soviet Union. The particular tactic at that time was to try to duplicate the Yugoslavia experience. When it became apparent that this tactic would not succeed, a redoubled effort was made in the direction of the Soviet leadership. Both tactics followed from the same common imperialist strategy of divide and conquer.

Only recently, the fundamental conceptions of U.S. foreign policy were aptly summarized by one of the nationally syndicated columnists, William S. White, who more often than others reflects the Johnson Administration's view on foreign policy. Gloating over the depth of the Sino-Soviet split, he said, "In short,... the one true question now is how the West can exploit it towards its own security. The man who finds the right answer, and finds it in time, will take a place in history that few leaders have ever had." (Washington Post, Feb. 11.)

They collaborate with revisionists But want to destroy the USSR, too

While collaborating with the revisionist Soviet leaders in order to undermine if not destroy the People's Republic of China with one hand, the Johnson Administration is at the same time, with the other hand, leaving no stone unturned to achieve the same objective with regard to the USSR.

A recent example is the threat by the Johnson Administration to put into operation the Nike X anti-missile system (ABM) while nonetheless continuing to build up its offensive missile weaponry, which is directed against the USSR as well as China.

To millions of people throughout the world it has become plain that the U.S. government has been stretching out its hands to embrace the Soviet leaders for a very long time now. But the motive for the embrace is to strangle the Soviet Union and not to befriend it. The class antagonisms between the USSR and the USA have not been eliminated but have been driven beneath the surface, or rather been subordinated to what appears to the Soviet revisionists to be a "superior objective." But the class antagonisms are sure to reassert themselves with greater force than ever at a later date.

However, the alliance between the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet revisionist grouping is a fact of international life today which cannot be ignored. It makes a consistent revolutionary struggle against it on the part of all the working class and liberation forces throughout the world all the more necessary.

WORKERS WORLD

Editorial office:
46 W. 21st Street, New York, N. Y.

Telephone: AL 5-0352

Editor: Vincent Copeland
Manager: Dorothy Ballan

VOL. 9, No. 4 — FEBRUARY 17, 1967

Published Twice Monthly



'Bridge to the East'— or West?

The promptness and precision with which the leaders of the USSR and Czechoslovakia have acceded to the outrageous demands of Washington in the case of Vladimir Kazan-Komarek, is a dismal capitulation by the revisionists to U.S. imperialist blackmail.

This white guard assassin has long been sought by Prague for nothing less than trying to organize the overthrow of the socialist government of Czechoslovakia while in the hire of Western imperialism — in this connection, he is also wanted for murder. In addition, it is widely known in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe that Komarek is a U.S. spy.

Three months ago, Washington sent this reactionary criminal to a "business conference" in Moscow. The USSR rightfully responded to this blatant provocation by ordering the Aeroflot jet carrying Komarek back to Paris to make an unscheduled stop in Prague — thus enabling the Czech police to arrest the fugitive.

The U.S. monopolies then turned on the heat and demanded the immediate return of their agent, threatened the cancellation of the Moscow to New York air pact, cancelled the visas of all Czech trade and cultural officials and informed Prague that the Export-Import Bank would not guarantee any

commercial credits until Komarek was freed.

The incident came to a sorry end last week as the Czechs held a three-day "closed trial" from which the Czechoslovakian masses were barred to protect "state secrets," while two U.S. officials were permitted in the courtroom throughout.

The original charges of high treason and murder were disallowed by the court and Komarek was given an eight-year suspended sentence and then "expelled," that is, returned to his U.S. paymasters 24 hours after the trial.

(It should be noted that many of Komarek's subordinates, who were unfortunate enough to have been captured before the era of "Bridges to the East" received long jail sentences and even death sentences for executing the crimes which Komarek admitted in court to having organized.)

Thus, in their headlong leap to establish an accommodation with U.S. imperialism, the revisionists have set free a sworn enemy of the socialist state in return for promises of trade.

Brezhnev (who was in Prague during the trial) and Novotny, in their chase after the spurious "benefits" of "peaceful coexistence," have only furthered the disintegration of the socialist camp and dramatized the ominous growth of imperialist influence in Eastern Europe.

Short Fuse in Nicaragua

On Sunday, February 5, General Anastasio Somoza, Jr. was elected President of Nicaragua. This fraudulent and blood-stained election extends the now over 30 years of rule of the Somoza family into a probably still more bloody future.

On Monday, February 6, The New York Times expressed distress at the fixed election and the continued rule of the Somoza dynasty.

"The immense wealth gathered by the former dictator, Gen. Anastasio Somoza, Sr., remains safely in the hands of the family," the paper editorialized, "So does the Government and so does the National Guard."

What the Times does not say is that Somoza was a creature of U.S. imperialism, put into leadership of the Nicaraguan National Guard during the U.S. Marine intervention of 1926-33. This intervention included the aerial bombing of Ocotal and Chinandega, Nicaraguan towns, in an attempt to defeat the Nicaraguan patriots led by Augusto Sandino. The wealth the Somozas gathered was only their share of the Nicaraguan riches which were looted by U.S. imperialism.

What the Somozas don't own in Nicaragua is owned by United Fruit,

Standard Brands, Standard Fruit and Steamship, Robinson Lumber, Weis-Ficker Mahogany, Texaco, and other U.S. monopolies. They all are partners with the Somozas — and senior partners, at that.

The Times warns the opposition to Somoza not to attempt to overthrow him violently, but to hope for "evolution." Perhaps the richer and more respectable of the opposition will heed the warning. But even they are fed up with the Somozas. As for the masses, they understand as well as the conservative opposition or the New York Times, that an open war against Somoza is a war against U.S. imperialism.

Peace Leaders Move to Right "Spring Mobilization" Seems to Lack A Serious Program Against the War

The Spring Mobilization Committee predicts that the April 15 demonstration against the war at the UN and the Opera House in San Francisco will be "the most massive gathering of opposition to war in the history of the American peace movement."

It will be a most massive gathering all right. But if all the people there accept the program of the Spring Mobilization Committee, it won't be the kind of "opposition to war" that tries to stop the warmakers in their tracks. It will be the kind of opposition that provides the Administration's "loyal opposition" with a mass base.

In the committee's eight-page printed brochure of February 6, among several thousand printed words about the horrors of war and the need for a bigger and bigger peace movement, there is not one word about demanding immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

Somewhere in the middle of it is a phrase about self-determination, which might imply withdrawal but could as easily — and more logically, considering its general line — mean that the U.S. should grant "free elections" and label such a farce "self-determination."

The whole brochure could easily have been published by those liberal bourgeois forces who seek "negotiations" in order to end the imperialist war with an imperialist peace. Indeed, the whole impression given is that that is just who is behind it.

The only militant thing about the publication is the statement of DRV President Pham Van Dong to Harrison Salisbury. And this was previously printed in the New York Times.

Reverend James Bevel, an associate

of Martin Luther King, is national director of the Mobilization Committee. He speaks in the pamphlet about "working on the UN ambassadors" and "appealing to the UN." This is utterly ridiculous for any serious anti-war committee, although it would be logical enough if this kind of a demonstration in front of the UN were any good in the first place.

Hanoi and the NLF have long ago repudiated the UN, which is comprised of a majority of imperialist nations and their puppets — and is in the last analysis an instrument of U.S. imperialism. The UN line — the U Thant line — is to "end the bombing" and conduct "negotiations" — but not to demand full, complete and immediate withdrawal of the U.S. from Vietnam. (This is approximately the position of Fulbright, R. Kennedy, the New York Times, etc., etc.) To demonstrate before the UN without criticizing or condemning that body only helps to strengthen the UN line among the people, especially among the demonstrators themselves.

Moreover, just at the time when the whole press is taken up with talk of "peace signals" and "end the bombing" maneuvers, greater clarity is needed in the anti-war movement than ever before. Getting a bigger crowd in front of the UN to cheer for the politics of Robert Kennedy may only succeed in providing more potential dupes for the politics of Lyndon Johnson.

And just at this time, Rev. Bevel wants to "force other groups, basically conservative groups, to become protest groups ... and we have to start working on the church brothers, seminaries and Baptist conventions."

Under the circumstances, the Spring Mobilization Committee is far more likely to become a "basically conservative group" itself, than to win these groups to a real anti-war line. This is because it does not have a strong, consistent anti-imperialist line of its own, and will only recruit from "Baptist conventions" and the like, with the liberal bourgeois program of those who want "negotiations" but conceal their real program of keeping U.S. domination over Southeast Asia.

The "basically conservative groups" will remain basically conservative — unless their members are won to an anti-conservative program — that is, an anti-imperialist program that demands U.S. withdrawal above everything else and refuses to compromise on that point.

The Spring Mobilization Committee unfortunately does not have this program. Such program as its predecessor, the Fifth Avenue Parade Committee did have has already been watered down by the new committee in the interest of a false unity, or misplaced altogether out of eagerness to conciliate with the liberal capitalists.

Problems Caused By Two Pregnancies

SAIGON, Jan. 28— U.S. and South Vietnamese officials are perplexed over whether to treat an unborn child as a prisoner of war.

One of the prisoners is a pregnant woman whose baby is expected within the next few weeks.

Experts are studying the Geneva Convention on War Prisoners to determine whether the baby is to be given the status of the mother.

Meanwhile back home in the good old U.S.A. another mother faces a problem.

Last week, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller announced happily that "Happy" had given birth to a six pound baby boy.

The problem is how much of the multi-billion Rockefeller empire should be allotted to the new heir.



"AS A LIBERAL, I'D LIKE TO EXPRESS A MODERATE, BUT NOT AN EXTREME, OPINION..."



"I DEPLORE THE USE OF SEMI-POISONOUS GAS, NAPALM, RAZOR-FRAGMENT BOMBS AND TORTURE BY THE U.S. AGGRESSORS AGAINST THE VIETNAMESE PEASANTS!"



"HOWEVER, BOTH SIDES ARE GUILTY OF EXCESSES, SO WHY SHOULD I PROTEST?"

Zanzibar Government Hits Plantation Bosses

Zanzibar, Jan. 17 — The government of this country today announced confiscation of three more large plantations in its continuing land reform program.

More than 500 fruit, coconut, clove and other types of plantations have been taken over in the past two years, according to Reuters' news agency.

The Liberals Lead Hunt for "Signals" of Surrender

War-Hawk Johnson Takes Off the "Truce" Mask

New Bombing Shows "Peace" Maneuvers Only Imperialist War Tactics

Ever since Johnson stepped up the U.S. invasion of South Vietnam with the bombing of North Vietnam, he has continually covered his savage aggression with the sheep's clothing of "peaceful intentions" and the innocent bleat that the "enemy" compels him to attack.

He and his Administration have tried unceasingly to convince the world — almost word for word as Hitler did — that the victim of their aggression is responsible for the violence because of his unwillingness to surrender.

The present U.S. "peace" campaign, although it may prove more effective this time because of changes in the international situation, is absolutely no different in its motivation and should not be regarded for one moment as anything worth supporting by the anti-war forces. It is nothing but the imperialist-diplomacy side of imperialist war.

The fact that there have been differences of opinion in Washington only adds up to a division of labor between the imperialist hawks and the imperialist doves — both of whom defend the U.S. exploitation of the colonial peoples — over how best to advance the business interests of the rulers of America.

JOHNSON'S OPPONENT-BROTHERS

Up to now the real difference in the ruling class was over whether to try to end the war with demanding the semi-surrender of the Vietnamese revolution — or to push to take on the whole Chinese revolution with an all-out Asian war. The Fulbrights, Lippmanns, Robert Kennedys, etc. are

opposed to the latter course simply on the tactical grounds that the U.S. is not strong enough to do this successfully. And that is the real substance of their opposition to Johnson.

In defense against its opponents in the ruling class as well as against the genuinely anti-war movement of the masses, the Johnson Administration maintains that it is still waiting for some "signals" from the other side — with Johnson, of course, the one who decides whether they are true signals.

Johnson wants nothing more than "that five-letter word, peace" he whines. But the intransigence of the Vietnamese defending their sovereignty and their right of self-determination has so far prevented him from attaining his allegedly peace-loving goal. This is because Johnson really demands unconditional surrender.



Pilotless U. S. plane shot down in North Vietnam last fall.

POSITION OF DVR

Premier Pham Van Dong implied in his conversations with Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times during the Christmas holidays that a U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam might not be an absolute advance requirement for negotiations. Then, Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh said directly that negotiations could begin as soon as the U.S. bombings were discontinued "definitely and permanently." This was first reported by the Australian journalist, Wilfred Burchett, and then publicly repeated by Mai Van Bo, the DVR representative in Paris.

It was Mai Van Bo's comment that was received by Kennedy and relayed to Johnson with much newspaper fanfare at the beginning of last week.

An eloquent commentary on the seriousness of Kennedy's opposition to Johnson on the war was the former's conduct in this affair. After the whole world was told that Kennedy had received the long-awaited "signal" for negotiations, Kennedy went to the White House to report to Johnson. After his visit with the President, Kennedy refused to make any comment except for denying that he had received any particular information in Paris at all and that Newsweek, which carried the main report, was wrong.

Kennedy's obvious "diplomatic" agreement with Johnson on tactics is a measure of the short distance that separates him from his factional opponent in the capitalist class where vital interests of imperialism are concerned.

PEACE-SEEKING & SABRE-RATTLING

Two days after his meeting with Kennedy, Johnson, the "peace-seeker," was breathing fire again and released a letter he wrote to the Pope,

which said:

"I know you would not expect us to reduce military action unless the other side is willing to do likewise."

And the next day his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, held a sabre-rattling press conference at which he said:

"They (the DVR) must not expect us to stop our military action, when they continue their military action by invasion." (The U.S. invasion of Vietnam has been increased to an over-all figure of half a million troops while Rusk and Johnson have been making their "peace" speeches.)

Rusk has been singing this song, literally for years. But he sang it louder last week, surprising many Washington observers with his stridency. Some thought it was strictly a bargaining posture, since Walt Rostow and Bill Moyers, prominent White House assistants, had been talking about the "smell of peace."

At the very least, however, Rusk's object was to steer the press away from speculations on a peace settlement and to harden the public mind against any concessions to Vietnam.

Hanoi, however, had cautioned the U.S. not to interpret its suggestion as a sign of weakness and indicated that it was ready, as Premier Pham Van Dong had told Salisbury to continue fighting "for another ten years — what do you think of twenty?"

But Johnson and Rusk were pressing what they considered to be their advantage, regardless. And they nonchalantly tore their own sheep's clothing with their verbal bayonet practice against the Vietnamese people.

KOSYGIN'S ROLE

Contributing to the situation, but hardly helping it, was the declaration of Soviet Premier Kosygin in London that unconditional cessation of the bombing (of the North) was "necessary in order to enable talks to take place."

Previously the Soviet leaders had demanded unconditional U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. But now their line seemed to be indistinguishable from that of the liberal capitalists, Fulbright, Kennedy, etc. Kosygin's London statement was interpreted in revolutionary circles as a willingness to make a deal with the U.S. at the expense of Vietnam.

This has been verified in news reports on February 14th and 15th detailing the intimate collaboration between Kosygin on the one side and Wilson and Washington on the other.

It was apparent at the week's end that behind-the-scenes maneuvers had been enormously accelerated on the world arena and that the struggle in Vietnam might be strongly affected by the adverse intervention of outside forces.

THOSE WHO FOLD UP & THOSE WHO FIGHT

Meanwhile in the United States the anti-war forces showed a tendency to provide a chorus for the Kennedy-Fulbright program of semi-surrender for Vietnam. This was because of the confused and conciliatory position of many of the "peace" leaders.

It became clearer that if the Vietnamese revolutionaries should be forced into an unwilling compromise, a number of half-hearted "peace" leaders in the U.S. might go along with it instead of condemning their own government for its imperialist aggression in "peace" as well as war. Indeed, some of these leaders were already making their position indistinguishable from the liberal imperialists' and were changing their slogans to suit the occasion.

In this situation the real anti-war vanguard raised the cry louder than ever to demand the immediate and complete withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam.

How Staughton Lynd "Supports" War Crimes Tribunal

Turning "Other Cheek" to Johnson

Bertrand Russell and the leading spirits of the War Crimes Tribunal most often reflect on that old chestnut: "I can take care of my enemies, but God save me from my friends!"

Staughton Lynd is one such "friend" of the War Tribunal in the United States.

An associate editor of the same magazine ("Liberation") that Dave Dellinger, a Tribunal member edits, and Dave Horowitz, another member contributes to, Lynd writes a peculiar editorial about the Tribunal in the November issue. The editorial deserves comment at this late date, because of the increasing ambiguousness of some U.S. "peace" leaders. And this editorial is ambiguous, indeed.

"I believe it is the intention of the Tribunal to function as a grand jury rather than as a petty jury," he says, "that is to bring in an indictment rather than a verdict. The verdict will be rendered by the same 'opinion of mankind' to which the Declaration of Independence appealed in 1776... This conception of the Tribunal seems to me valid. It seems to me critical, however, that the jury — that is, ourselves — keep constantly in mind that it is we, not the Tribunal or the North Vietnamese Government who are to render the verdict; and that the appropriate way for us to render that verdict, should we find the U.S. Government guilty of war crimes, is not by punishing someone, but by increasing our own opposition to the war."

For a man "critical of courts... and jails," Lynd gives a pretty good imitation of a lawyer in court, trying to get a softer sentence for his client. Obviously the Tribunal will lack

the power to render a legal verdict and to give Johnson the sentence he deserves and make it stick. Obviously it is compelled to act more in the nature of a grand jury as far as the manner it receives and considers the evidence is concerned. And the chief criminals have so much power that they not only can refuse to appear and be cross-questioned but they are even using inordinate pressure to prevent the Tribunal from sitting at all.

But Lynd has accepted the Tribunal's legal form only to make sure his readers grant it no anti-war essence. The president of the Tribunal, Jean-Paul Sartre, addressing its first mass meeting in Paris on November 28, said:

"This is the way we must show our solidarity with the Vietnamese people. Their struggle is our struggle. It is our struggle against American hegemony, against American imperialism."

If Lynd really supports the Tribunal in any way, no echo of these words from its president finds its way into his editorial. Lynd is at best "impartial" as between the U.S. and the Vietnamese people, that is between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. And he certainly is not for a "struggle against American hegemony, against American imperialism."

Lynd opposes finding any U.S. officer (particularly the captured bomber-pilots) guilty of war crimes for the atrocity he commits, and seems to prefer a broad indictment of U.S. policy instead. What he really feared, of course, at the time he wrote the editorial, — and he said it — was that the North Vietnamese might actually

give some punishment to the bomber-flyers. This would have upset many of Lynd's friends, not to mention his bosses at Yale. The bourgeois hysteria against N. Vietnam's right to try the flyers co-incided neatly with Lynd's forgiveness of their crimes.

Bertrand Russell has written pages and pages exposing individual atrocities that go far beyond the "call of duty" but Lynd says:

"We can assume individual responsibility for trying to prevent future war crimes at the same time that we ask by our action that individuals not be punished for war crimes already past."

This is an argument for not having any War Crimes Tribunal at all, at least not like the one that has been founded in London and Paris!

If "individuals are not to be punished for war crimes already past," they certainly should not be punished for crimes not yet committed. In Lynd's peculiar logic the whole concept of crime itself is dissolved, and the horrible deprivations of imperialism (which Lynd is not even sure exists) become merely a force of nature and an "indictment" becomes only a rhetorical statement. And that is about what Lynd really wants the Tribunal's indictment to be.

If Lynd is so disposed toward charitable forgiveness for the U.S. bomber-pilots, and others, such as torturers, etc., who are "under orders," and toward not allowing the Tribunal to "find the United States Government guilty of war crimes," because only "we" can do that, it is pretty obvious that he is not really for the War Crimes Tribunal at all — regardless of his cagey editorial.

A New World Was Born - And Died to Be Re-Born!

The Paris Commune

By MICHAEL MARGOLIES

The Paris Commune, a proletarian state that "failed," was the model for the successful Russian Revolution of 1917 and the equally successful Chinese Revolution of 1949.

The Chinese have gone further than anybody else in an all-out effort to put the ideals of the Commune into practice. Fighting revisionism and bureaucratism they have established broad Commune-type governments in Shanghai and Peking during the most recent days of the revolution. Below is a brief account of the Paris Commune of 1871.

In March, 1871, at the end of the Franco-Prussian war, the Parisian workers, defending themselves against the onslaught of the French ruling class, seized state power. It was the first time in history, that the working class, once destroying the old state machinery, had been able to seize and hold state power in its own name.

During the previous August, almost the entire male population of Paris had been conscripted into the National Guard to defend the city against Prussian attacks in a war they had opposed. When the Empire collapsed in September and a provisional republic was set up, the revolutionary Parisian masses began to set up elective military bodies that were made up of the Guard members in every district.

In struggling against a terrible 135-day Prussian siege, the masses developed a heightened confidence in their own class as well as a heightened hatred of the ruling class which caused them so much suffering. The bourgeoisie, fearing the growing power of the workers, wanted to quickly capitulate to the Prussians.

In addition, the Empire and the large towns had taken on heavy debts and the war had ravaged the country's resources. There was little profit that the French bourgeoisie could make in this war. On January 27, they signed a truce with the Prussians.

But Bismarck demanded huge indemnities which the bourgeoisie were not willing to pay themselves. They wanted to transfer their burden to the masses. This they could only do after the crushing of the Paris workers.

A reactionary National Assembly was set up in Versailles to negotiate surrender terms with Bismarck and press a campaign against the Paris workers. On February 24, the workers organized their own Central Committee of the National Guard. It was composed of elected delegates from each company and of elected battalion commanders. Among its leaders were members of the First International.

In effect, a workers' army was being formed. A condition of dual power now existed, with two rival governments — one in Paris and one in Versailles.

Behind the scenes, Bismarck had advised the French National Assembly, "Provoke the insurrection while you still have the power, in order that you may crush it for good."

On March 18, the bourgeois Assembly sent troops into Paris to disarm the Guard of their artillery. Clashes

The undefeated: wounded, almost helpless, like Communards, they defy oppressor.



Twenty-eight liberation fighters, released by the Saigon puppet army, walk toward Hien Luong Bridge leading to North Vietnam. In the middle of the bridge the men stopped and, in a dramatic gesture showing their contempt for General Ky's "gifts," threw their Saigon-supplied clothes into the river below.

(They are actually members of the NLF and residents of the South, but the puppet government in Saigon does this as a stunt to show the prisoners should "go back where they came from" in the North.)

occurred; some of the troops came over to the workers, the rest were driven out. The police were powerless.

The workers, led by the Central Committee of the National Guard, controlled the city. All ties with the Assembly were shattered. Bourgeois power, armed and unarmed, was smashed. Paris was a proletarian dictatorship.

On March 26, elections for the Commune were held. Its very first decree was the suppression of the old standing army and police and their replacement by the armed people.

"From the outset the Commune had to recognize that the working class ... must on the one hand, abolish all the old oppressive machinery used against itself and, on the other hand, must safeguard itself against its own representatives and officials by declaring them all, without exception, to be removable

at all times." — Engels' introduction to Marx's "Civil War in France."

The Commune demanded that all special privileges for officials be eliminated. The pay of a representative was limited to the wages of a skilled worker. The elected body of the Commune was to be held responsible as an executive body as well as a legislative one. The proposals of the workers' government had to be thoroughly discussed and worked out with the revolutionary masses and the officials were to be held responsible for carrying them out. All posts of the Commune — administrative, judicial, and educational — were elective and those officials were immediately recallable by the masses.

Some of the measures taken by the Commune were the separation of Church and State, the reconstruction of the police along elected lines, a moratorium on rent, the abolition of fines in the factories, the abolition of night work in the bakeries, the workers' occupation of factories abandoned by the owners, and their reorganization on a cooperative basis. In the Louvre Artillery Works a factory council was set up. The director, the shop foreman and the bench foreman were elected by the workers. The factory council met every evening to discuss the next day's work.

The Commune was limited in its life span and was isolated. But it is quite obvious that if it had lasted longer and gained allies throughout France, it would have expropriated the capitalist-owned means of production and organized a system of socialist planning for the people.

But the ruling class plotted constantly to destroy it. After weeks of bloody battles along the approaches to Paris, troops were sent to invade and destroy the Commune at the end of May. The men and women workers of Paris fought heroically to defend their own proletarian regime, but were defeated. The city was almost totally destroyed. Thousands upon thousands were executed.

One typical bourgeois of Paris, J. Audeoud, wrote in his diary, of the executed Communards:

"How the honest man's heart delights to see them lying there, riddled with bullets, befouled and rotten. The stink of their corpses is an odor of peace, and if the all-too-sensitive nostril revolts, the soul rejoices."

Many of the wounded Communards had been buried alive.

The following morning the world awoke to see that their defiance had never been broken. Through the broken earth that covered them, an arm pointed upward in the last act of proletarian defiance.

Its fist was clenched.

Dave Mitchell Goes to Prison; Supreme Court Turns Its Back

NEW HAVEN, Feb. 6 -- Dave Mitchell, the youth who refused to be drafted and charged the U.S. Government with violating its own laws and international laws (including the U.S.-dictated Nuremberg decisions) surrendered here today to begin his five year term in federal prison.

About 50 well-wishers were on hand to greet him as he arrived a little late because of the big eastern seaboard snowstorm. Over half of them were from New York and included a group from Mitchell's own organization, the End the Draft Committee as well as a number from Youth Against War and Fascism.

They set up a picket line to condemn the Government and call for an end of the dirty war. They were still picketing when Mitchell walked into prison.

Mitchell began fighting the draft nearly six years ago at the age of eighteen, but more recently took the Government to court on the basis of the Nuremberg decisions, which he explained would make him a criminal if he served in the U.S. war of aggression

in Vietnam.

In his two Federal Court hearings he was denied the right to discuss the Nuremberg judgments or any other international obligation that the U.S. has signed.

The case is still pending decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. But one of that body's judges, using a technicality, remanded Mitchell to prison anyway!

The End the Draft Committee in a prepared statement said that the youth's jailing "exposes the Government's fear that Mitchell represents increasing numbers of his countrymen." This now seems to be obvious to foes as well as friends of the anti-war fighter.

At almost any point in his long fight, Mitchell could have avoided a prison term by pleading that he was a "conscientious objector" — that is, that a purely personal or religious repugnance to violence forbade him to get involved in the war. This would have taken the authorities off the hook as far as their own responsibility for the war was concerned. And Mitchell would

De Gaulle for Viet Masses? Never! Wants Viet Peace for Paris Profits

Among those who understand most clearly what U.S. big business has in mind for Vietnam is that flexible but intransigent representative of French big business, Charles de Gaulle.

Vietnamese Studies No. 8 says: "French imperialism is the most important buyer of South Vietnamese goods, and French investments at times represent 50 per cent of the total investments in South Vietnam; French property is valued at two billion francs (about \$400 million); 90 per cent of the rubber areas and a large number of light industrial enterprises belong to French capitalists."

Now if the U.S. were merely fighting to "restore peace" in South Vietnam and destroy all opposition to Premier Ky — i.e. protect colonial rule. Why on

neither have gone to Vietnam nor have been put into prison.

But he chose to fight it out. Key Martin, chairman of Youth Against War and Fascism, declared that "As in the case of Nazi Germany, the true heroes will be those who resisted the war and the war machine, not those who went along and cooperated with it."

earth would French big business and de Gaulle object to that?

They wouldn't, of course. But they know quite well that if the U.S. wins in South Vietnam, French business loses, as well as the Vietnamese people. And they are quite right.

The U.S. didn't build the big bases at Danang and Cam Ranh Bay to protect French business interests. And the Chase Manhattan Bank didn't open its branch in Saigon last year to loan the Rockefeller billions to French exploitation of Vietnam, either.

The only peculiar thing about de Gaulle's attitude is that he shows a disposition to fear American capitalism more than Vietnamese communism.

But for the immediate future, U.S. big business is the tougher and more ruthless enemy of French business, whereas the French could do business with the Vietnamese for a long time yet, if the U.S. were out.

De Gaulle's opposition to the U.S. on Vietnam is the most eloquent proof-positive that the U.S. aims to make an economic colony out of South Vietnam.

Spanish Students Join Workers in War on Fascism

Franco Regime Rocked by Protests

By FRED GOLDSTEIN

Spain is a seething cauldron of anti-fascist activity. Since the great wave of industrial strikes which rocked the Franco regime in 1962, the Spanish proletariat has conducted an increasingly militant and widespread campaign of class warfare against the fascist tyranny in Madrid.

A mushrooming number of sit-down strikes, lightning walkouts, slow downs and public demonstrations conducted by the illegal workers' committees have the Franco government on the defensive.

Two months ago 13,000 metal workers sat down at the Standard Electrica Company of Madrid (owned by the U.S. International Telephone and Telegraph) and forced the notorious Tribunal of Public Order to release four of their leaders from prison.

This was an unprecedented victory over the fascist government and was followed by similar protests in Bilbao, Asturias and Seville. The industrial workers of Barcelona have continually defied the bosses. Fifteen thousand Asturian coal miners are conducting intermittent strikes for higher wages and improved living conditions.

Inspired by the fervent rebirth of the class struggle, thousands upon thousands of Spanish university students have given forth with an enormous outburst of militant protest and turned that country's campuses into a nationwide network of opposition centers to the fascist tyranny of Franco.

The mighty eruption of the student struggle, from Barcelona to Valencia, from Madrid to Saragossa, is a concentrated outburst of political hatred for fascism by a whole new generation.

The burning national task in Spain which animates tens of thousands of youth to defy Franco and fight the police is to put an end to the fascist system of political regimentation, whose sole function and objective for a quarter of a century has been the continued enslavement of the working class. Indeed, the immediate cause of the latest anti-Franco upheaval was the determination of the students at the

University of Madrid to champion the cause of the proletariat.

On January 27 the infamous Spanish Security Forces suppressed a workers' demonstration in Madrid for higher wages, better working conditions and free trade unions. In this connection the riot police also invaded the University of Madrid law school where the students were holding a simultaneous demonstration to support the workers. Both demonstrations were broken up and at least 30 students and 70 workers were arrested.

But the students, who have been fighting for years to legalize their political organizations and activities, free of police terror, were in a fighting mood. On the following day the dean of the law school resigned in protest and the law school students demonstrated against the illegal police invasion of the campus. Four hundred students set up road blocks of wooden beams across the main road to the campus to block the police from entering. The police charged the students and arrested scores. That night 13 schools of the University of Madrid voted to call a 24-hour protest strike the following Monday.

When Monday rolled around, squadrons of police arrived in jeeps, buses and armored cars mounted with high pressure water-jets. Unintimidated, seven hundred students marched on the rector's quarters to protest the authorization by the university authorities of the illegal police raid of two days before. With nightsticks and water-hoses the police attacked the students and dispersed the demonstration. But the students regrouped by the medical school and fought a pitched battle in the school court-yard. The riot forces were pushed to retreat several times by a hail of stones and by homemade smoke bombs thrown from windows and balconies. Finally, with night sticks flying, a cordon of 150 police charged, cornering the students on the steps of the building, and beat them mercilessly with clubs. Those who retreated into the dining room were pursued and police, according to an eye-witness from Vancouver, Canada, "beat everyone they could lay their hands on."

Franco's method of education by police club and water hose only fanned the flames of rebellion. The following day the regime closed the University of Madrid locking out 17,000 students.



Spanish worker-soldiers show their spirit at beginning of 1936-39 revolution. Franco won. But the new generation is determined to carry on.

But the lid was off. Fifteen thousand students at the University of Barcelona, long a thorn in Franco's side, voted to go on a 48-hour sympathy strike for Madrid, demanding that the government recognize the Free Student Union. The Union is illegal and its leaders have repeatedly been jailed, expelled, fined and harrassed. Nevertheless the Union represents the vast majority of university students in Spain.

In fact, on the very day that Barcelona voted to strike, students from all over the country were holding the Congress of Free Students at the University of Valencia despite a police ban on the assembly and the arrest of 20 student leaders the night before. The 8,000 students of Valencia, following the lead of Barcelona and Madrid, voted for a 24-hour strike to protest the police invasion of the student congress and the arrest of their leaders.

One step behind the students at every stage of the struggle, the government closed down the University of Barcelona on Feb. 2, giving the students 10 days in which to repent their crimes in writing. (Naturally no one repented.) The students answered back with a protest meeting of 3,000 at which they denounced the reprisals and then adjourned en masse to the streets of Barcelona to air their demands.

The fourth school to be closed down was the University of Saragossa which voted a 24-hour sympathy strike for Madrid, Barcelona and Valencia on February 4.

The protest then began to reach landslide proportions as the universities of Santiago, Malaga and Salamanca joined Saragossa in the walk-out. And the day afterwards, students at Valladolid and Granada capped the wave of protest by shutting down their respective campuses.

According to official estimates by the Spanish government no less than 75,000 in all have been involved in what is shaping up to be the severest and most widespread assault on the fascist government since the great industrial strike wave of 1962. Whatever the outcome of the struggle, the students, inspired by the growing revival of working class organization and protest, have shaken the foundations of the disintegrating system of Spanish fascism.

If the measure of the bankruptcy of a regime is its inability to hold the loyalty of the youth, then the Franco regime is surely in grave peril.

Ho Chi Minh, True Internationalist,

Hails Revolutionary Cuba

The following are excerpts from a front page article in the Jan. 29 issue of Granma, the Cuban English language weekly. The expression of revolutionary solidarity with Cuba and the Latin American revolution by President Ho Chi Minh of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, was made during a filmed interview for the Cuban Newsreel Department.

basing ourselves in the people, organizing the people and uniting the people."

Ho Chi Minh recalled the years of struggle when he was in the United States laboring as a seaman aboard French and British vessels.

"At that time," he pointed out, "I could not have visited Cuba, as the Cuban authorities would not have permitted me to enter their country. Now when I visit Cuba I will feel very much at home."

President Ho...expressed his desire to visit Cuba: "when we have triumphed over imperialism."

How Aggressive They Are, to Shoot Down U.S. Planes During a Truce!

FEB. 9 - "The Vietnamese have already violated the (Tet four-day) truce!" bellowed some news stations on the U.S. radio today. "They shot down an unarmed (U.S.) reconnaissance plane this morning." (Actually they shot down two of them before the morning was over, according to Radio Hanoi.)

One can imagine the reconnaissance pilot on his errand of mercy over Hanoi, with doves of peace plainly marked on his plane, dropping flowers and toy balloons for the children, calling plainly on his radio in the Vietnamese tongue

Picket to Protest Franco Fascism Show Unity With Spanish Students

A demonstration to support the recent anti-fascist upsurge by Spanish university students, and protesting the brutal repressions by the Franco regime against Spanish workers and students will take place on Friday, February 17, at 5:00 p.m. outside the Spanish National Tourist Office on 5th Avenue near 48th Street.

The demonstration has been called by Youth Against War and Fascism. A YAWF leaflet, distributed on campuses and at high schools throughout the city to publicize the protest reads in part as follows:

"Thirty years ago, a million Spaniards died fighting against Franco's fascist regime in a war reminiscent of the present war in Vietnam. After thirty years of silence, anguish, terror and fear...there is a widespread revival of the struggle against fascism reaching into campuses and plants in every corner of the country."

The demonstration outside the Tourist Office will coincide with a student-worker demonstration in Barcelona to demand the abolition of the Political-Social Brigade, the Spanish Political Police and the Court of Public Order. According to a UPI dispatch from Madrid on Feb. 10, the Barcelona rally "will be one of the most openly anti-government demonstration since the days of the Spanish Civil War."

Making Franco Pay Up

MADRID, Feb. 13 — The Spanish Government has finally agreed to grant a long-standing pay claim to workers in the national railroad system.

About 6,500 factory workers have just returned to work after a three-day lockout.

Students have just returned to classes after a ten-day shut-down of Madrid University, brought on by police clashes with them.

The North Vietnamese leader stressed the parallel situation in the independence struggles of Cuba and Viet Nam.

He recalled that Cuba's struggle was begun by Fidel Castro with just a few men. "In Viet Nam, at the beginning, we were few, but we were united. We must not fear the consequences,

Condemns Thai Puppets for Entering Viet War

A Message From the Real Thailand

(To Workers World from the Office of the Representative Abroad of the Patriotic Front of Thailand — Now in Peking, People's China.)

Since the beginning of this month the traitorous reactionary Thai authorities and puppet Premier Thanom Kittikachorn have made separate statements saying that they would send a combat battalion which it was later decided, should be expanded into a regimental combat team for the war of aggression in South Vietnam.

It consists of infantry units as the main force with other heavy artillery, tank, armoured and combat-ready logistics units.

In fact, the Thanom-Praphas traitorous clique had long ago played a nefarious role in the war of aggression against Vietnam. Since 1964 they had sent batch after batch of military equipment and field medical units to serve the aggressor troops. They also trained group after group of pilots for the Saigon puppet clique.

In July 1966, they sent an air transport unit complete with pilots and crew. In December the same year, they dispatched two fully manned war vessels. There are many more of such dirty dealings between the traitorous Thanom-Praphas clique and the U.S. imperialists in the war of aggression against Vietnam. Such deals were substantiated when the D.R.V. announced that there were Thais among the marauding pilots captured.

These official acknowledgements about the dispatch of Thai ground forces to serve the U.S. imperialists had to be made because they could no longer pull the wool over the eyes of the people of Thailand and the rest of the world.

That is to say, as lackeys of the U.S. imperialists, the traitorous Thanom-Praphas clique had to force the Thai army, navy and air force to serve as cannon fodder for its master — U.S. imperialism — in order to help the U.S. intensify further the frenzied war of aggression against Vietnam.

The sending of fresh reinforcements to Vietnam, which is being carried out in accordance with the directives of the world's No. 1 criminal, Johnson, laid down at the Manila meeting, fits in with the plan to extend the war of aggression in Vietnam to the whole of Indo-China and Asia region.

Later this was confirmed by U. Grant Sharp, U.S. commander-in-chief of the Pacific region, who said most arrogantly in Bangkok that the U.S. was now taking a direct part in the second guerrilla war in Southeast Asia and that is in Thailand.

The aim of the U.S. imperialists is to occupy the Asian and Pacific region by using Asians to fight Asians which they regard as the cheapest means of realising their plans of world domination in collaboration with the Soviet modern revisionists. Johnson is mustering cannon fodder from South Vietnam, South Korea, the Philippines, "Malaysia" and Thailand through the puppet cliques and

trying to cover up this dirty act by getting token reinforcements from Australia and New Zealand.

U.S. imperialism is carrying out a war of aggression in South Vietnam in order to occupy it, but the Vietnamese people, united as one, are fighting back heroically and winning one victory after another. U.S. imperialism therefore cannot but increase its aggressive forces there to 400,000 and has decided to further increase this number in the course of the year, while at the same time continuing to summon cannon fodder from its Asian puppets as reinforcements.

This shows that the U.S. imperialists are unable to defeat the Vietnamese people. It also shows the servility of the puppets which include the Thanom-Praphas clique in Thailand.

The people of Thailand and of Vietnam are carrying out their own struggles for national salvation, to throw out the U.S. imperialist occupationists and overthrow the puppet regimes. Therefore the young people in the Thai armed forces who are being press-ganged into the war of aggression to slaughter their Vietnamese brethren are being forced to give up their lives solely for the U.S. imperialists and the traitorous puppet clique. It will not bring any good to Thailand and its people and their Vietnamese brethren who share the same fate.

We, the Committee for Afro-Asian People's Solidarity of Thailand, most resolutely condemn this crime of the U.S. imperialists and the Thanom-

Praphas clique.

We call on all the men in the army, navy and air force and their parents, brothers and sisters and other relatives, all Thai patriotic individuals, organisations, public bodies and political parties, at home and abroad, who love peace and democracy to unite and use every possible means to strongly condemn and resolutely oppose U.S. imperialism and the Thanom-Praphas clique.

We call on all patriotic political parties, mass organisations and individuals in Vietnam, the United States, Korea, the Philippines, Malaya (including Singapore), Australia, New Zealand and the whole world who love peace, democracy and justice to raise powerful voices of protest and take any suitable action to stop U.S. imperialism and its lackeys from widening the war of aggression in Vietnam.

We are confident that your strident voice of condemnation and opposition will re-echo throughout the world. It will bring great inspiration and added unity to the peoples of Thailand and Vietnam and will ultimately stop the criminal acts of U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

The Committee for Afro-Asian People's Solidarity of Thailand

There are now 35,000 U.S. soldiers in Thailand and an undisclosed number of U.S. helicopters for use against the Thai people's freedom fight.

Bases have been built on a scale with those in Vietnam — notably the one at Sattahip, which will accommodate the largest jets in the world in its airport and nearly the whole 7th Fleet in its docks.

U.S. "aid" to the Government has just been doubled.

Tanzania Takes Over The Big Banks

By HENRY STONE

As army troops and Ministers cheered and jumped for joy, President Nyerere of Tanzania proclaimed on February 6 that his Government was taking over all banks in the country.

The banks include 29 offices of Barclays DCO (two per cent of its global representation); the Standard Bank, in which Chase Manhattan has a 15 per cent interest; and the Commercial Bank of Africa, in which the Bank of America has an interest.

A few days later, Nyerere's Government also nationalized the eight biggest flour-milling companies in Tanzania, and took a majority interest in the aptly named British-American Tobacco Co. and other companies.

Before Nyerere's proclamations of February 6, Army troops paraded through the streets of Dar es Salaam, carrying banners that read, "Capitalism is the Enemy of Socialism" and "Economy and Development Depend Upon Our Efforts."

The troops then marched to the headquarters of the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) for the mass rally at which Nyerere made his impassioned announcement. The troops waved their banners and applauded as Nyerere spoke.

In a mass meeting the day before, President Nyerere introduced the Arusha Declaration on Tanzania's path toward socialism. The TANU policy manifesto called for Government control of all major means of production; and said that overseas investment should not be relied on for the country's development.

It appears that the businesses will receive compensation and the masses will have to pay it. Imperialism is not yet really ousted. But Nyerere's moves have already aroused the enthusiasm of all the oppressed. After setbacks last year in Ghana and elsewhere, the struggle against imperialism is again gathering momentum in Africa.

Rob Williams Describes Red Guards From His Vantage Point in Peking

Also Speaks for Thailand Liberation

Rob Williams, the exiled Afro-American leader, has now been in People's China for several months and now has had time to adjust himself and tune in on the stirring events there. He strongly defends the Red Guard movement in the January *Crusader* — published in Peking — in the following unequivocal language:

"According to the calumnies of the pathological liars, shameless detractors and wicked enemies of the liberation struggles of the world, the glorious Red Guard is not a proletarian movement of students, workers, peasants and soldiers, but a strange breed of inanimated objects summoned from outer space to reek havoc on the purveyors of "civilizing" western influence on a romantically primitive and quaint China.

"This is evil-crooked and wishful thinking made of the same substance of what the pigeons left on the flagpole.

"The great Chinese Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a mass movement of the people, for the people and by the people, determined to enhance and consolidate people's power. Unlike the long suffering and victimized Afro-American's cry for "black power,"



Robert F. Williams

the Cultural Revolution is (a successful) assertion of people's power. It is a vibrant movement to sweep away the last vestiges of class privileges, the abuse of power by a handful of re-

actionaries, the cultural aspect of imperialism, lingering feudalism, capitalism and social injustice....

"If this Cultural Revolution were not in the cause of humble people, how could its conductors emotionally identify with the disinherited, brutally oppressed and exploited share-croppers of Mississippi? How could they identify as brothers, with the victims of police brutality in Watts, Chicago, Harlem and Detroit?

"Who are those who hate and detract from the glory of the meek inheriting the earth? Why are they opposed to a revolution that gives the most ordinary of the citizenry the right to question authority that cannot hide behind congressional immunity? Why are they so spitefully opposed to the poorest of peasants having an equal right to attend universities? Why are they so avidly opposed to the thought of a Mao Tse-tung, who teaches that the human being should dedicate his life to the service of humanity without consideration of status or gain?"

Williams, who participated in the most direct sense as a liberation leader in the U.S., is noted for his building the first organized armed defense guard in modern times (in Monroe, N.C.) and for saying publicly as early as 1959 that "Negroes must meet violence with violence" — meaning that self defense as practiced in Monroe should be elevated to a nationwide campaign.

Appearing recently at a meeting of exiled Thailand liberation fighters in Peking, he said:

"There can be but one sane reply to Johnson's insane Johnsonism... The honorable answer in Thailand is now being given by the Patriotic Front... In Asia, Africa and Latin America honorable patriots are replying to U.S. imperialism in the only language it understands."

Did U.S. "Clean Up" Iron Triangle?

"Operation Cedar Falls," a scorched-earth campaign of up to 30,000 U.S. and puppet troops against the NLF-controlled "Iron Triangle" outside of Saigon, ended late in January. Its purpose, according to Time Magazine, was "not only to chase the enemy from his nests, but to make those nests permanently uninhabitable." Bulldozers, bombs and defoliants were

used. The entire village of Bensuc was deliberately razed.

The end of the operation presumably meant the end of the NLF in the "Iron Triangle."

A week later, a "search and destroy" mission of GI's suffered heavy casualties in the "Iron Triangle" at the hands of guerrillas.

Is There a U.S.-USSR Alliance Against China?

Continued from Page 1

Soviet Union still socialist In spite of Kosygin

But this does not mean, as has been asserted recently, that the social system of the USSR has become capitalist. Not at all. State ownership of the basic means of production still exists in the Soviet Union. This is absolutely incontestable. As long as this is so, capitalism as a social system has not been restored in the Soviet Union. Elements of a capitalist economy have been introduced in the Soviet Union. But this has not yet materially altered the basic character of the social foundations of the USSR, which is shaped by state ownership of the means of production.

It may also be said that there have been many

instances of mass repression practiced by the Soviet authorities. These repressions and gross violations of the civil liberties of Soviet citizens are nothing new, either. But here again it is incorrect to infer from this that a capitalist or fascist dictatorship now exists in the USSR as some already claim. This would necessarily mean that the class foundations of the proletarian dictatorship established by the October Revolution had undergone a qualitative change.

Clarity on USSR will arm masses For sudden turns in world situation.

Such a sweeping generalization is both inaccurate and unnecessary for the proper conduct of a firm and irreconcilable struggle against the revisionist grouping in the USSR and against imperialism. It could also cause endless ideological confusion and pose a

considerable danger in the event of a sudden turn in the international situation.

It would also unnecessarily alienate millions upon millions of working people throughout the world, who know in their bones that all is not lost in the Soviet Union and would passionately defend it against imperialist aggression.

All the more is it necessary to have a clear line of demarcation between the neo-bourgeois restorationist grouping on top and the basic social system of the USSR. The latter has survived as a wholly progressive social development and shows tremendous potential for continued growth. The former can be vanquished as a regressive social phenomenon only by the combined effort of the Soviet people. In no other way can the Soviet Union be regenerated as a healthy socialist state.

U.S. Blocks Quaker Medicine From Canada to Vietnam

How Wall Street Makes A "Good Neighbor" Get Into Line

By MILT SEAMAN

At a time when the Canadian government is questioning U.S. policy in Vietnam, a Wall Street banker turned up in Ottawa to remind them who their boss was.

James S. Rockefeller, Chairman of the First National City Bank and their subsidiary Mercantile Bank of Canada said as much as he dressed down a Canadian legislative committee which is considering a number of amendments to the Canadian Bank Act that would curb U.S. investment and its stranglehold on Canada.

Appearing before the Committee on Finance, Trade, and Economic Affairs in Ottawa last month, Rockefeller assailed a proposal that would limit the assets of any bank more than 25 per cent foreign-owned to twenty times the authorized capital — a limit the Mercantile Bank has already broken.

Rockefeller's arrogant remarks, backed up by a number of stiff protests from the U.S. State Department, and warnings of U.S. retaliation against Canadian bank agencies in the U.S., pointed up how seriously the U.S. looks upon any Canadian resistance to U.S. imperialist policy.

Clearly, the saber rattling is not just a matter of limitation of a few million in profits for the Rockefeller empire.

What is even more fundamental to the U.S., Canadian law and policy must be subordinated to U.S. big business.

This problem was raised recently by Prime Minister Pearson when he spoke before a Canadian television program "The Nation's Business" and then again before the House of Com-

mons.

"Foreign capital (he meant U.S.) is welcome," he said, "but it must be subject to Canadian law only and responsive to Canadian policy!"

Less than two weeks earlier, some members of this same Parliament had raised strong objections to the United States' right to subject Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. drug companies to U.S. laws. They were questioning Washington's order to these companies to stop selling and shipping medical supplies to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front by the Canadian Friends Service, a Quaker group.

It seems that Mr. Somerfield, chief counsel for the U.S. Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control, told Canadian reporters in Washington that foreign (Canadian) subsidiaries of the U.S. are subject to U.S. law and that sending unlicensed exports to North Vietnam is in violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

He even went further, according to these reports, and pressured the Royal Bank of Canada not to honor the checks sent to the Quakers from residents of the U.S.

This writer is reminded by this situation of a similar one in 1963 when he attempted to send medical supplies to Cuba through Canada. The Canadian Railway Express manager said somewhat fearfully, "These packages will have to be shipped through the U.S. anyway, so you might as well take it back yourself. We have to follow their laws not ours."

The Wall Street-Washington view that Canada is just another extension of

their domain — a servant in the household of the Morgans, the Rockefellers, and the DuPonts — is founded on the fantastic amount of Canadian wealth that has passed into their hands.

At the end of 1955, ten billion dollars of Canadian resources had passed into Wall Street's hands, and then continued at the rate of more than a billion dollars each year. A Royal Commission on "Canada's Economic Prospects" stated that the above figure is an estimated "book value" — based more or less on the price of the original investments. They are now worth a great deal more.

In petroleum, gas, autos, mining, smelting, machinery, electronics, synthetic chemicals, the real value has multiplied so rapidly and the profits are so great that American corporations who own these plants have increased production to the level of 60 to 100 per cent of Canada's output in these industries.

In the electronics industry, there is not a significant Canadian-owned company in Canada. Admiral, General Electric, and Westinghouse divide up the market. Canada's huge new chemical industry is almost wholly U.S.-owned and is divided between duPont, Dow, Monsanto, and Standard Oil.

Sometimes the American owners leave the Canadian corporate names unchanged to cover up the take-over. Canada Imperial is really Standard Oil, British American Oil belongs to Gulf, and McCall Frontenac is wholly owned by Texaco. In mining, Aluminium Company of Canada is Mellon, International Nickel of Canada is Morgan-Rockefeller, and the whole industry is

in U.S. hands. Even the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railroad is 86 per cent owned by U.S. interests.

Wall Street looks upon these plants as if they were in Detroit or Pittsburgh — and they restrain any Canadian effort to subject them to Canadian law.

James Coyne, one-time Canadian National Bank Governor, warned graduates of University College in Toronto, that Canada may be taken over by the U.S.A. very soon indeed — before 1970, he said.

The New York Times on Feb. 7 in a moment of truth revealed Canada's colonial status when it stated, "More United States capital is invested here than in any other country, more than \$25 billion in subsidiaries and securities."

Rockefeller's visit and Washington's threats carry with them an implicit warning to Pearson that what took place in 1963 can happen again.

At that time the U.S. was furious over Prime Minister Diefenbaker's huge sales of grain to China and his policy of trade with Cuba as well as his resistance to U.S. financial expansionist policy. Washington flexed some economic muscle and as Richard Starnes said in his column in the then Scripps-Howard chain in May 1963 (a column that was suppressed in Canada):

"Adroit statecraft by the American State Department brought down the bumbling, crypto anti-Yankee government of John Diefenbaker... The American intervention was coldly calculated to do precisely what it did, and it was a brilliant success."

The U.S. is once again flexing its muscles at Canada. Washington is in a frenzy over Canada's effort to resist its rule — particularly on the question of Vietnam.

Whether the U.S. will once again dismiss what they apparently consider their colonial servants in Ottawa remains to be seen.

Latin "Nuclear Ban" Bans Everybody But You Know Who!

MEXICO CITY, Feb. 10 — The U.S. is going through the motions once again to adopt a "nuclear ban treaty" for Latin America designed to intimidate and blackmail the Republic of Cuba. On Feb. 1, the U.S. and its puppet Latin American governments proposed a treaty which would ban all nuclear explosives from all of Latin America except Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Panama Canal (the only areas in Latin America where the U.S. has nuclear weapons!!!).

The U.S. carried this fraudulent treaty further by proposing that the Republic of Cuba respect the treaty in exchange for including the U.S. base in Guantanamo in the treaty.

The net effect of this would be that the U.S., with its bases in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Panama Canal, would be able to build its nuclear stockpiles while Cuba and the rest of Latin America would be prohibited from developing their own nu-

clear weapons. And, to top it off, the U.S. would have the UN administer the treaty!

The Cuban government has, of course, denounced this nuclear blackmail, which would give only the U.S. the "legal" sanction to develop nuclear weapons in the Western Hemisphere.

Today, at a planning meeting in Mexico City, the U.S. received another setback when the Latin American governments decided against the U.S. proposal to ban even the production of peaceful atomic explosives. This surprising development may soon be reversed by U.S. pressure, but it is a sure sign that few have faith in the good will of the U.S. warhawks who monopolize the atom in this hemisphere.

MEXICO CITY, Feb. 13 — A nuclear ban treaty was accepted here today by a preparatory commission

Did You Think You ELECTED The United States Government?

— It was announced in Washington last month that Johnson had appointed 66,289 persons to Government office in 1966 alone.

This raises an interesting question about how the U.S. is really governed.

Its officials are elected, we are told. But it is extremely doubtful if all the elected officers in all the states of the United States combined would come up to the above colossal figure.

It is also extremely doubtful if many of the 75 million voters in the country know or even have heard of the vast majority of Johnson's appointees. Even the employees of the offices and bureaus who get these appointees as their bosses

of 21 Latin American governments. As expected, the treaty was soundly rejected by the U.S., since it included Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the Panama Canal, which contain the U.S. nuclear bases in Latin America.

are seldom acquainted with them beforehand.

True, Johnson himself was elected by the people (after he was carefully groomed and appointed to be a candidate by the powerful big business forces which stage-manage the political conventions of the two major parties). But not one voter in a thousand understands that he is giving up his rights to vote for a whole Government when he raises his hand for a President.

The huge appointed bureaucracy of the Government is of course a vital arm of the capitalist state, as is the Army, the Navy, the police, the courts and the prisons. It is in fact more important in many respects than the elected officials, if only because it is more permanent, more irreversible and can work more unobtrusively and effectively for the big business class it serves.

But this is all the more reason why the masses are not permitted to vote for it.

Oil Barons Ordering Another Coup? CIA Hand Visible as Syria Battles Enemies

Is the U.S. plotting to turn Syria into another Dominican Republic? Is the hand of the CIA presently conducting subversive activities to overthrow the Syrian government?

Israel's top Arab affairs analyst, Eliezer Ben Moshe thinks so. No friend of the present regime, led by Dr. Nureddin Attasi (Secretary General of the ruling Baath Socialist Party), Moshe is certainly no ally of the Syrian government's struggle to free itself from the domination of U.S. imperialism and the oil empire of Rockefeller and company. A New York Post dispatch on January 11 from Tel Aviv said that Ben Moshe "believes American counter intelligence has been trying to topple the Damascus government."

Whether he was referring to the unsuccessful coup of September 1966 to overthrow Dr. Attasi's regime is not clear. However, for such a highly respected Israeli spokesman to make such a statement gives credibility to CIA involvement.

Dr. Ibrahim Makhus, a Syrian Deputy Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs, narrowed this credibility to a certainty in a statement made shortly after the coup attempt when he accused the imperialists of engineering the abortive coup. In an address at the launching of construction work on a Syrian-owned 400-mile oil pipeline, Foreign Minister Makhus pointed an accusing finger at the Iraq Petroleum Company. "The IPC is extremely hostile to the Attasi regime," he said, "which has brought them to task with respect to their transit royalty payments to Syria since 1955!" (Middle East Economic Survey, Sept. 23, 1966)

The IPC is a consortium of oil companies that include Standard Oil of New Jersey and Mobil Oil, both Rockefeller satellites. Syria is in struggle with them over a greater percentage of the lush profits that are extracted from the 900,000 barrels a day that are carried through Syrian pipe lines from the oil fields in Iraq to the Mediterranean port of Baniyas, Syria.

The Syrians have shut off the flow of oil since early December. The IPC would welcome the overthrow of the regime and there is every reason to believe they are spending huge sums of money to bring it about.

On January 4, Syrian authorities

reported they had seized what they called "agents" with large amounts of money crossing over from Jordan into Syria with the mission of overthrowing the Syrian government.

The Syrian spokesman said that this confirmed information that was given to Syria by a Jordanian military officer who had defected. The officer reported that "he had been instructed by the Jordanian Chief of Military Intelligence to supervise a plot to assassinate Syrian leaders...the plot was to be carried out by Syrian army officers who had defected to Jordan in September after an attempt to overthrow the regime failed."

What makes these cloak and dagger attempts to overthrow the Attasi regime reek of a U.S. inspired plot is Washington's own estimation of the present Syrian government.

Thomas F. Brady, Middle East specialist for the New York Times, who obviously is in touch with U.S. authorities for much of his information, reported on Syria's swing to the left on January 16: "A Syrian 'Red Guard' organized by the Marxist Labor Federation purged nationalized banks, insurance companies, and factories of managers who had shown 'vestiges' of bourgeois mentality." Brady, calls the Attasi regime "the hard-line Marxists of the Baath party."

Ben Moshe, previously quoted as believing that the CIA has been trying to topple the Attasi regime, also said at that time that he believes that "Syria could become the region's first 'people's democracy' within 18 months."

It is this estimation of the Attasi regime that makes CIA involvement in a plot to overthrow the government a virtual certainty.

What sort of conferences are taking place now at 30 Rockefeller Plaza, the nerve center of the Standard Oil-Rockefeller empire over this possibility? What sort of consultations are now going on between this office and that loyal servant of oil, Lyndon B. Johnson and his associates in the CIA?

To pose this question is to answer it. They have intervened, they are plotting now, and they will take further steps to safeguard their precious mountains of gold — just as they have done in Indonesia, in the Dominican Republic, and in Vietnam.

South Africa Ship Incident Highlights U.S. Hypocrisy

By NAOMI WERNER

Last week, the U.S. government cancelled all shore leaves for the crew of the carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt, returning from duty off Vietnam, and cut short its scheduled stop-over at Capetown, South Africa.

The cancellation by the racist ruling class in Washington on the grounds of opposition to apartheid is sheer hypocrisy. American investors and industrialists are among the principal beneficiaries and mainstays of the oppressive Vorster regime.

According to Fortune Magazine of December 1966, the list of U.S. companies involved in South Africa "reads like a Who's Who of U.S. enterprise." The market value of U.S. investments in mines and factories in South Africa is over \$1.2 billion. Ford, G.M. and Chrysler produce 60 per cent of all the cars in South Africa. Mobil, Caltex and Shell are the major distributors of oil in that country. Newmont Mining and American Metal Climax are only two of many U.S. companies which exploit the rich resources of

South Africa — uranium, gold, diamonds, copper, timber, etc.

Investment in South Africa is especially profitable for U.S. corporations because of the starvation wages paid to African workers. While a mining company has to pay an American miner \$2.70 or more an hour, the South African Black miner is paid about 10¢ an hour.

Thus, when 40 ruling class representatives in Congress complained that "the visit would appear to condone South Africa's policy of apartheid," it was clear they wished to avoid only the appearance of condoning apartheid.

And in the same sense, the New York Times editorial of Feb. 5 which condemns the carrier's call as unnecessary is not merely an exercise in hypocrisy. It is really an expression of the fear that such a friendly gesture toward South Africa would further inflame all Africans against the racist U.S. government and expose the true nature of U.S.-South African relations, which are characterized by U.S. economic domination and the common exploitation of colonial slave labor.



Through the Magnifying Glass

By John Moore

Brainwashing Johnny

On each school day, Johnny is being brainwashed by the big business educational apparatus. In a quiet but firm soft-sell, which permits no basic disagreement, U.S. teachers, themselves victims of four to five years of intensive brainwashing, use business-produced propaganda organs which aim to mold Johnny into a tool of the U.S. ruling class.

"School approved" newspapers for kids are used in nearly all schools. School authorities push them. Companies publishing them send continuous come-on letters to teachers promising gimmicks and easy to use, ready-made lessons. Johnny is usually commanded to bring in the money to pay for his own indoctrination.

A leader in the field is American Education Publications which puts out the "Weekly Reader" for grade schools.

SCHOOL PROPAGANDA TAKEN OVER BY XEROX

In May 1965, American Educational Publications was taken over by Xerox.

Xerox is a famous fast-growing, money-making company specializing in photocopying equipment. It is based in a suburb of Rochester, N.Y., but it does business all over the U.S. and Canada, and is rapidly expanding throughout Latin America. It already has subsidiaries in Mexico, Costa Rica, Panama, the Bahamas, Venezuela and Peru.

In November 1966, the boss of Xerox, S.M. Linowitz, was made ambassador to the Organization of American States (OAS) — the U.S.-run club which controls its Latin American colonies. Maybe it was a coincidence that the November 9 Weekly Reader (for 5th graders) had a full page map study of Venezuela. However, if so, it was only the first such coincidence where Latin America was first in the thoughts of both the boss of Xerox and the editors of the Weekly Reader.

The December 7 front page is headlined: "Tools for Freedom -- A Helping Hand for Latin America." In this piece Johnny reads: "Thousands (of workers in Latin America) are becoming skilled workmen, thanks to the help of U.S. industries. The tools and machines used by the young men in their schools are gifts from U.S. companies... During this year about 275 U.S. companies have taken part in the program. They have provided over a million dollars worth of tools. Some tools are new and some are secondhand."

WHAT JOHNNY DOESN'T HEAR

Aside from the fact that this means that each of these multi-million dollar companies gave less than \$3,500 apiece — and a part of this in secondhand tools — what Johnny doesn't hear about is that these U.S. companies are bleeding Latin America as they take hundreds of millions of dollars worth of its wealth and that this training of a few Latin American workers is merely to provide skilled workmen that U.S. companies need for further exploitation.

In the January 11 Weekly Reader, a seaway from the Caribbean to the Pacific is proposed as the solution to poverty in Colombia — "trade would increase jobs."

Johnny is not told that it would increase U.S. business profits much more.

WHAT JOHNNY IS TOLD ABOUT PUERTO RICO

In the February 1 edition, Johnny is told of democracy in Puerto Rico — "Puerto Ricans to Vote on Their Future" — the vote to be whether Puerto Rico is to be a "commonwealth," a state, or independent.

How is Johnny to know that this vote is completely bogus and that it has been fittingly compared to Hitler's plebiscites — where the conquered were forced to vote for their conquerors.

In the same February 1 edition, a center spread of pictures and text ("New Age Dawns for a Caribbean Island") makes Puerto Rico seem like a modern utopia.

That Puerto Rico, conquered in 1898 by the U.S., has been exploited and plundered and oppressed since then, will never reach Johnny's ears in his U.S. schoolroom.

LOS ANGELES PROPAGANDA FOR KIDS — FREE

While the Weekly Reader is nationwide, some papers are put out locally by business groups. An example of localized big business propaganda newspapers in schools is "The Student Outlook" put out by the notoriously anti-labor and generally reactionary pro-Reagan, Los Angeles Times. This publication is aimed at older students. It is given out to some 370,000 young readers in Los Angeles and Orange counties (with special orientation sheets for their teachers). It is given out free of charge. The Los Angeles Times considers it worthwhile to spend \$116,000 to propagandize kids in the area.

Outlook, aimed at teen-agers, makes a pretense of being "objective."

For instance, the Jan. 3, 1967 edition takes up the burning issue of the draft. Outlook headlines its articles "Vietnam Reopens Long-Standing Draft Debate" — just an impartial look at this thing. But the article soon makes clear that all to be debated is how to get men for the army and the war with as little squawk as possible. The draft is falsely treated as if it had always been a part of American life — instead of being imposed in peacetime only from the time of World War II.

And what should be done about the draft?

In the midst of the article, a McNamara speech is quoted calling for "all young men to give their country two years of service..."

McNamara's statement is followed by these words by the writer: "This program, labeled Universal Military Training, has long been favored by the public, a recent Gallup Poll indicated. (Seventy per cent of those interviewed voted positively for McNamara's UMT plan.)"

The truth is that in spite of tremendous Pentagon pressure for UMT in the 40's and 50's, there was so much opposition from the public that Congressmen dared not pass it. There is probably more opposition now.

However, after loading the dice for UMT and knocking other proposals, the Outlook article ends up sweetly and innocently: "Do you favor any of the plans mentioned?"

These are just a few samples of the continuous brainwashing devices used on Johnny by the propaganda organs in the schools.