

Long Live Marxism-Leninism!

May Day 1965

MAY DAY 1965 registers many important changes in the relationship of world forces. We note the following developments:

First, the forward motion of the revolution within the Socialist camp.

Second, the smashing down, by the movements of national liberation, of all the barriers put in their way by imperialism and revisionism.

Third, the upswing of the working class movements in the imperialist countries.

The main political ingredient of these developments has been what in fact is the dynamic force of present history, the great upsurge of the forces of Marxism-Leninism.

All of this means that the ascending motion of the revolutionary cycle is in full process.

The two most significant events since May Day 1964 have been the acquisition of the A-bomb by the People's Republic of China and the ouster of Nikita Khrushchev as the king-pin of world modern revisionism.

Referring to the significance of these historical events, the Vanguard of October-November 1964 stated:

"The events of October 15 and 16, 1964, that is, the ousting of Nikita Khrushchov from the Party and State leadership in the Soviet Union, and the explosion of an atomic bomb by People's China, should be considered as inter-related aspects of one single social-historical process. Both incidents express great weaknesses and deep political fissures in American imperialism. Both events represent staggering blows to the American imperialists and to world revisionism."

People's China with the acquisition of the A-bomb broke the U.S. imperialist nuclear monopoly which had been made possible by the treacherous actions of the Soviet revisionists; it put an end to the U.S. policy of nuclear blackmail; it unleashed the full revolutionary potential of the exploited and oppressed people of the world, and spelled out the beginning of the end of the capitalist-imperialist system.

The ouster of Nikita Khrushchov from the Party and State leadership in the Soviet Union dealt a tremendous blow against world revisionism. It is to be observed that despite the great significance of the political exit of Nikita Khrushchov, Moscow still remains as the center of world revisionism.

In the March 23, 1965 statement by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao* (People's Daily) and *Hongqi* (Red Flag) entitled *A Comment On The March Moscow Meeting* the following is stated:

"The number of those believing in Khrushchov revisionism was already dwindling in any case. Now, of course it is even harder to make others believe in Khrushchovism without Khrushchov. Similarly, the number of those obeying Khrushchov's baton was already decreasing. Now, of course it is even harder to make others obey the baton taken over from Khrushchov. The small divisive meeting so painstakingly contrived by the new leaders of the CPSU turned out to be neither fish nor fowl; this not only shows that Khrushchov revisionism without Khrushchov is wrong and bankrupt, it also shows the real importance of the persistent struggle of the Marxist-Leninist Parties and the Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism and against this divisive meeting."

"All the same, we have to thank the new leaders of the CPSU for insisting on calling the divisive meeting. This bad thing can be turned into a good thing. It has helped people quickly to strip the

(continued on page 9)

THE MARXIST-LENINIST

VANGUARD



"Without a Revolutionary Theory

There can be no Revolutionary Practice!"

Published by the Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party in the U.S.A.
Box 137, Planetarium Station, New York City

Vol. VII - Nos. 4-5

267

Price 10 Cents

April-May, 1965

U.S. Imperialists Face Disaster in Viet Nam

After the end of World War II, American imperialism stepped out on a grandiose attempt to expand its power in the colonial and semi-colonial areas of the world.

In line with such predatory schemes, the American imperialists developed the specific foreign policy of "sharing" or "inheriting" those colonial holdings which the European imperialists found difficult or impossible to retain. That was the reason why, long before the decisive defeat of French imperialism at Dienbienphu, on May 8, 1954 the American imperialists had made ready to take over the whole of South Viet Nam.

The Geneva Conference which marked the end of French imperialist hegemony in Indo-China made public its historical Geneva Accord on July 21, 1954.

The participants at the Conference included People's China, the Soviet Union, Cambodia, Laos, Great Britain, France and the United States. With an eye on the prospects for grabbing South Viet Nam and in order to remain free to act in its own interest American imperialism refused to sign the Geneva agreement. On the same day that the Geneva Accord was made public President Eisenhower made public the reasons why the U.S. "could not" sign the agreement. Eisen-

hower's statement read as follows: "The U.S. has not been a belligerent in this war. The primary responsibility for the settlement in Indo-China rested with those nations which participated in the fighting."

That statement put on display the crassest and most hypocritical form of demagoguery.

The Geneva Accord stipulated that two years from the date of the agreement, specifically by July 20, 1956, two things should take place in South Vietnam. One, total withdrawal of French troops from the territory of South Viet Nam (this was carried out) and two, nation-wide elections to be held prior to the reunification of the whole territory of Viet Nam. (This election was sabotaged by the Ngo Dinh Diem regime, under direct orders from the Eisenhower administration.)

Since 1954, the sequences of historical events in South Vietnam shows a specific pattern of development — on the one hand there are the constant attempts by American imperialism to subjugate the Vietnamese people and on the other hand the heroic efforts of the masses of the South Vietnamese people endeavoring to build up resistance and win national liberation.

Initially United States imperialist military intervention in South Vietnam was "modestly" represented by Eisenhower's appointment of a so-called mission to supervise Diem and the rest of the American imperialist stooges. Parallel with this, the SEATO PACT was concocted by Foster Dulles in order to further facilitate American imperialist penetration in Southeast Asia.

At the very beginning of the South Vietnamese "experiment" the American imperialists thought that all that was required to make their new chattels behave was to adopt the policy of utilizing native stooges as their colonial overseers. That policy had been extremely successful to the Yankee imperialists in Latin America for nearly a century. But the policy of relying on South Vietnamese stooges and "strongmen" of the type of Trujillo, Ubico, Batista, Balaunde, Betancourt, Munoz Marin, etc. boomeranged on the American neo-colonialist masters of South Vietnam. Therefore, the Eisenhower administration's early efforts to enslave South Vietnam were based on a simple plan to utilize the Diem regime as an anti-people's satrapy. But American

imperialism did not, and could not, take into account the revolutionary currents prevalent in Southeast Asia at this juncture of history. Deluded by their chauvinistic arrogance they could not even remotely conceive of any possibility of the South Vietnamese people revolting against Quisling Ngo Dinh Diem and least of all, against "mighty, invincible U.S.A."

But it is in fact that very chauvinistic arrogance that causes the American imperialists to become blind to historical reality and makes it impossible for them to perceive the powerful, irresistible revolutionary energies which are thrusting the Vietnamese masses, together with the other peoples of Southeast Asia, into decisive anti-imperialist struggles.

As the Vietnamese people began to create the tools of struggle and to forge the weapons of their freedom the American imperialists were simultaneously forced to escalate their predatory war.

It is instructive to note that South Vietnam's N.F.L. (National Front For Liberation) was officially founded on December 20, 1960, and that this coincided historically with the beginning of J.F.K.'s American imperialist administration.

Thus "humane," "liberal" John F. Kennedy became the "creator" and executor of the criminal Staley-Taylor and McNamara plans of military aggression against the Vietnamese people. Logically, the "advisory set-up" of the Eisenhower period was promptly converted into a small army of imperialist mercenaries. The helicopter corps made their appearance as American imperialist birds of prey in the Vietnamese battle fronts. A full-fledged four-star general was designated to command the American imperialist army of occupation in South Vietnam.

But all to no avail!

Every American imperialist effort, military and political, was decisively defeated by the heroic people of South Vietnam.

**AMERICAN IMPERIALISM
ALREADY DEFEATED
IN VIET NAM**

While the representatives of American imperialism in South Vietnam, from "ambassador" Henry Cabot Lodge to "ambassador" General Maxwell D. Taylor, were sending endless messages filled with "optimism" and "augurs of victory," the South Vietnamese N.F.L. fought valiantly and relentlessly on its way to the victorious liberation of three fourths of South Vietnam's territory.

By the summer of 1964 it be-

(Continued on page 2)

"Communist Spectre"

Haunts West Coast

Lessons of Los Angeles Labor Struggle

The Labor Fronters of the AFL-CIO are growing alarmed by the mounting signs of revolt in the ranks of the members of organized labor in the United States. Every single affiliate local of the trade union internationals in the AFL-CIO is experiencing the shock of the massive, though incipient, stirrings of labor's rank-and-file.

The International Union of Electrical Workers (I.U.E.), the National Maritime Union (N.M.U.) as well as hosts of other unions are being rocked by the open protests of an aroused membership. Growing unemployment and job insecurity, which is rapidly approaching the critical point, is pressuring the rank-and-file of the trade unions into struggle against the bosses and against their own treacherous leadership.

In the NMU, and as a result of the shameless sell-out of Joseph Curran and company to the ship-owners, unemployment has reached explosive proportions. In the Port of New York alone, there are close to 19,000 unemployed seamen representing the Deck, Steward and Engine departments.

At the same time that the millions of the trade union rank-

and-file begin to punch their way out of their escalating miseries, the great masses of unskilled and semi-skilled, unorganized workers, step-up their efforts to attain organized status in the labor movement.

Every city, town and village in the U.S. is witnessing this so far frustrated struggle for organization by thousands of separate groups of unskilled workers in diverse fields of production, in industry and agriculture.

Every attempt by the unorganized masses of workers to join an existing trade union or to establish their own organization has (so far) been beaten down by the concerted actions of the bosses, the government agencies, and the trade union Labor Fronters.

A living example of such

struggles for the organization of the unorganized masses of unskilled and semi-skilled workers recently took place in Los Angeles, California. The immediate struggle in Los Angeles involved one of the most exploited segments of the American working class in that area, the car washers.

These workers, the overwhelming majority of whom are Negroes and Mexican-Americans, work under miserable sweatshop conditions. Their average hourly pay is \$1.15. The average take home pay for the car washers is thirty odd dollars per week. On busy days they are forced to work through the work-day without time off for lunch or for rest.

Some time ago, the Teamsters' Union "organized" some of these car washers, but soon enough dropped them as "too hot to handle." It was under such conditions and circumstances that the Automobile Maintenance Workers' Union, Local No. 1, was formed to fight for the trade union organization of the car washers in Los Angeles.

The AMWU signed hundreds of these workers as members and

(Continued on page 9)

U.S. Imperialists Face Disaster in Viet Nam

(Continued from page 1)

came evident that all the messages of "optimism" were nothing but official concoctions and lies. American imperialism once again faced the terrible alternative of acknowledging defeat and withdrawing its interventionist forces or escalating the war, in the hope that the Vietnamese people and their allies could be cowed into some sort of "negotiations."

This time American imperialism really showed panic and desperation. L. B. Johnson ordered the provocation at the Bay of Tonkin last fall, and later as Commander-in-chief he ordered the bombings of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam as well as giving the go-ahead sign to the use of barbaric chemical warfare.

Where is American imperialism heading? Which side will win the struggle? These and many other questions are being asked all around the world by billions of people who are witnessing the naked criminality of American imperialist aggression in Viet Nam, at the same time that they are observing the amazing spectacle of the thorough thrashing of the U.S. imperialist colossus by the revolutionary masses of Viet Nam.

Referring to the American imperialist war of aggression in Viet Nam, the Sixth POC Conference's Main Report stated: "In Viet Nam their plight (American imperialism) is even more critical. There the fate of American imperialism in Southeast Asia has already been decided. In the near future Viet Nam will become a military, economic and political meat-grinder. The question of who is going to win in Southeast Asia has already been decided by history. The final defeat and the withdrawal of the American imperialist forces has been postponed by the escalation of the war, but the inevitable defeat will also have a more devastating impact on American imperialism." (Vanguard, October-November, 1964)

This estimate of American imperialism's so-called special war in South Vietnam and general aggression in Southeast Asia, has been corroborated by recent history. In economic terms it is currently estimated that the cost of American imperialism's war of aggression in Viet Nam has risen to \$775 million dollars (officially) and to over 1 billion dollars (actually).

Interventionist forces casualties have risen to proportions which the official American imperialist statistics do not dare show. The American imperialist escalation of the war in Viet Nam has resulted in a parallel increase of American casualties. A graphic chart depicting the upward spiral from year to year shows the following:

Year	Number of American Casualties
1961	30
1962	443
1963	982
1964	2,111
1965 (three months)	1,086*

(Hsinhua News Agency April 7, 1965)

Another Hsinhua dispatch from Hanoi dated April 6, 1965 makes the following statement: "The South Viet Nam Liberation Army and guerrillas in the first quarter of this year killed, wounded or captured nearly thirty-five thousand U.S.-puppet troops, including one thousand and eighty-six Americans, according to V.N.A. quoting incomplete figures of the South Viet Nam Liberation press agency.

"During the period the South Viet Namese Liberation forces launched more than three thousand attacks, assaulted various

important enemy strategic communication lines, broke through many strong defence lines, and eliminated or mauled many enemy main forces among which three battalions, fifty companies and seventy-three platoons were completely wiped out and one regiment, eight battalions and dozens of companies were routed. They also razed to the ground one hundred and ten fortresses on the enemy defence lines, downed or damaged two hundred and five enemy planes, sank or damaged 44 gun-boats or warships, destroyed 250 military vehicles including 70 m. 113 amphibious cars and captured over 7,000 guns of various kinds." (Hsinhua, April 6, 1965)

But somebody may object to the source of these statistics and insist that they could be fraudulent. We say, the peoples fighting for national freedom cannot afford to fool themselves.

At any rate, here we present an "objective" observer's report of the dismal and frustrating defeat that American imperialism is experiencing in South Vietnam. James Mossman, reporter for the British magazine *New Statesman*, after a recent visit to Saigon stated the following:

"On returning to Saigon after two years, it was a shock to find that everyone I met told me privately and often publicly that the Americans had lost the war in South Vietnam. . . .

"... in the capital the air smells of defeat. The city is more sordid than ever it was under the former dictator Diem and his swarming relatives.

"... because the Vietnamese army is too small to police the whole country, its tactic is to swoop, strike and pass on, leaving the Vietcong to pop up again behind its back. Naturally the villagers incline to the communists because they are the people most consistently on the spot. Four-fifth of the country is waterlogged in this way and all the might of the seventh fleet, with its floating citadels of steel and its nuclear weapons, is unable to plug the holes. . . .

"When the Americans first arrived, they used to say that they were going to make the Vietnamese army unlearn its French tactics of sitting in strong-points and teach it to get out and fight the enemy in his own backyard. Now they are adopting French tactics themselves by withdrawing to the cities and citadels and leaving the countryside to the enemy. This is the tactics that ended for the French in Dien Bien Phu." (New Statesman)

It is obvious that American imperialism has already been thoroughly defeated in Viet Nam despite all the braggadocio and bluster which is now being displayed by American imperialist spokesmen.

"NEGOTIATIONS" U.S. IMPERIALIST SLOGAN

Consciousness of this fact and the fearsome portent of its impact on U.S. colonial policy is expressed by one of American imperialism's shrewdest and most competent ideologists Walter Lippmann. Here is the way he sees the situation in Viet Nam: "The theory, which was propounded by Gen. Maxwell Taylor when he persuaded President Kennedy to enlarge our intervention, was that with enough arms, more money, and some American military advisers, the South Vietnamese could create an army able to subdue the Viet Cong rebellion. Until a year ago, more or less, this was the theory on which our excellent Secretary of Defense rested his hopes and his plans, and staked his reputation as a political prophet.

"The theory has not worked. Our side has been losing steadily the control of the countryside. It

has failed to win the allegiance of the peasants who are not only the majority of the nation, but are the one and only source of military manpower. Today, the principal highways north and south, east and west, have been cut by the Viet Cong and the cities where our clients are holed up are being supplied by air and by sea. The South Vietnamese Army has not surrendered, but it has so little will to fight and has such a high rate of desertion that we can no longer count on South Vietnamese soldiers even to supply sentries for American air bases and installations.

"The basic character of the war has changed radically since President Johnson inherited it from President Kennedy. It used to be a war of the South Vietnamese assisted by the Americans; it is now becoming an American war very inefficiently assisted by the South Vietnamese. In fact, it would not be much of an exaggeration to say that the South Vietnamese, who have good reasons to be war weary, are tending to sit on the sidelines while we, who have promised to 'win' the war, are allowed to show how we can win it. . . .

"Having staked our prestige on the outcome of the civil war which is being lost in South Vietnam, we may find ourselves with a choice between the devil of defeat in South Vietnam and the deep blue sea of a much wider war in Eastern Asia." (Newsweek, April 12, 1965)

Indeed the future appears bleak for the American imperialists not only in South Vietnam, but in Southeast Asia as a whole, and it is for that reason that Lippmann, shrewd imperialist hound that he is, offers "another choice" to his masters. He ends the above mentioned article by stating: "That choice could perhaps be avoided if we remember in time that when there is no military solution to a conflict, there must be negotiation to end it. In such a situation, only fools will go to the brink and over it." (Ibid)

KICK U.S. IMPERIALISM OUT OF VIET NAM—ONLY REVOLUTIONARY SLOGAN

Clearly, the only salvation for American imperialism out of the Vietnamese vise is to "negotiate." Try to win back at the conference table what is already irretrievably lost on the battlefield. We should note right here that it is precisely the division between the call to "negotiations" and the call to "kick the American imperialists definitely and permanently out of Viet Nam—North and South,"—that distinguishes the revolutionaries from the liberals, the Marxist-Leninists from the revisionists and Trotskyites.

For real Communists and anti-imperialists, the main guideline in determining their policy on the Viet Nam question has to be the acceptance and unconditional support of the position taken by the South Vietnamese N.F.L. (National Front of Liberation) in regard to the war.

On March the 22nd, fully conscious of the criminally aggressive policy of escalation of the "special war" by the American imperialists, the heroic N.F.L. of South Vietnam made public its courageous stand by a statement which included the following significant passage. "The U. S. scheme to send to South Vietnam more combat troops of the navy, ground and air forces of the U.S. and its satellites, to conduct air strikes against North Vietnam and the Kingdom of Laos in an attempt to gain a 'position of strength' and compel the South Vietnam National Liberation Front and the South Vietnamese people to sell out their fatherland in some negotiation with the U.S. is definitely only a day-dream of men politically crazy and militarily adventurist.

"The only way out for the U.S. imperialists is to get out of South Vietnam." (Emphasis Ours, Vanguard Editor)

That statement is unambiguous

Vanguard

Box 137
Planetarium Station
New York City

Box 996 — Chicago 90, Illinois

Box 6604 — Cleveland 1, Ohio

Box 8442 — Philadelphia, Pa.

Box 72112 — Watts Station, Los Angeles 2, Calif.

P.O. Box 3164, Eureka, Calif.

P.O. Box 77452, San Francisco, Calif.

Published by the Provisional Organizing Committee
to Reconstitute the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party
in the U.S.A.

Box 137, Planetarium Station, New York City

Subscription — \$1.00 per year

and categorical. No negotiations that could jeopardize the freedom already obtained in three-fourths of the South Vietnamese territory and which cost so much heroic blood and so many precious lives.

Kick the American imperialists out of Vietnam!

No negotiations with the predatory criminals while their forces remain on Vietnamese territory!

This is the ringing call of the N.F.L. of South Vietnam that is spreading like a revolutionary prairie fire all over Asia, Africa and Latin America.

PEOPLE'S CHINA LEADS THE WORLD IN SUPPORT OF VIET NAM

The powerful voice of People's China thunders its noble response through the pages of the "People's Daily." "Only by throwing the U.S. aggressors out of South Vietnam can there be peace in Vietnam, Indo-China and Asia. Only thus can the peace and security of China be assured. It is therefore the sacred international duty of the Chinese people to aid the Vietnamese people.

"We have already proclaimed that the Chinese people respond resolutely to the statement of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and are ready to send the South Vietnamese people all the necessary aid, including arms and all other war material. In order to wipe out the U.S. aggressors, we are also ready to dispatch our men to fight shoulder-to-shoulder with the South Vietnamese people whenever the latter require us to do so. Our aid to the people of southern Vietnam in their struggle against the U.S. aggressors will go on until the day when the U.S. imperialists are driven out of Vietnam. So long as the U.S. keeps up the fight we will keep up our aid until the Vietnamese people win final victory." (People's Daily, March 29, 1965)

In the name of the people of North Vietnam the Fatherland Front, on April 8th, answered the call in the following manner: "At present in the face of the frenzied aggression carried out by the U.S. aggressors against the South and their attacks on the North, more than ever before, we must fight together with our fellow countrymen in the South to annihilate the U.S. imperialist aggressors and traitors.

"In response to the appeal of the Central Committee of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, our 17 million people in the North pledge their close solidarity with their compatriots in the South in the fight against the common enemy and support with might and main the revolutionary Liberation movement of our compatriots in the South. If to defend North Vietnam is the sacred duty of the South Vietnamese people, to support the South is the sacred duty of the North Vietnamese people. Vietnam is one. The Vietnamese people are one. The U.S. imperialists are committing aggression against our fatherland. It is the duty of all Vietnamese to

fight the enemy for national salvation. That is self-evident. That is an inviolable right of all nations under imperialist aggression.

"Our people are a heroic people. No force on earth can subjugate us. For thousands of years in the past, our people had proved themselves to be an undaunted, indomitable and heroic people and have on many occasions fought resolutely and victoriously against enemies several times stronger.

"Today, history has entrusted us with an extremely heavy but extremely glorious task: to defeat the U.S. imperialist aggressors, the ringleaders and most ferocious of the imperialists, the deadliest of the colonialists, enemy number one of the peoples throughout the world, so as to liberate the country completely and defend our fatherland—an outpost of the Socialist camp, win a great success for the national Liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America and contribute to the defense of peace in Southeast Asia and the world."

Through the Democratic Fatherland Front, on March 27th, the Korean people pledged their adherence to the March 22nd Statement of the South Viet Nam N.F.L. The Korean Fatherland Front statement read: "Just at this time when the U.S. imperialist aggressors are running mad to spread the flames of war, the black claws of the aggressors must be resolutely chopped off.

"Today the South Vietnam people are shedding blood in their heroic battle against U.S. imperialists' aggression not only for their own freedom and liberation but also for the interests of North Vietnam and other Socialist countries and for peace of the whole world.

"The heroic Korean youth and people of all walks of life who demonstrated matchless courage in the fight against the U.S. imperialist aggressors are eagerly asking to go as volunteers directly to aid the fighting South Vietnamese people."

The Laotian people made their pledge of allegiance to the common defense of Viet Nam against the common enemy, American imperialism.

"On behalf of the Laotian people, the Neo Lao Haksat declares its support for the statement issued by the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation on March 22, 1965. It is a forceful statement from a heroic nation now gaining victories over U.S. imperialism—the most ferocious and deadliest common enemy of the Laotian people, the Vietnamese people and all other peoples of the world. . . .

"Should U.S. imperialism venture to start war in this region, the Laotian people, together with the South Vietnamese people, would smash U.S. imperialist aggression to defend the independence, sovereignty, unity, terri-

(Continued on page 3)

U.S. Imperialists Face Disaster in Viet Nam

(Continued from page 2)

torial integrity and peace of the Indo-Chinese countries."

The Indonesian people's fighting reaction to American imperialist stepped-up aggression in Viet Nam, was recorded in the following dispatch from Hsinhua News Agency.

"Djakarta, March 13th — The general chairman of the Indonesian Peace Committee, Mrs. Aminah Hidayat, in a statement yesterday most strongly protested against the use of poison gas by U.S. imperialism against the Vietnamese people in defiance of world wide condemnation.

"She called on the world's peoples to support the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression.

"The Indonesian People's Youth League in a cable to the U.S. government voiced stern protest against its savage air strikes on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the use of poison gas in South Vietnam.

"The cable warned the U.S. authorities that they must stop forthwith their adventurous action in Vietnam.

"Warta Bandung said in an editorial last Friday that the U.S. imperialists had taken the savage action because they could no longer cover up their shameful defeat in South Vietnam.

"The only alternative for the U.S. was to withdraw all its armed forces and stop its intervention, otherwise it would certainly be wiped out, the editorial concluded."

The African peoples through the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization stated on April 8th:

"The people in South Vietnam, as proved by the statement, are resolved to fight to the end until the ousting of the last American aggressor from their soil, so as to liberate South Vietnam completely, defend North Vietnam and reunify their country.

"The AAPSO permanent secretariat 'fully supports the standpoint and spirit of the revolutionary struggle contained in the statement.' It said, 'We hold that the Vietnamese people's struggle against the aggressive American imperialists is the common struggle of the Asian and African peoples, and that the Vietnamese people's victory is our own. In their heroic and fierce struggle, the South Vietnamese people have always relied mainly on their own strength and capacity. However, the Asian and African peoples have a duty to give our Vietnamese brothers and sisters all necessary assistance so as to help accelerate their victory.'"

The workers of Paris, Orleans, Marseilles and other French cities joined the world-wide expressions of solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people. Fifty thousand Italian workers demonstrated against American imperialism in the city of Genoa alone. The Japanese seamen refused to take American imperialist arms destined for South Vietnam. All over the earth the peoples let their voices be heard in support of the Vietnamese fighters.

Speaking with knowledge of the Latin American people's experience, the Mexican daily "El Dia" of Mexico City exults: "The United States had always been in the habit of using armed forces against small countries. But in its aggression against Viet Nam today, all its cannons, marines and air raids, along with poison gas failed to attain its purpose. . . . The U.S. has lost its moral prestige in Viet Nam."

IMPERIALISM CANNOT EXIST WITHOUT EXPLOITATION OF COLONIES

When "El Dia" refers to "loss of moral prestige" it is not talking about some ethical abstrac-

tion. It means that American imperialism's ability to keep colonies and semi-colonies "in line" has been greatly undermined.

Imperialism, and especially American imperialism, cannot exist without the plunder and rape of the colonial areas. Anything that threatens to stop the immense flow of wealth extracted from the colonies and semi-colonies acts in fact, as a blood clot in imperialism's economic and political cardio-vascular system. The American imperialist's fear is not so much for what they have lost in South Vietnam. What they really dread is what some American imperialist spokesmen refer to as the "domino" or chain reaction potential of their defeat in Viet Nam.

It is precisely this type of apprehension which alternately transforms them into raging maniacs threatening the People's Republic of China and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam with nuclear extinction and further escalation of the war, and at the same time puts out innumerable "feelers" for a "negotiated settlement."

These "two sides" of American imperialist policy in Viet Nam are in fact one single side, the aggressive war policy of American imperialism in Southeast Asia.

Frantic with worry and fear American imperialism is mobilizing all its allies to help extricate itself from the dangerous cul-de-sac in Viet Nam.

In far off India, American imperialism's Ambassador Chester Bowles "pleads" with the Asian nations to help create a suitable climate for negotiations. At the same time, in the name of L.B.J., Chester Bowles offers some "available cash" from American imperialism's international "pork barrel," as reported by the New York Times. "New Delhi, April 12 — Ambassador Chester Bowles of the United States called today for an 'affirmative initiative by leading nations of Asia' to find a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam in response to President Johnson's policy statement of last week.

"At a news conference, the ambassador also restated the President's appeal for cooperation with the United Nations Secretary, U Thant, to organize the rehabilitation of Southeast Asia with economic assistance pledged by President Johnson." (N.Y. Times, April 13, 1965)

JOHNSON'S WAR MISSIONS

At the same time the Johnson administration is sending out two "missions" to Asia. One, dispatching American imperialism's "old reliable" Henry Cabot Lodge to begin talks for possible extension of the war in Southeast Asia. Lodge's itinerary includes Japan, Taiwan, Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and South Korea.

The other "mission" is headed by that illustrious representative of the British Labor government, Patrick Gordon Walker. Gordon Walker's "mission" is better understood when it comes straight from the horse's mouth. The Times London dispatch which carried this news item made the "reasons" for the "mission" quite explicit.

Commenting on the rejection of Gordon Walker's "offer" to "visit" Peking and Hanoi, the dispatch stated: ". . . The twin rejections were therefore a keen disappointment here. The news was particularly disappointing because it indicated that North Vietnam now was firmly in the camp of the Chinese.

"The assumption here has been that the best chance of easing the escalating warfare in Vietnam would lie in an independent attitude by Hanoi. . . . British experts have been of the opinion

that the Soviet Union is the best hope for a moderating influence on Hanoi, and an influence toward negotiation." (N.Y. Times, April 13, 1965)

American imperialism is not contented with just a couple of "missions." A third one is in the working. So another avenue and vehicle of American imperialist pressure is being geared to intervene in favor of "negotiations" and "just settlement" — the United Nations, a tool of American imperialist policy and nominally headed by "brown Hammar-skjold" U Thant.

ENTERS THE BROWN HAMMARSKJOLD

The New York Times openly admitted the steps already taken by the Johnson administration in that direction. "The Secretary General, U Thant, began conferences today with Eugene R. Black, retired president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, on President Johnson's proposals for a vast program of economic development in Southeast Asia.

"Mr. Black said he had arranged the meeting at the request of President Johnson to get Mr. Thant's views on the situation.

"Adlai E. Stevenson, chief United States representative, joined in the last 45 minutes of the talks, which lasted two and a half hours. . . .

"Mr. Black said on leaving that Mr. Thant had shown a 'very keen interest' in the President's proposal for a billion-dollar development program to stabilize Southeast Asia but that obviously they were only beginning to scratch the surface of the idea." (N.Y. Times, April 14, 1965)

But the revolutionary forces in Asia are keenly aware of the present tactics of American imperialism. Therefore, the "labor" representative of "his Majesty's loyal opposition" on the aforementioned "special mission" for American imperialism was unceremoniously told to keep himself "the hell away from Peking and Hanoi." Those revolutionary forces are also actively exposing the war plans which are even now being hatched by American imperialism and which "missionary" Henry Cabot Lodge is supposed to supervise for the Johnson administration.

As to the role which the American imperialists have carved out for the U.N. in the critical situation which American imperialism finds itself in Southeast Asia there is no possible equivocation as to where the Southeast Asian peoples stand. "An editorial today in Jenmin Jih Pao, the official organ of the Chinese Communist party, advised U Thant, the United Nations Secretary General, that if he intended to visit China and North Vietnam, he was 'knocking at the wrong door.'"

The United Nations has nothing to do with the Vietnam question, the editorial added. "It is the duty of the countries participating in the (1954) Geneva Conference to safeguard the Geneva agreements and no meddling by the United Nations is called for, nor will it be tolerated." (Toronto Globe and Mail, April 12, 1965)

This certainly makes it absolutely clear that no actions similar to the infamous role that the U.N. played in the Congo (Leopoldville) will be countenanced by the revolutionary forces in Southeast Asia.

But the American imperialists are not counting on their fellow imperialists, on their compradors and agents in the colonies and semi-colonies, on their Labor Front stooges, or on the social democrats and Trotskyites alone to help bail them out of their dangerous position in Southeast Asia.

WORLD REVISIONISM'S COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY CHORES

American imperialism is counting heavily on the Khrushchevite "leadership" of the Soviet Union, on the Titoites and indeed on the

totality of world revisionism to perform their special chore of helping the imperialist counter-revolution in the name of the "revolution."

Every word and every action of the world revisionists is permeated with this treacherous content.

Precisely because the struggle in Viet Nam is so decisive and critical for American imperialism, do the modern revisionists redouble their efforts to pull their American imperialist masters out of the threatening quagmire.

Alexander Kerensky is, without question, an authority on demagoguery and treachery, and when he tells the American imperialists to "trust" Kosygin and company he is offering them some sound advice. Referring to Kosygin's "mission" to North Vietnam, North Korea and People's China, late last February, Kerensky stated: "Kosygin's recent visit to North Vietnam, North Korea and Peking was not to facilitate the possibility of the intervention of China, but the contrary." (New York Times, April 7, 1965)

As soon as the United States imperialists started to step up their military attacks against Viet Nam, the Soviet "leaders" and their Titoite partners, started their filthy campaign for "negotiations" and "political settlement" of the Vietnamese question.

Overtly as well as covertly the revisionists have desperately tried to create an atmosphere of pessimism and fear in the ranks of the Vietnamese people.

They have spewed forth their cowardly bourgeois pacifism and attempted to sell to the peoples of Southeast Asia American imperialism's stale gimmick of the so-called danger of nuclear holocaust and extinction.

Look Magazine of April 20, 1965 carried the record of an interview with some Soviet revisionist "leaders." Here is part of that interview.

"I asked Mme. Ekaterina Fur-tseva, minister of culture, and



James Jackson, National Committee Member, POC

the first and only woman to serve on the Presidium of the Communist party for the entire U.S.S.R. (which was formerly known as the Politburo), how the Soviet Union could ever hope to improve living standards without disarmament. Her answer was long, and I took almost verbatim notes. In part, she said, 'All reasonable people now understand that war means annihilation. The fact is that both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have tremendous forces. If war breaks out, catastrophe is unavoidable. Neither country can stand aside.

"You of the United States like your way of life. Very good. We don't object. We like our life. Thus, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. must find ways to live side by side. Disarmament is the biggest issue of the day between our nations — and by far. If we can progress with disarmament, everything else is easy to solve. All else is subordinate. Cultural matters are easy and relatively insignificant. So, too, with the issues of East Germany and trade.

"Rapprochement with the United States is very important to

us in the U.S.S.R., and it is also important to you. Our revolution is now 47 years old. My country was almost completely destroyed at the end of World War I. I will not even speak of the last war. Our people have a right to a normal, peaceful life.'

"Michael Millionshchikov, vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, readily agreed that higher living standards for the Soviet people are impossible without disarmament. 'Our armament program prevents putting enough of our resources into improvement of living standards for our people,' he said. He, too, spoke of the Soviet people's horror of another war, of their deep desire for peace. 'We of the Soviet Union know what total war is,' Millionshchikov said. 'We know it so well that we are those who most want peace.'

From this defeatist, "peace at all costs" laissez-faire attitude, the Soviet revisionists pass on to the more active role of main advocates and proponents of the U.N.'s "peace-keeping" force. A Hsinhua dispatch of March 28, 1965 exposed the "new" efforts of Brezhnev, Kosygin and company to establish a "legal" anti-national liberation military set-up in the U.N.

IMPERIO-REVISIONIST PLOTTING

Hsinhua's dispatch stated: "During Khrushchov's reign, it may be recalled, the Soviet government had all along favoured the establishment of a 'United Nations force.' In July, 1960, the Soviet representative in the United Nations Security Council voted for the organization of a 'United Nations force' to intervene in the Congo (Leopoldville). In July, 1964, Khrushchov went a step further in circulating a memorandum for the establishment of 'United Nations armed forces'.

"Renewing the proposal put forward by Khrushchov in his memorandum, Fedorenko urged the committee to discuss the question of future U.N. operations in the light of the Soviet government's memorandum concerning measures toward increasing U.N. efficiency in ensuring international peace and security' . . .

"With ulterior motives, Fedorenko in his speech associated the situation in Indo-China with the U.S. 'peace-keeping operations', saying that the committee began its work 'in a characteristic atmosphere created by the U.S. actions in Southeast Asia that are extremely dangerous to the cause of peace.'

"Yugoslav delegate Danilo Lekic then chimed in with Fedorenko. The situation in Vietnam had completely changed the international picture, he alleged. If this continued then it would be increasingly difficult to prevent the conflict from spreading. In view of this situation, he said, the work of the special committee should be accelerated to restore the working capacity of the General Assembly.

"U.S. delegate Francis T. W. Plimpton availed himself of the opportunity to repeat U.S. slanders against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Arguing in gangster's logic, he said that peace would come when Hanoi ended 'its policy of violence and terror' in an effort to destroy the government of South Vietnam." (Hsinhua News Agency, March 28, 1965)

On March the 26th, 1965, Soviet ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, acting on a formal request by the Soviet government, met with Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

A Reuter's dispatch of the same date laid bare the collusion of the Soviet revisionists with the American imperialists on the Vietnamese question. That dispatch stated:

"Diplomatic observers believed, however, that Mr. Dobrynin's call on the Secretary of State probably had more than usual significance. For one thing, it was interpreted as a continuing interest by the Soviet government in probing for a possible peaceful

(Continued on page 4)

U.S. Imperialists Face Disaster in Viet Nam

(Continued from page 3)
settlement of the Vietnamese conflict."

"LINE" OF CPUS REVISIONISTS

The native brand of revisionists keep up a steady propaganda for "peace" and "negotiations" and of course with a heavy coating of white-wash for American imperialist number one, L. B. Johnson.

The organ of the CPUS revisionists, *The Worker* of April 6, in an editorial article on Viet Nam, states:

"The truth of the matter is that Bundy, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and the others now running the dirty war in South Vietnam want to turn it into a military showdown with the forces seeking independence in Southeast Asia and with the socialist countries." (*The Worker*, April 6, 1965)

The Worker of April 11, 1965, in another editorial, states:

"... the President should tell the American people on which side he stands." (*The Worker*, April 11, 1965)

Unable to hide the bloody crimes of America imperialism and its barbaric actions in Viet Nam the 26th Street State Department agents try to shield the "commander-in-chief" of American imperialist interventionist forces as well as to project the only solution that American imperialism finds useful in Viet Nam these days, the solution suggested by Walter Lippmann and by all the apologists of American imperialism.

The same editorial projects the "negotiations" solution in a subtle reference to the "wishes of the American people." The editorial says:

"Most Americans want a cease-fire in Vietnam, negotiations for a peaceful settlement and for the U.S. soldiers to come home to their families." (*Ibid.*)

Now the "line" of the CPUS on the Vietnamese question is complete and the slogans advanced for their May Day "celebration" spell it out — "For Peace in Viet Nam" — "Negotiations must replace escalation!"

"LINE" OF AMERICAN TROTSKYITES

The Trotskyite partners of the 26th Street revisionists, while collaborating quite closely in all "mass activities" on Viet Nam take a "left" position and spew forth their anti-Communist filth in the name of the "defense of Viet Nam." The SWP, the SLP,

and the Spartacist group (the last one an integral part of PLM) constantly bombard the Marxist-Leninist forces behind the facade of a demagogic anti-imperialist position on Viet Nam. The fact is that on the Vietnamese people's struggles the Trotskyites are repeating the same tactics and adopting the same line that they used (quite successfully, it must be said) on the Cuban revolution.

The Trotskyites of the Spartacist group clearly express the chameleon-like character which is so peculiar to Trotskyism.

First they send "congratulations" and "pledges" of adherence to the embattled Vietnamese people as exemplified by a cablegram sent to the DRV Government which they immediately "converted" into a press release.

The cablegram dated February 8, 1965 stated:

"President Ho Chi Minh, Democratic Republic of Viet Nam

Hanoi, North Viet Nam: "Spartacist in fullest solidarity with defense of your country against attack by United States imperialism.

"Heroic struggle of Vietnamese working people furthers the American revolution. Spartacist Editorial Board."

Then the Spartacist Trotskyites proceed to smear the most powerful and decisive force supporting the Vietnamese people's struggles — People's China. The January-February 1965 issue of the Spartacist makes the following statement precisely on the issue of the international relations of peoples:

"The Stalinist policy of Chinese hegemony over non-Chinese nationalities is as much a violation of the right of peoples to self-determination and contradiction of the basic interest of the international proletarian revolution as is the Great-Russian chauvinism of the Kremlin. This is shown most clearly in the cases of Tibet (where Chinese policy resulted in an uprising under reactionary leadership) and of Formosa. Though the Peking bureaucrats use the most violent language to denounce imperialist treaties at the expense of China, they completely endorse the imperialist Cairo agreement (among Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang) which gave Formosa to China. Using this imperialist treaty as a pretext, the Chinese Stalinists refuse to recognize the right of the Formosan workers and peasants to self-determination and reiterate their intention to seize

Formosa by force of arms. The practical effects of this policy are to give political aid to Chiang in his oppression of the Formosan people and to help U.S. imperialism in its policy of isolation and containment of the Chinese revolution."

To the crypto-Trotskyites of the "new Marxist-Leninist Party," Milton Rosen, Mort Scheer and company, this is, of course, compatible with the "defense" of the Vietnamese people.

The Trotskyite Weekly People of the so-called Socialist Workers Party, in their March 13, 1965 issue express their "Marxist-Leninist defense" of the Vietnamese people by stating the following:

"There is a civil war in South Vietnam, but the bureaucratic masters of the so-called 'Communist' world, exploiting the legitimate rebellion of long-oppressed people against their corrupt oppressors, have involved themselves. Vietnam, as we have repeatedly pointed out, is one of the peril points in the world where the imperialisms of the East and West are in dangerous frictional contact."

Marxist-Leninists throughout the world are quite aware of the U.S. imperialists' two-pronged tactic of preparing for greater escalation of the war and a simultaneous pressure for "political settlement" on the Viet Nam question. The Marxist-Leninists are cognizant of the treacherous meaning of the revisionists' call for "negotiations." As comrade D. N. Aidit, chairman of the Communist Party of Indonesia, stated:

"A hue and cry is being made for negotiations on the Vietnam question because U.S. imperialism will be doomed if it is hit there persistently." (*Hsinhua News Agency*, April 7, 1965)

Let the revisionists shout themselves hoarse calling for "negotiations." The revolutionary forces of Southeast Asia and indeed throughout the world will not heed that counter-revolutionary siren song. They will keep on fighting until American imperialism is kicked out of Southeast Asia and beyond.

L.B.J.'s DEMAGOGIC PRONOUNCEMENTS

In the past few weeks the American imperialists, through their chief spokesman, L. B. Johnson, have made a series of demagogic statements endeavoring to hoodwink and confuse the American people and the peoples of the world.

Those official pronouncements attempt to paint U.S. imperialist policies and aims in "democratic," "humanistic" and "philanthropic" colors LBJ's speech at Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965 among a million other

demagogic utterances stated:

"We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. . . ."

"We have no territory there, nor do we seek any. . . we want nothing for ourselves."

COLONIAL ROBBERY—ONLY IMPERIALIST MOTIVE

The most sanguine liberal would take exception to such hypocritical posture. Even "progressive" representative Frank Church (Democrat, Idaho), a member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, admits the robber, imperialist role that the United States plays today. In a recent article in the *Saturday Evening Post* he stated:

"We conquered the Pacific in the Second World War. It is our moat, the broadest on earth, from the Golden Gate to the very shores of China."

That may sound chauvinistic and arrogant, and it is, but at least it reflects the true policy of American imperialism in Asia.

In regards to the "altruistic selflessness" of the American imperialists in Viet Nam it could be said that it really takes a big dose of cynicism and gall to be able to say the things stated by LBJ. But, after all, LBJ, like all American imperialists, does not only show contempt for the intelligence of the peoples of the world, he also believes that the American people are short of intelligence as well as of memory.

At a Governors' conference on August 4, 1953, president Dwight Eisenhower, already licking his chops in greedy imperialist expectancy of grabbing South Vietnam, stated:

"Now let us assume that we lost Indo-China. If Indo-China goes, several things happen right away. The peninsula, the last bit of land hanging on down there, would be scarcely defensible. The tin and tungsten that we so greatly value from that area would cease coming. . . . So when the United States votes \$400,000,000 to help that war, we are not voting a giveaway program. We are voting for the cheapest way that we can to prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the United States of America, our security, our power and ability to get certain things we need from the riches of the Indo-Chinese territory and from Southeast Asia."

Only an idiot or political imbecile could fail to understand that American imperialist policy in Latin America, in Africa or in Asia is based on its predatory colonialist aim of robbing the peoples of their wealth. As brazenly stated by Eisenhower in the preceding quote what the U.S. wants from Southeast Asia is to "get

certain things we need from the riches of the Indo-Chinese territory and from Southeast Asia." That was, is and remains the policy and the socio-political motive of American imperialism. There is not, nor could there be any other motive. It is also clear that what Rep. Frank Church calls "our moat," is but American imperialism's "mare nostrum" an integral part of the American capitalist empire.

But as the Roman slave empire with its mare nostrum was obliterated by history, the same historical fate is inevitable for capitalist-imperialism including American imperialism.

HISTORY TEACHES ALL "CONQUERORS" ARE FINALLY DEFEATED BY THE "CONQUERED"

Describing the great conquests made by Emperor Trajan in the beginning of the second century a.d., Edward Gibbon the English historian states:

"He descended the river Tigris in triumph, from the mountains of Armenia to the Persian Gulf. He enjoyed the honour of being the first, as he was the last, of the Roman generals, who sever navigated that remote sea. His fleets ravaged the coasts of Arabia; and Trajan vainly flattered himself that he was approaching the confines of India. Every day the astonished Senate received the intelligence of new names and new nations, that acknowledged his sway. They were informed that the Kings of Bosphorus, Colchos, Iberia, Albania, Osroene, and even the Parthian monarch himself, had accepted their diadems from the hands of the emperor; that the independent tribes of the Median and Carduchian hills had implored his protection; and that the rich countries of Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria, were reduced into the state of provinces."

The Trajan conquests marked the highest point of the "power that was Rome." 250 years later the Roman empire was practically in its last gasps. Today, history develops at the pace of the advanced industrial societies that exist in the present world. And what took centuries then, today occurs in a matter of a few years.

One thing is certain that the Trajan conquests represented the very beginning of the sharp antagonisms between the conqueror Romans and the hordes of oppressed "barbarians," which culminated in the final collapse of the Roman slave empire.

The "barbarians" of the present moment of history the Latin Americans, the Africans, and the Asians have begun their drive towards the total destruction of their enslavers, the imperialists headed by American imperialism.

Southeast Asia is leading the liberating "hordes."

Economics of "Great Society"

(Continued from Feb.-March, 1965 issue of Vanguard)

"We are convinced that the Soviets are eager to encourage American investments, said Elliott Haynes, executive vice-president of Business International, a trade group that sponsored the Russian trip." (*Newsweek*, January 18, 1965.)

Right from the horse's mouth! Right there you have in all its treacherous nakedness the "theory" of "victory by economic competition" of the modern revisionists.

WHO FEEDS THE "WELL FED AMERICAN"?

Another form of "U.S. affluence" is the projection of the fraudulent image of the "well fed American." The U.S. imperialists claim to be able to feed all of the American people and indeed the whole world with its "farm surpluses." As the *New York Times* explains it — "An affluent and growing United

States consumed more food last year than ever before.

"When all figures are in it is expected that the total value will hit \$84 billion, an increase of \$2 billion over 1963. Ten years ago it was \$60 billion.

"Consumers had the choice of 8,000 items on grocers' shelves, compared with about 1,500 about 20 years ago. Two-thirds of these products are new or have been basically improved within the last decade." (*New York Times*, January 11, 1965)

The American imperialist "economists" and other assorted apologists of their system, tacitly ignore the effect of the \$70 billion invested in foreign markets. (The bulk of which is represented in colonial and semi-colonial investments.)

They very conveniently forget American imperialism's "favorable balance of trade." This simply means that the bulk of co-

lonial and semi-colonial production (including food products) finds its way to the U.S.A.

The American imperialist economy able to feed the world? Baloney! The sycophants of U.S. imperialism claim that this "abundance" is the creation of their great capitalist "farming." In fact they claim that the only thing wrong with U.S. agriculture is that it is over-productive.

"Farm production has outrun effective demand. Three decades of farm programs designed to control production and support prices have not put agriculture on a solid basis. The annual bill for federal price supports, crop storage and surplus disposal runs to \$4 billion — a total the Johnson administration views with much concern." (*Christian Science Monitor*, January 6, 1965)

What is the real state of affairs in regard to U.S. agricul-

ture? As is the case in American imperialist production in general the main trend in agriculture is toward concentration of capital and production. This trend toward concentration in agriculture was described by the *Christian Science Monitor* as follows: ". . . less than a million farms in this country sell more than \$10,000 worth of products annually. These efficient farms make up only 27 percent of the total number of farms. Yet they market nearly four-fifth of the total product." (*Ibid.*)

Spokesmen for the American monopolies candidly admit that the main reason for the policy of "price-supports" to American agriculture is to enrich not this 27% but a very small percentage of monopoly corporations, who dominate farm production. It is for this reason that despite all the "threats" to "free the market," the level of Federal spending on agriculture remains unchanged. As the *New York Times* states: "Year-end indications were that net farm income would be approximately the same for 1964 as for 1963, about \$12.4 billion, despite lower income in some crop groups, notably wheat. Gross farm income continued its

steady rise, moving up another \$100 million in 1964 to a peak of \$41.9 billion. Farm expenses climbed in parallel to \$29.3 billion, likewise an increase of \$100 million.

"Included in the gross farm income figure is \$2.2 billion in Federal money." (*New York Times*, January 27, 1965)

Continued government support for agriculture has resulted in great profits being reaped by the large packing and processing plants.

With this high degree of concentration there has come into being the most representative type of agricultural producer in the U.S.A., the colonial laborer.

Thus the Mexican "braceros" in the West and Southwest, the Negro and Puerto Rican migratory workers in the East and the Negro sharecroppers in the South represent an extension of neo-colonialist exploitation within the U.S.A.

In the same way as American imperialism robs the mineral wealth of the colonies and semi-colonies, so does it take away their food products. The U.S., not Brazil, Costa Rica or Colom-

(Continued on page 5)

"Malaysia"

Background Material

(The following article was submitted by "China Features" for the exclusive use of the MARXIST-LENINIST VANGUARD. The article clearly exposes the role of American imperialism in the so-called Malaysian problem. "Malaysia" is nothing but a neo-colonialist scheme of American and British imperialism. Sub-head ours. ED.)

By Ho Bien

The "Federation of Malaysia", a joint creation of the British and U.S. imperialists, is an instrument for suppressing the revolutionary movements of the peoples of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah. It is a military base posing a direct threat to Indonesia — a springboard for aggression in Southeast Asia.

By imposing "Malaysia" on the peoples of these areas, Britain has switched to the tactics of "combine and rule" where its tactics of "divide and rule" no longer worked. This was tried out by Britain in Africa, when the Central African Federation forcibly incorporated Zambia, Malawi and Zimbabwe. But it failed there because of the strong opposition of the people, who forced the artificial "Federation" to be dissolved.

From the beginning, U.S. imperialism has been actively involved in the creation of "Malaysia."

Before the "Federation of Malaysia" was rigged up, the U.S. imperialists pretended to support the desire of the people of these territories for "national self-determination" and dispatched a so-called UN team under Laurence Michelmore, an American, to Sabah and Sarawak to conduct a spurious "investigation." Refusing to allow observers from Indonesia and the Philippines to participate, this team ran the whole show.

Despite Britain's attempt firmly to control and intimidate the local people, by sending aircraft carriers, warships, helicopters, troops and police, during the "investigation," many mass demonstrations against the neo-colonialist "Malaysia" project took place. In Sarawak 22 trade union organizations submitted a joint memorandum to the "UN team" expressing their solid opposition.

However, the "UN team," disregarding all facts, reported on September 14, 1963, that it had found "little evidence of articulate and organized opposition to the ('Malaysian') Federation."

In the guise of the "Federation of Malaysia," British imperialism has continued its military occupation of Singapore and Malaya. Through the "Malaysia" agreement, it has extended the 1957 British-Malayan "defence and mutual assistance agreement" to cover all the "Malaysian" territories and place them under military occupation. Britain's plan, following the establishment of "Malaysia," with its base in Singapore as the centre, is to forge a chain of military bases in Malaya, Sarawak and Sabah, to link it with the two SEATO member countries, the Philippines and Australia, and thus to encircle Indonesia and Southeast Asia and suppress the national-independence movement in these regions.

Headed by the Rahman-Razak clique, the government of the "Federation of Malaysia" is carrying out the colonialist policies of Britain. Hand in glove with the reactionary Thai authorities, it is trying to wipe out the national - liberation armed forces on the Malayan-Thai border. "Malaysia's" foreign policy follows the United States. It helps train troops of the reactionary cliques of south Vietnam and Laos in "jungle warfare" on its own territory, and openly violates the Geneva agreements by sending strategic war material, troops and warships to south Vietnam. In international affairs Rahman has zealously served the United States and the

Indian reactionaries in Washington's plot to create "two Chinas" and on the Sino-Indian border question.

U.S. IMPERIALIST STAKE IN "MALAYSIA"

Johnson has greatly increased U.S. support to "Malaysia" to oppose Indonesia. Last July, he announced the sending of military aid to "Malaysia." In November, a U.S. military mission arrived in Kuala Lumpur to discuss concretely the matter of giving military aid to "Malaysia," helping to train its armed forces, etc. At the same time the United States used the UN Security Council to discuss the false "Malaysian" "complaint" against Indonesian "aggression." Recently, Washington shoved "Malaysia" into the

Security Council as a non-permanent member. Such flagrant provocations and hostile actions sparked Indonesia's decision to quit the UN.

In supporting the creation of "Malaysia," the United States has an eye on its rich resources.

The First U.S. National City Bank of New York said, in a special brochure, that the formation of "Malaysia" had brought great opportunities to the U.S. The present market in "Malaysia," it went on, was more than half as large again as that of Malaya and about four times that of Singapore in the past. It noted that the pivotal position of Singapore was of particular importance and was an ideal base for regional business. The brochure urged U.S. capital to extend

its economic expansion to Sabah and Sarawak.

During his visit to Kuala Lumpur last year, David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, said that the existence of a branch of his bank in Singapore, which was to be set up within a month, could encourage U.S. investment in "Malaysia." Tengku Abdul Rahman, prime minister of "Malaysia" revealed in a speech last March, at the opening ceremony of an oil refinery of the U.S. Standard Vacuum Oil Company, that foreign investments in the "newly rising industries" in Malaya had reached 620 million Malayan dollars, with the U.S. as the biggest foreign investor. Eleven U.S. companies are enjoying the preferential treatment.



Indonesians demonstrating against the U.S. — British concocted "Malaysia" — a product of neo-colonialism.

Economics of "Great Society"

(Continued from page 4)

bia, consumes the Latin American coffee crops; Central American bananas and other tropical fruits are mainly consumed in the U.S., not in Costa Rica, Honduras or Nicaragua; Puerto Rican, Peruvian, Cuban, Haitian, Mexican, etc., sugars are not consumed in those countries, but are exported to the United States.

In the same way as the European "high dietary standards" rest squarely on the starvation standards of the Afro-Asian colonial producers, in the same way America's "high level of food consumption" is propped against the hunger of the Latin American toilers.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM DRAGS LATIN AMERICA INTO THE "GREAT SOCIETY"

The most basic and decisive aspect of the U.S. economy is represented by its relations to the colonial and semi-colonial areas of the world. There is a constant outflow of wealth toward the imperialist metropolis of America and Europe from the colonies and semi-colonies. In order to keep that outflow of colonial booty constantly moving, the U.S. imperialists attempt to establish "mutually beneficial" trade relations with the "underdeveloped" nations of the world. Thus, the "generous" American imperialists offer the colonial

chattels a share in its "Great Society."

A servile sycophant of U.S. imperialism, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, chairman of the Inter-Committee for the Alliance for Progress, echoed this "aim" at a "Doing Business In Latin America" seminar in Philadelphia at the plush Bellevue-Stratford Hotel recently: "He said that trade between Latin America and the U.S. as well as the rest of the world is necessary for waging the same kind of war on poverty that the American people are carrying on within their own borders." (Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, February 4, 1965)

Let us examine the concrete effects of this U.S. "mutually beneficial trade" with the nations of Latin America. The so-called Central American "Common Market" which was set up in August 1961 under the direct tutelage of the late John Kennedy is a key example. This "market" includes the nations of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

The degree of the economic dependency on American imperialism by these Central American nations is made quite explicit by the New York Times when it stated: "In recent years Central American countries have been importing more goods than they have been exporting. This imbalance, which is expected to grow worse, is partly from eco-

nomie growth. As the countries increase manufacturing facilities for consumer goods, they are faced with the necessity of importing more machinery with which to produce more consumer goods." (New York Times, January 4, 1965)

Thus we see that the "Common Market" of Central America in reality serves no other purpose than to further nail that region's economic dependency to American imperialism. This was admitted in a rather blunt fashion by U.S. News & World Report on January 18, 1965 when it stated: "Central America is being rated more and more attractive as an area for investment by U.S. firms. Key reason: The new Central American Common Market means that a new plant can produce for a regional market of 12 million persons, instead of one million to four million in one nation."

"Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador make up this quintet. Since the region lacks most of the modern conveniences, any gain in living standards stirs a new large demand for manufactured goods."

"To bring in additional capital, the Committee for Economic Development, a U.S. research group, is suggesting not just national drives, but a regional investment program." (U.S. News & World Report, January 18, 1965)

And even the more "tactful" New York Times revealed that "The five countries have a combined population of about 11 million. The value of the annual output is about \$2.5 billion. . ." (New York Times, January 12, 1965)

Referring to another American imperialist "colonial office," the Latin American Free Trade Zone, which includes Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Colombia, Mexico, Ecuador, Peru and Chile the same issue of the New York Times went on to describe American imperialist policies in the following manner: "These aims are staggering. They are to build in a continent whose raw materials flow out to the U.S. and Europe and return as manufactured goods, a vast economic unit whose industries will consume its raw materials and whose products will supply a continental market." (Ibid)

American imperialism has had no need to impose neo-colonialist relations on Latin America since, historically speaking, American imperialism developed and tested these policies in that area. That is why some Africans refer to American neo-colonialist policies as the "Latin Americanization of Africa."

But the increased dependency of the Latin American nations on Yankee imperialism is quite evident. For instance, Brazil, a member of the Latin American LAFTA, recently signed a pact guaranteeing safety of private foreign investments. Steps are being taken to secure a similar pact in Peru. The chief of the private investment division of the agency for International Development, described these Dra-

conian agreements in the following terms. "Such pacts include guarantees against expropriation or confiscation of property owned by foreign investors or businesses against loss due to blocked foreign currencies and against damage from war."

"Mr. Carter said the U.S. had pacts with 61 countries and the rate of applications indicates American businessmen are giving increasing priority to such coverage." (U.S. News and World Report, January 18, 1965)

Venezuela is another area of vastly increased U.S. monopoly penetration. "Venezuela has one of the highest rates of United States investment in Latin America and, indeed, in the world. In 1959, the total amount of U.S. private investment in the country was \$4,114,805,900. In the 1963 statistical index, only four years later, this figure had increased to \$4,537,313,000. (These estimates are based on the ratio of Bs. 3.35 for one U.S. dollar.) . . ."

"The same statistical analysis shows a decline in the investment in mining, construction and services. Mining fell from \$3,840,000 to \$2,797,910 and commerce from \$160,149,200 to \$159,337,310. Construction, that had been \$32,805,900 was four years later \$30,477,600. . ."

"The U.S., which is Venezuela's largest source of imports, had 54 per cent of the nation's total imports, amounting to \$523 million in 1963. In the increased demand for U.S. capital goods, this figure will undoubtedly expand. . ." (Ibid)

Apace with its industrial penetration the representatives of American banking capital are showing that they already control the banking concerns of Latin America. Thus the Latin American banking firms are rapidly becoming simple appendages of the U.S. banks. The Chase Manhattan Bank of N. Y. C. (Rockefeller) announced its financial control of Peru's banks by stating:

"To better serve its many American and overseas customers, Chase Manhattan is now associated with Banco Continental, Lima, Peru. This significant step has been taken to keep pace with the growing need for international banking services."

"One of Peru's most dynamic banks, Banco Continental, is based at Jiron Lampa 535 in the capital city, Lima. It has 37 other offices located within the greater Lima-Callao area, and ranks high among all Peruvian commercial banks."

"In keeping with Chase Manhattan's international banking traditions of working with local banks, the new relationship provides many advantages for people doing business in South America."

"Briefly, putting Chase Manhattan's commercial and international banking know-how together with Banco Continental's local facilities, creates an organization which can extend superior service to both Chase Manhattan and Banco Continental (Continued on page 11)

Khrushchevites Still at the Helm Of Warsaw Treaty Organization

The following press release from the People's Republic of Albania represents important documents in the struggle against modern revisionism. It exposes the treacherous policies of the Soviet revisionists which endanger the security of the Socialist camp — not only by undermining the security of the People's Republic of Albania but the security of the German Democratic Republic as well as all the member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Furthermore, for those naive people who believe that the crimes committed by the Soviet revisionists were the product of one person — Nikita Khrushchev — and not the product of revisionist policies, these documents expose the fact that Brezhnev, Kosygin and company are continuators of these revisionist policies. These documents also reveal the continued subservience of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization to the counter-revolutionary policies of the Soviet revisionists. It clearly proves that the Polish "authorities" merely carry out orders from Kosygin, Brezhnev and company and did not dare act upon the legitimate claims made by the People's Republic of Albania on the reactionary actions of Soviet revisionists and the dangerous situation in which the Warsaw Treaty Organization finds itself today.)

Documents in connection with the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty held January 19 to 20, 1965.

I. The invitation of the Government of the People's Republic of Poland to the People's Republic of Albania to take part in the meeting.

On January 5, 1965, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Poland, acting under the instructions of its Government, sent to the Embassy of the People's Republic of Albania in Warsaw to transmit to the Government of Albania, its No. GM-022-1-65 which states among other things:

"In connection with the feverish plans of certain states of NATO to set up a multilateral nuclear force and the danger of thus paving the way for the West German militarists to possess nuclear weapons, it is proposed that this problem be discussed in its entirety by the member states of the Warsaw Treaty and that a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee be called for this purpose, proposing Warsaw as the meeting place.

"The object of the proceedings of the Political Consultative Committee will be 'The stand of the Member states of the Warsaw Treaty toward plans to set up a multilateral nuclear force.'

II. The reply of the Government of the People's Republic of Albania to the Government of the People's Republic of Poland in connection with their invitation to the People's Republic of Albania to take part in the January 19, 1965 meeting.

"No. 101.

"The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Albania presents its respects to the Embassy of the People's Republic of Poland in Tirana and, upon instructions from its Government, has the honor to submit the following with the request that it be transmitted to the Government of the People's Republic of Poland:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Albania received Note No. GM-022-1-65, dated January 5, 1965, through which the Government of the People's Republic of Poland, in its capacity as the country in which the meeting will take place, invites the People's Republic of Albania to take part in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty which will be held in Warsaw on January 19, 1965.

"The Government of the People's Republic of Albania, unable to respond positively to the invitation in question for reasons the Government of the People's Republic of Poland is well aware

"The meeting will open at Warsaw on January 19, 1965.

"In connection with this, the Government of the People's Republic of Poland, as the Government of the country where the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee will take place, invites the People's Republic of Albania to take part in the meeting of the Committee.

"In principle, the proceedings of the Committee are envisaged to be conducted on the level of First Secretaries of Central Committees and of Chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of the member states of the Treaty, with the participation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Ministers of Defense.

"Requesting that the above be transmitted to the Government of the People's Republic of Albania as soon as possible and hoping for a positive reply, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs takes this occasion to repeat the assurance of its consideration to the Embassy of the People's Republic of Albania."

of, and which are re-emphasized in the accompanying document, conveys to the Government of the People's Republic of Poland, in its capacity as the Government of the country where the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee will take place, the letter which it addresses to the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty which will be held in Warsaw on January 19, 1965, with the request that this letter be handed to the plenary session of the Political Consultative Committee, so that it may be read and considered by it.

"The Government of the People's Republic of Albania reserves the right to make public the views expressed in this letter at the moment and by the means it will consider appropriate and necessary.

"The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Albania conveys the assurances of its consideration to the Embassy of the People's Republic of Poland.

"Tirana, January 15, 1965."

To the meeting of the Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty.

WARSAW

Comrades: The Government of the People's Republic of Albania received the note of January 5, 1965, whereby the Government of the People's Republic of Poland, as the government of the country in which the meeting is going to take place, invites the People's Republic of Albania to take part in the Meeting of the Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty to be held in Warsaw on January 19, 1965.

Relative to this question, the Government of the People's Republic of Albania deems it necessary to make known its attitude:

1. The Warsaw Treaty was created to guarantee the security of the Socialist States, members of the safeguarding of peace in Europe against any aggression on the part of the imperialists and of their North Atlantic military bloc. It was created "for the further promotion of friendship, collaboration and mutual aid in keeping with the principles of the observance of the independence and of the sovereignty of States, as well as the non-interference in their internal affairs." The provisions of that alliance have given expression to the lofty principles of equality and reciprocal respect, of international solidarity and of the rights and duties of the signatory countries.

The People's Republic of Albania, a signatory country of the Warsaw Treaty, has been and is a member of that Treaty, possessing equal, complete and inviolable rights and it has always honorably carried out its obligations within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty.

However, by their attitudes and practical actions, the governments of the other signatory countries have allowed the government of the Soviet Union, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, to encroach upon the lofty principles and norms of the Warsaw Treaty as well as upon its fundamental provisions, and to divest the latter of its power as an important international instrument in the interest of Socialism and peace. In an exceptionally arbitrary and crass manner they have systematically and deliberately violated the principles and provisions of the Warsaw Treaty in connection with the People's Republic of Albania. These principles and norms have been denied and violated on no political, moral or juridical grounds whatsoever. As a member nation of the Warsaw Treaty the People's Republic of Albania is entitled to equal and sovereign rights.

The Albanian government, through numerous official declarations and documents has maintained a firm attitude and has vigorously protested to the governments of the States included in the Warsaw Treaty the endless number of hostile acts that have been carried out during the last four years against the People's Republic of Albania. The Albanian government deems it necessary to briefly recapitulate some of these acts:

1. Dating back to the year 1961, the Soviet government, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, in an arbitrary and unlawful manner has de facto excluded the People's Republic of Albania from the Warsaw Treaty. This arbitrary policy has created serious difficulties for the People's Republic of Albania. These actions have been called forth because the People's Republic of Albania

has remained faithful to the Marxist-Leninist principles underlying the Warsaw Treaty and because the People's Republic of Albania has not submitted to the anti-Marxist line and to the chauvinistic great power dictate of the Soviet leadership headed by Nikita Khrushchev.

By arbitrarily excluding the People's Republic of Albania and by acting contrary to all provisions and spirit of the Treaty, the governments of the other States included in the Warsaw Treaty, have held numerous meetings at diverse levels, official, public, and private, military and political. At these meetings unlawful decisions, not conforming to rule, have been made against the People's Republic of Albania.

2. The other member countries of the Warsaw Treaty are held responsible for having allowed the Soviet government, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, to commit exceptionally hostile acts against the People's Republic of Albania, a Socialist State, a bonafide member on an equal footing of the Warsaw Treaty.

It is necessary to mention some of these actions since they are an integral part of the activities of the Warsaw Treaty. These ideological disputes and other anti-Albanian activities of the Soviet government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, both headed by Nikita Khrushchev, have been raised and will continue to be raised by the Albanian side until they have been given the correct Marxist-Leninist solution.

a) The government of the Soviet Union arbitrarily tore up the existing bilateral agreements on the commitments it had assumed in the spirit of the provisions of the Warsaw Treaty for the equipping of the Albanian army and for the defense of the People's Republic of Albania. The Soviet government cut off all armaments and supplies for the Albanian army; robbed Albania of eight submarines which were the property of the Albanian State as well as the Albanian warships which were being repaired at the Soviet port of Sebastopol. The Soviet government thus weakened the defense potential of Albania and of the Socialist camp, and aroused the ambitions of the American imperialists, of the Greek monarch-fascists, of the Italian reactionaries and of the Titoite renegades and plotters against Albania. Faced with this situation, the Albanian government was compelled to tax the economy of the country to the utmost in order to strengthen the defense of the Fatherland and the frontiers of the Socialist camp in this sector.

b) The Soviet government one-sidedly broke all relations; completely annulled all the credits granted to the People's Republic of Albania by the regular agreements for the period of years from 1959 to 1965; broke and annulled all the agreements regularly concluded between the two countries; recalled all the Soviet specialists from Albania; totally suspended every collaboration and every economic, commercial, technical-scientific and cultural relation by disregarding, among others, article 8 of the Warsaw Treaty which makes it compulsory on the part of signatory parties "to further develop and promote economic and cultural relations."

On April 26, 1961, in the letter signed by the present Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Kosy-

gin, the Soviet government notified the People's Republic of Albania, that the Soviet government had renounced "the former principles of mutual ties in all fields of political, economic and military cooperation." It organized an economic, political and military blockade against Socialist Albania and carried on diverse hostile actions against it. (Emphasis ours, Vanguard Ed.)

c) The Soviet leadership, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, from the rostrum of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union advised the Albanian people to launch a counter-revolution against the Party of Labor of Albania and the Albanian government. They have openly advocated the forcible removal of the leaders of the Party and of the Albanian State. They slandered the Albanian leaders by referring to them as "agents of imperialism."

d) These unprecedented hostile activities reached their climax, by trampling upon not only the Warsaw Treaty, but also upon every principle and every norm governing relations among Socialist States. With diabolic ends in mind, in December 1961, the government of the Soviet Union shamelessly broke off diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania.

e) The Albanian government accuses the Soviet government of its many overt and concealed acts committed during the last few years against an allied Socialist country, member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, as is the People's Republic of Albania. The other States, included in the Warsaw Treaty Organization, are informed of the aforementioned facts. These countries, likewise, are not ignorant of the fact that the Soviet government, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, has openly supplied with armaments the Yugoslav Titoite group which is a recognized agency of American imperialism and which has constantly plotted and is plotting to do away with the People's Republic of Albania and to reduce it to the status of a Yugoslav province. Nor are they ignorant of the fact that the Indian reactionaries who attacked the Socialist People's Republic of China and who are jailing and torturing Indian Communists are openly supplied by the Soviet Government with large quantities of the most modern armaments. How could it be possible that the aggressors against a Socialist country, and the persecutors of Communists, are not only called friends and faithful allies of a Socialist state, but are also helped with all available means? This clearly exposes how the Soviet leaders express solidarity with the Indian reactionary bourgeoisie and with its agent, Dange, in its aggressive designs against a fraternal country as is Socialist China and in its persecution of the Indian revolutionary Marxist-Leninists.

Such acts are not in keeping with the principles and aims of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and with the internationalist basis of the relations that should exist among Socialist States. The Socialist States that are included in the Warsaw Treaty Organization must not permit, but must condemn, such monstrous acts, which even if they are not committed in the name of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, yet they are committed by a member country of that Organization.

These unlawful and inimical acts systematically committed during a period of four years by the Soviet government, which are contrary to the provisions of the Warsaw Treaty and to the principles governing relations between Socialist States, have seriously violated the sovereignty, the rights and lofty interests of the People's Republic of Albania as a Socialist country and as a member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The Soviet govern-

(Continued on page 7)

Khrushchevites Still at the Helm Of Warsaw Treaty Organization

(Continued from page 6)

ment has created within the Warsaw Treaty Organization, a situation for Albania which is one of inequality and of intolerable discrimination.

It should be stressed that the invitation sent to the Albanian Government to attend the meeting of the Consultative Political Committee to be held on January 19, 1965, is not only contrary to the rules of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, but is also a discriminatory act committed against the People's Republic of Albania. The Albanian Government appreciates the concern of the government of the People's Republic of Poland in undertaking the task of sending the invitation and of notifying the Albanian Government of the question proposed for discussion at that meeting. However, rules and justice require that the People's Republic of Albania, a member State possessing equal rights in the Warsaw Treaty Organization, cannot merely be informed of a decision arrived at by the other member governments without its approval. The president of the Warsaw Treaty Organization should have had prior consultation with the Albanian government with reference to the proposal for calling the meeting, as well as the agenda, the date and place of the meeting, and the rank of the representatives. The president himself should have sent the invitation.

The fact that the Albanian government is now being sent an invitation to attend the meeting of the Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization totally ignores the situation, created within the Warsaw Treaty Organization, against the People's Republic of Albania. It is as if nothing had taken place — that with reference to the lawful rights of a sovereign Socialist country anyone can act according to his own dictates. This attitude can only be regarded by the Albanian government as an attempt to ignore the aforementioned anti-Albanian acts.

Under these circumstances, and since there does not exist within the Warsaw Treaty Organization conditions of equality and respect for the sovereign rights of the People's Republic of Albania as a member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, it is impossible for the Albanian government to take part in the meeting of the Consultative Political Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization scheduled to be held in Warsaw on January 19, 1965.

II. The participation of the People's Republic of Albania at the meetings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization becomes possible only when, on the basis of the provisions of the Treaty and of the norms governing relations among Socialist States, it is guaranteed the justice and equality given to other member States, when it is guaranteed its sovereign rights, freedom of speech and action within the Treaty Organization which, as has already been stated, have been arbitrarily violated and denied. In order that the Albanian government can take part in the meetings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization; in order that it can take its lawful place in it; that it can be respected as a member possessing equal rights, and so that there shall be no repetition in the future of the former serious errors, the following lawful demands must be fully met:

1. There must be recognition and condemnation of all the arbitrary violations of the provisions and of the spirit of the Warsaw Treaty, as well as the illegal and hostile acts committed by the Soviet government

against the People's Republic of Albania within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty Organization with the object of restoring and guaranteeing the lawful and complete rights belonging to the People's Republic of Albania in the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

2. The Albanian government demands that the Soviet government immediately return every military means, material or equipment which is the property of the People's Republic of Albania; that it pay for the damages which the Albanian government had to incur to ensure the defense of the People's Republic of Albania and of the Socialist camp; that it pay for the damages it has caused to the People's Republic of Albania by the one-sided annulment of the credits, agreements and other relations of an economic character.

The Soviet government must immediately and forthrightly correct the fatal error of the rupture of diplomatic relations with Albania. The Party of Labor of Albania and the Albanian government have publicly stated the manner in which the Soviet government must correct this error.

In case it fails to do so, then the Soviet government clearly demonstrates that it is hostile to the People's Republic of Albania; that it has no desire to see that an atmosphere is created whereby the People's Republic of Albania is given her equal rights and lawful place within the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and that the invitation sent to the Albanian government to attend the meeting is fraudulent in nature and character.

The Albanian government demands that the Soviet government be severely condemned for its anti-Albanian and anti-Socialist activities; that the Soviet government make public acknowledgment and forthrightly correct the serious errors it has committed against Albania; that it immediately stop the supply of armaments to the Yugoslav Titoites, to the Indian reactionaries and to any government that uses these armaments to suppress its own and other people.

3. The governments of some countries, members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, while maintaining diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania, and on no legal or moral grounds and without valid reason, drove out the Ambassadors of the People's Republic of Albania from their countries, and withdrew their own Ambassadors from Albania. The Albanian government demands that these governments take the necessary steps to normalize their diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of Albania.

4. The Albanian government legally wishes to know:

a) What were the causes that led to the violation of the Treaty and of its provisions and to the exclusion without any right whatsoever of Albania from the meetings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization? What member country was it that undertook this hostile act against a Socialist country? The Albanian government, as an equal member and within its legal rights, so that it may have full knowledge, wishes that it be given the verbal processes (minutes) of the meetings at which unlawful decisions have been discussed and taken against the People's Republic of Albania.

b) The Albanian government has the right to be fully informed, without concealing anything, of all of the activities of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, since Albania, in an arbi-

trary and illegal way, has been kept out of the meetings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Accordingly, on the basis of the rights granted to it by the Treaty as a sovereign and equal member, it wishes, so as to be fully informed, that it be given the minutes and decisions taken on various questions by the Warsaw Treaty Organization at public or private meetings, and by its political and military bodies during this period.

c) During the period prior to the *de facto*, arbitrary and illegal exclusion of the People's Republic of Albania by the Warsaw Treaty Organization, in unison and unanimously, including, also, the People's Republic of Albania, various meetings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization agreed upon a series of decisions of great political, economic and military importance, as well as of international and domestic character to the signatory countries of the Warsaw Treaty.

The Albanian government within its lawful rights wishes to know what was the fate of these common important decisions. Which of them have been carried out and in what manner have they been carried out? Which of them have not been put into effect? For what reasons and by whom have they been violated? In order to be fully informed the Albanian government wishes to receive copies of the reports, of the discussion and of the decisions taken relative to these questions by the leading bodies of the Warsaw Treaty Organization during the period of four years since Albania was arbitrarily deprived of the right to participate in the meetings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

d) The Albanian government wishes to know whether the Moscow Treaty for the partial suspension of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed in Moscow on August 5, 1963, between the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Great Britain, has been concluded in accordance with the collective decision of the other member States of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, or was it the work of one member State with the other States of the Warsaw Treaty Organization adhering to it separately?

The Albanian government attaches importance to this question, for if it is a joint decision, it is illegal, not only because the People's Republic of Albania, as a member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization was not consulted in such a decision, but also because it is contrary to the Warsaw Treaty and to the common line and policy of the Socialist countries long since approved relative to the question of nuclear weapons and to disarmament. In the event that the Moscow Treaty was signed with the initiative of one member country of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, namely, the Soviet government, while the others have adhered to it separately, then the Albanian government can but come to one conclusion: that the Warsaw Treaty Organization has been undermined by the arbitrary will of one government on a question so vital to the camp of Socialism and to the peoples of the world. This attitude of disregard on the part of the Soviet government must be severely condemned.

The government of the People's Republic of Albania has been, and is, firmly against the Moscow Treaty for the partial suspension of nuclear tests because this Treaty runs counter to the Warsaw Treaty and particularly to Article 7 of that Treaty. It is illegal as well as harmful to the interests of Socialism and to the interests of peace and of international security. It is a shameful capitulation to the nuclear blackmail of American imperialism, and is of ser-

vice only to the bellicose policies of imperialism; it strengthens the position of the United States of America by ensuring it nuclear monopoly; it is a fraud against the people; it serves to encourage imperialist aggression and to bring nearer the danger of a nuclear war.

In making the above expose, the government of the People's Republic of Albania is motivated by the defense of the legal rights of the Albanian people and the People's Republic of Albania, and by the lofty interests of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and those of the Socialist camp.

Should the governments of the member States of the Warsaw Treaty Organization carefully examine the aforementioned demands of the Albanian government, by taking into account the provisions, spirit and responsibilities of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, they will see how correct and legal are these demands.

The Albanian government cannot approve and cannot fail to sharply condemn all the illegal, arbitrary and anti-Socialist acts that have been committed against it, particularly by the Soviet government. The Albanian government considers that in case the governments of the other States included in the Warsaw Treaty Organization should hold a similar correct and principled attitude toward these acts, this



Jose A. Roman, National Committee Member, POC

would be helpful to our Organization in proceeding on the right path, so that it can become a genuine defender of the Socialist camp. So that the Warsaw Treaty Organization may become such an entity, it must not permit the arbitrariness of one government that believes it alone can make the laws, while the others must blindly follow; that this same government may decide today that for four years it will not invite to a meeting a member State, while on the next day as though nothing had happened and no harm had been done, extends an invitation for attendance.

The government of the People's Republic of Albania believes that in the event that the proposed correct steps are carried out, then will the suitable conditions be created for the Albanian government to attend the meeting, since it will possess full and equal rights to openly make known its views in connection with the activities, the organization and the political and military plans of our Organization, as well as on numerous other questions which the Soviet government, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, has set on an incorrect and perilous path. The Albanian side has openly and sincerely told the other Socialist countries that genuine Marxist-Leninist unity has been and remains the basis of its struggle for principle. However, other countries have fiercely fought against the People's Republic of Albania, have damaged it, and have plotted against it. The Albanian government is in possession of indisputable documents and facts showing that a group of people who were and are at the head of a powerful Socialist state, a

member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, have collaborated with the Titoite renegades; with the Greek monarcho-fascists, with the American Sixth Fleet and with agents of this group inside Albania for the overthrow, by the force of arms, of the People's Power in Albania.

The Albanian government likewise is aware of the fact that this same group of people have also made efforts within the Warsaw Treaty Organization to commit, in the name of that Organization, treacherous acts similar to those mentioned above, as well as others against the Albanian people.

But in both cases, thanks to the unity, to the spirit of patriotism, and to the vigilance of the Albanian people, led by the Party of Labor of Albania, they did not succeed in achieving their treacherous, inimical and anti-Marxist designs. How much longer can anyone continue to defend these people? Will their criminal deeds go unpunished? This must not come to pass. On its part the People's Republic of Albania, just as it has done up to the present, will defend itself with all its might against its enemies and against treacherous people.

The Albanian government by carrying out as always, its internationalist duty, and desirous that these terrible errors be corrected and that the treacherous activities of the hidden enemies be eliminated, — since these activities, in the not too distant future will be exposed to the light of truth, asks the friendly governments, members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, to objectively re-examine these questions. For the sake of the great interests of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, of the Socialist camp and of Communism, the Albanian government urges the governments who took the initiative in inviting the People's Republic of Albania to attend the meeting, to carry these questions boldly through to the end so as to eliminate enmity and decay; so as to create a strong and sound revolutionary situation in the relations among the Socialist states based on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Our government is convinced that Marxist-Leninist principles will be triumphant whether certain people like it or not.

The People's Republic of Albania has carried high and honorably the banner of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and of the internationalist unity of the Socialist camp. It will relentlessly fight so that the unity among the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and of the entire Socialist camp may be re-established on the only correct and tested foundation, on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism.

The Albanian people, the Party of Labor of Albania and the government of the People's Republic of Albania, have a clear conscience because they are marching on the right path, and also because they have carried out in the past, are carrying out today, and will continue to carry out their Marxist-Leninist duties.

III. Even though the necessary conditions have not been created for it to take part in the meeting of the Consultative Political Committee to be held on January 19, 1965, the government of the People's Republic of Albania, as a member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization deems it its duty to make known its views on the item included on the agenda of that meeting, namely, that of the plan to establish a multilateral nuclear force which actually means supplying West Germany with nuclear weapons.

1. The Albanian government on many occasions has officially

(Continued on page 8)

Khrushchevites Still at the Helm Of Warsaw Treaty Organization

(Continued from page 7)

made clear its forthright opposition to the plans to supply West Germany with nuclear weapons. It has fought, is fighting and will continue to fight any attempt on the part of the United States of America to supply the Bonn government with these weapons of mass extermination. Today State power in West Germany is in the hands of those same imperialist groups who brought Hitler to power; the State power is in the hands of the revanchist militarists whose aim is the annexation of the German Democratic Republic and the starting of a new war against the Socialist countries. Today West Germany is the main ally of United States imperialism and the chief hotbed of imperialist aggressions in Europe against the countries in the Socialist camp.

The supplying of nuclear weapons to West Germany encourages the Bonn militarist rulers in their aggressive plans; increases the danger of war in Europe and in the world. Therefore a forthright opposition to these dangerous plans is the imperative duty of all peace-loving countries, and first of all, of the countries in the camp of Socialism. It must be noted that the danger represented by the supply of nuclear weapons to West Germany has as its source, and has developed as a result of the anti-Marxist policies and the policy of capitulation to United States imperialism pursued by the Soviet government, headed by Nikita Khrushchev. The signing of the Moscow Treaty for the partial banning of nuclear tests hastened the process in this respect and gave encouragement to the American and Bonn governments. Nikita Khrushchev with this infamous Treaty not only encouraged the atomic armament of West Germany, but also negotiated against the future of the German Democratic Republic thus putting in jeopardy its right and its freedom, its independence and sovereignty.

The government of the People's Republic of Albania, openly and publicly denounced the criminal aims pursued by Nikita Khrushchev and his group with the signing of the Moscow Treaty. His secret and fraudulent aims are dangerously bearing fruit in Europe and in other parts of the world. Thus, irrespective of the bombastic statements of Nikita Khrushchev to the effect that the Moscow Treaty would prevent the atomic armament of West Germany, what was foreseen is actually taking place: namely, that the United States of America, the "reasonable and peaceful friend" of the former head of the Soviet government, is arming with nuclear weapons the Nazis of Bonn and is bringing nearer the danger of the outbreak of a new world war. Then why was the Moscow Treaty concluded, and against whom was it directed? It is obvious that it was done so as to promote the interests of the imperialist warmongers and to disarm the Socialist countries and the other peace-loving countries and peoples of the world faced with the aggressive policies of United States imperialism.

The United States of America is arming West Germany with nuclear weapons in order to attack the Socialist countries. This danger cannot be averted, the peace and the lives of people cannot be defended against the nuclear disaster which the American imperialists and their allies are preparing by pursuing, as the Soviet government is doing, a policy of capitulation to

imperialism. The Soviet government attempts to cover its capitulation to imperialism by spouting such concepts as "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition" and others which it has stripped of their Leninist revolutionary spirit. Peace and mankind cannot be defended by believing in and by disseminating propaganda that presents the American imperialists as "moderate," "reasonable," and "liberal" as the Soviet leaders do. If they really are such people as the Soviet government claims them to be, then why all this uneasiness and fear on its part in connection with the creation of the multilateral nuclear force?

The Albanian people, like all the other people, are disturbed but not frightened in the face of the policies of aggression of United States imperialism who is the chief enemy of Socialism and of peace, who is preparing the war and is arming its allies to attack our Socialist countries.

The Albanian government holds, that this situation can be met not by making concessions to the United States of America, but by pinning it against the wall, and by forcing it to retreat. To do this, one must condemn and cast aside the policy of surrender to imperialism; the unity of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and of the entire Socialist camp on the basis of Marxism-Leninism must be restored; the imperialist menace must be opposed with the united military, political and economic strength of the camp of Socialism in the first place, as well as that of all the revolutionary and anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces in the world. Unfortunately, the present policy pursued by the Soviet government is proceeding in a dangerous course and is helping the unleashing of war by United States imperialism.

One of the chief aims for which the Warsaw Treaty Organization was created was to head off the danger which a militarized West Germany, a NATO member, constituted for the Socialist countries and for peace. At the present moment West Germany is being armed with nuclear weapons and is being instigated by the United States of America. This constitutes a real danger, and the Warsaw Treaty Organization cannot allow such a policy to continue. On the contrary it must work out a common revolutionary policy capable of successfully fighting the imperialist's policies of aggression.

2. The Albanian government believes that in the present situation, when the Bonn government encouraged by the Soviet government's policy of capitulation and at the direct instigation of its allies, arrogantly talks about the annexation of the German Democratic Republic, our member-countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization are called upon to defend with all of our might the German Democratic Republic. In the past, the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization have taken correct joint decisions with respect to the German problem. However, during the last four years, these decisions have been discarded and replaced by erroneous decisions of surrender. It had been jointly decided that during 1961 a peace treaty would be signed with Germany or separately with the German Democratic Republic. That on this basis the problem of West Berlin would also be settled. But the Soviet government, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, was frightened; it capitulated before the United

States of America and wrecked the joint decisions for the signing of a peace treaty with Germany by pursuing aims which put in jeopardy the destinies of the peoples of the rest of the Socialist countries and of the world. The government of the People's Republic of Albania have always been of the opinion that the dragging out and procrastination on the peace treaty with Germany serves only the interests of the imperialists. The people responsible for this act and its dangerous consequences are chiefly responsible for this.

The defense of the German Democratic Republic is a question of vital importance to all the Socialist countries. It is evident that if one fails to defend the German Democratic Republic one cannot properly defend the final Oder-Neisse boundary of the People's Republic of Poland; one cannot properly defend the western boundary of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. These are bound together and are dear to all the Socialist countries. Should the necessity arise, they must be defended even by force of arms and at the cost of our lives. The sacred duty of the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization is the defense of our countries, of our people and of Socialism; not the hatching of plots against fraternal countries as Nikita Khrushchev and his group have done. Truth is bitter, but still it remains the truth.

3. The Albanian government maintains that it is urgent to correct the serious errors committed by the Soviet government. First of all: a) There should be signed, at the earliest possible moment, a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic.

It becomes clear that the western powers, with a view of achieving their aggressive aims against the German Democratic Republic and the Socialist camp, are not prepared to sign a peace treaty with the German Federal Republic. Therefore, it is useless to procrastinate any longer. Any further postponement of this question will arouse the ambition of West Germany to annex the German Democratic Republic and will weaken the position of the Socialist states. The People's Republic of Albania is ready to sign, as soon as possible, together with the rest of the Socialist countries, a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic and to accept all the responsibilities that may arise from this action.

b) The Warsaw Treaty Organization should formally declare, that in case the United States of America arms West Germany with nuclear weapons in the form of the multilateral nuclear force, or in any other form whatsoever, all the Socialist countries as a counter-measure, will arm themselves effectively with nuclear weapons.

c) The Moscow Treaty should be denounced by the governments of those Socialist states that have signed the Treaty.

The government of the People's Republic of Albania is convinced that any other measure or decision taken would be ineffectual in the face of the threats of both the United States of America and of the West German revanchists, and furthermore would not stop their warmongering activity.

The policy of capitulation and of charlatanism of Nikita Khrushchev has met with shameful failure and has also caused tremendous dangers. This is most clear to the governments of the other member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

The government of the People's Republic of Albania calls upon the governments of the friendly countries, members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, to renounce the policy of capitulation to United States imperialism which the Soviet gov-

ernment, headed by Nikita Khrushchev, has tried to impose on the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and that it should return, at the earliest possible moment, to the correct Marxist-Leninist policies. At this precise moment the forces of the Socialist camp and of the world revolutionary movement are tremendous and the international situation is most fa-

vorable for undertaking such a change. This favorable situation must be utilized and advantage should be taken of the existing sharp contradictions in the ranks of the imperialists in order to sharpen them as much as possible and thereby advance our great cause of Socialism, of Communism and peace. Tirana, January 15, 1965.

IV. Resolution of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization regarding the People's Republic of Albania.

"Resolution of the Political Consultative Committee of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

"Having taken cognizance of the January 15, 1965 letter of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Albania, the Political Consultative Committee notes that the People's Republic of Albania refuses to par-

ticipate in the proceedings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

"Under these circumstances the question of further participation of the People's Republic of Albania in the proceedings of the Warsaw Treaty Organization depends on the decisions of the government of the People's Republic of Albania."

V. Letter of the Government of the People's Republic of Albania to the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization on its irresponsible decision toward the People's Republic of Albania.

"Tirana, January 29, 1965.—To the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The disregard you have shown through your undated and unnumbered decision in reply to the January 15, 1965 letter of the government of the People's Republic of Albania, a legal member-State of the War-

saw Treaty Organization, places great responsibility on you.

"The Albanian government stands firm in respect to its legal and legitimate demands which are based on the dispositions of the Warsaw Treaty. The Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Albania."

Economics of "Great Society"

(Continued from page 11)

super-profits now accruing to American imperialism from U. S. investments in the Union Miniere and other "Belgium" corporations.



Nona S. Black, National Committee Member, POC

Referring to Union Miniere expansion in the exploitation of the Congolese sub-soil the New

York Times stated:

"Union Miniere du Haut-Katanga, the huge copper and cobalt company in Katanga, is producing at near-record levels. Officials indicate that 275,000 tons of copper will be produced this year. Three hundred thousand tons is the expectation for 1966.

"Economic analysts here now predict that export revenue for the year will be \$315 million, about \$25 million less than the total that would have been attained if exports had continued at the January-to-June level. But it is \$8,000 above last year's level.

"The rebellion's impact on exports will be somewhat greater next year, analysts believe." (New York Times, January 25, 1965)

The bloody Stanleyville massacres organized by American imperialism were not "mercy missions" at all, but desperate attempts to hold on to its stolen colonial loot.

(To be continued next issue)

Subscribe to:

PEKING REVIEW

China Reconstructs

Evergreen

Women of China

WORKER'S INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE

P.O. Box 1548

San Pedro, Calif. 90733

Write for Free Catalog

"Communist Spectre" Haunts West Coast

immediately started the fight for union recognition and for shop contracts with the car wash owners. A strike situation arose in one of the car wash establishments, the Rosecrans Car Wash at 2420 Rosecrans Avenue, near Gardena, in the City of Los Angeles. No sooner had the first pickets begun to move at the Rosecrans Car Wash, than the local press commenced to publish screaming headlines denouncing the organizing drive of Local No. 1 of the AMWU.

FASCIST PRESS INITIATES "ANTI-RED" BROADSIDE

The Daily Breeze hysterically shouted "World Conquest Via Car Wash." (Los Angeles Daily Breeze, January 22, 1965)

The Independent - Press - Telegram of Long Beach warned "Militant Reds Upset Car Wash Industry." (Independent - Press - Telegram, January 24, 1965)

This propaganda barrage was echoed by the Los Angeles Times and Daily Signal.

Coverage of the strike situation at Rosecrans' Car Wash by

the Los Angeles press kept up a steady anti-Communist barrage. The Daily Breeze, reeking with the heavy stench of imperialist and fascist ideology, gave its "impartial" side of the news by describing the aims of the AMWU in these terms — "Today the car wash industry,—tomorrow the world." (Daily Breeze, January 22, 1965)

Robert Schwartz, co-owner of the Rosecrans Car Wash reacted immediately to the strike by contacting the Carwash Owners Association. At the emergency meeting called by the Association \$100 apiece was assessed as an initial fund from its 200 members to begin the fight against the AMWU. This money was placed in a fund for the use of Jones and Jones, a goon, scab Pinkerton "legal" outfit by the Owners Association to help them fight the AMWU. The Owners Association unequivocally stated that it would stop at no means to defeat the car washers and to keep them from joining the AMWU. "... a spokesman for the busi-

ness firms said 'before we'd give in to a communist union we would fight until everyone went broke.'" (Daily Signal, January 21, 1965) "Norman Jones, representing the Automatic Car Wash Association of Southern California said after an emergency meeting of the employer groups:

"We are taking this thing seriously. We want to have nothing to do with such an organization, and will fight it with all of our legitimate and legal rights because of what the organization stands for, not because it calls itself a union." (Los Angeles Times, January 21, 1965) And "... Police Capt. Joseph Stephens said the Police Dept. 'will do all it can to prevent violence in activities stemming from organizations such as this one.'" (Ibid) —Emphasize our Vanguard Editor)

REVOLUTIONARY TACTICS VS. REFORMISM ON TRADE UNION QUESTION

What type of organization is this AMWU that scares the car wash owners and the organs of the State so that they "will fight it with all of their legitimate and legal rights"? Harry Bernstein, Labor Editor of the Los Angeles Times, answers this question

thusly: "... AMWU was established by the 'Workers Organizing Committee', which is aimed at organizing unskilled and semi-skilled farm workers and city workers.

"Laski [President of the AMWU and the Workers Organizing Committee, and Chairman of the West Coast Region, POC] explained his group is opposed to the U.S. Communist Party, which he charges 'collaborates' with capitalists. . . .

"Most unions, he said are just tools of the capitalists, and the Communist Party is in the pocket of the ruling class' . . .

"He claimed the union he heads has about 500 members 'and we have adopted a revolutionary trade union position' . . .

"... to get decent wages there has to be a constant fight against the capitalists, and this cannot be done without the intention of eliminating the capitalist system.'" (Los Angeles Times, January 21, 1965)

And what are the perspectives for the AMWU? The Daily Breeze, January 21, 1965, reported that "Although his 'local 1' today is the only local of the AMWU Lasky is confident his membership . . . eventually will

extend throughout the car wash industry.

"After that?"

"The farm workers are overworked, underpaid and denied even the rudest of benefits,' Lasky said. 'They need to be organized.'" (Emphasis ours, Vanguard Editor)

Charles Sutton of the Independent-Press-Telegram stated: "In the context of organized labor's current aims — the guaranteed annual wage, hospital benefits, pensions, job security and the like — the fledgling AMWU's goals appear almost crude in comparison. . . ." (Independent-Press-Telegram, January 24, 1965)

Charles Sutton is so right when he states that the AMWU's program is not within the safe, non-struggle limits foisted upon the organized labor movement by the fascist Labor Fronters. The so-called programs for the guaranteed annual wage, hospital benefits, pension plans, etc., spewed forth by the Labor Fronters constitute nothing more than phoney slogans and a platform for staging internal sham battles. Under the guise of "struggling" for these goals, the Labor Fronters have converted the trade unions into nothing better than employment agencies for the bosses.

While these "leaders" boast of "fighting for the guaranteed annual wage," they at the same time "advise" — in fact, demand — the rank-and-file union members to accept pay cuts in order to "keep the companies in business." While these Labor Fronters boast of "fighting for job security" they become the chief strike-breakers when the union rank-and-file refuses to go along with their sell-out ("sweetheart") contracts which permanently eliminate jobs, as in the recent strike of the I.L.A. (See Feb.-March 1965 issue of Vanguard.) It is no wonder then that the ruling class is so anxious to keep the existing organized labor movement in the hands of these demagogic and treacherous henchmen. And it is no wonder either that they are alarmed at the program and activities of the AMWU, which constantly exposes the role of these valuable agents of American imperialism.

Had the AMWU "discovered" a "lesser evil" between the fascist labor leaders such as "militant" Jimmy Hoffa and Joe Curran and company, or had the AMWU "detected" a "revolutionary motion" among the middle echelons of the trade union brass there is no doubt but that the AMWU would have received all kinds of financial assistance and legal protection.

Had the AMWU renounced its program and activities of organizing the unorganized, the unskilled, and semi-skilled workers, it would have been given full benefit of Labor Front "respectability."

It is precisely because of AMWU's revolutionary program and activities that all the agents of the ruling class, and every organ of the State apparatus was mobilized to smash it from its very inception.

Good bourgeois apologist that he is, Charles Sutton, in the aforementioned article, states that the AMWU is "linked" to the "Provisional Organizing Committee to Reconstitute a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party known to its members simply as POC." He also echoes his imperialist masters when he writes about the "dangerous" nature of POC.

"POC, composed of a small group of ex-Communist Party members who were expelled from the Party after Khrushchev's famous denunciation of Stalin in 1956, might truly be called a Stalinist party. Its communism is a tough, unbending no-holds-barred philosophy. . . .

"One of Laski's first pronouncements to those rallying to his flag is that he IS a Communist, and that the charge will be thrown at him — and the

(Continued on page 10)

May Day 1965

(Continued from page 1)

new leaders of the CPSU of their veil of Marxism-Leninism and to expose their true revisionist features. It is helping people to see through their fine words to the essence behind the appearance. It is helping all Communists and revolutionary people the world over to realize that the emergence and development of Khrushchov revisionism is by no means a matter of a few individuals or an accidental phenomenon. It has profound social and historical causes. So long as imperialists and reactionaries exist and so long as there are classes and class struggle in the world, Khrushchov revisionism will inevitably recur in one form or another and the struggle against it will not come to an end." (pp. 20-21)

And further:

"The new leaders of the CPSU continue to follow Khrushchov's policy of unscrupulous interference in the internal affairs of the fraternal parties and engage in disruptive and subversive activities against them. They have been colluding with Japanese Trotskyites, right wing social-democrats and renegades from the Japanese Communist Party, and have perpetrated every kind of disruption and subversion against the Japanese Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, they publish articles in their press attacking it and giving open support to a handful of renegades such as Yoshio Shiga, Ichizo Suzuki and Shigeo Kamiyama. They have been supporting Indonesian Trotskyites and other counter-revolutionary forces in opposing the Indonesian Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism and in disrupting the anti-imperialist national front of Indonesia. They have been attacking the New Zealand Communist Party. . . . they have been carrying on all kinds of disruption and subversion against the Communist Party of Burma and other fraternal Parties upholding Marxism-Leninism." (Ibid, p. 13)

In this new stage in the struggle against modern revisionism we should be especially vigilant and watchful of the new covert ways in which revisionism operates. Since the modern revisionists are so rapidly being exposed they have to recourse to extreme demagogy and trickery. It should be especially noted that collaboration with Trotskyism is a present feature of revisionist policies and tactics in the world today.

This holds true of our country, of course. Observe how the clearing house of revisionists and Trotskyites in the East has "developed" by the simple action of adding or changing the initials in their title. This alphabetical "progression" records the "great" change from PL to PLM and from PLM to PLP.

This "evolution" does not alter its political base one iota. This political base was and continues revisionist-Trotskyite. No superficial shifts could or will change this fundamental fact. For as the Chinese comrades have so aptly remarked:

"Marxism-Leninism teaches us that just as an individual must as a matter of course be judged 'not by his professions, but by his actions; not by what he pretends to be, but by what he does, and what he really is,' so must a political party. 'In historical struggles one must distinguish still more the phrases and fancies of parties from their real organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves from their reality.'" (Ibid., pp. 6-7)

This "anti-revisionist" revisionist-Trotskyite group, created by the orders of American imperialism with the blessings of its god-fathers the CPUS and SWP is but a screen to hide the class-collaborationist policies of the CPUS revisionists and the SWP Trotskyites.

This counter-revolutionary organization (PLP) together with the CPUS, SWP, SLP, Workers' World, Spartacist, etc., is historically doomed to oblivion.

Other events of decisive political and historical importance which have taken place during the past year have been the resurgence of the Congolese people's revolutionary struggle and the decisive victories of the Vietnamese people against the American imperialists.

Despite the forcing of gorilla regimes throughout Latin America, the militancy and combativity of the people is resurging in a massive way. In five Latin American countries guerrilla warfare has been steadily developing — in Venezuela, Peru, Honduras, Guatemala and especially in Colombia. In this last country the growth of guerrilla warfare has alarmed the Colombian bourgeoisie, as well as their masters in the North, the American imperialists.

Despite very strenuous efforts to hide the enslavement of the

Puerto Rican nation and people behind the facade of neo-colonialist trappings, the Puerto Rican people are in the process of creating the weapons of its revolution. The liberation cadres are being developed from the Puerto Rican working class' raw material. The **Movimiento Libertador de Puerto Rico** represents this new revolutionary feature of the Puerto Rican people.

The apologists for American imperialism are predicting another "hot summer" in the United States. This exposes the panic and fear of Mr. Charlie's minions of the constantly rising temper of militancy and revolutionary fervor of the Negro people. Try as they may the ideologists of American imperialism cannot reduce the geographic limits of the Negro question to the states of Alabama and Mississippi. The Negro Question transcends every state of the Union. It is present in every village, town or city of the country. Mr. Charlie and his minions have reasons to be concerned and worried. As much reason as he has to be concerned and worried about Viet Nam, the Congo or Colombia. It is all one problem, huge, ever-growing and worrisome.

It is to be noted that as the Negro masses and especially the Negro workers move into the anti-imperialist struggle the Uncle Toms evolve from simple tools and agents to outright Quislings. This is indeed the pattern observable in the colonial and semi-colonial world in general. James Farmer, Martin Luther King and their ilk are but the counterparts of the Munoz Marins, Sanchez Vilellas, Leonis, Leon Valencias, Freis, Tshombes, Macapagals, Rahmans, Shastris, Souvanna Phoumas, etc.

But precisely because the compradors, Uncle Toms and other stooges of imperialism are forced to become open agents of imperialism they begin to lose their status as "leaders of the people." Like the revisionists in the Socialist and working class movements, the Quislings in the colonial and semi-colonial world are becoming over-exposed and as a result are being isolated from the revolutionary masses.

Pressured by the revolutionary forces of the world the American imperialists are forced to clamp down on the American people and especially on the oppressed national minorities. Fascist brutality stalks the whole nation, and the working class, in particular the Negro, the Mexican, the Mexican-American, the Puerto Rican, the Indian and other minority workers receive the brunt of the reactionary onslaught. Lynchings are "legal" occurrences these days. Negroes and Puerto Ricans are brutally assassinated by the police in the streets, in the police precincts or in the jails. Note the "epidemic of suicides," of "hangings" of Puerto Ricans in the police precincts and jails of New York City.

But the masses of Negro workers, of Puerto Rican workers, of Mexican-American workers are daily struggling against this fascist bestiality in "democratic" USA.

The American working class in general is beginning to stir and move however slowly, to struggle against their class enemy and its stooges in the labor movement.

This MAY DAY 1965 is a day of rejoicing for the working class of the world, including ours. We are living through the most revolutionary period of history and the American working class is making ready to play its decisive role in this historical epoch for upon its great shoulders falls the tremendous task of burying the most brutal, the most exploitative enemy of the peoples of the world and of mankind — its own ruling class, the American imperialists.

FOR THE VICTORY OF MARXISM-LENINISM IN THE WORLD!

FOR THE VICTORY OF THE HEROIC FIGHTERS FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION THROUGHOUT THE WORLD!

FOR A WORLD UNITED FRONT AGAINST AMERICAN IMPERIALISM!

FOR THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS!

FOR THE UNITY OF THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS — WHITE, BLACK AND BROWN!

FOR THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF THE NEGRO NATION IN THE BLACK BELT AND FOR THE FULL RIGHTS OF THE NEGRO MINORITY!

FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF PUERTO RICO AND FOR THE FULL RIGHTS OF THE PUERTO RICAN MINORITY!

FOR THE FULL RIGHTS OF ALL MINORITIES IN THE U.S.!

FOR THE TOTAL DEFEAT OF MODERN REVISIONISM AND TROTSKYISM!

LONG LIVE THE SOCIALIST CAMP LED BY PEOPLE'S CHINA!

FOR PEACE, NATIONAL LIBERATION AND SOCIALISM!!!

"Communist Spectre" Haunts West Coast

(Continued from page 9)

union — with all the force and contempt his enemies can muster.

"To Laski's gratification, the bulk of the men have ignored the accusation. As one of them explained, 'We're not Communists. But the Communists were the only ones who came along to help us. You see what I mean?'" (Independent - Press - Telegram, January 24, 1965)

POTENTIAL POWER OF UNSKILLED MASSES FEARED

Why is it that the powers-that-be are so concerned and alarmed with the organization of a few car washers?

The answer is that the powers-that-be understand that what is involved is not just a handful of car washers, but in fact the potential motion of millions of unskilled workers into labor struggles.

The car wash strikes in Los Angeles constitute just the embryo of potential struggles of the American working class.

The unskilled and semi-skilled workers, especially the Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers, are the section of the American working class who are ready to struggle today. It is the organization and motion into struggle of these workers which the ruling class fears the most.

The Vanguard of July 1962 posed this problem in the following manner: "... we are basing ourselves on the most exploited and the most oppressed — the masses of unskilled workers in the United States — that is our concentration! ... the reality of the United States presents the bulk of the Negro, the Puerto Ricans, the Mexicans, and the other minority workers as the heart of the unskilled group in the United States. ..."

The Main Report to POC's 1962 Labor Conference referring to this same problem stated the following: "... The most exploited are those sections of the working class who get the least results from their labor. Exploitation is based on the fact that a worker produces surplus value and it is taken away from him. And those workers from whom the most is taken are those who are most oppressed by imperialism and therefore are the first to move in the struggle." (Vanguard, December 1962)

When POC speaks of "those workers from whom the most is taken" and "those who are most oppressed by imperialism" it specifically refers to the semi-skilled and unskilled, in industry and agriculture, and especially the Negro, the Mexican, the Mexican-American, the Puerto Rican, the Indian and other minority workers in the United States.

COLONIAL SUPER-PROFITS— SOLE AIM OF RULING CLASS

Recently, the American imperialist State, in an attempt to diminish the impact of this country's ever-rising army of unemployed, passed a Congressional Act barring the Mexican "bracero" from entering the USA to plant, cultivate and harvest the vegetable, fruit and lettuce fields of the Southwest.

A seeming contradiction has thus been created. On the one hand the growers are beefing that "Americans won't do stoop labor." What they really mean is that they have been hurt by taking away one important source of cheap labor, the Mexican "bracero." He (the grower) still exploits the Mexican-American farm worker, but that is not at all sufficient to handle 3 billion dollars worth of agricultural crops in California alone.

When the growers state that the American farm workers "won't do stoop labor" they are lying in their teeth. The fact is that they can get hundreds of thousands of white farm workers

from the Ozarks anytime they want. But that won't keep their cheap labor in line. Sooner or later their source of super-profits, cheap labor, will begin to disintegrate.

As we have stated, in general, farming in this country is based on colonial labor and it won't do to use white farm workers no matter how cheap it is initially secured. It is the masses of non-white farm laborers that fit the bill and answer the need for the super-profits made by the growers in the Southwest.

The government bureaucrats, including Secretary of Labor, Wirtz, understand this problem as well as the growers do. That is why they are offering a specific solution to the problem. This is what they project.

"The Labor Department is preparing a major program to recruit tens of thousands of additional workers to pick crops this spring, summer and fall. ..."

"The department hopes to recruit Negro college students, Indians living on reservations, Puerto Ricans and unemployed youth living in city slums. ..." (New York Times, March 19, 1965)

Forget about the college students. That's put in there for show. Actually, it means the spreading of the use of Negro and Puerto Rican farm "peons" from the East to the Southwest.

RULING CLASS MOBILIZES STATE TO SMASH AMWU

In an unsuccessful attempt to break the militancy of the strike, the Car Wash Association with their hired goon, Jones and Jones, viciously threatened the AMWU organizers and the striking workers. A member of the Car Wash Owner's Association, a Mr. Coleman, owner of the Sav-On Car Wash, drew a gun on the AMWU organizers and snarled — "If you don't get off my lot and stay away from my men, you are going

to wind up with a bullet between your eyes."

On the evening of January 14, 1965, Robert Schwartz of the Rosecrans Car Wash with a platoon of goons forced his way into the AMWU union hall in an attempt to disrupt a meeting of the maintenance workers. Schwartz and his goons had to be forced to leave the premises.

The police and the fascist bourgeois press intensified their efforts to discredit the strike of the AMWU, and to protect the white scab labor hired by the car wash owners in a futile attempt to keep the Rosecrans Car Wash operating.

While the car wash owners hoped to intimidate the workers and the union, the exact opposite took place. The strike at Rose-

crans Car Wash spread to six other car washes. Charles Sutton, in the same aforementioned article, was forced to admit, "The strike, now entering its second week, already has shaken the industry to its foundations. ..."

"Volume at Rosecrans Wash, the hardest hit of all, has dropped 60%, perhaps more."

Charles Sutton, through his article, then makes public the frantic pleas of Robert Schwartz of Rosecrans Wash, "What we need now is public support. Without the public's business we're lost. Please tell them to support us." (Ibid) No support whatsoever came from the people.

Support for the car wash owners did come from the police, the NLRB, the fascist press, the Labor Fronters and the Birchites.

The car wash owners, through their goon outfit, Jones and Jones, utilized another organ of the State apparatus, the National Labor Relations Board, to attack the union.

LABOR ARISTOCRACY'S IDEOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC LINK TO RULING CLASS

The Birchites organized an "anti-Communist demonstration" at the Rosecrans Car Wash to "counteract" the effects of the strike. "The 'peaceful' action was reported by Lenox Sheriff's deputies who witnessed it at the car wash. ..."

"The 50 anti-communist demonstrators were organized by two Hawthorne men, a Harbor City man, and a Torrance man. ..."

"Evans and another of the organizers, Thomas E. Starr of Harbor City, own a Harbor City construction company, Starr-Evans, Inc. ..." (Daily Breeze, January 28, 1965)

Paul Evans stated: "A lot of us [participants in the Birchite, scab-goon demonstration] belong to the Carpenters' Union Local 1478, Redondo Beach. ..." (Ibid)

Note how the bosses, Paul Evans and Thomas Starr, of the Starr-Evans Construction company, and Local 1478 of the Car-

penters' Union, joined forces to attack the AMWU.

That particular local of the Carpenters' Union is comprised of highly skilled, lily-white members. They are part of that section of the U.S. working class which receives "wages above their surplus value." The Vanguard of July 1962 characterized this aristocracy of labor thusly: "... It is precisely in the epoch of imperialism that the aristocracy of labor is created, that the high salaries granted to the top echelons of the labor force is not based on struggle, but on bribery; it is not based on wresting from the exploiters greater concessions but cooperating with the exploiters in their suppression of the colonial peoples and getting as a reward a share of the exploita-

tion of the workers in the colonial areas.

"And so we see in this sector not the key and decisive, progressive areas of the working class but that sector of the working force which is closest tied to imperialism."

The Birchite goon-scabs did not organize their anti-Communist demonstration at Rosecrans Car Wash unassisted. Paul Evans shamelessly explains: "We ... called most South Bay police stations and every other source we could find to ask what we could do to legally fight Lasky..." (Daily Breeze, January 28, 1965 — Emphasis ours, Vanguard Editor)

The CPUS revisionists talk about the Birchites as if they operate on Mars. Here we see the real role that these fascist goons play and their direct relationship to the imperialist State apparatus. They take their orders directly from the police department, and they don't make a move until they are instructed by the officials of the fascist SS Guard as to the specific task they should carry out.

Paul Evans, Birchite organizer of the "demonstration" had this to say about the AMWU: "... the only difference between what Lasky's pack thinks and what the gooks we are fighting in Viet Nam think is distance." (Ibid) This is the ideology of imperialism, chauvinism, turned fascist.

BOURGEOIS "DEMOCRACY" AND "JUSTICE" AT WORK

The car wash owners were confronted with a spreading strike situation as a result of their failure to intimidate the leadership of the AMWU and the striking workers with their vicious threats and open attacks. Conscious of the fact that the role of the organs of the State is to defend and protect the interests of the propertied classes, the car wash owners called upon the Los Angeles Police Department to break the strike. Five of the AMWU organizers were arrested and charged with "inciting to

the armies and the police — serve the class in power. State power has always been used by the ruling class to maintain the oppression of the exploited classes. Present-day socio-political reality in the USA merely confirms this Marxian truism.

Who was really guilty of trespassing at the AMWU union hall on January 14, 1965? Robert Schwartz of the Car Wash Owners Association!

Who drew a gun and threatened to shoot the AMWU organizers? Coleman of the Car Wash Owners Association!

Who hired the strike-breaker outfit, Jones and Jones, to harass and intimidate the striking workers and the AMWU? The Car Wash Owners Association!

Who organized the "anti-Communist demonstration" to provoke a riot on the picket line? The police and the Birchites!

Yet these were not the forces arrested! Of course not! They enjoy the full protection of bourgeois class "justice."

Logically, the AMWU organizers and the striking workers were charged with, and arrested for, the very crimes which their class enemies committed. This is the type of "justice" and "democracy" reserved for the working class by the bourgeoisie.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM ACTS TO PREVENT EXPOSURE OF ITS REVISIONIST AGENTS

The arrest, jailing and official charges made against the AMWU organizers were plastered in all the local bourgeois press.

"Five Picketers Booked In Riot At Car Wash. ..."

"Five men were booked on suspicion of inciting to riot and suspicion of trespassing."

"They were: Michael I. Lasky ... James A. Thomas ... Felipe S. Perales ... Leland W. Lewis ... and Arnold M. Hoffman. ..."

"In addition, Thomas, Perales and Lewis were charged with resisting arrest and battery. Thomas was charged with battery against a peace officer. ..." (Daily Breeze, January 18, 1965)

"Arrested and booked on suspicion of rioting or inciting a riot were Mike Laski ... James A. Thomas ... Leland Lewis ... Felipe Perales ... and Arnold M. Hoffman. ..." (Los Angeles Times, January 17, 1965)

"Laski and four other strikers were arrested Sunday during a near-riot in front of the Rosecrans Car Wash. ..."

"They were booked on suspicion of rioting or inciting a riot." (Los Angeles Times, January 21, 1965)

Even the NLRB "complaint" by Jones and Jones against the AMWU included the same charges of "inciting to riot," "assault and battery," and "assaulting police officers."

At the hearing on January 18, 1965, Judge Keenan stated the charges which were: Michael Laski and Arnold Hoffman charged with "trespassing" and "inciting to riot." These and the additional charges of "assault and battery" were placed against Felipe Perales and Leland Lewis. James Thomas was charged with all of these plus "attacking a police officer."

These were the charges on which Judge Keenan set the bail for the five organizers as high as \$2,500.

At the next hearing on February 10, 1965 the charges against all five "defendants" read: "trespassing, participating in a riot and disorderly conduct"! These are all misdemeanors!

Michael Laski, in the name of the five "defendants" asked Judge Keenan what had happened to the original charges of "inciting to riot," "assault and battery," and "attacking an officer." Judge Keenan answered with the adroitness of a Sunset Boulevard ham actor: "What charges? There were never any other charges."

What really happened to cause (Continued on page 11)



The Five "Defendants" Outside of Los Angeles Municipal Court Building.

to wind up with a bullet between your eyes."

On the evening of January 14, 1965, Robert Schwartz of the Rosecrans Car Wash with a platoon of goons forced his way into the AMWU union hall in an attempt to disrupt a meeting of the maintenance workers. Schwartz and his goons had to be forced to leave the premises.

The police and the fascist bourgeois press intensified their efforts to discredit the strike of the AMWU, and to protect the white scab labor hired by the car wash owners in a futile attempt to keep the Rosecrans Car Wash operating.

While the car wash owners hoped to intimidate the workers and the union, the exact opposite took place. The strike at Rose-

crans Car Wash spread to six other car washes. Charles Sutton, in the same aforementioned article, was forced to admit, "The strike, now entering its second week, already has shaken the industry to its foundations. ..."

"Volume at Rosecrans Wash, the hardest hit of all, has dropped 60%, perhaps more."

Charles Sutton, through his article, then makes public the frantic pleas of Robert Schwartz of Rosecrans Wash, "What we need now is public support. Without the public's business we're lost. Please tell them to support us." (Ibid) No support whatsoever came from the people.

Support for the car wash owners did come from the police, the NLRB, the fascist press, the Labor Fronters and the Birchites.

The car wash owners, through their goon outfit, Jones and Jones, utilized another organ of the State apparatus, the National Labor Relations Board, to attack the union.

The Birchites organized an "anti-Communist demonstration" at the Rosecrans Car Wash to "counteract" the effects of the strike. "The 'peaceful' action was reported by Lenox Sheriff's deputies who witnessed it at the car wash. ..."

"The 50 anti-communist demonstrators were organized by two Hawthorne men, a Harbor City man, and a Torrance man. ..."

"Evans and another of the organizers, Thomas E. Starr of Harbor City, own a Harbor City construction company, Starr-Evans, Inc. ..." (Daily Breeze, January 28, 1965)

Paul Evans stated: "A lot of us [participants in the Birchite, scab-goon demonstration] belong to the Carpenters' Union Local 1478, Redondo Beach. ..." (Ibid)

Note how the bosses, Paul Evans and Thomas Starr, of the Starr-Evans Construction company, and Local 1478 of the Car-

"Communist Spectre" Haunts West Coast

(Continued from page 10)

the original charges, that had been spread in all the papers, and that Judge Keenan himself stated in Court on January 18, 1965, to be dropped and to disappear into thin air?

The local powers-that-be realized that the AMWU organizers had to be arrested in order to break the strike. But in the State Department, or somewhere, the "higher ups" were worried about the political impact of those arrests. The jailings of POC Communists would expose the revisionist CPUS. And at this point the "higher ups" were planning to launch its new political "sputnik" — the "Marxist-Leninist," "anti-revisionist," revisionist Progressive Labor Party of the Trotskyites and revisionists. Therefore, the State Department was especially worried about the international impact of POC Communists going to jail.

It was for these reasons that the "higher ups" in Washington took over the trial and called the shots. It was for this reason, too, that the felony charges of "inciting to riot," "assault and battery," and "attacking a police officer" had to be dropped leaving only misdemeanors on the docket. However, while the felony charges were dropped the exorbitant bail remained.

The great incongruity between the charges and the bail again shows the very "unusual" procedures adopted at this trial. Obviously, there are two attitudes here: one that commands and the other that counter-commands. It is quite understandable why Robert Schwartz of the Car Wash Owners Association stormed out of the Courtroom, "enraged," riled by the verdict that these "rabid Communists" were let go almost scott free.

DIMITROV'S DEFIANCE OR FOSTER'S RELIANCE ON BOURGEOIS "JUSTICE"

The Court insisted that the five AMWU organizers secure legal counsel to represent them at the trial. The five organizers contacted the American Civil Liberties Union, the "legal heroes" of the revisionists, as a test in order to expose the real nature of this bourgeois institution. This was done without any illusion about "legal" defense or about the specific role that the ACLU might play.

At that very moment the ACLU was involved in protecting the Ku Klux Klan from "unlawful persecution." The New York Times of February 16, 1965 reported that — "The American Civil Liberties Union protested today a proposed investigation of the Ku Klux Klan and certain other groups by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. . . .

"It would be easy for us, as it is for some others, to cheer the proposed investigations," John De J. Pemberton, Jr., chairman of the liberties unit wrote. "But the vitality of the democratic institutions we defend lies in their equal application to all." (New York Times, February 16, 1965)

The American Civil Liberties Union, good "liberal" imperialist institution that it is, will defend the "Constitutional rights" of the American Nazi Party, the Ku Klux Klan, the Birchites, the Trotskyites and the revisionists. But when it comes to defending the AMWU and POC, they absolutely refused, through their spokesman in Los Angeles, a certain Dr. Monroe, to have anything to do with that particular case.

The Vanguard of February-March 1965 made this analysis of the use of "legal defenses" in the U.S.A.: "History and experience has proven that the use of 'legal defenses' in the United States today, is quite limited and even politically dangerous for it serves

to obscure the class basis of the legal struggles." (Vanguard, February-March 1965)

The role of real Communists in the bourgeois Courts is not to defend themselves, but to expose this arm of legal terror and intimidation of American imperialism.

Referring to this specific case the same issue of Vanguard states:

"The West Coast POCers harbored no illusions whatsoever about the existence of the remotest possibility of 'fair trial' for them. They were ready, ideologically and politically, to take the 'legal' blows of the class enemy including jail terms. . . .

"The bourgeoisie has always and everywhere used intimidation as a weapon in the class struggle. Thus the image of unconquerable power, which the American imperialist State has studiously created by the institution of legal terror, begins to lose its coercive effect under the impact of the class struggle.

"The devil is not as ugly as they paint it, so goes the saying. The American imperialist State's coercive apparatus becomes puny and contemptible when it is faced by people with principles. This, despite its undeniable troglodite bestiality. . . .

"The simple remarks made by the West Coast POC 'defendants' before Judge Keenan and a jury,

are fully expressive of POC's stand in the face of growing fascism in the United States. 'In the course of this trial we the defendants harbor no illusions concerning the nature of this bourgeois justice, court or jury. We are aware that the justice that will be dispensed in this court room is the justice of our class oppressor which can never be impartial or unbiased. What we have done for our class we will do a thousand times over regardless of the verdict of this jury. We expect no justice from this court!' (Ibid)

Following the directives of the American imperialist powers-that-be, Judge Keenan instructed the jury to bring in a "guilty" verdict against the AMWU organizers. The "defendants" were given a high fine amounting to \$700, twenty days suspended jail sentences, and one year's probation. In this way the American imperialists protected their showcase "Communist" Party US, and their "anti-revisionist" revisionist-Trotskyite cohorts.

The powers-that-be feel confident that between the Labor Fronters of the AFL-CIO, as well as the "independents," the revisionist CPUS, the Trotskyite SLP, SWP, Workers World, Spartacist and the new revisionist-Trotskyite "sputnik" PLP, they can shore-up the revolutionary energies of the American working class. Life and history will show that no power inside the U.S., or outside of it, can prevent the revolution from emerging and developing within the United States.

Economics of "Great Society"

(Continued from page 5)

customers.

"If you do business in Peru, it will be worth while to talk to the people at Chase Manhattan or at Banco Continental and find out how your business can benefit." (Chase Manhattan ad in the New York Times, July 21, 1964)

COMPRADORS — GUARDIANS OF SUPER-PROFITS

The same accelerated pace of American imperialist penetration in the economies of the Latin American nations is evident in the following item dealing with Chile's extractive industries.

"Under the plan announced by Mr. Frei, the Chilean Government will acquire 51 percent of the Braden Copper Company, Kennecott's subsidiary, for \$80 million to be paid over 20 years. Kennecott in return will reinvest all the money in the Chilean copper industry.

"In an effort to expand production, the government and the company will put up another \$120 million jointly to expand production.

"In its arrangement with Anaconda, the Chilean Government owns 25 percent of a new company to be formed jointly with Anaconda to develop an untapped deposit in northern Chile. However, Anaconda's four subsidiaries in Chile will not be touched, the President said.

"The Anaconda plan is similar to one signed in early November by Mr. Frei and New York's Cerro Corporation, which aims at the development of the Rio Blanco copper facilities 40 miles northeast of Santiago, the Chilean capital.

"A joint \$61 million venture, Cerro owns 75 percent while the Chilean Government, pricing, and marketing of the mineral." (Christian Science Monitor, December 12, 1964)

Note here that the Chilean government has been converted into a state monopoly arm of American imperialism. This form of imperialist comprador regime relations are being extended to the whole of Latin America.

This explains how the American imperialist monopolies could roll up such huge profits in 1964. The setting up of the Central American Common Market, the LAFTA, etc., has only served to facilitate the funneling of super-profits extracted from the toilers of that area into the Yankee monopolies' coffers. Typical of the whole of Latin America is the situation of the small nation of Panama.

"... economists in Mr. Robles' Cabinet emphasize that this small country of 1.12 million inhabitants already is paying more than 12 million annually to service its external and internal debt." (New York Times, January 17, 1965)

No wonder the Panamanian masses exhibit such bitter anti-Yankee imperialist moods. This explains the heroic struggles of the Panamanian people against U.S. imperialism. The same is true of Venezuela, Bolivia, Peru, indeed all of Latin America. Logically, the stepped-up robbery of Latin America by American imperialism has resulted in stepped-up fight-back by the people.

But the growing resistance of the peoples exploited and oppressed by imperialism is causing great alarm in American imperialist circles. Writing in *The Philadelphia Inquirer* Milton Freudenheim stated: "The private enterprise system and a financial peace itself are endangered by the widening gap between rich and poor nations, a free world business survey warns.

"The alarm is sounded in a survey of 175 business leaders from 58 countries published by the National Industrial Conference Board, a respected U. S. businessmen's research organization." (Philadelphia Inquirer, November 29, 1964)

Of course, the struggle against U.S. penetration is not limited to Latin America, but is worldwide in scope.

While U.S. imperialist relations with Latin America are well known, the U.S. penetration and expansion into Africa and Asia is not so well understood. Relying almost entirely on indi-

rect means, the U.S. monopolies have widely expanded into Africa. The increasing spiral of U. S. investments in Africa is shown by the following statistics:

1950 — \$287 million
1955 — \$664 million
1958 — \$842 million

Today it exceeds \$2 billion. (Survey of Current Business, March 1963)

Some major areas where U. S. corporations have penetrated or are penetrating are:

- Inga power site in Congo — Alcoa, Reynolds Metals
- Power site in (French Congo) Bethlehem Steel will exploit iron deposits, U.S. Steel take manganese
- Volta Dam project in Ghana — Kaiser
- Konkoure River project in Guinea — Olin Mathieson Company
- Manganese deposits in Gabon — will be exploited by COMILOG, owned by U. S. Steel
- Oil deposits in Gabon — Socony Mobil

This does not include U.S.-owned foreign companies, or projects where the U.S. has only a minor share, such as Rhodesian copper, which is 25% U.S.-owned.

It should be noted that in order to keep those investments producing super-profits for the monopolies, the American imperialists developed their so-called policy of "aid" to the "backward" areas. The following table corresponds to the allotment of "aid" to African states:

1953 — \$28.6 million
1956 — \$50.5 million
1959 — \$194 million

American imperialist "aid" has been greatly increased the last few years, as the New York Times shows. "By 1960 economic assistance to Africa had reached \$207 million. The next year saw a dramatic increase in total economic aid to nearly \$460 million, including farm surpluses and Export-Import Bank loans. This level of aid has been maintained since. The annual average has been \$40 million from 1961 through 1964." (New York Times, January 25, 1965)

At the same time, the U. S. A. through its investments in European banks and industries also channelizes investments toward Africa and Asia.

The "Common Market" nations are also pouring capital into Africa in the form of "aid."

"Eighteen African nations associated with the European Common Market are expected to benefit further this year under the terms of a treaty signed two years ago in Yaounde, the capital of Cameroon.

"The five-year treaty calls for about \$730 million in financial aid — the bulk of it for general economic development. Part of the funds will be used to help offset price fluctuations in farm commodities sold in the Common Market at world levels." (New York Times, January 25, 1965)

The role that the U.S.A. plays as the hub of neo-colonialist imperialism was indicated by the following report:

"West Germany, prodded by the United States and an increasing number of new African nations, is rapidly piling up foreign aid commitments — too rapidly, according to some domestic critics.

"Bonn has made financial commitments to 333 projects involving 30 countries south of the Sahara.

"In the first half of 1964 private West German investors transferred less than \$1 million to all Africa, scarcely more than in the same period the year before.

"Exports to Africa amounted to \$250 million, less than 2 percent of total West German exports in 1964. By comparison, Britain and France exported \$1.37 billion and \$625 million, respectively, to Africa." (New

York Times, January 25, 1965)

LIBERIA — U. S. IMPERIALIST BEACHHEAD

In "Black Africa" U.S. has an old neo-colonialist example to follow, that of Liberia. This "independent" nation has long been a source of super-profits for Firestone and other American monopolies. The latest expansion of American imperialist exploitation of Liberia was explained by the American imperialist press as follows: "Nimba is the famous 'iron mountain' developed by the Liberian American-Swedish Company. . . . The mine site, where there are proven deposits of 250 million tons of the highest grade iron ore, is at an 8,000 foot elevation near the Guinea and Ivory Coast borders. . . .

"The value of iron-ore exports for 1964 was about \$91 million, twice as much as in 1963." (New York Times, January 25, 1965)

Typical of how U.S. capital has penetrated the nations of Africa is the following story of oil in Nigeria. "Up to the end of 1963 the only name in the oil industry that meant something to the Nigerians was the Shell-BP Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria, which, as Shell Darcy, began the search for oil in Nigeria in 1937 and made its first shipment of crude oil in 1958. From a modest 22,900 tons in 1958, Nigeria's total oil exports rose to 5,783,000 tons in 1964. . . .

"Besides the Shell-BP, 6 other companies are actively engaged in exploration. These are the Nigerian Gulf Oil Company, a subsidiary of the Gulf Oil Corporation of U.S.A.; the Nigerian Agip Oil Company; Calasiatic Topco (Amoseas); Mobil Exploration Nigerian, Ltd.; Tennessee Nigeria, Inc., and Satrap Nigeria, Ltd." (New York Times, January 25, 1965)

Alongside the direct exploitation by U.S. firms is the role of the U.N. with its various international monetary agencies. Hence a dam to be built over the Niger River is financed in the following way. "The cost of the dam, including the first stage of a national power grid, was originally estimated at \$190 million. This rose to \$202 million last year — the second year of the plan. Of this, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is providing \$82 million, Britain \$14 million, the United States \$14 million, Italy \$25 million and the Netherlands \$2.8 million." (New York Times, January 25, 1965)

In Ghana, the Volta Aluminum Company is building the largest reduction plant outside of North America, with a capacity of over 150,000 tons. This corporation is owned by the Kaiser-Reynolds monopoly set-up. Ghana expects a private foreign investment of \$847 million annually.

In Sierra Leone, "The largest single development last year was in the formation of a new company, Sherbro Minerals, Ltd., to mine rutile, a titanium ore. The company was formed by the Pittsburgh Glass Company's chemical division and British Titan Products, Ltd.

"Initial investment amounts to \$15 million, and an Export-Import Bank loan of \$10.2 million. . . ." (New York Times, January 25, 1965)

As is the case with the "independent" Latin American nations most of the African nations have to give guarantees against "expropriation" and promises for an "open door" on U.S. exports.

In Africa the front-line of resistance and struggle for national freedom is in the Congo. The Congolese people are heroically fighting U.S. imperialist exploitation and aggression.

The reason why Lyndon Johnson ordered the massacre of Stanleyville was precisely to stem the popular tide of struggle as a means to guarantee the

(Continued on page 8)

Nature of Revisionist-Trotskyite Conspiracy in U.S.

When the Soviet government began to clamp down on the Bukharanite Rights and the Trotskyite "lefts" in the early and middle thirties, those two groups of imperialist agents joined forces against the October Revolution.

It was quite logical that the Bukharanite Right opportunists and the Trotskyite "left" opportunists should find a common ground to fight against the Soviet government and especially since they had already evolved from a political current within the Russian working class, with a wrong theory and program, to a mere band of wreckers and saboteurs.

Something similar has occurred within the Communist movement of the world today.

The forces of revisionism and Trotskyism have established a system of liaisons which permits them to operate jointly against the Marxist-Leninist forces.

This "united front" efforts of the revisionist-Trotskyite cabal exhibits diverse forms of operations.

In our country, this counter-revolutionary "united front of the left" is so common that it has become routine.

In most cases, the "participants" from the revisionist CPUS or the SWP take part in a myriad of "joint ventures" but never do they openly identify themselves as members of one group or the other.

On the West Coast the "united action of the left" has been in existence for a few years.

The United Civil Rights Committee (over-all coordinating committee for the Uncle Tom organisms, CORE, NAACP, MVAC, etc.) houses quite a number of this "united front" element. Among these you will find Daniel Gray of the CPUS and Leslie Evans of SWP.

In the "Friends of the SNCC" you find August and Carol Maimudes of the revisionist CPUS and Julius Snipper of the SWP.

In the Student's Peace Union (now defunct) there were Peter Pearce and Mallory Pearce, of the CPUS, and Michael Goldman of the SWP.

In the Fair Play for Cuba (also defunct) there were Martin Hall and D. Varilla representing the CPUS and Steve Roberts and Al Lewis of the SWP.

The so-called Pacifica Foundation and radio station KPFC (L.A. - S.F.) features Dorothy Healy, Southern California Chairman, CPUS and Theodore Edwards, Southern California SWP Chairman, as regular commentators.

All of this takes place while a sham battle of words is kept up by both counter-revolutionary groups purporting to "expose" each other.

PLM — SPEARHEAD OF REVISIONIST - TROTSKYITE CABAL

On the East Coast the main vehicle of revisionist-Trotskyite "collaboration" is the so-called PLM, and related organisms, the Harlem Club, the Workers' World, Spartacist group, etc.

Since its inception the PLM was assigned the role of "clearing house" for the joint counter-revolutionary efforts of the revisionists and the Trotskyites in the eastern part of the United States.

In order to enable the Trotskyites to "join" the revisionists in counter-revolutionary "united front" activities, the Trotskyites have undergone quite a change in the last few years. However, since they are masters of the political camouflage and can take any position at any given moment this "change" has not been difficult.

That is the reason why they

shelved their line of "proletarian purity" with which they started to bombard the Cuban Revolution. Sensing the possibility for "joint" counter-revolutionary activities between themselves and the Cuban and American revisionists they did short work of their "proletarian principles."

TROTSKYITES HANDED BACK "REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST" STATUS BY REVISIONISTS

Thus, the Fair Play for Cuba became the laboratory for revisionist-Trotskyite "cooperation" and "united front" activities.

In the course of those activities around the Cuban question the revisionists succeeded in "restoring the status" of "Socialist revolutionaries" to the Trotskyites.

Ever since then, the Trotskyites have adopted a policy of "support" to every revolutionary struggle of the people and then logically proceeded to adopt the revisionist line of political sabotage.

The March 22, 1965 edition of the Trotskyite "The Militant", organ of the SWP, published the "Manifesto of the Fourth International on Viet Nam."

As usual, in the "Manifesto" the Trotskyites talk "revolution," but wind up peddling defeatism and counter-revolution.

So-called Manifesto starts by "viciously attacking" American imperialism when it states: "Each day the aims of the criminal aggression of American imperialism against the Vietnamese revolution and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam becomes clearer." (The Militant, March 22, 1965)

Then the "Fourth Internationalists" proceed to paint a picture of "healthy," "powerful," and "invincible" American imperialism in order, precisely to create a mood of pessimism and defeatism. Said the "Manifesto": "Yankee imperialism is not in a desperate impasse at the moment. It is not caught up in a situation in which it feels there is no way out, even temporarily, except to risk suicide. Its military and economic strength stand at the greatest height in history. Prosperity reigns in the United States." (Ibid.)

Then, and in order to help put across the pro-American imperialist line of the Soviet revisionists, the "Manifesto" adds: "It is particularly urgent that the governments of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China close ranks before the common danger." (Ibid.)

Note the stress on "cooperation" between the Soviet government and the government of the People's Republic of China.

What became of the Trotskyite phoney charge of the "counter-revolutionary bureaucracy prevalent in the Soviet Union and China?" For obvious reasons the Trotskyite gimmick has been shelved here.

The counter-revolutionary essence of Trotskyite "policies" is easy to detect if one adheres to Marxism-Leninism and takes into account the chameleon-like character of Trotskyite tactics.

This is especially important today when the Trotskyites are working through many groups, each having a specific division of labor.

It was a long time ago that the Trotskyite "Workers' World" eliminated Trotsky's photograph from its front page and substituted it for a black and white hand symbol. But while this par-

ticular group (WW) eschews any direct identification with Trotsky or Trotskyism, its fellow agents, the Spartacist group, takes up the cudgels for open Trotskyism and the "Holy War against Stalinism."

Both groups work through the PLM crowd.

PLM — "CHOSEN" TO LEAD FIGHT FOR "PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY"

The Spartacists feel pretty confident about the role that PLM will play in the struggle for "proletarian democracy." In Trotskyite lingo this simply means counter-revolutionary actions against the Socialist camp.

Referring to the need to "expose" the "class-collaborationist policies of the Soviet bureaucracy" the Spartacist of July-August 1964 stated: "The Progressive Labor Movement, much smaller than the American CP, has found much needed moral support in the CCP's criticism of the Soviet leadership. But, since the Chinese have not gone beyond superficialities and formalism the responsibility now confronts PL to explain the development of class-collaborationist policies by the Soviet bureaucracy." (Spartacist, July-August, 1964)

Now, any naive soul might think that the Spartacist merely wants the PLM to do the job that People's China with her "superficialities and formalism" is unable to perform. But that is not the case at all. Spartacist expects PLM to carry out the very program that the Fourth International quite conveniently forgot to mention in its "Manifesto on Viet Nam."

The same Spartacist article quoted above continues: "The open split between the ruling groups in the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union is a fact of world-historical significance. On the surface the split appears to be a dispute over ideological questions among self-proclaimed 'Marxist-Leninists.' In its underlying reality, however, the split has a vastly different meaning. It signifies the eruption of irreconcilable material antagonisms between national Stalinist bureaucracies. The context of this struggle is the mortal crisis of the Stalinist system squeezed between the pressures of unyielding world imperialism and of rising working classes internally. . . ."

"Only confused centrists could try to explain the Sino-Soviet dispute in terms of the indigestible 'ideological' apologia issued by the two sides and limit their conclusions to a judgment as to which of these positions is more or less correct, is righter or lefter. The Marxist, proletarian, view starts with the recognition that the political groups symbolized by both Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are mortal and irreconcilable enemies of proletarian democracy, of socialism, and of the working class. Only on this basis can the real issues in their conflict be grasped. . . ."

"The success of Mao Tse-tung and his followers in channeling and distorting into the form of a national-bureaucratic straight-jacket the socialist drives of the Chinese revolution testifies only to the thoroughly and consistently counter-revolutionary nature of the Maoist bureaucracy. The petty-bourgeois nationalist nature of Chinese foreign policy is demonstrated most dramatically by the fact that Peking's border claims against New Delhi are supported by the Chiang Kai-shek regime occupying Formosa. . . ." (Ibid.)

So as to make absolutely certain that PLM's "crypto-Trotskyite" leadership understand the "task" laid out before them, the article is summarized thusly: "The program of the Fourth International for the Soviet Union as set forth in 1938, which posed the central task of the Soviet workers as the restoration of Soviet democracy, is entirely val-

id today not merely for the USSR but for the deformed and degenerated workers states generally. . . ." (Ibid)

And these filthy Trotskyite dogs are the "comrades" of Rosen, Scheer and company, the "leaders" of the movement that "runs parallel to that of the Chinese Communist Party" as the bourgeois press has characterized the PLM. Some gall!

FREE RENT PROVIDED FOR REVISIONISTS AND TROTSKYITES

Availing themselves of the "generosity" of the American ruling class on the 10th and 11th of February last, the revisionist-Trotskyite cabal held a "unity of the left Conference" at a college campus in Lansing, Michigan.

The participating organizations included the DuBois Clubs, Freedom Now Party, the Youth Against Fascism and War and the PLM. Among the featured speakers there were: Milton Rosen, and that Trotskyite shyster, Conrad Lynn.

The decisions of the "unity" pow-wow of the revisionists and Trotskyites is important only and only because PLM was assigned to be the hub of "unity of the left in the East."

What all of this means is that the Lansing, Michigan pow-wow decided that in the East "united front" activities of the revisionists and Trotskyites had to be carried out through the PLM.

Unfortunately, for the revisionist-Trotskyite cabal, things have been going from bad to worse for PLM in the past few months. PLM has been losing the honest, non-revisionist, non-Trotskyite members so fast that only the hard core of the "lend-lease assignees" of the CPUS, SWP, Spartacist and Workers' World remain.

To make things worse that "business" involving the recent expulsion of Phillip Abbott Luce, the PLM editor, has laid bare the counter-revolutionary character of PLM.

The PLM "leaders" claim that this degenerate beatnik (Luce) started on the drug habit under the pressure of tensions developed as a result of his "arrest." Oh, yeah! How come his wife is an addict also, and she was not arrested?

The "discovery" that Luce was an employee of the "White Citizens' Council" in Mississippi was as belated as the "discovery" that both, he and his wife, were drug addicts.

The PLM "leaders" charged that Luce stole \$800 from PLM with which to buy drugs.

REVISIONISTS AND TROTSKYITES SHARE IN "AFFLUENCE OF GREAT SOCIETY"

Referring to CPUS "affluence" and "wondering" at its source, Victor Reisel, the fascist columnist for the Journal-American wrote:

"One of the mysteries intriguing American intelligence services is the source of new funds pouring into the American Communist Party. Capitalist dollars now are more numerous in Party circles than Marxist dialectics. Communist leaders and activists are spending cash like it was going out of style.

"In the past few weeks, for example, at least 25 members of the Party high command, drawn in from across the country, flew to Moscow for post-Khrushchev orientation.

"At a minimum rate of \$730 round-trip between Kennedy Airport and Moscow, the Communist groups had to spend over \$20,000 for air travel alone. This does not include another \$5,000 for cross-country trips to the New York airfield. They disbursed thousands of additional dollars on hotel bills and the minutia of travel. Even Marxists eat.

"This hegira to Moscow is but one of many trips made by the

Party leadership in the past few months. Party theoretician Dr. Herbert Aptheker virtually shuttles to the Communist capital." (Journal-American, November 13 1964

There, there, don't fret yourselves, Messrs. Rosen and Scheer! What's a measly \$800? You are already sharing in the division of that loot, and you know there is yet much more to come from the counter-revolutionary racket.

But how could it be that a degenerate beatnik like Luce, could become "the Editor" of the "theoretical organ" of a "Marxist-Leninist movement?"

If PLM were a real Marxist-Leninist organism, that would, of course, be impossible. But since PLM is just a revisionist-Trotskyite set-up it is quite logical that all types of de-classed elements should be permitted to join it. "Ideologist" Phillip Abbott Luce should not be considered by any stretch of the imagination as a "plant in a Marxist-Leninist organization," but simply as the prototype of member in such an organism as PLM.

Recently the PLM has been "transformed" into the PLP — so what? It is still the same miserable revisionist-Trotskyite set-up!

The bourgeois press gave ample publicity to the "birth of this mouse," from the proverbial mountain. It has expressed the nonsense that PLM "parallels" the political line of the Communist Party of China. But no sooner is the ink dry on those deliberate distortions than they have to quote William Epton, one of the PLM "leaders" to the effect "the Party (PLP) was not connected with the Communist Party of the United States or with Chinese communism." (New York Times, April 19, 1965)

The bourgeois press has shown a remarkable generosity in relation to the revisionists and the Trotskyites and has extended this to PLM.

The bourgeois press, with tongue in cheek, claims that PLM has 1,500 members. The fact is, that the CPUS, SWP, SLP, PLM, the Workers' World and the Spartacist—all put together, do not add up to 1,500 members.

PL, PLM or PLP, the initials don't matter. What really matters is that as an integral part of the revisionist-Trotskyite cabal, PLM will be exposed and totally defeated by the real Marxist-Leninists and anti-imperialist forces in the United States.

In the international movement there may arise some temporary confusion about the role of PLM. But what could prevent the exposure of PLP, the creature of the revisionist-Trotskyite cabal? Ask Messrs. Rosen and Scheer to expose the role of the Trotskyites in the world and in the nation, and watch what happens. They cannot expose themselves!

Ask them to expose the United States revisionists and they will answer with a bunch of generalities and anti-Soviet utterances. How could they be asked to expose the very force that created them?

Vanguard

Box 137

Planetarium Station
New York, New York

— I enclose \$1.00 for a one year subscription.

— I would like further information about POC.

Name

Address

City