

Progressive Worker

OCTOBER 1968
TEN CENTS



REPRESSION PRAGUE AND CHICAGO



Progressive Worker



Published Monthly By
PROGRESSIVE WORKERS MOVEMENT

VANCOUVER
35 East Hastings Street, Vancouver 4, B.C.

TORONTO
MAY 1st BRANCH.
P.O. Box 1151, Adelaide St. Postal Station
Toronto 26, Ontario

EDITOR: JACK SCOTT

Signed articles do not necessarily
represent the views of the
Progressive Workers Movement

Produced entirely by Voluntary Labour

Authorized at second class mail by the Post Office Department
through one for payment of postage in cash.

Subscribe Now



35 East Hastings St Vancouver 4, B.C.
12 issues \$1.00

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG

Volumes I-IV

Volume	Pages	Cloth	Paper
Volume I	348 pages	\$2.50	\$1.60
Volume II	472 pages	\$3.00	\$2.00
Volume III	344 pages	\$2.50	\$1.60
Volume IV	460 pages	\$3.00	\$2.00

Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung . . . 50c

Mao Tse-tung: Four Essays on Philosophy . . . 50c

Selected Readings from the Works of
Mao Tse-tung . . . 2.00

Selected Military Writings of
Mao Tse-tung . . . 2.00



Advance Books and Periodicals

35 East Hastings Street, Vancouver 4, B.C.

REPRESSION IN CHICAGO

The dramatic events that occurred in the vicinity of the Democratic Convention in Chicago have put U. S. liberal circles into deep shock. Holding to a deep and abiding faith in the essential goodness and fairness of U. S. democracy and American "civilization", the liberal element was far from prepared for the eruption of fascist brutality Mayor Daly loosed on Chicago despite the fact it was this same Daly who had given police "shoot to kill" orders when Black Americans were demonstrating against the discriminatory and genocidal policies of the bourgeois state.

What happened at Chicago is not at all extraordinary nor is it by any means uncommon in the United States today. Black people have been treated in even more brutal fashion for centuries. But somehow the white majority just doesn't seem to be able to get too excited over the brutalization of Blacks. It has not become apparent to them that the appetite for murder in the fascist police was whetted on the stone of anti-Black discrimination and brutality.

The shock of realization caused one radio reporter on the scene to exclaim in amazement: "These are not Blacks that are being beaten, they are whites." That involuntary exclamation reveals much that is rotten in the heart of white, bourgeois America. The shock and sensation of Chicago was all the more intense because among those beaten by the police were some of the children of upper middle-class Americans who were in Chicago to support their hero, Eugene McCarthy. Most of these were not beaten on the streets. To reach them, police had to penetrate to the upper floors of the high-class Chicago Hilton Hotel.

It has been common practice for reporters employed in all the media of mass propaganda to scale down the brutal actions of police, and other state forces,



who attack the Black communities. In the vast majority of cases, reports have made Blacks out to be the architects of their own misfortunes and mainly responsible for police actions which they insisted, were directed toward maintenance of "law and order". In view of these circumstances, the beatings administered to the reporters must come under the heading of "poetic justice". P. W. fails to see the point of why it should be considered more reprehensible to beat one reporter than it is to indulge without let-up in the brutal beatings continuously administered to a considerable section of the community. The representatives of the press have no solid basis for protest until they are prepared to expose and protest the murder and brutality occurring daily under the direction of the state -- and that includes the murder and brutality perpetrated against the people of Vietnam.

Chicago seems to have given still further release to vicious forces of fascist reaction. It has been widely known for some time that police, and other so-called "law officers", belonged to openly fascist organizations such as

the John Birch Society, Minute Men, etc. Until now, these "law officers" engaged in their extra-curricular activities out of uniform -- except in the southern states where a uniform has always been accepted as a license to beat and murder Blacks. Since Chicago, these "officers of the law" have moved blatantly into the open and in uniform in all areas of the country.

In New York, police officers in uniform, and wearing "Wallace for President" buttons openly invaded a courtroom where some Black people were being tried and there, in open court, they beat up both spectators and accused. In California, Oakland police, while on official duty, fired numerous shots into a Black Panther Party headquarters that was located in a building occupied by many people. The "officers of the law" have at last removed their mask of civilized legality and revealed their true fascist features for all to see. As the crisis of U. S. capitalism sharpens, events such as these cited here will occur more often. There are many Chicagos in store for the people of the United States in the near future.

What happened inside the Democratic Convention in Chicago was at least of equal importance with what happened outside. The deep and permanent split that developed in the ranks of the Democratic Party is dramatic and reliable evidence that the U. S. ruling class is rapidly approaching the point where they will no longer be able to rule in the old style of bourgeois democratic parliamentary processes. The ruling class will have to resort more and more to open armed terror in order to hold on to state power.

The modern Democratic Party is undoubtedly a bourgeois party. But it is a bourgeois party of a particular sort, and it is this particularity which gives particular significance to the deep split in the Party at Chicago -- a split which extended even into the upper echelons.

The Democratic Party as we now know it was the special creation of the Roosevelt wing of the United States ruling class. It was brought into being during a former period of crisis in U. S. society when there were serious differences in the ruling group on how to maintain the bourgeois state. There were powerful groups who opposed Roosevelt -- reflected in the fact that more than 80 per cent of the press took up a position of firm opposition. These elements considered the ordinary processes of the bourgeois-democratic apparatus to be no longer effective and argued for a resort to open coercion. Roosevelt, on the other hand, still had faith in the ability of the normal organs of bourgeois-democratic state power to handle the situation if some temporary concessions were made to the militant demands being advanced by workers, farmers, intellectuals and sections of the middle class. In this way, Roosevelt maintained, the inevitable revolutionary confrontation between the rulers and the ruled could be postponed.

This modern Democratic Party was the special creation of the Roosevelt forces. A political machine created for the special


purpose of implementing the Roosevelt program for the salvation of United States capitalism.

The particular significance of this political machine was its character of a coalition of representatives of diverse social groups in the U. S. Roosevelt was eminently successful in welding together within the framework of the Democratic Party a coalition of representatives of workers, farmers, intellectuals, middle class elements and small capitalists. The fact that the Roosevelt effort to save capitalism was highly successful needs no elaboration. There were, of course, many reasons for this success, including the failure of the left in America, but that is another, and a long subject. The advent of the anti-fascist war undoubtedly did much to maintain the coalition and extend its existence beyond what would have been possible under "normal" conditions.

At the Chicago Convention, the Democratic Party was still composed of the elements of the Roosevelt coalition and their heirs. But the coalition which had been born in a period of crisis was now being dashed to pieces on a sharper and deeper crisis. In the crisis that gave birth to the coalition, the ruling class could make certain concessions to head off a revolutionary outbreak -- even if some had to be forced to grant concessions. The anti-fascist war, with its broad democratic objectives, stabilized the economy temporarily and strengthened the coalition.

Now that capitalism is in deep crisis there are no concessions that can be made to salvage the situation. There is no popular war to help stabilize the economy; only an unpopular war of imperialist conquest that further aggravates the crisis. Confronted by this critical situation, some of the Roosevelt liberals imagine they can duplicate the Rooseveltian performance of the '30s and save capitalism in spite of the capitalists by reforming the

shattered coalition. These efforts are doomed to failure because new conditions, new problems, require new solutions.



The things that cemented together the Roosevelt coalition are no longer with us. They are as dead as Roosevelt himself.

What is needed now is a new coalition of peoples democratic forces dedicated to the attainment of radically different objectives. A coalition led, not by Rooseveltian capitalists, but by the working class. A coalition not dedicated to saving U. S. imperialism, but to the destruction of that system and its replacement by a society that puts an end to aggression and the exploitation of man by man. Only on this basis can a solid and permanent coalition be constructed.

The hour is growing late in America. Fascist elements have penetrated into all sectors of the state and repression is becoming increasingly rampant. It is not only in the streets of Chicago but in all the councils of state power that the fascist menace lurks. Chicago was a clear warning of what lies ahead in the near future.

NEITHER BREZHNEV, KOSYGIN NOR DUBCEK!

Events in Eastern Europe have reached a climax in the occupation of Czechoslovakia by forces of certain of the Warsaw Pact nations. Soviet tanks rumbling through the streets of Prague, Bratislava and other cities are forcing millions around the world to make a closer examination of recent developments in the so-called "Socialist" bloc.

As is usual in such historic events we get everything but truth and an objective reporting of the events from the various channels of mass communication. Distortion is the common denominator of the mass news media. Reports from sources in the U. S. S. R. are no more dependable than any others and most of the clandestine radio facilities in Czechoslovakia are in the control of members of the Dubcek crew of representatives of the bourgeoisie. The Czechoslovak workers have yet to be heard from.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Leading spokesmen in Moscow have loudly declared they marched on Prague to put an end to Dubcek's betrayal of Socialism. Aside from the fact that these self-proclaimed "defenders of socialism" had long since themselves betrayed the October Revolution and the Proletarian State, they had also presided at Dubcek's installation in power.

Novotny, who preceded Dubcek and was deposed by him, contrary to the brand of "Stalinism" fixed on him by the Dubcek gang of reactionaries, was the personal favorite and protege of Krushchov who led the initial assault on socialism by the Soviet revisionist representatives of the bourgeoisie. Novotny was chosen as the one to build capitalism in Czechoslovakia under the direction and domination of the revisionist masterminds in Moscow.

However, the Czechoslovakian capitalists were not content to remain forever under the domina-

tion of Moscow and bound by firm ties to the Soviet trading system which inhibited their development. They wanted freedom to move on their own in the world market, to make deals where they considered them to their own best advantage. These noisy bourgeois elements were also urgently demanding a more vigorous development of the counter-revolution.

The Moscow stooge, Novotny, was manifestly incapable of giving the kind of leadership necessary for the realization of the demands of the national bourgeoisie who then went in search of a more likely candidate for the role of leading the counter-revolution. Their chosen agent was Alexander Dubcek, until then unknown and without authority in the country.

Dubcek had surrounded himself with agents of the national bourgeoisie, reactionary extremists, criminals released from jail and reactionary church spokesmen who were once more openly in political affairs. The universities, intellectuals and various professional groups, all of which had become, under Novotny, the special preserve of a privileged elite steeped in bourgeois ideology, also provided a strong base of support for the Dubcek faction.

Dubcek and his capitalist masters moved to oust the Novotny clique and seize the positions of power and authority in the Party and the state apparatus. The Soviet revisionists and their closest supporters in the Warsaw Pact bloc, viewed with alarm the proposal for the unceremonious dumping of their hand-picked favorite son, Novotny, and his replacement by a noisy unknown who looked quite capable of rocking the boat in rough in the rough seas of counter-revolution conspiracy. They decided to make an effort to protect Novotny.

A so-called "Warsaw Treaty" meeting was held in Poland and an ultimatum served on the Dubcek faction to cease and desist from their attempts to unseat

Novotny. The ultimatum was followed up by the military manoeuvres conducted on Czechoslovak territory without the consent of the Czechoslovakian government. The whole affair was a massive case of blackmail and it was aimed at terrorising the people and forcing them to accept a Soviet revisionist solution to political and economic problems. The meeting and subsequent actions of the 5 Warsaw Treaty nations was illegal since Czechoslovakia-theone involved-Romania and Albania, all original signatories of the treaty, were excluded from participating in the deliberations and making the decisions.

The armed blackmail was followed by meetings at Curna and Bratislava where Dubcek and his clique apparently agreed to remain loyal to Moscow and to place some restrictions on the activities of the more noisy of the bourgeois elements in Prague who were demanding, among other things, an immediate break with Moscow, resignation from the Warsaw Pact and the establishment of ties with the west. Brezhnev and Kosygin agreed to the handing of power to the Dubcek faction and Novotny removed himself from the scene offering no resistance whatever, resigning all his posts and slinking from the scene like a whipped cur.

Dubcek, therefore, like Novotny before him, enjoyed political power because of the support rendered him by the Soviet revisionists. If he used his authority to advance capitalist interests he was able to do so only because the Krushchovites had made it possible. Having themselves installed the culprit their claim of intervention to prevent him from betraying socialism has little evidence to support.

INTERVENTION

Following the meetings at Curna and Bratislava the Warsaw forces were withdrawn from Czechoslovak territory. It is obvious

from subsequent developments that the National bourgeoisie took withdrawal for a sign of weakness and began pressing for a more vigorous advance on all fronts. Their determination to proceed with all possible speed in the building of capitalism was evident from a number of very obvious signs.

The "2,000 word manifesto", an open declaration of capitalist objectives in Czechoslovakia, was widely distributed and demands pressed for its early implementation.

The bourgeoisie mounted an hysterical and emotional demonstration of welcome for the visit of Tito, chief representative of U.S. imperialism in the Slavic world.

The Dubcek group were conducting private negotiations for closer political and economic relations with the west, particularly with U.S. imperialism and for trade agreements that would turn the emphasis of foreign trade agreements that would turn the emphasis of trade from Russia to the west.

A Czechoslovak application for a loan from the U.S.-controlled World Bank was being given favourable consideration, mainly on the basis of a promise that Czechoslovakia would be opened up as an area of exploitation by foreign capitalists.

The capitalists were demanding that Dubcek forcibly disarm the Worker's Militia in the factories which had remained loyal to fundamental working class principles which the bourgeois elements labeled "Stalinism".

For the Kruschovites, who were walking a political tightrope, these were alarming developments that contained the seeds of disaster for their well-laid plot to smash socialism and put the capitalists back in the saddle. The decision was taken to force Dubcek and the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie back into line and under the control and discipline of the Soviet clique. Success of

the planned operation to rebuild capitalism was critically dependent on unity and discipline within the revisionist camp. Indisciplined action on the part of one member of the gang could place the whole scheme in jeopardy. The armed forces of the truncated Warsaw Pact were turned back in the direction of Czechoslovakia.

WHY INTERVENTION?

Moscow's leading spokesmen are trying to pose as "defenders of socialism." They claim their march into Czechoslovakia is a selfless act to preserve socialist gains. But they studiously avoid dealing with a number of questions crying out for answers.

Why is it necessary to "defend socialism" from the forces they, themselves, had helped to put in power in Czechoslovakia? They were already acquainted with the political and economic program of the Dubcek faction.

Why should they expect us to believe that their work to return the Soviet Union to the path of capitalism equips them for the "defense of socialism" in Czechoslovakia?

How is it that the people of Czechoslovakia, 20 years after the seizure of state power, were unable to suppress internal forces of reaction? Is it not a fact that the only foreign forces engaged directly in the strengthening of capitalist elements in Czechoslovakia were the revisionist ruling clique in the Soviet Union and that the Moscow Kruschovites were directly responsible for Dubcek's rise to power?

For Moscow, these are embarrassing questions the answers to which would reveal conclusively that it is not socialism they were defending; what they were really concerned with was the orderly and safe conduct of the nation back to the capitalist fold. It was other and quite different reasons that Moscow and its allies had for the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia.

(1) From the military point of view Czechoslovakia is one of

the most important strategic areas in Europe. It is understandable that the insecure Soviet ruling clique should be disturbed to the point of hysteria at the thought of such an area becoming a solid part of the western imperialist camp. Having turned Russia into the path of capitalist development, and competition with the U.S. and other imperialists in the world markets, the Kruschovites must naturally look to the possibility of the antagonistic contradiction inherent in imperialist competition leading to conflict. Military necessity compels the Soviet rulers to maintain control over this Eastern European bastion.

(2) After seizing control of the Party and the state the revisionists encountered many difficulties. The economy is stagnant or even foundering, agricultural production in a disastrous state and living standards steadily deteriorating. Consequent on the economic decline and deteriorating living conditions, resentment is spreading and opposition to the revisionists is on the increase. National bourgeois elements are seizing advantage of discontent and demoralization in the various republics to establish a political and economic base of their own. Bourgeois nationalist circles in the federated republics are advancing demands for a share in the profits of exploration. The Kruschovites reply to these demands in the time-honoured imperialist way-with measures of national oppression. Every just demand of the non-Russian national groups is branded reactionary and bourgeois and suppressed by methods bordering on fascist terror.

In the Ukraine, for example, the Ukrainian language has taken second place to Russian and Russian culture supplants the culture of the Ukraine. Similar trends can be observed in Georgia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania etc. Great Russian chauvinism is rampant, encountered by the revisionist traitors.

Success on the part of Czechoslovak capitalists in breaking the

ties with Moscow and failure of the ruling clique to take steps to control the situation would have strengthened the bourgeois nationalist groups in the other areas, boosted their morale, caused them to take heart at the Czechoslovak success to the point where they would soon have made their own bed for power and independence. Occupying Czechoslovakia the revisionists were acting not only to control the situation there, they were also acting to ward off national uprisings and general disaster in the non-Russian republics and to keep intact their crumbling empire.

(3) From the viewpoint of the troubled economy, the defection of Czechoslovakia to the west would have constituted a serious blow to the Soviet Union. The loss of the advanced industry and agriculture of Czechoslovakia would have shaken the Soviet revisionist structure to its very foundations and heightened the crisis of the Soviet economy just when they were promising better things to the Russian workers. As a source of industrial machinery, consumer goods, agricultural products and a source of raw materials, Czechoslovakia was important to Russian economic development.

(4) A reason of first-rate importance for Moscow's act of desperation was the obsessive fear of revolution. The noisy activities of the Prague reactionaries was of such a nature as to threaten complete exposure of the whole revisionist conspiracy to end socialism, restore capitalism and enslave the people. Exposure would bring on a cataclysm that the revisionists dread more than anything else—a revolutionary rising of the working class that would end bourgeois pretensions and destroy their revisionist representatives.

Bourgeois demands for the forcible disarming of the workers militia constituted a crisis of enormous magnitude. Any definite move on the part of the Dubcek faction to enforce this demand of the capitalists would have been met with armed resistance. (The workers had already conducted an

armed demonstration in opposition to this demand.) Armed resistance would have meant revolution would not have been confined to Czechoslovakia - it would have swept across Eastern Europe like a prairie fire and engulfed Western Europe in the flames of revolution.

Had the Russians waited a few weeks longer before acting they would have been forced to march into Czechoslovakia to protect Dubcek and the bourgeoisie from the armed workers in order to guard against the inevitable spread of revolution. Entering Czechoslovakia at this time under the pretext of "protecting socialism" from Dubcek will present the revisionists with the opportunity of "maintaining law and order." Far from "protecting socialism" the revisionists acted to ensure the order by progress of work in the restoration of capitalism.

ARE THESE VALID REASONS?

One must ask the question: Do we have here valid and sufficient reasons to justify the occupation of Czechoslovakia?

If it is conceded that the revisionists are justified in defending their central power base for the purpose of organizing and enforcing an economic system based on the exploration of man by man, then one would have to agree that the reasons are, indeed, valid - just as valid as the reasons stated by the U.S. imperialists for attacking Cuba, intervening in the Dominican Republic, overthrowing the government of Arbenz on Guatemala, carrying on mass slaughter in Vietnam and a thousand other acts of aggressions. But we look at the situation from the viewpoint of revolutionaries, and to a revolutionary these are not valid reasons for invasion of a sovereign state.

Moscow's alibi could not stand up to close scrutiny. In the absence of foreign intervention, (which, in the event, came only from Moscow and her allies) the struggle against the bourgeois reactionaries was a matter for the working people of Czechoslovakia alone to deal with. There is every reason to believe that

they would have dispensed with that task most efficiently in the near future. But that is exactly the kind of development Brezhnev, Kosygin and their colleagues feared most, for had they waited for the workers to settle accounts with the bourgeoisie their own day of reckoning could not have been long postponed.

OUR POSITION

Having rejected the Soviet claim of acting in the interests of socialism and refusing to accept the real reasons as valid justification for the occupation of Czechoslovakia we must not proceed to declare our position in relation to the invasion and occupation of this independent republic.

We condemn the occupation as a flagrant act of aggression against a sovereign state and we place before the Soviet aggressor precisely the same demand we place before all aggressors—an immediate and unconditional end to all acts of aggression and immediate withdrawal from the territory of the sovereign state of Czechoslovakia continues under occupation.

We must also register our strong protest at the way the Warsaw Treaty, originally set up for the just purpose of common defence against imperialist intervention, has been converted under the influence of Brezhnev, Kosygin and Ulbricht, into a weapon for attacking those of its participants who refuse to follow blindly the dictates of the Moscow revisionists.

Having stated our primary demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the aggressor we must now proceed to other important considerations.

What we are faced with in this situation is not just a simple problem of a small capitalist nation being over-run by a large capitalist-imperialist nation. The problem is somewhat different and more complex and, consequently, demands a different approach.

Instead of a confrontation between 7

two capitalist nations-large versus small-this situation involves a confrontation between two revisionist groups drawn into conflict by the antagonistic contradiction that tear them apart despite their common desire to restore capitalist political and economic relations. Both are guilty of a gross betrayal of socialism and the gains of the workers revolution in Eastern Europe. One group considers the absolute domination of Moscow over the revisionist camp as essential to the success of the anti-socialist, anti-working, class conspiracy. The other group, responding to the clamorous demands of its own national bourgeoisie, wants greater freedom of action, more haste and boldness in the business of restoring capitalism, sufficient independence to be able to conclude their own international treaties and trade agreements, even at the expense of other partners in the revisionist camp. Moscow jealously guards its right to exclusive contacts with U. S. imperialism and the Bonn Republic, and continues to consolidate and expand such contacts and alliances even while they condemn the Dubcek faction for proposing the conclusions of similar alliances by the Czechoslovak Republic.

It seems obvious that the working class has little to gain by extending aid and comfort to either one of these two gangs of traitors. Both, in their separate ways, are equally desirous of enslaving and exploiting the working people of Czechoslovakia. In fact, it is not inconceivable that Svoboda and Dubcek will be restored to power by the very people that deposed them, after they have been properly chastened and convinced of the error of their ways and of the need to sacrifice some of their own personal and selfish interests for the common good of the whole revisionist camp. The road back, of course, may well prove more difficult than the road out.

After due consideration of all the factors involved, and while still emphasizing our primary demand for the immediate withdrawal of the aggressors from

Czechoslovakia, we proclaim: "Neither Brozhnev, Kosygin nor Dubcek-Svoboda, but a peoples armed resistance and a socialist revolution." It is only when the common people of Czechoslovakia drive out the aggressors by their own efforts, and establish a revolutionary government of the common people dedicated to the task of building a socialist society, that the critical problems of the republic will begin to be solved.

POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE SITUATION

The most dramatic aspect of this situation is the flagrant act of aggression perpetrated by the Soviet revisionists in the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. But it is not by any means the only or the most important aspect.

When the Soviet revisionists headed the forces that invaded Czechoslovakia they exposed before the whole world, and for all time, the depth of their treachery to mankind. No longer will they exercise over the international movement the degree of influence they once enjoyed. Out of this is bound to come a revolutionary upsurge among the workers in the industrially advanced nations of Europe. The Czechoslovak events have descended on a continent already seething with revolt, especially in France, Italy and West Germany. Only revisionist betrayal headed off a revolutionary challenge in France.

A single spark could start a general conflagration in Europe. Czechoslovakia might yet provided that spark

Condition in Czechoslovakia can never return to their former state. The occupation forces cannot withdraw and leave the problem to find its own solution, and anyone installed in power while the aggressor remains is sure to be suspect. The revisionists are in a blind alley where it is impossible to go forward and difficult to go back.

Any solution that comes out of a possible temporary agreement

among the quarrelling revisionists is certain to be unsatisfactory to everyone.

The result of the crisis can only be a considerable weakening of the political and economic positions of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie and a strengthening of the relative position of the working class, together with an increase of political understanding among all of the working people. We can be optimistic about the workers moving more boldly on to the arena of struggle. The final exposure and break-up of the revisionist camp will release the long penned-up revolutionary energies of the working class. The general situation in the world heads more surely and deliberately on the direction of a revolutionary solution to the general crisis of the capitalist system, an outcome all the more certain by reason of the decisive weakening of revisionist control and influence in the revolutionary movement.

THE WEST AND THE OCCUPATION

Should some future researcher emerge deeply puzzled from a study of the historic events of the day he might well be forgiven for coming to the conclusion that our so-called western world suffered from a severe case of split personality.

Capitalist spokesmen in the west, on the one hand, take advantage of the situation to denounce "communist terror and aggression" while, on the other hand, the same gentlemen loudly extol the virtues of "socialism" in Czechoslovakia. It almost seems that they cannot quite make up their minds whether to be good capitalists or "democratic socialists", of the Czechoslovak type of course.

Our own first minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, who laid claim to an understanding and appreciation of the "difficulties the U. S. faced in Vietnam" and said a denunciation of U. S. aggression in Vietnam would serve no good purpose, (despite the fact that Canada has certain well-defined

obligations under the Geneva agreement), cut short a vacation in sunny Spain to fly back in haste to darkest Ottawa in order to issue a hastily-prepared denunciation of alleged "communist aggression."

The chief spokesmen for U. S. imperialism, Johnson and Rusk, their hands dripping with the blood of murdered millions in Vietnam and elsewhere, appear before the world weeping crocodile tears about "communist aggression" and calls for immediate withdrawal even while they insist that U. S. armed forces will remain in South Vietnam and the North suffer continued and increased bombing raids. We expect that the United States will make the fullest possible use of the situation in an attempt to draw attention away from Vietnam.

All of this, plus the resolutions of condemnation at the United Nations, are developments that we must naturally expect. After all, collusion between U. S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism must not be too obvious, so a little parlour game must be played with sharp words, everyone knowing the rules beforehand. We must look behind the words for the deeds.

U. S. spokesmen issued a gratuitous denial that they knew of the impending invasion of Czechoslovakia two weeks before it occurred through information relayed to them from the Soviet State Department. Some commentators and editorial writers are saying the future may show that the Soviet Union preserved the peace of the world by occupying Czechoslovakia because it headed off a decision of East Germany to go it alone.

Diplomats at the U. N. (including U. S. representatives) have let it be known they are now ready to quietly drop the subject of Czechoslovakia.

Johnson has issued a public statement saying the invasion of Czechoslovakia will not change friendly relations be-

tween the U. S. and the Soviet Union, nor will it be allowed to inhibit further discussions on greater areas of cooperation between the two nations, including attempts to end the fighting in Vietnam. Johnson also insisted he still wished to go to Moscow for a "summit meeting" as soon as possible.

The words are denunciation and condemnation, the deeds are sweetness and light indicating a happy collusion between friends.

Undoubtedly the U. S. imperialists would like to see the vast market of Eastern Europe opened up to foreign investment and exploitation at a more rapid pace. However, they do have some understanding of the complex problems confronting the revisionists in their difficult task of restoring capitalism. The restoration is not a forward, progressive step from a lower to a higher social system; it is a backward counter-revolutionary move beset with many difficulties.

The danger of a general conflagration inherent in the noisy demonstrations and extreme demands of the Czechoslovak reactionaries was just as much a subject of fear to the U. S. imperialists as it was to the Soviet ruling clique. The U. S. therefore, had just as large a stake in the occupation of Czech territory as Moscow. The U. S. imperialists unquestionably acquiesced in the invasion; if not before the fact then certainly after it.

The occupation of Czechoslovakia, far from being taken in opposition to U. S. wishes, is just one more act of collusion in the conspiracy to divide and share the whole world between them. U. S. - Soviet cooperation will be strengthened, not weakened.

THE C. P. OF CANADA

The crisis in Europe has routed the leaders of the Communist Party of Canada from their

accustomed state of between-election hibernation to issue what they laughingly call a "statement". The C. P. leaders on such occasions appear in either one of two roles, the choice depending on the situation. When they want to convey the impression of "militancy" they come out cackling like a bunch of ferocious chickens. On some occasions, the present one, for example, they bleat like a flock of frightened sheep.

Just five days before the invasion the Party newspaper was on the street declaiming against the "imperialists and reactionaries" who were looking for a serious split in the "socialist camp". According to the "Tribune" the Bratislava and Cierna meetings had forever ruled out the possibility of any serious difference. The "Action Program" of the Dubcek faction was hailed as a great contribution to the cause of "socialist democracy". There was no really serious threat, according to the "Tribune", to the orderly building of a "socialist society" in Czechoslovakia.

A few days later, with their world crashing down on them, these so-called "leaders" come out with a "statement" approximately long enough to cover the back of a ten cent postage stamp. They are "disturbed" by the occupation. Disregarding all known facts they claim intervention came at the request of "the majority of the Presidium" of the Party. They counsel "all concerned" to facilitate "the early withdrawal" of foreign troops. In their usual fashion they essay to silence all criticism with denunciations of "anti-Sovietism" without making clear whether the occupation is "anti-Soviet" or if demands for "early withdrawal" are really "anti-Soviet" because they question the wisdom of Moscow and suggest the "world leaders" need advice on how to keep their own house in order. In brief, the

C. P. leaders are offering a classic example of how to ride at the same time, two horses going in opposite directions.

The fact is that events in Europe confront the C. P. of Canada with the problem of how to salvage a program and policy that now lies in ruins at their feet - a program that for years they have stoutly defended as painting the road to socialism in Canada.

They have berated Marxist-Leninists for insisting that "political power flows from the barrel of a gun". The Czechoslovak events clearly demonstrate that, while they reject this principle in words they accept it in practice. The gun barrel is the basis of power in Czechoslovakia today.

Staunchly adhering to their discredited "peaceful parlia-

mentary road to socialism". Kashtan and his cronies consistently denied that there could be class struggle under socialism. Czechoslovakia has punctured their utopian dream. We are now anxiously awaiting their ideological defence of the theory that there can be class struggle under socialism in Czechoslovakia but no such struggle in the Soviet Union which has been happily building "communism" for nearly 20 years. They will surely make the attempt.

What of the C. P. leaders cherished theory of a multi-party government for the building of socialism? This was one of the heresies advanced in Dubcek's bourgeois "Program of Action" which the Warsaw Treaty forces undertook to destroy. Can we now look forward with happy expectancy to seeing a corporal's guard of Warsaw Treaty forces marching into the Party's Cecil Street mansion in Toronto to depose Kashtan? For that event

WOMEN WHO WORK

Upon reading the Aug./Sept. issue of Progressive Worker, the article on "Equality" brought to my mind the trials and tribulations of the women I work with. Although I've never written before, I felt prompted to write about those of us who are in the mass of unorganized labour.

Our office handles data processing. Every day we battle the elements from paper fleas (which bite our arms, legs and faces and make us look like a measles epidemic hit) to the poor lighting and lack of ventilation. We have poor pay and shift work. Many of the girls are part-time and the rest of us are permanent part-time; which means we work a forty-hour week or more and have no medical plan, no group insurance or pension plan.

Although, as I said, I'm not a writer, I want to tell the people who read this paper what it's like to have "equality" for working women in the 'sixties. Below are some incidents I know of.

Susan went for an interview at a large insurance company before she came here. She and her husband needed the extra pay cheque if they were ever going to be able to save money for a down payment on a house.

The man who interviewed her (a Mr. O'Malley) asked Sue if she was married. She said she was and so he proceeded to inquire if and when they were going to have children. Sue said not for quite a few years, because they could not afford any. Then this man wanted to know if they used birth control pills. Sue said no they didn't. Then he asked what type of mechanical device they used, if any. Sue was flabbergasted at his question, but replied by telling the name of the device. Then this fat Babbitt wanted to know if she used this device every time. That did it for Sue. She stomped out of that office alternately flushed with anger and humiliation. Maureen, on the other hand, once

we should declare a national holiday.

The dwindling forces of the C. P. of Canada have been stricken one more serious blow. If the federal elections were to be held now the miserable handful of votes they garnered would disappear almost entirely. Revisionism in the form of C. P. organization has been struck a serious blow, but revisionism as an ideology of capitalism is still very much with us. The events in Europe, and those to follow in the days immediately ahead, have contributed and will contribute much to the ideological clarification of many complex problems in the struggle for socialism. But it would be wrong to think that things will happen automatically. Revolutionaries must press the struggle with even greater effort and it is our hope that P. W. will prove to be an effective weapon for use in the battles that lie ahead.

worked for a big public utility. Here, there was a union. It was an American one though. They paid their dues and saw a bureaucrat once in a while who was getting fat and prosperous but he never did anything about pay or working conditions. He just kept telling the girls that they were working for the best company in Canada.

Moe is a little on the heavy side at about 5'4" and 140 lbs, but is one of the best skilled workers I know. The company hired her but told her she would have to lose a little weight. The company doctor gave her a diet and a time limit to lose the weight in. She lost weight but not fast enough for the company, so she was fired.

Equality for the working women in the 'sixties to my mind hasn't improved since we were given the vote in 1921 and is still the stinking lie it's always been.

--by Anna St. Marie

canadian worker

THE UNIONS--WHAT'S AHEAD

We have just emerged from one more major round of union negotiations during which the impression was of important gains having been made. But in spite of the optimism, and the self-congratulatory tone of the comments originating in the board rooms of the union bureaucracy, one has no difficulty in detecting an air of pessimism and frustration pervading the ranks of the ordinary union members.

A query commonly heard on all sides is: "What is the use of it all? Prices will go up and, in a few months we will be back to where we were, or even worse off." Many of the workers have an uneasy feeling of being on a treadmill where they have to keep running at full speed just to keep from losing ground.

An item of increasing importance, one of which the average worker is daily becoming more conscious, is the widening gap in income between the higher-paid sections of the organized workers and the extremely low incomes of most of the unorganized majority. A steadily-growing number of trade unionists are coming to the realization that the unions have developed into self-centred and selfish cliques no longer mindful of their duty to speak out and act with vigor and determination on behalf of the low-paid, sweated and still unorganized workers.

It has not escaped the attention of a great many unionists that the unorganized represent more than 75 per cent of all the workers, who receive substandard wages, and in the case of several million a standard of living well within the category of absolute poverty. This majority is growing increasingly bitter at the way in which society -- including

the trade union movement -- appears to be grinding them ever deeper into poverty and degradation and ignoring their plight, except to pass pious resolutions or use their condition of poverty as an election gimmick.

It is growing ever more apparent that the political representatives of the ruling class are intent on taking advantage of the situation to turn the unorganized majority--especially the poorest sections--against the organized minority. Due to the seeming indifference of the unions, (bureaucratic interest does not extend beyond telling the poor, "Why don't you get organized?") reactionary circles have experienced a fair measure of success in their anti-union efforts. British Columbia and Ontario, both highly industrialized and highly unionized provinces, have started to process labour-muzzling legislation of a nature that has been unknown in Canada for over 30 years. Indications are that the Federal government will follow suit with similar statutes and possibly an order to change the Labour Board into a "public interest body" with trade union representatives excluded. Up until the present, the trade union movement has shown itself to be singularly ineffective in resisting these anti-labour measures and has actually exhibited little desire for any positive action beyond briefs and petitions.

If this trend is allowed to continue unchecked, the coming period could prove extremely perilous for the unions, and for the working class as a whole. The crisis of the capitalist system is already sharpening and will grow worse in the coming months. The ruling class are sure to act in defence of their profits and of the special privileges the existing

social order guarantees them. To achieve this goal they will launch fierce attacks against the workers -- against the organized section of the workers in the first place. Any disunity in the ranks of the workers as a class could be fatal to all. Still more disastrous to the workers' cause would be any measure of success attending the efforts of the reactionaries to set one section of the working class against another section they feel rightly or wrongly is of no consequence, are receiving special concessions at the expense of the poor.

This is no "pipe dream" or "crying wolf". It is all too real, and a situation that requires immediate emergency attention and action before it gets completely beyond the control of the labour movement.

The task cannot be left to the tender mercies of the bureaucrats who already are reacting in the time-honoured way of all opportunists -- taking advantage of the crisis to further personal ambitions. One bureaucratic faction strives mightily to unseat another so they may take a turn at enjoying the fruits of office. But so far the average worker has not entered the fray in any decisive manner and until that happens the interests of the rank and file will receive little, if any, attention.

Those workers in the unions who are politically mature bear a special responsibility to champion the interests of the rank and file; point their attention to the critical situation; emphasize the urgent need for the unions to quit operating on a "business as usual basis" in this period of deepening crisis in the capitalist system and under the menace of

possible victory for the most reactionary forces, who would forge still stronger chains to bind the working people in slavery. The left must mobilize the workers for action.

Trade unions developed out of



primitive organizations such as friendly societies and similar self-help groups. As they developed into actual trade unions, they became centers for rallying workers for common action. From action as individual workers, they passed over to joint action in defence of the welfare of all. In their origins, then, trade unions represented spontaneous attempts to end competition between workers, or at the very least to restrict such competition and obtain contractual conditions that would raise the industrial workers above the status of slaves.

In the early period of union development, revolutionaries, starting with Marx and Engels, supported and encouraged all efforts by the workers to organize and deal collectively with employers. The International Workingmen's Association -- the First International -- paid a lot of attention to trade unions and the problems of factory organization and also supplied the workers with a center for the organization of movements of international solidarity. The International, for example, played an outstanding role in the 8-hour day fight of the 1880's, which was a movement of great political significance.

12 But the left was also critical of

the limitations in the outlook and goals of the trade unions. The concentration on direct and local struggles with individual capitalists for limited gains within the framework of the capitalist system was pointed out as one of the serious weaknesses of the movement. The class-conscious revolutionaries stressed the need for workers to go beyond organization for limited economic objectives to organizing themselves as a political party having the aim of putting an end to the wage system and the capitalist mode of production. On this subject, the International Workingmen's Association, in convention at Geneva in 1866, endorsed a resolution on the trade unions, the contents of which are still relevant in Canada today. A particularly relevant passage reads:

"In addition to their original tasks, the trade unions must now learn how to act consciously as focal points for organizing the working class in the greater interests of its complete emancipation. They must support every social and political movement directed towards this aim. By considering themselves champions and representatives of the whole working class, and acting accordingly, the trade unions must succeed in rallying round themselves all workers still outside their ranks. They must carefully safeguard the interests of the workers in the poorest-paid trades, as, for example, the farm labourers, who due to especially unfavourable circumstances have been deprived of their power of resistance. They must convince the whole world that their efforts are far from narrow and egoistic, but on the contrary, are directed towards the emancipation of the down-trodden masses."

Important points to be underlined in this passage are those stressing the necessity for the trade unions to act in defence of the interests of low-paid workers, with special stress on the need to struggle for the COMPLETE emancipation of the working class. Considering the absolute neces-

ity for a struggle on these two inter-related fronts, it requires to be said that the union movement in Canada is falling far short of grappling with the essential tasks confronting it today. Behind the gaudy facade built up by the "public relations" men, behind the voluminous briefs and reports drawn up by the university-trained "labour experts", lies the stark reality that the trade unions are ideologically and organizationally in far worse shape now than ever before in the history of the labour movement. Demoralization and frustration have reached such an extreme that no more than 3 to 4 per cent of the members attend union meetings, although they are generally held no oftener than about 9 times per year.

On the question of defending the low-paid workers, the bureaucrats have no interest whatever in acting on behalf of anyone not paying dues. Even solidarity between unions is now almost non-existent, the main concern being maintenance of jurisdictions and membership raiding against each other. Instead of working to unite the movement in common action for the good of all the bureaucrats vie one against the other like cheap carpetbaggers. Official propaganda among the rank and file members tends more and more to emphasize the advantage gained over a rival union -- or even between locals of the same union -- rather than stressing the need for all to advance together against a common enemy.

Today, more than ever before, unions concentrate on purely economic demands thus electing to work within the framework of the capitalist system. With contracts being signed for periods of 3 to 5 years, most of the unions' time is occupied with the ordinary tasks of bureaucratic administration of little interest to the average worker.

"Political action", so-called, is confined to urging support for right-wing social democracy which is cast in the role of the "political arm of labour". This

policy limits political activity in the unions to that of an electoral machine active only during election campaigns. With elections happening every 3 or 4 years, there is little of keen political interest over long periods of time to hold the attention of the workers.

It is easy to see that there are long periods during which there is nothing of interest for the rank and file. So far as political and economic struggle is concerned, the unions are mostly desert land

The political movement of the working class naturally has for its ultimate aim the conquest of political power. But the economic and political struggles are not totally isolated from one another. When workers demand, and strike for a 7-hour day that is an economic movement. However, when the demand develops into movement to forcibly obtain a 7-hour law, it is a political movement. The economic stage of the struggle can grow into the political.

Today, for example, several important trade unions have raised, with varying degrees of seriousness, the demand for a guaranteed annual income in contract negotiations with individual employers. In its present state, this is an ECONOMIC demand which attempts to take care of the interests of just those workers represented in negotiations. It is, furthermore, a demand with serious limitations, providing a guarantee for only a very limited period in the event of a decline in production and consequent unemployment.

But if the demand for a guaranteed annual income was raised to the level of a demand for a LAW guaranteeing a minimum level of income to all for life then it would require the bringing into being a political movement of great importance. Rallying the entire union movement, and around it the millions of unorganized, for economic action to force the enactment of such a law would be a political movement of great magnitude. It would also

have the important effect of healing the already existing serious rift between organized and unorganized workers. This is an especially serious matter with the reactionaries bending every effort to stir up strife between the extremely low-paid majority and the unionized minority.

For the past twenty years or more fake radicals in the unions have contributed a large share of the effort needed to create the political desert now existing in the movement. This is particularly true of members of the Communist Party of Canada who have obtained bureaucratic positions in a number of unions. These make-believe radicals announce it would be an error to raise the question of socialism in the unions because Canadian workers are not interested in socialism. Thus they seek to "justify" their failure to raise and fight for the introduction of working class politics in the unions. As Lenin once said, there are only two kinds of politics, working class politics and capitalist politics. It follows if one does not fight for working class political action, then the only alternative is capitalist politics. Issues that lead in the direction of ultimate victory for socialism are the only basis of real working class politics.

The fact that this nation is dominated by U. S. imperialism presents labour with the golden opportunity to organize a struggle for an objective that is truly in the national interest and at the same time a step in the direction of socialism. In other words, real and effective working class political action.

Labour should give a lead to the nation in the struggle for independence by becoming the central force uniting all the people around a demand for the nationalization of foreign-owned concerns without compensation. More than sufficient compensation has already been paid the U. S. monopolists, in the form of enormous profits reaped over a period of years. The nationalized property should be truly national and

have no private shareholders.

In order to fight effectively for the measures essential to securing national independence, the trade unions themselves will have to be free from foreign domina-



tion. This would be so under any circumstances, but it is even more so in the present situation where the dominant control of the economy is in the hands of U. S. monopolists, and unions in Canada are under control of the United States labour lieutenants of imperialism who are solidly committed to U. S. capitalism and to U. S. domination of the world. An independent Canadian union movement is an absolute necessity and one of the things the unions must place high on their agenda.

A national minimum wage of at least \$100 per week, established by law, is a political demand



which would begin to provide for the needs of the WHOLE working class. Where to get the money? From the exorbitant profits now going to a privileged few and mainly from the major section

the economy now in foreign control but which should be nationalized.

In order to make the foregoing demand really effective and meaningful, an additional related demand must be put forward, namely; a government statute guaranteeing to all as an inalienable right, a job or an adequate income as provided in the minimum wage act.

ALBERTA LABOUR BOARD SUPPORTS U.S. UNION

The Canadian Electrical Workers Union has sent us a press release accusing the Alberta Labour Board of discrimination against employees of the Phillips Cables Co., Sentinel (near Coleman), Alberta, and their union the C. E. W. U. The decision appears to have been made with complete disregard for the principles of workers to join the union of their choice. The decision is arbitrary, unjust, and violates the democratic will of the vast majority of Phillips employees.

The board refused to call a hearing which under Section 71 of the "Labour Act" entitles dissatisfied groups to do. This is not democracy. It does not even pretend to be democracy. Phillips employees are being denied the right to their choice of Trade Union. Freedom of association is supposed to be guaranteed by the Canadian "Bill of Rights". Why is it not put into effect in Alberta?

Between January and September of this year there were a series of developments that began with Phillips employees becoming fed up with the I. B. E. W. (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of America) which is the bargaining agent at the plant. The employees decided to throw the I. B. E. W. out. The C. E. W. U. was invited in, the C. E. W. U. chartered a local and elected officers, 108 out of 112 in the plant asked the employer not to deduct dues for the I. B. E. W. The employer refused this request. The C. E. W. U. then made

Obviously these are not the "normal" demands advanced by unions in contract negotiations with individual employers. They are political demands that go far beyond the present aims of the trade union movement and require a different approach.

First of all the unions will have to act COLLECTIVELY and unitedly instead of in their present highly individualistic and competitive fashion. The entire


union membership will have to be mobilized for the struggle under militant leadership, and beyond them and around them will have to be rallied the entire working class and all working people. This is a fight which cannot be won with pious resolutions and demagogic speeches. It will require long and fierce struggle under new leaders and with new forms of organizations. It will require an end to viewing the capitalist system as untouchable.

application to the Labour Board for the right to become bargaining agent C. E. W. U. Local 2, now representing 106 out of 112 employees (94%). In April the Alberta Labour Board rejected the application on an insignificant technicality. At about the same time the I. B. E. W. cancelled all local meetings. In May, 100 employees signed a petition supporting C. E. W. U. and asking the Board to reconsider the April decision. The Board signed the appeal.

By virtue of a right under section 71 of the Labour Act, Local 2 made its second application. On September 3rd of this year the Board dismissed the application.

Presently the employees are being forced to pay dues to the I. B. E. W. who has not held a local meeting in seven months.

The C. E. W. U. position is straight forward and clear. Allow the Phillips employees a secret ballot vote to determine which union should represent them. The discredited I. B. E. W. (American) and the Alberta Labour Board are working hand in glove against the interests of Canadian Workers. This is a lesson that is not new to Canadian Workers, the struggle in British Columbia by the Pulp and Paper Workers for recognition at Harmack and Prince George are a few examples of past injustice on behalf of Labour Boards. If this continues in the future, workers will be forced to use new methods of organizing unions of their choice. This can be accomplished by simply passing by the Government Labour bodys that do not have the slightest interest in justice for the working class.



RECOGNITION

policy that made it red-baiting?

After 4 years of existence the Pacific Tribune (C. P. journal in B. C.) has finally consented to take note of our presence. True enough the recognition was extended in a rather negative and boorish manner - but recognition it was, nevertheless. The reason for this historic event was due to a C. P. decision to comment on the emergence of the Council of Canadian Unions at Sudbury in July of this year. We are not quite certain if the matter was dealt with because P. W. reported and commented on the founding convention of the new organization or if it was solely because it had come into existence. However, since the Tribune writer has offered to discuss the matter we hasten to oblige.

The first item we propose to discuss is the authors complaint of having been "red-baited with the pronouncement that it was "Communist dominated". Now if MacDonald had said the Communist Party of Canada is Communist - dominated that would unquestionably have been red-baiting the C. P., in which case we would have associated ourselves with the Tribune protest. However, we cannot fault MacDonald on that score. He is so confident that there are no Communists in the C. P. that he helped promote a resolution at the last C. L. C. convention that removed all disabilities against members of that Party holding membership or office in the C. L. C. The Union bureaucrat who wrote the Tribune article was there and applauded the measure.

So far as P. W. is concerned we merely reported that the C. P. leaders opposed the establishment of a Council of Canadian Unions and cited what we believed was evidence substantiating the fact. The Tribune writer acknowledges the truth of what we said and calls it red-baiting. Since when does relating the facts constitute red-baiting? Or perhaps it was our disagreement with the C. P.

That raises an interesting item for speculation. The C. P. leaders have a strong desire to become parliamentary representatives some day. What if the impossible should happen and a C. P. parliamentary majority get itself elected? Would we be justified in suggesting the first legislation up for consideration would be a statute raising disagreement with the C. P. from the status of a "red-baiting" sin to the level of a crime against the state, calling for summary court martial and immediate execution or, at the very least, to imprisonment for life? Better play it safe and stop criticizing the C. P. leaders for doing their thing.

The Tribune article makes a point of calling to our attention the fact that we did not list the Public Service Alliance as one of the absentee unions. There was no need to remind us, it was no oversight. We just don't consider the P. S. A. a union - certainly not above the category of "company Union". The only reason the C. L. C. accepts them in affiliation is to collect the per capita on 115,000 bodies. But the Tribune's remarks give us a good idea of what those people consider a union to be. Among other things the P. S. A. stands for: Outlawing strikes in the civil service; Compulsory arbitration; Scabbing, as outlined in a letter during the postal strike, instructing their members it was a public duty and a contractual obligation to cross picket lines; Stoolpigeon service when, in the same letter, P. S. A. members were ordered, if they could not get through the picket line to inform the authorities it was because of a fear of violence and subsequent injury (thus making a good case for an injunction). This in our considered opinion, does not constitute a union worthy of the name. However, we concede the Tribune the right to disagree with us and hold the opposite opinion.

The author, aware of the rising

tide of sentiment in favour of independence, pays lip-service to an independent Canadian union movement. In this he is like the politician who, during an election campaign, fervently declares himself in favour of motherhood, the home and the family but, when elected, puts into effect legislation that is certain to undermine and ultimately destroy the conditions necessary for maintaining the family in decency. The way to build Canadian unions is to go out and build them. Declaring in favour of such organizations and at the same time repeating for half-a-century "now is not the time" will leave us exactly where we are now - under U. S. domination. The C. P. leaders, in spite of all their talk, are not now, and never have been, in favour of an independent Canadian Union movement. Their record will show that to be the case.

When the Party was founded the independent Canadian unions were on the verge of reaching an absolute majority of the organized workers in Canada and could have gone on to drive the U. S. unions out altogether. It was the Party leaders who saved the situation for the U. S. craft unions. Tim Buck, who was architect of the policy as head of the Party trade union work, when writing of the events later in his book 30 years, a history of the C. P. of Canada, boasted that it was the Party's influence among the "foreign born workers" that tipped the scales in favour of the craft unions.

The Party leadership is interested in only one thing, obtaining positions in the trade union bureaucracy. As evidence the Mine Mill fiasco is a case in point. When the Steelworkers Union was insisting that the Mine Mill officials must go before unity could be achieved the C. P. officials and the C. P. leaders in Mine Mill damned the Steel Union as U. S. dominated and one of the most undemocratic organizations on the face of the earth. But when the ultimatum of dismissal was dropped and guarantees of security in an

appointed office, with a generous pension to follow, were offered to the C. P. heads of Mine Mill the Steel Union was transformed overnight into a great democratic body with broad Canadian autonomy. It is indeed surpassing what changes can be wrought with a little corn of the realm. The Mine Mill crowd was so anxious to grab the offer that an Ontario

court has declared they failed to take sufficient time to do it legally. These great militants even tried to install a trusteeship over the Sudbury local to force the reluctant workers into accepting the foul deed.

If "Observer" in the Pacific Tribune would for once relate the truth he would inform the readers

PROMISES! PROMISES!

We have always known that political promises, in this wonderful democratic society of ours, are of no more significance than an election campaign gimmick, and never to be thought of as seriously intended for government policy. We confess, however, that we are just a little breathless at the speed with which Pierre, the "swinging" Prime Minister, junked his highly touted "Just Society" with never a note of apology for having led so many good citizens up the garden path. In the United States, which our politicians are fond of copying, the "New Frontiers" proved to be just the old ones expanded far enough to take in Vietnam and the "War on Poverty" ended up with a unanimous decision going to poverty. Now our Pierre, with the sound waves from his election rallies scarcely stilled, announces to a hushed and expectant citizenry that his "Just Society" just isn't there. It appears that our underprivileged millionaires - including Pierre himself, and his family - and the U. S. holders of the mortgage on our fair domain, are just not able to afford a "Just Society" just yet. Record profits and "Just Societies" are not compatible, therefore the "Just Society" must go.

When it was first announced in the heady atmosphere of a hot election campaign the "Just Society" was understood to mean that the problem of poverty in the nation would be tackled with vigor and imagination. And poverty is one commodity most observant people agree we have plenty of. Even a blue ribbon jury like the economic

four million citizens - 20 percent of the total population - living in conditions of abject poverty and no one, including magnificent Pierre, will deny it. Actually an estimate of one-third of the nation living in poverty and an additional third barely above the subsistence level would be a much more accurate picture. It seems that the gentlemen of the economic council may have counted only those of our people who are actually showing signs of disease from advanced malnutrition.

In his patented exuberant manner, following a holiday with "Jet Set" in Franco's sunny Spain, Pierre decides on an immediate measure to tackle the problem of poverty he announces cancellation of the winter works programme. The down-trodden monopolists, reduced to their last few hundred billion, are not able to afford winter works this year. Well, at least it ought to take care of some of the poverty. Hopefully, a few of the less robust will die off, thus reducing the total number of the poverty stricken.

While the nations first minister finds it impossible to secure the necessary funds to alleviate the hunger of a number of our citizens he seems to have no difficulty in procuring ample funds to subsidize right-wing reactionaries and fascist elements who are introduced into the country disguised as "political refugees". There is a host of authentic political refugees just south of our international border, a fact which seems to raise no ripple of concern in the hallowed halls of parliament. There are countless

the C. P. will stick to the U. S. unions so long as they can get appointed to well paid positions. But if Canadian unions win the day the C. P. leaders will support them, provided they can get a similar deal.

More accusation of "red-baiting"?
Ho Hum!

Black and coloured people around the world who could easily qualify as refugees, but it seems that one must be both white and reactionary in order to qualify for Pierre's "refugee assistance programme". Most of all we have our own refugees from poverty who are deserving of our first attention. As a start, put back the winter works programme and then let us go on from there.

As a prelude to dimming the bright vision of the "Just Society" the Prime Minister cautioned us not to expect miracles and stressed the need for "a sober awareness of reality". In other words; business as usual at the same old stand.

Incomes cannot rise unless productivity increases, according to the inventor of the "Just Society". In simple terms that means work harder for less and watch profits grow. If that is anything new and dynamic P. W. fails to see it. The capitalists have been singing that tune for centuries.

The last parliament let a bill on prices of pharmaceutical products die along with parliament itself. Recent reports have more than borne out what almost everyone knew all along: manufacturers of brand name drugs are unmercifully gouging the sick and mainly the old and destitute. But magnificent Pierre is not going to be rushed into protective legislation. More important is stepping up production so as to ensure an increase in profits for the rich and emergency action to provide assistance for reactionary refugees from abroad.

Ever since the days of the hungry

thirties liberal reform economists have been advising restrictions on government spending during periods of broad industrial expansion and an increase in government expenditure when expansion slackens off. This has long been referred to as "pump priming".

In accordance with this advice government spending should rise sharply, since industrial construction is declining sharply and unemployment showing a steady tendency to increase. But the Prime Minister announces that the policy of this government will be to cut spending drastically and cancellation of the winter works programme is one step in that direction. In short, the alleged modern reform liberal Prime Minister is proceeding on an economic course, the direct opposite to that suggested by the reform economists. Limiting government expenditure, curtailing wage increases and im-

There has recently grown up in Saskatchewan an organization known as the Col. J. Sutherland-Brown Volunteer Brigade. The founders of this Brigade are motivated by opposition to the U. S. take-over of agricultural land, industry and mineral resources in Saskatchewan and against the over-flights of U. S. nuclear bombers. We are in complete solidarity with the anti-imperialist sentiments of the Brigade although we agree with Farley Mowat that there is little point in firing blank ammunition at bombers passing over. We also consider it of little value to go serving an eviction notice on the Yankees until one is prepared to enforce it. However, those are things which the members of the Brigade will discover from their own experience. In the meantime our support is with the Brigade against the imperialists.

Whoever chose the name of J. Sutherland-Brown must have been well versed in Canadian military history. By the same token, those responsible show signs of

proving productivity was the central theme of the speech from the throne at the opening of parliament so we can certainly look forward to legislation of the classical "belt-tightening" variety. The only hope to escape from this was offered by the Prime Minister in this passage:

"Unless Canada can maintain an economy that is efficient, competitive and productive in relation to the most advanced nations on earth, we cannot have the basis for a society from which poverty has been eliminated, we cannot maintain high levels of employment and income and we cannot insure the standard of life to which Canadians generally aspire".

So what we need as a prelude to introducing the "Just Society" is some good old capitalist cut-throat competition on a world scale. That was not even new when imperialism was born. Every exporting nation tries to sell its workers the same

J. SUTHERLAND-BROWN?

a lack of political understanding. This is quite understandable and will be corrected with time and experience in the struggle.

What cannot be so lightly dismissed is the way in which some self-styled "revolutionaries" in the CNLF in Toronto eulogize not only the Brigade, but the person of J. Sutherland-Brown. This concerns presenting Sutherland-Brown in the role of "Canadian patriot" and reporting his military plan in such a way as to make it seem applicable to the conditions of today. The CNLF is wrong on both counts. Sutherland-Brown, as head of military intelligence in Canada, was very much a part of the Imperial General Staff and a representative of British Imperialism's North American interests when Britain was still a first-rate power in the world. Sutherland-Brown's plan was perfected in response to a request from the Imperial General Staff and in the interests of "empire defence". It was not motivated by any sentiments of "Canadian patriotism"

forged bill of goods. That way lies more poverty - not less. Besides, Pierre neglected to mention the all-important fact that the U. S. imperialists control the natural resources which are our chief exports and, accordingly production and exports are suited to U. S. needs and export prices, as well as the prices set for what we import, are decided in the U. S. not in Canada.

The first important step to be taken in the direction of ending poverty is to free our economy from U. S. control. After that we can plan the construction of an all-round economy including secondary industry and also seek our own markets to our own liking. In other words, we must take absolute charge of our own destiny.

We imagine Pierre will stand aghast before such a suggestion.

and was influenced by Imperialist demands -- not Canadian needs.

The report to the Imperial General Staff unquestionably contained expressions of anti-U. S. sentiments. But these sentiments were not anti-imperialist nor were they influenced by any desire to defend the independence of Canada. The reverse side of Sutherland-Brown's anti-U. S. stand was the loyal support he extended to British imperialist domination in the world at a time when that domination was being challenged.

It was precisely these sentiments that spurred Diefenbaker's anti-U. S. declarations and got him into so much trouble with the Kennedy administration. But we all know now just how shallow was this Diefenbaker stand and that it was not based on anti-imperialism. It is probably of some significance that Diefenbaker's influence is strongest in Saskatchewan.

The Sutherland-Brown Report. 17

adopted in 1921, did not deal exclusively with Canada's political and military position vis a vis the United States. It stated Canada's role as a factor in defence of the world interests of British imperialism and only with the U. S. as one of the rising powers challenging the domination of a Britain weakened by the effects of a recently concluded armed conflict.

In 1921, Britain was still dominant in Canadian economic and political affairs, and as such, stood as the main enemy of Canadian independence. The Sutherland-Brown Report was designed to defend and maintain that domination and was therefore contrary to the true interests of Canada.

Up until 1914, British capital almost completely dominated the Canadian economy. By the end of the first world war, the United States began to show definite signs of displacing British investment in Canada. By 1926, the total of U. S. investment had surpassed that of Britain, being

almost 50 percent greater by that time.

It is evident that the Sutherland-Brown Report was fashioned at a time when the U. S. capitalists had begun to present a serious challenge to Britain's dominant position in the world. The British Imperialists were not yet prepared to accept their inevitable fate of being a third-rate power, and even contemplated armed conflict to protect her vested interests in the colonial offspring in North America. Canada had nothing to gain from the support of one side against the other in this struggle -- especially not from support for what was then the dominant power in the quarrel.

So far as the independence of the nation is concerned, the Sutherland-Brown Report has absolutely nothing to offer -- unless, of course, one is prepared to argue that the right to choose who will be the foreign ruler constitutes freedom.

Does the Report offer to the

forces struggling for independence anything of value in the military sense?

The military proposals contained in the Report were based on orthodox military tactics having to do with the employment of extensive heavily armed forces in positional warfare. This is the natural approach for anyone looking at the problem from the viewpoint of a powerful well-armed nation with a large pool of reserves to call upon. It has no relationship whatever to the military needs of a small nation fighting for its independence against a large nation enjoying superiority in personnel and in arms. Only people's war can suffice in such a situation.

The military report submitted by Col. J. Sutherland-Brown in 1921 has really nothing to offer in the way of acceptable advice in the fight for independence. Popularizing it will render no service to the movement and could result in real damage.

RAPE OF THE KOOTENAYS

For the second time in this decade, the beautiful Kootenay area of British Columbia has become the victim of a major sell-out of Canadian resources. The first, of course, was the Columbia River Treaty which was pretty well on a par with the purchase of Manhattan Island for a bagfull of cheap glass beads. Now we have Kaiser and the Crow's Nest sell-out.

Henry Kaiser who, twelve years ago, offered two million dollars a year for the waters of the Columbia River, has literally struck gold in the coal mines of south-eastern B. C. (By the way, Kaiser's two million dollar offer was accepted by B. C.'s Premier Bennett, but nullified by an Act of Parliament.) This time with the Crow's Nest coal, as with the 1961-1964 Columbia scandal, there was no nullifying Act.

This time also, as with the Columbia, conflicting and omitted facts make a clear picture of the financial and legal obligations impossible to perceive. But, as you can tell where the mess is by the flies it attracts, so you can deduce some fairly certain conclusions by watching the antics of Bennett and Co. on this little bit of treachery.

Now, owing to the fact that Bennett hasn't directly defended his position when he is attacked for selling too cheaply, we gather that this allegation is true. He has instead largely rested his defence on the associated or related benefits that B. C. will receive. In essence, Bennett has said that the Kaiser deal will provide a stimulus to B. C.'s economy. It will supposedly re-open and expand coal mining operations thereby (1) providing

jobs for unemployed mine personnel, and (2) produce equipment and supply orders for other areas creating employment there also. It sounds good, but it just isn't what's happening.

This writer discovered during a recent visit to the area that workers are being evicted from company houses they occupy in Michel B. C. After eviction, the house is demolished and burned "so that they can't move back in" as a minor Kaiser official stated. This is the cruel reality posed to Bennett's lies about jobs for the unemployed in the mining towns.

While Kaiser goes about demolishing the tall, drab, old houses in Michel, new ones -- in fact, a whole sub-division -- is being built in nearby Fernie. These new houses aren't for the unemployed of the Crow's Nest how-

ever -- they are for the Yankee employees of the Kaiser Corporation.

When you think of it, something as big as Kaiser just wouldn't see much sense in buying something locally when it could get virtually everything it needs from other divisions of the organization.

Although Kaiser's main interest is centered at Michel-Natal, the grasping hand can be seen in other places. Coal Creek, a deserted coal town about seven miles south of Fernie, is one such place.

Coal Creek was closed down in 1958. For sixty years prior to this it had been bread and butter to the Fernie area. It was a town with fierce working class traditions and a history of bitter struggle. For ten years the rails and mine cars were left to rust, and the miners' homes left to moulder and crumble. Then Kaiser moved in, tore up everything with scrap metal value and razed virtually everything else to the ground.

A sad enough end, allright (especially to nearby residents who were hoping the mine might re-open) -- but this was no played-out mining camp. Former residents and workers say that the deposits are barely touched. cursory examination (kicking the sides of several mountains with my foot) revealed that there's damn little else under there -- the place is lousy with coal. As a matter of fact, one of those mountains has been burning underground most of this century and it's been estimated to keep on doing so for quite a few more centuries.

Anyway, there are a lot more weird and wonderful things about this sell-out, but there's enough known about such deals to draw some general conclusions.

First of all, Kaiser, like any stinking Yankee carpetbagger, is in Canada to make as much as he can while giving as little as possible in return: he wants maximum profits. He'll take narrow-gauge railway tracks or anything else he can make a buck out of.

Next -- Mr. Bennett. He, or any other capitalist politician in Canada, would make a deal with the devil if he thought he could cut his "friends" in and keep himself in public office for a few more years.

Needless to say, a few more deals like this and the country will be in a much worse mess than it presently is. By selling the Columbia for a song, our misleaders squandered the greatest potential hydro-electric and irrigational complex in the world.

Agriculture and industry from Winnipeg to Vancouver are already feeling the pinch of an unnecessary ceiling on their growth. Now one of Canada's greatest coal deposits will be exploited in a wasteful and unplanned manner, diminishing its usefulness to future generations of Canadians.

-- by Robert O'Brien

ON WHOSE SIDE?

Editors Note:

The Paris "Peace Talks" regarding the war of U. S. Aggression in Vietnam have now been going on for five months. They have been accompanied on the battlefield by ever greater victories for the Vietnamese people. However, in spite of the continued defeats of the U. S. on the battlefield, some people have become disturbed by the very fact that "peace talks" are going on and by continued reports in the U. S. press, that the U. S. is getting closer, even if slightly to winning at the bargaining table what it cannot take by force of arms. There have been other reports, giving hints of a betrayal in the wind by the D. R. V. government against the people of Vietnam. The people who have been taken in by these false reports, still carry on their discussions of their doubts in a

principled way, and in a manner calculated to strengthen the struggle of the Vietnamese people.

However, there do exist people and organizations, who have used the "peace talks" as an excuse to attack the Vietnamese people, the leaders and the government of the D. R. V. They do not do this out of ignorance, for these people have access to the Vietnamese press, and these people lend aid and comfort to the Imperialist Aggressor.

A Toronto based organization calling itself "Canadians for the National Liberation Front of Vietnam" (C. N. L. F.) has distributed a mimeographed "Bulletin" of recent date, in which the editors have taken as the most important immediate objective of the organization in

attack upon the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam for having alleged embarked on a course of deliberate betrayal of the people's war against the U. S. imperialist aggressor. To this end the C. N. L. F. Bulletin publishes an editorial certain statements of a general nature as "evidence" in support of their accusation. The editorial is supported by several other articles of a like nature. We propose to both examine and challenge the so-called "evidence" submitted by the C. N. L. F. editorial writers.

The editorial (on page 2 of the Bulletin) makes the categorical assertion that the D. R. V. has already abandoned two of its key demands, preliminary to the abandonment of all. The two demands allegedly already abandoned are: (1) For a complete cessation of the bombing and all war-like acts. (2) For the withdrawal of 19

all foreign forces. This astounding revelation will no doubt come as a complete surprise to most people who have been labouring under the impression that the D. R. V. was insisting on COMPLETE and UNCONDITIONAL cessation of the bombing and all other acts of war against the D. R. V. If the C. N. L. F. is in possession of evidence to the contrary then one would naturally expect it to be presented for examination as to its reliability. However, the Bulletin scribes present no such evidence and by an unfortunate oversight fail to state the source of the information on which they base their conclusion.

Following the allegation of abandonment of the above two demands the page 2 editorial goes on to state: "... the D. R. V. has created a 'flexible climate' by no longer stating that the N. L. F. is the 'sole genuine representative government of the South Vietnamese'." It has stated that it will accept a coalition government and the Americans have been quietly eliminating the worst uglies in the Ky-Thieu regime..."

Deprived of a knowledge of sources we are unable to enlighten our readers on the exact make of crystal ball used by the C. N. L. F. spokesmen. We will, therefore, be forced to limit ourselves to citing authentic evidence which conclusively proves the opposite - and we will provide sources. Since the Bulletin articles appear to have been prepared sometime in June we will attempt to stay with evidence of that date, or later, in order to ward off any claim that the Bulletin "evidence" is based on later material.

On July 17, a memorandum on the 14th anniversary of the Geneva Agreement was issued in Hanoi over the signature of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the D. R. V. Under the sub-title "The Unswerving position of the Government of the D. R. V." the document declared: "The Government of the D. R. V. ... put forward its four points as the basis for the settlement of the Vietnam problem.

States withdraw U. S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam and stop the bombing of North Vietnam..."

President Ho Chi Minh of the D. R. V. in his appeal marking the same anniversary, declared: "Our stand is very just and clear: when the U. S. imperialists put an end to their war of aggression against our country, cease their bombings and shellings of North Vietnam, withdraw all the U. S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam... peace will be restored..."



A mass public rally in Hanoi on July 20th (which included representatives of the N. L. F.) passed a resolution which included a passage identical to the one in the appeal quoted above.

Contrary to the claim of the C. N. L. F. editorial, spokesmen on all of the above occasions continued to insist that the N. L. F. was "the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam and on August 14th, in an interview with Roberto Rinalodo - as reported in the Vietnam News Agency Bulletin in response to the question "would the talks lead to a wider discussion on a political solution in the South?" Yuan Thuy, Minister of State of the D. R. V. replied, in part: "... All questions concerning South Vietnam shall be decided upon by the South Vietnam people. The South Vietnam Front for National Liberation is the authentic representative of the South Vietnam people.

UP TO AUGUST 29, 1968 3,121 U.S. aircraft were downed

"... The Front has continued the Vietnamese people's glorious traditions of struggle against foreign aggression. It is the great political force which now assumes the historical task of defeating the U. S. aggressors and their lackeys to liberate the South, defend the North, build up an independent, democratic, peaceful, neutral, and prosperous South Vietnam and eventually to reunify Vietnam by peaceful means..."

"The government of the D. R. V. and the entire Vietnamese people unreservedly support the South Vietnam N. F. L. and its political programme"

All the spokesmen and documents quoted here unanimously reiterate that "the North is the firm base for the South"

The editorial claims that the D. R. V. has "stated it will accept a coalition government". Neither the spokesman, nor the place where the alleged "statement" was reported, is known to us. We do, however, have a direct statement to the contrary. In the interview with Rinaldo, Minister of State Yuan Thuy was asked: if a coalition government... would be an acceptable transitional solution to the political problems in the South, to which he replied: "The question of a coalition government, like all other questions concerning South Vietnam, must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves in accordance with the political programme of the South Vietnam N. L. F., the authentic representative of the South Vietnam people, without foreign interference"

About the "elimination of the worst uglies" we have no information. We know only of a presidential candidate being sentenced to 5 years hard labour for including in his

programme a proposal to open negotiations with the N. L. F. with a view toward ending the conflict. Perhaps the C. N. L. F. considers him one of the "worst uglies"

The complaint advanced in some quarters that the Paris talks make things more difficult for the anti-imperialist movement in



North America is not considered by us to be a valid argument against them. The people of Vietnam are not obligated to conduct their struggle in such a way as to make things easier for us. Quite the contrary: It is we who are under a deep obligation to conduct ourselves so as to relieve, in however small a degree, to relieving the burden on the heroic people of Vietnam.

When there is a clear choice of accepting the word of a representative of the D. R. V. over that of an imperialist spokesman we will elect to go with the D. R. V. For example; in reference to Harriman's claim that progress was being made at "tea-breaks" a claim forthrightly denied by the D. R. V. - the C. N. L. F., possibly under the impression that all Americans are faithful to the "no-lying" tradition of George Washington, choose to accept the word of Harriman. In the Bulletin article signed by P. S. T. we find the following: "The Paris

"tea-breaks" are rolling along nicely. More sugar Mr. Harriman". On this point of mis-information, Yuan Thuy says: The American side spreads rumours that there has been progress... rays of hope, straws in the wind etc., just to deceive the American people... Its attempt in doing so is to soothe American and world public opinion. If this is a correct estimation, and we believe it to be so, then the C. N. L. F. is aiding U. S. imperialists in the business of spreading such rumours through the articles published in the Bulletin.

We concede the point that every nation has its quota of cowards and traitors, and Vietnam is no exception to the rule, although the history of the struggle there would seem to indicate there are less of the vicious breed there than in many places and the people have demonstrated an infinitely greater capacity than most to deal with them - a capacity born of decades of struggle.

However, it is not the existence of cowards and traitors, and the need to be on guard against them, that is being discussed by the C. N. L. F. What the scribes in the C. N. L. F. Bulletin are claiming is that the GOVERNMENT of the D. R. V. has DELIBERATELY ADOPTED treachery and betrayal as a plank in their national and state programme. This line is the core of both the editorial and of the article by P. S. T. This is done in the name of friendship with Vietnam. With friends like that, who needs enemies?

The Bulletin editorial says: "The D. R. V. on June 28th on Hanoi Radio, admitted that North Vietnamese troops are fighting in South Vietnam. A similar admission was made by the N. L. F. ... The D. R. V. had previously attempted to disregard American condition #2 (to secure withdrawal of North Vietnam's armed forces) by denying that its troops were fighting in the South".

This is a straight U. S. version.

What the D. R. V. has always maintained is that the struggle in the South is an indigenous one arising from the fact of U. S. aggression. They have also insisted that the people of the North have both the right and the duty to assist their kith and kin in the South and that this is no concern of the U. S. imperialist. This correct policy took on still more weight as the U. S. increased its aggression and extended the war to the North.

The C. N. L. F. people seem to believe that adherence to this principled position presents the aggressor with a strong argument in defence of their moral right to defend the South from "aggression from the North". Apparently the C. N. L. F. disagree with the stand that Vietnam is one country and one people, that an aggression against one is an aggression against all and the U. S. has no moral right to be anywhere in Southeast Asia. We have always affirmed the policy of one Vietnam and continue to do so.


The great victory at Khe Sanh was the cause of rejoicing and celebration of anti-imperialist and progressive forces around the world, but P. S. T. has nothing but sneers and contempt for it. He says: "the second "Dien Bien Phu" didn't come off". It was Johnson, not Vietnam, who referred to Khe Sanh as a possible Dien Bien Phu. U. S. commentators in the field to sign a declaration that Khe Sanh would be held - that it would not become "a second Dien Bien Phu".

Nevertheless, and in spite of the arrogant contempt expressed by P. S. T., the U. S. marines and puppet troops were driven from Khe Sanh in what was a major defeat with enormous losses. The revolutionary working class press around the world hailed Khe Sanh as important and significant, but P. S. T. considers it worthy of nothing more than crude cynicism.

The reference to Khe Sanh coupled with the linking of the N. L. F. to the alleged admission of the presence of North Vietnam forces

in the South (an admission which the C. N. L. F. obviously considers a "betrayal") as a policy. This belief is further strengthened in the publication of an editorial from the journal of an organization outside Canada which was the first to launch an attack on Vietnam (and remains almost alone in that respect until now). That organization long since openly accused the N. L. F. of taking the path to betrayal and since the C. N. L. F. has failed to state otherwise we feel justified in assuming they have chosen to identify themselves with that stand.

P. S. T., who sits at his ease in his well-appointed Toronto apartment, and has never yet heard a shot fired in anger, undertakes to give the people of Vietnam some gratuitous and unsolicited advice. In his article he writes: "The only way to get anything out of an imperialist is to beat it out of him". Like all tragedies this has its element of humour. It was the Vietnamese who, in practice and with the price of their lives blood had,



more than other people, taught the world the very lesson which P. S. T. - who was barely out of his diapers when Vietnam began this modern saga of heroism in their anti-Japanese resistance - now proposes to teach them.

We in P. W. M. were the first organized group in Canada to take a decisive stand in support of the N. L. F. As long ago as February 1965, the B. C. leaders of the

Communist Party published a statement in which they said of us; "... there are those... who emphasize winning instead of ending

the war in Vietnam". We said then that WINNING is PRECISELY what we wanted for, in our opinion a peoples victory over the imperialist aggressor was the only sure path to peace.

Our position has remained consistent throughout. We said then, and we say now, so long as the people of Vietnam are fighting the imperialist arms in hand they will receive our unqualified support. The C. N. L. F., on the other hand, say; "fight the war as we dictate and for objectives of our choosing, or suffer the loss of our support. They are guilty of the very crime of which they correctly accuse the Moscow clique - blackmailing a people fighting for freedom.

In the meantime the Vietnamese carry on with fighting the aggressor and continue to register great victories. The balance sheet of the people's war has recently been published, listing the achievements to mid - 1968.

DENOUNCING A FORGERY

Dear Friends,

A forged document has come into my hands which purports to be a supplement to one of my letters from China. Its aim is not only to discredit me personally, but to arouse antagonism in Vietnam against China, by a vicious, fabricated criticism.

It is a four-page leaflet similar in type-face and form to my usual supplements. It has the title: "Problems Ahead for Vietnam, by Anna Louise Strong" in large letters in green ink. It is dated "Peking, April 1968". It copies my style and even takes phrases and sentences that I have previously used, mixing these with other statements which I would never use. Moreover, no publication of any kind was issued by me in April, 1968.

I denounce this publication as a forgery. I shall denounce it again in my next Letter from China, which

will be No. 60. But since it will take some weeks to write my next Letter, I am sending this brief statement to about 60 chosen friends who have means for spreading news.

I do this not only to spread as quickly as possible the knowledge that this leaflet is a forgery but also to ask for your help in finding out in what areas of the world it is circulating and how long its distribution has been going on. I myself have only one copy which fell into my hands three days ago. I would therefore appreciate it if persons who have received a copy of the forgery would tell me when they received it and send it to me with any envelope in which it came if this has any indication of possible source. It seems clear from my single copy that the forgery has been done not by any individual but by an organization well supplied with

funds and staff and seeking to injure both China and Vietnam.

Very truly yours,
Anna Louise Strong.

QUOTES FROM LBJ

Nobody in this world can put on a political rally like that great executive Dick Daley of Chicago. He makes it so much fun being a democrat that you don't see how anybody could be anything else. (Chicago, October 30th, 1964)

"I'd like to see you support the U. S. political system as fanatically as the Nazi youth did theirs during the war." (President Johnson, speaking to U. S. students, as reported in the NEW YORK TIMES, February 6, 1965)

CHINA SENDS MESSAGE TO VIETNAM

Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the Chinese people and Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and his close comrade-in-arms Comrade Lin Piao, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and Comrade Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council, on September 1 sent a message to Comrade Ho Chi Minh, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Vietnam Workers' Party and President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and other Vietnamese Party and government leaders, warmly greeting the 23rd anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The message reads in full as follows:

Hanoi

Comrade Ho Chi Minh, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Vietnam Workers' Party and President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam,

Comrade Truong Chinh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National Assembly of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam,

Comrade Pham Van Dong, Premier of the Council of Ministers of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam:

On the occasion of the 23rd anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, we, on behalf of the Chinese people, the Communist Party of China and the Government of the People's Republic of China, extend our warmest congratulations to the Vietnamese people, the Vietnam Workers' Party and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Under the leadership of the Vietnam Workers' Party headed by Chairman Ho Chi Minh, the heroic Vietnamese people have won great victories in their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation. This is the result of the Vietnamese people's fearlessness in making sacrifices, their arduous struggle, their perseverance in people's war and their tit-for-tat struggle against U.S. imperialism which is aggressive by nature. The victories of the Vietnamese people's war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation have contributed to the struggle of the people of all countries in the world against U.S. imperialism.

The U.S. imperialist ambition to forcibly occupy the southern part of Vietnam and divide and

separate the Vietnamese nation will never change. To achieve this purpose, U.S. imperialism is energetically carrying out its peace talks scheme while further expanding its war of aggression against Vietnam. The Soviet modern revisionist leading clique is collaborating with it in an attempt to have the Vietnamese people's war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation abandoned half-way. The Soviet modern revisionist leading clique has long become the No. 1 accomplice of U.S. imperialism in its aggression against Vietnam.

However, U.S. imperialism plus Soviet revisionism still cannot save the U.S. aggressor from his fate of inevitable defeat in Vietnam. Their arrogant and rabid attempt to redivide the world by collaborating with each other is meeting with stronger and stronger resistance from the people of all countries. The more U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism collaborate, the more clearly the people of the world will see through them as jackals of the same lair.

The situation in the Vietnamese people's war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation is excellent. Although there will still be all kinds of difficulties and twists and turns on the road of advance, we are deeply convinced that so long as the 31 million Vietnamese people, who have long been tested in war, bring into full play their thoroughgoing revolutionary spirit and persevere in protracted war, they will definitely win final victory in their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation.

The 700 million Chinese people will, as always, resolutely support the Vietnamese people in carrying through to the end their war to resist U.S. aggression and save the country!

Long live the militant friendship between the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples!

Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China,

Lin Piao, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China,

Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.

September 1, 1968, Peking



flute player


(Indian ink)

Phan Ke An

A medical attendant

(Water-colour)

Sy Ngoc



**PEOPLE'S
ART
FROM
VIETNAM**

Vigilance

(Indian ink)

Tran Van Can