

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 1, No. 6

November 1, 1963

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

ALGERIA SCORES GAINS IN DEFENSE AGAINST MOROCCAN ATTACK

PARIS, Oct. 27 -- While the fighting in the border area between Morocco and Algeria remains inconclusive at the moment, in other fields the Ben Bella government has made great progress.

Egypt has come to the aid of Algeria with important military help. Throughout the Arab world, sympathy is heavily on Algeria's side and a number of diplomatic moves have been made to demonstrate that in Africa, Hassan II is becoming more and more isolated.

Most important of all, however, the conflict had the effect of galvanizing public opinion on an immense scale in Algeria. The scenes again are reminiscent of those in Cuba at moments when the counterrevolution struck at the Castro government. Each attack, when it was met head on and with explanations of the issues, aroused the population to greater enthusiasm for the revolution and to greater alertness in defending it and readiness to sacrifice to the utmost to preserve it.

A larger and larger number of Algerians are taking to the streets to express their sentiments, whether in immense crowds for rallies called to hear speakers, or in long lines to volunteer for active combat. This is a most significant sign of the fervor that is catching up the population.

Its effect on the armed uprising in Kabylie has been spectacular. Instead of spreading, the counterrevolutionary attempt was localized and then began to shrink. Now the formation appears to have split with a decisive group of leaders headed by Mohand Ou El Hadj seeking to make their peace with the government and to participate in the armed defense of the country.

The Ben Bella government has wisely welcomed this move -- indeed it followed an active policy from the beginning of leaving the bridge open for such a development.

And the nationalizations are continuing. The latest ones included a modern paper and carton plant at El Harrach, and eleven establishments at Skikda (formerly Philippeville).

The slogans appearing on banners and in the newspapers display the mood of the people: "Hundreds of Thousands of Volunteers to Defend the Socialist Revolution," "Forward for the Defense of the Revolution."

The crowds shout violent slogans against the Moroccan king: "Hassan, Assassin! We Will Win!" "Hassan, Assassin! Socialism or Death!"

To the astonishment of correspondents, the women of Algeria, most of them still wearing their traditional veils, have been among the most active in mobilizing sentiment in defense of the revolution. Many of them lined up to volunteer for the fighting, despite the rejection of their offers by Algerian men who are still rather backward on this question. A crowd of women in Algiers carried a great banner through the streets reading, "Down with the monarchy, cancer of the Peoples!"

The line of the government is well represented by a proclamation issued by the Political Commissariat of the National Popular Army:

"Through your struggle, the Moroccan people will perceive the light of which they have been deprived so long and will liberate themselves from the retrogressive regime and all its vestiges."

The proclamation concludes: "Your efforts will break the yoke borne by your Moroccan brothers. Free your brothers as you have freed your country. Fight the reactionary, opportunist regime. The battle which you are undertaking is the final one for driving back colonialism and its traitors of North Africa. The cause of justice which you are defending will never be vanquished by oppression and colonialism."

The capitalist newspaper Paris-presse l'intransigeant October 17 viewed the essence of the struggle as follows:

"The frontier conflict in which Ben Bella and Hassan now confront each other is above all the clash of a Castroist revolution which appears contagious and a monarchy that is turning more and more toward the West.

"The key to this crisis is to be found in the declaration made only a month ago by Colonel Boumediene: 'To win, the Algerian socialist revolution must be extended.'"

In New York, the Herald Tribune, a daily that has good connections on Wall Street and should know what it is talking about, admitted editorially October 17:

"The Algerians, before and after winning their independence, promised to negotiate a settlement with Morocco, but then procrastinated.

"The Moroccans, tired of waiting and thirsting for the rich mineral and oil resources in the region, real or fancied, evidently decided to force the issue."

By forcing the issue, however, Hassan II, without intending it, has given a great fresh impulse to the socialist trend of the Algerian Revolution.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PEASANTS OPENS IN ALGERIA

PARIS, Oct. 26 -- The three-day National Congress of Peasants which opened yesterday in the Majestic theater in Algiers is a most important gathering. It brings together representatives of the class that fought imperialist France to a standstill in a seven-and-half year of unprecedented violence and terror, that then pressed forward to take the land abandoned by the French colons, and did so in a way that led to sweeping nationalizations and the establishment of a socialist sector of the economy.

They meet after some six months of setting up and attempting to operate Management Committees and Workers Councils of a highly democratic character. And they meet in the face of the threat of armed rebellion in the Kabylie and an attack by the reactionary Moroccan monarchy that could escalate into war. What they say and decide in this Congress can settle a good many questions in Algeria.

The first session was impressive even to the hardened cynical reporters of the capitalist press. Here is what the correspondent of the Paris daily Le Monde writes [October 27]:

"Astonishing spectacle: three thousand peasants, the dark hue under the white turban, a face that is the image of their land, weathered, hollowed and molded by erosion, baked by the sun, furrowed with wrinkles. Three thousand real peasants, seated in this room to hear technical reports, statistics. . . .

"It is not sure that they will understand everything, but to see them speaks volumes. They are here, they are called, "Messieurs les congressistes" ["Gentlemen of the Congress"], their opinions are sought. They have in their hands a small red folder with very serious things inside. Here is the genuine revolution. Why be astonished then if every time the name of Ben Bella is mentioned they applaud? After which they formulate such criticisms that an observer who has not been warned would classify them among the most unconditional of the opposition.

"They are not sparing in their criticisms. Badly paid, badly provisioned, without supplies or seeds, they have come to say that they cannot continue like this.

"Those of Tizi-Ouzou ask that the land be divided, those of Sétif want guns to shoot jackals, those of Zeralda fire a hot broadside at officials who want to impose on them in a bureaucratic way. The commissioners of the agrarian reform, they say, must come from the people and know the land. In Batna they want the chairmen of the committees to be men of mature age. A delegate of Tébessa brought up the case of his region where the fields are sown with mines. Suggestions rain down. No one is spared.

"But the criticisms are not made in the manner of the servant of Chekhov's The Cherry Orchard who considered all occasions appropriate for saying that just the same things were better before the abolition of serf-

dom. The Algerian peasants are not content, they complain, but they want to go forward."

The Algiers daily Le Peuple published [October 25] some brief remarks by a number of delegates who were interviewed at the Maison du Peuple as they waited to be assigned lodgings. These give a good indication of the difficult problems Algeria faces:

Haouhach Aïssa (24), chairman of a Management Committee at d'El-Affroun:

"I wish this Congress full success. Certainly everything is going good in our sector. However, we are bothered by the lack of supplies. On this subject we have to indicate that some agricultural mechanics who got 745 francs [\$1.54] a day like us found this amount insufficient and refused to continue to work with us. They left for private jobs. The mechanic who worked with us nevertheless got 2,000 francs [\$4.12] a day. He wanted more and he left."

Salem Djelloul (27), chairman of a Management Committee at Aneur Smaïn:

"I'll tell you first of all, 'Long live socialism and long live Ben Bella.' I will add, 'We'll break the aggression of Hassan II and all the enemies of Algerian socialism the way we break clods.'

"We regret that it's only the cities that have doctors and there aren't any at all in the countryside where we are."

Benzahri Rabah (36):

"We are happy over the advent of socialism and we are determined to do everything to realize this aim. We are determined to work with the same intensity we showed in liberating the national territory from the claws of colonialism. We will defeat Hassan II the way we defeated the foreign oppressor."

Ali Rahmani Mohamed (22):

"We wish full success to our Congress and we reaffirm our total support to the socialist policy of Brother Ben Bella. We must, however, indicate the lack of mechanics in our farms. We have to say in addition that we were obliged to call on private transport to deliver our products."

Dagani Saïd (40):

"Our Management Committee is doing very well. We hope that this year things will go even better due to the fact that there will be no delay in the delivery of seeds. We must tell you that we lack a pharmacy. We have to make a very long trip to get medicine."

Amari Ben Yahia (28) of Saïda:

"In the frame of socialism, we only ask to be able to work. However, we need material aid, especially in regard to parts which we can't get.

"We also lack silos to store our grain in."

"Since seeds haven't yet been delivered to us, we suggest that seed co-operatives be created. It's necessary, too, that supply stores should be set up a little everywhere and not just in the capital."

Mohammedi Ali (41):

"Our only hope is the Management Committees, that is, socialism. Thus everyone will have his part. Thus will equality be genuinely established among all the children of the Algerian people.

"We have to indicate in our Management Committee the insufficiency of supplies.

"We hope that there will be no delay in the delivery of seeds. . .
[Balance illegible.]

El-Kou. . . [part of name illegible] (43):

"We lack fertilizer to get better success with our crops. We are more decided than ever to work."

Bouafir El Hadj (27) of Merad:

"We need understanding and wisdom. We can do things above our strength, but we must be remunerated. We would also like to have accounts drawn up on the management of our farms.

"The peasant must have an annual vacation like the functionary. We would also like a bonus for output. In addition, men should be placed in the kamas and responsible posts who understand the peasants.

Derbal Abdelkader (21) of the Hadjout domain:

"We lack supplies and houses. We likewise want a school because our children aren't being taught."

APPEAL FOR AID TO ALGERIA

ALGIERS, Oct. 17 -- The National Office of the Committee for European Nongovernment Aid for Algeria has issued the following appeal:

"The royal Moroccan army has attacked the Algerian Socialist Revolution with the help of the imperialists.

"The response has been a mass outburst of the Algerian people.

"Throughout the country volunteers are moving toward the front.

"All the friends of the Algerian Republic will feel the urgency of mobilizing and sending the most rapid possible aid.

"Organize meetings,

"Publish articles in the press,

"Collect and send us immediately medicines, antiseptics, antibiotics, bandages.

"Do everything possible to defend and protect the Algerian Revolution."

MOROCCAN EMBASSY PICKETED IN LONDON

LONDON, Oct. 19 -- Members and supporters of the British Algeria Committee marched in London today with placards reading, "Hands off the Algerian Socialist Revolution!" "Hassan Fears Algerian Land Reform!" "Free the UNFP Leaders in Morocco!" "Hassan, Friend of Franco, Invades Algeria!" "Vive l'Algérie Socialiste!" and similar slogans.

The demonstrators marched from Albert Hall to the Moroccan embassy in Queensgate Gardens where they formed a picket line.

A deputation interviewed the First Secretary, being refused permission to see the Ambassador. After stating their vigorous protest, they rejoined the pickets outside.

A similar and larger protest demonstration is planned for next Saturday. After going to the embassy, the plan is to march through the centre of London.

The British Algeria Committee has issued an appeal to all European Algeria Committees to stage similar demonstrations.

WAVE OF NATIONALIZATIONS IN ALGERIA

On October 7 Fidel Castro sent a message congratulating Ben Bella on the sweeping nationalization of land and other private property following the recent election. Other revolutionists throughout the world would no doubt agree that Castro expressed their sentiments, too.

The fact is that the nationalizations have continued, reaching new heights following the armed rebellion in Kabylie. Some examples can be given.

The Satac coach company, a nation-wide transport system that handles both passengers and freight, was taken over on the workers initiative.

This was followed by the nationalization of three other coach companies, Sata, Satas and Mory Omnitransport.

In the Bône region a number of industrial enterprises were taken over, including Kaouki mills which have a capacity of some 275 tons of flour a day, the Duvivier flour mill, and the Hippone salt works.

In the department of Saoura all transport and the big hotels were nationalized.

At Bou-Hanifia two hotels and a hospital connected with thermal baths were declared "vacant property" and turned over to the Ministry of Tourism.

At Constantine twenty-eight establishments were taken over, including eight theaters and some hotels. Among the latter, the Cirta hotel belonged to Mohand Tiard, one of Algeria's big industrialists.

In Oran, the big Hotel Martinez was nationalized.

BEN BELLA AS SEEN THROUGH CAPITALIST EYES

"The main fact now is that Algeria has chosen its camp, the 'socialist' camp. At this very moment, the collectivization of the land has gone further in Algeria than Yugoslavia. More than 3,000,000 hectares [a hectare equals about two and a half acres], of which 2,700,000 belong to the French colons, have been 'confiscated' and placed under the authority of management committees."

That conclusion is not an extract from the thesis of an overly enthusiastic supporter of Ben Bella. It is the pessimistic opening paragraph of an article by Jean-Francois Kahn which appeared in the October 10 issue of the pro-Gaullist daily Paris-presse l'intransigeant. An attempt at a realistic estimate of what is happening in Algeria, the article reflects the foreboding of French imperialism over events in the former profitable colony. It makes rather fascinating reading.

"This is the first time in white Africa that a government has broken radically with the principles of liberal economy and attacked with equal violence the petty bourgeoisie as such," continues Kahn.

"The choice is pregnant with consequences. First of all because Nasser's socialism, considered up to now to be the model for all the Arab and African leaders has been largely left behind by the Ben Bellist revolution. The Egyptian agrarian reform appears quite superficial beside the one Ben Bella is carrying out."

Not even religion, in Kahn's gloomy opinion, has served to block this development. "In addition, the Algerian leader has won his bet on making Islam the support and vehicle of his socialism -- and everybody knows that Islam is one of the rare religions constantly growing stronger throughout Black Africa."

How is this drift toward increasing radicalism to be explained? Kahn, who is quite evidently a knowledgeable writer, makes a stab at an answer:

"The question already posed in regard to Castro arises -- how did it happen? Ben Bella is not a theoretician. He knows the Koran a lot better than Marx whom he has probably not even read (he has however read Mao and Giap).

"The Cuban leader greatly impressed him when he went to Havana and a Cuban personality even told me, some time ago, that at the meeting with Castro, Ben Bella conducted himself like a student listening to the lessons of a master. However that may be, Ben Bella got caught up in socialism much more than he wished to."

From what he considers to be the subjective side of this process, Kahn turns to objective considerations. "The origin of this was the decree,

to which perhaps insufficient attention was paid, legalizing the institution of management committees in the vacated properties abandoned by the French colons. A nationalized sector thus saw the light of day, but it was particularly vulnerable. Hence it was necessary to extend it, to protect it, then consolidate it. Each measure called forth another.

"At the moment, Ben Bella finds himself facing this situation: a great part of the plants, wholesale trade and agriculture have been taken over by the state, the local bourgeoisie has been crushed in the egg and the last French colons are preparing to leave. But the means of managing this 'socialist sector' are completely lacking.

"Thus the interested services are putting the finishing touches to a very precise plan that projects the nationalization of the banks, credit, and foreign trade, then the socialization of the mineral wealth and what remains of industry.

"All this is to be ready by the beginning of 1964 -- but it is likewise provided that everything will be liquidated in two weeks if France carries out another nuclear test in the Sahara."

Kahn now comes to what is for him and French imperialism the most important question of all:

"At this point the problem of the oil is posed. The Algerian government contacted the ENI of the late Mattei* some time ago seeking a very advantageous agreement on a 25-75 basis to thus break what it calls the monopoly of the cartel. But the Algerian newspapers have already published articles advocating nationalization pure and simple."

Can this course be carried to the end? Kahn is not sure; yet he trembles for the future: "But all this requires a certain organization of the masses, a certain political conception. Here the model is already at hand, that of Castro and Mao Tse-tung: mobilization of the youth who are now accused of falling into that Western degeneration known as the twist, political indoctrination through biased literacy campaigns, creation of voluntary labor projects, accelerated Arabization of everything including the metric system. 'As long as we don't speak in Arabic,' Ben Bella has said, 'our socialism lacks a dimension.'"

Kahn ends his article on a note of bleak despair: "All this is now projected. The Algeria of Ben Bella is preparing to play in North Africa the role which Cuba is playing in the heart of the Americas."

*Mattei, head of the giant Italian semi-government industrial combine, was killed in an airplane crash last year. There is a persistent rumor that he was a victim of the OAS, the terrorist organization of the French colons.

NEW ARRESTS IN BILBAO

Twenty people, most of them youths, have been arrested and imprisoned in Bilbao. They are charged with having participated in the organization of a ten-minute stoppage in the most important plants in the city as a demonstration of solidarity with the striking Asturian miners.

CASTRO ASKS KENNEDY TO LIFT BLOCKADE BECAUSE OF HURRICANE

In a three-hour radio speech October 21, Fidel Castro appealed to the Kennedy Administration to lift the economic blockade on Cuba for reasons of humanity so that the devastated country can turn to the staggering job of reconstruction after the worst hurricane in history.

Castro did not ask for assistance from the United States. "What we only ask," he said, "is that they cease a blockade on a country which has suffered a disaster of this kind."

Castro said that the number of known dead was 1,157. He revealed that "starvation killed as many persons as floods" following the hurricane.

"Everywhere there is utter destruction" the Cuban revolutionary leader continued. "Virtually every family in Oriente Province has lost someone. Almost all roads and railroads there are destroyed.

"The amount of damage is not known. A census is under way to determine it. Eighty per cent of the fruit in the stricken area was lost. Livestock losses have not been determined. Entire herds perished. Half the coffee crop was lost. Sugar cane was damaged greatly. Cotton suffered greatly."

A total of 11,103 homes were destroyed, 21,248 others damaged.

In appealing to Washington to lift the blockade exercised by the world's richest, strongest and most arrogant country against the tiny, stricken island, Castro spoke with great moral authority. Despite the difference in economic systems, his government was the first to rally to the help of Chile when that country was devastated a few years ago by a series of earthquakes. The Cubans sent millions of dollars worth of supplies to the earthquake victims.

Kennedy did not wait long to display how well a pious Christian imperialist statesman knows how to respond to an appeal to humanitarian feelings. On October 23 an obscure State Department spokesman was assigned to release a statement to the press:

"Our policies toward the Castro regime have been determined by its Communist character, its hostility toward the United States, and its efforts to overthrow other governments in the hemisphere by violence, terror and subversion. As long as the Cuban Government chooses to follow this aggressive course, it leaves us no choice but to maintain our present economic controls."

The brutal statement, turning down Castro's appeal, also reminded the press that the American Red Cross had made an offer of disaster relief after the hurricane which was rejected by the Cuban government.

(When the Red Cross offer was publicized, Castro made the following statement: "The aid that we have refused is the aid of the Yankee imperialists. This was unhappy for them, because they would have liked to appear generous, offering a little mercurochrome to the country in which they have provoked damage infinitely above that of the hurricane Flora. They have not yet paid the \$10,000,000 they owe in indemnification for the prisoners of Playa Girón.")

The Cuban embassy in Paris has issued the following statement: "All persons or institutions desiring to send help to the victims in Cuba can use the following address: Harold Gramatges, compt bancaire au profit des sinistrés de Cuba, No. 4675, Banque Commerciale pour l'Europe du Nord, 21 rue de l'Arcade, Paris 8."

APPEAL TO LATIN-AMERICANS TO HELP CUBAN HURRICANE VICTIMS

The Argentine Committee of Solidarity with the Cuban Revolution appealed to the Argentine people October 19 to start an aid campaign for the hurricane victims, according to Hshinhua.

The committee calls for the collection of contributions in all parts of the country. It also urges the restoration of diplomatic relations with Cuba.

In co-operation with the Uruguayan organization of Solidarity with Cuba, the committee has resolved to start a campaign of solidarity with Cuba throughout Latin America.

CHINESE HELP ARRIVES IN CUBA

The first batch of articles donated by the Chinese Red Cross for hurricane victims in Cuba arrived in Havana by special plane October 20, the Chinese news agency Hsinhua reports.

The articles included 4,062 kilograms of medicine and 1,952 kilograms of powdered milk.

Yi Cheng-hsin, representative of the Chinese Red Cross, who arrived with the donation, was warmly welcomed at the airport by Cuban Red Cross President Giberto Cervantes.

Yi Cheng-hsin expressed the Chinese people's deep concern for the victims of the hurricane and the firm belief that the united Cuban people would surely overcome the difficulties caused by the disaster.

Cervantes thanked him and requested the Chinese representative to convey the gratitude of the Cuban Red Cross and people to the Chinese Red Cross and people.

Hsinhua also reports that the first donation from the Chinese government of aid for the victims of the hurricane arrived October 19. This was a preliminary shipment of 9,059 tons of rice.

After the ship tied up at Santiago in eastern Cuba, ceremonies were held on the dock. Regino Boti, Cuban Minister of Economy accepted the donation in behalf of the Cuban people from the Chinese Ambassador Shen Chien and expressed the gratitude of the Cuban government and people.

Major Armando Acosta, general secretary of the Oriente provincial committee of the United Party of the Socialist Revolution, spoke from the improvised platform of an electric loading machine.

The crowd included longshoremen and 500 volunteer coffee harvesters about to set off for the mountains.

Major Acosta said that the people in Oriente and in all Cuba would be grateful forever for the fraternal aid from Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese government and the Chinese people and would never forget this aid which came to the Cuban people at a difficult moment. The Cuban people, he said, would not only overcome the natural calamities and restore production by their labor, but would also build "a beautiful socialist country" in their land.

The speech of Major Acosta was repeatedly interrupted by cheers of "Long live Fidel!" and "Long live Mao Tse-tung!"

CEYLON GROUP URGES RELIEF FUND FOR CUBA

COLOMBO, Oct. 21 -- The United Left Front has written to the Acting Head of the government, Mr. C.P. de Silva, requesting the government to consider organizing an official Cuba relief fund to which collections from the public can be sent, and also to consider making a contribution itself towards relief measures in Cuba.

A letter signed by Dr. N.M. Perera, Dr. S.A. Wickremasinghe and Mr. Philip Gunawardena states, "You will be aware of the extensive damage done to Cuba by the recent hurricane. Many lives have been lost and Cuba's economy has been seriously affected by the loss of crops, cattle, railroads, etc.

"The Government of Cuba has brought these facts to the attention of all other governments and peoples and has appealed for assistance to help them recover from this natural calamity."

MOSCOW SAYS STORY ABOUT "ULTIMATUM" TO CUBA IS FABRICATION

The Soviet news agency Tass on October 24 denied a widespread report that the countries adhering to Comecon were about to serve an "ultimatum" on Castro. "The report is a false provocation from beginning to end, having no other aim than to cast a shadow on the relations between Cuba and the USSR and the other member countries of the 'Comecon,'" the dispatch declared.

Tass reaffirmed the Soviet Union's firm support of Cuba, "the isle of liberty," and announced a series of relief measures for the victims of the hurricane.

The false report, referred to by Tass, appeared in the October 10 issue of The Financial Times of London. It was a feature article signed "By Our Soviet Correspondent."

According to this source, "A 'showdown' is unofficially but reliably reported to be taking place in Prague between Cuba and the Comecon countries, led by the Soviet Union, which have become tired of pouring huge sums of aid into the Caribbean island, all to no effect.

"An ultimatum is to be presented to Cuba, according to which Cuba will have to receive a powerful economic commission from Eastern Europe which will reform her economy (and some of her political system), or else cease receiving the East European aid which has been running at a rate of \$1.6 million a day in the past year.

"These developments have been coming out of a meeting which opened in Prague on October 7."

The article made a number of allegations which gave it the appearance of having been written by someone with inside connections.

For example: "The Soviet delegate stated bluntly that Cuba could not expect any great food subsidies from the Comecon countries. Because of the bad harvest, the Comecon countries would have to buy grain in the West, and we don't earn our export dollars to drop them into the Havana sewers."

Another example: "The Czechoslovak delegate accused the Cubans of favouring Chinese policy and dismissing Cubans favourable to the Soviet line."

If there was any basis to the report at all, it would appear that wiser heads have reconsidered. A bureaucratic crackdown on the Cubans because of their independent views would not pay off at the moment. In the Soviet bloc countries the Cuban revolutionists are extremely popular figures.

KHRUSHCHEV ANNOUNCES MAJOR AID FOR HURRICANE VICTIMS IN CUBA

In a message to Fidel Castro, released by Tass October 24, Khrushchev announced that "the Central Committee of the Communist party and the Soviet government, having taken into consideration the extent of the damage suffered by the Cuban people due to the tropical hurricane Flora, have decided to grant disinterested aid."

Besides the help already earmarked for Cuba, the Soviet government has decided to send the following:

-- A complete plant for the manufacture of prefabricated large-size homes as well as all the blueprints and technical help necessary to install it.

-- Giant earth movers, bulldozers, cranes and heavy trucks to help the Cubans reconstruct devastated structures.

-- Thirty thousand tons of cement, 20,000 cubic meters of wood, 100,000 square meters of glass and 100 kilometers of wire.

-- Linen, canned meat, animal fat and dehydrated potatoes.

-- Five million meters of cloth, ready-made clothing and 250,000 pairs of shoes.

In addition, Cuban orders placed for 1964 will be speeded up. Before the end of 1963, the Soviet Union will deliver 3,000 tons of canned meat,

1,000 tons of canned milk, 900 tons of butter, 8,500 tons of edible oil, baby food, and a series of other products.

In his message, Khrushchev said that "the courage and stoicism with which the Cuban people have tackled the grievous consequences of this natural catastrophe has inspired sincere respect among all the peoples of the USSR."

Radio Moscow reported that twenty Soviet ships are on their way to Cuba with supplies for the victims of the hurricane.

In Havana the Institute of Agrarian Reform announced the arrival of 1,500 tons of coffee bought in Brazil by the Soviet Union for the people of Cuba.

GERMAN-CUBA MAIL CENSORED BY U.S.?

An old Nazi custom seems to have been preserved by U.S. occupation forces in West Germany. The news magazine Der Spiegel charged October 21 that the U.S. Army screens all private mail between West Germany and Cuba. The magazine backed its charge by publishing samples of microfilmed correspondence.

Under an agreement signed in 1955, the United States, Britain and France retained the privilege, as conquering powers, of censoring mail and tapping telephones in West Germany.

The total annual volume of West German mail to Cuba, according to Der Spiegel is 160,000 letters and postcards.

"THE FIRST ALL-OUT NUCLEAR CONFRONTATION"

Everyone who yearns for a world of enduring peace should note down for must reading an article in the October 28 Newsweek titled "October, 1962 -- The Cuba Crisis: Nuclear War Was Hours Away."

Revealing new details about the crisis, Newsweek declares: "The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. stood frighteningly close to war, the world terrifyingly close to destruction. It was the first all-out nuclear confrontation in history."

The description of the scenes in the deep corridors below the Pentagon sounds as incredible as something out of science fiction. In a central control room where some thirty top officers of the general staff had "their forefingers pointed at the ultimate buttons," they "could see a small box which relayed radar readings of BMEWS (Ballistic Missile Early Warning System) from stations across the top of North America; flashing numbers would count Russian missiles fired at the U.S. and predict their toll. Nearby hung a U.S. map, where NUDETS (Nuclear Detection System) would show in red dots wherever a nuclear weapon might strike."

Seven officers and sergeants had control of the final pushbutton. "One officer and one sergeant carried holstered .38-caliber pistols, bone-

handled, snub-nosed weapons intended only to shoot any member of the team who might crumble under pressure and threaten to set off war on his own panicky impulse." [What if he didn't "threaten" but just acted under panic?]

All that was needed was a "Klaxon signal" from Kennedy and a coded message would flash out to all Strategic Air Commands from "Alaska to Guam, Spain to England. The coded message: go to war."

In this "practice run" in "nuclear confrontation" here is what Kennedy had set loose:

"The controls in the War Room that week showed that 90 B-52s packed with 25- and 50-megaton bombs were constantly crisscrossing the Atlantic, awaiting the order to go. On the ground, 550 more loaded B-52s, 800 lighter B-47s, and 70 faster and newer B-58 Rustlers were standing by. Eight Polaris submarines in the North Atlantic had their 128 missiles trained on Russia. In the Mediterranean and China seas, Sixth and Seventh Fleet aircraft carriers had nuclear bombers poised for take-off. Across the U.S., 102 Atlas, 54 Titan, and twelve Minuteman ICBM's (intercontinental ballistic missiles) sat on their launching pads. . . .

"While this awesome nuclear air armada assembled, other services too were one step short of war at DEFCON 2. [The "Defense Condition" just below DEFCON 1 "which is war."] The Army had put together the biggest invasion force since World War II, rushing about 100,000 men to the Southeast, principally Florida, where they could be ferried the 90 miles to Cuba. Besides those 100,000, said Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff, he had 10,000 to 20,000 more for backup support. . . . Marines, thousands-strong, also moved into Florida. . . ."

So far as Kennedy was concerned, this was it, and the whole top command waited for the Klaxon.

"When I went down to the command post, I had a feeling I never had before," an Air Force captain is reported to recall. "I wondered if I would see my wife and kids again. I felt we were near to war."

In the control room where officers sat in "eighteen softly upholstered, beige cloth-covered chairs," "Panoramic screens scanned U.S. outposts around the globe, bulb-clustered boxes showed troop movements, lighted maps flashed with blobs of color, each indicating a nuclear warplane or missile aimed and 'cocked' at millions of human beings who lived on in ignorance of their peril."

And then?

"And then Khrushchev flinched. The drooping but still vigilant men in the War Room could draw a deep, shuddering breath: the world could live for yet a while."

As Newsweek puts it, "It was the first all-out nuclear confrontation in history."

When will the second one occur?

OPERATION "BIG LIFT"

Operation "Big Lift" has received wide publicity in the United States as a demonstration of the speed with which the world's mightiest imperialist power can plunge its forces into another war on any continent.

Some 16,000 men were ferried from the United States to Germany and France in 63 hours and 30 minutes. Since this was only a practice operation it was not geared to top speed. In war, according to one commander, the time could be cut to 36 hours and an entire division could be taken across the Atlantic every three days.

David Lawrence, a well-known reactionary American columnist, in commenting on the maneuver said that "when the treaty banning certain nuclear tests was signed recently, the military strategists did not stop thinking of the prospect of war." [New York Herald Tribune October 23.]

He noted that the United States is spending about \$1,000,000,000 a year to maintain American troops in Europe and that the total bill since the end of World War II now amounts to \$50,000,000,000.

The troops that were transported in Operation "Big Lift" are scheduled to take part in mock nuclear war games to be staged by forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from October 30 to November 5.

The world will thus have an opportunity to see how well prepared the Allied armies are, with the help of fresh forces from Texas, to engage in a nuclear war in the heart of Europe.

FRENCH NUCLEAR GAMES AROUSE CONSTERNATION

It is now official. France has joined the nuclear "club." French Information Minister Alain Peyrefitte told the press October 15 that "France has begun to provide itself with an operational nuclear force." He refused to say how many Mirage IV's and A-bombs [Little ones, only four times the power of the one that destroyed Hiroshima.] had been turned over to the air force so far, saying this was a military secret.

However, according to the Revue de Défense Nationale [as quoted by the October 3 Paris-presse l'intransigeant] de Gaulle's coveted "force de frappe" is well ahead of schedule. Medium-range rockets will be ready by 1966-67 and about the same time France should have "its stock of H-bombs."

A fleet of from 50 to 90 bomb-carrying planes are envisaged. In addition a fleet of five nuclear-powered submarines, each carrying 16 rockets with nuclear warheads, is planned. The first one will be launched in two or three years.

On October 22 Messmer placed before the Commission of National Defense the arms budget prepared by the Ministry of the Armed Forces. In 1964 an expenditure for equipment of 9,106,000,000 francs [about \$1,821,200,000] is projected. Out of this, 40 per cent is earmarked for nuclear arms.

The heads of the Army General Staff have already introduced nuclear weapons in their war games. In the just-concluded Jura exercise atomic

bombs were employed as "tactical" weapons by the French "Blue" forces against the simulated attack of the "Red" forces. Writing in the London Times of October 20, Stephen Coulter notes:

"With consternation, watching Members of the Parliamentary Defence Committee saw this series of smoke clouds, each supposed to be an atomic explosion about the size of Hiroshima, rise up from the 'Red' area. After a 15-minute interval, to let the radiation disperse, the 'Blue' tanks and aircraft went in and mopped up the 'invaders.'

"Everything had been worked out beforehand and there was nothing improvised about this display. The officers who see this as the right way to use nuclear weapons appear to be dominant on the General Staff at the moment."

André Monteil, a senator who watched the exercises was told by a general that the seven tactical atom bombs used by the "Blues" was their reply to two tactical atom bombs dropped by the "Reds."

"This, M. Monteil points out," the Times correspondent reports, "is an example of the dangers of nuclear escalation inherent in current French defence policy. If these things had really happened, an entire French province would have been wiped out fifteen minutes later and, in two hours, the whole of France would have ceased to exist."

U.S. NOW "MODERNIZING" ITS ARTILLERY

What the Pentagon calls "modern artillery" is now going to Europe and the Pacific to build up battlefield strength, according to an announcement in Washington October 21. "Modern artillery" -- in the Army language of today -- means artillery equipped with nuclear warheads.

In addition, Sergeant missiles -- nuclear weapons with a range of about 75 miles -- are being stationed in Europe.

The eight-inch howitzer artillery is being furnished with "larger numbers of nuclear warheads."

"This program, which the United States has discussed with its allies," the statement said, "will produce an over-all increase in the quality and quantity of artillery fire power."

Behind these words, with their dry flavor of bleaching bones and graveyards, is to be seen a new concept -- the "tactical" use of nuclear weapons. Instead of nuclear war being visualized as a possible outcome of "brush-fire" wars, to be avoided by all possible means, the generals have decided to turn things around -- get around the opposition to nuclear war by introducing "small" nuclear weapons in brush-fire wars.

"Modern artillery," equipped with nuclear warheads, is the answer to this sought-for qualitative and quantitative improvement in the firepower available for what the generals, with tongue in cheek, call "limited engagements."

DO THE DEAD OF HIROSHIMA WEIGH ON HIS CONSCIENCE?

As a gentleman farmer, retired after a spectacular career in the art of mass butchery of human beings, and now concerned about his memoirs, General Eisenhower gives evidence of a most unexpected symptom -- something like a conscience stirs in him.

In a book The White House Years, to be published next month, the General confesses for the first time that in 1945 he believed that dropping an atomic bomb on Japan was "completely unnecessary."

In a previous book Crusade in Europe, Eisenhower had intimated that he had been of this opinion. He now states flatly that his view was that Japan was "already defeated" and that the United States should "avoid shocking world opinion."

Eisenhower claims that he expressed his opinion to the late Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War, apparently ten days before the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima.

Eisenhower's efforts to now disclaim any moral responsibility for the decision that spelled the destruction of two immense cities should be weighed against the following facts:

(1) He never made his views public at the time and did not even put up a fight for them in top army circles.

(2) In early 1953, after he had become president on the promise of ending the war in Korea, he considered using nuclear weapons in an all-out attack on North Korea and Manchuria. The suggestion, according to Eisenhower, came from General Douglas MacArthur when they met in New York shortly before Eisenhower took office.

"If we decided upon a major new type of offensive, the present policies would have to be changed and the new ones agreed to by our Allies," Eisenhower writes. "Foremost would be the proposed use of atomic weapons."

In another place he explains one of the calculations involved: ". . . to keep the attack from becoming overly costly, it was clear that we would have to use atomic weapons."

One of the primary considerations against going ahead was anticipated opposition from such allies as Britain. Eisenhower discloses that Churchill reacted sharply when Eisenhower told him that if the Korean war were resumed, "we would feel free to use the atomic bomb against military targets, whenever military advantage dictated its use."

Fortunately, the Chinese and North Koreans agreed to certain terms demanded by the American forces and Eisenhower shelved the proposal to use nuclear weapons.

"PEACE-LOVING" PRESIDENT

Under President Kennedy, military budgets have risen 25 per cent. The current annual rate is \$51,000,000,000.

NEVILLE ALEXANDER CASE

The case of Dr. Neville Alexander, placed on trial in South Africa on charges of "sabotage" [reported in World Outlook October 4 and October 18] has aroused considerable indignation in Germany and Belgium where this Negro scholar is well known. A circular, distributed by his Belgian friends, provides the following information about his background:

Dr. Neville Alexander won two doctorates with very honorable mention in German philology, the first at Cape University, the second at Tübingen in Western Germany for a thesis on the German playwright Gerhardt Hauptmann. He was the first colored South African student to ever receive a scholarship from the well-known Alexander Von Humboldt-Stiftung Foundation and the first colored South African scholar to win a doctor's degree in Germany in German philology.

During his stay in Western Germany he won the sympathy and affection of a wide circle of professors and students both for his exceptional intellectual capacities, his attractive friendliness and his sympathy for humanitarian and progressive causes, above all those connected with the freedom movement of the colored peoples.

In South Africa, before leaving for Germany, Dr. Alexander was one of the outstanding young militants in the Non-European Unity Movement [NEUM], one of the most representative movements of the indigenous South African population which was led by the writer Tabat and which sought universal suffrage and the political, economic and social emancipation of the South African people.

The NEUM was banned by the Verwoerd government under the law passed to "suppress Communism," but it was reconstituted under the name of the African People's Democratic Union of South Africa [AFDUSA]. Its leading figure Tabat recently sought refuge in Tanganyika and was met with a warm official greeting by the government of that country at Dar-es-Salem.

The sympathy which Dr. Neville Alexander won in German university circles is now evident in the big movement against his arrest. Among the participating organizations:

- The Verband Deutscher Studenten, the confederation of all student organizations in Germany.
- The ASTA [self-governing student bodies] of the universities of Hamburg, West Berlin, Frankfurt and Tübingen.
- Some thirty professors of the University of Tübingen.
- Students of the Theology Faculty of the University of Göttingen.
- The Alexander Von Humboldt-Stiftung Foundation.

In addition, the big German trade union of metal workers, IG-Metall, has publicly protested the arrest of Dr. Alexander.

In Great Britain the arrest of Dr. Neville Alexander has likewise aroused protest among liberal, labor and antisegregationist circles.

Dr. Neville Alexander was a close friend of another distinguished young colored South African, Dr. Kenneth Abrahams, the only doctor in the Behebe district in South West Africa, whose case was a recent world-wide sensation. Dr. Abrahams, it will be recalled, escaped to Bechuanaland after being arrested. There he was kidnapped by Verwoerd's secret agents and smuggled back to South Africa. Through diplomatic pressure, the British government succeeded in securing his release and return to Bechuanaland.

The case of Dr. Neville Alexander, like that of Dr. Abrahams, casts a harsh light on the thesis of Verwoerd according to which the policy of apartheid permits the "separate but equal" economic and cultural development of the indigenous people of South Africa in segregated territories called "Bantoustan."

The truth is that Verwoerd is persecuting in the most ferocious way all the colored intellectuals and scholars in South Africa, inasmuch as he believes that they are the most likely to offer leadership to their people in the struggle against the inhuman regime of exploitation and oppression inflicted on them under apartheid.

MORE NEWS ABOUT NEVILLE ALEXANDER CASE

[The following item is taken in its entirety from the Cape Times of October 17. -- Editor.]

11 Accused of Plotting a Revolution!

Charges that Dr. N.E. Alexander, a non-White student, and 10 others conspired to overthrow the South African Government by violent revolution, guerrilla warfare and sabotage will be made against them when they appear at the Criminal Sessions on November 4.

They will also be accused of plotting to steal arms and ammunition from the SA armed forces and police.

The indictment was served on the 11 accused in gaol yesterday.

They are Neville E. Alexander, Don J.W. Davis, Marcus Solomons, Elizabeth v.d. Heyden, Fikile C. Blam, Lionel B. Davis, Leslie v.d. Heyden, Dulcie E. Alexander, Doris v.d. Heyden and Gordon F. Hendriks. [The eleventh name is not listed.]

Mr. W.M. v.d. Berg [the attorney general] has issued a certificate directing that the 11 accused be tried at a summary trial in the Supreme Court in Cape Town on Nov. 4.

It is not yet known who the judge will be.

The main charge is sabotage..

The allegations are that the accused during the period April 1, 1962 to July 12, 1963, at meetings and gatherings held at Crawford, Lansdowne, Athlone, Sunnyside, and Lincoln Estate in the Wynberg district and at Woodstock, Maitland, Salt River, Walmer Estate and Kensington in the Cape

Town District, and at places in Elsie's River and Bishop Lavis Township, Bellville, conspired to commit acts which would have endangered the safety of the public and the maintenance of law and order.

They are also alleged to have conspired with one another and other people to overthrow the Government by means of a violent revolution, guerrilla warfare and sabotage.

In the process persons would have been killed and murdered and State property damaged and destroyed.

GARLANDS COUNTER CENSURE OF GOPALAN

By. S. R. Singh

NEW DELHI -- A.K.Gopalan, leader of the Communist group in the Indian parliament was "publicly" censured by the National Council of the CPI [Communist party of India], which concluded its five-day session here on October 19, on charges of "open and willful defiance and public slander of the party."

Gopalan's "crime" was that he had addressed a mass rally at Calcutta organized by the Democratic Convention [a grouping allegedly sponsored by "pro-Peking" leftists in the CPI] to demand the release of political prisoners and to protest against the "antipeoples" food policy of the Congress government. Gopalan had also charged the national leadership, which is headed by S.A.Dange, with "reformism and revisionism" and "total surrender to the Nehru government."

An earlier move to oust Gopalan from leadership of the parliamentary group and to suspend him from the National Council was given up when three major state units of the party, West Bengal, Andhra and Kerala, dominated either by leftists or centrists, threatened to split and set up a rival party. The resolution censuring him was finally carried by a majority of votes with some abstentions. E.M.S.Namboodiripad, leader of the "centrist" group, who had just returned from Moscow after medical treatment, warned the Council against any such precipitous move. He did not attend the meeting where the censure motion was carried.

Other charges of "indiscipline" levelled against Gopalan and also against the leftist leader from Andhra, P. Sundarayya, were referred to a control commission. Sundarayya, who is leader of the Opposition in the Andhra legislative assembly, publicly criticized Dange for his "surrenderist policy" in relation to the Nehru government. He had been "directed" not to make public speeches criticizing the "official" party line.

The internal struggle within the CPI, however, has not ended with the censure motion against Gopalan. It is proposed that different state units of the party take action against "dissidents," including members who participated in the activities of the Democratic Convention in West Bengal. But, faced with a possible split, the Dangeite leadership appears to have decided to slow down the disciplinary drive against its opponents. A move to legalize and perpetuate the present ad hoc "provisional" committee imposed on the Bengal party was postponed until the leaders still in jail in the state are released.

Gopalan, for his part, submitted a memorandum to the Council justifying his participation in the Calcutta rally on political grounds although he agreed that it might be construed as a "technical breach of discipline." (The CPI Central Executive had ordered him not to address the rally.) Gopalan has accused the Dangeite leadership of having failed to organize mass movements to "tackle the food problem and secure the release of party detenus in Bengal."

(Ironically enough, while the National Council was in session in New Delhi, a rice godown in Calcutta was raided by an angry mob in protest against profiteering grain dealers. The mob was dispersed by police with tear-gas shells.)

Earlier, the National Council adopted a resolution (52 for, 22 against and 3 "neutral") endorsing the stand of the Communist party of the Soviet Union in the Sino-Soviet conflict and criticizing the Chinese Communist party for elaborating a "dogmatic, sectarian and adventurist platform which is being pressed forward as the only correct line for the world Communist movement."

The resolution also said, "This alternative line, unilaterally decided by one single party runs counter to the Moscow declaration and Moscow statement, Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism."

The Council also rejected by a vote of 52 to 25 an "alternative" resolution presented by Namboodiripad criticizing both the "revisionism" of Moscow and the "dogmatism" of Peking. The resolution was supported by the entire "left." Leftists maintain that this "victory" of the Dangeite leadership was possible only because of the continued imprisonment of about 35 leftist members of the party's National Council.

As if to rebuke the national leadership, Kerala party members gave a hero's welcome to Gopalan and Namboodiripad (both are from Kerala state) when they arrived at the Trivandrum airport October 20 after the Council meeting.

The affair was described as an "unofficial" reception spontaneously organized to protest the "humiliating public censure" of Gopalan by the Council. A local party leader told a newspaper correspondent that if Dange and Govindan Nair (a Dangeite member of the Central Executive from Kerala) were to visit Trivandrum they would get "no garlands and shoes."

Both Gopalan and Namboodiripad were profusely garlanded by their supporters.

IF YOU NEED A CONSOLING WORD

If you feel blue and depressed about living in such a bitter and ferocious world, you can now get instant relief. Simply ask the telephone operator to dial 273636 for you in Zurich, Switzerland. You can then listen to a one-minute tape recording on a text from the New Testament prepared alternately by Protestant and Roman Catholic clergymen. This month's text on "Tele-Consolation" is about loving one another.

GREEK COMMUNIST PARTY LINES UP

A Moscow dispatch reports that the Central Committee of the Greek Communist party has issued a statement declaring where it stands in the Chinese-Soviet dispute: "The Communist party of Greece resolutely rejects the position taken by the Chinese Communist leaders in regard to the problems of war and peace, their attacks against the Leninist party of the USSR and against peaceful coexistence and the détente in international relations."

"The Chinese leaders," the resolution asserts, "are slipping more and more profoundly into dogmatism and sectarianism and are now launching themselves onto the road of adventurism."

The resolution does not take up the opportunist mistakes made by the Greek Communist party. At the end of the second world war it was in position to convert Greece into another Yugoslavia. Instead, in accordance with Stalin's diplomatic deals, the Greek Communist leaders welcomed British troops, who moved against the labor movement. The Greek CP thus helped pave the way for restoration of the monarchy. As a result some of the Greek Communists are still in concentration camps.

CRIMINAL INSULT TO FRANCO'S POLITICAL POLICE

Carlos Zayas, a 29-year-old Madrid hotel manager, was placed on trial October 25 for a novel crime; namely, calling Franco's political police what they are -- "political police."

On June 8, 1962, Zayas was arrested by plainclothesmen of the "social brigade." (This body was formerly called the "politico-social brigade," but Franco for some reason decided he preferred a less euphonious name.) Zayas was tried on the charge of maintaining relations with Belgian minister Spaak, the Italian socialist Nenni, Labour party members of Parliament and members of the International Commission of Jurists. Such associations were to be expected, since Zayas was one of the founders of the Socialist Teachers Association. He was sentenced to two years in prison.

When Paul VI became pope last summer, Zayas was one of those whose sentence was commuted in honor of the occasion.

But he soon slipped back into his criminal ways. Back at his desk in the hotel, he told some of his employees that he had not been arrested for a crime but for his political ideas and that the agents who picked him up were "political police."

A stool pigeon tipped off the authorities and Zayas was soon brought to justice for his foul insult to the political police. The prosecuting attorney is demanding a three-month sentence for the new crime.

The three-month sentence may not sound too stiff for a "repeater" in fascist Spain but it also means that Zayas, if convicted, will have to serve out his previous sentence.

Under Franco you'd better watch what kind of language you use in referring to the political police.

ADENAUER GIVES WAY TO ERHARD

By E. Germain

After fourteen years at the helm of the new German bourgeois state, the German Federal Republic, Konrad Adenauer finally gave up his post of federal chancellor. Ludwig Erhard is now the political leader of the German bourgeoisie. What is the significance of this shift? Does it mean "the end of an epoch," as many commentators maintain? Does it herald a basic change in the policies of German imperialism?

Under Adenauer, West German imperialism rose like the fabled phoenix from the ashes of total defeat to again become in a few years the main capitalist power of the European continent. Germany rapidly regained not only economic power but political independence, converting its status from that of a defeated, occupied country, fragmented into zones controlled by foreign military satraps, into an independent ally of American imperialism, enjoying equal standing with the other Western capitalist allies of Wall Street.

Indeed, if one bears in mind the insistence with which the representatives of the United States campaigned in favor of the immediate rearmament of West German capitalism, the fact that West German generals were granted top posts in the imperialist alliance, that the West German army is by far the strongest capitalist army today on the European continent, it can be concluded that West Germany is in fact Washington's principal and most privileged ally in Europe.

This rapid reversal in alliances was, of course, a result of the "cold war" and the fear that came over the masters of American capitalism at sight of the tremendous rise in strength of the Soviet Union and the steady deterioration of the position of capitalism in the world balance of power after the victory of the Chinese Revolution. Washington's fundamental course since the end of World War II has been to create and fortify a world alliance of capitalist powers against the rising forces of revolution. It is arming that alliance to the teeth in order to oppose each new revolutionary advance -- and to prepare for another world war.

Occupying a strategic position in this world balance of forces, Germany had to be included in the imperialist alliance. Otherwise all of Western Europe -- with an industrial potential still equal to or greater than that of the Soviet Union -- could tilt toward the camp of the workers states. Once the U.S. decided on the rapid restoration of West Germany and its inclusion in the world imperialist alliance, it was only a question of time and diplomacy until German capitalism regained its former economic and military strength.

Against Rapid Reunification of Germany

For many reasons, Adenauer was ideal for this role. And it must be admitted that he did a good job for his class.

Adenauer is a typical representative of the Rhineland bourgeoisie centered around the Cologne banking houses which were always traditionally oriented toward the West and hostile to the Prussian Junkers and the old finance-capital centered in Berlin. In fact, after World War I, a part of

these forces toyed with the idea of splitting the Rhineland from Germany, and Adenauer was among them. Intimately connected with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, these circles viewed the partition of Germany after the defeat of Hitler as a blessing in disguise. For the first time a German state came into being in which the Vatican wielded a majority, an impossibility in a united Germany.

Adenauer looked at German reunification with a cold eye for additional rather obvious social and political reasons. In Soviet-dominated East Germany, which was later to become the German Democratic Republic, were located the traditional strongholds of the German labor movement, Berlin, Saxony and Thuringia.

True, the Soviet occupation and Stalinist excesses under the Ulbricht regime terribly discredited Communism in these areas. Still, the most probable outcome of free elections would have been an overwhelming Social-Democratic majority, making rule in a united Germany through classical capitalist parties very difficult.

Moreover, no matter how bitterly the East German workers hated Stalinism, they would scarcely tolerate without resistance handing over nationalized factories, built with their bare hands at tremendous sacrifice, to former capitalist owners who had not invested a cent in them for almost twenty years. Yet a united Germany, in which completely nationalized industry existed in the eastern part, would create knotty problems for capitalist economy in the western part and quite possibly tip the scales against durable capitalist stabilization in any form.

For all these reasons, Adenauer centered German efforts in foreign policy on the consolidation of the Western alliance rather than aiming at the reunification of Germany. He supported John Foster Dulles' "brinkmanship" policy of "rolling back Communism" to its prewar frontiers -- when the time became ripe for the effort. However, at crucial moments such as the uprising of the Berlin workers on June 16-17, 1953, and Khrushchev's crushing of the Hungarian uprising on November 4, 1956, Adenauer followed the tip-off from the State Department to "play it safe" and avoid any military adventure that could set off World War III. . . and signify the immediate and total destruction of Germany.

Thus under Adenauer German capitalism looked towards the West and the South rather than the East. The main goal was the integration of Western Europe and increased participation in Western Europe's exploitation of economic lebensraum in the colonial and semicolonial countries of Africa and Asia rather than setting out for early "reconquest" of the lost territories to the east.

At the same time Adenauer cautiously avoided abandoning the formal claim that the German Federal Republic represented the whole of Germany. He never formally recognized the German Democratic Republic nor the new frontiers in Eastern Europe drawn on the maps at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. In this way he staked out the future claims of German capitalism without pressing for their immediate realization.

The Secret of the Economic "Miracle"

The "miraculous" restoration of Germany's power since 1948 has a double foundation: on the one hand, the "cold war"; on the other, intensi-

fied exploitation of the German working class.

Crushed first by the Nazi dictatorship, then by the war and the Allied terrorist saturation bombings of Germany's big cities, and finally by the occupation and the fearful ordeal of Stalinism, the German working class could not find strength to struggle for power when Wall Street decided to rebuild Germany. The workers had to accept reconstruction on a capitalist basis.

Thus they had to begin with real wages less than half those of other West European workers and less than one-fourth the real wages of the American workers. Such low wages, in combination with a more or less up-to-date technology, permitted an extremely high rate of exploitation and a correspondingly high rate of profit, with extraordinary possibilities for capital accumulation. That's the whole secret of the economic "miracle."

But the logic of capitalism works in two directions. The faster the rate of capital accumulation and the greater the production of wealth, the greater the number of workers with jobs and the lower the rate of unemployment. The consequence: a rise in the workers' demand for a share in this increasing wealth.

The extremely low level of wages in the 1948-50 period assured a considerable margin of "security" for German capitalism. In annual negotiations wage increases of five to ten per cent could be conceded without affecting Germany's favorable competitive position in the world market. The annual concession bought "social peace" and a quiescent, reformist labor movement.

Each year the price was paid until -- after twelve years -- German wages became the highest in Western Europe, topping even the wage scales of the British workers.

At this point, Germany's competitive position came into question. Steel, coal, shipbuilding, even the German specialties of optical goods and machine tools, began to lose out to Italian, British and Japanese competitors who benefited from lower wages. To complicate things, full employment barred the effective imposition of "wage restraints" on the trade unions by purely economic means. German capitalism needed a political solution to this increasingly dangerous situation.

The lines of such a solution were clear enough. Preparations must be made for a change in government and the increasing involvement of the Social Democracy in ruling the country.

The leaders of the Social Democratic movement had for their part been doing their share in preparing for this turn. The vestiges of the former pseudo-Marxist ideology had been liquidated and replaced by brazen espousal of the "market economy" and private property in the means of production. Participation of the Social Democracy in the government provided the best possibility for "disciplining" the unions, since the German Social Democracy still controls a big sector of the trade-union apparatus and is able to throw heavy and effective weight on the side of "wage restraints."

This is the main explanation for the clamor of the German bourgeoisie since the 1961 general elections to change the government and to symbolize

the change by letting Adenauer go. Erhard in a coalition government with the FDP ["liberal" party] leader Mende, a typical representative of German industry, signifies the end of the political monopoly exercised by the CDU [Christian Democrats] since 1949 and could mean a transition either towards a Mende-Brandt or Schroeder-Brandt cabinet, Schroeder seeming to be the man the CDU is now grooming.

Coming Shift in Foreign Policy?

The need for a change has been felt in foreign policy as well as domestic politics. Adenauer's one-sided course in relation to the integration of Western Europe was spelled out by close collaboration with Gaullist France, the creation of a "Paris-Bonn axis" to dominate the Common Market and West Africa, the exclusion of Britain from the European Economic Community and a struggle within the imperialist alliance for "equal say" with Washington. This policy became an increasing source of embarrassment and irritation to the leading forces of the West German bourgeoisie.

In the first place these highly class-conscious men have a realistic appreciation of the relationship of forces on the European continent. De Gaulle's miniature atomic bomb (only four times the power of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima) gives them no feeling of "security" in face of the military might of the USSR's nuclear rocketry. More than ever this bourgeoisie wants the "comfort" of the American "nuclear umbrella," wants American troops on the continent and in Germany, and has an itch to get its own hands on nuclear weapons, even if only through a "multilateral nuclear NATO force."

The timing of the American army maneuver "Big Lift" was not lost on the German bourgeoisie. As Erhard stepped into Adenauer's shoes, the "Big Lift" demonstrated the feasibility of transporting whole divisions across the Atlantic in a few hours. From a technical point of view it is clearly demonstrated that American troops need not be kept on the European continent. Time-wise, troops based in the United States are now closer to Germany than when they were based in the British Isles in World War II!

"Big Lift" was the American way of reminding the German capitalists not to take anything for granted. The element of blackmail was obvious. "Give up playing with de Gaulle and knuckle under to the Americans. Otherwise we might pick up our marbles and get out!"

The new German chancellor hastened to indicate his sensitivity to the warning. At the first meeting of ministers of the Common Market powers at which he was present after becoming chancellor, Erhard broke the French-German united front.

Growing competition in the world market combined with an increasing drag in the big postwar boom made it more and more imperative for the West German bourgeoisie to bolster their trade defenses abroad instead of being sucked deeper into de Gaulle's rather unrealistic plan for "French supremacy" in Western Europe. Western Germany especially requires rapid extension of the Common Market, already too narrow for the colossal economic potential that has been created. Western Germany requires rapid penetration of Asian, Latin-American and North American markets. Consequently the German capitalists take a favorable view of the American imperialist scheme for an "Atlantic zone of free trade." They are antagonized by

French insistence on tariff protection for agricultural goods produced in the Common Market, since this means higher food costs for Western Germany (and thus higher nominal wages) coupled with greater difficulties in forming trade partnerships with food-exporting countries overseas.

For all these reasons, Washington is pleased with the replacement of Adenauer by Erhard and would be even more pleased by the replacement of Erhard by the Social Democrat Willy Brandt, the West German politician who toes Washington's line in the most servile way.

But -- one may well ask -- is German imperialism freeing itself from the arms of de Gaulle only to fling itself into the passionate embrace of Wall Street? If economic difficulties become aggravated, might not the Germans again resume politics on their own -- on a world scale? Aren't there vast potential markets for German machines and German chemicals in the Soviet bloc and China? Can't these markets be opened up, or at least can't the threat of opening them up persuade Washington that after all Germany is now "responsible enough" to be permitted to have a few small nuclear weapons of its own? And once such weapons are in the hands of a new Bundeswehr won't a new and frightening chapter open in the history of diplomacy?

It is the perspective suggested by such questions that explains -- among other factors -- the frantic efforts of the Soviet bureaucracy to convince U.S. imperialism that it should underwrite the new frontiers in Eastern and Central Europe through a "nonaggression" pact, and that this should be done now before the German ally is strong enough to prevent this by a veto.

But economic contradictions sharp enough to impel the German bourgeoisie once again along the road of "independent" adventures (if only as blackmail) would also intensify social tensions within Germany itself. It would mean the end of annual wage rounds and thereby the end of German working-class quiescence. A showdown would loom between those sectors of the German labor movement so committed to "collaboration" with the class enemy that even a "wage freeze" is acceptable and those sectors prepared to defend real wages and trade-union rights.

Whatever the immediate outcome of such a showdown, it would mean the end of the long phase in which the German working class was only a passive object in German politics, a phase that has lasted thirty years. Adenauer's departure may prove to have been a landmark here, too.

GUERRILLA WARFARE -- A METHOD

By Ernesto Che Guevara

[Continued from last issue.]

During the development of the armed struggle, two moments of extreme danger for the future of the revolution appear. The first of these, arising in the preparatory stage, concerns the way in which the decision to struggle and the clarity of the goal of the popular forces conform to each other. When the bourgeois state advances against the positions of the people, it must evidently produce a process of defense against the enemy who, at this moment of superiority, is attacking. If the minimum objective

and subjective conditions have already developed, the defense must be armed, but in such way that the popular forces are not converted into mere recipients of the enemy's blows; neither must the area of armed defense be permitted to become transformed simply into an ultimate refuge for the persecuted. Guerrilla warfare, a defensive movement of the people at a given moment, bears in itself -- and it must be constantly developed -- a capacity for attacking the enemy. This capacity is what in time determines its character as a catalyzer of the popular forces. This means that guerrilla warfare is not passive self-defense, it is a defense that includes attack and from the moment that this is posed as such, it has as its final perspective the conquest of political power.

This moment is important. In social processes the difference between violence and nonviolence cannot be measured by the number of shots exchanged; it corresponds to concrete and fluctuating situations. And it is necessary to be able to see the instant at which the popular forces, conscious of their relative weakness, but at the same time of their strategic power, must oblige the enemy to take the necessary steps to prevent the situation from deteriorating. It is necessary to upset the equilibrium between the oligarchical dictatorship and the popular pressure. The dictatorship constantly seeks to exercise its rule without the ostentatious use of force. To oblige it to present itself undisguised; that is, in its true aspect of violent dictatorship of the reactionary classes, contributes to unmasking it. This deepens the struggle to such a degree that recovery is impossible. The firm beginning of an armed action of wide scope depends on how well the forces of the people accomplish the task they have assumed of compelling the dictatorship to worsen or unleash the struggle through military means.

Emergence from the other dangerous moment depends on the power held by the popular forces of an ascending development. Marx always recommended that once having begun in the revolutionary process, the revolutionary proletariat must strike and strike without rest. Revolution that does not constantly deepen is revolution in regression. The fighters, tired out, begin to lose faith and can then lend success to some of the maneuvers to which the bourgeoisie have so accustomed us. These can be elections in which power is given to another gentleman with a more honeyed voice and angelical face than the alternative dictator; or a coup by the reactionaries headed, in general, by the army supported, directly or indirectly, by the progressive forces. There are others, but it is not our intention to analyze tactical stratagems.

We call special attention to the maneuver noted above of a military coup. What can the militarists offer in genuine democracy? What loyalty can they demand if they are mere instruments of domination wielded by the reactionary classes and the imperialist monopolies, and a caste which, through the arms it possesses, seeks only to maintain its own prerogatives?

When, in situations of difficulty for the oppressors, the militarists conspire and overthrow a dictator, already defeated in reality, it must be assumed that they do this because he is no longer capable of preserving their class prerogatives without extreme violence, something that, in general, does not correspond at present with the interests of the oligarchies.

This conclusion by no means signifies that military figures should

not be utilized as individual fighters, separated from the social medium in which they have served and against which they have really rebelled. And they must be utilized within the framework of the revolutionary leadership to which they belong as fighters and not as representatives of a caste.

In the already distant past, in the preface to the third edition of The Civil War In France, Engels said: "The workers, after every revolution, are armed; because of this the disarming of the workers has always been the first commandment of the bourgeois who find themselves at the head of the state. Hence, after every revolution won by the workers, a new struggle has broken out, ending in their defeat. . . ." (Cited by Lenin in State and Revolution.)

This game of continual struggles in which a formal change of some kind was gained along with a strategic setback, had been repeated for dozens of years in the capitalist world. The permanent cheating of the proletariat in this respect has now been going on periodically for more than a century.

Another danger is that the leaders of the progressive parties, carried away by the desire to maintain for some time more favorable conditions for revolutionary action through the use of certain aspects of bourgeois legality, confuse two goals, something that is very common in the course of action, and forget the definitive strategic objective -- to take power.

These two difficult moments of the revolution, which we have briefly analyzed, are obviated when the Marxist-Leninist party leaders prove capable of clearly seeing the implications of the moment and mobilizing the masses to the maximum, taking them along the correct road to resolving the fundamental contradictions.

In developing the theme we have assumed the eventual acceptance of the idea of armed struggle and also of the formula of guerrilla warfare as a method of combat. Why do we consider, under present conditions in the Americas, that guerrilla war is the correct road? There are fundamental arguments which, in our opinion, determine the necessity for guerrilla action in the Americas as the central axis of struggle.

First: Accepting it as true that the enemy will struggle to maintain power, it is necessary to consider how to destroy the oppressor's army. For this a popular opposing army must take the field. This army is not born spontaneously; it must arm itself from the arsenal which the enemy boasts, and this entails a hard and very long struggle, in which the popular forces and their leaders are always exposed to attack from superior forces without adequate conditions of defense and maneuverability.

Against this, the guerrilla nucleus, based in terrain favorable to the struggle, guarantees the security and permanence of the revolutionary command. The urban forces, directed from the better location of the army of the people, can carry out actions of incalculable importance. The accidental destruction of these groups does not kill the soul of the revolution, its command, which, from the rural fortress, continues to catalyze the revolutionary spirit of the masses, organizing new forces for other battles.

In addition, in this zone begins the construction of the future state apparatus charged with efficiently guiding the class dictatorship during

the transition period. The greater the struggle, the bigger and more complex are the administrative problems; and their solution trains the cadres for the difficult task of consolidating power and developing the economy at a future stage.

Second: The general situation of the Latin-American peasantry and the more and more explosive character of its struggle against the feudal structures in the framework of a social situation of alliance between local and foreign exploiters.

Returning to the Second Declaration of Havana: "The peoples of America liberated themselves from Spanish colonialism at the beginning of the last century, but they did not free themselves from exploitation. The feudal landowners assumed the authority of the Spanish rulers, the Indians continued in painful servitude, the Latin-American man in one form or another continued to be a slave and the tiniest hopes of the people gave way under the power of the oligarchies and the yoke of foreign capital. This has been the truth of America -- in one hue or another. Today Latin America lies beneath an imperialism fiercer, much more powerful and crueler than the Spanish colonial empire.

"And before the objective reality and the historically inexorable Latin-American revolution, what is the attitude of Yankee imperialism? To prepare to wage a colonial war against the peoples of Latin America; to create an apparatus of force, the political pretexts and the pseudo-legal instruments subscribed to by the reactionary oligarchies to repress with blood and fire the struggle of the Latin-American peoples."

This objective situation shows us the dormant, neglected force of our peasants and the need to utilize it for the liberation of the Americas.

Third: The continental character of the struggle.

Can this new stage in the emancipation of the Americas be conceived as the confrontation of two local forces struggling for power in a given territory? With difficulty. The struggle will be to the death between all the popular forces and all the forces of repression. The paragraphs cited above also predict this.

The Yankees will intervene out of solidarity of interests and because the struggle in the Americas is decisive. In fact they are already intervening in the preparation of the repressive forces and the organization of a continental apparatus of struggle. But from now on they will do this with all their energy, punishing the popular forces with all the arms of destruction within reach; they will not let the revolutionary power become consolidated and, if someone succeeds in doing so, they will return to the attack, not recognize it, seek to divide the revolutionary forces, introducing saboteurs of all kinds, creating frontier problems, launching other reactionary states against it, attempting to economically smother the new state, to annihilate it, in short.

Given this American panorama, it is difficult for victory to be won and consolidated in an isolated country. The union of the repressive forces must be answered by the union of the popular forces. In all countries in which the oppression reaches unbearable levels, the banner of rebellion must be raised, and this banner will have, out of historic

necessity, continental characteristics. The Cordillera of the Andes is destined to be the Sierra Maestra of the Americas, as Fidel said, and all the immense territories which this continent contains are destined to be scenes of struggle to the death against the imperialist power.

We cannot say when these continental characteristics will be acquired, nor how long the struggle will endure; but we can predict its arrival and its triumph, because it is the result of inevitable historic, economic and political circumstances and its course cannot be deflected. To initiate it when the conditions are given, independently of the situation in other countries, is the task of the revolutionary force in each country. The development of the struggle will determine the general strategy; the prediction concerning its continental character results from analysis of the opposing forces, but this does not exclude -- far from it -- an independent outbreak. Just as the initiation of the struggle at one point in a country is destined to develop throughout its breadth, the initiation of revolutionary war contributes to developing new conditions in the neighboring countries.

The development of revolutions occurs normally through inversely proportional surges and refluxes; the revolutionary surge corresponds to the counterrevolutionary reflux and, vice versa, in the moments of revolutionary decline there is a counterrevolutionary rise. At these instances, the situation of the popular forces becomes difficult and they must resort to better methods of defense in order to suffer less damage. The enemy is extremely strong on a continental scale. Because of this the relative weakness of local bourgeoisies must not be analyzed with the thought of making decisions of restricted scope. Still less can one think of a possible alliance between these oligarchies and the people in arms. The Cuban Revolution has rung the alarm bell. The polarization of forces will become total -- exploiters on one side and the exploited on the other; the mass of the petty bourgeoisie will incline to one of the factions or the other in accordance with its interests and the political skill with which it is handled; neutrality will constitute an exception. That's the way the revolutionary war will go.

Let us consider how a guerrilla focal center can be started.

Relatively small nuclei of persons decide on favorable places for guerrilla warfare whether it be to open a counterattack or to ride out a storm and there they begin to act. The following must be established very clearly: in the first period the relative weakness of the guerrilla forces is such that they must work only to become established in the terrain, to get to know the surroundings, establishing connections with the population and reinforcing the places that will eventually be converted into their base of support.

There are three conditions for the survival of a guerrilla force that begins its development under the premises outlined here: constant mobility, constant vigilance, constant mistrust. Without the adequate use of these three elements of military tactics, the guerrilla force can hardly survive. It is necessary to state that the heroism of the guerrilla fighter, at this time, consists in the greatness of his objective and the enormous series of sacrifices that must be made to carry it out.

These sacrifices are not the daily combat, the face to face struggle

with the enemy; they take on more subtle forms, more difficult for a person engaged in guerrilla fighting to resist.

They will perhaps be severely punished by the enemy armies; split into groups at times; martyred if they fall prisoner; pursued like harried animals in the zones in which they chose to act; with the constant uncertainty of having enemies dogging one's steps in the guerrilla conflict; with constant mistrust of everyone, since terrorized peasants can turn them over to the repressive troops, in some cases to get rid of the pretext for the troops being there; without any other alternative than death or victory at a time when death is a concept present a thousand times while victory is a myth in which only a revolutionary could dream.

This is the heroism of the guerrilla fighter. Because of this it is said that to move is also a form of fighting, that refusing combat at a given moment is only a form of fighting. The basic thing is, in face of the general superiority of the enemy, to find the tactical form of gaining relative superiority at a chosen point, whether it be to concentrate more effective forces than the foe or to assure advantages in utilizing the terrain that will reverse the relation of forces. In these conditions tactical victory must be assured. If relative superiority is not plain, it is preferable not to act. Combat that does not produce a victory must not be undertaken so long as it is possible to choose the "how" and the "when."

Within the frame of wide politico-military action, of which it is an element, guerrilla warfare continues to grow and to become consolidated. Bases of support then continue to be formed as the fundamental element in which the guerrilla army can prosper. These bases of support are points in which the enemy army can penetrate only at the cost of great losses --- bastions of the revolution, the refuge and resort of the guerrilla forces for incursions of greater and greater distance and daring.

Now comes the time to determine whether the difficulties of a tactical and political order have been simultaneously overcome. The guerrilla fighters can never forget their function as vanguard of the people, the mandate they incarnate, and because of this they must create the necessary political conditions for the establishment of the revolutionary power based on the total support of the masses. The great demands of the peasantry must be satisfied in the measure and form required by the circumstances, converting the entire population into a compact and decided conglomeration.

As difficult as the military situation is at first, politics is no less delicate; and if a single military error can liquidate the guerrilla forces, a political error can put a brake on its development for long periods.

The struggle is politico-military; this is how it must be developed and, consequently, how it must be understood.

The guerrilla struggle, in its process of growth, reaches a time in which its capacity for action covers a specific region where there are more than enough men available and the concentration in the zone is too great. Then comes the beehive effect in which one of the chiefs, a distinguished guerrilla fighter, shifts to another region and goes on repeating the guerrilla chain, subject, of course, to a central command.

It is necessary to point out here that it is not possible to aspire to victory without the formation of a popular army. The guerrilla forces can be increased up to a certain size; the popular forces, in the cities and other zones accessible to the enemy can cause havoc, but the military potential of the action still remains intact. It must always be borne in mind that the final result must be the annihilation of the adversary. To accomplish this, all the new zones that have been created, plus the zones of perforation behind the enemy's lines, plus the forces operating in the principal cities, must have a relation of dependency in regard to command. The closed hierarchical order that characterizes an army should not be attempted, simply a strategic order. Within determined conditions of freedom of action, the guerrillas must carry out all the strategic orders of the central command installed in one of the zones, the safest, the surest, preparing the conditions for the union of the forces at a given moment.

Guerrilla warfare or a war of liberation will have in general three phases: first, the strategic defensive, in which a small force that flees bites the enemy; it doesn't take refuge in order to carry out a passive defense in a small circle; its defense consists in the limited attacks it can make. This stage passed, a point of equilibrium is reached in which possibilities of action between the enemy and the guerrilla forces become established and, then, the final moment of flooding over the repressive army which leads to taking the big cities, to the big decisive encounters, to the total annihilation of the adversary.

After reaching the point of equilibrium, where both forces respect each other, on continuing its development guerrilla warfare acquires new characteristics. It begins to introduce the concept of maneuver; big columns that attack strong points; a war of movement with transfer of forces and relatively strong means of attack. But, due to the capacity of resistance and counterattack which the enemy still retains, this war of maneuver does not definitively displace the guerrillas; it is only a form of their action, a greater magnitude of guerrilla forces, until, at last, a popular army is crystallized with divisions of armies. Even at this moment, marching ahead of the actions of the principal forces, go the guerrilla fighters in their "pure" form, cutting communication lines, sabotaging the whole defensive apparatus of the enemy.

We have predicted that the war will be continental. This signifies also that it will be prolonged; there will be many fronts, it will cost much blood, innumerable lives for a long time. But, something more, the phenomena of polarization of forces that is occurring in the Americas, the clear division between exploiters and exploited which will exist in future revolutionary wars, signify that when the armed vanguard of the people takes power, the country, or countries, that succeed in this, will have simultaneously liquidated in the oppressor both the imperialists and national exploiters. The first stage of the socialist revolution will have crystallized; the peoples will be ready to heal the wounds and to begin the construction of socialism.

Will there be other, less cruel, possibilities?

It has been some time since the last division of the world occurred which the United States took the lion's part of our continent; today the imperialists of the old world are developing again and the strength of the European Common Market terrorizes the North Americans themselves. All this makes it possible to believe that the possibility exists of watching

as spectators at an interimperialist battle, after which new advances could be made, perhaps in alliance with the strongest national bourgeoisies. Leaving aside the fact that passive politics never brings good results in the class struggle and that alliances with the bourgeoisie, however revolutionary it may appear at a given moment, have only a transitory character, there are considerations relating to time that induce one to take a different position. The sharpening of the fundamental contradiction appears to be so rapid in the Americas that it disrupts the "normal" development of the contradictions of the imperialist camp in its struggle for markets.

The national bourgeoisies have united with North American imperialism in their great majority and must encounter the same fate as the latter in each country. Even in cases in which pacts or coincidental contradictions appear between the national bourgeoisie and other imperialisms against the North American, this occurs in the framework of a fundamental struggle that will necessarily involve, in the course of its development, all the exploited and all the exploiters. The polarization of the antagonistic forces of the class adversaries has been, up to now, faster than the development of the contradictions between the exploiters over the division of the booty. There are two camps: the alternative will become clearer for every individual and for every special layer of the population.

The Alliance for Progress is an attempt to restrain the unrestrainable.

But if the advance of the European Common Market or any other imperialist group into the markets of the Americas were to occur more rapidly than the development of the fundamental contradiction, the only recourse would be to introduce the popular forces like a wedge in the open breach, taking them all into struggle and utilizing the new intruders with clear consciousness of their ultimate intentions.

Not a position, not an arm, not a secret must be handed over to the enemy under penalty of losing everything.

The fact is that the eruption of the American struggle has occurred. Will its vortex be in Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador. . . ? Will the present skirmishes be only manifestations of an uneasiness that has not ripened? It does not matter how the struggles of today turn out. It does not matter, in the final analysis whether this or that movement is temporarily defeated. What is definitive is the decision to struggle which is maturing day by day, the consciousness of the necessity for revolutionary change, the certainty of its possibility.

This is a prediction. We make it with the conviction that history will prove us right. Analysis of the objective and subjective factors of America and the imperialist world indicates to us the accuracy of these assertions based on the Second Declaration of Havana.

[The end.]

Imprimerie: 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2 (imprimé par les soins de l'éditeur)

Directeur-gérant: Pierre FRANK.