

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Vol. 1, No. 8

November 15, 1963

21, rue d'Aboukir - Paris-2<sup>e</sup>

## FRENCH WORKERS SAY, "PAY ATTENTION!"

PARIS, Nov. 7 -- Some two million workers in government and nationalized industries made yesterday a holiday in France -- but a holiday with a message: pay attention to labor's demands!

Gas and electricity went off promptly at eight a.m. in most places and stayed off until five p.m. Government offices were vacant. No mail was distributed. Water pressure went down. Electric trains stayed in the stations. The Paris subway closed its gates to passengers.

Traffic lights went dead -- which didn't contribute to orderliness as automobiles on streets increased abnormally in number. Air traffic was cut forty per cent. Garbage went uncollected. Hospitals took care of only serious and emergency cases. Schools went on recess for the day. TV fans had to skip their favorite programs.

Some bakeries were in short supply because of reliance on electric mixing machines and gas ovens. Butchers worried as refrigerators warmed up. Restaurants served cold meals. People got unaccustomed work outs because of arrested elevators. Women skipped beauty parlor appointments -- no hair dryers, no lights. A journalist complained about his electric razor not working when he plugged it in.

The absence of electricity and gas, the dip in water pressure and the difficulties in transportation were scarcely conducive to a high rate of production among the millions of workers who were not called out. In eastern France the miners decided to show their approval of the general action by downing tools.

Thus the whole economic life of the country was affected by what is known in French as perturbations.

Such an extensive nation-wide demonstration is not the first of its kind and will not likely be the last.

How are such actions to be explained? What do they point to?

For some years -- more exactly since the boom reached its height -- it has been observable that the layers of workers hitherto viewed as the vanguard, like the metal workers, have engaged in struggles of less and less scope while the workers in the public services, government offices, etc.; that is, categories that formerly were the least advanced politically have been demonstrating more and more frequently and, in some cases, going into strike action.

The explanation is obvious. The metal workers, above all the skilled categories, have turned full employment to advantage, winning wage increases without big struggles. In contrast workers in the so-called "civil service" have not been getting much response from their employer, the government. Their wage rates are behind schedule and consequently they have been driven more and more frequently and strongly into protest actions.

These actions -- like the long strike of the miners last spring -- demonstrate the mighty potential power of the working class and its capacity to struggle on the economic level. The establishment of the de Gaulle regime, so baneful in the field of political struggle has not greatly affected struggles on the economic level.

This could be a solid base of departure for the workers' movement. Unfortunately the leadership of the workers' unions -- Stalinists, traditional reformists, Catholics -- like the corresponding political leadership do not have the slightest intention of undertaking a struggle that might hurt the regime and eventually set in motion revolutionary consequences. The economic struggles are not only divorced from a political perspective of that kind, even as economic struggles they occur only at the lowest level.

Thus a day in which demands are publicized by a stoppage must be viewed as a kind of preparatory mobilization, a kind of test run before engaging in more serious struggles for correspondingly more serious aims.

For the trade-union leaders, such stoppages have a different objective. They want to demonstrate, during negotiations with representatives of the government, that the workers are behind them. They are looking for backing for themselves, and hardly more, in order to take credit for the small increase which the government may grant its employees.

In general, for some years, the workers have responded to these appeals of the trade-union leaders, but with rather diminishing enthusiasm. They don't want to disavow their organizations even if they display great timidity. It is not very likely that the government, which does not hide its hope that the workers will leave their organizations out of weariness, will see its wishes realized. The labor market still remains favorable to the employees. At certain times some categories of workers begin strikes almost spontaneously as was the case with the miners last spring -- such will to resist being quite unexpected to the leadership of the workers' organizations.

But for the situation to develop more profoundly, for the appear-

ance of more powerful economic confrontations, there must be either a turn in the economic situation itself or big political changes. When these will occur cannot yet be confidently predicted.

### RIGHTISTS SUFFER HEAVY DEFEAT IN GREEK ELECTIONS

In the November 3 elections in Greece, the rightists suffered a heavy defeat, the National Radical Union headed by Constantine Caramanlis, which had governed the country for eight years, not only losing its absolute majority [some 39 per cent of the vote] but dropping behind the Center Union of George Papandreou [above 42 per cent]. The extreme left, represented by the EDA [United Democratic Left] under John Passalidis, held its own with a little over 14 per cent of the vote. [The Progressive party of Spyros-Markezinis came a little under 4 per cent, independents registered about half of one per cent.]

The capitalist press has found the results to be a big surprise. Surprise for whom and why? The elections two years ago were marked by fraud and the use of terror to keep Caramanlis in the majority. At the time the well-experienced politician Papandreou [born in 1888], sniffing the wind, loudly denounced the fraudulent elections and appealed to the monarchy to cut loose from Caramanlis. After some hesitation, the king lent a sympathetic ear.

Mass discontent in Greece has risen considerably. Certain layers of the bourgeoisie feel the need for a government holding real approval. Hence the need to let popular opinion be registered.

This does not mean that prosperity will come to Greece and that democracy will flower for the Greek workers and peasants. The new regime is more concerned about an equitable distribution of profits among the bourgeoisie than about stopping the fight against "Communism."

The situation will prove to be all the more unstable since the Center Union won by only a relative majority and will find it quite difficult, both on the right and the left, to construct a coalition.

Also there are good reasons for believing that the elections will, in the final analysis, prove to be the reopening of a period of intense revival of political life, of a growing polarization of forces. However feeble the liberalization of political life now to be expected, the Greek masses, whose potential is enormous, will take full advantage of the new situation and far from being lulled by the nonsense about "democracy" in Greece spun by the leaders of the Communist party, will resume the struggle that was smashed after the war following Stalin's commitments at Yalta to his American and British "allies."

### MORE NATIONALIZATIONS IN ALGERIA

During a press conference November 4, Bachir Boumaza, minister of the National Economy, announced that all tobacco and match factories in Algeria have been nationalized. A number of firms are involved.

The government said that it recognized the right of the owners to "indemnification" and that it would open negotiations on payment.

## NEW SITUATION IN GREECE

### A Background Article

ATHENS -- A new stage, characterized by the breaking up of political stability, opened in Greece June 11 with the resignation of Premier Constantine Caramanlis. His regime, in power for the past eight years, owed its rise to a relation of forces favorable to capitalist reaction. It was supported by big capital (especially the banks), the "allies," the throne and the military clique of royalist officers.

Among the broad suppressed and exploited masses (workers, poor peasants, employees, city petty-bourgeoisie) the eight-year regime of the ERE [National Radical Union, the extreme right-wing party headed by Caramanlis] was a dark period of increasing misery.

Exploitation was intensified. The oppressive police-state became more brutal. Fascist bands appeared. Unemployment mounted and workers had to emigrate. The tax burden became insupportable. Waste and corruption in government reached gigantic proportions. Military expenses mounted and foreign imperialist rocket bases were installed. Medieval views prevailed in lower schools and universities. The blood of workers, of peasants, students and two left-wing members of parliament, Lambrakis and Tsarouhas, was spilled in the streets.

The distance between the exploited popular masses and the government of the parliamentary dictatorship of capitalist reaction became wider and deeper year by year, month by month.

The working-class movement for immediate demands, despite the strong brakes applied by the traitorous trade-union leadership headed by Makris, Theodorou and Co. curved upward in the past four years. In 1959, strikers numbered 195,000; in 1960, 395,000; in 1961, 515,000; in 1962, 818,000. The figures for 1963 will be still higher; in the first two months alone, 154,000 were listed. The class ferment is especially visible among working youth.

In some instances the struggles amount to real class battles against the state machine. (The December 1, 1960, battle of the Athens construction workers.) The poor peasants, too, have engaged in militant mass demonstrations even in the face of bloodshed as at Iraklio-Creta and Valto-Xiromero.

The students have staged militant actions over such demands as "15 Per Cent of the Budget for Education" and "No More Hiroshimas." Teachers, employees and small tradesmen in the cities have expressed their discontent in strikes and slow-downs.

The 1961 elections, conducted under a royalist provisional government ("elections of terror and fraud," they were called) sharpened the opposition of the masses to the rightist government and deepened the differences between the ERE and the Center Union [party of the liberal bourgeoisie].

Expressing the interests mainly of a sector of the industrial capitalists, and operating also as a safety valve for popular indignation, the Center Union with Papandreou at its head has campaigned under the slogans, "Honest government! Honest elections! An honest electoral system!"

Mass pressure, however, is strong and is advancing beyond the aims of the Center Union. A peaceful meeting called by Papandreu on April 20, 1962, despite a government ban, developed into a real class battle against the oppressive state machine as a demonstration of the popular desire to exercise the democratic right of assembly. Since then the struggle for economic demands has grown more intense, spreading into the countryside, involving the youth and embracing larger numbers of the working people (strikes of doctors, school teachers, etc.). These movements, including antiwar rallies, have been met by government terrorism and the appearance of fascist bands linked to state functionaries. The reaction reached its peak last May in Thessalonike when Lambrakis was murdered and Tsarouhas gravely wounded.

The response to this was a huge popular demonstration at the funeral of Lambrakis, one of the biggest rallies on record.

It was in this situation that differences between the throne and Caramanlis appeared. The throne, which had favored and supported the Caramanlis regime, began to feel that this unpopular government had served its purpose. The feeling among the masses that Caramanlis and the throne were in solidarity with each other was dangerous for the dynasty. Queen Frederika suffered great loss of prestige during her trip in London when she was picketed by Abaticlou, the militant wife of a political prisoner held for many years in the jails of Greece.

In addition it should not be overlooked that the British are seeking to regain their positions in Greece as the American aid program is reduced. Among wide circles in England and Europe, the House of Glucksberg symbolizes a rule that has kept a thousand political prisoners in jail for more than eighteen years. The "cordial friendship" between Paul of Greece and Elizabeth of England, disturbed by the Cyprus question, was not helped by the growing unpopularity of the Caramanlis regime among the British people who associated it with the Tories now threatened by a Labour victory.

Besides this, a sector of the Greek capitalist class lacks confidence that ERE can handle the economic problems of Greece to best advantage in relation to the Common Market.

Finally the throne found Caramanlis' cultivation of a personal following among the royalist officers not exactly to its liking.

The growing differences eventually led to a breakdown in the relations between the king and Caramanlis.

For the palace this signified turning away from the worn-out image of the premier, an attempt at "renovation" of the right wing under another leadership, a new effort to hoodwink the masses, and a certain appeasement of international public opinion -- in brief the use of Caramanlis as a scapegoat.

As for Caramanlis, he resigned in order to re-establish the parliamentary standing of the ERE and strengthen his grip on the state machine, both of which seemed feasible in view of an electoral system that heavily favored his party. His stance against the throne, he calculated, would impress his electoral social following.

The provisional government of Pipinelis was an agency of the palace

but it was also supported by the parliamentary majority of the ERE. It sought unsavory aims: to dupe the masses and prepare the new elections in such a way as to favor the right wing.

In accordance with the first aim it purged the government of elements representing the tendency to go too far beyond bourgeois law in their crusade against popular fighters like Lambrakis. Yet it did not fail to display sympathy and understanding for criminal officers of the gendarmerie.

Thus it arrested four officers, Mitsou, Kamoutsis, Diamantopoulos and Papatriantafilou, but granted them comfortable apartments at the General Police Security of Thessalonike where they enjoyed all conveniences, including telephones, visits and balconies from which they could address friends who tossed kisses and flowers to them.

Radio Athens was permitted to carry all the attacks against the judges who ordered the arrest of the four.

The Pipinelis government refused proportional system for the elections, maintained the threat of terrorist extra-parliamentary action against opposition parties, rejected the demands of the working people, shed the blood of the peasants in Aheloos. As a counterattack to the mass indignation over the Thessalonike crime, it accused "extreme left-wing" elements of preparing the murders and slandered the left for an alleged separationist position in relation to Macedonia. Finally, with the benediction of the throne and in collusion with the ERE it prepared the November 3 elections to give maximum advantages to the right wing.

The replacement of the Pipinelis government by the new provisional government headed by Stylianos Mavromachlis did not change anything essential in this situation.

In the process now under way, it should be recognized that the ultra reactionary right, hit by a rise in the mass movement in the last period, suffered a defeat when Caramanlis was forced to resign.

The Center Union represents the "democratic" reserve of capitalist reaction, the "democratic" support of the throne, and the "democratic" agency of imperialism. The policy of the Center Union is in substance to argue with big capital, the palace and American imperialism that it represents the preferable form of capitalist rule in Greece, since it can do the work better and ensure a better climate and safer regime for capitalist exploitation and oppression.

If the appeal by the Center Union is not accepted by these reactionary forces it will not be because they doubt the aims of the Center Union but because they feel that in the present phase at least, a right-wing government with Caramanlis or his successor can better check the masses.

The Center Union quite consciously seeks to channelize the dynamism of the masses and to confine it within the limits of bourgeois political change. Through its demagogy in the past two years, the Center Union has succeeded in attracting large numbers of peasants and the petty bourgeois; in this way playing its role as an obstacle to further radicalization of the masses while at the same time creating illusions among them.

Instead of attempting to counter these illusions, the leaders of the Communist party and the EDA are taking a contrary course, seeking to strengthen illusions through a policy of class collaboration, of constituting a "patriotic front" and forming a union with the "national" and "democratic" bourgeoisie.

Throughout this period the EDA has acted as the left shadow of the bourgeois Center Union, begging that its collaboration be accepted. The EDA has rejected leading a mass struggle against the regime. While the Center Union cheated the masses, the EDA and the Greek Communist party openly betrayed the historical aims of the working class and its allies by eulogizing a wing of the bourgeoisie, supporting the throne and giving up the flag of class independence.

In the electoral campaign the working and popular masses must conduct a hard fight against the capitalist parties. Let them vote once more for EDA despite the irresponsibility of its leadership before history.

The November 3 elections offer little to the working people. Their problems will finally be solved in a different arena than the parliamentary one. Nevertheless they must utilize every shred of bourgeois parliamentarism, expressing by their vote:

- Hate for the bourgeois parties of the right and the center, the state staffed by murderers, the throne and imperialism.
- Class opposition to the regime of exploitation, oppression and war.
- Disapproval of the policy of class collaboration and the "patriotic front" with bourgeois parties.
- Readiness to fight in a united front of the working class for economic, trade-union and political demands of the worker and peasant masses, the strategic orientation being establishment of a socialist democracy of people's councils.

The political crisis of the regime of exploitation reflects a growing movement of the masses. Let us try to strengthen and enlarge these struggles as the only way of getting out of today's hell.

#### ANOTHER STEP IN DE-STALINIZATION

The October 27 issue of Izvestia published an article by Ivan Maisky, the Soviet ambassador to London under Stalin, paying tribute to a person liquidated at the height of the monstrous Moscow frame-up trials of the thirties.

Maisky's article is entitled "A Diplomat of the Leninist School" and the person to whom this posthumous praise is offered is Nikolai Krestinsky, one of the main victims of the last great trial in March 1938.

Maisky traces Krestinsky's career from the time he became a Bolshevik in 1903 until he last saw him toward the end of 1936, a year before he became a victim of "Stalin's personality cult."

A well-known figure when the October Revolution broke out, Krestinsky

became a member of the party's Central Committee, was Commissar for Finance and between 1919 and 1921 was one of three party secretaries. Later he was assigned to the diplomatic field.

Krestinsky is best known to historians of the Soviet scene, however, as a prominent opponent of Stalinism and one of the leaders of the Left Opposition founded by Leon Trotsky. Under the terrible pressures mounted by Stalin against all political opponents, Krestinsky eventually capitulated.

This did not save him from the wide mass purges instituted by Stalin. In 1938 he appeared among the victims in the prisoners dock in a frame-up trial that set a precedent for all time by its excesses of paranoiac imagination. On the same bench, Stalin had also placed Bukharin, the outstanding leader of the Right Opposition, and Yagoda, the head of the political police who had savagely persecuted the Trotskyists for ten years under Stalin's guidance and organized the previous frame-up trials in which Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov, both of whom were in exile, were the main targets.

"Confessions" were wrung from the victims, including Krestinsky, that Trotsky had been in touch with the British, German, Japanese and Polish spy services not to mention "White Guard" Russians and "Mensheviks." Krestinsky "admitted" his own "involvement," saying under Prosecutor Vyshinsky's prodding that he had received some 2,000,000 gold marks from the German spy service which he had turned over to Trotsky to keep the "Trotskyites" going abroad. In return he claimed that "regular" reports had been furnished the Germans.

Under the heading of "sabotage" the "spies" allegedly caused "25,000 horses to perish" and, in Siberia, inoculated hogs with "swine fever and the plague." In the same trial Stalin's political police had defendants "confess" about poison plots involving the personal physician of Lenin and Stalin in which such figures as the novelist Maxim Gorky allegedly fell victim.

The trial was punctured by Trotsky from his exile in Mexico as a fantastic tissue of self-contradictory fabrications based on "evidence" produced in previous frame-up trials that had already been proved to be false. An example was an "airplane trip" to Oslo which Piatakov, one of the defendants had "confessed" taking to see Trotsky (then in Norway) after visiting Hitler's lieutenant Rudolf Hess. It was proved that no such plane nor any other foreign plane had landed at Oslo, neither at the specified time nor in the months before and after.

Trotsky's exposure of the frame-up, however, did not stay Stalin's hand. Among those marked for summary execution was Krestinsky.

What is the meaning of the article in Izvestia that speaks well of Krestinsky although it skips over his being a leader of the Trotskyist Left Opposition?

In the rehabilitations previously undertaken of Stalin's victims, the beneficiaries have been mostly loyal followers of Stalin whose liquidation was often not easily comprehensible at the time. (Stalin feared them as persons capable of leading an eventual political opposition.) Krestinsky is somewhat different. He was a well-known Trotskyist for quite a period before he was finally broken.



Khrushchev, of course, knows exactly who Krestinsky was. Having taken the step of letting Maisky speak well of him, why should not similar treatment be given to others like him? To do this, however, would mean moving closer to the main thread of all the frame-up trials; that is, the monstrous false accusations levelled against the Trotskyists, beginning with Trotsky himself.

Is Khrushchev ready to give a tug on this thread? The recent attacks against the followers of Trotsky, organized in the Fourth International, give an opposite impression.

Nevertheless even this partial new step is to be hailed. To speak favorably of Krestinsky constitutes another damning indictment of the frame-up trials which brought such infamy to the Soviet government during the dark days of Stalin's unhappy rule. May it help inspire the Soviet people to demand a bit more from Stalin's heirs.

### A WELCOME DEVELOPMENT IN PEKING'S POLEMICS

What may prove to be the opening of a new and important turn in Peking's handling of its dispute with Moscow was signaled October 23 when the editorial departments of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi published "Apologists of Neo-Colonialism," their fourth joint article in the series commenting on the July 14 open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Hammering on Khrushchevite revisionism of Lenin's theory and practice in relation to the colonial revolution, they take Khrushchev and French Communist party leader Thorez to task for their failure to support Algeria's seven-and-a-half year war for national independence, they sharply criticize the attitude of the Soviet government during the Congo crisis, they quote approvingly from Fidel Castro's "Second Declaration of Havana," and they attack the Soviet bureaucracy's doctrine of "socialism in one country" or "a few" countries.

The three most important sections of the long article are as follows:

#### 1.

#### Khrushchev's Attitude Toward Algerian Revolution

"Take the example of the Algerian people's war of national liberation. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. not only withheld support for a long period but actually took the side of French imperialism. Khrushchev used to treat Algeria's national independence as an 'internal affair' of France. Speaking on the Algerian question on October 3, 1955, he said, 'I had and have in view, first of all, that the U.S.S.R. does not interfere in the internal affairs of other states.' Receiving a correspondent of Le Figaro on March 27, 1958, he said, 'We do not want France to grow weaker, we want her to become still greater.'

"To curry favour with the French imperialists, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. did not dare to recognize the Provisional Government of the Republic of Algeria for a long time; not until the victory of the Algerian people's war of resistance against French aggression was a foregone conclusion and France was compelled to agree to Algerian independence did

they hurriedly recognize the Republic of Algeria. This unseemly attitude brought shame on the socialist countries. Yet the leaders of the C.P.S.U. glory in their shame and assert that the victory the Algerian people paid for with their blood should also be credited to the policy of 'peaceful coexistence.'

2.

### French Communist Party Attitude Toward Algerian Revolution

#### "An Example of Social-Chauvinism. [Subhead in original.]

"Similarly, according to proletarian internationalism, the proletariat and the Communists of the oppressor nations must actively support both the right of the oppressed nations to national independence and their struggles for liberation. With the support of the oppressed nations, the proletariat of the oppressor nations will be better able to win its revolution.

"Lenin hit the nail on the head when he said:

"The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would actually be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of "colonial" slaves who are oppressed by capital.' (Lenin, Selected Works, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1951, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 472-73.)

"However, some self-styled Marxist-Leninists have abandoned Marxism-Leninism on this very question of fundamental principle. The leaders of the French Communist Party are typical in this respect.

"Over a long period of time, the leaders of the C.P.F. have abandoned the struggle against U.S. imperialism, refusing to put up a firm fight against U.S. imperialist control over and restrictions on France in the political, economic and military fields and surrendering the banner of French national struggle against the United States to people like de Gaulle; on the other hand, they have been using various devices and excuses to defend the colonial interests of the French imperialists, have refused to support, and indeed opposed, the national-liberation movements in the French colonies, and particularly opposed national revolutionary wars; they have sunk into the quagmire of chauvinism.

"Lenin said, 'Europeans often forget that colonial peoples are also nations, but to tolerate such "forgetfulness" is to tolerate chauvinism.' (Lenin, Collected Works, Russian ed., State Publishing House for Political Literature, Moscow, Vol. XXIII, p. 52.) Yet the leadership of the French Communist Party, represented by Comrade Thorez, has not only tolerated this 'forgetfulness,' but has openly regarded the peoples of the French colonies as 'naturalized Frenchmen,' refused to acknowledge their right to national independence in dissociation from France and publicly supported the policy of 'national assimilation' pursued by the French imperialists.

"For the past ten years and more, the leaders of the French Communist Party have followed the colonial policy of the French imperialists and served as an appendage of French monopoly capital. In 1946, when the

French monopoly capitalist rulers played a neo-colonialist trick by proposing to form a French Union, they followed suit and proclaimed that 'we have always envisaged the French Union as a "free union of free peoples"'. And that 'the French Union will permit the regulation, on a new basis, of the relations between the people of France and the overseas peoples who have in the past been attached to France.' In 1958, when the French Union collapsed and the French Government proposed the establishment of a French Community to preserve its colonial system, the leaders of the C.P.F. again followed suit and proclaimed 'we believe that the creation of a genuine community will be a positive event.'

"Moreover, in opposing the demand of the people in the French colonies for national independence, the leaders of the C.P.F. have even tried to intimidate them, saying that 'any attempt to break away from the Union of France will only lead to the strengthening of imperialism; although independence may be won, it will be temporary, nominal and false.' They further openly declared: 'The question is whether this already unavoidable independence will be with France, or without France and against France. The interest of our country requires that this independence should be with France.'

"On the question of Algeria, the chauvinist stand of the leaders of the C.P.F. is all the more evident. They have recently tried to justify themselves by asserting that they had long 'recognized the correct demand of the people of Algeria for freedom.' But what are the facts?

"For a long time the leaders of the C.P.F. refused to recognize Algeria's right to national independence; they followed the French monopoly capitalists, crying that 'Algeria is an inalienable part of France' and that France 'should be a great African power, now and in the future.' Thorez and others were most concerned about the fact that Algeria could provide France with 'a million head of sheep' and large quantities of wheat yearly to solve her problem of 'the shortage of meat' and 'make up our deficit in grain.'

"Just see! What feverish chauvinism on the part of the leaders of the C.P.F.! Do they show an iota of proletarian internationalism? Is there anything of the proletarian revolutionary in them? By taking this chauvinistic stand they have betrayed the fundamental interests of the international proletariat, the fundamental interests of the French proletariat and the true interests of the French nation."

3.

On the Theory of Socialism in One Country

"The question of what attitude to take towards the relationship between the socialist countries and the revolution of the oppressed nations, and towards the relationship between the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the revolution of the oppressed nations, involves the important principle of whether Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism are to be upheld or abandoned.

"According to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, every socialist country which has achieved victory in its revolution must actively support and assist the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations. The socialist countries must become base areas for supporting and develop-

ing the revolution of the oppressed nations and peoples throughout the world, form the closest alliance with them and carry the proletarian world revolution through to completion.

"But the leaders of the C.P.S.U. virtually regard the victory of socialism in one country or several countries as the end of the proletarian world revolution. They want to subordinate the national-liberation revolution to their general line of peaceful coexistence and to the national interests of their own country." [Our emphasis.] [For complete text of "Apologists of Neo-Colonialism" see Peking Review October 25.]

These declarations represent a welcome development in the theoretical position of the Chinese Communist party in its conflict with Khrushchev. They offer striking confirmation of the correctness of the Trotskyist estimate at the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International last June that the Chinese side is relatively the more progressive.

However, while publicly attacking the theory of "socialism in one country" for the first time, the editors of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi put themselves in the strange position of quoting -- Stalin, as support for their arguments. And they imply that the "liquidationists represented by Trotskyites and Zinovievites" back in 1925 defended -- the theory of socialism in one country!

This posture is so grotesque, in such glaring contradiction to the well-known facts of the discussion in the CPSU during the twenties that one is tempted to wonder if this attempt to "rehabilitate" Stalin on the most incredible grounds of all is not the "sly way" of some "Trotskyite wrecker" in Peking out to torpedo the campaign for Stalin with a truly monumental joke.

As a matter of fact, the editorial departments of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi are unjust even to Stalin. We find ourselves saddled with the quite unexpected and, we are sure, thankless chore of having to defend Stalin against his Chinese partisans in order to keep the historical record straight.

They quote from a text of 1925 in which Stalin describes "liquidationism," and they imply that he was describing the views of Trotsky and Zinoviev. This, however, is not true.

The document they quote from happens to be a famous one in the history of Soviet developments. It has often been cited by Trotskyists because it is the one document in which Stalin himself correctly described how the outward signs of bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet state would become visible in foreign policy.

Stalin made his statements on June 9, 1925, during an interview with students of Sverdlov University. The interview was published in France as a 61-page pamphlet Questions et Réponses by the "Librairie de l'Humanité."

The key quotation cited by the Renmin Ribao and Hongqi authors is taken from the answer to the second question. This question was: "What are the dangers of degeneration of the party which would be determined by the stabilization of capitalism if it were to become prolonged?"

Stalin's answer starts with the following "historical" words: "These

dangers, do they really exist? Yes, and they exist independently of the stabilization, which would only render them more palpable."

The quotation can be found on pages 18-19 of the above pamphlet. Nowhere in the document does Stalin accuse the Opposition of responsibility for these dangers to which he refers to or say that they are manifestations of the policy of the Opposition!

There is good reason for this. Everyone at that time in Russia and the international Communist movement knew that the Opposition stood in the forefront of the defense of the perspective of world revolution and did not show the slightest sign of "petty bourgeois nationalist isolation" in the field of international affairs.

That the editors of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi indicate opposition to the doctrine of "socialism in one country" is, of course, much more important than their curious attempt to attribute this theory to -- Trotsky, and to credit Stalin with starting the fight against this pernicious theory!

However, this strained effort like their general "apology" for Stalin serves to seriously discredit their progressive cause and to cast a repellent shadow on their course. A revolutionary Marxist policy is not served by lies, even in a struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy. Turn towards the full truth, Chinese comrades, and your cause, in alliance with the forces of world revolution, will become invincible!

#### ALGERIA'S CONGRESS OF PEASANTS -- A REVOLUTIONARY GATHERING

While the world press played its spotlight on the western borders of Algeria where the attack launched by Morocco's king might open up the possibility of intervention by the United Nations à la Congo, another, potentially much more significant event was occurring in Algiers. This was the three-day Congress of Peasants held October 25-27. It became a milepost in the development of political consciousness among the Algerian masses. We will return to this congress and its significance in future issues, for the moment we wish only to call attention to an article by David Rousset in the current number of Le Figaro Littéraire [November 7-13]. His observations at the congress are of considerable interest.

First was the impression made on him by the delegates whom he estimated at three thousand. Coming from all over Algeria, they were genuinely of the soil, "rough" men "who had never in their lives spoken before a microphone or camera."

The first day when they approached the rostrum where government officials sat, they were diffident and a little ill at ease. When they turned toward the audience, they felt at home. By the second day they knew that the congress was really theirs and they showed it in everything they did. "They spoke before the president of the Republic, before the ministers, before the nation, without any attention to manners, in their direct manner, crude, hard, the way they think."

Rousset cites as an example of their directness "a simple worker from Tlemcen" who, speaking about the lack of medical facilities in his area, said, "It's necessary to declare the doctors vacant property." [Posses-

sions left by the French settlers when they fled from Algiers were declared "vacant property" as a preliminary step toward nationalization.]

Rousset was impressed by the obvious absence of any attempt to rig the meeting. The organizers had not even thought about heating the place. "No sergeants at arms. No parades. No songs. A few flat inscriptions: 'Long live the decrees of March 22!' 'The land to those who till it.' The atmosphere was created by the delegates themselves. And by afternoon they heard the delegate from Aurès" declare: "All the officials must be elected by the workers." And the delegate from Zéralda: "The officials must be chosen in the light of their professional competency; they must remain close to the peasants; they must get rid of the bureaucratic spirit."

On the second day when Ben Bella entered the hall while the delegate from Médéa was delivering an attack "against the new-born bureaucracy of the state," the delegates rose to give the president a tremendous ovation. "But, with the end of the applause, a number got up to demand that the delegate from Médéa repeat his grievances from the beginning. Which he did and in the same language."

These peasants discovered during the course of the meeting, that their problems were the same on a national scale, that they could be solved only on a national scale, and that they themselves represented an extremely powerful social force likewise on a national scale.

"One of them, moreover, explicitly said the next day during his speech: 'We have been able to get together among the delegations and compare our points of view.' They understood, including in an almost physical way, that the six thousand self-management committees constitute a national force. The closed circle of their regional experience was broken. This shift in consciousness, which they had not really experienced until they were finally assembled, elbow to elbow, this exhibition of their power, changed everything, transformed everything, made this congress an authentic congress of peasants."

They got right down to business. First of all they talked about the results of their work on the farms and the fact that production had not fallen down. "This was visibly the point of honor among serious workers." They wanted the country to understand their new attitude. A peasant of Miliana said: "Before, we worked without understanding. Now we know the problem." They appeared "sure of themselves" but with great simplicity of manner. Thus the delegate from Tiaret began: "I'm going to say a few words. But if I'm mistaken, excuse me."

"And then they began to talk about the obstacles, all the obstacles. Those concerning technical means. Those arising from administration. Like the conflicts with other peasants from barren lands. Like the difficulty former partisans have of adapting themselves. Like the irritating seasonal unemployment. And each one also explained how, in his sector, they had sought to find solutions, to improvise palliatives. For the first time it had ever occurred, the peasants were speaking. For the first time they were not letting someone else speak for them."

The problems, including those tied in with their relations to the government, were thus placed in the open for the joint consideration of the entire body. Not the slightest attempt was made from the rostrum to shut off discussion. On the contrary, although the officials were raked

over the coals, they listened. When someone from the floor became repetitious or took too much time, the other delegates shut him off. They wanted to hear from all sectors.

One of the most significant outcomes was the universal insistence that the only possible solution to the difficulties lies through the management committees. These have now become part of the basic thinking of the working masses of Algeria.

"In one year, the agricultural workers have learned much. The reports of the pre-congress and the resolutions adopted by the national congress are a thousand leagues from the generalities of the Tripoli program. The peasants have learned the vital importance of machines and their maintenance. They have recognized the role of bookkeeping and of investments. They have been initiated into the dangerous pitfalls of the commercial circuit.

"It would be an error to believe that they are satisfied with demanding higher wages, family allowances, paid vacations. They based their demands on a program of management. If many specified that one must not at all wait for the state, it was to grant themselves greater authority, a more genuine independence. Doing this, they ranged themselves as a social force distinct from the state and dealt as equal to equal with the administration. This perhaps appears as the most extraordinary in their one-year apprenticeship -- the discovery they have made of the nature of the state."

Rousset deals with this at some length, explaining how these agricultural workers view their situation and their relations with the state in the most palpable way.

"They have grasped that their social emancipation requires, to be genuine, that they themselves possess the means of production, the machines and the money, and that they, in consequence, control the commercial circuit. They have understood that the state is not at all the people even when it undertakes the defense of the interests of the people, and that they must not let the administration possess the machines and monopolize the funds. And that is why all of them without exception launched violent attacks against the SAP [Sociétés Agricoles de Prévoyance, the government agricultural benefits institution]. They see very well that through the SAP the state could dispossess them. They therefore demanded that the tractors should be taken away from the SAP -- those belonging to it from the beginning as well as those seized as vacant property -- and made into property of the self-management committees."

Here is the solution discussed by the delegates:

"They proposed that where the tractors are not very numerous they should be rationally divided among the farms, assembled at a single station, but under the control of the self-management committees concerned. And as they have learned the ruses of the administration, they posed the crucial problem of parts that are removed and of repairs, demanding the centralization of the shops and their being placed under the control of the committees, so that the agricultural workers themselves can fix the price of repairs, determine the order of priority in the jobs and know the status of supplies.

"They denounced the bad handling of sales of their products because of being placed in charge of incompetent and dilatory officials. They demanded that crops should be sold at the market price or at prices publicly fixed by the state and that the agricultural workers should know, with the least possible delay, the revenue received from products they have delivered. They proposed, in consequence, that the management committees should be authorized to make sales themselves on the local markets or on an area level, that the books should be placed under their control and that co-operatives to handle sales should be set up. They demanded that the state fix as early as possible the rate of levies. Finally, to assure financial autonomy, they advocated that each self-management committee should have a bank account."

In Rousset's opinion, by confronting the administration in this way in the field of the technical administration of the big nationalized domains, the agricultural workers discovered their own social identity. "This first national congress thus provided in a fundamental way the public expression of a new social force, conscious of itself. It follows that the agricultural workers are on the eve of achieving political consciousness."

This is of great significance in the author's opinion. "The crucial importance of the event relates to the position which these agricultural workers occupy in the national economy. It is a decisive position. They manage the richest and best equipped lands: 2,500,000 hectares. This gives them not only control of the food supply of the country, but of the principal source for the formation of the national capital.

"A strike unleashed by them could precipitate Algeria into ruin. Repression could resolve nothing, since as history has demonstrated, the peasant cannot be compelled to produce enough if he doesn't want to. That is why their genuine power is much greater than their numbers. And they are now conscious of this."

They return to their villages with a much different outlook than the one they had only days before when they set out for the congress. "In their discussions with the state, their firmness can be based on texts that have the force of law. They therefore return to the villages with increased authority, and, in addition, more effective authority than is wielded elsewhere in the country."

Before the congress, government circles were divided over how best to approach these problems. A "centralist, statist" tendency argued for direct administration. This was centered around ONRA [National Office of Agrarian Reform]. An opposite tendency, advocating greater autonomy for the peasants on the grounds that productivity cannot be ordered from above but depends on the social interest of the workers, was centered around the BNASS [National Bureau for Animation of the Socialist Sector].

The conflict lasted throughout the spring and summer. When the congress convened, the centralist tendency appeared to have won out. However in the work panels of the congress which prepared the documents for adoption, the centralist tendency suffered a serious setback. "The motions which its partisans presented were rejected and the resolutions finally adopted essentially favored the self-management delegates. This victory was entirely due to the firmness of the peasants present in the panel commissions. The agricultural workers thus showed their power which is considerable."



INDICTMENT QUASHED IN SOUTH AFRICAN TRIAL OF ELEVEN

Last July 11 in Rivonia, a fashionable suburb of Johannesburg, police raided the home of Arthur Goldreich, a painter. They arrested 17 persons whom they found there holding some kind of meeting. Later the artist managed to escape. His wife and servants were released. But nine of those seized were held incommunicado in solitary confinement for "questioning" under South Africa's notorious "antisabotage" law [passed May 2].

On October 9 they were told that they faced trial twenty days later on charges of "responsibility" for 222 acts of "sabotage" during the previous 18 months. Under the "antisabotage" law the death penalty can be inflicted.

Seven of the defendants were described as members of a "national high command" and of "an executive committee of the National Liberation Movement" of the "Umkhonto We Sizwe" [the spear of the nation], a shock troop organization connected, according to the Minister of Justice, to the Communist party and the African National Congress [ANC], both of which are proscribed in South Africa.

Included in the indictment were Nelson Mandela, who was already in prison serving a five-year sentence for "inciting violence," and James A. Kantor, a member of a firm of criminal lawyers to which Harold Wolpe, a brother-in-law of Goldreich, belongs. Wolpe fled after the Rivonia raid. Kantor was arrested after the lawyers' offices were searched. He claims he knows absolutely nothing about what Wolpe might have been doing.

Among the six African, one Indian and four white defendants were some very prominent names in the former legal political opposition to the South African government:

Nelson Mandela, 45, influential Negro attorney, formerly associated with Oliver Tambo, one of the heads of the ANC, now in exile.

Walter Sisulu, 50, former general secretary of the ANC, a miner by trade. Freed on bail, he went into the underground three months before being arrested at Rivonia.

Dennis Goldberg, 34, former leader of the Congress of Democrats party.

Lionel Bernstein, 45, an architect who was considered to be a leading theoretician of the Communist party of South Africa before it was banned.

Govan Mbeki, a former Communist leader and area organizer of the ANC.

Ahmed Mohammed Kathadra, 33, general secretary of the Indian Congress of the Transvaal.

Raymond Mahlaba, a lieutenant of Mbeki.

Elias Matsoaledi, Adrew Mlangani, James Kantor, and Bob A. Hepple, a Johannesburg lawyer.

On October 11 the United Nations by a vote of 106 to 1 [the opposing vote was cast by South Africa] passed a resolution condemning the trial and requesting the "immediate unconditional release" of all the prisoners

as well as other "persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid." [See World Outlook October 18.]

The answer of the Pretoria government to this was that the UN's request was "unheard of interference" in the internal affairs of South Africa.

The trial opened according to schedule on October 29. Judge Quartus de Wet brought it to a swift conclusion on the second day. He upheld the contention of the defense that the indictment was "fatally defective" and dismissed the charges.

This, however, did not mean freedom for the defendants. Police immediately pounced on them in the courtroom, arresting them again on unspecified charges, and hustled them into cells before anyone could confer with them. Under the "antisabotage" act, they can now be held in solitary confinement for a fresh period of ninety days. When this time is up, the process can be repeated indefinitely.

Dennis Goldberg stood on a chair to shout to his family. Police pulled him down. Ahmed M. Kathrada raised a clenched fist, the African nationalist salute, before the police dragged him out.

When Judge de Wet reprimanded public prosecutor Percy Yutar for lack of specific allegations in the state's case, the prosecutor tried to introduce the state's opening address as a substitute for additional data.

"This is an entirely irregular way of conducting the case," the judge said. "I won't accept it."

Yutar then argued that there was no need to detail the exact nature of the alleged crimes because, in the state's view, the accused knew what they had done.

"That presupposes that they are guilty," the judge said.

When Yutar complained that the judge's attitude would compel the state to take more time to comply with such requirements, the judge said: "It is not the function of the Court to draw up an indictment for the state."

Before the judge quashed the indictment, the state removed one of the prisoners from the dock and put him in "protective custody." This was Bob A. Hepple, who, the public prosecutor said, had agreed to turn state's witness.

It was not known whether he had served as a stool pigeon at the Rivonia gathering or whether he had been tortured during the detention period until he reached the court in a brain-washed condition.

#### HOW A PRISONER LIKE MANDELA IS KEPT

The London office of the African National Congress made public on October 25 the text of a letter smuggled out of the Pretoria prison, describing conditions under which a prominent prisoner like Nelson Mandela is

kept. The text of the letter follows: [World Outlook received a French version provided by the provisional secretariat of the Comité Anti-Apartheid in Paris, consequently there may be a few discrepancies with the original letter.]

\* \* \*

"The political prisoners are kept in the worst possible conditions in the South African prisons. For example, Nelson Mandela has been put in category D, the worst so far as privileges and rights are concerned, although the police say that he is a 'completely disciplined prisoner.' (All prisoners of the ANC are now automatically classified in category D.)

"He passes twenty-three hours a day, alone, in a six by ten foot cell. He has at the most two half-hours a day for exercise, alone. He is forbidden to speak with other prisoners. No reading is granted him, neither books nor newspapers, except textbooks for correspondence courses which have been approved to be brought in.

"He has the right to receive a 30-minute visit from his wife each six months, and can write and receive one letter each six months. He cannot buy or receive food other than the prison rations which consist, for breakfast, of corn meal with either sugar or pea soup, without milk; for dinner, corn meal with a little meat or, alternatively, kidney beans; in the evening, corn meal.

"He sleeps on the floor on a felt pad or a rush mat. He has a stool and a small table, a concession for his studies. Those who don't study, sit on the floor.

"These conditions are the same for all the other racial groups who are political prisoners -- most of them are in the Pretoria prison -- except that the food is better for the other groups. It is necessary to compare Mandela with the way he was a year ago to see the ravages caused by such conditions."

#### NEW YORK TIMES CONFIRMS REPORTS OF SOUTH AFRICAN PRISON CONDITIONS

[In a special story to the New York Times, sent from Johannesburg, October 28, Robert Conley offers a vivid description of prison conditions in South Africa which confirms the stories that have been seeping out of this fascist-like land into less prominent organs of the world press. Because of its interest, we offer extensive extracts below. Asterisks indicate omissions. -- Editor.]

There are few midnight knocks on the door by the Security Police in South Africa. Sometimes there is only the late afternoon ringing of the telephone. In an age of increasing mechanization, it is easier for the Security Police to phone a political suspect to tell him that he is wanted for questioning than it is to go to his home. If he is not there, the message is left with his wife. "Your husband is to report to Caledon Square at 7 P.M.," one woman was told in Capetown. Her husband went to the Security Police headquarters on the square, and he never returned.

Few do.

He became one of the 320 or more South Africans, aged 17 to 83, who

have been held, in solitary confinement throughout the country for alleged political activities against the state and its racial policies.

Since the first suspects were seized in May, these "detainees" have become South Africa's "forgotten men." A ban has been placed on all information about them.

Some have been confined in solitary rooms and cells for five and a half months, beyond the reach of the courts, their lawyers and their churches. No one knows how many have been held "for interrogation" that long, except the Government. As far as the rest of South Africa is concerned, all of those detained are out of sight, as if they had vanished from the face of the earth.

The law that permits such detentions is aimed at eliminating the threat of "Communism."

Under South African law, "Communism" can mean almost anything that is opposed to the Government's policy of apartheid, or "apartness," which decrees that the country's 3,250,000 whites must be separated racially, physically and geographically from its 13,815,000 Africans, Asians and mixed-blood "coloreds."

One African told of being locked in a black-walled room for four weeks, never knowing whether it was night or day. His sole contact with the outside world, in his words, was the "keyhole in the door."

Throughout his waking hours he peered through it, he said, and his only clock was the plate of corn meal mush brought to him at breakfast, lunch and dinner. \*\*\*

Unlike regular prisoners convicted of specific offenses, the persons detained cannot have visitors, reading matter, cigarettes, clean clothes or even a bath, unless the Security Police permit it. "In the eyes of the police, the detainees are non-people," remarked one South African lawyer.

Wellington Sikiti, 18, a Johannesburg student, said that he was not allowed to take a bath and was not given clean clothes during the entire 87 days of his solitary confinement at the Ferndale police station near here. The Security Police, he said, would only permit him to use the outside faucet at the station house.

"All I could do was splash my face with a little cold water," he added. "My body was filthy and I felt like an animal."

Immediately after his release, the youth fled to the neighboring British protectorate of Bechuanaland.

Those detained are deprived of the rights of even a common thief. South Africa's Criminal code stipulates that no prisoner can be put into solitary for more than two days a week. The Code does not apply to detainees. They are political suspects. Prison authorities have absolutely no say in how they are treated. Only the Security Police decide that.

They are not even prisoners. They are not arrested. They are "detained." Few charges are brought against them. None need be. They are in a singular world that lies beyond the normal concepts of law.

The sole purpose of their detention is interrogation. They can be held without trial until they answer all questions to the satisfaction of the Security Police.

In the words of South Africa's Minister of Justice, Balthazer J. Vorster, the detainees can be held for questioning up to "this side of eternity." \*\*\*

This situation is a result of the General Law Amendment Act of 1963, known as the "No trial" Act. It gives the Government of Prime Minister Hendrik F. Verwoerd the strongest political police powers ever in South Africa in peacetime.

Any commissioned South African police officer is empowered by the Act to detain without trial for successive 90-day periods any person he "suspects" may have committed certain political offenses. The officer can hold the individual for indefinite interrogation "at any place he may think fit" even on the suspicion that the person is "in possession of any information" about political offenses.

The Act has ended the political suspect's right of habeas corpus -- a right that had existed in South Africa for three centuries and which required that a prisoner be brought before a court to decide the legality of his imprisonment or detention.

The Act has also invaded for the first time in South Africa's history the sanctity of the lawyer's chamber, the religious confessional and the press.

Any lawyer, clergyman or journalist can be detained if a police officer "believes" that he has obtained confidential information about political offenses.

The individuals detained, themselves, are denied the right of refusing to answer questions that might tend to incriminate them. They either answer or they are held. \*\*\*

[Dr. Verwoerd argues that South Africa's whites are locked in a "struggle for survival" and that the Act is needed to confine persons deemed likely to commit "sabotage," endanger the safety of the state, or advocate, advise, defend or encourage the achievement of "any of the objects of communism."]

The Johannesburg Bar Council discounts the Government's explanations. It says that the detention powers are not intended to confine persons regarded as dangerous to the safety of the state, or to apprehend actual revolutionaries, but to permit a "police inquisition."

That appears to apply in the case of Robert H. Strachan, 37, a former art teacher at Port Elizabeth.

The Security Police removed him from a cell in the Pretoria local jail, where he had been serving part of a six-year term on charges of conspiring to carry out bombings. He was placed in solitary confinement as a detainee.

As a convict, Strachan had certain rights, protected by the penal

code. As a person detained, he has no rights and the Security Police can do whatever they wish to him, free from any interference.

The main effect of the weeks of solitary confinement is mental torture. Those detained use that term to describe the sense of unending isolation, where there is no one to talk to and nothing to do.

To fill those moments, some of those held sit or sleep. Some stand and walk around, counting their footsteps until the mind grows numb. Some jump up and down. A few scream, a few weep and others withdraw within themselves.

After five weeks in solitary, one African began to fear that the Security Police would move him. "I was afraid that they would send me to another cell I did not know," he said.

Most of the persons detained are held in police stations, rather than in jails and prisons. The rooms often measure no more than 8 by 14 feet. At Marshall Square, the Johannesburg police headquarters, several Africans said that they were kept in rooms with walls that were painted black or dark brown.

"A dim light was kept burning night and day," one man said. "The only windows were narrow slits high up near the ceiling. You could not see out. The only way to reach the slits would have been with a ladder."

Sometimes there is a mat on the floor to sleep on, a concrete slab for a seat and a pail for a toilet. Sometimes there is less.

Prolonged interrogations to wear down a suspect apparently are infrequent. The Security Police appear to let the effects of solitary confinement do the work for them. They are said to act almost off-handedly toward those detained and usually confront them only once a week. If the suspect refuses to answer questions the usual reply from the police is said to be: "Well, see you next week." \*\*\*

Mrs. Albertina Sisulu, 45, the wife of an African nationalist leader, spent seven weeks in a room that she said had a peep-hole in the door for the guards to keep watch.

"Every time I wanted to wash I had to cover the peep-hole with a handkerchief," she said.

She was seized because the Security Police were seeking her husband, Walter M. Sisulu, the Secretary General of the African National Congress, who had gone into hiding. One of the Sisulus' five children, Max, 17, was detained separately for 24 days for the same reason. He later fled to Bechuanaland. \*\*\*

Nearly all of the South African newspapers have given up trying to keep a count of those detained. Their figures trailed off in mid-July when the total was at 177 cases. Since then only scattered paragraphs have appeared, noting that "five Africans" or "10 coloreds" were seized in a given part of the country. \*\*\*

Whatever the rest of the world thinks about the detentions and however strong its condemnations, Mr. Vorster, the Justice Minister, has only one remark to make.

"The Government and the country," he says, "owe much to the police."

SOMETIMES SOUTH AFRICA'S POLITICAL POLICE GET IMPATIENT

[The following is the full text of an article by Colin Legum which appeared in The Observer of November 3. The Observer is a well-known generally reliable London weekly that avoids sensationalism. The sub-heads in the article appear in the original. -- Editor.]

In Johannesburg last week, a prominent South African barrister, Dr. George Lowen, Q.C., complained about the "curtain of silence" which hangs over political prisoners held under the General Law Amendment Act 1963.

This Act empowers the police to arrest any person on suspicion for questioning, and to keep him in prison for 90 days without any charge and without the right to see anybody.

After the first 90 days prisoners can be committed and recommitted to prison indefinitely. The object of the Act is to make "suspects" talk in order to combat subversion.

This silence, which shrouds between 350 and 500 political prisoners, has been lifted by 11 detainees recently released from the Pretoria Central Prison. Their sworn affidavits about the methods used to make them talk have been brought to London. Three of the 11 give details of torture by electric shock methods which were first used in Algeria.

The names of the detainees and of the policemen they mention in their affidavits have been withheld to protect them, as they are all still in South Africa.

Handcuffed

B. was arrested in Cape Town last June, and was transferred to Pretoria in August. "On arrival I was called into an office where I found Lieutenant S., who asked me some questions which I was unable to answer. Then S. said he had no time to waste, I should be taken away and shock my brains into remembering. . . .

"They immediately took me to another office, where Sergeant G. and another ordered me to undress myself. I was left with only my underpants. They started to hit me while undressing with clenched fists. For some days I could not open my jaw. They handcuffed me and ordered me to squat with my knees protruding above my arms which were handcuffed so that I was placed in a helpless position.

"A canvas bag was pulled over my head to the neck, which made breathing very difficult. . . . I could feel something tied round my two thumbs and my left little finger. From there I felt the electric shock as if it were being switched on and off time and again. At the same time they kept on asking me questions as they switched off, and when I refused to answer the questions they switched on.

"At one stage I felt a blow on the right side under my armpit as if it was a kick. They did this to me until I promised I would answer the questions, and then they removed the handcuffs and the canvas bag. I was ordered to dress."

P. was also arrested last June while trying to get to Bechuanaland. He was taken to Pretoria in July. "When I came in there were several of the Special Branch men including Mr. F. [whose name is mentioned by several of the detainees]."

"I was choked and my neck ringed up and twisted. They all started hitting me with fists and kicked me about. At this stage Mr. F. was sitting behind the desk."

He described how they tried to get him to tell about a camp he had attended in Cape Town. Unlike Mr. B.'s experience, he described how a stick was pushed between his arms, which were thrust underneath his knees and then handcuffed.

"A canvas bag was put over my head. . . . Then I felt something like wire tied to my little fingers on both hands. Then I felt electric shocks which were applied occasionally. Then I would be lifted up by the stick and be left to drop down on my back. . . ."

"All the time they were doing this to me they were forcing me to admit that I know Mr. G. [one of the accused in the sabotage trial] and Mr. Sachs [Albie Sachs, a Cape Town barrister now held under the 90-days detention law]. . . . I was whipped with a hosepipe and also judo chops [were] applied on my kidneys and on the back of my neck.

"I was handcuffed for the second time and they told me they were going to kill me and that nobody would ever ask them anything. I was put to the same treatment of electric shocks. . . . The pressure was so high that I messed myself up. Then I was released to go to the lavatory.

"On my return from the lavatory the same treatment was applied and I messed myself up again."

#### List of Names

Much the same story of repeated assaults and subsequent applications of electric shock is described by 33-year-old M., who was questioned about two other detainees and about Looksmart Solwandle, who, the police say, committed suicide in prison.

"I felt a shock on my arms. I again started to cry. As I was crying they kept on saying 'talk.' After a while I said all right I will talk. They then took the canvas bag off my head and the kierie [stick] from between my legs, and I was then able to stand up. . . ."

"They had a list containing a lot of names and asked me if I knew the names of seven people. . . . My reply was that I did not know any of them. They again put the canvas bag over my head and the kierie between my legs and proceeded as before.

"I again said that I will talk, and then they said I should talk whilst in that position, and they called out the names again one by one and I admitted that I knew them. . . . They then told me that those boys were being sent out of the Republic of South Africa for military training and that when they finished training they would come back and kill the whites. . . ."

Two of the detainees tell in their affidavits what happened when they



tried to report the assaults to the visiting magistrate, who, according to the Minister of Justice, Mr. B. Vorster, is supposed to ensure that the detainees are properly treated.

### Magistrate's Reply

L., a 40-year-old member of the African National Congress, says: "I saw the visiting magistrate and reported to him that I was assaulted by the police. In reply the magistrate said: 'You also wanted to go to Tanganyika to learn and come back and kill the whites so they are doing what they like on you.'"

An attempt to clarify the circumstances of the death of Mr. Solwandle, a former newspaper seller of the now defunct left-wing newspaper New Age, was abandoned last week. Dr. Lowen, lawyer for the dead man's family, withdrew from the inquest because he said he did not want to expose himself or witnesses to prosecution.

This fear arises from the fact that some of the witnesses are 90-day detainees who are under banning orders, and it is an offence to publish or quote any statement by a banned person. Their evidence, therefore, cannot be used.

It has also just been revealed that Solwandle himself had been served with a banning order while he was in jail. Nothing that he told other prisoners, therefore, can be used in evidence either. For these reasons the attorneys have instructed Mr. Lowen to withdraw and that seemed to be the end of the matter. But the Deputy of Justice announced that permission would be granted for the statements of banned persons to be quoted at inquest hearings. In view of this assurance the instructing attorneys are now reconsidering their position.

### FIRST HANGINGS UNDER SOUTH AFRICA'S NEW LAW

The first hangings under South Africa's new "sabotage" law took place in Pretoria's central prison November 1 when three men were sent to the scaffold.

The three -- Lennox Madikane, Vezile Felix Jaxa and Mxolosi Demane -- were sentenced to death last May.

They were alleged to have participated in riots last November in which five Africans and two whites were killed when crowds accused by government officials of belonging to the Pan-Africanist Congress, a proscribed organization, demonstrated in Paarl.

The case involved 21 defendants originally. Five were acquitted and sixteen were found guilty of "sabotage." Of these, eight were given twelve-year sentences, five were given eighteen-year sentences, and three the death penalty.

## SOUTH AFRICA -- PARADISE FOR CAPITALISTS

In the United States, the Verwoerd government has vigorously publicized investment opportunities in South Africa under its benevolent rule, stressing such attractions as low-cost labor, ease of withdrawing profits or capital from the country and the protection of a stable capitalist-minded government. The package is a luring one for dollar-loaded free enterprisers scanning the foreign scene for areas in which a fast buck can be had without too great a risk.

That this advertising campaign has paid off handsomely is shown by a recent report in the Wall Street Journal from South African correspondent Ray Vicker. He says that South Africa is drawing U.S. bankers, stockholders and businessmen in a most impressive way.

Total American investments in South Africa are now estimated by pleased financial circles in Johannesburg to be \$600,000,000, an increase of twenty-five per cent in two years.

Goodyear Tire and Rubber is spending \$4,200,000 to expand its Uitenhage plant by about thirty per cent. This will bring the company's total investment in South Africa to nearly \$17,000,000.

First National City Bank is planning to open a branch in Durban's new banking center in November. This will give the Manhattan concern its third office in South Africa.

Lilly Laboratories is opening a 30,000-square-foot plant at Isando.

Beckman Instruments has announced plans for a subsidiary in this inviting country.

At least five new chemical plants, costing more than \$70,000,000, are either under construction or in the planning stage in the Sasolburg area of the Orange Free State.

The Palabora Mining Co. is investing \$100,000,000 in a new copper mine which is expected to produce about 80,000 tons of blister copper annually starting in about three years.

Victor explains why American capitalists are finding South Africa to be so irresistible. It's not just Verwoerd's high-powered advertising. "American companies doing business in South African industry are averaging profits of 27 per cent on invested capital."