

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Vol. 1, No. 12

December 13, 1963

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

## NO COMMENT

"Indeed, as if to emphasize our personal involvement in the tragedy of President Kennedy, we now learn that, immediately following his murder, the US military authorities, in accordance with standing instructions, ordered a general alert of the strategic nuclear forces; and that, in the 91 minutes which elapsed between Mr Kennedy's death and the ceremony of swearing in the new President, sole responsibility for unleashing nuclear war devolved on the American Chiefs of Staff.

"These sombre facts underline the importance of the crime in Dallas. An American president now carries greater responsibilities than any man in history; whether we go on living depends to a considerable extent on his nerve and judgment." -- New Statesman, London, Nov. 29.

## ACLU ACCUSES DALLAS POLICE

With a promptness and firmness probably unprecedented in the history of the staid organization, the American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU] on December 5 issued an indictment of the way the Dallas police handled the case of the assassination of President Kennedy. The statement was symptomatic of the nation-wide feeling of shame and embarrassment at the evident rule of lynch law in the municipal building of the Texas city.

The ACLU charged the Dallas police with gross violations of civil liberties. The organization said that it would have been "simply impossible" for Lee H. Oswald, the accused assassin, to get a fair trial because he had already been "tried and convicted" through declarations issued to the public by the Dallas officials.

In face of the contentions of the Dallas police and District Attorney Henry Wade that Oswald's rights were not infringed, the union, whose purpose is to defend constitutional guarantees, raised these questions:

"How much time elapsed before he was advised to his right to counsel?

"How much time elapsed before he was permitted access to a telephone to call his family and an attorney?

"During what periods and for how long was Oswald interrogated?

"What methods of interrogation were used?

"Was he advised of his right to remain silent?"

The organization extended its indictment to television, radio and the press for the "pressure" they exerted on Dallas officials.

It accused the Dallas police of responsibility for the murder of Oswald, saying that the transfer of Oswald from the city jail was "a theatrical production for the benefit of the television cameras," and that minimum security considerations were flouted by the "capitulation to publicity."

Even had Oswald lived, said the ACLU, he "would have been deprived of all opportunity to receive fair trial by the conduct of the police and prosecuting officials in Dallas."

The blistering declaration said, "From the moment of his arrest until his murder two days later, Oswald was tried and convicted many times over in the newspapers, on the radio and over television by the public statements of Dallas law enforcement officials.

"Time and again high-ranking police and prosecution officials stated their complete satisfaction that Oswald was the assassin. As their investigation uncovered one piece of evidence after another, the results were broadcast to the public.

"All this evidence was described by the Dallas officials as authentic and incontestable proof that Oswald was the President's assassin.

"The cumulative effect of these public pronouncements was to impress indelibly on the public's mind that Oswald was indeed the slayer."

Under these circumstances, Oswald could not have obtained a fair trial anywhere in the country, said the report. Any trial that might have been held would have been a hollow formality.

The ACLU called on the special seven-man panel created by President Johnson to investigate the assassination of President Kennedy to also examine the treatment accorded Oswald.

## DALLAS CHILDREN APPLAUD

A November 24 Reuters dispatch from Peking received prominent display in the American press as a telling example of "Communist mentality."

According to Reuters, "Authoritative sources said school children here applauded yesterday when they were told of the death of Mr. Kennedy, who had been represented to them in Peking propaganda as the world's wickedest man."

The New York Times singled this out for an ironic headline: "Peking Children Applaud."

Although it cannot be approved, of course, the action of the Chinese children is understandable in view of the American blockade of China, American support of butcher-dictator Chiang Kai-shek and the maintenance of the Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Straits as a permanent military threat. Chinese children have been taught that it is patriotic to hate the imperialist foe as personified by whoever is in the White House.

On the same day that Reuters put this story on the wires, a Dallas minister, the Rev. William A. Holmes delivered a bitter sermon, stating that "the spirit of assassination" had flourished in the city for some time.

Among the examples he cited was the clapping and cheering by fourth-grade children in a public school when their teacher told them of the assassination of President Kennedy.

The children's action, said the minister, mirrored the intolerance learned from their parents.

This intolerance, of course, is the poisonous racist variety which white parents spoon-feed to their children in the South. Dallas babies were taught to hate Kennedy as Enemy No. 1 because he favored civil-rights legislation, however weak, and had even brought out the troops to protect a lone Negro student "integrated" at the hitherto lily-white University of Mississippi.

In a taped television interview in Dallas November 26, the Rev. Holmes repeated what he had told his congregation on Sunday.

Even before the interview was over, such a flood of protest poured into the station that the police decided to take the minister and his family secretly to a friend's home and then to put guards at both residences. The guards are to be maintained indefinitely.

H. Williams, a school principal, denied the truthfulness of what Holmes had said. According to Williams, the children did not cheer when the assassination was announced. He said that an order was read over the public address system telling the children to go home at once but without telling them why. They may have cheered at the announcement to go home, as any child would."

On November 27 eleven other Methodist ministers issued a statement endorsing the Holmes sermon.

"We can document times over the exclamations of approval by school children at the death of President Kennedy," they said in the statement.

"We believe they reflect home and community attitudes of disrespect for the office of the Presidency and for duly constituted Government authority.

"We believe the Rev. Holmes correctly assessed the situation. We affirm that he does not stand alone, and add our voices to his appeal."

At Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, the faculty of thirty-five passed a resolution unanimously endorsing Mr. Holmes's sermon.

Miss Joanna Morgan, of Lake Highland Junior High School, said that those who cheered were in a small minority. Other teachers had told her of similar cheering.

"Goodie, goodie," one child was reported to have said.

The indignation in Dallas over what the minister said did not concern the truth or falsity of the facts but that he had dared speak about them. One housewife said vehemently:

"No matter whether there is any truth in what he said or not, he had no business saying it before a nationwide television audience."

#### NEO-NAZIS FIRST TO SAY OSWALD AMBUSHED WALKER

Did a German neo-Nazi journal in Munich scoop the world press in a sensational new turn in the investigation of the assassination of Kennedy? Did Oswald, accused of shooting the President and the Dallas policeman J.D. Tippit, also take a shot at the ultra-rightist Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker last April 10? These are the questions that are being asked following an Associated Press dispatch from Washington December 6 alleging that Mrs. Marina Oswald, widow of the accused former marine, said her husband came home "on the night of April 10" and "boasted" of having fired at the racist-minded hero of the John Birch Society.

The accusation was first made, not by Mrs. Oswald, but by the National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung of Munich, Germany. Immediately after the assassination of Kennedy, this ultra-nationalist sheet published an interview with Maj. Gen. Walker in which the American racist said that the murder of President Kennedy "did not constitute a surprise."

The general continued: "The assassin is a Marxist, an avowed Communist. The tragic death of President Kennedy proves in striking fashion that the danger must not be underestimated. It was not as great a surprise as they would like us to believe."

In reporting the assassination, the National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung emphasized that the real name of Jack Ruby, the killer of Oswald, is Rubinstein, that the lawyer whom Oswald sought to represent him, John F. Abt, is "of the Jewish religion." It also made Abt out to be a Communist sympathizer.

The Munich paper then revealed, naturally without advancing any proofs, that Lee Oswald had tried to assassinate General Walker, shooting at him through a window but missing. According to the National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung the investigation of the attempted murder was suspended on orders from Robert Kennedy, brother of the President and head of the Department of Justice.

The same issue of the paper carried an interview with Senator Goldwater and another with Austin J. App, "President of the German-Americans." Goldwater recommended to the Germans "to be vigilant." App said that Johnson would "find more sympathy among the German-Americans than Kennedy."

The Paris daily Le Monde, in reporting this story [November 30], made the following editorial observation:

"These positions taken by an organ which is trying to attract many personalities to its cause and to exploit often insignificant interviews with them are not at all astonishing in themselves. They stand out under the circumstances as evidence of a maneuver aimed at exonerating figures of the American extreme right from any possible involvement in the Dallas crime."

If Le Monde felt no astonishment November 30 at reading the scoop published by the neo-Nazi newspaper, it expressed utter perplexity at seeing the same news repeated by the Associated Press December 6 with "government sources" in Washington given credit for the "new turn" and Oswald's widow listed as the ultimate source. Here is how Jacques Amalric handled it in the week-end issue of Le Monde:

"Least astonishing in this new 'turn' is not the fact that the news was already announced a week ago in the neo-Nazi journal of Munich, the National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung, as we indicated in our edition dated November 30, 1963. This journal, which continues to exploit the crimes of Dallas in an openly Nazi and anti-Semitic spirit, affirmed at the time that Oswald had certainly tried to assassinate General Walker. It went even further and accused Mr. Robert Kennedy, head of the Department of Justice, of having suspended the investigation at the time.

"These accusations against the brother of the assassinated President were repeated Friday by General Walker himself (which leaves little doubt about identity of the informer of the National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung). He affirmed in particular: 'I would not be surprised if the man who assassinated President Kennedy tried to assassinate me previously.' And after telling about the attempt, of which he was the victim the night of April 10, 1963, when he was 'filling out his tax forms,' he criticized Attorney General Robert Kennedy, because the investigation had not been carried out: 'I know that the investigation was abandoned on Robert Kennedy's orders. If it had been followed up, Oswald

would be in prison and President Kennedy would be alive today.' Which makes Mr. Robert Kennedy indirectly responsible for the assassination of his brother.

"To prop up this new accusation which would overwhelm Oswald, the American newspapers claim that the name and telephone number of the extremist ex-general were found written in his address book. The Washington Evening Star discloses however that the FBI carried out ballistic tests to try to determine if the bullet from the gun which missed General Walker was fired from the gun presumably used by the assassin of President Kennedy and that these tests were inconclusive. It is known nevertheless that Oswald was already in possession of the arm which he presumably bought under a false name by correspondence; according to the Dallas police, he would have completed the transaction March 20.

"Another disturbing element in this affair: it appears to have been confirmed that the research carried out by the FBI in this new direction originated with the wife of Oswald himself, whom he married during his stay in the USSR. Marina Oswald, who is of Soviet nationality, is said to have spontaneously declared to the federal agents that on the morning of April 11 her husband boasted of having tried to assassinate General Walker. She supposedly even said that her husband was very excited in announcing this news to her. A curious wife from whom has already emanated some overwhelming depositions against her husband! It was she in particular who already certified to the Dallas police that Oswald possessed a gun like the one used to kill the President and that this arm had disappeared just before the crime. It was she again who supposedly left lying around, when her husband was already accused of the murder of the President, compromising photos (which no one has yet seen) and considerable Communist or pro-Castroist literature.

"The sudden idea of General Walker, accusing Oswald, right after the death of President Kennedy, of having tried to assassinate him some months before, is likewise at least astonishing. General Walker actually never offered the least proof of his assertions and at the time of the investigation of the attempt to assassinate him never even mentioned a suspect who might have had the name of Oswald."

As Le Monde noted when the National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung first named Oswald as the man who took a shot at General Walker, the objective of the accusation was self-evident. It sought to divert attention from co-thinkers in Texas. The new "turn" of repeating the neo-Nazi journal's accusation, with nothing less sensational than confirmation from "government sources" and presumably the Russian-speaking widow of Oswald, likewise offers grist to the ultra-rightist mill. It brings General Walker prominently into the news and in the most favorable political light -- as almost a martyr from the same gun used against Kennedy.

If true, the "scoop" offered to its readers by the neo-Nazi journal in Munich will go down as a remarkable instance of clairvoyance. But if untrue -- isn't an intensive investigation called for of General Walker, his connections among "government sources" and the strange use that is being made of Mrs. Oswald? Just who is serving as translator for her? Does she perhaps believe that in "free" America one must make a Moscow-type "confession"?

## JOHNSON -- A CHAMPION OF CIVIL RIGHTS?

### American Negroes Adopt Wait-and-See Attitude

By Evelyn Sell

What happens now to the civil-rights struggle with Lyndon B. Johnson in the White House? The answer can be put briefly: It is too early to tell about the tactics and timing, but the eventual goals and the main battle lines remain the same.

There has been, of course, a good deal of speculation about this Southern leader's attitude towards the Negroes' struggle for equality. His initial speeches and steps were designed to assure Negroes and colored peoples throughout the world that he would press for civil rights. On November 27 the new president spoke before a joint meeting of both houses of Congress. Prominent among the guests whom he invited to hear his talk was Mrs. Zephyr Wright, the Negro woman who has been the Johnson's cook for twenty years.

Johnson told Congress: ". . . no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil-rights bill for which he fought. We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for one hundred years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter -- and to write it in books of law."

The newspapers have headlined this call for action. But at the moment the bill is bogged down in legislative machinery. Both the Southern Democratic congressmen and their counterparts of the North can be expected to continue delaying action as part of their strategy of destroying it by attrition.

Johnson continued: "I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil-rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this nation every trace of discrimination and oppression based upon race or color."

Since Johnson himself brought up his past civil-rights record, let's take a look at it.

### Ruler of the Senate

As majority floor leader, Senator Johnson held the most powerful position in the Senate. The majority leader, elected by his colleagues at the beginning of each session of Congress, organizes and controls the forces of his party in the Senate. He makes the motions, designates debaters, allocates times of speeches, and generally plots strategy for his party in the Senate. Therefore, whatever his party does -- or does not do -- becomes part of his own personal political record.

This was the situation that Majority Leader Johnson faced in 1957: he White House was held by a Republican, Eisenhower. Normally the Democrats get seventy-five to eighty per cent of the Negro vote, but in 1956

millions of Negroes voted Republican rather than support the party of the Southern racist Dixiecrats. The politicians in both parties responded to this new turn. The Republicans sponsored a civil-rights bill in a bid to win even more Negro support. The Democrats, attempting to lure back the Negro votes, decided to alter their traditional strategy on civil-rights legislation. Johnson had quite a problem on his hands: how was he to win back Negro votes and still prevent a split within his own party between the Northern and Southern wings?

For eighty-seven years all civil-rights legislation in the Senate had been blocked by the Southern Democratic politicians who control powerful legislative committees and who use the filibuster to defeat civil-rights bills. The filibuster works like this: a minority of senators take turns speaking. Debate cannot be ended by a simple majority of those present but only by a two-thirds of all senators whether present or not. Thus, a little over one-third of the Senate can tie up that body indefinitely. To hold the floor, any nonsense is considered in order. Thus those participating in a filibuster will read whole telephone directories, cook books, etc. The filibuster is ended only by adjournment or when the majority gives in. Any civil-rights bill, therefore, requires the consent of the Southerners.

Adroit Parliamentary Maneuver

The first test of the sincerity of the Democrats on civil rights and Johnson's skill in keeping party unity came at the opening of Congress. Each Congress lasts for two years and on the opening day the Senate adopts the rules of procedure under which it will operate during that whole period. Filibustering is permitted under Rule 22 and unless that rule is changed on the opening day, the threat of filibuster hangs over the Senate for the next two years. All the liberals make great speeches about how they will fight to change Rule 22 -- but it is still in effect to this very day. Each opening day sees a sham battle acted out for the benefit of the voters: the liberals heroically fight Dragon 22 and then go down in glorious defeat before the Evil Spirits of Conservatism. In 1957 a variation on this theme was worked out by Johnson as majority leader.

A Democratic senator from a western state made a motion to consider the rules; i.e., to open the possibility to change rules. Johnson was immediately recognized by the chairman. Johnson made a motion to table; i.e., to stop any consideration of changes in rules. By unanimous vote the Senate postponed the motion to table for six hours. That made everybody happy. The liberals got a chance to make their speeches; the white supremacists were assured they could keep their precious filibuster weapon; Lyndon Johnson was happy because he had prevented the civil-rights issue from breaking up party unity.

(The Democrats are a contradictory mixture of (1) Dixiecrats who are interested in maintaining the Jim Crow, nonunion situation in the South; (2) Northern big city machines interested in the "pork barrel" -- political jobs, patronage, contracts, graft; and (3) the labor bureaucracy who deliver the white and black working-class vote in return for the prestige and pay-off received from the top leaders of the Democratic party who represent big-business interests.)

## Compromise Does It

The fate of the civil-rights bill itself was part of another clever political maneuver. A compromise was worked out with the Southerners. They promised to hold back their filibuster on condition that the bill be weakened so much that it would be acceptable to the South.

This new strategy worked out beautifully both for the Northern liberals, who needed the Negro vote, and the Dixiecrats, who sought to keep the Negroes second-class citizens. After Congress adjourned, the leader of the Southern bloc, Senator Russell of Georgia, said, "The fact that we were able to confine the federal activities to the field of voting and keep the withering hand of the federal government out of our schools and social order is to me the sweetest victory of my twenty-five years as a senator from Georgia."

Well, so much for Johnson's record in the Senate as champion of civil rights. What about his record since then? One thing you must admit: he gives very good speeches about freedom, equality, justice, brotherhood, etc. He has been talking civil rights real good -- ever since he decided to push for the presidency three to four years ago.

Historical precedent stands against election of a Southerner as President. (Johnson is the first Southerner to gain the White House since the Civil War.) He consequently sought to build an image as a "Westerner," a Texas ranch owner.

The erupting Freedom Now struggle was forcing all presidential aspirants to come out for civil rights if they wanted to win national office. Kennedy had a hard time selling Johnson as his running mate to the labor and Negro delegates at the 1960 Democratic convention. A big selling job has gone on ever since.

## Words Outweigh Deeds

In 1961 Johnson became head of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and won the praise of Negro leaders although the record shows that he did little in fact to change employment opportunities for the mass of Negroes. But -- he talked good. For example, last August 15 he addressed a group of Michigan businessmen at a conference sponsored by the committee. He said, "The mere fact that we have let so many years go by before we launched serious action [against employment bias] does not mean that we have any excuse for letting more years go by."

A few days earlier he had told a group of Houston, Texas, businessmen, "Certainly we know it is wrong -- certainly we know it is a corrosive cancer in our society -- for tax-paying, arms-bearing, vote-casting Americans to be unable to find a bed for the night or meals for their children along the highways of our free and decent society."

In addition to his promptness in calling for a speedy vote on the civil-rights bill, President Johnson has made special efforts to cement relations with prominent Negro leaders. On November 29 he spent forty-five minutes with Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Asso-

ciation for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], the oldest and largest civil-rights organization in the United States.

Coming out of this conference, Mr. Wilkins said, "We have very great faith in the President's attitude on civil rights." Wilkins is one of the "Big Six," the leaders of the six most outstanding national civil-rights groups. (The other five groups and leaders are: Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference [SCLC]; A. Philip Randolph of the American Negro Labor Council [ANLC]; James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE]; James Forman and John Lewis, of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC, pronounced "Snick"]; Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League [NUL].) The "Big Six" announced that they were meeting on December 3 to chart their course for the coming period.

### Question of Demonstrations

One of the important points to be discussed is whether or not to call off demonstrations for a certain period. There has been a suspension of almost all civil-rights demonstrations since the assassination of President Kennedy. Immediately after the event, planned demonstrations were either called off or turned into memorial services. The well-known Negro author Louis E. Lomax asked America's Negroes "to suspend all demonstrations at least through the holiday season in tribute to the President."

Even the conservative Wilkins would not commit himself to such a proposal. The spokesman of the most militant group of the "Big Six," James Forman of SNCC, rejected such a suspension, saying ". . . all is not quiet on the Southern front and is not going to be quiet."

In Detroit, four members of the Group on Advanced Leadership [GOAL] picketed the annual Thanksgiving Day parade and handed out leaflets calling for a Christmas boycott; i.e., to refrain from buying presents as a demonstration of Negro buying power and in order to force stores to hire more Negroes.

White and Negro Democratic party politicians are rallying behind President Johnson -- a national election is due next year and the Republicans are a real threat. Even those Negroes who were extremely critical of Johnson in 1960 are praising him today and expressing confidence in his civil-rights outlook.

Southern leaders are happier with Johnson than with Kennedy. Roy Mayhall, chairman of the state Democratic executive committee of Alabama, said that "as President Johnson is the first Democratic President from the South since the War Between the States, the Southern states more than likely will support him."

Reports from the Negro man-in-the-street, however, show that most of them have taken a "let's wait and see" attitude about the new President. And a warning note was sounded by SNCC leader Forman that "if Johnson doesn't deliver on civil rights, we should not deliver him back to the White House in 1964."

HUGO BLANCO JOINS FOUR COMRADES IN HUNGER STRIKE

Hugo Blanco, the leader of peasants in the Cuzco region of Peru, and Benito Hualpa Quispe, president of the Federación de Campesinos de Cuzco, held in prison at Arequipa, joined Antonio Cartolín and Máximo Molina, president and vice-president of the Federación de Campesinos [peasants] de Ayacucho, and Santiago Arroyo, another prisoner, in an "indefinite" hunger strike.

The three latter prisoners are being held in connection with land seizures by peasants at Ongoy which were repressed by government troops last October with considerable bloodshed.

Julio Cabrera, a representative of the Federación Campesina de Ayacucho, said that Cartolín and Molina demanded "immediate release since none of them were present when the events at Ongoy occurred."

He said that the detention of Arroyo was "likewise an abuse, since he is not a leader."

The three men from Ayacucho began the hunger strike when their demand met with no response and Hugo Blanco and Benito Hualpa Quispe, when they learned about it, joined them out of solidarity.

Luis Huaco Zavalaga, lawyer for the prisoners from Ayacucho confirmed the report about the hunger strike upon returning to Lima after visiting Arequipa.

Antonio Cartolín and Máximo Molina were arrested in Lima when they went there in an effort to obtain an interview with President Belaúnde to lay before him the true story of what happened at Ongoy.

[We are unable, unfortunately, to give the date when the hunger strike began. Our correspondent in Lima sent us only a newspaper clipping without indicating the name of the paper or the date. The story itself, which is undated, said that Hugo Blanco "today" joined the "indefinite hunger strike initiated Monday by the peasant leaders of Ayacucho."]

MESSAGE FROM HUGO BLANCO TO THE PERUVIAN PEOPLE

The November 11 issue of Revolución Peruana, organ of the Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario [Revolutionary Left Front]\*, of which Hugo Blanco is president, published the following "message" from their leader to the Peruvian people:

"The Peruvian people are living at a decisive moment and their destiny depends in great measure on the attitude which its revolutionary vanguard adopts. We must assume with serenity and courage the historic task which is ours.

---

\*The FIR is composed of the Agrupación Pro-Unificación de la Izquierda Revolucionaria, the Partido Comunista (Leninista) Peruano and the Partido Obrero Revolucionario.

"Faced with the revolutionary pressure of the masses tired of centuries of hunger and misery, the exploiting classes, realizing the danger which a government of the Batista type would signify for them in these conditions, have had to resign themselves to making some concessions, to giving crumbs to the people through a government which calls itself democratic despite having jailed dozens of trade-union and political leaders and having begun to massacre peasants.

"The reformist measures of the present government, including the Project for Agrarian Reform, are nothing but maneuvers to hold back the Revolution, which has already been placed underway by the Peruvian people. The least blind sector of the exploiting classes understands that the oligarchy must retreat in order not to be crushed, imperialism likewise understands this.

"The Peruvian people and their vanguard thus stand before two roads: trust in the government or trust in themselves.

"If the people trust the government this will mean suicide, suicide such as befell the peoples of Guatemala, who trusted in Arbenz, and Argentina, who trusted in Perón.

"If at this crucial moment the Peruvian people suspend their struggle, the government of Belaúnde will change into one of the most reactionary that Peru has had; if it does not, then it will be swept aside by the oligarchy.

"This is what the exploiters seek through their phony 'truce.'

"If, on the contrary, the people trust in their own power and are not stopped by promises, if all of us in Peru follow the heroic example of the communalists of Centro, who did not wait for the oligarchy to become charitable; if, to make our revolution, we trust in ourselves, not only will we succeed in avoiding going backward, we will soon win the genuine demands of the people.

"The communalists of Centro wanted to take back their land, they didn't want promises, they didn't want to pay for something that is theirs, and they didn't say this, they did it! We have been saying it for centuries. Now we are tired of talk and we have begun to act and we must continue to act.

"Undoubtedly there will be prisoners and deaths, but the genuine revolution which our country so much needs will be made.

"Land or death! We will win!"

HUGO BLANCO GALDOS

Secretary of Agrarian Reform of the  
Departmental Federation of Peasants  
of Cuzco.

LUIS VITALE SENTENCED FOR PRO-CUBA POSITION

SANTIAGO DE CHILE -- Luis Vitale, a well-known Trotskyist leader of this country, has been sentenced to 541 days of exile at Curepto, a town in the south.

The pretext for condemning one of the main leaders of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario [Revolutionary Workers party] was a leaflet favoring Cuba and advocating Marxist-Leninist positions.

The truth is that Vitale, together with other Trotskyists, has been persecuted for some years. In May 1962 the witch-hunting was increased. In October, at the time of the crisis over Cuba precipitated by the U.S. government, Vitale had to go into hiding to avoid persecution from the political police.

Expressions of solidarity with Vitale have been received from various political and trade-union sectors of the left.

In the Senate a bill proposing a general amnesty has been submitted. It will be a long process to win this, however.

Senator Salvado Allende, candidate for the presidency in 1964, has also indicated that if he wins he would release Vitale.

SUPPORT IN CHILE FOR HUGO BLANCO

SANTIAGO DE CHILE -- A meeting was held at the Esmeralda theater September 27 to celebrate the anniversary of the victory of the Chinese Revolution. The meeting, which was attended by some 500, aimed at helping the development of a "pro-Chinese" wing in the Communist party of Chile.

During the meeting, a message signed by Humberto Valenzuela, general secretary of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario [Revolutionary Workers party], was read. The message asked the meeting to go on record as supporting the revolutionary struggle in Peru. Help for Hugo Blanco in particular was asked and an appeal made for the initiation of a campaign in Chile to help win his freedom from prison.

The audience applauded the message and a resolution was passed supporting the struggle for the freedom of Hugo Blanco and his comrades. A series of actions was projected, including a letter to the Peruvian embassy protesting the treatment of Hugo Blanco and demanding his release.

A group of young workers and students, some of whom were recently expelled from the Communist party of Chile because of their pro-Chinese views, have organized the Movimiento Revolucionario Comunista [MRC]. On the wall in their headquarters they have painted a mural six meters wide

and three meters high in which Hugo Blanco is given prominent place.

The mural depicts a great number of workers and peasants among whom three figures stand. In the center is Salvador Allende, candidate for the presidency of Chile in 1964; to his right, Francisco Julião, the peasant leader of Brazil, and to his left, Hugo Blanco.

#### CAMPAIGN IN URUGUAY FOR HUGO BLANCO

A delegation of the Committee of Foreign Relations of the Peruvian FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario] recently went to Montevideo where they spoke at a meeting in the headquarters of the Movimiento Revolucionario Oriental [a pro-Castroist grouping which has two members in parliament].

The delegation made a report on the situation in Peru and it was agreed that the campaign to free Hugo Blanco and the other prisoners would be stepped up.

#### FREEDOM OFFERED TO HUGO BLANCO?

Two southeast London groups, active in the campaign in behalf of Hugo Blanco, the Peruvian peasant leader imprisoned at Arequipa, have been told that he was offered his freedom if he would pledge not to try to overthrow the government. According to the same source, he refused to make the pledge.

The two groups, the Eltham Well National Co-operative Guild and the Greenwich Young Socialists, passed resolutions appealing for the freedom of Blanco. The Greenwich resolution was sent to the Constituency Labour party which approved it and forwarded it to Transport House. The Guild resolution was sent to the Royal Arsenal Co-op which took similar action. The International Department of Transport House then took up the matter and finally wrote back, reporting what it had learned about Hugo Blanco's stand.

#### FIR BULLETIN APPEARS IN BUENOS AIRES

The first issue of a Bulletin published by the Peruvian FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario] has just appeared in Buenos Aires. The Bulletin, edited by the Committee of Foreign Relations of the FIR, contains instructive information. Among the items are the following:

(1) Peru has 165 political prisoners, the most prominent being Hugo Blanco, 286 in provisional liberty and twenty exiled.

(2) Peasant occupations of the land are continuing. The peasants of Río Huallaga took over a considerable area of land on September 2. During the same month, 2,000 communalists of Yanacocha occupied 900 hectares [one hectare = 2.47 acres] in Huaratambo. At Huaylacucho four haciendas [large estates] were taken over. At Huanca y 3,000 communalists invaded the Moro

acienda, a holding of the imperialist company Cerro de Pasco. They occupied 500 hectares of the property. At Yacta, communalists, shouting, "Land or death!" occupied the Corpacancha hacienda. Police killed Adrian M. Hidalgo. In the north of Peru peasants seized the Huabal estate and some others in the district of Canchaqui. Other occupations took place at Jauga, Puno.

(3) Peasants of the Cuzco region held a big meeting in September favoring occupation of the land. They carried placards bearing photographs of Hugo Blanco. The Federación de Estudiantes [Federation of Students] organized a "March on the Palace" to demand release of the prisoners.

(4) A group of political and intellectual figures of the left in Argentina sent President Belaúnde a telegram asking for freedom for Hugo Blanco and a general amnesty. The telegram was signed by Silvio Frondizi, Moner Sanz, Latendorf, Ernesto Sábato, Carlos Astrada, Viñas, Falotta, Tieffemberg, Marcos Kaplan, and others.

#### TROTSKY INCLUDED IN HAVANA MURAL

SANTIAGO DE CHILE -- Julio Benítez, Secretary of Foreign Relations of the Central Unica de Trabajadores de Chile [CUT], the large trade-union federation, on returning recently from Cuba told the following story.

A delegation of Latin-American trade-union leaders were visiting various cities of Cuba. When they came to a new district, Habana Este, they saw an immense mural painted at the entrance of the workers' area. The mural was a representation of the 1917 Russian Revolution and showed various Bolshevik leaders such as Lenin and others. Among them stood the figure of Trotsky.

Julio Benítez asked the reason for putting Trotsky in the mural. The guide replied that Trotsky was there because the mural dealt with the Russian Revolution and Trotsky undoubtedly participated as an outstanding leader in that Revolution.

#### PRO-CHINESE WING ADVANCES IN CHILE

SANTIAGO DE CHILE -- As a consequence of the Chinese-Soviet crisis, a pro-Chinese wing has developed in the Chilean Communist party. This led about four months ago to formation of the Movimiento Revolucionario Comunista [MRC].

The MRC is composed of students and workers, some of whom left the CP, others of whom were expelled. Some maintain membership in the CP. The group has published two issues of a Bulletin which advocates Marxist-Leninist positions and maintains a correct line in relation to the national situation.

The MRC does not defend Stalin, as does the Chinese Communist party, and does not make any concessions to the national bourgeoisie.

The members do not attack Trotsky and in general display no anti-Trotskyist prejudices. It is a pro-Chinese grouping with the best revolutionary positions which is bringing together all the revolutionary tendencies.

Around the Spanish edition of Peking Review and other Chinese publications, a different pro-Chinese grouping called Espartaco was organized several months ago. This group, composed of intellectuals of the Communist party, stayed within the party until it was expelled at the beginning of October because of a meeting held in support of China. Among those expelled were David Benquis, Vazquez, Berchenco (painter), Armando Cassigoli (poet), Palacios and others.

This group holds sectarian views with regard to Trotskyism. It is composed of old cadres of the CP habituated to bureaucratic practices.

A month ago the two pro-Chinese groups, Espartaco and MRC, united. They expect soon to publish a periodical.

The Trotskyist groups in Chile, including the Partido Obrero Revolucionario, have supported meetings organized by the pro-Chinese wing, giving support to the increasingly revolutionary positions but without making any concessions to the errors of the Chinese Communist party.

The situation can be summarized as follows: The crisis within the Chilean CP is not yet very deep. The expulsions and departures from the CP have up to now affected only a small number of students and intellectuals.

Few workers have broken with or been expelled from the CP. Nevertheless the discussion is continuing among the CP ranks to such an extent that the CP leadership periodically publishes resolutions directed against the pro-Chinese wing.

What is most interesting is that the Communist militants who leave, join the pro-Chinese positions not out of concern for the defense of Stalin featured by the Chinese CP but because they see in China the "revolutionary road" and in the Soviet CP the "peaceful road."

This means that independently of the Stalinist errors of the Chinese CP, pro-Chinese groups are being generated that express with considerable closeness Marxist-Leninist policies, especially among the youth sectors who have no major anti-Trotskyist prejudices and who are not interested in defending Stalin, but who fervently desire unification of all the revolutionary groups in a single Marxist-Leninist party.

CEYLON COMMUNIST PARTY ON VERGE OF SPLIT

By Sydney Wanasinghe

COLOMBO -- The Ceylon Communist party [CCP], which did not feel even the slightest impact of events like the Hungarian Revolution, Poznan and the Twentieth Congress, has cracked wide open in the current crisis facing the international Communist movement. The split in this party, which has hitherto remained monolithic, is almost complete. It has only to be regularized at the "rebel" convention which is to be held shortly.

About two months back the Central Committee [CC] of the CCP adopted by majority vote a resolution condemning the Chinese position in the current international dispute. The minority in the CC led by N. Shanmugathan, secretary of the Ceylon Trade Union Federation [CTUF] and Premalal Kumarasiri, editor of the Sinhalese language weekly of the CCP, declared that the CC had no legal right to take this decision because its term of office should have expired in December 1962. Therefore, they claimed, the present CC did not represent the views of the party; and they started a campaign within the party for an immediate conference to discuss this problem and to elect a new leadership.

In spite of the CC decision, the Sinhalese and Tamil weeklies of the party continued to publish articles which supported the Chinese position. The majority in the CC acted swiftly and removed Premalal Kumarasiri and H.M.P. Mohideen from their posts as editors of these papers. Subsequently notices were served on the two, requesting them to show cause why disciplinary action should not be taken against them for violating a CC decision. Shortly after this, Premalal Kumarasiri left for Djakarta to attend the Afro-Asian Trade Union conference. The CC of the CCP thereafter postponed action on him and decided by a majority vote to expel N. Shanmugathan.

This led to an intensive campaign by N. Shanmugathan inside the party against the leadership. He was later joined by Premalal Kumarasiri, after the latter returned to the island from Djakarta. Party cell meetings and public meetings were held in a number of places in the city and the outstations. At these meetings the policy of the CP leadership came in for severe criticism. Attempts of the CP leadership to ban these meetings to the members and prevent them from being held proved futile. Shanmugathan alleges that the CP leadership even resorted to bribery to disrupt his meetings. Most of them were very well attended. CP members took a prominent part in organizing them, but as yet have met with no disciplinary action.

The displaced editors of the party papers were immediately taken in as editors of the Sinhalese and Tamil papers of the CTUF. These papers, which are utilized to attack the CP leadership directly, were fortnightly. Now they have been reorganized as weeklies and steps are being taken to bring out the Sinhalese paper as a daily from January 1964. The CTUF has set up a well-equipped printing press with modern machinery obtained from the German Democratic Republic.

So far the only rebels to be expelled are N. Shanmugathan and T.

Moorthy. Both of them belong to the Tamil-speaking minority. This, and the failure on the part of the CP to take disciplinary action against a single Sinhalese-speaking rebel, together with the virulent communalist attacks levelled at N. Shanmugathan and other Tamil-speaking revolutionists who reject the reformist perspective of winning power through parliament proves beyond doubt that the CP leadership has followed communal lines in acting in this matter.

The pro-Peking secretary and treasurer were removed from office by the pro-Soviet minority of the Central Committee of the Communist party and Progressive Youth Leagues. Subsequently the majority in the Youth League CC (nineteen out of thirty) met and expelled seven pro-Soviet members, including the President. This majority claims that the president, Sarath Maththetuwagama, who was in agreement with the Chinese position earlier, is now a prisoner in the hands of the Soviet wing.

The CTUF, which is the trade-union organization of the CCP, forms the main base of the Peking wing. All attempts on the part of the CP leadership to take the trade unions away from Shanmugathan's influence have failed. A few meetings summoned by the leadership in the branch unions to rally support for the official line of the CCP proved to be miserable fiascos. This gave rise to a spate of meetings in a number of branch unions which reaffirmed their faith in the Peking line leadership. As yet the CCP leadership has made no attempt to form a separate trade-union organization. Attempts to capture the CTUF from within have proved futile. A few of the Moscow supporters in the leadership of branch unions have been removed from office at the branch level. B.M.G. Mendis, a Moscow supporter, still remains in the leadership of the CTUF.

At the annual general meeting of the Afro-Asian Solidarity League the two wings of the party clashed openly. An attempt by the CCP leadership to oust Mrs. Theja Gunawardena from the post of president of the league failed. The Peking wing also alleges that the party leadership maneuvered to get her out of the press commission. They accuse the CCP leadership of serving the interests of the bourgeois press in attempting this. Mrs. Theja Gunawardena is a prominent supporter of the Chinese position in the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Indian disputes. She is the author of a book entitled Khrushchevism, a strong attack on Soviet policy. She has been very active in many of the front organizations of the CCP, such as friendship associations and solidarity leagues, etc.

The Cuban Solidarity League has also become inactive. This is partly due to the factional fights in the CCP and partly due to admission of petty-bourgeois communalist careerists into its ranks.

Eighty-seven leading members of the CCP, who met November 17, decided to summon the Seventh National Conference of the party. These eighty-seven members signed an appeal addressed to "the real Marxist-Leninists in the CCP." They elected an organizing committee of thirty-five to make the necessary preparations for the conference. Premalal Kumarasiri was elected secretary of this committee.

Addressing the meeting, he stated: "The present reformist trend is not only a deviation from Communism. It is a deadly enemy destined to

destroy the Communist movement. It is a treacherous current which betrays the proletarian revolution. It is the historically assigned duty of the real Marxist-Leninists to smash the current reformism."

Speeches made at this meeting, reported in the Worker, the weekly organ of the CTUF, show clearly the determination of this hard core of members to form a party of their own. The eighty-seven members who were present at this meeting and the twenty-nine others who subsequently added their signatures to this appeal are drawn from the leadership of factories, Youth Leagues, district committees and party locals. Ten of them are members of the CC of the CCP. In the appeal they levelled a number of damaging charges against the leadership. [See World Outlook December 6.]

The factional struggle in the CCP has brought to light the corruption that existed in it. Building up "yes men" by granting favors like jobs in embassies and firms engaged in trade with countries of the Soviet bloc, organizing trips abroad for henchmen, racketeering in commissions for Trade with Socialist Countries, covering up embezzlement of party and trade-union funds and thereby building up corrupt stooges, victimization of those who disagreed with the leadership -- all these things are in process of being unravelled.

The "rebels" in the CCP, like their co-thinkers in the Chinese Communist party, have come out in defense of Stalin. In this, they merely repeat what the Chinese are saying.

The Ceylon Communist party is thus faced with a serious crisis. Hitherto there had been only isolated cases of expulsions and resignations. But in none of these instances has there been a challenge to the leadership that can be compared to the present one. This is not a revolt but a rebellion of the first order. The bankruptcy of the leadership is seen from their helpless attitude -- allowing things to pass by without intervening. They cannot afford to intervene because that will only strengthen the tide against them. The inevitable split is only a matter of time.

#### SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT DIVIDES WORLD PEACE COUNCIL

The meeting of the World Council of Peace which ended in Warsaw December 3 was overshadowed by the Sino-Soviet conflict. The Soviet bureaucracy was unable to maintain its time-honored custom of preventing a division of the vote and thus presenting a unanimous front to the outside world. The text of the Council's final appeal, approving the Moscow treaty to end nuclear weapons tests -- excepting those underground -- won 274 votes, with 42 opposed and 4 abstentions. The Chinese, North Korean, North Vietnam and Albanian delegates were in the opposition. The identity of the abstentionists was not publicized.

Previously, a Chinese draft, denouncing the Moscow treaty as "trickery" was rejected by 230 votes with 38 against and 18 abstentions.

The existence of an opposition involving almost fifteen per cent of the Kremlin-led World Peace Movement has thus broken into public view. V. Tchkhikvadze, spokesman of the Soviet delegation, admitted to the press

after the meeting that the World Peace Movement is "encountering serious difficulties created by the Chinese representatives."

A Warsaw dispatch of the New China News Agency, dated the same day, accused the Soviet delegation of having prevented the Chinese delegation from taking the floor on at least one occasion.

The Kremlin seems in a quandary on how to solve the crisis which the Sino-Soviet rift has created in the World Peace Movement, in many other front organizations, and in the world Communist movement itself. Khrushchev is in reality faced with an opposition of two kinds: (1) Communist parties lined up with the Chinese or who refuse to condemn the views of the Chinese. This includes, according to certain sources, at least twenty parties, among them the Japanese and Indonesian organizations. (2) Communist parties that are willing to join in condemning the political views which separate the Chinese Communist party from the Communist party of the Soviet Union but which refuse to sanction organizational measures against the Chinese Communist party. This includes again at least twenty parties, among them such important ones as the Italian, Polish, Hungarian and Rumanian.

The combined weight of this variegated opposition was sufficient to block Khrushchev's proposal to hold a world conference of Communist parties on the occasion of the anniversary of the October Revolution. The majority rejected the proposal out of fear it would lead to an irreparable organizational break. Khrushchev was forced to retreat.

Since then there have been indications that the Khrushchev leadership is again cautiously testing the possibility of engaging in new direct bilateral Sino-Soviet discussions on a high diplomatic level.

Probably the Chinese will not reject these overtures. But they made clear during the session of the Chinese National Assembly which just ended in Peking that they will agree to talks only on the basis of complete equality and the complete economic and political independence of China from the Soviet bureaucracy.

#### EDITOR OF "REVOLUTION" SPEAKS IN ROME

ROME, Dec. 1 -- Jacques M. Vergès, editor of the monthly magazine Révolution spoke at a conference held here yesterday under the auspices of Tiers Monde, a leftist publishing house. The conference brought out a number of young people associated with working-class organizations.

Vergès said that while his publication supported the orientation of the Chinese Communist party, its aim also was to provide a kind of forum open to contributions of various origins. He said that beginning with the next number, the magazine would no longer concentrate solely on Asia, Africa and Latin America, but would address the workers' movement as a whole, including the workers in the advanced capitalist countries.

In the discussion, Vergès was asked for further explanation of his or the review's positions, some of which were criticized, in particular the

analogy between the Moscow treaty on nuclear testing and Munich.

Livio Maitan of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International spoke on the present orientation of the Chinese Communists on the decisiveness of the colonial world in the victory of the world revolution. He criticized distortions which have been made by opponents of the Chinese in presenting their positions. He then criticized the defense of Stalin made in certain texts of the Chinese, declaring that on the basis of pro-Stalinist positions it is not possible to work for the revolutionary renewal of the workers' movement, particularly in Italy.

In his reply, Vergès paid special attention to the latter part of Maitan's remarks. Vergès said that in the first place two analyses had been made up to now of the work of Stalin, one by Trotsky and the other by Khrushchev. As for him, he did not accept the one made by Trotsky. He said this, however, without offering a word of explanation. He then said that he considers the analysis made by Khrushchev to be absolutely non-Marxist. Thus, the problem must be studied. But one cannot fail to note that many of those who criticize the Chinese for their position on Stalin were once rabid Stalinists themselves and still continue to utilize execrable methods.

#### THE DUSSELDORF TRADE-UNION CONGRESS

The special DGB [Trade Union Council] congress held in Düsseldorf November 21 and 22 adopted a new "program of principles." This constitution, like the Godesburg program of the SPD [Social Democratic party of Germany] consists of high-sounding phrases having no basis in any serious analysis of the situation in either Germany or the world as a whole. It is much less interesting than the discussion which led up to its adoption.

At Munich in 1949 the DGB laid down some general principles that envisaged socialization of the key industries. The SPD dropped much of this "out of date" socialist stuff in order to "modernize" itself, meaning adapting to the petty-bourgeois current that might be led to vote socialist. The SPD "new look" was fostered a good deal by the unprecedented and almost uninterrupted prosperity of Germany during the past fourteen years. The DGB leadership, too, wanted to follow the course of the SPD. The main figure in the federation of sixteen unions favoring this was Georg Leber, boss of the building laborers.

Leber made his first big move a year ago October at the Hannover DGB congress when he advocated adoption of a resolution agreeing to "emergency laws" to be adopted by parliament that would grant unusual powers to the government in case of any "emergency" inside or outside Germany.

IG Metall [the metal workers union], almost 2,000,000 strong (the DGB has some 6,500,000 members altogether), maintained, however, that existing legislation gave sufficient power to the government to cope with any emergency. Leber was beaten by a two to one vote.

Since the Hannover congress several scandals have shaken German public opinion. Strauss, the minister of defense, an ardent follower of the

Dulles' cold-war line, had to resign because he ordered the arrest of members of the editorial staff of Spiegel, a liberal German weekly, under accusation of high treason. This involved publication of a report about military maneuvers in Germany which proved the superiority of Soviet armed forces.

In ordering the arrest of Spiegel's editorial staff, Strauss was "somewhat" illegal. His real concern was that Spiegel possessed proofs that he was not too clear on the dividing line between his personal accounts and the government defense budget.

Another scandal involved Höcherl, Minister of Interior and a friend of Strauss. He came under public fire because he agreed to secret censorship by Occupation authorities of all mail sent to Cuba from Germany. It turned out that Höcherl's own administration, charged with the "protection of the constitution," had not refrained from tapping telephones and opening private correspondence.

All this had made a deep impression on the delegates at the DGB congress in Düsseldorf. They realized that IG Metall was quite right in contending that the government had sufficient legal powers and didn't require any more. Therefore, at Düsseldorf, a new paragraph was introduced in the new "constitution" of DGB, stating explicit opposition to any new emergency laws or regulations. Out of 425 delegates, only about 20 were opposed!

In another vote, following a somewhat scholastic discussion about the meaning of a paragraph characterizing exploitation under the capitalist system which was formulated so that it could be interpreted as covering only the past, or as covering both the past and the present, Georg Leber was beaten by 425 to 40.

Leber contended that there's no such thing as "proletarians." The unions, he argued, have won so many improvements in the past one hundred years that it is a fallacy to continue such outdated language.

Unfortunately the discussion did not probe very deeply and the congress decided in a rather formal way to approve a dubious compromise worked out by the rules committee which offered a variable interpretation. The personal defeat of Leber, however, had a profound political meaning.

The DGB congress at Düsseldorf registered a victory for the workers in the metal, chemical and printing trades unions. They were joined by others who felt more by instinct than by any clear explanation that the "new style" proposed by Leber in relations with the employers does not lead to results which can be defended face to face with the rank and file.

No doubt the strike and particularly the lockout of 350,000 metal workers last May in Baden-Wurtemberg must have impressed some union bosses who otherwise would have probably followed the "new style" of class collaboration in which the unions play the role of permanent fire brigades.

It is, however, too early to conclude that the Düsseldorf congress of the DGB is a victory for the "left." That will depend very much on the development of the German economy, on the necessity to fight when the

employers can no longer offer yearly "wage gifts." It will depend, too, on how much pressure the left and the right wings of the DGB exert in order to shift the trend in either direction.

MANNHEIM WORKERS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST HIGH COST OF LIVING

On November 7 at Mannheim, 40,000 workers and public employees responded to an appeal by the local trade-union federation [DGB] to demonstrate publicly against the continual increase in the cost of living. This became the first of a series of demonstrations urged by the national DGB leadership.

Since 1962 the workers in West Germany have been hit in two ways. First, Minister of Economy Erhard [now premier] sought to impose "wage restraints" on the unions. Secondly, the prices of basic necessities accelerated upward. From October 1962 to October 1963 the following percentage increases occurred:

Bread	6.70	Rice	9.09	Milk	13.63
Tomatoes	44.27	Eggs	19.04	Pork cutlet	8.73
Prepared ham	8.9	Beer	15.84	Coal	8.62
Fuel oil	4.36	Rent	20.00		

To add insult to injury, the government, unable to announce any impending turn in this upward climb, imposed a supplementary contribution for sickness compensation.

The trade-union leadership felt forced to react demonstratively. Their reaction was essentially defensive. The employers have been hammering away in demagogic and slanderous fashion about the alleged "wage-price spiral." In face of this barrage, the reformist leadership drew back from pressing for significant wage increases and turned to the much "safer" campaign of protesting rising prices. This was, of course, very popular not only among unionized workers but even among less class-conscious workers, among housewives, pensioners and other low-income social layers.

The very success of this campaign, however, can bring new pressure to bear on the trade-union leadership for better answers to the "wage-price spiral" lies. It can touch off a new struggle for more than token wage increases.

The size of the Mannheim demonstration and its impact on the consciousness of the German workers was all the more remarkable since it took place in a cold, driving rain and at the very same time that millions all over the country watched television as the rescuers saved eleven men at the Lengede mine disaster.

For the first time, not only the metal workers but members of traditionally less militant unions marched in closed ranks from their plants to the square where they were to assemble. These included brewery workers, workers from the river harbor and municipal employees. Many taxi drivers plastered their automobiles with posters and drove to the demonstration. The town's transportation system came to a halt for fifteen minutes and

drivers and conductors distributed leaflets among customers appealing to them to participate in the demonstration.

Preparations were excellent, much better than the metal workers strike some months ago which made such an impression in Mannheim. The trades council of the local trade-union federation set up an organization committee. This committee assigned tasks, imposing a strict division of labor. The leaders of the Mannheim trade-union federation participated directly in this work, touring the plants and asking the workers to make sure to attend the demonstration. Wherever this was done the response was extremely high. Participation was lower in some of the plants where the preparations were carried out in a routine or bureaucratic way such as merely sending out a few circulars a couple of days before the demonstration.

Propaganda alerting and appealing to the public was equally well organized and impressive. Sandwich men marched through the main shopping center of Mannheim a few days before the demonstration, carrying posters especially directed to housewives and suggesting to them the need to participate in the protest against the rise in the cost of living. This met with a big response.

The last day before the demonstration, a long column of automobiles covered with posters and accompanied by a sound truck drove through all parts of the city, appealing to the populace to participate in the demonstration.

Many trade unionists, inspired by this activity, began initiating their own measures. In a medium-sized factory employing 700, the boss forbade the workers to participate in the demonstration, which was scheduled for three p.m., ordering them to work until 4:15. The secretary of the trade union with jurisdiction in this industry, on being informed, hastily drove up to the plant gates with a sound truck and spoke to those inside for more than an hour over the loudspeaker, asking them to join the demonstration no matter what the boss said and assuring them of the backing of the whole Mannheim trade-union movement.

The shop stewards remained hesitant and afraid. But more than ninety per cent of the workers left the plant in time to get to the demonstration at three p.m.

"What the meaning of all this? What will follow next?"

It's an old experience to hear workers ask this kind of question after a successful demonstration like the one at Mannheim. Much skepticism among West European workers is due to their common experience that nothing real is done to follow up a success like this one. That is why Mannheim trade unionists and socialists are concentrating on demonstrating that this time things will be different and that a big campaign will be launched to lessen the burden of mounting prices.

The unions must demand immediate cost-of-living allowances. If the employers refuse to grant them, they must be included in the next bargaining round. Contracts should be made for a shorter time so as to make it

asier to make adjustments for price increases. Contracts must include either an escalator clause or a clause making them automatically void when prices have increased a certain percentage so that the union has a legal right to negotiate a new contract that will take into consideration the new price level.

At the same time a big educational campaign should be developed to show that these remedies are only of limited importance, that the economic system itself is what is basically wrong and that the only permanent solution lies in carrying out the old demand of the Munich trade-union program -- socialization of industry!

### THE PEOPLE OF ERITREA SEEK THEIR FREEDOM

The following is the text of an interview with Idris Mohammed Aden, former president of the parliament of Eritrea who is at present head of the Liberation Front of Eritrea. Idris Mohammed Aden headed a delegation which recently visited a number of European countries and which placed a petition before the United Nations.

Q. What is the aim of your trip and especially your visit to the UN?

A. The Liberation Front of Eritrea is trying to do everything possible to bring the situation in Eritrea and the struggle of the people of Eritrea before world public opinion. Up to now we have been victims of a veritable conspiracy of silence. Our appeal to the UN is explained by the fact that the federal constitution for Eritrea was decided on by a majority at the General Assembly of the UN itself.

Q. What is the origin of your movement?

A. It is necessary to return for a moment to the events following the war. In accordance with the peace treaty concluded between Italy and the Four Powers (U.S., USSR, France and Great Britain), the latter were to decide on the fate of Eritrea, a former Italian colony. When agreement proved impossible, the General Assembly of the UN made the decision I mentioned. According to this decision, imposed on the people of Eritrea without any democratic consultation, Eritrea was integrated into the Ethiopian empire with a special federal structure and quite important autonomous rights. On paper, the government of Eritrea had legislative, executive and judiciary powers at home while the federal government undertook to handle defense, foreign affairs, the questions of finance, foreign trade and communications both internal and external. Eritrea was to have its own democratic constitution.

Q. What was the attitude of the Ethiopian government?

A. The Ethiopian government, in practice, completely ignored the principles of the UN resolution. In reality, the economy of Eritrea was subordinated to the Ethiopian economy; democratic rights were suppressed; the federal system was nothing but a façade, pure and simple. The Ethiopian army, under the command of General Abe Ababe, stepson of the emperor imposed a regime of terror and pillage. All the symbols of Eritrea were

eliminated and the two languages spoken locally, Arab and Tigré, were abolished as official languages. Hundreds of the inhabitants of Eritrea were killed or imprisoned without trial. Ethiopia, after having blocked the functioning of the first Assembly of Eritrea and obliged its president -- who is speaking to you now -- to resign, held another election in September 1956 for an Assembly on the basis of rigged elections. In November 1962 the complete integration of Eritrea in the Ethiopian empire was openly proclaimed in flagrant violation of the UN decision.

Q. Concretely, what does the abolition of democratic liberties which you referred to mean?

A. The suppression of all political organizations and all trade-union organizations. The only party that is permitted is a party favorable to the union with Ethiopia, composed exclusively of the priests and bishops of the Coptic church.

Q. What is the aim of your movement?

A. Our movement expresses the profound aspirations of the people of Eritrea for independence. We remember that these aspirations were very strong at the end of the war and that the federal solution was imposed by terror and by all kinds of pressure. However, we were willing to try it out. Now the results are in and we are struggling for the independence of our country. We have asked the African states to form, under the auspices of the UN, an African committee to study the demands of Eritrea and the situation in our country. The committee must be authorized to conduct a democratic plebiscite.

Q. You are not unaware of the fact that following a series of unhappy experiences, the most advanced African elements are not very much in favor of any more divisions among the African countries and that they support by preference unifying tendencies. Aren't you afraid that your position might be considered as opposed to these unifying tendencies and be suspected of tribalism?

A. We are in agreement with the criticism of the progressive Africans on the multiplication of tiny states -- since many of them were formed under the inspiration of French imperialism -- and fragmentation in the Congolese way. But, in the first place, Eritrea, while being a small country, has, just the same, more than two million inhabitants. In the second place, in its whole history Eritrea was never under the domination of Ethiopia. Independent until the sixteenth century, it came under Ottoman sovereignty until 1885, the date of the beginning of Italian domination. Finally, the structure of Eritrea, despite its backward status, is more advanced than that of Ethiopia, which has not ceased to be an absolutist feudal state in which forms of serfdom are still in force. The domination of the Ethiopian empire over Eritrea cannot thus be considered anything like a progressive unifying influence.

Q. What is your estimate of Haile Sélassié and the role he is playing at the current stage in Africa?

A. Haile Sélassié wishes to present himself today as a partisan of

African unity and the whole world knows about his activity during the past year. We understand that it is often difficult for us to explain the reasons for a struggle directed in the first place not against European colonialism, but against an African state. However, things in themselves are clear.

Hailé Sélassié is a despot of medieval style and the world cannot have forgotten the ferocity with which he stifled a reform movement a few years ago that was quite mild. Inside the country, he has to face an opposition that is very much alive, with whom we, among others, have established contact.

On the international plane, Hailé Sélassié is one of the most important points of support for American imperialism in Africa. Naturally he has need of diversions to camouflage his real policies. That is why he wishes to show that he is moving with the times in playing the role of partisan of African unity. But nobody should be taken in on the real nature of his regime and his policies.

Q. What are the forms of struggle used by your movement?

A. In the situation as it exists in Eritrea, where all legal possibilities have been completely eliminated and terror is exercised on a wide scale, you can struggle only in the underground. In actuality, our movement has been obliged to utilize guerrilla methods of struggle.

Q. What is the social composition of your movement?

A. While our movement is followed with sympathy by wide social layers in the country -- as a consequence of the policy of national oppression applied by Ethiopia -- our forces are primarily peasants.

Q. What is the position of the worker sectors of the country?

A. During the time of British administration, the workers had the possibility of organizing themselves in unions, but Ethiopia suppressed all rights of the workers. Despite this, big struggles have broken out. In 1957 there was a strike for six weeks against antiunion measures at Massaua and Asmara. The Ethiopian authorities used arms, killing or wounding 400 workers. Three hundred workers were condemned to prison terms. Unions organized in underground form are among the most ardent partisans of our struggle.

Q. What is the political orientation of your Front?

A. We are struggling now for independence. As we see it, independent Eritrea will follow the socialist example of the Cuban and Algerian revolutions. We are making an appeal to the European workers' movement in order to assure ourselves of their solidarity, first of all by letting them know about the struggle which the revolutionary movement of Eritrea has already been conducting with its guerrilla forces and its underground fighters.

November 29, 1963

Book Review

DEUTSCHER'S BIOGRAPHY OF TROTSKY

By Joseph Hansen

THE PROPHET OUTCAST by Isaac Deutscher. New York: The Oxford University Press. 1963. 543 pp. \$9.50.

The final volume of the trilogy tells the story of Trotsky in banishment from the workers state which he, together with Lenin, had founded. It describes the great intellectual contributions made by this giant revolutionist in these years, his final political battles, and the bitter personal tragedies that befell him before he was slain by Stalin's emissary. The volume was obviously not an easy one for the biographer. The central issues of our time, in which Trotsky stood as the continuator of Marx, Engels and Lenin, are still with us, have grown in acuteness in fact, and it is impossible to deal with Trotsky without also dealing with these. To talk about Trotsky means to talk about the capitalist system in its period of decay and violent resistance to social and economic change, about reviving the proletarian democracy destroyed by the reactionary bureaucratic caste that appeared in the Soviet Union, about the as yet unresolved problem of creating a leadership capable of leading humanity forward to a new and better order.

No matter how Deutscher chose to handle these topics, what he said was bound to be controversial. An additional hazard was that the Trotsky of these years was the Trotsky most familiar to the present generation, the man who still exists in living memory and whose image seemed to become engraved on all who met him, if only briefly.

The biographer met these challenges very well indeed. As in the previous volumes he remains scrupulous toward facts,\* seeks the truth,

---

\*Even such a biased reviewer as Carleton Beals was reduced to pointing to the listing of "Almazar," a right-wing general involved in Trotsky's political break with Diego Rivera, as "proof" of Deutscher's "pseudo-scholarship." "No such general has ever existed or been a presidential candidate," Carleton Beals assures us in the October issue of The Independent. "Such is Deutscher's notable scholarship." Beals, evidently emotionally upset by the passing reference in the biography to his strange role in the Dewey Commission, displays such ill will that he does not even offer to make the necessary correction about the Mexican general. The name should be spelled Almazan. The petulance of Beals, of course, could be due to Deutscher's "pseudo-scholarship" in another unfortunate matter: "Deutscher does not even spell my name correctly. His account is a sham, and a distortion. Save your money." (Deutscher spelled the name of His Royal Highness "Carlton.") Beals' own pseudo-scholarship in relation to Mexico showed up, however, when he failed to note the most obvious error in Deutscher's biography. In the photographs facing page 480, the caption reads: "Two views of the 'little fortress' at Coyoacan." The top view is of the home owned by Frida Kahlo where Trotsky first stayed after coming to Coyoacan. The bottom view is of the house which Trotsky had to buy after the break with Diego Rivera.

and does not hide his own views and predilections. The disagreements one may have with him thus center on points in which his judgment and political views affect the final portrait he offers of Trotsky. The merit of the biographical material he has assembled can be questioned by no one, unless ill will enters in. It is a precious contribution to knowledge of Trotsky, his ideas, and the character of the time he lived in.

The general plan of the volume is the same as the two previous ones. Deutscher presents summaries of Trotsky's main writings during the years under consideration, plus excerpts to give the reader a taste of the original. These are nearly always well chosen and constitute a valuable part of the book. But since, unlike the earlier years, most of the original sources are readily available, the biographer has legitimately reduced the proportion of anthology to the necessities of historical narrative.

Conscientious work in the Trotsky archives at Harvard has enabled Deutscher to present new material of the greatest interest. He was particularly fortunate to obtain the special permission of Natalia Trotsky before her death to examine family correspondence. The revelation thus provided of the family life of the Trotskys, particularly when it was caught up most tensely and tragically in the tempestuous public struggles of the final years, adds a new dimension to the image of Trotsky hitherto available to the public. Deutscher even permits us to glimpse over his shoulder a few lines related to Trotsky's love-life with Natalia, words written only for her. Finally, Deutscher has interviewed many people who met Trotsky or who worked closely with him. From their reports he has selected what he felt he needed or had room for.

Out of these rich and varied sources a picture of Trotsky emerges that is the most life-like of the three volumes, although, to be completely frank, the finished portrait does not quite catch Trotsky, in my opinion, at least as he was known to his closest collaborators in the final years, and calls attention rather too much to the biographer. I will return to this.

\* \* \*

Deutscher considers the Prinkipo period, from 1929 to 1933, to be by far the most productive and fruitful of Trotsky's final years. He devotes half the volume to it. Trotsky's literary production at Prinkipo was indeed enormous and of the highest quality: the three-volume History of the Russian Revolution; an autobiography, My Life; a series of profound and stirring articles on the most crucial issue of the day -- the rise of Nazism; continuation of his current appreciations of developments in the Soviet Union, the only original Marxist contribution on this subject at the time; occasional writings of first-rate importance on such topics as the beginning of the Spanish revolution; and a wide correspondence on an international scale related to the task of reconstructing the revolutionary-socialist movement.

Deutscher does an excellent job of inventorying and assessing these treasures. His praise of Trotsky as a historian is especially warm and appreciative:

"Like Thucydides, Dante, Machiavelli, Heine, Marx, Herzen, and other thinkers and poets, Trotsky attained his full iminence as a writer only in exile, during the few Prinkipo years. Posterity will remember him as the historian of the October Revolution as well as its leader. No other Bolshevik has or could have produced so great and splendid an account of events of 1917; and none of the many writers of the anti-Bolshevik parties has presented any worthy counterpart to it."

Deutscher does not hesitate to estimate it as the greatest work of its kind: "His historical writing is dialectical as is hardly any other such work produced by the Marxist school of thought since Marx, from whom he derives his method and style. To Marx's minor historical works, The Class Struggle in France, The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, and The Civil War in France, Trotsky's History stands as the large mural painting stands to the miniature. Whereas Marx towers above the disciple in the power of his abstract thought and gothic imagination, the disciple is superior as epic artist, especially as master of the graphic portrayal of masses and individuals in action. His socio-political analysis and artistic vision are in such concord that there is no trace of any divergence. His thought and his imagination take flight together. He expounds his theory of revolution with the tension and the élan of narrative; and his narrative takes depth from his ideas. His scenes, portraits, and dialogues, sensuous in their reality, are inwardly illumined by his conception of the historical process."

The autobiography, in Deutscher's opinion, is less satisfactory because of a certain unevenness. One can agree with Deutscher in this without sharing the reasons he offers for finding the latter part of the book not up to what can be expected from Trotsky at his best. Deutscher holds that Trotsky's explanation of the struggle with Stalin is defective. Trotsky "does not go to the root of the matter and he leaves Stalin's ascendancy only half explained." Deutscher feels that Trotsky pictures Stalin as too much villain and that he "virtually ignores the intrinsic connexion between the suppression by Bolshevism of all parties and its self-suppression, of which Stalin was the supreme agent." The flaw, in Deutscher's view, is thus due to faulty political vision -- a considerable weakness in the man whom Deutscher otherwise views as a supreme political genius. However, Trotsky was quite familiar with the theory for which Deutscher argues, concerning the alleged organic connection between Bolshevism and Stalinism. He specifically rejected it on more than one occasion, and with arguments that I find still convincing.

Trotsky's defective political insight, if such it is, is not peculiar to My Life; it is common to everything he wrote, touching this subject, in his final years. What really gives the autobiography its unevenness is the shift away from personal material. The first chapters are on the level of great autobiographical literature. The latter parts shift to political polemic. Excellent as this may be in its own right, it clashes increasingly with the autobiographical form in which it is cast. In contrast to his openness in the first parts in offering absorbing intimate material; Trotsky, in the final parts, becomes more and more reticent.

The reasons for this are perfectly understandable and, in fact, do Trotsky credit. His primary interest was not psychological self-revelation

but political action. He remained to the end of his life a leader who necessarily subordinated all other considerations to the interests of the political wars he was engaged in. Deutscher, one must agree, is right in saying about the autobiography that "if he had not written it in 1929, or shortly thereafter, he might not have written it at all."

In unity of form and content, Deutscher's biography contrasts favorably with the final sections of My Life. As we follow Trotsky's thought and the course of his political battles, we participate at the same time in his personal fortunes. We catch some of the pleasures, the more common emotional stress, and the searing tragedies. We get to know something of Zina, the daughter who suffered a nervous breakdown under Stalin's persecution, who resisted psychoanalytic treatment and who finally committed suicide. Leon Sedov, the devoted son comes to life for us -- Leon, who had such a close political and personal relationship with his father that he became the receptacle for explosive paternal tensions that could find no other safety valve and which Leon could not understand but only brood over in the final days before his own death at the hands of the implacable common foe. Natalia emerges as a granite figure. To Deutscher she is the heroine of the epic and all who read this biography are bound to share his admiration for her. She was truly of the stature required to share to the end the fortunes of the prophet outcast.

\* \* \*

As the titles of the trilogy indicate: The Prophet Armed, The Prophet Unarmed, and The Prophet Outcast, Trotsky's capacity to see into the future was, for Deutscher, his most irresistible gift. He cites examples of Trotsky's almost uncanny accuracy. Two of them in the final volume will undoubtedly impress everyone who reads them. The first one, on the grand level of the international class struggle, illustrates the contrast between Trotsky's clear vision of the meaning of the rise of Hitler and the blindness of the Stalinists, represented in this case by Thaelmann:

"As late as September 1932, a few months before Hitler became Chancellor, Thaelmann, at a session of the Comintern Executive, still repeated, what Mûnzenberg had said: 'In his pamphlet on how National Socialism is to be defeated, Trotsky gives one answer only, and it is this: the German Communist Party must join hands with the Social Democratic Party.... This, according to Trotsky, is the only way in which the German working class can save itself from fascism. Either, says he, the Communist party makes common cause with the Social Democrats, or the German working class is lost for ten or twenty years. This is the theory of an utterly bankrupt Fascist and counter-revolutionary. This is indeed the worst, the most dangerous, and the most criminal theory that Trotsky has construed in these last years of his counter-revolutionary propaganda.'

"'One of the decisive moments in history is approaching', Trotsky rejoined, '... when the Comintern as a revolutionary factor may be wiped off the political map for an entire historic epoch. Let blind men and cowards refuse to notice this. Let slanderers and hired scribblers accuse us of being in league with the counter-revolution. Has not counter-revolution become anything...that interferes with the digestion of communist bureaucrats...nothing must be concealed, nothing belittled. We must tell

the advanced workers as loudly as we can: After the 'third period' of recklessness and boasting the fourth period of panic and capitulation has set in.' In an almost desperate effort to arouse the communists, Trotsky put into words the whole power of his conviction and gave them once again the ring of an alarm bell: 'Workers-communists! There are hundreds of thousands, there are millions of you.... If fascism comes to power it will ride like a terrific tank over your skulls and spines. Your salvation lies in merciless struggle. Only a fighting unity with social democratic workers can bring victory. Make haste, communist workers, you have very little time to lose.'

The second example is Trotsky's admonition of Trygve Lie, who later became head of the United Nations. The then Minister of Justice in the Norwegian government put Trotsky under house arrest, barred him from answering the charges in the infamous 1936 Moscow frame-up trial, and even cut him off from correspondence. Lie attempted to force Trotsky to sign a shameful agreement not to make any statements referring to the Moscow frame-up trial, in which Trotsky and his son were principal victims, and to submit the mail, telegrams and telephone calls of himself, his wife and secretaries to censorship. "Twenty years later eye-witnesses of the scene still remembered the flashes of scorn in Trotsky's eyes and the thunder of his voice as he refused to comply." He levelled a series of damaging questions at Trygve Lie.

"At this point Trotsky raised his voice so that it resounded through the halls and corridors of the Ministry: 'This is your first act of surrender to Nazism in your own country. You will pay for this. You think yourselves secure and free to deal with a political exile as you please. But the day is near -- remember this! -- the day is near when the Nazis will drive you from your country, all of you together with your Pantoffel-Minister-President.' Trygve Lie shrugged at this odd piece of soothsaying. Yet after less than four years the same government had indeed to flee from Norway before the Nazi invasion; and as the Ministers and their aged King Haakon stood on the coast, huddled together and waiting anxiously for a boat that was to take them to England, they recalled with awe Trotsky's words as a prophet's curse come true."

\* \* \*

[To be continued.]

A TIP

The final volume of Isaac Deutscher's biography of Leon Trotsky is readily available in England at a considerable saving over the price of the American edition. Send £2/5s. (U.K.) or \$6.50, check or international money order to WIR Publications, 374 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

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

Directeur-Gérant: Pierre FRANK.