

# WORLD OUTLOOK

## PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Vol. 2, No. 8

February 21, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2°

In this issue:

Page

Resolutions of the Fourth International:

On the Character of the Algerian Government. . . . .	1
New Developments in the Angolan Revolution . . . . .	3
Washington's Last Card in South Vietnam. . . . .	5
Behind the Bloodshed in Cyprus . . . . .	6
"Self-management" Proves a Success in Algeria (First Balance Sheet) -- By Henri Dumoulin . . . . .	10
Text of Ben Bella's Speech on the Success of Self-management (Cash Bonuses for Workers) . . . . .	12
An African Leader Scores a Point . . . . .	15
A Survivor Recalls How Stalin Liquidated Congress Delegates . . . . .	16
Works by Trotsky Circulate in Italy. . . . .	18
Belgian Students Protest Intervention in Cyprus. . . . .	18
The UN Expedition to Atlanta -- By Evelyn Sell . . . . .	19
In Quebec the Armory Raid Was Not Unpopular. . . . .	21
Nehru's Congress Party Routed in Goa (An Analysis of the Election Results) -- By Kailas Chandra. . . . .	22
New Frontier Breaks Through White House Window . . . . .	26

### ON THE CHARACTER OF THE ALGERIAN GOVERNMENT

PARIS, Feb. 17 -- The United Secretariat of the Fourth International today issued the following statement, summarizing the views of the world Trotskyist movement on the character of the Algerian government:

\* \* \*

For some time the course of the new regime in Algeria has shown that it is a "Workers and Peasants Government" of the kind considered by the Communist International in its early days as likely to appear, and referred to in the Transitional program of the Fourth International, as a possible forerunner of a workers state.

Such a government is characterized by the displacement of the bourgeoisie in political power, the transfer of armed power from the bourgeoisie to the popular masses, and the initiation of far-reaching measures in property relations. The logical outcome of such a course is the establishment of a workers state; but, without a revolutionary Marxist party, this is not guaranteed. In the early days of the Communist International it was held to be excluded in the absence of a revolutionary Marxist party. Experience has shown, however, that this conclusion must be modified in the colonial world due to the extreme decay of capitalism and the effect of the existence of the Soviet Union and a series of workers states in the world today.

An essentially bourgeois state apparatus was bequeathed to Algeria. A crisis in the leadership of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] came to a head July 1, 1962, ending after a few days in the establishment of a de facto coalition government in which Ferhat Abbas and Ben Bella represented the two opposing wings of neocolonialism and popular revolution. The struggle between these two tendencies within the coalition ended in the reinforcement of the Ben Bella wing, the promulgation of the decrees of March 1963 and the ouster successively of Khider, Ferhat Abbas and other bourgeois leaders although some rightist elements still remain in the government. These changes marked the end of the coalition and the establishment of a Workers and Peasants government.

As is characteristic of a Workers and Peasants Government of this kind, the Algerian government has not followed a consistent course. Its general direction, however, has been in opposition to imperialism, to the old colonial structure, to neocolonialism and to bureaucratism. It has reacted with firmness to the initiatives of would-be new bourgeois layers, including armed counterrevolution. Its subjective aims have repeatedly been declared to be the construction of socialism. At the same time its consciousness is limited by its lack of Marxist training and background.

The question that remains to be answered is whether this government can establish a workers state. The movement in this direction is evident and bears many resemblances to the Cuban pattern. A profound agrarian reform has already been carried out, marked by virtual nationalization of the most important areas of arable land. Deep inroads have been made into the old ownership relations in the industrial sector with the establishment of a public and state-controlled sector. Yet to be undertaken are the expropriation of the key oil and mineral sector, the banks and insurance companies, establishment of a monopoly of foreign trade and the inauguration of effective counter measures to the monetary, financial and commercial activities of foreign imperialism.

Among the most heartening signs in Algeria are (1) in foreign policy the establishment of friendly relations with Cuba, Yugoslavia, China, the Soviet Union and other workers states with the possibility this opens up for substantial aid from these sources; (2) the active attitude of the government toward developing the colonial revolution

in such areas as Angola and South Africa; (3) within Algeria the establishment of the institution of "self-management." "Self-management" with its already demonstrated importance for the development of workers and peasants democracy offers the brightest opening for the establishment of the institutions of a workers state.

As a whole, Algeria, as we have noted many times, has entered a process of permanent revolution of highly transitional character in which all the basic economic, social and political structures are being shaken up and given new forms. This process is certain to continue. It will be greatly facilitated and strengthened if one of the main problems now on the agenda -- the organization of a mass party on a revolutionary Marxist program -- is successfully solved.

The appearance of a Workers and Peasants Government in Algeria is concrete evidence of the depth of the revolutionary process occurring there. It is of historic importance not only for Algeria and North Africa but for the whole African continent and the rest of the world.

#### NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE ANGOLAN REVOLUTION

PARIS, Feb. 17 -- The United Secretariat of the Fourth International today issued a statement indicating its position on recent developments in the movement seeking Angolan independence. In particular, the Fourth International called attention to the increased weight of the Angolan National Liberation Front in relation to other movements engaged in the freedom struggle.

"The most effective way in which revolutionary Marxists can help the Angolan freedom fighters find their way to the program of socialism," said the United Secretariat, "is to participate actively in the struggles led by the FLNA, to help them obtain material support in fighting against Portuguese imperialism, and to back them in resisting every neocolonialist maneuver, above all those emanating from American imperialism."

The full text of the resolution is as follows:

\* \* \*

Since the summer of 1963, radical changes have occurred in the national revolutionary movement of the Angolan people against Portuguese imperialism.

On the one hand the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola [MPLA] has become badly split and weakened, the majority of its members, under the initiative of Viriato Da Cruz, leader of the radical left wing, having broken with Dr. Agostinho Neto who united with dissident neocolonialist and feudal organizations.

On the other hand the Angolan National Liberation Front [FLNA]

has been officially recognized by the Organization of African Unity [OUA] as the only really combat organization and it has been reinforced by the entrance of numerous former members of the MPLA. The Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile [GRAE] set up by the FLNA has been given "de jure" recognition by nine independent states of Africa, including Algeria.

At present the MPLA forces remaining in emigration are virtually cut off from the Angolan underground; whereas the guerrilla forces under the leadership of the FLNA are undertaking, after a lull, increasingly broad military action against Portuguese colonialism, not only in the Bakongo region, but also in other districts of Angola, strengthening the position of the Revolutionary Government among the Angolan Tshokwés, Luenas, Umbundus, Baïlundos and Kimbundus, thereby overcoming in practice the drawback of Bakongo preponderance within the Union of the People of Angola [UPA], out of which the present movement evolved. This national expansion has been accompanied by a vigorous campaign of the FLNA against tribalism.

The promise of help from the African states has not materialized on the necessary scale due to pressure from neocolonialist and openly imperialist forces. Thus the FLNA leadership is being forced to turn more and more towards revolutionary sources for aid, including the workers states, above all China. That this leadership has given indications of being willing to turn in this direction is an encouraging sign.

On the programmatic level, the FLNA is, of course, far from the perspective of revolutionary socialism and its leadership is not immune to neocolonialism and the pressure of imperialism. However, once a dynamic mass movement is launched, it cannot remain static. In the very process of the struggle, the great programmatic questions will inevitably come to the fore. These include the necessity for constructing a revolutionary-socialist party, the need for a revolutionary land reform, nationalization of the major means of production, a clear break with world imperialism and the establishment of fraternal relations with the workers states.

The most effective way in which revolutionary Marxists can help the Angolan freedom fighters find their way to the program of socialism is to participate actively in the struggles led by the FLNA, to help them obtain material support in fighting against Portuguese imperialism, and to back them in resisting every neocolonialist maneuver, above all those emanating from American imperialism.

#### PROGRESS REPORT

Almost nineteen years after the end of World War II, the monthly testing of air-raid sirens in France came to an end in the departments of Seine, Seine-et-Oise, Seine-et-Marne and Oise. From now on the tests will be held only every two months.

## WASHINGTON'S LAST CARD IN SOUTH VIETNAM

When Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh overthrew the military junta headed by Maj. Gen. Guong Van Minh on January 30, he gave as his reason that the junta had proved "soft on Communism" after it overthrew the Diem regime last November. Khanh also said that the junta had engaged in a "plot" that was "backed by the French" to turn toward "neutralism" and end the war in South Vietnam through a negotiated settlement. The U.S. State Department made out that it had been surprised by the new coup d'état and that it was "uneasy" over the situation.

Circles close to the French government offer a different opinion on the meaning of Khanh's seizure of power. They claim that it was done with the approval of Washington. The French imperialists, of course, are not disinterested observers. They are watching for an opportunity to make a comeback in their former colony. Nevertheless it serves them, for the time being at least, to bring out certain facts that might otherwise remain concealed.

An interesting analysis of the Khanh regime, written by Georges Chaffard and reflecting the French view, appeared in the February 11 Paris daily Le Monde. According to Chaffard, the governmental combination announced by Khanh on February 8, "implicitly reveals the difficulties and the limits of the enterprise" undertaken by Khanh in toppling the junta.

"The majority of the traditional political personnel decline to venture any opinion. This is because waiting has again become the order of the day for a big section of the South Vietnam bourgeoisie at a time when the thesis of neutralization is gaining ground even among certain American circles."

It was the ultranationalist minority, in Chaffards' opinion, that sought the purge of January 30. But they are divided by rivalries between clans and personalities. "The operation advised by the American services, the unification of the two most fiercely anti-Communist formations, the Dai-Vet party (of the 'Grand Vietnam') and the Vietnam Quoc Don Dang (V.N.Q.D.D., formerly linked with Chiang Kai-shek) proved to be unfeasible." Because of the failure of this maneuver, Khanh "had no other recourse but to assume responsibility for the government himself."

### Two Main Puppets

Chaffard calls attention to the two most important persons in Khanh's regime: Dr. Pham Huy Quat, the minister of foreign affairs, who "is probably the political brains," and Professor Nguyen Xuan Danh the second vice-president, who is in charge of economic and financial affairs.

"Principal leader of the Dai-Vet, Mr. Pham Huy Quat passes for a strong personality, and in any case proclaims himself to be a determined adversary of neutralism. His nomination at the head of South

Vietnam diplomacy will reassure Mr. Dean Rusk and Mr. McNamara. In Paris, on the other hand, it will not be forgotten that Dr. Quat, who has presided since December over the Commission of Foreign Affairs of the Council of Notables, was one of the principal inspirers of the motion demanding that diplomatic relations with France be broken."

Nguyen Xuan Danh "is a pure product of American 'upbringing.' He recently returned to Saigon after an absence of seventeen years. Beneficiary of a scholarship granted by the Japanese occupation in 1945, he went to Tokyo to study, from where he went to the United States after the war. A graduate of Harvard, functionary of the International Monetary Fund, he returned to Vietnam in the entourage that accompanied Mr. Cabot Lodge in August 1963. He was at once sent by his American friends to Paris to try, without much hope, to reunite the anti-neutralist opposition in exile. After the fall of the Diem government, he became governor of the National Bank. The United States expects, no doubt, that his nomination will provide stricter control over the utilization of American aid."

Chaffard notes that none of the figures who were imprisoned under the regime of the Ngo brothers is part of the new government. Maj. Gen. Minh, who headed the overthrown military junta, accepted the post of figurehead president in order "to safeguard the unity of the army."

"There are few observers in Saigon," declares Chaffard, "who are prepared to predict a long life for the new team, who represent only a very small fraction of Vietnamese opinion, and whose chances of lasting hinge solely on the loyalty of the army. To intensify the war against the Vietcong, no substitute team remains. If the present regime, in its turn, suffers a setback, no alternative will remain but to call on the partisans of a negotiated neutrality."

#### BEHIND THE BLOODSHED IN CYPRUS

For the past several months, the big powers of the West, particularly Great Britain and the United States, have allotted spectacular publicity day after day to a tiny island in the eastern end of the Mediterranean whose total population amounts to some 565,000. The fratricidal conflict between the communities of Greek and Turkish origin in Cyprus is pictured as a deadly threat to world peace, requiring immediate armed intervention.

The seemingly senseless bloodshed between two peoples that have lived peaceably together for centuries does, indeed, seem strange; and it would seem in order to send troops to put a stop to it. Yet there are aspects to this clamor that are suspicious, to say the least.

First of all, there is the odd reluctance of Great Britain and United States to ask the United Nations to take full charge. They have been insisting on sending NATO troops strictly controlled by them. This is all the more intriguing in view of the proved capacity of the

United Nations to uphold imperialist interests in such situations as the war in Korea and the civil strife in the Congo. Why are President Johnson and Prime Minister Sir Douglas-Home so concerned about blocking the United Nations if the threat to world peace is as grave as it is pictured and if the United Nations really is, as they claim, an instrument for peace?

And what is actually stirring up the 450,000 people of Greek origin and the 115,000 of Turkish origin in face of the fact that under some three centuries of Turkish domination, they traditionally united in opposition to the oppressor?

The truth is hinted at in an editorial in the February 15-16 New York Times [international edition]. Archbishop Marakios, head of the Republic of Cyprus, is berated for rejecting "the Anglo-American plan for an allied peace-keeping force on Cyprus" and for being "adamant on taking the issue to the United Nations, insisting that the force be put under control of the Security Council."

Marakios, it seems, is afraid that the island will be partitioned. What he wants is to stop the slaughter, guarantee the island's territorial integrity and prevent any foreign intervention. "What this would really mean is that the peace-keeping force would be obliged to prevent the island's threatened partition. . . and that it would prevent Turkey, Greece and Britain from exercising their treaty rights to intervene."

This voice of American imperialism then admits: "Behind these issues looms the Russian shadow, which long antedates the cold war. It was to keep Russia out of the eastern Mediterranean that Cyprus was first put under British rule at the Berlin Congress of 1878, and it is for the same reason that Britain and the United States seek now to keep Russia from creeping in again through the United Nations and the large Communist element on Cyprus."

In brief, a dirty game of imperialist power moves is involved.

The Greek community, which constitutes a majority of three-quarters of the population, goes back more than 2,000 years. They have maintained their identity through many invasions. The Turks came to the island in 1570, seized some of the best land and founded families that are still living in Cyprus. British imperialism displaced Turkish rule and brought the island into the Empire. The inhabitants of the island, through long association and mutual interests, considered themselves more and more as Cypriotes. The division along religious lines (Greek Christians and Turkish Moslems) offered no major obstacle to this development.

But Cyprus became caught up in the big political currents that stirred the postwar world. With the decline of the Empire and the rise of Arab nationalism, the British imperialists had to retreat in the Middle East, finally being forced to give up even their Suez "life line." They converted Cyprus into a new military anchor.

At the same time, the Cypriotes began a heroic struggle to break Great Britain's grip on their island. How was London to meet this political threat to its military bases there? Endowed with centuries of experience in such things, the British rulers applied a tried and tested strategem: divide et impera -- divide and rule.

### How Turkey Became Involved

Here is how Eric Rouleau describes it in Le Monde [February 7]:

"Thus British diplomacy was led to resort to an astute expedient aimed at neutralizing the action of the Greek Cypriotes in favor of Enosis [union with Greece], but which was subsequently to lead to the sharp crisis now agitating the Atlantic powers. The expedient consisted of introducing Turkey into the foreground of the Cypriote scene as-a counter to Greece, which, on August 20, 1954, officially asked the UN to recognize the Cypriote right to self-determination.

"Having ceded Cyprus to the English in 1878, and renouncing all claims to the island in 1923 with the signing of the Lausanne treaty, Turkey up until then had showed no interest in its former province. Greek incorporation of Cyprus even appeared undisputed, since Mr. Churchill himself, like most of the British leaders, had held from the beginning of the century that Enosis constituted 'an ideal worthy of being pursued seriously, stubbornly and energetically' by the Hellenic people of Cyprus."

In face of the Greek move to take the matter to the United Nations, coupled with an armed insurrection on the island against British occupation, Sir Anthony Eden, in 1955, made a sensational decision. "He invited the Greek and Turkish to a tripartite conference for the purpose of examining 'political and military problems concerning the eastern Mediterranean, including Cyprus.' Ankara was jubilant. The invitation conferred on Turkey, for the first time in thirty years, a say in Cypriote affairs. In Athens it was believed at first that what was involved was a move toward a three-way settlement, if not 'capitulation' of the British government to the pressure of the movement for Enosis."

However, new complications swiftly appeared. "The Turkish delegation, in fact, adopted an intransigent attitude. It opposed Enosis, claiming that Cyprus as 'former Ottoman territory' had never belonged to Greece. It objected to independence for the island by talking about 'the Communist influence,' which, according to the delegation, was preponderant among the Greek Cypriotes, and would constitute a threat to the security of Turkey. Finally, it raised the problem of the future of the Turkish minority. The conclusion was predictable: only the maintenance of the politico-military role of Great Britain could offer the indispensable guarantees to Ankara."

Since then, Turkey has become more and more involved in Cypriote affairs, doing its utmost to stir up the grossest passions of the Turkish community and playing the role required to make it appear



that Great Britain is indispensable in Cyprus as a mediator.

The Cypriotes continued their struggle against British domination; and the custodians of the declining Empire finally had to concede the island its political independence in 1960. However, they tied up the package with quite a few strings.

### World's Longest Constitution

First of all, Turkey was granted the right to bring troops into the island -- for the first time since they were expelled in 1878. Turkey was given the right to intervene in Cyprus affairs if the status quo should be threatened.

Second, the British forced the Cypriotes to grant the Turkish minority special privileges such as they had never known in the past even under Turkish rule. These included many economic advantages. The effect of granting such privileges to the Turkish minority was to poison relations between the two communities.

Third, the British foisted a constitution on the republic that probably is without parallel. It has 199 Articles and hundreds of paragraphs, regulating life down to ridiculous detail.

The main principle of this constitution is the abrogation of majority rule by giving the Turkish minority absolute veto power over any essential proposed legislation or governmental decisions. Thus the Makarios regime was bound hand and foot in face of worsening economic conditions on the island and rising popular demands. When Makarios last November 30 issued a memorandum proposing amendments to this legislative strait jacket, the response was provocation of civil strife.

Last, but far from least, in granting Cyprus nominal independence, the British asserted sovereignty over two military bases. In addition they set aside a dozen areas for training purposes.

The basic imperialistic stake in Cyprus is Akrotiri and Dhekelia, the twin military bases that constitute Britain's Mediterranean Guantánamo. An estimated 12,000 troops are stationed here on constant alert, ready for action in any of the Middle East or African theaters.

The United States shares the facilities. Atomic bomber patrols fly their missions from the island, where nuclear weapons are reportedly stockpiled. Cyprus is an important link in the American communications network, both for relaying coded messages from Washington and for recording broadcasts in the Middle East region for later study by "agents of the F.B.I. and the C.I.A.," according to Eric Rouleau.

It is concern over maintaining this military stronghold that is behind the British policy of stirring up murderous conflict between the Greek and Turkish communities to whom Cyprus belongs.

First Balance Sheet

"SELF-MANAGEMENT" PROVES A SUCCESS IN ALGERIA

By Henri Dumoulin

ALGIERS, Feb. 9 -- The socialist agrarian reform underway in the Algerian countryside has already gone through a number of stages.

First of all, in the weeks following independence, there appeared a spontaneous movement of the peasant masses who sought to continue working the big rich holdings abandoned by the routed colons [French colonialists].

The People's National Army (formerly the National Liberation Army), this armed force of peasants, putting aside their rifles for the plough, supported the movement by participating in the 1962 Operation Harvest and Labor [Opérations Récoltes et Labours].

In a few months, the combined action of the spontaneous movement of the peasant masses, of Ben Bella and BNASS (Bureau National d'Animation du Secteur Socialiste, the role of which was primarily to influence the leadership and to articulate theory for the rank-and-file movement and to inspire it) recovered hundreds of thousands of hectares of land for the Algerian people that had been abandoned by the European colons and listed as "Bien Vacants" [vacated property].

In March 1963 the three historic decrees,<sup>1</sup> a real charter of Socialist Self-management, capped this first stage of the Agrarian Reform. And the peasants and workers character of the government, or more precisely of the leading team assembled around Ben Bella became clearly apparent.

The next stage was marked, in October 1963, by the nationalization of all the holdings of the European colons, bringing the total of land under the socialist sector close to three million hectares.

The agricultural workers, the fellahs, these illiterate, forever persecuted men, took possession of Algeria's present main wealth, her main source of capital and surplus products.

The October Congress of the Workers of the Land [Travailleurs de la Terre] in the self-managed agricultural sector testified to the awakening of consciousness of a class called on to play the determining role in the first phase of the construction of Algerian socialism.

---

<sup>1</sup>These as well as historic texts of the Algerian Revolution have been published in a pamphlet, Documents sur l'Autogestion (Ministry of Information with the participation of BNASS). See also Discours du Président Ben Bella (from September 28 to December 12, 1962). These can be obtained by writing to L'Algérie dans le Monde, 26 rue Ben M'hidi Larbi, Algiers, Algeria.

Thirdly, we come to the important aspect of the March decrees involving the material interest of the permanent workers in their enterprise through sharing the profits of the self-managed farm in the form of bonuses.

Everyone wondered whether the government would be able to carry out this considerable promise. On February 7 Ben Bella took up this question in a radio message which testified to the socialist understanding of the head of the Algerian government. He said that the promise would be met and spoke of the significance this held for the future of self-management in Algeria. [See text of speech on page 12.]

Finally, there is the further development of the agrarian reform. The government has announced the draft of a law to limit the extent of all property. This will be placed before the National Assembly by next April.

To carry out this fundamental stage of the agrarian revolution will arouse not a little hostility on the part of average and large Algerian proprietors.

That is why it is requisite for the government to reinforce its support and popularity among the permanent workers of the socialist sector. With regard to this, bonuses for the fellahs in the self-managed sector will have positive consequences.

But it must never be forgotten that the agricultural socialist sector, while it accounts for close to seventy-five per cent of the gross product of agriculture, and more than sixty per cent of all exports, did not employ during the first year of nationalization more than a hundred thousand workers and their families out of a peasant population of seven million persons, of whom two million are employable men.<sup>2</sup>

Thus it is the duty of revolutionary Marxists to not underestimate the difficulties and the contradictions existing on the road of the Algerian Revolution.

Alongside the socialist sector, exists a traditional agricultural sector, extremely poverty-stricken, to which the Revolution up to now has been unable to bring anything substantial.

But, as Lenin said shortly after the victory of the Soviets in the USSR: "We must prove to the peasant that the Bolsheviks are

---

<sup>2</sup>We cite these figures from the Paris daily Le Monde. If they are only approximate, they nevertheless appear dependable. The nationalizations of October 1963 increased the employment figure somewhat. Even if the accuracy of the figures should be challenged, it is certain that the number of permanent workers in the socialist sector only includes a minority of the mass of fellahs.

actually coming to the aid of the small peasant, ruined, deprived of everything, dying of hunger, in his cruel present situation. Either we will prove this to him or he will tell us to go to the devil."

It would appear important therefore that the next law involving the Agrarian Reform should not just limit peasant ownership but should in one way or another come to the aid of the small fellahs, who with their two or three hectares [one hectare = 2.47 acres] cannot make ends meet.

Still more serious is chronic unemployment, a heritage of colonialism that affects one out of two in the cities and a little less in the countryside. This plague is a difficulty that is becoming more and more urgent for the government. Only revolutionary methods can bring an end to it.

In face of these problems, all revolutionists and Marxists must fully support the new battles which the Algerian Revolution confronts in its struggle for the construction of socialism.

#### Cash Bonuses for Workers

#### TEXT OF BEN BELLA'S SPEECH ON THE SUCCESS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

The following is a translation of the text of Ben Bella's February 7 speech on the success of self-management in Algeria:

\* \* \*

Workers,

The auditing of accounts decided at the time of the Congress of Peasants has been completed.

The time has come to make a first balance sheet of self-management in the agricultural sector. This balance sheet confirms the correctness of the position taken by the party and the government, against wind and sea, in deciding to place confidence in the workers by entrusting them with management of the means of production.

Your efforts have rendered eloquent results. The size of the profits constitutes the most stinging reply to the slanderers of socialism in our country and those who have always lived from the labor of others.

Up to now our main objective has been to reactivate production, to give to the socialist sector the means to play a pilot role in the construction of the new society.

Thanks to your sacrifices, to your sense of responsibility, self-

management has succeeded. Your success is proof that you have made your own the generous principles of collective management of the national patrimony.

United in your national organizations and in the party, you constitute the spearhead of your socialist revolution.

It is through you that the socialist transformation of our country will be carried out and it is through the self-managed sector that our economy will develop.

Up to now we have had to face urgent problems. Their solution has not always been reached under normal conditions but it was necessary first and above all to assure production and subsistence for the workers while waiting to balance accounts.

That is why in the first period we made uniform periodic advances to all categories of workers.

The progress registered since then permits us to enter a second stage provided for in the decrees of March; namely, the application of Article 4 of Decree 63-98 of March 28, 1963, which provided for a scale of remuneration according to job ratings and norms of productivity.

Thus we will be able to meet one of the fundamental demands of socialism which envisages that everyone should be paid according to his labor.

A classification of workers according to job ratings and skills with a corresponding scale of remuneration will be submitted very soon for the approval of the workers.

The difference in basic remuneration according to job ratings and productivity is just because it corresponds to each one's efforts, experience and technical qualifications.

It assures emulation among the workers, constitutes a factor of encouragement to creative spirit and initiative and permits growth of production.

The audits have revealed substantial over-all profits. We say "over-all" because if the big majority of enterprises show a positive balance, a number of tiny enterprises for various reasons have not ended up with a profit.

The enemies of socialism will not fail to ascribe the deficits of certain enterprises to embezzlement by the workers. I must state the truth: embezzlement has occurred but only in a few cases. This is due to the survival of the individualist spirit common to all exploitive societies. Capitalist society is founded on the principle: rob others or be robbed yourself -- work for someone else or make him work for you. Men reared in this society, workers and peasants like

the others, remain for a while impregnated with these habits.

That's why people can be found among them, too -- fortunately only a tiny minority -- who think of getting things without caring about others.

It is necessary to fight tirelessly against careerism, those seeking to acquire or to maintain special privileges, those who want to assure their own comfort without regard for the islands of misery that remain in the country.

Nevertheless, there is one error we must not commit. Negative attitudes must not cause us to lose sight of what is essential: management during the past year had to be undertaken under difficult conditions and a great many workers had to face painful conditions in their daily lives.

The deficit therefore does not imply that workers in enterprises that were not profitable did not display the necessary effort. Not to give them bonuses would mean not taking into consideration the conditions under which they had to take over these enterprises.

We have no right to penalize them.

Taking into account these considerations, we have decided that for the year 1963, a bonus of 230 new francs [\$46 U.S.] will be granted workers of enterprises that showed a profit and a bonus of 110 new francs [\$22 U.S.] will be granted to workers in enterprises where the provisional balance sheet, we are convinced, was negative.

These bonuses will be given to the workers of agricultural enterprises under self-management before the Aid-Es-Seghir [February 14, the end of Ramadan, the Muslim religious holiday]. However, and the workers concerned will understand me, no bonuses will be paid to workers in enterprises placed under self-management last October, because they have not yet completed the financial accounting period. Their accounts will be audited in 1964.

I wish to add that the profits distributed this year have high symbolic meaning. They testify not only to the efforts made by the workers of the self-managed sector, but likewise to a principle. We are convinced that the workers in self-management are fully conscious that they are not merely wage-workers, but producers engaged collectively in the operation and development of the socialized national patrimony.

All the more so in view of the fact that this special bonus was set in a more or less arbitrary way because it was necessary to make deductions for the various national funds such as the National Fund for Investment, of amortization and the national fund for the equalization of employment.

You are not unaware of the difficult conditions which our country

is still experiencing.

You are not unaware that there are workers like you who are still unemployed because of lack of jobs.

The sums deducted from the profits of self-management for the reconstruction of the country and for the creation of new jobs in barren regions are the expression of the solidarity of the workers and of national unity from the Aurès to Oranie and from the Kabylie to the Oasis.

This solidarity is a measure of the harmonious development of the nation as a whole and constitutes proof of the superiority of the socialist system over all other regimes.

The distribution of the profits is an event of capital importance.

What better homage could be rendered to those who produce than to place in their hands the fruit of their labor after they have been deprived of it by their exploiters of yesterday?

The event is of capital importance today because it constitutes the first fruit of our action in a sector vital to the economy of our country. In the same way it constitutes the best promise for future socialist harvests.

Algerian workers, forward to new victories for self-management. Long live socialism.

#### AN AFRICAN LEADER SCORES A POINT

Today's main problems tend to become polarized between the great powers. However, the situation is also characterized by the incapacity of the top leaderships to maintain strict control over all the forces that are bringing about the big transformations occurring in the world. Thus it is not without interest to stress the fact that certain forces, apparently insignificant in relation to the great powers, can express points of view and indicate tendencies of the highest importance.

For example, the president of the Republic of Guinea, Sekou Touré, the head of a quite small country, who began by saying "no" to de Gaulle, and who for a few years appeared to be among the vanguard in Africa, then went backward, recently wrote an article dealing with the question of peace. The article was published in Nouvelle Démocratie, a magazine edited by French Communist party leader Jacques Duclos but in which various fellow-travelers like P. Cot, exercise considerable influence.

The article appeared during Chou En-lai's tour of Africa. How-

ever, it is not clear whether it was written before or after he reached the continent. Whatever its connection with that, the article expresses a point of view that will certainly not sound alien to many African revolutionists.

Sekou Touré disputes the idea that peace "should concern only the great powers." And here is what he adds:

"If anyone thinks that the tripartite agreement on stopping nuclear tests in the atmosphere is determinant, Africa has the right -- Africa which is still under foreign domination -- to believe that the liquidation of Portuguese fascism and the South African dictatorship would better serve to guarantee world peace than the agreement in question. Because, after all, among the signatories of the agreement don't we find those who, under one pretext or another, continue to arm the mercenaries of Portugal and who are preparing to grant South Africa remote-control rockets? Such facts speak more eloquently to the peoples of Africa and to the conscious people of the whole world than does the Moscow tripartite agreement."

No one can accuse the government of Guinea of ambitions about having nuclear armaments. Sekou Touré's point of view flows directly from a realistic appreciation of the immediate dangers facing the peoples of Africa and those responsible for these dangers.

A statement like this one casts fresh light on the disputes at certain conferences of peace or youth organizations (like the Helsinki festival some three years ago) where the Chinese and Soviet representatives argued over the priority of tasks -- the struggle for world peace or the struggle against imperialism. Their quarrel also reflected genuine preoccupations among representatives of peoples who, if they have already gained formal political independence, understand how uncertain this remains.

#### A SURVIVOR RECALLS HOW STALIN LIQUIDATED CONGRESS DELEGATES

As part of the commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the seventeenth congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, the February 7 Pravda printed an article by Lev Shaumyan, one of the few survivors among the delegates. That congress was, in the phrase employed by Khrushchev in his report at the twentieth congress, the "victors'" congress; the victors being Stalin's faction after it had crushed all the opposition groups. But these "victors" found their victory particularly bitter in succeeding years. Stalin turned against his own followers and made a veritable hecatomb out of them while at the same time exterminating his defeated opponents.

Shaumyan cites the figures that Khrushchev placed before the twentieth congress. Out of 1,966 delegates to the 1934 congress, 1,108 were liquidated. Out of 139 members and alternates elected to the central committee, 98 fell victim.



The Pravda article also recalls that it was the assassination of Sergei Kirov, leader of the party in Leningrad, that served as Stalin's pretext to unleash the terror. Whereas Khrushchev in his speeches at the twentieth and twenty-second congresses, spoke only of troublesome and obscure circumstances surrounding the assassination, Shaumyan speaks of it as a "premeditated and carefully planned crime."

It would be interesting to know the "new" facts which led to the conclusion about Stalin's guilt. Trotsky showed at the time that the known facts pointed in this direction.

A real innovation in Shaumyan's article is his affirmation that among "some of the congress delegates. . . above all those who remembered Lenin's testament" the "idea was ripening that it was time to transfer Stalin from the post of general secretary to other work."

From all that is known up to now, there is nothing to indicate that there is any substance to the affirmation that the delegates considered any such proposal. It is known that in the Central Committee, as late as 1932 after the elimination of oppositionists, at a time of great difficulties in the countryside, Stalin was once placed in a minority. But he had overcome that situation. In 1934 Stalin's sweep was complete; no one disputed him. It is more likely that he had not forgotten what had occurred in 1932 and his congenital mistrust led him to believe that he could never be sure of his position with men who had passed through the fire of the Revolution. Hence the fearful purges which cut down his own followers as well as others in order to liquidate the old generations and place new men without a past in their place.

While Shaumyan speaks of the delegates, he doesn't name a single one, not even Khrushchev who took the floor at this congress to make a speech in which he did not fail to pay eloquent tribute to Stalin as the "leader of genius." In fact, among the flatterers, Khrushchev was among the most extravagant.

Shaumyan's article shows that "de-Stalinization" continues under the same conditions as before. The Khrushchevist leadership does not seek to bring out the complete truth regardless of whom it may affect, but doles out half truths bit by bit, hoping these will prove of immediate advantage. Khrushchev would like to dissociate the bureaucracy from its own past, from Stalin. This is an impossible task.

#### THERE'S-NO-DOUBT-ABOUT-THAT DEPARTMENT

"President Johnson needs time to study the world outside of the United States. We live in an enormously complex, revolutionary, profoundly disturbed age, and a very dangerous one. The President must understand this. It is a mistake to serve the American people soft soap instead of the strong medicine of harsh reality." -- Editorial in the New York Times February 15-16 [international edition].

### WORKS BY TROTSKY CIRCULATE IN ITALY

Books by Leon Trotsky are now circulating extensively in Italy and publishing houses are bringing out new editions quite frequently. Even the official publishing house of the Italian Communist party, brought out a general volume last year that included writings by Zinoviev, Bukharin and Stalin, and the complete text of Trotsky's Lessons of October.

Samonà and Savelli, a leftist publishing house, has just issued an Italian translation of Trotsky's Lenin\* in a beautifully bound edition (the cover has a reproduction of a Diego Rivera mural showing Lenin and Trotsky).

In addition, Sugar, a Milan publishing house, has announced that it will release an edition of Terrorism and Communism within a few days.

A new edition of the History of the Russian Revolution is expected to appear before the end of the year.

Lenin was presented to the public at a meeting in Rome sponsored by Samonà and Savelli on February 5. A large crowd attended composed mostly of young members of the Communist party and left-wing Socialists.

A talk was given on the book by Livio Maitan, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

---

\*For a copy send an international money order for 1,400 lire [\$2.25 U.S.] to Libreria Terzo Mondo, Via 24 Maggio 47, Rome.

### BELGIAN STUDENTS PROTEST INTERVENTION IN CYPRUS

BRUSSELS, Feb. 8 -- The Federation of Socialist Students of Belgium today protested the proposed inclusion of Belgian troops in a NATO force to be sent to Cyprus.

The Bureau of the organization said that it was opposed in principle to sending Belgian troops abroad, "particularly to Cyprus whose national problems are the affair of the Cypriotes themselves and not NATO."

The Socialist students added: "The pretended humanitarian arbitration by Great Britain conceals in actuality an attempt to utilize the Turkish minority to maintain Britain's position as arbiter and its strategic bases in the Mediterranean."

THE UN EXPEDITION TO ATLANTA

By Evelyn Sell

Twelve members of the United Nations Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities made an informal visit to Atlanta, Georgia, on January 26. They had been invited by the U.S. member of the subcommittee, Morris Abrams, who wanted them to see a Southern city which had worked successfully to solve interracial problems. The UN group saw a lot in Atlanta -- but not exactly what they were invited to see.

Intensive picketing of segregated businesses, clashes with the local Ku Klux Klan and mass arrests of Negro demonstrators had erupted during the days preceding the visit from the UN group. The demonstrations were led by the militant youth organization SNCC [Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee].

Abrams had asked John Lewis, national chairman of SNCC and one of the activists in Atlanta, to call off demonstrations while the UN visitors were in town. Lewis refused, telling Abrams that the civil-rights fighters would show the visitors "what Atlanta is really like."

Greeted at Airport

SNCC pickets greeted the UN group at the airport. The Negroes carried signs reading, "Welcome to a Segregated City" and "Atlanta's Image is a Fraud."

Later that day the visitors watched several hundred student demonstrators form for a march on downtown Atlanta to protest segregated restaurants. Some of the picket signs were designed especially for the UN observers, such as: "Atlanta Needs UN Help."

The UN group missed seeing the direct confrontations between SNCC demonstrators and the hooded and robed Ku Klux Klan members. The Klansmen picketed establishments that had desegregated their facilities.

While the UN visitors were being wined and dined by city officials, Klansmen and Negroes shouted taunts at each other and scuffled briefly in the street.

Four SNCC members were beaten by six white persons when they sought service in a segregated restaurant; and 84 Negroes were arrested.

What impression did all this make on the UN dignitaries? Most of them were reluctant to talk about the racial situation in Atlanta. However, the delegate from India, Sira Arcot Krishnaswami, said, "What has heartened me is the progress in Atlanta's racial situation through faith in the democratic ideas."

The UN group then flew back to New York and the Negroes of

Atlanta continued to struggle for democracy.

### No Moratorium on Segregation

On January 30, after five days of increasingly militant actions, the mayor of Atlanta called on civil-rights leaders to suspend demonstrations for thirty days.

The older more conservative Negro leaders were willing to accept a moratorium. They have insisted right along that the way to win equality is through peaceful negotiations with "well-meaning" white leaders. These negotiations, however, have done little to break down long-established segregation patterns in jobs, housing, schooling and public accommodations.

The younger more militant Negroes, led by SNCC, broke through the deadlocked negotiations between Negro leaders and white officials by staging demonstrations during the month of January. While the mayor was meeting with white and Negro leaders to discuss the moratorium on demonstrations, the young Negroes resumed picketing outside a downtown segregated restaurant.

Such actions on the part of the younger militants have forced Atlantans to grant concessions in an effort to blunt SNCC's all-out attack on discrimination and to give support to the conservative Negro leaders who can thus claim small victories for the methods of compromise and negotiation. It is obvious, however, that without the spur provided by SNCC's militancy, the old ways of life; that is, Jim Crow life, would have gone on in Atlanta forever.

A good example of a gain clearly ascribable to pressure created by SNCC was the change in policy towards a federal public accommodations law announced by The Atlanta Constitution, one of the South's leading newspapers, which had been dead set against civil-rights legislation to force businesses to desegregate. On January 21 the publishers printed an editorial entitled, "For a Public Accommodations Law; Against SNCC-Led Lawlessness."

The editors explained that they had believed that Atlanta businessmen could be persuaded to voluntarily end discrimination. Most good hotels and some restaurants had done so but most businesses had not, thereby "seriously jeopardizing the name and future of a city that others have labored, through many difficult adjustments to build. . . . Faced with the alternatives either of passing a Federal law or of seeing Atlanta further degraded and stripped of its ideal of fair play, this newspaper now endorses the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Bill and urges its prompt passage. Atlanta urgently needs it."

IN QUEBEC THE ARMORY RAID WAS NOT UNPOPULAR.

TORONTO, Feb. 7 -- One of the biggest arms robberies in Canadian history was pulled off in Montreal last week by six armed young men. The incident was headlined in the press and caused widespread speculation as to the identity and motives of the raiders.

They entered an armory through an open door, tied up eight persons and took four mortars, four bazookas, two machine guns, 59 semi-automatic rifles, 34 Bren guns and about 17,000 rounds of ammunition -- enough to start a small war according to one police official.

The city police director, while stating it was too early to speculate about the identity of the raiders, said he did not believe they were part of any organized criminal organization. He spoke reassuringly to Montrealers who might be jittery over the possibility of another wave of what the press refers to as "extremist terrorism."

[Last year a series of bombings caused considerable property damage and the death of a watchman.]

Troops have been moved in to guard the armories and the police stated that they were not sparing their own manpower in security operations.

La Presse, the French-language afternoon newspaper, said it received a telephone call telling of the theft from a man who said he was a member of the Comité Revolutionnaire du Quebec.

A French-language radio-station newscaster reported he had received a call from an unidentified person who told him that thirty armed men would march soon on the Bomarc missile base at La Macaza, Quebec.

To date the police have made no arrests. The student council of the French-speaking University of Montreal expressed concern at police questioning of thirty students there about the raid.

Although there is no evidence to support the conclusion, the tendency is rather widespread to ascribe the raid to one of the groups of revolutionary nationalist youth which have been forming in Quebec in the past couple of years.

Last fall members of the Front de Libération Quebecois [FLQ] were found guilty of exploding Molotov cocktails and dynamite to call attention to the cause of independence for Quebec. After being held incommunicado for a week, without a warrant or charge, some of them pleaded guilty. In the convictions, sentences ranged from six months to 12 years.

Quebec reaction to the FLQ case and the recent armory raid is typified by the comments of Abbé Jean-Paul Tremblay at a Catholic conference: "I express my admiration to those 20-year-old geese fretting

behind bars, imprisoned for having committed some foolish acts because they believed in French Canada. I salute their courage, and assure them that nothing is lost. On the contrary, all is assured."

Real Couette, leader of the Social Credit party in Quebec, a rightist grouping that seeks to capitalize on nationalist aspirations, said that the action of the armory raiders was "nothing compared with the butchery of French Canadian youth conscripted during World War II."

He added: "Is not the economic context in which we are living at this moment, is not the treatment inflicted on youths, the kind of treatment that would drive them to rise in revolt against any kind of established authority?"

Although the people of Quebec are no doubt disturbed by the death that resulted from the bombing, they support the aspirations of the youth for recognition and acceptance of the French Canadian nation and they seem pleased rather than otherwise over the success of an armory raid that mocked the army of "the English."

## NEHRU'S CONGRESS PARTY ROUTED IN GOA

### An Analysis of the Election Results

By Kailas Chandra

BOMBAY [Delayed] -- Prime Minister Nehru's Congress party was completely routed in the first "democratic" elections ever held in the former Portuguese pockets of Goa, Daman and Diu on December 9, 1963. The Maharashtrawadi Gomantak party [MGP], a coalition of dissident Congress members and Praja Socialists who advocated Goa's immediate merger with the neighboring state of Maharashtra, won a majority of 16 seats in the 30-member Goa-Daman-Diu assembly and both the seats for the Indian parliament. The United Goans party [UGP], a new formation which has advocated the status of a separate state for Goa within the Indian Union, won 12 seats in the assembly.

The Congress party, which contested all 30 seats to the assembly and both parliamentary seats, won only one place -- a lone uncontested seat from Daman, a small pocket in Gujarat state.

Of a total electorate of 350,039, those voting were listed at 260,372. The Maharashtrawadi Gomantak secured nearly 110,000 votes; its principal opposition, the United Goans, 74,081; the Congress party, 43,100 (eighteen Congress party candidates forfeited their deposits); independents, some 17,000. A high number of invalid votes were cast -- 10,837 -- a consequence of illiteracy among voters.

The "Frente Popular," sponsored by the Communist party, ran eight candidates and secured only 4,589 votes, winning no seat. The Commun-

ist party advocated the "gradual merger" of Goa with Maharashtra.

### Unpleasant Surprise for Nehru

The elections in Goa were an important barometer for the Congress party. In December 1961, the former Portuguese territories were integrated by the Indian government through a "police action." Two years later, the Congress party -- although recently organized in Goa -- made an all-out bid to win the elections. Its complete rout came as a big surprise even to its opponents.

The wound is a sore one but Congress party leaders can draw some consolation from the fact that although they lost the vote, the Goans showed that they favor closer integration with the Indian Union.

The smashing victory of the MGP leaves no doubt about the popular appeal of merging Goa with neighboring Maharashtra. Nehru, however, refused to concede this, claiming that "the majority" had not voted for merger. Technically, the MGP won only 45% of the vote. But some sections of the Congress party also advocated merger. However, the Union government may hold out for some time.

Dayanand Bandodkar, president of the Gomantak and now the leader elect of the Gomantak Assembly party (a small mine owner himself), has announced that the first act of the new assembly would be to pass a resolution demanding immediate merger of Goa with Maharashtra. (If Goa is merged with Maharashtra, the remaining two pockets of Daman and Diu will be merged with Gujarat.)

[The first session of the assembly held in January did not adopt a resolution on Goa's merger with Maharashtra. Under pressure from the Central government at New Delhi, Dayanand Bandodkar, chief minister of Goa, assured Nehru that he would not precipitate a crisis on the merger question at this time.]

In principle there is nothing wrong with maintaining that Goa should have the status of a Union territory, keeping its cultural entity, until the Goans themselves clearly show that they have decided otherwise. Nehru assured the Goans their right of self-determination when they were liberated from Portuguese imperialism.

### Damaging Blow to Congress Party

The Goa elections in themselves may not have any direct impact on the revolutionary movement in India; but the defeat of the ruling Congress party, at a time when popular discontent is rising against the regime, is bound to help inspire militant struggles of the masses.

Of course, the possibility of the victorious MGP joining the Congress party, should its demand for merger with Maharashtra be conceded, must not be ruled out. The United Goans party, a combination of former pro-Portuguese elements, is also bargaining for fusion with the Congress party on condition that the "status quo" be maintained

and that the former Portuguese pockets be treated as a separate "state" within the Indian Union.

What cost the Congress party so dearly was not so much the ambivalent, often contradictory, statements made by its leaders on Goa's future as their association with unpopular vested interests linked with Portuguese colonial rule before liberation.

Their talk about preserving the cultural entity of the Goans applied to the elite, the educated middle-class Goans who did not really suffer under the Portuguese.

The majority of Goans see things differently. To the semiserfs on the land, the agricultural laborers and underpaid mine workers who never enjoyed any legal protection against undue exploitation, merger with Maharashtra is attractive. They hope to benefit from the relatively progressive tenancy legislation and labor laws prevailing in Maharashtra.

Under Portuguese rule, government employees were treated as a privileged cast, a postman drawing a salary of Rs. 350 [one rupee = \$.21], and a bailiff Rs. 250. An agricultural worker could never hope to get even Rs. 15 a month.

This disparity in economic status still persists in Goa two years after liberation. The outmoded feudal land-tenure system perpetuated by the Portuguese still exists, too.

It appears that Goa with a population of 600,000 spends Rs. 2.50 crores [one crore = 10,000,000] on government administration; whereas the neighboring Ratnagiri district with double the population spends less than Rs. 50 lakhs [one lakh = 100,000]. The new commitments under a "democratic" set-up would raise the capital budget on administration alone by another Rs. one crore, thus foisting a top-heavy administrative apparatus on Goa, if the "status quo" continues.

It is in this context that the popular verdict of the Goans must be considered. In a situation like this, all parochial and communal sentiments are bound to be roused. Undoubtedly the electorate in Goa were divided into two major camps, along communal lines, the Catholics (who constitute 30% of the population) predominantly voting for the United Goans and the majority of Hindus voting for MGP. On religious grounds, the Catholics received preferential treatment under the Portuguese.

### Regional Interests

Regional chauvinism was an unhealthy aspect of the campaign. This was worked up by elements under the influence of middle-class parties and regional bourgeois interests in the neighboring states of Maharashtra and Mysore who are eyeing the rich mineral resources of Goa and therefore want an immediate merger. The big bourgeois interests of India would prefer continued central administration for Goa.



At election meetings addressed by Defense Minister Y. B. Chavan, a pertinent question was repeatedly put to him: "One hundred and five persons had to be offered as martyrs to the Congress to secure the linguistic state of united Maharashtra. Tell us how many would be needed to secure Goa's merger with Maharashtra?"

Chavan, who is a Maharashtrian and represents the regional aspirations of the Maharashtrian bourgeoisie and rich peasants, finally responded at the end of his election tour in Panjim with the categorical statement that an overwhelming majority of Goans favor merger with Maharashtra. This cut right across the campaign statements of other Congress leaders like Morarji Desai and S. K. Patil (both known to be trusted representatives of big business) in favor of a Union territory status for Goa.

Chavan's declaration tilted the balance in favor of the "mergerists" and led to polarization of popular sentiment on an issue that was made to look crucial for the future of the Goans.

The outcome of the Goa elections has evoked a strange reaction from the other neighboring state of Mysore. The Congress party government in Mysore, under pressure of the regional bourgeoisie, has protested against the move to merge Goa with Maharashtra.

#### Stand of Left-Wing Parties

Unfortunately, the left in India has forgotten its class and ideological loyalties. The traditional left parties, like the Communist party of India, the Socialist party and the Praja Socialist party, have behaved like local patriots on disputes arising out of border adjustments between Indian states.

On the conflict between Maharashtra and Mysore, for example, these petty-bourgeois leftists on either side of the border acted like stooges of the regional bourgeois interests and not like Communists and Socialists who have an international outlook.

Their attitude has been similar in the dispute over the allocation of water from the two major rivers, Godavari and Krishna flowing through the South Indian states.

That is why the working-class and left parties which led powerful democratic movements for reorganization of states on a linguistic basis could not use these movements to further the cause of socialism. They were caught in the tow of regional bourgeois interests.

One cardinal principle in all these disputes, forgotten both by the "right" and the "left" parties in this country, is the inherent right of the people of a particular territory to democratically determining their own juridical set-up. The popular decision of the majority should be binding on all. Leftists, at least, who stand for the unity of all the toilers should have held firmly to this basic principle.

In the absence of militant class struggles of the proletariat,

however, regional chauvinism has found an exaggerated expression in India in the recent period.

So far as the future of Goa is concerned, the outcome of the December 9 elections is a positive indication. The Goans, who speak Konkani, a dialect closely allied to Marathi, are close culturally and socially to Maharashtra. A majority of them desire to be integrated with Maharashtra.

They should be allowed to determine their future with but one proviso: the rights of linguistic or religious minorities should be fully protected by the majority.

### NEW FRONTIER BREAKS THROUGH WHITE HOUSE WINDOW

When Lyndon Johnson took over Kennedy's desk, he swore that he would carry on the "New Frontier." Johnson has kept his word. In fact, displaying true pioneer spirit, he has enlarged and expanded on the Kennedy heritage.

The new pinnacle was achieved February 4 when Johnson announced the appointment of Dr. Eric F. Goldman as a White House consultant. Goldman's "main job" will be to bring in new ideas from wherever he can find them. This, Johnson's aides announced, is a "unique approach to channel the nation's best thinking to the White House." Johnson "wants to insure a wide-open window for new ideas." He "doesn't want a good idea not to reach the proper hands."

In keeping with Johnson's sweeping vision, Goldman is to serve without pay. To earn his bread and butter, he will continue teaching history at Princeton.

Here's our "good idea" this week for the open window: Put Goldman in touch with Herman Kahn and his staff of 35 at Hudson Institute, who are running a "think factory" -- at a cost to the U.S. government of \$1,000,000 a year -- to systematically explore all possible outcomes of the nuclear arms race.

Some remarkable ideas have been fathered in the "think factory." For instance, in 1961 Kahn said that if he were given \$10,000,000,000, he would, in less than ten years, build a "doomsday machine" which "if detonated would destroy everything in the world."

There's an idea for Goldman to marvel at as he leans out of that window in the White House on his days off from Princeton!

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

Directeur-Gérant: Pierre FRANK.