

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 10

March 6, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2^e

In this issue:

Page

"Critical Support" for Whom? -- By Joseph Hansen.....	1
The Coming FLN Congress in Algeria -- By L. Couturier.....	3
A Victory for Both the Kurds and Nasser -- By A. Said.....	7
London Council Elections -- Omen of the Future? By John Powell	8
No Crime to Return from Cuba -- By Ruth Porter.....	10
Canadian Students Support Indiana Witch-Hunt Victims By Catherine Scott.....	11
The Political Shift in Bolivia	12
New Revolutionary Party Formed in Chile.....	15
Can You Shame India into Communism? (S. A. Dange Turns to "Mass Fasting") -- By Kailas Chandra	18
The UN Ponders South Africa -- By Franz J. T. Lee	20
We Are Gratified and Considerably Surprised	23

"CRITICAL SUPPORT" FOR WHOM?

By Joseph Hansen

A seventh long article replying to the July 14 "open letter" of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union appeared in the Peking Review of February 7. Like the previous six, the polemical piece was prepared by the joint editorial departments of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi. It is titled "The Leaders of the C.P.S.U. Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times."

This is an important installment in the series, as it bears down heavily on the responsibility of Khrushchev for the deepening division between Peking and Moscow and its repercussions among Communist parties throughout the world. We hope to provide a close analysis of its arguments and its meaning in the near future. For the time being we call attention to a peculiarity that has appeared in previous articles in the same series. Many of the arguments echo charges made by the Trotskyists against the heads of the Soviet bureaucracy for

decades, but they are advanced in guise of defending -- Stalin!

We call special attention to the following contention:

"The Trotskyites, who have long been politically bankrupt, are among those applauding the leaders of the C.P.S.U. The former actively support the latter on such fundamental issues as the attitude one should take towards Stalin, towards U.S. imperialism and towards the Yugoslav revisionists. They say, 'The situation created by the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and still more by the Twenty-Second Congress is eminently favourable for the revival of our movement in the workers states themselves.' 'We have prepared for this for more than 25 years. Now we must move in, and move energetically.' 'In relation to the Khrushchov tendency, we will give a critical support to its struggle for destalinization against the more conservative tendencies.'

"Just consider! All the enemies of revolution support the leaders of the C.P.S.U. with alacrity. The reason is that they have found a common language with the leaders of the C.P.S.U. in their approach to Marxism-Leninism and world revolution, and that the revisionist and divisive line of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. meets the counter-revolutionary needs of U.S. imperialism."

The three quotations cited by the authors appear to read in logical continuity. But as the authors indicate, they are taken from a 1956 document of the Socialist Workers party of the U.S.A., a document written five years later by the International Secretariat of the Fourth International, and a 1963 document of the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International.

We will not stop here to put these quotations into context. The amount of reading which the authors had to undertake to find them is proof enough that they are aware of the true position of the world Trotskyist movement and that they deliberately sought to falsify it. This, we agree, is in the tradition of Stalin, but not in the tradition of either Marxism, Leninism, or the simple truth. The fact is that the Trotskyist movement, from the beginning, has offered critical support -- not to the Khrushchevists -- but to the Chinese.

This is well known throughout the radical movement and far beyond. When the Khrushchevists call attention to it, they are not lying, although few people in this world, as the Chinese should well know by now, are more given to lies and slander. [See the attacks on the Trotskyists by Izvestia, etc., reported in World Outlook September 27, October 4, November 8 and 22.]

Nevertheless, there is a grain of truth in the conviction of the editorial boards of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi that Khrushchev enjoys critical support from the Trotskyist quarter. For their next installment we offer them the following sentences for quotation, saving them the drudgery of combing through Trotskyist publications for the past eight years in search of something juicier:

"The Trotskyists have hailed the process of de-Stalinization in the Soviet Union and other workers states; their main complaint is that it has not gone fast enough or far enough and that this confirms Trotsky's position that it will require a political revolution to restore the program of Leninism in the first workers state."

And here is another juicy sentence with the quotation marks likewise already provided: "As against those who seek to restore the worst totalitarian practices of the dark days of Stalin, the Trotskyists have repeatedly declared they stand for critical support to Khrushchev."

We hope that in return for our willingness to provide such perfect quotations, that our friends responsible for Renmin Ribao and Hongqi will use them in their next article.

But we would also appreciate it if they would explain to their audience why it is that on a world scale, in the Sino-Soviet conflict, the Trotskyists consider the Chinese side the more progressive. Here are a few sentences offered for this purpose, with the quotation marks again provided to save the editors of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi time and effort:

"The Trotskyists consider it a slander to say that Yugoslavia is a capitalist country. They also think it is absurd and unworthy of revolutionists to grovel before the shade of the hated dictator Stalin. They sharply disagree with the Chinese on these two points as well as on a number of others. But in reaffirming the primacy of the international class struggle, the importance of the colonial revolution, the need to discard illusions about a 'parliamentary' road to a socialist victory, the need after coming to power to establish socialist political and economic forms, the advisability of having no confidence in the class enemy, and the necessity to oppose American imperialism as enemy No. 1, as well as on other points, the Trotskyists think the Chinese have done the international revolutionary Marxist movement a great service and in this they offer them critical support."

THE COMING FLN CONGRESS IN ALGERIA

By L. Couturier

The congress of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] is scheduled to be held in about two months. The Algerian press is publishing articles and letters from readers on the future congress. The December 13 issue of Le Peuple featured the "Program of Work for the Preparatory Commission of the Congress of the FLN." [See World Outlook January 3.] In September President Ben Bella promulgated a constitution in which article 23 reads: "The FLN is the sole vanguard party in Algeria." Article 24 specifies: "The National Liberation Front defines the policy of the nation and inspires the action of the state. It controls the action of the National Assembly and the

Government." There is really no need to search through Algerian texts; the three letters "FLN" crossed the borders of Algeria many years ago to win the hearts of the exploited throughout the world.

Yet it is necessary to recognize the facts -- the FLN defined by the Algerian constitution, which the militants are discussing -- this FLN does not exist.

What actually exists under this name is a narrow organization composed of militants whose links with the masses vary according to place but which are generally thin. For example, among the three hundred workers of the Laimeche Ali co-operative of Tizi-Rached, in Kabylie, there are four party members although this is a "pilot" co-operative requiring a militant background for those who work there.

To say that the FLN, a vanguard revolutionary party, does not exist, is admitted, moreover, by most Algerian militants. They speak about "creating the party of tomorrow," about a "new FLN," in brief of upsetting what exists while retaining the respected name.

Prisoners of Old Concepts

The reasons that brought about the liquidation of the Front are multiple. They were analyzed with great depth and lucidity in the Tripoli program. The leaders were unable to pass beyond the immediate stage of the armed struggle and diplomatic battle. While the peasant, in the course of combat, progressed rapidly on the political level and presented more and more revolutionary demands, the leadership remained prisoner to military-bureaucratic concepts and did not arm the militants ideologically. Thus came into operation the fusion, calamitous for all revolutions, between the political organization and the state apparatus -- it took the form of the disappearance of the FLN in the GPRA [Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic] and its various extensions abroad and in the ALN [National Liberation Army] at home.

With the winning of independence, the diplomatic and military tasks were displaced by the pressing need to construct a new state and a new society. Political militants were needed, united by a common ideology in the framework of a dynamic organization. The Tripoli program bitterly observed: "The sole reason for the existence of a party is its ideology. It ceases to exist as soon as it comes to lack one."

The penalty was the crisis of the summer of 1962 and the confusion of many militants.

The pressure of the peasant masses was such that the wing most closely linked to them triumphed. Ben Bella took leadership of the country and began a socialist policy by reinforcing and "legalizing" the Management Committees which appeared spontaneously after the departure of the Europeans.

But the difficulties remained enormous whether they concerned

the smooth functioning of Self-management, the problem of unemployment, the development of industry or sabotage by the bourgeois elements or Pieds-Noirs [the French born in Algeria]. The Kabyle crisis was an indication although it remained quite isolated; the demonstrations in Oran were another quite worrisome indication, showing that elements opposed to the present course could find a certain climate for growth.

Need for Bold Advance

In such a situation, a revolutionary power can grow stronger only by advancing, by paralyzing those in the opposition who have deep social roots. Thus the reply to the "Kabyle rebellion" was the nationalization of wide areas of land. Such measures, however, should not be decreed empirically, under the direct pressure of passing events. What is necessary is a short and long-range plan in order to determine priorities and so that the masses can participate in a conscious way in constructing a new society.

To carry out a plan integrated in the Algerian reality, to be able to draw the peasants and the workers into undertaking it, a party linked to them is needed. Thus the great importance of the coming congress of the FLN, and above all its preparation.

Little is known at the moment about the documents to be submitted to the delegates, but from the program of work for the preparatory commission, there is every reason to believe that they have a resolute socialist outlook.

* * *

Whatever its formulation may be, the program defends a socialist line. But then in Algeria to have any audience you have to be socialist. That is why everything definitively depends on the way in which it will be applied; that is, the structure, the composition of the FLN assumes great importance. The best resolutions can be sabotaged by defective or provocative application. But the only guarantee that the line defined by the congress will be actually applied resides in the organization of a party democratically linked to the masses, drawing from them its strength and dynamism.

Danger of Bureaucratism

The big danger faced by the Algerian Revolution comes less from the big bourgeoisie, whose weakness is well known, than from the bureaucracy which every victorious revolution necessarily secretes. All the more so in a country of low economic level where there exists a not inconsiderable layer of small merchants, employees, intellectuals, aspiring to play a more important role than under the French occupation.

Even those who are not of petty-bourgeois social origin can change insofar as leadership posts entrusted to them by the revolution go to their heads, they acquire a taste for power, for the commodities that become available, and they cut themselves off from the people.

They become bureaucrats.

These bureaucrats exist in great number in Algeria and the struggle at the Congress will be conducted against them. That is, if they are unable to "manipulate" the congress by the methods well known in our countries of Europe and if the voices of the genuine militants ring out.

This means that it is necessary to attach great importance to the way in which the delegates are selected. In the Algerian press, many letters from readers demand that the delegates be elected by their fellow workers or by the inhabitants of the village and that the two criteria should be actual participation in the war for freedom and their attitude toward self-management and the present socialist line. This way of proceeding seems eminently desirable to us and could even be extended to designate those who are to be members of the FLN before they proceed to elect their leaders.

Problem of Democracy

We have not insisted on a certain number of ideas which appear still insufficiently elaborated in the Algerian documents dealing with the party. How democratic will the internal life of the single party be? How can those be heard who have other ideas on the problems of tactics or strategy? How can the construction of a socialist society be reconciled with the desire to achieve a new unity among "all the people," "like during the war"? How to assure close ties between the party, the poor peasants and the workers?

All these questions are posed and will certainly be discussed at the congress. The latest issues of Révolution Africaine show that the Algerian militants have already begun to study them and that the struggle against the bureaucratic degeneration of the party and the state remains one of their major concerns.

We do not believe that the congress will have a magic effect and that from the present void will spring a party ideologically solid and linked to the masses. The party will be built day by day in the course of socialist construction, winning little by little the best militants who are now scattered. But in the same way that a successful birth can augur favorably for the development of an infant, so a democratic, representative congress will assure a good send-off for the revolutionary vanguard party of the new Algeria.

MOMENT OF TRUTH

Cassius Clay after winning heavy-weight championship: "I don't like to fight. I don't like to get hurt. I don't like to hurt anybody. I only fight to make a living and when I have enough money I won't fight anymore."

A VICTORY FOR BOTH THE KURDS AND NASSER

By A. Said

After much agony, destruction and bloodshed, the war against the Kurds of Iraq came to an end February 10 and the Kurds were assured of their "national rights in the framework of the national unity of Iraq."

It is a victory not only for the insurgent Kurdish people, but for the anti-imperialist movement of the whole Arabic East.

The war waged by the rulers of Iraq against the Kurdish people divided the forces of the anti-imperialist movement in this area and embroiled the Arabic and Kurdish freedom movements. It also caused the Iraqi rulers to co-operate with SEATO (Turkey, Iran, Great Britain). Israel, too, took a benevolent attitude toward this war because it weakened the whole Arabic nation in its struggle for freedom and development.

Nasser and Ben Bella, who understood the problem very well, had advised the Baath government in Iraq to recognize the rights and demands of the Kurds. But the Baathists, who were relying on Iraqi chauvinist forces, refused to follow this advice and launched the dirty war against the Kurds.

The overthrow of the Baath regime and the prominence of Nasserite forces in the one that replaced it, made it possible for the Iraqi government to take a new look at the Kurdish problem.

In the upsurge of November 18, 1963, against the Baathists, besides the pro-Nasserites led by Abdal Aref, strong forces of the old regime of Nur el-Said participated. These included military people of the British school, high civil servants of the old state apparatus, and friends and allies of the big landowners and compradores. These still remain in the government.

Consequently ruling circles are torn between the pro-Nasserite tendency led by Aref and the most conscious neocolonialist tendency represented by pro-imperialist elements of the army and the state machinery. The solution of the Kurdish problem hinges on the outcome of this struggle.

Public opinion in Iraq was not sympathetic with the war against the Kurds nor with the rulers who oppress Arabs as well as the Kurds. The early bankruptcy of the Baathist regime encouraged a mass movement which was met by repressive measures against the Nasserites and the Communists.

The summit conference of the rulers of the Arab countries in Cairo was essentially a test of the relative influence of Nasser and the Baathists in the Arab world. The result was defeat of the Baath and a decisive victory for the Nasser line. This was decisive for

Iraq, too. Without any doubt, the step taken by Aref concerning the Kurdish problem was a direct consequence of this conference and a component of the general strategic line of the Arab movement elaborated there.

Aref's step was thus greeted with enthusiasm in Egypt and Abdel el Nasser immediately congratulated Aref. At the same time, the Baath apparatus in Syria, where it is still ruling, started a campaign against the Iraqi regime. In press commentaries and editorials it charged Iraq with granting secret conditions to the Kurds.

The step taken by Aref towards the solution of the Kurdish problem is nevertheless only a beginning of his new policy. In the near future one can expect other steps in order to adjust the Iraqi policy to the general Nasser line.

LONDON COUNCIL ELECTIONS -- OMEN OF THE FUTURE?

By John Powell

LONDON, Feb. 21 -- Now that Sir Alec Douglas Home has written off a March general election as a "practical proposition" -- the next decisive, electoral contest will take place on April 9.

On that day will be held the first elections for the newly created Greater London Council, which will replace the existing London County Council, the Middlesex County Council, and the Metropolitan portions of the counties of Kent, Essex, Surrey and Hertfordshire.

The significance of these elections, nationally and internationally, is greater than is perhaps generally realised.

Since 1934, the London County Council, one of the largest local authorities in the world has been run by a Labour majority. This Labour majority rule has remained a constant reminder to the government at Westminster that London remained loyal to Labour despite the electoral shifts nationally. The Conservative government, which had chalked up three electoral victories in the postwar period, were determined to cap their successes with the greatest prize of all -- the recapture of London for the Tory cause.

In 1961, with a divided Labour party still reeling from the 1959 electoral defeat, and demoralised in part by the Gaitskellite attack on the unilateralists* and Clause Four** -- the London Tories

*The "unilateralists" advocate giving up nuclear weapons without waiting for "the enemy" to do so first.

**"Clause Four" affirms Labour's commitment to nationalisation of industry.

were all set for a victory at County Hall. In a bitterly fought contest, the Labour party held its commanding position, winning by 84 to 42, the last position (1958) being 101 to 25.

It was this rebuff which spurred the Tories to press on with legislation to liquidate the London County Council, even though many surrounding areas (Tory controlled) had to be sacrificed in the process.

The purpose of the re-arrangement of local government in the new Greater London area was to fix and gerrymander a permanent Tory majority by redrawing the boundaries of London -- the suburban parts of London tending to be conservative and middle class.

The London Government Bill was bitterly fought by the Labour party, as the social services -- housing, education, children's, welfare, etc., were to be broken up and handed over to the local new boroughs (the lower unit of local authority). In many cases this meant handing education and housing to a Tory borough, with all the consequent disruption that this would entail.

Now the die is cast. On April 9, one hundred Greater London Councillors are to be elected over an area seven times larger than the existing London County Council area, containing one-fifth of the population of England and Wales (8,500,000 people) and embracing 105 Parliamentary constituencies.

The Little General Election, as it is now being called, may well end in a Labour victory, despite the gerrymandering. If so, as the Evening Standard pointed out in an article on January 23, "it's curtains for Sir Alec."

It is interesting to note that when Herbert Morrison led Labour to victory in 1934 on the London County Council for the first time, coming as it did after the 1931 Ramsay MacDonald debacle, the news reached the Viennese workers who were then engaged in a mortal combat with their local fascists, and they were greatly encouraged in their struggle.

A Labour victory in 1964, too, could have similar significance. A Labour Greater London poses the question urgently and sharply of Labour to power nationally on a socialist, Clause Four programme. This has both European and international implications -- which fact has not been lost on the British ruling class.

NOT ENOUGH TO MAKE UP FOR THE TAINT

Ten Scotsmen hiked 14 miles through rugged mountains, worked all night in an open boat in stormy seas to secure two loose U.S. torpedoes worth \$80,000 and were rewarded a total of \$98 by the U.S. Navy. They returned the money as an "insult."

NO CRIME TO RETURN FROM CUBA

By Ruth Porter

NEW YORK, Feb. 23 -- Thanks to the courage, tenacity and integrity of Negro reporter William Worthy, on February 20 the travel ban provisions of the reactionary McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 were declared unconstitutional.

In a unanimous and history-making decision, a three-judge panel of the Fifth Circuit United States Court of Appeals reversed Mr. Worthy's conviction and three-month prison sentence for re-entering the land of his birth "without bearing a valid passport." The Court rejected the idea "that a citizen, absent from his country, can have his fundamental right to have free ingress [entry] thereto subject to criminal penalty if he does not have a passport. . . . The government cannot say to its citizen, standing beyond its border, that his re-entry into the land of his allegiance is a criminal offense." The Union of South Africa is the only other country known to jail citizens for coming home without a passport.

Mr. Worthy, foreign correspondent for the Baltimore (Maryland) Afro-American, has long been challenging the constitutionality of the State Department travel bans. His passport was lifted in 1957 after he defied the State Department's ban on travel to China. Mr. Worthy rejected the Government's offer of a new passport if he would sign an oath promising in the future to abide by "geographical restrictions" decreed by the State Department.

The present case resulted from Mr. Worthy's "unauthorized" 1961 trip to Cuba, which is also out-of-bounds to U.S. citizens. Since the charges filed against him on his return were the first brought by the government against a native-born citizen for re-entering the country, it is widely believed that they stemmed from the generally favorable news dispatches filed from Cuba by Mr. Worthy.

The Johnson administration is expected to authorize Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to appeal the decision to the Supreme Court. Kennedy initiated the prosecution in 1962 while his brother was President.

The following statement to the press was released by Mr. Worthy after the Appeals Court reversed his conviction and sentence:

"Because of the growing agitation against the travel bans by newsmen, students, scholars and other citizens, I had long hoped that the Fifth Circuit judges would not blanch in the face of these arbitrary and unconstitutional executive decrees.

"I am happy that my optimism was warranted. It remains to be seen if, on the public's right to know and to travel, the Johnson administration will be more enlightened than its three predecessors. The rest of the world will be greatly heartened if President Johnson

gracefully drops this absurd and unprecedented criminal prosecution. He, Mr. Rusk and Attorney General Kennedy should proclaim that the American people, including newsmen, are free to go where they wish, in order to see for themselves what is happening in countries momentarily out of favor in Washington."

CANADIAN STUDENTS SUPPORT INDIANA WITCH-HUNT VICTIMS

By Catherine Scott

TORONTO, Feb. 20 -- The Canadian academic community has given full and vigorous support to three student victims of the current witch-hunt in Bloomington, Indiana. A Canadian branch of the National Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students has been set up and many professors have agreed to act as sponsors for the committee.

Tom Morgan, Jim Bingham and Ralph Levitt were charged under an anti-Communist Indiana law and face two to six years in prison if found guilty. The charge is based on a speech given on campus March 25, 1963, by Leroy McRae, a Negro and National Organizational Secretary of the Young Socialist Alliance. McRae spoke in favour of self-defense for Negroes in situations where the police condone violence against them.

Local Prosecutor Thomas Hoadley interpreted this to mean advocating "violent overthrow" of the government.

The speaker was not indicted but three of the officers of the Young Socialist Alliance, which sponsored the meeting, were charged.

Tom Morgan visited three Ontario universities from February 2 to 8. His meeting at the University of Toronto was sponsored jointly by the Students Administrative Council, the Student Christian Movement and the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. It was attended by 225 students and faculty members who contributed \$135.

A collection of \$105 was raised at the meeting at York University where 135 students attended out of an enrollment of 500.

At the University of Waterloo, 35 students attended a meeting sponsored by the local Student Christian Movement and gave \$33.

Morgan obtained three radio interviews as well.

A Toronto Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students has been set up with Douglas Ward as chairman. Ward is president of the Student's Administrative Council and is currently arranging meetings for the indicted students in Montreal. He has issued an appeal to all student leaders, student governments and professors across Canada for sponsorship and financial aid.

Sponsors of the National Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students include Bertrand Russell; Linus Pauling; James Baldwin, American Negro author; and John Lewis, Chairman of SNCC [Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee]. In Canada, many professors have registered support for the committee including Prof. H. Northrop Frye, principal of Victoria College; Prof. G. Tatham, the Dean of Students at York University and Prof. R. M. H. Sheppard, Registrar of University College.

[For more information about this important case write to the National Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students, P.O.Box 213, Cooper Station, New York 3, New York.]

THE POLITICAL SHIFT IN BOLIVIA

LA PAZ, Bolivia, Feb. 20 -- The situation in the country, now that the struggle for the presidency is underway, has become more and more tense, with deep differences appearing, not only among the most important political groupings but also inside them. The struggle between Paz Estenssoro and Juan Lechín, who were former allies, is assuming greater and greater political and social significance, going far beyond their individual quarrel. This is rounded out and complicated by the often violent struggles in which the different tendencies or factions of their partisans have become engaged.

The recent congress of the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario], which was reported in World Outlook February 7, was an important event from several angles which are well worth considering more closely if only briefly.

First of all, in the opinion of competent observers of Bolivian politics, it was Paz in reality who pressed for the break, deliberately seeking to split the party and oust Lechín. Why did he do this?

Lechín, it is said in leftist circles in Bolivia, played a role in the MNR as long as the worker and peasant masses actively followed this party, as long as it reflected, if only in a distorted way, the interests of these popular layers. Under these conditions, he could continue to play with the right wing. He obtained control of a part of the state apparatus and he enjoyed a certain number of privileges.

But as soon as the masses left the MNR, Lechín was suspended in midair. The reactionary right wing gained complete control of the MNR, which seized all the key positions in the state and the party, refusing to share power with Lechinism, which, within the MNR itself, no longer represented anything.

In practice Lechín had become useless due to the fact that he was no longer capable of playing the role of a brake on the masses

in the name and in the interests of the MNR. The right wing no longer cared to pay the price it had paid in the past for Lechin and decided to finish with him, taking away all his positions and finally eliminating him from the party.

In the interests of his own cause, Paz Estenssoro has been seeking to "put together" a new left. This may be the significance of the formation of the "National Liberation Front" headed by Chavez Ortiz. [See World Outlook February 7.]

Despite the absence of the Lechinist left wing, the MNR congress witnessed an internal conflict of extreme violence which was settled through battles that included some wounded. The crucial question was the apparently secondary one of designating a vice-presidential candidate.

Three MNR Factions

The Estenssoro right wing, adhering to U.S. imperialism and working in close touch with the American embassy, was in fact absolute master of the congress, but it was divided in three factions.

The first was an ultraright tendency openly inspired by the army, which did not hesitate to organize "mass" demonstrations; namely, mobilizing in the streets employees of the military administration, conscripts in civilian clothes, women and peasants brought directly to the city. The candidate supported by this campaign, supported moreover by the Americans, was the air force general Barrientos Ortuño. The Minister of Labor has publicly denounced him as "the candidate of the Pentagon."

The second tendency, which expresses the particular interests of the bourgeoisie interested in exports from the eastern regions (Santa Cruz, Pando, Beni), rallied behind the candidacy of Senator Rubén Julio.

The third faction, the state and party apparatus, favored Federico Fortun, a confidant of Paz Estenssoro and executive secretary of the MNR. It was this third group, the most numerous at the congress, which finally carried the day. Fortun will thus be the candidate alongside Paz Estenssoro.

New Center of Polarization

The struggle opened by Paz and the right wing of the MNR to isolate and dump Lechin has nevertheless had consequences which its initiators did not foresee. Excluded from the MNR, Lechin, by force of circumstance was obliged to establish contact and liaison once again with the masses. Thus, no matter what his personal intentions may be, he is becoming a more and more powerful pole of attraction, a new polarizing center for the worker and peasant forces and certain advanced sectors of the petty bourgeoisie.

The scope and actual thrust of this process are not yet determinable. These will depend to a considerable degree on Lechin's attitude in coming weeks and months. However, it should be noted that some 40,000 miners have decided to follow him.

This has caused some alarm among certain layers of the MNR. Former president Hernán Siles Suazo has even suggested a compromise solution to save the unity of the party at the last minute. His solution envisages running two MNR candidates for the presidency. The voters could indicate their choice in the Uruguayan way ("lemas" and "sublemas" -- splitting their votes). As for the miners, they are out and out partisans of a new party.

Lechin has called a congress of his partisans in early March. But it is necessary to point out that in the Lechinist camp, too, there is serious dissension. First, there is a tendency that is not hostile to the proposal made by Siles Suazo; i.e., not to break with the MNR up and down the line. A different tendency, contrariwise, wishes to form a new party for which it is now preparing the statutes and the program. A name has already been chosen (Movimiento Izquierdista Revolucionario). Actually, in La Paz, the new party is held to already exist -- the tendency favoring a compromise with Siles has no possibility of winning.

"Stalinists" and "Trotskyists"

But even within the new party there will be an internal struggle which in practice has already begun. The real issue in the differences will soon be clear; it concerns strategy as well as tactics. In fact the militants who come under the label of "Lechinism" have different origins. Some are of "Stalinist" background; others are generally "Trotskyist." The first are more or less organized; they support Lechin unconditionally; they advocate revolution by stages and on a national democratic program. The others who are regarded as "Trotskyists," are not organized, yet represent a more advanced and more proletarian sector than the "Stalinists."

The "Stalinists" wish to get rid of the "Trotskyists" in order to establish control over Lechinism. Towards the end of January they demanded the expulsion of Ernesto Ayala Mercado, reputed to be a Trotskyist theoretician who is at present ambassador to Mexico. They accused him of "opportunism" and "wavering." The workers wing defended Ayala, explaining that other elements of the left have served in an official capacity at the government level and no one wanted to expel them for that reason. This was only a pretext, they contended. The expulsion did not take place. Lechin seems to be balancing between the two sectors.

Another important question with many implications is the favorable attitude displayed by bourgeois and "Stalinist" elements of Lechinism for a working alliance against Paz with the Bolivian Socialist Falange (a fascist-like rightist tendency) and Guevara Arze who headed a split from the MNR to the right a few years ago.

The congress of the Lechinist movement will thus be an event of great importance in the political life of Bolivia at this stage. Rightist and conservative elements do not hide their apprehension and there are even rumors in La Paz of a military coup to prevent it. It goes without saying, however, that such a measure would provoke an energetic answer from the masses and could precipitate a crisis.

NEW REVOLUTIONARY PARTY FORMED IN CHILE

SANTIAGO, Chile -- The Movimiento Revolucionario Comunista together with the grouping associated around Polémica with the Trotskyists of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario [POR] united to form a new Chilean party February 1. The new organization decided to continue the name "Movimiento Revolucionario Comunista" [MRC].

The original MRC group was composed of young students, workers and employees who were formerly members of the Communist party. With the development of the Chinese-Soviet conflict, they began to form a pro-China tendency about a year ago. Some of them broke with the CP; others were expelled; and others tried to stay in the CP to develop a left wing. The initial nucleus of the MRC was then formed. It published bulletins which attracted much attention in the bourgeois press and which were harshly attacked by the CP.

At the end of 1963, the MRC joined another pro-Chinese group, "Espartaco" [Spartacus], and the two groups staged a pro-Chinese meeting in the Teatro Baquedano which attracted a crowd of some 700 persons. This meeting was supported by the Trotskyists of the POR.

The two groups soon split, however. The reason for this was that the Espartaco group turned out to be both pro-Stalinist and pro-Chinese. Its membership was dominated by old bureaucrats, little interested in the national scene, who did not care to unite with other groups, who held anti-Trotskyist prejudices and whose main activity was the distribution of Chinese documents. The building of a revolutionary party was beyond them.

In view of this, the MRC broke with the Espartaco group and at the beginning of the year called for the unification of all revolutionary groups. The POR and Polémica accepted.

The Polémica group was made up of members who had left the organized Trotskyist movement for one reason or another and by others who had left the Communist and Socialist parties.

The POR was a Trotskyist group, linked to the working class, whose trade-union and political leaders are well known for their activities in defense of the Cuban Revolution. They have suffered police persecution for this in recent years. The Trotskyists joined the young Communists in their ideological struggle, offering them

help in their meetings and publications. This greatly facilitated the unification.

The new party has now been joined by Clotario Blest and his group. This is of great significance. Clotario Blest is the outstanding leader of the Chilean working class. He served as president of the confederation of trade unions for nine years and has been hauled into court many times for participating in demonstrations in behalf of the Cuban Revolution. He had previously joined with the POR in common actions.

The Revolutionary Communist Movement is based on Marxist-Leninist principles: Struggle for the defeat of the bourgeoisie and the installation of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a stage of transition in order to arrive at a classless society.

It rejects the Stalinist policy of class collaboration and supports the Cuban Revolution, attempting to draw the best lessons from it for the Chilean revolution.

The new party supports the most revolutionary and progressive Chinese positions in the Chinese-Soviet conflict (the problems of peaceful coexistence, support to the colonial revolutions, the revolutionary road versus the peaceful and parliamentary in order to achieve socialism, etc.).

This support to the Chinese revolutionary positions, appealing to the best militants who have appeared in the crisis of the Communist party, does not constitute unconditional support to all the Chinese positions. In order to make this clear, the Unification Plenum of the new party adopted a resolution against Stalinism as a political and organizational concept, and opposed the mistaken positions of the Chinese with regard to the Indonesian Communist party, and with regard to Yugoslavia which the Chinese contend is a capitalist state, etc.

As for national policy, the new Marxist-Leninist party is struggling for: (a) widening of the process of unification to include other revolutionary groups; (b) supporting with revolutionary methods the Allendista movement (Allende is the candidate of the Communist and Socialist parties for the presidency of Chile in September 1964 and is supported by most workers), attempting to develop a revolutionary tendency within this movement through rank-and-file Allendista revolutionary committees; (c) strengthening the ties between workers, unions, CUT [trade-union confederation], peasants, poor people, pro-Cuba committee, etc.; (d) improving the already existing links with rank-and-file Communists and Socialists.

The newspaper of the MRC is El Gallo Rojo [The Red Rooster], a biweekly of which three numbers have already appeared.

Some conclusions can be drawn from this experience:

(1) This is one of the first unifications between Trotskyists and revolutionary Communists to come out of the Chinese-Soviet crisis. It is proof that within the Communist parties pro-Chinese wings arise which rapidly evolve toward revolutionary Marxist positions without anti-Trotskyist prejudices and tending toward revolutionary regroupment without sectarianism. Such cases are of greater probability in countries or continents like Latin America where a rising revolutionary process exists.

(2) There are various pro-Chinese wings. Some evolve rapidly toward revolutionary Marxist positions, without anti-Trotskyist prejudices, especially those composed of young Communists who joined the Communist party after the twentieth congress and "de-Stalinization." Other pro-Chinese wings, on the contrary, become ossified in the old Stalinist positions, especially when they are led by Communist cadres educated in the Stalin era.

(3) The main question in the Chinese-Soviet dispute is the discussion on the peaceful versus revolutionary road. The Communist rank and filer who decides in favor of the Chinese position does not do it to defend Stalin but to reaffirm the revolutionary road. Primarily he sees in the Chinese the revolutionary road and in the Russians the peaceful and parliamentary road. This aspect is decisive for a strategy that attempts to win Communist militants and to construct a Leninist-Marxist party with mass influence.

(4) In Latin America, the pro-China wing which rose up in the Communist parties has been strongly influenced by the Cuban Revolution. Still more, in some cases these pro-Chinese wings were at the beginning pro-Cuban wings. This influence is decisive because the Cuban Revolution has stirred up new forces and revolutionary groups that tend toward revolutionary regroupment. Thus it is not strange that the pro-China wings that evolve most rapidly toward revolutionary Marxism, pose as an immediate objective the unification of the various revolutionary groups. In this sense, unification can occur -- it has already occurred in some countries -- between Communist groups that break with the Communist party and new organizations and forces brought forward by the Cuban Revolution.

(5) The unification of a Trotskyist group with rank-and-file Communists who break with the Communist party is possible to the extent that the Trotskyist group acts without sectarianism, trusting not so much to the Trotskyist label as to the program of the Fourth International, loyally supporting the Communists who break with their party without carrying on any dirty, splitting activities which might win this or that isolated militant, constantly carrying on common actions, not giving paternalistic advice, but acting together in the class struggle.

(6) In Latin America, an over-all strategy is required for the construction of Marxist-Leninist parties with mass influence. This strategy consists, in general, with the exception of certain countries, in the revolutionary regroupment of the Castroist currents, the Com-

munists who break due to the Chinese-Soviet crisis, Trotskyist groups, revolutionary trade-union sectors, militants who break with the Socialist party, and workers disillusioned with the petty-bourgeois nationalist movements. This regroupment -- which is not centrist but revolutionary -- can appear in its first phase as a United Revolutionary Front, leading later to the complete unification of the revolutionary forces.

CAN YOU SHAME INDIA INTO COMMUNISM?

S. A. Dange Turns to "Mass Fasting"

By Kailas Chandra

BOMBAY -- Leaders of the Communist-controlled AITUC [All India Trade Union Confederation] conducted a three-day "mass fasting" (beginning February 20) in important cities and towns "to press their demands which include reduction of prices of essential commodities by at least 25 per cent, further revision of the cost of living index, nationalisation of banking and state trading in food grains." Several hundred leaders of the AITUC all over India, including its president S. S. Mirajkar in Bombay, were among the "hunger strikers."

This "new" strategy of the CPI [Communist party of India], in reality a resort to the old "Gandhian" technique of exercising "moral pressure" on the capitalist class and its state by "self-suffering," in place of the classical weapons of class struggle such as demonstrations and strikes, came as a big surprise to the left movement. A section of the capitalist newspapers saw a "welcome change" in the "red tactics of class war" in favour of more "peaceful and constitutional" methods, although some of them discovered as usual a "sinister" game behind the "strategy."

The call for "mass fasting" is supposed to be the first phase of the AITUC's agitation against rising prices and taxes in the country. The second phase would be mainly demonstrations in front of industrial units on March 7, and the third and last phase would take the form of a "satyagraha" (a token demonstration) before Parliament House in New Delhi on April 6!

Why should the CPI which considers itself the vanguard party of the Indian working-class party resort to such discredited methods of struggle, especially at a time when the working class is prepared for militant action in support of their legitimate demands? Is this because the trade-union movement is so demoralised that it cannot think of strikes and other forms of mass demonstrations? Above all, what is the attitude of Marxists to the weapon of "hunger strikes" in the struggle of the exploited masses? These questions require clarification.

Just as the Marxists condemn "individual terrorism" because it places a premium on the "heroism of an individual" at the cost of the initiative of the masses (apart from the fact that terrorism is invariably used by the ruling capitalist class as a weapon to suppress popular struggles), Marxists also discard the technique of "hunger strikes" (except in extraordinary situations like protests in jails) as a weapon in the revolutionary struggle against capitalism.

As acts of individual "self-suffering," "hunger strikes" have the effect of disorganising mass movements, since the initiative passes from the masses in action against capitalism to the "self-suffering" individuals who are supposed to bring "moral pressure" on the exploiting classes. The result is that the masses are disoriented from their real course of conscious collective action which alone can bring about their "socialist liberation."

When capitalism inflicts hunger and starvation on millions of people, there is no reason why the "leaders" of the working class should impose starvation upon themselves! Nor can they expect capitalists to be moved by such token demonstrations of "suffering."

Mahatma Gandhi, as the leader of the national struggle against imperialism, utilised the weapon of "hunger strikes" deliberately as a pressure tactic. His basic objective was to bring pressure on imperialism to win concessions for the bourgeoisie while ensuring that the masses did not seize the initiative and carry the anti-imperialist movements beyond the limits in which he conceived them.

The bourgeois leadership of the national struggle, while seeking mass participation as a pressure weapon against imperialism, was mortally afraid of independent revolutionary action of the masses, which threatened even the indigenous propertied classes. In that context the so-called weapon of "nonviolence" and "individual satyagraha"* and "hunger strikes" had a special meaning as pressure weapons of the national bourgeoisie. Gandhi never hesitated to wind up his anti-imperialist mass struggles (Chouri-Choura shootings by the British police in 1922, Civil Disobedience movement in 1931-33, etc.) when the masses took the initiative in their own hands and transcended the limits imposed by him.

It appears that CPI leader S. A. Dange hopes to play in the working-class movement today the same role which Mahatma Gandhi played in the anti-imperialist movement, the role of a moderator of mass action. This ideally suits the present "class collaborationist" line of the Dangeite leadership of the CPI.

Dange with all his Marxist background knows that any united class action by workers even for their elementary trade-union demands

*"Satyagraha" means literally "Insistence on Truth," but as a part of the Gandhian struggle it assumed the meaning of token defiance of British laws.

has immense revolutionary potentialities in India at the present juncture. The Congress Government which runs a corrupt, backward capitalist state -- despite its protestations of "democratic socialism" -- cannot concede any major demands of the working class, nor can it solve any major problems of the Indian society, whether it be of "spiralling prices," or of raising production, or of a "living wage" for workers.

Whatever "concessions" the capitalists give to the workers in the form of slight increases in cost-of-living allowances or wages paid to workers are quickly overtaken by the rising prices manipulated by capitalist traders.

Fifteen years after independence, an unprecedented economic crisis has overtaken the capitalist economy in India, with its inevitable impact on the political, social, cultural and even moral sphere, a crisis that cannot be resolved within the matrix of a backward capitalist system. Only under systems based on social ownership of the means of production, only a socialist revolution accomplished through politically planned and conscious struggles of the working class and other exploited masses, can combat that crisis and pave the way for future progress.

Dange probably knows this but the limitations imposed on him by the present "class collaborationist" line of the CPI -- dictated again by the exigencies of the Khrushchev leadership trying to "peacefully coexist" with imperialism -- prevents him from launching a programme of bold mass action which alone can bring about a healthy polarisation of class forces in Indian society.

Dange wants to limit struggles of the masses, distort them and put them into a strait jacket of pressure tactics to win minor concessions from the ruling bourgeoisie. That explains his present role as a reformist trade unionist, a virtual saboteur of workers' strikes. The question, however, is how long the rank and file of the CPI, known for their heroic sacrifices in the cause of the working-class movement, are going to tolerate all this Dangeite humbug and stunts in the name of Communism.

THE UN PONDERERS SOUTH AFRICA

By Franz J. T. Lee

In accordance with the resolution of the Security Council of December 7, 1963, a group of independent experts from Sweden, England, Yugoslavia, Ghana and Tunisia was appointed by United Nations Secretary General U. Thant, to study the possibility of transforming South Africa into a multiracial state.

In January this delegation was refused entrance by the South

African Republic "as interfering in the internal affairs of the South African state."

Is such UN intervention "practicable"? Although a "multiracial" state in South Africa is practicable, yet this word has different connotations to a "freedom fighter" in Africa, a UN diplomat and an overseas investor.

The Afrikaander Nationalists have unleashed the blind forces of anarchy in South Africa. The police force has been turned into a lawless group. The Bantu chiefs have lost the support of the African population and have been handed firearms for use on the masses. With the last draconic laws, a permanent state of emergency hangs over the country. The whole population has lost respect for law. This breakdown of law has become a permanent feature and one of the expressions of the need for an immediate radical change.

Ever since Sharpeville, the oppressed and exploited masses have been aware of the immediate need for unity of action and a national united front for the liquidation of the present Herrenvolk state. In South Africa and South West Africa the "National Liberation Front" [NLF] uniting various democratic and socialistic organizations, has been formed. Recently the ANC [African National Congress], PAC [Pan-Africanist Congress], and CPSA [Communist Party of South Africa] have also decided to form a united front. The February 14 Spark states that "a basic unity of purpose and action among the forces of national liberation is necessary."

How determined the oppressed population is to win its freedom can be judged from the current witch-hunt trials in Cape Town, Pretoria, Pietermaritzburg, Port Elizabeth, Grahamstown and Bellville, where Dr. Alexander, Sisulu, Mandela and 188 others stand on trial, their lives at stake because of their political views.

In spite of the mass arrests of over 6,000 members of the NLF, PAC and ANC, the struggle has gained ground. Many formerly dormant sections of the population, including whites sincerely interested in the liberation cause, are showing an awakened interest in throwing off the yoke of apartheid, by means of a radical socio-economic transformation of the South African society, destroying the present status quo based on undemocratic principles, oppression and exploitation.

A head-on collision between the forces of liberation and the Herrenvolk government is thus inevitable. Thus far the mass movement has not put up a serious challenge to the rule of the Afrikaander nationalists; even the wave of sabotage is only a minor embarrassment, calculated to annoy the government. Having learned from their past errors, the real revolutionary forces in South Africa are preparing a revolution that out of necessity will effectively sweep away Afrikaander rule.

Afrikaander nationalism, however, is pushing on relentlessly

with its apartheid policy in the very teeth of history and era of imperialistic decline. Backed by a huge army, these nationalists are still the strongest political group and will be so for still quite a time. The Verwoerd regime is clearly hell-bent on NOT letting up the pressure on the mass movement and will not change its policy of complete political domination and complete exploitation of the nonwhite working class.

Now what do the UN diplomats and overseas investors fear?

The following South African advertisement in the Paris daily Le Monde, February 28 and March 3, 1963, provides an answer: "The 14,000 enterprises of South Africa have an annual production of 26,000,000,000 francs [\$5,200,000,000]. . . the economic situation of South Africa is stabilized, national income is high, living standards steadily increasing, industries in full swing, investments amount to 19,500,000,000 francs [\$3,900,000,000] and it has been calculated that American investments brought a 27 per cent profit per annum. . . Here everything smells of opportunity, development and wealth. . . Western Europe invested 3,948,500,000 francs [\$789,700,000] in South Africa."

The overseas investors as well as the domestic industrialists and mining magnates are fully alive to the fact that Afrikaander Nationalist rule is endangering the security of their investments (and sky-rocketing profits) more and more. The pressure from the mass of nonwhites -- who exist far below the breadline level because of low wages, lack of opportunity in all spheres of public life and lack of political rights -- has reached such a pitch that at least a top section of the mass movement must be bribed in order to release the tension and stabilize the very volatile and explosive situation.

In a nutshell, what is giving the diplomats at the UN sleepless nights is the fear that the coming revolution may sweep away capitalism and imperialism from South Africa. The longer Verwoerd resists change, the greater the possibility that this may occur. Cum grano salis, the real purpose of the UN Committee is to work out ways and means of transforming South Africa into a state that will protect the interests of foreign and domestic capital; concretely, a plan has to be devised to introduce a neocolonialist regime, without using violence, in South Africa.

The UN can avoid a murderous massacre and guarantee the economic balance of the West only if it sincerely considers the democratic aspirations of the black, brown, yellow and white masses. This seems a most unlikely outcome. But without it, intervention is doomed to catastrophic failure.

WE ARE GRATIFIED AND CONSIDERABLY SURPRISED

The first issue of World Outlook appeared last September 27. That's not very long ago. Yet our weekly news service has had a success much beyond our expectations.

It is true that the need for a service of this kind had long been felt and we were certain that it would prove useful. But we must confess that we hadn't expected such an enthusiastic response.

Of greatest interest to us is the number of individuals, particularly students, who have sent subscriptions together with letters of praise. Our idea was a service of limited circulation, used mostly by independent radical, socialist, labor, and colonial-liberation newspapers. The response in this area has been good; and from the number of World Outlook items that have appeared in many countries, some of them in newspapers or magazines of rather large circulation, we consider our undertaking to be a success. But the response of persons who want World Outlook for themselves as a source of news and ideas has surprised us. Many of them heard about World Outlook either indirectly or by word of mouth and sent in a subscription.

From our mail bag in the past couple of months, here are some typical comments:

Delhi: "I have been immensely pleased with World Outlook. The need for it has been, so to say, crying out for some time. I wish it all the success in its great work."

Iraq: "We are making big use of World Outlook. It is a great job."

Mexico: "We express our thanks and our congratulations for the interesting news and valuable analyses contained in World Outlook."

Germany: "The impression of World Outlook is really excellent."

Denmark: "This effort is very useful."

Toronto: "I went through back issues of World Outlook in order to write an article on Algeria. I was really surprised to see how easy it was to put together the material for a very good article covering the high spots. Those who have been writing the Algerian material have been doing a tremendous job."

Bombay: "World Outlook is serving a role that reminds me of Inprecorr in the twenties."

Colombo: "I look forward to World Outlook. I have cyclostyled Germain's article 'Back to Lenin' for sale."

Puerto Rico: An "interesting publication."

New Zealand: "I would like to subscribe. . . How long has World Outlook been in existence? Are past copies available?"

New York: "I am binding World Outlook for permanent file copies."

St. Paul, Minnesota: "We are tremendously interested in World Outlook here. It is very useful, especially the material on Algeria. The answer by Pierre Frank to Izvestia pleased me mightily. And Germain's answer to the Peking Review defense of Stalin was excellent."

Madison, Wisconsin: "It makes the bourgeois press seem unnecessary. . . . Your presentation and analysis of the Algerian Revolution has finally brought clarity to an extremely complex question. . . . I would like to have a complete file. . . ."

Bloomington, Indiana: "I am long overdue in sending you a note of appreciation for the publication of World Outlook. Over here we are quite enthusiastic about it."

* * *

We could quote many more similar comments. Most impressive of all to us, however, has been the number of subscriptions, since we are only too conscious of the fact that for many persons, especially students, the expenditure represents a financial sacrifice. This income, we report with the greatest pleasure, has made World Outlook self-sustaining up to now. That, we believe, has few precedents for this type of service in the radical movement.

Our thanks to all of you who have demonstrated in this most concrete way what you think of World Outlook. For our part, we will do our best to maintain the high standard in news reporting and analysis which we sought to meet in undertaking its publication.

IN COMING ISSUES

"The Black Muslims of America" -- a series by Evelyn Sell, World Outlook correspondent who has been reporting from the vantage point of Detroit on the Freedom Now struggle in the United States.

* * *

An appreciation of Deutscher's biography of Leon Trotsky by J. B. Stewart, who is unusually qualified to speak on certain sectors of the material covered in the monumental work.

And, of course, continued reports and articles by Marxist journalists and theoreticians on all continents.