

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 12

March 20, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

Biggest Rally in History of Brazil.....	1
First Campus "Sedition" Trial in U.S. (The Bloomington Case).....	3
Bertrand Russell Backs Bloomington Students.....	5
The Black Muslims Today [Part II] By Evelyn Sell.....	5
The Congress Party Makes A Bid to the Left By Kailas Chandra.....	9
Peruvian Leftists State Common Aims.....	12
New Democratic Party Red-Baits Canadian "Trotskyists" By Catherine Scott.....	14
Continental Congress to be Held in Montreal.....	16
Fate of Pietro Tresso Still Disturbs Italian Workers Movement -- By Livio Maitan.....	17
Eritreans Continue Their Struggle.....	20
Georg Lukacs Takes Up the Moscow-Peking Dispute By Fernand Charlier.....	21
Franco's Spain on Europe's Doorstep By Ramón Vazquez.....	25
Documents:	
Fourth International Denounces Rabat Verdict.....	29
Get U.S. Troops Out of Vietnam!.....	30

BIGGEST RALLY IN HISTORY OF BRAZIL

In Havana on February 21, Francisco Julião said that a "pre-revolutionary situation" has opened in Brazil. [See World Outlook February 28.]

That his observation may have been an accurate one was indicated by the rally held in Rio de Janeiro March 13. Most observers, said Irene Guimaraes, special correspondent of the Paris Le Monde, believed "it would go down in history as the most imposing mass demonstration ever held in Brazil up to now."

Some 200,000 persons, mostly workers, came hundreds of miles from all over Brazil to the rally sponsored by the trade unions.

The polarization of class forces is indicated by the fact that Carlos Lacerda, the reactionary governor of Guanabara, banned the meeting. It was protected from the governor's forces by 3,000 federal troops armed with rifles and machine guns and backed by tanks.

The meeting was addressed from a balcony by President João Goulart, who is moving to the left in order to keep control of the popular forces. Goulart told the huge crowd that this very day he had signed a decree expropriating all privately held uncultivated land on a six-mile strip on either side of all highways, railways and waterways in the country. [Only an estimated 2.8 per cent of private holdings will be affected.] These strips will go to landless peasants.

Goulart said he had also signed a decree expropriating the seven remaining privately owned oil refineries, and that before the day was out he would sign an "urban reform" law regulating rents.

The crowd roared its approval of the measures. Goulart admitted, however, that these were only token steps. To get a genuine agrarian reform, he said, it would be necessary to change the Constitution.

Warming up, Goulart demanded reform of the banking system and the right of the illiterate to vote. He attacked the church hierarchy, and he said that "if blood should ever flow in the struggle now being conducted for the reform of institutions, the responsibility will fall on the reactionary minorities who seek to defend certain impermissible privileges by any means."

[Point was given to these words when March 15 dispatches reported that Adhemar de Barros, governor of São Paulo state, said that he would use his 40,000 police to block any land seizures by federal authorities. Big landholders all over Brazil were reported threatening to fire on any peasants who may interpret the federal measures as a signal to move ahead and take the land.]

Goulart's brother-in-law Lionel Brizzola centered his speech at the rally against the federal congress, which is dominated almost completely by representatives of Brazil's feudalistic landholding oligarchy. He called for a Constituent Assembly and the establishment of a "truly democratic" government. The crowd responded with roars, "Close the parliament!"

Some people, said Le Monde's correspondent, stressed the odd resemblance of the rally of workers to "the big meetings of Mr. Fidel Castro."

"Perhaps it would be an exaggeration," he concluded, "to say that this Friday March 13 marked the rise of the curtain on the first act of the Brazilian revolution, but it was certainly the prelude."

The Bloomington Case

FIRST CAMPUS "SEDITION" TRIAL IN U.S. HISTORY

NEW YORK -- One of the most severe and repressive attacks on the constitutional rights of United States citizens is presently being conducted in the state of Indiana against the nation-wide socialist youth organization, the Young Socialist Alliance [YSA]. In Bloomington, Indiana, the seat of the state university, three officers of the local chapter of the YSA have been indicted, are out on bond and face two to six years in prison under the infamous Indiana Anti-Subversion Law.

This is the first time in U.S. history that students have been charged with sedition for their activities on a university campus. The results of this case will be of crucial significance to the future of the post-McCarthy generation of students that has begun to stir in support of the Negro people's struggle, the Cuban and other colonial revolutions and social justice in general.

Tom Morgan, 23 (a native of Terre Haute, the birthplace and home of the great American socialist leader, Eugene V. Debs), Jim Bingham, 25, and Ralph Levitt, 25, were first indicted on May Day of 1963 on trumped-up charges of having assembled to allegedly advocate the violent overthrow of the state of Indiana and of the U.S. government. The occasion of the assembly? A meeting on the Indiana University campus, sponsored by the YSA, at which the speaker was Leroy McRae, YSA national organizational secretary. McRae, a young Negro socialist and civil-rights fighter, said that in addition to the tactic of non-violence the Negro people must be ready to defend themselves, a right guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, against the violence of the white supremacists and Ku Klux Klanners.

The local prosecutor responsible for bringing this indictment was right-wing, John-Birch-minded Thomas A. Hoadley. Hoadley made numerous allegations against the YSA and its officers, which were played up by the "yellow press" in Indiana, in order to inflame public opinion against the defendants.

Among these charges were that the YSA was organized by "Moscow-trained agents" (the YSA is a Trotskyist youth group); that the YSA was "in a running gun battle with the State of Kentucky" (the group had organized aid to striking miners in the Hazard, Kentucky, area); and, most recently, that it was somehow connected with Lee Harvey Oswald, the alleged assassin of President Kennedy.

The law under which the indictments were brought is a key element in the case. The Indiana Anti-Subversion Law was passed by the Indiana legislature during the height of the McCarthy hysteria. In that same period, Indiana officials attempted to ban the story of Robin Hood from the public schools, because this story-book hero took from the rich and gave to the poor; this made him an obvious "subversive."

In the 1920's Indiana was a seat of power of the Ku Klux Klan. In the 1930's the Silver Shirts, a fascist stormtrooper organization, flourished there. More recently, in 1958, the John Birch Society was founded in the state capital. Such ultraconservative traditions are embodied in the Indiana Anti-Subversion Law, which states that it is the "public policy" of the state of Indiana to "exterminate Communism, Communists and any or all teachings of the same."

The students are being defended by Leonard B. Boudin, a noted constitutional authority and General Counsel of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and by Daniel T. Taylor, III, of Louisville, Kentucky. The defense attorneys contend that the indictments should be thrown out because the Indiana law is unconstitutional on the following grounds: (1) it violates the constitutionally guaranteed freedoms of speech, assembly and conscience; (2) a technical point, that it is superseded by federal legislation, such as the Smith and McCarran Acts, etc. (This, of course, in no way implies support for these odious federal sedition laws.) The defense will contend, finally, that even if the law were valid, the Indiana students did not violate the provisions concerning advocacy of violence against the government.

The prosecution, supported by powerful business and press interests, claims that the students are not necessarily guilty of any particular violation of the law but that their ideas constitute a conspiracy against the state of Indiana. Hoadley stated: "We want only to stamp out Communism and what it stands for."

On March 20 the defense will plead its motions in the Bloomington courts. If unsuccessful, the case will then proceed to a jury trial, in which the prosecutor will attempt to enter as evidence the entire content of socialist theory, of Marxism, Leninism and Trotskyism.

A national defense committee has been formed to publicize the legal and moral issues in the case and raise funds for the costly court battle. The Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students is dedicated to one purpose, the defense of the indicted YSA officers and victory over the Indiana witch-hunt. The national and international support that CABS is getting marks its efforts as a high-water point in recent American labor defense history.

All expressions of international support are strongly welcomed. Please send all inquiries and messages of support to:

Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students
P. O. Box 213, Cooper Station
New York, New York 10003

BERTRAND RUSSELL BACKS BLOOMINGTON STUDENTS

Bertrand Russell, the famous British mathematician and philosopher and the Honorary Chairman of the Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students, made the following statement regarding the Indiana "sedition" case.

"The attempt to persecute independent political thinking in the United States is indicative of the extent to which those who are pushing mankind towards nuclear annihilation are unprepared to allow independent and critical consideration of the alternatives. The persecution of the Bloomington Students is the most naked authoritarianism; it affects not only academic freedom, but the duty on the part of all of us to oppose the mad policies which governments have followed. The danger to survival today is intimately related to the inability to speak out effectively against governments, East and West. I hope that there will be an international demand for justice in the case of the Bloomington Students, whose example should inspire everyone who follows individual liberty."

THE BLACK MUSLIMS TODAY

By Evelyn Sell

II.

The typical Muslim congregation has several outstanding features:

(1) The Muslims attract the young. Eighty per cent of the members are between 17-35 years of age. Young ministers are the rule.

(2) The Muslims attract men in contrast to the typical Negro Christian church where women are in the majority.

(3) The Muslims are a working-class group. Very few intellectuals or professionals are interested in temple membership but an increasing number of young college students are joining.

Born in the Northern urban ghetto, the movement has stayed there, concentrating its temples, its businesses and its recruiting in the poorest working-class sections. They remain in the heart of the black ghetto although their present wealth could allow them to move into better areas.

Recruiting is done in the pool halls, bars, barber shops, stores, street corners and jails. Many Muslims are ex-convicts, dope addicts, alcoholics, prostitutes -- the derelicts of capitalist society. The movement has astonishing results in rehabilitating these people. A dramatic example of how the movement transformed a former dope addict

and criminal is provided by Malcolm X. Shabazz, minister of New York's Harlem Temple No. 7 and the second most important Muslim in the country.

He was born Malcolm Little in Omaha, Nebraska, around 1927. His father, a Baptist minister and an ex-Garveyite, was under constant fire from whites who resented his outspoken militancy against Jim Crow. Malcolm remembers what happened when the Ku Klux Klan burned the family home: "The firemen came and just sat there without making any effort to put one drop of water on the fire. The same fire that burned my father's home still burns my soul."

Added fuel to that soul-scorching fire was provided when his father was mysteriously killed. Malcolm was sure racists murdered him.

Converted in Prison

The family moved east and during his late teens Malcolm became a successful petty criminal in the Harlem underworld. After several trips to jail he landed in a maximum security prison in Massachusetts. While there he read "thousands of books because I wanted to know what made people the way they are." He didn't find the answer to his needs in the prison library. His brother, a member of the Detroit temple, visited him in prison and converted him to the Muslims.

"I am what you would call an ex-convict," he has said. "I am not ashamed of this because it was all done when I was a part of the white man's Christian world. As a Muslim, I would never have done these awful things that caused me to go to prison. . . . When I was in the world of the Christians, I behaved as they did; I did what the white man did because, like everybody else, I thought this was the best thing possible to do."

A person who becomes a Muslim is literally reborn inwardly and outwardly. The change involves one's name, religion, country, language, code of ethics and cultural values. The first symbol of this rebirth is the casting off of the slavemaster's name and taking on instead the last name of "X." Certain highly favored Muslims are granted their "original names" by Muhammad. Thus Malcolm X was granted the name "Shabazz."

Code of Behavior

A Muslim's personal behavior is distinctive. It is purposely designed to be the opposite of the usual stereotyped picture presented by prejudiced whites. They practice the ideal middle-class morality that the white middle class merely talks about.

Muslims are forbidden to smoke, drink liquor, carry weapons, laugh or speak loudly. They must preserve cleanliness of body "inside and outside."

Equality between the sexes is emphasized but each sex is assigned its own appropriate role. Sexual morality is strictly enforced and very Puritanical. Women are not allowed to wear make-up of revealing clothes. Divorce is allowed but frowned upon.

All Muslims are encouraged to hold steady jobs and practice thrift (buying on credit is forbidden). This responsible attitude toward employment plus their dignified and neat personal appearance have gained them an excellent reputation among employers. The result is that the average Muslim family enjoys a higher standard of living than most Negro working-class families. This increases their self-esteem and helps fill the temple coffers since every Muslim must contribute a percentage of his earnings to the movement.

Infractions of the rules are punished. The Fruit of Islam group in each temple supervises trials of those accused of adultery, use of narcotics, misuse of temple funds, reporting temple activities to outsiders, eating or selling pork, sleeping during meetings or not attending meetings, etc. Sentences range from performing labor in the temple, to suspension for a period of time, to expulsion.

What the Muslims Want

The entire back page of every issue of Muhammad Speaks is devoted to the Muslim program. Here are some extracts:

"We want freedom. We want a full and complete freedom. We want justice. Equal justice under the law. . . We want equality of opportunity. . . We want our people in America whose parents or grandparents were descendants from slaves, to be allowed to establish a separate state or territory of their own -- either on this continent or elsewhere. We believe that our former slave masters are obligated to provide such land and that the area must be fertile and minerally rich. We believe that our former slave masters are obligated to maintain and supply our needs in this separate territory for next 20 to 25 years -- until we are able to produce and supply our own needs. . . "

"We want an immediate end to the police brutality and mob attacks against the so-called Negro throughout the United States. . . As long as we are not allowed to establish a state or territory of our own, we demand not only equal justice under the laws of the United States, but equal employment opportunities -- NOW! . . .

"We want the government of the United States to exempt our people from ALL taxation as long as we are deprived of equal justice under the laws of the land.

"We want equal education -- but separate schools up to 16 for boys and 18 for girls on the condition that the girls be sent to women's colleges and universities. We want all black children educated, taught and trained by their own teachers. . .

"We believe that intermarriage or race mixing should be prohibited."

A Muslim minister once summed up their aims more succinctly: "To get the white man's foot off my neck, his hand out of my pocket and his carcass off my back. To sleep in my own bed without fear, and to look straight into his cold blue eyes and call him a liar every time he parts his lips."

How do the Muslims plan to achieve these goals? They don't participate in or organize picket lines or demonstrations. They don't involve themselves in politics or election campaigns. They will not even challenge Jim Crow through the court system. By what tactical means do they hope to achieve their goals? They are silent about this.

Muhammad, quoting Fard's revelations to him, says that the white world is doomed, "it's complete disintegration is both imminent and inescapable." Allah has warned his people of how he would destroy the world created by the white man. America is scheduled for its apocalypse in 1970.

Are the Muslims merely awaiting Armageddon? No one believes that. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and local police keep a close watch on the organization. Conservative Negro leaders, constantly needled by the Muslim taunts that they sell out to whites, make dire predictions about outbreaks of violence from the movement. The ordinary white person, fed hysterical rumors by the capitalist press, is uneasy about the tightly disciplined power commanded by Muhammad.

A young New York Negro exclaimed, "Let me tell you -- they've got some stuff for The Man (i.e., the white man) even the Mau Mau didn't have! If he tries to crowd them like he's been used to doing the rest of us all the time, they're going to lay it on him from here to Little Rock."

[Next week: Relations with Other Groups.]

TIME MARCHES ON

Japanese competitive power has grown enormously since the eve of World War II. Her precision cameras and electronic goods are listed among the world's "best buys." Now Japan is threatening Swiss and German watchmakers in their home territory. In 1962 Japan sold 19,000 Seiko watches and clocks in Europe. In 1963 the figure was 60,000. The figures should soon mount as Japanese mass production methods bring prices still lower.

THE CONGRESS PARTY MAKES A BID TO THE LEFT

By Kailas Chandra

The Indian National Congress party at its recent Sixty-eighth Session at Bhubaneshwar "formally" accepted democratic socialism as its goal, a goal which it has preached for the last ten years. The Congress party has defined what it claims to be a "concrete programme" for realising that goal of socialism. The newly elected Congress president, Kamaraj, followed this up in his presidential address with an appeal to all those who had faith in the "ideology of socialism and democracy" to join the Congress in the "common task of building of a new society on the basis of this ideology instead of frittering away their energies in small groups and organisations."

This seems to have created a flutter among sections in the traditional left parties in India, particularly in the Praja Socialist party [PSP] and the Communist party of India [CPI]. Asoka Mehta, former chairman of the PSP, who has already accepted a cushy job as vice-chairman of the Planning Commission, has been urging his followers to seek new "areas of cooperation with the Congress." He has been suggesting that all who believe in democratic socialism must join the ruling Congress to "strengthen the hands of Prime Minister Nehru and democratic socialists within the Congress."

The PSP leadership has answered this appeal by expelling Mehta for defying party discipline. But it is now certain that a section of the PSP leadership associated with Mehta will eventually join the Congress.

The Central Executive Committee [CEC] of the CPI, which met in New Delhi after the Bhubaneshwar session of the Congress, likewise reacted with enthusiasm to what it termed the "emergency of democratic forces" within and outside the Congress. It also praised the rising "forces of the left in the Indian National Congress" and assured its ranks that it was looking forward to "unity of the progressive forces within the Congress with those outside." The CEC resolution in fact said that "never since the Independence have the possibilities of such unity been so great and the need so desperately urgent."

This is supposed to be a part of the strategy of Communist party leader S. A. Dange in seeking an alliance with the "progressive Indian bourgeoisie" against the reactionary right wing of the Congress.

All these pronouncements by traditional "left" parties have created a great deal of confusion in the working-class movement as a whole about the precise class role of the Congress in India.

No Shift in Sight

In fact the deliberations at Bhubaneshwar and the subsequent developments "inside and outside the Congress" do not give any indi-

oation of any fundamental shift in the policies of the bourgeois leadership of the Congress.

In the first place it is totally fallacious to think that the so-called "left or democratic forces" within the Congress, led by middle-class radicals like Krishna Menon, K. D. Malavia or Biju Patnaik scored a victory at Bhubaneshwar. These leaders, in frustration over the dominant right-wing leadership of the Congress, did make radical speeches, did denounce monopoly capitalism and even demanded such radical measures as nationalisation of banking and state trading in food grains. But theirs was a cry in the wilderness.

K. D. Malavia moved a resolution urging the Congress government to nationalize banking and introduce state trading in food grains, but he had to withdraw his resolution lest it might be rejected by an overwhelming majority of the delegates had it been pressed for a vote. The new Working Committee elected by the delegates did not include any nominee of the so-called Congress "left." Malaviya who was put up as the only effective candidate on behalf of the "left" was defeated. Krishna Menon who was supposed to have been nominated to the Working Committee by the Congress president was also left out of the highest policy-making body of the Congress.

It was explained later that this "temporary defeat of the left" was due to the illness of Prime Minister Nehru who had a stroke and could not participate in the deliberations. This says nothing about the real alignment of forces within the Congress today. In fact the Congress leadership is held more securely than ever by the right wingers, trusted by the big bourgeoisie of India. The periodic debates that take place among Congressmen about the "building of democratic socialism," also in the context of the unseemly scrambles for power among the regional party leaders in different states, does not really pose any threat to the capitalist class in the country.

There might be at best an awareness on the part of Congress leadership of the growing crisis in the economic and political spheres. In fact the "ideological disputes" among the Congress leaders reflect the disputes between different strata of the Indian bourgeoisie on how best to tide over the present crisis, in the larger interests of the capitalist class as a whole. The Call, the New Delhi journal of the Revolutionary Socialist party points out, "Socialism in Congress parlance has been a label for selling state monopoly capitalism to the toiling masses in India and for keeping their democratic and class yearnings in proper check."

"From Bhubaneshwar where the Congress held its 68th session to New Delhi, seat of Indian Parliament, the road is apparently a long one," thus complained the pro-Nehru weekly Link of New Delhi (February 16). It said ruefully: "When Parliament began its budget session on Monday [February 10], the usual 'curtain-raisers' scarcely made mention of the Bhubaneshwar spirit or how the Bhubaneshwar decisions might influence attitudes and statements of policy in the House."

Some Pertinent Questions

Link, as the mouthpiece of the Congress "left" posed these meaningful questions: "How is the Government going to implement the inspiring pledges made in the resolution on Democracy and Socialism? How are the promises to restrict property and privilege, to reduce economic disparities and assure a minimum standard of living for all, to check concentration of economic power and eliminate business malpractices, to complete land reforms, going to be fulfilled? Expectations among the people that the first session of Parliament after Bhubaneswar would give some indications of the beginnings of a more decisive turn towards socialism were not unjustified. Many of the steps suggested in the Bhubaneswar resolution were meant not for a distant transition towards a socialist state but for immediate application to cure many economic ills and check undesirable tendencies which if allowed to grow could become serious obstacles to socialist progress."

But even the Link did not fail to notice that the address by Vice-President Zakir Hussain, discharging the functions of the president, to the joint meeting of the two houses of parliament "made no reference to the socialist pledges made at Bhubaneswar. The reference to socialism in the address or to radical economic measures was no more than routine.

"In spite of difficulties and distractions," the address said, "we have continued to move forward towards our objective of a democratic and socialist order at home and for peace and cooperation in international affairs."

In the opinion of Link, however, "If the public debate in the period between the Jaipur AICC session and the Bhubaneswar Congress is a true guide to public opinion in the country, it can be taken only as showing a wide measure of dissatisfaction over the slow pace of economic progress and particularly towards the socialist objective."

Squabble over Nehru's Crown

The disillusionment of the petty-bourgeois radicals at the growing disparity between the promises and the performances of the Congress leadership cannot be described any better. Yet the clamour among these petty-bourgeois radicals to crowd into the Congress party, to share the fishes and loaves of office and participate in the mad scramble for power and factional struggles among Congressmen in different states, does not seem to have abated. This enthusiasm for Congress entry cannot be explained by any serious "ideological" or "principle political" considerations.

In fact the illness of Nehru at the age of seventy-five has raised the problem of his succession. Within the Congress party itself, torn by regional loyalties, there is an unseemly race for succession, but no agreement about the successor. There is a contro-

versy around every Congress leader of national stature from the extreme right wingers like Morarji Desai and S. K. Patil to the so-called "leftists" like Krishna Menon and K. D. Malaviya.

There are many radical intellectuals like Asoka Mehta and Jayaprakash Narayan (who once renounced politics to orient toward the supra-class sarvodaya movement) and others who entertain the grand illusion that with their past "halo" of socialism they can step into the shoes of Nehru to serve the needs of the Indian bourgeoisie. For the lesser fry in the "radical" movement there are many cushy jobs that attract them to "democratic socialism."

The scramble over the succession to Nehru explains much about the changes and shifts in the left movement today. The fundamental problem, however, is whether the leadership of the Indian bourgeoisie, which has exhausted all possibilities of doping the masses with false promises of "democratic socialism," can really resolve its political crisis by infusing "outside socialist blood" into the Congress.

Neither Prime Minister Nehru, with his great personality, nor any successor who might succeed him can provide an effective answer to the unprecedented crisis and a truly explosive situation emerging in the country within the framework of capitalism. What is needed is a revolutionary settlement of accounts with an outmoded capitalist system and what is delaying such a final settlement of accounts is the lack of revolutionary working-class leadership.

PERUVIAN LEFTISTS STATE COMMON AIMS

An important step toward united action was recently taken by three radical organizations in Peru: the National Liberation Front [FLN], the Movement of the Revolutionary Left [MIR], and the Front of the Revolutionary Left [FIR]. The latter organization is a union of the Agrupación Pro-Unificación de la Izquierda Revolucionaria, the Partido Comunista (Leninista) Peruano and the Partido Obrero Revolucionario. The chairman of the FIR is Hugo Blanco, the peasant leader now held in prison at Arequipa.

The FLN, the MIR and the FIR joined in issuing a declaration on the present situation in Peru in which they state their common aims. The following extract from the statement appeared in No. 36 of Voz Rebelde, organ of the MIR:

* * *

The undersigned organizations of the left feel that it is their duty to address the people in a united way in order to clearly establish their point of view with respect to the grave events affecting the Republic.

Six months were sufficient to demonstrate the incapacity of the present executive and legislative authorities of the nation to solve the fundamental problems facing the country. These problems remain, even becoming worse. This is the case, for example, with the demand of the peasants for land; the demand for immediate nationalization of the oil industry; the need for higher wages; the need to meet the high cost of living; the free exercise of all civilian rights as well as a general amnesty for all political prisoners without exception, and full national sovereignty with regard to the foreign policy of Peru.

The traditional forces of the oligarchy and imperialism, and the agents in their service, above all the leadership of the APRA [Alianza Popular Revolucionario Americana] in collusion with Odría, are directly responsible for this unhappy state of affairs. They maintain things this way through their positions in parliament and the reactionary press, and through the vacillations, contradictions and complicity in practice of the present government of architect Fernando Belaúnde Terry.

Still worse -- they are scheming to block a solution to these problems.

The lack of an adequate revolutionary political leadership in the people's struggles weakens, exhausts and in the final analysis cancels them out. Sectarianism, the division between the working class and the peasants on the one hand and the men and organizations of the left on the other, only aid reaction and imperialism and all the enemies of the Peruvian Revolution. United, the left is invincible.

The undersigned organizations of the left are now mobilizing for the following common objectives:

- Immediate nationalization of the oil industry and against any conciliation with the international oil trust.
- Genuine agrarian reform; against the reactionary law cooked up by parliament and the administration; for the liquidation of landlordism and for handing over the land to those who work it.
- For raising wages and salaries and meeting the high cost of living.
- Against the repression, the McCarthyite conspiracy and discriminatory laws such as Article 53 of the Constitution.
- For a general amnesty without any exceptions.
- For self-determination and the full sovereignty of Peru in international policy.
- For solidarity with all the peoples who are struggling for

their national liberation and particularly with the peoples of Cuba and Panama.

Long live the unity of the leftists for the Peruvian Revolution!

Long live Peru!

For the FLN [Frente de Liberación Nacional],
R. P. Salomón Bolo Hidalgo, chairman.

For the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria],
Dr. Luis de la Puente Uceda, secretary general.

For the FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionaria],
Apolinario Rojas, secretary general.

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY RED-BAITS CANADIAN "TROTSKYISTS"

By Catherine Scott

TORONTO, March 11 -- The New Democratic party, which was founded in 1961 with the support of the trade-union movement and with high hopes for its early development as an effective political weapon for the Canadian working class, is moving steadily to the right and losing its popular image as a dynamic organization capable of taking stands on important issues.

The expulsion of ten young socialists from the Ontario section of the party marks a further step in the narrowing of its base. According to the February 24 Globe and Mail, Toronto's morning paper, "By confirming the expulsion of ten young radicals -- committed to total public ownership of major industry -- the council turned decisively toward moderate economic and social planning that leaves room for both public and private enterprise."

While the youth were expelled on the organizational grounds of belonging to the Young Socialist Alliance, this comment from the daily press points up the political issues involved. The youth were described in the Daily Star of February 24 as "Trotskyite-Marxists -- followers of basic Communist philosophy who reject the form it has taken in the Soviet Union."

One of the defendants, Allan Engler, told the press, "The expelled youth were active in the struggle within the New Democratic party to adopt a socialist program of opposition to the present Canadian military alliance commitments, public ownership of major industry and support of the colonial revolution throughout the world."

The Daily Star continues, "Undaunted by their exclusion from the

ranks of the NDP, they are now publishing a four page monthly tabloid, Young Socialist Forum, which supports the NDP unconditionally and calls for a socialist program for the party."

On Canada's west coast, the British Columbia section of the party expelled eight young people and suspended three more in a similar witch-hunt situation a year and a half ago. Since then the leadership have publicly red-baited one of the party's members in the British Columbia provincial legislature, Cedric Cox, for going to Cuba. In a subsequent election he was defeated by a narrow margin.

Cox, the chairman of the Vancouver chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee visited Cuba as a guest of the Cuban government and subsequently made a tour through Canada and parts of the United States for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee to report on his experiences.

Now the British Columbia NDP is considering proscribing membership in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee just a short time after a provincial convention which passed a resolution supporting the Cuban people and opposing the American blockade. This points up clearly the contradiction between the sentiments of the rank and file of the party who are sympathetic to Cuba and the leadership who are threatening expulsion for those who work to publicize the achievements of the Cuban Revolution.

Meanwhile in Quebec NDP insensitivity, and in fact outright hostility, to the nationalist aspirations of the French Canadian people (see World Outlook December 27) has resulted in a serious drop in their vote in two recent by-elections. In one riding the NDP percentage of the total vote cast declined from 12.0% to 6.6% and in the other from 11.4% to 3.9%. Unfortunately the Parti Socialiste du Quebec did not urge its supporters to work in the election.

The NDP members of parliament meanwhile continue to alienate the French population by objecting to an increase in French language radio service, criticizing the Royal Commission on Biculturalism "for dividing Canada into two languages and two cultures," etc.

In Saskatchewan, where the NDP is in power, the proposal by the privately owned Canadian Pacific Railways [CPR] and the government-owned Canadian National Railways [CNR] to abandon some 1,400 miles of branch lines in the province because they are unprofitable, confronts the government with a very serious problem. The cuts would directly affect 67,000 people. Four hundred and twenty-six grain elevators, handling close to fifty million bushels of grain annually, would be affected. The communities involved could only be sustained by a road construction program that would bring a tremendous financial load to bear on the province.

The NDP government arranged a conference where local delegates met CNR and CPR officials. The conference demanded a Board of Inquiry to study the impact of the proposals and asked the government to pro-

vide an information program to publicize the effect of the cuts.

When the railways claimed the abandonment would improve their financial position by \$5,300,000 annually, the minister of industry, Hon. Russ Brown replied, "Any such claim by the railroads must be balanced against the effect such proposed branch abandonment would have on the social and economic well-being of the Saskatchewan people.

While the NDP opposes scrapping these lines it fails to advance the one real solution -- nationalization of the CPR and the unification of the two systems.

Certain members of the NDP leadership have been flirting with the idea of climbing directly on the bandwagon of capitalism through merger with the Liberal party. This has met with favorable publicity in the daily papers.

A merger would of course signify the total demise of the party as a working-class formation. The more conscious elements in the leadership have rejected the proposal. However, it is a logical extension of their whole rightward policy. For socialists in the NDP who want to convert the NDP into an effective working-class party, the proposed move poses again and more sharply the dangers of the policies of the present leadership.

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS TO BE HELD IN MONTREAL

TORONTO -- The second continental congress for the sovereignty and independence of the peoples of the Americas and for solidarity with Cuba is to be held in Montreal next July 16-19.

Originally scheduled in Uruguay, the change was made after Michel Chartrand, leader of the Parti Socialiste du Quebec, visited Havana in January and urged that it be held in Canada. The first congress was held in Brazil.

Montreal city authorities and the Canadian minister of external affairs have assured officials of the movement that delegates will be welcomed and that there will be no difficulties over admission to the country.

The congress will discuss economic, political and social conditions in Latin America.

In addition a discussion will be held on the five points submitted by Cuba to the United Nations during the November 1962 Caribbean crisis.

These are: (1) cessation of the economic blockade and all

measures of commercial and economic pressure exercised against Cuba by the U.S. in every part of the world, (2) cessation of all subversive activities against Cuba being undertaken by the U.S. from its own territory and satellite countries, (3) cessation of pirate raids from the U.S. and other bases, (4) cessation of all violations of Cuban air space and territorial waters by U.S. aircraft and warships, (5) withdrawal from Guantánamo naval base and the restoration of the Cuban territory occupied by the U.S.

FATE OF PIETRO TRESSO STILL DISTURBS ITALIAN WORKERS MOVEMENT

By Livio Maitan

ROME -- In the new atmosphere which the process of de-Stalinization has created in the Italian workers movement, the personality of Pietro Tresso has for some time attracted attention, even in the big official press of the Italian Communist party [PCI] and Nenni's Italian Socialist party [PSI].

Pietro Tresso, a well-known militant worker, was active in the PCI during the twenties, becoming one of the leaders of the party. When the crisis that was to lead to his expulsion began to take shape, he was a member of the National Secretariat. Together with two other members of the same body (Leonetti and Ravazzoli), Tresso -- who was known in the underground as "Blasco" -- opposed the Stalinist line of the "Third Period" [ultraleft adventurism] which Stalin sought to impose on the Italian Communist party as well as all other sections of the Communist International.

After a very sharp debate, the Togliatti group succeeded in getting a majority through procedural trickery and a little later they expelled Tresso and his comrades, immediately opening up against them the usual campaign of denigration and slander.

Tresso then joined the Trotskyist movement, working in France in a leadership capacity, including on the international level. Arrested during the war, he was freed in 1944 by the underground fighters. He disappeared a little later under most suspicious circumstances. It was generally believed that he was killed by Stalinist agents assigned to do the job in accordance with the tactic of physically exterminating the Trotskyists which was practiced at that time by international Stalinism.

A biographical pamphlet about Tresso was published two years ago by Alfredo Azzaroni, an intellectual of right-wing socialist orientation, who collaborates in an extreme right-wing Social Democratic magazine. The pamphlet, of no pretensions in itself, carried a preface by Ignazio Silone, the well-known right-wing Social Democratic writer, who has practically retired from politics but who makes a

foray from time to time primarily against the Communist party.

It was largely due to this preface by a figure widely discredited in the workers movement that Bandiera Rossa, the newspaper of the Italian Trotskyists published a rather severe criticism of the pamphlet about Tresso, which contained some obvious errors. Azzaroni sent a letter of rectification which was published by Bandiera Rossa. Aside from this criticism and Azzaroni's letter, the pamphlet was met with almost total silence.

A few weeks ago, without anything new seeming to have happened, Rinascita, the PCI weekly, printed a letter from Stefano Schiapparelli, who was secretary some years ago of the Communist Federation of Vicence, the region where Tresso was born. After attacking Azzaroni's pamphlet, Schiapparelli levelled arguments in the Stalinist style against the Trotskyist movement. (For example, characterizing La Vérité, the French Trotskyist newspaper, as an "anti-Communist and anti-Soviet" organ and contending that La Vérité, for which Tresso wrote, was a legal publication while La Vie Proletarienne, the organ of the Italian émigrés was not.) He ended by rejecting what Azzaroni wrote about the death of Tresso. Schiapparelli, in fact, offers his own explanation, making it sound authoritative because he was in France at the time in the same area where the group was operating that freed Tresso.

"I recall very well," Schiapparelli writes [Rinascita, No. 5, 1964], "that one day in the month of May 1944, a French (Communist) comrade, who, as a runner for a 'resistance center' was in touch with different underground groups, on learning that I was Italian, asked me if I knew Blasco. He told me that Blasco was with an underground group (without indicating exactly where, as was the custom then in accordance with the most elementary rules of underground work). He added that Blasco had serious lung trouble and that he was being cared for as best as possible in the circumstances. He also told me that Blasco had sent the head of the underground a biography in which he mentioned having been a leader of the PCI and that he had been expelled for well-known reasons.

"I replied that I knew Blasco very well, that his biography corresponded with the truth and that he would have to settle his problem with the party in Italy after the liberation."

Some time later, toward the end of July 1944, Schiapparelli, before returning to Italy, met the underground fighter once more. He told him about the death of Blasco due to his illness. "I still remember his words: 'Your lad is dead.' I returned to Italy at the end of July 1944. I told Comrade Amendola in Milan what I knew so he could inform whomever he had to."

Three weeks after Schiapparelli's letter, Rinascita [No. 8, 1964] printed a short note signed "r." (It is almost certainly from Togliatti.) The note mentioned a letter received from a Communist, Elio

Franzin, who had asked that Tresso's position be clarified by thorough studies of the period. Rinascita stated that it was in agreement, adding that the historical study must be genuine and not a pretext for slander.

A second letter, which Rinascita summarized in a rather dishonest way, was published verbatim by the Socialist daily Avanti! [February 25]. This was from Alfredo Azzaroni. After defending his pamphlet and mentioning the criticism that appeared at the time in Bandiera Rossa, which he misinterprets (or distorts), he poses the following questions to Rinascita and Schiapparelli:

"(1) Why did this revelation about the death of Blasco due to an illness come so late?

"(2) Why did the preceding inquiries, including one by the PCF [French Communist party], fail to uncover anything that would bolster this tardy version?

"(3) Why has the underground chief who is supposed to have in his possession Blasco's autobiography still keep it secret?

"(4) Why haven't Amendola and the old comrades to whom Schiapparelli confided the truth about the death of Tresso spoken up to defend the PCI from the accusation of having liquidated an opponent? Why didn't they speak with surviving members of his family?"

Together with the summary of Azzaroni's letter, Rinascita ran a note in which the author (characterizing Tresso in passing as "this comrade") declares:

"It is clear that Schiapparelli told only what he knew and what was reported to him. It was not possible for us, nor did it come within the jurisdiction of our party, to undertake an inquiry of our own which would have had to take place, as it did take place, in an area foreign to us and which was carried out by those who should and could carry it out."

Bandiera Rossa, the newspaper of the Italian section of the Fourth International, joined in the polemic in its March number. After mentioning the bureaucratic performances of Schiapparelli in the Federation of Vicence and after pointing out that the comparison between the French newspaper La Vérité and La Vie Prolétarienne, organ of an émigré group, did not hold at all and demonstrated absolutely nothing, Bandiera Rossa continues:

"Why did he remain silent up until now? Why doesn't he give all the information in his possession? Why doesn't he help to identify the persons he mentions, to find the documents he refers to? Must we suppose that it is a clumsy move on his part or that the higher ups are preparing something, perhaps an opportune adjustment, a 'rehabilitation' with some dissimulation, and Schiapparelli was asked to make the opening move?

"We shall see. Nevertheless right now we denounce Rinascita's shameful note. . . We say bluntly that our movement does not demand any rehabilitation, because Tresso does not need to be rehabilitated. From the historical and political point of view, things are very clear to us, and if Togliatti is so concerned about avoiding speculation on the part of adversaries of the Communist movement (including Mr. Azzaroni, who collaborates with the disreputable right-wing Social-Democratic organ among other things), he can do something quite simple, which requires neither investigation nor research. Let him publish or see to the publication of all the documents of the time, those of the PCI as well as those of Tresso and his comrades with regard to the question over which they were expelled. The documents are enough -- everyone can draw his own conclusions.

"On the problem of the death of our comrade, the affirmation of 'r.' that it 'was not possible for us, nor did it come within the jurisdiction of our party, to undertake an inquiry of our own. . . ' constitutes monumental hypocrisy. Aside from the fact that those who conducted the inquiry do not appear to have taken into account the truth which Schiapparelli now reveals to us and on which Rinascita seems to avoid taking a position, to hide behind an absurd 'jurisdiction' signifies quite simply to duck the problem, to try to hush up the matter.

"For those who want to investigate the facts -- and not create scandals or indulge in speculation -- the solution is very simple. Let a commission be formed composed of militants of the Italian workers movement, representatives of all tendencies who take an interest in the question; let this commission begin to function after its composition has been unanimously accepted; let all its members take an obligation not to express any opinion or to publish anything before the work is finished. These are suggestions to which could be added supplementary guarantees. This is the proposal we make and we are quite willing to let others take the initiative in it."

ERITREANS CONTINUE THEIR STRUGGLE

The struggle for the freedom of Eritrea from the feudalistic monarchy of Ethiopia has scored several recent successes, according to the Eritrean Liberation Front.

On February 2 guerrilla fighters of the Eritrean Liberation Army ambushed an Ethiopian patrol at Ansaba, killing 20 and wounding others. Equipment was captured, including 32 rifles and machine guns and considerable ammunition.

A patrol dispatched from Keren to hunt down the revolutionists ran into another ambush and had to withdraw leaving their dead and wounded behind. The Eritreans have the advantage of rugged mountains

in addition to dedication to the cause of national liberation.

The Ethiopian government has retaliated against the freedom fighters in various areas. On January 26 in the village of Tamarat they killed Hassan Al-amin Sayak, a small merchant. He was not given any trial but simply murdered on the unproved charge of selling food to revolutionists.

On February 3 in the village of Sedri Abdura they killed two brothers, Hamid Omar Almadai and Mohammed Hamid Omar Almadai. These farmers were not involved in the struggle but a battle took place near where they lived.

On the same day at Sedri Abdura, Ethiopian troops killed a mother named Maka Mohammed Hamid who sought to defend her daughter from rape by the soldiers. They also killed the daughter.

The Ethiopian emperor summoned tribal chiefs and officials from the western region of Eritrea. He gave them a dressing down, accused them of hypocrisy and said that they were conspiring with the revolutionists while falsely declaring allegiance to him. He threatened to take reprisals on the whole area indiscriminately.

The Ethiopian government has already concentrated nomadic and seminomadic tribes in certain restricted areas to prevent them from participating in the revolution.

This is the same tactic which the French army practiced in Algeria -- with conspicuous lack of success.

GEORG LUKACS TAKES UP THE MOSCOW-PEKING DISPUTE

By Fernand Charlier

The February issue of Les Temps Modernes, the Paris magazine edited by Jean-Paul Sartre, carries an article by the well-known Hungarian theoretician Georg Lukacs. The author, who was minister of culture in 1919, at the time of the first Hungarian revolution, and again in 1956, in the Imre Nagy government, entitled his article "Contribution to the Debate between China and the Soviet Union."

Lukacs, who has been kept under surveillance since he left the Yugoslav embassy where he was granted refuge in November 1956, is resolutely and unconditionally in favor of N. S. Khrushchev and his "de-Stalinization."

Since his article is presented in the form of theoretical observations, it is necessary to present a short summary of his main points.

In the opinion of Lukacs, who bases his conclusions on a study of

the letters exchanged between the central committees of the Soviet and Chinese Communist parties, the position of the Soviet leaders is the only one that has any validity. Khrushchev, he maintains, enriched Leninism by proclaiming at the time of the Twentieth Congress that wars are no longer inevitable.

Let us note in passing that the theory of peaceful coexistence, including the theory that it is possible to avoid war between the socialist and imperialist camps, was advanced long before the Twentieth Congress. Stalin held in 1952, in his Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR(1) that it was necessary to maintain "the thesis of Lenin on the inevitability of wars in general between imperialist countries" and on the contradictions between these countries, more important than the contradiction between the socialist camp and imperialism. From this he drew the conclusion that wars between the two social systems were avoidable, because "the capitalists, while they accuse the USSR of aggressiveness, do not believe it themselves." From that, the possibility of peace fronts with a part of the bourgeoisie, for whom their internal contradictions take precedence over their hostility to the socialist system.

At present Khrushchev maintains this deduction despite having abandoned the thesis about interimperialist contradictions taking precedence. The ideology of the bureaucracy in its decline could not but lose the consistency which, it must be recognized, it had in the days of Stalin.

Lukacs consequently places the Khrushchev who has enriched Leninism on the same plane as Lenin when the latter revised "the thesis of Marx, according to which proletarian revolutions could begin only in the most developed countries and succeed only on an international level."(2)

In addition to the apologetics for the man who sent the Soviet tanks against the revolutionary Hungarian masses, it should be noted that Lukacs still attributes to Lenin -- in accordance with Stalinist and post-Stalinist Soviet orthodoxy -- the invention of the theory of "socialism in one country."

Khrushchev's main merit therefore, according to Lukacs, is to have given humanity the hope of avoiding nuclear war, while the Chinese maintain -- still according to Lukacs -- that an "inevitable" world war is the only road to world socialism."(3)

(1) Pages 36-47 in the French text: Les Problèmes Economiques du Socialisme en URSS.

(2) Les Temps Modernes, February 1964. Page 1482.

(3) Loc. cit.

There is not space in this short article to refute, on the basis of texts, such a presentation of the "big debate." As we see it -- in the light of the content of the documents presented by the two sides -- the debate does not concern the "avoidability" or otherwise of a world war but rather the means of doing so.

Of more interest is Georg Lukacs' judgment of the Chinese positions. As he sees it, the Chinese positions are in complete accord in their characteristics with the essential features of Stalinism. These are: sectarianism (which is evident in "empty, abstract deductions"), "revolutionary phrases," subjectivism. Again and again, Lukacs describes Stalinism both politically and organizationally in this way. "We speak here naturally of the most important features of Stalinist politics and organization, of its subjectivist-sectarian traits."(4)

With the concern for probing deeply which everyone recognizes in him, and which we were the first to salute when it was more apropos, Lukacs declares that the infatuation of western intellectual circles over the Chinese theses is symptomatic of petty-bourgeois impatience and despair. He holds that it is even this same attitude which explains the popularity of such contemporary authors as -- Samuel Beckett.(5)

One cannot help being reminded here of the official "philosopher" of the French Communist party, Roger Garaudy, when, in the name of confidence in the masses, he sought to brand Jean-Paul Sartre as despairing when he said that he was ready to pack his bags and join the Algerian National Liberation Front.(6)

"Subjectivist-dogmatism," "sectarian subjectivism," "fanatic subjectivism," "equally subjective credulity" (Lukacs refers to Stalin who did not wish to believe in the imminence of the Nazi invasion in 1941) -- this is the essence of Stalinism and of Maoism, according to the author of the article, to whom "a theoretical counteroffensive, a war against Sino-Stalinist sectarianism ought to be the practical political demand of the day."

This is the essence of Lukacs' essay.

A more worthy "contribution to the debate" could have been hoped for from the author of one of the most interesting -- although contro-

(4)Op. cit., p. 1484 et seq.

(5)Op. cit., p. 1483.

(6)Roger Garaudy in "Questions for J-P. Sartre." (Collection Clarté, 1960. Pages 20-21.)

versial -- Marxist works on alienation.

The alienation of the Stalinist world is a subject which could provide fruitful theses for young Marxist researchers. The fact is that this latest essay by Lukacs only muddles matters.

In our opinion, Stalinism constitutes a pseudo Marxist ideology characterized by an attitude that is the exact opposite of "subjectivism," of the "abstract phraseology" or ultraleft wishful thinking which Lukacs attributes to the Chinese leaders. Stalinism, with its doctrinal foundation in the "theory of the construction of socialism in one country" constitutes a revision in the opposite direction. Far from fitting the description given by Lukacs, the fundamental philosophical trait of Stalinism is much closer to objectivist fatalism.

For the young Stalin, a mediocre interpreter of Marxism, "the development of consciousness is preceded by the development of the material side, by that of external conditions: first of all changing the external conditions, the material side, and then changing consciousness accordingly." This was how Stalin defined Marxist materialism in 1906.(7)

In his uncompleted work Stalin, Leon Trotsky explained why this mediocre Marxist was exactly the man the bureaucracy needed:(8) the wily empiricist, the opportunist who improvised his policies "from day to day," who compelled his adherents to make abrupt turns, and whose policy was aimed at maintaining the international status quo in which the tired, isolated revolution found itself.(9) This was not the politics of an "abstract revolutionary phrasemonger," but the very antithesis: a conservative, opportunistic bureaucrat.

As for the Chinese leaders, didn't they say -- this was, it is true, in the epoch of the "Hundred Flowers" -- that the "errors" of Stalin had "gnoseological" [concerning the theory of knowledge] roots, perhaps indicating in this way the Stalinist philosophical ideas to which we have just referred?(10)

The fundamental explanation for Lukacs' error in judgment cannot be explained otherwise than by the impossibility for him to utilize the arm of criticism (as the Hungarian workers utilized the criticism of arms in 1956) against the social foundations of Stalinism; that is,

(7)Stalin. Complete Works. Vol. 1, pp. 262 et seq. (French edition.)

(8)Trotsky. Stalin. Pp. 538-540. (French edition.)

(9)The article by Lukacs is followed by an article by Isaac Deutscher which cites both Stalinist and Khrushchevist examples of this "peaceful coexistence."

(10)See the article in the People's Daily, "Once Again on the Historic Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

the ruling bureaucratic caste. Thus he is obliged to describe the Stalinist terror as the "maintenance of methods of government which could be justified during the period of civil war," (11) without explaining why the bureaucracy (which he cannot name) was compelled to use force against the Russian Bolshevik cadres and the proletariat of the USSR.

The old philosopher has sought through strategem to meet all the self-criticisms imposed on him since the very birth of Stalinism -- Zinoviev was the first to excommunicate him. He is now reduced to adulating Khrushchev, the very one who, one morning in the summer of 1958, ordered his butchers to send their bullets crashing through his comrade Imre Nagy.

It is only in rare places -- and perhaps we are mistaken in this -- that Lukacs indicates in a hesitant way that he would like to see a settlement of accounts with Stalinism. For instance, he says that a theoretical counteroffensive "ought" to be the demand. Again, he says that the conflict with the Sino-Stalinists offers "the possibility" for such a settlement of accounts.

The old fox put things sufficiently well in 1957 in his foreward to the Italian edition of his Contribution to the History of Esthetics, when he explained how "a Marxist author, in times past, found himself more than once under the necessity of making a compromise in order to publish his own works and to exercise influence," and how "these compromises were centered around the person and the work of Stalin." Perhaps we are wrong in suspecting that similar considerations are involved around the person and works of Khrushchev. . .

No, it is not to Lukacs to whom we must ascribe the poor essay which Jean-Paul Sartre published. It must be credited to the Soviet tanks, to Kadar and to Nikita Sergeevitch. And we hope that Lukacs will live to see the day when the young Hungarian workers will tell him, like the old revolutionary hymn of 1871: "No, the Commune is not dead!"

(11) Op. cit., p. 1499.

FRANCO'S SPAIN ON EUROPE'S DOORSTEP

By Ramón Vazquez

Under the title: "One of the Leaders of Spanish Socialism Told Me," the Paris daily Le Figaro published in its March 2 issue a long interview which its Madrid correspondent Jacques Guillemé-Brulon arranged with Professor Tierno Galvan. This was on the eve of consideration by the Council of Ministers of the European Economic Com-

munity of Franco's bid to enter the Common Market. The two events are scarcely a coincidence.

A process of economic evolution has, in fact, been underway in Spain, a process of which the main lines were laid down by the Stabilization Plan (1959) and the Development Plan (1963-67), with their corollaries: massive emigration of Spanish workers (850,000), ruin of small business, proletarianization of small peasants, big private investments and state loans for Spain, relative industrialization of certain regions, creation of new modern industries (chemical, for example), etc., etc.

The aim of this process is, of course, to transform the old Spanish economic structure based on autarchic finance capital and agriculture, with its two poles peculiar to underdeveloped countries -- immense landholdings on the one hand and innumerable tiny plots on the other -- into a more "modern" structure; that is, monopoly capital closely linked with and, in the final analysis, dependent on the international trusts. Spain's entry into the Common Market constitutes an important step in this evolution.

It is quite evident that such a process entails contradictions and serious friction, both political and economic, domestic and foreign. It is no secret that Spain's entry into the Common Market faces strong resistance. Certain countries, including Italy, Belgium and Holland, are opposed, hiding their real reasons for this opposition under reluctance to admit into the "concert of democratic European nations" -- which, as everyone knows is the Common Market -- the dictatorial regime of General Franco.

Contrary to this, the governments which are interested in bringing Francoist Spain into the Common Market (primarily Paris and Bonn), are exerting pressure on the "recalcitrants" and on public opinion, seeking to demonstrate that the Spain of today is "liberalizing" itself, that a "dialogue" has begun among certain leading circles and the "opposition," even the Socialists, etc.

The interview with Tierno Galvan is part of this campaign. It is even implicitly acknowledged in the editorial note accompanying the interview: "If this informative interview can contribute in a modest way to evoke, in the future, new fruitful constructive exchanges between two political worlds, which simple common sense calls for on both sides, we shall be very pleased, since we are among those who cherish the hope of seeing this land of Spain, which has suffered so much, taking her place in accordance with her true dimensions in the concert of nations." Farther on they dedicate the document to the "necessary reconciliation between Spaniards. . . ." We note in passing the identity in views between the Le Figaro and the Spanish Communist party on "national reconciliation." A significant meeting of minds!

As for the Franco regime, it has every reason to display a more "liberal" look in relation to Europe in general and the European

Social Democrats in particular. We should not forget that the Social Democracy is preparing to play the role of a relief team for several governments where it already holds important posts. If the threat of an economic recession were to mount, the chances for the Social Democrats would increase, in accordance with the old tactic of the bourgeoisie of letting so-called workers parties carry the responsibility for periods of austerity.

To return to Spain. A number of signs indicate that certain leading circles are preparing to fabricate "an opposition to the throne," a highly respectable one, of course, but with a "social" or "socialist" label. This operation will run up against the "hard-core" of Francoism: certain generals, the big landlords, certain Falangist circles, etc.

Of course, this "hard core" often represents the social layers who have benefited from the autarchic economy of yesterday, who are afraid that the present evolution, entry into the Common Market, and the conquest of the Spanish market by the international trusts and their Spanish associates will end in a catastrophic economic situation for them. With particular characteristics due to the politico-economic conditions of our country and the Franco regime, which has been in power for twenty-five years, the same contradictions which other European countries have experienced and are still experiencing, between monopolistic "neocapitalism" and a conservative and aged capitalism, have been born in Spain.

Thus we can place the publication of the interview with Tierno Galvan, above all the freedom with which he spoke about socialism (at least what he understands this term to mean, which has nothing in common with the real thing), as a sign of this "liberalization," guided by remote control from above. It is not the only one. Ruiz-Gimenez, ex-minister of national education, a personal friend of Franco and one of the leaders of the Christian Democrats, published an article several months ago under the significant title: "Notebooks for the Dialogue."

Ruiz-Gimenez, like the other leaders of the Christian Democrats, is convinced that his party is destined to come to power in Spain. In his "Notebooks" he undertakes a dialogue between the "liberals" of the present government on the one hand, and Socialists of the Tierno Galvan type and Christian Democrats, on the other, noting the common link.

Another symptomatic fact is the recent trial of Spanish Socialists which was dragged out for years and in which the defendants were condemned to token punishment. Since they had already spent months in prison and years of freedom on probation, they left the court free as air. Certain observers, however, were surprised that they were given even virtually symbolic sentences. These observers hoped that the evolution would proceed faster. In reality, because of the contradictions between political and economic interests, the evolution can occur only in zigzags, a "liberal" measure being followed by an

"authoritarian" one, and this disconcerts those who take only a superficial view of the problems.

The trial was nothing less than a magnificent tribune for socialism "in the European style." Certain lawyers like Jimenez-Fernandez (leader of the Left Christian Democracy), insisted on how inconsistent it would be, at a time when Spain is crossing the threshold into Europe, to condemn men who profess the same ideas as the future partners of the Spanish government -- Spaak, Nenni, Wilson, without doubt, and why not Brandt or Defferre? The court, which in accordance with the recent law was civil and not military, willingly recognized "the nobility of the ideas of the defendants" but since the law proscribed (for how much longer?) their activities, they applied the law.

The trial had barely ended when rumors circulated in Madrid, a Swiss journal even echoing them, that some of the defendants had talked with certain members of the Franco government, particularly Franco's present crown prince, Vice-President Muñoz Grandes, about constituting a legal, respectable Spanish Socialist party, independent from the PSOE [Partido Socialista Obrero de España], whose leadership, as everyone knows, has been in exile since 1939. It is difficult at the moment to get to the bottom of these rumors. Were they, perhaps, started so as to reach the ears of the Council of Ministers of the European Economic Community?

In any case, it seems that Tierno Galvan was alluding to them when he said in his interview: "Spanish socialism is a whole. Although various regional groupings with their respective objectives have been able to rise here and there, it seems improbable to me that a Socialist party detached from its origins could become an effective factor of order and political equilibrium." These "origins" for Tierno Galvan are evidently not Marxism but the PSOE. In short, Tierno Galvan, after having been the editor of the manifestoes of the Spanish Union (monarchist), and having been associated with Dionisio Ridruejo, recently entered the PSOE. He at first demanded wide autonomy for the socialists inside the country. This was refused by the leadership in exile. Tierno Galvan bowed, or at least made it look like he was bowing, to party discipline.

The only conclusion we can draw from all this is that once again in history, in response to the call of the bourgeoisie, the social reformists are answering, "Present!"

Tierno Galvan, who calmly said that in "Spain the opposition has the nature above all of moral protest in which are found all the social classes, temperaments, etc.," (the interview cited above) is completely ready to collaborate with the Spanish bourgeoisie in the farce of "liberalization." He is not the only one to shake the tinsel of a certain "socialism," the better to dupe the working class and the better to betray them to the profit of the predominant layers of the Spanish bourgeoisie of today: the monopolistic capitalists.

If part of the Spanish Socialists are ready for the "European"

game of the capitalists, the Communist party, for its part, on abandoning the class struggle for "national reconciliation," is proposing a so-called antimonopoly program to the masses which in practice coincides with the demands of certain "left" Falangist circles who represent the interests of the middle layers.

Neither the PSOE nor the Communist party today represent the genuine interests of the working class. But the working class is there, and the workers struggle can only grow and become organized. And the whole world, the Communist party and the PSOE included, must take it into account. We will return to this.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL DENOUNCES RABAT VERDICT

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following statement to the press on March 15:

* * *

The Fourth International denounces with indignation the scandalous verdict in the Rabat trial against the militants of the vanguard belonging to the Union Nationale des Forces Populaires of Morocco.

The eleven death penalties, which included Mohammed Basri, Moumen Diouri, Omar Benjelloun, imprisoned since last July, and Ben Barka, who was already condemned to death for expressing solidarity with the Algerian Revolution, constitutes a new stage in the only real plot involved in this case -- the plot of the neocolonialist Moroccan authorities against the movement which has conducted the struggle in recent years against French imperialism and sought to win genuine economic and political independence for the Moroccan masses.

The Rabat trial has placed a glaring light on the plot masterminded by the Moroccan monarchy following its stinging electoral defeat. The defense exposed the torture practiced by the police on the defendants, the violations of judicial procedures, and especially the denial of the right of the defense to bring in French attorneys in accordance with Moroccan law. After some weeks of battling these deliberate, illegal procedures of the court, the lawyers and the defendants ceased to participate in what had become a mockery of justice.

Together with the odious death sentences, the court made a repugnant effort in its verdict to divide the defendants.

The Fourth International, in sending its greetings to the defendants, appeals to the world workers movement and the liberation movements of the colonial peoples to indicate their feelings about the scandalous Rabat verdict and help save the lives and win the release of these militants of the Moroccan vanguard.

GET U.S. TROOPS OUT OF VIETNAM!

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following declaration on March 16:

In recent weeks the imperialist rulers of the United States have been threatening to extend their undeclared war in South Vietnam into North Vietnam. At the moment they have somewhat muted their belligerent declarations about bombing Hanoi. Since McNamara's return to Washington the talk has been reduced to mounting guerrilla forays into North Vietnam and to increasing the already colossal flow of weapons and dollars to keep the rotten Saigon regime in power.

The danger thus remains that U.S. intervention in South Vietnam can "escalate" at any time. This in turn would almost surely bring in China and the Soviet Union.

The basic fact in South Vietnam is that U.S. imperialism and the reactionary puppets it is maintaining there face a military debacle. In the same region where imperialist France suffered a historic defeat a decade ago, the still mightier power of imperialist America now faces a still more spectacular catastrophe at the hands of an insurgent people seeking national liberation and socialism.

What power the colonial revolution is revealing! With a courage that will live forever in the memory of mankind, the Vietnamese people are following the example of the Chinese, the Cubans, and the Algerians, and, almost barehanded, are seizing the very arms brought to suppress them in order to turn them against their would-be conquerors.

This lesson will ring throughout the rest of the colonial world with thousandfold force, bringing fresh tens of millions to their feet in rebellion against the schemes of the new imperialist combination that was created on the ashes of World War II.

And inside the United States itself, big sectors of the population, particularly among the workers, farmers and minorities, will recall the lessons of Korea and speak out more insistently against the insane policy of plunging American forces into military adventures in foreign lands. The same sectors that created an irresistible pressure at the end of World War II to bring the GI's home, will gain in courage in demanding that the American troops be withdrawn from Vietnam.

The whole world will back them in three slogans that are the most realistic in the situation:

Hands Off Vietnam! Let the Vietnamese people determine their own fate! Get U.S. Troops Out of Vietnam!