

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 18

May 1, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

FLN Congress Reaffirms Algeria's Socialist Orientation -- by Livio Maitan	1
Fourth International Sends Greetings to FLN Congress	5
Viriato da Cruz Joins Angolan Front	5
New Stage in Spanish Workers Struggle -- by Ramon Vazquez	6
The Lesson of Brazil -- by Manolo Sarmiento	10
The "Cutback" in Nuclear Production	13
Showdown Looming in Southern Rhodesia	14
Werner Heisenberg Affidavit Offered in Alexander Case	15
Nelson Mandela Tells Court, "I Am Ready to Die"	17
Civil-Rights Exhibit at World's Fair -- by Evelyn Sell	21
New Miracle Product for Your Nerves	23
Oswald Photo Was Faked -- by Joseph Hansen	24
And What About that Shot Fired at General Walker?	27
Belgian Gov't Bows to Doctors -- by Fernand Charlier	28
"Trotskyist" Purge in British Communist Party	30
Québec Students Say It with Snowballs -- by R. Brock	31
Ontario's Hospital Crisis -- by Catherine Scott	33

FLN CONGRESS REAFFIRMS ALGERIA'S SOCIALIST ORIENTATION

By Livio Maitan

ALGIERS, April 23 -- The congress of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] came to a close Monday night with speeches by Chairman Bachir Boumaza and Ahmed Ben Bella, who was elected Secretary General. On Tuesday afternoon a mass meeting was organized in Algiers to present the members of the newly elected Central Committee. Ben Bella utilized the occasion to make another speech, commenting on the decisions of the congress and on the current political situation.

As was expected, the congress unanimously adopted the program and the resolutions proposed by the political commission and by the economic and social commission. The general line of these texts was

not questioned in actuality by anyone. The amendments that were accepted, although in certain instances not without interest, did not involve the essential points and implied no essential modifications.

This outcome of the congress, we repeat, should arouse no surprise. It is clear, in fact, that what in Algeria is currently called the "socialist option" corresponds to the deepest aspirations of the Algerian masses. Under these conditions opponents could not attack the fundamental lines of the program without suffering a very severe defeat. It must not be forgotten in addition that on the theoretical and programmatic level, the left holds big advantages, while the conservative and rightist elements are much less clear politically. Furthermore they do not preoccupy themselves with working on programs and texts. It is significant in addition that outside opponents -- those who did not participate in the congress -- thought it necessary themselves in some of their declarations to the press abroad not to question the "socialist option."

Having said this, it would be altogether wrong to conclude from this that the congress expressed substantial unity and represented an absolutely positive acquisition. In reality, rather profound differences found expression in quite distorted and deformed ways at the congress, and there is no doubt that Ben Bella felt very strong pressures, perhaps stronger than he had expected.

It is difficult to single out and characterize currents, political tendencies, which in reality exist only in a rather approximate form. The often very lively debates brought into relief the existence or the survival of groups and "clans" the origin of which goes back to the past, including the crisis of the summer of 1962 and October 1963. The arguments advanced and the themes in dispute appeared secondary in themselves, at times being more linked to the past than the present. But at bottom, they expressed political differentiations and oppositions.

In a general sense the congress was the rather faithful reflection of the present political scene in Algeria. (Those absent, it is hardly still worth noting, achieved, so to speak, their own liquidation and more than ever are outside the real play of forces.) And the conservative resistance -- which is real, and despite everything, very powerful in the country, was evident at the congress, at times even with extreme proposals. These were primarily the Islamic themes which were advanced by sectors as an ideological cover for their real tendency and their real interests. One delegate even went so far as to propose that it must be made obligatory for women to wear the veil and to completely cover their arms with sleeves!

The polemic about and between the military figures also won the attention of the congress. The old rivalries between the army of the interior and the army of the frontiers was revived, feeding on new themes and grievances. Colonel Boumedienne, whose role appears

to be declining in the present phase, was reproached, for example, for utilizing a certain number of cadres out of the French army. In his defense, Boumedienne invoked technical reasons and said he was ready to give up the cadres referred to, in the event different means could be provided to meet the technical requirements.

But the struggle became sharp and rough above all in connection with the election of the Central Committee. It is evident that where it is undesirable or impossible to openly question the general orientation and program, the real game becomes the conquest of positions in the leadership, of key posts (this is true obviously not only of the party but also, and even more, of the state, the administration, the economy, etc.). Thus there were fierce encounters, not in the full sessions, in the official meetings, but in the circles where the list of candidates was being made up to submit to the congress. There is no need to cite the rumors, founded on leaks. A sentence in the closing speech by Ben Bella says much about the atmosphere in the final phase of the first sessions of the FLN. "It is my duty to tell you," said Ben Bella, "that for three or four days, after overworking, I have been under nervous tension. If I have offended some brothers with my words, I beg their pardon from the depths of my heart."

The composition of the Central Committee, composed of eighty members and 23 alternates, is, on the whole, the most significant indication of the congress. Roughly speaking, two groups can be distinguished of almost equal force (thirty odd members each), representing respectively the tendency that is most properly Ben Bellist, and the army of the interior. It should be noted that chiefs of the former wilayas, including some who openly fought against Ben Bella, are on the Central Committee -- even people who for a time took to the hills such as the well-known Mohand Ou El Hadj who was with Ait Ahmed last fall. The Boumedienne group is represented by about fifteen persons, the others being linked in general to the former Federation of France and the present organization of the Algerian emigrants in France and Europe [Amicale des Algériens en France].

Another aspect worth underlining: The Ben Bellist tendency includes at the same time elements of the left who favor self-management, etc., such as Mohamed Harbi the editor of Révolution Africaine, and others who could be considered to be a tendency more inclined toward bureaucratic solutions and less enthusiastic about self-management (for example, Mahsas, Boudissa).

It is thus to be seen that the Central Committee is a body containing a certain equilibrium of forces and in which Ben Bella plays and will continue necessarily to play the role of an arbiter to a considerable degree. In fact, his personal position has been still further reinforced, and an amendment to the statutes approved by the congress goes in the same direction: while the original draft envisaged the election of the Secretary General by the Central Committee, it was finally decided that the Secretary General is to be elected by the congress.

New Political Bureau

The Political Bureau elected by the Central Committee also includes representatives of all the groups and tendencies, including elements that are flatly conservative, even reactionary, who took to the hills. The Political Bureau, after the departure of Khider and Bitat, had been reduced to three members, all of whom were re-elected. The new Bureau of seventeen members is as follows: Ahmed Ben Bella, Secretary General of the party and President of the Republic; Col. Houari Boumedienne, First Vice-President of the Council and Minister of Defense; Saïd Mohammedi, Second Vice-President of the Council; Bachir Boumaza, Minister of the National Economy; Abdelaziz Bouteflika, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Ahmed Ali Mahsas, Minister of the Agrarian Reform; Mohammed Seghir Nekkache, Minister of Social Affairs; Ahmed Medeghri, Minister of the Interior; Hadj Ben Alla, President of the National Assembly; Ali Mendjeli, Vice-President of the Assembly; Omar Benmahjoub, Deputy of Orléansville; Col. Tahar Zbiri, Head of the General Staff of the ANP [Algerian National People's Army]; Col. Mohand Ou El Hadj, former Commander of the Seventh Region (Kabylie); Col. Chaabani, former Commandant of the Fourth Region (Biskra); Youcef Khatib (Col. Si Hassan), former Commandant of Wilaya 4 (Algérois); Hocine Zaouane, representative of the Federation of Greater Algiers; Aït El Hocine, Chairman of the Amicale des Algériens in France.

From all the evidence, it is clear that the situation at the congress led to a certain retreat on some very indicative points (role and conception of Islam). This was evident in a clear and unmistakable way in the differences between the speeches made by Ben Bella at the beginning of the congress and at the meeting in the Esplanade de l'Afrique.

Almost all the conscious cadres in Algeria are now convinced that the socialist orientation has been settled and that the program has been more or less accepted. But the real problem now, they feel, is its application -- how to apply the line and program and by what means, by what instruments.

This problem remains to be solved and it is on its solution that the revolutionary experience now under way in Algeria will be determined in the period now closely ahead.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL SENDS GREETINGS TO FLN CONGRESS

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International sent the following message to the FLN Congress in Algiers:

To the Congress of the Front de Libération Nationale
Algiers

Brothers, Comrades,

The Fourth International sends you its warmest greetings. Through you it salutes the Algerian Revolution, its magnificent example, its militants and its glorious martyrs. The Fourth International wishes the most complete success to the work of your Congress, which will constitute a memorable date in the construction of socialist Algeria.

Long live the Algerian Revolution!

Long live Socialist Algeria!

For the United Secretariat
of the Fourth International

Pierre FRANK

VIRIATO DA CRUZ JOINS ANGOLAN FRONT

The New York Times gave front-page billing to the news from Leopoldville April 22 that the National Front for the Liberation of Angola, headed by Holden Roberto, had decided to accept the membership application of Viriato da Cruz, for years a leading member of the rival Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola.

The Times, writing from the viewpoint of American imperialism, considered the news to be bad. It took the move as further evidence of Holden Roberto's disillusionment with "the United States and other Western countries" for not putting "pressure on Portugal on negotiating with the rebels."

In addition, the flow of weapons from the West has been cut down. As a result, the Times sees Roberto turning toward other possible sources. It recalled his announcement last January that he would send an arms mission to Peking.

The Times also viewed the acceptance of Viriato da Cruz as a sign of increasing radicalization of the members of the NFLA, a tendency which Holden Roberto might not necessarily approve, in the opinion of the New York daily.

THE NEW STAGE IN THE SPANISH WORKERS' STRUGGLE

By Ramon Vazquez

With the big strikes of 1962, a new stage opened in the workers' struggle in Spain. Since then, almost without interruption, a whole series of actions have been conducted by the Spanish workers in pursuit of their demands.

In 1963 the Asturian miners -- in the vanguard of the present battles -- again went on strike and held out for two months against all kinds of pressure from the bourgeoisie, who resorted to violent repressive measures, arresting and torturing miners, inflicting cruel reprisals on their wives, etc. [See World Outlook October 4 and November 8.]

In recent weeks a new series of struggles has taken place, worthy of serious analysis. In fact, in Mieres (Asturias) as well as in Rio Tinto (Andalusia) and in Madrid, at the time of the demonstration at the headquarters of the "trade unions" during their congress, the Spanish workers energetically demanded trade-union freedom -- the right to organize themselves in class trade unions. For the first time, it should be noted, a thousand Madrileños "descended" on the huge building of the Falangist trade-union bureaucracy to shout in the faces of the "leaders" and the "delegatos": "You don't represent anything!!" "We want free trade unions!!" When the demonstrators were arrested, the Madrid factory, Pegaso, staged a solidarity strike in behalf of those taken into custody.

Of course, this is a democratic demand with which not only Communists, Socialists, Anarchists and, naturally, revolutionary Marxists are in agreement, but also certain sectors of the Catholic church, which is preparing to organize a Christian trade union on the basis of the present fraternal organizations for Catholic youth and adult workers. Even a number of "neocapitalists," having in mind the politico-economic evolution which they would like to bring about in Spain, think that corporatist and ultrareformist unions, well integrated in the capitalist system, could be more useful than the present vertical unions (employers, staff and workers in the same union). This holds all the more in view of the fact that the enormous bureaucratic apparatus of the present unions still constitutes an instrument of pressure in the hands of the Falange, of this Falange which the "neocapitalists" would like to crush politically because, in defense of the interests of certain middle layers, it seeks to oppose the domination of the monopolies and integration into Europe.

But this is only one aspect of the question, even though it is very important and must be constantly borne in mind, compelling genuinely revolutionary groups to make more precise the content of the demand: for freedom of the trade unions. Just as important, if not more so, is the following aspect of the question: The Spanish

working class has succeeded, through numerous struggles and despite the absence of a consistently revolutionary leadership (which it has always lacked), in imposing strikes as a means of struggle under the Franco dictatorship, although strikes are legally banned and equated to a subversive and even insurrectional movement. Strikes in Spain still remain illegal. But the Spanish workers have succeeded in imposing them de facto on the government and the capitalists, who find themselves obliged today to recognize strikes. This victory barely having been gained, the workers have taken up a new objective -- trade-union freedom, an open struggle against the vertical Falangist "trade unions."

This struggle, which has just begun, found its echo in the recent student demonstrations in Madrid, Barcelona, Seville, Saragossa, etc., against the SEU [Syndicato Española Universitario, the compulsory Falangist organization]. It is interesting to note that in their leaflets the students expressed solidarity with the workers in their common struggle for trade-union freedom.

* * *

It is necessary to state that once more in the history of the workers' movement of our country, the Spanish workers, in this new stage of their struggle which holds such enormous revolutionary possibilities, remain divided and confused in their struggle, without a powerful revolutionary organization capable of heading the movement and guiding it to the conquest of power.

This is just what is posed. In face of the evolution of Spanish capitalism toward the monopolistic concentration that is underway, despite the many conflicts and the friction among the bourgeoisie itself, there is only one revolutionary alternative -- the taking of power by the industrial proletariat and the peasantry, the proletarian revolution. It seems necessary, unfortunately, to state certain elementary truths to combat the myths that have flourished in the soil of opportunism and political confusion.

While the leaderships of the Communist party and the Partido Socialista Obrero de España advocate struggling for democracy; that is, continuing capitalist domination under new forms(1); other groups, without analyzing in the least the politico-economic reality of Spain, are advocates -- above all in words -- of armed struggle to overthrow Franco. In the final analysis, both currents, despite the insults which they throw at each other, are in agreement on the ultimate objective: the overthrow of Franco and in disagreement only

(1) In this regard it is interesting to compare the statements made by Tierno Galvan, published in the Paris daily Le Figaro [see World Outlook March 20], with the article by Juan Goytisolo which appeared in the April 2 issue of the French liberal weekly L'Express. Both are advocates of the "opening toward Europe" in the name of the opposition of the Spanish "left."

on the means for achieving this. Neither of them are capable of working out genuinely revolutionary strategy and tactics linking the struggles of today against the economic and political structures of Francoism with the general struggle against capitalism and for the conquest of power.

There exists among certain groups of young people -- and some not so young -- an idealistic vision of the revolution, according to which a few small groups, armed and resolute, can succeed in seizing power through audacious actions.

The reformism and immobility of the traditional parties, even more than their own inexperience, drives these young people to search for other roads of action, and they sometimes tend to conclude that patterns of struggle, often ill-studied and ill-assimilated, can be successfully applied in Spain without taking into account certain fundamental differences in the situations. A mechanical analogy is thus often made between Franco's Spain and Batista's Cuba.

Most certainly, the revolution will not be made "peacefully," and not thanks to a hypothetical vote in a hypothetical parliament. But small "Blanquist" groups will not make it either. It will be the working class, the industrial proletariat closely allied with the agricultural workers and the poor peasants, the armed and organized workers, who will make the revolution in Spain.

This poses two problems. The first one, the gravest, the most urgent, concerns organizing a revolutionary party of the proletariat, a party that does not exist at present.

The second problem involves revolutionary strategy. With regard to this, to elaborate a strategy that is genuinely revolutionary -- and not just phraseology -- it is necessary to begin with what actually exists. It is necessary to begin with the workers' movement that is struggling for its demands. This spontaneous and sketchily organized movement has already imposed the strike weapon as a means of struggle against the dictatorship and has deepened and widened the content of its demands to include, as we have noted, trade-union freedom. Certainly, the joint efforts of the bourgeoisie and the reformists in the workers' movement can limit these struggles -- for a period at least -- within the framework of economic demands and "democratic" rights. But it is here, within the workers' movement that the decisive battles must be fought and not in foreign capitals through the blows of press conferences and demagogic appeals to an armed struggle that would not seek to go beyond "overthrowing the dictatorship and returning to the republican legal framework of 1936," even if this hazy objective is enveloped in pseudo-revolutionary phraseology. The liberal republic of 1931-36 is completely anachronistic in our days. Nobody wants it and it is doubtful that anyone would take up arms to impose it on the country. Not the proletariat in any case.

It is necessary, then, to begin with this workers' movement now being reborn from the ashes, after, we could almost say, "fascism had passed like a terrific tank over the workers' skulls and spines," to paraphrase Trotsky. It is necessary to carry on a relentless battle within the workers' movement, against reformism, to win leadership and take the movement out of the "democratic" rut where it risks becoming stuck. It is necessary to elaborate and to apply a revolutionary strategy capable of linking the struggles of today with those of tomorrow, the economic and democratic demands with the revolutionary struggle for power.

This is not simple. Above all in the current ideological confusion. Admittedly, the reformism of the Communist party has given rise to a profound crisis in that party and the birth of at least three "pro-Chinese" groups; but for the moment, these groups are debating in the greatest confusion, from the viewpoint of both organization and theory.

In the Socialist party, too, a crisis is developing, although less sharp up to now than the one in the Communist party. This crisis is due to the projected collaboration of the Socialist leaders with the bourgeoisie in the "Europeanization" of the regime, which has justifiably aroused indignation among many young socialists.

The main problem on the agenda is to work out and put in practice an over-all effective revolutionary political platform. Elements of such a platform have begun to appear little by little. The Frente de Liberación Popular, for instance, an organization that appears to be seeking to seriously orient toward revolutionary Marxism, has launched the slogan for Workers and Peasants Committees of Struggle, not as mere organs of "economic" struggle -- in the style of the Communist party with its teleguided Trade Union Opposition -- but as basic fighting organs in the class struggle in all its forms. In the present situation, the formation of such committees would be a big step forward in the necessary organization of the worker and peasant masses. Naturally, this is not enough. First of all, the committees must really be organized. It is next necessary to co-ordinate them on a national level and above all orient them politically.

A whole series of urgent questions faces the Spanish working class to which answers must be found in action. In the trade-union question, for example, which is on the agenda today, is it necessary to fight for legalization of the old federations, the UGT and CNT [the social-democratic Unión General de Trabajadores and the anarcho-syndicalist Confederación Nacional del Trabajo] (to which will doubtless be added a Catholic federation)? And on what bases? More and more of the opposition movements are coming out in favor of a single federation. This seems positive to us, but the difficulties of realizing it must not be underestimated.

But this is only one of the problems which the workers' struggle

poses at the moment in Spain. In reality, the problem, we repeat, is to work out concrete slogans, forms of action, and the political platform required to transform the spontaneous and potentially revolutionary movement of today into a conscious, socialist, revolutionary movement capable of carrying the struggle against capitalism. For successful guidance in such a transformation, it appears to us, a vanguard workers' party is required. Thus the problem of the revolutionary party is still problem No. 1 for the Spanish revolution today.

In our opinion, this party can be formed only through the collaboration at first and then the fusion of the revolutionary Marxist groups that are scattered today as minorities in various organizations.

THE LESSON OF BRAZIL

By Manolo Sarmiento

MEXICO CITY -- The coup d'état organized by the "gorillas" [reactionary militarists] in Brazil is the logical continuation of the coups d'état which have occurred in a number of countries in Latin America. This one, however, is of much greater significance than all those in Argentina, Ecuador, Peru, El Salvador, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic put together.

Goulart stood in the center of the Latin-American nationalist stream. His efforts to resolve the burning problems of his country were sincere -- insofar as his nationalism permitted him to move. In addition Goulart was practically the only Latin-American leader who considered the Alliance for Progress to be something more than subject matter for speeches. The reforms he sought were all outlined in the Punta del Este Charter. These included a timid expropriation that did not involve more than five per cent of the land in the hands of the latifundists, a timid control of rents in Rio de Janeiro, the expropriation of a few oil refineries, and the extension of the right to vote to illiterate citizens.

This touched off a violent reaction among the ruling classes, who supposedly support the Alliance for Progress. They unleashed a campaign in which they identified Goulart's moderate nationalism with "communism."

One of the outstanding features of the events in Brazil was the clarity with which it showed the depth of the revolutionary situation in Latin America and -- the crying need for revolutionary Marxist leadership. By supporting Goulart as a nationalistic, reformist, progressive bourgeois, the leftist circles around the Communist party led by Luis Carlos Prestes, proved how blind they

were to the reality in Brazil and what criminal misleadership they offered. To place confidence in Goulart as a leader of the Brazilian bourgeoisie, or at least that sector that stood for the "structural reforms" needed by Brazil, signified playing into the hands of reaction.

The catastrophe in Brazil was prepared by illusions sowed among the masses by the petty-bourgeois nationalists and the Khrushchevists. As they depicted it, the problem in Brazil was to struggle only against the "feudalistic landlords" who constitute the main obstacle to development. The way to fight imperialism, according to this school, is "democratically," "with a nationalist struggle," by no means deepening the struggle to an anticapitalist level, since this would alienate the national bourgeoisie, the important ally for this "stage."

One of the crimes of Latin-American reformism is precisely to advocate this profoundly mistaken and antiscientific concept of a revolution in sealed-off stages; that is, first against "feudalism" and then -- we will see.

In Brazil two per cent of the population controls eighty per cent of the arable land. The struggle against this "feudal" structure, according to the reformists, thus involves the urban bourgeoisie as an extremely important element. The reformists placed all their cards on this nationalist, allegedly antifeudal bourgeoisie.

Even a brief indication of the facts will show how erroneous this view is. The development of Brazilian industry, above all in the south, in the São Paulo region, is due primarily to the dollars obtained from agricultural exports like sugar, cocoa, cotton, tropical fruits and above all coffee. In Brazil, a most common phenomenon is the urban industrialist who has his cattle ranch or coffee plantation.

This production of raw materials is directly linked to the world capitalist market. With the money received, the Brazilian landholder, in accordance with the times, was sooner or later compelled to begin investing as a capitalist. In feudal days it was quite different, but as in the rest of Latin America, the landlord of today is not a feudal lord but the descendant of feudalists. A big sector of the Latin-American bourgeoisie developed out of this landed aristocracy.

Mariátegui, Peru's great revolutionary Marxist theoretician, writes in his Seven Essays: "Thus it was that this caste [the landholding aristocracy], was forced by its economic role to assume in Peru the function of a bourgeois class, although without losing its aristocratic colonial vices and prejudices."

The Brazilian landholder, like his kind in Peru, does not view his land as a feudal estate provided with serfs but rather as a

capitalist enterprise producing for the market, although there are notorious similarities between the European feudalists and the American latifundists. Mariátegui says again: "Along the coast, the latifundist has reached a more or less advanced level of capitalist technique, although exploitation still rests on feudal practices and principles. The organization of the production of cotton and sugar cane is in correspondence with the capitalist system. Considerable capital is involved and the land is worked with machines and modern methods."

The Brazilian plantation owner, on receiving his profit in dollars, cannot accumulate them by simply storing them in his mattress. He has to invest. The enormous growth of exports and the consequent rate of import of dollars is evident in the rise of the banks and gigantic financial enterprises of São Paulo. This, then, is the origin of the finance capital of that city.

In view of its own origin, its present relations and its position (the most important in the country), this bourgeoisie is not against the status quo in the countryside. On the contrary. The composition of this bourgeoisie, its multiple links with landholding families, as well as the control of the banks by the big exporters, show how utopian (and therefore criminal) it is to advocate making a "revolutionary" alliance with it.

Brizzola and Goulart are representatives of a tiny nationalist bourgeois sector that wants to avoid a revolutionary storm through reforms. But their bourgeois lucidity is such that an abyss exists between what they preach and what they do. They appealed for "structural reforms," but when the time came to act, they saw that the only forces that were with them were the popular masses and that their own class, as a whole, had abandoned them.

Goulart's aim was to save the bourgeoisie from a socialist revolution, not to build a bridge toward it. In announcing his reforms and appealing to the masses, he remained highly conscious of his role as a bourgeois leader. He refused to follow the example of the sorcerer's apprentice. He understood perfectly that the forces unleashed by "structural reforms" -- under circumstances requiring a mass struggle against his own class -- could not be confined to reformist channels but would burst over everything, opening up the process of permanent revolution and paving the way for the establishment of a proletarian power. Before this perspective, Goulart preferred to look like a demagogue who was really only interested in maintaining himself in power. In that way he helped to keep the lock on the flood-gates of social revolution.

The Brazilian bourgeoisie ruled out even the smallest reforms proposed by Goulart, immediately cancelling the minor measures he had taken. Is any better indication needed of its real position in Brazil? Its resistance to reforms, even those completely within the limits of the Alliance for Progress, shows what a profoundly conservative force it is.

The role of imperialism, utterly in contradiction with the objectives outlined in its own Alliance for Progress, shows once again what a farce this program is. What North American imperialism is interested in is the \$1,500,000,000 invested in Brazil.

The scandalous and shameful events in Brazil show that Trotsky's words in 1938 are as timely as when they were first uttered: "The crisis now facing humanity is the crisis of the leadership of the proletariat."

THE "CUTBACK" IN NUCLEAR PRODUCTION

The simultaneous announcement by Johnson and Khrushchev April 20 that the world's two major nuclear powers have decided to cut back production of nuclear explosive materials, stirred editorial writers to express fresh hope that it might mean at least a halting step in the direction of disarmament.

The New York Times, which is in position to know, offered a more candid explanation. John W. Finney, writing in the April 22 issue [International edition] said the agreement "will not reduce by one kiloton the ability of both sides to wage a hot war.

"The production of atomic weapons will not be affected by the moves, although ultimately the growth of the nuclear arsenal of the two sides may be retarded."

The truth is, Finney said, that for "nearly four years" the cut-back has been in sight. "After nearly two decades of ever increasing production, the nuclear arsenal contained tens of thousands of weapons." The U.S. "by the middle of this year will have more than a \$1 billion surplus of processed uranium. . . ."

The surplus is so huge that the United States "has more than enough weapons materials to continue modernizing and expanding its nuclear arsenal." One of the results of the hundreds of nuclear tests conducted by the United States is the discovery of how to produce "miniature" nuclear weapons. Thus the U.S. armed forces are now completely equipped with thousands of "small, battlefield weapons," which is what is meant by "modernization," and enormous supplies are still available.

"It was this huge surplus of enriched uranium combined with an impending oversupply of plutonium that permitted the Administration to take the initiative in January to cut back the production of the two fissionable materials."

And so Johnson arranged with Khrushchev to do a little peacemongering on the cheap. Khrushchev was obliging. A little favor in helping Johnson to win the election next November might well be remembered. American Presidents are like that, aren't they?

SHOWDOWN LOOMING IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

LONDON, April 18 -- Southern Rhodesia is on the verge of a showdown crisis between the new extreme racist White government and the black majority of the country, according to all reports arriving here this week end. One of the first acts of the government of Prime Minister Ian Smith, who last week replaced the "moderate" racist Winston Field in a further shift to the right forced by the extremists, was to arrest the African leader Joshua Nkomo and several of his associates. This has been taken by the people as the signal for a coming proclamation of "independence" from the British Commonwealth and the establishment of a regime approximating Apartheid as practiced in Verwoerd's South Africa.

Hundreds of Negro women took to the streets Friday in a singing, dancing, chanting protest demonstration that stirred the center of Salisbury (the capital) to a sense of crisis. The racist police arrested many and gave displays of the kind of brutality common to these sadists everywhere. On Saturday, what has been described as "black commandos" retorted by raids on one of Salisbury's biggest department stores.

Arrests were made only after the city center was virtually turned into an armed police camp. "Wild disorder" is reported from Bulawayo -- Nkomo's hometown -- and the African township in Salisbury, with hundreds of shop windows broken and dozens of cars stoned and overturned.

In Northern Rhodesia, the new African majority government of Kenneth Kaunda has pledged all aid short of military to the significantly named "People's Caretaker Council" headed by Nkomo. Similar action is expected from the African government of Nyasaland, the third of the territories which constituted the now dissolved Central African Federation by means of which British financial and commercial interests had hoped to maintain a bastion of white rule on the continent.

The Tory government, in all its wings, hopes that the Smith government will be forced by the storm to quickly give way to a "broadly based center government" headed by the notorious Sir Roy Welensky, who left politics after the dissolution of the Federation, claiming he was double-crossed by the British. The Tories hope that they can thus get about five years in which slowly to give way to a government of the African majority by the institution of a few concessional reforms.

Whether this will actually come about and work is now apparently going to be settled in the streets of Southern Rhodesian towns. The outcome may have a considerable influence on developments in South Africa which borders Rhodesia.

WERNER HEISENBERG AFFIDAVIT OFFERED IN ALEXANDER CASE

From clippings received from South Africa, we are able to provide further details about the sentencing of Dr. Neville Alexander and ten other defendants in Cape Town April 15 to sentences up to ten years because of their political opposition to the government's fascist-like apartheid policy. [See World Outlook April 24.]

In a final appeal before the court, the defense attorneys introduced a number of affidavits in behalf of the defendants. Four of the affidavits were from West Germany where Dr. Alexander gained fame during his days at Tübingen University.

Werner Heisenberg, the world famous nuclear physicist and winner of a Nobel Prize, now the president of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, wrote that the chief defendant in Cape Town's notorious "sabotage" trial was a fellow of the Von Humboldt Foundation from October 1958 to July 1959. His term was twice extended, Prof. Heisenberg said, because of his outstanding scholarly work at the Tübingen University where he received his doctorate magna cum laude.

A similar affidavit was presented by Dr. Friedrich Beissner, Professor of German Philology and director of the Institute of German Language and Literature at Tübingen University. He said, among other things, that Dr. Alexander was an outstanding young man of most estimable qualities.

Judge H.A. van Heerden, however, brushed all such things aside. In his opinion they were guilty of breaking South Africa's infamous "sabotage" law, although he conceded that no actual deeds had been committed -- all that was involved being the expression of ideas and "intentions."

He recognized that they were well-known in South Africa and had high standing. [The newspapers have given the witch-hunt trial tremendous publicity in South Africa -- although a great conspiracy of silence has been maintained throughout the rest of the world about this important case -- and a "large crowd" formed in the street around the court on the day the verdict was handed down.] But in the judge's eyes this made their dangerous thoughts all the more reprehensible.

Under the terms of the law, the judge found them guilty of belonging to the National Liberation Front -- an organization which the defendants admitted they had formed. Judge van Heerden noted that they had read books about guerrilla warfare and had discussed introducing techniques of "armed insurrection into the liberatory struggle" against the white Herrenvolk. The defendants had even written documents.

"The court is satisfied that these documents are not those of a study group -- aimed at forming a united liberatory front or merely to study political matters.

"They are those of a paramilitary organization with both military and political aims.

"By means of a combination of political agitation and guerrilla warfare, supplemented by wide-spread sabotage, strikes and demonstrations, they aimed at the overthrow of the Government of the Republic."

The plan, according to the judge, was to establish cells in each town and to train members as guerrilla fighters and leaders.

Some of the witnesses had been subjected to prolonged solitary confinement, and the defense had introduced expert testimony on how this could affect what the witnesses might say. [See World Outlook April 10.] The judge disagreed. He said he had watched these witnesses in court and they looked all right to him. "To the court he appeared a perfectly normal witness," he said of one.

Moreover, the medical experts hadn't actually examined the specific witnesses. "They therefore could not say whether these were types that would be affected by detention. In any event the medical evidence is that whatever the effect might have been, it would have worn off by the time they came to give evidence in court."

The judge made the following statement concerning the state's case, which should provide an indication as to the nature of the "sabotage" law:

"The State, by establishing the existence of the N.L.F., and its aims, has proved a conspiracy to commit unlawful and willful acts. The State has shown that if the acts contemplated were committed, the safety of the public and the maintenance of law and order would have been endangered.

"The property of the State and others would have been destroyed and persons would have been maliciously killed and murdered."

And so, although no acts at all were committed that "would have" allegedly had such dire consequences, according to the prosecution, all seven men and four women, most of them school teachers, librarians, students (one was a minister) were given savage sentences. Five were given ten years in South Africa's fetid prisons; two seven years; and four were "let off" with five years.

NELSON MANDELA TELLS COURT "I AM READY TO DIE"

The trial of Nelson Mandela and eight other defendants on charges of violating South Africa's "sabotage" act, which had been adjourned six weeks, was resumed April 20 in Pretoria.

This was just five days after South Africa's second show-case witch-hunt trial -- involving Dr. Neville Alexander and ten others -- came to a close. Undoubtedly the Alexander trial served to establish certain precedents for the further handling of the Mandela case.

The Mandela trial opened last October 29. It was quashed the same day by the judge because of the "irregular" way in which the prosecution had prepared the case. This did not bother the prosecution much, however. The police pounced on the defendants in the court room, a quite legal procedure under South Africa's fascist-like laws, and dragged them back to their cells while a new case was prepared. At that time there were eleven defendants but it was announced that one of them had agreed to turn state's witness and in return would not be prosecuted.

Although Mandela was already serving a prison sentence, he was charged with "responsibility" for 222 alleged acts of "sabotage." Under this law he can be given the death penalty. [For background see World Outlook October 18 and November 15.]

On his first day again in court, Nelson Mandela read a long statement entitled "Why I Am Ready to Die," which was placed on the press wires. [The case has received good publicity abroad, among other reasons because of the interest displayed by the United Nations in it.] Extensive sections of Mandela's statement, which specifies his beliefs, appeared in the London Observer of April 26. From that source, we have reproduced some of the highlights:

* * *

I am the first accused. I hold a Bachelor's Degree in Arts and practised as an attorney in Johannesburg for a number of years in partnership with Oliver Tambo. I am a convicted prisoner serving five years for leaving the country without a permit and for inciting people to go on strike at the end of May, 1961.

* * *

I admit immediately that I was one of the persons who helped to form Umkonto We Sizwe [The Spear of the Nation], and that I played a prominent role in its affairs until I was arrested in August, 1962.

I, and the others who started the organisation, did so for two reasons. Firstly, we believed that as a result of Government policy, violence by the African people had become inevitable, and that unless responsible leadership was given to canalise and control the

feelings of our people, there would be outbreaks of terrorism which would produce an intensity of bitterness and hostility between the various races of this country which is not produced even by war. Secondly, we felt that without violence there would be no way open to the African people to succeed in their struggle against the principle of white supremacy.

But the violence we chose to adopt was not terrorism. We who formed the Umkonto were all members of the African National Congress, and had behind us the A.N.C. tradition of non-violence and negotiation as a means of solving political disputes.

* * *

It may not be easy for this court to understand, but it is a fact that for a long time the people had been talking of violence -- of the day when they would fight the white man and win back their country, and we, the leaders of the A.N.C., had nevertheless always prevailed upon them to avoid violence and to pursue peaceful methods. When some of us discussed this in May and June of 1961, it could not be denied that our policy to achieve a non-racial State by non-violence had achieved nothing, and that our followers were beginning to lose confidence in this policy and were developing disturbing ideas of terrorism.

It must not be forgotten that by this time violence had, in fact, become a feature of the South African political scene. How many more Sharpevilles would there be in the history of our country? And how many more Sharpevilles could the country stand without violence and terror becoming the order of the day?

At the beginning of June, 1961, after a long and anxious assessment of the South African situation, I, and some colleagues, came to the conclusion that as violence in this country was inevitable, it would be unrealistic and wrong for African leaders to continue preaching peace and non-violence at a time when the Government met our peaceful demands with force.

Umkonto was formed in November, 1961. Umkonto was to perform sabotage, and strict instructions were given to its members right from the start that on no account were they to injure or kill people in planning or carrying out operations.

The fight which held out the best prospects for us and the least risk of life to both sides was guerrilla warfare.

* * *

I started to make a study of the art of war and revolution and, whilst abroad, underwent a course in military training. If there was to be guerrilla warfare, I wanted to be able to stand and fight with my people and to share the hazards of war with them.

I approached this question as every African Nationalist should do. I was completely objective. The court will see that I attempted to examine all types of authority on the subject -- from the East and from the West, going back to the classic work of Clausewitz, and covering such a variety as Mao Tse-tung and Che Guevara on the one hand, and the writings on the Anglo-Boer War on the other.

* * *

Another of the allegations made by the State is that the aims and objects of the A.N.C. and the Communist Party are the same. The allegation as to the A.N.C. is false.

* * *

It is true that there has often been close co-operation between the A.N.C. and the Communist Party. But co-operation is merely proof of a common goal -- in this case the removal of white supremacy -- and is not proof of a complete community of interests.

It is perhaps difficult for white South Africans, with an ingrained prejudice against Communism, to understand why experienced African politicians so readily accept Communists as their friends. But to us the reason is obvious. Theoretical differences amongst those fighting against oppression is a luxury we cannot afford at this stage. What is more, for many decades Communists were the only political group in South Africa who were prepared to treat Africans as human beings and their equals; who were prepared to eat with us; talk with us, live with us and work with us. They were the only political group which was prepared to work with the Africans for the attainment of political rights and a stake in society. Because of this, there are many Africans who, today, tend to equate freedom with Communism.

It is not only in internal politics that we count Communists as amongst those who support our cause. Although there is a universal condemnation of apartheid, the Communist bloc speaks out against it with a louder voice than most of the white world.

I turn now to my own position. I have denied that I am a Communist, and I think that in the circumstances I am obliged to state exactly what my political beliefs are.

I have always regarded myself, in the first place, as an African patriot. . . .

It is true, as I have already stated, that I have been influenced by Marxist thought. But this is also true of many of the leaders of the new independent States. Such widely different persons as Gandhi, Nehru, Nkrumah and Nasser all acknowledge this fact. We all accept the need for some form of Socialism to enable our people to catch up with the advanced countries of this world and to overcome

their legacy of extreme poverty. But this does not mean we are Marxists.

* * *

From my reading of Marxist literature and from conversations with Marxists, I have gained the impression that Communists regard the parliamentary system of the West as undemocratic and reactionary. But, on the contrary, I am an admirer of such a system.

The Magna Charta, the Petition of Rights and the Bill of Rights are documents which are held in veneration by democrats throughout the world.

I have great respect for British political institutions, and for the country's system of justice. I regard the British Parliament as the most democratic institution in the world, and the independence and impartiality of its judiciary never fail to arouse my admiration.

* * *

Basically, we fight against two features which are the hallmarks of African life in South Africa and which are entrenched by legislation which we seek to have repealed. These features are poverty and lack of human dignity.

South Africa is the richest country in Africa, and could be one of the richest countries in the world. But it is a land of extremes and remarkable contrasts. The whites enjoy what may well be the highest standard of living in the world, whilst Africans live in poverty and misery.

The lack of human dignity experienced by Africans is the direct result of the policy of white supremacy. White supremacy implies black inferiority. Legislation designed to preserve white supremacy entrenches this notion.

Africans want to be paid a living wage. Africans want to perform work which they are capable of doing, and not work which the Government declares them to be capable of. Africans want to be allowed to live where they obtain work, and not be endorsed out of an area because they were not born there. Africans want to be allowed to own land in places where they work, and not to be obliged to live in rented houses which they can never call their own. Africans want to be part of the general population, and not confined to living in their own ghettos.

Above all, we want equal political rights, because without them our disabilities will be permanent. I know this sounds revolutionary to the whites in this country, because the majority of voters will be Africans. This makes the white man fear democracy.

"Drive a While for Freedom"

A CIVIL-RIGHTS EXHIBIT AT WORLD'S FAIR OPENING

By Evelyn Sell

On April 9 the Brooklyn branch of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] announced plans to tie up New York World's Fair traffic on opening day, April 22. Leaflets urged: "Drive a while for freedom. Take only enough gas to get your car on exhibit on one of these highways."

[In the United States, a tactic of stalling automobiles on a highway offers quite practical possibilities. Possession of an automobile has long been a necessity for a majority of workers as transportation to and from the job. Millions of Negroes own automobiles, and they are not always low-priced or second-hand models, although many installments may still be due on them, since they are most often bought on "easy" credit terms. Even several decades ago, automobiles were used by American and Canadian workers to form virtually impassible barricades around plants during strikes.]

Mayor Wagner's administration quickly swung into action against the "stall-in" plan. A new traffic regulation made it illegal to run out of gas on expressways, bridges and tunnels. Offenders will have to pay a \$50 fine.

The very next day the sanitation workers union stated that all 10,000 members would refuse to show up for work on April 22 if they were asked to haul away stall-ins. The president of the Sanitation Men's Local 831 said, "We're not going to scab on anyone fighting for freedom or civil rights."

However, the sanitation workers' principles were not matched by Brooklyn CORE's parent organization. On April 11 the national leadership of CORE suspended the Brooklyn branch and warned all other CORE members against participation in the stall-in. The Manhattan and Bronx chapters refused to give up their support to the project and withdrew from the national organization over the issue.

A member of the CORE steering committee that ordered the suspension called the stall-in "non-violent hell-raising. It won't end segregation but it might end CORE." The committee announced that its plans for the Fair were to picket the pavilions of six southern states and six companies who engage in unfair hiring practices.

Paternalistic Advice

The stall-in plan has been blasted by conservative Negro leaders and the so-called friends of civil rights among white liberals.

New York senators Keating and Javits urged Negroes to ignore the proposed stall-in. Keating called the plan "a demonstration of irresponsibility." Senators Humphrey (Democrat) and Kuchel (Republican) who are leading the bipartisan civil-rights bill forces, issued a joint attack on the militant tactics used in civil-rights demonstrations.

In an April 15 statement they condemned "Illegal disturbances, demonstrations which lead to violence or to injury. . . ." They claim that such demonstrations "strike grievous blows at the cause of decent civil-rights legislation." They urged Negroes instead to pursue a "peaceful crusade with the same good manners, forbearance and devotion so abundantly displayed last August in the civil-rights march on Washington."

Last August's civil-rights march was designed to persuade Congress to pass civil-rights legislation. Now, almost a year later, no such legislation is on the books but Humphrey and Kuchel tell the Negro people to be peaceful, forbearing and good-mannered in the face of repeated bombings, shootings, police brutality and legislative do-nothingism.

Their go-slow advice is even more ironic when we know that the civil-rights bill has been locked up in the Senate for five weeks through the efforts of eighteen Dixie Democrats and one Southern Republican.

Even if this pitifully inadequate bill is passed by the end of the summer, as is now predicted, the average Negro will not benefit from its provisions for many years to come. Laws are only as good as the enforcement powers that back them up. The sad story of the Supreme Court school desegregation decision reveals the sober truth about the enforcement of civil rights in the United States. Ten years after the court verdict less than ten per cent of southern Negro children attend integrated schools.

Kennedy's Brother, Too

In the face of this sorry record the so-called good friends of the Negroes persist in denouncing all militant attempts by the Negroes to gain some measure of equality. They warn the Negroes that any "excesses" by civil-rights forces will bring down the wrath of the racists upon the whole movement for Freedom Now.

Attorney-General Robert Kennedy added his voice to this chorus when he spoke before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16. He fully endorsed the warnings of Senators Humphrey and Kuchel who claim that the passage of the civil-rights bill would be seriously hampered by violent demonstrations.

Appearing with Kennedy at this meeting were a number of Negro leaders who issued a statement condemning the proposed stall-in at

the World's Fair opening. Such an action, the statement claimed, would be contrary to the "broad interests and needs of the Negro people."

The statement was signed by Roy Wilkins of the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People], Whitney Young of the National Urban League, A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Dorothy Height of the National Council of Negro Women, James Farmer of CORE and John Lewis of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee [SNCC]. (Mr. Lewis later denied signing the statement although newspapers listed his name.) The Rev. Martin Luther King endorsed the statement, also.

Ministers Attack "Freedom Now"

Other militant Negro groups are currently under attack as the country braces itself for the expected race crises of the summer. A group of Negro Baptist ministers in Detroit condemned "extremists" who, they said, are spreading "violence, bitterness and hatred" under the guise of working for civil rights.

The ministers specifically condemned the Michigan Freedom Now Committee, which is petitioning to get on the state ballot, and the Group on Advanced Leadership [GOAL] which has waged successful battles to get fair history texts into Detroit public schools so that white and black children can learn the true history of Negroes in this country.

Dr. Williams, the president of the Baptist Ministers Conference, said, "Extremism is neither God's way nor the American way. I want you to make this clear to your people from your pulpits. I want you to tell your people that this protest thing has gone overboard, that it has gone too far."

Protest groups such as the Brooklyn CORE, GOAL and the Freedom Now Party are continuing their militant struggles in the face of repression, threats, warnings and the withdrawal of the faint-hearted from the ranks of the freedom fighters. It is racist violence that "has gone too far"; the struggle to win true equality has not gone far enough yet.

NEW MIRACLE PRODUCT FOR YOUR NERVES

The Associated Press reported April 21 that the United States government has been producing vast quantities of a new product for your nerves. Odorless, tasteless, virtually invisible, a single drop, breathed or soaked into the skin can kill within four minutes, in fact the nerve gas is "hundreds of times more toxic" than any insecticide now on the market. The U.S. Army rates it as almost as good as nuclear weapons. Besides that, it's "inexpensive." So you can relax.

"LE MONDE" DECLARES OSWALD PHOTO WAS FAKED

By Joseph Hansen

PARIS, April 23 -- The leading daily of Paris, Le Monde, which enjoys a world-wide reputation for its high standards of journalism, this week stated flatly that the sensational photograph of Lee Oswald, featured in such magazines as Life, Newsweek and Paris-Match, showing the alleged assassin of President Kennedy brandishing a rifle, a pistol and a newspaper, was -- a fake.

Since this affirmation was made in the April 21 issue of Le Monde other publications have featured the "new 'mystery'" -- as it was called by Le Monde -- and at least two have reproduced the evidence of the fakery. The most crushing proof yet adduced of Oswald's guilt has thus suddenly become the most damning evidence of a frame-up.

The faked-up "proof" was spotted by Analyses et Documents, a Paris socialist documentary service, and published in their March 19 edition. Here is what they wrote:

"Among the 'proofs' promised by the Dallas police, immediately after the arrest of Lee Oswald, was a photograph showing the alleged murderer brandishing the rifle used in the killing in one hand and a newspaper in the other. The newspaper was said to be either The Militant, a newspaper of the American Trotskyist party, or a headline, 'Be a Militant,' an editorial from an issue of a newspaper of the John Birch Society, a fascist-like organization. The photograph was not produced by the police at the time. It has just been produced, in the United States, three months later, by Life and the Detroit Free Press under conditions that are all the more disturbing since the two copies are identical in all respects except the representation of the rifle. In the one, the rifle, with a short stock, is equipped with a telescopic sight; in the other, the rifle, with a long stock, has no telescopic sight. The first photograph was bought for \$5,000 by Life Magazine from James Martin, the FBI agent charged with guarding Marina Oswald, the wife of Lee Oswald. The other was bought, according to a Dallas policeman, by G. Roberts of the Detroit Free Press. (It was reproduced in Newsweek March 2, 1964, p. 54)."

The article in Analyses et Documents continues: "Paris-Match (No. 777 of February 29, 1964) published the falsified reproduction showing the rifle equipped with a telescopic sight on the cover, under the caption: 'This photograph ends the mystery of the death of Kennedy.' The falsification is evident, in fact, since according to the police, the photograph was taken in the spring of '63, while the sight was fitted, according to the same police, November 6, 1963."

Who made the fake photograph? Analyses et Documents speculates that the U.S. federal police agencies themselves are involved, that they are trying to hide the real circumstances of the murder of the

president of the United States.

Le Monde declares that a check has been made and the observations of Analyses et Documents "have been revealed to be accurate: the photograph published by Newsweek shows Oswald holding a rifle without a telescopic sight, while the telescopic sight is very plain on the photograph published by Paris-Match and Life Magazine. The newspaper which the alleged assassin of John Kennedy is holding in this photograph is not identifiable; it seems to have been whited with gouache [opaque water color] with this in mind. We recall that according to some versions that it was supposed to be The Militant, organ of the American Trotskyists; according to others it was a newspaper of the extreme right-wing John Birch Society, in which an editorial carried the title: 'Be a militant.' Mr. Jesse Curry [Dallas chief of police], at the time of his press conference [where he first talked about the photograph] scarcely showed himself very precise, since he likewise cited, according to some press agencies, the Communist newspaper Daily Worker.

"However that may be, the fakery is certain. Someone or a group was interested in creating the belief that the gun brandished by Oswald was really the one used in the assassination of John Kennedy. It would seem impossible to identify with sureness a gun in a document as indistinct as this photograph -- one can also ask moreover how Mr. Jesse Curry was able to affirm that the revolver which Oswald carried at his hip and of which only the butt can be seen -- is really the one that killed Officer Tippit. The Warren Commission will not be able to explain this new enigma."

A series of startling articles on the assassination of Kennedy was recently completed in the liberal Paris weekly L'Express. The author is an American, Thomas Buchanan, but his analysis of the evidence was too "hot" for the big press in the United States and he had to seek a European outlet. In L'Express of April 23 he summarizes the facts about the now notorious photograph and adds this:

"Which then is the good photograph? L'Express posed this question to the Paris representatives of Life and Newsweek. Life cabled to its office in the United States, and gave us the official reply: 'No comment.' [In English in original.] Newsweek is waiting for a reply.

"One or the other, or both American journals have been, it seems, victims of an operation that is at least curious."

Today's New York Herald Tribune [European edition] took all this without batting an eye. It reported the discovery in Paris that the photographs in Life and Newsweek were exactly alike except for a minor detail. Under the caption "Too Simple for French," the Herald Tribune said: "This was enough to set off the press here, which from the beginning has refused even to consider anything so simple as

Oswald having killed the President. Most papers have preferred to print exclusive and inside stories of dark and complicated plots."

This is the line that has been followed consistently by the capitalist press in the U.S. with the possible exception of the New York Times among the major papers. The line is that it is perfectly normal in the U.S. to have someone like Oswald assassinate a president, displaying marksmanship that few experts in the world could match, and just as normal to have him protest his innocence and then be assassinated in turn in a police headquarters in front of the TV screens of the entire country by a super-patriotic gangster who earns a normal living as a police stool pigeon and strip-tease entrepreneur. In Europe all this just doesn't appear normal, the American newspapers explain; Europeans are more devious and suspicious-minded than clear-thinking, uncomplicated Americans who can see what is obvious.

The truth is that the Europeans are much more simple-minded in their approach to the case than the American press cares to admit. The Europeans tend to believe that a man should be considered innocent until he is proved guilty. They do not deny that Oswald might be guilty, but they feel that they are entitled to know the evidence.

When the "evidence" that is adduced turns out, as it has in instance after instance, to be nonexistent, or self-contradictory, they draw the uncomplicated conclusion that something smells very fishy about the whole case.

The series by Thomas Buchanan had great impact in France. It is now to appear in book form with simultaneous translations in a number of languages. It has been reported that even the original English manuscript may see the light of day.

Buchanan's approach was quite different from the one followed by the Dallas police and their U.S. federal collaborators. They operated from the beginning on the theory that Oswald was guilty and that the evidence was bound to prove it. Thus there was a strong tendency to imagine "evidence." Certain proofs that did not fit the preconceived hypothesis apparently simply vanished or were forgotten. And, as the photograph proves, in at least one instance proof was deliberately falsified. Buchanan's procedure, on the contrary, was to assemble all the known facts -- as they appeared in the press -- and see what deductions could be drawn from this.

Proceeding in this empirical way he was able to demonstrate that the probabilities are high that a number of persons were involved in the murder and that Oswald was most likely not the killer although he was in on the plot. Buchanan suggests specific clues that should be followed up. The identity of the policeman who permitted Oswald to leave the warehouse should prove of interest, he indicated. Likewise the identity of the detective who tailed Oswald from the warehouse to

his room and then to the theater. Another mystery that cries for investigation, in his opinion, is the role of Officer Tippit.

Behind the persons directly involved in the plot, Buchanan suggests the value of investigating the figures whom he thinks stood to gain most politically from the assassination -- the ultra-reactionary oil barons of Dallas.

As for Oswald, Buchanan is of the opinion that he was a minor figure in this political assassination, probably connected with a federal agency, who was selected to serve as the scapegoat.

AND WHAT ABOUT THAT SHOT FIRED AT GENERAL WALKER?

The photograph reportedly purchased by Life Magazine for \$5,000 from the FBI agent placed in charge of Marina Oswald, the wife of the alleged assassin of Kennedy, was doctored up in some photographic laboratory it has now been shown. This should call fresh attention to another bit of strange "evidence" in this case that reeks of frame-up.

The "evidence" is the assertion, ascribed by the press to Marina Oswald that her husband confessed to her that he had fired a shot at the ultra-reactionary Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker on the night of April 10, 1963. This assertion received major headlines in the big press throughout the world, and it was, of course, quite damaging to the alleged killer of President Kennedy.

But Marina Oswald's purported declaration was not the first to be made crediting the hero of the John Birch Society with having been shot at through the window of his home (but miraculously missed) by the same expert marksman who was able to fire with almost unbelievable speed and accuracy at a swiftly moving target in the presidential car.

The first source to make this revelation was the German neo-Nazi National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung of Munich. This sheet said immediately after the assassination that Lee Oswald had attempted to shoot Maj. Gen. Walker. It charged that the investigation of the attempted murder had been suspended on orders from Robert Kennedy. The same issue carried an interview with Walker himself.

All this was reported in the Paris daily Le Monde of November 30. It was not until December 6 that the Associated Press repeated the story about Oswald allegedly firing at the general. The Associated Press did not credit the Munich fascist newspaper as the original source. Credit was given instead to "government sources" in Washington and Oswald's widow was listed as the ultimate source. How, then, did the neo-Nazi newspaper in Munich get this information at least

a week before the Associated Press in Washington?

In pointing to the thinness of this piece of "evidence" in the case built against Oswald, World Outlook [see issue of December 13, 1963, p. 4] declared that the new charge against Oswald "brings General Walker prominently into the news and in the most favorable political light -- as almost a martyr from the same gun used against Kennedy.

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

This line of inquiry has not yet been followed up. There seems to be little likelihood that it will be. The resources needed to dig up the facts in this direction seem to have been mobilized for other purposes -- such as faking a photograph to convict Oswald in the pages of U.S. journals of mass circulation like Life Magazine.

THE BELGIAN GOVERNMENT BOWS TO THE DOCTORS

By Fernand Charlier

BRUSSELS, April 20 -- After seventeen days, the refusal of the majority of Belgium's doctors to handle cases came to an end. The "strike" order of the medical associations was lifted after they had received a guarantee from the Social-Democratic and Christian-Social government that discussions would be opened "on fundamentals"; that is, on the content of the government medical insurance law sponsored by Minister Leburton.

Thus the government came out the loser in this "battle." It offered a helping hand to the medical associations just when their "strike" was beginning to disintegrate! It is worth inquiring why these concessions were made. The principal reason is that the government is pulled in opposite directions by antagonistic forces.

The corporatist "trade-union chambers" ["chambres syndicales"], as the medical associations call themselves in Belgium, represent the very epitome of reactionary "liberalism." Above and beyond their "defense of the liberal professions," is to be seen the hand of the extreme right-wing movements, organizing among the "middle classes" on a fascist-like basis.

The government is based on an alliance between the Christian

Social [Catholic] party and the reformist Socialist party. Its platform, like that of similar governments in Europe is "neocapitalism," the "renovation" of the capitalist system. It hoped that the favorable aspects of the medical insurance law -- despite its great weakness -- would lead the working class to forget the harsh blows it has had to take, such as the law on maintenance of "order."

Through the social aspects of the law, which granted free care -- but not medicine, etc. -- to widows, invalids, pensioners, and orphans, it hoped to fight on two fronts:

(1) To keep the upper hand over the "Parti de la Liberté et du Progres" [the former Liberal party], which the doctors support;

(2) To present a favorable image to the workers, counteracting the effects of jumps in prices, and hiding its incapacity to finance public utilities, which has been reflected in a relative decline of the budget for public health in recent years.

This explains why the government -- despite the progress represented by the Leburton law -- did not succeed in arousing great enthusiasm among the workers for the law itself. It also explains why it was not able to convince the majority of "hesitators" in the medical profession. It had to resort to coercion to mobilize the "striking" doctors.

Big mass demonstrations took place against the reactionary maneuver of the doctors. The central slogan of these demonstrations was "For a National Health Service!" This demand was advanced by the socialist left wing and by the two Communist parties. It should be noted, too, that the demand was included in the program of the Social Democrats. But this official program was written before collaboration with the government!

In the light of this, one can understand why trade-union boss Louis Major sought to bring the demonstrations to an end at the first signs of an agreement.

It is not likely that the government will give way on all the demands of the doctors -- long bargaining will take place again during the discussions "on fundamentals" which are scheduled to begin April 22. But the Fédération des Industries Belges [FIB, the most representative employers' organization] rushed to the assistance of the doctors and has just come out in favor of reconsidering free medical care. The argument advanced is the "danger of medical over-consumption."

This is a well-known phenomenon. It was seen in Great Britain on the introduction of the National Health Service. It involves an increase in care. But it must be added that after a certain time, the "consumption of care" becomes stabilized around a new level. The

phenomenon in fact shows quite simply that many needs formerly went without being taken care of.

The Social-Democratic Minister Leburton declared, when the "doctors' strike" came to an end, that he felt "reasonable optimism." But in face of the difficulties of the hardly glorious bargaining now on the agenda, some of the Social Democrats are thinking in terms of a collapse of the present government. This would permit them -- they hope -- to regild their coat of arms in the electoral campaign that would then be opened.

"TROTSKYIST" PURGE IN BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY

The London Sunday Telegraph of April 19 reports that a "purge of Trotskyists is in progress in the British Communist Party." A directive urges party members to report anyone they suspect of "disruptive activities" -- a rather wide category in an organization shaped under the influence of Stalin.

To help the members in their detective work, the circular asks: "Who are the Trotskyists in your area? Which group do they belong to? Where do they work and show themselves?"

"Who sells the various publications? We want to know so that we can protect the party from their activities."

The top bureaucrats seem particularly concerned about the penetration of "Trotskyist" ideas among the youth. Members of "other organisations," says the directive, have infiltrated Communist student branches, "deliberately joining our party for the purpose of disruption."

A confidential "history" of Trotskyist organizations in Britain, running to more than 12,000 words, has been distributed inside the party. The document is critical of the lack of awareness among party members that "dangerous disruptive activity can result from the work of very small groups."

The campaign against Trotskyism in the British Communist party appears to be motivated by two considerations: (1) To counteract the sympathy evident in certain sectors of the party for the Peking position in the Sino-Soviet conflict. A number of expulsions have already occurred over this issue and it is evident that more are to follow. (2) To demonstrate as effectively as possible that the top leadership stands squarely in Khrushchev's camp. The directive is a "British" application of the campaign against Trotskyism launched in Moscow.

In Moscow's campaign, which is associated with the Sino-Soviet

conflict, the Fourth International and organizations in ideological sympathy with it such as the Socialist Workers party in the United States have been subjected to heavy fire in various official publications. Most recently, Suslov, in his report on the Sino-Soviet conflict, singled out the Fourth International for attack and accused the Chinese Communist party leaders of having borrowed from its arsenal of ideas and giving them a "Chinese" veneer in their efforts to expose Khrushchevist "revisionism." [See World Outlook April 10 and April 24.]

QUEBEC STUDENTS SAY IT WITH SNOWBALLS

By R. Brock

QUEBEC [Delayed] -- Some 4,000 French-speaking university students marched on the provincial legislature here April 1 to demand free university education. Massing in front of the heavily policed building, they roared their approval as student leaders called for a "new social policy" to end Québec's economic planning. The slogans they carried on placards included: "For a policy for farmers, workers, unemployed, students"; "Less for arms, more for the people"; "Québec belongs to us, let's take it"; and "The quiet revolution must be a social revolution."

Although originally intended to support the fiscal demands of the Québec Liberal government at the Dominion Provincial conference taking place here at the same time, the demands of the students escalated into what was in effect a damning indictment of the government's failure and inability to solve the province's economic, social, and political problems. And if there was any doubt concerning the basically antigovernment sentiments of the marchers, it was dramatically dispelled when all 4,000 of them turned their backs on Trade Minister Gérard Lévesque, representing the Lesage administration. When he attempted to make himself heard above their lusty heckling, they began pelting him with snowballs.

Premier Lesage had refused to address the students. And their repeated cry "We want Lesage" didn't exactly resemble a fan club slogan.

The march was organized by the student associations of the three French-language universities -- Montreal, Laval, and Sherbrooke -- as well as the classical college students, the Presse Etudiante Nationale, the Normal school students, and the Copains of St.-Henri. Also participating were a small group of "free English students," mainly from McGill University. The march was supported by the peace movement, including the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. The English-language Canadian Student Union throughout Canada endorsed it.

But the official students' associations of the English universities had declined to participate in what their spokesmen termed "premature" demonstrations, saying they feared "violence" would erupt and claiming that they opposed the "socialization of education" as demanded by the French students. (The administration of Sir George Williams University went so far as to threaten with expulsion anyone who participated in the demonstration.) The English press had for days before the march predicted bloodshed and violence. And even the mass-circulation French daily La Press had, just previous to the march, attacked it for embarrassing the government. In view of this opposition, the high degree of participation and orderliness of the marchers was a vivid refutation of all these Cassandras and their hangers-on.

Emulating the Negro March on Washington last summer, the organizers established defence guards to handle discipline and avoid police intervention. In fact, the only incident, a minor one, occurred when a few of these guards overzealously tried to break up some signs belonging to the militant separatist group, the Front Républicain pour l'Indépendance.

Both in their speeches and in a hard-hitting eleven-page brief which they presented to the Québec government, the students demonstrated the broad aims behind the march. As Pierre Marois, president of the University of Montreal students' association, said: "It is not for ourselves that we demand free education, but for our 'moral members,' who are as intelligent as us, if not more, and who vegetate today because they did not have the necessary money to continue their education."

Their brief pointed out: "We are perfectly aware that the investment of astronomical sums in education will not in any way settle the problem of chronic unemployment which strikes so hard the workers of Québec."

Moreover, it said, "most fishermen and farmers live in insecurity and have completely inadequate incomes. They are exploited by middlemen, incapable of coping with foreign competition and are victims of a badly organized market. They often have only the choice between going into debt and becoming the eternal slaves of the credit companies, or abandoning the land of their fathers and joining the multitude of non-skilled workers on the labor market of the urban centres."

Thus, the brief concluded, "if free education is not accompanied by a sufficient economic amelioration of the underprivileged classes it will remain a measure which will profit above all the bourgeois classes in the same way as family allowances allow certain people to obtain more comfort, without being in any way a really effective solution in families where the father is chronically unemployed."

Calling for economic planning, the brief warned against "fear-

ing to go against certain interests, for it is certain that, left to itself, economic development will still be confined to already strongly industrialized areas, and always to the profit of the possessing classes, on both sides of the [U.S.] border."

It also condemned as "completely unacceptable" the expenditure by Canada of 23 per cent of its \$7 billion budget on "national defense," while the provinces lack sufficient funds to carry out the proper "social policies."

ONTARIO'S HOSPITAL CRISIS

By Catherine Scott

TORONTO, April 16 -- The fundamental crisis in Canadian medicine that drew world attention in 1962 to the Saskatchewan Medicare program and doctors' strike, has again hit the headlines. In Ontario, Canada's most heavily populated province, the shortage of hospital beds has reached emergency proportions.

For the past decade, hospital corridors have been used for lack of space in the wards and patients have had to wait weeks for ordinary operations. But recently an emergency case died because no bed could be found for him in Metropolitan Toronto. Yet the victim had fully paid-up hospital insurance collected by the provincial government.

Prepaid hospital insurance is compulsory for the vast majority of Ontario residents, but the government has failed to provide adequate hospital accommodation. The government makes very substantial grants to hospitals but they are governed by private boards, often representing some religious group, and always dependent to some degree on charitable donations. There is no over-all planning of construction -- the responsibility rests with individuals in each community.

The shortage of beds is further aggravated by a shortage of nurses. Supposedly recipients of a three-year training program, they are in reality spending over half their time as hospital workers. The hospitals exploit these students to cut labour costs. Graduate nurses are underpaid, overworked and arbitrarily treated. As a result many graduate nurses change their occupation. The shortage is so severe that some completed hospital buildings could not open for this reason.

In British Columbia where a prepaid medical insurance plan covers about 75 per cent of the population, the doctors are demanding a raise of almost six per cent. The trade unionists in the plan are fighting hard to force the doctors to negotiate. They object to

the fee increase when the average annual income for doctors is between \$17,000 and \$18,000.

And in Saskatchewan the fight of 1962 over Medicare is not yet over. The privately controlled hospitals are still barring doctors, who have co-operated with the government insurance plans, from hospital privileges. A Royal Commission has recommended that a government board be set up to which rejected doctors can appeal. The Saskatchewan Federation of Labor has urged the government to take over the hospitals if necessary in order to provide pro-Medicare doctors with hospital facilities.

Meanwhile the people of Saskatchewan are solving the problem in their own way. Because of the refusal of many doctors to deal with the government insurance scheme and because of the obvious advantages of group practice, community clinics have sprung up across the province, organized through co-operative associations.

So far there are fourteen clinics with forty doctors participating, all of whom bill the government directly. The clinics provide improved facilities, group consultation and give the patient, through the co-operative, some say in the medical service provided.

A bright note last week was the cable sent to the Belgian government by a dozen Saskatchewan doctors offering their services to the Belgian people, who were victimized by the doctors' "strike" there.

CORRECTION

In last week's World Outlook in T.J. Peters' "London Letter," on page 10 the sentence inside the parentheses in the second paragraph from the top should read: "However, they forced the government to concede labor representation on the 'independent tribunals' which could help them lay the case for their demands before the public. . . ." etc.