

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 19

May 8, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

Khrushchev's Warning to U.S. on Cuba -- by Joseph Hansen	1
Proposed Conference of Communist Parties -- by Pierre Frank	4
What Kind of Unions Are They?	6
Pentagon Seeking "Death Ray"	6
Cubans Challenge Yugoslav Action	7
Please Correct the Address for Shipments of Gold	9
Che Guevara on the Cuban Party, Brazilian Crisis, Etc.	11
Spy Plane Flights Exposed in Venezuela	14
Venezuelan FALN Rescues Prisoner	15
Italian Trotskyists Call for Resolute Struggle	16
Guerrilla War Continues in Eritrea	17
U.S. Heads for Disaster in South Viet Nam	
-- by Juan de la Cruz	18
1,340 Civil-Rights Battles in U.S. -- by Evelyn Sell	21
Lenin's Correspondence with Second International (Book Review) -- by Fernand Charlier	23
Multimillionaire Has Only Praise for South Africa	26

KHRUSHCHEV'S WARNING TO THE U.S. ON CUBA

By Joseph Hansen

At a May Day dinner in Moscow, Premier Khrushchev read the text of a prepared speech containing the sharpest warning to the U.S. government delivered by any top Soviet official since the crisis over Cuba in October 1962. Once again the topic was Cuba and the provocative acts committed against the heroic people of this revolutionary island which again risk setting off a chain reaction that could end in a nuclear catastrophe.

The essential paragraphs, dealing with continued flights of U.S. spy planes over Cuban territory in violation of Cuba's sover-

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE - Hebdomadaire

Abonnement, 26 numéros : 37,50 F, à Pierre FRANK, 21, rue d'Aboukir, Paris (2^e).

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send dollars 7.50 or 2/15 s. or 37,50 francs to : Pierre Frank, 21, rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2^e, France.

eignty and in violation of international law, dealt ostensibly with the interpretation of Khrushchev's policy of "peaceful coexistence."

The policy should not be misread, said Khrushchev. Rumors had been spread in the United States about an understanding between the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the flights of U.S. spy planes over Cuban soil. No such understanding exists, the Soviet premier declared. The USSR supports completely the "five conditions" laid down by Fidel Castro at the time of the crisis created by Kennedy over placement of rockets in Cuba in October 1962. "There could never be any question of such an understanding," he said, "because the USSR will never reach an understanding with another state to the detriment of a third country, no matter whether it is big or small.

"We have already said," he continued, "and we declare once again that a threat to Cuba, the continuation of the violation of its sovereignty, the intrusion into Cuba's air space, can have disastrous consequences.

"This will be a disaster, first and foremost, for those who carry on a policy of provocations and aggressions against Cuba.

"We wish to say once again to those who are playing with fire, that in violating the principles of peaceful coexistence and in demonstrating a lack of consideration with regard to other countries, they can drag the world into a new war."

A Blind Reaction

The State Department brushed aside the warning as so much May Day oratory. As the State Department's reply to Khrushchev's words, press officer Richard J. Phillips told a news conference that the overflights of the spy planes would be continued.

The White House would do well to consider a bit more closely whether Khrushchev was just engaging in the Soviet equivalent of Fourth of July speech-making in the United States. Johnson, like Kennedy and Eisenhower, understands perfectly that Khrushchev's basic policy toward the United States is a continuation of Stalin's policy -- he seeks an over-all understanding at the expense of world revolution. Johnson understands this so well that he has indicated that he supports Khrushchev as against Mao in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

The question arises: Is Khrushchev willing to sell-out the Cuban Revolution as part of the payment for an over-all deal? This is what was implied in his denial that any secret agreement exists approving continuation of the flights of spy planes over Cuba.

It is not necessary to argue whether Khrushchev is willing to make a deal at the expense of the Cuban Revolution. It can be

granted that he would be perfectly willing and even relieved to be able to make such a bargain. This is shown by his whole past which is not one of revolutionary struggle or devotion to revolutionary principles but of careerism in the bureaucratic structure of the USSR under the not exactly moral rules laid down by Stalin.

The point is -- and this is what the White House should ponder -- can Khrushchev get away with it?

Could Mean His Head

The answer is that it would be an exceedingly dangerous gamble and Khrushchev is aware of it.

First of all, the Cuban Revolution is headed by independent figures who have displayed political talent and a moral stature not matched since the days of the Bolsheviks. They are immensely popular not only among the Latin-American masses, and among the peoples of Africa and Asia, but among the masses of China and above all Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union where they have a special aura.

It would be difficult to conceive a single act in the field of foreign policy that would bring greater discredit to Khrushchev and the group around him than a crude betrayal of the beleaguered Cuban revolutionaries. It could well finish Khrushchev -- not slowly, but swiftly -- and open the way for genuinely revolutionary forces to displace the present regime in the USSR and install a new one with a dynamic outlook like the one displayed in the days of Lenin and Trotsky.

Would Prove Mao's Thesis

The chances for such an outcome rose considerably with the development of the Sino-Soviet conflict. Clearly Mao would not have the slightest interest in acquiescing in a betrayal of the Cuban revolutionary leadership. On the contrary, the Chinese government, representing one-quarter of the human race, would emblazon the betrayal on their banners as the most convincing proof of everything they have charged against the Khrushchev leadership.

Their denunciations would find fresh receptivity among the Soviet masses, and the Chinese bid for leadership of the Communist parties throughout the world would be greatly advanced despite their bizarre appeals to the ghost of Stalin.

As an old practical politician, Johnson should be able to grasp that the very reasons impelling him to favor Khrushchev, should also impel him not to force Khrushchev to deliver something that would signify his own swift destruction. Khrushchev, as another old practical politician will draw the line on that. This is the meaning that the White House should draw from Khrushchev's warning. It is not just oratory; it is not just bluff; it is very serious.

THE PROPOSED CONFERENCE OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

By Pierre Frank

The exacerbation of the Sino-Soviet conflict has reached the point of a rupture in fact between the Soviet and Chinese tendencies. While the Chinese have won only a minority of Communist parties, their repeated attacks have placed the Khrushchevist leadership in an embarrassing position in which its authority has been undermined. If the attacks do not necessarily strengthen the ranks of the Chinese tendencies, they favor centrifugal currents in relation to the established leaderships of the Communist parties.

The Soviet leadership consequently has been led to raise the question of formally condemning the Chinese leadership in order to check the disintegration of its own authority. Thus the Suslov report advanced the proposal to convoke a new conference of Communist parties to consider the dispute. Under the present conditions, where no political compromise is possible, this would signify a gathering of all the anti-Chinese currents in the Communist parties to vote for the condemnation of the Mao leadership.

But a difficulty arises. The Communist International no longer exists. The Communist parties are no longer tied to each other by formal organizational bonds; in 1957 and 1960 the conferences did not create any central body. Before convoking a conference, therefore, it is necessary to obtain the agreement of those whom it would be desirable to have in attendance.

If Khrushchev's policies of "peaceful coexistence," of the "peaceful and parliamentary roads," etc., are supported by the majority of the leaderships of the Communist parties, more than one is hostile -- for reasons peculiar to each case -- to pronouncing any kind of anathema on the Chinese leadership. The main reason is the resistance to cutting international links which, by force of things, would give too much weight to the leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

What is the situation in this regard among the Communist parties?

Outside the workers states, there are three big Communist parties where things stand as follows:

(1) The French party where Thorez, since an agreement reached with Khrushchev before the Moscow conference of 1960, has lined up faithfully with the Soviet leadership. As a result, Thorez has been beating the drums for a gathering of the Communist parties in accordance with Suslov's proposal.

(2) The Indonesian party which is supporting the Chinese, and which consequently does not want such a conference.

(3) The Italian organization where Togliatti and most of the members of the Italian leadership, both to the right and left of him, are against an excommunication and therefore against a conference called for that purpose. An Italian delegation has gone to Moscow. If the Italian leadership should refuse to attend a conference, other European parties would certainly follow suit.

Finally, among the workers states of Eastern Europe, the opposition of the Poles, and the less clear opposition of the Hungarians would be reinforced.

It is also probable that Communist parties in Asia, Africa and the Americas would not show up.

Under these conditions, to convoke a conference where, in place of the 81 parties that were present in Moscow in 1960, only sixty odd parties attended, would constitute a serious setback for Khrushchev even before the agenda was voted on. One can be sure that he will do everything possible to avoid such an outcome. It is safe to conclude that he will conduct hard negotiations, especially with the Italian leadership, which occupies a kind of key position in the situation, in order to find a formula for agreement, a compromise corresponding both to his own needs and those of the other leaderships who, although they are right-wing opportunists, nevertheless do not care to recreate a system which appears to them to be too rigid.

Up to now there is no evidence that would indicate that an organizational compromise at the expense of the Chinese is excluded or that the conference will not take place. Khrushchev needs it badly. He cannot impose it because he lacks the means to operate the way Stalin did. Presumably he envisages paying a high price for what he wants.

This juncture in the Sino-Soviet conflict illustrates, in any case, the depths of the impasse of the bureaucratic system of the Communist parties on the international scale. In an International with a democratic regime, composed of parties that also have democratic regimes, the discussion of political differences would have a completely different aspect and a World Congress would be able to reach a majority opinion without being concerned about questions of prestige, of skirting issues, etc. It is true that the discussion in such an International would not remain within a framework imposed by bureaucratic leaderships whose material means are in inverse proportion to the power of their theoretical and political arguments.

Confronted with this incapacity to hold a free discussion, many a member of the Communist parties is inevitably led to ask if either of the two sides really represents Leninism. Here, too, it is easy to see why the question of Trotskyism, of the Fourth International, has been brandished in the conflict by the two powerful antagonists who are confronting each other.

WHAT KIND OF UNIONS ARE THEY?

The Soviet trade-union leaderships refused to send a delegation to the May Day celebration in Peking and cancelled the invitation they had extended to the Chinese trade unions to send representatives for the festivities on the same day in Moscow's Red Square. The Chinese trade unions, on the other hand, renewed their invitation to the Soviet trade unions.

The decision of the Soviet trade unions raises a very serious question: Are the Soviet trade unions really workers organizations?

At the Tenth Congress of the Bolshevik party in 1921, Lenin declared that the workers ought to have trade-union organizations capable of defending their rights, "even against their own worker's state." The workers' rights must not be viewed from a narrow economic angle. The Soviet workers must also have political rights, especially the right to disagree with policies of the Soviet government or of the ruling party at a particular moment.

Whatever may be the differences and the relations between the Communist party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist party, nothing can justify the Soviet and Chinese trade unions automatically lining up with the parties and governments of their countries and more or less breaking relations with each other. This situation occurred once before, at the time of the Yugoslav-Soviet conflict in 1948. Is it necessary to repeat the scandal?

The attitude of the leaders of the Soviet trade unions shows that they are not the representatives of the workers but vulgar government functionaries. Despite all the changes that have come with "de-Stalinization," the Soviet workers still do not have genuinely independent organizations; in particular they don't have genuine trade unions. This raises the question of the antibureaucratic political revolution which will re-establish Soviet democracy, granting, among other things, the right of independent workers organizations to be maintained within the framework of the workers state.

PENTAGON SEEKING "DEATH RAY"

The new military budget in the United States includes \$6,400,000,000 for "research," including development of a "death ray." Deadly nerve gases are already being stockpiled. However, the generals want to add something even more ghoulis to their arsenal.

A "death ray," long a favorite among science-fiction writers, might be developed out of the "laser," an electronic instrument that releases bursts of light in narrow wave lengths of enormous power.

CUBANS CHALLENGE YUGOSLAV ACTION

Under the title, "An Unfriendly and Hostile Act against Cuba," the Havana daily Hoy published an unusual front-page editorial in the April 11 issue which deserves to be studied by well-wishers and defenders of the Cuban Revolution. Because of its interest, we are providing the following translation:

* * *

As is known, a second Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Nonaligned Countries has been called.

The preparatory meeting held in Colombo set the gathering for October in Cairo.

At the first Conference -- which was held in Belgrade -- Cuba attended, represented by the President of the Republic, Compañero Osvaldo Dorticós. From Latin America observers were also sent by Brazil, then under a democratic and peaceful-minded government, and by Bolivia.

The results of that meeting were positive and met with a favorable response in international public opinion.

The first Conference, which had a very wide composition, adopted agreements in favor of world peace, of the right of peoples to self-determination; condemned the manifestations of colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism; and, in addition, formulated concrete declarations on certain acute questions of an international nature affecting people's freedom movements. The right of Cuba to self-determination and the recovery of exercise of its sovereignty over the territory occupied by the Guantánamo Naval Base was the subject of a specific declaration in the final document of the Conference.

In the agenda of the second Conference, themes again appear which are promising for the cause of peace, for the relaxation of international tension and better understanding among peoples. Thus the themes of colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism are included in the proposed agenda for the meeting that is being prepared.

However, in contradiction to the objectives of the Conference -- conditioning the character of its composition -- in the preparatory meeting at Colombo something absurd happened which cannot but cast a shadow on the second Conference: this time the Government of Venezuela was invited to participate at the very moment when, at the instigation of the United States and in line with a coarse provocation of the CIA [Central Intelligence Agency], it is carrying out a real plot against Cuba, a plot involving grave risks to peace in the Caribbean and, in the final analysis, the world.

The delegation which pressed the most vigorously for the invitation to the Government of Venezuela was the one from Yugoslavia. Such an attitude on the part of the Government of Yugoslavia must necessarily be regarded as an unfriendly, disloyal and hostile act against Cuba.

The present Government of Venezuela, day in and day out, is the most aggressive and servile pawn of Yankee imperialism in Latin America. The Government of Venezuela is acting against the interests of peace in the Caribbean today and actively conspiring against peace by promoting in the OAS [Organization of American States] an action designed to prepare conditions which could be propitious for an attack on our country.

Venezuelan foreign policy thus corresponds completely with the meddling and aggressive plans of the CIA and the Pentagon.

While the Government of Yugoslavia was pushing the unreasonable invitation to Venezuela, ex-chancellor Falcón Briceño was making a new trip through Latin America, in the name of his government, with the aim of forming a fictitious majority in the OAS which would give a green light to all kinds of attacks against Cuba. Venezuela is attempting to use the OAS as a shield for anti-Cuban adventures.

Can someone who is hatching armed aggression be favorably greeted in a Conference that aims to mobilize forces to slow down the aggressors?

The Government of Venezuela is also lined up against the right to self-determination, since, out of hatred for the Cuban Revolution, whose example is inspiring neighboring peoples, it has espoused the aim of an invasion of Cuban territory by foreign forces. In this way -- as Compañero Fidel has explained -- it is "more Papist than the Pope" and calls for the United States and other countries of the continent to plunge into such an adventure, condemned to failure and incalculable consequences for humanity.

The move by the Yugoslav Government to foster the participation of the Government of Venezuela in the next meeting at Cairo, besides contributing to adulterate the obligatory anti-imperialist composition of the gathering, constitutes an unworthy act of gratuitous offense to our country.

In America Cuba is the vanguard of the struggle against imperialism. The Government of Venezuela is today in America the vanguard of imperialism in its struggle against the people's freedom movement in this continent. To invite the Government of Venezuela to an international gathering in which the phenomenon of world imperialism must be faced is not only a contradiction, but, in addition, an affront to the clean and glorious Cuban achievements.

The peoples of Latin America will not be able to understand

this absurdity. The feelings of the peoples of Venezuela and Cuba have been deeply wounded. Nothing explains, much less justifies, the conduct of Yugoslavia.

Cuba has the right to expect a rectification.

Memo to Peking and Moscow

PLEASE CORRECT THE ADDRESS FOR SHIPMENTS OF GOLD

The Peking People's Daily strongly implied April 27 that Soviet Premier Khrushchev has been financing the world Trotskyist movement. The editorial did not specifically name Khrushchev. The reason for this failure remains obscure since it could scarcely be out of consideration for Khrushchev's feelings. Nor could it be out of fear of a libel suit in view of Khrushchev's poor chances of winning in any Chinese court. Perhaps this will be cleared up when the People's Daily carries out its promise to furnish "proofs."

The charge about Khrushchev slipping money to the Trotskyist movement was part of a long commentary on Suslov's report, which the People's Daily published in the same issue. One of the main points in Suslov's report is the accusation that the Chinese leaders are playing the game of the Trotskyists. [See World Outlook April 17 and April 24.]

The assertions of the People's Daily about Khrushchev and the Trotskyists are as follows: "We must remind you that there is indeed a person who in the past supported Trotsky's reactionary views and had therefore to make a self-criticism for committing the error of Trotskyism; that there is indeed a person who, singing the same tune as Trotsky, launched a frenzied campaign against Stalin at the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist party, with the result that the Trotskyites in all countries, then at the end of their rope, began to raise their heads; and that there is, indeed, a person who is now in collusion with Trotskyites everywhere and buying them over for the dirty work of sabotaging revolution. We are prepared to publish the relevant materials when necessary."

This charge makes a logical counterpoint to the material which appeared last November in the Yorkshire Post and Le Figaro implying that the British Trotskyists were receiving -- not Moscow -- but Peking gold!

One Pierre Bertrand, writing in the November 19 Le Figaro said: "Everything strengthens the belief, whatever the facts may be, that this attempt at infiltration, of which the Communist leaders are not without uneasiness, has chosen as instrument various Trotskyist groups across the Channel who have displayed for several months a

revival of activity which can be ill explained if it is not due in part to support thanks to financial aid, the origin of which remains obscure."

Getting more specific, Mr. Bertrand cited the Yorkshire Post: "In British Communist circles, in any case, it seems that they are convinced, observes the 'Yorkshire Post,' that China is at present not sparing any effort -- including the financial plane -- to try to build a new Communist international obedient to Peking." [See World Outlook November 29, p. 19.]

These allusions to finances being disbursed by both Peking and Moscow to the Trotskyist movement did not fail to attract the attention of the treasurer of the Fourth International, Pierre Frank, one of the founders of the world Trotskyist organization.

Pierre Frank was still trying to track down the Chinese yen min piao supposed to be flowing into the Trotskyist movement in England when he read in Le Monde that it was really Soviet rubles and Peking was prepared to prove it. With so much cash in sight, the treasurer of the Fourth International could not resist the temptation. He sat down at his battered Erika portable and banged out the following letter to the editor of Le Monde:

"Editor:

"In the April 28 issue of your newspaper, you published extracts from an article which appeared in the People's Daily of Peking declaring among other things:

"... a person [Khrushchev, it would seem] who is now in collusion with Trotskyites everywhere and buying them over for the dirty work of sabotaging revolution. We are prepared to publish the relevant materials when necessary."

"So that my request might be heard in Moscow as well as Peking, I would appreciate your printing this letter in your columns.

"As treasurer of the Fourth International, I can state that I have not received a centime either directly or indirectly from Moscow, and my organization is in financial difficulty from one year's end to the next. I am thus obliged to ask -- if you will excuse the expression -- 'Where's the dough?' And I invite Peking to publish whatever proofs it has without waiting, and I ask Moscow to indicate to whom the funds were sent.

"If I can take advantage of your courtesy, I should like to add that before the war the Trotskyist movement was accused of being in the pay of Hitler and the Mikado, and some months ago it was said in the British press that Peking was sending big sums to the Trotskyists. But in no case did any of this money reach me. Has it become necessary to remind them, then, that we are a movement doing

everything that revolutionaries can possibly do in the open, that I have a very modest office at 21 rue d'Aboukir in Paris, and that it is surprising that governments in other ways so sensible should always resort to questionable intermediaries to send the money to those for whom, it appears, it is intended?

"Thanking you in advance,

"Cordially yours,

"Pierre Frank"

CHE GUEVARA ON THE CUBAN PARTY, BRAZILIAN CRISIS, ETC.

Recently Che Guevara, the well-known Cuban leader, spent a few days in Algeria. While there he granted an interview to the weekly Révolution Africaine [April 18]. The following is a translation from the French text of this interesting discussion:

* * *

Question: One of the characteristics common to Algeria and Cuba is that, contrary to experiences such as those of the USSR and China for example, revolutionary movements of imprecise nature took power; then, wishing to build socialism, ran into the problems of constructing a socialist party. How have you handled the rather particular questions raised by a process of this kind?

Answer: In Cuba we had three problems:

(1) Who could be a member of the party?

First of all, those who were former members of our movement, affiliated on the basis of an imperfect system of elections organized under all the uncertainties of the underground, etc. But all the former members had to appear before the masses on the job and be admitted by them before they could join.

Next, those who were simply elected on the job. The masses were urged to elect those whom we call exemplary workers; that is, citizens who distinguish themselves in their productive activity first of all. But, since an exemplary worker may not be politically worthy, a commission of our movement discussed with him in order to judge his capacity to be a good militant and referred him to his electors with the necessary explanations, if need be until a solution was reached.

(2) What is the role of the party in the state?

At the beginning we committed an extraordinarily bad error in making the party an organ of administration, whereas, as we came to understand later, it should have been only the ideological motor and the political controller.

As an ideological motor, the party must explain and popularize in depth the national decisions of its leadership and of the state.

As political controller, the party watches and abstains from administering. At any level except the top one, the party organizations must not impose their point of view on the administration, but only pose the problem before the higher bodies of the party itself. Even when, for example, the director of a factory is at the same time a member of the party, he must act as a militant in his cell and an administrator in his enterprise.

(3) What are the relations between the party and the state?

We have not yet found a solution to this problem. We are searching empirically for a road. Elections in their Western form seem false to us. For example, a legislative body shaped by bourgeois methods becomes either a brake on the state or a gathering of "yes men." We have maintained the old administrative structure and we have not made a new constitution, but we have introduced empiric changes when it was necessary. In short, we lack a completely new organization of the state. We count on the party to find a solution to these questions.

Q: But since a party and a state exist despite everything, are you looking for the solution to the problems in their relations in the direction of separation of powers or fusion?

A: As I said, the task of each of these two pillars of our society is particular but the policy is the same. The three most important personalities of the state, who are at the same time the three main authorities of the party, personify the unity of the line and application of our domestic and foreign policies.

Q: There is a problem which faces all the revolutionary movements in the world: the fusion of the party and the state always leads finally to the fusion of policies and ideology. For example, suppose that the state is obliged to practice a policy of peaceful coexistence, while the party believes that such a policy is not correct. . . Are you searching for a means to permit the party and the state to maintain their independence with regard to each other?

A: Yes, we think that this independence must exist. But, we acknowledge that we are searching for the formula which we lack on this subject.

Q: With regard to the second problem which you pointed out, bearing on the distinction between the administration and the party,

have you found a concrete system for applying it?

A: We cannot say that we have really found a system of this kind, but we have a principle which I explained when I said that we considered the administration and the party as two parallel hierarchies. But I must make clear that we have not sought a solution in the sense of barring members of the party from exercising certain administrative functions or vice versa (contrary to what we did in the unions, since we established, for example, that a factory director could not be a member of the union). In other words, we tried to establish a distinction between the prerogatives and not with regard to persons.

Q: When there is a conflict between the administration and the party, who has the final word?

A: We discuss together but the party makes the final decision.

Q: After the coup d'état in Brazil, what do you think of the situation in Latin America?

A: In 1961, we participated at Punta del Este at an economic conference which was to give birth to the Alliance for Progress under the patronage of the United States. We exposed secret papers which the Venezuelan patriots had seized in the American embassy at Caracas. At that time Teodoro Moscoso was ambassador of the USA to Venezuela. The filched papers revealed that Brazil, in the strategy of the United States, occupied a key position in Latin America. They concluded that they had to liquidate the progressive left in that country.

The United States hoped to finally succeed in isolating Cuba from the rest of Latin America. Up to now Brazil had blocked this maneuver. Today all this is changed.

Falcón Briceño, who is traveling all over the American continent, has the firm hope of gaining rapid condemnation of Cuba, this time with the aid of the new Brazilian authorities.

Nevertheless the calculation of the United States is perhaps a mistaken calculation. From its key position, Brazil on the eve of a civil war, is capable of drawing into the movement the countries having a common frontier; that is, the major part of Latin America.

Q: Must it be concluded from the collapse of the Brazilian left that reformism is condemned to defeat in Latin America?

A: Assuredly. In Latin America every classic army is a class army and all the bourgeoisies are counterrevolutionary classes par excellence.

Q: What is the position of Cuba with regard to the next conference of nonaligned states?

A: In principle, Cuba is not hostile. But it is my turn to ask you a question: "Do you consider Venezuela, whose government is fighting against its own people, to be a nonaligned state?" No, it is not. Now Venezuela is to participate in this conference. . .

Q: At the last Afro-Asian conference, which was held in Algiers, many delegations expressed the view that to get out of the impasse created by the Sino-Soviet conflict, it was desirable to have the adherence of the Latin-American movements.

A: In principle, Cuba is in agreement on joining. She would reinforce the anti-imperialist contact of the Afro-Asian peoples. For the other Latin-American movements, it's a question of who would be invited to join. If it were those that are supported by the present governments in power, believe me, they will in no way reinforce the Afro-Asian solidarity movement.

SPY PLANE FLIGHTS EXPOSED IN VENEZUELA

The United States is flying U-2 type spy planes over Venezuela, according to a report published in the March 10 issue of Pueblo y Revolución, the underground publication of the FALN [Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional -- Armed Forces of National Liberation]. The information was obtained by the Intelligence Service of the FALN.

The following is a translation of the article:

* * *

The preoccupation of imperialism over the upsurge of guerrilla forces in many colonial and semicolonial countries who are struggling for liberation, has become an obsession, a veritable psychosis. Fifty-seven thousand (57,000) antiguerrilla experts of the State Department are now engaged in fighting national focal centers and giving instruction to native traitors to counteract this method of liberation chosen by the peoples.

The main counter guerrilla training camps are in Panama, South Vietnam, Europe and North America itself. But not content with this, in each country annual courses are being given against rebellion. Here in Venezuela, for example, courses are being given at San Juan de los Morros, Puerto Cabello, La Mariposa, Conejo Blanco, etc. With the approval of the traitor governments, the State Department is making desperate efforts to smash the people's liberation movements, trampling on national sovereignty and dignity to impose plans that have nothing to do with the reality in our countries.

The Intelligence Service of the FALN has exposed a plan elaborated by the hated Yankee Military Mission, which is operating in Venezuela, that violates our national sovereignty, diverts money from the nation and converts the Venezuelan army into a mere automaton in the service of interests foreign to our people. The plan is the following:

Since February North American planes of the U-2 type called P-2V have been flying at high altitudes over the country's coast. The planes are equipped with radar of 100 miles radius and fly constantly back and forth along the coast in an east-west direction. The P-2V's are in communication with three destroyers of the Venezuelan navy located in the west, the center and the east of the country. They are equipped with radar of more than 200-mile radius. In addition they remain in touch with the Centro Operacional de Comunicaciones (COC) installed at Conejo Blanco, a centralized organism for military communications in the country. Through this center, or directly, the P-2V's order light B-25 bombers which can act as interceptors, or F-86's which are genuine interceptors.

The function of this military equipment, which is costly to keep in action, is nothing less than to combat the growing development of the guerrilla forces and to intercept their points of supply. The North American militarists and their native agents forget that such technical measures are of little efficacy in face of the decision of the peoples to mount a war of liberation. They also forget that the traitors and those who sell-out their country are only a camarilla at the top of the army and that the great majority of our officers, noncoms and soldiers are honest and are joining the FALN on an increasing scale. In their posts in official bodies, in street struggles or in guerrilla detachments, they know how to fight at the side of the people to defeat imperialism in its drive for domination.

We call on all the civilian and military patriots to sabotage this antinational plan imposed by the Yankee Mission.

VENEZUELAN FALN RESCUES PRISONER

In a bold move in Caracas April 27, two members of the FALN staged a daylight raid on a hospital at Barquismeto. Their objective was not the cash box but the rescue of a captured comrade José Toro Torres. Armed with submachine guns, they overpowered a guard and the chief nurse and escaped with Toro in a stolen taxi.

The rescued freedom fighter had been captured last November and sentenced for allegedly participating in the bombing of a bridge. Recently he had been transferred to the hospital.

ITALIAN TROTSKYISTS CALL FOR RESOLUTE STRUGGLE

ROME -- The National Executive of the Revolutionary Communist Groups, the Italian Section of the Fourth International, published a resolution April 5 on the political situation in the country.

The first part of the document deals with the economic situation and its principal causes. [See World Outlook April 10 for analysis on this topic.] "The conclusion to be drawn," declares the resolution, "is clear: in reality there are two fundamental lines, two fundamental alternatives. In the one case, the existing system is accepted as given. It is then difficult to object to the logic of certain positions of the foe and certain conjunctural measures and at the most all that can be advanced is the perspective of rationalizing reforms which in the present context can by no means actually eliminate the imbalances and bottlenecks which are denounced as abnormal but which are strict consequences of the structuration acquired by the system. In the other case, the necessity is understood of an attack on the structural centers, the necessity of beginning reforms of an anticapitalist nature so as to radically alter the logic and functioning of the economic machine, the necessity of destroying the dominant positions of the big capitalist groups with the aim of bringing about real programming and balanced development, with priority placed on general collective needs; and then one can only envisage a line of action implying in reality breaking up the system. . . . The alternative is not programming controlled by the monopolies or democratic programming [the slogan of the Communist party]; but capitalist programming, which is necessarily and irreversibly monopolistic, or collectivist programming.

"This signifies in substance that the central question, whether one likes it or not, is the question of power. . . ."

The resolution continues: "All this explains why, among other things, the class struggle in Italy -- and countries of analogous structure -- is so difficult and why it is so hard to record successes of general import. The fact is that the foe not only has inexhaustible resources and a security apparatus of long and varied experience, but its resistance is all the more vigilant and resolute in view of the fact that even in considering particular and immediate necessities, inevitably the regime is brought into question, the question of power is posed. That is why the struggle can only be a hard one and it is absolutely illusory and ridiculous to try to bypass the obstacle, to evade the fundamental terms, to develop a strategy aimed at avoiding a frontal clash, a revolutionary conflict with the foe no matter what its specific forms or ultimate date may be."

The last part of the text indicates the tasks facing the workers movement at this stage, specifying a whole series of transitional aims. It concludes as follows: "The governmental experience of the SP [Socialist party] has demonstrated once more that in the framework

of bourgeois society, a workers party participating in the government can play only a subordinate role, objectively of collusion and connivance. Thus the problem that is posed is not to struggle for more or less weight for one or more workers parties in the government, operating in the framework of the system, but to fight for a government that really aims at breaking this framework in order to carry out organically anticapitalist structural reforms. Such a government can only be the expression of the workers, the peasants, the popular and petty-bourgeois masses, excluding the representatives of capitalist interests, a government formed by the workers parties and possibly by petty-bourgeois formations resolved to break with the ruling classes and to accept in fact the leadership of the proletariat, a government which will be supported by the unions and other mass organizations.

"It will be said that the relationship of forces needed to impose such a solution does not exist. But, whatever may be the particular analyses of the situation and the appreciations of the possibility of it occurring in the near future, the problem is precisely to struggle, on the basis of the indicated platform, to make the relationship of forces change and to bring about shifts in the popular and petty-bourgeois masses who are still under the influence of the political formations of the bourgeoisie."

GUERRILLA WAR CONTINUES IN ERITREA

During March the Eritrean Liberation Army engaged in several clashes with forces of Haile Selassie's government. In the Gash region eight Ethiopian soldiers were killed and others wounded.

Captain Abdulkadir Mohammed Ali, a police officer at Tesenie, narrowly escaped death when a hand grenade exploded near him. Two of his companions were seriously injured; he received minor wounds. Although he is an Eritrean, the captain is notorious for his loyalty to the Ethiopian authorities.

A patrol of the Eritrean Liberation Army under the leadership of Ato Gabre Hawaii and Osman Hussein attacked a police post in the Marab Malash region. Two police were killed. A chief in that region, loyal to the Ethiopian authorities, was also killed.

In retaliation, Ethiopian forces attacked the peaceful village of Pamim in the Gash region. They looted shops and violated women. They accused villagers of co-operating with the revolutionists.

When Humad Mohammed Ismael, the chief of the village, tried to dissuade them, they replied by whipping him until he fainted.

Fighting is continuing in the mountains of Eritrea.

U.S. HEADS FOR DISASTER IN SOUTH VIET NAM

By Juan de la Cruz

[The following article is taken from Laging Una, a Filipino newspaper published in the United States. A subscription to this lively monthly can be had by sending \$2.50 to the editor, Martires M. Monosco, 3003 Future Place, Los Angeles 65, California U.S.A.]

* * *

President Macapagal of the Philippines told a visiting American newsman in Manila March 25 that withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Viet Nam "could lead to disaster" -- meaning that without American military backing the Saigon puppet dictatorship would collapse. That is patently true. What Macapagal does not understand is that the Washington policy-makers will suffer a much greater disaster if they continue trying to impose a reactionary regime on South Viet Nam's 14 million people.

The United States is intervening in what, essentially, is a civil war, a struggle of social classes. In flagrant violation of the principle of self-determination, Washington seeks by brutal force to subject the mass of the population to a government of the propertied elements. The dictator in Saigon was not elected by the people. He was selected by the U.S. to do its bidding. Hated by the vast majority, the Saigon regime would not last a month without massive American support.

Waging Undeclared War

America's war against the people of Viet Nam is of necessity an undeclared war. The consent of Congress was neither asked nor received. In decisions involving war and peace, the legislature is always bypassed. Roosevelt took steps assuring U.S. involvement in World War II long before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Truman plunged the nation into the Korean "police action" and the obliging Congress gave its rubber-stamp approval. Kennedy and Eisenhower prepared the disgraceful Bay of Pigs adventure against Cuba and Kennedy gave the signal that launched it, without consulting Congress. Nor did Kennedy ask the consent of Congress for the "confrontation" over Soviet missiles in Cuba, although this could have triggered a world war. That's U.S. democracy in action. That's how much control the American people have over governmental policy.

Two influential senators -- J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Wayne Morse of Oregon -- are urging that U.S. military forces be withdrawn from South Viet Nam. Morse has referred contemptuously to the current puppet-dictator in Saigon, Gen. Nguyen Khanh, as a "tin-horn soldier tyrant" who occupies his present position solely by virtue of U.S. backing. There can hardly be any doubt that Morse and

Fulbright reflect a sizeable body of public sentiment. Opposition to U.S. participation in the "dirty war" in Viet Nam is widespread.

Threat of Escalation

Defying this growing sentiment, Defense Secretary McNamara, the Detroit whizz kid of Edsel car fame, has announced that the U.S. will continue to back the Saigon regime "for as long as it takes" to beat back the tide of revolution. He sees the road ahead as "long, difficult and frustrating" -- which is in sharp contrast to his Pollyanna statements of just a few months ago.

Other spokesmen of the administration speak darkly of "escalating" the war by attacking North Viet Nam and McNamara says that such enlargement is not excluded. They delude themselves with a fiction of their own creation -- namely that the revolutionary Viet Cong fighters receive arms and other supplies from North Viet Nam and that without this aid their movement would collapse.

The proven fact, of course, is that the modern weapons used by the Viet Cong are made in the good old U.S.A. Some are taken from soldiers of the Viet Nam army, or militiamen, who are captured or killed. Others are obtained from Viet Nam army defectors who go over to the side of the revolution, sometimes in small groups or singly, often by the score, occasionally by the hundreds. As for food and other supplies, these too are obtained within the country. The guerrillas are part of the general population and closely integrated with it, for they are the fighting arm of the peasants and rural workers. When not engaged in combat, they work in production, helping supply food and other necessities both for themselves and others.

Like every reactionary ruling class trying to hold back the tide of revolution, the American imperialists stubbornly refuse to admit, to themselves or others, the fact that the Viet Cong guerrillas are closely integrated with the population of South Viet Nam. They prefer, because it suits their purpose better, to represent the Viet Cong as agents of an alien Communist conspiracy that can be defeated if only enough money and weapons are poured into the fight.

They feed endlessly on such illusions. When college students turned out with American flags in Saigon, Ambassador Lodge and the myopic McNamara took that as a sign that the "people" support the puppet military regime and its American backers. But these were the sons and daughters of the rich and well-to-do, a tiny minority of the population. The countryside of innumerable villages and settlements is held by forces loyal to the Viet Cong, better known in South Viet Nam as the National Liberation Front.

The NLF, politically, is a coalition of three parties and some twenty professional, social and religious organizations and representatives of minority ethnic groups. In 1960 it adopted a program

and a flag. In February, 1961, it held its first national congress, attended by over 100 elected delegates.

Controls Most of Country

Today the NLF exercises effective political control over three-fourths of the country. It operates through local elected organs which collect taxes, maintain order, build schools and hospitals, establish simple industries. It carries out a program of land reform and defends the "liberated areas" with locally recruited people's armies.

In the strategic Mekong River delta area south of Saigon, an estimated 95 per cent of the people pay taxes to the NLF. The armed forces of the NLF here consist of 4,000 full-time fighters and 12,000 guerrillas and militiamen. They are in practical control of the 697 "strategic hamlets" built by the government to "protect" the population from the NLF.

To those not wilfully blind, the NLF is not a small, isolated rebel movement but a popular uprising. The U.S. military presence can prolong the struggle. Americans and their puppet forces can kill and wreak havoc. But victory will continue to elude them. A spokesman for the NLF has been quoted as saying to a correspondent: "What makes you think the Americans are superior to the French? We'll drive the Americans out, too, even if it takes ten years."

Following his recent visit to the scene of action, McNamara has announced that more millions of dollars of the U.S. taxpayers' money will be piped to the Saigon puppets -- in addition to the \$1.5 million a day that is already being spent. What remains after Gen. Khanh and his associates have siphoned off some of the money to fatten their Swiss bank accounts will be used to increase the "security forces" by 50,000 men, all armed by the United States.

More and More Destruction

In addition, the Viet Nam air force will get more modern planes with which to bomb and destroy Viet Nam villages. The "over-extended" strategic hamlet program will be overhauled. A civil administrative corps will be built to "bring better public services to the people."

But many long-time observers in Saigon, writes Los Angeles Times correspondent Ed Meagher, believe that it is "too late, that the Communists' hold on the population and territory is already such as to be close to a fait accompli." And he adds: "It is unsafe to drive practically anywhere in Viet Nam outside of the principal cities because of probable interception by the Viet Cong."

In historic retrospect, King Canute of old is considered stupid for trying to sweep back the tide with a broom. What can we think of the broom wielders in the Pentagon and the White House?

1,340 CIVIL-RIGHTS BATTLES IN U.S.

By Evelyn Sell

The Justice Department reported that there have been 1,340 civil-rights demonstrations in the United States during the last eleven months, an average of almost four a day. These demonstrations have taken place in the north and south, from New York city on the east coast to San Francisco on the west. They have involved from half a million persons, as in last August's March on Washington, to the twenty-one persons who staged a sit-in at the St. Louis city hall.

Some of the 1,340 demonstrations were organized by well-known, long-established groups such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP]. Some were organized by the new national civil-rights groups which sprang up in the 50's and 60's, such as Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference [SCLC] and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee [SNCC]. Some were sponsored by small local groups such as the Group on Advanced Leadership in Detroit [GOAL]. Some were completely spontaneous.

During these 1,340 demonstrations a wide variety of techniques were used to call attention to civil-rights demands and to force concessions from the white capitalist power structure. There were the sit-ins, sleep-ins, rent strikes, school boycotts, mass marches, picket lines and civil disobedience campaigns.

As these protests erupted across the nation an often-repeated wail came from the capitalist politicians, "We just can't understand it! We always had such good race relations. Whatever problems we did have we were gradually solving. It must be outside agitators who have come in here and stirred up our happy Negro community."

Listen to Cecil Creal, mayor of Ann Arbor, Michigan: "Ann Arbor is way ahead in the field of civil rights and liberal thinking, way ahead of any other city in the state. . . and it really surprises me that some of these things are happening here when other cities just give lip service to civil rights, and we have taken the lead and actually done something in the field."

Ann Arbor is a small town whose greatest claim to fame is that it is the home of the nationally known, highly respected University of Michigan. There are 3,000 Negroes in town. For almost a year now Ann Arbor has been the scene of large demonstrations and militant picket lines directed against discrimination in housing and jobs, against the city council and the police force and against segregated churches. These activities have earned Ann Arbor the new title of "Picket City" and this is what Mayor Creal is talking

about when he wails that "some of these things are happening here."

The past year's activities were sparked off by the actions of a small nationalist youth group called the Direction Action Committee [DAC]. Their militancy stirred the older civil-rights groups into more forceful activities.

"These young people are bitter," said Mrs. Emma Wheeler, NAACP president. "They want to see things accomplished and we can't show them any changes."

DAC claims to represent the true feelings of the Negro community which has grown impatient with token civil rights and which has little confidence in the nonviolent passive resistance philosophy of CORE [Congress of Racial Equality].

"That's why it's mostly white people on our picket line," explained Walter Blackwell, CORE director. "A lot of Negroes say they just can't take that kind of action, they can't restrain themselves if somebody insults them or knocks them down."

Blackwell told about a "nice little white grandmother who came up to me and said, 'I've been living here thirty years and we've always gotten along until you people started this trouble.'"

The CORE leader commented, "She ignored the fact that Negroes are still packed in ghettos here, that every day people are denied jobs. Just because somebody made a protest and followed it through she thought it was trouble."

One of the major tasks of the Freedom Now movement has been to wake up all the "nice little white grandmothers" to the facts of life about racial oppression in this country. Those facts of life are that such oppression exists, that the Negroes are no longer going to put up with it and that changes must come about quickly or Negroes, through their demonstrations and civil disobedience, will make Jim Crow practices so expensive and unwieldy that the white capitalist power structure will find it easier to change the status quo than to spend their time and energies in stifling the Negro revolt.

It was this "strategy of chaos," of shaking things up, of rocking-the-boat that was behind the recent stall-in at the New York World's Fair. Although the promised 2,000 cars did not appear on the highways leading to the Fair, the stall-in can be considered a great success in terms of drawing the attention of the world to the race situation in the United States. The newspapers and New York city officials were quick to call the stall-in a "fizzle" because the expected traffic jam did not develop. But the traffic jam failed to materialize because tens of thousands of people stayed home rather than face the promised stall-in. Fair officials expect-

ted an opening day attendance of 250,000 to 500,000 but only about 83,000 persons actually showed up.

Stall-ins, rent strikes, boycotts and marches -- they all help throw the politicians' lies right back into their teeth. It was never true that "we always got along so fine until a few agitators started making trouble." The civil-rights protests -- 1,340 of them during the last eleven months -- have uncovered the rotten package inside the "democratic" wrapping. They have served to educate a vast number of Americans and peoples throughout the world about the true nature of the highly touted American Way of Life.

Book Review

LENIN'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH SECOND INTERNATIONAL

By Fernand Charlier

CORRESPONDANCE ENTRE LENINE ET CAMILLE HUYSMANS 1905-1914. Edited by Georges Haupt. Editions Labor, 342 Rue Royale, Brussels 3, Belgium. 1963. 164 pp. 99 Belgian francs [U.S. \$2; U.K. 14s.6d.]. (The book is available only in French.)

The upper crust of the Belgian Social Democracy, with Paul-Henri Spaak in the lead, turned out at a reception April 17 held by the publishers to promote a recently printed volume of the correspondence of Lenin and Camille Huysmans, the dean of the Social Democracy.

In those years Huysmans was secretary of the Socialist International Bureau. He was the driving spirit, beginning with 1905, in this body created by decision of the Fifth Congress of the Socialist International held in Paris in 1900. And it was in his capacity as secretary that he carried on correspondence with Lenin.

The volume includes many documents which have never before been printed. They enable us to gain fresh appreciation of the relations between the Bolsheviks and the Second International and to study the attitude of the latter toward the existence of the two factions, the Bolsheviks on the one hand and the Mensheviks -- who were linked by strong affinities to the Western opportunists like Vandervelde -- on the other.

The correspondence destroys in particular the simplistic image, drawn later by Zinoviev and especially Stalin, presenting the Bolsheviks as oriented from the very beginning of their struggle against Menshevism toward a rupture with the opportunists and centrists of the Second International.

Lenin's letters show how much the Russian party, in practice, stood alone in the International in taking really seriously the revolutionary traditions, the symbols of the solidarity of the workers, and the intransigent slogans to which the International gave lip service. This was particularly true for the 1907-12 period.

In the preceding period (1905), Lenin's correspondence with Huysmans, whom he did not know personally, was of purely administrative character. It was dominated by Lenin's preoccupation with overcoming the bias of the International and the wavering of his own Central Committee (Bolshevik), his aim being to name a Bolshevik to the Bureau as representative of the Social Democratic Labor party of Russia in addition to -- and if possible in place of -- Plekhanov, who did not recognize the validity of the Third Congress of the Russian Social Democratic party (Bolsheviks) held in 1905.(1)

The relationship -- interrupted when Lenin left for Russia -- was not resumed until the Seventh Congress of the International at Stuttgart in 1907. At the moment, the situation in the International was more favorable for Lenin as the representative of a party which had held its last two congresses -- 1906 and 1907 -- as a reunited organization. Lenin was very satisfied with the Stuttgart Congress, which he considered to be a big victory for revolutionary Marxism over reformism. He attended all the meetings he could of the Socialist International Bureau from 1908 to 1911, and the correspondence shows this. For example, he postponed a projected trip to meet the expiricriticist Bogdanov at Maxim Gorky's home in Capri when he learned that a meeting of the Bureau was planned.

The correspondence in that period shows Lenin very confident of the future of the International, although the editor of the book, Georges Haupt, exaggerates in affirming that Lenin saw in the Socialist International Bureau the "General Staff of Socialism." None of the letters bears this out.

After Lenin met Huysmans at Stuttgart, the letters became very cordial. In his comments, Haupt even cites a statement by Huysmans recalling his discussions with Lenin, indicating the lively interest Lenin displayed in the problem of Belgium's nationalities.

The correspondence also shows the importance of Huysmans' role as secretary of the Second International. He succeeded in making the Bureau a co-ordinating body, which was the maximum that could be done in such a heterogeneous International.

(1) Russia -- like the other countries, had the right to two votes in the Bureau. These were divided between the Social Revolutionaries and the Social Democrats. The problem was thus to obtain the vote for a Bolshevik, or failing that, to gain part of the single vote.

Lenin's relations with the Bureau of the International began deteriorating, however, after the Bolshevik conference of January 1912 where the formation of the Bolshevik party was consummated. It was this conference that "opened the era of the true existence of the Bolshevik party," as Trotsky was to put it later.

The majority of the delegates of the Socialist International Bureau, interested only in "Western" questions, considered it, without much concern, to be just another "split." Vandervelde believed, before checking the situation on the spot in Russia, that the Russian "sectarianism" was a product of the backwardness of the country. This was the context in which Kautsky -- whose opportunism was hidden under a varnish of orthodoxy -- and Rosa Luxemburg, because of her profound differences with Lenin on questions of organization, took up the cudgels for the "liquidators" (the current engendered by the main tendency of the Mensheviks) and constantly involved the indifferent Bureau in the unifying and conciliatory initiatives undertaken by the small émigré groups who stubbornly resisted the new Bolshevik unity.

These documents permit us to see the repercussions in the International of the conflict between Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, which were troublesome for the Bolsheviks. They darkened Lenin's relations with the International and reinforced the attempts of the Bureau to achieve "unification" of the Russian Social Democracy on the basis of the "August bloc" and unity with the liquidationist (reformist) current.

The correspondence also shows the high moral authority of the International, and especially its congresses. At the end of July 1914, we see Lenin still preparing his report for the congress which was scheduled to take place in Vienna, if the war had not broken out. . . .

The Lenin-Huysmans correspondence likewise testifies in favor of the thesis that the Bolsheviks were deeply integrated in the Second International. According to Haupt, it is precisely this integration that must be taken as the starting point to understand the import of the break of the Bolsheviks with the International after the betrayal of August 1914.

The documents are presented in four large chapters (1905; 1907-11; 1912; 1913-14), fitting into the history of the struggle of tendencies in the Russian Social Democratic party. Each chapter is preceded by a short introduction by Georges Haupt who is a professor at the Sorbonne.

The book provides very useful material for all those studying the history of Bolshevism and the Internationals.

It's a Paradise on Earth

MULTIMILLIONAIRE HAS ONLY PRAISE FOR SOUTH AFRICA

Garfield Weston, a Canadian multimillionaire industrialist, is highly enthusiastic about South Africa's "apartheid." He feels that it is paying off handsomely. His opinion is an authoritative one, too; he heads an enterprise that employs 6,000 workers in South Africa, and last year's profits jumped close to \$1,500,000 above the previous year while the first quarter of this year was the best in the company's history.

Weston voiced his opinion in Toronto on returning from a three-month trip to South Africa where he heads "George Weston Limited," one of a number of companies under his management.

Africa was never a "black country," he was quoted as saying by the French-language La Presse of Montreal [April 21]. You have to be precise. "It is ridiculous to try to compel the South African government, by means of the United Nations, to grant the right to vote to millions of colored people whose customs are not ours and who have no conception of Christian morals."

In his opinion, the word "apartheid" simply means that "you isolate the blacks in their own districts."

"Believe me," he said, "every black mammy can appeal to the government for the solution of any social problem."

In housing, he claimed, Verwoerd's government puts up as good homes for the blacks as the British government does for whites in England.

He boasted that the government of South Africa has raised the standard of living of the African population by five per cent a year and if anyone in his Canadian audience didn't believe it they should go and see for themselves whether or not he was exaggerating.

"In our company," the Canadian plutocrat wound up, "we employ white boys, Bantu boys, and boys from the Basuto tribe, who all work together, and I didn't see a sullen look on any of their faces."

[No, we didn't make up the above. That's the way a white multimillionaire really thinks as he prepares himself in the Christian way for the better world to come.]