

# WORLD OUTLOOK

## PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Vol. 2, No. 24

June 12, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

Workers Occupy Plants in Argentina.....	1
Nigerian Workers Stage General Strike.....	2
Student Demonstrations in South Korea.....	3
Attempt Under Way to Crush Colombian Guerrillas.....	4
Paz Wins Illegal Bolivian Election.....	5
Francisco Julião Arrested.....	9
Mexican Communist Group Analyzes Brazilian Defeat.....	16
Appeal Denied in Alexander Case.....	5
Alexander Case Witnesses Charged with "Sabotage".....	20
Help Needed to Save Abrahams' Home.....	6
Guerrilla Struggle in Cameroun.....	19
Counterrevolutionaries Strike Again in Algeria -- by Henri Dumoulin.....	7
Negro Party Wins Place on Michigan Ballot -- by Evelyn Sell.....	10
The Havemann Case -- by Ludwig Dürer.....	12
On the Proposed Programme for the CPI -- by Himoo Kalani.....	21
That Week End Meeting in Honolulu.....	11

### WORKERS OCCUPY PLANTS IN ARGENTINA

Having managed to clamp down a counterrevolutionary lid on Brazil, U.S. imperialism must now consider what to do about another Latin-American cauldron that appears ready to boil over. This time it is Argentina. The Illia government, which won a rigged election July 7, 1963, is in deep trouble.

The new rise in the class struggle began May 18 when the Confederación General de Trabajadores [CGT] opened the second phase of its "plan of struggle." This was the occupation of the plants, each action being undertaken by surprise.

By June 5 a total of 3,850 industrial establishments and pub-

lic services had been occupied. The number of workers involved had reached the impressive total of 1,900,000.

When Illia came to power, the CGT levelled the following demands:

- (1) An increase in pensions and retirement pay.
- (2) Abolishment of the decrees and repressive laws limiting the free exercise of trade-union rights.
- (3) Effective action against the rise in the cost of living which has deeply affected the workers' buying power.
- (4) Establishment of a minimum scale and a sliding scale of wages.

The government made some concessions on the first point but stalled on the others. It referred the demand about the repressive laws to congress and it set up a parliamentary commission to study the question of granting a sliding scale of wages. During March and April, the CGT suspended application of the second phase of the "plan of action" because of these government gestures.

Finally on May 18, the CGT announced that it could wait no longer.

In face of the power and scope of the workers' action, the Illia government has felt forced to proceed quite cautiously. As yet it has not mobilized massive armed force as in previous comparable situations.

However, it has now threatened the leaders of the CGT with application of a law that could carry sentences of up to six years in prison. The Attorney General has begun action accusing the CGT heads of "illicit association" because of their "desire to change the social order and to undermine the essential individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution."

The "individual rights" referred to are the property rights brought into question by occupation of the plants.

The CGT responded to the threat by issuing a declaration that in case of any arrests there will be "a general occupation of all establishments for an indefinite time."

The latest events in Argentina show once again the profundity of the economic and social crisis in which the country is caught up. With the downfall of Juan D. Peron in 1955, U.S. imperialism counted on the establishment of a more pliable regime. However, this signified "austerity" for the masses and particularly an effort to crush the political opposition centered around the unions in the form of

"Peronism." This has not succeeded. The occupation of the plants may foreshadow a resurgence not so much of "Peronism" as a new militancy owing much more to Fidel Castro than to the figure who retired to Spain, abandoning the movement that mistakenly took him as its symbol.

### NIGERIAN WORKERS STAGE GENERAL STRIKE

A general strike, begun June 1 in Lagos, rolled massively through Nigeria, Africa's most heavily populated country, bringing the total number of participants to 1,000,000 by the end of the first week.

The government of N'namdi Azikiwe strengthened police and army forces detailed to guard against "sabotage."

Despite a ban on demonstrations in the streets of Lagos, thousands of strikers attended a meeting organized by the Joint Action Committee, a body set up by the United Labour Congress and the Nigerian Trade-Union Congress last September.

The strike action was set off by the government's persistence in maintaining a wage freeze, the principal demand being for an increase in pay.

The general strike also has political overtones. Certain leaders of the political opposition to the government have been in prison since last fall while others are refugees in Ghana.

### STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS IN SOUTH KOREA

Some 10,000 unarmed students, demonstrating in Seoul June 3 for the resignation of President Chung Hee Park, were given a taste of clubs and tear gas by the police. They replied with stones. Their aim was so effective that the police admitted they suffered 409 wounded. The students damaged two police stations in addition with stones and wrecked four police boxes.

They then stormed capital building compounds and captured a dozen army trucks and police jeeps. They drove these through the streets chanting: "Park regime step down," "Strike down millionaire profiteers" and "The country will be better off without the Park regime."

Tens of thousands of Seoul residents, many applauding, followed the students.

After the police fled, the students set up traffic control teams at major intersections.

The Park regime at once declared martial law. The puppet general was clearly reminded of the downfall of the Syngman Rhee regime which was brought about by similar demonstrations in 1960.

As Seoul continued to simmer, student demonstrations spread to eleven other cities in South Korea. On June 5 the General closed down the schools until next September.

"The unrest," said the United Press International, "appears to reflect resentment over economic difficulties, frustration over the lack of job opportunities, irritation over corruption in the Government and dismay at the constantly changing educational policies."

The New York Times added that prices have risen by fifty per cent in the past year and unemployment has reached twenty-five per cent of the labor force. In addition, "Doubts were cast on the regularity of last fall's elections."

An obvious point that should have been mentioned is that the vaunted American Way of Life does not seem to appeal to the youth of South Korea.

#### ATTEMPT UNDER WAY TO CRUSH COLOMBIAN GUERRILLAS

Prensa Latina reports from Bogotá that a massive drive, involving up to 20,000 troops, has been launched against the guerrilla forces entrenched in the Central Cordillera where they have set up the independent Republic of Marquetalia.

The peasants in this region came from areas in which they were driven away by big landholders. They banded together to battle government troops and armed gangs hired by the feudalistic landlords.

According to Prensa Latina, a loan of \$546,000 from the Inter-American Development Agency has been invested in the military expedition. It has the most modern equipment granted by the United States. The U.S. government has put out some \$17,000,000 to help crush the enclaves held by the rebellious peasants.

The government troops have laid down air and artillery barrages as they proceed. Numerous arrests have been made and peasants have been imprisoned and sent to concentration camps. Many of them have been tortured.

### PAZ WINS ILLEGAL BOLIVIAN ELECTION

The election which Victor Paz Estenssoro won May 31 strengthened his position but heightened social tension in Bolivia. He was unopposed, since the opposition withdrew, calling for a boycott on the grounds that the re-election was unconstitutional. Paz doctored the constitution two years ago to make it legal to succeed himself.

Former Vice-President Juan Lechin and former President Hernan Siles Suazo staged a hunger strike over the election results. They ended it after five days, announcing that they had achieved their aim of "avoiding violence."

Students in La Paz protested in a more vigorous way. They erected barricades in front of the University. This demonstration was broken up by the police.

The miners at the Siglo XX mine decided to declare the mine zone a "free territory" no longer under government authority. They called for abrogation of a decree on imports from the United States and declared a state of "permanent alert."

### APPEAL DENIED IN ALEXANDER CASE

Permission to appeal against the convictions and prison sentences imposed on Dr. Alexander and ten others for allegedly conspiring to overthrow the government of South Africa was refused May 27 by the judge involved in the case, Justice H.A. van Heerden.

The appeal was made on the basis of irregularities committed by the prosecution.

The judge did allow "special entries" to be made on certain irregularities, however, and these can constitute the basis of another effort at appeal. This requires a large amount of money which the defendants -- who have been kept in prison since their arrest -- have been unable to raise up to now.

Meanwhile some of the families of the defendants are in difficult circumstances. The following account of what faces the mother of the most prominent prisoner is taken from the City Post, a Capetown weekly [April 26]:

"A woman who needs all her bravery to keep going is Mrs. Dombeta Alexander -- her son, Neville, is on Robben Island, sentenced to ten years' imprisonment for conspiring to overthrow the State by violent revolution. Her daughter, Dorothy, is in Roeland Street jail, serving five years for the same reason.

"She still seems able to be philosophical and cheerful about this great personal tragedy, though she is now the sole support of the family. Her husband lost a leg in the last war and is drawing a disability pension and she has a 12-year-old son. Mrs. Alexander teaches at a primary school in Mowbray, but will soon be forced to retire on account of her age.

### HELP NEEDED TO SAVE ABRAHAMS' HOME

Efforts are continuing to assure the home of the parents of Dr. Kenneth Abrahams from being attached by the South African government. Dr. Abrahams is a political refugee named in the Alexander case as a militant opponent of the apartheid system. In an unsuccessful habeas corpus action in the Cape Supreme Court last August, he was levied for R661.51 [one rand = \$1.40]. When he could not pay this sum, the government threatened to attach the home he had left to his parents when he fled the country. Dr. Abrahams managed to get a loan to hold off the government wolves and thus won some time.

Dr. Abrahams parents Mr. and Mrs. K.F. Abrahams live in the four-room house with six children and a two-year-old granddaughter. They were told by the Deputy State Attorney that unless the matter of R661.51 was settled within 14 days the house would be attached.

A Cape Times reporter called at Abrahams home in Vertrou Road, Crawford, on May 1. Mrs. Abrahams had just received the news about the government order. "It is terrible," she said. "I don't know what to think. We cannot possibly raise the money. As it is, we pay R34 a month to a building society on the first bond.

"We moved here when Kenneth left last year to practise in South West Africa. We had been forced to leave Walmer Estate after 26 years because they were building Boulevard East."

[Walmer Estate was declared a "white area" due to enforcement of the Group Areas Act and all colored people had to move out no matter how long they had lived there.]

The Cape Times reports that Dr. Abrahams is working in a hospital in Fort Jameson, Northern Rhodesia, and that his wife is teaching there. They had to leave their two children behind in Windhoek where they are living with their grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. O. Schimming.

To help in this case, send an international money order or personal check to Franz J.T. Lee, 74 Tübingen, Schwabstrasse 22, West Germany.

COUNTERREVOLUTIONARIES STRIKE AGAIN IN ALGERIA

By Henri Dumoulin

ALGERIA, June 2 -- Many rumors have been circulating in recent days concerning the renewal of counterrevolutionary activities led by Ait Ahmed in opposition to the Ben Bella regime. In the interior of Algeria, where your correspondent is at present, the rumors come over transistor radios, broadcast from Europe. These newscasts are at the bottom of the sometimes extravagant reports about the renewal of armed struggle in Kabylie, attempts to assassinate top government figures, and even an attempt to assassinate the head of the government.

The Algerian press has provided little information about these happenings and has impounded French newspapers and publications carrying articles about them. The silence has favored the venomous and slanderous insinuations of all those who hate Ben Bella. Nevertheless, despite the wild exaggeration, the rumors do contain a grain of truth.

On the Algerian side it was the President himself who cut through the tactic of silence, declaring: "The nation will break those who oppose the revolutionary legality established by the Congress of the FLN" [Front de Libération Nationale].

The official information that followed this declaration seems to indicate that up to now the action of the counterrevolutionaries has been limited to terrorist blows against party militants or authorities representing the government.

In Kabylie itself, the opposition lost a big trump when the former head of Wilaya III, Mohand Ou El Hadj rallied to the government side. The recent FLN Congress elected him to the Political Bureau. It was he who declared in a village near Tizi-Ouzou: "We will oppose the designs of the counterrevolution with all our force and by every means."

Despite the support of imperialism, the counterrevolution does not seem to have any chance of widening, at least for the time being.

[The "Front des Forces Socialistes" headed by Ait Ahmed began renewing its activities sometime before the FLN Congress which was held April 16-22. In a leaflet distributed clandestinely early in March, Ahmed called for "rethinking the agrarian reform" and also came out flatly in favor of protecting "private investments" in Algeria and for a "new" financial and fiscal policy. The Paris daily Le Monde asked pertinently (March 7) if Ahmed's "Front" after its defeat last October had not "chosen to attack the regime from the right, after having sought to outflank it from the left."]

[On June 4 Révolution Africain accused foreign imperialist

forces of backing the counterrevolution. ". . . Portugal has decided to come to the aid of the Algerian counterrevolution. At Cap-Djinet, near Collo, and at Port-Gueydon, arms appear to have been delivered to the counterrevolution by the Portuguese services." The Algiers weekly also named the French oil interests as being involved, plus West German monopolists, including Mercedes and Volkswagen. In addition, Révolution Africain listed the Central Intelligence Agency, stating that "this organization is closely linked with the Portuguese, the oil interests and the German financiers" and that "through the many agents in its pay, it has already given aid to the counterrevolution in order to slow down to the maximum the process of building socialism."]

If the rebellion is much weaker than the foreign radio stations would like people to believe, and if considerable means have been mobilized to combat it, the root of the evil remains and the problem is to get at this. It is necessary to attack its fundamental social base: the big rural proprietors and the bureaucratic and neocolonialist elements entrenched in the administration and state apparatus.

What is required is the extension of the agrarian reform. [See World Outlook May 22.] This would cut off the social base of the counterrevolution, and, by the same token, open a perspective for some 1,200,000 small fellahs [small holders] and landless peasants who constitute the mass base of the Revolution against all comers. The Revolution needs their support. To draw them in, they must be given something concrete. If this is not done, the chances for the counterrevolutionary opposition could become more serious.

At its last meeting the Central Committee of the FLN projected, within the framework of a house-cleaning operation and a struggle against bureaucratism, the preparation of municipal elections linked to reconstituting the party. Inasmuch as the majority of the local administrations remain reactionary bodies or too often retain, if not the men, at least the methods of the colonial period, the importance of such elections is clear. To many persons holding posts, they appear ominous. Thus to carry them out, especially in a completely democratic way, many obstacles will have to be overcome.

The self-managed industrial sector includes about 450 enterprises out of a total of around 1,000. Of these 30% are in the building industry; 25% in food; 4% to 5% are genuine basic plants like the Verreries d'Afrique du Nord and the metal plant Acilor. The rest are semihandcraft. The self-managed sector includes some 10,000 workers -- about 12% of the workers in industry.

One of the major difficulties in this "socialist sector," as the program adopted by the Congress of the Industrial Sector states, is "the existence of a powerful private sector controlling to a large degree the importation of raw materials, the channels of distribution and credit." Here the main enemy is imperialism with its trusts and

cartels that seek to maintain their economic fortresses inside the country.

To struggle against the capitalist sector, the Algerian Revolution must naturally rely on the class struggle. And the workers in the capitalist enterprises understand that they must find the means to come to the aid of the "self-managed sector" and help move toward socialism.

An appropriate measure appears to be workers' control. Through this the workers could better meet the attempts of the capitalists to sabotage or slow down the development of the economy and, above all, better prepare for the establishment of workers management in their enterprises.

Thus it is quite significant that the 250 or so workers of Renault-Algérie passed a motion in the general assembly of their union noting actions in various plants that tended among other things to move toward "control, by the workers, over plant management through plant committees" in enterprises not yet under self-management.

These actions, said the motion, "correspond to the requirements for constructing socialism in independent Algeria."

The motion appealed to the government, "and more particularly to brothers Boumaza, Minister of the National Economy, and Ben Bella, President of the Republic, to promulgate a text instituting workers control in enterprises that are not under self-management."

Such a measure, coupled with the extension of the agrarian reform, would rally such forces as to effectively end the hope of the counterrevolution to maintain even a small armed base anywhere in Algeria.

#### FRANCISCO JULIÃO ARRESTED

According to Agence France Press, Francisco Julião, the well-known peasant leader was arrested June 4 at a farm in São Gabriele in the State of Goias where he was disguised as an agricultural worker.

The founder of Brazil's famous Peasant Leagues was a deputy in the Pernambuco parliament. The counterrevolutionary Castello Branco regime, which seized power through a coup d'état, listed Francisco Julião on April 10 among those whose civil rights were to be arbitrarily cancelled, and he went into hiding.

The peasant leader was taken to federal headquarters of the political police in Brasilia.

## NEGRO PARTY WINS PLACE ON MICHIGAN BALLOT

By Evelyn Sell

The all-Negro Freedom Now party has won a place on the Michigan state ballot. The party was officially certified on May 28 after election officials carefully checked their qualifying petitions. Dedicated party members collected a total of 21,726 signatures (almost 7,000 more than the legal requirement) in order to place an all-Negro party on a state ballot for the first time in American history.

The Michigan Freedom Now party stands as the advance guard of independent Negro political action. Negroes in other parts of the country are making bids for public office although they have not organized themselves into independent parties. In the Deep South, for example, militant Negroes enter the Democratic primaries in order to gain a place on the ballot. These primary elections function as nominations elections and the winners are then placed on the ballot to run under the party name during the general elections. For the past hundred years the Democratic party has dominated Southern politics and nomination to the Democratic ticket assures election.

### Alabama

A number of Alabama Negroes ran in the primaries and most of them won places on the November ballot which is equivalent to winning the offices. The defeated candidates were Mrs. Amelia Boynton, running for the U.S. Congress, and Mrs. Bernice Johnson who was running for the Jefferson County school board.

Three other Negroes were successful in the Macon County primaries and thus scored the first Negro breakthrough in Alabama politics since the Reconstruction days that followed the Civil War. A fourth Negro drew more votes than his white opponent but did not win a clear enough majority and is in a run-off election to determine whether he or the white politician will appear on the November ballot.

These victories at the polls were credited to the fact that civil-rights fighters had waged a long and determined effort to win the vote for disfranchised Negroes. As a result of their battle, Negro voters now outnumber whites in this particular county.

### Mississippi

In Mississippi three Negroes are running for seats in the U.S. Congress. They are Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, the Rev. J.E. Cameron and James M. Houston. Aron Henry, president of the Mississippi National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], has announced that if the Negro candidates lose the election they will go to Washington anyway and try to unseat the winning white candidates.

Henry said, "We intend to challenge these congressmen for

their seats on the floor of Congress because they cannot be legally elected where so many Negroes are deprived of voting."

Mrs. Victoria Gray, candidate for the U.S. Senate, is a leader of civil-rights activities in the area around Hattiesburg, Mississippi. For over three years she has been teaching citizenship and voter-registration classes. Her campaign is emphasizing education issues in Mississippi.

Civil-rights workers have also formed the "Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party" in order to send their own delegates to the Democratic National Convention. These delegates will challenge the right of the official delegates, chosen and supported by racists, to represent the people of Mississippi where almost half of the population is Negro.

#### Georgia, Arkansas, North Carolina

C.B. King, a noted civil-rights attorney, is running for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. He has handled most of the civil-rights cases in southwest Georgia during the recent period. A Negro woman has filed for Congress in Arkansas and is running against the white incumbent who has attacked NAACP leaders as "Communists." In Halifax County, North Carolina, eleven Negroes have filed for local offices and a twelfth is running as a congressional candidate.

A significant political race is taking place in Monroe, North Carolina, where a Negro woman, Mrs. Mildred Oxner, is running for the Board of Education. Monroe, North Carolina, was the city where Negroes first organized themselves for armed defense against racists. The Negro community there, under the leadership of Robert Williams, became the focus of national attention because of their militant battles during the late 1950's. Police harassment and a frame-up charge of kidnapping drove Robert Williams into exile in Cuba in 1961.

These bids for Negro political power are helping to make 1964 an election-year landmark in the history of the United States.

#### THAT WEEK END MEETING IN HONOLULU

When a handful of Washington bureaucrats met in Honolulu June 1-2 to decide whether to escalate the war in South Vietnam at risk of plunging the world into a nuclear conflict, the Paris Le Monde spotted a flaw: "The Washington leaders seem to hope that few people. . . will notice that most of the participants. . . are people who see each other every day on the banks of the Potomac. It is doubtful that the mere fact they meet on an island in the Pacific will contribute to reinforcing their lucidity."

## De-Stalinization in East Germany

### THE HAVEMANN CASE

By Ludwig Dürer

HAMBURG -- The process of de-Stalinization is developing more slowly in the German Democratic Republic than in the other East European countries. In addition, at least up to now, the successive stages and thrusts have come as by-products of events in the neighboring countries. These aspects testify to its inner dynamic and driving forces.

On the one hand, the ruling bureaucracy is aware that the stupidity and short-sightedness characteristic of Stalinist methods have become a serious obstacle to any further social development, thus threatening its own interests. On the other hand, the moods and resistance of the masses reveal a tendency that could lead to explosions similar to the workers uprising of June 17, 1953.

To reduce the pressure, the Ulbricht group has been forced to make certain concessions along the lines of de-Stalinization. The group hopes in this way to stabilize the foundations of its rule. But the maneuver can meet with only temporary success, since each step toward "liberalizing" the regime, each reform of its absolute rule creates at the same time new starting positions for further strengthening the antibureaucratic, anti-Ulbricht forces.

The inner dynamics of the process has been clearly shown in the Havemann case.

Dr. Robert Havemann, a specialist in theoretical chemistry, is one of the world's top scientists. Born in 1910, he studied chemistry at the universities in Munich until 1933. For him, however, scientific knowledge extended far beyond the laboratory and the professor's chair. His social-mindedness led him to join the Communist party in 1932 on the eve of Hitler's victory. From 1937 to 1943 he was an assistant at the University of Berlin. His extra-curricula activities included helping Soviet and French workers, deported to Germany, to form an opposition group. For this the Nazis condemned him to death on December 16, 1943. Even the Nazis understood the value of his theoretical work, however, and they deferred his execution twice in order to permit him to continue working in prison on research in chemical theory.

The American occupation authorities took him out of jail and placed him in charge of the famous Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in West Berlin. However, his outspoken opposition to the U.S. nuclear war policy and his courageous stand in favor of social and economic developments in East Germany did not meet American specifications, and he was fired in January 1948.

Since then he has been a professor of chemistry at the Humboldt University of East Berlin. In 1950 he became a member of the People's Assembly of the German Democratic Republic and won high respect among leading circles of the SED (the East German Stalinist party). In 1960, Ulbricht personally decorated Havemann for his great merits in "the building of socialism."

It is of special significance that a man of such standing should become the spokesman for antibureaucratic sentiments against the Ulbricht regime.

On occasion in the past, Prof. Havemann opposed bureaucratic dogmatism and the antidialectical, mechanistic pseudoscience of the Stalinists in the field of science. His latest actions appear to have been inspired by the "thaw" in Czechoslovakia (e.g., the discussion around the writer Franz Kafka). Sindermann, the member of the SED Political Bureau who started the polemic against Havemann, stated: "One should not fail to understand the connection between his revisionist theories and the conceptions emanating from Czechoslovakia that are spreading among us."

Ideological relations between the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia were very close until recently since these were the two countries in which the bureaucratic leaderships had succeeded in keeping the de-Stalinization process under strictest control. In recent months the situation has changed considerably in Czechoslovakia. A "Slovak spring" has been spreading rapidly across the country, and the atmosphere in more than one respect resembles 1956 in Poland and Hungary on the eve of the uprisings.

While the conference of historians of literature at Liblice was taking up the question of Kafka, Prof. Havemann opened an attack in Leipzig on certain philosophers in the Soviet Union, accusing them of having discredited dialectical materialism among scientists by their mechanistic approach. The scientists under attack sent a sharp protest to the Academy of Science in the German Democratic Republic, accusing Prof. Havemann of having slandered them. Various party and student papers published the protest, thinking it an auspicious occasion for opening an attack on Havemann.

To their discomfort, prominent scientists in the Soviet Union of higher standing than those attacked by Havemann, expressed solidarity with the German professor.

Support from such well-known figures, encouraged Havemann to take bolder moves. He gave a series of rather wide-ranging lectures at the Humboldt University beginning in October 1963. These came to an abrupt end when he was fired on March 13, 1964.

In the series, Prof. Havemann, starting from his professional knowledge, developed important concepts about freedom, socialist democracy, bureaucratic distortions and Bonapartist tendencies in the

period of transformation from bourgeois society to socialist society, the social foundations of understanding and morality among the masses in the transition period.

The conclusion was soon drawn that through this discussion with party ideologists, Havemann was trying to bring the "thaw" in the German Democratic Republic up to the level it had reached in the Soviet Union and other East European countries. The lectures met with a big response. The auditorium was always packed, students coming from all parts of the country to hear him. They began to reproduce the texts of the lectures. It appeared that the students, who in the German Democratic Republic are linked much more closely to the working class and to political life than is the case in the Western countries, were looking for a frame of reference for the discontent of the broad layers of the population against the ruling regime. The concepts they sought had to be in strong opposition to the bureaucratic methods of rule practiced by the leadership of the state and party without bringing into question the socialist foundations of society or without violating communist principles. In fact they should demonstrate that it is precisely the bureaucratic methods that cause serious damage to the socialist foundations and that stifle the dynamic nature of Marxism with dogmatism.

This development brought a reaction from the party leadership. During conferences of active members of the SED, sharp discussions broke out between official party ideologists and Prof. Havemann, who was supported by some followers he had won among the ranks of the SED youth cadre. The very fact that the party bureaucracy had to accept such a discussion instead of "solving" it in the customary administrative way showed that it was on the defensive. Its position became all the more difficult inasmuch as colleagues and friends of Havemann in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union could publicly express and defend ideas similar to his without incurring punishment and in some cases even with support from the party leadership.

In this uncomfortable situation, the SED leadership received an unexpected assist from the Western press. The newspaper Hamburger Echo des Abends published an alleged "interview with Havemann" claimed to have been conducted by one Ness. The "interview" was based on notes taken by Ness during a personal discussion with Havemann. As if on order, this newspaper thus furnished the SED officialdom with "proof" that Havemann had "publicly slandered the workers and peasants state of East Germany in interviews granted to the Western press, and abused the responsibilities which he held as a professor and head of conferences at the university." This was sufficient for expulsion from the party and revocation of his post in the university.

It is not yet clear how the "discussion" between Havemann and Ness was set up. It is not impossible that Ness acted as a conscious agent of the SED leadership to secure a pretext for taking administrative measures against Havemann. Whatever the truth may be, Ness

objectively played such a role nonetheless. The role of the Hamburger Echo des Abends, a Social-Democratic paper, in this, and the failure of any official paper to denounce the open help given Ulbricht, prove once again that the press of Western Germany and the political forces behind it do not in reality favor weakening the Ulbricht regime, at least in the direction of even the mildest de-Stalinization.

The Social-Democratic editors of the Hamburg newspaper have reciprocated here with a method used for many years by the SED in relation to left and progressive forces in the German Federal Republic. The SED press commonly publicized their activities in such a way as to discredit and isolate them in West Germany. The Social-Democratic and trade-union bureaucracies, and also the West German political police ("Verfassungsschutz"), were thus publicly tipped off, the SED knowing perfectly well that the result would be repression of those who had been cited. The SED papers thus gained propaganda advantages and at the same time weakened the left forces in the West German labor movement.

The Havemann case shows that the West German bourgeoisie does have something in common with the Ulbricht bureaucracy -- a joint interest in blocking the rise of a Communist opposition in the German Democratic Republic. In reality a victory by antibureaucratic forces over Ulbricht would deal a heavy blow against the rulers of the Federal Republic, since such a development would lead rapidly to rebirth of the West German labor movement. The West German bourgeoisie understands very well the difference in principle between chatter about "democratic socialism" that amounts to all intents and purposes to adaptation to the ideology of the ruling class, and Havemann's demand for socialist democracy -- which is synonymous with workers' democracy.

Havemann lost the possibility to defend his opinions publicly. In distinction to the custom of the past, however, he was not put on trial, nor was he accused of treason. Over the objections of the SED he was even given a research grant by the Soviet Union. This is an indication of the difference in atmosphere among some of the East European countries. It shows that the democratization process is further advanced in the Soviet Union than in the German Democratic Republic and that steady pressure is being exerted by the Soviet Union on the SED and the government of the German Democratic Republic. This could be of great importance in further strengthening the antibureaucratic opposition in the German Democratic Republic. More and more forces will be inclined to act openly as it becomes clear that voicing open criticism no longer means the risk of arrest and long years in prison, and as it becomes clearer that in other countries of the "socialist camp" the same ideas can be expressed with a certain degree of legality.

The Havemann case occurred within the confines of a university and took the form of a controversy over issues in the social sciences.

In reality the discussion was a political debate involving the most important political problems of the transition period between capitalism and socialism. It implied the whole struggle against bureaucratism in the party, state and society which Lenin led during the last years of his life and which the Left Opposition, under Trotsky's leadership, carried on after his death.

MEXICAN COMMUNIST GROUP ANALYZES BRAZILIAN DEFEAT

[The overthrow of the Goulart government in Brazil by a group of ultrareactionary conspirators is now being analyzed and discussed among vanguard currents in Latin America in order to draw the appropriate lessons. The following article represents the views of the "Frente Obrero Comunista de Mexico" (Communist Workers Front of Mexico), a "pro-Chinese" grouping. The article is an extract from a lengthy polemic entitled "Fracasos y Mentiras de los Revisionistas" (Failures and Lies of the Revisionists) which appeared in the March-April issue of the Front's publication La Verdad Obrera (Workers' Truth). The emphasis appears in the original.]

\* \* \*

On March 26, in a document published in the daily "Novos Rumos," the Brazilian Communist party (nucleus that follows the revisionist policy), defined its position in the national political situation in Brazil with an ecstatic report of a mass meeting held in Rio de Janeiro on March 13. According to the BCP in "Novos Rumos," the meeting "constituted an event marking a new stage in the struggle against imperialism for the political and economic emancipation of the country." As we know, this meeting was organized and convoked by the president of Brazil João Goulart and it was he who spoke there with timid phrases, reflecting his vacillating policies. The document of the BCP in "Novos Rumos" states that "For the Communists, support of the president and the battle which he is opening up to reform the structures of the country constitutes the first obligation."

Hardly two weeks passed and the EVENTS discredited the position of the revisionists. Goulart abandoned the struggle and went abroad without fighting, revealing himself to be unarmed in face of the police and military forces before whom he surrendered without trying to pursue "the battle which he was opening." The revisionists of Brazil had to change their position quickly!

But it is interesting to observe the posture which they had adopted. In reality all Communists know that the first obligation of a Communist is to struggle for the interests of the working class and the people, through whatever forms may be necessary, organizing and strengthening the leading vanguard of this struggle: the Party of the working class. It is clear that Goulart and his vacillating

government did NOT represent the interests of the working class of Brazil nor the Brazilian people. Goulart represented one of the ruling factions in Brazil which, terrified at the perspective of a revolutionary explosion of the pauperized masses, sought to direct this struggle through small concessions, concessions that had as their ultimate aim the maintenance of bourgeois rule. In Mexico, in the era of the 1929-33 world crisis and the one that followed it (1935-39), which in Mexico signified greater deepening of the crisis, an increase in strikes and the peasant struggle, we had demagogic presidents of the Republic who by means of ultrarevolutionary phraseology and concessions on paper and some genuine concessions which were torn from them by the mass struggle, slowed down the revolutionary rise of the masses, diverted them from their essential objectives; and, drawing on the support of the group of adventurers in Mexico who called themselves "left" and "Communist," confused and paralyzed the people's struggle until they succeeded in defeating it and maintaining in power the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in the service of imperialism. In that epoch what remains clear is the BETRAYAL committed by the fake "Communists" and "leftists" led essentially by the old government agent Lombardo Toledano and his impotent followers Laborde and Campa. It is clear that these people, the latter being reformists and opportunists and the former on the government payroll, made a mockery of the "Popular Front" line, and, submitting to the class enemy, failed to organize the Party. They subjected it to the bourgeois-bureaucratic state, transforming themselves, in short, into simple harmless assistants of the bourgeoisie. The slogan of these traitors was clear: "The first obligation of the 'Communists' (and 'leftists') was to support the president in his struggle to reform the structures." They no longer carried out a class policy, but a policy of tailing the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in the service of imperialism. Once the mass struggle was diverted, confused and paralyzed, the end result was that the bureaucratic bourgeoisie stayed in power and again induced docility and conformism among the masses.

The position of the present leaders of the BCP is analogous (excepting the differences). They have not carried out an independent policy that takes into consideration, from the point of view of the workers' struggle and the toiling masses, their own and antagonistic class forces, the correct characterization of the social regime in Brazil and the bureaucratic bourgeois government, the almost total domination of Brazil's industry, commerce and finance by the North American monopolies. The Brazilian revisionists have forgotten that the bourgeois state that exists there, submissive to imperialism, is dominated by a weighty counterrevolutionary bureaucracy, by bourgeois courts and by POLICE AND MILITARY FORCES that guarantee the landlords and the bureaucratic and intermediate bourgeoisie ruling the country for their own profit and that of their imperialist masters. The misery and desperation of the masses compels the rulers of Brazil to carry on verbal demagoguery and to attempt some timid modifications in the country's economy, but the ruling classes are by no means ready to risk their domination NOR PERMIT THE ORGANIZATION OF POPULAR FORCES capable of guaranteeing and carrying forward

the structural reforms which our ruling bureaucracies advocate but do not grant.

To expect that the class enemy will grant "structural reforms" is an attitude that could be characterized as idiotic and infantile if it were not, as it is, an attitude of betrayal of the working class and the popular masses, committed by those who call themselves "Communists."

We genuine Communists must understand that only by eliminating the bourgeois-imperialist, landlord state and the capitalist bureaucracy that makes it up, replacing it by a democratic people's state that enjoys the support of the worker and peasant masses, the support of the petty bourgeoisie and a possible sector of the "patriotic" bourgeoisie -- a state set up by the influence of the ORGANIZED workers and with the support of its own forces -- would it be possible to carry out "structural reforms." To imagine anything else is adventurism, means evading the central problem and confusing and diverting the workers towards positions of opportunism and toward bourgeois policies contrary to the proletariat and the national interests.

The "first obligation" of Communists is to specify the interests of our class and its allies, adopt our own independent policy and organize the class and the masses INDEPENDENTLY, preparing them to struggle IN ALL ARENAS for the essential class and national objectives in the anti-imperialist struggle.

We Communists must recognize that the bourgeois state is based on the bureaucracy, the courts and the physical police and military forces and that only by creating our own force capable of defeating the class enemy can we carry forward the revolution to the benefit of the great masses of the people.

The revisionists have confused bourgeois democracy and its bourgeois power with popular democracy and popular power. And this confusion has grown into an enormity with the dogma of the revisionist and counterrevolutionary thesis that socialism can always be won through a "peaceful transition," that a proletarian party is not necessary for this transition and that all that is necessary is for the bourgeoisie in power to voluntarily give up its power little by little, making "structural reforms." From this limping, antiproletarian position they draw the slogan of "supporting" the bourgeois "presidents" of the bureaucratic oligarchy, in whose hands they place the historic future of their peoples and of the working class.

That's how far the revisionism goes of the old leaders of the BCP like Luis Carlos Prestes!

## GUERRILLA STRUGGLE IN CAMEROUN

The former French colony of Cameroun was granted formal independence January 1, 1960. On October 1, 1961, the British Cameroons, following a United Nations referendum, joined up to constitute the Federal Republic of Cameroons. [Both areas were part of the German colony of Kamerun which was seized by the French and British in 1916 as one of the prizes of World War I.] But the new country is not a happy one. French troops are still there. They constitute the real power behind the puppet government of Ahmadou Ahidjo.

"Laws of a fascist character keep the people completely without liberties," Mbog Charles, representative of the Popular Union of the Cameroons [UPC], explained during a recent visit to London. "Kamerunians must have passes to travel from one town to the next, and visits to towns are limited. Curfews cover the whole country. The political party of Ahidjo forbids all other political organizations. The economy of the country, with its large French investments, is subjected to the control of France and other powers. French air and NATO military bases control the country."

The UPC representative cited the following examples of repressive actions against the people:

"On February 1, 1962, 25 political prisoners were put into a sealed compartment on the Douala-Yaoundi train and suffocated. Dead on arrival, they were hurried to a common grave without funeral services, and the newspaper which reported the matter was seized and the director was expelled from the Kamerun.

"On May 1, 1963, in the NDE region, 50,000 peasants were removed from their homes because this sector was declared a 'prohibited area.'

"On October 25, 1963, the National Assembly passed Law No. 60/PJL/ANF, which allowed military tribunals to pass sentence of death or hard labor in perpetuity on all found guilty of having 'spread rumors or made comments or proposals prejudicial to the regime.'

"In January, 1964, 15 people were publicly executed in Douala, Edea, Bafoussam, and Boua, and other places, of whom 10 were executed in the single day of January 3.

"Although the last elections on April 26, 1964, were reported to have been held without incident, several people were in fact killed during incidents. This was not unusual, as there have been people killed in all the elections in Kamerun since 1955.

"Thousands of people are in concentration camps and prisons in Yoko, Douala, Edea and Dschang.

"Newspapers are often proscribed and seized, while political

parties or trade unions not recognized by the regime are outlawed, and their leaders detained, exiled or imprisoned."

A militant opposition to the regime has organized armed units to fight for freedom. These are active in about one-third of the region. They have been met with savage measures but are continuing their struggle.

The aims of the Popular Union of the Cameroons were outlined by Mbog Charles as follows:

"Withdrawal of foreign troops and military technicians, closure of the concentration camps, abolition of the 'prohibited zones.'

"General and unconditional amnesty for political acts since 1955.

"Abolition of the agreements which place Kamerun under the domination of foreign powers.

"Restoration of democratic and trade-union rights, abrogation of the laws on the 'state of emergency,' etc., and the withdrawal of cases against Kamerunians, whether at home or abroad.

"Dissolution of the Assembly and fresh elections."

#### ALEXANDER CASE WITNESSES CHARGED WITH "SABOTAGE"

Witnesses in the case of Dr. Neville Alexander, who refused to testify in behalf of the prosecution, are being martyred by the fascist-like South African government. They, too, now face charges of committing "sabotage."

This was the charge levelled against two Coloured teachers, Gerald Hamilton Ross, 30, and Achmat Ajam, 24, when they appeared before J. Van Rensburg in the Cape Town Magistrate Court May 5.

The hearing was adjourned to May 20 and they were granted bail of R250 [one rand = \$1.40] each on condition that they report daily to specified police stations between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m.

Three others appeared on the same charge. They were Gerald Herman Giose, 32, a Coloured teacher; Cyril Wallace Jacobs, 25; Yusuf Lucas, 19, and Dorothy Adams.

Giose was first charged on February 5. The others were charged on December 1 and bail of R250 each was granted on December 27. It was the thirteenth time the hearing had been adjourned. The witnesses, who refused to testify against their friends, were originally held under the infamous 90-day detention clause.

ON THE PROPOSED PROGRAMME FOR THE CPI

By Himoo Kalani

CALCUTTA -- The section of the CPI [Communist party of India] opposed to the Dange leadership are now circulating for discussion a "Draft Programme" for the party. This is the political platform of what is known as the left ["pro-Chinese"] wing of the CPI and if the threatened split materializes, this may, with some modification, constitute the basic political document of India's new Communist party. The "draft programme" has, thus, immense political significance for the future political evolution in the country and as such merits serious study by every serious political tendency of the country.

In an "Introduction" to this programme, M. Basavapunniah claims that this is the first comprehensive programme that the CPI is going to discuss and adopt in its long career of four decades; previously the party's policy was guided by occasional political theses and resolutions but "none of these documents had any sustaining character for the whole stage of the revolution" and "our present endeavour to prepare this draft is precisely to meet this long-felt need."

Structure of the Draft Programme

The structure of a revolutionary programme itself must reflect a principled, Marxist approach to the problems to be discussed in that programme. The programme has to start from a discussion of the foundation of politics -- that is, the socio-economic structure of the country -- and then pass to the most basic issues in politics, the role of the various social classes in that country; it is only on the basis of such an analysis, based on one's ideological approach, that one can proceed logically to the elaboration of a detailed programme of demands for the coming revolution. The programme must deal with all problems from a generalised and fundamental standpoint, which accounts for its stability and vitality even after a long time; factors of secondary, local or transitory importance may be discussed in political resolutions, but they have no place in a programme. Besides, programmatic formulations must be terse, relevant and follow each other in logical sequence, leading inexorably to the conclusions, emphasized in the programme.

Judged in the context of the above Marxist criteria, the Draft Programme does not completely fulfil the prerequisites of a genuine programme; it contains the elements of a programme, side by side with features that are characteristic of a political thesis or a resolution. The treatment is very often amorphous and vague; paragraphs follow each other not always in strict logical sequence; sometimes the same discussion is scattered in various sections, whereas things which ought to have been discussed separately are grouped together in the same paragraph; thus an economic analysis is mixed up with political, social and even cultural developments sometimes in the same sen-

tence. All this makes the Draft Programme appear at times irrelevant, uneven in quality, and superficial.

Even a cursory examination of the contents of the Draft will confirm this. There are eleven sections in it, of which sections V-XI are under specific subject headings, whereas sections I-IV have no captions, for no obvious reasons. The captions of sections V-XI are as follows: Section V: Agrarian Reform; Section VI: Conditions of the People; Section VII: Balance Sheet of Planning; Section VIII: Foreign Policy; Section IX: State Structure and Democracy under Congress Rule; Section X: Programme of People's Democracy; Section XI: Building of People's Democratic Front. The first four sections deal with the following subjects: Section I deals with the national and international situation that led to the transfer of power in India and the major characteristics of the present epoch with the opportunities it offers to the underdeveloped countries. Section II deals with the failure of the Indian bourgeoisie to complete the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution, despite the favourable evolution of the international situation. Section III analyses the dual role of the national bourgeoisie -- oppositional and compromisist in relation to imperialism -- and its ever present tendency to come to terms with imperialism. Section IV is mainly devoted to economic developments in India after the transfer of power.

Thus, it can be seen that Sections IV and V cover the discussion relating to the economic structure of Indian society; but the exposition is neither very systematic nor at all comprehensive. Important aspects have been overlooked; e.g., there is no information regarding the relative strength of the state sector and the private capitalist sector, no discussion of the three five-year plans and their impact on the economic structure of the country; the impact of capitalism on the agricultural and rural economy has been practically ignored and the necessary conclusions therefrom have not been drawn. Section VII is mainly repetitious and its contents should have been incorporated in Section IV. Major conclusions should always be backed up by sufficient economic data, which is not always the case with this "draft." Section VI is a hotch-potch and, in its present form, has no place in a programmatic document; it should be replaced with a section devoted to the study of the Indian social classes and their political role. The caption of Section VIII and the scope of its contents display ideological confusion; in a Marxist-Leninist programme, the international policy and outlook of the Indian Marxists should have been elaborated in a suitable section; beyond stating certain broad generalities, this is nowhere discussed in the draft; instead in Section VIII, the foreign policy of the Indian government is analysed in detail; this can be adequately covered in the section on Indian social classes, under the role of the Indian bourgeoisie. Section IX is also redundant and its contents could be more logically incorporated in various other sections.

It is, thus, quite clear from the above discussion that if the left Communists want to build a revolutionary party in India,

based on the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, they will have to undertake a considerable remodeling of the structure of the present draft. It is likely that some of these defects are due to hasty drafting and will be rectified during the discussion stages. This deficiency has been, in fact, recognised in the "Introduction" to the draft.

Although the draft falls short of the requirement of a genuine Marxist-Leninist programme, it signifies a definite advance on the earlier political documents of the CPI, at least since the Second World War. Compared to these documents, the draft's superiority -- as regards its comprehensiveness, ideological clarity, etc. -- is incontestable. Even in its present inadequate form, the draft programme can become an ideological weapon in the hands of the cadres and the masses oriented towards radical action.

### Positive Features of the Draft Programme

It is only when this programme is viewed in perspective, in the background of the CPI's political past, that the strong points of the programme come out in sharp contrast, and its deficiencies can also be understood. Every political party grows out of its past and even while repudiating this past, may often carry over vestiges of the past in the present. The draft programme, with its strong as well as weak points, its forthright class approach to some issues coupled with ideological confusion on others, its revolutionary inclination along with lingering illusions about "peaceful means" and "parliamentary democracy" -- should all be taken in the context of the new revolutionary tide in the world on the one hand and the past history of the party on the other.

From the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism, the positive aspects of the draft, signifying a unique phase in the CPI's political thinking, can be briefly summarized as follows:

(1) The draft correctly characterizes the transfer of power in 1947 as a deal between the imperialists and the native bourgeoisie in their mutual interest, under the pressure of unprecedented mass upsurges (paragraph 2, page 1).

(2) The draft defines the class character of the emergent Indian state as "the organ of the class rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords [!] led by the big bourgeoisie." According to the draft, "This class character essentially determines the role and functions of the state in the life of the country" (Section IX, paragraph 72, p. 30).

(3) Regarding the political essence of the Congress government's economic and other policies, the draft states "After independence, the ruling bourgeoisie proceeded to develop the country's economy on the basis of capitalism, to further strengthen its class position in Society" (paragraph 17, p. 6). Rejecting the idea that the extension of the state sector signifies automatically a step to-

wards socialism, it says "this planning has nothing to do with socialist planning" (paragraph 21, p. 2) and "the state sector itself in India is an instrument of building capitalism (paragraph 24, p. 9).

(4) On the government's agrarian policy, the draft opines "that the aim and direction of its agrarian policies is not to smash the feudal and semi-feudal fetters on our land relations. . . but to transform feudal landlords into capitalist landlords and to create a stratum of rich peasants. . . who can constitute the main political base of the ruling class in the countryside." (Paragraph 32, p. 16.)

(5) On the basis of its over-all economic analysis, the draft comes to the categorical conclusion "that in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. . . it is futile for underdeveloped countries to seek to develop along the capitalist path." (Paragraph 62, p. 25.)

(6) Repudiating the foreign-policy line, followed by the CPI leadership for the last decade or so, the draft sums up its position in the following terms:

"The foreign policy of any state and its government, in the final analysis, is nothing but the projection of its internal policy . . . The foreign policy of the Government of India naturally reflects the dual character of our bourgeoisie, of opposition to as well as of compromise and conciliation with imperialism. Unlike the monopolist bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries, the Indian bourgeoisie for its very development needs world peace." (Paragraph 63, p. 26.)

The draft distinguishes three different phases in the evolution of the Indian Government's foreign policy. "In the early period after independence. . . the government of India exhibited marked tendencies of succumbing to the blackmail of the imperialist camp and leaned heavily on it." (Paragraph 64.) "Later, with the debacle of the imperialist army in Korea and Vietnam, with the growth in the economic and military might of the socialist world. . . with the new unprecedented upsurge in the liberation struggle in Asia and Africa . . . began a new phase in the Government of India's policy of non-alignment" (paragraph 65). The openly pro-imperialist orientation in the Indian Government's foreign policy, which is increasingly becoming evident in the recent period, is attributed in the draft to "the increasing reliance of its five-year plans on aid from the Western countries, particularly from the USA. . . Government's inability to solve the basic problems facing the Indian people and the contrast in countries where the working people in power have built within a short period a stable socialist economy, and growth and accentuation of social contradictions within the country due to the economic policies of the government. . . (This) new phase arises from the very class character of the present government" (paragraph 68, p. 29).

(7) The draft poses the need for a people's democratic revo-

lution, and emphasizes repeatedly the working-class leadership of this revolution. It exposes the failure of the bourgeoisie to carry out the tasks of the unfinished bourgeois democratic revolution and shows that the leadership of the revolution must, therefore, pass into the hands of the proletariat. The draft links up the fate of the democratic revolution with the socialist revolution, since the proletarian leadership of the revolution cannot allow it to stop in the middle of the road.

This is what the draft says on this vital issue: "Ours is a democratic revolution in an entirely new epoch of world history, when the proletariat and its political party is destined to assume its leadership and not leave it to the bourgeois class to betray it in the middle " (paragraph 107, p. 47), and "the leadership of the working class. . . will ensure that the Indian revolution will not stop at the democratic stage but will quickly pass over to the stage of effecting socialist transformation" (paragraph 126, p. 55).

#### Deficiencies in the Draft Programme

Despite the above-mentioned positive features and new departures in the draft, there are also quite a large number of political and ideological deficiencies in it; some of these are of serious political significance, while others may be of lesser importance. One aspect of these deficiencies -- namely, that relating to the structure of the programme and its exposition -- has already been dealt with. Here we propose to confine the discussion to the content of the programme.

On some major issues, as stated before, the draft displays a clear class approach; but in numerous other places in the draft, the sharpness of the class approach is not at all evident; vague un-Marxist formulations are used extensively; ideological confusion and ambiguities abound and sometimes concessions are made to alien classes and alien ideologies (such as nationalism), resulting in downright contradictions in the draft. Since it is not possible to amplify all these criticisms in the present discussion, attention will be confined only to the fundamental lapses of the draft.

(1) Regarding the crucial issue of the People's Democratic state which the People's Democratic Revolution will usher in, the draft is significantly silent. Of course, the draft is emphatic about the working-class leadership in this state; at times the exposition seems to indicate that this state is equivalent to a workers' and peasants' government or even a workers' state (e.g., "This demands first and foremost the replacement of the present bourgeois-landlord state and government by a state of the working people and a government led by the working class on the basis of a firm worker-peasant alliance," (paragraph 22, p. 37), while in some other places, the draft speaks of the necessity of bringing certain sections of the exploitative classes -- such as the rich peasantry and a section of the national bourgeoisie -- as participating allies in the

People's Democratic Front, which means that the People's Democratic State will not be a workers' state. The drafters ought to know that according to Marxism-Leninism, there cannot be any other variety of state between the bourgeois state and the proletarian state and also that a multiclass state is an absurdity.

(2) This brings us to some of the glaring contradictions in this draft. In Section V, the draft has characterized the rich peasantry as the chief beneficiary of the government's legislation and other state aids and thus as the main social pillar of the bourgeoisie in the countryside; but in Section XI (paragraph 114, p. 50), the draft suddenly declares "by and large, they can also, therefore, be brought into the democratic front and kept as allies in the People's Democratic Revolution." The draft does not explain what concessions are to be given to this layer to keep it in the front and how the irreconcilable conflict of this exploiting layer with the other more reliable allies of the Front -- e.g., the poor and landless peasantry are to be reconciled. In their eagerness to enlist the co-operation of as many classes as possible in the People's Democratic Front, the drafters forget the elementary truth that the contradiction between the rural bourgeoisie and the industrial bourgeoisie is relative, while their hostility towards the proletariat and the semi-proletarians is absolute. Merely heavy taxation and high price of industrial goods cannot snap the tie between the rich peasants and the urban bourgeoisie and compel the former to become allies of the common peasants in the Democratic Front.

(3) The same kind of un-Marxist and unreal outlook characterizes the attitude, adopted in the draft, towards certain hypothetical sections of the national bourgeoisie which are supposed to have no link with either foreign capital or Indian monopoly capital, and which are, thus, expected to sympathise with the anti-imperialist and antifeudal objectives of the People's Democratic Front (paragraph 117, p. 51). It is one thing for a proletarian party to exploit the contradiction and the rivalry between the various sections of the bourgeoisie to advance the revolutionary cause, and it is quite another to build up a theory about the bourgeoisie's "objectively progressive character" (p. 51) and thus to sow fresh illusions in the minds of the masses about them. Such theories, if seriously meant and implemented in action, are bound to lead to the backsliding of the revolution and cause disillusionment among the ranks of the revolution's best friends, as they have done in the past in so many countries.

(4) In the struggle between the right and the left wings inside the CPI where the latter continually subjects the former to charges of reformism and revisionism, one would have expected in this draft a clear enunciation of the Marxist-Leninist attitude towards bourgeois-democratic institutions. Marxist-Leninists have a dual attitude towards "bourgeois parliamentarism"; while they defend, up to a point, bourgeois democracy against fascist attacks, they also defend the toiling classes against the attacks of bourgeois democracy,

since bourgeois democracy represents, despite its democratic façade, nothing but the dictatorship of capital over labour. As such, the Marxist-Leninists do not and cannot conceal their aim of destroying bourgeois parliamentarism, when the proletariat is able to establish its own, new state apparatus.

Unfortunately, the draft programme seeks to answer, in a defensive and propagandist manner, bourgeois charges of "subversion of democratic institutions" against the Communists. According to the draft, "The threat to the parliamentary system and to democracy comes not from the working people. . . . The threat comes from the exploiting classes. . . . The Communists defend parliamentary and democratic institutions. They strive to preserve and develop them further [!] and to make democracy full and real for all [?]" (emphasis ours) (paragraph 88, p. 35). Coming to India's "democracy," the draft says "Although a form of class rule of the bourgeoisie, India's present parliamentary system also embodies an advance for the people. It affords certain opportunities to them to defend their vital interests [?]. . . and mobilise them to carry forward the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress." (Emphasis ours.) (Paragraph 87.) The draft does not say anything about how Marxists are to link up parliamentary activity with their revolutionary activity; as a result, this one-sided emphasis only on the virtues of the "Indian parliamentary system," as well as the unqualified statement about the Communists' loyalty to democratic institutions can have dangerous consequences, in lowering the ideological consciousness of the CPI's radical cadres and causing illusions about parliamentary democracy among the masses. This is a very serious defect of the draft.

(5) The draft also lacks clarity and boldness in facing up to the crucial question about the road to the conquest of power. "The Communist Party of India strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means" (our emphasis) (paragraph 120, p. 53); and as if to counter-balance this statement the draft states in the very next paragraph, "However, it needs always to be borne in mind that the ruling classes never relinquish their power voluntarily. . . . It is, therefore, necessary for the revolutionary forces to be vigilant and so orientate their work that they can face up to all contingencies." Equivocation and diplomatic tact, it must be understood, have no place in a Marxist-Leninist programme. Instead the draft should have clearly stated that much as the Communists would like the transition from capitalism to socialism to occur peacefully, the issue of "peace or violence" does not depend on their will; past histories conclusively prove that the need of revolutionary violence arises precisely because of the existence of organised, counterrevolutionary violence. The revolutionary forces will, therefore, have to remain prepared for the worst eventuality and cannot count on the most favourable variant.

(6) The draft also deviates from the spirit of internationalism which is the very essence of Marxism. There are numerous refer-

ences to "our great country," "our great people," to the people's "patriotism" and to the need to rouse "the patriotic enthusiasm" of the masses. This undue concession to nationalism, that is to say, to the political backwardness of the masses, is alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. One of the major tasks of a Marxist-Leninist party is to educate its cadres not in the spirit of patriotism, but in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. The Communist Manifesto enjoined upon all Communists never to forget that "the working men have no country; we cannot take from them what they have not got."

(7) The draft is completely silent on those burning international issues, around which a serious and bitter controversy is raging now in the ranks of the international Communist movement -- e.g., the issue of war and peace and the meaning of peaceful coexistence, attitude towards Stalin and the Stalin era, attitude towards the national bourgeoisie of the newly independent countries, nature of the transition from capitalism to socialism, together with the related issue of the so-called "parliamentary road to socialism," and the nature of the road for socialist reconstruction.

The draft declares its adherence to the two Moscow Declarations of 1957 and 1960; but this declaration of loyalty does not clarify the drafters' own outlook on the above-mentioned points of dispute. As already stated above, the draft contains some cautious and cryptic statements on only two of the foregoing issues -- namely, the road to the conquest of power and attitude towards parliamentary democracy -- but even here the draft is not very clear. The peculiar structure of the programme where there is no place for stating the international policy of the party, has technically helped the drafters to avoid these ideological controversies, but, in so doing, it has also considerably lowered the ideological quality of the draft programme. Abstentionism can never be a virtue in revolutionary politics.

(8) This is particularly true in regard to Stalin. The issue of Stalin is not primarily a matter of history or of setting certain historical records straight; it has serious relevance for the contemporary working-class movement. Stalin's theories and practices have influenced and still continue to influence, for good or evil, a large section of the working-class leaderships in the world, despite the formal repudiation of the man for the last eight years. If the theories and practices of the Stalin era are defined as Stalinism, then it becomes at once clear that while Stalin is dead, the issue of Stalinism is still very much alive. Stalinism has two broad aspects -- one relating to his method of handling Soviet domestic affairs (involving as it does the related issues of proletarian democracy and the role of bureaucracy in a workers' state, especially during the period of socialist construction) and the other relating to his method of conducting international affairs, both within the international Communist movement and vis-a-vis the various imperialist powers (this involves also a number of issues of great theoretical and practical importance, e.g., attitude towards the

imperialists, the theory of peaceful co-existence first propounded by Stalin, the issue of what is the correct international policy for a workers' state, the nature of the revolution in a capitalistically underdeveloped country with the following triple theories -- Stalin's theory of revolution by stages, Dimitrov's theory of a "bloc of four classes" and Mao Tse-tung's theory of People's democracy, etc., etc.).

A proletarian party has to clarify its stand in regard to two basic issues, raised by Stalinism today, that is, whether it chooses the over-centralized, bureaucratic road or the road of proletarian democracy, during the period of socialist construction; and secondly, whether in its revolutionary activity, it is going to limit the growth of the revolution by imposing artificial barriers on it on the basis of the theory of revolution by two stages (first democratic, then socialist), or, to develop the revolution uninterruptedly, from its lowest to the highest stage, on the basis of its inner drive and potentialities and not on the basis of any theoretical schemata.

The draft has implicitly rejected the Stalinist schemata -- about revolution by stages, but on the other issue of Stalinism -- bureaucracy or proletarian democracy? -- the draft maintains a studied silence. This abstentionism cannot but affect the ability of the draft to attract at least the advanced section of the working-class cadres and even more, the radicalized section of the intelligentsia.

#### An Over-all Assessment of the Draft Programme

Applying the strict standard of Marxism-Leninism, the draft programme, in its present form, can be regarded as a centrist programme, standing midway between reformism and proletarian revolution.

Some of the ideological confusion in the draft is undoubtedly due to the burden of inertia, to the old mistaken policies of the CPI and the ideological heritage of the Stalin era. The attitude towards a section of the national bourgeoisie and the rich peasantry as prospective allies in the People's Democratic Front and vagueness about the class character of the People's Democratic State come under this category.

At the same time, the silence of the draft on the issues involved in the Moscow-Peking controversy as well as its equivocal position on some other issues are partly due to the inability of the drafters to come to any definite conclusion as yet and partly due to the existence of various ideological groupings among the anti-Dange wing.

It would be incorrect to view the draft as a finished, static and rigid document or to assess its political significance merely in terms of the past political thinking or ideological affiliation of the drafters.

The draft is an index of the current phase of thinking of the section of the CPI sponsoring it, which in turn is a by-product of the turmoil in the Indian political scene as well as of the crisis in the international Communist movement.

Further maturing of this crisis in the national and international sphere will undoubtedly cause this section of the CPI to undergo further evolution and its programmatic stand is also bound to evolve in keeping with it.

The gradual deepening of the process of world revolution in all its forms -- such as the destruction of colonialism, the conversion of anti-imperialist liberation struggles steadily into social revolution, the universal tendency towards social ownership of the means of production and the irrepressible urge for more and more democracy for the toiling people in all countries -- all these will surely exert their healthy influence on the militant cadres of the left CPI. Under this impact, they will be impelled towards a genuine revolutionary orientation at least on all the major issues. The developing class struggle will compel them to test out many of their old theories and hypotheses and to eliminate the deficiencies in their present thinking. The present draft programme will then be regarded as a passing episode in this process of evolution.

The anti-Dange wing of the CPI, or more precisely its left section, has already become a major factor in our national politics. The first requisite of a revolutionary party is its capacity to resist the pressure of its "own" bourgeoisie; the left CPI has unmistakably demonstrated this capacity on a mass scale during the worst phase of nationalist hysteria in this country. To those who are acquainted with the history of the Communist parties of various countries, the surrender of a major section of the CPI to the Indian bourgeoisie will not cause much surprise; but what appears to them also as a new and very encouraging development is the refusal of a significant section of this party to kow-tow to this class-collaborationist line. The anticapitalist stand of the left CPI and its link with the masses and the radicalized youth, coupled with its general militancy and revolutionary inclination -- for the first time opens up, against the background of the revolutionary world, the prospect of a mass, revolutionary Marxist party emerging in India in the foreseeable future. No revolutionary Marxist in India can look upon this phenomenon as a bystander. Whether he functions inside the CPI or outside, he has a duty to try to influence this process in such a manner that the weapon of the coming Indian revolution -- a mass party, based on the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and tested through a series of serious class combats -- can be shaped out with a minimum wastage of time.