

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 32

September 25, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

General Strike in Saigon .....	1
Attempt to Crush Political Opposition in Bolivia .....	4
The Territorial Issues in the Sino-Soviet Dispute .....	5
Negro Struggle Shakes Party Alignments in U.S. -- by Evelyn Sell .....	7
Dr. Perera vs. Leon Trotsky .....	9
Rise in West German Economic Cycle .....	10
Ready to Resume Nuclear Testing .....	11
The Lumpa Church Rebellion .....	12
USSR Has New Weapon Capable of Destroying Mankind .....	14
Two Steps Forward, One Step Back (On the ninth article of the Chinese Communist party in reply to the "Open Letter" of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the USSR) -- by Ernest Germain .....	15
Ben Bella Maintains Pressure on Oil Companies .....	21
Japanese Trotskyists Publish Theoretical Magazine .....	24
Documents:	
In Celebration of the Centenary of the First International .....	22
For the Congolese Freedom Fighters .....	25

## GENERAL STRIKE IN SAIGON

It is almost a year since Washington decided to topple the Diem regime. [See World Outlook November 8, 1963.] The hope was that a new puppet government would win popular support and prove more capable of conducting the dirty war against the FNL [Front National de Libération]. It turned out to be a fatal move. Neither the generals nor the civilians favored by the U.S. State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency have shown the slightest capacity to form any kind of stable power. The generals have displayed the greatest

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE - Hebdomadaire

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

political stupidity, engaging in repeated coups d'état in light opera style. For some days the only civilian at the disposal of the U.S. "advisors" was one Nguyen Xuan Oanh, who spent his adult life in Japan and the United States and who is said to hold an American passport issued in the name of "Jack Owen."

The fragility of the regime was dramatically demonstrated when students, demonstrating in the streets, knocked General Khanh out of the capital for several weeks, the "strong man" reportedly suffering a "mental collapse" that was nonetheless not a "nervous breakdown." Buddhists and Catholics, fighting in the streets, further paralyzed the power structure set up by the American military, diplomatic and spy services.

The situation has been developing toward a climax. Increasing military successes have been registered by the FNL, widening the territories under its control. The battleground is moving closer to Saigon. Demonstrations have flared up in various areas against the puppet government. A noteworthy one was the uprising September 20 of a mountain tribe especially trained by the Americans to fight the FNL. The tribesmen were reported to have arrested their American advisors and, armed with bows and arrows, to have seized the Ban Me Thuot radio station.

Now a most significant development has occurred. For the first time in the years of civil strife and American intervention, the working-class masses of Saigon have moved onto the political stage.

A 48-hour general strike was called for September 21 and 22. It involved the workers in transportation, water supply, electricity, railways and many plants. On September 21, tens of thousands of workers demonstrated in the streets. The strike was all the more significant since it was completely illegal.

The leaders of the CVT [Confédération Vietnamiennne du Travail], which has some 300,000 members, denied that the strike had any political aims. The primary objective was to compel Vimtex, a textile plant employing 2,000 workers, to take back 1,500 workers locked out by management following the government proclamation of a state of emergency August 7.

But although the general strike was proclaimed to have only a limited aim, it must be considered in the context of the present situation. It should be noted, moreover, that the strikers began adding other demands -- recognition of the right to strike and to hold trade-union meetings despite the state of emergency proclaimed by the government. They also demanded an end to military conscription and an end to the state of emergency. The strike obviously implies a great deal politically.

Before World War II, Saigon was the center of a strong revolu-

tionary movement. It even had a considerable Trotskyist tradition. The present top trade-union leaders were installed, it is true, by the Diem regime. But there is no lack of cadres in the trade-union movement who have a socialist orientation.

During the years of terror under the Diem regime and the military dictatorship, workers under special surveillance could not budge. They had to wait patiently until the situation eventually reached such ripeness that the downfall of the system was obviously near.

That is the point now reached. According to Max Clos, special Saigon correspondent of the Paris daily Le Figaro, the strike was launched following "pressure from the rank and file. . . actually brought to bear for only eight days." He reports that there were "heated discussions among the trade-union leaders," that "some of them were against a strike under any circumstances, fearing that the government would accuse them of playing into the hands of the Vietcong. They did not succeed in imposing their position." [Le Figaro, September 22.]

The same correspondent provides evidence, perhaps unconsciously, of the self-assurance of the workers. He asked one of the strike leaders if he did not fear the intervention of the army. "The army is tired," he was told. "I am sure that it will not march against the workers."

The 48-hour strike testifies to the political understanding of the workers. After so many years under the yoke of the oppressor, they do not intend to move blindly. They have begun with a limited movement in order to test the ground, to feel out the resistance.

The workers of Saigon are sizing up their own strength. They are initiating a course that can bring an end to the war and assure a solution for South Vietnam and at the same time Vietnam as a whole.

Through their strike action, the Saigon workers have given the lie to the imperialists who claim that the struggle in South Vietnam is led by the Communists of North Vietnam and by Peking. The struggle of the FNL guerrillas is based primarily on the peasants of the delta region. With the strike of the Saigon workers, the overwhelming bulk of the population of South Vietnam has now lined up actively against the generals in the service of U.S. imperialism.

The entire world should rally to the side of the Vietnamese people. Everywhere the demand should be raised to withdraw the American troops. Their continued presence in this part of the world, as still another mysterious incident in the Gulf of Tonkin demonstrates, constitutes a standing threat to widen the armed conflict under the lying pretext of defending the freedom of a people who above all want to free themselves from the presence of these intruders.

## ATTEMPT TO CRUSH POLITICAL OPPOSITION IN BOLIVIA

The unconstitutional election staged by Victor Paz Estenssoro May 31 to gain a third four-year term for himself as president of Bolivia has been followed up with logical, if reactionary, consistency.

On August 21, Paz broke diplomatic and commercial relations with Cuba. Six officials at the Cuban Embassy were ordered to leave at once.

In an editorial August 25, the New York Times declared that Paz "and the key elements in the ruling MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario] party did not want to conform to the Organization of American States resolution calling for sanctions against Cuba." But "Bolivia reportedly was given no choice. It was a case of conforming or of facing a severe cut in United States aid -- and Bolivia cannot carry on without such aid."

The heavy State Department pressure on poverty-stricken Bolivia has now had further consequences. On September 20 Paz proclaimed a "state of siege." This meant the suspension of such civil liberties as still remained in the badly battered constitution.

According to the Bolivian government, a vast "conspiracy" had been discovered involving guerrilla fighters of the Bolivian Falange, a fascist-minded grouping, and guerrilla fighters of revolutionary socialist orientation. The plot, again according to Paz's spokesmen, also involved former President Hernan Siles Zuazo, who is neither fascist-minded nor socialist-oriented but of the same general political coloration as Paz himself.

Hundreds of political arrests were made. Although no details and few names were mentioned, they appeared to be part of a nationwide witch hunt directed mainly against left-wing opponents of Paz's unconstitutional regime.

Siles and 34 other alleged "plotters" were put on a plane September 22 and flown to exile in neighboring Paraguay. Among them were leading figures of the political opposition. Juan Lechin Octendo, the well-known trade-union leader of the miners who was vice-president of Bolivia until he broke with Paz last January because of the drift of the government toward the right under U.S. pressure, was reported to be in hiding. At Huanuni, miners were said to have taken four high officials of the Mining Corporation of Bolivia as hostages. In La Paz armed militia loyal to Paz were patrolling the streets.

Thus the Alliance for Progress bore its expected bitter fruit in the Andean republic. Once again the alternative was clearly posed -- either a reactionary dictatorship or a socialist revolution in the example set by Cuba. U.S. imperialism has ruled out any middle road for Latin America.

THE TERRITORIAL ISSUES IN THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE

[An inquiry about the stand of the Trotskyists on two important questions in the Sino-Soviet dispute was recently received by the Fourth International. These were:

[(1) The claims raised by the People's Republic of China to territory that has been held by the Soviet Union since the overthrow of the Czarist government.

[(2) China's support of Japan's claim to the Kurile Islands, which were taken by the Soviet Union after its victory in World War II.

[Pierre Frank, one of the main figures of the Fourth International, gave the following reply.]

\* \* \*

I should like to thank you for providing me with the opportunity to deal with questions on which the Fourth International itself has not yet taken a formal stand. We have been preoccupied with the fundamental international issues at stake among the workers parties and have placed priority on these questions rather than the relations among workers states. But it goes without saying that the Fourth International, like all other working-class organizations, must likewise take a position on issues involving relations among the workers states.

We took up the question in a broad way at the time of the break between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia in 1948. When the Soviet technicians were withdrawn from China, we again considered the problem. What we said then still holds; namely, that differences among the parties in power, even if they lead to a split, should in no case be permitted to provoke serious repercussions between states having the same social character.

This is the broad principle we hold to in determining our position with regard to the territorial problems that have been raised.

In the question of the Kurile Islands, Khrushchev was reported to have said to some visitors from Japan: "As for the Kurile Islands they have no economic importance for the USSR. They are only of military importance. If the United States should some day withdraw from Japan and give up Okinawa, well we would reciprocate one hundred per cent." (Le Monde, September 17.)

If this is an accurate report, Khrushchev himself recognizes that the Kuriles are Japanese territory.

To justify the occupation of foreign territory by a workers'

state, the Fourth International would in no case argue its "economic importance." The bargaining aspect, in which Khrushchev involves the United States, is likewise inadmissible. On the other hand, in certain circumstances, we would not deny that the Soviet government has the right to take into account military considerations involving the defense of the Soviet Union. But such considerations must be advanced with a good deal of caution. Above all, it is necessary to prove whether present militant needs are of such nature that they must take priority over everything else -- especially the negative repercussions that can occur among the masses of the occupied country. As a general rule, it appears to us that the military benefits are minor compared to the accompanying political disadvantages.

With regard to territories in dispute between two workers states -- in this case the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China -- we cannot take as the criterion either the shifts in boundary lines of long ago or the fact that the Soviet Union is the oldest workers' state. The criterion should only be the wishes of the peoples now living in these areas. The right of a people to determine their own fate is the only fundamental criterion. This was the traditional position of the Bolsheviki as it is today of the Fourth International.

In October 1917 the young Soviet power recognized the right of Poland, Finland and other countries to decide for themselves, even if this signified bourgeois rule. If it is now objected that since then the Soviet Union was constituted, it should be recalled that in 1922 when this occurred, the issue was discussed and Lenin took a strong position in favor of the right of every Soviet republic to separate from the Union (see his letters of December 30 and 31, 1922, on the nationality question, which were violently aimed against Stalin and the Great Russian bureaucracy). The platform of the Left Opposition (Trotsky-Zinoviev) in 1927 likewise vigorously defended national rights within the Soviet Union. Trotsky was even in favor of the right of the Ukraine to constitute an independent Soviet Republic.

What the wishes of the populations are in the areas referred to by the Chinese leadership and by Khrushchev are not known to us. But the only fundamental criterion, I emphasize once more, is the right of peoples to determine their own fate. The problem of boundary lines and similar issues are heritages of the past or arise in the process of constructing the socialist society. The workers states should work out some kind of international law and institutions independent of the state structures to which such questions could be submitted and resolved according to the criteria of socialist democracy.

Unfortunately, these contradictions are now being exacerbated by the ruling bureaucracies. However, it seems improbable to us that the current tensions involving territorial questions between the Soviet Union and China could degenerate into an armed conflict, although the dispute has been embittered in a dangerous way.

We are confident that the current crisis of the Communist movement will, after sharp struggles, end with the removal of Stalinism and all the gross bureaucratic deformations. One of the consequences will be a great improvement in relations among the workers states. But this outcome is still not something immediate.

### NEGRO STRUGGLE SHAKES PARTY ALIGNMENTS IN U.S.

By Evelyn Sell

As the election campaign in the U.S. goes into its final weeks, it is apparent that the Freedom Now struggle has had -- and will continue to have -- profound effects on the make-up of the two major political parties. The expanding demands of the Negro struggle are forcing the professional politicians out of their "business as usual" ruts. Splits and new coalitions within the parties and between them will continue to occur as the various groupings seek to adjust to the new social realities created by the civil-rights movement.

The most obvious indication of this process is the Goldwater candidacy whereby the nouveaux riches western oil and war-contract millionaires hope to climb into the summits of political power on the backs of Southern racists and the loudly proclaimed "white backlash" which Alabama's Governor Wallace scared up during his recent election bids in the Northern primaries.

Especially significant is the impact of the Freedom Now struggle on the Democratic party coalition which was brought together by Roosevelt in the 1936 election. The economic crisis of the thirties introduced a strange assortment of political bedfellows: the Dixiecrats, the big city political machines in the North, organized labor and urban Negroes. This coalition endured through a world war, cold war, "police" actions in various parts of the world, recessions, inflation, automation and the witch-hunt. The myth was spread that this coalition would endure forever, nothing could break it up -- especially since the few challenges to this structure failed to disrupt the alignment of forces. Today, however, the hammer blows of the Negroes' battles for equality and dignity are pounding the Democratic party into a new shape.

The Northern party machines have long been able to reach satisfactory arrangements with the Southern political bosses and they would continue their mutually profitable association if the Negro struggle would allow them to -- but the unrelenting pressure of the Negro revolt does not leave much room for any more comfortable accommodations. The wedge of civil rights has been thrust between these two wings of the party and each freedom battle pounds that wedge in ever deeper. The Southerners cling desperately to Jim Crow because their political power is dependent on a disenfranchised Negro

population. The Northern "liberal" wing is dependent on the urban votes and the Negro is fast becoming the balance of power in the nation's major cities. These different bases of political strength will inevitably lead to newer and deeper clashes between these two sections of the Democratic party.

Labor, the other major partner, is also being affected by the Negroes' demands and activities. The political arm of organized labor has been frozen within the Democratic party. The challenging demands of the Negroes are the first tingling sensations which indicate a return of warmth and life. The amalgamation of organized labor and Southern reactionaries has provided winning tickets for the Democrats at election time but it has also provided a source of inevitable friction and crisis within the party. The Freedom Now struggle aggravates that unstable relationship by continuing to press for job equality and economic gains.

Union activities in the South inevitably run smack into the fist of the antilabor racists who control the economic, social and political life of the area. As long as organized labor remains tied to the Northern wing of the Democratic party it cannot take up a militant struggle against its Southern political associates. The Dixiecrats are an embarrassment to the liberal labor Democrats and the labor allies are a pain in the neck to Southern politicians. Despite their basic conflicts, labor and the Dixiecrats have been held together with the glue of Northern Democratic machine politics. The Negro struggle is dissolving that glue.

The "liberals" and their labor partners are using the threat of a Goldwater victory to help whip dissatisfied workers into line. Before the Republican convention there were a number of Negro threats about swinging black votes to the Republicans. The flagrantly evident racist support to Goldwater, however, has blocked any significant movement of Negroes into the ranks of the Republican party. As a matter of fact, long-time Negro politicians within the New York Republican party are refusing to campaign for the presidential nominee of their party.

Caught between the Democratic frying pan and the Republican fire, many Negroes state their intention to "go fishing" on election day (i.e., abstain from voting). The more advanced sections of Negroes are taking the first steps toward creating a genuinely effective alternative to the two capitalist parties. The most developed expression of this tendency is the Freedom Now party, organized in the North last summer after the mammoth March on Washington.

The withdrawal of significant blocks of Negro votes from the labor-endorsed candidates in the North -- either through abstentionism or independent political action -- will necessarily create a deep crisis in the labor-Democratic machine partnership. The labor bureaucrats may want to cling to the Democrats but they won't be wanted if they can't deliver the very important Negro vote!

The shock waves of the Freedom Now struggle are thus rattling the teeth of the labor bureaucracy and the Democratic party big-wigs. How is the struggle affecting the political consciousness and activities of the rank and file? The loudest, most publicized reactions have come from the most conservative sections of the working class. The main body of the white working class has not been heard from yet. The obvious political messages of the Freedom Now struggle are thrust repeatedly at the white workers immobilized within the Democratic party. The very existence of a Freedom Now party on the Michigan ballot breaks through the fairy-tale argument that "We must stick to the Democrats. We can't do anything on our own." If a small group of Negroes can create a party, get on the ballot and fight in their own interests, then why can't the much more numerous, rich and powerful labor movement?

The Negroes' political activities are a preview of what the white workers will be forced to undertake once they start to move -- and they will move; they have no choice in the matter, just as the Negroes had no choice but to struggle against their conditions of life. The political activities of Negroes today have far-reaching consequences in terms of breaking up the long sustained political alignments within the capitalist parties and in terms of providing rich lessons to help educate the working class as a whole for their next major struggle: the construction of an independent political organization which will challenge the capitalist system.

#### DR. PERERA VS. LEON TROTSKY

In Colombo, on July 15, the former Trotskyist leader Dr. N.M. Perera, who accepted the offer of the Ceylonese Prime Minister to join a coalition government sponsored by her party, attempted to justify his betrayal of the basic principles of revolutionary socialism with the following argument on the floor of parliament:

"Surely, we know that the Government in Australia is a Coalition Government. For the last fourteen years that has been the position, and it is very successful. What is your explanation of that? It depends upon the basic principles on which you come to an agreement, to make a coalition succeed or fail. Coalitions do not succeed in England for various reasons, and not necessarily because a coalition as such cannot function. Quite a number of governments in the West European countries are coalition governments of one type or another. Italy has had no other government but a coalition throughout its recent history. France, West Germany, all those countries have coalition governments. All that I am saying is, do not generalize from the experience of Great Britain alone."

Almost exactly twenty-five years ago, in July 1939, Leon Trotsky addressed an "Open Letter" to the workers of India. In this

letter he had some things to say about coalition governments which Dr. N.M. Perera has apparently forgotten. Yet they sound as fresh as the day they were written. It would be interesting to hear Dr. Perera's comment on them in parliament, if it does not disturb his conscience too much:

"The Stalinists cover up their policy of servitude to British, French, and USA imperialism with the formula of a 'People's Front.' What a mockery of the people! 'People's Front' is only a new name for that old policy, the gist of which lies in class collaboration, in a coalition between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In every such coalition, the leadership invariably turns out to be in the hands of the right-wing, that is, in the hands of the propertied class. The Indian bourgeoisie, as has already been stated, wants peaceful horse trading and not a struggle. Coalition with the bourgeoisie leads to the proletariat's abnegating the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The policy of coalition implies marking time, temporizing, cherishing false hopes, hollow maneuvers and intrigues. As a result of this policy, disillusionment inevitably sets in among the working masses, while the peasants turn their backs on the proletariat and fall into apathy. The German revolution, the Austrian revolution, the Chinese revolution, and the Spanish revolution have all perished as a result of coalition policy. The selfsame danger also menaces the Indian revolution where the Stalinists, under the guise of a 'People's Front,' are putting across a policy of subordinating the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. This signifies, in action, a rejection of the revolutionary agrarian program, a refusal to arm the workers, a rejection of the struggle for power, a rejection of revolution."

#### RISE IN WEST GERMAN ECONOMIC CYCLE

COLOGNE -- West Germany is experiencing its fourth boom since the end of World War II. A government economic report which predicted a nominal rise in the gross national produce of 6.4% and a real rise of 4.5% -- signifying a price jump of 2% -- proved to be much too low. The estimate now is 9% for the gross national product and 6.5% for the real rise.

The main stimulating factor was a boost in exports and a resulting rise in investments. The favorable balance of trade may well prove to be the highest in the history of Germany, the forecast being DM 10,000,000,000 [one Deutsche Mark = \$.25].

Profits have shot up and the Institute of Economic Science, a trade-union institution, predicts that DM 20,000,000,000 in profits will be ploughed back into business in the form of self-investment. This is twice as much as the 1963 figure, constituting a new postwar record.

The situation is all the more favorable for German capitalism since wage contracts signed at the beginning of 1963 covered the next eighteen months. Under German law, a union is held liable to maintain its contracts unless they contain specific provisions to the contrary. Strikes in violation of contracts can thus mean penalties running into tens of millions of dollars for the unions.

The coalition government of Christian Democrats and Liberals promised measures that would prevent the boom from getting out of hand so as to block undue price rises and a jump in the cost of living. However, the government faces difficulties. It can't lower tariffs on agricultural products, which would help keep down prices, without risking the loss of peasant support in the election next year. Moreover, it has begun lightening taxes on certain middle-class layers, knowing very well that this will be reflected in a still higher rate of investment and further overheating of the boom. This move was also part of the political preparations for next year's election which the government regards as more important than anything else.

As things now stand, the Christian Democrats may very well win the 1965 elections, much to the chagrin of the Social Democrats who sought to gain popularity by dumping the last remnants of a socialist program and conforming to liberal capitalist views.

The latest master stroke of the Social Democrats was to help re-elect Heinrich Lübke, the Christian Democrat candidate for president. By this strategy, argued Fritz Erler, one of the outstanding brains of the one-time believers in socialism, the Social Democrats "co-determined" who would be president of the Federal Republic!

This was too much for even Social Democratic stomachs to hold down without some signs of indigestion. In the secret vote of the elective body composed of 1,024 members, 443 of whom are Social Democrats, it is estimated that about 40% either abstained or voted for Bucher, the Liberal candidate.

This milk-and-toast opposition reflected the resistance in various "Länder" party organizations to party orders from headquarters in Bonn.

#### READY TO RESUME NUCLEAR TESTING

The Pentagon and Atomic Energy Commission announced plans September 8 to go ahead with exercises this fall on atmospheric nuclear testing. While approving the nuclear test-ban treaty last year, the U.S. Senate insisted on provisions for continued practice without setting off nuclear explosions. The announced aim was to keep the U.S. armed forces ready to resume testing at any moment.

## THE LUMPA CHURCH REBELLION

FORT JAMESON, Northern Rhodesia -- Although not yet fully independent, Northern Rhodesia has already gone through its first experience at sabotage and calculated destruction. And there is very little doubt that at the very root of all the recent trouble has been the forces seeking to undermine the independence and reconstruction of Zambia [name chosen for Northern Rhodesia, whose independence is scheduled to be granted October 24].

The Lumpa Church rebellion against authority was far more than a mere expression of its independence from the governing party. While the friction between members of this church and members of the United National Independence Party [UNIP], now in power, has led and could have led to minor skirmishes, assault and retaliation, this latest rebellion, so widespread, involving thousands of persons and causing the loss of hundreds of lives and many hundred wounded, had more profound causes than a mere altercation between church and state. We believe that Mrs. Alice Lenshina was a mere tool, a pawn in a complex plot to embarrass Government on the eve of independence and to undermine its authority.

Alice Lenshina received her formal religious education from the Church of Scotland Mission. In 1953 she claimed that she had died on September 25 but was reborn, for on reaching heaven God had refused her permission to enter and had entrusted her with the task of banishing witchcraft from the world. She set about this with alacrity. After establishing her own (Lumpa) Church, she embarked on an enthusiastic campaign in the northeastern part of the country. By 1955 the church had made more than 50,000 converts spread over most of Northern Rhodesia, and 60,000 pilgrims had visited her at her village. Most of these were "stolen away" from the established mission churches.

She preached against polygamy, witchcraft, drinking, smoking, dancing and all worldly pleasures. She exacted a stern dedication from all her converts. Much to the annoyance of the missionaries she preached against the New Testament, declaring it to be "obsolete." But above all she was an excellent businesswoman. All pilgrims had to pay before being granted an audience, or to be blessed or healed. Many spent a few days or weeks soaking up the purifying atmosphere surrounding Lenshina -- and paid for board and lodging; church members made large and regular contributions. ("Pay now -- pray later.")

By 1958 the church was a well co-ordinated, well-organized body. The first clash with police took place at that time. Great friction then arose between the Lumpa Church and the two leading political parties -- as Lenshina firmly forbade her followers from participating in "politics." Those discovered in possession of a party card would be forced to burn these in public. Frequent clashes occurred between Lumpa members and UNIP members, rising to a peak in

1962 with the elections. But nevertheless UNIP must have made inroads into Lenshina's following because the membership dropped to below 15,000.

With the November 1963 elections, UNIP, capturing 55 of the 75 seats, took over control of the country, and the Lumpas feared that they would be made to suffer for their lack of co-operation during the liberatory struggle. On December 28, 1963, thirty Lumpas were attacked by 100 UNIP supporters. The vast majority of members withdrew into entirely isolated villages which they surrounded by moats and pointed stakes up to nine feet high. After this, peaceful co-existence between Lumpas and the rest of Zambia was impossible. Lumpas recognised only the authority of Lenshina.

In June, 150 Lumpas attacked a police patrol but were rapidly subdued. The Prime Minister himself visited Lenshina and she promised to command her followers to obey the law of the land and to remain at peace. This promise was never kept. Instead the Lumpas made preparation for "total war" on all the non-Lumpas.

On August 24 a band of Lumpas ambushed a police patrol, killing two policemen. It was the signal for a massive Lumpas war of attrition on all the other villages in the Chinsali area. Dozens of villages were burned and their inhabitants slaughtered, the Lumpas attacking with muzzle-loaders, bows and arrows, spears and axes. There were five main waves of assault. The first by Lumpas in the Chinsali area. Then by the army which had now been mobilised against them. Then by Lumpas in the Lundazi district; and again army retaliation. Finally by relatives and friends and neighbours of those killed by the Lumpas. In all, some 600 people were killed and 400 wounded.

After two gory weeks the Lumpas Church was broken, banned by government decree, and its adherents scattered, or arrested. Alice Lenshina and her husband surrendered to the police.

Apart from the heavy drain on the resources of the country (more than 1,000 troops and police were called into action), many residual causes have been created. Some 6,000 refugees, driven from their homes, have to be resettled. Epidemics of smallpox, typhoid fever, pneumonia, malnutrition, rabies and dysentery have started in the big, hastily set up refugee encampments. The long, difficult process of the rehabilitation of the Lumpas is to be faced. Vengeance against the Lumpas must be kept to the minimum.

To add to the confusion and to magnify the difficulties confronting Government, on the day after the second great Lumpas assault, the Amalgamated Engineering Union went on strike. This AEU consists of only 84 men, all whites (South African and Southern Rhodesian) and they were able to enforce a total stoppage of all trains in Zambia for two weeks! On the day after the Rhodesian Railways had consented to the wage increase demanded, the Rhodesian Railway Workers Union

(also all-white) struck for the same reason -- and again no train could run. These consecutive strikes, at such a critical period, were described by Prime Minister Kenneth Kaunda as a "national disaster," and "a dagger thrust at the heart of the nation." It cost the country nearly £700,000 [£1 = \$2.80] and seriously hampered the transport of supplies to the front!

The Lumpa rebellion, and the railway strike, are now at an end. No thorough assessment is yet possible, but Dr. Kaunda himself believes that unknown agents are working against him, to sabotage his efforts at building Zambia. On August 6 he said, "Whoever this mastermind is, he must be discovered and as operations continue his identity is bound to come out." The facts give much substance to this thesis.

- Friction between UNIP and the Lumpa Church, at its worst in late 1962, had decreased since then, especially with the rapid progress toward independence scheduled for October 1964.

- There had been absolutely no precipitating factor occurring in mid 1964 which could have driven the Lumpas beyond the point of endurance.

- The main victims of all Lumpa attacks have been mere innocent villagers, women and children and not UNIP members as such.

- The Lumpas had nothing to gain from their gigantic acts of defiance, and their cause was hopeless from the outset. As much as everyone else they were victims and not the perpetrators of the rebellion!

Finally we should state that the UNIP government, still in the process of consolidating its authority, emerged from this terrifying ordeal with flying colours, and with its prestige much enhanced.

#### USSR HAS NEW WEAPON CAPABLE OF DESTROYING MANKIND

Khrushchev told a visiting group of Japanese parliamentarians September 15 that the Soviet Union has a new military device capable of "exterminating humanity."

"I have never seen anything like it," he was reported to have said. "It is the most powerful, the mightiest of all existing devices. Its power is limitless."

As a shiver of fear went round the world, Khrushchev backed down somewhat. He did not claim that the weapon was "limitless," he said. He also explained that it was not a nuclear device. But the fear died slowly and speculation continued as to the nature of the secret weapon.

TWO STEPS FORWARD, ONE STEP BACK

On the ninth article of the Chinese Communist party in  
reply to the "Open Letter" of the Central Com-  
mittee of the Communist party of the USSR

By Ernest Germain

When the Sino-Soviet dispute broke into the open, it was not difficult to predict that all the theoretical and practical problems posed by forty years of degeneration of the world Communist movement would sooner or later be brought forward and thrown into the arena by one or the other of the two protagonists. It is nevertheless quite remarkable how far the Chinese Communists go in their ninth article\* replying to the "Open Letter" of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union in posing the problem of the social roots of the present crisis of world Communism.

Like the other recent ideological contributions of the Chinese Communists in the dispute, the article is basically contradictory. It combines an important step forward in theory with a dangerous departure from Marxism. It condemns social inequality as the root of revisionism in the leadership of the Soviet state, employing the sharpest terms about this since the struggle launched by Trotsky against the privileges of the bureaucracy. At the same time the authors of the article advance the erroneous concept that the Soviet bureaucracy is a bourgeois layer and that it has embarked upon a course of restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The problem of explaining the bureaucratic degeneration of the first workers state has stood as a challenge to all currents and organizations of the international labor movement. The only tendency that obstinately shut its eyes to the facts was the official Communist movement under Stalinist leadership. The shock was all the greater, then, when under pressure of rising mass discontent and unrest the Soviet bureaucracy felt forced to sacrifice the Stalin cult at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union and initiated "de-Stalinization." Khrushchev and his group energetically sought to limit the entire problem of Stalin's crimes and the grave degeneration of the state and the economy to forces within the social superstructure, trying to explain them away as products of ideology; i.e., products of the "cult of the personality." But among thinking militants of the Communist parties, this explanation satis-

---

\*"On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and its Historical Lessons for the World." Published by the editorial departments of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi, July 13, 1964.

fied no one. Well-known leaders of big Communist parties like Togliatti and Gomulka publicly stated that this explanation was insufficient, to say the least. Mao Tse-tung is to be credited with having taken a step beyond Khrushchev's infantile "explanation" as early as 1956-57 when he pointed to the social contradictions that continue to manifest themselves during the whole historical period between the overthrow of capitalism and the final completion of communist society as constituting the source, in the final analysis, of the evils that had appeared in Soviet society.

A second significant step forward has now been made by the theoreticians of the Chinese Communist party. Going beyond "social contradictions" in general, they have put their finger on something more concrete -- the appearance of a "privileged social stratum" in Soviet society.

The characteristics of this privileged layer are sharply described, often with considerable insight:

"The privileged stratum in contemporary Soviet society is composed of degenerate elements from among the leading cadres of Party and government organizations, enterprises and farms, as well as bourgeois intellectuals; it stands in opposition to the workers, the peasants and the overwhelming majority of the intellectuals and cadres of the Soviet Union."

If, in this passage, the distinction between the "healthy" and the "degenerate" sectors of the intelligentsia and the cadres is still reduced to ideological or moral factors, the basis of this degeneration in social and economic conditions is clearly indicated in other passages:

"The members of this privileged stratum have converted the function of serving the masses into the privilege of dominating them. They are abusing their powers over the means of production and of livelihood for the private benefits of their small clique.

"The members of this privileged stratum appropriate the fruits of the Soviet people's labor and pocket incomes that are dozens or even a hundred times those of the average Soviet worker and peasant. They not only secure high incomes in the form of high salaries, high awards, high royalties and a great variety of personal subsidies, but also use their privileged position to appropriate public property by graft and bribery." [Emphasis added.]

Thus high incomes; i.e., great social inequality constitutes the root of the degeneration of the Soviet state and economy. Far from being the "healthy" sector, the "overwhelming majority" of the "intellectuals and cadres"; i.e., those who benefit from these enormous material privileges, are part of the "privileged social stratum" in the Soviet Union.

In its analysis, the ninth article of the Chinese in reply to the "Open Letter" correctly stresses that Lenin (and they could have added Marx as well) had already warned against the danger of bureaucratic degeneration of the workers state apparatus as a result of excessive social inequality.

"Lenin laid great stress on waging persistent struggles against the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies, on arousing the broad masses to take part in government work, on ceaselessly exposing and purging bureaucrats and new bourgeois elements in the Soviet organs, and on creating conditions that would bar the existence and reproduction of the bourgeoisie. . . . At the same time, he laid great stress on adherence to the principle of the Paris Commune in wage policy, that is, all public servants were to be paid wages corresponding to those of the workers, and only bourgeois specialists were to be paid high salaries. From the October revolution to the period of Soviet Economic Rehabilitation, Lenin's directives were in the main observed; the leading personnel of the Party and government organizations and enterprises, and Party members among the specialists, received salaries roughly equivalent to the wages of the workers." [Emphasis added.]

Again, in drawing the general lessons with regard to the degeneration of the Soviet state, the article states:

"The system of high salaries for a small number of people should never be applied. The gap between the incomes of the working personnel of the Party, the government, the enterprises and the people's communes on the one hand, and the income of the mass of the people on the other hand, should be rationally and gradually narrowed and not widened. All working personnel [cadres] must be prevented from abusing their power and enjoying special privileges."

It is interesting that they also add among the same lessons:

"It is always necessary for the people's armed forces of a socialist country to be under the leadership of the party of the proletariat and under the supervision of the masses, and they must always maintain the glorious tradition of a people's army, with unity between the army and the people, and between the officers and men. It is necessary to keep the system under which officers serve as common soldiers at regular intervals. It is necessary to practice military democracy, political democracy and economic democracy. Moreover, militia units should be organized and trained all over the country, so as to make everybody a soldier. The guns must forever be in the hands of the Party and the people, and must never be allowed to become the instruments of careerists." [Emphasis added.]

All these remarks mean objectively that under the pressure of their own revolution, which is still very much alive, and under pressure from the colonial revolution to which they are much more responsive than the essentially conservative parvenu Soviet bureaucracy;

under pressure, too, of their fight with Khrushchev, the Chinese leaders have now raised the banner of equality for the Soviet masses.

This is an event of considerable consequence. For if their campaign for the rehabilitation of Stalin and against de-Stalinization does not have the slightest chance of arousing a response among the Soviet workers and peasants, a campaign in favor of equality and against the material privileges of the Soviet bureaucracy has every chance of a favorable reception among the Soviet working class. It could trigger reactions of great scope. Suffice it to note that the Chinese leaders now accuse Khrushchev of suppressing workers strikes in the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, it is obviously impossible for the Chinese leaders to conduct an intensive campaign against inequality in the Soviet Union while at the same time displaying a complacent attitude toward the introduction of increasing inequalities in their own country. In this respect, the campaign against social inequality in the Soviet Union indicates that social inequalities in China are less developed than in the Soviet Union. Also, such a campaign tends to make it more difficult for the Chinese bureaucracy to increase its own privileges and easier for the Chinese masses to insist that their leaders practice what they preach about the evils of social inequalities.

The effort to rehabilitate Stalin while at the same time attacking social inequality as the root of the degeneration of the Soviet state leads the Chinese leaders to a dazzling performance in acrobatics. It is easy to prove, if it is not universally known, that under Stalin the "party maximum" (restriction of the incomes of party members, exercising cadre functions in the state and economy, to the level of skilled workers) was abolished in 1930; that under Stalin not only did social inequality take on monstrous proportions, it became an official dogma, the Bolshevik tradition of struggle against inequality being officially proscribed as "petty-bourgeois egalitarianism"; that under Stalin this social inequality became institutionalized; e.g., by imposing fees for entrance to universities.

The authors of the ninth article cannot completely deny this. So they admit that "before Stalin's death high salaries were already being paid to certain [!] groups and that some [!] cadres had already degenerated and become bourgeois elements."

They do not offer the slightest proof for the assertion that only "certain" cadres had degenerated under Stalin. The fact is that the whole top layer of the state, party and economic administration enjoyed enormous material privileges under Stalin, the top party leadership holding among other things the privilege of going to "special shops" where they could buy (sometimes free of charge) all kinds of luxury goods denied the common people. The existence of such shops was concealed from the public. As for the armed forces under Stalin, is it necessary to recall that he destroyed the

militia system instead of introducing it? That he completely divorced the officer caste from the ordinary soldiers? That the mass of the people did not have the slightest control over the "security" forces? That the political police were able to organize purges and frame-up trials and to murder or deport thousands upon thousands of honest Communists?

The authors of the ninth article also "forget" that Stalin's struggle against Trotskyism, which, they say, "smashed the vain plot of the bourgeoisie to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union," was in reality a struggle against those who consistently opposed the privileged elements. They "forget" that the struggle led by Trotsky against the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet Union was waged under the central slogan "For Greater Equality!"

The acrobatic performance of the editors of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi was required for the obvious purpose of finding that although great inequality already existed under Stalin, "before Khrushchev came to power, they [the privileged stratum] did not occupy the ruling position in Soviet society. Their activities were restricted in many ways and they were subject to attacks. But since Khrushchev took over. . . the new bourgeois elements have gradually risen to the ruling position in the Party and government and in the economic, cultural and other departments, and formed a privileged stratum in Soviet economy."

The Chinese leaders, however, do not have the slightest proofs to support these assertions. Even their thesis that social inequality has increased under Khrushchev is open to doubt. Differences in wages have undeniably been reduced under Khrushchev, the lower brackets being substantially increased, the higher ones slightly lowered. At the same time, however, it seems that the differential premium system has been somewhat increased under Khrushchev. Moreover the increase in "managers' rights" and in "material incentives" not only for workers but for leading bureaucrats tends to cancel out the reduction in the wage differential. The accumulation of durable consumer goods, bordering on the accumulation of private fortunes (e.g., houses), has also substantially increased. A balance sheet would probably show maintenance of the status quo in social inequality, all levels having improved their incomes as a result of the general increase in the standard of living in Soviet society.

The truth is, of course, that under Stalin the bureaucracy as a privileged social stratum had already institutionalized most of its privileges; i.e., had become a social caste. It has remained a privileged social caste under Khrushchev.

Under Stalin, the Chinese leaders never uttered a word about increasing social inequalities in the Soviet Union. For ten years under the rule of Stalin's heirs, they remained silent about it. Now having suddenly discovered that such inequalities exist in the Soviet Union, they at once start talking about the restora-

tion of capitalism and characterize the bureaucracy as "the principal component of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union today" and characterize the "revisionist Khrushchev clique" as "political representatives of the Soviet bourgeoisie." This extremism corresponds to certain needs felt by the Chinese leaders.

They find it necessary to offer a theoretical explanation for what undoubtedly appears to tens of thousands of Chinese Communists to be a monstrous degeneration. How can people responsible for such degeneration be considered by any stretch of the imagination to be still related even remotely to the working class?

This problem is, of course, not at all new to the Trotskyist movement which was founded on a thorough appreciation of all its ramifications. Time and time again it has confronted revolutionists who suddenly became aware of the fearful crimes committed by the Soviet bureaucracy against the interests of socialism, the Soviet proletariat and the international working-class movement. Under the shock of stumbling across the truth, Communist cadres have repeatedly lost their bearings and decided that the Soviet state and its leadership must be bourgeois (state capitalism). But experience has proved over and over that the Soviet state and its bureaucracy have a dual nature. The bureaucracy is to be credited not only with committing monstrous crimes but also in its own peculiar way with defending nationalized property (against capitalist opponents of nationalized property and proletarian opponents of the bureaucracy, both abroad and at home). Only the Trotskyist analysis of the contradictory character of the bureaucratic caste that developed in the first workers state has fully explained this complex formation.

In addition, like the Yugoslav leaders before them in the late forties and early fifties, the Chinese leaders find it necessary to explain to the masses in a way easily grasped why they are involved in a bitter struggle with the Kremlin. The Marxist theory of the Soviet bureaucracy developed by Trotsky seems to them much too complicated and sophisticated. They find it easier to "explain" that Khrushchev is restoring capitalism, just as Djilas and Kardelj in the early fifties "explained" that Stalin had introduced "state capitalism" in the Soviet Union. The main difficulty with this seemingly simple theory is that it is incorrect. Its proponents wind up in contradictions that not even the most complicated explanations can untangle.

A few years after having discovered "state capitalism" in the Soviet Union, the Yugoslav leaders suddenly found themselves wooed and won by the Soviet "state capitalist" leadership. And the Chinese leaders, while accusing "Khrushchev and his clique" with seeking to restore capitalism, still express their desire to arrive at unanimous agreements with them!

On the theoretical level it is ludicrously inconsistent to wage a fierce struggle against the theory of the "peaceful transi-

tion from capitalism to socialism," while at the very same time maintaining the theory of the possibility of a "peaceful transition from socialism to capitalism."

And if Khrushchev is restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union, what becomes of the class nature of the Communist parties that continue to follow the Khrushchev line in many countries?

To add to the tangle, what about the class nature of those Communist parties -- only a few, but they represent a special problem! -- which, while paying lip service to Khrushchev, are obviously carrying on revolutionary activities in their own countries? For instance, is the Venezuelan Communist party fighting to overthrow capitalism in Venezuela or to "re-establish" it?

It should be obvious that it is impossible to seriously adopt the theory that capitalism is being restored in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev without losing the capacity to judge correctly, and therefore to intervene correctly, in a great many important events in the world today.

That is why it is possible to forecast that like the Yugoslav leaders before them, the Chinese leaders will eventually pull up short in developing the theory that the Soviet Union is "capitalist."

In any case, for those who support both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, it is requisite to stress the fundamentally identical class nature of both the USSR and China. This is the objective basis for the Soviet-Chinese military alliance which it is in the interests of the international working class to maintain against imperialism.

Khrushchev does not help in this by slanderously comparing Mao Tse-tung with Hitler and by offering military aid to the Indian bourgeoisie against the Chinese workers state.

#### BEN BELLA MAINTAINS PRESSURE ON OIL COMPANIES

In inaugurating a hydrocarbon center in Algeria September 15, Ben Bella again denounced the oil companies engaged in exploiting the reserves in the Sahara. He accused them of conducting themselves like a "state within a state."

"Nothing would be more contrary to our socialist option than to remain content with the role of a tax collector to which certain people would like to confine us," Ben Bella said. He envisaged the Algerian state as a "producer," active "at all stages of the production of oil" and utilizing "petroleum and gas for the benefit of the national economy and its development."

IN CELEBRATION OF THE CENTENARY OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

[The following is the text of a declaration issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

One hundred years ago, on September 28, 1864, the International Workingmen's Association held its inaugural assembly in London. For the first time the world proletariat had its own international political party.

Despite political limitations, organizational weakness and consuming internal disputes, the First International carried out tasks of historic importance. For the first time, national organizations of the working class were able to draw on the joint experience, knowledge and skill of the proletarian movement as a whole. They learned how to unite their forces against the common enemy.

The First International did not prove able to carry on its work to a final successful conclusion. However, its program, enriched by fresh experiences and knowledge, became embodied in successive international organizations.

The Second International created great mass parties and brought knowledge of scientific socialism to millions of workers, particularly in Western Europe, before it ignominiously collapsed in 1914 in face of the task for which it had been preparing for years; namely, offering revolutionary socialist opposition to imperialist war.

The Third International witnessed the consolidation of the first workers state, following the first victorious working-class revolution in 1917, and sowed the seeds of revolutionary socialism throughout the colonial world. After the conservative bureaucracy headed by Stalin usurped power in the Soviet Union, the Third International became an instrument of Moscow's foreign policy, was even turned against revolutionary upsurges in many countries and was finally dissolved by Stalin in 1943.

How well have the fundamental principles of Marxism withstood the test of one hundred years? Capitalist spokesmen say that Marxism has been disproved. Revisionists, again and again, have said that Marx's views require basic alteration. The truth is that Marxism, particularly as it has been developed and enriched by figures like Lenin, Trotsky and Rosa Luxemburg, offers the only key to a rational understanding of world society and the only effective method to change it for the better.

In particular, the past century of struggle, including glorious victories and bitter defeats, shows that Marx and Lenin were completely right when they warned that it is utopian to believe that

a "peaceful road" to socialism can be found. The very latest evidence is to be found in the cases of Cuba and Algeria.

In the world of today, complex and difficult problems face the international working class. On these the Fourth International, building on the best in the three previous internationals, offers the insights of living Marxism. To the workers in the Soviet Union and the other workers states, it offers the only rational explanation for the strange phenomenon of Stalinism, which it fought from the very beginning under the guidance of Leon Trotsky. The partial revelations made by Khrushchev at the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party confirmed in the most trenchant way the analysis made by Trotsky decades before. By the same token, these revelations confirmed the correctness of the platform of the Fourth International for the workers states; namely, the establishment of proletarian democracy as defined and explained by Lenin in State and Revolution.

Today the international working class faces a task of world-wide proportions. On the one hand, it must complete the colonial revolution which opened with the victory of the Chinese Revolution in 1949 and reached a new height ten years later with the victory in Cuba. On the other hand, it must begin, and bring to swift conclusion, socialist victories in the highly developed capitalist countries.

This is the only sure way to prevent a third world war and the possible extinction of mankind through a nuclear conflict. It is the only way to win a world that guarantees racial equality, the equality of men and women, of the youth and the aged -- a world of boundless abundance, full opportunity for human development, well-being from cradle to grave; the bright socialist world of enduring peace, of international brotherhood.

The road out of the capitalist jungle is not an easy one. It is beset with difficulties. Some of the principal problems are now being discussed by advanced workers in all continents, particularly in association with the differences in the Sino-Soviet dispute. In that controversy, we believe that the Chinese Communist leaders have said many correct things but that they are greatly in error on the question of Stalin's role. No single person did as much as Stalin to turn possible proletarian victories into certain defeats and to slow down, cripple and halt socialist revolutions.

The celebration of the centenary of the First International would be a mere formality if it were not done with the aim of reviving and strengthening proletarian internationalism. Let us recognize that the forces opposed to that kind of internationalism are still strong and that this resistance is rooted in the bureaucracies of workers organizations. This conservative, reactionary tendency must be fought. The world proletariat, as the founders of the First International taught, needs its own world organization to fight a world enemy.

After the Third International was corrupted by the Soviet bureaucracy and then finally dissolved by Stalin, the program laid down in the first four congresses of the Third International was preserved by Leon Trotsky. It became part of the basic program of the Fourth International, founded in 1938.

This is the organization that has assured the continuation of the theory and practice of revolutionary socialism first advanced in an organized way by the First International.

Whatever your views may be, whatever your differences may be with other working-class organizations, on this day let us join in celebrating the great historic beginning made by the First International. And let us pledge to seek ways of uniting in common struggle against capitalism and imperialism, in the spirit of international proletarian unity.

Proletarians of all the world, unite!

#### JAPANESE TROTSKYISTS PUBLISH THEORETICAL MAGAZINE

The Japanese Trotskyists, divided into various groupings for some years, have been engaged for some time in efforts at uniting in a common organization affiliated to the Fourth International.

As a step in this direction, the two biggest sectors have undertaken to publish a joint bimonthly theoretical magazine called Fourth International.

The first two issues included articles on the maturing revolutionary situation in Korea, the present stage of the restoration of Japanese imperialism, the specter of Trotskyism in the Sino-Soviet dispute, the position of the Japanese Communist party in the Sino-Soviet dispute, and several articles on Japanese politics.

The second issue also offered its readers a full report on the situation facing the Ceylonese Trotskyists following the capitulation of Dr. N.M.Perera. It published an article on the subject by Edmund Samarakkody, a declaration by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, a declaration by the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary Section), and a statement by the Japanese Revolutionary Communist League.

The third issue, scheduled to appear in September, will offer a series of articles on the Japanese trade-union movement.

FOR THE CONGOLESE FREEDOM FIGHTERS

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following statement September 22.]

\* \* \*

Belgian and U.S. imperialism have joined forces in imposing on the peoples of the Congo the brazenly neo-colonialist Tshombe regime. Tshombe headed the separatist government set up in Katanga in 1960 under the auspices of the Union Minière trust. Directly involved in the murder of Patrice Lumumba, Tshombe has long personified the reactionary, tribal and pro-imperialist forces in the Congo that have condemned that unfortunate country to division among the international trusts and their native agents.

The imperialist masters of Africa feel that their rich holdings in the Congo are threatened by the efforts of the people to end colonial rule, to achieve freedom, and to break out of imperialist exploitation and misery. The foreign rulers are prepared to go to any lengths to maintain their grip. They imposed Tshombe on the Congo under the thin guise of "national reconciliation." The cynicism of this slogan was shown by the fact that the army with which this "national reconciliation" was to be achieved was put together out of the Katangese gendarmes who openly fought against the unity of the country in 1960-62, out of former professional killers of the French OAS [Secret Army Organization] which was used against the Algerian freedom fighters, out of murderers of Hitler's SS [Schutzstaffel] Troops, and the worst white racist mercenaries now being recruited in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. To further bolster their puppet, the imperialists are moving more and more openly in providing military aid such as airplanes and weapons.

In face of the openly pro-imperialist and neo-colonialist character of the Tshombe regime, the popular uprising of the Congo masses led by various Lumumbist forces represents a new upsurge of the Congolese revolution which came to an abrupt halt in 1961 with the temporary defeat of the Lumumbist forces. The Congolese masses are fighting for the unity and independence of their country, for ousting the stooges of imperialism. Their struggle at a certain stage will inevitably put in question the holdings of the imperialist trusts in the natural resources of the country.

While civil strife is involved, the predominant character of the struggle is a war of national liberation against the direct agents of imperialism. This war is highly progressive. It deserves full support by the toiling masses the world over, especially in the imperialist countries. The victory of the freedom fighters will touch off a new revolutionary wave throughout equatorial Africa. A defeat, on the other hand, would strengthen the barbarous colonialist regimes in Angola and Mozambique, the white racist "apartheid" rulers of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa with whom Tshombe is

collaborating more and more openly.

In the Congo, it is the duty of working-class and Marxist militants to participate in the forefront of the struggle, serving as the best soldiers in the fight for national liberation. They should offer the freedom fighters a program of nationalizing the holdings of the foreign trusts and establishing collective agriculture. Such measures could greatly contribute to lifting the Congo out of its present misery. During the very course of struggle, their efforts will lay the foundations for a mass Marxist party based on the program of scientific socialism and dedicated to continuing the Congolese revolution down the road to socialism.

The reactionary resolution adopted on the Congo question at the Addis Ababa meeting of the Organization of African States is to be utterly condemned. By recognizing the Tshombe government and refusing to support and to grant aid to the anticolonialist struggle of the Congo Committee of National Liberation, the majority of "independent" African governments assembled at Addis Ababa showed their fear at establishing a "precedent" that would favor other uprisings of the toiling masses against "established" governments in Africa. Most of these governments are themselves obviously neocolonialist and fear similar popular upsurges. This is especially true of the Emperor of Ethiopia who was instrumental in striking the bargain with the murderer Tshombe.

Down with the puppet regime of Tshombe, a stooge of imperialism!

Workers of the United States, Belgium and Britain: compel your imperialist governments to stop giving aid to the Tshombe regime!

Long live the emancipating struggle of the Congolese freedom fighters!

Long live the African revolution!