

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 37

October 30, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

| | |
|---|----|
| Why Not Accept the Chinese Proposal? | 1 |
| Moscow Promises a Better Explanation | 3 |
| French CP Asks New Moscow Leaders What It's All About -- by Pierre Frank | 4 |
| Setback for Government Coalition in Belgian Elections | 6 |
| Under the Verwoerd Regime | 7 |
| Plan Resumption of Action in Angola | 8 |
| Demonstrations in Bolivian Cities | 9 |
| Famous Last Words | 10 |
| Guerrilla Fighting Flares in Venezuela | 11 |
| Meets Standard of Modern Liberals | 11 |
| The Joint Statement of the FLN and the French CP | 12 |
| Guerrilla Warfare in Mozambique | 14 |
| Southern Rhodesia, A "Volcano" | 15 |
| Zambia Gains Political Independence | 15 |
| Suspicious-Minded Americans | 16 |
| Revolt Shakes Abboud Regime in Sudan | 17 |
| Ceylonese Trotskyists Plan New Paper | 17 |
| Allen Sentenced for Attempt to Leave Nigeria | 26 |
| Documents: | |
| South Africa (A Memorandum Submitted to the Committee of Nine) -- Part 2 | 18 |
| Ceylonese Trotskyists Defend Freedom of Press | 27 |
| China Proposes a Nuclear Summit Conference | 30 |

WHY NOT ACCEPT THE CHINESE PROPOSAL?

When it made its first successful test of a nuclear weapon on October 16, the Chinese government proposed that a summit conference be convened. Addressing all governments, it proposed that the conference include "all the countries of the world."

The aim of the conference would be to reach an agreement on

the "complete banning and total destruction of nuclear arms." As a first step, the Chinese government proposed that the nuclear powers and those about to become nuclear powers make a pledge not to employ nuclear arms whether against "non-nuclear countries, denuclearized zones, or against each other." [For full text of the declaration see page 30.]

The Johnson administration responded with unusual speed. The explosion of the nuclear weapon, it seems, was loud enough to remind the arrogant rulers of America that China after all does exist. But Johnson's answer was scarcely satisfactory. He dismissed the proposal of the Chinese government as so much "propaganda."

But Johnson's assertion is not equivalent to proof. If the American government is convinced that the Chinese proposal is only propaganda then they should have no hesitation in proving it by accepting the invitation. The outcome of the conference would show who is sincere and who is not.

The truth is that the Johnson administration is convinced that the Chinese government means exactly what it says. The Chinese government is fully prepared to subscribe to an international agreement to dismantle all nuclear weapons, destroy all the stockpiles, ban any further manufacture of atomic arms and end all further testing, whether in the atmosphere or underground.

The Johnson administration showed that its own declarations were mere propaganda by refusing to accept even the proposal of the Chinese government to pledge never to use atomic arms.

Washington did make a gesture about extending the partial nuclear test-ban treaty to include underground testing. What hypocrisy! After almost twenty years of testing, including an admitted thirty-five underground tests in the past year, after heaping up atomic weapons to such heights that all humanity could be liquidated at least seventy times over in a nuclear war, Johnson is willing to consider a ban on all further tests!

The truth is that the United States is now no longer in need of further tests; indeed has not needed any new tests of any kind for some time. This is proved to the hilt by two scientists, both of whom have participated in the U.S. nuclear weapons program, in the October issue of Scientific American.

Two other alternatives are open to the Johnson administration if it is sincerely interested in stopping the nuclear arms race, or in helping to avoid further atomic pollution of the earth's atmosphere: (1) It can declassify all information on how to make nuclear weapons, thus making it unnecessary for the Chinese government to conduct further experimental tests. (2) If it doesn't want to go to a conference with China, it can propose universal disarmament without a conference and show that it means business by begin-

ning unilaterally to dismantle its own nuclear stockpile.

Actions of this kind would at once signify a fundamental change of course, away from nuclear war toward peace.

It is not likely that the Johnson administration will adopt any of these rational alternatives to its present suicidal course. Thereby it will lend further substance to the Chinese argument that under the circumstances there is no choice but to build a nuclear "deterrent" as part of the military defense against the American military threat.

MOSCOW PROMISES A BETTER EXPLANATION

The two heirs, Brezhnev and Kosygin, appear to be highly embarrassed over the world's unwillingness to believe their first story of how they came to power; i.e., through the resignation of Khrushchev due to age and the state of his health.

Communist party delegations from countries as widely separated as Belgium and India were in Moscow seeking to learn the true facts. And both l'Unitá, the Italian Communist party paper, and Drapeau Rouge, the Belgian Communist party paper, said assurances had been given that "important documents" would be published within the week, giving an honest account of how Brezhnev and Kosygin fell into office.

The ranks of the Communist movement are raising sharp questions over Khrushchev's ouster. In France, the National Committee of the Union of Communist Students, for example, passed a declaration by a two-thirds majority demanding that the full transcript of the October 14 session of the Central Committee meeting that kicked out Khrushchev should be published, including Khrushchev's remarks.

The French students said that the latest events put in question the value of the Soviet Union as an example. They registered their "disagreement with the methods" used against Khrushchev. How could such things happen "eight years after the Twentieth Congress?"

"A total return to Communist democracy in all fields constitutes one of the elementary conditions," their statement said, for "resolution of the internal contradictions of the socialist countries and the problems posed in the organization of the workers movement."

The students stressed that the "grave differences" in the international workers movement "cannot be resolved except by deepening the discussion among the ranks before bringing the debate to a close."

FRENCH CP ASKS NEW MOSCOW LEADERS WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT

By Pierre Frank

PARIS -- The leadership of the French Communist party decided to send a delegation to Moscow after hearing that Khrushchev had been deposed.

"It cannot be said that in deciding to send a delegation we changed our attitude toward the CP of the Soviet Union due to our Political Bureau being pushed into it despite itself," Secretary General Waldeck Rochet said at a press conference October 23.

The remark was not needed. The Political Bureau's first declaration, dated October 16, actually contained no reference to the "methods" or the "conditions" of Khrushchev's ouster, still less did it say anything about sending a delegation to Moscow. It dealt only with the need to continue the policy being followed by the CP of the USSR. Three days later, l'Humanité published an editorial signed by Fajon, a member of the Political Bureau. Here, too, nothing was said about the methods, the conditions, involved in Khrushchev's removal. Fajon did say in alluding to the interest in the affair among the ranks of the French Communist party:

"It [the Political Bureau] sought to stress that if the French Communists are keenly interested in the decisions taken by their Soviet comrades, their major concern is to see that their own decisions become effective."

And they are concerned about the combat for peace, social struggles, the next municipal elections. . . and "the international activity of the Party."

But this attempt at creating a diversion had little success among members of the French Communist party. On October 21, the Political Bureau made a new decision, justifying it as follows:

"While holding that what is most important is the pursuit and consistent application of this political line [peaceful coexistence], the PB of the FCP nevertheless desired to obtain the most complete information and the necessary explanations concerning the conditions and the methods by which the changes that had been decided on by the CC of the Communist party of the Soviet Union were carried out. That is why the PB decided to ask the Central Committee of the CP of the Soviet Union to receive a delegation from the FCP."

It can be seen why Waldeck Rochet felt compelled to say the PB had not been pushed; the facts clearly prove it.

The leadership of the French Communist party, it will be noted, had to go to Moscow to ask for explanations. . . from the

authors of the successful coup. This is because, as Waldeck Rochet said in the same press conference, "the PB wanted to act without haste, taking account of the facts, as a serious party must." In Paris, naturally, a "serious party" cannot see that the Soviet workers know no more than the members of the PB about the conditions and the methods involved in the change of leadership in the party and the state. In Paris they cannot see the absence of democracy in the Soviet Union. They are so serious that they knock only at the right door. They don't want to hear anything from the old leaders that would contradict the new ones -- such methods aren't to be dreamed of in the French Communist party!

However timorous the decision of the Political Bureau, it is nevertheless a daring step for this leadership; they have never done anything but line up with Moscow. Possibly it is a compromise between members of the Political Bureau who want something formal to support their position as "yes men" and others who would prefer a more reserved attitude.

There were signs on the eve of a Central Committee meeting the first part of October that some members of the Political Bureau were hostile to holding the scheduled conference of twenty-six parties, advancing reasons quite similar to those of the Italians. The other members of the Political Bureau carried their own view, even committing the party to go to the end against the Chinese.

This leadership now finds itself in an extremely embarrassing position. Not only did it take a very aggressive position against the Chinese before October 14, condemning what Togliatti had said in his testament, but even two days after learning of Khrushchev's ouster, l'Humanité condemned the Chinese nuclear test; and, at the Mouvement de la Paix [Peace Movement], Souquières, the French Communist party representative, added a condemnation of the Chinese to a resolution which was reproduced in Pravda with the exception of his offending paragraph.

In addition, at its last Central Committee meeting, the leadership of the French Communist party declared once more that it approved the policy of neutrality proposed by de Gaulle for Vietnam, while Pravda, immediately after the new leadership was installed, let it be known that the Soviet conception of neutrality in that part of the world is different from de Gaulle's.

The Khrushchev affair comes shortly after the death of Thorez, who was succeeded by a weak leadership, people lacking authority both among themselves and in the party. The crisis that has long been smoldering in the French Communist party has again been stirred. The day it flares up in a big way has without doubt been brought much closer.

SETBACK FOR GOVERNMENT COALITION IN BELGIAN ELECTIONS

BRUSSELS -- In Belgium's municipal elections October 11, the government coalition of Social Democrats and Catholics (Social Christians) suffered a severe setback. The Catholics were particularly hard hit. Although the final count in the more than 2,000 municipalities is still to be announced officially, it is clear that the vote for the Social Democrats was down 3.5% (from 38% of the total to 34.5%) while the vote for the Catholics was down 5.5% (from 40.5% to 34%). The Social Democratic leadership therefore had the dubious satisfaction of seeing their party becoming technically the strongest in the country due to smaller losses than the Social Christians.

The official Communist party (pro-Moscow) made modest gains throughout the country, recovering from the losses suffered in 1958 and regaining the level held in 1952. In the Borinage, however, which has been in economic decline since the coal-mining crisis of 1958-59, the Communist party registered considerable gains, repeating its success in the 1961 general elections. The over-all vote for the Communist party was nonetheless very low, some 3.5% of the electorate, a gain of 1.5%.

The unofficial Communist party (pro-Peking) ran a big slate but generally drew only a small vote. There were two important exceptions. In the Brussels region, where the party won nearly one-third of the membership of the old organization, it also received one-third of the Communist vote. In the Charleroi region, it outdistanced the official party in several townships, among them Charleroi itself. The over-all vote for the unofficial Communist party was 0.3% of the electorate.

Since the Social Democrats lost more votes than the Communists won, the election can be judged as having registered a slight swing to the right. This is particularly true of Brussels, where the right-wing Liberal party chalked up gains, and Antwerp where the Flemish nationalists scored. The shift away from the Catholics is due to wide dissatisfaction among the middle classes over the financial and tax policies of the coalition government. The swing away from the Social Democrats to the Communists in the industrial areas reflects dissatisfaction among advanced workers over government measures designed to appease big business (e.g., support for antistrike laws in 1962).

With a tendency now evident among the middle class to move to the right and the working class to move to the left, the Social Democratic party leaders are in a quandary over how to limit losses in the general elections next year.

Their first move was to try to block the membership from engaging in any truly critical examination of general policies. This was done by launching a witch-hunt against leaders of the left

wing. The secretary of the Liège trade-union federation, Jacques Yerna, legal editor of the weekly La Gauche has been threatened with expulsion; the leadership of the Socialist Youth have been placed on the carpet charged with gross indiscipline.

It remains to be seen if the right wing can get away with this diversionist maneuver. The attack against the left wing will hardly sit well with the rank and file, particularly since left-wing candidates did exceptionally well in the municipal elections. Between six and twelve municipalities will have a left-wing Socialist administration when the final count is in. All the left Socialist members of parliament who supported La Gauche will thus become mayors of their respective towns, thereby greatly strengthening their positions.

UNDER THE VERWOERD REGIME

In an official report to parliament, Minister of Justice Balthazar J. Vorster has admitted that 1,439 persons have been convicted of "sabotage" in South Africa. The figure includes 1,162 alleged members of "Poqo" and 277 others mostly belonging to the African National Congress and Umkonto We Sizwe ("Spear of the Nation").

The figures show that 126 people have been found guilty of "receiving training outside the borders of the Republic for subversive activities." It was not clear whether these victims were included in the number convicted of "sabotage."

Vorster also revealed that 737 people have been detained under the notorious 90-day law. This provides that a victim can be held indefinitely in solitary confinement without charges.

As in Nazi Germany, people live in dread of the police knocking at the door at any time for evidence of "subversive" activities. Raids are by no means confined to blacks or coloured people. Last July 4, for example, a nation-wide police raid, staged at seven in the morning, terrorized some very prominent citizens.

The list of those subjected to police questioning, sometimes for hours, included the following: Leo Marquard, South African historian and publisher; Gerald Gordon, QC, leading counsel in the Alexander case; Dr. W. Hoffenberg, a leading medical figure; Dr. R. E. van der Ross, principal of Battswood Training College; Anthony Delius, political correspondent of the Cape Times; Brian Barrow, magazine editor of the same daily newspaper; R. A. Gill, editor of the Pretoria News; Cecile Eprile, editor in chief of the Goldeh City Post and Drum; Braam Fischer, QC, defense counsel in the Mandela case; and Peter Brown, national chairman of the Liberal

party.

Sir De Villiers Graaf, leader of the Opposition (which is so tame that Prime Minister Verwoerd permits it to function in parliament), said of the raid that it left a "gnawing suspicion that the vast powers enjoyed by the police are either being abused, or that the police must be harbouring suspicions of plots so widespread, and involving such important sections of our people, that the very existence of the State is threatened."

The police in fact hold powers only comparable to those of the Gestapo. Yet even this does not appear to be sufficient for the racists of South Africa's Herrenvolk. A General Law Amendment Bill was submitted to the Assembly in June to extend the death penalty, now provided for those who undergo training in "sabotage" outside the country to those trained inside the country. The death penalty would apply to anyone who has "in the Republic or elsewhere attempted, consented or taken steps to undergo, or incited, instigated, commanded, aided, advised, encouraged or procured any person to undergo training or obtained any information."

A compulsory minimum penalty of five years imprisonment is provided and application of the law is made retroactive to 1950.

The bill would extend for one more year an "emergency" temporary law, passed in 1962, under which the police can hold anyone for twelve-day periods without bail. It would make it unnecessary for the prosecution to show 90-day detainees copies of statements they might have made while in the hands of the police.

Witnesses who refuse to give evidence in court can at present be jailed for successive eight-day periods. This would be extended to successive one-year periods.

A witness can be made liable to this provision, moreover, if he "fails to answer fully and satisfactorily any question put to him."

Another provision makes it possible to take a person charged as an "accomplice," swear him as a "witness," and thus subject him to these provisions. The defendant can be compelled to become a "witness" in this way and forced to reply to any question "the reply to which would tend to incriminate him."

PLAN RESUMPTION OF ACTION IN ANGOLA

Holden Roberto, president of Angola's government in exile, announced October 23 in Dar-es-Salaam that a "massive onslaught" against the Portuguese imperialist rulers is planned by the Angolan freedom fighters to begin with the onset of the rainy season.

DEMONSTRATIONS IN BOLIVIAN CITIES

Social tensions in Bolivia have not declined since that unhappy country was forced by the Johnson administration to break off relations with Cuba. In Cochabamba October 21, fighting broke out between police and students. A report, lacking in details, put the casualties at two killed and a dozen wounded.

Minister of Interior Ciro Humbolt, on arriving in La Paz, said the account had been exaggerated -- that there were no deaths, only thirteen wounded, one of them seriously. He said that an agreement had been reached between university officials, student leaders and the police under which an arrested student leader was released and the students in turn released hostages they had taken.

In Washington, however, an unnamed spokesman of the State Department took a more serious view. According to this source, anti-American "riots" took place the week before at Oruru and Potosí, and the unrest could spread to La Paz, endangering the regime of Victor Paz Estenssoro who recently had himself re-elected in violation of the constitution.

Again according to the same source, the disturbances in Cochabamba broke out after Bolivian "security police" arrested Willi Camacho, a student leader, on charges of plotting to overthrow the government. Some 400 students at the University of San Simone then threw up blockades near the school and began throwing rocks at the police.

The cops responded with tear gas. The counterattack failed when the police ran out of supplies. The students came through their barricades, surging into the city. The police then opened fire.

Peter Burr, a member of the Peace Corps, who claimed he was an innocent bystander, was hit in the leg by a bullet.

It was also reported in Washington that sharp differences have arisen between Paz Estenssoro and his Vice-President Rene Barrientos. The ambitious Barrientos, former commander of the Bolivian Air Force, has a reputation of being even more abjectly pro-American than the president.

On October 23, students in La Paz went into action. They organized a demonstration to protest what the police had done in Cochabamba. The cops in the two-mile-high city resorted to tear gas in an effort to break up the student rally. They were met with showers of stones.

Adding to the unrest in Bolivia was a steep rise in the price of tin, the country's principal source of foreign exchange. On October 13 the metal hit an all-time high of £1,655 [\$4,634] a ton

on the London Metal Exchange.

"Tin consumers, in the thick of a fast, furious and marvellous year," wrote Business Editor Robert Heller in the October 18 London Observer, "spent the week working hard to persuade the United States Government to make a quick \$15 million or so by selling some tin. Washington is in the most enviable of positions. It has the goods; and nobody else has."

Washington got the "goods," by offering economic aid to Bolivia; i.e., buying up tin at low prices and stockpiling it as a "strategic material." Bolivia's imperialist Big Brother is now in position to cash in handsomely.

Upon the decision of the Industrial and Strategic Materials Division of the State Department's Office of International Resources to begin releasing its tin holdings on the world market, the Paz Estenssoro government registered its protest.

"If Bolivia is prevented from benefiting from a legitimate fluctuation in the price of its principal product, the possibility for the country to contribute to its internal efforts is thereby blocked," said an official note addressed to the U.S. government. "The increase in sales of North American tin on the world market upsets the plans for developing the Bolivian mining industry."

It was doubtful, however, that the Johnson administration would pay much attention to this complaint from the tiny country in the Andes. After all, the State Department succeeded in its game of compelling the Bolivian government to break off relations with Cuba, thereby lowering the risk that the Bolivian people might follow the example of the Cuban Revolution. Thus weakened, Paz Estenssoro has little choice but to pay an additional price for the aid and protection given him by U.S. imperialism.

FAMOUS LAST WORDS

At the end of his South American tour, de Gaulle was presented to student officers of the Brazilian army assembled in a small amphitheater in Rio de Janeiro. By coincidence it was the same day that the People's Republic of China tested its first atom bomb and the United States tested the seventeenth of the current year's series.

Among other morale-building bits of wisdom, the general offered his audience the following:

"If fate should take us into a world conflict -- you and we, once again, we would be together in battle."

GUERRILLA FIGHTING FLARES IN VENEZUELA

The Leoni government, deeply worried over a rise in guerrilla activities in Venezuela, has decided to "mop up" the mountainous Bocono region in the state of Trujillo.

Zones suspected of containing the freedom fighters have been bombed by the air force.

In other engagements, the government claimed it had killed nine rebels, suffering in return the loss of three men.

Following the example of the South Vietnam government, the Leoni regime has now decided to undertake a rather desperate measure. It has ordered the complete evacuation of the entire peasant population from the region.

Agence France Press reported from Caracas October 24 that the Bocono guerrilla forces are rumored to be under the command of Fabricio Ojeda who was imprisoned on charges of armed rebellion but who managed to escape from his jailers after a year behind bars.

MEETS STANDARD OF MODERN LIBERALS

"In general political orientation, it is often forgotten that Johnson. . . has always been about as progressive as a Texan can be and still keep on getting re-elected." -- Editorial in the October 19 Nation (New York), in which this liberal magazine explains why it "will surprise no one" to see it on the Democratic party bandwagon.

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN THE BRITISH LABOUR MOVEMENT

You will appreciate THE WEEK -- a News Analysis for Socialists. Includes facts and figures, telling extracts from the press on economic and political issues, and rank-and-file contributions on timely topics.

You need THE WEEK now to keep up better with developments in Britain following the victory of the Labour party. Send for a free sample copy.

THE WEEK, 54 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham, England.

THE JOINT STATEMENT OF THE FLN AND THE FRENCH CP

Although Algeria has been an independent nation for more than two years, after having struggled arms in hand for almost eight years to free itself from French imperialism, it is first now that the French Communist party finally sent a delegation there.

It did so on the invitation of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale]. The visit, it can be assumed, was made possible by the death of Thorez, the long-time General Secretary of the French Communist party. Under his leadership, the standing of the party with the Algerians was not exactly glorious or appreciated.

The French Communist party leadership offered proof of the importance it placed on the junket. It was represented by Waldeck Rochet himself, three other members of the Political Bureau, Guyot, Frischmann, Piquet, and by a specialist in "colonial" questions, Lachenal.

In a joint statement issued in the name of the FCP and the FLN, the Communist delegation said how much they had been impressed by the results up to now "to build a socialist Algeria." They forgot their insistence up to not so long ago that Algeria must find a place in the French Union, the "genuine French Union."

The French Communist delegates promised "to publicize the Algerian reality on a big scale in France, the success of the Algerian people, their party and their government. . . ." They promised "to intensify the action already begun against the racist campaigns being conducted by the enemies of the two peoples."

However doubtful one may be that the FCP, the most faithful servitor in Moscow's diplomacy, has assumed this new attitude out of disinterested reasons,* it would be extremely satisfying if the FCP would now match its words with deeds, if it would utilize the means at its disposal to draw the attention of the French workers to the problems of the Algerian Revolution, to the need for displaying workers solidarity with it. Better late than never!

*The essential reason for this turn is to reinforce the influence which the Soviet government would like to exercise in Algeria by means of material aid, which has already been considerable. But the FCP leadership is also seeking its own advantage in this new move. Immediately following the liquidation of Khrushchev, Fajon, a member of the Political Bureau, explained to uneasy members of the French Communist party that they should not be bothered by what goes on in the USSR but should preoccupy themselves first of all with their tasks in France. In a second editorial in l'Humanité entitled "The Happy Meeting with Algeria," he breathed smoke and flame for the Algerian Revolution in a style that many would have liked to see in past years.

Nonetheless, it is not possible to discuss this event without calling attention to the following sentence in the joint declaration:

"The Algerian delegates showed their gratitude for the support given to Algeria by the French Communist party during the war of liberation. . . ."

Nothing testifies more to the diplomatic character of the document than this. Rather than recite the whole history of the policy of the FCP during the war with Algeria, we will cite only the terms in which it was characterized in the Charter adopted at the Congress of the FLN last April:

"Far from elucidating the nature of the Algerian resistance and the revolutionary meaning of the demand for independence, the parties of the French left made a pretext of the insufficiencies of the FLN and the existence of a European minority to camouflage their refusal to grant unconditional support to the struggle of the Algerian people.

"The vote for special powers* which signified intensification of the war in Algeria testified to their tendency to subordinate the struggle of the Algerian national liberation movement to the French political game.

"In face of SFIO hostility and the absence of practical and ideological support from the other currents in the left, networks of support for the FLN were constituted in France. These networks, whose formation was followed by demonstrations among the conscripts, testified to the possibility of resistance among the French people to the war.

"In its relations with the anticolonialist movements in France, the party [the FLN] must not give way to resentment. The necessities of the anti-imperialist struggle, the search for important allies must be placed above all other considerations."

Each one of these paragraphs is a slap in the face for the leaders of the French Communist party. We cannot blame the Algerians today for seeking to utilize allies who shone so little in the past, if they now offer material aid of some value. But it is not necessary to pay for this by falsifying history. The leaders of

*On March 12, 1956, about ten weeks after the January 2 elections that gave a majority to the left, which had promised to stop the hostilities in Algeria, the government headed by the Socialist Guy Mollet asked parliament for "special powers" to "pacify" Algeria. The main item was authority to send troops to Algeria. Passage of the demand for "special powers" meant sharpest intensification of the war. The Communist deputies, under pretext of fostering a united front in the future with the Socialist party, voted for the "special powers." The vote shook the Communist rank and file.

the FCP would have signed the joint communiqué if these few words had been left out.

More importantly, all of history, particularly that of Stalinism, demonstrates that lies about historical events do not serve the cause of the revolution. This is a law which the Algerian Revolution cannot escape.

GUERRILLA WARFARE IN MOZAMBIQUE

The struggle to free Mozambique from Portuguese imperialism has taken an active turn with resumption of guerrilla warfare in the colony. In Dar-es-Salaam, FRELIMO [Frente de Libertação de Moçambique -- Mozambique Liberation Front] announced that twenty Portuguese troops have been killed and several wounded since the offensive was resumed September 24-25. The freedom fighters suffered three dead and seven wounded during the same period.

The Portuguese have assembled 25,000 troops in Mozambique, stationing most of them along the Tanganyika border. They are using bombers and reconnaissance aircraft in hope of stemming the revolt.

Thousands of refugees were reported to be crossing the Ruvuma river following Portuguese reprisals. They said that Portuguese troops burned Mueda township and were setting fire to everything in sight of five air bases built during the past year.

In Dar-es-Salaam October 23, Eduardo Mondelane announced on behalf of FRELIMO that a rebel government will presently be set up and that only "exceptional circumstances" could compel it to go into exile.

The September issue of Mozambican Revolution, published by FRELIMO in Dar-es-Salaam, charges that a secret agreement has been concluded between the fascist government of Portugal and the racist Ian Smith, prime minister of Southern Rhodesia. The deal was apparently reached in conversations between Smith and dictator Salazar held in Lisbon September 4-5-6. Salazar has vigorously sought foreign alliances to bolster Portugal's grip on her restless colonial empire.

Mozambican Revolution also scored six Labour Members of Parliament who accepted a Portuguese invitation to visit Angola and Mozambique in August. The MP's were wined and dined by the Portuguese imperialist masters and returned home with glowing reports about their trip. Ronald Ledger saw "perfect understanding existing between the white and black populations -- an understanding which until today I never saw or heard of in any other country."

SOUTHERN RHODESIA, A "VOLCANO"

With the dismissal of Maj. Gen. John Anderson, commander in chief of Southern Rhodesia's armed forces October 24, racist-minded Prime Minister Ian Smith moved a step closer toward the coup d'état which he has been openly preparing.

The official reason given for retiring Anderson was "old" age. He is fifty-one.

The general offered a more cogent reason. He rejected feelers from Smith, saying he would not support "any unconstitutional action." Anderson said he had been accused of being the only stumbling block to Smith's plans for a take-over. "I think I have the support of the other services in my opposition to an illegal seizure of independence by the Rhodesian Government."

Smith is seeking to set up a government representing Southern Rhodesia's 110,000 voters, mainly whites, which would exercise dictatorial power over the country's some 3,000,000 Africans. To build up a pretense that he is backed by the popular will, Smith has staged a referendum of the voters on November 5. For the rest of the population he has rigged a gathering of chiefs and headmen. The seclusion and secrecy in which this meeting is being held is so great that not a single representative of the press has been able to get in.

The new Labour government in England stated that whatever the outcome of the meeting of chiefs, it would not be considered a fair test of what the majority of Africans feel about independence under present conditions. Prime Minister Wilson invited Smith to come to London for talks. Smith turned this down, stating that it was "a little premature. . . ."

The London Sunday Times confessed editorially [October 25], "Rarely do volcanoes, natural or political, give such plain forewarning of eruption as has been given by the constitutional Krakatoa in Rhodesia."

ZAMBIA GAINS POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE

After seventy-five years of British colonial rule, Zambia gained political independence October 24. A joyful celebration was staged in Lusaka, a crowd of 100,000 packing into the immense stadium to hear the speeches. Zambia, with a population of 3,600,000, is the thirty-eighth African country to gain sovereignty.

The victory will give fresh inspiration to the freedom fighters in the bordering countries, particularly Angola and Mozambique, which the Portuguese imperialists are seeking to retain, no matter what the cost in suffering and bloodshed. The population in South-

ern Rhodesia will likewise be encouraged to strengthen their resistance to the racist government of Ian Smith.

Zambia faces difficult problems, however. The South African Herrenvolk regime of Hendrik Verwoerd is fully aware of the dangerous threat which Zambia's freedom represents for the apartheid system in South Africa. An unholy alliance between the Portuguese fascist dictator Salazar, Verwoerd and Ian Smith has already been functioning. One of the evidences of this is the relationship among the secret police of the three countries. Political opponents of Verwoerd have been kidnapped as far away as Lusaka and dragged into South Africa.

Farther in the background stands a still more powerful imperialist force -- the United States. American finance capital has taken a keen interest in Zambia. The country happens to possess fabulous mineral resources -- it is the world's second largest producer of copper.

In token of Washington's paternalistic concern over Zambia's future, President Johnson sent as his personal representative to the independence celebration a businessman, Charles W. Engelhard. He is reported to be a director of twenty-three South African companies.

These include, according to the October 24 New York Times, "the two principal organizations for recruiting segregated labor for South Africa's gold mines."

The Zambia News, in an editorial on the meaning of such a figure representing America at the independence ceremonies, said it was a "poor choice."

In what surely rated as one of the understatements of the year, the editors declared, "There is nothing in Engelhard's background that would endear him to Zambia."

SUSPICIOUS-MINDED AMERICANS

The universal conviction in Europe that Oswald may have been framed or did not act alone in the death of Kennedy was repeatedly explained by American propagandists as due to the "suspicious" minds of Europeans, who are accustomed to political plots. In uncomplicated America, they said, the view was simpler.

The Louis Harris poll, published October 19, reveals that 33% of all Americans still believe, even after the Warren Commission report, that there were accomplices and that the full story is not yet known.

REVOLT SHAKES ABBLOUD REGIME IN SUDAN

Gen. Ibrahim Abboud, who seized power in the Sudan in 1958, suspended the constitution, dissolved parliament, banned all political parties and set up a military junta, was in deep trouble after popular outbursts that began October 22 with a student demonstration in Khartoum protesting the violent suppression of a Negro separatist movement in the south.

According to reports trickling through a tight censorship, the police killed one of the students. A delegation was sent to the authorities to lodge a protest. All of them were arrested.

On October 23 violent demonstrations broke out in Khartoum. Among the slogans were "Down with Yankee imperialism!" [American aid has helped Abboud stay in power.] The crowds damaged the American Embassy and set fire to the American Information Service.

The regime replied with a curfew and energetic police action. But the demonstrations spread on the following two days. The armed forces were ordered to "shoot on sight" anyone who damaged property. Tanks, armored cars and machine guns were brought out and troops were deployed in public buildings. These moves had little effect. Crowds sacked the progovernment paper Al Rai Al Aam [Public Opinion] as well as the Belgian and Koweit embassies.

The government closed all schools and appealed for "calm." The school teachers, however, had already joined the students and disturbances were spreading to Omdurman, Kassala, Atabara, Port Sudan and other towns.

On October 26 Abboud announced over the Omdurman radio that he had dismissed his cabinet and dissolved the military junta. These were first steps, he said, toward establishing a new constitution. Meanwhile he personally would retain all government powers. He again appealed for "calm" but it remained to be seen whether the maneuver was not too little and too late to appease the popular anger.

CEYLONESE TROTSKYISTS PLAN NEW PAPER

The Ceylonese Trotskyists, organized in the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary Section), are planning an English-language publication to be called New Spark. The first issue is scheduled for November.

The party is already publishing a Sinhalese paper Samasamajaya. A Tamil paper Putachi [Revolution], begun as a monthly, has now been converted into a biweekly.

SOUTH AFRICA

A Memorandum Submitted to the Committee of Nine

[This concludes the text, begun in the Oct. 16 issue, of the analysis of the political situation in South Africa and the nature of the struggle for liberation there, submitted to the "Committee of Nine" of the Organization of African States by a group representing various sectors of the freedom-seeking movement.]

* * *

Negotiations for Unity

On three separate occasions between 1943 and 1949 the rank and file of the African National Congress at their own Conferences forced a resolution demanding that its leaders must open negotiations with the federal body, the All-African Convention, with a view to restoring unity. On the first two occasions the negotiating parties, that is, the representatives from the African National Congress and the All-African Convention, agreed that the African National Congress should come back to its former position and take its place besides other African organizations in the federal body, the All-African Convention, which they agreed was to be the mouthpiece of the African people. In spite of the acceptance of unity at these two meetings, the leadership of the African National Congress chose to ignore the decision to re-unite with an organization which was at that time being pilloried by the Imperialist press in South Africa as being "extremist," "unreasonable" and "unrealistic" in its demands.

On the third occasion, in 1949, when the rank and file of Congress once more called upon its leadership to approach the All-African Convention in order to re-establish unity, a special meeting of the leadership was called at Easter. The Minutes of that meeting speak for themselves. The records show that Mr. I. B. TABATA, on behalf of the delegation for the All-African convention, moved the following resolution:

"In view of the political crisis facing the African people today, in view of the urgent necessity to unite the people for the purpose of fighting oppression and for full democratic rights, this joint Session of the African National Congress and the All-African Convention Executives Committees, meeting in Bloemfontein this 17th day of April, 1949, resolves that this unity be based on:

"(a) A demand for full citizenship rights equal to those of the European.

"(b) A rejection of inferior status as expressed in the segregated inferior political institutions created for a so-called child-race and for the perpetuation of white domination, viz the

Native Representative Council, the Bunga, the Location Advisory Boards and any other institution of a similar nature which may be created to substitute, supplement or strengthen the existing institutions.

"(c) The acceptance of Non-collaboration, that is, the rejection of the Native Representative Council, the Bunga, the Location Advisory Boards, the Native Representation Act, etc."

Here I may explain that a Bunga is simply an instrument for assisting the Native Commissioners in the rural areas, that is, the Reserves, in their work of administration. The Location Advisory Board performs the same function in the segregated urban locations. The Native Representative Council, sarcastically called a Native Parliament, has no powers of legislation or administration. These were merely toys to keep the people from demanding their right to sit in Parliament, Provincial Councils and Municipal Councils.

The acceptance of the policy of Non-collaboration is an active policy involving the refusal to assist the oppressor in operating those separate institutions for our oppression. It means the rejection and active boycott of all separate elections under the Native Representation Act of 1936, whereby three White people were elected by African voters to represent the whole African population in a Parliament of 153 representatives for the White minority.

At this special meeting of the Executives of the African National Congress and the All-African Convention, the delegates of the All-African Convention made a special offer in order to eliminate any wasteful spirit of rivalry at that crucial moment in our struggle. (The Nationalist Government had come into power in 1948.) They proposed that in the Executive of the United federal body, the African National Congress would be guaranteed one-third of the seats and in addition it could contest the remaining two seats, provided that the African National Congress accepted the following conditions:

1. The acceptance of the Ten-Point Programme, that is, the demand for all those rights that are enjoyed by the Whites only: the right of the full franchise, to vote and be voted into Parliament for all adults in South Africa, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

2. NON-COLLABORATION WITH THE OPPRESSOR.

3. The acceptance of the principle of UNITY OF ALL OPPRESSED GROUPS, AFRICANS, COLOUREDS AND INDIANS.

It should be explained here that this was the policy that the Imperialist press called extremist, revolutionary and "unrealistic."

Negotiations for Unity broke down. The Congress leadership could not accept the policy, because (a) they were operating the

very institutions, the Native Representative Council and the Bunga, against which the Convention was calling for a boycott; (b) they were committed to supporting and organizing the elections for the three White candidates to represent the African people in the White Parliament. Invariably the candidates were the liberal bourgeoisie, with whom an attachment with the Congress was of long standing. It might be mentioned here that some of the chief spokesmen for the African National Congress were Messrs. Selope Thema, J.B.Marks and Oliver Tambo.

The failure to achieve Unity at this stage was a triumph for the representatives of Imperialism in South Africa, assisted by the local Communist Party, which, for its own reasons fought to keep the African National Congress out of the Unity of all the oppressed.

Those facts throw into bold relief the divergent paths followed by the two tendencies of the liberatory Movement in South Africa. They reveal in a concrete way the logic of the position of the two groups, following upon their divergent policies.

We repeat that it is of paramount importance for the leaders today to ask themselves in which direction their policies are leading the people. Whose interests are being served objectively by their actions? In whose battle are they calling upon the people to engage? In this new and critical phase of the struggle for liberation, and within the framework of the contest between Afrikaner Fascism and the representatives of Imperialism -- all of which is taking place within a larger context of the confrontation of Imperialism versus Socialism on a world scale -- it behooves the leaders to pause and take stock before it is too late.

The All-African Convention's Conception of the Struggle

The struggle as conceived by the All-African Convention and the Unity Movement in 1943 compelled them to insist on the maximum unity of all the organizations representing the different layers of society. From the outset they foresaw that in the given African conditions it would not be possible for a Herrenvolk Government peacefully to grant the demands of the oppressed people. It was not a question of pleading for justice against this or that racial law, or of bringing pressure on the Government to gain this or that concession. Neither is it possible for any one section of the oppressed to gain freedom for itself only. It is a question of a fundamental struggle against a whole system of oppression. The whole of South African society has to be reorganized from top to bottom, that is, politically, economically and socially.

It is these aims that dictate our whole approach to the vital question of UNITY; our approach to the form of organization that is necessary; our insistence on the independence of the struggle and our approach to the function of an organization.

With this in mind the All-African Convention set itself the task of organizing the oppressed on a nation-wide scale, with a single aim and programme, the Ten-Point Programme, and to bring the struggle under one leadership. The aim was to bring under one roof the innumerable organizations, political organizations, civic bodies, teachers' associations, peasant committees and organizations and workers' organizations, and to politicise them. In order to conduct a sustained struggle it was necessary for them to know not only WHAT they were fighting AGAINST, but also to formulate clearly their positive aims in the struggle, to visualize THE GOAL OF LIBERATION.

Peasantry the Key to the Liberatory Struggle

In this situation the All-African Convention understood that it was of paramount importance, to begin with, to concentrate on winning the support of the peasantry. This was not only because the landless peasants comprise by far the greatest majority, but because they are the most exploited and oppressed and therefore constitute the greatest revolutionary potential. In addition to this there is the all-important factor of migrant labour -- that peculiar situation in South Africa where not only the mines and the White farms but also heavy industry are run on peasant labour. Thus no serious struggle could take place in South Africa without the participation and co-operation of the peasantry.

The main purpose of all the segregationist or Apartheid laws in South Africa has always been to ensure a steady supply of cheap labour. All the regulations and proclamations operating in the Native Reserves are designed to smoke out the Africans from their homes and force them to enter the inescapable recruiting channels that feed the economy of the country.

The so-called Rehabilitation Scheme in the Reserves, which the Herrenvolk has been trying to enforce for more than fifteen years, was nothing more than an attempt to rob the peasantry still further of land and cattle and render them destitute victims of the recruiting machine.

The struggle took the form of resistance to the Rehabilitation Schemes. The first time that the All-African Convention caught the attention of the peasants, particularly in the Transkei (Cape Province), was when they joined the battle against the Government Schemes. It brought into the struggle political consciousness, linking land hunger of the peasants with their lack of political rights.

In this way the struggle was put on the road of the true liberatory struggle with the slogan of LAND AND LIBERTY. In every district throughout the Transkei there existed a branch of the Cape African Teachers' Association, which was itself affiliated to the All-African Convention. The membership of these branches acted as cadres of the All-African Convention in the villages, carrying the

policy of the organizing the peasantry into the national body.

For the first time in our political history the intellectuals were integrated with the peasantry and made common cause with them in their struggles. We formed peasant committees in the villages which served as centres of resistance to the Government schemes.

Government Attacks

The Government replied with vicious measures to suppress the Movement. But the peasants continued to resist. The police and the army were called in and surrounded the district of Mount Ayliff near Pondoland, where a leader of the All-African Convention was arrested and charged with incitement. From far and near the peasants attended his trial to demonstrate their solidarity with the All-African Convention.

The Movement spread to other districts in the Transkei and went over into Witzieshoek in the Orange Free State, where the army was called in once more to shoot and arrest the people, destroy their crops and burn their huts. Similar incidents took place in the Northern Transvaal, in Zeerust and Sekhukhmiland. The people were subjected to a reign of terror. But the Movement spread to the Glen Grey district in the Cape Province and across to Zululand in Natal. Everywhere the peasant leaders of the resistance were being exiled and thousands were put in jail. The first exiles were peasant members of the All-African Convention in the Glen Grey District.

Thereafter the Government turned its attack on the All-African Convention itself. The CAPE AFRICAN TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION was outlawed. By this time the All-African Convention had linked together the struggle against the Rehabilitation Scheme with the struggle against the Verwoerdian debased "Bantu Education." All the members of the Executive of the Cape African Teachers' Association were summarily dismissed from their posts, and later hundreds of teachers, members of the Cape African Teachers' Association lost their jobs. In this way, the Teachers' Association was the first African organization to be outlawed.

Yet all this time the imperialist press in South Africa was strangely silent. The world was never told about this struggle, the most fierce in the recent history in South Africa. Both Imperialism and Verwoerdian Fascism were united in an attempt to crush it. The army would surround a village, mow the people down, rape their women and destroy their crops in the fields.

But the Imperialist press maintained its calculated silence on such outrages. Why?

Such struggle was undermining the very basis of the economic structure. Whoever organized the peasantry in South Africa was

interfering with the vital source of labour for the mines, farms and industry, including heavy industry. This Movement had to be crushed at all costs. But even more than this was at stake.

This was the real national struggle that is fighting against both Verwoerd Fascism and Imperialism. It is the struggle for liberation in South Africa. In short, it is the struggle that is fighting for the overthrow of the whole political, social and economic system of the Herrenvolk.

At this stage it is important to correct a misconception that has been created in the outside world. The dramatic event of the Sharpeville and Langa (Cape) massacres in 1960, resulting from the passive resistance campaign of the young Pan Africanist Congress, has been presented as the starting point of the struggle of the African people for liberation. Far from this being so, the truth of the matter is that these events were an overflow, a spilling over of the tidal wave of resistance that had engulfed practically all the Reserves in the country. The interesting fact is that the men who marched in the Cape Town demonstration from Langa Location were not the townspeople. They were practically all living in the segregated barracks in the Location; that is, they were the migrant labourers who had been forced to leave their families in the Reserves. It was the grim struggle that was going on in the Reserves that influenced them to join the march.

It was at this point that the Imperialist press, with a blaze of publicity, stepped in and gave a distorted picture of the events in their sum total, thus falsifying the true perspective. It gave the impression that this was the beginning of the struggle; they isolated it from the main stream and succeeded in capturing and harnessing it to the battle of Imperialism against Verwoerd.

While the Imperialist press has focused attention on this so-called new struggle in the towns -- of which it had full control -- it has kept the blanket of silence on the struggle in the Reserves. While publicizing every victim of the bannings, house arrests and recently the 90-day Detention Act in the towns, so that today the English press has a compilation of over a hundred names of the detainees, the same press maintained a rigid silence firstly on the fact that for the last three years there has been in force in the Reserves a Proclamation enabling any policeman to arrest and incarcerate any African on mere suspicion, and that he can be kept in jail for an indefinite period. Under this Proclamation thousands of African peasants are languishing in jail. Secondly, the press maintained its silence about the officials of the All-African Convention. Yet during the same period, and more particularly after the Pondoland disturbances, its leaders were jailed, put under house arrest or banned.

The aim of Imperialism and its press is clear. It is to shut off from the knowledge of the world the true Liberatory Movement, the

struggle that is being carried on with great heroism particularly by the peasants in the Reserves, and without any help whatsoever from any source in the outside world. The purpose of Imperialism is to isolate the struggle, smother it and crush it with those armaments it has enabled Verwoerd to pile up.

The Struggle Intensifies

Nevertheless the true struggle today has reached a new level. It has acquired depth and breadth and is moving forward with a new momentum. The All-African Convention has once more issued a call for UNITY. It has called upon the oppressed in all walks of life to organize themselves into a Nation. For it is only as a Nation acting under a single unified command that they can prove themselves equal to the demands of the present crucial situation.

The All-African Convention could now speak with greater authority, which it had earned over a long period during all the struggles of the peasants. It had earned the respect of the people, not only because its leaders had been instructed to remain in the country and face persecution together with the masses, but also because it had not hesitated to criticise the masses when it had considered them to be making mistakes.

To give one example: before the ill-prepared revolt in Pondoland in 1960, the peasant leaders had come all the way to the Eastern Cape to consult the Executive of the All-African Convention. They were advised against the revolt at that time and the leaders were convinced that the Executive was right. However, the masses ignored the advice, with disastrous results.

Now the fearlessness of the Convention leaders in going against the stream has borne good fruit. Today most of those village committees that participated in the Pondoland revolt belong to the All-African Convention. In addition to this, the leaders have come as individuals into the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa (APDUSA), a national political organization which is itself affiliated to the All-African Convention and the Unity Movement.

The last six months have seen the All-African Convention grow by leaps and bounds. In addition to the village-committees all over the Transkei, it has now won over the MAKHULUSPAN, numerically the biggest organization in all South Africa. We have been penetrating also into the towns, where for the first time African, Coloured and Indian workers and intellectuals are joining as individuals the new organization, the APDUSA, which has captured the imagination of the oppressed.

As we write this document, news is coming in that the Verwoerd Government is letting loose its terrors on members of the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa. And still the press maintains its silence.

Unity Essential to a Protracted Struggle

If the history of the last twenty years has taught us anything at all, it is that the Movement will continue to suffer the unnecessary losses of our brave men and women, UNLESS UNITY IS ACHIEVED.

It has taught us:

(a) That unity is a prime necessity for the successful conduct of a protracted struggle.

(b) That a precondition for united struggle is a complete break with the agents of Imperialism in South Africa.

(c) That the maximum unity can only be achieved in the actual conduct of the struggle, provided that the struggle is an independent one, free from the influence of the ideas of an enemy class, and has a principled base and a correct policy.

(d) That a nation-wide organization under a central command is essential for the waging of a protracted struggle for liberation.

This means that the numerous organizations must be brought under one leadership. A national political organization, like an army, has its strategy and its tactics, which must be synchronised and put into operation under a single unified command. If this is not done, anarchy will reign, with frustration, disillusionment and wastage of human life following in its trial.

It should be added here that within the country itself, contrary to the beliefs abroad, there exists today far greater unity amongst the oppressed people of South Africa than there has been since the crisis of 1935, when all the African organizations of that time came together and decided to create the federal organization, the All-African Convention, as the mouthpiece of the African people.

Neo-Colonialism the Danger

In conclusion, we feel that it is a matter of great urgency to point out that the struggle in South Africa has reached a critical stage which might decide the course of events and the fate of our people for a long time to come.

We ask the independent States in the continent of Africa who are committed to the assistance of their brothers in the South, to make a careful study of the complex situation in our country and to give us such assistance as will save us from the fate of NEO-COLONIALISM.

The decisions taken by them at the Addis Ababa Conference

have far-reaching implications. It is for this very reason that we would urge that a full understanding of our complex political problems is of paramount importance.

It is within the power of the independent States of Africa to give such assistance it might be used to land us in the quagmire of neo-colonialism.

It is equally within their power to assist in putting the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa on the road leading to true independence, a road that leads to political liberty and freedom from want. It is a road that leads to the achievement of that society where there will be no exploitation of man by man, a society in which every man and woman shall have the opportunity to develop his or her potentialities to the utmost.

The people of South Africa cry out for aid and support from their brothers. They need it urgently. Time is running out.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune,
"Omitted, all the voyage of their life
is bound in shallows and in miseries."

PRESENTED BY:

I.B. Tabata, President of the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa and leader of the delegation.

N. Honono, President of the All-African Convention.

Miss J. Gool, Chairman of the Working Committee of the Non-European Unity Movement.

November, 1963.

ALLEN SENTENCED FOR ATTEMPT TO LEAVE NIGERIA

Dr. Victor Leonard Allen, who faces a three months trial in Lagos on charges of "sedition," was sentenced October 20 to two months imprisonment on each of two counts of giving a false name to an immigration officer and presenting a forged travel certificate. The Leeds University lecturer had sought to leave Nigeria disguised as a member of the Hausa tribe. Judgment has been reserved on the sedition trial until November 10.

CEYLONESE TROTSKYISTS DEFEND FREEDOM OF PRESS

[The following statement on a proposed law to vest control of the press with the Ceylonese government has been issued by the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary Section), the official Trotskyist movement of Ceylon.]

* * *

Having failed on 12 previous occasions, Mrs. Bandaranaike's Government has at last, no doubt with the assistance of her new accoucheurs in the persons of Dr.N.M.Perera and others, brought forth a definitive Press Bill which has now been presented in the Senate.

The LSSP(R), without any hesitation whatever, roundly condemns the bill and calls upon the organised labour and socialist movement to mercilessly oppose this new attempt to curtail the already diminishing civil liberties of the people.

It is a notorious fact that historically the native property-owning classes have shown a singular lack of enthusiasm in the struggle for democratic rights. Indeed the elements of democracy were introduced by the imperialist bourgeoisie when it directly ruled Ceylon, and many of these in the face of the determined opposition of native vested interests.

It is, therefore, not a matter for surprise that ever since 1948 when political power passed into their hands, the political representatives of the bourgeoisie, whether organised in the UNP [United National party] or the SLFP [Sri Lanka Freedom party] have systematically sought to undermine the democratic rights enjoyed by the people.

In the context of a shrinking economic base and the existence of an independent labour movement democracy is a luxury the native bourgeoisie can ill afford and therefore the latter's rule has been steadily punctuated with anti-democratic legislation -- the disfranchisement of the so-called Indians, the Public Security Act, the discriminatory language legislation, the more rigorous amendments to the Public Security Act, the whittling down of collective bargaining, the imposition of compulsory arbitration -- and now comes the Press Bill which seeks to create a thoroughly subservient and totally sycophantic press at the service of that section of the bourgeoisie presently exercising political power.

But involved in the current attempt is something more than the mere suppression of inconvenient news (Sunethra or Giridara) or the promotion of a Byzantine press. What is aimed at is nothing less than the throttling of the free voice of the revolutionary socialist and independent trade-union movement, even though the declared purpose is the "regulation" of the monopoly Press represented by the daily newspapers.

Only Philistines and renegades can entertain the hope that the proposed Press Commissioner, the Press Council and Press Tribunal can hold the scales evenly between capitalist law, order and morality and the revolutionary Press. It is well known that the daily Press, for all its grossly partisan news coverage and its indecently vulgar editorial comment on all matters pertaining to the labour and socialist movement, is an important vehicle for the trade unions both for airing of their grievances and for the influencing of public opinion in their favour.

In fact it is one of the few instruments that is available to them to combat the misrepresentation of the Government itself whenever they engage in any direct struggle.

It is precisely for this reason that in any determined showdown the Government promptly seeks to avail of its powers under the Public Security Act to impose a censorship, like during the CTB [Ceylon Transport Board] strike of February 1963. It is a measure of the impertinent arrogance of Mrs. Bandaranaike's Government that in respect of the freedom of the Press it dares to introduce as part of the normal law what till hitherto was a power under the exceptional emergency law of the country.

The attempted legislation of the Government has already produced a new crop of defenders of "democracy," and in particular, of the freedom of the Press. The LSSP(R) as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and toilers, has no illusions whatever either in bourgeois democracy or in the protestations of the new champions of democracy, the Press magnates of Lake House, Times and Davasa group of newspapers.

Neither does the LSSP(R) make a fetish of democracy or of the freedom of the Press which is included within it.

It declares that the bourgeois Press, like its confreres in other parts of the capitalist world, is in the words of Lenin and Trotsky, "monstrous factories of falsehood, libel and spiritual poison." But, however serious the abuse of existing democratic rights by the bourgeois press, at no time in its long history has the international proletariat ever entrusted to the bourgeois state, however liberal its form, the task of "controlling" the press or acting as the watch dog of democratic rights even when under attack by the more extreme parties of the right.

Indeed, its utter distrust of the bourgeois state as the custodian of democratic rights is expressed in the universal demand of the working class for the repeal of all repressive laws. This distrust stems from the very character of the state as the instrument of bourgeois oppression.

The vesting of every additional power of repression, including the powers now sought in the new Bill, is an attempt to place a new

noose round the neck of the socialist movement.

The LSSP(R), therefore, cannot under any circumstances entrust to the state the task of controlling even the admittedly corrupt Press of Ceylon. To do so would be to aggravate all the existing problems created by the bourgeois Press and to give them a highly concentrated and, therefore, an even more terribly oppressive character.

It is true that the freedom of the Press, like all the other rights in a bourgeois democracy, is heavily weighted in favour of the capitalist class as to make a mockery of it when it comes to its exercise. But despite the lack of real equality in the exercise of the known democratic rights, including the freedom of the Press, the revolutionary party of the working class defends unreservedly the existing democratic rights, however meagre these rights are; indeed, it constitutes the spearhead of the fight for their extension.

This is done, not out of veneration for "democracy," but because the most favourable arena for the party of the working class to carry out its historic task is that which contains the widest democracy.

Any other regime not only makes the work of the revolutionary party more difficult and exhausting but also tends to reduce the working class itself, in terms of class consciousness, to a state of virtual amorphousness.

The LSSP(R) warns the people that all repressive laws, whatever the declared purpose at the time of legislation, are finally used against the working class and the toiling people. The present bill is no exception to the general rule.

Indeed, since the bill touches on an important democratic right, the right of free expression, the working class is vitally interested as no other class. This is so because it is the expression of the views of the working class which will be directly attacked.

In the case of the capitalist class even if one section of its Press is attacked the class interest of the bourgeoisie will be protected by the Press of the capitalist state.

Hence the labour movement must ruthlessly struggle against the new bill and strangle this foul monster, which the Government of Mrs. Bandaranaike has dared to offer the public.

CHINA PROPOSES A NUCLEAR SUMMIT CONFERENCE

[The following is the text of the declaration issued by the Chinese government October 16 in connection with its first test of a nuclear weapon. The original title is "China Succeeds in Its First Nuclear Explosion."]

* * *

On October 16, 1964, at 3 p.m., China exploded an atomic bomb and thus achieved its first nuclear test. This is an important success won by the Chinese people in their struggle to strengthen national defense capacity against American imperialism's policy of nuclear blackmail and threats.

All sovereign countries have the inalienable right to defend themselves. All countries concerned about peace have the common task of safeguarding world peace. In face of the mounting nuclear threat of the United States, China could not remain inactive, doing nothing. China was obliged to proceed with nuclear tests and the development of nuclear arms.

The Chinese government has always advocated the complete banning and total destruction of nuclear arms. If this could have been realized, China would not have had to develop nuclear arms. But our position met with stubborn opposition from American imperialism. The Chinese government has long stressed the following: The partial nuclear test ban treaty concluded in Moscow in July 1963 by the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union was an enormous fraud designed to take in the peoples of the entire world; the aim of this treaty was to consolidate the nuclear monopoly of three nuclear powers and tie all the peace-loving countries hand and foot; and far from lessening the nuclear threat brought to bear on the Chinese people and the other peoples of the world by American imperialism, it accentuated it. Even at the time it was signed, the American government flatly declared that the treaty did not by any means signify that the United States would refrain from carrying on underground nuclear tests and employing nuclear arms, from manufacturing them, stocking them, exporting them and disseminating them. The events of the past year have fully confirmed this position.

For more than a year, the United States has never stopped manufacturing various nuclear arms on the basis of tests they have conducted. Even more, seeking constant perfection, they have carried out dozens of underground tests during this period in order to perfect the nuclear arms they are fabricating. The introduction in Japan of American nuclear submarines constitutes a direct threat to the peoples of Japan, China and the other countries of Asia. The United States is proceeding to disseminate nuclear arms, handing them to the West German revengists through the so-called nuclear multilateral force, thus threatening the security of the Democratic German Republic and the other socialist countries of Eastern Europe.

The American submarines carrying Polaris missiles with nuclear heads are cruising in the Straits of Taiwan, the Gulf of Tonkin, the Mediterranean, the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic oceans, thereby threatening peace-loving countries everywhere and all the peoples struggling against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism. Under these circumstances how can it be maintained that the nuclear blackmail and threats levelled by the United States against the peoples of the entire world no longer exist, simply because of the false impression created by the temporary halting of American nuclear tests in the atmosphere?

The atomic bomb is a paper tiger. These celebrated words of President Mao Tse-tung are known to everyone. This was our view in the past and it still remains our view. China is developing nuclear arms not because we believe in the omnipotence of nuclear arms or intend to use them. Quite to the contrary, by developing nuclear arms China aims precisely at breaking the nuclear monopoly of the nuclear powers and causing nuclear arms to be done away with.

The Chinese government is faithful to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian internationalism. We have confidence in the peoples. It is man who determines the outcome of war and not any weapon, no matter what kind. The fate of China is determined by the Chinese people, that of the world by the peoples of the entire world, and not by nuclear arms. China is developing nuclear arms to defend and to protect its people against the danger of a nuclear war unleashed by the United States.

The Chinese government solemnly proclaims that at no time and under no circumstances will China be the first to utilize nuclear arms.

The Chinese people resolutely support the freedom struggles of all the oppressed peoples and nations. We are sure that the peoples of the various countries will end up victorious thanks to their own struggles and mutual support. China's possession of nuclear arms constitutes great encouragement for all the struggling revolutionary peoples and a considerable contribution to the maintenance of world peace. In the question of nuclear arms, China will not fall into either adventurism or capitulationism. The Chinese people is a people in whom one can have confidence.

The Chinese government understands perfectly the good intentions of peace-loving countries and peoples who are asking that all nuclear tests be stopped. However, more and more countries understand that the more American imperialism and its partners are able to maintain a nuclear monopoly, the greater the danger of a nuclear war. They possess it while you don't; consequently they are very arrogant. But as soon as those who oppose them likewise possess it, they will no longer be so arrogant, their policy of nuclear blackmail and threats will not be as effective, and the possibility of achieving the complete banning and total destruction of nuclear arms

will become greater. We sincerely hope that nuclear war will never break out. We have the profound conviction that insofar as the peace-loving countries and peoples unite their efforts and persist in the struggle, it will be possible to do away with nuclear war.

The Chinese government solemnly proposes to the governments of all the countries of the world that a summit conference of all the countries of the world be convoked to undertake discussions on the complete banning and total destruction of nuclear arms and that, as a first step, the summit conference should reach an agreement under which the nuclear powers and the countries which might very soon become nuclear powers bind themselves not to employ nuclear arms either against non-nuclear countries, denuclearized zones, or against each other.

If the countries that possess great quantities of nuclear arms do not even want to bind themselves not to use them, how can it be expected that countries that do not yet possess them will believe in their concern for peace and refrain from undertaking possible and necessary defensive measures?

As in the past the Chinese government will exert all its efforts to promote, through international consultation, the achievement of the noble objectives of the complete banning and total destruction of nuclear arms. Before that day dawns, the Chinese government and people will unswervingly follow their own road to strengthen their national defense, defend their country and safeguard world peace.

It is man who fabricates nuclear arms; it is man, we are sure, who will eliminate them.