

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 43

December 11, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Spaak Admits Deaths Were Provoked in Congo.....	1
Hoover's Slur of Rev. King Stirs Bitter Response -- by Evelyn Sell.....	4
Housing Segregation Increasing in U.S.....	7
Did the Doctor Pass Lie-Detector Test?.....	7
New Attacks Against Apartheid Opponents.....	8
South Africa's Minister of Justice.....	8
Ben Bella Approves Chinese Bomb Test.....	9
The Tamil Minority Problem -- by Edmund Samarakkody.....	10
Kremlin Permits John Reed to Praise Trotsky.....	13
Three Years at Hard Labor for "Insulting" Shah.....	13
Wilson's Dilemma after the Run on the Pound -- by T. J. Peters.....	15
U.S. Post Office Serves as Political Police.....	18
Heavy Setback for Kremlin Campaign against Peking -- by Pierre Frank.....	19

SPAAK ADMITS DEATHS WERE PROVOKED IN CONGO

While the American backers of the "humanitarian" operation in the Congo are still insisting that it was completely justified and that there was no alternative, if any of the white "hostages" were to be saved, the Belgian and British participants in the grisly adventure have shifted their line somewhat.

In face of the mounting evidence of the savagery and bestiality of the forces under their command, they are beginning to admit that everything was not as noble as their imperialist propaganda at first claimed. For instance, the London Times [November 25], while claiming that the operation was both necessary and successful as a whole, felt forced to admit:

"At the same time there is no doubt that the landings precipitated the shooting of an as yet uncertain number of hostages, men and women alike; the tragedy is not lessened because some such shooting had been foreseen as the possible price for the safety of the others."

The admission clearly implies that the sponsors of the "humanitarian" operation deliberately decided to sacrifice at least part of the hostages. This bolsters what the rebels say. No hostages would have been killed if the negotiations had been continued instead of being arbitrarily broken off by the American and Belgian imperialists.

Similar evidence is available from another authoritative source. In an interview granted to the Paris daily Le Monde [December 1], Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs Paul-Henri Spaak said: "The risk was either to arrive too late, or -- and this is what happened to a certain degree -- to provoke the very drama we sought to prevent." In clearer language, Spaak admits that the "humanitarian" operation precipitated a number of deaths.

The imperialists are doing their utmost to cover up their guilt by pointing to the way in which the primitive Africans took the lives of some of the hostages. They remain silent about the behavior of the "humanitarian" paratroopers, the white mercenaries whose pay they guarantee, and the columns of Tshombe's killers, all of whom coordinated their moves in accordance with the master plan worked out in Brussels and Washington, the real aim of which was to deal an overpowering military blow to the rebel government at Stanleyville.

A newspaper as conservative as the London Sunday Times [a weekly not to be confused with the daily Times] had this to offer from Derek Wilson, its Léopoldville correspondent [November 29]:

"The savagery of the Congolese has been nearly matched by the cold-blooded indiscriminate murder by Tshombe's South African and Rhodesian mercenaries during their week long push north from Kindu to Stanleyville.

"With machine guns and hand grenades they massacred the population remaining in nearly every village they passed through, sparing neither women nor children. A French correspondent who advanced with the mercenary column told me 'with those mercenaries it's racialism gone mad.'

"This week's Belgo-American operation has done precious little to help put down the rebellion -- incidentally revealed to be much more extensive than generally thought -- and Tshombe's chances of ending it reasonably and quickly are as hopeless as ever."

In an editorial [November 28] Le Monde, while joining in con-

demning the actions of the rebels, did not neglect to point icily to what the other side was doing:

"The Stanleyville revolutionists do not have at their disposal the channels of publicity available to Mr. Tshombé, and Western public opinion being, it must be acknowledged, much more sensitive to the murder of one European than to twenty blacks, more is said about the atrocities committed by some bands of 'savages hopped up with drugs' than the cold-blooded repression which has been carried out for three days by the Katanga mercenaries and gendarmes. If it is true that a government, no matter what kind, would feel forced to react to the odious 'blackmail with hostages,' as did the Brussels government, it is necessary to observe nevertheless that the 'humanitarian operation' announced by Mr. Spaak degenerated into a bloody affair in which black and white civilians have been selected as the victims in this struggle that is both tribal, racial and political."

Even in Belgium, where Spaak did everything possible to cover up the blood under showers of roses for the "humanitarian" paratroopers as they paraded in Brussels, bits of the truth have appeared in the press.

### Youth Slaughtered

The December 5 issue of La Gauche quotes Jacques Cordy, special correspondent of the conservative Brussels daily Soir, writing from Stanleyville:

"Nearby on de Gaulle avenue, the headquarters of the Youth of the MNC-Lumumba had been turned into a slaughterhouse. Twenty-five bodies, trickling blood, were piled on the lawn, inside the building, against the cupboards, the dressers, on the desks, on the lighted kitchen stove, everywhere. A fearful scene.

"They have just been killed," the officer explained. 'They had shut themselves in, hiding in all the corners. But they made the error of making a noise. One of our men came in. They moved. He began shooting. Other soldiers came to the rescue. It was a real massacre. They are all members of these 'Youth' who were always raiding the town. . . .'

"Deafening shots again crashed inside the headquarters. They were completing the horrible business. The bursts of shots spurted flesh, blew open skulls. Coolly, some cameramen, who came from I don't know where, took pictures. All this was absolutely insupportable. In the evening a new fusillade -- a last rebel, hidden in the ceiling, had come down. He was killed at once.

"The odious unleashing of violence that in turn calls for violence started long ago in the Congo. It is impossible to see when and how it will be stopped."

## HOOVER'S SLUR OF REV. KING STIRS BITTER RESPONSE

By Evelyn Sell

Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., winner of the 1964 Nobel Peace Prize as "the person who has done most for the furtherance of brotherhood among men," attacked an American institution recently and set off some very unbrotherly verbal fireworks. King sent a telegram to J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] for forty years, in which he charged that the FBI was not making any arrests in the June 1964 murder of three civil-rights workers in Mississippi, in the September 1963 bombing of a Birmingham church which killed four Negro children and in the cases of brutality against Negroes participating in the mass civil-rights meetings in Albany, Georgia, during 1962. King further charged that the FBI was not adequately protecting Negroes in the South because the bureau's agents were racially prejudiced Southerners.

Hoover angrily retorted by calling King "the most notorious liar in the country." Let's take a look at the record and see just who is the most notorious liar in the country. We don't have to go back forty years, just a few months.

J. Edgar Hoover paid an official visit to Mississippi at the beginning of the summer. He arrived in Jackson on June 10 to open a new FBI field office. The white and Negro students preparing to launch the Mississippi Freedom Summer Project had appealed to the federal government agencies to protect them from the racists. Hoover went to Mississippi and spent a very pleasant time with the political representatives of the racists: Gov. Paul Johnson, Mayor Allen Thompson of Jackson, Col. T.B. Birdsong of the state highway patrol and Chief Rayfield of the Jackson city police.

In a press conference held that day, Hoover described Gov. Johnson as "a man that I admire." (It was Gov. Johnson who defied the federal marshals attempting to enroll Negro James Meredith at the University of Mississippi. It was Gov. Johnson who called on the South to defy the recently enacted civil-rights bill.) Hoover also stated, "We most certainly do not and will not give protection to civil-rights workers. In the first place, the FBI is not a police organization. It is purely an investigative organization. The protection of individual citizens, either natives of this state or coming into the state, is a matter for local authorities. The FBI will not participate in any such protection."

The FBI and the local authorities form a mutual admiration society. A month after Hoover's statement, Police Chief Ben Collins of Clarksdale, Mississippi, stated, "The FBI comes in here every day and we have coffee every day. We're good friends." Chief Collins is one of the leaders of the reign of terror against Negroes in his area.

It was about this time that Hoover made another statement that "lawlessness in the South is no worse than lawlessness in the North." Charles Evers, field secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP] in Mississippi, protested Hoover's statement in a letter he sent the FBI chief. "We must feel that when the national director of the FBI can make statements such as this the lunatics who would deliberately destroy human life or property are encouraged," Evers wrote.

Certainly the events following Hoover's visit to Mississippi, and his comments that the FBI would not protect civil-rights workers, confirmed the fact that racists were encouraged from many quarters to terrorize and murder at will.

Eleven days after Hoover left Mississippi three civil-rights workers disappeared. Two days later the charred remains of their station wagon were found in a swamp. Hundreds of state and local police plus a detachment of sailors from a nearby naval base searched for six weeks for the missing youths. A number of other bodies were turned up during this search. For example, on July 12 and 13 the mutilated bodies of two young Negroes were found in a river.

The Negro comedian Dick Gregory, who has personally participated in many civil-rights demonstrations, gave the FBI a letter and a tape recording sent to him. The letter named the burial spot and the murderers of the three civil-rights workers. The FBI claimed the information was phony, the letter writer was just some crazy guy. However, on August 4, FBI agents brought an excavator to the center of a 250-foot long, 25-foot high dirt dam and scooped down 20 feet to the exact spot where the victims were buried. Then followed rumors that the FBI was questioning "a preacher, a salesman and three cops." The burial place and the persons being questioned had all been detailed in the letter received by Gregory.

The bombings, shootings, threats and beating of Negroes and civil-rights workers continued throughout the summer and early fall. Criticisms of the FBI began to mount. In October Rev. Williams Banks, Supreme Grand Master of the International Mason Lodges in the U.S., urged all members to write to President Johnson and demand the immediate resignation of J. Edgar Hoover. Banks wrote, "With no explanation for the 40 bombings of schools and churches in Mississippi and no one having been arrested or punished, we feel the Federal Bureau of Investigation is dragging its feet."

"I am at a loss to understand," Banks continued, "how such a competent organization as the F.B.I. is unable to solve these bombings of homes, churches and schools when they have built a reputation for solving many major crimes. There must be something wrong somewhere."

Then Martin Luther King, Jr., sent his telegram to Hoover. Hoover hastened to make the FBI look good. The FBI revealed that it

knew who the murderers of the three civil-rights workers were and, further, that it has identified the Ku Klux Klansmen responsible for the 1963 bombing of the Birmingham church.

The FBI also listed arrests in the South: the arrest of Deputy Marshal Denver Short, Jr., in Georgia; the arrest of four white men charged with burning a Negro church near Dawson, Georgia; 11 arrests in McComb, Mississippi, involving bombings and other violence; 7 arrests in Natchez, Mississippi, involving shootings and beatings; 7 arrests in Pike County, Mississippi, for racial violence; 5 arrests in Neshoba County, Mississippi, of law-enforcement officers charged with police brutality.

These arrests are only a drop in the bucket spilling over with racial violence in the South. Most of these arrests are really meaningless because the charged persons are then tried and acquitted by lily-white Southern juries. The first arrest cited by the FBI was of Deputy Marshal Short charged with cursing voter registration workers and firing his gun at the tires of their cars. Short was acquitted by a district jury in Georgia. Byron de la Beckwith, accused murderer of NAACP official Medgar Evers, is still free and still participating in anticivil-rights groups because all-white juries have twice been unable to return a verdict against him. The Ku Klux Klan, holding its national convention in Georgia during September, was able to celebrate the recent acquittal of two Klansmen charged with the murder of Lt. Col. Penn, a 48-year-old Washington, D.C., Negro educator.

Negroes, well acquainted with the perversions of Southern justice, are nevertheless correctly demanding that the FBI uncover and arrest all violators of civil and human rights. King's telegram unleashed a storm against Hoover. James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, demanded the resignation of Hoover because the FBI chief appeared to be "engaging in a vendetta against the civil-rights movement. . . It is an untenable situation for the Administration and the Justice Department to be saying and doing one thing and the chief of the FBI to be saying publicly something quite opposed." (Farmer seems to forget that the Justice Department, too, refused to protect civil-rights workers in Mississippi this summer.)

Roy Wilkins, head of the NAACP, criticized Hoover's statements which appeared in a recent issue of Newsweek magazine. Hoover is quoted as saying, "I have been one of these states' righters all my life. Naturally, I get more and more irritated when I see Congress passing along to us matters which should be handled at the state level. When you weaken the state authorities you do a great disservice to law enforcement all over the country."

Wilkins commented, "Perhaps Mr. Hoover needs to review his position as FBI director in the light of that referendum [the Nov. 3 election] and to decide where his allegiance lies -- not as to love of country, but as to Federal-state relationship and the issue of color-blind Americanism."

Wilkins was one of the Negro leaders who met with President Johnson the day after Hoover called King a liar. The delegation of Negroes told the president that they sided with King and that they, too, felt that the FBI had not provided proper protection for Negroes. Reporters asked how the president responded to the statements against the FBI. Wilkins answered, "The President simply listened to us. He did not give any answer or comment."

President Johnson gave his comment and his answer last May. At that time he took the highly unusual step of exempting Hoover from mandatory retirement at the age of seventy on January 1, 1965. At a White House ceremony President Johnson told Hoover that he could stay on the job "indefinitely" and that "the nation cannot afford to lose you."

Like the FBI agents, Johnson, too, is a Southerner.

#### HOUSING SEGREGATION INCREASING IN U.S.

Karl E. Taeuber, a population expert at the University of Wisconsin, reported that with a few notable exceptions residential segregation is on the increase in the United States. On the basis of studies of U.S. census reports Mr. Taeuber stated, "It seems likely that the degree of residential segregation between whites and nonwhites has been increasing in both northern and southern cities during most of the century since the Civil War."

Segregation indexes were computed for 109 cities. In 1940 the index was 85.2. This rose to 86.1 in 1960 showing an increase in segregated housing patterns. During this twenty-year period there was some decline in segregation in the northeastern and western states. The north central states remained unchanged at 88.4. The major increases occurred in the southern states.

The over-all rise in national segregation occurred during the period when the U.S. government was supposedly launching its program to insure first-class citizenship to all American citizens.

#### DID THE DOCTOR PASS LIE-DETECTOR TEST?

Dr. Stefan Possony of Stanford University has discovered that the electronic lie-detectors used by the Central Intelligence Agency in screening applicants tend to eliminate the "clean, all-American" types sought by the spy agency. Apparently they get emotional when asked about their sex life and this registers as lying. On the other hand, "homosexuals, drones, and communist agents" tend to pass with flying colors.

NEW ATTACKS AGAINST APARTHEID OPPONENTS

LUSAKA, Zambia, Nov. 30 -- W.M. Tsotsi, vice president of the Unity Movement and Karrim Essack, chairman of the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa [Apdusa] are still being held under South Africa's 90-day law. The South African government has agreed with the British authorities that Mr. Tsotsi is a British subject, without dual nationality, but requests to either release or charge him on this basis are met with a wall of silence.

Fresh attacks have now been made against adherents of the two organizations. In the middle of November, two executive members of the Unity Movement, Enver Hassim, an attorney practicing at Durban, and Dr. Zulei Christopher, a publications officer of Apdusa, were arrested under the 90-day law. Both of them had been banned and confined since last January. The wife of Dr. Christopher was also arrested; however she was released on bail last week.

Under the same act, six peasant leaders were arrested at Bizana, Transkei, and two at Lusikisiki. All were members of Apdusa.

Dr. Ahmed Ismail Limbada, treasurer of the Unity Movement escaped to Bechuanaland in the nick of time. Five other branch officials also escaped -- Diliza Lande and Edwin Ngcalu from Johannesburg, Mtutuzeli Mpehle from the Transkei, Ronald Britten from the Cape and Miss Alma Carolissen.

When they arrived in Francistown, they met Eric Jama who fled from the Cape after being endorsed out and made his way to freedom. They are now waiting for entry permits to Zambia.

Dr. Limbada had been banned for five years before and was now serving his second five-year ban. Miss Carolissen and Diliza Lande were both banned. Threats of 90-day detention were hanging over the heads of the rest.

SOUTH AFRICA'S MINISTER OF JUSTICE

LUSAKA, Zambia -- South Africa's Minister of Justice Vorster stated that he had received more than 2,000 cables and letters from all over the world, including the United Nations, pleading that he reprove Zinakale Mkaba, father of three, Vuyisila Mini, trade-union organizer, and Wilson Khayingo, a delivery hand, who were alleged to have killed a police informer named Mange.

Vorster said that he was rejecting these pleas with contempt because "murder" had been committed.

On the morning of November 6, the three opponents of apartheid



met their death as martyrs to the cause of freedom.

Vorster is a sadist of notorious background. During the last war he was a general in a pro-Hitler Afrikaner secret organization, the Ossewa-Brandwag which had an extremist corps called the Stormjaers (stormtroopers). This organization, which openly espoused the doctrines of Nazism, was responsible for many acts of sabotage during the war. Pylons and post offices were blown up, rails were tampered with. In the bombing of the post office at Benoni, an innocent passer-by was killed.

Under the Smuts government, two stormjaers were found guilty and sentenced to death. There was a hue and cry amongst Afrikaner circles and petitions for mercy flooded the government. Smuts reprieved them and within a fortnight of the Nationalist victory in 1948, they received free pardons and were subsequently feted as heroes at a big dinner given in Pretoria to celebrate their release.

Vorster, as one of the leaders, was interned during the war. Verwoerd was editor of Transvaler at the time. He was found guilty in a court of law of being an agent for the Nazis and an upholder of fascism.

As minister of justice in charge of one of the biggest police forces in the world, Vorster has transformed the whole country into a virtual concentration camp. For its size, South Africa has the biggest daily jail population in the world. Figures released in South Africa itself on November 5 reveal that the daily jail population for 1963 was 67,000 (mainly for violations of racial laws) as against 3,000 in the Netherlands. By way of comparison, the population of the latter country in 1962 was an estimated 11,797,000; South Africa's estimated 1961 population was 16,236,000.

#### BEN BELLA APPROVES CHINESE BOMB TEST

The Chinese government announced December 3 that Ahmed Ben Bella, head of the Algerian government, sent a message to Chou En-lai November 17 congratulating China on successfully carrying out a test of a nuclear weapon.

Ben Bella reportedly said that he greeted the news "with joy and satisfaction." He said that the test constituted a brilliant victory for the Chinese people and a solemn date in the history of the Afro-Asian peoples.

He also supported the Chinese proposal for a world "summit" conference of all the countries to discuss a ban on nuclear weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles. He noted that Algeria was already on record for a world disarmament conference.

THE TAMIL MINORITY PROBLEM

By Edmund Samarakkody

Prior to 1947 the peoples inhabiting India and Ceylon were by law British citizens, as these two countries were parts of the same British Empire. In both India and Ceylon the political and economic control and exploitation commenced with the superimposition of capitalism in more or less semifeudal economies. The military bureaucratic method of capitalist development in semifeudal conditions meant that many aspects of feudal relations, economic and social were permitted to remain as before. Such relations of feudal oppression as caste, creed, communal and sex oppression often facilitated imperialist penetration and exploitation in these countries. In the case of India, even old semifeudal political territorial divisions (rule of Maharajahs) were fostered right up to 1947, when political independence was granted to India.

Thus the bourgeois democratic revolution which was ushered in these countries by military bureaucratic methods remained incomplete. When British imperialism relinquished political control of India and Ceylon, the socio-economic system in these countries, while remaining bourgeois in character, had many unaccomplished democratic tasks, like the removal of the barriers of caste, creed, race, and sex discrimination; and also the tasks of the real unification of the separate territorial divisions which had received only a coloration of unification through a unified British administration.

This situation was clearer in the east of India. Here, the failure to achieve the unification of the country was tragically shown in the open vivisection of the country into India and Pakistan -- a Hindu state and a Muslim state. Even within these two large territorial divisions real unification has up to date not taken place. Minority groups -- religious, racial, and caste groups, continue to be in a state of virtual war. In other words the struggle for democratic rights exist in these so-called unified states in a real way. In both India and Pakistan feudal land relations also remain.

In the case of Ceylon, the socio-economic relations were more bourgeois than in India. In land relations, only the remnants of feudalism remain, and that, too, in the remote parts of Ceylon. But the problem of unification of the country remained. The Kingdom of the Tamils and the Kingdom of the Singhalese were artificially brought together through British rule and a semblance of unity prevailed. Caste and religious conflict of old was also camouflaged, and was evident even during British rule.

The old divisions and oppressive relations came to the surface from time to time as was revealed in the case of Singhalese-Muslim communal riots in 1915. Also in the period of agitation for Constitutional Reform, the Tamil-speaking minority in the north and eastern provinces became articulate and revealed their claims for better and

equitable representation. An early manifestation of the coming open conflict between the Singhalese and the Tamil minority was the anti-Indian movement started by Mr. A. E. Gunasinghe about 1932-33.

At this stage the movement was directed against only a small section of the Tamil-speaking people -- the Malayalee and Cochin people of South Indian origin. The further development of this movement naturally extended to other persons of recent Indian origin in the plantations and other parts in Ceylon.

Concretely, the first legal step to maintain Tamil minority oppression and the legalised subordination of a minority group to the Singhalese majority was taken through the Citizenship Acts of 1948. Through these Acts, the Singhalese bourgeoisie with the support of a section of the Tamil bourgeoisie enforced discrimination against the Tamils of recent Indian origin, the large majority of them being workers in the plantations, and the rest in Colombo and certain urban areas being workers or traders.

By these Citizenship Acts nearly one million persons in the category of Indian origin were deprived of citizenship and reduced to a position of a legally oppressed Tamil minority, thereafter referred to as "stateless" persons without franchise and without rights to social services like free education and poor relief and unemployment relief.

These persons, workers and others were up to 1948 considered and treated as citizens of Ceylon and as equal before the law through British citizenship. Those presently in this category of so-called stateless persons are either those very persons who had citizenship rights up to 1948 or their children.

Since the passing of these Citizenship Acts, these persons (nearly one million), who are legitimately in Ceylon and participating in the economic life of Ceylon and recognised as such, and who have opted to remain in Ceylon, have now been reduced to the state of an oppressed minority. The case of these oppressed people is nothing less than the legalisation of semifeudal minority oppression that remained concealed during the direct rule of the British imperialism.

In other words the tasks of the unification of the country; i.e., the unification of the Singhalese majority with the Tamil minority and other groups remained unaccomplished. This task is the responsibility of the Ceylon bourgeoisie and the problem appearing as a citizenship question or a language question is only two aspects of the same problem of completing the bourgeois democratic revolution in Ceylon.

But in the era of the decline of capitalism the national bourgeoisie of Ceylon or other backward countries are incapable of performing tasks in their own interests, in this case the task of the

real unification of the country. In this situation the Ceylonese bourgeoisie (the United National party and the Sri Lanka Freedom party) have sought to throw the problem on the shoulders of the Indian bourgeoisie. It is of course a fact that the Indian bourgeoisie have themselves failed to complete their own democratic tasks. In their country racial, caste, and religious oppression remain as before, both in India and Pakistan. But the problem of the so-called stateless persons of Indian origin is not a problem of the Indian bourgeoisie and discussions with the Indian government on this question is irrelevant and only helps to draw a red herring across the trail.

The problem is none other than to remove the barriers of caste, creed, sex and race within the population of Ceylon. All the people of Ceylon are of Indian origin -- some are of very early origin and others of more recent origin. And this difference has no bearing on the cause of the so-called stateless persons.

The development of the question of majority-minority relations in Ceylon since 1948 is further proof that the question of the so-called stateless is part of the Tamil minority problem. The anti-Indian agitation movement appeared to be directed at persons of Indian origin only. That is the reason why the Tamil bourgeoisie of the northern and eastern provinces even supported discriminatory legislation against these people.

But when the movement soon extended into a general anti-Tamil movement, after 1950, and culminated in open violence and language riots in 1956 and later in 1958, the Tamil bourgeoisie came to the realisation that the anti-Indian movement was only an aspect of the anti-Tamil movement.

Stated differently it is now clear that the language rights of the Tamils and their fight for equal status with the Sinhalese, and the struggle of the people of recent Indian origin for citizenship rights, are one and the same struggle for democratic rights of the people in Ceylon.

The struggle of the Tamil minority for language and citizenship rights cannot be separated from the struggle of the Moors, Burghers and other racial groups for equal status in relation to the Sinhalese majority, nor can it be separated from the general democratic movement to eliminate oppression arising out of caste, creed and sex.

However, in the context of the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and wage earners, the democratic movement can be led only by the working class. In its own struggle for emancipation from the oppression and exploitation of the bourgeoisie, the working class will harness the general movement of the oppressed in order to channelise all the exploited and the oppressed in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. Thus the working class will categorically support the rights of Tamils for equality with the majority; and, in the concrete situation, the rights of the Tamils to have Tamil also declared a state language; and with no less determination

the working class will support the rights of the Tamils of recent Indian origin -- the rights of the so-called stateless persons in Ceylon for full citizenship.

### KREMLIN PERMITS JOHN REED TO PRAISE TROTSKY

The French-language Soviet weekly Les Nouvelles de Moscou carries an article in the November 14 issue in which Trotsky is praised. The title of the article is "The Second Day," and the author is John Reed.

The article was originally written for the American socialist press on the first anniversary of the October Revolution. It appears to be a preliminary sketch for the famous book by John Reed, Ten Days that Shook the World. Two young Soviet historians, I. Krasnow and S. Rakhlina, dug it up and prepared it for publication in a Russian translation in Izvestia from which Les Nouvelles de Moscou took it.

In the article, Reed mentions Leon Trotsky in the most favorable way, once as a member of the Presidium of the Second Pan-Russian Congress of Soviets, and again as a member of the Council of People's Commissars.

From Reed's report, it can be gathered that Trotsky was second in popularity only to Lenin. Reed tells how the crowd greeted the announcement of the names of the Council of People's Commissars in accordance with their revolutionary merits. He mentions that the applause received by Trotsky was loud and inordinate, by Lenin "interminable."

This is the first time in more than thirty-five years that the Kremlin has permitted the Soviet press to mention Trotsky in a positive way. This never happened while either Stalin or Khrushchev ran things.

### THREE YEARS AT HARD LABOR FOR "INSULTING" SHAH

Two members of the Central Committee of the League of Iranian Socialists, Ahas Aghelisade and Manuutcher Safa, who were arrested last June, have been condemned by a military court in Teheran to three years at hard labor. They were convicted of the crime of "having insulted His Majesty the Shah of Iran."

The insult to the royal clothes horse was alleged to have been committed in the wording of a leaflet distributed in Teheran commemorating the popular uprising of the year before. The real reason for

the arrest was to strike a blow at the socialist organization which has been meeting with a favorable reception, particularly among students. The League of Iranian Socialists is seeking to build a "national united front" to replace Mossadegh's National Front.

The trial itself was a travesty. According to Iranian law, a defendant and his legal counsel must be permitted to study the file of the prosecution at least ten days before the trial opens. In this instance, neither the defendants nor their court-appointed attorney were shown anything until the trial actually started. When they protested, the court granted a short recess to permit them to "read" the prosecutor's case.

The attorney appointed by the court followed the proceedings for only the first day. He was afraid of being jailed himself if he showed himself too zealous in defending his clients!

The defendants who were processed in this kangaroo trial join other socialists in the jails of Iran. Among the leading socialists or nationalists in prison are Professor Basargan, Dr. Sahahi, Taleghani and Fruhar. Dr. Mossadegh, the former prime minister and leader of the National Front, who nationalized the oil wells of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company and was then overthrown by a combination of British-American imperialism and native reaction, has been under house arrest for many years. Iranian socialists claim that the Shah's secret political police have blocked him from coming out in favor of the "national united front" which they advocate.

For eleven years terror has replaced democratic liberties in Iran. The influence of foreign capital has increased tremendously as has the strength of the indigenous capitalists. The Iranian bourgeoisie can consolidate their positions only if they act as compradors, or go-betweens, for they are in continual need of credit and subsidies from foreign capitalism.

The Shah's "agrarian reform" turned out to be a complete failure. Prices have been rising rapidly along with inflation. Unemployment, a traditional problem in a country where the average peasant finds only ninety days' work a year on his tiny plot, is spreading more and more.

Iran is close to a prerevolutionary situation. Up to now, however, the government-sponsored terror has succeeded in preventing formation of a genuinely revolutionary leadership. The workers and peasants also lack militant mass organizations.

The Iranian Communist party (the Tudeh party) is weak and discredited. The kowtowing of the Kremlin to the Shah and his family and its role in helping to deceive the people about his "progressiveness" has embittered the more conscious vanguard in towns and countryside alike. The National Front has disintegrated. Under these conditions, the Iranian Socialists have called for a united front of all

the oppressed and exploited who want to free their country from the Shah, the domination of foreign capital, and the direct and indirect tools of these arch enemies of the Iranian people.

They do not conceive the proposed "national united front" in an opportunist manner, subordinating the exploited masses to the "national" bourgeoisie. They clearly state that the goal of their organization is to steer the mass struggle toward socialist revolution. In the program which they project for the "national united front," they propose such slogans as nationalization of the land and national resources, including the water supply, self-government of the peasants on nationalized farms, consolidation of the nationalized oil industry, nationalization of all foreign trade firms, a state monopoly of foreign trade, and nationalized industrial firms.

#### WILSON'S DILEMMA AFTER THE RUN ON THE POUND

By T. J. Peters

LONDON, Dec. 5 -- Even sooner than expected, the brave words uttered by the Wilson leadership on its presentation to parliament have run up against the harsh reality of its self-imposed limitations as a social-democratic government. That is, its announced commitment to reorganize society under capitalism with justice for the working population and the "scientific modernization" of the industrial structure have clashed with the demands of the capitalist market and the requirements of the state upon which this market rests -- a market and a state set-up which the Labour party leadership is pledged only to reform, not to abolish and replace.

The mere declaration of its intentions -- in the "Queen's Speech" and in the Budget presented -- was enough to create a crisis atmosphere on the stock exchange and in the [financial] City. The City gentlemen had stoically borne the widening gap of the balance of payments position -- the unchecked growth of imports over exports -- the stagnation of production and the foreign loans contracted with a free hand to cover the gap so long as the Tories remained in Whitehall [the government administrative center]. As soon as the Labour government was installed, and took the first emergency measures to curb imports along with social welfare legislation, the City fraternity used the inconvenience [a 15 per cent tariff] caused to the financiers' partners abroad as an excuse to stimulate a run on the pound sterling. They hung on to their declining coupons and converted as much of their sterling holdings as they could, and this process became a chain reaction when their counterparts in the other European markets followed suit. Their objective was to force the Wilson administration to retract its social welfare measures, steel nationalization, etc., or to compel it to devalue the pound and in consequence to be overthrown.

For the moment, this objective has not been achieved. The central government banks of the great powers, above all the American Federal Reserve Bank, have come to the rescue of the pound; not out of altruism, of course, but in self-protection. The Labour government has not gone back on its declared legislative program -- but it has shown itself prepared to knuckle under in various and devious ways:

In refusing to speed up payments of the new pension schedules to the old people and widows to ease their burdens at the worst time of year; in spreading word that the coming capital gains and corporation taxes would not be much greater than present wealth taxation; in conceding to the delivery of Buccaneer aircraft to the racialists in South Africa, whom Wilson denounced and anathematized in such fiery terms only the week before; and, of course, in toeing the line on foreign policy issues (such as the Congo airlift) set by Washington.

Formally, however -- no matter how shamefully the bold words have by now had to be swallowed, and no matter how empty the grandiose scheme of social change announced by Wilson may now look -- the legislative measures called for by the Labour manifesto remain on the parliamentary books. In fact, the story has been told in the usually reliable financial columns of the press (for instance, the Guardian, Nov. 28) that Wilson rejected all demands by the creditors to go back on this program and was prepared to go to the country in a new election if there were to be such strings attached to the loans necessary to prevent devaluation.

Whether this is true or not, no known commitments were made that have affected legislation already introduced. Does this mean that the road is now clear? That the international fraternity of finance capital will simply sit by and watch this program being enacted?

The real truth is that the official financial centers, above all the American, came to the rescue of the British currency in sheer fear of the snowballing effect its devaluation would have, particularly on the dollar, for with the fall of these "reserve currencies" (which, with gold, form the backing of the whole world credit structure) there was the possibility that this could lead to an international crash as a forerunner of a runaway depression, with unforeseeable results. The built-in stabilizers of "neocapitalist" finance were thus brought to bear on what was otherwise the normal play of the capitalist market to stave off an immediate catastrophe.

It should not, however, be doubted that even acting in self-defense, the American creditors and their partners are any less keen than the speculators and private stock-exchange operators to effect a retreat on part of the Wilson government in its social legislation. They are merely prepared to take their time with such pressures and to enforce a slower pace of attrition.



What will the Wilson government do after this threat has become clear? They have seen the run on the pound, and know the meaning behind it. On the gamble of retaining their Tory representatives in power -- which just missed -- the City financiers allowed the financial crisis to grow. Now, they were quite prepared to let the Labour government and with it the ordinary people who work for wages and salaries, pay up for the losses. This course was encouraged by the most "unpatriotic" attacks of the capitalist politicians and the press. It should be an object lesson to the social democrats -- and their followers in the ranks -- on how to consider the "national interest." If the leaders have been impressed and learned something, they have still to show it.

But there is a certain amount of aroused reaction outside government circles, in the parliamentary party and in the Bevanite press which reflects the mood of the activist rank and file.

There has been an organized protest action on the pension delay among the parliamentarians, particularly the new members, which was summarized in the complaint of one of their spokesmen that the government is demonstrating its respectability to the financial community at the expense of the old and the weak -- an echo of Wilson's and Bevan's complaint against Gaitskell in former days. There is a growing demand on the part of this new parliamentary left wing for regular meetings to exert control upon the government. From the same quarter there has come criticism and pressure on foreign policy. But nothing cohesive has as yet come to the fore.

In the current Tribune, Michael Foot has indeed raised the right questions, writing on "The Pound and Politics." Referring to the underlying pressure of the financiers and the reaction of the government, he says: "To impress stupid people, it is necessary to take stupid actions. Such an indisputable conclusion surely offers an immensely strengthened reason for removing the wealth from such irresponsible hands, for vastly extended public ownership, for socialism on a national and international scale."

It is something for a social democrat to draw such a conclusion, even if he has had to wait for a particularly dramatic demonstration of the insanity of the workings of the capitalist system, to make it. It is even more pertinent for him to note: "Democracy must find such intervention intolerable. And as long as such international financial power responsible to no one exists, democracy is on a leash. The core of the Socialist case is that it proposes to make democracy effective, that only by the transfer of economic power can genuinely free institutions be protected and established. Rarely has the case been so spectacularly underlined as in the past few weeks."

And he is right again to stress: "We must seek escape from such a perilous situation by all the means open to us. . . It would be a pitiable betrayal of the Labour movement not to bend all our energies to this task. The survival of democratic government itself

depends upon our success."

So far, so good. Does Foot therefore propose to follow the logic of these very pertinent contentions? Alas, no -- "But, alas," he says, "it is not within the power of a Labour Government (even with a larger majority than four it would be difficult) to make a full-scale transfer of economic power in Europe and the Western world. It is not possible even in Britain itself, given the programme on which the election was fought and only just won." Logic is thus defeated by the parliamentary mystique, or what Lenin disrespectfully but not imper- tinently used to call parliamentary cretinism.

In fact, Foot's own sharp observations point inescapably to the need to break out of the political strait jacket that an insane capitalism has imposed on the British Labour movement. Tory politi- cians representing the ruling class are never bothered by formal pro- grams in emergencies -- they act on the premise that the prime law is survival. For the British Labour movement to survive this crisis, an emergency program, emergency measures, will be required that obviously break through the capitalist framework of the economy and the state. There is no reason why a Labour government should not take such bold initiating action, why it should consider its past election program a restriction to it, why it should not view a radical course speeding up the pace of socialist advance as entirely in the spirit of that program in the new emergency.

There is certainly no reason why the left wing in the Labour party should not demand it, propagate it, explain it, and above all, demand: Take the mass of the population, the working class into the Labour government's confidence. Open the books so that the whole country can have a look at how the crisis grew under the Tories and developed to the present perilous point.

That, it would seem, is the precondition for finding a way out of the dangerous situation developing in Britain. Resolutely pur- sued, it can inspire and arouse the labour movement in Europe and in the whole Western world to follow suit.

Marxists cannot, like Foot, confine themselves to pointing to the true state of affairs, to show the dangers, and then meekly apolo- gize for the Wilson government's retreat from the socialist elements of its program. Their task is to arouse the Labour movement to bar that retreat, and to prepare for the advance the whole situation cries out for.

#### U.S. POST OFFICE SERVES AS POLITICAL POLICE

An addressee may get foreign mail which the U.S. Post Office considers to be "communist," but he must fill out a form asking for it. It has now been revealed that the names are handed over to the witch-hunting House Committee on Un-American Activities.

HEAVY SETBACK FOR KREMLIN CAMPAIGN AGAINST PEKING

By Pierre Frank

The conference of twenty-six Communist parties, which the leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union set for December 15 with the objective of assembling a majority against the line of the Chinese Communist party, has been deferred, as was expected when Khrushchev was dismissed from office. It has been announced in addition that the Chinese have refused to participate in a conference proposed for next March.

Without any doubt, the project of banning the Chinese Communist party from the official Communist movement suffered a heavy setback. The project itself played a big, if not determining, role in Khrushchev's downfall. After that it became inevitable that the conference would not be opened on December 15. But the question still remains -- is a compromise possible?

In recent weeks, the Soviet and Chinese leaders have made public statements on the differences which were formerly accompanied by so much abuse. The abuse has disappeared but not the differences. The Soviet and Chinese leaders each insist on the positions they previously maintained, without any softening whatever. The interpretation can obviously be made that at the opening of negotiations each side will maintain its maximum positions and that this need not signify the impossibility of arriving at a compromise. But it should be noted that neither side has said much about the differences on the state level. Moscow -- without fundamentally modifying the international policy of the Soviet bureaucracy -- has stiffened its declarations concerning imperialism with regard to the Congo and Vietnam. Thus the expression of differences is now occurring primarily on the ideological level.

If the pro-Moscow Communist parties are remaining as silent as possible on the Sino-Soviet conflict, Tito is not bound by the same considerations and at the Congress of the League of Yugoslav Communists, he violently assailed the Chinese, claiming that it was not a question of ideological differences but of "big power designs and hegemonist methods among the Chinese leaders." This declaration is inconsistent. Tito forgets that on the state level Khrushchev conducted himself toward the Chinese the way Stalin did toward the Yugoslavs; he forgets the period when he correctly denounced the Soviet leaders in the same terms.

At the very brink, the downfall of Khrushchev temporarily halted the drive toward a split. The ideological differences separating the Soviet and Chinese leaders are not the result of mental lucubrations; they flow from the very different conditions in which the two bureaucracies operate. The one is hoping to be able to reach an over-all agreement with Washington; the other finds itself in a conflict with American imperialism and in material difficulties in

which it sees no way out except by weakening its antagonist.

For the moment, the Soviet bureaucracy, although it is backed by a majority of the Communist party leaderships and holds an apparently more advantageous position on the international plane, is on the defensive. It is seeking to exploit the apathy among the workers of the capitalist countries and the hopes of the Soviet masses for immediate improvements in their standard of living. The colonial revolution, contrariwise, tends to favor the Chinese and it will do the prestige of the Soviet bureaucracy no good to neglect the colonial masses too much.

The present period of secret negotiations, of criticisms directed at anonymous people, of pretense, recalls the not-so-distant period when the Chinese and Soviet leaders fought each other indirectly by attacking the Yugoslavs or the Albanians. This offers no more of a solution than did the previous period. The ideological differences cannot end in a compromise; on the contrary, their deepening is inevitable. Quite recently in the leadership of the Italian Communist party, Amendola went even further than the late Togliatti in revisionism, logically raising the question of a fusion with the Social Democracy.

The Soviet bureaucracy has lost considerable authority. It will never be able to re-establish an alignment responsive to its command. No bureaucracy will be able to take the place it once held. The price paid for Stalinism in the past was a heavy series of defeats; the current price is a long period of confusion. But revolutionary Marxism will end by again assuming its legitimate place on the road of world revolution.