

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 4

January 22, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Cuban Students Withdrawn from Rumania	
-- by Joseph Hansen	1
New Give Away Begins in Brazil	3
The Atomic Diplomats Play with War-Suicide	
-- by Maurice Leuven	4
Neville Alexander in "Times Literary Supplement"	6
Ahidjo to the Rescue of Tshombe	9
Verwoerd's Police State -- by Franz J. T. Lee	11
Part of the Dollar Empire	14
Discussion of "Literature and Revolution"	15
Guerrilla Activity, Strike Threat, in Colombia	17
Book Review:	
A Famous Set of Minutes -- by Louis Couturier	18

## CUBAN STUDENTS WITHDRAWN FROM RUMANIA

By Joseph Hansen

The withdrawal of 130 Cuban students from Rumania, news of which was carried on the press wires January 15, was accompanied by no immediate official explanation from either the Cuban or Rumanian governments. According to travelers from Bucharest, the action was taken by Havana when the Rumanian government banned the Cuban students, most of whom were studying at the University of Bucharest, from staging a rally in commemoration of the victory of the Cuban Revolution. The students were then called home.

The Vienna correspondent of the New York Times offered the following speculation as to the reasons for this rift in the relations between Rumania and Cuba:

". . . the Rumanians, with much at stake in a rapprochement with United States, regarded the proposed demonstration as a potential

threat of violence against Americans or the United States Embassy....

"Rumania is seeking economic assistance from the United States in the form of increased trade, while some American manufacturing concerns have been considering setting up shop in Rumania for production under Rumanian license.

"The improvement of Rumanian-American relations lay in such delicate balance that the Bucharest regime, as it was outlined here, could not risk Cuban student disorder of an anti-American character.

"It is recognized even among Communists that the repetitious violence against American missions in Moscow and elsewhere usually is based on the passive consent of the police authorities.

"Restraint by the Rumanian police already had been seen in December in the Rumanian-African student demonstrations arising from the American-Belgian airborne intervention in the Congo."

While too much should not be read into this development, several things nevertheless stand out.

First of all, it was shown once again how remote from reality is the thesis advanced by certain ultraleft currents, such as the one represented by the London Newsletter, that Castro has been signalling to Washington to give him an opportunity to sell out the Cuban Revolution. What better opportunity could Castro ask for to prove his readiness to line up than to go along with the Rumanians in soft-pedaling protests against the bloody intervention of U.S. imperialism in the Congo?

Instead, the Rumanians, by ostentatiously dissociating themselves from the Cubans -- following a criminal decision not to join with the Cubans and others in demonstrations of international solidarity in behalf of the Congolese people -- utilized the well-known firm stand of the Cuban revolutionists against American imperialism as a foil in order to emphasize their own softness toward Wall Street and their readiness to be had. The move will be read perfectly by the experts in the State Department, as Bucharest intended.

The Rumanians grossly insulted the Cuban students by implying that they would not act in a disciplined way if they were permitted to hold a rally in celebration of their own Revolution. More importantly, however, the Bucharest bureaucrats indicated their readiness to stab the Cuban Revolution in the back in return for economic aid such as Washington has given to Yugoslavia. They revealed how utterly unprincipled their calculations are and how ready they are, in the final analysis, to betray the interests of socialism in their own country in response to the blandishments of the State Department and the Manhattan banks.

The reactions in Peking will bear watching. In the Sino-Soviet conflict, the Rumanian bureaucracy has been utilizing the differences

in order to advance its own interests. This has been deftly encouraged by Peking while Moscow has watched with ill-concealed anger.

It is in the interests of world socialism for Rumania to gain a voice and a role that is independent from the Moscow bureaucracy. However, for Rumania to fall into dependency to American imperialism would be an utter disaster. The indication that the Rumanian bureaucrats are thinking of taking this road is what is most ominous in the incident over the Cuban students. If they were moving in the direction of genuine independence, then their course would be to follow in the footsteps of the Cubans -- not the Yugoslavs -- and to display this with special acts of solidarity with Havana in its heroic struggle against the Northern goliath.

Will Peking, which has been talking magnificently about Leninism, now remind the Rumanians of the need to adhere to basic principles? Will Mao and his team choose to draw the attention of the Rumanians to the dangers of Titoism? Or will they choose to remain silent, thereby implying their own readiness to bargain with American imperialism at the expense of others?

#### NEW GIVE AWAY BEGINS IN BRAZIL

At the end of December a decree was signed by Gen. Humberto Castelo Branco, the president put into office by a coup d'état last April 1, reversing a historic policy followed by every government in Brazil up to now. The decree opens up Brazil's fabulously rich iron ore reserves to private capital.

Brazil has about one-third of the world's known iron ore reserves. But after the ruthless exploitation of Brazil's gold, diamond and rubber resources, public sentiment grew so strong against giving away any more of the country's resources that no government dared to concede to the imperialist pressure to open up the high-quality iron ore bodies. Thus Brazil exports only eight million tons a year, about two per cent of the world market.

The decree favors the Hanna Mining Company of the United States, which operates through the St. John del Rey Mining Company (a British concern), and the Antunes Mining group, a Brazilian company in which the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, of the United States, holds an interest.

General Castel said his decree aimed at increasing Brazil's share of trade, as well as her foreign exchange income. He did not mention in whose pockets the profits would eventually land.

The decree was so flagrant that even Carlos Lacerda, one of the main architects of last April's counterrevolutionary coup d'état, felt forced to denounce it as a violation of the constitution. He said that it should have at least been debated and decided by congress.

THE ATOMIC DIPLOMATS PLAY WITH WAR-SUICIDE

By Maurice Leuven

PARIS -- The lowering of the danger has brought to the surface the natural antagonisms dividing the capitalist nations. The ruthless nature of competition over profits is once again becoming evident. For more than ten years after the end of the last war, the United States dominated completely an exhausted, alms-seeking, politically servile Europe. The economic recovery of Europe has now upset the balance on which the Atlantic Pact was erected. Germany, Belgium, France have experienced such prosperity that the latter country was able to come to the rescue of the dollar in 1963. But Michel Bosquet, writing in the Nouvel Observateur [November 26], has shown that the prosperity in the European countries was accompanied by colonization of American capital, reducing them to humiliating dependency.

In addition, the United States, which had to underwrite the costs of Atlantic armaments virtually alone, looks with jaundiced eye at a European economy in position to compete, thanks in part to lower defense budgets. During the Spiegel crisis, the "insufficiency" of Germany's military expenditures was brought out as well as American demands for greater participation by Germany in paying for the expenses of the Atlantic Pact. On November 18, Walter Rostow, of the U.S. State Department, discussing the problems in dispute among the NATO partners, pointed in passing to the need for equitable sharing of the "burden" of costs.

Thus at the heart of the debate is to be found, on the one hand, the struggle of the United States to maintain and reinforce its domination as a "super imperialism" over the rest of the capitalist world, and on the other hand, the European resistance to this drive. The weakness of the means of European resistance on this level -- well shown by Michel Bosquet (to reject American capital means seeing it go to a neighboring country, thus fostering inter-European competition) -- shifts the struggle from the economic to the political field, or, more exactly, tends to incite setting up a political shield for the economy.

The simplest solution would obviously be to organize Europe as a politico-economic unit in face of the United States. But the national frontiers still serve in the entrenchment of complex interests handed down by history, and, even on a European scale, the constitution of a super imperialism is proving impossible. Those who played, as against de Gaulle, the role of pure Europeans rising above all chauvinism (such as the MRP [Mouvement Républicain Populaire]), really sought, with Robert Schumann and the European Coal and Steel Community, to impose the supremacy of France over "defeated" Germany. De Gaulle has continued along this line more than might seem; and, the relation of economic forces in Europe being irreversibly in favor of Germany, it is through his nuclear "striking force,"

employed as a political weapon, that de Gaulle seeks to impose French leadership in the mystique of European super imperialism.

Germany's opposition in this area goes without saying. It is reinforced by the backing of the United States in which French operations are tripped up through limited concessions to the five other countries of little Europe. The most spectacular of these concessions today is the Multilateral Nuclear Force or MLF. Its importance lies less in setting up crews of mixed nationalities on twenty-five ships -- submarines later -- carrying rockets with nuclear war heads, than in controlling their possible use: "the finger on the atomic trigger." The representatives of the USSR are correct when they say that this is a stage in the dissemination of atomic arms, not the contrary.

The United States cannot agree to European unity unless it remains under American political as well as economic control. One can apply to England, which is hostile to the MLF, the reasoning that Raymond Aron ascribes to de Gaulle concerning the atomic "protection" forced on capitalist Europe by the United States: there is "no reason for paying for what circumstances have led the United States to grant gratuitously." England, of course, is satisfied with paying less than a national striking force would cost, while de Gaulle, seeking a diplomatic atomic weapon, charges the French more than it would cost to participate in the MLF.

The welter of contradictory interests is nevertheless threaded by a common aim: to find the political means of gaining the biggest share of capitalist profits -- the division of markets playing its role in these rivalries.

The military problems go beyond this.

Atomic weapons have ruined the whole classic strategy to such an extent that the biggest problem has become to figure out who, in controlling them, can "dissuade" the most without ever resorting to them. There is no guarantee that the reply to that question is improved by reducing to two the number of those possessing these Apocalyptic arms. Thus it is certain that the Chinese bomb, by making the Americans back up in Vietnam, had a more peaceful effect than the Russian bomb. The danger lies in the capacity of holders of atomic bombs to start a war-suicide. This is conceivable only on the part of capitalist regimes condemned by history. The Gaullist argument hinges on the possibility of the United States abandoning Europe rather than engaging in a war signifying self-annihilation; that is, on the likelihood of the U.S. drawing back from a war-suicide. The Gaullist strategy of "absolute retaliation" is the concept of war-suicide in which the eternity of France would resemble the pyramids of Egypt.

In the final analysis, atomic arms play the role of dissuasion against revolution in the "Atlantic" world, particularly in Europe. The clash between the striking force of France, NATO or the MLF are

thus secondary. Those who insist on our choosing between one or the other only reveal their own choice among different monopolists, or their own political ignorance. The problem for revolutionary militants consists not only in paralyzing the atomic trigger finger of their own imperialist rulers, but also -- by ending alliances of the NATO type -- in ending the right of the "allies" to intervene against social movements culminating in revolution on the territory of any one of them. It is a question of standing in the turbulent area between the poles of today's terrorist dissuasion. And to do so until the American proletariat itself disarms one of these poles, that of its own imperialism, thus eliminating the final risk of war-suicide.

The task is enormous, but not impossible. The period of Atlantic squabbling opens possibilities for workers offensives against all the partners, enemy No. 1 for each of them being in their own country. France is a weak link; to overturn de Gaulle is a realistic perspective. One of the themes of a common front should be that such an overturn would signify the atomic neutralization of this country.

NEVILLE ALEXANDER IN "TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT"

[Because of their interest in relation with the case of Dr. Neville Alexander and ten other nonwhite South Africans, most of whom are now suffering indescribable indignities and abuse in Robben Island, South Africa's version of a Nazi concentration camp, we are publishing in full a book review which appeared in the December 31 issue of The Times Literary Supplement (London) and a letter concerning the review that appeared in the issue of January 14.

[Gerhart Hauptmann, the subject of the review, is the German dramatist, most famous for his revolutionary play The Weavers which at one time was familiar to nearly all socialists, particularly in Europe.

[C.L.R. James, the author of the letter, is a literary critic and educator, well known in Jamaica, Trinidad and England. He is the author of a number of books, including The Black Jacobins.]

\* \* \*

DRAMATIC POET

Hauptmann: Centenary Lectures. Edited by K.G. Knight and F. Norman. 167 pp. University of London Institute of Germanic Studies. 30s.

NEVILLE E. ALEXANDER: Studien zum Stilwandel im dramatischen Werk Gerhart Hauptmanns. 150 pp. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, DM. 19.80.

Despite his uncommonly consistent box office appeal in German theatres, Gerhart Hauptmann as a dramatic poet remains a problematic figure even in his native country. In England, though he had Edwin Muir among his translators, he met, on the whole, with indifference which has if anything increased as time goes on, notwithstanding sustained efforts by some of his English admirers to create an audience for him. It is therefore no wonder that Professor Mainland, in the introductory lecture held at London University on the occasion of the centenary two years ago (which now, together with three other lectures, makes a somewhat belated appearance in print), should have felt forced to strike a somewhat apologetic note. This stands in rather odd contrast to the other Centenary Lectures, which seem to place him on a level with Ibsen and even Chekhov and contain, in an otherwise welcome discussion of Hauptmann's little regarded (and not yet fully published) epic poetry, purple passages of the greatest fervour.

The trouble with Gerhart Hauptmann is that he upsets his readers by his apparent rapid changes of front and even style just when they feel they understand his aim and have him well classified as a naturalist dramatist, as a romantic or as a neo-classicist. Mr. Neville E. Alexander, whose study was written at Tübingen before he returned to his native South Africa where he is said to be in trouble with the authorities, has produced much the most intelligent piece of criticism for some time with the avowed aim of solving, or at least explaining, these apparent contradictions. He sees in fact the essence of Hauptmann's work for the theatre throughout his long creative period rightly in a series of sharp and almost irreconcilable antitheses which correspond, to some extent, to the odd mixture of Silesian pietism in his personality with a positivist belief in progress. The creation of characters divided into two opposing camps between which there can be no contact makes for highly dramatic situations, but it carries within it from the outset a fundamental weakness -- namely, that no development or any final solution is possible within their determinist world and that the figures must justify their actions and reveal themselves in a succession of monologues rather than in true conversation.

It may well be that it was this sense of inherent lack of communication which stultified to a large extent what looks today like one of the most interesting aspects of Hauptmann's work: his effort to replace the stilted language of the nineteenth-century stage by the use of speech rhythms derived from the living tongue. Hauptmann employed realistic speech, and even occasionally dialect with considerable craftsmanship and was, as Mr. Alexander points out, able to ring the changes so that each one of his characters has his distinct idiom based on everyday speech. What mars the result is not merely that (as the poet himself gradually realized) the use of his local Silesian dialect did not escape the risk of almost all dialect on the German stage, of sounding condescending and even ludicrous. A far graver handicap for Hauptmann as a dramatist was his ultimate distrust of the power of ordinary language to bridge the gap between

the characters of his plays, which led him into the habit of abandoning the prose idiom at certain crucial stages, so that his characters are made to burst into lyrical verse utterance, always uncharacteristic and often downright bombastic. It may well be this aspect of his style which is particularly disconcerting to English readers and audiences even where they find most to admire in Hauptmann's early naturalistic dramas.

\* \* \*

#### HAUPTMANN AND DR. ALEXANDER

Sir, -- In your reviewer's incisive but not unsympathetic comment on Neville E. Alexander's Studien zum Stilwandel im dramatischen Werk Gerhart Hauptmanns (TLS, December 31, 1964), he remarks incidentally that Alexander "whose study was written at Tuebingen . . . returned to his native South Africa, where he is said to be in trouble with the authorities."

The known facts are these. Dr. Alexander was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment after one of the Verwoerd government's "sabotage" trials in Capetown last spring. The sentence is now under appeal while he is serving his term, under the usual severe conditions.

Dr. Alexander wrote this work while in Tuebingen on an Alexander Humboldt fellowship, of which he was the first non-white recipient in South Africa. His successor as recipient of this fellowship was a son of Dr. Verwoerd.

It is of interest to record that the Alexander case aroused considerable protest and substantial aid in German academic circles, where his work is highly regarded. A committee of students and faculty members covering most of the universities in the Federal Republic raised the bulk of the funds to meet the costs of the original trial and are now engaged in a similar effort on behalf of the appeal.

Recently an Alexander Defence Committee was formed in England, which is cooperating with the "Defence and Aid" organization in support of victims of apartheid. The committee's secretary is Mrs. C. Kirkby, 27 Thursley House, Holmewood Gardens, London, S.W.2.

C.L.R. JAMES  
20 Staverton Road  
London, N.W.2



AHIDJO TO THE RESCUE OF TSHOMBE

[The following statement, issued by the Jeunesse Democratique du Cameroun, has been translated from French by World Outlook.]

\* \* \*

In a speech delivered at Ndikiniméki December 19, 1964, while campaigning in the Mbam region, [President Ahmadou] Ahidjo stated his position on the tragic events in the Congo for the first time. He took up the cudgels for Tshombe, stating in particular:

"We [Ahidjo] have always thought that the other African states, together with us, must within the measure of our means grant aid to the Congolese people and to the legal government so that peace and harmony could be restored. . . . We cannot agree to certain African states interfering in the internal affairs of other African states." [Emphasis added.]

This signifies that the Ahidjo government:

(1) Considers the Tshombe government to be legal and consequently asks the African states to back the imperialist aggression in the Congo and to furnish the necessary aid to subdue the valiant Congolese people.

(2) Condemns the African states which, concerned about Africa's independence and dignity, answered the imperialist challenge by granting help to the Congolese patriots.

In the UN, after the green light from the French delegation, the Kamerun delegation headed by Ahidjo's Minister of Foreign Affairs Balla Benoit, in concert with the Nigerian delegation, spared no efforts to come to the aid of the imperialists and Mr. "Cash Register" by participating in maneuvers to stop talking about the Belgian-American aggression at Stanleyville. In the Council of Ministers of the OAU [Organization of African Unity], meeting in New York to study the situation created in Central Africa as a consequence of the Belgian-American aggression at Stanleyville, the Kamerun delegation especially distinguished itself by being the only one to vote against a resolution advocating the immediate withdrawal of the mercenaries from the Congo.

Ahidjo's position openly in favor of Tshombe and the imperialists is not at all surprising to those who know how Ahidjo came to power and how he maintains himself. What is involved in brief is a manifestation of solidarity between "two walking museums of imperialism and neocolonialism."

If, in effect, Tshombe is the murderer of Patrice Lumumba, Mpolo and Okito, Ahidjo's hands are red with the blood of Reuben Um Nyobe, Felix-Roland Moumié, Martin Singap and many other Kamerunian patriots. It is no secret that the regime in Yaoundé, like the one

in Léopoldville, owes its existence to imperialist bayonets and foreign mercenaries. In Kamerun, Ahidjo is backed by French troops and African mercenaries of the Community of the OAS [Organization of African States], while in the Congo, Tshombe is backed by Belgian paratroopers, South African mercenaries and American bombers piloted by Cuban counterrevolutionaries.

It was not by accident that the murder of F.-R. Moumié November 3, 1960, by the French Red Hand was followed ten days later by the signing of the agreement again placing Kamerun in total dependence on the imperialists. The massacres and bombings inflicted on the populations of Sanaga-Maritime, Bamiléké, Mounjo, etc., recall those inflicted on our brothers of Bukavu, Albertville and Stanleyville. In short we are dealing with two regimes that are as like as two peas in a pod.

The puppets in Yaoundé serve as reminders to those who try to find national or African sentiments in them. In advocating that the Congolese people be abandoned to the mercenaries from South Africa and the USA in order to save Tshombe, Ahidjo shows himself once again to be an inveterate enemy of African independence and unity. He adhered to the OAU only to refurbish his own coat of arms and because he thought that this organization would become a Holy Alliance to support the traitorous puppet governments of Africa at any price under guise of their "legality."

Ahidjo's vicious attitude toward the revolutionary states of Africa that have decided to go beyond pious resolutions to concrete acts, is the expression of the disarray and panic spreading among the puppets in Yaoundé who believe that with the support of the Belgian-American imperialists, the real Africa would tolerate Tshombe as it has temporarily tolerated Ahidjo.

Bowing to the new strategy of an imperialism flooded by the revolutionary tide in Africa, Asia and Latin America, Ahidjo's policy of nonalignment has recently led those who are least alert to believe that the regime is evolving toward a certain independence in relation to the neocolonialist powers and toward a healthy understanding of the interests of the African peoples in general and the Kamerunian people in particular. Unfortunately there is no substance to this. The facts force us to recognize that Ahidjo is trying to fool African and world opinion in order to break the front of anti-imperialist forces to which the Kamerunian people are closely linked in their armed struggle against Ahidjo's neocolonialist dictatorship and in favor of the establishment of a regime of new democracy in Kamerun.

The Jeunesse Démocratique du Cameroun [Democratic Youth of Cameroun] brands the attitude of puppet Ahidjo and renews its solidarity with the Congolese youth and the Congolese people. The JDC states that the attitude of the Kamerunian people in relation to the tragic events in the Congo is not that of the traitor Ahidjo, but that of

the Union des Populations du Cameroun [UPC], expressed November 26, 1964, by the Comité Révolutionnaire of the UPC in its statement on the events in Stanleyville, an attitude of support to the Congolese people in combat against imperialism and its lackey Tshombe.

The Jeunesse Démocratique du Cameroun is pleased about the aid which certain African states are granting to the CNL [Conseil National de Libération] despite the threats and the blackmail of the imperialists and we hope that they take the second step toward recognition of the Government of the Popular Republic at Stanleyville as the state authority representing Léopoldville Congo, particularly in the OAU.

The Jeunesse Démocratique du Cameroun holds, as stated in particular in its November 28 statement, that in face of the imperialist coalition, the anti-imperialists and antineocolonialists must unite to save Africa from the danger represented by imperialism and its lackeys like the Tshombes and the Ahidjos. This is the only means of achieving genuine unity and independence in the African continent.

#### VERWOERD'S POLICE STATE

By Franz J. T. Lee

When the Nationalist party, composed mainly of Afrikaans-speaking whites, that is, Boers, came to power in 1948, its leader, Prime Minister Dr. D. F. Malan, had the following to say:

"The history of the Afrikaner reveals a determination and a definiteness of purpose which make one feel that Afrikanerdom is not the work of man but a creation of God. We have a Divine right to be Afrikaners. Our history is the highest work of art of the Architect of the centuries." (Quoted in The Rise of the South African Reich, Brian Bunting, Penguin. 1964. p.7.)

In 1953, Malan's successor J. G. Strijdom explained the goal of the Boers in South Africa:

"Our policy is that the Europeans must stand their ground and must remain Baas [master] in South Africa. If we reject the Herrenvolk idea. . . how can the European remain Baas? Our view is that in every sphere the European must retain the right to rule the country and to keep it white man's country." (Quoted in African Nationalism, N. Sithole, Oxford University Press. 1961. p.47.)

Justice Millin, a member of the South African Supreme Court, said the following about the present Prime Minister Dr. H. F. Verwoerd:

"He did support Nazi propoganda, he did make his paper [the Transvaler] a tool of the Nazis in South Africa, and he knew it." (Quoted in Witness in the Dark, S.Gronje. A Christian Action pamphlet. 1964. p.1.)

When an attempt to assassinate him failed, Dr. Verwoerd said: "White South Africa must continue to rule!" To this, he added: "I do not have the nagging doubt of ever wondering whether, perhaps, I am wrong." (ibid. p.1.)

As early as 1942, the present Minister of Justice B.J.Vorster stated his goals:

"We stand for Christian Nationalism which is an ally of National Socialism. You can call this anti-democratic principle dictatorship if you wish. In Italy it is called Fascism, in Germany National Socialism, and in South Africa Christian Nationalism." (ibid. p.4.)

Because of his Nazi associations and activities, the Smuts government of South Africa interned Vorster. He became prisoner No. 2229/42 in Hut 48, Camp 1. In January 1944 he was released on parole and kept under house arrest in Robertson.

In 1962 when he became Minister of Justice, he made the following memorable declaration: "Rights are getting out of hand." (Dagbreek, November 18, 1962.)

During the debate in parliament in 1963 over the proposed General Law Amendment Act (generally known as the 90-day law), he said: "It is not a very nice thing to see a human being broken. The man taking these powers must take responsibility for them."

In the same year, on May 31, the anniversary of the white republic, he bluntly declared: "We have reached the stage in our national life where we realize more and more that there are times in a nation's history when not only reason must speak but blood as well -- and that time is now!" (Witness in the Dark, p.4.)

The International Commission of Jurists offered the following judgment in 1963: "Anyone who doubts that South Africa has become a police state should examine its laws. The question is then no longer in doubt." (Verwoerd's Police State, Christian Action Pamphlet, London. p.2.)

Let us take two examples. The Sabotage Act, 1962, defines as "sabotage" an extraordinarily wide range of offences, including trespassing, encouraging the achievement of any social, economic or political change, and obstructing traffic. Virtually anything disapproved by the government can be called "sabotage." Similarly, every opponent of apartheid is a "communist" -- whether or not he ever heard of Marx, socialism or communism. The burden of the proof lies with the defen-

dant. The minimum penalty is five years' imprisonment and the maximum is death.

The 90-day act empowers any police officer to arrest, without warrant, and to detain without trial, for indefinitely renewable periods of 90 days -- in solitary confinement -- anyone suspected of intent to commit certain political offences or suspected of having information concerning the intent of someone else. The worst features of the law are the following:

- (1) Detained persons are removed from the protection of the courts.
- (2) The right of habeas corpus is withdrawn.
- (3) The police can use torture.
- (4) Detained people are compelled to testify against themselves under duress; they are forced through torture to incriminate themselves, their families and comrades.

On January 11 this fascist-type law was suspended. But Vorster himself emphasized that the law was only suspended -- not repealed. He said that he would not hesitate a moment to apply it again at any time if he deems it necessary.

Despite official denials, massive evidence exists on the torture of political prisoners. Some of this evidence is cited in Witness in the Dark. For instance, a police officer accused of murdering an African prisoner testified March 13, 1964: "I don't think there is a police station in the country that does not use violence during questioning."

Here is a typical instance taken from the Rand Daily Mail of March 4, 1964: "Johannes Matlahotsoi told the court today he was arrested by Maree and Coetzee and taken to the Bultfontein police station. . . . A blindfold was placed over his eyes. . . . he was hit on the hands with what felt like a sjambok [leather whip]. . . . What felt like two pieces of wire were attached to his little fingers. Johannes heard a 'burning sound,' and his body was 'painfully jerked many times.'"

The conditions under which political prisoners are held in South Africa's jails resemble those in Nazi Germany. Here is an extract from an eye-witness account of life in Robben Island:

"The greatest complaint is starvation. Not only is the standard of food ridiculously low, but the quantities served are meager . . . some of the youth are exposed to exploitation by criminals for immoral purposes. . . . when coming from work all prisoners are searched. They are made to strip completely and do the 'tauza dance,' exposing their sexual parts." [See World Outlook July 31, 1964.]

Patrick Duncan, son of a former Governor-General of South Africa, who has been officially classified under the monstrous laws of the country as a "communist," writes the following:

"Prisoners, but only non-white prisoners, are made to strip naked when they return to jail. They are made to jump up in the air, clapping their hands, opening their mouths, then turning around. This is known as the 'tauza' or the Zulu dance." (South Africa's Rule of Violence, Patrick Duncan. Methuen. 1964. p.79f.)

In this way humiliation and indignity are inflicted on political prisoners in an effort to demoralize and degrade them.

Between 1961 and 1964, South Africa's defence expenditures quadrupled, rising to £104,000,000 sterling; i.e., a military expenditure exceeding the combined budgets of the politically independent African states. Vorster planned to have 105,000 men for the army at the beginning of 1965 as compared to 9,000 in 1960. The force of 15,000 armed white police is being co-ordinated with the army. A police reserve of 50,000 -- partly Coloureds and Indians -- is being organized.

Research is being conducted in poison gas, tear gas, chemical-bacteriological-weaponry, rockets and nuclear weapons. The modern poison gases, Tabun, Soman and Sarin -- developed in the closing stages of World War II by IG Farben -- are being produced in large quantities in a South African plant near Sasolburg in the Witwatersrand.

"It is within the bounds of our resources to make an atom bomb," a South African scientist was quoted as affirming in the January 12, 1962, Rand Daily Mail. Similarly the Zurich magazine Südafrika, No. 1 of 1964, stated: "South Africa is in a position to exploit atomic energy." How atomic weapons will fit in with South Africa's policies can be imagined.

The whole present world tendency shows the anachronism of apartheid. It must end in a cul de sac.

Already in 1667, John Locke in "A Letter Concerning Toleration" wrote: "Just and moderate governments are everywhere quiet, everywhere safe; but oppression raises ferment and makes men struggle to cast off an uneasy and tyrannical yoke. . . . there is only one thing which gathers people into seditious commotions, and that is oppression."

#### PART OF THE DOLLAR EMPIRE

Of the estimated \$100,000,000 in foreign investments in Bolivia, \$60,000,000 is held by two U.S. outfits -- W.R. Grace Co. and Gulf Oil.

DISCUSSION OF "LITERATURE AND REVOLUTION"

PARIS -- A round-table discussion was recently held here on Leon Trotsky's Literature and Revolution, which, strangely enough, has only now first been translated into French. The discussion was organized by the Karl Marx Circle and attracted a crowd of some 250, composed mostly of students, members of literary circles, workers, and a good representation of the various colonial peoples to be found in Paris.

The discussion was led by Maurice Nadeau, the well-known literary critic, who wrote a preface for the French edition of Trotsky's famous work. He noted that the evening's discussion dealt with the same theme considered at a recent meeting sponsored by Clarté and he expressed surprise that Jorge Semprun had failed to mention Trotsky's book there although the week before he had criticized it in Nouvel Observateur.

Trotsky, said Nadeau, while writing in the period of the great literary flowering that followed the October Revolution, had touched on problems and offered answers which Stalinism, a little later, utterly discarded.

After Maurice Nadeau, Jean Schuster spoke of the faithfulness of the Surrealists to the positions stated in the manifesto issued by André Breton, Diego Rivera and Leon Trotsky which called for the formation of a federation favoring independent revolutionary art. He recalled the profound agreement in the analyses offered by the great revolutionist and the conceptions of the Surrealist group fighting on the cultural front, particularly concerning the established defeat of "literature," in the bad sense of the term, and the confident call for a new poetic age.

Michel Lequenne, who served as moderator, read a letter from François Chatelet stressing what breadth Trotsky gave to Marxist criticism, how far it was from the "reductive schematism" of what is called "orthodox Marxism." Like Maurice Nadeau, he disagreed on the possibility of a "proletarian culture," and pointed to the perspective of a revolutionary art and literature.

Daniel Guerin then spoke about the crisis in the field of fiction and the growing importance of essays and scientific works as "literature." This is shown, he said, by the success of "pocket books." He compared one of Trotsky's writings, not included in Literature and Revolution, with a paragraph written by Proudhon prophesying the end of poetry.

All these themes and others were then taken up for several hours in a dialogue between these four and the audience, among whom were recognized writers and artists. The possibility of a proletarian literature was argued for, Victor Serge and other working-class writers being cited.

Maurice Nadeau maintained that contempt of the workers was shown more by those who insisted they could take up the profession of writing, and who pointed to what they wrote as noteworthy because they were workers, than those like Trotsky who, while struggling to make it possible for everybody to have wider access to culture, refused to see a culture in products of inferior quality which were only tentative documents or at best stages toward the art of a classless society yet to be born.

The youth, who constituted the biggest part of the audience, participated in the discussion the most vigorously. One of them wanted to know what the art and literature of the future would be like, a question none of the leaders of the discussion attempted to answer. Another one scored the Zhdanov period in the Soviet Union. "A socialist leadership has no right to demand that writers serve them." Several argued that an order to create a socialist culture proved in itself the absence of a socialist infrastructure, first because the socialist culture did not exist, and second because the order was "backward."

This started a discussion on the risk arising in a period of constructing socialism; namely, a refusal by writers to bow to the needs of the times and to reject their role of participating in the defense in the field of writing.

Lequenne replied to this that art and literature register the tensions in society, and a leadership blind enough to want to domesticate them would thus break the thermostat which would enable the tensions to become self-adjusting.

Jean Schuster was asked if Surrealism still has a role to play as a group and if the new literary currents haven't gone beyond it. He said that the Surrealists gave full attention to research in forms, such as the "new novel," but that the group maintained its existence, conceived as a struggle, unwilling to disappear until a new wave should actually go beyond them. He regretted that this had not yet occurred.

A girl in the audience raised the problem of the alienation of the vanguard writer or artist and the forces pulling them away from creativity and action. This led to an exchange showing that some in the audience were thinking of the profoundest problems related to the complete transformation of the world. In this context, the place of art and literature in our society, their relation with revolutionary activity demand restudy, particularly since the break up of the massive encrustations of Stalinism.

Pierre Frank, who together with Claude Ligny translated Literature and Revolution into French, observed that it had taken forty years to have the book published in a country that claimed to be pre-eminent in culture. The book had been virtually buried by those who yesterday bowed to the decrees about "socialist realism."



Today these same people only want to consider it a historic document.

Requests came from the audience that the evening's discussion, which was taken down on tape, should be published. It was promised that an attempt would be made to do this, although in view of the length of the discussion it would make a small book itself.

### GUERRILLA ACTIVITY, STRIKE THREAT, IN COLOMBIA

According to a January 9 dispatch from Bogotá, which was carried on the wires of Agence France Presse, guerrilla forces in Colombia have succeeded in linking up with the Venezuelan FALN [Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional], which are conducting guerrilla fighting in a number of areas, including regions bordering Colombia.

On January 7, said the dispatch, 45 men "in green uniforms, black berets and red arm bands bearing the initials of the National Liberation Army" occupied a village in the province of Santander, 150 kilometers from the Venezuelan frontier.

Most of the inhabitants of Simacota, along with the police detachment, had gone to a larger neighboring village where an open market was being held. After killing a police sergeant and two of his assistants, the guerrilla fighters easily took the village.

They searched twenty houses, taking what they needed. After that they "exhorted the villagers to armed revolt." When a contingent of the regular army arrived, fighting broke out. Two of the regulars were killed by the guerrilla fighters before they retreated into the mountains.

Meanwhile tension was rising in the main centers of Colombia. A special correspondent of the New York Times reported January 15 that President Guillermo Leon Valencia was "struggling with what both observers and participants consider the gravest economic and political crisis he has yet faced. . . ."

His immediate problem was to "avert" a general strike called for January 25. The strike was scheduled in protest against "a new sales tax and the rapid rise of prices that followed it."

The President was holding meetings with his cabinet and with labor leaders and had called a meeting of governors of departments "to discuss measures to hold down prices."

The Confederation of Colombian Labor was reported to have agreed to several compromise measures but it remained to be seen whether the government's frantic efforts to head off the strike would succeed.

Book Review

A FAMOUS SET OF MINUTES

By Louis Couturier

Les Bolcheviks et la Révolution d'Octobre: présentation et notes de Giuseppe Boffa. Editions Maspéro. Paris. 361 pp. 19 francs.

I Bolscevichi e la Rivoluzione d'Ottobre. Verbali delle sedute del Comitato centrale del Partito operaio socialdemocratico russo (bolscevico) dall'agosto 1917 al febbraio 1918. Introduzione di Giuseppe Boffa. Editori Riuniti. Rome. 468 pp. 3,000 lire. [In Italian.]

French-reading students of the Russian Revolution at last have available the complete minutes of the sessions of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party from August 1917 to February 1918. Maspéro Publications have found these old documents of interest in contrast to the publishing houses of the French Communist party which loftily ignores them. The Communist party of the Soviet Union published them in 1958 and the Italian Communist party in 1962; but the PCF, always prudent, doubtlessly preferred to wait until time has tempered the passions and perhaps wiped out the memories of those who learned the history of the Russian Revolution from the party's manuals.

To read these dense pages with their crossfire is utterly absorbing. The preparation of the October Revolution, the taking of power and the Brest-Litovsk peace are recorded in expressions of opinion, decisions, minutes of discussions and votes. What is particularly striking is the frankness in expressing differences when vital political questions in the revolution were discussed. The speakers defended their points of view with sharpness but the arguments they used, even reproduced almost fifty years later, lose none of their political honesty. Different tactics or strategic lines clashed; a spade was called a spade, and there was no need at all to adduce old age or compromising associations to criticize concepts or acts.

Lenin comes down from the divine throne where Stalinist hagiography put him to take his place among the worker militants. A front place, certainly, but among the militants. And it is seen that even the most obscure did not fear to express disagreement with Comrade Lenin. Many times, Lenin found himself in a minority, and when he succeeded in getting his line adopted, it was always by power of argument and never by police maneuvers. . . . The Central Committee strongly resembled a "discussion club" where unanimity of thought was far from the rule, where tendencies formed, worked out documents, resigned provisionally, confronted each other, in short, worked under conditions that would seem to paralyze action. . . Yet this "debaters'" Central Committee accomplished more than the later monolithic Stalin-

ist ruling bodies that issued orders to everyone. It can be understood how little Thorez' successors are inclined to let people learn about this instructive aspect of the lesson of October 1917. . .

There are two ways of taking liberties with such explosive documents. The first is to completely ignore them. It is easily seen how provisional this must be and what it says about the moral level of those who follow such a course. The second is even less effective. The documents are published (which is a great deal, we admit) but they are preceded by a commentary that plays the same role as an injection of morphine when the victim is wheeled to the operating table.

Giuseppe Boffa, editor in chief of Rinascita, the journal of the Italian Communist party, was assigned to anesthetize the reader. Maspéro Publications have already brought out two small works by this author and they publicize him as being "already very well known for his notable essays on Soviet history." But Boffa has never produced anything but poor pieces of politico-literary clowning that merit no attention. At most, one could ascribe the "errors" abounding in his book The Great Turn to the five years he had just spent in Moscow where objective information is not easily obtained. But today! He lives in Italy where a number of works have appeared on the Russian Revolution, particularly by Trotsky. Yet Boffa seems to know them only through the criticisms made of them by Stalin.

He dares to write that when these minutes were first published, in 1929, it was to struggle "against the legend of Trotsky" which John Reed's book in particular had served to create. Symmetrically, their republication in 1958 served "to dissolve that of Stalin." But, in reality, Boffa, always adept at adjusting to his milieu, concedes that they "destroy" no one, but place each one in his proper place.

Boffa goes so far as to affirm that in November 1924, Stalin polemicized with Trotsky "to establish the correct version of the facts"; it was only later that he falsified history. Why then did he wait until 1929 to publish these famous minutes? The so-called legend of Trotsky was gone. In 1929, six years had passed in which oceans of paper had flooded the USSR falsifying the history of the Revolution. Since 1924, Stalin had been lying in hundreds of thousands of copies of books, and Boffa lies doubly in 1964 when he pretends that at that time Stalin was an archangel whose sole preoccupation was to prevent Trotsky from falsifying history. If you take the trouble to check the text by Stalin which Boffa cites and which appeared in No. 7 of the Cahiers du Bolchevisme, January 2, 1925, ("Trotskyism or Leninism"), you will find not only the slanders that later became standard concerning the "permanent revolution," and the scraps of polemical phrases written by Lenin against Trotsky in the 1905-17 period, but also affirmations like this: "It does not enter my mind to contest the importance of the role played by Comrade Trotsky in the insurrection, but I must say that he did not have and could not have had a special role; as chairman of the Petrograd

Soviet, he only carried out the will of the Party instances in charge who were directing him step by step." And further on he explains that the left Social Revolutionaries also fought very well. . . .

In the same number of Cahiers du Bolchevisme there is a document by Zinoviev "Bolshevism or Trotskyism?" in which, after flagellating himself over his attitude in October, he adds his bit. But this idyllic epoch with Stalin did not last long and Zinoviev joined the Opposition in 1925, staying until 1927, when he capitulated, going over to Stalin for a nine-year period that was crowned by his execution. If these minutes could have destroyed a so-called legend of Trotsky, Stalin would have published them in 1925. But he didn't . . . . In 1929, Stalin wanted to make Zinoviev's capitulation irreversible. Trotsky had been expelled from the party since January 1928 and exiled. Thousands of members of the Opposition had been deported. To publish the minutes was a way of putting pressure on Zinoviev and Kamenev by recalling their comportment in October 1917 when they were "capitulationists." Just as the police know very well how to make a person sing who has done something wrong, so Stalin knew how to break men by striking at their weak points.

Boffa's whole introduction runs in the same vein. It displays flagrant bad faith, a smug, deliberately studied ignorance and an eclecticism which causes one at times to regret the thick lies of classical Stalinism. At least we knew then with whom we were dealing while here the most astounding untruths are packaged in thoughtful considerations about the Stalinist "weaknesses, errors and faults."

Let us hope that these thirty-eight first pages do not cause readers to turn aside from the book. The richness of the discussions of the Bolsheviks in 1917 offers all the greater contrast to the verbal contortions of badly de-Stalinized individuals working in the interest of new legends.