

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 8

February 26, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Malcolm X -- Martyr in the Cause of Freedom	
-- by Joseph Hansen	1
Chaos in Saigon Eases War Crisis	4
Outbreak in India over the Language Question	
-- by Kailas Chandra	5
Police "Error" in Caracas	8
Ninth World Youth Festival	9
An Appeal to American Relic Collectors	9
On Guerrilla Fighters and Militia	
-- by Hugo Blanco	10
Transkei Rejects Bantustans	14
Madrid Students Score a Victory	20
Workers Control Advocated in Algeria	21
Can the Dollar Stand Any More Investment Abroad?	24
Cuba Tackles the Problem of Bureaucracy	26

MALCOLM X -- MARTYR IN THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

By Joseph Hansen

The assassination of Malcolm X February 21 was a heavy blow to the freedom struggle in the United States and with it the struggle for socialism throughout the world.

The political identity of those who plotted the assassination has not yet been established. On February 16, however, Malcolm X charged at a public meeting, reported in the February 22 issue of the American socialist weekly, The Militant, that the bombing of his home two days earlier had been ordered by the Black Muslim leader Elijah Muhammad. He said that Raymond Sharrieff, supreme captain of the Fruit of Islam, the Black Muslim defense guard, had threatened him in a public telegram. He accused the Black Muslims of having friendly relations with the terrorist Ku Klux Klan and Lincoln Rockwell's Nazi

organization. He cited several attempts on his life and he charged that although the police knew about the plans to attack him they had done nothing. Plainclothesmen were in the audience when he was shot down.

The most reactionary forces in the United States had reason to seek the death of Malcolm X. He was rapidly moving to the forefront as the most authentic voice of the freedom-seeking Negro masses in the United States. What he represented was the rise of a new militant consciousness that is now beginning to challenge the old, conservative, pacifist-minded leadership. His views were evolving and while it remained to be seen how far he would go, he was clearly attracted by revolutionary socialism. Coming across the American Trotskyist movement, he paid it high respect, developed friendly relations with some of its members and leaders, and was beginning to study its tenets. Recently he became a subscriber to World Outlook.

Malcolm X belonged to the generation that was shaped ideologically under the twin circumstances of World War II and the monstrous betrayals and defaults of the Stalinized Communist parties. These circumstances operated with special force on him as a member of an oppressed people.

His rebellion, as can often be the case, at first took the wild form of delinquency. However, after bitter experiences, including a long term in prison, he began to seek the causes for his miserable position in society. His first steps in this process, again, were not unusual. The religion given him was bad, he decided. Yet he did not proceed directly toward a scientific outlook. There was no powerful Socialist or Communist movement in the United States to help him in this step. He went through a transitional stage of seeking a more humane and positive religion. For a time he thought he had found this in the Black Muslim faith. But this, too, proved inadequate to his inquiring and developing mind. Breaking from Elijah Muhammad, he turned to the orthodox Muslim sources. He had not completed this phase when he was murdered.

The rise of the Negro movement in the United States, which was fostered by the consequences of World War II and the great postwar revolutionary upsurge in the colonial world, began to draw Malcolm X out of the shell of religion and into the active world of political struggle. Talents of a high order cast him for the role of a leader in this mighty movement, and television helped convert him into a national figure of great prominence in a remarkably short time. There was little doubt that he was marked for a consequential role in the freedom struggle in the United States.

His turn in this direction, representative of the trend of the most promising sector of the black nationalist movement, was highlighted by his forming a political grouping, the Organization of Afro-American Unity.

The principal issue on which he stood, and which gave him his extraordinary appeal to the Negro masses, was the right of self-defense and advocacy of practicing it. In this he foreshadowed the next great turn in the civil-rights movement in the United States.

With infallible instinct, his foes singled this out for special treatment in commenting on his assassination. Misrepresenting his position as advocacy of "violence," they claim that his death reveals the operation of a kind of natural justice. Thus the New York Times, in a lead editorial [February 22 international edition], said that "his ruthless and fanatical belief in violence not only set him apart from the responsible leaders of the civil rights movement. . . It also marked him for fame, and for a violent end." The editors even went so far as to say that he "spawned" the forces that ended in his death.

According to this logic, the "prince of peace" spawned the forces that nailed him to a cross. The modern prophet of nonviolence, Mahatma Ghandi, did likewise, for he died at the hand of an assassin. The Rev. Martin Luther King, an American disciple of Ghandi, is not without a similar propensity, for he came close to death at the hands of a knife-wielding fanatic.

The remarkable blindness of the editors of the Times is shown even more glaringly by their overlooking the continual assassinations in the South of advocates of nonviolence. What does their victimization prove?

Malcolm X's position on this question must be examined on its own merits. Do victims of violent assaults have the right to defend themselves? Does an oppressed group have the right to organize an effective defense against the violence of its oppressors? The entire history of mankind, particularly the history of revolutions, says yes. The truth is that there is no other road to an eventual end to all class violence and the murderous currents it spawns. What the editors of the Times and those who think like them really object to is that an oppressed people, especially the Negro people in the United States, should defend themselves against violence occurring on an endemic, nation-wide scale. If Malcolm X is to be criticized at all it should be because the defenses at his meeting, after repeated threats to his life, were not effective enough.

The generation to which Malcolm X belongs has already produced outstanding figures -- Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, Patrice Lumumba. These men found their way independently to the revolutionary struggle, demonstrating that it is possible to by-pass Stalinism. There are others like them developing in rebel movements throughout the world. They will become the heroes and models of the younger generation now undergoing ideological formation. These two generations are destined to lead the world into its socialist future.

That world, we may be sure, will never forget its martyrs, its Patrice Lumumbas, its Malcolm X's.

CHAOS IN SAIGON EASES WAR CRISIS

According to a February 22 dispatch from Saigon, the latest set of puppets have offered a reward of \$100,000 (yes, that's American dollars) for the capture, "dead or alive," of fourteen officers involved in the coup d'etat of February 19. The fourteen, headed by Col. Pham Ngoc Thao and Gen. Lam Van Phat, were "at large." The New York Times [February 22 international edition] raised the "suspicion," that "the Vietcong may have infiltrated the highest councils of the Vietnamese armed forces."

It was not reported whether Saigon had put the name of Lieut. Gen. Tran Thien Khiem on the list of malefactors. He should be easy to capture since he is Saigon's ambassador to Washington. He hailed the coup d'etat and was ready to head the new "government."

With the downfall of this clique, came the downfall of Lieut. Gen. Nguyen Khan, who was ousted from office by the loyal forces after they "saved" him from the plotters. And among the waltzing generals, President Johnson, from the most feared head of government in the world, was rapidly becoming the most ridiculous.

How could Johnson, with the government in Saigon clearly in the shape of a crumbled cookie, go ahead with his monstrous threat to "defend" it by extending the war into North Korea? Exactly what was he defending?

Whether he liked it or not, Johnson was compelled to slow down while another painful effort was made to paste together a new puppet government which could be presented as "stable" and "popular" and "anti-Communist" and well worth the risk of a nuclear holocaust.

Meanwhile the crisis in Washington deepened. Precious time had been given the American people to begin registering their deep opposition to Johnson's war adventure. One senator reported that his mail was running fifteen to one in favor of negotiations.

Socialists and members of the peace movement were mobilizing their forces for demonstrations..

The sector of the capitalist class that considers the risks altogether too high was putting on heavy pressure for reconsideration and some kind of negotiations, utilizing the French government as a go-between. The New York Times was even campaigning with strong arguments for such a course.

The world could thank the power of the revolution in South Vietnam for bringing at least temporary relief from Johnson's fit of "brinkmanship."

OUTBREAK IN INDIA OVER THE LANGUAGE QUESTION

By Kailas Chandra

BOMBAY -- The Congress government and the bourgeois press are now busy searching for scapegoats for the unprecedented mass upsurge in Tamilnad that is protesting against what has been construed as an imposition of Hindi as the official language in the south. Chief Minister Bhaktavatsalam thrusts responsibility on the "left Communists," the DMK [Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam] and some "mill owners."

This is how the congress leaders are trying to whitewash their utter failure to evolve a national language for the country even seventeen years after independence.

The fact is that the intensity with which the students and other sections of the people, including the working class, reacted to the enforcement of the Official Languages Act shows how deep the popular discontent has become against the capitalist-landlord regime of the Congress.

More than sixty persons have been killed and hundreds wounded by the police and the army after it was called out. Demonstrators, in turn, burned buses and trains, attacked police stations and destroyed public property all over the state. Infuriated by the police atrocities, the demonstrators burned two police sub-inspectors to death at Tirupur and some constables lost their lives at Gudalur. In Madras and other principal urban centres of the state, the demonstrators raised barricades and engaged the police in pitched battles for days.

The call for anti-Hindi agitation was initially given by the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, which observed Republic Day (January 26) as a day of mourning. (This was the day Hindi became the official language of India.) The DMK which had once stood for the secession of the south from the Indian Union has now given up its demand for a sovereign Dravidastan.

On the eve of the agitation, the DMK leaders were arrested in mass and this touched off the widespread demonstrations. The brutal manner in which the police handled the peaceful student demonstrators in Madurai and other places was responsible for rousing popular anger.

The students in the state formed their own Anti-Hindi Action Committee to conduct the movement. The imposition of Hindi as the official language has been resented strongly by the educated petty-bourgeois masses. They fear the lowering of job opportunities if Hindi is enforced as the official language in the government services in place of English. Hindi is more "foreign" to the south state than English.

Behind the anti-Hindi agitation lies a feeling of deep social insecurity. In the midst of growing unemployment, the petty-bourgeois masses face serious competition for the limited number of available jobs. This has been intensified by the rising cost of living and the failure of the government to solve the basic food problem. One of the frequent slogans of the anti-Hindi demonstrators has been: "You don't give us food; now you want to stifle our voice."

The southern people have always viewed Hindi as a symbol of "northern domination," as a language of the big monopoly capitalists (Marwaris, Gujartis from the north). English, which was introduced by the former British imperialist rulers, has existed as the only common medium of intercourse among the different language groups in India for the past two hundred years. (India has fourteen regional languages with independent scripts.)

Once the agitation began it soon got out of control of the DMK leaders who sponsored it. DMK leader Annadurai, who was released after a few days detention, appealed for suspension of the agitation. This went unheeded. The demonstrations turned into a general mass protest against police and army atrocities. The working class in Madras, Coimbatore, Madurai and other industrial centres was drawn into the vortex of struggle. On February 11 there was a complete general strike throughout Tamilnad. The students' Anti-Hindi Action Committee finally called off the agitation after a categorical assurance from New Delhi that Hindi would not be imposed on the non-Hindi people.

The Congress leadership could not remain unaffected. Leaders like Kamaraj Nadar (the Congress party's national president, from Tamilna), Atulya Ghosh (Bengal), Sanjiva Reddy (Andhra), Nijalingappa (Mysore), who are supposed to represent the non-Hindi states, dissociated themselves from the Centre's decision and demanded that English should be retained as the official language indefinitely. Tamil ministers Subramaniam and Alagesan resigned from the central cabinet as a protest against the central government's refusal to make a statutory provision to retain English as the official language. This was no doubt a stunt by the Congress leadership from Tamilnad to save face.

Unable to maintain unity in the face of the popular upsurge, the top echelons of the Congress hierarchy found themselves plunged into a major crisis. The obstinacy of the Hindi chauvinists in the central government complicated matters for the Congress leaders from the non-Hindi areas. Even the assurances given by Prime Minister Shastri that the Official Languages Act, as adopted by parliament, provided for the continued use of English as an associate official language of the Union as long as the non-Hindi states wanted it, fell on deaf ears. For Shastri this was a climb down and a concession to popular feelings.

But a new demand, to amend the constitution of the Indian Union to retain English permanently as the official language, has been made. The Madras agitation has spread to the neighbouring states of Andhra,

Mysore and Kerala. There were violent demonstrations in some parts of Andhra. Students in West Bengal have taken up the cue and have organised massive demonstrations not only for the retention of English as the official language but also for the release of the almost 1,000 Communist leaders who have been arbitrarily arrested.

This is the first time that Tamilnad, which has a reputation of being relatively "tame," has experienced a mass upsurge of such magnitude.

Despite negative features, such as the absence of a competent leadership able to channelise the democratic urge of the people, the anti-Hindi agitation has amply demonstrated that the masses are capable of exceptional courage, audacity and sacrifice. This is another answer to those pessimistic "parliamentarians" who have lost faith in the ability of the masses to fight.

The demand that Hindi should not be imposed on those who do not speak it is a just, democratic demand which must be supported by all progressive sectors and the working-class parties. But this demand must be linked with the other wider economic and political issues facing the people such as food, rising prices, etc.

In the name of an "emergency," the Congress government has launched an offensive against civil liberties in order to cover up its own failure to solve any of the basic problems of the people. The first round was directed against the (Left) Communist party but the hatchet will fall on all left-wing parties and groups that offer an effective socialist challenge to the bourgeoisie.

None of the traditional left and working-class parties have advanced a programme for the language movement in the south. The danger arises that extreme reactionary parties will be able to take advantage of the situation to foment regional and linguistic chauvinism among the masses to serve their own reactionary ends. The working-class parties must drop this complacent attitude and work out a positive programme for movements seeking democratic demands like this.

India is entering a new phase of perpetual crisis, both on the economic and political fronts, with the bourgeois regime unable to solve any of the basic problems of the people. The traditional parties of the left are also disintegrating. New mass upsurges in the context of the growing economic distress are inevitable. The masses must be educated in action to throw up their own leadership and organs of struggle in the form of elected councils of workers, students and peasants on local and regional levels to formulate their own demands and to fight for them.

It is possible to link up the students' agitation against Hindi in the non-Hindi states with wider demands for democratisation of the management of universities and educational institutions, reduction in tuition fees, recognition of students' committees in schools and col-

leges, etc. Students are playing a dominant role in the newly emerging democratic struggles in every state, but their movements must be integrated with the working-class movement as a whole. Joint councils of workers and students can be organised. The working class must support these struggles with its own class demands for nationalisation of good trade, banking, import and export trade, workers' participation in management, etc.

The regional languages must indeed be developed as the languages of the administration. English should be continued as the official language as long as the people want it. It must be remembered that only a workers' and peasants' government can evolve a truly national language for this country.

The anti-Hindi agitation in the south has exposed the utter weakness of the Congress leadership and the hollowness of its organisational and political integrity. It is obvious that most of the Congress leaders do not possess even a national perspective and suffer from regional chauvinism of the worst type. The aimless drift of the bourgeois leadership can easily pave the way for the emergency of centrifugal tendencies and eventual Balkanisation of the country, with regional bourgeois interests trying to assert themselves in their own chaotic manner.

N.C.Chatterji, president of the All-India Civil Liberties Union, and twenty other Calcutta intellectuals have warned that the Congress party leadership, in trying to impose Hindi on the non-Hindi people and to suppress civil liberties, is paving the way for dividing the country.

This is a real danger. Unity of the nation as a whole is at stake; the bourgeois leadership of the Congress is unable to preserve it. There are also tendencies inside the Congress and the extreme right-wing parties like the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra party which favour liquidation of the existing parliamentary institutions in favour of a semimilitary dictatorship. The coming midterm election in Kerala will test the boasted democratic intentions of the ruling bourgeoisie.

The Congress leadership has been able to survive the present crisis only because of the nonexistence of a strong working-class party that can challenge its power. The working class must throw up a leadership that can rally together all the exploited strategy of the Indian people to guarantee the unity of India and to march to the goal of a socialist revolution.

THE LEONI GOVERNMENT expressed official "regret and grief" to the U.S. after trigger-happy Caracas cops shot down a Peace Corps member who came out of a jeep hands up February 19. The police "error" was to mistake an American for a Venezuelan. Otherwise it would have been a routine incident.

NINTH WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL

The ninth World Youth Festival is scheduled to be held in Algiers from July 28 to August 7. It is expected that 15,000 youth from forty countries will participate.

The International Preparatory Congress has announced that the Festival will concentrate on four major themes and that four days will be set aside for specific activities in connection with these. The themes are:

- (1) Friendship with the Algerian people and youth.
- (2) Solidarity with Africa.
- (3) Solidarity with the peoples struggling for national independence.
- (4) International co-operation.

AN APPEAL TO AMERICAN RELIC COLLECTORS

The American liberal weekly The Nation published a letter in its February 8 issue from a Japanese Buddhist priest appealing to Americans to return the relics they took during World War II. Two examples are cited:

"Life magazine for May 22, 1944, published a picture of a skull of a Japanese soldier that an American soldier had sent from the South Pacific as a souvenir to his fiancée in Phoenix, Ariz. Further, Time magazine of June 26, 1944, described how a U.S. Congressman sent President Roosevelt a letter opener made from the forearm of a Japanese soldier killed in action."

The Buddhist priest believes that "true and lasting world peace can never be achieved" until "thoughts of hate and bitterness" are "removed from one another's hearts." Perhaps the time is ripe for this, since World War II ended twenty years ago. To further these aims, he is devoting himself "to returning such mistreated relics to their homeland" to be "treated with the utmost solemnity. . ."

"If among your readers," he says to The Nation, "there is anyone who has received and possesses such relics, or anyone who has any information regarding such, please be so kind as to inform me."

All Americans -- if they have an ounce of Christian feeling -- will respond to this moving appeal, even if it comes from a source resistant to the Christian ethos. The address is Shinko Sayeki, 1-68

Horinouchi-machi, Minami-ku, Yokohama.

While the appeal is being circulated in the USA, it might be well to bring it to the attention of any Americans now collecting relics in places like the Congo and South Vietnam. Co-religionists of those who become processed as raw material may eventually ask that the finished relics be returned for solemn final rites in the country of their origin. In the interests of brotherly love and world peace, good Christian Americans will, of course, wish to be in position to respond. Please do not mistreat the relics in your collections from expeditions to other lands.

ON GUERRILLA FIGHTERS AND MILITIA

By Hugo Blanco

[The following letter by Hugo Blanco Galdos "in reply to a comrade" was written from the Central Prison of Arequipa, where the Peruvian peasant leader is being held without trial. Dated April 7, 1964, it has been included in a pamphlet entitled The Road of Our Revolution, published by Ediciones Revolución Peruana. In the discussion now occurring among radical circles in Latin America on the role of guerrilla warfare, Hugo Blanco offers in this letter some conclusions drawn from his own experience in organizing peasants in the Cuzco region. The footnotes have been supplied by the editors of the pamphlet.]

* * *

In Reply to a Comrade:

In Cuba, China, etc., the situation was characterized by the absence of advance formation of fighting mass organizations. It was completely to be expected that at first the masses felt very distrustful of the armed group; this determined their nomadic, guerrilla character. But when they gained the confidence and support of the masses they settled down. Under all these conditions, the guerrilla force becomes the axis of the people's struggle, the polarizing and organizing nucleus, the political vanguard. It is an armed group, organized and prepared independently of the mass movement, since this hardly exists, having yet to be organized as the offspring of the guerrilla force.

In Peru big mass organizations already exist and in the zones they cover there are few who do not belong to them.

What is fundamental is the following: Do you consider that Dual Power(1) exists at present in the countryside? If not, you will lean

(1) In a previous letter, dated February 7, Hugo Blanco refers to dual power arising in Peru in an atomized, unconscious form, without cen-

toward organizing guerrilla fighters(2) but if you are convinced it exists you will favor organizing a militia.(3)

After April, '62, although separated from my comrades and with my thinking still affected by the strong fumes of putschism, the heavy pressure of reality was reflected in a report I wrote: "Zone Liberated before an Insurrection." Although I believe it contains some erroneous concepts, the title alone shows how impressive was the development of Dual Power.(4) You also know what I have written on the Peasant Unions.(5) It seems needless to recall these things to a member of the FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario -- Front of the Revolutionary Left], "conscious factor of the awakening of the Quechua peasantry," as you put it. I do it because I suspect that your opinions on armed struggle are the fruit of your lack of knowledge and your separation from work among the ranks of the FIR.

If, in the armed struggle, we begin with premises so different from those in Cuba and China, its initiation must be different; this is the "dialectical process."

The guerrilla fighter, as you say, must "attract the sympathy" of the peasantry.

A militia is the product of the rise of the peasantry; the masses understand the necessity for armed struggle and create a militia; the peasantry gives birth to the militia and as such it enjoys its love and care from the very beginning. Don't forget that the peasantry has already come to organize Defense Committees; it is already conscious of their necessity and knows that it must set them up.

In place of your sentence: "There the mass movement is being linked with the embryonic forms of the armed struggle for power," I

tralization or program, but tending necessarily to develop and gain conscious form through the action of the vanguard.

(2)Independently of the development of the mass movement. Separate and apart from this is the fact that Trade Union Defense Committees, as the fighting arm of the peasantry, are compelled to use guerrilla methods during the struggle.

(3)This is the best designation we can give to the Defense Committees that arise and develop among the peasant masses, aside from the skills and technique they apply in combat.

(4)This report on dual power was approved by the national leadership of the FIR.

(5)Published in the mimeographed Revolución Peruana and approved by the national leadership of the FIR.

prefer: "There the mass movement is reaching the special forms of the armed struggle for power" (although this aim is not conscious in the beginning).

You ask: "What organism will prepare and organize the armed struggle? The peasants' union? The party?" Some other questions will help us find an answer: Who led the occupation of the land in Cuzco? The unions or the party? Who took power in Russia? The soviets or the party? The answer to your three questions is: the party through the mass organizations, in our case, the peasant unions. There is agreement on the peasant unions now; all that is lacking is to put it into practice.

". . . this type of struggle is brought to its conclusion by organisms skilled and disciplined in the science and art of revolutionary war. Consequently a trade union cannot organize or lead the armed struggle." These organisms are precisely the revolutionary Trade Union Defense Committees led by the party.

I don't deny the great importance of the party. On the contrary, I recognize that the enormous deficiency in '62 was the lack of a party. This weakness fostered the others.

The party must have cells in the peasant unions; this is a necessity for correct leadership of the armed struggle. We must learn from experience -- the outcome would have been different if there had been a well-organized party at least in La Convención and Lares. This is the negative side of the experience.

But we must also learn from the positive side of the experience. Why did I and my comrades last longer than any other group despite the lack of a party, lack of political clarity, lack of technical knowledge, etc.? Because we were a group growing out of the peasant union, nourished and cared for by our parent.

There are many characteristics of our reality which a guerrilla fighter would list as coming in the second stage: Complete knowledge of the population -- the three or four "yellow" patches are known (if they have not already been given the red coloration of the zone as was the case at Qochapampa, Mesada, etc.). Almost the whole population is organized; it will not only economically sustain, protect, inform, feed, etc., the armed groups, but much more, there will be occasions when the whole mass will engage in sabotage and even when the whole mass will fight. Of course, the latter will be sporadic until the moment of insurrection comes, but they will be ready. This does not mean that we precisely foster this, although it can happen at times that we must do so; I only want to indicate to you what we face and what we will be confronted with, the rich treasures we have at the start, the resources that we must not dissipate. (In the tense period of the Chaupimayo struggle all the union members served sentry duty in rotation.) The creative potentialities of the unions at La Convención and Lares could not be developed due to the lack of a party.

All these characteristics belonging to the "second stage of guerrilla warfare" give the armed group the possibility of establishing itself among an ultrafavorable population. If problems arise due to unusual persecution of a given militia unit, it can be moved to a union in another zone.

One of the fundamental conditions for a militia struggle is the size of the zone in which it develops; there should be many militia units, one for each union body. Without this, a militia takes on guerrilla characteristics, since the enemy concentrates on it and on one union. (This happened to us; nevertheless we were not a classical guerrilla force of the first stage). There will not be a repetition of a case like Chaupimayo where the attention of the enemy was concentrated.

With regard to guerrilla tactics, I am in complete agreement that these must be taught to the Defense Committees; they must not be empirical, the vanguard party exists for a reason. All the guerrilla knowledge that can be adapted to our militia strategy must be utilized.

Now concerning something fundamental: Is it easier to organize guerrilla fighters or a militia?

A big part of the peasantry are willing to face death, but not to leave their patch, their home. In this, too, they say: "Tierra o muerte." [Land or death.] The guerrilla fighter leaves his home and does not return until the struggle is over. The militia fighter stays home, continues working and when it is necessary to battle, he does it. For every one hundred peasants ready to join a militia, we find one willing to be a guerrilla fighter; I won't go into the details, but believe me, I know it from experience!

The troops of Manco II [last of the Incas], who had surrounded Cuzco ready to crush it, abandoned the project because it became time, I don't know if it was to plant or to harvest their potatoes.

None of this means being against organizing guerrilla fighters; among those who are willing some can be formed to help the militia.(7) But the fundamental organism of the armed struggle in Peru will be the militia of the union organized by the party.

We should take advantage of all the peculiarities of our reality. Having advanced so far, we do not begin from zero.

You say: "It is on the horse of the peasant movement that the FIR must move toward the armed struggle for power." Agreed; it was that way in Cuba too. The difference is that they first seized arms

(7) But subject to a centralized leadership in the revolutionary mass organization (unions), not outside it. The necessities of the struggles will determine the number and role of the guerrilla groups.

and then got the horse. We are in the saddle but we still lack arms. Why should we get off the horse?

I am sure that if what I say doesn't convince you, working with the rank and file will; the sooner the better.

Tierra o Muerte! VENCEREMOS. [We will win.]

HUGO BLANCO GALDOS

Central Prison of Arequipa, April 7, 1964

TRANSKEI REJECTS BANTUSTANS

LUSAKA, Zambia, Feb. 12 -- As he left the stage of South African and world politics, the inimitable Eric Louw, South Africa's ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs, made it plain to his fellow fascists that they would have to do something concrete about their protestations of freedom for their helots if they wished to be believed by their critics abroad. Subsequently Verwoerd announced in parliament that the Transkei would be given "self-rule," and in less than two years after the proclamation the Herrenvolk parliament passed the Transkei Constitution Act (No. 48 of 1963). This act conferred "self-rule" on the Transkei.

This monstrous fraud was designed, first, to placate the critics of apartheid especially at the United Nations and, second, to dupe the oppressed and restive masses of the people in South Africa itself. As soon as the details of the scheme were released, the All-African Convention at once exposed it as a devilish plan for the final enslavement of the whole non-white population. It was intended to be a blueprint for the rest of the oppressed non-white peoples in South Africa.

The Transkei was a strategic choice. For years this part of the country had been a veritable cauldron of the liberatory ideas of the All-African Convention and the Unity Movement. It had been the centre of the political boycott movement and opposition to the rehabilitation scheme (a device for the further impoverishment of the already poor peasants by culling their stock further, subdividing their small and inadequate land allotments, demolishing whole villages and removing the population and fencing the commonages so as to regiment and control grazing).

This peasant resistance movement has had its episodes which future historians will record in letters of fire and gold. For instance, in 1948, this movement led to the arrest and prosecution at Mount Ayliff (part of Pondoland) of I.B. Tabata, who was then engaged in the work of organising the peasantry under the banner of the All-African Convention to fight for their right to live as free men and women in their motherland. His dramatic acquittal gave a tremendous impetus to the struggle against the Rehabilitation Scheme in the Transkei and elsewhere.

As the arrogance of the Herrenvolk grew apace like a noxious weed and as the crisis of oppression deepened, so did the forces of resistance consolidate themselves into a solid bloc. Thus, by the time the rulers of South Africa foisted upon the population of the Transkei the fraud of "self-rule" there had been in some areas a sharp division of the population into two categories -- those who accepted oppression and those who were against it -- the collaborators and the Jacobites, as the people called them. Invariably the chiefs fell under the class of collaborators. Moreover, the effects of the general revolt, which reached its climax in Pondoland where several known collaborators were liquidated in 1960, were still being felt throughout the country generally and in the Transkei in particular. Besides, the ruling class know that the struggle for liberation in the reserves of South Africa will come to fruition on the broad back of the peasant movement. In this regard the Transkei could take the lead.

At once the inherent contradictions in the situation emerged. The officially recognised leaders of the people in the Transkei are either policemen-chiefs, headmen or policemen-intellectuals who manned and operated the Bantu Authorities system. Against the wishes of the people they claimed to represent, they accepted the self-rule fraud, thus ensuring the continued domination of the Transkei by the fascist Republic of South Africa. On the other hand, the people were determined to throw off the chains and shackles of domination.

But amongst the accomplices themselves a personality battle arose. From the beginning it was as much a struggle for power as it was a struggle for the tender kiss of the master's jackboot. There was no question of political principle involved. For all accepted the basic position of servitude. Matanzima put himself at the head of one group of quislings while the other preferred to collaborate under the leadership of Victor Poto. The chequered history of both these collaborators was well known to the oppressed people generally although Matanzima had earned for himself the notoriety of being the most hated quisling in South Africa -- the Tshombe of that country. By all considerations, Poto had the best chance in this disgraceful circus. With great expectation he looked forward to the day when he would receive the dubious honour of being referred to as the man who was the first to preside over what was intended to be the funeral rites of the nation.

But the Nationalist wing of the Herrenvolk made one mistake. They did Poto an injustice by thinking he was in opposition to them and they insisted on having their own child in the saddle -- Matanzima. They created a massive machinery which they promptly and vigorously set in motion to boost their quisling child. The press, the radio and every organ of propaganda was pressed into this campaign. The native commissioners and Hans Abraham, Commissioner-General for the Xhosa-speaking group, one of the three watchdogs chosen by Verwoerd to keep watch over his Bantustan kingdom were actively engaged in the task of ensuring that Matanzima got to the top. To the last, Verwoerd's and Vorster's representatives were actively manoeuvring.

This partiality on the part of their common father naturally angered Poto and his disciples, and the South African Liberals and the Progressives wasted no time in exploiting the situation in the interests of Herrenvolkism and capitalism. From now on the stage was set for the formation of political parties in the Transkei on the pattern of existing Herrenvolk political parties in the country.

This had not been contemplated by the authors of the Bantustans. But their brain child had escalated into a tempo of its own. Thus two major parties were formed in the Transkei. Since Matanzima supported and was supported by the Nationalists, Poto would oppose both Matanzima and the Nationalists. Since the United party had by now become indistinguishable from the Nationalist party, Poto would support the Liberals and the Progressives who supported him. Thus did we have the drama of politics played on the South African stage re-enacted in miniature form -- lilliputian caricature to suit the requirements of the Transkei Baboon's Parliament. Poto called his party the Democratic party while the tribal Matanzima called his the Transkei National Independence party. Both these parties reflected the two main wings of the ruling class -- the Liberals and the Apartheidists.

The United party proclaimed its alliance with Verwoerd when its leader, De Villiers Graaff made his now notorious "one man, one vote, over my dead body" speech. The reply to this speech by Poto's party showed how far this group had been alienated. It came from Sabata Dalindyebo who condemned both the Nationalists and the United party and rejected dummy political institutions. He said: "One man, one vote makes the most appeal to me and to many other Africans." He went on, "There is very little difference, if any, between the policy of the party of which he (De Villiers Graaff) is the leader and that of the Nationalists."

We have said that from the very beginning the people themselves were not taken in by the Bantustan fraud. Where they were consulted, they expressed their rejection of his system in no uncertain terms. Both the rulers and the collaborators knew this. The fraud, however, was foisted upon the population. This was only possible because of the general atmosphere of terror that prevailed, not only in the Transkei but throughout the country. There was the shock of the general state of emergency created by the Sabotage Act; there were the bannings, the house arrests, the prosecutions and the hangings; attempts to bludgeon everyone into conformity. In the Transkei itself there was in addition the Emergency Proclamation 400 of 1960 which placed the Transkei under martial law as a result of the application of which hundreds of innocent people were then apprehended and are now still languishing and rotting in the jails of the Transkei. In addition, all channels of protest had been outlawed. All this had the effect of submerging the voice of criticism.

During the elections themselves there was general intimidation; and incidents of actual assault on the opposition have been recorded. In Matanzima's area, for example, those who urged others to vote against

Matanzima were publicly assaulted. Elsewhere the people were told to vote or face dire consequences, including loss of "rights" in their areas.

Despite all this, however, attempts were made to boycott the elections. The boycott movement was inspired by the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa (APDUSA), an affiliate of the Unity Movement of South Africa. In Pondoland where this Movement was strongest, impias [warriors] were sent out to intimidate those who showed reluctance to vote and cow down the opposition. But in some areas, notably Mqanduli, whole villages stayed away from the polls.

Pressure was brought to bear upon all layers in the Transkei to vote for Matanzima and his men. The chiefs in particular came under fire. Chief Havington Zulu, a member of Poto's party has this to say on the subject: "I was nearly dismissed by the Republican Government for fighting against rehabilitation. I was called an underground Poqo. Chiefs who joined the Democratic party were threatened with dismissal from their positions. At Umtata I was taken into a dark house and questioned by people I could not see. They urged me to support Chief Kaiser Matanzima because he had saved me from dismissal."

Matanzima himself in one of his more boastful moments has said: "I have a keen eye on chiefs and will protect them. I have files on all chiefs and headmen and I am keen to see how they work."

In spite of all these machinations by the South African fascist government, the people themselves remain resolute. When the results of the mock general election were announced they showed that of the 45 elected members, 38 supported Poto. Matanzima had his greatest support from the 64 puppet chiefs, who are recognised or appointed by the government of South Africa and paid by it as its servants. The final result was a 54 to 49 victory for Matanzima over Poto. Thus the chiefs supported the Broederbond-backed candidates while the people rejected them.

In the by-election that took place in Gcalekaland, following the shooting by unknown persons of one of Matanzima's followers, Chief Mlingo Salakupatwa, in April, 1964, Matanzima's candidate, Majavu was defeated by Poto's candidate, Moses Dumalisile by 7,434 votes. The actual votes were 36,137 for Dumalisile and 28,703 for Majavu. The election itself was the first to be conducted on a party political basis. The people were called upon to choose between two policies. They voted against apartheid in all its connotations.

Here again intimidation and pressure were used in favour of Matanzima's man. On the eve of the by-election, Matanzima in his capacity as Chief Minister of the Transkei Bantustan sent the following letter to the chiefs and headmen in Gcalekaland:

Chief Minister's Office,
Transkei Government,
Umtata.

6th Oct. 1964

Chief Headmen,
Gcaleka Region

Re: Gcalekaland By-election.

As you are aware the By-election is close at hand. I advise all chiefs and Headmen to beware of Jackals that will turn against their own people. The usual practice of these Jackals is to lead the people into difficult positions where they will find themselves chased by the police. These Jackals bring about trouble between the chiefs and their people.

Stand with the Government if you wish to lead a happy and contented life because these Jackals themselves are being hounded by the police as they have communists sheltered under their blankets.

Vote for Paul Majavu, who is supported by Paramount Chief Zwelidumile Sigcawu and also by the Chief Minister of Transkei.

Let all sub-headmen be busy on the day of the by-election and see to it that the people are not misled.

(signed) K.D. Matanzima

Chief Minister of the Transkei.

Following upon this directive by the collaborator-in-chief, chiefs and headmen in Gcalekaland got busy; but their advice and instructions were deliberately rejected by the people.

The oppressed people of South Africa have moved on to the offensive. The initiative is theirs and the Herrenvolk cannot do anything about it. Although the governing wing of the Herrenvolk has not publicly acknowledged this fact, it has by its actions given it tacit recognition. For example, members of Poto's Democratic party, acting under pressure from the mass of the population, have with impunity condemned, rejected and publicly criticised and characterised as traitors to the cause of the liberation of the oppressed, the chiefs who follow Matanzima. Yet, in the face of these "treasonable acts" the Government has not been prepared to invoke the tyranny of the notorious emergency Proclamation 400 of 1960 which makes any criticism of a chief or headman a criminal and punishable offence. This despite Matanzima's request that its oppressive provisions be applied against his opponents.

Thus in his election manifesto in respect of the by-election referred to above, Moses Dumalisili was able to demand full ownership of land, abolition of job-apartheid and influx control regulations, universal education as opposed to African, Indian, Coloured and European education -- education to fit the child in a plural society; equal pay for equal work and equal qualifications, repeal of the rehabilitation scheme; repeal of Proclamation 400 and the institution of a truly national parliament. He demanded "one parliament -- not a parliament for Africans in the Transkei in Umtata, and a white parliament in Cape Town."

Speaking of Proclamation 400 and lack of freedom of speech and movement in the "self-ruling" Transkei, another one of Poto's men, O.O. Mpondo, had this to say recently: "There is no freedom in the Transkei. There has been a state of emergency since 1960. But we are prepared to go to jail in the struggle for liberation of all people in South Africa. We are prepared to die in carrying out the wishes of the party."

Another high-ranking official of Poto's party who is also a member of Steytler's reactionary Progressive party, the Rev. Benjamin S. Rajuili said in East London recently: "No chief can supersede the voice of the people. The people are now turning against their chiefs who want to carry out the wishes and whims of the South African government. To those chiefs who do not carry out the wishes of their people the emergency regulations are a boon."

Much of this, coming as it does from the opportunistic lips of incorrigible collaborators is so much lip service. But the fact that these turncoats have found it necessary to mouth these noble sentiments is significant of the mood of the teeming millions of the non-white oppressed people who have pledged themselves to fight for the realisation of a new way of life in South Africa. Under the banner of the All-African Convention, the Unity Movement and APDUSA, the nation is being galvanised for a final showdown with the Herrenvolk and their agents. The ideas of equality and freedom have become a living reality in our country. Even Matanzima has to represent his shameful collaboration as the royal road to "freedom." He declares: "The policy of multiracialism. . . is nothing else but an instrument of African oppression." And again: "It is clear that the Democratic party with its liberal policy, is determined to abolish chieftainship and African traditions. The people of the Transkei will defend any attempt to attack their traditions and customs." Once again the barbarian is invoking the dead gods of tribalism, the kaross and the voodoo cult despite the encompassing rays of the midday sun of scientific and technological development of the twentieth century.

Faced with the same dilemma, the architects and builders of the superstructure of apartheid that is now crumbling down like a house of cards, have of late been acting in rather strange ways. Not only have they refused to apply the sjambok [leather whip] in the Transkei as requested by their minion, Matanzima, but also throughout the country

they have manifested a softening up attitude towards the non-whites, which is a necessity imposed upon them by the circumstances in which they find themselves. The same situation has actuated the army chief, Fouché, to warn his fellow fascists that it will not pay them to shut their eyes to the reality of liberal ideas in the world. It seems that the Broederbond has decided that the steely hand of domination does not work effectively without the velvet glove. It seems that they have decided that the best way to win collaborators and influence political enemies is to woo and cajole them.

Thus during the Dingaans' Day celebrations -- those occasions on which the Afrikaner volk normally display their boorish arrogance -- some of the leading members of the Nationalist party and the government made certain pronouncements which normally should have brought upon their heads the wrath and resentment of all Afrikanerdom.

To take one example. The Minister of Bantu Education and Indian Affairs, W.A. Maree, spoke up against the way in which certain whites treat non-whites, particularly Africans. He said: "I am worried by their behaviour, not only on behalf of the non-whites but also on behalf of us whites (our emphasis). He referred to an incident that took place in Pretoria, where a few young constables drove a police van straight at a small crowd of Africans sitting on a pavement. He said: "They stopped in front of the Africans with screeching brakes and jumped out to inspect the men's reference books (domestic passes). After looking at the first book, the one constable just dropped it on the ground and left it lying there. Of course, not all of us are guilty of this sort of thing but there are individuals who do it -- how many young boys are there who do not boast the way in which they or their fathers beat up an African?"

This from a man who only recently would ban even the shaking of hands between whites and non-whites.

The chief actors in the drama which unfolds in the Transkei are all playing up to the population that is poised for the complete and final overthrow of domination and for the realisation of democracy for all, not in the Transkei but in South Africa as a whole.

MADRID STUDENTS SCORE A VICTORY

A two-day demonstration by students in Madrid February 18-19 ended in a victory. When a series of lectures entitled "Toward a Genuine Peace," were banned, two thousand students walked two kilometers to the rectorate shouting, "Down with the rector," "Democracy, yes, dictatorship, no." The next day they continued in the corridors, shouting similar slogans. The rector gave in. A theologian, R. P. Gonzales Ruiz, gave the first lecture, ending by saying that in fighting "religious alienation" it was all right to struggle together with "the Marxists."

WORKERS CONTROL ADVOCATED IN ALGERIA

[The following article has been translated from the February issue of the Bulletin de l'Autogestion (Bulletin of Self-management), published by the Frantz-Fanon Co-operative in Algiers. The article appeared under the title, "Le Contrôle Ouvrier Est Une Etape Necessaire à la Révolution Socialiste" (Workers Control Is a Necessary Stage in the Socialist Revolution).]

* * *

The idea of workers control in the capitalist sector of our economy is growing in popularity by leaps and bounds in the working class. The militants of the UGTA [Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens] and the party [the Front de Libération Nationale] understand that self-management cannot really triumph unless the capitalist sector of the economy is controlled in such a way that the employers, in complicity with counterrevolutionaries hidden in the state apparatus, cannot block its march forward. Several months ago, our vanguard trade-union sectors, particularly in the oil industry, asked for a broadening of the powers of the enterprise committees which up to now have served as a transitional institution leaving the economic power of the bourgeoisie untouched. Since close to eighty per cent of the national industry is in the hands of foreign and national capitalists, revolutionary measures must be undertaken if we expect to save industrial self-management from the terrible competition deriving from the capitalist industrial sector.

That is why in No. 2 [January] of this Bulletin of Self-Management we drew attention to the idea of workers control. We are able to report with satisfaction that since then, this idea has been picked up by many militants, including an important part of the working class still exploited by the industrial bourgeoisie. For several months some of the trade-union sectors have stressed the necessity of organizing workers control in the private enterprises. The national press has published accounts of this which we cite below. The importance of this idea is evident to everyone, particularly in recent weeks when workers control has been requested in numerous enterprises and explained in trade-union congresses.

One of the first to suggest workers control was the union at Renault-Algérie. At a General Assembly on May 20, 1964, the Renault section passed a motion in which it "asked the government to promulgate a law instituting workers control in the non self-managed enterprises." (In Le Peuple and Alger Républicain, May 28, 1964.)

At the congress of the Regional Union of Algiers, a delegate spoke on workers control (see Le Peuple, September 7, 1964): "Another participant," writes Le Peuple, "proposed instituting workers councils to control the employers' management (handling of funds, profits) in the capitalist plants." In a study on the industrial zone of Rouiba-

Réghai, Le Peuple concluded with an article September 25, 1964, entitled: "Enterprise and Workers' Control Committee in Employers' Management" in which it was shown that the broadening of the powers of the enterprise committees must aim at giving them power of decision in the economic area, thus putting into practice workers control over production.

The Federation of Oil Workers at the time of their national congress (beginning of October) launched the idea of joint management. The press commented on this slogan as being "a form of workers control."

Many studies and documents on the oil industry in the press have shown that the objective there, too, is to broaden the power of the enterprise committees.

Recently workers control was discussed at the congress of the UGTA. At the congress of the Lumber and Building Workers, a delegate declared, Le Peuple reports: "The private and self-managed enterprises must participate in elaborating national planning so that the plan will be of effective economic force. In the plants and industrial complexes, the UGTA must be able to propose delegates able to intervene in administering the plan. In order to make it imperative to apply the plan in the private sector, we propose that the UGTA organize effective workers control in the private enterprises, by granting broad powers to the enterprise committees, which, under union auspices, must become management bodies." (Also see Alger Républicain of the same date.)

A few days later, the congress of the EGA [Electricité et Gaz d'Algérie] workers continued the discussion on workers control, not only in the capitalist sector but also in the state sector of the economy. Thus an Algiers delegate said (see the reports in Le Peuple and Alger Républicain for December 12, 1964): "In our particular case of struggling against the bureaucracy, management by the ranks is required, and we must create the organisms to give us the right to control and to manage EGA as a whole. It's up to the congress to concretize these measures by forging the instruments to apply them."

With regard to workers control in the private sector, the same report stressed: "For the unions in the front line of the struggle in capitalist production, workers control of production, of merchandising and of planning is the most important task, if we want to meet the constant sabotage of our economy by the employers who have not understood and will doubtlessly never understand that our socialist option is irreversible."

The question was considered so important that the EGA workers in the port of Algiers proposed a motion concerning the line that the Federation of the EGA should support at the second national congress of the UGTA -- workers control organized by the UGTA. Here is the motion:

"In view of the coming congress of the UGTA, the second national

Congress of the EGA, meeting December 10, 11, 12 and 13 in Algiers, passes the following resolutions:

"--Whereas it is necessary to carry out the Charter of Algiers in practice;

"--And the national mass organizations control the state apparatus but imperfectly;

"--And the UGTA includes in its ranks the workers of field and industry:

"(1) Proposes that the UGTA sit with full rights in all the state organisms and that the National Assembly be composed essentially of workers and poor peasants.

"(2) On the capitalist enterprises.

"Without opposing working with bosses who are 'willing to play the game,' we hold that workers control of production, merchandising and planning is the only worthwhile guarantee to prevent injury to our socialist option.

"The Federation of the EGA goes on record to struggle henceforth to put the UGTA congress in March 1965 on the axis of these two fundamental problems."

In recent days, a series of strikes was unleashed in the capitalist industrial sector (at Durafour, SATI-Michelin, Saints-Frères, even in the nationalized Minoteries because of a bureaucratized management uncontrolled by the ranks of the workers). With regard to this the daily Alger Ce Soir of December 15, 1964, ran a headline on the WORKERS CONTROL requested by the 600 workers of SATI-Michelin who "are raising the problem of broadening the rights of the enterprise committee to include control of the management of the business."

It has been established that WORKERS CONTROL has sunk deeply into the consciousness of the working class. That the workers under self-management or in the state sector likewise propose that this idea should be discussed only illustrates the profound unity of our masses on the same objectives: to lay the foundations of a socialist economy. Workers control has been directly linked to the problem of planning. In truth it is impossible to plan an industrial economy, eighty per cent of which is held by the employers, whose antinational attitude now needs no demonstration. On the other hand, the sector of these employers who accept our fundamental option and conform with the requirements of a national plan, can find a place during the transition period. But without real workers control, the industrial and agrarian bourgeoisie will continue their tendency to anarchistically exploit our natural resources and our workers.

To safeguard self-management from the disloyal competition of capitalism; to organize national planning quickly; to make socialism irreversible in our country; let's organize WORKERS CONTROL in the capitalist plants.

CAN THE DOLLAR STAND ANY MORE INVESTMENT ABROAD?

One of the compensations of being a socialist is that no matter how difficult the problems of the movement may be, at least you don't have to try to solve the problems of capitalism. Take, for instance, the latest one handed to President Johnson concerning the diminishing stock of gold at Fort Knox.

On February 18 he called 370 industrialists and bankers into the White House. He wanted them to help him attack the drain on American dollars and gold by resisting the temptation to make loans and investments abroad. One of the main leaks from the United States is private capital. Johnson noted that it increased by \$2,000,000,000 last year.

"I want you to go back to your offices," he told his guests, "and call in your controllers and your vice presidents. I want you to ask them to consult every time they face a decision that involves sending money abroad. And I count on you to cut those outflows to the bone."

"I know this will involve some pain," he said firmly. "And it will mean passing up a few opportunities for profits. But, in the end, your country, your industry and your stockholders will all be better off for it."

Johnson put it all on a voluntary basis; but he made it clear to the group of industrial and financial wolves that if they don't reform he will propose legislation to curb them from sending capital outside the United States. Whether the pack displayed fear at this threat was not reported by the press.

Last year the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was \$3,000,000,000; so even if Johnson won all the bankers and industrialists to "join hands with me in a voluntary partnership" to block the outflow of private capital, his problem would still not be solved.

There is another outflow in which he happens to exercise considerable direct control, or very influential control through Congress. This is the outflow of U.S. military expenditures abroad. For the fiscal year 1964-65 total foreign "aid" approved by Congress amounted to \$3,200,000,000 -- a little more than the balance-of-payments deficit. What proportion of this covers legitimate assistance projects like

grain for India's famine-stricken millions is not easily ascertainable; but it is minor. Most of the outflow covers military hardware and personal spending money for a big stable of noisome puppets, beginning with Chiang Kai-shek.

In addition, the U.S. has its own military bases and installations, extending in a global network up to the frontiers of Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and China. Billions of dollars pour into this. Then there is the CIA, which can topple governments with the undisclosed funds at its disposal.

So why doesn't Johnson attack the drain of dollars and gold in this area? The reason is very simple. The billions of dollars pouring into these military expenditures, these war preparations, these interventions in the internal affairs of other countries, all go for one purpose -- to make it safe for American bankers and industrialists to invest private capital abroad!

If you don't understand that, you don't understand the first principles of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier and the Great Society, not to speak of the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, NATO, MLF and the Alliance for Progress. It was to make the world safe for American investments that Roosevelt plunged the U.S. into World War II with the end result of saving the Mikado and the Krupp family fortune. For the same reason, Truman went into Korea; Eisenhower and Kennedy into South Vietnam. It is why Johnson is considering plunging into North Vietnam and China, why he joined with Belgian imperialism in setting up Tshombe in the Congo, and why he hailed the overthrow of the Goulart government in Brazil last April.

In the light of Johnson's effort to make the bankers and industrialists see the crucial need to come to the aid of their country, their industries and their stockholders by cutting down drastically on foreign investments, we can finally divine the real reason for the enormously expensive blockade around Cuba.

It's not part of an effort to crush the Castro regime and thus open up Cuba once more to a flow of dollars. That would be unpatriotic as well as injurious to business and the stockholders. The true purpose is to keep the Wall Street bankers from undermining the American dollar through their well-known propensity to feed private capital into Cuba.

To quote Johnson's grim words to his profit-loving, investment-minded audience: "As President, I pledge whatever actions prove necessary to keep our economy strong and our dollar sound."

CUBA TACKLES THE PROBLEM OF BUREAUCRACY

MEXICO CITY -- In the proletarian revolution, an internal struggle is required against the bureaucracy that arises in the revolutionary process itself. In the decisive initial period in a colonial country, the revolution struggles with all its force against the external foe and its national bourgeois allies. Upon the consolidation of victory, the people turn their eyes to what has been accomplished by the revolution within the country.

Rooted in the international level, the proletarian energy penetrates the anticapitalist economic and social structure. With the same intransigence with which it struggled against imperialism, it now begins the battle for democracy and equality within its own ranks.

The biggest obstacle it encounters in the new stage is the bureaucratic social layer formed in the shelter of the revolutionary institutions. Made up of "functionaries" of the revolution, this sector does not appear openly counterrevolutionary. It is filled with the most rigid "Marxist Leninists" anxious to continually demonstrate their "revolutionary" wisdom. The bureaucrats can be former revolutionists but in the most part their ranks are made up of petty-bourgeois newcomers of all kinds who have recognized that the revolution is an accomplished fact, and who "joined up" without waiting. Generally they have not participated in the action that engendered the movement; there are even "revolutionary" bureaucrats who were notorious counterrevolutionaries on the eve of the popular triumph.

The Cuban Revolution did not escape this law, as shown by the experience crystallized in the speech of Fidel Castro on January 2.

That Fidel Castro is conscious of the problem of bureaucracy, of its rise within the revolutionary process, is proved by the following:

"What fault must we eradicate? You would say bureaucratism? There we are in absolute agreement.

"But how are we going to do this? By creating unemployment, laying off people? No! We must not do it that way. . . It would not be correct; it would not be just; because, gentlemen, if we are going to lay off anyone, we should begin by laying ourselves off first of all, because we are the ones who created bureaucratism. Certainly, bureaucratism came from the past, but in some cases we developed it, and in others we didn't fight it in an effective way." (Emphasis added.)

This indisputable fact did not prevent Castro from denouncing the phenomenon with all his characteristic vehemence. Going to the heart of the problem, he declared: "We must not confound administration with bureaucratism. Bureaucratism is in the first place a concept, the belief that everything is done from an office, a complete, hundred-

per-cent petty-bourgeois concept -- the world made in the image and likeness of a petty bourgeois, from an office, with the whole atmosphere and surroundings that are not proletarian surroundings. Second: it is the hypertrophy of certain administrative functions, often the product of the concept which we have created in these six years."

The administrative functions are indispensable. But their "hypertrophy" implies the appearance of "parasitic organisms, that is, unproductive organisms, which can also be created under socialism." This parasitic sector, which usurps resources that could be utilized to raise the standard of living of the producers, must be combatted. No injury must be done to elements indispensable for the construction of socialism. Still more, its growth places in danger the principles of socialism itself, deforming them and bringing about the reappearance of social inequalities.

This danger which confronts all victorious revolutions (above all in backward countries) is consciously stressed by Fidel when he exclaims with exceptional vigor and clarity: "I believe with all my heart that socialism has to guard itself against bureaucratism as much as against imperialism. This must not be forgotten, because it is a clandestine enemy. You have heard millions of people speak against imperialism. How many have you heard speak against bureaucratism?... Certainly, certainly, they are few. But it is a great evil which we have not taken into account, of which we are not conscious. And, nevertheless, it is an extreme evil; it upsets production; it consumes much of the energy of the people." (Emphasis added.)

The measures to take against it? Fidel proposes an amplification of popular culture, the elevation of the political level of the masses.

The entire thrust of the speech, however, was to go beyond this, for Fidel raised in principle the Bolshevik concept of socialist democracy as opposed to the arbitrariness and authoritarianism of the period under Stalin.

But what repercussions will this have in the official bureaucratized Communist movement, particularly in the superbureaucratized workers states?

Through allusions that were nevertheless very clear to those "who have ears to hear," Fidel expressed his opposition to the bureaucratic methods common in the socialist camp.

Referring to the necessity to work out a "concrete" policy that takes into account the particular situation of a given nation and party, without taking orders from anyone divorced from experience, Castro cryptically replied to the Soviet pressure (indirect in the best of cases) on him to take a position openly against the Chinese.

Most important of all, however, was what he said about the Soviet and general "socialist" aid to Cuba. Admitting its essential importance for the survival of the revolutionary island, he elaborated a quite improbable hypothesis but one which served to show his opposition to a position maintained sotto voce in Communist party circles. It is irresponsibly affirmed there that Cuba owes its very existence to the USSR. Conclusion: the Cubans must be uncritical in their support of the Soviet Union. They even go so far as to claim that Cuba is treated in a different way, that it lives at the expense of the socialist world, that trade between the island and the "socialist camp" is unilaterally in favor of the former.

Fidel clearly replied to these anti-Cuban "rumors" in stating that even "if" there had been neither a socialist camp nor socialist aid, Cuba would have survived.

In Cuba in 1965 some of the most important problems are being raised, not only for Cuba itself but for the whole Hemisphere and the other workers states. On a continental scale the struggle is between the Revolution and "peaceful coexistence" in the class struggle. In the island republic the struggle is between workers democracy and bureaucratic inequality. The outcome of this struggle can have wide repercussions throughout the noncapitalist world and in still broader areas.

NEXT WEEK

"Once Again on the Situation in the Angolan Movement,"
by Livio Maitan. A cogent analysis of differences that have
appeared among the freedom fighters.