

# WORLD OUTLOOK

## PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Vol. 3, No. 9

March 5, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
Behind Johnson's Secrecy .....	1
Student Agitation Rises in Spain .....	7
Walloon Section of New Socialist Party Founded in Belgium .....	11
After Wilson's "Hundred Days" -- by T.J.Peters .....	12
The U.S. "Victory" at Dong Hoi .....	14
The March 1 Meeting in Moscow .....	15
One of Malcolm X's Last Interviews .....	18
Malcolm X -- American Negro Fighter -- by Evelyn Sell .....	20
Alexander Defense Committee Formed in New York .....	24
Canadian Poets Aid Alexander Case .....	25
"Cittá Futura" Stirs Controversy in Italian CP .....	25
Dispute Sharpens Between French CP and Youth -- by Pierre Frank .....	27
For the White House Suggestion Box .....	28
Left-Wing Communists Witch-Hunted in India -- by S.R.Singh .....	29
Victory of a "Barefoot People" .....	33
Once Again on the Situation in the Angolan Movement -- by Livio Maitan .....	34

### BEHIND JOHNSON'S SECRECY

The respite in the Vietnam crisis provided by the last coup d'état turned out to be only too brief. The Johnson administration has resumed where it left off. Jet planes manned by American aviators are now systematically bombing targets in South Vietnam. With this move the White House ended the lying pretense about American troops being only "advisers" in the civil war. On the domestic front, Johnson issued a "White Paper" February 27 that sought to justify the dirty colonial war which Washington is now openly waging in Southeast Asia.

As yet, President Johnson has not seen fit to give out any information about his aims in this bloody conflict. The pressure for facts, however, has been very heavy. As a result unofficial accounts are now being "leaked," and the American public is getting an inkling of the monstrous game afoot. To the New York Times goes credit for finally breaking through in its campaign to at least find out where the United States is being led. Two articles, one from correspondent Robert Kleiman in Saigon, the other by the Times military editor, Hanson W. Baldwin, are so informative that they deserve extensive quotation. Both articles appeared in the March 2 issue of the international edition.

Kleiman reveals that the "highest American and Vietnamese officials" in Saigon said March 1 that they are "virtually certain" that "President Johnson has decided to open a continuing but limited air war against North Vietnam. . . ." In fact "instructions" were received from Washington in mid-February "to prepare the first air strike of the new series -- a joint American-South Vietnamese strike that was postponed during the abortive Feb. 19 Saigon coup and for which new orders now are awaited daily."

The "latest version" of the plan was submitted to Johnson in December. "Earlier last year, the project was known as the 'McNamara-McGeorge Bundy plan.'" [This confirms deductions made in World Outlook February 19.]

During the election, nothing was done about the plan. "But as soon as the election was over, two of the State Department's most brilliant young Asian experts sparked a new draft which, for the first time, won unanimous interagency agreement both in Washington and Saigon."

This plan was to offer North Vietnam some attractive bait in return for capitulation -- Washington is said to believe that Hanoi has absolute control over the freedom fighters in South Vietnam. The offer "was to be made even more attractive by opening a low-intensity war against North Vietnam."

"The idea was to reply to Hanoi's continuing, surreptitious, undeclared ground war against South Vietnam not with tit-for-tat blows set off only when Americans were injured but with a continuing, surreptitious, undeclared war against North Vietnam as already was being carried on in Laos." (We thus, learn, in passing, that the U.S. is waging a deliberate, undeclared war on Laos!)

"Attacks would neither be announced nor officially admitted. Raids, two or three a week, were to start near the 17th Parallel border with South Vietnam. These were to remain restricted initially to a few planes -- a 24-plane raid is by far the biggest yet employed in Laos -- striking at the bottom third of North Vietnam south of the 19th Parallel."

The "limit" would thus be the "19th Parallel." Something else was involved, however. "More important, the 19th Parallel limit would support assurances to Moscow and Peking that the raids were aimed neither at China nor at the destruction of the Hanoi regime."

It is thus quite clear that warmongers deliberately plotted to have the United States attack North Vietnam. These warmongers included President Johnson, who shelved the warmongering plot until after the election was safely over. Then he put it into action.

The article by Hanson W. Baldwin, which is a long one, marshals all the arguments in favor of going ahead with this war plot. The central thesis is that it is worth running the risk of a world war for the sake of the possible "gains" in Southeast Asia. Baldwin, it should be observed, does not represent the more reckless wing of the American military caste. He was among those in 1945 who deplored Truman's use of atomic weapons in Japan as a very serious "mistake" from the military point of view.

Baldwin puts the case for going ahead now. "And if we will not fight in Vietnam, where -- after the series of Communist conquests in the past 20 years -- will we fight? Where will we draw the line?" He is against any course that would give the United States a "portrait of flabby indecision."

He readily admits that "in itself" South Vietnam is not vital to the United States. "But if lost we would be forced to commence the next chapter of the world conflict in retreat, and at a disadvantage."

Baldwin takes up the various counter arguments and answers them one by one. In so doing he provides us with a good indication of the discussion now going on among top ruling circles in the United States. This is most instructive.

To the demand to "negotiate now," Baldwin declares that it is impossible because the U.S. "would lead from weakness, not strength." To change the situation "we shall have to raise our ante considerably."

If the French couldn't win, how can the U.S. expect to?

There is no comparison between French and American power, says Baldwin. "Particularly in the air and at sea we can mobilize power completely unavailable to France, backed up by the ultimate force which France did not possess -- a nuclear arsenal."

But you can't win a war against guerrillas.

"Not true. We have dressed up the fighting in Vietnam with a fancy name -- 'counter-insurgency,' -- but some of its basic

military elements resemble the kind of war Americans have fought successfully many times in the past in Nicaragua, Haiti and behind the main fighting fronts during the Korean War. Other anti-Communist guerrilla wars were won in Greece, the Philippines and Malaya.

"The Portuguese seem to have done a pretty good job of stamping out the rebellion in Angola. Guerrillas can be defeated, but it takes careful organization, special training and security forces that should be from 10 to 30 times larger than the guerrillas. It takes infinite determination and patience."

But to continue fighting or to expand the conflict will mean higher U.S. casualties and greater risks of expanding the war.

"Of course. You cannot win a war without spilling blood. We must pay the price of power. . . . In Vietnam, the longer we wait, the greater the price we shall have to pay for even partial victory (as we are now discovering), and the more restricted our choice of options."

What about the moral problem? The U.S. has "no moral right to be in Vietnam, or to attack North Vietnam."

"If we are inhibited from action by Hamlet-like indecision over legalistic concepts of international law, we shall lose the world."

On the difficulties created by the political instability in South Vietnam, Baldwin has a crushing rejoinder:

"Yet somehow or other the war has gone on, and somewhat better in some respects recently. Greater United States involvement -- above all, a tangible determination to win -- may well do more for Saigon's political stability than any amount of diplomatic pressures."

Not even the real danger of escalation and the possibility of a war with China moves Baldwin.

"This is the \$64 million question. It is quite clear that if the United States becomes more involved we must be prepared for greater effort by the enemy. Escalation in some form would be not only possible, but likely. But we have advantages. We are fighting as we did in Korea, on a peninsula where our superior sea and air power can be most effective.

"North Vietnam's few power plants and industries are vulnerable to destruction. The Gulf of Tonkin is easily blockaded. And China itself, with an obsolete air force and minimal naval power could not defend itself effectively against a determined air and sea attack. . . . It is quite possible that the United States might become involved in a new kind of Korean war. But this would not be

hopeless by any means."

The specter of nuclear weapons and the Soviet Union joining in does not disturb Baldwin greatly either.

"There is no certain answer to these questions, but a full scale nuclear war is highly unlikely. The United States has scared itself to death by its own nuclear propaganda. . . .

"Is it in any way probable that the Kremlin would risk for Vietnam what it would not risk for Cuba? . . .

"We must also remember the risks of delay. If there is a danger of nuclear retaliation today by Peking, how much greater will it be tomorrow when China will have accumulated a stockpile of weapons? Time is restricting our options.

"Clearly, then, the stakes in Vietnam are large enough to warrant the risks of greater United States involvement. . . . 'More of the same' on our part will no longer serve any purpose, save slow defeat."

This military expert, who, like Hitler, as Trotsky once described him, has no heart and an adding machine for a brain, outlines his own proposals. These in all likelihood reflect the thinking of the more "sober" wing of the Pentagon.

"First and foremost, we must recognize as a Government and as a people that we are fighting a war in Vietnam, not merely 'advising' how to fight one." This, he holds, would arouse determination, inspire an official enunciation of purpose and "create a more streamlined military operation in Vietnam."

Greater "security" measures must be taken. American infantry must be brought in.

"Continuous and heavy air and sea attacks against staging areas, supply routes, training fields, camps and recuperation centers of the Vietcong in North and South Vietnam and Laos will be necessary. . . ."

"The history of air power dictates the need for unrelenting massive attacks. Bombing targets in North Vietnam probably would have to be broadened to include power plants, bridges, industries, road junctions, docks and oil storage facilities. A naval blockade and naval gunfire may well supplement the air bombardment. To carry out effectively any such program as this, United States air and naval forces in the Western Pacific would require material strengthening."

This would include "United States ground troops -- perhaps in small numbers at first, but more later, particularly if North Viet-

namese regular forces and Chinese soldiers joined the Vietcong."

What would be the size of this commitment?

"How many United States soldiers would be needed is uncertain. . . perhaps 200,000 to 1,000,000 Americans would be fighting in Vietnam."

Those figures say a great deal and Baldwin knows it.

"Obviously, this would mean a Korea-type conflict, a major war, no matter what euphemisms would be used. Nor could we wage it in the present 'business-as-usual' economy. We would require partial mobilization, vastly beefed-up military production. Many weaknesses in our military structure would need strengthening. Even so, we could not anticipate quick success. The war would be long, nasty and wearing.

"No one could relish such a prospect as this; the stark statistics of war explain the President's reluctance to embark upon a path that has no turning."

Baldwin ends his article like a true militarist:

"Vietnam is a nasty place to fight. But there are no neat and tidy battlefields in the struggle for freedom; there is no 'good' place to die. And it is far better to fight in Vietnam -- on China's doorstep -- than fight some years hence in Hawaii, on our own frontiers."

In brief, what Baldwin is advocating is a "preventive" war at the risk of precipitating World War III and a nuclear holocaust.

The key piece in this monstrous calculation is the attitude of the Soviet Union. Baldwin only hints at it. For further information, we must turn to Raymond Cartier in the February 27 issue of the weekly Paris Match. Cartier maintains that the ultimate objective of Johnson's policy of widening the war is only to sit down at the round table and negotiate from a "position of strength."

"From all the evidence," he declares, "this audacious and astute combination rests on tacit Russian agreement. They reason, they talk, and above all they act in Washington as if this agreement were taken for granted. They don't believe for a second that the Soviets will furnish Ho Chi Minh with offensive arms enabling him to reply effectively. . . They hardly envisage the Russians replying by shifting the conflict to Europe and reopening, as a beginning, the Berlin dispute. . .

"But an error in the calculated risk, in the forecast of the unleashing of thrusts, in the evaluation of what remains of the solidarity still uniting Russia and China can have tragic consequences for the entire world."

The truth is, however, that either of two immediate possible turns can cause the White House to hesitate and even retreat -- a further rise in the revolution in South Vietnam or the sending of massive Soviet aid to North Vietnam. Either or both of these turns would not cause American imperialism to give up its long-range war plans, but it would cause the Washington warmongers to once again ask their electronic computers if this were not the wrong front at the wrong time, as they did in Korea.

The spotlight thus shifts to Moscow, where the heads of the Soviet bureaucracy are now confronted with a problem perhaps even graver than in 1938-39 when Hitler was preparing for his eventual attack on the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, other pressures are rising against the Washington warmongers. In the United States itself, the rulers have not yet achieved a common view on whether it is advisable to plunge ahead at the present time. Among the people, a few courageous voices are being heard, and a few demonstrations are to be noted. Never, in the history of the United States, has the country been brought so close to a major war with public sentiment so clearly against it on an overwhelming scale, as was just registered in the presidential election.

Abroad there is not a single big capitalist power that really supports the United States in Vietnam. Not even the Wilson government, which enjoys nothing so much as getting down on all fours and licking Johnson's cowboy boots in public, is really for his policy. Throughout the rest of the world the condemnation of the insane war adventure is universal.

These forces, if they are registered loudly enough and emphatically enough, can strengthen and hearten the opposition in the United States to such an extent as to convince the Texas gambler that the odds in the game of Russian roulette he is playing are not five to one, but just the reverse.

#### STUDENT AGITATION RISES IN SPAIN

The Franco regime is facing what the Paris daily Le Monde [March 2] describes as the strongest wave of agitation among the students since the victory of fascism in Spain.

The demonstrations began in Madrid January 26 when students participated with workers in demanding trade-union freedom. They flared again February 12 with a demonstration in Quevedo Plaza in which 2,500 students participated. On February 18 the rector at the University of Madrid cancelled a series of lectures. This touched

off a wave of protest and official reprisals that has been mounting on a day-to-day basis since then.

The demonstrations have increased in size, have begun to take on strong political coloration, and have made several test appearances in the streets of Madrid. The students have set up a structure that could easily become permanent.

They are now meeting with a sympathetic response elsewhere in Spain. On March 2, students in Barcelona, Bilbao, Valladolid and Zaragoza were reported in action.

### Franco's Cabinet Meets

Franco's cabinet was rumored to have held a special meeting February 26 to consider the alarming reports. The decision, according to the best information available, was to follow a "hard line" and to maintain the Caudillo's "principle of authority."

On February 18, some 2,000 students marched two kilometers in a snowstorm from the school of sciences to the rectorate to protest cancellation of the last of two lectures in a series entitled "Toward a Genuine Peace." Among their slogans was "Democracy, yes; dictatorship, no."

They followed this up the next day by milling through the corridors, shouting, "Down with the rector!" "Freedom of expression!" "Conference, yes; academic investigation, no!" (An investigation had been threatened.)

The dean heard a delegation but told them the ban would be upheld. They thereupon marched to the assembly room. There they were greeted by a surprise. The rector had conceded!

Theologian Gonzalez Ruiz went ahead with his talk, "The Christian Vision and Religious Alienation." On ending, he declared: "Within the framework of the most pure Christian theology, you can struggle honestly against all forms of religious alienation, together with the Marxists."

On February 20, some 3,000 assembled to hear Mariano Aguilar Navarro, a Christian Democrat, on "The Christian Democracy." They were told that the ban was again in effect.

### "Assembly of Free Students"

The assembly thereupon declared itself to be an "assembly of free students" and things now took a sharper turn.

On February 22, when some 1,500 again sought to meet as an "assembly of free students," their way was barred by the police. The shout went up, "Democracy, yes; dictatorship, no!"



Two days later, 5,000 students made a silent march to the office of the rectorate to place before him the resolutions taken at a second meeting of the "First Free Assembly of Professors and Students."

They were led by four professors of the school of philosophy and letters: José Luis Lopez Arauguren, Santiago Montero Diaz, Jesús Garcia Calvo, and Roberto Garcia de Vercher.

The police intervened. The four professors were arrested along with twenty-five students. A hundred students were wounded, twenty of them seriously. Some of the armed police force were also reported to have been injured.

The 5,000 students had met in the school of philosophy and voted for a series of demands. These included union autonomy, total amnesty for arrested students, free expression at the University, freedom of association, reform of the regulations of the University, solidarity with the workers struggling for the same right of trade-union freedom, and finally the right for all social classes to attend the University.

#### "Political Character, Yes!"

Asked whether the assembly had a political character, the students replied unanimously, "Yes!"

The silent march was declared by Professor Garcia Calvo to symbolize "the silence forced upon us."

The marchers were midway to the rectorate when the police blocked them. The students held their ground. At first the armed forces tried to disperse them by using high-pressure streams of icy water from fire hoses. The students resisted this for fifteen minutes until the water ran out. The armed forces then gave the bugle call to charge. Hundreds of police moved in on the students, "brutally beating them," according to an eyewitness account.

On February 25 an academic investigation was begun against the four professors. They were forbidden to show up at school. Ten students were arrested at their rooms. A large armed force occupied the University. The rector banned students from entering any buildings except those of their own schools.

Nevertheless, 3,000 students, working their way through windows, and obscure corridors, by-passed the police and held another meeting attended by the thirty-year-old Garcia Calvo, by Aguilar Navarro, the Christian Democrat and by Tierno Galvan, a well-known Social Democrat.

This assembly decided on an "indefinite strike" until the investigation was abandoned. They sent a message to all Spanish

universities asking them to express solidarity. They decided to hold another meeting the next day.

At this meeting they were joined by the school of economic and political science, who adopted motions echoing the democratic demands raised February 24, and expressing solidarity with the suspended professors and students.

The authorities answered by closing down the rebellious schools, by opening an attack on correspondents who were reporting the developments, and by issuing denials that the police had resorted to any violence.

On February 27, in the school of medicine, 2,500 students met under the chairmanship of Garcia Calvo and unanimously decided to transform their assembly into "a single representative and free organ of the University, with a constituent and transitional character until the creation of a new student union."

This body then met on March 1. About 4,000 students were present. They democratically nominated a "presidency." This consisted of union delegates of all the centers and schools outside of the official government union, plus a representative elected by each of the centers or schools still adhering to the government union, and two members of the presidency that had sat in previous sessions.

### "Day of the Free Student"

A decision was passed unanimously to set aside the next day, March 2, as the "Day of the Free Student" and to proceed in a non-violent and silent demonstration, led by the professors, to the Cibeles Plaza up to the office of the national minister of education, in order to give him the previously passed motions, plus a series of new ones.

These included lifting of the sanctions against the professors, cancellation of the academic investigation and of the fines levied against various students as well as reopening of the school of philosophy and letters and the school of medicine.

The students also denounced the "false and tendentious news published by the press in recent days concerning the events that have occurred at the University."

It remained to be seen what the fascist authorities would do about this new development, but it could precipitate a crisis for the regime. The students have strong ties with the Spanish workers and if they begin moving, too, it could spell the beginning of the end for Spanish fascism. The slogans now are for democratic demands. It is obvious that they can easily end up with the cry, "Capitalism, no; socialism, yes!"

WALLOON SECTION OF NEW SOCIALIST PARTY FOUNDED IN BELGIUM

BRUSSELS, Feb. 25 -- After founding the Brussels section of the new Belgian Socialist Workers party on February 7, the Walloon section of the party was officially launched as the "Walloon Workers party" at a convention in Charleroi on February 21.

More than 300 delegates from the federations of Liège, Charleroi, Namur, La Louvière, Verviers and Huy-Waremme attended. Observers from Brussels were also present.

The independent Socialist member of parliament from Namur, Fernand Massart served as chairman. Among those present were Jacques Yerna, regional secretary of the trade-union federation of Liège and Ernest Mandel, editor of the weekly La Gauche.

The main reports were given by François Perin and Robert Nicolas. Perin, a professor at Liège University, discussed problems of domestic and international policies. He argued for a federal structure in Belgium and for the country quitting NATO. While his report could be characterized as rather moderate, the report by Robert Nicolas, a Charleroi trade unionist, clearly adhered to the line of revolutionary socialism. He took up questions of social and economic policy.

The resolution, embodying the main ideas of both reports was adopted unanimously.

During the discussion, some twenty speakers took part, most of them factory shop stewards. The convention clearly showed the militant working-class basis of the party which, after a few weeks existence, already has solid groups ranging from twenty to two hundred members in most of the important factories in the south of Belgium.

The convention was given extensive coverage by the press, radio and television. More than a half dozen daily papers gave considerable space to the convention, averaging two full columns.

The young party has swung into action with a campaign against the forced closure of coal-mining pits in several regions and the unemployment threatening miners as a result.

A recruiting drive has been started in Liège, Brussels and Charleroi. Up to 175,000 leaflets have already been distributed in connection with this drive. A mass meeting is scheduled to be held in the largest auditorium in Brussels at the end of March.

Election tactics loom large among the immediate problems now being discussed in the party. General elections are due May 23, barely three months after the party's foundation.

## AFTER WILSON'S "HUNDRED DAYS"

By T.J.Peters

In more than one sense Harold Wilson's much-heralded "hundred days of dynamic action" tailed off into Winston Churchill's ninety years of pomp and circumstance. The quasi-feudal goings-on in the weeks of funeral anticipation and funeral ceremony were a fitting backdrop, mocking the proclaimed modernization program of the social-democratic sciencemongers. The Wilson government seems to have become hopelessly stalled in the bogs of the City and the Establishment.

In almost every respect the Wilson team, enjoying at its formation more support and approval from the Labour movement than any previous leadership because of its left social-democratic origins and the left coloration of its parliamentary program, has thoroughly disappointed both its mass following in the electorate as well as its narrower base among the party activists who propelled it to power.

Instead of grappling with the economic crisis left by the Tory party through a public inquest into its thirteen-years rule for the profiteers, the Wilson leadership has been anxious not to cause international "loss of confidence in sterling" and in the British economy under capitalism.

Instead of calling for mass participation of the working class in conducting such an inquest and in taking emergency measures to implement conclusions flowing from it, Wilson and his friends have been resorting to "orthodox" economic and financial manipulations such as the fifteen per cent import tax and the seven per cent bank rate, the net result of which has been to throw the burden of the remedies on the backs of the workers and those sections of the population least able to bear it. Even so, the crisis in sterling continues uneasily despite all the measures taken; and the economy only limps along, the massive American-led bankers' aid which saved the currency in November bringing about an ever greater mortgaging of the whole Labour program to the interests of international capitalism.

The employers at home, and their Tory friends in press and parliament, have been quick to seize on every opportunity to hamstring, to embarrass and to exploit the plight of the Wilson administration. They have not shied from spurring on "mass action" when it suited their purpose, not only in the doctors' "revolt" but also in the case of the cutbacks in the aircraft industry which, as was shown in the Ferranti scandal, have been playing the "defense needs of the nation" for suckers. If Labour refrains from leading the engineering workers in this industry to demand nationalization and workers' control of its future, others are prepared to utilize any

temporary dislocation in their jobs to lead them against Labour under banners with jingoistic overtones. That was what was shown by the odd spectacle of the aircraft workers' Hyde Park demonstrations twice within a month.

But even on the purely electoral front, the timid and even craven social-democratic reaction to the bankers' offensive has its unmistakable lessons. You cannot raise the parliamentarians' pay while postponing a much touted promise to increase old-age pensions, and expect the old-age pensioners and their supporters not to be disgusted. That's one thing that the massive abstentions in the Labour vote teach in part about Gordon Walker's defeat at the Leyton by-election which no one had expected. And another thing this event has taught is that playing "respectable" hide-and-seek with racialism is only grist to the mill of "respectable" racialists.

The Tories show every sign of making this kind of racialism (under the guise of "controlled immigration") one of their main aces in the coming electoral contests. Quite apart from the unprincipledness of the official Labour position in retracting past pledges to repeal the Tory Immigration Act recently passed to cope with the "colour problem," this is bound to feed reaction, particularly on the electoral front as the experience of Smethwick and now Leyton has demonstrated.

To get a full measure of the reprehensible nature of Wilson's retreat on such issues as this, they must be seen in the context of the whole of the so-called "multiracial commonwealth" and foreign policy set forth by him in opposition and even in the first days of his premiership. For they are not unconnected with the miserable showing in the matter of delivering Bloodhound aircraft to South Africa, to the whole swindle of the Malaysian Federation and the resultant confrontation with Indonesia and, finally and above all, to the support of the outrageous imperialist aggressions of the Lyndon Johnson administration in the Congo and particularly in Vietnam. The whole trend of policy has the effect of stamping the Labour government globally as part and parcel of white supremacist imperialism.

It is true that this support of American imperialism, like the domestic retreat, is shamefaced, covered up with mealy-mouthed equivocations -- and rumors of great, bold, behind-the-scenes moves that supposedly run counter to the public stand taken by Wilson, Stewart and Co. But in politics it is the public position on which parties and their spokesmen are judged. At a time of mounting opposition to the dirty Vietnam war in the United States itself -- a Labour government in Britain offers justification to the warmongers in the Pentagon and the White House!

Wilson's apologists claim that while the economic and financial crisis has frozen the public stance of Labour Britain in distorted fashion, the dynamism of the hundred days nevertheless has

had its effect in the internal machinery of government which is bound to bring about great radical changes. Not an inkling of this has met the public eye, however. It is true that the steel nationalization bill is still being processed for parliamentary action, especially under pressure from the steel workers themselves, but -- all surface indications are that this measure, too, is to be trimmed to the wind of compromise with the profiteers. The same holds true of the projected Rent and Land Act, and the tax proposals for the coming budget.

It must, however, also be admitted that the City and the whole business community remain hostile and distrustful, and still fear Wilsonian "radicalism" in spite of the reassurances of the "hundred days." But their fears are really that the pressures of the working class, in spite of all, might burst through the dam of the false "national interest" which the social democracy defends with them in common. Indeed, the workers of Britain are going through an experience which should convince them that social democracy, even of the most left variety, is incapable of resolving the social crisis and leading to socialism -- precisely because social democracy does not break with the whole concept of a common "national interest" with the profiteers, both in domestic and foreign matters, because it is content to leave intact the state machinery of the oppressors, the capitalist state.

For the Marxists in Britain the task remains, side by side with the workers, to absorb the lessons of the current experiences and to find in the course of action with them the breach through which the Labour movement can overcome the stultifying and self-defeating limits social democracy imposes on the Labour giant.

### THE U.S. "VICTORY" AT DONG HOI

Since President Johnson ordered the bombing of Dong Hoi in North Vietnam on February 7, world opinion has been preoccupied primarily with the military and political consequences of that action. Will American aggression "escalate" mankind into nuclear war? Where does the responsibility lie for this reckless adventure? What will be the Kremlin's reaction?

These and similar questions have been asked everywhere in the world. But one minor question was not given much attention in the world press. What did the bombing of Dong Hoi accomplish? Were there any victims? Were only "military objectives" wiped out, as the American newspapers claim?

A journalist who happened to see the bombing -- he reached Dong Hoi a few hours before the attack -- has provided an eyewitness

account. The journalist is Franz Faber of the daily Neues Deutschland, official organ of the East German Communist party. While many of the reports appearing in this paper must be taken with a great deal of caution, there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of this account.

According to Faber, nearly all the victims of the bombing -- the dead and wounded -- were children. In the nearby town of Vinh Linh, a bomb scored a bull's eye on a school, killing many of the children outright.

The office of the International Control Commission in Dong Hoi was also hit.

Many helpless fishing boats in the mouth of Gianh River, which enters the South China Sea near Dong Hoi, were caught without warning in gun and rocket fire.

Faber reports that no military objectives were hit, but many homes, schools and even hospitals were destroyed.

#### THE MARCH 1 MEETING IN MOSCOW

A number of months have passed since the downfall of Khrushchev. For the European workers states, for most of the Communist parties, the change meant at the same time the naming of two new "leaders" for the Communist world -- Brezhnev and Kosygin -- because of the privileged place held by the Soviet Union and its Communist party. How the change has worked out, nobody as yet knows outside of the very narrow circle which engineered it. Where the new leadership is headed is still less known. Does the new leadership itself know?

Since the downfall of Khrushchev, in place of his more or less impulsive but frequent declarations, almost total silence has reigned. It took Kosygin's trip to Asia and the American bombings in North Vietnam to prove that he really had a voice. Insofar as he made himself heard, however, it must be acknowledged that he said very little.

In the same period, the Chinese were likewise far from loquacious concerning Sino-Soviet relations. Without the least doubt, the aggressiveness of American imperialism, on the one hand, and the danger of a rupture due to the course taken by Khrushchev, on the other, contributed to bringing the two big workers states together on a government level against imperialism and to muting the differences at the party level.

The chancelleries of the capitalist states no doubt discuss

among themselves about international relations involving the USSR and China. It is quite probable that they have their own sources of information and in any case they can go directly to the highest authorities. But this is not the lot of members of the Communist parties; nor that of the working masses throughout the world, beginning with the Soviet masses themselves.

On this point as on many others, the limits of "de-Stalinization" are shown. Truth to tell, it is in this field that "de-Stalinization" is hardly visible; the determination of international and national policy remains the prerogative of a leadership which no longer employs such violence as formerly, which is no longer subjected to the will of a single man, which rests on a nucleus that is finding it difficult to achieve internal equilibrium but to which the masses must only submit and approve. "De-Stalinization," it cannot be repeated too often, represents a liberalization of the regime, not at all its democratization.

The modification of certain relations in Soviet society and the end of monolithism among the parties are realities that can be denied only under penalty of committing gross political errors; yet the results of the post-Stalinist process must not be overestimated so long as the bureaucracy is not confronted by actions undertaken by the masses.

It is excellent that the Soviet and Chinese governments have drawn together in the face of the Yankee aggressions in Vietnam; it confirms that imperialism will not be able to drive a wedge between the workers states, that just the contrary will occur. But on the party level, the silence on the most fundamental current strategic problems facing the workers movement is much worse than the polemics of the past years despite their excesses, misrepresentation of positions and insults. The differences have not disappeared, the problems remain and cannot be solved by the bureaucrats through maneuvers and jerry-rigged combinations.

Perhaps the most typical example of the present situation in the official Communist movement is provided by the fate of the international conference of parties advocated about a year ago in Suslov's report as a way out of the Sino-Soviet conflict. The proposed conference was to be preceded by a preconference. Last July the Khrushchev leadership set December 15 as the date and invited twenty-five Communist parties to join the Communist party of the Soviet Union in working out a document which in the given circumstances could be only a condemnation of the Chinese.

The Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership began by postponing the date of the preconference to March 1. In place of the hullabaloo that was heard when the meeting was scheduled, the official silence was complete when the meeting opened.

It was only in a semi-official way that it was learned that



of the twenty-five parties invited, a half dozen failed to show up (in addition to the parties lined up with the Chinese Communist party, the Rumanian CP abstained from attending), and that a number of parties that did attend are against convoking a conference to which the Chinese CP remains opposed. Among these parties are such important ones as the Italian CP, the strongest CP among the European capitalist countries, the Polish party whose leader Gomulka occupies a top-rank position in the official Communist apparatus. The Cubans have been holding to an independent position as was shown when they joined the Rumanians in voting for the proposal of the Albanian delegation calling for the United Nations to proceed to a vote, despite an agreement against this between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Of the parties invited to the meeting, hardly half would follow the CPSU into such a tribunal of party apparatuses. Under these circumstances, the silence is understandable. The conference was held on March 1 but its purpose was considerably changed. Instead of being set up to make a genuine decision, it became purely consultative. On the day the meeting opened, the Chinese broke the silence to give the new Kremlin team a taste of the fire they had poured on Khrushchev. It could be interpreted as a warning to stand up more firmly against American pressure in Vietnam.

In any case, March 1 marked one of the severest blows dealt to the authority of the Soviet bureaucracy. Some parties openly dispute that authority, others came to the conference to debate and not to approve. The CPSU could hardly get a majority among the leaderships. Even if the new and provisional Soviet leaders were to bring out a new political line, only the last of the yes-men, like those in the leadership of the French Communist party, would approve it without reserve, and it remains to be seen how long even this will last.

In the opinion of some commentators, Khrushchev created an illusion through his talkativeness; at present the bureaucratic machine is to be seen as it really is -- in theory a vacuum, in political practice completely empirical. It functions through inertia, without any real capacity to solve the gigantic problems that have arisen with the development of the workers states, the colonial revolution, the workers movement and relations with the capitalist world.

In this crisis, the real difficulties arise from the impossibility of maintaining the status quo; i.e., conditions favorable to maintenance of the Soviet bureaucracy, in face of changes in the mass movements on the one hand and the capitalist world on the other, particularly American imperialism which is displaying the dangerous aggressiveness of a wounded wild beast.

Antibureaucratic manifestations in the Soviet Union as well as in the workers states and the Communist parties are still weak and politically confused. This was a virtually inevitable result of

the decades of Stalinism with all the theoretical and political degeneration it entailed. Nevertheless, one of the most positive developments of the present period is the way the younger generations are seeking, in opposition to the traditional leaderships, a program different from the petty reforms held out by the usurpers of the October Revolution.

This is true not only of the youth of the underdeveloped countries who aspire to transform conditions in these countries in a revolutionary way, but also of the vanguard youth in the workers states who wish to breathe something besides the stale air in which they have been kept. It is true, too, of the youth in the capitalist countries who are not duped by the propaganda about a "welfare state."

These are only the first detachments turning toward the revolutionary Marxism that has been defended by a few under adverse circumstances for many years.

The depths reached by the international crisis of Stalinism, revealed by the downfall of Khrushchev, and the decomposition of the bureaucratic leadership, shown by such things as the circumstances of the March 1 meeting in Moscow, indicate the brightening perspective for the development of revolutionary Marxism and the construction of a new international leadership.

In the light of this perspective, the revolutionary Marxists are inspired to attack the old bankrupt leaderships more audaciously than ever both within and outside the traditional organizations.

#### ONE OF MALCOLM X'S LAST INTERVIEWS

The March-April issue of the Young Socialist, which was published on the eve of the assassination of Malcolm X, carries one of the last interviews with the martyred Negro leader. It was granted to editorial board members Jack Barnes and Barry Sheppard after Malcolm X returned from Africa.

The interview is of exceptional interest in revealing how far Malcolm X's thinking had developed. His break with the Black Muslim's was clearly motivated primarily by political reasons:

"It didn't involve itself in the civil or civic or political struggles our people were confronted by," he told the two editors of the Young Socialist. ". . . So the only way it could function and be meaningful in the community was to take part in the political and economic facets of the Negro struggle. And the organization wouldn't do that because the stand it would have to take would have been too

militant, uncompromising and activist, and the hierarchy had gotten conservative. It was motivated mainly by protecting its own self-interests."

The trip that Malcolm X took through Africa had great impact on him. He reveals the following, for instance:

"But, when I was in Africa in May, in Ghana, I was speaking with the Algerian ambassador who is extremely militant and is a revolutionary in the true sense of the word (and has his credentials as such for having carried on a successful revolution against oppression in his country). When I told him that my political, social and economic philosophy was black nationalism, he asked me very frankly, well, where did that leave him? Because he was white. He was an African, but he was Algerian, and to all appearances, he was a white man. And he said if I define my objective as the victory of black nationalism, where does that leave him? Where does that leave revolutionaries in Morocco, Egypt, Iraq, Mauritania? So he showed me where I was alienating people who were true revolutionaries dedicated to overturning the system of exploitation that exists on this earth by any means necessary.

"So, I had to do a lot of thinking and reappraising of my definition of black nationalism. Can we sum up the solution to the problems confronting our people as black nationalism? And if you notice, I haven't been using the expression for several months. But I still would be hard pressed to give a specific definition of the over-all philosophy which I think is necessary for the liberation of the black people in this country."

In describing his experiences going from country to country in Africa, Malcolm X stressed the influence of the militancy displayed on the African continent upon the thinking of black Americans.

"So you can't separate the African revolution from the mood of the black man in America. Neither could the colonization of Africa be separated from the menial position that the black man in this country was satisfied to stay in for so long. Since Africa has gotten its independence through revolution, you'll notice the stepped up cry against discrimination that has appeared in the black community."

Malcolm X spoke out strongly against the U.S. role in the Congo and Washington's ties with Tshombe.

"Probably there is no better example of criminal activity against an oppressed people than the role the U.S. has been playing in the Congo, through her ties with Tshombe and the mercenaries. You can't overlook the fact that Tshombe gets his money from the U.S. The money he uses to hire these mercenaries -- these paid killers imported from South Africa -- comes from the United States. The pilots that fly these planes have been trained by the U.S. The

bombs themselves that are blowing apart the bodies of women and children come from the U.S. So I can only view the role of the United States in the Congo as a criminal role."

He took a similar position on the U.S. role in Vietnam.

A number of other subjects were covered in the interview, including the civil-rights struggle in the South and the violence used by the white racists there against Negroes and the whites who dare to help them.

Malcolm X had some cogent things to say about the role of students and young people in revolutionary movements internationally.

Asked about the "world-wide struggle now going on between capitalism and socialism," Malcolm responded:

"It is impossible for capitalism to survive, primarily because the system of capitalism needs some blood to suck. Capitalism used to be like an eagle, but now it's more like a vulture. It used to be strong enough to go and suck anybody's blood whether they were strong or not. But now it has become more cowardly, like the vulture, and it can only suck the blood of the helpless. As the nations of the world free themselves, then capitalism has less victims, less to suck, and it becomes weaker and weaker. It's only a matter of time in my opinion before it will collapse completely."

For a copy of the issue of the Young Socialist containing this important four-page interview with Malcolm X, write to the Young Socialist, Box 471, New York, N.Y. 10003. A one-year subscription to the Young Socialist (five issues) is \$1.

### MALCOLM X -- AMERICAN NEGRO FIGHTER

By Evelyn Sell

#### I.

Two weeks before the first anniversary of his split with the Black Muslims, Malcolm X was shot to death as he began to address a rally of the group he organized in June 1964, the Organization of Afro-American Unity. Suspicion was immediately focussed on the Black Muslims led by Elijah Muhammad although later reports accused a "small terrorist group that follows the Red Chinese line and seeks to foment unrest among American Negroes." As usual, the Communists are targets for blame in any disturbing situation.

In the weeks prior to his murder Malcolm repeatedly asserted that the Black Muslims, under orders from Elijah Muhammad, had marked him for extinction. In an interview shortly before his death Malcolm

told a reporter, "I live like a man that's already dead. . . It doesn't frighten me for myself as long as I felt they would not hurt my family. . . I know brothers in the movement who were given orders to kill me. I've had high-placed people within tell me, 'Be careful, Malcolm.'" His lawyer reported that Malcolm planned to announce the names of "those who were trying to kill him" at the February 21 rally. But Malcolm had barely finished greeting the audience when a disturbance broke out. As the audience was diverted, a burst of gunfire rang out. Malcolm was dead on arrival at the hospital.

Police are holding two suspects. Eyewitness reports and the results of the medical examination indicate there were at least five persons involved in the murder plot. Relatives and followers of the black nationalist leader have promised vengeance for his death. Two days after the murder, the Muslim mosque in New York's Harlem (which Malcolm once served as Muhammad's minister) was destroyed by fire. The next day fire damaged the Los Angeles mosque. Police are alerted all over the country to possible repercussions among members of Muhammad's Nation of Islam. Special precautions are being taken to protect Muhammad.

The assassination of Malcolm X has been front-page news across the nation every day since he was shot. From the capitalist newspapers to Elijah Muhammad the chorus is, "He lived by violence and he died by violence." Muhammad, who claims that none of his followers were involved in the plot, said that Malcolm preached war and violence and "died according to his preaching." Civil-rights leaders are using the occasion to deliver sermons on the blessings of their philosophy of nonviolence. A spokesman for the Congress of Racial Equality stated that the death "emphasizes again the need for finding nonviolent solutions to human conflicts." Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP], declared, "The gunning down of Malcolm X is a shocking and ghastly demonstration of the futility of resorting to violence as a means of settling differences. Violence is not the answer to disputes either between warring factions within a group or between groups in the large society."

Capitalist newspaper articles and editorials emphasize the irony of Malcolm's death at the hands of fellow Negroes and the fear that a series of revenge killings would spill beyond the confines of the black nationalist groupings and begin to involve whites as well. As the February 23 Detroit Free Press editorial stated:

". . . as an act of violence, as an emphatic punctuation to a statement of America's dilemma, his death itself should be mourned. It is a part of the same small but frightening concept of redressing grievance by violence. It is, in this sense, a part of the same whole of the attempted assassinations of others, the bombings and burnings that seem to have increased around the country. . . Malcolm X, the minister of violence, would consider his killing ironic. His death underlines the very importance of law and order."

The Free Press echoes the popular myth about Malcolm X as "the minister of violence." The mass media would never print the truth on Malcolm's ideas on this point although he explained over and over what his stand was:

"I don't believe in violence. That's why I want to stop it. And you won't stop it with love. We only mean vigorous action in self-defense. . . They [the American government] are violent wherever they go -- Vietnam, the Congo, Korea. But when we try to protect ourselves against lynchers we are supposed to be nonviolent. . . We should defend ourselves against the violence of others. . . The press tries to make you believe everything upside-down. If you try to stop the lynching, you're a racist in reverse. With skillful manipulation of the press they make the victim look like the criminal and the criminal like the victim." (I personally heard Malcolm speak these words one week before he was killed.)

The Free Press included another false idea in its editorial: "He contributed little worthwhile to the nation. Except by those followers, he will hardly be mourned." Undoubtedly, Malcolm's death will not be as widely mourned as was the death of John F. Kennedy. But Malcolm's life and his death have far greater significance in American history than that of the former president of the United States. Kennedy was only one among many of the same type; there were others who could fill his role easily and quickly -- as Johnson proved. The smoothness of the shift from the Kennedy to the Johnson administration was loudly hailed as clear evidence of the great superiority of democratic processes and the American Way of Life. On the contrary, the smoothness of the transition was due not to democratic procedures but to the fact that government administrations obey the dictates of the capitalist rulers of America who have many political servants to answer their call. Kennedy, Johnson, Goldwater -- the actions of one can be substituted for the other, witness Johnson's carrying out Goldwater's program in Vietnam. The death of Malcolm X is quite a different story.

The militant Negro movement in this country is about a dozen years old and it has become more and more apparent within the past several years that it was heading into a worsening crisis of leadership. The dedication, bravery and participation of the Negro masses has been phenomenal -- but the struggle has been increasingly hampered and sidetracked by the nationally recognized leaders. The proliferation of small, new groups in Negro communities across the country and the rise of black nationalist sentiments and organizations testify to the search for a structure and a leadership capable of carrying the movement to new heights and to victory.

Malcolm X had the potential to fill the vacuum now existing in the leadership of the Freedom Now movement. It must be kept in mind that Malcolm was not a finished product at the time of his death. But he was developing in a manner that showed exciting possi-

bilities for the American and world revolutions. His evolution was cut short by assassins' bullets and revolutionists the world over can mourn the bright promise that was cut short.

It is true that Malcolm X was a unique person, immensely talented and influential, but we must never forget that the conditions that produced and molded him still exist in this country and are now working to thrust a new individual into the front ranks of the movement for human freedom and progress. It does not detract from Malcolm's importance to point this out.

The February 22 New York Times reported a conversation that took place in Harlem hours after the assassination. One woman said, "I'll tell you this. We're going to get another Malcolm X." The person with her replied, "That's right. For every one they get we've got ten more." That spirit is invincible!

Malcolm had to journey far to reach the revolutionary understanding he displayed during the last part of his life. The leaders that come after him will be able to build on his heritage and move even farther along the path of revolutionary consciousness and action. The speed and scope of Malcolm's development is an example of the explosive potentialities within the Negro community. Here was a man who spent a quarter of a century enduring the repressions of a racist society and sinking into the swamp of American decay. The next twelve years of his life were spent preaching the religious mysticism of Elijah Muhammad with its attacks against the devils with "blue eyes and blonde hair and pale skin" and its call for the creation of a separate state for Afro-Americans.

In the last year of Malcolm's life he repudiated Muhammad's religious doctrines (although he remained a practicing Muslim), he looked beyond the white skin color and saw that the real enemy was "American imperialism" and the "international power structure."

In an exclusive interview with United Press International during July 1964, Malcolm said, "I have done a complete about-face and I'm man enough to admit it. . . We don't believe in any of Muhammad's philosophy of separation. We believe the Afro-American should have his full part in the entire American experience. . . We realize that all white people are not bad. When I went to the holy city of Mecca I found white men walking arm and arm with black men."

There were some points he never repudiated or modified: his insistence on self-defense measures for Negroes attacked by racists, his uncompromising honesty about the facts of America's racist oppression at home and abroad, and his pride and self-dignity as a black man.

He gave repeated evidences during his last months that he was still in the process of changing and expanding his political viewpoints. For example, while speaking at a symposium during May 1964

he was asked what political system he favored. He answered, "I don't know. But I'm flexible. As was stated earlier, all of the countries that are emerging today from under the shackles of colonialism are turning toward socialism. I don't think it's an accident. Most of the countries that were colonial powers were capitalist countries and the last bulwark of capitalism today is America and it's impossible for a white person today to believe in capitalism and not believe in racism. You can't have capitalism without racism. And if you find a person without racism. . . usually they're socialists or their political philosophy is socialism."

[To be continued.]

#### ALEXANDER DEFENSE COMMITTEE FORMED IN NEW YORK

NEW YORK, Feb. 26 -- Officers and original sponsors announce the formation of the Alexander Defense Committee. Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Maxwell Geismar, Horace Kallen, John O. Killens, Slator King, and Staughton Lynd have invited other prominent men and women of various political beliefs to join them as sponsors of the Committee in aiding the defense of Dr. Neville Alexander and other political prisoners in South Africa.

Arrested in July 1963 and held without charges until November under the "Ninety Days Detention Act," Dr. Alexander and his friends, although never accused of having committed any overt act of sabotage, were convicted under the notorious sabotage law. The prosecution attempted to prove only that they had met to explore possible methods of conducting the struggle against apartheid and had read and discussed Marxist literature and works on guerrilla warfare. For these "crimes," five of the defendants, including Dr. Alexander, were sentenced to ten years imprisonment, while the others received sentences ranging from five to seven years. Since their conviction, the male prisoners have been held in the infamous concentration camp on Robben Island. After more than a year of delay, an appeal will be heard before the Supreme Court in Bloemfontein on March 2.

Action by individuals and organizations in West Germany, where Dr. Alexander studied and is well known in academic circles, England, Ireland, Japan, and Algeria has already brought widespread support for the defendants. Rolf Hochhuth, Theodor Adorno, Bertrand Russell, Isaac Deutscher, and C.L.R. James are among the thousands who have sought to aid these victims of South African "justice." Through their efforts, the costs of the March 2 appeal have been met.

Provisional officers of the Committee are: Paul B. Boutelle, Chairman; Robert H. Langston, Executive Secretary; Berta Green, Cor-



responding Secretary; and Dave Dellinger, Treasurer. In addition to raising money for legal defense and to aid the victims' families, the Committee will conduct an intensive educational campaign and will organize demonstrations to protest the savagery of the increasingly fascist-like South African regime.

Whatever the outcome of the March 2 appeal, the need for international support to opponents of apartheid will remain great. The Committee urges all who are in sympathy with the world-wide struggle for human dignity, who detest racial discrimination and national oppression, who desire to see civil and political liberties strengthened and extended throughout the world to join in support of the Committee's work.

Contributions and correspondence should be sent to: Alexander Defense Committee, P.O.Box 345, Canal Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10013.

#### CANADIAN POETS AID ALEXANDER CASE

At a poetry reading held under the auspices of Vanguard Books in Vancouver, British Columbia, February 12, two of Canada's leading poets, Alfred Purdy and Milton Acorn gave their support to the efforts to raise funds to help meet the cost of the appeal of Dr. Neville Alexander, the noted South African intellectual imprisoned by the Verwoerd tyranny.

The two poets read from their contemporary work to an audience of seventy, composed mainly of university students. The two well-known poets, Dorothy Livesay and Earl Birney, attended the meeting.

Chairman Jean Rands explained that Dr. Alexander has been sentenced to ten years for his political views. He is at present in the infamous Robben Island penal colony where Nelson Mandela is also being held under barbarous conditions.

#### "CITTA FUTURA" STIRS CONTROVERSY IN ITALIAN CP

ROME -- The organization of a leftist tendency inside the PCI [Italian Communist party] hinges on two important requirements: a national leadership and a publication. The latter seems to have appeared (at least temporarily) through the transformation of Città Futura from a monthly review of the Communist Students into the organ of the entire Youth Federation.

The two numbers issued since the change indicate quite clearly

that the aim was to establish a tendency publication.

One of the main features of the improved Città Futura is that articles are published not only from young Communist authors but also from party members with leftist positions.

In the January number, for instance, there is a significant article by Lisa Foa, who left the editorial staff of Rinascita, the PCI publication, after Pajetta was appointed editor. Entitled "The Chinese Strategy After the Bomb," the article defends the Chinese policy of seeking a ban on nuclear arms and points out the difference between the Chinese refusal to sign the Moscow test-ban treaty and de Gaulle's position.

In the same issue there is an excellent article by Paolo Santi on PCI policy in the factories.

In the February issue, Augusto Illuminati, a former leader of the Rome Communist Youth, challenges Amendola's revisionist arguments concerning a "united" party. [See World Outlook January 1.]

Malcolm X is given favorable treatment in both issues. And the American Trotskyist paper, The Militant, is quoted in the January issue by way of translation of an interview with Milton Henry.

Controversy was at once set off by the first issue. A letter from L. Lombardo Radice, a well-known rightist member of the PCI who specializes in articles on "the dialogue with the Catholics," was published in the February issue protesting an article by Titti Pierini, a young militant, attacking his ideas on policy towards the Catholics. Significantly, Lombardo Radice complains about too many older members of the party writing for Città Futura. He wishes the publication "not a long, but an intense and useful life."

This development comes in a situation of increasing tension between the party and the Communist youth. It is rumored that the party has postponed the national congress of the Communist youth due to the basic documents prepared for the congress being too "original" with regard to the party's line. If this is true, it will heat things up. The role of Città Futura will increase in importance as a rallying point for leftist militants.

An incident in Rome indicates the mood. At a public meeting at the Maestoso cinema, when chief speaker Amendola came into the hall (by coincidence the national anthem was being played), the Communist youth at once left the hall and stayed outside during the entire meeting, singing revolutionary songs.

The leader of the Communist Youth Federation of Rome, Pio Marconi, was listed to appear at the presidium of the meeting but he did not show up.

DISPUTE SHARPENS BETWEEN FRENCH CP AND YOUTH

By Pierre Frank

PARIS -- The Union des Etudiants Communistes [UEC -- the Union of Communist Students] is scheduled to hold its congress March 4-7. For the first time in decades it has been prepared in a democratic way despite the heavy pressure brought to bear by the leadership of the PCF [French Communist party]. [See World Outlook February 10.]

Clarté, the official publication of the UEC, which published a letter from the National Bureau of the student organization to the Central Committee of the PCF, has now printed a series of documents, resolutions and amendments submitted for discussion which will be presented for vote at the congress.

The documents voice the most diverse views. While the letter of the National Bureau expressed flatly rightist ("Italian") views, other documents like that of the Paris-Lettres sector take a left oppositionist position. A pro-Chinese tendency is likewise represented.

Confusion is also evident but this is scarcely surprising. Thousands of youth, attracted by communism, are discovering that in combination with the over-all attraction of the workers states, the official Communist movement is undergoing a crisis of exceptional severity and that the PCF leadership is remaining faithful to its Stalinist past, welded to the most complete political sterility. Under present conditions in France, these youth, in search of a correct orientation, find that they must still seek their way to the truth through the ideological confusion engendered by Stalinism.

The PCF leadership holds one important advantage. It can wield considerable influence among the very youngest layers. This is due to the fact that they did not go through the Algerian war and consequently have not had the personal experience of seeing PCF policies tested in a major question in which they could make an independent judgment. It is clear that the PCF leadership is aiming at this layer of youth in the special supplementary issue of the weekly France Nouvelle devoted to "The French Communist Party and the Students."

Of the twenty-four pages of this issue, eleven take up a reply to the youth leadership, six more are filled with material from students supporting the PCF leadership, and only three pages are provided for "extracts" from the letter written by the National Bureau of the student union. These extracts are carefully arranged, of course.

As for the PCF reply, this is one of those instances where quantity is not transformed into quality. It is filled with peremp-

tory assertions, utilizing quotations from the works of Marx and Lenin and of Thorez. The complaints of the youth concerning the methods used against them are dismissed in a single sentence as slanderous. The document offers the students not even a sketchy explanation of the "cult of the personality," but refers them, for an understanding of the Russian Revolution, to Aragon's Histoire de l'U.R.S.S., a book of which it is difficult to say more than that it signifies nothing.

What is most significant is that the PCF leadership felt it necessary to publish a special issue of France Nouvelle on this topic. The conflict with the students could not be minimized even though the UEC is a relatively weak organization. As in the case of the university personnel, who are supporting the students, the PCF leadership found that it had to present, even if in an incomplete and distorted way, at least a part of their documents.

Among the cells of the party there is in general no interest in the struggle between the PCF leadership and the UEC. The indifference is symptomatic of the low political level of the party ranks. They see no connection between this battle in the UEC, involving the Political Bureau, and their immediate preoccupations. But this indifference also means that the ranks will not follow the leadership in declaring the students and their supporters to be "antiparty," "factionalists," etc.

As for the university personnel who signed the letter concerning the conflict between the UEC and the party leadership [see World Outlook February 19], the policy of the leadership, as we forecast, is to try to scatter them in the basic party structure and there bring maximum pressure on each one individually so as to break them. Some, it is hoped, will capitulate; others will give up the struggle; some, considered to be the "instigators," will be disciplined, even expelled.

In battling the opposition, the party leadership is also exploiting the fact that the party is now engaged in the municipal election campaigns throughout France. Their main argument is: "At the very moment when the party. . ." This stock "argument," aimed at silencing the opposition within the party, is always used by this leadership for whom now is obviously never the time to discuss politically. . .

#### FOR THE WHITE HOUSE SUGGESTION BOX

To save on dollars, Johnson is trying to discourage Americans from going abroad. He ordered all passport offices to remove travel brochures and other "material which encourages foreign travel." Now if he would just extend his campaign to the Pentagon. . .

LEFT-WING COMMUNISTS WITCH-HUNTED IN INDIA

By S. R. Singh

NEW DELHI -- At long last, Home Minister Gulzarilal Nanda placed before the Indian parliament (February 18), a 45-page printed statement entitled "Antinational Activities of Pro-Peking Communists and Their Preparations for Subversion and Violence," as a poor substitute for the "White Paper" he had promised to the nation in justification of the mass arrests of Left Communists all over India in December. This has come as a big disappointment to the Communist-baiters.

The long-awaited statement gives lengthy extracts from documents distributed by the party, both openly and "clandestinely," speeches of its leaders made at public and "secret meetings," Chinese publications and comments of the spokesmen of the Rightist Dangeite Communist party about the ideological stand of their "erstwhile colleagues."

In an introduction to the printed statement, Nanda has reiterated that the government took action against the Left Communists only because it was convinced that their "plans and activities" had developed into a threat to the national security.

Nanda also trotted out the usual charge that the Left CP had been sustained "ideologically, morally, as well as financially by China." The government, therefore, was convinced that in the "final crisis" the Left CP could "count upon Peking's powerful support."

According to the statement, "in a procession taken out during the Trivandrum District party Conference in October 1964, one of the slogans shouted was 'Let four months pass, let the Chinese come, we shall rule the country and teach you a lesson!'"

E.M.S.Namboodiripad, leader of the left CPI, campaigning on behalf of the party for the mid term elections in Kerala scheduled on March 5, immediately denied the charge and said that the allegation was a pure fabrication. He has demanded that Nanda should place all the charges against his colleagues, now under detention, before a court of law.

Nanda's statement is divided into five chapters with the following headings: "Support to China over Tibet and Border Questions"; "Disloyalty During the Chinese Invasion"; "Dissemination of Pro-Chinese and Anti-National Documents"; "Split at Peking's Call"; and "Preparations for Subversion and Violence." The last chapter includes a report on the activities of the Left Communists in the Northern border region.

The statement claims that the party workers in the Punjab

had been told to "concentrate" at places like Dalhousie and Manali, where a large number of Tibetan refugees could be "recruited as agents for the party work on the other side of the border." Harekishan Singh Surjeat, a Punjab Communist leader is alleged to have emphasized the need "to start as many secret cells in the border areas as possible to maintain direct links with the Chinese."

The attempt obviously is to establish that the Left Communists broke from the Dangeite faction because they were directly instigated to do so by Peking. An allegation has also been made that the China Bank which was operating in India till the border conflicts took place in October 1962 had advanced substantial amounts to the Left Communist leaders. This again has been strongly refuted by Namboodiripad.

Another "charge" levelled against one Shankar Dayal Tiwari, a member of the National Council of the CPI [Communist party of India], is that he allegedly told a meeting that "the Chinese aim was not to gain territory but to help with arms and ammunitions in the likely event of a civil conflagration in the country." Tiwari is further alleged to have cited this as the reason for the State committees of West Bengal and Punjab, the two States close to the border line of the control "for not regarding the Chinese action as aggression."

The Home Minister Nanda has sought again to create a new mystery out of his statement by suggesting that it "contained only a part of the matter available with the Government." He has said that "it is not in public interest including the interest of the security to disclose at this stage more than what has been furnished in the statement."

The truth, however, is that even parliamentary Congress party leaders who had earlier met to scrutinise Nanda's statement were not convinced about the seriousness of the charges he had made to justify the arrests of the Communist leaders. Some Congress MPs are believed to have said that the charges mentioned were known theoretical positions of the Communists on important questions and not necessarily "actionable."

But the official statement has alleged that the left Communists are "firmly committed to the cause of promoting Chinese designs" and "in furtherance of her grand strategy of establishing hegemony over Asia and her declared aim of world revolution."

"The evidence of their (CPI) plans to launch a violent revolution and struggle which they hope will synchronise with a fresh Chinese threat to our borders cannot be lightly brushed aside," Nanda has claimed.

The statement also referred to the "trail of death and des-

truction to life left by the Communists in Telangana." This is an oft-repeated canard. It is alleged that "this was the grim and tragic role that the Left Communists were attempting to repeat." This is a reference to the peasant uprising in Telangana in 1948-50.

Another allegation is that the Left CPI was "in full agreement with the Chinese view that the concept of peaceful transition to socialism had little more than tactical value and that on the contrary that peaceful path would bring dangerous results and weaken the will of the proletariat."

The statement alleged that before the arrests of the Left CPI leaders on December 30, the "militant action" decided upon at Calcutta (October 1964) had been "rapidly transmitted to party cadres at all levels." "It was explained at various state and district committee meetings." Party leaders were supposed to have emphasized that "the Calcutta Congress had made a radical departure from their past views and it had come to the conclusion that it would be able to achieve people's democracy in India only through a violent revolution."

Another equally fantastic charge made by Nanda, but against "West Bengal leftists," was that they had circulated a document Guerrilla Warfare -- A Means, written by the Cuban revolutionary leader Che Guevara. The document reportedly said that "all Communists need not wait for all revolutionary conditions to develop but should themselves create such conditions."

These are the other "charges" included in the statement: The Left CPI has started strengthening its "tech apparatus" in the states by recruiting "reliable and unmarked party members for underground work"; and instructions have been issued for "infiltration" into government services. Thus "the decks were being cleared for action when the Government decided to intervene."

Further, the statement claims that the Left CPI had drawn up plans "to develop and strengthen its underground apparatus." "Secret underground committees" were being set up and arrangements made "to provide shelters for important party workers to go underground, to maintain links among them through couriers and organise secret dens for the safe custody of records, holding meetings, and the clandestine dissemination of literature. In some places funds, too, were provided for the purpose."

Another extraordinary piece of "evidence" cited against the Left CPI, according to Nanda's statement, was to establish the "pronounced pro-Peking orientation of the party": "While they were jubilant over the atomic blast by China in October in sharp contrast to the reaction of the people of India who were deeply perturbed by the threat posed by the country's security by China's emergency as a nuclear power, the Left CPI advised India not to develop atomic bombs. This shows the sort of balance of military strength between

the two countries which the Left CPI would desire." Extraordinary, indeed.

If Nanda is to be taken seriously, all those in India, including some Congressmen who have advised the government against making an atom bomb, should be jailed because they are thereby contributing to the military might of the Chinese workers' state against bourgeois India! Yet another charge is that Mao worship, "with or without the aid of a picture," had become "a part of their creed."

Only the Swantantra leader M.R.Masani, in the Lower House of Parliament, gleefully demanded that the government should arrange to translate the statement into all Indian languages and ensure its wide circulation!

Hiren Mookherjee, leader of the rightist CPI group in Parliament, however, demanded that there should be a full discussion on the Home Minister's statement in the House. Bhupesh Gupta, the "centrist" Communist (in the rightist CPI), took strong objection in the Rajya Sabha (Upper House) to the expression "pro-Peking Communists" used in the relevant item on the agenda paper. The government's justification was that the expression had been borrowed from newspaper characterising Left Communists as "pro-Peking."

The capitalist press has received Nanda's statement with utter skepticism. Free Press Journal, an English daily of Bombay, in an editorial entitled "Unconvincing" (February 20), said rather sarcastically: "The main thing that strikes any discerning reader of the Union Home Minister's statement on the 'anti-national activities of pro-Peking communists. . . ' etc., 'is how very little new it contains.'"

While stating that the government had made a "fairly competent job" of gathering and collating all published data relating to the ideological positions of the LCP, the Journal said that "whether these expressions of opinion, which are what they are, by the members of the Left Communist party amount to evidence of subversion and sabotage with a view to overthrowing the state by violence still remains a matter of doubt."

"The arrests of the Left Communists," the Bombay journal adds, "may thus be explained as a preventive step, though it remains to be seen if any imminent danger of violence and threat to security of the state is obvious to the Government." It has also recalled that the CPI (rightist) was also no believer in the parliamentary system until it adopted the Amritsar resolution "affirming its intention to function within the Constitution," but the party had "neither been banned nor its members shut up in jail before the date of the Amritsar resolution."

"While the Government must be given every latitude to extraordinary, even arbitrary steps in an emergency," the Journal contin-



ues, "it cannot hope to enhance the quality of Indian democracy by jettisoning civil liberties without popular approval. We remain convinced that the best way of exposing the anti-national activities of the Left Communists and of vindicating the high ideals of Indian democracy is to bring the arrested men to trial in a court of law."

E.M.S.Namboodiripad, the Left "centrist leader of the CPI" in a statement issued from Trichur (Kerala) said on February 22 that Nanda's statement in Parliament about the activities of his party was repetition of the slander which the Congress party had let loose to mar the chances of the LCP at the Kerala poll. He said that the statement had not provided any proof to substantiate the charges made against his party and demanded that the Home Minister should place the facts which he claimed to possess before a court of law. Namboodiripad also repeated his earlier offer to resign from the Left CPI if the "Government could prove the charges against it."

#### VICTORY OF A "BAREFOOT PEOPLE"

The eyes of the world are on the warmonger in the White House, and they are not looking at him with any favor. A vivid example is provided by Norte Revolucionario published in the north of Argentina. The February 16 issue hails the Vietnamese as a "barefoot people who have defeated the best-armed army."

All that is necessary to come to this conclusion, says the Argentine paper, is to attentively read the "dispatches from the imperialist news agencies themselves." It notes that the "peasants and hungry workers" in South Vietnam make their shoes from cast-off tires.

"The great weapon against which not even the most modern planes can prevail is an entire people struggling for their right to eat, which shelters the guerrillas and gives them precise information. . . ."

Norte Revolucionario criticizes the "bureaucratic leadership" of the USSR as being in part responsible for the aggression, since it's "all talk" with them and "peaceful coexistence," which leaves the hands of the imperialists free to "bomb as they please."

The editors agree that the danger of a nuclear conflict is rising because of the course of American imperialism. It sees hope, however, in the revolutionary struggle. "Only the liberation of the peoples oppressed by imperialism and the triumph of the workers in the capitalist countries against their own bourgeoisie can postpone the possibility of war. The power and the organization of the workers themselves, the Yankee workers and especially their Negro vanguard, will be the best guarantee in defeating the imperialists in their own territory, thus avoiding atomic war."

ONCE AGAIN ON THE SITUATION IN THE ANGOLAN MOVEMENT

By Livio Maitan

Far from diminishing, the controversies around the Angolan freedom movement have flared up again in recent weeks. Following an attack by Pravda [December 16, 1964] against Holden Roberto, which was repeated in various countries, particularly by Communist parties of pro-Moscow persuasion, grave declarations of similar kind have been attributed to leaders of the Congolese movement. In addition, on the initiative of the Youth of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale], a meeting was organized in Algiers February 3 in celebration of February 4, 1961, which the MPLA [Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola] maintains was the day the anti-imperialist struggle in Angola began.

First of all, let's take a look at what the Congolese say. In a press release dated January 13, the CNL [Conseil National de Libération], after expressing solidarity with the African peoples in their struggle against imperialism and racism, accuses Holden Roberto "of putting his soldiers in the service of the Léopoldville killers in order to combat the patriotic forces, particularly in the province of Kwilu." In going further than Pravda, the CNL also affirms that Holden Roberto is reported to have participated in meetings with the "Binza group" composed of Adoula, Bomboko, Kandolo, Nendaka, N'Dele and Mobutu, the alleged aim of which was to prepare the arrest and assassination of Patrice Lumumba. "Holden Roberto, who enjoyed the confidence of the late P. Lumumba might have been the key piece in furnishing information on the latter to this group and to the American embassy."

Repeating the accusation about Roberto conniving with the Americans, the communiqué continues:

"Information that has come into our hands, the authenticity of which we guarantee, shows that Holden offered Tshombe his fullest support in exchange for which Moïse Tshombe was to grant the GRAE [Governo da Republica de Angola no Exilio -- Government of the Republic of Angola in Exile] his support. The GRAE went so far as to place at the disposition of Tshombe's government, units of the ALNA [National Liberation Army of Angola] to serve as cadres in units of the so-called National Congolese Army [ANC]. In addition, Tshombe is said to have promised Holden to do his best to get the Portuguese, 'his long-time friends,' to open secret negotiations with him in order to 'block the route to the Angolans established in Brazzaville whose sympathies are with N'Krumah, Modibo Keita, the Arabs of North Africa and the Communist countries.'" The press release ends with an appeal to the Organization of African Unity.

Besides this, according to a November 29 Tass dispatch, Gaston Soumialot was said to have declared in Zanzibar that "Roberto

Holden was an enemy of the Congolese people. He granted aid to Tshombe and called on his partisans to fight for Tshombe's regime. Recently partisans of Holden, coming from Angola and fighting in Tshombe's ranks, were killed or taken prisoner during combats in the region of the Congolese towns of Mahagui, Aru and other places."

Spokesmen of the GRAE -- the official delegation in Algiers and the mission in Europe, for example -- have indignantly denounced all these accusations. Among other things, they have underlined the fact that the CNL press release was put out by a few members of the CNL living in Brazzaville and that Christophe Gbenyé, head of the Revolutionary Congolese Government, declared during a trip to Algiers that he did not know anything about the press release in question. At a press conference in Brussels February 4, Rezende Alvaro, director of the GRAE's information service, after calling attention to an accusation by one of Tshombe's ministers that Holden Roberto had furnished arms to the Mulélists, "formally denied the lying assertions" of Pravda and "of a wing of the CNL."

"No Angolan combatant," he stated, "has fought at the side of the Congolese forces and the mercenaries against the Congolese revolutionaries. And we are ready to accept the naming of an African commission of inquiry designated to establish the truth about this grave accusation."

Rezende Alvaro, who also denied the allegations that the struggle in Angola had come to an end, took up Pravda's accusations, making the following declaration:

"It is sad that Pravda, the newspaper of a great party like the CPSU, chose a moment when all of Africa and the whole Third World is opposing South African apartheid and neocolonialism and condemning the adventurist American policy in South Vietnam(1) and Central Africa, to lodge accusations against our government, which it refrains from proving but which do grave injury to our honor and our struggle for freedom. We consider the attitude of the organ of the CPSU to be an attempt to rehabilitate the Moscow revisionists whose credit went down in the Third World after their collusion with imperialism and their responsibility for the reverses suffered by nationalism in certain regions of Africa, particularly in the Congo. Moscow is trying to re-establish its credit among our peoples in order to overcome the bad impression made in the Third World by its collusion with imperialism, a collusion sufficiently brought to light by the Russian capitulation in November 1962 in Cuba in face of the Yankee blackmail, denounced more than once by the powerful

---

(1) On February 11 the GRAE representative in Algiers signed a joint declaration of the African freedom movements condemning the American aggression in Vietnam and expressing their unconditional support to the Vietnamese people by congratulating "the North Vietnam armed forces for their quick and precise reply." [See World Outlook February 19.]

People's Republic of China which, for the people of the Third World, now represents the vanguard of the anti-imperialist movement in the socialist camp."(2)

As for Soumialot's accusations, GRAE circles do not exclude the possibility that Angolans actually did fight against the Congolese partisans. But the GRAE had nothing to do with this. It is quite probable, they say, that it involves Angolan mercenaries who fought in the Katanga army, and who later went to Angola with the acquiescence of the Portuguese to return to the Congo when Tshombe came to power.

The day before Rezende Alvaro's press conference, the GRAE delegation in Algiers issued a press release under the titles: "Tshombe threatens the Angolan revolution" and "Resident GRAE kept under surveillance." The press release states that Holden Roberto, who was scheduled to go to Zambia, "was formally barred by the agents of the Congolese 'sûreté'" from leaving the territory of the Congo, and this was on orders from Munongo, Tshombe's 'Minister' of the Interior."

"The kitchen where such measures are cooked up," continues the press release "is known to everyone, and the GRAE, which reaffirms its fraternal solidarity with the people of the Congo, cannot refrain from observing that it finds some Congolese ready to betray the cause of a brother people (victimized and massacred), only out of loyalty to the orders of enemies of Africa. The GRAE has called the attention of the General Secretary of the Organization of African Unity to this state of affairs in order to pass on the information to all the states belonging to this body."

Replying once more to Pravda, the document declares: "The GRAE repeats, once again, that the only reason it has remained in Congo-Léopoldville is because of the logistic advantages offered by the frontier between Congo-Léopoldville and Angola, and also the presence in Congo-Léopoldville of nearly a million Angolans (émigrés and refugees) of which most are invalids, aged people, sick persons, orphans and widows. The GRAE, besides, has never excluded transferring its center to other neighboring countries of Africa..."

As for the attitude of the Algerians, it is evidently inspired by the decision taken by the Committee of Three. The official Algerian press in general favors unification of the Angolan forces (see, for example, the February 4 issue of Alger Républicain).

---

(2) In criticizing Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, an organ published by a small minority of the Fourth International in open violation of discipline, Rezende Alvaro uses "arguments" against Michel Raptis which are absolutely inadmissible and which we condemn in the firmest way. In addition he resorts to amalgams that are completely erroneous and arbitrary.

In addition it is reported that the Algerians will participate in the celebration to be held March 15, the anniversary of the beginning of the struggle observed by the GRAE. The anniversary will thus provide an opportunity for gauging whether the Algerians wish to maintain their present official position or move more openly in favor of the MPLA.

The Angolan situation, consequently, continues to remain very complex -- besides the country's specific features, the role of African and international factors is growing in weight. For our part, we would like to again emphasize several constants overriding some of the events and recent controversies.

(1) The MPLA enjoys considerable backing abroad and it is supported by the Soviet government and by the pro-Moscow Communist parties, but it has not become rooted within Angola up to now. Its activity is limited to the Cabinda enclave, where the FLNA [National Front for the Liberation of Angola] has also claimed up until recently to have forces.

(2) The Savimbi affair stirred political circles abroad particularly, but the former minister of the GRAE -- who, however, did not join the MPLA -- did not take along real forces.

(3) The FLNA continues to be the main force struggling in Angola and exercising an influence among the greater part of the Angolans who are refugees in the Congo.(3)

As for the arguments being circulated about this or that Angolan leader rumored to be "an agent of American imperialism" or a "friend of Tshombe," we repeat once again that aside from the fact that no serious proof has been offered up to now, this would not be of decisive importance. The real problem is to ascertain whether or not there is a movement that is struggling, whether it exercises preponderant influence among the masses at a given stage. If these conditions hold, then it is the duty of revolutionists to display active solidarity with those who are struggling, independently of the attitude or possible orientation of a leader or even of an entire leadership. Clarification is made possible and becomes a necessity in the dynamics of the struggle which bring out the political and social divisions and establish the conditions for a finished revolutionary orientation to prevail.

---

(3) This has been indirectly confirmed by the MPLA which again stated even in the sessions of the Commission of Three that it favored "a dialogue with the FLNA with the aim of forming a united front." If it were really believed that the GRAE and the FLNA were only instruments of imperialist agents, that they were nothing but replicas of the MNA [Mouvement National Algérien] during the Algerian war, how could one want a united front with them?

It goes without saying that revolutionary Marxists support all the forces actually in struggle against the imperialists, independently of the leaderships they adhere to. While not pretending to remain aloof from the fray like pious preachers, they do not believe they are called on to mix into every factional dispute that develops.

As for the tragic situation in which the FLNA and the GRAE now find themselves, we are more than ever convinced that they must seek some way out as soon as possible. In the Congo, under Tshombe, there is no future for them -- they risk being made prisoners or hostages or being wiped out. (Tshombe has already permitted the Portuguese to make raids on Angolan territory against the forces of the GRAE.) The problem cannot be solved by continual procrastination or by diplomatic ruses. There is no possibility of exploiting the interimperialist conflicts; the possibility of real aid and collaboration can be assured only by certain African states and workers states.

Despite all the difficulties that are involved, it is necessary to make some decisions. The struggle must be extended on a wider scale within the country; and the GRAE must transfer to a different African state.

This appears to us to be a condition for a new departure, for the opening of a new phase in the struggle of the Angolan movement.