

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 11

March 19, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

Gastro Appeals for Immediate Aid to North Vietnam	1
"Will Continue to Send Arms," Says Ben Bella	2
Selma and Vietnam -- by Joseph Hansen	3
Toronto Students Demonstrate for Selma	6
South African Court Reserves Decision on Alexander Appeal	7
More Political Arrests in South Africa	12
Trotskyists Uphold Class-Struggle Program in Ceylon Election	13
Mutiny among Tshombe's Forces	19
Malcolm X's Last Insights -- by Evelyn Sell	20
What Malcolm X Really Stood For (Review)	24
Documents:	
In Tribute to Malcolm X	30
Help the Vietnamese Revolution!	34

CASTRO APPEALS FOR IMMEDIATE AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

In a fighting speech at the University of Havana March 16, Fidel Castro appealed for immediate aid for North Vietnam.

"In face of the aggression against North Vietnam," he said, "our position is unequivocal. We think that all the aid necessary in men and arms must be granted North Vietnam. We hold that the socialist camp must run all the necessary risks to aid North Vietnam. We are well aware that if the international situation worsens, we will be the first target of imperialism. But we are indifferent to this. We will never agree to remain silent and to adopt a stupid attitude in the hope that we will be spared. This is our point of view. It is necessary to act the way we feel to be the most correct and the most revolutionary, and no one can pretend to give us revolutionary lessons.

"It would be absurd to underestimate the psychology of our people. That error has already been committed many times by Yankee imperialism. It would be lamentable for others to commit the same error. . . We have never been and never will be the satellite of anyone. This is not the time to be digging in the archives. As long as imperialism is taking the offensive, it would be ridiculous to argue over the sex of the angels. It would be ridiculous to ask whether the imperialists are paper or steel, whether they are behaving badly or not. Because we think it is ridiculous to wash dirty linen in public while the enemy is attacking. And it is not the most powerful they are attacking, but the smallest and the weakest.

"Grave dangers threaten us and they cannot be combatted with academic chatter. . . Divided revolutionaries, slandering each other, cannot face the imperialist enemy effectively. And no one is more affected by these divisions in the socialist camp than the little countries like North Vietnam and Cuba."

In a previous speech March 10, Castro launched a similar appeal and said his government was ready to help with arms and men.

"WILL CONTINUE TO SEND ARMS," SAYS BEN BELLA

[In a speech delivered March 8 during Algeria's celebration of International Woman's Day, Ben Bella promised to continue sending arms to the Congolese freedom fighters. The following is a translation of this part of his speech as published in the March 9 issue of the Algiers daily Le Peuple.]

* * *

I would like to say to the sister representing the Portuguese council, the representative of Palestine, and to the sister representing the Congo, how ready our country, our regime, has been since independence to affirm its entire, complete, irreversible solidarity with all the freedom movements, with our brothers who are battling against the Salazar dictatorship, in the Congo against the infamy that imperialism is attempting to carry out in that country. Wherever peoples are struggling, we have been ready since independence to send them aid without fail.

I would also like to say that since Algeria won her independence, no country -- bearing in mind our capacities -- has affirmed its solidarity with those who are struggling as much as we have.

We said what we thought about this at Addis Ababa and again when we met to study the problem of Palestine. We said it at the very moment when imperialism was preparing its crime against Stanleyville. In the plaza of the Martyrs we declared that American imperialism was mistaken, and that all the imperialists were mistaken if they thought that with Stanleyville everything was over.

On the contrary, everything was beginning. It was the same way when our plane was intercepted and the "five" were put in prison. A general in command of the Algiers zone told me on that November 22 that everything was over in Algeria. He added that it would also soon be over in Egypt where they were then preparing their crime. I said: "You are mistaken. You have arrested five Algerians, but there are 12,000,000 Algerians."

Similarly in the Congo, nothing was finished with Stanleyville. The imperialists sent arms; we sent arms, and we will continue to send arms. We will always give arms to those who are struggling, or struggling for the same causes for which we battled here.

At this very moment, our planes are flying towards the Congo, transporting arms.

In the same way, we have solidarized and will continue to do so with our brother democrats of Portugal who are fighting against the sinister Salazar. In the same way, we will assume all our responsibilities in the sacred battle of Palestine. We are not fighting there against 2,000,000 Zionists; because we know that it is American imperialism and all the imperialists who are confronting us and who are doing their utmost against the Arab world and who want a second South Africa to continue to exist there.

SELMA AND VIETNAM

By Joseph Hansen

President Johnson's frantic efforts to assure the American people that he intends to do something -- but really do something -- to guarantee the right of the Negro people to participate in elections in the United States is a sign of a deep shift in public opinion, one which the high command of the Democratic party judges to be politically dangerous.

The first reaction of the White House to the atrocities in Selma, Alabama, was the usual routine response. On March 8, the day after the Alabama state troopers had used clubs, whips, tear gas and horses against peaceful Negro demonstrators committed to the "non-violent" Ghandist philosophy of their leader, the Rev. Martin Luther

King, the Justice Department said that the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] was interviewing marchers to "gather evidence that might indicate use of unnecessary force by local law-enforcement officers and others."

Four days later, as the terror continued in Selma and the skull of the Boston clergyman, Rev. James Reeb, was smashed in by a club-wielding racist, Johnson was hinting that he had federal troops standing by in Alabama.

On March 15, he went to the extraordinary length of addressing a joint session of Congress to ask for effective legislation -- but really effective this time -- against discrimination in registration and voting. The address was timed before the television cameras at prime evening time and carried by all three networks.

As Tom Wicker, special correspondent of the New York Times put it: "Mr. Johnson's televised speech represented a sharp escalation in his efforts to achieve voting rights legislation and to cope with the explosive situation centering on Selma, Ala."

The usual pattern is that when domestic turmoil rises dangerously, a foreign adventure, even going so far as a war, is deliberately cooked up to divert attention and to close the dangerously widening gap between the classes. In this case, a flare-up in domestic social unrest tended to divert attention away from a foreign adventure that risks a nuclear holocaust. The White House had no choice but to offer a sizeable concession to public sentiment. At the same time, however, Johnson again escalated the war in Vietnam, sending a bombing mission to within a hundred miles of Hanoi on the same day as his congressional address.

There are many lessons to be drawn from the Selma events and their repercussions. A minor one was the death of the Rev. James Reeb. This was mourned, and properly so, throughout the United States except among the racists. The alert Johnson even picked up a telephone to offer his condolences to the widow.

But only sixteen days before the white minister and two of his associates were clubbed down by five white racists, Malcolm X was assassinated in New York. His foes said the ultimate cause of the murder of Malcolm X was his advocating self-defense against the force and violence of the racists. Where were the editorial homilies on how the nonviolent philosophy of the Rev. Reeb brought on his own doom?

But the most important thing to note is the swift and deep-going nation-wide reaction to the police terror in Selma. Sentiment rose so high that clergymen everywhere were threatening to mobilize. Demonstrations flared from coast to coast. Advocates of nonviolence like James Farmer began talking the forbidden language of effective self-defense. The spirit of Malcolm X seemed to be striding across

the United States.

What were the causes of all this?

First of all, Johnson's "escalation" of the war in Vietnam is deeply unpopular. The American people gave Johnson an unprecedented majority precisely because they were afraid of the policies advocated by Goldwater and because Johnson attacked Goldwater on his "trigger happy" propensities.

Immediately after winning office, Johnson disposed of his promises as so much campaign literature, precisely as the candidates of the Socialist Workers party had predicted.

But by breaking his promises so abruptly and without so much as offering a sentence of explanation, Johnson alienated those who had voted for him as the "lesser evil." He at once appeared to them for what he really is -- the trigger-happy twin of Goldwater.

The Selma events came immediately on top of Johnson's broken promises about not extending the war. The main impact of this was on the 22,000,000 Negro people and their allies. In the election, the Negroes permitted to vote had cast ninety-seven per cent of their ballots in favor of Johnson. They were voting against Goldwater's evident friendship with the racists. They took Johnson as the "lesser evil."

In Selma, they saw the continuation and even worsening of the old shape of things. When the first reaction of the White House was to do nothing, to only talk, to try to gain time, to mumble about more "laws," the blacks saw Johnson for what he really is -- the racist-minded twin of Goldwater, just a "Southern cracker," as Malcolm X described the Texas politician.

Thus the combination of the "escalation" in Vietnam and the police terror-stirred the American people as they have not been stirred for a long time. In Selma they caught a glimpse of the way America looks to the rest of the world. Is this the "democracy" of the boasted main defender of the "free world"? Is this what Johnson is exporting to South Vietnam? Is this what Johnson is offering to North Vietnam?

Johnson is now moving wildly to save his "lesser evil" image, to dissociate himself from the image of Selma. It remains to be seen if it is not too little and too late.

For the rest of the world, a certain lesson is to be learned from the anger of the American people over the policies of their rulers. Too often the United States is viewed as an unbroken and most depressing scene of political backwardness, political stupidity and insensitivity to the rest of humanity. The American imperialists seem to be able to get away with anything. This is not an accurate

picture.

There are forces in the United States that do want peace, that do want democracy, that do want friendship with other countries and who feel solidarity with all the humble of other lands. The outburst of feeling in America is an expression of these forces. They constitute potentially the most powerful obstacle to the reactionary policies of America's rulers both at home and abroad.

TORONTO STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE FOR SELMA

TORONTO, March 12 -- The sit-in at the U.S. consulate general by a squad of University of Toronto students in solidarity with the embattled Negroes of Selma, Alabama, has won wide public support in Canada. Television, radio and newspapers have been giving round-the-clock coverage since some 300 students marched on the consulate the afternoon of March 10. Thirty-eight sat down on the lobby floor of the consulate, blocking diplomatic goings on until forty police forcibly dragged them out one by one.

The ejected students made three attempts to re-enter the consulate but were blocked by police standing shoulder to shoulder in front of the entrance. Joined by other youthful supporters, the thirty-eight sat on the sidewalk, holding a vigil there throughout the night despite weather with the thermometer at twelve below freezing.

In behalf of the Friends of SNCC [Student Nonviolent Co-ordinating Committee], Diane Burrows declared that the aim of the demonstration was not only to protest the Alabama police terror but to make known their demand for federal intervention.

The following morning, police dragged some sixty-five students from the steps to permit consulate officials to enter. Two of the demonstrators nevertheless managed to interview the consul general. They said he told them that he and his staff were appalled by what is taking place in Alabama and even felt that the demonstration of the Toronto students was useful, having a cumulative effect.

A petition was thereupon drawn up and sent into the consulate staff, asking them to express their personal opinions.

Late in the afternoon, they got a written reply from the consul general. It said, "Neither I or my associates can comply with your requests to act in a purely personal capacity."

The students say they intend to stay at the consulate until the U.S. federal government takes effective action in behalf of the Negroes.

SOUTH AFRICAN COURT RESERVES DECISION ON ALEXANDER APPEAL

After a two-day session March 2-3, in which counsel representing the Alexander Eleven crossed swords with attorneys for the Verwoerd government, the Appeal Court at Bloemfontein announced that it would reserve decision until a later date. The court did not indicate how soon this might be.

The eleven defendants, who have been condemned for terms up to ten years on charges of "conspiring" to overthrow the fascist-like apartheid government by "force and violence," appealed their conviction on grounds of a miscarriage of justice. Their defense counsel cited a number of irregularities in the conduct of the trial.

In the preliminary stages, the defendants were held incommunicado under the infamous 90-day law and some of them were subject to torture.

At present the seven male defendants are in the notorious Robben Island prison along with other famous political prisoners such as Nelson Mandela. They have been subjected to monstrous indignities and assaulted by warders.

The following account of the first day of the hearing appeared in the Cape Times of March 3, one of South Africa's most prominent newspapers. It obviously attempts to put the political prisoners in an unfavorable light; but it was more objective than the account that appeared in the rival Cape Argus which tried to play up the government attorney. The headline in the Cape Times article reads "PRISON CENSORSHIP 'IRREGULAR,' COURT TOLD." The subheadings appear in the original.

* * *

BLOEMFONTEIN -- The appeal of Dr. Neville Edward Alexander, a 28-year-old Coloured teacher of Cape Town, and 10 others against their conviction on charges of sabotage began in the Appeal Court here yesterday.

They were found guilty by Mr. Justice H.A. van Heerden in the Cape Town Supreme Court in April last year of sabotage by conspiring to overthrow the Government through violent revolution, guerrilla warfare and sabotage.

They were alleged to have conspired sabotage while being members of the so-called Yu Chin Chang Club, or the National Liberation Front.

The appellants are Neville Edward Alexander, Don John William Davies, Marcus Solomons, Elizabeth van der Heyden, Fikile Charles Bam, Lionel Basil Davis, Ian Leslie van der Heyden, Dulcie Evon September, Dorothy Hazel Alexander (sister of accused number one), Doris van

der Heyden and Gordon Frederick Hendricks.

Got 10 Years

All are Coloured people, except Bam who is an African.

Alexander, Don Davies, Marcus Solomons, Elizabeth van der Heyden and Fikile Bam were each sentenced to 10 years. Lionel Davis and Gordon Frederick Hendricks were each sentenced to seven years.

Ian Leslie van der Heyden, Dulcie Evon September, Dorothy Hazel Alexander and Doris van der Heyden were each given the minimum sentence of five years.

The appeal is being heard by Mr. Justice N. Ogilvie Thompson, Mr. Justice P.J.Wessels, and Mr.H.J.Potgieter.

Mr.G.Gordon, QC, and Mr.R.M.Marais appear for the appellants and Mr.J.E.Nothing for the State.

Beginning his argument, Mr.Gordon submitted that the reading and censoring of certain written instruction of accused numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 11 by members of the Prisons Department at Robben Island before the opening of the defence case constituted an irregularity or illegality in connection with the trial. These were written instructions to counsel and certain affidavits by professors under whom Alexander had studied in Germany.

Not Lawful

There was nothing in the Prison Act or the regulations which authorized and, therefore, made lawful the reading of privileged communications between attorney and client by any member of the prison staff.

The trial was unfair in that from January 13, 1964, the fundamental principle of confidential access by the accused to their legal representatives was violated, with the following consequences:

The contents of the confidential communications may have come to the knowledge of the authorities or State counsel, although State counsel assured the court that as far as they were aware they neither saw nor became aware of the contents of such communications.

No assurances of a similar nature were given by the police.

Not Called

Even if believed, Sergeant Van Wyk's denial that he saw the instructions did not preclude the possibility that it was seen by other investigating police or the contents conveyed to them.

It was also significant that Col. J.G. McIntyre, Security Police Chief of Cape Town, was not called to give evidence, in spite of the fact that Captain Visser of the Prisons Department could not say that he did not discuss the case with Colonel McIntyre.

The names of people not yet mentioned in the State case were disclosed in the instructions and it was open to the police to interrogate these people either under the 90-Day Detention Clause of the General Law Amendment Act or otherwise, and so obtain information prejudicial to the accused.

The accused Alexander claimed that he was prejudiced and it was clearly a factor which weighed with him in electing to keep out of the witness box.

Grave Breach

"It was one of the gravest breaches of privilege one can conceive. How could the accused be expected to conduct their defence after that?" Mr. Gordon asked.

Mr. Justice Thompson: Why should the accused have been afraid to go into the witness box if those written instructions had contained the truth?

Mr. Gordon: The police might have got people held under 90-Days to give evidence against the accused or obtain information about them which would prejudice their case.

Lost Confidence

Mr. Justice Thomson: It is not enough to show that there had been an irregularity. You have got to show that it was a failure of justice.

Mr. Gordon submitted that whether or not the investigating authorities or State counsel became aware of the privileged instructions was not the sole test. The question was whether the accused had a well-grounded apprehension of any such awareness. "Justice should not only be done, but manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done."

It was submitted that, at the very least, the accused could not feel confident during the trial that their privileged instructions had not been seen by the investigating authorities.

The election of some of the accused not to venture into the witness box prejudiced all the accused, as, had Alexander's defence evidence been accepted after cross-examination, all the accused would have benefited.

The legislature obviously appreciated that a criminal trial might be rendered unfair in an infinite variety of ways, Mr. Gordon

said.

By way of example, prison authorities might refuse to allow an accused to communicate with a lawyer before the trial, telling him that he was not entitled to be represented except in certain particular cases.

Legal Remedy

Drugs might be administered to an awaiting-trial prisoner by ill-disposed warders with a view to inducing mental confusion.

Consultations between lawyer and client in prisons might be secretly tape-recorded.

A policeman or woman might be deliberately placed in court behind defence counsel, with instructions to peer over counsel's shoulder and read the accused's privileged instructions, or an awaiting-trial prisoner might be threatened with assault or starvation if he said anything in his defence.

It was submitted that it was to provide a remedy in such eventualities that the legislature employed the wide phrase "in connection with the trial."

Witness's Notes

In short, it was submitted that the accused did not have a fair trial, or, at the least there was a suspicion that they did not have a fair trial, Mr.Gordon said.

It was also submitted on behalf of appellants that the refusal to order the production of, and allow cross-examination on, certain notes made by the witness J.J.Kotze and relied on by him in refreshing his memory for the purpose of making his statement to the police, was an irregularity in the proceedings during the trial.

These notes, of certain conversations with accused Don Davis, were obvious relevant matter for cross-examination, and the defence was entitled to their production.

Evidence of Kotze was very important because he alleged that accused Davis had told him that they were planning violence, guerilla warfare and sabotage and that "they were going to kill the Whites in February."

If the judge's refusal to order production of the notes was irregular, the appeal must be allowed unless the State could show that even if the irregularity had not occurred, a reasonable trial court would inevitably have convicted the accused.

Mr.Gordon finally submitted that it was not permissible in law for counsel for the State to make any reference, direct or in-

direct, in cross-examination of an accused to a written statement given by him to police officials while being detained under the 90-Day Detention Clause.

The common law was clear that no statement made by an accused person may be given in evidence against him unless the prosecution showed (and the onus was on it) that the statement was freely and voluntarily made. This concluded Mr. Gordon's argument.

Had Gone

Mr. J. E. Nothling began argument for the State by discussing the question whether the refusal to order the production of the notes made by the witness Kotze constituted an irregularity.

He said since Kotze was no longer in possession of the notes at the time when the application for their production was made and did not know what had become of them after he had handed them to a police officer, and since there was no evidence that he was in a position to produce the notes, the trial judge could not properly have ordered him to produce the notes.

The application for the production of Kotze's notes was, in effect, an application for an order of discovery against the State, and as there was no procedure by which such an order could be made in a criminal trial the application was rightly refused.

Referring to the reading and censoring of the written instructions of appellants 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 11 by members of the Prisons Department of Robben Island, Mr. Nothling said Captain Visser, of the Prisons Department, read the notes because he considered it his duty to censor them.

Not Revealed

The appellants were at the time prisoners in the prison at Robben Island and the documents in question had not yet been handed to their counsel.

The trial court judge found as a fact that the notes were not shown to any member of the Security Police by the prison officials.

The censoring of the documents was not a proceeding in connection with the trial. It was merely an administrative matter concerning the management of the prisons.

If the instructions contained in the notes had been conveyed to the Security Police he would have had a much stronger case against him coming, Mr. Nothling said. But the trial court found, as a fact, that this had not happened.

The court adjourned till today. -- (Sapa.)

MORE POLITICAL ARRESTS IN SOUTH AFRICA

According to information received in Lusaka, Zambia, the Verwoerd government is continuing its political witch-hunt against all declared or potential opponents of the apartheid regime. The two latest victims are Lee Linda Sihlali and Mtshizana, a lawyer who has defended hundreds of victims charged under the "anti-Communism" or "Sabotage" acts.

Sihlali, a graduate of the University of South Africa and a teacher in Queenstown, was a member of the Cape African Teachers' Association [CATA] which became affiliated to the All-African Convention in the fight against oppression.

In 1954 when CATA rejected the debased "Bantu Education" which Verwoerd sought to impose on the African children, the entire executive board of the organization was dismissed from their jobs. Since then, Sihlali has been hounded from place to place by the police in addition to being blacklisted so as to deny him any opportunity to earn a living.

Despite the persecution, he was active in organizing landless peasants of the Transkei and was elected to the executive of the All-African Convention. In 1961 he became a founding member of the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa [APDUSA], which is affiliated to the Unity Movement of South Africa.

Sihlali was arrested February 24 at Rustenburg, according to the report. He is being held for trial on charges of violating his "banned" status and of allegedly attempting to leave South Africa without valid documents.

Mtshizana, who is also a prominent member of the Unity Movement of South Africa is being held at East London, Cape Province.

He had previously been arrested on the allegation that he was in unlawful possession of a firearm. The charge was dismissed but the police nevertheless served a five-year banning order on him.

Later he was arrested on another charge, the nature of which is not known to his friends in Lusaka. He was released on bond of £500 [[\$1,400]], on condition that he report to the police twice a day. On Mondays he had to report three times, once to one police station, twice to another. This had been going on since November 1963.

What charges the police have now placed against Mtshizana to justify declaring his £500 bail as forfeited is not known in Lusaka.

Friends are consulting on what can be done to help the two in their coming ordeal before the fascist courts of South Africa. The situation is especially difficult for the two as they are without funds.

TROTSKYISTS UPHOLD CLASS-STRUGGLE PROGRAM IN CEYLON ELECTION

The Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary) is battling for the revolutionary socialist program of the Fourth International in the March 22 elections in Ceylon. The LSSP(R) is running four candidates for parliament: Edmund Samarakkody in Bulathsinhala, Bala Tampoe in Colombo Central, Meryl Fernando in Moratuwa, and V. Karalasingham in Kankasanturai.

The LSSP(R) is campaigning against all the other parties, including the old LSSP in which Dr. N.M. Perera managed to get a majority vote last year for participating in the bourgeois coalition government of Prime Minister Mrs. Sirima Bandaranaike. Under the leadership of Edmund Samarakkody, a section of the membership, backed by the Fourth International, refused to join in the betrayal. They organized the LSSP(R) to carry on the program of class struggle on which the Trotskyist movement was founded in Ceylon, and today constitute the Ceylon section of the Fourth International.

The election campaign in Ceylon has offered exceptional difficulties for the four candidates. N.M. Perera and those who went along with him in his capitulatory policies are doing their utmost to eliminate the LSSP(R) from parliament, where they would stand as the only representatives of the working class categorically opposed to all capitalist governments. At the risk of seeing reactionaries elected, Perera has entered LSSP candidates against Meryl Fernando and Edmund Samarakkody. In Kankasanturai, the Communist party and pro-Chinese wing of the Communist party entered candidates against V. Karalasingham. (Both wings of the CP support the coalition government.) In Colombo Central, the two CP's did the same against Bala Tampoe. There, however, three seats are at stake.

The program of the coalition government, which lost office by a single vote in parliament last December, is one of rather fuzzy reforms glued together by Mrs. Bandaranaike's hope of keeping wages frozen and of blocking the working class from a political course that could lead to a socialist victory in Ceylon.

The capitalist right wing are waging a virulent campaign against her. It is not clear whether they believe they can defeat her, or think their pressure will keep her to the "right of center," or feel that propaganda in the McCarthyite mold is best calculated to win the approval of their imperialist allies abroad.

Thus part of Mrs. Bandaranaike's electioneering has been spent in defending the coalition she engineered between the Sri Lanka Freedom Party [SLFP], which she heads, and the Perera organization. When she launched her campaign January 16 at Anuradhapura, she said quite frankly to the capitalists and landlords of Ceylon:

"The progress we were making in some of the nationalised ventures was not fast enough. For progress in these fields you need

industrial peace. To have industrial peace you had to get the co-operation of the working classes of this country. To do so I sought the co-operation and assistance of the leaders of working classes. I did not do so with the ulterior motive of keeping myself in power or to destroy the Sasana as is being alleged by our opponents. I did it because I sincerely felt that that was one way of achieving the implementation of the socialist policies of the late Mr. Bandaranaike. You all know we formed a coalition with the LSSP who joined us to help us to implement some of the policies of the late Mr. Bandaranaike, which were common to some of their policies as well."

The most radical proposal in the platform of the SLFP is the formation of "workers councils." Here is the plank:

"To set up workers' councils in all institutions including Government Corporations. Whilst linking these councils on all possible occasion in the running of the administration they will be entrusted with the power to eradicate wastage, corruption and inefficiency. Further these Councils will be empowered to submit proposals to run these institutions efficiently. It will also be the duty of these Councils to educate its members on the necessity to maintain strict discipline among the workers."

Should the coalition win the election, it will prove instructive to see how much of this plank proves to be pure verbiage. The last sentence indicates that if "councils" should be set up, they will be used to police the workers and help enforce a wage freeze, insofar as that is possible against their resistance.

It is interesting to note that Mrs. Bandaranaike did not make an issue of the single vote by which her government lost office. In an election statement, the Ceylon Communist party (pro-Chinese) attacked the LSSP(R) for apparently helping to bring down the Bandaranaike government in the parliamentary vote. The statement declared that the Central Committee of the CCP "condemned the so-called leftist parties, like the MEP and the LSSP(R) for permitting themselves to be used as tools by reaction in defence of Lake House [the capitalist publishing monopoly]."

Madame Bandaranaike, however, said in her opening campaign speech that she did not consider that vote decisive. "The Government, although defeated, still had a majority in Parliament. We could well have called for a vote of confidence and obtained it when our MP's who were abroad had returned. But I did not choose to take that step. I decided that I would go before the people and take a verdict once again from the people of this country. . . ."

The one-vote margin was accidental, in her opinion, and she called attention to the speculation of a former collaborator who decamped to the extreme right wing. If one MP's tire had not gone flat, if Dr. N.M. Perera had not been sick, if Bernard Soysa had not been away from the island. . . . [The latter two are leaders of the

LSSP coalitionists.] Then her government would not have had to go to the electorate so soon. But no matter; she preferred it that way.

The right-wing bourgeois United National party [UNP] and the right-wing split-off from the SLFP, the Sri Lanka Socialist Freedom party [SLSNP] -- the ones who really brought down the government -- are doing their best to stir up the most backward and reactionary sentiments. Their propaganda is self-contradictory and even ludicrous; but they, of course, are not appealing to reason -- they seem to have been studying the campaign propaganda of the Democrats and Republicans in the U.S.

They do not at all agree that N.M.Perera and his lieutenants are captives in the coalition and that they have gone over to the program of the late Mr. Bandaranaike, as carefully and repeatedly explained by the really astute Prime Minister. Instead, they picture her as the naive widow of the late eminently respectable Mr.S.W.R.D. Bandaranaike, a gullible woman who has unfortunately fallen victim to the sly Marxists, boring their way from within. As they picture it, the coalition signifies that Ceylon is on the verge of a Marxist take-over. They even spell it out as a "Chinese" take-over, attempting to make capital out of the good relations between Mrs. Bandaranaike's government and the People's Republic of China.

"The Chinese dragon has been growing increasingly more menacing and carnivorous," runs a typical bit of this lurid propaganda. "When it is not moving into the territory of its neighbours, like Buddhist Tibet, when it is not grabbing jumping off points for further depre-dations as in her border war with India and when it is not breathing fire and thunder in order to cow smaller nations into submission, it is working insidiously to win friends whom it can proceed to devour at its leisure."

As evidence, an "invasion" of Ceylon is pictured as already underway. "Numbers of Chinese have been seen dogging the footsteps of Opposition candidates from Vaddukodai to Weligama, lending strength to rumours that there are many Chinese who cannot justify their presence in the island, as much sly entrants probably as any who have crossed the Palk Strait stealthily at night."

These "Chinese invaders," they note, have all been trained to speak perfect Ceylonese, so as to better carry out their sly, secret invasion. When it is pointed out that there are only thirty-five Chinese in Ceylon and that these are not all consummate linguists, this is brushed aside as merely the official figure. What about the hordes that have been slipping in illegally?

To show the lengths to which this nonsense reaches, Dudley Senanayaka, the leading figure of the UNP, claims he is being trailed in his campaign by Chinese "with cameras, film equipment and tape." In one place "a Chinaman jumped into Mr. Senanayake's path and shot a flash photograph of him." While the heroic Senanayake was "calming

the crowd" the insidious "Chinaman was whisked away in a car which suddenly appeared on the scene."

Another major theme in perfect harmony with the "invasion" absurdities is the "Marxist threat" to Buddhism. To believe these defenders of all that is holy in Ceylon, the "Marxists" in the coalition are there only to do in the Buddhist monks.

Mrs. Bandaranaike has answered this by assuring the electorate that her "Marxists" are really adherents of the Buddhist religion and in any case they stand on her program of giving Buddhism its "rightful place" in Ceylonese government and education. This, of course, is an excellent character reference, good for future use in applying for posts in coalitions.

Besides all this, the right-wing bourgeois politicians have seized on certain points where Mrs. Bandaranaike's coalition partners are singularly vulnerable and this provides the reactionaries with themes that contrast remarkably with the ones indicated above. Thus there have been big "exposures" of N.M.Perera, Colvin R. de Silva and Leslie Goonewardena as wealthy men, holding considerable stocks, costly homes and big estates.

The fact is that they happen to be wealthy men. Thus it is easy for the right-wing bourgeois opposition to show that the economic position of these men is bourgeois and that they should be condemned as bourgeois. (This is true of the Communist party leadership, too, and Dr.S.A.Wickremasinghe, the CP head, has been submitted to a similar "exposure.") The acreages of their plantations have been listed in the press, along with their stock holdings and their enviable incomes, all suitably spiced with pictures of their villas and flats.

The logical conclusion might seem to be that if these men are about to destroy Buddhism and capitalism in Ceylon and hand the island over to China, they are obviously betraying their own class, the Ceylonese bourgeoisie. But the right wingers have something different in mind. They are seeking to swing the working-class vote, and therefore this "exposure" is designed to convince the workers that the "Marxists" in the coalition are really only another set of bourgeois politicians in treacherous disguise. (Which may be true enough, but it's not the set favored by the UNP and the right-wing SLFPers who split from Mrs. Bandaranaike.)

This objective comes out quite clearly in another theme of the extreme right wing; namely that the "Marxists" in the coalition are betraying the workers!

Thus one of the right-wing campaigners declares: "Yet, within a few days, the strength of the masses, the enthusiasm that had been generated among clerks and harbour workers and the men and women employed in the factories were used as a lever to get a place for them-

selves in the Government of Mrs. Bandaranaike. The people were betrayed. Deliberately these leaders sabotaged the agitation for the 21 demands.

"In Opposition they had shouted that in industrial strikes the Government should support the just demands of the workers and intervene on their behalf. This was one of their constant demands of the Government of Mrs. Bandaranaike: that it was indifferent to the very people who had helped put them into power. In power these same Sama Samajists were guilty of the same offence. They turned a deaf ear and blind eyes to the strike of Velona workers."

The UNP and its satellites thus seek to utilize the very betrayal of the former Trotskyist leaders in Ceylon for their own reactionary ends! This indicates not only how cunning these bourgeois politicians are, but how a betrayal of principles by a working-class party can play into the hands of reaction in more ways than one.

But this has also added greatly to the difficulties faced by the LSSP(R) in its campaign. The four candidates and the members of the Ceylon section of the Fourth International have had to explain to the workers how the "Marxists" in the coalition are really betrayers of the basic principles of class-struggle politics. And they have had to do this in the face of smears that to do this means supporting the right wing.

In view of the immense confusion sown by the betrayal, it has not been easy to make the basic issues clear to the voters. Even such a left-wing formation as the pro-Chinese CP saw fit to join in the attack on the Trotskyists of the LSSP(R) who are intransigently holding up the banner of revolutionary socialism in Ceylon.

The principal piece of literature issued by the LSSP(R) is their election manifesto. This offers a Marxist analysis of capitalist rule in Ceylon in both its UNP and SLFP variations and what has happened to the conditions of the people under both regimes. The peasants suffer from continued landlessness, the workers from a wage freeze, with the use of repression to prevent them from a breakthrough. The middle classes, too, have suffered under SLFP rule. Unemployment, the rising cost of living, corruption, and the problem of the minorities and the unity of the nation remain the key issues.

The manifesto analyzes the coalition government and demonstrates that the assumption of government responsibility by the LSSP reformists changed nothing essential. The effect of their betrayal was to shore up the shaky government of Mrs. Bandaranaike and delay the possibility of bringing a workers and peasants government to power.

The LSSP(R) appeals for a "United Front of Working Class Parties and Organization in the perspective of an Anti-Capitalist Struggle," and advocates the following election platform:

- (1) The abrogation of the Soulbury Constitution, and the framing of a new Constitution by democratically elected representatives of workers, peasants, and toilers.
- (2) Immediate withdrawal of Ceylon from the British Imperialist dominated Commonwealth.
- (3) Guarantee of Democratic Liberties of the people including:
 - (a) Freedom of Speech, Press, Assembly and Association; and
 - (b) Full Trade Union Rights to all employees and Political Rights to employees of Government or Government Corporations and enterprises.
- (4) The repeal of all repressive legislation.
- (5) No discrimination in the field of education, employment or grant of any state aid or licence or in any other sphere against linguistic and religious minorities and no interference with their democratic rights, and more specifically the framing of legislation to make Tamil also an Official Language of Ceylon which status has already been accorded to the Sinhala language.
- (6) The grant of full citizenship rights to plantation workers and to all such persons who are now referred to as stateless persons, and who are desirous of obtaining Ceylon citizenship. All persons in the category of stateless who desire to leave Ceylon to be offered all facilities to do so.
- (7) The confiscation of all large Estates of Tea, Rubber, Coconut and Cocoa without compensation. All confiscated estates to be under the management and control of Workers' Councils.
- (8) Nationalisation of all Banks.
- (9) Confiscation of all large Industrial and Commercial Establishments and Enterprises without compensation. All such confiscated enterprises to be under the management and control of Workers' Councils.
- (10) Freezing of all Foreign Assets and prohibiting of the export of dividends.
- (11) Immediate unfreezing of wages -- a sliding scale of wages in relation to the cost of living to all wage-earners receiving less than Rs.500 [\$100] per month.
- (12) The Right to Work or Maintenance.
- (13) No Retrenchment without alternative employment and ade-

quate compensation for past services.

(14) Freedom of entry into estates and the grant of tenancy rights to all employees who are granted housing in Estates.

(15) Confiscation of property of employers who employ violence or intimidation against their workers.

(16) Opening of Books of all employers to workers inspection.

(17) The expropriation of all land suitable for house building and the establishment of Housing Schemes under the control and management of Tenants' Committees. Compensation to be paid only to owners of such land in the lower income groups.

(18) Taking Over of all tenements and the management of such tenements by Tenants' Committees.

(19) Nationalisation of all large paddy land holdings and allocation of cultivator rights to Peasants' Committees.

(20) (a) All landless peasants to be granted Crown lands with full rights of ownership. Where Crown land is not available suitable private land be expropriated without compensation, for distribution among landless peasants. Compensation to be paid only in the case of owners of land in the lower income groups. (b) All squatters of Crown land or private land belonging to capitalists and big landowners be granted full rights of ownership of land already occupied by them. All prosecutions at present pending in the courts of Law against squatters be withdrawn.

(21) State sponsored Co-operative farms for development of Animal Husbandry and other livestock farming.

(22) State sponsored reorganisation of and rationalisation of Cottage Industries on a co-operative production basis.

(23) All co-operative distributing centres to be under the direct management of consumers served by such centres.

(24) Workers' Control and Management in Government enterprises and Corporations.

MUTINY AMONG TSHOMBE'S FORCES

The 13th Commando Battalion at Bunia refused March 9 to accompany Tshombe's white mercenaries in a move north to fight the Congolese freedom fighters. They demanded to be flown back to Elizabethville. All correspondents have been barred from the zone.

MALCOLM X'S LAST INSIGHTS

By Evelyn Sell

III.

After Malcolm X's murder a member of the Chicago Temple of Elijah Muhammad's Black Muslim movement remarked, "You might say the chickens have come home to roost." This Muslim was referring to the famous remark made by Malcolm about the assassination of President Kennedy. Although forbidden by Muhammad to speak about the president's murder, Malcolm made the comment that the assassination was a case "of chickens coming home to roost."

Malcolm's explanation of what he meant by this was, ". . . the death of Kennedy was the result of a long line of violent acts, the culmination of hate and suspicion and doubt in this country. . . this country has allowed white people to kill and brutalize those they don't like. . . America -- at the death of the President -- just reaped what it had been sowing." (Exactly what newspaper editorials are saying about Malcolm's assassination now.)

Muhammad placed Malcolm under suspension for the remarks about Kennedy and for several months Malcolm remained minister of the Harlem mosque but was not permitted to speak in public. On March 9, 1964, Malcolm announced that he had split with the Black Muslims and was opening his own mosque in Harlem. Many Muslims left with him and later even one of Muhammad's sons joined Malcolm.

A formal statement was issued at a press conference held March 12. It is of value to trace the changes in program and outlook from the time this statement was issued until the day of Malcolm's death. The statement reiterated his religious affiliation with Islam and his belief that "the best solution is complete separation with our people going back home, to our own African homeland."

However, some new notes were struck: ". . . separation back to Africa is still a long-range program, and while it is yet to materialize, 22 million of our people who are still here in America need better food, clothing, housing, education and jobs right now." His new independence from Muhammad's control made it possible for Malcolm to now join other civil-rights groups and leaders in common actions. "Whites can help us, but they can't join us. There can be no black-white unity until there is first some black unity."

His previous remarks about self-defense took on a more specific character. "In areas where our people are the constant victims of brutality, and the government seems unable or unwilling to protect them, we should form rifle clubs that can be used to defend our lives and our property in times of emergency. . . ." This was the only part of the statement publicized by the mass media; and Negro leaders

rushed to denounce Malcolm and the proposed rifle clubs.*

On the crucial question of independent political action there was no definitive stand but only a promise of plans at "a later date." About two weeks later, on March 29, Malcolm announced that the first campaign of his new black nationalist movement would be a massive voter-registration drive. "We've got to get everyone in Harlem registered, not as Democrats or Republicans but as independents." Negroes must use the ballot as their bullet. In subsequent public speeches he attacked both the Democrats and Republicans with equal fervor: "Any Negro who registers as a Democrat or a Republican is a traitor to his own people."

A growing emphasis was placed on the international implications of the Freedom Now movement. In April 1964 Malcolm pointed out in a speech, ". . . any kind of racial explosion that takes place in this country today, in 1964, is not a racial explosion that can be confined to the shores of America. It is a racial explosion that can ignite the racial powder keg that exists all over the planet that we call earth. Now I think that nobody would disagree that the dark masses of Africa and Asia and Latin America are already seething with bitterness, animosity, hostility, unrest, and impatience with the racial intolerance that they themselves have experienced at the hands of the white West. . . It should also be understood that the racial sparks that are ignited here in America today could easily turn into a flaming fire abroad which only means it could engulf all the people of this earth into a giant race war."

This was a secular version of Muhammad's preachings of an Armageddon for the white devils. A week before his assassination I heard Malcolm talk of American, French and British "imperialism" rather than of the "white West" and instead of a "giant race war" he explained the necessity of uniting the internal struggle against American imperialism with the external struggle against American imperialism being waged by peoples throughout the world.

In this April 1964 speech Malcolm proposed a campaign which occupied much of his time and energy during his last year. "The civil rights struggle involves the black man taking his case to the white man's court. But when he fights it at the human rights level, it is a different situation. It opens the door to take Uncle Sam to the world court. The black man doesn't have to go to court to be free. Uncle Sam should be taken to court and made to tell why the black man is not free in a so-called free society. Uncle Sam should be taken

*Rifle clubs are quite common throughout the United States. Today they generally include sports and gun enthusiasts of all kinds who regularly engage in target practice and hunting, but they go back to the time of locally organized militia and to the provision included in the Constitution that "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." -- Editor.

into the United Nations and charged with violating the UN charter on human rights."

Shortly after making this speech Malcolm went to Africa to organize support among the independent nations for his proposal to carry the American Negro struggle into the United Nations. His followers in the United States began to receive letters from him that indicated further deep-going changes in his outlook toward whites and the establishment of a separate state. In an April 25 letter he described how he had witnessed in Mecca "a spirit of unity and brotherhood that my experiences in America had led me to believe could never exist between the white and non-white." Upon his return to America at the end of May he stated that he thought Negroes should stay and fight in the United States for what was rightfully theirs.

On June 28, 1964, Malcolm launched the Organization of Afro-American Unity [OAAU] patterned after the Organization of African Unity which was founded in May 1963 to unite all Africans in the fight to eliminate colonialism. The OAAU program showed a further development of ideas and a much more concrete approach to the daily tasks of the struggle. Specific projects outlined included community action to improve schools and textbooks, support to rent strikes and a housing self-improvement program, a community program to help unwed mothers, drug addicts, juvenile delinquents and veterans desiring to establish businesses. The major point was that the Negro community would control its own destiny through its own organs of power.

On political action: "The Organization of Afro-American Unity will organize the Afro-American community block by block to make the community aware of its power and potential; we will start immediately a voter-registration drive to make every unregistered voter in the Afro-American community an Independent voter; we propose to support and/or organize political clubs, to run Independent candidates for office, and to support any Afro-American already in office who answers to and is responsible to the Afro-American community."

In order to carry out the OAAU program it was necessary to build a substantial organization. Although Malcolm was a gifted orator and had been declared a highly successful organizer for the Black Muslims, the tasks now facing him were unparalleled in his career. How to go about this immense task? Did Malcolm X feel that he was now first beginning his true life's work? Did he feel the need to survey the difficult road he had travelled and to ponder what might lie ahead before plunging on? Did he feel that the next step should be to strengthen the links with Africa in preparation for what was coming in the U.S.? During the summer and fall of 1964 he was not to be seen in the ghettos of America; he was abroad in Africa, talking with the leaders of the struggle there against colonialism and imperialism. ". . . I spent five months in the Middle East and Africa," he said at a January 7, 1965, forum of the New York socialist weekly The Militant, "primarily for the purpose of getting better acquainted with them and making them better acquainted with us, giv-

ing them a first-hand account of our problems and what our problems actually consist of." Among the things he won was "official recognition and support" of both the Moslem Mosque, Inc., and the OAAU.

In July he addressed a conference of the Organization of African Unity and urged the members: "In the interests of world peace and security, we beseech the heads of the independent African states to recommend an immediate investigation into our problems by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. . . ." While in Kenya he was given time on the government radio and met with top-level government officials. The U.S. embassy protested such honors accorded a man held in low repute in the United States; but the Kenya government rejected the protest. The World Muslim League, founded in 1962 as the supreme religious body in the Muslim world, designated Malcolm as their official representative in the United States.

Malcolm visited Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Egypt, Zambia, Tanzania, Nigeria, Ghana, Liberia, Guinea, Algeria, Sudan and Kenya. He spoke with Nasser, Nyerere, Sékou Touré, Nkrumah, Azikiwe and Kenyatta. American newspapers complained bitterly that Malcolm was responsible for the African opposition to United States policies in the United Nations discussions on the Congo.

While Malcolm was busy overseas the OAAU began holding meetings. African and Afro-American history was taught once a week at a Liberation School. A biweekly newsletter, Blacklash, was published. On November 24, 1964, Malcolm returned to the United States. He spoke at OAAU rallies, flew to Europe for speaking engagements in France and England (the French refused him entry), and spoke at meetings across the United States.

He gave increasing evidence that he was considering the nature of capitalist society as a whole and the possibility of its being replaced by socialism. His close friends were well aware of this; but it was also clear from public remarks he made. In an interview with two editors of the Young Socialist [March-April 1965 issue] he said, "And if you notice, I haven't been using the expression [of black nationalism] for several months." Asked about the "world-wide struggle now going on between capitalism and socialism," he said flatly that it is "impossible for capitalism to survive."

Hot sparks began to fly between Malcolm and the Black Muslims. They were trying to evict him from a house which they claimed they owned and Malcolm claimed was given to him by supporters. Malcolm made public statements about Muhammad's personal and religious life, about financial links between the Black Muslims, the Ku Klux Klan and the American Nazi party. There was a report that Malcolm was planning to testify that the Muslims were not a bona fide religious group and therefore could not qualify for certain tax exemptions. Malcolm repeatedly asserted that he was "a marked man." On February 14 a fire bomb was thrown into his home. On the afternoon of February 21 he was shot to death at a meeting of the OAAU.

Who was responsible? Malcolm X repeatedly publicized the fact that a plot was underfoot to take his life. He named names. But provocateurs may have been at work. Sinister forces had everything to gain by touching off a blood feud among the black nationalists and thus diverting them from the common foe.

James Shabazz, the personal secretary of Malcolm X was completely correct in stating that the OAAU does not seek revenge, that it is a slander to accuse the followers of Malcolm X of such an aim, that what they seek is the exact opposite -- the unity of all sectors of Afro-Americans. This stand promises well for the movement that Malcolm X set out to build.

Who will now rise to the challenge and become the new, improved Malcolm X? This will be seen without long delay since the economic and social conditions that produced him exist on a nationwide scale and are growing in intensity. The courageous example of Malcolm X will inspire an entire new generation and he will be remembered as the first of a new galaxy of black leaders who will guide the way in remaking America from top to bottom.

[End of series.]

WHAT MALCOLM X REALLY STOOD FOR

TWO SPEECHES BY MALCOLM X. New York: Pioneer Publishers, 5 East Third Street, New York, N.Y. 10003. 1965. 32 pp. \$.25.

This well-printed pamphlet was compiled and published after the assassination of Malcolm X. Besides two full speeches by the martyred black leader, it contains the text of his statement upon breaking from Elijah Muhammad's Nation of Islam, remarks made at a forum of The Militant, the New York socialist weekly, a radio interview given some three weeks before his death and extracts from an interview granted the Young Socialist.

Malcolm X has been greatly maligned and slandered. This pamphlet provides invaluable material to show what he really stood for. From his own words, voiced over a period of almost a year, we can judge his views on some of the key problems facing the movement for black emancipation in the United States.

Of special interest is the evolution of these views as reflected in these same declarations. It is quite evident that Malcolm X was developing at a remarkable rate when he was struck down by the assassins' bullets.

Some of the highlights are indicated in the following ex-

tracts:

* * *

March 12, 1964

"Our political philosophy will be Black Nationalism. Our economic and social philosophy will be Black Nationalism. Our cultural emphasis will be Black Nationalism.

"Many of our people aren't religiously inclined, so the Muslim Mosque, Inc., will be organized in such manner to provide for the active participation of all Negroes in our political, economic, and social programs, despite their religious or nonreligious beliefs.

"The political philosophy of Black Nationalism means: we must control the politics and the politicians of our community. They must no longer take orders from outside forces. We will organize and sweep out of office all Negro politicians who are puppets for the outside forces."

* * *

April 8, 1964

"If George Washington didn't get independence for this country nonviolently, and if Patrick Henry didn't come up with a nonviolent statement, and you taught me to look upon them as patriots and heroes then its time for you to realize that I have studied your books well."

* * *

"And I say your people because I certainly couldn't include myself among those for whom independence was fought in 1776. How in the world can a Negro talk about the Declaration of Independence when he is still singing 'We Shall Overcome'? Our people are increasingly developing the opinion that we just have nothing to lose but the chains of segregation and the chains of second-class citizenship."

* * *

"So 1964 will see the Negro revolt evolve and merge into the world-wide black revolution that has been taking place on this earth since 1945. The so-called revolt will become a real black revolution. Now the black revolution has been taking place in Africa and Asia and in Latin America. Now when I say black, I mean nonwhite. Black, brown, red or yellow. Our brothers and sisters in Asia, who were colonized by the Europeans, and in Latin America, the peasants, who were colonized by the Europeans, have been involved in a struggle since 1945 to get the colonialists, or the colonizing powers, the Europeans, off their land, out of their country.

"This is a real revolution. Revolution is always based on land. Revolution is never based on begging somebody for an integrated cup of coffee. Revolutions are never fought by turning the other cheek. Revolutions are never based upon love your enemy, and pray for those who spitefully use you. And revolutions are never waged singing, 'We Shall Overcome.' Revolutions are based upon bloodshed. Revolutions are never compromising. Revolutions are never based upon negotiations. Revolutions are never based upon any kind of tokenism whatsoever. Revolutions are never even based upon that which is begging a corrupt society or a corrupt system to accept us into it. Revolutions overturn systems, and there is no system on this earth which has proved itself more corrupt, more criminal than this system, that in 1964 still colonizes 22,000,000 African-Americans, still enslaves 22,000,000 Afro-Americans."

* * *

"All of our people have the same goals. The same objective. That objective is freedom, justice, equality. All of us want recognition and respect as human beings. We don't want to be integrationists. Nor do we want to be separationists. We want to be human beings. Integration is only a method that is used by some groups to obtain freedom, justice, equality and respect as human beings. Separation is only a method that is used by other groups to obtain freedom, justice, equality or human dignity.

"So our people have made the mistake of confusing the methods with the objectives. As long as we agree on objectives, we should never fall out with each other just because we believe in different methods or tactics or strategy to reach a common objective.

"We have to keep in mind at all times that we are not fighting for integration, nor are we fighting for separation. We are fighting for recognition as human beings. We are fighting for the right to live as free humans in this society. In fact, we are actually fighting for rights that are even greater than civil rights and that is human rights.

"We are fighting for human rights in 1964. This is a shame. The civil-rights struggle has failed to produce concrete results because it has kept us barking up the wrong tree. It has made us put the cart ahead of the horse. We must have human rights before we can secure civil rights. We must be respected as humans before we can be recognized as citizens."

* * *

"The difference between the thinking and the scope of the Negroes who are involved in the human-rights struggle and those who are involved in the civil-rights struggle -- those so-called Negroes involved in the human-rights struggle don't look upon themselves as Americans.

"They look upon themselves as a part of dark mankind. They see the whole struggle now within the confines of the American stage, but they look upon the struggle on the world stage. And, in the world context, they see that the dark man outnumbers the white man. On the world stage the white man is just a microscopic minority.

"So in this country you find two different types of Afro-Americans, the type who looks upon himself as a minority and you as the majority, because his scope is limited to the American scene; and then you have the type who looks upon himself as part of the majority and you as part of a microscopic minority. And this one uses a different approach in trying to struggle for his rights. He doesn't beg. He doesn't thank you for what you give him, because you are only giving him what he should have had a hundred years ago. He doesn't think you are doing him any favors."

* * *

"There are only 11,000,000 of our people in South Africa, there are 22,000,000 of them here. And we are receiving an injustice which is just as criminal as that which is being done to the black people of South Africa."

* * *

"In fact, when you see how many of these committee men are from the South you can see that we have nothing but a cracker* government in Washington, D.C. And their head is a cracker President. I said a cracker President. Texas is just as much a cracker state as Mississippi -- and even more so. In Texas they lynch you with a Texas accent and in Mississippi they lynch you with a Mississippi accent."

* * *

May 29, 1964

"Also, they say travel broadens your scope, and recently I've had an opportunity to do a lot of it, in the Middle East and Africa, and while I was traveling I noticed that most of the countries that had recently emerged into independence, they have turned away from the so-called capitalistic system in the direction of socialism. So out of curiosity, I can't resist the temptation to do a little investigating wherever that particular philosophy happens to be in existence or an attempt is being made to bring it into existence."

* * *

"The system in this country cannot produce freedom for an Afro-American. It is impossible for this system, this economic sys-

*Contemptuous term used by whites themselves for the most ignorant and boorish sectors of the white population in the South. -- Editor.

tem, this political system, this social system, this system, period. It's impossible for this system as it stands to produce freedom right now for the black man in this country."

* * *

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 and you happen to get that person into a conversation and they have a philosophy that makes you sure they don't have this racism in their outlook, usually they're socialists or their political philosophy is socialism."

* * *

January 7, 1965

"In 1964, 97 per cent of the black American voters supported Lyndon B. Johnson, Hubert Humphrey and the Democratic party. Ninety-seven per cent! No one minority group in the history of the world has ever given so much of its uncompromising support to one candidate and one party. No one people, no one group has ever gone all the way to support a party and its candidate as did the people, the black people, in America in 1964. . .

"And the first act of the Democratic party, Lyndon B. included, in 1965, when the representatives from the state of Mississippi who refused to support Johnson came to Washington, D.C., and the black people of Mississippi sent representatives there to challenge the legality of these people being seated, what did Johnson say? Nothing! What did Humphrey say? Nothing! What did Robert Pretty-Boy Kennedy say? Nothing! Nothing! Not one thing! These are the people that black people have supported. This is the party that they have supported. . .

"The frustration of these black representatives from Mississippi when they arrived in Washington, D.C., the other day, thinking, you know, that the Great Society was going to include them -- only to see the door close in their face like that. That's what makes them think. That's what makes them realize what they're up against. It is this type of frustration that produced the Mau Mau. They reached the point where they saw that it takes power to talk to power. It takes power to make power respect you. It takes madness almost to deal with a power structure that's so corrupt -- so corrupt.

"So 1965 should see a lot of action. Since the old methods haven't worked, they'll be forced to try new methods. . . ."

* * *

January 28, 1965

"The Organization of Afro-American Unity feels that as long as our people in this country confine their struggle within the limitations and under the jurisdiction of the United States government, we remain within the confines of the vicious system that has done nothing but exploit and oppress us ever since we've been here. So we feel that our only real hope is to make known that our problem is not a Negro problem or an American problem but rather, it has become a human problem, a world problem, and it has to be attacked at the world level, at a level at which all segments of humanity can intervene in our behalf."

* * *

"Now the African nations are speaking out and linking the problem of racism in Mississippi with the problem of racism in the Congo and also the problem of racism in South Vietnam. It's all racism. It's all part of the vicious racist system that the Western powers have used to continue to degrade and exploit and oppress the people in Africa and Asia and Latin America during recent centuries.

"And when these people in these different areas begin to see that the problem is the same problem and when the 22,000,000 black Americans see that our problem is the same as the problem of the people who are being oppressed in South Vietnam and the Congo and Latin America, then the oppressed people of this earth make up a majority, not a minority. Then we approach our problem then as a majority that can demand, not as a minority that has to beg."

* * *

"We see where the problem of Vietnam is the problem of the oppressed and the oppressor. The problem in the Congo is the problem of the oppressed and the oppressor. The problem in Mississippi and Alabama and New York is the problem of the oppressed and the oppressor. The oppressed people all over the world have the same problems and it is only now that they're becoming sufficiently sophisticated to see that all they have to do to get the oppressor off their back is to unite and realize that it is one problem -- that our problems are inseparable. And then our action will be inseparable. Our action will be one of unity and in the unity of oppressed people is actually the strength, and the best strength of the oppressed people."

* * *

Interview in the "Young Socialist"

"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. . .

"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 TRIBUTE TO MALCOLM X

[The following statement on the death of Malcolm X was issued March 12 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky.]

* * *

The death of Malcolm X, who was assassinated at what might have been the beginning of his real life's work, was a grievous blow to the freedom movement in the United States and to the cause of the oppressed in all lands.

In the politics of the United States, he epitomized first of all the speed with which a revolutionary trend can develop from seemingly the most unpromising beginnings. It was not the fault of Malcolm X that he entered manhood as one of America's delinquent youth. Like countless others he was denied equality of opportunity; and, not knowing any better, he responded in a primitive way. That he could emerge from such a background to become one of the country's outstanding radical figures in but a few short years tells much about the tempo of American politics and the swiftness with which revolutionary tendencies can evolve, once they appear, in this politically backward heartland of the world capitalist system.

The role of the Black Muslim movement in Malcolm X's development is to be noted. His break from Christianity was progressive; the Black Muslim movement helped him, as it has helped many others, to gain self-respect, to find a feeling of identity, to achieve human dignity. The negative side of the Black Muslim movement -- its tendency to withdraw to the side lines, to stop short of participation in the great civil-rights and political struggles of our times, to refuse to collaborate with other forces in seeking common aims, to reject science, to throw up a bureaucracy and to freeze in a conservative mold -- did not prove to be an insuperable barrier to Malcolm X's further development. His was not an exceptional case; he pointed the way for a trend that can become of great importance in a relatively short time.

Malcolm X epitomized above all the inherent militancy of the

American working people. Although at this stage his movement is not nearly comparable in size to the "nonviolent" movement headed by such figures as the Rev. Martin Luther King, it is far more typically American. Ghandism is exotic in the United States and is not destined to hold the center of the stage for long. The militant tendency represented by Malcolm X is certain to move to the forefront. The reason is clear enough. The extraordinary pattern of violence in the United States stems from the methods long traditional to the ruling capitalist class and its Bourbon allies in the South. The American workers have had such schooling in this that it has become a virtual reflex with them to respond with appropriate defensive measures. None of them can long be restrained by sermons about the virtues of sheep-like forbearance and repeated turning of the other cheek.

The need for adequate defensive measures to meet the murderous violence of the racists was the central point reached by Malcolm X in his thinking; he advocated it with growing understanding of its meaning and ramifications. He thus gave voice to a fundamental principle on which the American working class stands; and must be counted as one of the forerunners in its development on a huge scale in the class struggle in the United States. Had he been permitted to live, he would most certainly have become one of the leaders in organizing this method of protecting and advancing the freedom movement.

As a defender and tribune of the Negro people, whom he sought to arouse to a higher level of consciousness, Malcolm X had to cope day in and day out with the world of white oppressors. Here the development of his thinking was particularly marked. Among the whites he came to distinguish the "power structure" as the main source of evil. Toward the last he had distinguished a most important new feature -- the "capitalist" power structure.

This faced him with a key problem. If the white capitalist power structure must give way so that a better world can be built, with what should it be replaced?

Malcolm X's thinking turned toward socialism. How far he would have gone, it of course cannot be said. He was murdered before this phase of his development had been completed. This turn, however, was perfectly logical. First of all, it is an inherent tendency in the very class structure of the United States. It is not difficult for American workers, when they begin to think politically, to come almost directly to socialist conclusions. Moreover, despite the years of McCarthyism and prosperity, a native socialist current, tracing its origin back to Debs and before, remains not far below the surface. Secondly, the existence of the Soviet Union, of China and the other workers states exercises an influence despite the torrents of hate-propaganda poured in their direction and despite the real flaws and evils observable in those countries. The Cuban Revolution in particular, with its thoroughgoing destruction of discrimination, has had an influence among those layers of the working people in the United States who are the most direct victims of racism and all

that goes with it. Thirdly, the strong tendency among the new African states to move in a socialist direction and to speak for socialism has had increasing impact among the blacks in the United States.

All these things attracted and stimulated the mind of Malcolm X. In this again, he epitomized a tendency among the working people of the United States, especially the blacks, that has been growing visibly stronger alongside the rise of the civil-rights struggle and the Freedom Now movement.

One more influence upon Malcolm X should be mentioned. This was the patient and persistent work of the American followers of Leon Trotsky organized in the Socialist Workers party. Their contribution in the struggle for Negro equality stems directly from theoretical insights provided by Leon Trotsky and elaborated over the decades in the light of lessons learned in the struggle itself. Their theory held open the possible development of a movement such as the one represented by the Black Muslims long before it appeared. When it showed up on the scene, they proved capable of recognizing it, of seeing its positive side and some of the possibilities in its further evolution. They became one of the first forces in the country to rally in vigorous defense of this much persecuted and much misunderstood movement.

This was noted, particularly by Malcolm X. His appreciation of the Socialist Workers party and the American Trotskyist paper, The Militant, is a matter of record. What this really represented, however, was the tremendous progress he had made from an empirical, almost instinctive, reaction to the various loathesome sides of American class society to a consistent theoretical grasp of it as a whole. To Malcolm X, the American Trotskyist movement represented the most attractive features of socialist thought and action.

This trend in the thinking of Malcolm X was underlined by his increasing appreciation of the international side of the fierce daily struggle he was engaged in. As was to be expected, this appreciation came primarily through the Afro-American linkage. Behind the vision of an attractive African homeland, which is widely current among the blacks of the United States, lies something very real -- the need for international solidarity and backing in their struggle for full citizenship inside the United States. The tremendous advances of the colonial revolution throughout the continent of Africa, particularly dramatized by the victory in Algeria, have stirred, encouraged and inspired the Negro people as a whole in the United States. It is one of the sources of the rise in their spirit of militancy and the increasing energy of their involvement in the civil-rights movement.

Malcolm X felt this in a most intimate way and he set out to consciously develop ties with the African revolution, making an extended trip there one of the means of doing this. Seeking help in Africa for the black movement in the United States, he had to explain this movement and its aims to its politically more advanced natural

allies there. In the process he himself gained in understanding. During this trip he learned a profound truth -- that the general needs of a revolutionary struggle really do transcend color, that the oppressed, both black and white, have something in common, both in the foe they face and the goals they seek. For the most effective struggle, they must unite and pool their resources and efforts.

But such practical internationalism, however limited it may have been for the moment in specific projects, must be recognized as closely related to the general socialist outlook. By another road, Malcolm X was coming to revolutionary socialism when he was shot down.

Obviously there were many reactionary forces who stood to gain by silencing the voice of Malcolm X. He knew that he was a marked man. Several attempts were made on his life. Malcolm X had achieved such firmness of character that he rose above whatever fear or despondency he may have felt. His first concern was what might happen to his family. To the public he maintained to the last the image that best expressed his inner being -- the fighting, eloquent defender of a just cause. He had barely begun speaking before another audience in New York when the assassins struck.

Who stood behind these miserable tools? Malcolm X felt that the plot was directed from within the Black Muslims from whom he had split. But there were other forces, most sinister forces, interested in seeing this "agitator and troublemaker" out of the way. It is not excluded that provocateurs were at work. Within hours after Malcolm's death, an enormous concerted campaign was underway in the press, radio and television, attempting to sharpen the differences between the Organization of Afro-American Unity headed by Malcolm X and the Black Muslims from whom he had split. A Black Muslim Mosque in Harlem was burned. . . .

If the enemies of both groups hoped for a fratricidal war, such as has brought deadly injury to similar movements in other countries, they were disappointed by the stand taken by James Shabazz, the personal secretary of Malcolm X. In an interview granted to The Militant, he scored the allegations that the followers of Malcolm X seek vengeance for the death of their leader. Instead, he appealed for unity among Afro-Americans and other peoples of African descent, and a closing of ranks against the common enemy.

This is an absolutely correct stand, a stand favored by Malcolm X himself as revealed in the tape recording of a speech he gave shortly before he was assassinated.

The death of Malcolm X, like the death of Patrice Lumumba, is an enormous loss to his own people and to the international socialist movement. But it is clear that his development was not something purely personal, although it was hastened and made easier by his great talents and his courageous readiness to recognize limitations

in his own outlook as he came to see things more clearly and profoundly. The development of Malcolm X foreshadows the development of millions in the United States cast in his image. He will be remembered in the coming American revolution not only as a martyr but as a trail blazer.

HELP THE VIETNAMESE REVOLUTION!

[The following appeal was issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International March 11.]

* * *

The Vietnamese Revolution Needs Help -- Now!

Stop the Criminal Aggression of American Imperialism!

Each day the aims of the criminal aggression of American imperialism against the Vietnamese revolution and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam become clearer.

For a time it was claimed that "reprisals" were being carried out against raids of the South Vietnamese freedom fighters on American military bases implanted in their country. This pretext has now been abandoned. American planes are continuing to bomb towns, villages and ports in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. American marines have now been committed for the first time as ground troops against the South Vietnam freedom fighters. The Seventh Fleet is being readied for deployment against the shores of North Vietnam in order to blockade its ports and cut off its coastal shipping.

Thus the Pentagon's blueprint for extending the conflict is being methodically carried out, as is openly proclaimed in the American press. The aim is to progressively throw the full weight of American imperialism into the balance in hope of halting the development of the Vietnamese revolution.

It is of little moment whether the State Department is simultaneously pursuing a "secret" design to compel the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to "negotiate"; for Washington refuses to recognize the South Vietnamese Front of National Liberation as the legitimate representative of the South Vietnamese people; Washington is brandishing over both the freedom fighters of South Vietnam and the government of North Vietnam its crushing military superiority and the threat of plunging the world into a nuclear conflict; and it has repeatedly made clear that the only basis it considers "acceptable" for negotiation is the "withdrawal" of the freedom fighters from the ter-

ritory of their own country.

It is bare-faced imperialist propaganda worthy of a Goebbels to maintain that the partisans of the Front of National Liberation are "foreign troops" and not genuine revolutionists nurtured by the South Vietnamese people themselves, the best representatives of the peasants and workers who rose in revolt against the landlords and comprador bourgeoisie and their policy of supporting -- with the aid of the money and guns of a foreign power -- the bloody dictatorship of the Diems and the not less bloody dictatorship of the generals who succeeded them! As if a revolution mounted by the broad mass of the people, which has torn nine-tenths of its arms from the hands of the foe, could be told to "play dead" or "give up" at a signal from Hanoi, Peking, Moscow or anywhere else!

Most serious of all in this increasingly dangerous situation is the apathy which the leaderships of the principal workers states display in face of the step-by-step "escalation" of U.S. military intervention in Southeast Asia. Up to now the Kremlin officials and the Communist party leaderships largely under their influence or control have deplored the American aggressions as a "serious threat to the consolidation of peace." What "consolidation"? What "peace"? The only peace to be found through consolidation of the military aggression and counterrevolutionary actions of imperialism is the peace of the grave and slavery. The peoples of the world of today will never acquiesce, no matter what the refusal costs them. This is a great new fact in world reality which everyone who wants peace must take as basic in working out an international policy aimed at averting World War III and a nuclear holocaust.

The government of the People's Republic of China appears at the moment to be most concerned about pinning on Moscow the blame for a possible defeat of the revolution in Vietnam. But unless Peking itself acts, its course can be interpreted as "keeping hands off" while the Pentagon moves ahead. The shouting at Moscow would then look like nothing but phrasemongering designed to cover up a betrayal. No matter how correct Peking's criticisms of Moscow may be, it has its own responsibilities in the situation, including the defense of the new China. The government of the People's Republic of China would do better to offer to Khrushchev's heirs a joint public commitment to protect the common interests of the two workers states, and those of the socialist revolution, in Southeast Asia. Then let the workers of the world judge the response!

There are some who have been taken in by the propaganda of American imperialism which aims at convincing its current and prospective victims that unless the Pentagon militarists are meekly granted what they want, then you can expect them to start a nuclear war, even if it means the utter destruction of the United States. How little these easily impressed "experts" understand the real nature of the Washington "hawks"; or more properly "vultures." One of the reasons their "escalation" is proceeding step by step is to care-

fully test the resistance so as to be able to stop or even retreat in case it proves tougher than expected. Instead of being "provoked" into a nuclear answer if they receive an effective reply to their provocations, the American militarists will at once reassess the situation. But if the resistance proves softer than expected, then these same militarists will proceed more brazenly than before. Precisely in this lies one of the gravest dangers. The emboldened White House and Pentagon can become caught up in a course in which their deepening commitment makes retreat increasingly difficult. This could be the "oversight," the "accident," that takes them over the brink into World War III.

The only language that imperialism understands and respects is action sufficient for it to sense the real forces it is up against. Wrathful or tearful verbal protests only arouse contempt among these rulers of the capitalist world. They take mere shouts and polite or nasty letters as signs that it is safe to proceed according to plan. They become more and more aggressive since their aggression has cost them nothing; in fact, "paying off" from their limited point of view. The only way to block the "escalation" and to cut it short before it is too late, is to show the imperialists on the scene itself that their course is much more dangerous than they had believed, that their calculations are wrong, and that their military aggression did not pay off and promises still worse if continued.

Yankee imperialism is not in a desperate impasse at the moment. It is not caught up in a situation in which it feels there is no way out, even temporarily, except to risk suicide. Its military and economic strength stand at the greatest height in history. Prosperity reigns in the United States. Even if the capitalists are willing to risk from 70,000,000 to 140,000,000 Americans in a nuclear conflict, why should they risk their present profits, their present comforts and the pleasure of their latest gadgets? Their course in Vietnam is not the product of hopeless despair, but the consequence of cold and deliberate calculation in which they evaluate the risks as being low and in any case ascertainable as they proceed. They are banking on the weakness of the leadership of the workers states, particularly the leadership of the Soviet Union. They are counting on the divisions, especially the division on the governmental level between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. They expect all this to hinder and block the response that should have normally been expected to their monstrous decision to widen their intervention in the civil war in South Vietnam into a war against North Vietnam, and -- if this proves workable -- into a crippling military thrust against the People's Republic of China. If they should run into a vigorous reaction at the very beginning, then the results of their test probe would be read in Washington as a signal to reconsider. The elementary needs of self-defense would call for retreat from a palpably suicidal adventure.

This is what Fidel Castro obviously referred to in his speech of March 3 when he said: "We must show the imperialists that we are

not afraid of them. When you don't resist them, they continue further; but when you resist them, they stop."

This is what the Afro-Asian students and the handful of Moscow students who joined them meant in their demonstration before the American Embassy in Moscow, protesting against the aggression in North Vietnam, when they shouted at the Kremlin authorities who used violence on them: "Traitors! You've sold out to the imperialists!"

This is what the vanguard of the masses in many countries indicated they wanted as they joined in demonstrations of solidarity with the Vietnamese revolution.

It is not only the fate of this revolution that is involved but the fate of the whole colonial revolution. One of the things which Yankee imperialism is seeking to establish in Vietnam is a precedent for something new -- its "right" to intervene with bombs, napalm and ground troops whenever it pleases anywhere in the world. It is seeking to establish American imperialism as the final law, the ultimate disposer of the destinies of all countries and all mankind. It proposes to nail down its "supreme right" to suppress revolutions by all means wherever they flare up or wherever they are incipient on the globe, from Brazil to the Congo to Vietnam!

If suppression of the colonial revolution is the immediate aim of this Johnson "doctrine," the workers states are the ultimate target -- and this includes the Soviet Union. Should American imperialism get away with wiping out villages and towns of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam with bombs and jellied gasoline, its appetite will increase ravenously for a similar test of the People's Republic of China. This can be seen from certain propaganda themes already appearing in the big daily newspapers of the United States, such as the advisability of striking "before China gets a nuclear arsenal," and the "common interests" of the United States and the Soviet Union in "containing" revolutionary China. The final target is the Soviet Union. Let it be recalled that Hitler had "common interests" with Stalin in the period when he was preparing his invasion of the Soviet Union.

To block the dangerous "escalation" initiated by Johnson in Southeast Asia, all possible steps must be taken at once to strengthen the revolution in South Vietnam and to build up the defenses of North Vietnam. This requires immediate material aid on a large scale and the opening of a campaign of effective revolutionary socialist propaganda directed at the American forces. Let the example of the early days of the first workers state be recalled when Lenin and Trotsky appealed directly to the troops sent against them. The Bolshevik leaflets calling for fraternization with the revolution did as much to weaken the invading imperialist forces as the brilliant military defense put up by the newly formed Red Army. Let the American imperialists today learn the true danger they are running in advancing on the mainland of Asia. On the other hand, to take the course of capitulating to blackmail only encourages the warmongers, invites

further extension of the military adventure and increases the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

It is particularly urgent that the governments of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China close ranks before the common danger. This does not mean giving up the ideological and political differences; these can be continued and threshed out on a party level. But let the governments close ranks! A joint statement should be issued clearly and solemnly warning imperialism of the fundamental solidarity of the two countries and their common interest in defending their planned economies and other revolutionary gains against the threat that has now been raised against them in the clearest form through the bombing of North Vietnam and the deepening military involvement of American imperialism on the mainland of Asia.

It is equally urgent for both governments to join in a clear declaration of intention to protect both North Vietnam and the revolution in South Vietnam and to show by action in the most concrete way that this defense has begun, will be improved as rapidly as possible and will be carried through to the end with genuinely Leninist determination.

And in every country it is urgent that the workers, the youth, the students, the women should show by the thousands and the millions their concern about the criminal aggression of American imperialism. Let them call "Halt!" to Johnson through demonstrations of solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people and their revolution.

Down with imperialism and its policy of blood and lies!

Long live the international solidarity of the working class with the beleaguered Vietnamese revolution and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam!

Long live the world socialist revolution, the only means of definitively freeing humanity from the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust!