

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 19

May 14, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

## In this issue

Page

U.S. Invasion of Dominican Republic	
Stirs World-Wide Anger	1
Japanese Workers Express Solidarity	
with Vietnamese and Koreans	7
Escalation à la Pentagon	9
Japanese Intellectuals Demand End to Vietnam Bombings	10
Japanese General Tells Johnson How to Avoid Disaster	10
May Learn About War the Hard Way	12
Japanese Unions to Send Material Aid to North Vietnam	13
Japanese Socialist Leader Denounces U.S. War Moves	13
U.S. Tightens Vietnam Censorship	14
Labourites Gag at Backing U.S. Marines	15
Johnson Fails to Inspire Saigon's Troops	15
Sugar-Coated Pill for Steel Stockholders	16
Electric Shock Torture Resumed in South Africa	17
The May Day Parade in Algiers -- by Henri Dumoulin	18
Proud Achievement of South African Justice	19
Prestige on the Cheap for de Gaulle -- by Pierre Frank	20
A Fertile Ground for "Communism"? -- by Evelyn Sell	22
The Unity Movement of South Africa -- by Susan Craig	27
Bourguiba's Proposal on Israel	31
H-Bomb Test Still Providing Data	33
The Alexander Eleven	34
Good Deal for Aluminum Kings	35

## U.S. INVASION OF DOMINICAN REPUBLIC STIRS WORLD-WIDE ANGER

The White House decision to pull a blitzkrieg on the Dominican Republic and occupy the small, poverty-stricken, dictator-cursed country with 30,000 marines and paratroopers, touched off the greatest wave of anger against American imperialism since 1958-60. At that time, it will be recalled, Vice-President Nixon was received with

stones and curses by angry crowds throughout his "good will" tour of Latin America; while President Eisenhower was forced to cancel a projected trip to Japan because of the explosive point reached in the pent-up wrath of the Japanese people.

Today Johnson would do well not to venture into Latin America, Japan, or almost anywhere outside the United States. He has become the most hated man in the world.

Here are some samples of reactions in various cities:

Santiago de Chile: Hundreds of young people, mostly students, demonstrated in the streets May 5, particularly in the area of the U.S. embassy and on Avenida O'Higgins, the main street of the capital, demanding that the U.S. get out of Santo Domingo.

All the political parties, including the governing Christian Democrats and the next biggest party, the Radicals, published resolutions condemning the U.S. occupation of the Dominican Republic.

The chamber of deputies called a special session which denounced the U.S. "aggression" and demanded the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the island.

Lima: Crowds of students demonstrated angrily against the U.S. They stoned the U.S. embassy.

Quito: An estimated 200 students demonstrated here. At Guayaquil an automobile parked in front of the American consulate was blown up. The resulting fire burned other vehicles.

Barranquilla and Cartagena: Demonstrations in these two Colombian cities included the stoning of the facade of a U.S.-Colombian center and the burning of an American flag in Barranquilla. Police succeeded in blocking the burning of a second American flag in Cartagena.

Caracas: In full daylight a group machine-gunned the U.S. embassy. Other assaults were made against American business firms and cultural institutions. In scuffles with the police, 18 were wounded. Demonstrations were reported in many other towns in Venezuela.

Rio de Janeiro: Despite the brutal military-police dictatorship of General Castelo Branco, 500 students staged a demonstration May 7 clearly aimed at the U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic. They did it by parading before the French embassy to demonstrate approval of de Gaulle's criticism of the U.S. occupation of the island. Heavy contingents of military police kept a watchful eye on the students.

Montevideo: Demonstrations of increasing violence broke out against the U.S. On May 6 a bomb exploded in the local office of an American cable company.

Buenos Aires: Some thousands of students began demonstrating May 5 in front of the Congress against the landing of U.S. troops in Santo Domingo. They chanted anti-American slogans, broke windows, set fire to tables on terraces in the streets, and threw Molotov cocktails at the police. The demonstrations continued on following days, growing in volume and spreading to other towns.

Madrid: Franco's fascist dictatorship could not keep order in face of the anger over the U.S. troop landings in Santo Domingo. Several hundred students demonstrated in front of the Dominican embassy shouting such slogans as "Yankee murderers!"; "Yankees, Get Out!"

The Madrid cops finally succeeded in breaking up the demonstration, making a number of arrests. The controlled Madrid press, which had hailed Johnson's moves from the very first day, began to change its tone by May 8, striking a critical note over Johnson's unilateral action.

Vienna: Some 300 students mobilized in the Austrian capital. They demonstrated in front of the American embassy, denouncing U.S. actions in the Dominican Republic.

Berlin: Hundreds of students demonstrated at Potsdam and sent a declaration to the American military mission protesting the U.S. aggression against the Dominican Republic.

While such actions, coupled with innumerable resolutions and declarations by all kinds of organizations, indicated the feelings of the overwhelming mass of humanity about Johnson's espousal of the "Big Stick" policy of Theodore Roosevelt, American reporters found themselves with no choice but to reluctantly expose the monstrous lies which Johnson used to cover up and justify the invasion.

A typical example is provided by the dispatch sent by Barnard L. Collier May 7 to the New York Herald Tribune. He could find no similarity between the facts in Santo Domingo and the stories issued in Washington. In his opinion this was not the fault of the local information services of the U.S. troops or State Department. "But these officers are finding themselves in an impossible position with correspondents who get around in the U.S.-controlled and rebel zones, and eyewitness events which are vigorously denied or papered over."

These local officials are told little and the little they are told is "often false or misleading in the extreme."

In Washington, for instance, on May 3, Johnson said, "Today there are between 1,000 and 1,500 dead people whose bodies are in the streets of Santo Domingo..."

"That statement," said Collier, "even if it were made during any time in the whole crisis -- even in the worst and most blood-bathed part of it -- was patently false. Reporters, including myself, who have been through the worst parts of the rebel districts, have seen no more than six to ten bodies, which is bad enough.

"The very idea of 1,000 to 1,500 corpses rotting under this tropical sun is repelling."

Collier offered the opinion that Johnson used that figure "in good conscience," but the reporter found this as "disturbing as the unprecedented misinformation system here."

Some other U.S. lies exposed by Collier: On the night before the U.S. marines were sent in, the U.S. embassy told a group of correspondents "that 12 anti-rebel Dominicans were lined up against a wall and, to cries of 'Paredon,' were personally machine-gunned to death by the present rebel leader, Col. Francisco Caamaño."

The truth: "Not a single reporter has found concrete evidence of the 'paredon' episode, and there are now reports that one of the key men said to have been killed in that incident, is alive, although wounded."

The U.S. embassy also told correspondents at the same time "that there were 53 hard-core Communists directing the rebellion, and a list of them was passed out by the embassy."

The truth: "But as of nine days later, no hard proof has been provided by any official sources here, although reporters who know the Dominican situation have personally found that, indeed, several of the listed are Reds and active here."

The U.S. military told correspondents May 4 that a "small fishing trawler-type boat had sneaked into the harbor and sailed up the Ozama River, to fire with machine guns on forces of the 82d Airborne, dug in on the eastern edge of the river."

The truth: A freighter had been in the harbor for several days. "It also turned out that the rebels were trying to start a fire aboard, but each time firemen tried to reach the ship, they came under heavy barrages from the opposite shore."

On May 5 a military press officer told correspondents that no U.S. patrols were going into rebel territory. That same day a patrol penetrated rebel territory for ten blocks. At first the U.S. military denied the story; then they said the patrol had merely

become lost.

The truth: "After the briefing, a major admitted off the record that the U.S. troops were under orders to pursue snipers anywhere in the city -- even into the deepest part of the rebel territory -- if that would secure the area. This order, he said, was in effect, despite the cease-fire arranged by the Organization of American States."

Whatever the source of these lies and dozens like them, whether they originated in the Pentagon, the State Department, the White House or the Central Intelligence Agency, they were obviously what is known in these circles as "psychological warfare." They followed the same pattern as the flood of lies that poured out of Washington at the time of the invasion of Cuba. The aim of this lying propaganda was quite simple. It constituted the verbal smoke screen required for the military and political operation ordered by Johnson.

In Santo Domingo itself, the counterrevolutionary American forces moved according to the standard rules to be found in the Pentagon's textbooks.

The excuse for the first move was to protect American lives and property, although not a single American had been so much as touched and the aim of the revolutionists was the limited one of restoring a democratic constitutional government that had been overthrown by a coup d'état. This excuse, which was advanced by Johnson himself, was sufficient to cover the first landings.

As additional thousands of troops were airlifted, the thin original excuse was dropped and a different one, again mouthed by Johnson, was offered. This was the hoary one about the "Communist danger." The real reason, of course, was to protect the holdings of two American sugar companies against the potential threat inherent in the revolution and to safeguard the Trujillo dynasty which has performed so heroically for American imperialism these many decades.

The build up of troops was fantastically large -- at the last count, some 30,000; and they have brought in the most modern and deadly equipment, including tanks and bombers.

This monstrous military power dug in rapidly, obviously preparing to submit the population of Santo Domingo to a bloodbath such as would be recorded for all time, transmitting the name of Johnson in this way to generations yet unborn.

Against such military power, even the most heroic revolutionists would have little chance in view of the lack of opportunity to get the people properly organized and to secure the means of defense from other countries.

The wielders of the Big Stick proceeded methodically to the next step -- to demand that civilians give up the guns that had been handed out in the first days of the revolution. The distribution of arms was supreme evidence of the democratic character of the movement, for it placed final control of the Dominican revolution in the hands of the people.

How well this move succeeds remains to be seen. If the arms are surrendered, then the Dominican people will undergo violent suppression, perhaps lasting for many years, as happened in the case of Greece at the end of World War II.

Along with this move, the U.S. embassy is seeking to divide the leaders of the popular upsurge through apparent concessions (resignations of the worst butchers among the Trujillo forces) and efforts to lure the main figure, Caamaño, into a trap or into capitulation. These maneuvers appear to be having some success. The men subjected to these blandishments are not really communists or revolutionary socialists. They are exactly what they said they were, followers of Juan Bosch, people who have deep illusions about the nature of bourgeois democracy. Given the opportunity, they will of course come to terms with Washington. But then this is no surprise. This was precisely the program of Juan Bosch.

What Bosch and those like him fail to appreciate is that American imperialism no longer has any confidence in their capacity to contain a revolution within the limits of bourgeois democracy. The imperialists are profoundly convinced that once begun, a popular revolution in the world today tends by its own inner logic to become converted into a socialist revolution.

And that is why, nowhere in the world today do they place much confidence in the capacities of bourgeois democratic regimes, particularly those following decades of dictatorship such as that suffered by the Dominican people.

If they have any choice at all they will inevitably take the Chiang Kai-sheks, the Syngman Rhees, the Diems, the Batistas, the Castelo Brancos, the Somosas and the Francos. In the Dominican Republic they will concentrate the same way in finding another Trujillo and they will do their utmost to keep him in power if they have to sit him on twice or four times 30,000 U.S. bayonets.

This policy, however, demonstrates not the power of American capitalism but its weakness. The trend toward revolution on a world-wide scale is becoming irrepressible. The people want democracy; they want socialism. Counterrevolutionary troops can contain them only for a brief time. American imperialism is nearing the final question -- shall it accept defeat or perish in the hell of nuclear war?

JAPANESE WORKERS EXPRESS SOLIDARITY WITH VIETNAMESE AND KOREANS

Osaka, Japan

Each spring the Japanese workers customarily undertake economic struggles. They began this year, too, as usual. [See World Outlook May 7.] But something different has been added. Besides seeking economic demands, the Japanese workers are voicing their disapproval of U.S. intervention in the Vietnamese civil war and they are condemning the negotiations between the Japanese and South Korean governments, which have very reactionary objectives.

A meeting was sponsored here April 21 by the Joint Struggle Committee of the All Tele-Communications Workers' Unions to protest the escalation of the war and the negotiations with the Pak regime. The assembly passed three declarations -- a message of solidarity with the South Vietnam Front of National Liberation, a protest to the American embassy and a protest to the Japanese government.

The texts of these statements, which are good examples of the feeling of the workers from one end of Japan to the other, are as follows:

\* \* \*

To the South Vietnam National Front of Liberation

We Japanese workers cannot contain our deep anger over the violent aggression of American imperialism in Vietnam.

We express our solidarity with the Vietnam National Front of Liberation which stands at the head of the Vietnamese people in their heroic struggle for national liberation in face of American domination and violence.

American imperialism, which has now taken off the mask, is sinking in the mire and threshing about in vain.

The workers and peoples throughout the world, including us Japanese workers, will never forgive American imperialism for its oppressive rule over South Vietnam and its unjust bombings in North Vietnam.

Moreover, we will never acquiesce in the existence itself of American imperialism.

At the same time we must take note that Japanese monopoly capitalism, the enemy of the Japanese workers, is beginning to lift its head in the Asian crisis centering around Vietnam. The Japanese monopoly capitalists are lending aid to American imperialism in the common interest of the two powers -- to defend their mutual position

as masters. And in the Far East they will reappear fully clad in the armor of imperialism.

You, fighters of the Vietnamese National Front of Liberation, struggling heroically in the delta of the Mekong!

We Japanese workers pledge that we will fight against our own enemy at home, that is, the Japanese monopoly capitalists and American imperialism which is utilizing Japan as a military base; and we express our solidarity with you.

Let us fight together to the end for peace and for the workers and peoples all over the world!

\* \* \*

### Protest Sent to the American Embassy

American Ambassador Mr. Edwin O. Reischauer:

The aggression against South Vietnam and the bombing of North Vietnam committed by the USA exhaust the catalog of inhuman outrages and constitute an insane violation of peace.

We who wish peace and happiness to all the world can no longer stand your mad and immoral actions.

Today in our modern society it is the unquestionable right of all peoples in the world to determine their own fate and to lead peaceful and happy lives. This right is inviolable.

Whoever infringes this right is an aggressor and our enemy as human beings.

In South Vietnam, you Americans are committing the following crimes: You Americans rode roughshod over the Vietnamese people, forced them to line up with your "anti-Communist" military policy and your "divide and rule" policy of openly obstructing the unification of Vietnam despite the deepest wishes of the Vietnamese people. And you reply to the people's demand for self-determination with violence.

You Americans should realize that America will have to fight against the peoples of the whole world if you continue your reactionary policy of murdering and moving toward the crisis of a world war.

We support the struggle of the South Vietnamese people and demand that you put a stop to your bombing of North Vietnam and that you immediately withdraw from South Vietnam.

\* \* \*



## Protest Sent to the Japanese Government

We assembled here in protest against negotiations between the Japanese and Korean governments and against American aggression in Vietnam, and in solidarity with the heroic struggles of the Korean and Vietnamese peoples;

Do hereby bitterly accuse the Japanese government of playing a criminal role in the Far East with its Japan-Korean Negotiations and its aid to American aggression in Vietnam.

It is clear that the Korean people have been fighting at the risk of their lives against the Japan-Korean Negotiations and in resistance to the Pak government whose oppressive rule has reached extreme limits.

Disregarding the vehement objections of the Korean people, the Japanese government and the monopoly capitalists are forcibly pressing the negotiations. Needless to say, the government and the capitalists intend to keep the Korean people from unifying their country and they aim at nailing Korea down as a base in their "anti-Communist" policy. At the same time they seek to secure the highly profitable exploitation of the Korean people..

To establish friendly relations between the Korean and Japanese people, we believe that the road does not lie through the Japan-Korean Negotiations but through joining the Korean people in struggling against these negotiations.

In addition, the Japanese government is playing a criminal role against the South Vietnamese people. It is helping America's puppet government in South Vietnam and permitting Japanese citizens to become involved in the war as seamen on American landing craft.

The Japanese government, in fact, is entering the war of aggression in Vietnam on the American side.

We hereby express our determination to work in common with all the Japanese workers to overthrow this criminal government by force and to fight on the side of the Korean and Vietnamese peoples.

## ESCALATION A LA PENTAGON

"Let's take, for example, an island where 500 American citizens are in danger. We send 500 Marines to protect them. That makes 1,000 American citizens in danger. So we send 1,000 Marines, which makes 2,000 Americans in danger. Then we send 2,000 Marines, which makes 4,000..." -- Le Canard Enchaîné.

### JAPANESE INTELLECTUALS DEMAND END TO VIETNAM BOMBINGS

OSAKA -- Various movements against the war in Vietnam are spreading far and wide in Japan. For instance, T.Tanikawa, president of Hosei University, one of the "Big Six" in Japan, joined with novelist J.Osaragi and three professors emeritus of Tokyo University -- T.Miyazawa, H.Ouchi and S.Wagatsuma -- in filing a joint proposal April 21 with Prime Minister Eisaku Sato asking the government to appeal to the U.S. for an immediate suspension of air attacks on north Vietnam.

They also urged the government to make clear that if the war in Vietnam should escalate to a scale involving other countries that Japan would bar American military bases in Japan from being used for combat operations.

They sent an English translation to President Johnson, Vice-President Humphrey and various senators.

A total of 93 scholars, artists, novelists and educators signed the proposal before it was handed to the prime minister at his official residence.

### JAPANESE GENERAL TELLS JOHNSON HOW TO AVOID DISASTER

Some instructive parallels between Japanese experience in the period before the opening of World War II and the current experience of the U.S. in Vietnam have recently been drawn. An outstanding example was the one pointed out by the expert in Far Eastern affairs, Professor Owen Lattimore. [See World Outlook April 16.] A similarly thoughtful article, written by Kiyooki Murata appeared in the April 15 issue of the Japan Times.

He notes a big change in the amount of analysis now devoted in Japan to the Vietnamese situation "in sharp contrast to the remarkable indifference that had prevailed here until last autumn."

One of the things distinguishing the "majority Japanese view" from the "official U.S. position" is in the nature of the struggle in south Vietnam.

"The predominant view is that the current conflict in South Vietnam is a civil war -- fought between a nationalist movement and a regime allied with a foreign power.

"From this analysis, it follows that the course of action to be pursued is that the U.S. must pull out of South Vietnam."

This recommendation, says Murata, "seems to carry a certain persuasiveness in the light of the fact that the situation in which the U.S. finds herself is similar to where Japan was at the beginning of the major conflict in which she became involved and which later ended in a devastating disaster."

The "parallel between the Japanese and American experiences was first brought home" when the Japanese read President Johnson's repeated statement: "We seek no wider war." The Japanese noted that even while he was saying this, "the war in Vietnam widened."

"It was highly reminiscent of what happened in the 1930s. In the days and weeks following the first shot fired at the Marco Polo Bridge near Peking between the Japanese and Chinese troops in July 1937, the Japanese Government declared it sought no 'wider war.' The Japanese expression was 'fuka-kudai hoshin,' the policy of 'not expanding' the local conflict.

"Despite the 'nonexpansion' proclamation, the fighting spread throughout China, presumably because the military overruled the policy of the Government. It then escalated into a global war."

Kiyoaki Murata calls attention to an article written by Lt. Gen. Kenryo Sato in the May issue of the monthly Bungei Shunju. Lt. Gen. Sato was one of the leading exponents of a "positive" military policy against Nationalist China. In his article, this military expert, recalling the somber experience of Japan, "warns against the U.S.'s falling into the same pitfall Japan had fallen into in the 1930s and 1940s and recommends withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam."

Japan's object in beginning the "Manchurian Incident" in September 1931 and founding the puppet state of Manchukuo was, "in terms of shibboleths," to "separate Manchuria from China in order to make it the first line of defense against the menace of communism in Russia."

The justification offered for this policy was that "the Manchus were not to be dominated by the Chinese and that they deserved independence. In the political language of the 1960s, Japan was trying to preserve the right of the Manchurians 'to be left alone.'"

But to "secure" Manchukuo, it was necessary to "secure" the adjacent region in China itself.

"It was for this purpose that an incident was created in July 1937. And despite the Tokyo avowal of its adherence to the policy of nonexpansion, the armed conflict spread to other parts of China. By the end of 1938, Japan had occupied Hankow and Canton, not to mention Shanghai and the Nationalist capital of Nanking."

Now came a severe lesson for the Japanese army. "Contrary to its expectations, the Nationalist regime, seeking asylum in Chungking in the far corner of Szechwan, refused to capitulate."

The ability of the Nationalists to continue resistance was due in part to aid coming through Burma and French Indochina.

To cut off these supply routes, Japan invaded northern French Indochina in the autumn of 1940. Gen. Sato, a principal figure in this operation, says:

"It not only had no effect in settling the Sino-Japanese incident but also, led to the stationing of troops in southern French Indochina and eventually touched off the Pacific War. For all of this I have deep regrets."

Certain strategists in the Imperial General Headquarters proposed early in 1940 that Japan should withdraw from China. Sato vigorously opposed this.

"If we withdrew on our own," he reasoned at the time, "it would mean we have lost the war while winning the battles. It would, therefore, make the Chinese despise us on top of their being hostile to us as they are...To withdraw now without bringing about a conclusion of this major campaign would mean nothing but defeat."

Sato proposed an alternative which he thought would bring the Nationalists to their knees. This was to cut off their two supply routes running through Kunming. The proposal was like "the policy being pursued by the United States today in trying to cut off the Ho Chi Minh Trail."

The plan was vetoed, but Sato knows today that even if he had had his way, the objective would have proved elusive. "It is on the basis of this experience," concludes Murata, "that the former general of the Japanese army urges the U.S. to admit the failure of its policy in Vietnam and pull out its troops."

#### MAY LEARN ABOUT WAR THE HARD WAY

The difficulty recently experienced by the U.S. in getting Japanese men to apply for jobs sailing U.S. Navy landing ships going to Vietnam seems to have been solved. At Sasebo and Yokohama 1,200 men fought for 380 crew openings. The Japanese press is quite disturbed about this. Investigation disclosed that the recruits were men in their twenties or even younger. Noboru Ito, a well-known critic, observed that the young generation "has had no first-hand experience of war, and its misery and evils."

### JAPANESE UNIONS TO SEND MATERIAL AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

The General Council of Japan Trade Unions [Sohyo], which represents 4,212,754 out of Japan's total organized workers of 9,799,653, announced May 6 that the giant labor federation will send an "encouragement mission" to the workers of north Vietnam as an expression of solidarity in their struggle against U.S. aggression.

The announcement was made by Sohyo's Secretary General Akira Iwai at the opening session of the twenty-eighth convention of the Japan Teachers Union at Mito.

He said that Sohyo is planning to send material aid, including medical supplies, to the north Vietnamese working masses.

Sadamitsu Miyanohara, chairman of the 600,000-member Japan Teachers Union [Nikkyoso] declared in the opening session of the convention that everything concerning Vietnam should be left up to the self-determination of the people of Vietnam.

He called for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam.

Even if criticized for placing too much importance on struggles for political causes, the union should now rise for maintenance of world peace, Miyanohara said.

He added that the union would make an urgent appeal for peace addressed to the entire people and that the union executive would propose a drive to collect the signatures of 10,000,000 Japanese aspiring for world peace.

### JAPANESE SOCIALIST LEADER DENOUNCES U.S. WAR MOVES

Kozo Sasaki, vice-chairman of the Japan Socialist party, was unanimously elected chairman at the party's extraordinary convention in Tokyo May 6. He succeeded Jotaro Kawakami who resigned March 11 due to ill health.

Before being elected, Sasaki opened the convention with a powerful speech on the deepening crisis over Vietnam.

"The United States," he said, "is now baring its barbarian nature of imperialism in Vietnam and trying to expand the war to China while at the same time applying terroristic pressures upon the

Dominican people who have risen to wipe out reactionary and dictatorial politics from their country.

"It is now clear as daylight that the United States is a habitual criminal interfering with the internal affairs of other countries and is thus the provocateur of world wars."

Sasaki denounced the Sato government as "representing Japan's rightist, reactionary force."

"The government," he continued, "is doing its best to protect the interests of monopolistic capital to the neglect of the working masses."

The present political climate, he charged, is similar to the one that prevailed on the eve of the "Manchurian Incident" [when imperialist Japan began the invasion of China]. "We must not tread the same perilous path."

In an interview May 10, Sasaki denounced Harold Wilson for his slavish approval of Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam and his neocolonialist activities in Malaysia.

"Wilson's attempt to build a new Britain within the framework of the Commonwealth accounts for the emergence of a sugar-coated colonialism," he said.

Sasaki revealed some illusions in Wilson, perhaps, when he urged that the head of her Majesty's Government "turn over a new leaf and become a good socialist."

#### U.S. TIGHTENS VIETNAM CENSORSHIP

According to a UPI dispatch from Da Nang, an American military spokesman told fifteen newsmen April 26 that the "United States Government would run them out of Vietnam if they failed to play ball with the new press restrictions."

The unnamed officer was quoted as declaring: "Your accreditation will be lifted without appeal, your agency will be informed, and the U.S. Embassy will recommend that you will be declared persona non grata."

The two official spokesmen were a marine corps captain and an army lieutenant colonel.

Besides telling the newsmen that they were under orders not

to transmit any news except within the newly tightened limits, the spokesmen of the American military command revealed "for the first time in public" that "the South Vietnamese Government no longer has authority over those parts of its territory occupied by the American Armed Forces."

One of the spokesmen was quoted as saying, "The Vietnamese have no jurisdiction in American areas."

This amounts to an anonymous declaration that the U.S. is seizing territory in Vietnam and ousting its own puppets from even nominal control, thus belying the propaganda in Washington that the U.S. seeks "no territory" in Vietnam.

#### LABOURITES GAG AT BACKING U.S. MARINES

Harold Wilson's crawling subserviency to President Johnson in matters of imperialist assaults on tiny weak countries is beginning to turn a few more stomachs among Labour members of parliament. On May 10, twenty of them presented a motion in the Commons urging the government to refuse to support American policy and actions in the Dominican Republic. The motion reads:

"That this House, noting that the Rebellion in the Dominican Republic was against a military dictatorship and for the purpose of restoring to office a President described in The Times as 'the first freely elected head of the Dominican Republic for 38 years,' deploras the build up of United States forces, notes the criticisms by many Latin American states of the United States policy and actions in the Dominican Republic, and urges her Majesty's Government not to give support to the policy and actions of the United States Government in this respect."

#### JOHNSON FAILS TO INSPIRE SAIGON'S TROOPS

In an April 26 dispatch from Saigon, the Manchester Guardian reports that Saigon's troops "are becoming increasingly reluctant to get involved in the war at all." Out of 270,000 men, only 30,000 are considered to be "reliable." Among the reasons given is the conversion of the war into "an American show," the "constant discussions about possible peace talks" over the radio, and the display of U.S. military might which makes them feel unneeded. The reporter fails to mention that they might just not care to get killed for the sake of saving face for Johnson.

SUGAR-COATED PILL FOR STEEL STOCKHOLDERS

The adoption of the White Paper in the House of Commons May 6, while seeming to assure the renationalization of the steel industry also indicated a certain fissuring of the Labour party. Two aspects of the White Paper and of the debate in the House of Commons revealed a lot of shady maneuvering and a most sensitive concern for the stockholders.

First of all, there was the proposed compensation. Marxists are in general opposed to paying compensation when nationalizations occur, since it can easily be demonstrated that the capitalists have been paid many times over through their profits, and even if they were not, their private interests could not be permitted to stand in the way of the needs of the people. But as Marx and Trotsky pointed out, compensation is not a matter of principle. Whether a workers government should or should not pay compensation in a given instance is a problem of tactics and the relationship of social forces.

In Britain, however, the problem has its own peculiarities. The Attlee government nationalized the industry after Labour's 1945 victory. The Tories, coming back into power in 1951, denationalized steel. The Labour party leaders then made a solemn pledge to re-nationalize as soon as they again came into power, and not let the private owners get another juicy bonus out of renationalization after the very handsome gift from the Tories.

But Wilson's White Paper proposes rates of compensation which are 20% to 40% above the current quotations on the stock market! The Financial Times published the following table giving the figures for the various companies:

<u>Company</u>	<u>No. of shares (in millions)</u>	<u>Proposed Compensation Price</u>		<u>Thursday's Price</u>	
		<u>shillings</u>	<u>pence</u>	<u>shillings</u>	<u>pence</u>
Colvilles	19.51	47	6	28	0
Consett	10.00	19	10	15	6
Dorman Long	22.50	29	10	23	9
Lancashire	9.00	34	3	21	4-1/2
South Durham	13.87	26	3	19	9
Steel of Wales	40.00	32	5	19	9
Stewart & Lloyds	49.50	32	5	29	9
Summers (John)	30.48	36	0	29	3
United Steel	50.00	38	3	27	6

Adhering to the tradition of British understatement with admirable discipline, the editor of the Financial Times commented: "It must be admitted at once that the basis for compensating shareholders in quoted steel companies is fair and that the terms are better than



expected. The Government, which clearly has its eye on foreign opinion [Wall Street and the White House] as well as on the strength of the opposition to its proposals, may even be criticised by Labour's left wing for being unnecessarily generous..."

In fact Ian Mikardo, a member of the executive of the Labour party and one of the late Aneurin Bevan's lieutenants, did complain, although not very loudly, against what he called "madly over-generous" compensation. In the May 7 Tribune, he wrote that "During the few hours of that Central Hall meeting, some people made more money (tax-free) out of steel shares than a locomotive-driver, a docker or a miner can earn in his whole working life."

This "unearned capital gains" so generously handed the coupon clippers is all the more scandalous in face of the government propaganda about there not being enough money to pay the old-age pensioners the moderate increase they were promised or to permit the workers to get a wage adjustment to meet the rising cost of living. There is money enough when the stockholders in the steel industry hold out their hands -- even more than they expected!

While grumblings were heard in the left wing of the Labour party over Wilson's uncommonly solicitous concern for the feelings of the stockholders, a second scandal occurred. During the debate in the House of Commons over steel nationalization, George Brown, Wilson's economics minister stated that while he favored 100% government ownership he was willing "to listen" to any proposal to the contrary from the steel barons.

Brown had no authority from any Labour party body to make such a concession. It took the Labour MP's and apparently even some of the cabinet members by surprise. Some stormy scenes followed that led to charges of a gross breach of discipline.

Brown's "excuse" was that it was just a maneuver to get two recalcitrant right-wing members of the Labour party, Woodrow Wyatt and Desmond Donnelly, to vote in favor of the White Paper. More likely it was a maneuver to open the way to a new attack against 100% nationalization of the steel industry.

#### ELECTRIC SHOCK TORTURE RESUMED IN SOUTH AFRICA

Although it was reported that torture of political prisoners by electric shock had been stopped in August 1963 after the Ngudle inquest, it is again in prevalent use by the South African police, according to an attorney, Joel Joffe. In London April 28, he said that magistrates courts found undefended Africans almost automatically guilty on political charges.

## THE MAY DAY PARADE IN ALGIERS

By Henri Dumoulin

### Algiers

The May Day demonstration here proved to be bigger and more enthusiastic than last year when Ben Bella was a guest of honor at the Moscow parade. Algiers this year came closer to the Algiers of 1963 following the March decrees instituting workers self-management.

Nevertheless the official banners along the parade route bore the usual slogans. There was no direct reference, for instance, to the most positive resolutions of the recent congress of the UGTA [Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens] calling for implementing the next stage of the agrarian reform, wider participation of the working masses in the management of the economy and the struggle against the "bureaucratic layer now crystallizing out." [See World Outlook April 23.]

The crowds in Algiers displayed but mild interest; the number of parades and demonstrations associated with the receptions accorded visiting heads of states has made them blasé.

The participants in the parade, however, testified to the popular enthusiasm over the international workers holiday. The floats and decorations were colorful and imaginative.

"There is no Islam without social justice"; "Long live the agrarian revolution"; "Real workers co-ordination" proclaimed the placards of the Fédération Nationale des Travailleurs de la Terre [National Federation of Agricultural Workers] which headed the parade. The crowds of field workers in the streets of the capital and other big cities proved that the FNTT is getting under way.

Likewise new was the greater prominence of anticapitalist sentiments among the ranks. A placard of the COGEHORE [Commission de Gestion des Hôtels et Restaurants -- Hotel and Restaurants Management Committee] read: "For the victory of the laboring masses over capitalism, imperialism, colonialism. Turn all means of production over to the workers."

Some of the participants began chanting, "Shoot the bourgeoisie!" [Les bourgeois, au poteau!] They were promptly stopped by those in charge.

Workers had also made up their own placards: "Let's apply the resolutions of the Second Congress of the UGTA"; "For a labor law based on self-management"; "Let's organize community self-management councils everywhere."

Women participating in the parade showed that they had lost

none of the dynamism that brought them into the streets last March 8 six to tenfold the expected number of 1,500. Even those who got into trouble at home with their men folk were out again, more energetic and aggressive than ever. Young women workers for whom the country's independence has opened the way to new means of expression will not give up their conquest so easily.

The complete absence of any cult of personalities was notable. There were no portraits of state, party or trade-union leaders. There were no banners saying, "Long live so and so!" The demonstrators, as usual, shouted their customary slogan: "Long live Ben Bella!"

There were fewer international slogans than usual, but the variety of topics was as striking as in previous parades. Thus some of the participants chanted, "Peace in Vietnam! Johnson -- Murderer!" Others were more precise: "Get the American aggressors out of Vietnam!"

Among the marchers, too, banners were carried by groups of Cubans, Africans, the Arab countries and the various workers states.

#### CORRECTION

In the article by Henri Dumoulin, "The Algerian Revolution Again in Movement," in the April 23 World Outlook, the translation reads: "In fact, the pressure of the workers, their dissatisfaction with the incipient bureaucratic tendencies in the unions and elsewhere was so strong that the congress ended by completely sweeping out the entire previous UGTA leadership. Not a single member of the executive committee was re-elected. A number of rank-and-file militants were brought into the leadership..."

This is incorrect. The national secretariat was completely swept out, but (with the exception of Chaffai, the former secretary of the organization) still retain their membership on the present executive committee. In addition, rather than "rank and file militants," the new secretariat is made up of regional or even local cadres of middle level. Most of the 560 delegates at the congress were middle-level, trade-union cadres.

#### PROUD ACHIEVEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN JUSTICE

According to statistics released by the United Nations, 850,000 lashes have been administered by the courts of South Africa in the past ten years. The yearly average is 80,000 lashes administered to 17,000 victims. This is eight times the number 20 years ago.

PRESTIGE ON THE CHEAP FOR DE GAULLE

By Pierre Frank

Proletarian internationalism is one of the concepts that have suffered particularly under the old traditional Social Democratic and Stalinist leaderships. It has been corroded by the most variegated ideas about "national independence."

The Social Democrats, in the name of proletarian internationalism, have condemned the struggles of colonial peoples for national independence (Guy Mollet in France, for example, in the case of Algeria); and if they have likewise denounced "nationalism" in European countries, it has been to support a policy in complete subservience to Washington.

The leaders of the Communist parties, for their part, apply the concept of "national independence" in both the colonial countries, where it is completely valid, and in the imperialist countries where it is reactionary. But in each case they advocate alliance with the bourgeoisie or with one of its wings, a course that can lead only to catastrophic results.

In the present period, when centrifugal tendencies have become stronger in both the bloc of workers states and the bloc of imperialist countries, one of the most striking instances of what the confusion can lead to is the ability of de Gaulle to reap enormous benefits because he is able to assume the role of main champion of "national independence."

It is forgotten that he granted independence to Algeria only because the Algerian people compelled him to do so by force in a struggle that was prolonged for four years under his regime. Also forgotten is everything that exposes the phoniness of his proclaimed breadth of vision -- the intervention of French troops in Gabon, the continued French domination, often marked by brutality, over Martinique, Guadeloupe, Djibouti, Réunion, New Caledonia, Tahiti, etc. Forgotten, too, is the artificiality of the "independence" of most of the former French colonies in black Africa and Madagascar where neocolonialism can be seen in almost pure form.

All this is forgotten because de Gaulle threw a well-aimed stone at Washington's involvement in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, although not without a slap at Moscow at the same time with his innuendo about "modern imperialisms." The move was cheap enough and would never have been made if Washington had felt inclined to give him a helping hand in the little matter of manufacturing nuclear weapons.

De Gaulle's trouble-making in the Atlantic Alliance is favored

by both the Soviet and Chinese governments -- and, of course, no one can blame them for seeking to take advantage of the contradictions in the imperialist camp if they do not build up de Gaulle's prestige among the masses in the colonial countries and in France.

To paintup de Gaulle may not be of great import in Latin America where the role of French imperialism is minor. In the Far East it is highly dangerous, for it could confront the South Vietnam Front of National Liberation with a difficult situation. In Africa it fits in with the machinations of all the neocolonialist forces. And in France it contributes to paralyzing a workers movement that is still suffering from the defeat it sustained with de Gaulle's coming to power in 1958.

No one is more aware than de Gaulle of the value of the slogan of "national independence." In a recent television speech, he virtually launched his presidential campaign on the theme of "national independence." He presented himself as the man tied to no strings, inferring that the other candidates could not say as much and that therefore they were more or less in the service of the USSR or the USA.

Thus even before the electoral campaign got under way, this thrust added to the disarray in the opposition which has been centering around the Social Democrat, Gaston Defferre. Some of them, able to see, have been insisting that Defferre, while standing on his pro-Atlantic, pro-European platform, should cut free from Washington and not let de Gaulle reap all the benefits of being "anti-American."

The leadership of the French Communist party has suffered from a similar paralysis. It has organized only one meeting against the American interventions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. As for the presidential election, it stands on generalities and is visibly fearful of the reception that would be given a party candidate if no last-minute agreement can be reached on a joint candidate for the entire left. Among the voters generally to be found in the Communist column, there are some who are responsive to de Gaulle's demagoguery as was shown in the 1958 referendum.

The official Communist press in France does not talk about "socialism in one country." But this Stalinist doctrine has never been repudiated and it is being continued in the form of "national independence" as understood by Stalin's heirs. Its evil effects can be seen in the prestige it enables an old fox to accumulate on the cheap and in the disorientation it spreads among the broad masses.

A FERTILE GROUND FOR "COMMUNISM"?

By Evelyn Sell

The civil-rights movement has often been accused of being a fertile recruiting ground for the Communist party and the communist ideology. Witch-hunt sentiments and warnings have been a familiar accompaniment to demonstrations and other protest activities. However, there has been an ebb and flow of "anti-Communist" battle cries. Lately the antiradical campaign has been hitting high-tide marks.

Reactionary groups and politicians are, of course, the most vociferous in these attempts to discredit the civil-rights fighters by labeling them "Communists" and, therefore, un-American traitors who deserve to be crushed speedily. Robert Welch, founder of the right-wing John Birch Society, recently told reporters that the entire civil-rights movement is part of a Communist blueprint to establish a "Negro Soviet republic in the southeastern United States." Welch explained that this blueprint was laid out in 1929. (After thirty-six years of failing to establish a "Negro Soviet republic" one can wonder about the supposed influence of the Communist party!)

The Ku Klux Klan, notorious racist organization currently under fire because of its involvement in so many murders of civil-rights workers, has always warned of dangerous "Communist" elements leading the Negro struggle. James R. Venable, imperial wizard of the National Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Inc., said that the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] should use its agents "in the Communist field rather than trying to catch KKKs." Mississippi's Senator James Eastland says that every civil-rights freedom school in his state is a "Communist indoctrination center."

Southern political boss Leander Perez, who boasted over national television that nothing happened in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, without his approval, appeared before the Senate judiciary committee at the end of March in order to speak against the new voting-rights bill now being considered by Congress. Perez told the committee: "The purported Voting Rights Act of 1965 is designed to implement the Communist party plan and would provide its greatest impetus. This bill is undoubtedly a hand-in-glove deal with the very mass action demonstrations which form part of the Communist revolutionary conspiracy."

When Perez warned the senators that anyone voting for this bill would be accommodating the "Communist conspiracy" he aroused the ire of the politicians who support civil-rights legislation. Michigan's Senator Philip Hart exploded, "That's absolutely nuts." Senate Republican leader Everett Dirksen demanded -- and received -- a retraction from Perez. The pro-Communist charge hit too close to

home this time!

There have been a number of hints and rumors lately that more liberal elements in America's political structure are becoming alarmed about "Communists" within the civil-rights struggle. There are vague reports that responsible Negro leaders are weeding "Communists" out of their organizations. For example, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., has supposedly embarked on such a house-cleaning campaign within the Southern Christian Leadership Conference [SCLC]. The Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] has gotten rid of its more radical local leaders, another report states.

In his March 20, 1965, column Eric Sevareid notes: "A new chemistry is working in this [civil rights] movement; otherwise so steady and wise a man as Martin Luther King would never have defied a Federal court order as he did in Selma. He did so because he would have lost his leadership if he had not.

"That speaks volumes for the strength of new elements in the general movement -- the totally irresponsible, the neurotically egocentric who seek to purge their own sense of guilt-by-inaction, the coldly calculating political ideologues, including it must be said, the disguised young Communists who want to perpetuate disorder for disorder's sake. Even the best friends of the Negro movement in the higher ranks of the federal government are becoming alarmed about the left-wing infiltration.

"If historic patterns continue to be repeated, then we will see a violent internal struggle in the Negro movement, a dramatic attempt to purge it of the politically-minded miners and sappers. The more provocations that stupid or cruel white supremacists provide, the longer that day will be postponed." (My emphasis throughout.)

Such internal struggles and purges are being reported and evidence is building up that underneath the smoke screen of charges and denials of "Communist influence," a major battle is shaping up between the more conservative and the more radical elements within the Negro movement. At the end of 1964, newspapers reported that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP] and King's SCLC had pulled out of the Council of Federal Organizations [COFO] which had been directing civil-rights programs in Mississippi. The New Orleans Times-Picayune, for example, said that COFO had lost a good deal of its financial support and had attracted "a group of radical, Marxist-leaning kids whom local Negro leaders will no longer tolerate."

David Dennis, assistant program director for COFO's Mississippi Project, rebutted that he was "not aware of any people in COFO now who have a Communist background." He denied that anyone had been thrown out of COFO because of questionable loyalty to the

United States. "I think if anyone comes down to help people to vote, and risk their life for this cause, they are loyal Americans," he explained.

Besides the NAACP and the SCLC, the major civil-rights organizations involved in COFO are the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC] and the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE]. A great deal of the "anti-Communist," antimilitants heat is being focused on these two latter organizations. SNCC bears the brunt of the complaints. A Detroit Free Press article of April 6, 1965, quotes an anonymous long-time civil-rights activist as saying, "To me there are plenty of straws in the wind that indicate the Commies ...are lending whatever vestige of strength they've got now to helping SNCC" but "on the whole, I don't feel the movement is dominated by Communists or steered by them."

A similar comment was made by no less a person than Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach. Katzenbach told an interviewer during April that the Communist party has no control over civil-rights organizations or their leaders. Although the party had attempted to gain such influence it had been "remarkably unsuccessful in actually influencing any decisions and certainly has not captured any of the leadership," Katzenbach stated.

Alabama's Attorney-General Richmond Flowers recently asserted that there was "no evidence of Communism. We are constantly on the alert for signs of it, but we haven't found it."

The hottest, most venerable Communist-hunter of all is J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the nation's secret police, the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI]. Last year he told a House committee, "The [Communist] Party is continually searching for new avenues in order to expand its influence among the Negroes. In particular, it has sought ways and means to exploit the militant forces of the Negro civil-rights movement."

What conclusion had J. Edgar Hoover come to about Communist influence within the civil-rights movement? In a speech made in December of last year he declared that the civil-rights movement "is not, and has never been" dominated by Communists. He explained that this fact was because both white and Negro leaders "have recognized and rejected Communism as a menace to the freedom of all."

There is something to what Hoover says. Despite their denials to the contrary, it is true that civil-rights leaders and organizations have been screening persons and eliminating or discouraging people with known political affiliations in the left-wing movement in this country. I personally know of a very recent incident in Detroit where a member of the Socialist Workers party was refused membership in the local chapter of CORE because of his political affiliation.



Jim Monsonis, head of the Washington chapter of SNCC, denied that his organization screened out radicals as the other older civil-rights groups did. (Please, note: he says the other groups do screen.) Monsonis explained, "We have no political test for membership and we never will have. If a person is willing to come down and risk his neck under the clear discipline and organization of SNCC, then he's welcome. If he isn't going to do that and he's a troublemaker of some kind, we'd ask him to leave because he's not an effective staff worker."

Yet I have heard private reports from persons who were engaged in SNCC's summer projects and they say that a very efficient but fairly subtle screening process does take place. The issue of radicals joining SNCC or working in SNCC projects has been a hotly debated one in that organization.

This screening or weeding out of radicals and Communist party members is only a partial answer, however, to the question: Why have radical groupings, in general, and the Communist party, in particular, failed so far to recruit more members from the civil-rights movement and failed so far to exert a more decisive influence within the Negro struggle?

The answer is not a simple one, yet it is a crucial one to those concerned with the future of American radicalism and the civil-rights movement. There are a number of important aspects to be considered: the effects of the cold war on the internal struggles of the American people, the long and bitter history of Negro and white relations in this country, and the particular relationship of the Communist party with the Negro community.

The details of the "anti-Communist" witch-hunt which has raged within the United States since World War II does not need a listing here. The whole world is quite familiar with at least the general outlines of that campaign. What effect has this witch-hunt had on Negroes? There are a number of contradictory currents within the Negro community on this question. A large number of Negroes have expressed their feelings in the succinct sentence, "It's bad enough being black without being red, too." The daily clashes with Jim Crow are enough to cope with; why add further reprisals by adopting an ideology and an organization which has been persecuted by the federal government, business establishments and police groups?

Other Negroes have swallowed the government's "anti-Communist" program -- just as large portions of the white population have. They have accepted the stereotyped image which has been thrown at them again and again through all mass communication channels: "Communism" is a foreign ideology based on everything which is completely contradictory to every American ideal; "Communists" are foreign agents intent on destroying civilization and particularly the highest form of civilization, the United States of America. For many Negroes

being an American is to be as "white" as possible and this, in turn, means being "anti-Communist."

However, there are those Negroes who are unwilling to accept the stereotyped images of Communists -- partly because they know that they, too, have been stereotyped and they are suspicious of such tactics. There is a certain amount of sympathy for the underdog (a trait enshrined in the American ethos). There is a certain amount of admiration for and agreement with socialist ideas and the socialist support of civil-rights for all. And there is a certain amount of vindictive joy in the knowledge that the dominant-white-American-master-race has had to suffer frustrations and defeats on occasion from the proclaimed enemy. When Negroes watch a Hollywood western they cheer sympathetically whenever an Indian topples a white man into the dust. The Communist world's triumphs have produced similar cheers -- and for similar reasons. Whoever is against The Man (the white man, the master) can't be all bad.

This latter attitude is an inevitable outcome of almost four hundred years of slavery and semislavery. Antiwhite feelings run deep in the Negro community. Hate has begotten hate. Since the power structure in this country has traditionally been in the hands of whites, every antiwhite struggle is automatically converted into a clash with the rulers of American society. Leaps in class consciousness, leaps in political understanding and leaps in methods of struggle within the Negro movement are derived from the tense and dynamic nature of this Negro-white relationship. This is a tremendously revolutionary force and it impels some Negroes toward the socialist movement -- but there are other quite different roads which are taken as well.

Many times antiwhite sentiments have taken the form of hate all white men, be suspicious of all whites, avoid all whites, turn your back on all aspects of white society. Many Negroes, therefore, take no clear stand on anti-Communism or pro-Communism. It's only another white "ism" to them and as such has nothing to offer them as black people. Since they are not truly accepted as Americans, since they have been cast out of the white man's society, since they have become alienated from the dominant white culture, then they have no concern either with adopting or rejecting the white man's ideologies and organizations. Their search is for something unconnected to white Western civilization. So, there are Negroes who refuse to participate in any part of the American struggle because they intend to exist within their own isolated subculture or because they plan to leave this country and make a new life elsewhere.

There are those Negroes who are intent on building their future within the United States -- but apart from the white world. Whatever must be done to solve their problems must be done completely by their own forces with their own ideas. They reject any notion of joining with their natural allies within the white community, the

exploited workers. They base their rejection on powerful facts in American history, past and present. Although black exploitation has been most profitable to slaveholders and wage-slave bosses, white farmers and workers have often provided the battle troops for capitalist generals determined to stifle Negro unrest. Attempts to unite with whites in organs of struggle against the common enemy and for common goals have produced their share of failures and betrayals. And why, these Negroes ask, should we unite with an obviously passive white working class riddled with prejudice when the black freedom struggle has proven to be so powerful and vital on its own? Why should we dilute our strength with whites who have not yet reached our level of militancy and dedication and courage? Why should we set ourselves up for more betrayals from weak-kneed, hypocritical whites?

To appreciate the strength of these feelings, they must be considered against the background of the Communist party's real record in this field. We will return to this in another article.

### THE UNITY MOVEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

By Susan Craig

For more than twenty years the Unity Movement of South Africa has stood for a united and independent struggle of all nonwhites against a whole system of oppression and segregation, and for liberation. It was in 1943, during the ferment created by the Second World War, that the All-African Convention, a federal body uniting all the existing organizations of the African people, sent out a clarion call for the unity not only of all Africans but of all sections who suffered under a common oppression, the Africans, Coloureds and Indians.

This was the most important step that the nonwhites had taken up to that time in their struggle against oppression. For the first time they demanded equality for all men and women in South Africa, irrespective of race, color or creed. It marked a complete rejection of racialism. It marked a rejection of the alleged inferiority of the black man and all the political machinery employed by the white state for his economic exploitation and racial oppression.

In calling for an independent struggle, the Unity Movement emphasized that a complete break-away from the tutelage of all white herrenvolk parties was absolutely essential for the creation of a truly national organization determined to wage a successful struggle for liberation.

This was a revolutionary step. To reject inferiority and claim full equality was to reject the whole policy of segregation practiced by the South African state. Today that policy stinks in the nostrils of the world under the name of Apartheid.

When the All-African Convention sent out its call for unity, a tremendous response came from many Coloured organizations united under a federal body called the National Anti-CAD; that is, opposed to the projected Coloured Affairs Department which, like the already existing Native Affairs Department, was to treat the Coloured people as outside the body politic of the country.

Together, the National Anti-CAD and the All-African Convention formed what was then called the Non-European Unity Movement [NEUM], a name selected to emphasize the oppression common to all sections of the nonwhites. This later became simply the Unity Movement. At its first general conference, more than 150 organizations and branches were represented.

The leaders of the Unity Movement went straight to the core of all the social and economic disabilities suffered in common by the nonwhites; namely, lack of political rights.

In December 1943, they drew up a ten-point program for full democratic rights. This was to constitute the basis of a principled struggle against segregation and the whole South African system of oppression. Described as "a programme representing the minimum demands and fundamental needs of all sections of the people," it was to have far-reaching effect on the outlook and attitudes of the oppressed. There were to be other leaders who rejected the concept of a united and independent struggle freed from the manipulations and influences of white herrenvolk parties; but when they addressed the people, they, too, echoed the great call for democratic rights. For these demands had become part and parcel of the political thinking of all the oppressed.

Here, then, are the ten democratic demands formulated by the Unity Movement:

(1) The franchise; i.e., the right of every man and woman over the age of 21 to elect and be elected to Parliament.

This means the end of all political tutelage, of all communal or indirect representation, and the granting to all Non-Whites the same universal, equal, direct and secret ballot as at present enjoyed exclusively by Whites.

(2) Education. Compulsory, free and uniform education for all children up to the age of 16, with free meals, free books and school equipment for the needy. This means the extension of all educational rights, at present enjoyed only by White children, to

all Non-White children, with the same access to higher education on equal terms.

(3) Inviolability of person, of one's house and privacy. This is the elementary Habeas Corpus right. The present state of helplessness of the Non-Whites before the police is an outrage of the principles of democracy.

(4) Freedom of speech, press, meetings and association. This means the abolition of the Riotous Assembly Act, directed specifically against the Non-Whites. It embodies the right to combine, to form and enter Trade Unions on the same basis as Whites.

(5) Freedom of movement and occupation. This means the abolition of Pass Laws and restriction of movement and travel within the Union of South Africa. It means the right to live and look for work wherever one pleases.

(6) Full equality of rights for all citizens without distinction of race, colour or sex. This means the abolition of all discriminatory Colour Bar laws.

(7) Revision of the land question in accordance with the above. The relations of serfdom at present existing on the land must go, together with the iniquitous Land Acts, and the restrictions on acquiring land.

(8) Revision of the civil and criminal code in accordance with the above. This means the abolition of feudal relations in the whole system of justice -- police, magistrates, law-courts and prisons -- whereby the punishment of the same crime is not the same, but is based on the skin-colour of the offender. There must be complete equality of all citizens before the law.

(9) Revision of the system of taxation in accordance with the above. This means the abolition of the Poll-tax on Africans, or of any other tax applicable specifically to the Non-Whites, or discrimination between Whites and Non-Whites.

(10) Revision of the labour legislation and its application to the mines and agriculture. This means specifically the revision of Industrial Conciliation and Wage Acts, the elimination of all restrictions and distinctions between the White workers and the Non-White worker; equal pay for equal work; equal access to Apprenticeship and skilled labour. This means the liquidation of indentured labour and forcible recruiting for labour on mines and White farms. It means the abolition of the old Masters and Servants Act.

With the above ten-point program, the nonwhites staked their claim as equal members of the South African state. A resolution adopting the ten-point program stated: "Only the realisation of the

10-Point Programme can bring about true democracy in South Africa, can bring peace and security to all the people of our country and terminate the strife and division."

The formation of the Unity Movement meant a sharp break with old political attitudes. The rejection of the alleged inferiority of the black man, and the claim to full equality, involved new methods of struggle.

The Unity Movement recognized that the white government policy of segregation and what was called "trusteeship" was an instrument of domination over the nonwhites. With the lie of the inferiority of the black man, it imposed on them special segregatory institutions such as the Native Representative Council acting under a white overseer; Location Advisory Boards (operating in African locations in cities) and Bungas (councils) operating in rural areas under a white Native Commissioner. With the so-called Native Representation Act, it had also created the farce of "Native" elections for three white members -- "Native Representatives" -- to represent Africans in a white parliament of 153 members.

The Unity Movement therefore adopted the totally new policy of noncollaboration, which it defines as "an active policy involving the refusal to assist the oppressor in operating those separate institutions for our oppression. It means the rejection and active BOYCOTT of all separate elections under the Native Representation Act [of 1936]."

In their campaigns throughout the country, especially in the Transkei "Native Reserve" in the Eastern Cape Province, the leaders of the All-African Convention and the Unity Movement successfully inculcated in the people the use of the boycott weapon of struggle.

In a mounting tide of opposition to the machinery of bogus representative councils and elections, the Transkei Organised Bodies, representing many peasant organizations, called upon the "Native Representatives" (whites) and the African members of the Native Representative Council to resign. It expelled those who stood for election to the Council and those who took part in the voting.

It was in 1946 that the rising temper of the African people precipitated the adjournment of the Native Representative Council. By 1947 white candidates canvassing in the Transkei for the coming elections were told outright by the peasants that they had no right to come there to address them against their decision to boycott all sham elections. The whole trick of separate representation and bogus councils, they said, was designed to keep their eyes away from the only place where laws are made -- in parliament.

As resistance on the part of the African peasants to the increasingly fascist measures of the Nationalist (Verwoerd) govern-

ment spread through the "reserves," they took up a slogan of the true liberatory struggle: Land and Liberty -- Land and Political Rights.

This is the liberatory struggle that the Unity Movement of South Africa stands for. It is the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples of South Africa. It knows the struggle will be long and hard but it shall not cease the struggle until liberation for all is achieved.

### BOURGUIBA'S PROPOSAL ON ISRAEL

Jerusalem

On April 21, Tunisia's President Habib Bourguiba captured the headlines with his "new" plan to end the Arab-Israeli conflict -- to set up a federation of states of the Arab East that would include Israel.

A superficial analysis might lead one to conclude that this is a very revolutionary proposal. It happens to be true that only the real integration of Israel in its geographical environment could ever solve this tragic problem.

But Bourguiba didn't propose anything really new. The scheme has been offered before in various forms by others in official or semi-official Arab circles. During the Bandung conference ten years ago, a similar proposal was adopted with the approval of the Arab delegations.

Coincident with Bourguiba's proposal, an interview with Nasser appeared in the French magazine Réalités in which the head of the United Arab Republic advanced ideas not too different from those of Bourguiba. These hinged on Israel opening its gates to Arab refugees who want to return to their homeland and paying compensation to those who don't want to come back. He has made similar proposals repeatedly in press declarations from 1955 to 1964.

Nasser's differences with Bourguiba, therefore, do not primarily involve this subject. Nasser's attacks on Bourguiba, as made for instance in a speech not so long ago, have centered on the pro-imperialist and neocolonialist position of the Tunisian president, particularly in the conflict between Egypt and West Germany.

(However, in a speech May 1 in Cairo's Republic Square devoted mainly to Egypt's internal problems, Nasser rejected Bourguiba's proposal out of hand. Nasser said he refused to accept coexistence with Israel, "which is an imperialist base." Unfortunately, he had nothing to suggest but the completely unrealistic demand to implement

the 1947 resolution of the United Nations on the partition of Palestine. This demand, which has also been advanced by the Communist parties of the countries in the Arab East, is in complete opposition to the interests of the Arab socialist revolution.)

What Bourguiba really sought was to pose an "alternative as against Nasser's." This was correctly and gladly noted in the April 25 issue of the Tel-Aviv daily Haaretz. The revolutionary trend in the Arab world is becoming more and more of a threat to imperialism. That is why a pro-imperialist alternative is required that would help to isolate Algeria and Egypt. Bourguiba's proposal would help fill this need.

Bourguiba serves both French and American imperialism. And while they have divergent interests in the Arab world and they are divided by interimperialist contradictions, they could use a common alternative to the Arab revolution.

At each meeting of the Arab heads of state, conflicts which reflect the contradictions between reaction and revolutionary needs become more and more acute.

Hassin Haikal, a journalist in Nasser's inner circle, very clearly expressed the Egyptian regime's attitude toward Israel: "One must frankly state that a collision (between the Arab top conferences and the possibilities of the Arab revolution) is approaching, and if there is no escape from such a collision, I would unhesitatingly choose the possibility of the Arab revolution, as it is the only road which leads to the main goal. Also there is no doubt that Israel represents the main danger to the Arab revolution, because on the one hand it is backed by imperialism, which is still in power in many parts of the Arab world through its interests, commitments and relations, and on the other hand it supports Arab reaction and fosters its retreat in the face of imperialism. This means that the conflict with Israel does not take place in a vacuum but is linked with the aggressive powers of world imperialism on the one hand and with local feudalism, reaction and its exploitive ruling positions on the other." (Haikal seems to have forgotten that not only imperialism but also the Soviet Union actively participated in creating the state of Israel in the 1947-49 period.)

The quotation clearly indicates the anti-imperialist road the Nasser regime is traveling. If this is placed in the context of revolutionary potentialities in Egypt, it is possible to better understand the fears of imperialism and the real background of Bourguiba's statement.

In its April 13 issue, the Hebrew daily Haaretz reproduced an interview with De la Gorce, a "left" supporter of de Gaulle and collaborator of the weekly Jeune Afrique, which enjoys Bourguiba's patronage. De la Gorce knows his way around the Arab world and he



is much in favor of Bourguiba's pro-French and neocolonialist activities. Nevertheless he is realistic in this interview. He states that Bourguiba's proposal of a federation can't solve the problem of Israel, because Bourguiba is an agent of the West. He doesn't state, of course, that Bourguiba is linked to the Zionist regime of Israel precisely because of his political nature.

"They (the left forces in the Arab countries) write and speak against Israel, but for them it is a secondary business. In their circles there is none of the deep hostility existing among the nationalists. Their main criterion is whether Israel remains allied to the Western bloc, whether it is a tool of America. The more Israel appears to be an ally of the USA and the West, the more the Egyptian left regards it as an enemy, a tool of the imperialist camp ...They certainly don't assume that war is the only solution, that Israel should be destroyed. This means that any step taken by Israel to prove that it is not linked to the West, any shift in its balancing act between the blocs, would strongly influence Egypt and the Arab world."

Continuing, he says that "if in the future a positive solution can be found (for Israel), this could be accomplished only by a left revolutionary state, strong enough not to fear the accusation that it has capitulated to the West. Bourguiba's greatest weakness is the fact that he is allied to the West....The job will have to be done by a strong, left leader." (Emphasis added.)

The conflict between Israel and the Arabs can only be solved in alliance with the Arab revolution, against imperialism. It cannot be overcome by nice-sounding phrases from a neocolonialist like Bourguiba. The conflict in the final analysis involves the struggle of the Arab revolution against an imperialist bulwark in its own sphere. What is required is the socialist unification of the Arab world and its federation with a socialist Israel.

#### H-BOMB TEST STILL PROVIDING DATA

When the U.S. exploded a hydrogen bomb March 1, 1954, the natives of Rongelap and Ailingae in the Pacific were "accidentally" exposed to the fallout. Up to 1957 they were reported to be still in good health. Today the effects are beginning to show up. Pigmented moles, miscarriages, noncancerous (thus far) lumps in thyroid glands and some stunting of growth have afflicted the 82 victims. The moles have appeared on the skin where it was directly exposed to radiation. Boys poisoned by the dust at the age of five, show signs of slow growth of bones. The symptoms are directly associated with radioactive strontium and radioactive iodine ingested from contaminated water and contaminated foods.

THE ALEXANDER ELEVEN

[The following ballad to the tune of a Canadian folk song was composed by Shiam Nislem and sung by him at a benefit social in London for the prisoners in the Alexander case. An appeal against the conviction was recently rejected by the South African courts. The eleven, including four young women, are serving sentences of up to ten years for their "crime" of political opposition to the apartheid system. The men are in the notorious Robben Island prison where more than 1,000 political prisoners have been put behind bars. Contributions to help the prisoners and their families can be sent to Mrs. C. Kirkby, 27 Thursley House, Holmewood Gardens, London, S.W.2.]

The judge arose and read the charge;  
The victims strained their ears.  
"We accuse you all of sabotage;  
And each sentence will be ten years."

"But we're not guilty," Alexander said;  
"Segregation mustn't be."  
The judge said, "Now you're as good as dead;  
In South Africa no man's free."

The quiet life is grand because  
There's no call to stand and fight;  
But how many here would oppose the laws  
If he thought that the laws weren't right?

Dr. Neville Alexander is such a man;  
And as his life is tried,  
You'll see how just such a man can stand  
When his cause is justified.

The African coppers are hissed and feared  
Among the Southern downtrod.  
When eleven people simply disappeared  
There was no one who thought it odd.

For ninety days they were confined to cells;  
They were beaten and tortured and defiled.  
Who could know of their private hells  
Till the day when they came to trial?

The judge arose and read the charge;  
The victims strained their ears.  
"We accuse you all of sabotage;  
And each sentence will be ten years."

"But we're not guilty," Alexander said;  
Segregation mustn't be."  
The judge said, "Now you're as good as dead;  
In South Africa no man's free."

So the eleven were led off in single file,  
Another split in Freedom's Bell,  
To serve their terms out on Robben's Isle  
Ten years of a living hell.

Ten years of their life those people gave  
To freedom for you and me  
Because so long as one man in this world's a slave  
Then none of us are free.

#### GOOD DEAL FOR ALUMINUM KINGS

One of the reasons for the keen interest of the British and American imperialists in turning the Cheddi Jagan government out of office in British Guiana now seems to be fairly clear.

The Reynolds Metals Company has just signed a very advantageous contract with the coalition government now in power. The contract is to run for twenty-five years.

In addition Reynolds has been granted exclusive exploration rights over 1,279,000 acres. If the company wishes, this can be converted into a lease running for seventy-five years.

The coalition government agreed to dredge the Berbice River to help the company double its present yearly production of bauxite.

On top of this, the coalition agreed to freeze the rate of income tax levied on the company for the next twenty-five years.

There is to be, in addition, a fixed rate on export duties for the next twenty-five and possibly seventy-five years.

In return Reynolds agreed to pay British Guiana \$500,000 in advance taxes.

Even an outright gift of this size would amount to small change for this big aluminum outfit. As an advance, they lose only the interest the money could have drawn in the bank or as a loan.

Commenting on this deal, Mortgaging Guyana writes in the March issue of Thunder, the official publication of the People's

Progressive party:

"Reynolds is a mighty Company. They have struck a mighty good bargain from their point of view. If they can be treated in this way, the other bauxite Company -- Demba -- will soon be making similar demands, and so will the other sharks -- those fishing for oil and base metals.

"A half million dollar advance tax payment is good consideration for the concessions won. It is a gift to the country for being so generous with its resources. No wonder these Companies are singing praises to the coalition!"