

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 10

March 12, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

"Unity -- Not Vengeance," Says Companion of Malcolm X	1
Castro Points Way Out of Vietnam Crisis	3
Johnson -- a Case of "Unclouded Vision"?	5
Left Wing Communists Win in Kerala	7
Spanish Students Gain Concessions	10
Bertrand Russell Assails Wilson for Abetting War in Vietnam	12
Leftist Labour Leader Resigns from Wilson Government	15
Ink Bottles for the American Embassy	16
Statistics Confirm Soviet Economic Difficulties	18
The Soviet Union Today	19
Stefan Heym's Plea for Proletarian Democracy	23
Alexander Defence Committee Demonstrates in Trafalgar Square -- by Alan Adair	25
Successful Strike Action in Argentina -- by O. Gomes	26
Sit-Down Strikes with Hostages	28
Youth Give French CP Leaders Tough Battle -- by Pierre Frank	29
General Humberto Delgado Reported Missing	30
Che Guevara Stresses Proletarian Internationalism	31
The Meteoric Rise of Malcolm X -- by Evelyn Sell	35

"UNITY -- NOT VENGEANCE," SAYS COMPANION OF MALCOLM X

In an interview published in the March 8 issue of the New York socialist weekly The Militant, James Shabazz, personal secretary of Malcolm X, indignantly scored the charge that members of the martyred leader's organization were seeking revenge for their leader's death.

"Intelligent people," he said, "realize that the tremendous power structure that exists in the United States and throughout the world came into being by dividing people, who had just grievances,

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 10

March 12, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

"Unity -- Not Vengeance," Says Companion of Malcolm X	1
Castro Points Way Out of Vietnam Crisis	3
Johnson -- a Case of "Unclouded Vision"?	5
Left Wing Communists Win in Kerala	7
Spanish Students Gain Concessions	10
Bertrand Russell Assails Wilson for Abetting War in Vietnam	12
Leftist Labour Leader Resigns from Wilson Government	15
Ink Bottles for the American Embassy	16
Statistics Confirm Soviet Economic Difficulties	18
The Soviet Union Today	19
Stefan Heym's Plea for Proletarian Democracy	23
Alexander Defence Committee Demonstrates in Trafalgar Square -- by Alan Adair	25
Successful Strike Action in Argentina -- by O. Gomes	26
Sit-Down Strikes with Hostages	28
Youth Give French CP Leaders Tough Battle -- by Pierre Frank	29
General Humberto Delgado Reported Missing	30
Che Guevara Stresses Proletarian Internationalism	31
The Meteoric Rise of Malcolm X -- by Evelyn Sell	35

"UNITY -- NOT VENGEANCE," SAYS COMPANION OF MALCOLM X

In an interview published in the March 8 issue of the New York socialist weekly The Militant, James Shabazz, personal secretary of Malcolm X, indignantly scored the charge that members of the martyred leader's organization were seeking revenge for their leader's death.

"Intelligent people," he said, "realize that the tremendous power structure that exists in the United States and throughout the world came into being by dividing people, who had just grievances,

one against the other so the forces of oppression could control both. Thus we understand why the power structure would utilize any opportunity to try to give the impression that we are fighting one another instead of our common enemy.

"But Brother Malcolm died for the concept of unity of Afro-Americans and other peoples of African descent. We are concerned with furthering the concept for which he died -- a unity of Afro-American peoples and people of African origin in other parts of the world, and a unity of American Muslims with Muslims throughout the world -- not with fighting, black militant against black militant, while our oppressor stands by laughing."

Asked about the charges in the press that supporters of Malcolm X were responsible for the burning of the Nation of Islam Mosque in Harlem, James Shabazz offered the following comment:

"This is reminiscent of the Reichstag Fire incident in Germany where the Nazis burned down the Reichstag themselves in order to justify oppressing people later on. The power structure is trying to create pretexts now that will justify oppressive measures which they already plan to put into force against all the militant elements in the struggle for liberation in this country.

"Therefore, it doesn't surprise us, after the journalistically created 'blood-brothers' hoax and the Statue-of-Liberty fiasco, that the power structure is again attempting to create a basis to justify further oppressive measures which it has been planning to use against the militant people who are seeking freedom from oppression."

While Shabazz spoke personally and not in an official capacity for either the Muslim Mosque, Inc., or the Organization of Afro-American Unity, he vigorously emphasized the views of the founder of the two organizations, citing a tape recording made by Malcolm X shortly before his death in which the militant leader said he was certain his followers would not seek retaliation. (The tape recording has been repeated on radio programs.)

"Brother Malcolm died teaching a concept of a unity of oppressed people. Oppressed people cannot achieve unity by fighting against one another while the real culprit, who pits them one against the other, stands back and smiles. Brother Malcolm's assassination must be viewed in terms of the forces that ordered it rather than in terms of the tools that perpetrated the act.

"It was not simply coincidental that he was assassinated after having been refused admittance to France and after an attempt had been made to prevent him from re-entering England, two countries which -- like the United States -- are world powers that have tremendous populations of peoples of African origin and Muslims, all of whom are oppressed -- truly a thorn in the side of a power structure determined to go to war in Asia against other non-white peoples."

The correctness of the appeal made by James Shabazz for unity in face of the sinister forces that stand to gain by pitting sectors of Afro-Americans and Muslims against each other, is being underlined by the strange way the police have proceeded in investigating the assassination of Malcolm X.

When James Shabazz and Francis Reuben, another of Malcolm X's closest associates, went to police headquarters in response to a request to explain why they thought they did not need police protection, both of them were detained and then Francis Reuben was arrested. Although he was unarmed he was charged with "felonious assault" and violation of the Sullivan Act (possession of a gun -- a serious charge in New York). The police claimed that a witness had identified him as a bodyguard of Malcolm X who had shot one of the killers in the leg! Because of this wound, the slayer was captured by the police.

The Militant also reports that three other followers of Malcolm X have been charged under the Sullivan Act. Police broke into an apartment where John 57X, Cyril 2X and Willie Hilton were visiting. The police claimed that they found a shotgun in the apartment and so they arrested the three for being in the "presence" of the firearm.

An appeal has been made for financial contributions to help in the legal defense of Reuben Francis. The address is as follows:

Reuben Francis
Organization of Afro-American Unity
Hotel Theresa
2090 Seventh Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10027

CASTRO POINTS WAY OUT OF VIETNAM CRISIS

On March 8, the first contingent of U.S. Marines landed in South Vietnam. When the rest arrive, the admitted number of U.S. armed forces intervening in the civil war will be 27,000.

The main significance of the landing of Marines, however, is not the quantitative side. These are the first ground troops. More will come. If the thinking of Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, accurately reflects Pentagon blueprints, as many as 1,000,000 may eventually be brought in. [See World Outlook March 5.]

This latest move taken by Johnson is another step in the "escalation" through which the Pentagon is probing the defenses of

North Vietnam, the People's Republic of China and, in the final analysis, the Soviet Union. The "escalation" will proceed, according to all indications, until the Pentagon feels that it has run up against solid resistance.

While this has been going on, both Moscow and Peking have loudly and correctly denounced the U.S. aggression against North Vietnam. Moscow has promised adequate material aid. But as yet evidence of this has not appeared.

Is the slowness of the Kremlin in living up to its promise one of the factors in the renewed flare-up of the Sino-Soviet dispute? It is hard to say, although this seems to be implied by Peking's angry denunciation of the repressive moves taken by the Soviet police and soldiers against the students in Moscow who demonstrated in front of the American embassy.

This is the situation which gives full meaning to recent courageous moves made by the Cuban government. Castro has pointed a possible way out of the Vietnam crisis that appears to offer much more hope than, for instance, merely following Tito's example in writing a letter to the madman in the White House.

On March 3 in a television broadcast, Fidel Castro accused the United States of being guilty of "Hitlerite crimes" in Vietnam.

He regretted that Cuba does not lie closer to Vietnam geographically so that it could help Southeast Asia with "all its resources" and send North Vietnam "anti-aircraft guns and planes together with pilots."

"The American imperialists," he continued, "are destroying cities and killing people with whom they are not at war. The imperialist master blackmailers have taken off their mask and are now undertaking systematic attacks that are no longer even 'reprisal' attacks."

The Cuban prime minister added: "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."

"They are only blackmailing master murderers, but if they want to kill, they can also die."

He said that he was "sure that North Vietnam will not find herself all alone in face of the crimes of imperialism. We know that the North Vietnamese people are a heroic people, they belong to the socialist camp and it is the duty of all of us socialists to help them with all our strength."

Castro also said, "The situation in Vietnam proves that Cuba must remain alert, and that is why we are guarding our arms and are

ready to repulse any traitorous attacks."

This was not oratory. It was plain speaking. But after all what can tiny Cuba do, only ninety miles from Florida, under blockade, and with the entire American continent and the Pacific Ocean separating it from the heroic Vietnamese?

On March 8, the Cuban government did do something. It made a gift of 10,000 tons of sugar to the North Vietnamese people, in order to help them in "their heroic struggle against Yankee imperialism."

At a ceremony in Havana President Dorticós and Prime Minister Castro presented the gift to Nguyen Than Ha, ambassador of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Vo Dong Giang, head of the mission of the South Vietnamese Front of National Liberation.

Cuba thus won the honor of being the first workers state to publicly present North Vietnam with substantial material aid for use in its defense against the aggression of U.S. imperialism.

It would seem that it is now up to the others to do as well in proportion to their size, strength and proximity to the scene.

JOHNSON -- A CASE OF "UNCLOUDED VISION"?

President Johnson refuses to talk about his aims in escalating the dirty war of conquest in South Vietnam. He has imposed silence on his entire entourage. This silence is supposed to confuse and frighten "the enemy" -- which includes the American people -- so that they will not be able to tell what he is really up to. Thus various informed guesses are being offered as to the nature of his game. We offer four of interest:

Raising on a Pair of Jacks

"In the middle of the storm, President Lyndon Johnson maintained a calculated silence. In his own councils, he is bitter about domestic proposals for a swift settlement -- and he is irked by the diverse and mounting diplomatic pressure to push him to the conference table. Fundamentally, he thinks he is in a precariously weak bargaining position at the moment. He sees nothing to be gained by being harried into serious negotiations when the conditions are patently unfavorable.

"Mr. Johnson is not a professionally trained diplomat nor has he had any extensive experience with the intricacies of international negotiation. But he is an old and inveterate poker player -- and

that background alone gives him an unclouded vision of the high stakes and the basic rules of any prospective bargaining session. He knows that the first requirement for negotiation over Southeast Asia is the assurance that he can bargain successfully. He knows -- and he intuitively respects -- Hanoi's current upbeat assessment of its mission to invest and overcome South Vietnam. He asks rhetorically why would Communist North Vietnam want to come to the bargaining table -- and why would it be interested in serious negotiations -- when it seems to hold so many high cards?" [Newsweek, March 8.]

Looking for a Sellout

"The Johnson Administration is neither willing to accept defeat nor bold enough to face the consequences of an extended war, and so it is in a tight spot. This is the real background to the constant talk in Washington about so-called negotiations from positions of strength.

"The aim of the Johnson Administration is quite clear -- to get at the conference table what it could not get on the battlefield. It wants to bind the south Viet Nam liberation forces hand and foot, and strengthen the positions of the U.S. forces and the puppet regime so as to get a breathing spell. Isn't it too much wishful thinking on Johnson's part to hope to grab back at the conference table what it has lost on the battlefield? Can anything ever be so easy for the United States? Peace in Viet Nam can be readily achieved, but it can be only after the U.S. aggressors have withdrawn from south Viet Nam and certainly not before. The United States must stop its aggression and intervention in Indo-China and let the Indo-Chinese peoples settle their own problems." [Translation of February 19 Renmin Ribao editorial, published in the February 26 issue of Peking Review. Emphasis added by Peking Review.]

The Real Stakes are Very High

"PALO ALTO -- American air attacks on North Vietnam are a prelude to U.S. bombing of Red China's nuclear test sites, Sen. Wayne Morse (D - Ore.) charged at Stanford University Wednesday.

"Morse, a long time foe of U.S. policy in South Vietnam, was asked if he thinks we have escalated the war to improve our position at the bargaining table.

"I'll tell you what it is -- it is preparatory to bombing the nuclear test sites in Red China," Morse replied.

"They intend to provoke her and provoke her until she makes a misstep, then we'll hit the nuclear site in Red China and when they do that, the big show is on."

"He said that in this event, it is doubtful Russia would refrain from entering the war on Red China's side.

"'You can't win a war in Red China by bombing from the air,' he told an audience of 2,000. 'If the war escalates and China sends troops into Vietnam, then we will have to send 300,000 American soldiers, and that's a minimum, into Vietnam.'" [Exclusive dispatch to the Los Angeles Times, March 4.]

Insanity Is Involved

"Imagine a nice sack with a few billion cubic meters of Chinese sand hanging in the air. Underneath, a ladder; on the ladder, a fireman armed with an ax; below, a functionary of the Vietcong sawing the steps he can reach. Each time a step goes, the fireman climbs a step and swings the ax over his head; when he reaches the top of the ladder (this is the 'position of strength') he will hit the sack.

"At least that's how I visualize 'escalation' and its captivating gradual method.

"As to what will happen when the fireman hits the sack with a harder ax-blow than usual, you would have to be a prophet to say.

"A number of American experts believe that intimidated by such energy, the sack will collapse.

"That just what bothers me. There's a chance, in that case, for a lot of sand to come pouring down." [André Frossard in the Paris Le Figaro, March 4.]

LEFT WING COMMUNISTS WIN IN KERALA

By Kailas Chandra

BOMBAY, Mar. 6 -- The Left Communist party led by E.M.S. Namboodiripad emerged as the largest single party, capturing 40 seats in the 133-member legislative Assembly of Kerala state in the midterm elections held on March 4. Twenty-eight of these are held under detention, along with the Communist leaders recently arrested and detained by the Union government under the so-called Defence of India Rules. Namboodiripad, the only leader outside prison, has been elected, trouncing his Right CPI [Communist party of India] rival by a margin of 7,500 votes.

The Congress party has, however, become the second largest group in the new Assembly with 36 members. The "Kerala Congress" -- a group of rebel Congressmen who forced fresh elections in the state by voting the ministry led by R. Shanker out of office -- has secured 23 seats.

One of the significant outcomes of the elections in Kerala was the total rout of the Dangeite "Rightist" Communist party which secured only two seats out of 78 candidates it had fielded as part of the "United Front of Left" with the Revolutionary Socialist party [RSP] and "progressive" independents. The RSP also did not secure any seat in the Assembly.

The Samyukta Socialist party [SSP] which had an electoral "adjustment" with the Left CPI got 12 seats while the Muslim League, a party representing the Muslim minority in the state, got six. Ten "independents," some of whom were supported by the Left CP, have been returned. The Swatantra party has also made its appearance in the state politics for the first time by returning one member to the Assembly. (Results from two more constituencies are still to be announced.)

On the eve of the elections an attempt was made to form a united front of the various left parties in the state. The Right CPI and the RSP could not agree with the Left CPI on the question of seeking an electoral adjustment with the Muslim League in some constituencies.

Although no party has secured a clear majority in the 133-member Assembly, the Left CPI is in position to form a government in coalition with, or with the support of, its electoral allies, namely the SSP, independents and perhaps the Muslim League. The Right CPI will be left with no alternative but to support such a ministry.

The Union Home Minister G.L.Nanda had, however, said before the elections that the Left Communists would not be released even if elected to the Assembly, as their arrests were not related to the Kerala elections. During a recent visit to Kerala, Nanda boasted that he was "allowing pro-Peking Communists" to contest elections while under detention "so that the people will have a chance of disowning them"! The Kerala voters have given a fitting reply to Nanda.

The Congress party might still make a bid to seek coalition with the rebel Congressmen but even then, the two parties together will not be in a position to command an absolute majority in the Assembly. It remains to be seen whether the Central government will release the Left Communists so that they can explore the possibility of forming a ministry. This is going to be the crucial test for bourgeois democratic institutions in India.

Refusal by New Delhi to release the elected legislators still under detention will certainly be interpreted as a serious challenge to the popular verdict expressed in the Kerala poll.

Namboodiripad, who headed the Communist ministry till it was dismissed by the Central government in 1961, said soon after his election was announced: "I am grateful to the voters of my constituency who have seen through and defeated the disrupting game played

by the Dangeites. I shall have the opportunity to congratulate the voters of Kerala for defeating the game played by the Congress, particularly by the Home Minister Shri G.L.Nanda."

Namboodiripad was elected to the Assembly from his home constituency Pattambi where he was confronted with a four-cornered contest.

These are some of the highlights of the elections in Kerala:

K. Aniruddhan, a Left Communist prisoner, defeated the former Chief Minister R. Shanker in Attingal, considered to be the stronghold of the Congress.

In Kottayam another Left Communist detenu M.K.George defeated a former Congress minister M.P.Govindan Nair.

Other Left Communist leaders (still under detention) elected included P.R. Gopalan and Mrs. Gouri Thomas (both ministers in the former Namboodiripad cabinet), C.H.Kanaran and Mrs. Susheela Gopalan (wife of A.K.Gopalan, the detained leader of the Left CPI group in parliament).

T.V.Thomas, a Rightist Communist (husband of Gouri Thomas and a minister in the CPI-led government), was, however, defeated. V.R.Krishna Iyer, also a minister in the former Communist ministry, supported by the Right CPI, lost his deposit in the contest against a Left Communist. Other Rightist CPI tops did not contest.

No comment was immediately available from the Right CPI leaders about their debacle in Kerala. S.A.Dange, chairman, and C. Rajeshwar Rao, general secretary of the party, were away at Moscow attending the "consultative" meeting of international Communist leaders. It is, however, clear that the masses in Kerala, the most literate state in India, have rejected the "middle of the road" (class collaborationist) policies of the Dangeite opportunists and have voted for the militant class struggle programme of the Left CPI without being intimidated by the mass arrests of its leaders.

The bourgeois Congress party has also been rejected by the people and the "China Bogey" raised by Congressmen to scare the voters away from the Left CPI has boomeranged. The bourgeois leadership is facing a dilemma whether to release the Left CPI leaders or take steps to wind up the democratic institutions. There is a move to once again dissolve the state legislature and impose "President's Rule" on the state on the plea that none of the political parties has a stable majority in the new Assembly.

In any case, the situation in Kerala will precipitate a major political crisis in the country in the next few weeks.

SPANISH STUDENTS GAIN CONCESSIONS.

Some 4,000 students at the University of Madrid held a meeting of their newly constituted "Assembly of Free Students" March 1. After electing a leadership, they set aside March 2 as the "Day of the Free Student" and decided on a demonstration in the plaza before the office of the national minister of education. [See World Outlook March 5.]

The initiative taken by the Madrid students met with a response from other students throughout Spain. In Bilbao, for instance, 12,000 students in various colleges and technical schools decided to go out on strike March 2 in token of solidarity. In Barcelona all the colleges and technical schools outside the official student union declared a solidarity strike to last from two to eight days. In Valencia close to 1,000 students met in the philosophy department under the chairmanship of Professor Carlos Paris El Garrido in the university's first "free assembly." In Grenada the university authorities themselves suspended school "because of the currently existing tension." In Sevilla a demonstration of more than 1,000 students shouted for a free union. They were dispersed by the police but no arrests were made. In Salamanca another student demonstration on its way to the city hall was blocked by the police. The University of Cadiz also went out on strike. In Zaragoza a "free assembly" was held. At Valladolid and Oviedo the schools of commerce joined in strike action.

The students registered in the affected schools represent about eighty per cent of the entire university student population in Spain.

The main test on March 2 came, as expected, in Madrid. Heavy contingents of police were mobilized to meet the students. Some 5,000 joined in the demonstration, which lasted for more than two hours in the cold and snow. In accordance with the decision of the "free assembly" the day before, they demonstrated in silence, carefully avoiding violence.

Moving in with clubs, the police sought to prevent the students from assembling in Cibeles Plaza. At a signal from a bugle they charged with particular violence in front of the offices of Agence France Presse which are located close to the plaza. Many priests participated in the demonstration and some forty of them were added to those arrested.

In sign of their anger over lying stories printed in the official press about their actions, the students tore up stacks of the daily papers, littering the streets.

In face of this demonstration and the wave of solidarity actions throughout the country, the fascist regime decided that it was wise to make a retreat.

On March 3 the rector of the University of Madrid, Gutierrez Rios, whose arbitrary decision to cut off a series of lectures had precipitated the student struggle, announced that the schools of medicine, philosophy and letters would be reopened the following day. He gave as his reason "the petitions formulated in writing by the professors and student representatives."

In doing this, the rector by-passed the SEU [Sindicato Español Universitario], thus dealing the official fascist union a body blow.

Meeting on March 3, the "free assembly" scheduled a session for two days later to draw up a draft program to be submitted for elaboration to various university centers.

Another concession came on March 4. In an unheard of move in fascist Spain, the press published a letter from students and professors that not only talked about the struggles between the students and the police but which "protested against the publication of a note that did not objectively reflect the reality of the facts." This was a direct reference to a note from the Ministry of Information which had been published in the whole Spanish press concerning the incidents of February 24.

Five professors were reported to be studying the basis for a new union to replace the UEC which is now only a handicap and embarrassment to the Franco regime.

On March 5 the Catholic publication Ya gave a detailed report of the strikes and assemblies that had occurred the previous day in Spain. The Madrid dailies published a press release that even included the names of student delegates under arrest.

In the "free assembly" meeting that day in Madrid, more than 5,000 students attended. The next meeting was scheduled for March 9 to hear a report on "conversations with the authorities."

The meeting demanded reinstatement of five suspended professors and the withdrawal of sanctions against a number of students. They gave the rector until March 9 to grant their demands.

The arrest of Garcia Calvo, the young professor who chaired the first meetings of the "free assembly," could create fresh friction. He is being held incommunicado.

Through their militant action, the Spanish students have succeeded in gaining some important concessions. It remains to be seen what Franco will do. He is an old hand at the cat-and-mouse game and may now count on reprisals directed against the student leaders. In the present climate, however, this could prove to be a costly mistake.

BERTRAND RUSSELL ASSAILS WILSON FOR ABETTING WAR IN VIETNAM

In a speech at the London School of Economics February 15, Bertrand Russell bitterly assailed the foreign policy of the Wilson government as a "betrayal" of all its election promises. The eminent philosopher and pacifist criticized Wilson most harshly for his policies in Vietnam, the Congo and Malaysia.

Russell began by citing the promises of the Labour leaders relating to disarmament. He then examined the record since they took office and showed that not a single promise has been honored. Instead they have continued the policies of the Tory government in this field. He then turned to the most dangerous world areas:

"You doubtless know a good deal about the war in South Vietnam, but I will give a very brief outline of its progress and character. South Vietnam was part of French Cochinchina, but after a long process of civil war, the French were excluded from the whole region. A Conference was summoned to meet at Geneva in 1954. The conclusions reached were sensible, and, if they had been carried out, no trouble would have arisen. Vietnam was to be independent and neutral, and was to have a parliamentary government established by a General Election. The Americans did not like this. They professed to suspect that Vietnam would become part of the Communist bloc if left to itself and that North Vietnam was already, and has continued to be, part of the Communist bloc, in spite of reiterated statements by the Government of North Vietnam that they are and wish to be neutral.

"The Americans sent observers who decided that South Vietnam was too disturbed for a general election. There were in South Vietnam three parties: the peasants, who constituted the large majority; the Buddhists; and a tiny minority of Christians, who had been supporters of the French. The Americans decided to support this small faction. They did so at first by sending technical aid and material and 'Advisers.' It was soon seen, however, that the 'Advisers' were taking far more than a passive part in the war that ensued between the American-supported minority and the Buddhists and peasants. The war has continued now for many years and the American-supported Government -- or, more outspokenly, the Americans have steadily lost ground. It has been warfare of an incredibly brutal kind, brutal to a degree seldom equalled by any civilised Power.

"Eight million people have been put in barbed wire concentration camps involving forced labour. The country -- civilians, animals and crops as well as warriors and jungle -- has been sprayed with jelly gasoline and poison chemicals. Fifty thousand villages were burnt in 1962 alone.

"The following account was published in the Dallas Morning News on January 1, 1963: 'Supposedly the purpose of the fortified villages is to keep the Vietcong out. But barbed wire denies en-

trance and exit. Vietnamese farmers are forced at gunpoint into these virtual concentration camps. Their homes, possessions and crops are burned. In the province of Kien-Tuong, seven villagers were led into the town square. Their stomachs were slashed, their livers extracted and put on display. These victims were women and children. In another village, expectant mothers were invited to the square by Government forces to be honoured. Their stomachs were ripped open and their unborn babies removed.'

"And the anti-Communist Democratic Party of Vietnam told the International Control Commission that: 'Decapitation, eviscerations and the public display of murdered women and children are common.'

"It is, as the Nation of January 19, 1963, called it, "a dirty, cruel war," and one can only agree with the leader of the Vietnamese Democratic Party when he said in an interview on C.B.S. (reported in the Vietnamese Democratic Bulletin for September, 1963): 'It is certainly an ironic way to protect the peasant masses from Communism.'

"It is generally admitted that there is no hope that the Americans can win this war. Obviously failing in South Vietnam, they are now considering extending the war to North Vietnam in spite of the fact that China has declared its support of Vietnam if that should happen, and Russia may follow suit.

"The Labour Party had, hitherto, been opposed to this policy which involves the risk of world war. As late as June 4, 1964, the Daily Worker said that Mr. Wilson, at the end of talks in Moscow, was opposed to carrying the war into North Vietnam as well as to North Vietnamese infiltration into the South. But, since the formation of his Government, the Labour Party has agreed with America to support that country in its war of conquest. The Guardian reports on December 10, 1964, that Mr. Wilson told President Johnson that Britain wholly supported the legitimate role the United States is playing in South Vietnam.

"The Labour Government is doing this in spite of the fact that the vast majority of the inhabitants of South Vietnam are opposed to this American war and want to achieve peace and neutrality -- as the North Vietnamese have repeatedly asserted that they also wish -- and in spite of the extreme unparalleled brutality of the war and in spite of the fact -- and this is to be noted -- that the Americans have no shred of right in South Vietnam and are conducting a war of a type to which the Labour Party has always been passionately opposed. Moreover, if the Americans extend the war to North Vietnam, as they threaten to do, we and they will be involved in a war with China of which the consequences are bound to be horrible -- possibly all-out nuclear war. For all these consequences, the Labour Government will share the responsibility."

Russell continues with an equally damning indictment of

American-Belgian policy in the Congo and the shameful role of the Wilson government in assisting them.

"Similar troubles are being stirred up by British initiative in the war between Malaysia and Indonesia," he continued, "a war likely to be as bloody and atrocious as the two of which I have been speaking and to last as long, with no victory possible."

And these are not the only places "where the Labour Government is supporting Western imperialism." Russell pointed to British Guiana, Aden and the South Arabian Protectorates where "it is following the policies of the Tory Government. . . ."

"All these are shameful attempts to support the tottering supremacy of Britain and America against the wishes of the populations concerned, and against the vast movement for independence which is agitating formerly subject peoples. It is a terrible fact that the Labour Government is supporting these hopeless and cruel attempts at subjugation. It is an almost worse fact that it is running the risk for us of these wars escalating to large nuclear wars.

"Its reception of China's overtures towards peace and disarmament is a dreary pointer to its attitude. Soon after the Labour Government took office, Premier Chou En-lai wrote to our Prime Minister proposing that the governments of the world should undertake not to use nuclear weapons, and suggesting a summit conference. Mr. Wilson replied: 'I do not believe the procedure you have suggested is the best way to make progress in present circumstances.' . . . In the past few years the West has rebuffed several overtures made by China towards nuclear disarmament and denuclearised zones. If China is not included in disarmament discussions there is little hope for peace in the world. The Labour Government might have taken -- might still take -- a new and more realistic attitude, taking the promises of the East, as well as the West, at face value, at least as a basis for discussion, until they have been proved to be hollow. But our new Minister for Disarmament seems to be interested chiefly in how to keep up our armed forces more cheaply than hitherto."

The Labour Government, Russell pointed out, "has done nothing apparent to implement Labour's promises" in disarmament negotiations, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, the reduction of man-power and arms, the private sale of arms and a series of similar items. It has directly broken its promise about arms for South Africa and opposition to the spread of nuclear arms. And it has increased the cold war tensions.

"What are we to think of this betrayal? Is it the result of a kind of blackmail owing to the parlous state of the economy and finances of the country? But, surely, those who were about to take office must have examined the economic and financial condition of the country and the extent of its dependence upon the United States, and made plans to carry out their promises with the results of their

examination in mind. Had they not the courage to attack their problems boldly -- or, indeed, with the probable end-results of their actions in mind, realistically?

"What hope is there for Parliamentary democracy when the leaders of a Party, upon achieving office, act in direct contradiction to their electoral promises? Those Labour Party members who do not like treachery have hitherto kept quiet in the interests of unity. But what is the use of unity in evil? The cardinal virtues in gangs of criminals are unity and loyalty.

"Before we are committed irrevocably -- and we are rapidly being so committed -- to policies leading to disaster for ourselves and for all the inhabitants of the world, we should make known in unmistakable terms our abhorrence of present policies. To wait much longer will be to wait too long. If the Labour Party is to regain any part of its former championship of vitally necessary reforms, those who voted for it on the basis of its electoral Manifesto will have to insist that the leading members of this present Government must lose hope of ever holding office again.

"Whatever they may have done or not done in regard to their pre-election promises, they have got us into, and propose to keep us in, at least two of the most cruel and useless wars that there have ever been -- wars of extermination. Against this policy we must protest in every possible way."

LEFTIST LABOUR LEADER RESIGNS FROM WILSON GOVERNMENT

Frank Allaun, a prominent figure in the left wing of the British Labour party, resigned his post as parliamentary private secretary to Colonial Minister Anthony Greenwood March 5. The resignation came as a protest over Prime Minister Wilson's slavish support of U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

Allaun added his name to a list of signers of a motion in the House of Commons calling on Wilson to stop backing President Johnson.

Left-wing leaders in the Labour party found it difficult from the beginning to stomach Wilson's foreign policy, which turned out to be a bare-faced continuation of Tory imperialist policy. The increasing danger that Johnson's course in Vietnam would trigger World War III has alarmed the whole world. Public opinion in England could not be sealed off from the rest of humanity and placated indefinitely by soft words mixed with sweet-smelling smoke from Wilson's pipe. Uneasiness has now begun to mount over the situation in Southeast Asia.

Allaun's resignation is but one of the first consequences of this turn. There will be more to come if Wilson decides he has no choice but to continue cheering as Johnson drives both of them straight toward disaster.

INK BOTTLES FOR THE AMERICAN EMBASSY

(And a Black Eye for the Kremlin)

[The student demonstration at the American embassy in Moscow March 4 made world headlines. Particularly significant were the overtones of opposition to the Kremlin's apparent policy of procrastination in coming to the aid of North Vietnam against the aggression of U.S. imperialism. We offer below a translation of an eyewitness account which appeared in Drapeau Rouge [Red Flag], official organ of the Belgian Communist party. The account is all the more interesting in view of the fact that the correspondent of Drapeau Rouge has in the past been noted for his pro-Khrushchevist bias.]

* * *

MOSCOW, March 4 (by telephone from our permanent correspondent J.-M Chauvier) -- Burning with anger, some ten thousand students from Asia, Latin America and Africa -- most of them Vietnamese and Chinese -- sought to attack the embassy of the United States in Moscow Thursday afternoon in protest against the American raids against North Vietnam. At one o'clock the militia set up heavy security barriers, including a half circle of trucks and snow plows lined up hub to hub.

Hundreds of unarmed police moved into place. With the flags of North and South Vietnam at their head, the demonstrators arrived about three p.m., but were confined to a sector of the boulevard opposite the embassy and about fifty meters from the building. In numerous places, the militia only put up weak resistance and the demonstrators easily got through the barriers. In other places fisticuffs occurred. The demonstrators shouted their slogans: "Down with the Yankee imperialists!" "Yankees, go home." They moved forward shoulder to shoulder singing "The Internationale" and other songs of the Vietnamese struggle.

A half hour later, most of the assailants were close to the embassy. A shower of ink bottles and bricks hit the front of the building, shattering many windows (not a single one remained unbroken on the first two floors). An hour later a squadron of mounted militia charged them in order to clear the street. Some of them were armed with clubs with which they hit the demonstrators. They replied by swinging their placards. The struggle became widespread and there

was danger that it would degenerate. "Shame!" the demonstrators shouted at the militia and others went further. "Traitors! You've sold out to the imperialists! That's your friendship!" The strains of "The Internationale" could be heard again in many places.

About 4:30, having cleared the embassy surroundings with the help of a dozen fire trucks, the militia held off. The demonstrators were thus able to regroup. Here and there militiamen and demonstrators talked calmly with each other. The Moscow crowd sympathized with the demonstrators but never joined in the demonstration. Almost everywhere groups formed and discussions were carried on:

"That was not right, comrades," some passers-by said.

"But they're bombing our villages. Our women and children are being massacred, and you aren't doing anything!" retorted some students.

"But why blame us? Why pick a scrap here? The place to fight is in Vietnam!

"Let's go!" replied the demonstrators.

Very animated discussions likewise broke out among the Soviet citizens. Certain Moscow youth joined the demonstrators.

It was learned later that five students had been arrested. Excitement mounted again. Certain students wanted to move with their comrades into a new assault against the militia. But the demonstrators' own squads assigned to keep order [service d'ordre] handled the situation. Some hundreds of young Soviet soldiers, likewise unarmed, then came to reinforce the militia. An army fire truck drove up; the demonstrators surrounded it and questioned the occupants, pointing to the red star with the hammer and sickle decorating their uniforms. The soldiers agreed and fraternised with the students. The fire truck turned around. Elsewhere the soldiers had heavy work with other demonstrators.

The demonstrators next held a meeting under the benevolent eye of the militia (of whom at least ten members had been wounded).

A Vietnamese speaker talked about solidarity with the Soviet people and asked those in Moscow to support the action underway. He added: "We will not budge until our five comrades are freed!" About six o'clock their liberation was obtained. Keeping their ranks in order, the demonstrators went to the embassy of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to demonstrate their solidarity with the Vietnamese people.

Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko offered apologies to the ambassador of the United States Thursday evening for the damage caused to the embassy.

STATISTICS CONFIRM SOVIET ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES

The role that Soviet economic difficulties played in the downfall of Khrushchev stood out a little clearer upon publication of the official statistical report for 1964 in the January 30 issue of Pravda. The year 1964 was one of the worst since the death of Stalin.

The growth of industry as a whole was the lowest in recent years; i.e., 7.1%. But a whole series of sectors fell below this average rate. Light industry reached only a 3% increase and the food industry a mere 2%. Production of metal cutting and transforming machinery practically stagnated. The output of locomotives was below that of 1963 as was the output of various agricultural machines, radios and ready-made clothing. Meat production was down 20% (!) compared with the previous year, and processed meats were down 23%.

Real income per capita rose by only 3.9%, actually less than in various advanced capitalist countries in 1964.

The same statistics, which contain only a small chapter on agriculture, significantly avoid giving any specific figures on the 1964 grain harvest. All we learn is that sales of grain products to the public were up 4% as compared with 1963 (a year when the harvest was unusually bad). Consumption of cloth was down 3% in 1964 as compared with 1963, and the sale of automobiles was also down 3%.

The figures on animal husbandry show the disastrous effect of the wholesale slaughter of hogs during the winter of 1963-64. In fact in 1963 the number of hogs was down to 41,000,000, against 70,000,000 in 1962; and had risen to only 53,000,000 by the end of 1964; i.e., a figure nearly 25% lower than 1962. The decrease in the number of hogs is especially noticeable among the co-operatives and collectives -- 15,500,000 less than in 1962. Privately owned hogs rose to nearly the 1962 level; that is to within 1,600,000, or 10% lower.

The number of sheep and goats was down 11% compared with 1962, and 7% as compared with 1963. The figure for cows has remained at exactly the same level of 38,000,000 for three years. As for cattle, the slight dip in 1963 was overcome in 1964 to again reach the 1962 level.

The balance sheet for animal husbandry is therefore one of either stagnation or decline.

THE SOVIET UNION TODAY

A series of six articles entitled "Interregnum in the USSR" ["L'U.R.S.S. Entre Deux Règnes"], which appeared in Le Monde [February 14-22], are of unusual interest. Written by Michel Tatu upon his return to France after seven years in Moscow as special correspondent of the Paris daily, they attempt to draw a balance sheet of the Khrushchev period and thus cover a much broader range than he attempted in his daily dispatches. Tatu is not a disciple of Marxism as is clear from his terminology and his conclusions, but he is an extremely perspicacious observer, and his principal points are well worth summarizing.

To begin with, the author notes what has changed and what has remained the same during the years he lived in Moscow. Building construction is impressive as is the continued development of the cities. Clothing is better, conversation freer, and so on. But along with this a heritage remains from the Stalinist past: border controls between Poland and the USSR are stricter than between capitalist states; there are innumerable difficulties in the distribution of goods; the official press is dull; the only foreign papers on sale are those published by the Communist parties, etc.

After a rapid sketch of such things, Tatu probes more deeply, attempting to estimate where "de-Stalinization" stands today.

Khrushchevism, he notes, can be divided "into two very unequal periods: the ascendant phase, in which the most audacious steps were taken, culminating in 1957 with the ouster of the 'anti-party' elements, the triumph of the first sputniks, Mao Tse-tung's trip to Moscow and the rallying around Mr. Khrushchev of an almost solid Communist movement. This lasted until the beginning of 1960 But with 1960 began the phase of decline. Abroad, the stages of this phase were the violent outbreak of the Chinese-Soviet conflict, the awakening of nationalist currents within the bloc, the setback of attempts at improving the status quo in Berlin, the backing-down in Cuba, and, in a more general way, falling behind the United States in the strategic superiority which Moscow believed it had won with the sputniks. At home this period coincided with the renewal of a decline in agriculture. . . with an unavoidable slowing down of investments in certain sectors and particularly a decline in returns. . . A stagnation in the standard of living illustrated by the rise in the prices of food products in 1962 and the burial one by one of the fairest promises. . . ."

The limits of the changes brought about by "de-Stalinization" are shown through many examples.

In the economy, Tatu cites the oscillations between concentration and deconcentration, the gumming up of the works in economic developments, the fraud and falsification practiced by the bureau-

crats, especially those in the party, etc. Tatu thus confirms with many details the reports that have been appearing regularly in the press about this.

On the role of the authorities, Le Monde's correspondent has some telling things to say. There are no more arrests without cause; the terror has passed. Considerable progress has been registered "in the role of the police and decline of arbitrariness in Soviet life." But "in the eyes of the public, things appear in a different light." The heads of the KGB [secret police], "consider it to be a sign of a return to 'Leninist norms,' for example, that people whose conduct appears suspect are called in for 'interviews' -- a widespread practice -- for preventive rather than punitive reasons. It is not difficult to imagine what these 'interviews' are like. . . if you know that a mere telephone call from the 'spetsotdiel' (special service) to any enterprise or administration is sufficient for anyone to lose his job. . .

"Another factor must be taken into consideration: the return to 'Leninist norms' in police questions does not at all mean liberalization (the word is always rejected with horror by the authorities), but only -- and this is all -- the reversion of this field of activity to the party leadership. Since the party itself is not a model of democracy in its internal life, and still less so in its attitude toward the rest of society, the risk is great of seeing one arbitrary authority substituted for another. In fact, cases are not lacking, where instead of the police, certain sectors of the party apparatus, or local political functionaries, take the initiative in persecutions, utilizing the judicial apparatus as well as the police system for this."

No public balance sheet has been drawn on the crimes of Stalin. "It is known only that prisoners were freed by the 'tens of thousands' during the two big years of the thaw in 1956 and 1957. They received an individual certificate of rehabilitation, in return for which they made a written declaration to keep silent about their adventure (later, however, this formality was given up). . . The chronicles on this chapter continue to remain very discreet; any publication of lists of names or of statistics is prohibited. The biographies in the official texts of the most illustrious are limited to ending with the standard formula: 'Fell victim to the arbitrariness in the period of the cult of the personality.'"

"The role attributed to Stalin by Soviet historiography has not yet been determined in a definitive way. . . It is not enough to say that the archives are still lacking that would permit the history of Stalinism to be written. . . it is the desire to open the files that is missing."

The author emphasizes that "if there is a field in which de-Stalinization has changed the state of things little, it is certainly that of ideology. . ." If you go through Pravda at the end of 1952

and beginning of 1953, you will find articles hailing Stalin, the "encyclopedia of fundamental knowledge in the domain of Marxism-Leninism" and denouncing the doctors who were accused in an infamous frame-up of plotting his death. The names of the authors of these typical Stalinist articles are the very ones familiar to the readers of 1965!

Changes in the personnel of the ideological apparatus are much fewer than among the regional secretaries and among the technical and economic cadres. One of the reasons for this is simple: "The official doctrine has been changed on some very important points, the political line is no longer the same, but the nature of the propaganda work, the methods employed, the style, remain completely identical with those under Stalin. . . . One kind of conformity followed another, and it is scarcely surprising that the high priests who introduced and spread the first should themselves most qualified to instill the second. . . . then the third. . . . The best way to be a Khrushchev-ist was still the Stalinist way. This consisted of repeating literally, without any originality, the slogans handed down."

Tatu provides material on what he calls "the new class," meaning the dignitaries, the privileged layer, including "the elite" of the intellectuals. The standing of these people "derives less from their pay than from multiple advantages in kind which the regime grants these cadres (from an automobile to a dascha), and perhaps still more of those subtle and infinite 'facilities' which, in this country where complications can occur at any moment, place the beneficiary above common mortals at the very outset. To be relieved of waiting in line, standing at the windows, going through the formalities, not to have to confront the crowds in the stores and the bad quality of their articles. . . . to receive on the contrary from the 'special network,' without any trouble, an imported product ordinary people don't know about, to ride in a Chaika and to have tickets reserved for the most coveted spectacles; to be able in short to arrange by a discreet telephone call all the bothersome trivial things; to have all this is to avoid three-fourths of the difficulties of Soviet life."

Tatu also indicates that posts are more easily available to the "children of the rich." "One is struck," he writes, "upon looking up the biographies of today's high functionaries, to see how many of them, who were not even thirty in 1941, spent the entire war behind the front, in second-rank civilian duties."

He writes finally on this topic that "For many, authority has become an end in itself, what is still skepticism among the people having been transformed by the de-Stalinization shake-up into cynicism in this layer."

". . . Moral rigidness is no longer the first virtue among the present heirs of the Bolshevik commissars. The Chinese touched a raw nerve on this in their polemical articles last year. Their argu-

ments would have been more convincing if they themselves had not been caught up, in turn, by an analogous phenomenon. At least they talk about 'permanent revolution,' they provide for draconian measures to periodically plunge the cadres 'into the mass of the people.' That's certainly the last thing they would dream of in Moscow."

Let us turn now to Tatu's conclusions. The broad masses, he says, are skeptical on the political level, feeling that they cannot "in the least influence the decisions on top. . . . It is already 'being political' in Moscow to read Pravda, to list the coups, and to possibly ask deferential questions of party representatives during the 'explanation meetings.' Among the youth there is certainly a small fringe of 'oppositionist intellectuals' who limit themselves in actuality to reading foreign publications and to smuggling out a few manuscripts. At the other extreme another fringe is to be found composed of Komsomol officials, a kind of Boy Scouts of the regime in whose zeal it is difficult to distinguish genuine faith from political careerism. Between these two poles, the broad mass of the youth are looking in particular for a road into technology and industry, much surer fields from which one can gaze serenely at the rest of the world."

But Tatu adds: "In the economic order likewise we have seen that the resumption of progress imperatively demands a radical recasting of methods; however any change in this field cannot but have repercussions sooner or later on the political structures and customs. . . . One can envisage the conservatism of the governing apparatus, which finds the maintenance of its 'new class' privileges a stimulus at least as powerful as ideological fanaticism once was, succeeding in upholding the status quo for a very long time. But this would then mean letting the economic development of the country gradually decline to that of a second-rate power, with technical progress itself threatened, and hence, in the long range, the strategic potential on which foreign policy is based. We reach the point where the road of totalitarianism branches off and heads farther and farther away from the road of efficiency."

As for the future, he offers the hypothesis: "The period of 'collective leadership' which now exists can end up again in the rule of one person. . . but it is not completely excluded either that it can lead to an extension of free debate, first within the Central Committee of the party, then to broader layers of the apparatus of the party or state; finally, who knows? to public opinion itself."

He lists the various social groups capable of exerting pressure, but leaves out the working class.

He states that the gradual extension of what he calls "debate"; that is, Soviet democracy, is not occurring, although this outcome appears to him to be the "only desirable one" in the present international context. But "the present uncertainty, the doctrinal tone

of the press. . . brings out more strikingly than ever everything that is frozen and profoundly conservative in the structures of the regime. To resort to a popular formula, it is still very difficult to see the possibility of a 'peaceful transition' from totalitarianism to democracy."

Despite all his perspicacity, Tatu shows that he remains within the framework of bourgeois thought when he leaves out the capacity of the working class to bring about a transition from the bureaucratic regime to Soviet democracy through a political revolution.

STEFAN HEYM'S PLEA FOR PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY

A speech given by Stefan Heym last December 4 at an "International Colloquium of Authors from Socialist Countries" held in East Berlin is still echoing in East Germany. Heym is an old Communist who lived for many years in the United States during the years of Nazism in Germany. Today he lives in East Berlin where he is a member of the Communist party. Although he was awarded the "National Prize," East Germany's highest distinction for artists and scientists, the well-known Communist author was not invited to the colloquium. He went anyway and asked for the floor. The speech which he then wrote in one night and delivered the next day is now going the rounds.

Heym began by telling an anecdote which he heard from Ilya Ehrenburg, the well-known Soviet writer. In 1956, the story went, the producer of a film in which Stalin was glorified was taken to task. He defended himself by submitting the scripts he had been given to make the movie with. One sentence reading, "Stalin leaves the room," had been corrected. The corrected sentence read, "The great Stalin leaves the room." The correction was in Stalin's own handwriting. . .

Such an anecdote raises many questions, Stefan Heym said. "Not only questions of a medical nature -- the psychiatrists of the future will certainly closely study the morbid symptoms and reach a correct diagnosis of that sick man, Stalin. But more important is the question of revolutionary ethics. How did it happen that thousands of Communists, experienced fighters, could gradually acquiesce in a situation which they should have considered evil and against their ideals?"

After making the point that Stalin wasn't able to destroy the validity and viability of socialism, Heym continued:

"How much more could have been accomplished through the efforts and sacrifices of these men [who were building socialism], and

how much further history would have advanced by today if they had not been held back by something that is with great discretion today called 'a deformation of Leninist norms'?

"For the sake of mankind, it is necessary to clean up the dirt that was swept under the rug, it is necessary to clean the rug itself and to disinfect the room Stalin left."

Heym pointed out that if the socialist countries have scored great progress in industry, technology and the natural sciences in recent years, philosophy, the arts and literature have lagged badly behind. The intellectual atmosphere appears singularly placid; but this apparent placidness screens great uneasiness. Public declarations often have a double and even triple meaning. Hypocrisy is universal.

"This is very dangerous," Heym said, "and can lead to stagnation and decline. There is only one way to avert this, and that is to bring things out into the open, to discuss, to weigh and to make corrections. To maintain silence any longer, to act as if the old rules were still valid, or, even worse, to create the false impression that you have adapted your ideas to new facts when in reality you are still clinging to the old dogmas can only heighten the cynicism to be felt everywhere.

"The key, it appears clear, is therefore fearless discussion. Discussion without tabus, with scrutiny of what appear to be evident truths, with questioning of things that seem to have long been established. It is above all necessary to deal with the central problem, the contradiction between revolutionary democracy on the one hand, which implies constant questioning of ukases, constant re-examination of doctrine, and, on the other hand, revolutionary discipline, which calls for submission and unconditional execution of directives."

Heym called for a deep-going and critical debate, particularly of the problems of artistic, literary and scientific creation. The need for debate and discussion goes very deep, he said, and where the censor's red pencil forbids real debate, false debates spring up.

Heym ended by taking up the argument about "the enemy listening in." He granted that the enemy in the capitalist countries listens in; but the tactic of silence is more costly, in the long run, than probing for the truth even under the eyes of the enemy. "We should not shrink from the cost of reaching the truth, for the truth is always revolutionary; and where its finger touches the revolution, there it indicates something wrong -- not with the idea of the revolution, but with the way the idea has been applied. . . .

"When we discuss freely, it is not to please Time, Inc., or the Axel-Springer publishing house in Hamburg [the biggest newspaper trust in West Germany]. We do it instead to cleanse socialism of the rust and blood stains of the Stalin period, and from the mold of

bureaucracy, so that socialism can again shine in the great light cast by those who gave their hearts and their lives for it, so that socialism can again inspire mankind, especially the youth, with that enthusiasm capable of changing the world."

Speeches like this are not rarities. Similar ones have been heard many times since 1956 in East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet Union. "De-Stalinization" has given the intellectuals a voice, but not satisfaction. In their way they, too, are preparing the political revolution with their passionate pleas for truth and reason.

ALEXANDER DEFENCE COMMITTEE DEMONSTRATES IN TRAFALGAR SQUARE

By Alan Adair

LONDON, Feb. 27 -- Members of the British Alexander Defence Committee carried placards in Trafalgar Square opposite South Africa House last night. Their slogans read: "Free the Alexander Eleven," "Free Sobukwe, Mandela, Niar, Alexander, Harris, Kitson," "Free All Political Prisoners," "Labour -- Help South African Militants," "Dockers -- Boycott South African Boats," "No Arms for Verwoerd."

The demonstration took place as thousands of workers passed through Trafalgar Square on their way from the job. The purpose was to help publicize the appeal of Dr. Neville Alexander and ten other nonwhite South African militants given prison terms up to ten years for allegedly planning to commit acts of "sabotage."

Following the demonstration, a public meeting was held. Speakers included Stan Newens, a newly elected Labour member of parliament; V. Pillay, vice-chairman of Anti-Apartheid; N. Nkoana, chief representative in Europe for the Pan-African Congress; J. Kozonguizi, representing the South West African National Union and F. Landman on behalf of the South African Coloured Peoples Congress.

All the speakers, some of whom knew Neville Alexander in South Africa, expressed great respect for his ideas and the part he and his friends had played in the struggle against apartheid. They spoke with deep feeling of the difficulties facing freedom fighters in South Africa.

N. Nkoana said that fifty leading members of his organisation have been hanged over the past months.

J. Kozonguizi identified himself with Alexander because "Alexander struggled for socialism" and because he tried to educate a cadre capable of leading the masses into a serious and planned strug-

gle against the Verwoerd government. He ended on the theme that "no court in the world will decide the fate of the African revolution."

The secretary of the British Alexander Defence Committee, Connie Kirkby, outlined the activities of the committee since it was formed five months ago. She pointed out that through donations, collections, and social activities some £500 had been raised to help pay the costs of the appeal. She explained that this work had not only helped the Alexander Eleven but had assisted in the general campaign against apartheid.

She urged the audience to think of the families of the defendants, who are in dire need of financial help.

"Technically, they are not in prison, but is there really that much difference in South Africa from being inside or outside of jail -- isn't it all one big concentration camp?" she asked.

The meeting ended by passing a resolution which urged the Parliamentary Labour party to initiate a campaign for the release of all South African political prisoners.

SUCCESSFUL STRIKE ACTION IN ARGENTINA

By O. Gomes

BUENOS AIRES -- Trade unions representing some hundreds of thousands of workers in government-operated industries such as railways, the telephone system, harbor installations, maritime, subways, etc., recently confronted the Illia administration with a series of strike actions.

The main demand was for wage increases going as high as forty per cent because of the steep rise in the cost of living. Without refusing in principle to meet the wage demand, the Illia administration began by offering a more modest increase, citing the difficult financial situation facing the government -- the deficit in the budget is now running at almost fifty per cent.

The workers replied with a series of forceful measures -- working by the rules, partial strikes and 24- or 48-hour strikes, with threats to make them indefinite. The top leadership of the Confederación General del Trabajo -- dominated by the Peronists -- took no part in this; they have practically given up their famous "Plan of Struggle." Despite this, the unions involved, some of which are headed by Peronists and others by "free" or "democratic" officials, succeeded in partially co-ordinating their action through bodies that were previously purely decorative. This was the case with the unions in transport, railways, maritime, the air service,

etc., which had always acted separately under their own leadership but who united their forces this time in the "Confederación Argentina de los Trabajadores del Transporte."

Faced with the possibility that the conflict could widen and take an unforeseeable course, the government had to back down. At the beginning of each strike the government reaction was always the same -- turn down the demands and issue threats of all kinds. Thus they talked about suspending personnel, withdrawing certain concessions already granted, not paying for days missed, etc. They even talked about mobilizing the workers -- particularly in the railways -- putting them under command of the army.

Although these threats met with full approval among the bourgeoisie, they accomplished nothing. The government retreated and a series of partial agreements were reached based on granting most of the workers' demands.

As a result of this victory, some of the unions won substantial increases. The telephone workers, for example, gained a twenty-seven per cent boost for the first eight months of the contract and an additional fifteen per cent for the following seven months. As in the other cases, the contract is retroactive, covering the last four or five months of 1964. Up to now only a few disputes remain to be settled.

As a whole, the strike movement was a success. It is true that the desire of the "democratic" leaderships to reach an agreement prevented the gains from being greater. And although circumstances induced the unions to genuinely co-ordinate their actions, they never succeeded in this. It was more of an aim than an actual reality. For all that it was sufficient to help compel the government to give in. Despite its weaknesses, the experience will undoubtedly be of use in future struggles.

But it was not only the firmness of the workers that influenced the outcome. There were other reasons. At no time did the government resort to violent repression, despite the verbal threats. This was due to the fact that the extensiveness of the movement would have demanded the use of the army. The government wished to avoid this, for it would have given the army a central role and placed it in position to bring weight against the authorities themselves. In addition, massive repression on the eve of the elections, scheduled for the end of February and beginning of March, would have seriously hurt the government party -- Radicalismo del Pueblo -- and increased the influence of Peronism.

All this brought the government to give in. But if the Illia administration ended one headache, the concessions will bring it new ones. The government was not merely offering an excuse in its first response to the workers' demands -- the deficit in the budget does not permit big increases. Consequently the only way of avoiding a still worse imbalance in the budget is to put through a proportional

increase in rates for the various services. In some cases -- the telephone service, for instance -- this would mean an increase of ninety per cent. It is easy to see what this would do to the standard of living of broad sectors of the population, all the more so since, despite repeated promises to the contrary, the Illia administration recently felt compelled to increase the rates for gas, electricity and fuel.

Thus conditions are ripening for another rise in trade-union struggles. For the moment the government is perhaps able to handle the situation. There is no doubt that the general economic situation in the country has improved. Unemployment has dropped, at least in the big urban centers like the capital, its suburbs and in Rosario and Córdoba, the next largest cities. The most important unions -- textiles, metals, the "Light and Power" employees, etc., -- have made many important gains. This all tends to create a certain tranquil climate. But inflation continues to gnaw away; price controls are ineffective. Little by little the improvements that have been won will be dissipated. In addition the rise in employment will encourage the workers and the experience of the successful strikes will bolster their militancy. A new wave of strikes will then be seen in Argentina.

SIT-DOWN STRIKES WITH HOSTAGES

Workers in some of the plants in Northern Argentina have developed a new wrinkle in sit-down strikes, reports Norte Revolucionario, a socialist paper of the region. The wrinkle is to take hostages.

This has occurred in some of the sugar mills in disputes over back pay as well as in other plants. It was used with success at a ceramics factory in San Antonio when management turned down a demand to settle up on back pay and threatened to shut down one of the furnaces.

At two plants, Amalia in Tucumán and Astarsa in Vicente López, according to Norte Revolucionario, "hostages were held despite threats from the police and in both cases decisive victories were won. At the Amalia plant. . . negotiations were conducted while the hostages were held; and, without even going to the bank, management paid up a few hours after the occupation began."

In other occupations in the same region where no hostages were taken, it took ten to fifteen days to win even partial victories.

To carry out an effective sit-down strike, experience has shown, says Norte Revolucionario, that the solidarity of workers in other plants and also of the small merchants is extremely important.

It means that solidarity actions can be counted on along with material and moral support sufficient to ensure victory.

YOUTH GIVE FRENCH CP LEADERS TOUGH BATTLE

By Pierre Frank

The congress of the UEC [Union des Etudiants Communistes] ended March 7 in Paris with the victory of the leadership of the French Communist party [PCF]. The outcome was visible for the past year. At the preceding congress, partisans of the PCF leadership gained ground, particularly among the new members, those still very young at the time of the Algerian war. This was what the PCF leadership counted on, and they succeeded, particularly in the provinces.

Nevertheless, the congress was not an easy one for the PCF leadership. From beginning to end it was marked by the struggle of tendencies, something not seen at any congress of a PCF organization for some thirty-five years. About 350 delegates favored the PCF leadership; the opposition had around 150 which included some 100 for the left wing and 50 for the out-going National Bureau.

The two sides fought very vigorously, the partisans of the outgoing National Bureau, a pro-"Italian" tendency, centering their efforts primarily on procedural questions. The left wing at one point walked out in full view to hold a caucus meeting.

The Stalinist character of the PCF leadership stood out strongly. A speech by Roland Leroy, the Political Bureau member charged with staying on top of the UEC, was characteristic. Speaking after having gained the majority, he very violently attacked his opponents. The question that aroused the greatest anger among the PCF leaders was the right of tendencies. Against this right, virtually the entire old Stalinist vocabulary was trotted out. The PCF leadership had taken due precaution to see that no representatives of other Communist parties were present. We're internationalists, you see!

The newly elected leadership is virtually unanimously with the PCF leadership. Out of more than 80 members on the new National Council, only three or four representatives of the opposition were named and they refused to stay as hostages. But the current majority is not homogeneous. At the congress itself it could be seen that the majority was composed of about half who are rigidly with the PCF leadership and another half who are also followers but who were surprised and shaken by the problems raised during the discussion. On two points, one concerning the account of the congress in l'Humanité, the official PCF newspaper, and the other concerning the possibility of opposition documents at the time of the next congress, this majority split down the middle. This promises something for the future,

and not a distant one.

Victory won, Leroy wasted no time. He immediately moved into the UEC headquarters and removed from its library, which is opposite the Sorbonne, the issues of Clarté (the UEC publication) containing documents written by the opposition, as well as all the "subversive" literature sold there, among other things books written by Trotsky. We're going to have order!

We reported previously that the Communist university personnel carried the crisis of the UEC into the PCF. [See World Outlook February 19.] This could have had considerable repercussions and the leadership reacted vigorously as we have also reported. It seems that the leadership has succeeded. The intellectuals have not taken any public steps such as broadcasting their names. They were frightened by the audacity they had displayed and are now trying to forget it. This is too bad; it is certain that it will not prove sufficient to win forgiveness from the leadership.

GENERAL HUMBERTO DELGADO REPORTED MISSING

Despite disclaimers by Spanish authorities that they know anything about it, the London Observer continues to insist that General Humberto Delgado, leader of the Portuguese Liberation Front, vanished in Spain while on a secret mission.

The Observer ran a front-page story about it February 28 and added fresh details in another account in the March 7 issue.

"Delgado entered Spain some time after February 8," declares the British weekly, "presumably in disguise and carrying one of the six passports he used for clandestine visits to inhospitable countries. His purpose apparently was to meet leaders of the underground opposition at a remote part of the Portuguese frontier, as he had done on previous occasions.

"On February 14, a colleague in Morocco received a postcard from Delgado in Spain, saying, in coded form, 'mission accomplished.' Nine days later word was received through underground channels that he had been arrested by the Spanish authorities in Badajoz. Both the Spanish and Portuguese Governments have since denied any knowledge of his whereabouts."

According to the Observer, Delgado's supporters suspect that the PIDE, the Portuguese secret police, have agents in Algiers who could have had Delgado trailed "up to the moment of his arrest."

A spokesman of Delgado's organization, Henrique Cerqueira, said in Rabat that Delgado may have been denounced by a rival organization. It is his belief that the General was arrested in Spain and handed over to the fascist regime in Portugal.

CHE GUEVARA STRESSES PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

[The remarks of Ernesto "Che" Guevara at the Economic Seminar of Afro-Asian Solidarity, held in Algiers February 22-28, aroused considerable interest. In the absence of an official text, we have assembled the two reports on his participation which appeared in the Algerian dailies Alger Républicain and Le Peuple of February 25. The translation below is by World Outlook.]

* * *

"Cuba has come to this conference so that the voices of the peoples of America can be heard," Che Guevara said in opening. "We have come as an underdeveloped country and as a country that is constructing socialism."

The Cuban minister, who spoke in French, emphasized that a common aspiration unites Cuba with the other countries of Africa and Asia, that it was not by accident that permission was granted to a representative of Cuba to offer his opinion among the peoples of Asia and Africa.

"Ever since the monopolist capitalists got hold of the world, they have kept the immense majority of mankind in poverty.

"In order to raise the level of the underdeveloped countries," he continued, "it is thus necessary to struggle against imperialism; and each time a country is detached from the imperialist tree, not only has a partial battle been won against the main enemy, but a contribution has been made in genuinely weakening it, in taking a new step toward the definitive victory. . . and in this struggle to the death there are no frontiers. . ."

"The practice of proletarian internationalism is not only a duty of the peoples who are struggling to assure themselves a better future, it is, besides, an ineluctable necessity -- after having insisted on the solidarity of the peoples in struggle -- for the countries on the road of development and for the socialist countries.

"The development of the countries which have today taken the road to freedom, must be underwritten by the socialist countries; this is my profound conviction.

"How can it be considered of mutual benefit to sell at the world market price raw materials which have cost such sweat and suffering to the masses of the backward countries and to buy at the world market price, the machine products of the big automatic plants of today?

"It is the duty of socialist countries to end their tacit complicity with the exploiting countries of the West."

Briefly analyzing the problem of long-term credits for the development of basic industries, the Cuban minister observed that frequently "the countries benefiting from credits are ready to establish industrial bases that are disproportionate in relation to their present capacity in which products are not intended for domestic consumption and in which such an effort will jeopardize their reserves."

"Our reasoning," he said, "is that the investments of the socialist countries in their own territory weigh directly on the state budget and are not recoverable except through utilizing products that are completely processed up to the point of being manufactured products. We propose that thought should be given to the possibility of making investments of this type in the underdeveloped countries."

After having underlined the necessity "of establishing an alliance between the underdeveloped countries and the socialist countries," Guevara drew the following conclusion:

"There can be no socialism without a change in consciousness such as to bring about a new fraternal attitude with regard to humanity, in the individual domain, in the interior of the society that is in process of constructing socialism or which has already constructed it, and also in the world domain in relation to all the peoples still suffering from imperialist oppression.

"We think that it is in this spirit one must envisage the responsibility of aiding the dependent countries, stopping the talk about developing mutually beneficial trade on the basis of prices imposed on the backward countries through the law of value and unequal international trade relations, relations which are also a consequence of the law of value."

Guevara then spoke of the commercial relations between Cuba and the other socialist countries, adding that the peoples of Africa and Asia must follow the same road as Cuba, "because they will win sooner or later, no matter by what name they designate their socialism at present."

The Cuban spokesman specified how the setting of prices must be conceived:

"A profound change in concept would be to change the order of international relations. It must not be foreign trade that determines policy; but on the contrary, foreign trade must be subordinated to a fraternal policy toward other peoples.

"Development cannot be abandoned to utter improvisation; the construction of the new society must be planned. Planning is one of the laws of socialism, and without it socialism could not exist. Without correct planning, it is impossible to adequately guarantee the harmonious links that must be established among the various econ-

omic sectors of a country in order to accomplish the leaps forward demanded by the epoch itself in which we live. Planning is not an individual question posed for each of our countries -- small, with unbalanced development, proprietors of some raw materials, or good producers of certain products, manufactured or semifinished, but without any production in the other domains -- in an isolated way. This planning must be oriented, in actuality, from the first moment, toward a certain specialization according to region, so that the economies of the various countries can become complementary and thus reach integration on the basis of genuine mutual benefit."

Guevara warned that "one could not expect confidence from the socialist countries if one plays the game of balancing between capitalism and socialism, and if one tries to utilize these two forces as elements in opposition to each other so as to gain certain advantages."

"It sometimes happens," Guevara warned, "that in face of the impossibility of securing a certain investment with the aid of the socialist camp, one ends up getting it through an agreement with the capitalists. And these capitalist investments carry defects not only in the way in which the loans are made, but also other complementary defects of great importance, as in the case of the establishment of mixed societies with a dangerous neighbor as partner. Since these investments in general are parallel to those of other states, the risk is run of seeing them produce divisions between friendly countries because of economic conflicts. And then, in addition, all this creates the danger of corruption arising from the constant presence of capitalism, with its well-known skill in presenting images of development and well-being which turn the heads of not a few people.

"A little later, one faces a drop in prices as a logical consequence of the saturation of the market due to the production of the same kind of products. The countries affected in this way face the necessity of soliciting new loans or of permitting supplementary investments due to the competition. The final consequence of such a policy is to place the economy back in the hands of the capitalists and to return slowly but surely to the past. In our opinion the only safe way of undertaking investments with the participation of the imperialist powers is through the direct participation of the state, as the sole buyer of goods, by limiting the imperialist action to contracting for supplies and by not permitting it to get inside the door of our home. Only in this case does it appear to us permissible to profit from the interimperialist contradictions in order to obtain less onerous conditions."

Speaking of the forms of neocolonialist penetration, the Cuban minister noted "the establishment of close relations between foreign capital and the budding indigenous bourgeoisie.

"We must establish a great compact bloc which will in turn aid new countries to free themselves not only from the political but

also from the economic power of imperialism."

On the need for solidarity with peoples struggling for their freedom, Guevara said:

"Arms must not constitute a merchandise in our world; one must deliver them without any payment and in the quantities required by the peoples who need them."

To overcome difficulties in economic development, a great leap forward must be made in technology and this must be done wherever required. He stressed that "agriculture must be considered as the fundamental pillar of development."

Turning to another subject, Guevara said: "We warmly support Algeria's proposal about institutionalizing our relations. We would only like to present some supplementary considerations:

"(1) To make the proposed union an instrument of struggle against imperialism, the co-operation of the Latin-American peoples and an alliance with the socialist countries are required.

"(2) The revolutionary character of the union must be safeguarded by barring the entry of governments or movements that do not identify themselves with the general aspirations of the peoples, and by creating mechanisms to remove those that leave the correct road, whether it be a government or a popular movement.

"(3) We must work for the establishment of new relations on the basis of equality between our countries and the capitalist countries, by instituting a revolutionary legal system to protect us in case of conflict and which would give a new content to our relations with the rest of the world."

Guevara closed by calling "the attention of the seminar to the fact that Cuba is not the only country in the Americas, but it is the only one which has the opportunity of speaking before you today; that other peoples are spilling their blood in order to conquer the right which we enjoy today, and to address from here, and from all the conferences and gatherings taking place simultaneously, messages of solidarity to the heroic people of Vietnam, of Laos, of so-called Portuguese Guinea, South Africa, Palestine, and all the exploited countries which are struggling for their emancipation. We must forward our friendly greetings to our brother peoples of Venezuela, Guatemala and Colombia, who today, arms in hand, are definitively saying no to the imperialist enemy."

THE METEORIC RISE OF MALCOLM X

By Evelyn Sell

II.

Many people are drawing lessons from the life and death of Malcolm X. "Responsible" public leaders draw lessons which bolster their viewpoint. For example, Edwin Berry, head of the Chicago Urban League, said, "Malcolm had a great mind. His being driven into nationalist movements was a great mistake. It is too bad that his great mind and commitment could not have been used to help the movement. Such is the tragedy of a sick society."

On the contrary. Malcolm's life was not the "tragedy of a sick society" but a triumph over the worst diseases of this society and a source of great revolutionary optimism for people around the world who are struggling to create a new, healthy society. If Malcolm had accepted the living death which is the lot of most Negroes in the United States or if he had allowed himself to act as a liberal front for the capitalist power structure, then his career would have been another "tragedy of a sick society." A brief review of Malcolm's short life proves that all the racist repressions and brain-washing techniques cannot stifle the development of revolutionary consciousness within the Negro people.

An article in the March 20, 1964, World Outlook outlined Malcolm's early years and his entrance into the Black Muslim organization led by Elijah Muhammad:

"He was born Malcolm Little in Omaha, Nebraska, around 1927. His father, a Baptist minister and an ex-Garveyite, was under constant fire from whites who resented his outspoken militancy against Jim Crow. Malcolm remembers what happened when the Ku Klux Klan burned the family home: 'The firemen came and just sat there without making any effort to put one drop of water on the fire. The same fire that burned my father's home still burns my soul.'

"Added fuel to that soul-scorching fire was provided when his father was mysteriously killed. Malcolm was sure racists murdered him.

"The family moved east and during his late teens Malcolm became a successful petty criminal in the Harlem underworld. After several trips to jail he landed in a maximum security prison in Massachusetts. While there he read 'thousands of books because I wanted to know what made people the way they are.' He didn't find the answer to his needs in the prison library. His brother, a member of the Detroit temple (of the Nation of Islam), visited him in prison and converted him to the Muslims."

This marked the close of the first stage of his life and his

triumph over the pressures that were forcing him into the stereotyped image of Negro criminality. As Malcolm has pointed out, "The worst crime the white man has committed has been to teach us to hate ourselves." Malcolm was able to break out of the strait jacket of self-hatred, an abbreviated and inadequate formal education, criminal activities and dope addiction. He was never ashamed of his career as a dope peddler, pimp, numbers man and burglar; "I am not ashamed of this because it was all done when I was a part of the white man's Christian world. . . . When I was in the world of the Christians, I behaved as they did. . . ."

Malcolm joined the Muslims in 1952 and he shot with meteoric speed to the very top ranks of the group's hierarchy. He became minister of the Harlem Temple number seven and built it into a very large and powerful force. He was chief trouble-shooter and public voice for Elijah Muhammad both within the United States and in other areas of the world such as Africa. When the Nation of Islam attracted nation-wide attention at the end of the 1950's it was Malcolm who received the most publicity. His charismatic personality and fiery speaking talents made him the focal point of public knowledge of the movement he represented.

The power structure in New York recognized him as a tremendous force within Harlem, the largest Negro ghetto in the country. When a Black Muslim brother was struck and taken to jail by police on the night of April 14, 1958, hundreds of fellow Muslims surrounded the police station. Fearing a riot the police called on Negro leaders to handle the situation. Malcolm X came to the station, negotiated hospital care and release for the beaten Muslim and then stepped outside and made a slight gesture to the waiting crowd. Within minutes they vanished. The awed police Captain McGowan remarked, "No man should have that much power over that many people. We cannot control this town if one man can wield that kind of power." Malcolm was soon to reach even greater national and international prominence.

Radio and television appearances, magazine interviews and articles, speeches at universities and rallies introduced Malcolm and the Muslim point of view to increasing numbers of Americans. His relations with top African delegates to the United Nations and his trip to Africa to pave the way for Muhammad's 1959 trip to Mecca established Malcolm abroad. He became known as "the St. Paul of the Black Muslim movement."

Mass media immediately seized upon and publicized all of Malcolm's comments pertaining to violence and hatred of white people. When a chartered plane bound from Paris to Atlanta crashed on June 3, 1962, Malcolm interrupted a sermon he was delivering to a Muslim meeting in Los Angeles and announced, ". . . a very beautiful thing has happened. . . . Somebody came and told me that [God] had answered our prayers in France. He dropped an airplane out of the sky with over 120 white people in it. . . . we will continue to pray and we hope that every day another plane falls out of the sky. . . . We call on our

God -- He gets rid of 120 of them at one whop."

A year later he explained to noted Negro author Louis Lomax, ". . . some of these Uncle Tom Negroes rushed into print to condemn me for what I had said. But what was wrong with what I said? Everybody has a God and believes that his God will deliver him and protect him from his enemies! Why can't the black man have a God? What's so wrong when a black man says his God will protect him from his white foe? If Jehovah can slay Philistines for the Jews, why can't Allah slay crackers for the so-called Negro?"

Most white Americans didn't appreciate Malcolm's logic; but increasing numbers of blacks responded to his frank words. As a former president of the New York NAACP chapter said, "Malcolm says things you or I would not say. When he says those things, when he talks about the white man, even those of us who are repelled by his philosophy secretly cheer a little outside ourselves." Malcolm dared express 400 years of pent-up hate.

An anonymous Negro cab driver in Harlem told Life photographer Gordon Parks, ". . . that Malcolm ain't afraid to tell Mr. Charlie [the white man], the FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation -- U.S. secret police] or the cops or nobody where to get off." Malcolm, in searing words, flayed the United States government, Uncle Tom Negro leaders and their nonviolence philosophy, police groups, white liberals -- everyone who stood in the way of black freedom. He ridiculed the integration movement which aimed to bring Negroes the right "to sit down on a toilet next to a white man." He ridiculed "the Negro revolution" led by Uncle Toms directed by the white power structure. What was needed was "the black revolution," led by black men and aimed at the acquisition of land. Malcolm analyzed great revolutions of the past (the English, French, American) and explained that they all resulted in a transfer of power through gaining control of the land. Many of his examples were drawn from history and he spent much time in his talks discussing past history. Particular attention was paid to Afro-American history.

Malcolm and the Black Muslims were having increasing impact on American life. At the same time, the progress of the Freedom Now struggle affected the Black Muslims and their second-in-command. Earlier this year Malcolm explained the significance of the Black Muslims and described the pressure that led to the split within the organization.

"It's contribution to the black struggle for freedom in this country was militancy. It made many of our people dare to get loud for the first time in 400 years. It made many of the black leaders of the civil-rights movement dare to get loud for the first time -- I mean really loud -- for the first time in nearly 400 years in our country. . . they gave respectability to the civil-rights groups and gave acceptability to the civil-rights groups. Ten years ago or more, the NAACP was looked upon as a radical leftist, almost subver-

sive, movement, and then when the Black Muslim movement came along, the power structure said thank the Lord for Roy Wilkins and the NAACP . . . The Black Muslim movement attracted the most militant young black people in this country. The most restless, the most impatient and the most uncompromising black men and women were attracted to the Black Muslim movement. . . It actually developed, it grew, it became powerful -- but it was in a vacuum. And it was filled with extremely militant young people who weren't willing to compromise with anything and wanted action. More action, actually, than the organization itself could produce."

There was a growing pressure within the ranks of the Black Muslims to join in the daily civil-rights struggles of the Negro masses and as the 1964 national election campaign loomed on the horizon there was strong sentiment to engage in independent political action. Toward the end of 1963 there were persistent rumors that a struggle was taking place within the Black Muslims and a split was imminent between Malcolm, leading the young militants, and the business-as-usual group around Muhammad.

[To be continued.]