

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Vol. 1, No. 4

October 18, 1963

21, rue d'Aboukir - Paris-2°

## BEN BELLA WINS BIG VICTORY IN KABYLIE

PARIS, Oct. 14 -- With the entry of government forces into Fort-National, Azazga and Ain-El-Hammam (formerly Michelet) without firing a shot, the armed rebellion against the Ben Bella government suffered a major defeat. Hocine Ait Ahmed and Mohand Ou El Hadj, heads of the so-called "Front of Socialist Forces" who withdrew into the hills, had lost the towns in which they might have set up a counter center to Algiers. They found themselves sealed up in the Kabylie mountains, their supply lines cut off from substantial foreign aid.

Clearly, the mass of the population in Algeria had rejected their appeal to take up arms. The main consequence of the inflammatory declaration of war against the Ben Bella government, which the conspirators had expected would start a nation-wide conflagration, was a set of burned fingers.

"For us," said Ben Bella at a press conference October 12, "the Kabylie business is over."

"The victory," he said, "belongs to the Algerian people and to the Kabyle people who refused the arms that were offered to them by the rebellion."

Asked what he intended to do about the chiefs of the attempted uprising, Ben Bella replied: "It is evident that Mr. Ait Ahmed and Colonel Mohand Ou El Hadj will be arrested."

As to the prospects of their gaining fresh forces through guerrilla tactics, Ben Bella quoted Mao Tse-tung's declaration that "the guerrilla should live among the people as a fish does in water." He added: "These fish don't have any water."

The impressive government victory was due to a number of factors. First of all, the government refused to respond to provocations and made no attempt to drown the attempted counterrevolution in blood. It relied mainly on political means to defeat the challenge to its authority. Ben Bella went at once to the people, appealing to them in giant mass meetings and over the radio for support. The call went out for the formation of defense committees throughout the country.

The pace of nationalizations was stepped up. Each day's issue of the Algerian papers reported new takeovers on all sides. Many of these, like the bus system in Algiers, were due to the initiative of the workers themselves, who formed committees and asked for immediate nationalization.

Spokesmen of the revolution, headed by Ben Bella himself, next took to the field to explain what was happening. In towns and villages they talked about what the revolution had already achieved and how committed the Ben Bella government is to socialism. They admitted shortcomings and difficulties but they appealed for help and understanding in remedying them.

In Kabylie where the rebellion centered, appeals were made directly to the forces that might have been taken in by the demagogic propaganda of the "Front of Socialist Forces." In direct talks with partisans of the FSF, government spokesmen asked them to "rectify" their "error" and support the government.

Finally, when the political ground had been thoroughly prepared, the government troops were sent in. However they, too, took a political approach, appealing for unity. They were under orders not to shoot even if fired on.

As they neared the stronghold of Ain-El-Hamman, the birthplace of Ait Ahmed, two government soldiers were wounded by long-range sniper fire as the rebels withdrew. The troops displayed exemplary discipline and did not return the shots. Total government casualties in the two-day drive that succeeded in occupying the main Kabylie base held by the FSF were two dead and three wounded.

From the attitude of the local population the government drew the conclusion that such a large number of troops as had been brought into Ain-El-Hamman were not needed and, a day after entering, the majority were withdrawn.

#### CHINA GRANTS ALGERIA \$50,000,000 LOAN

China's announcement October 9 of a \$50,000,000 loan to Algeria came as most welcome news to the Ben Bella government on the eve of the climax in meeting the armed rebellion in Kabylie. The loan was half the amount granted previously by the Soviet Union.

The Ben Bella government has sought to avoid taking sides in the dispute between Moscow and Peking but the memory of the aid provided by China during the difficult days of armed struggle is still fresh in Algeria. Amar Ouzegane, Algerian government representative now in China, has been referring to this during his tour.

In addition, according to New China, he has harshly criticized the French Communist party for failing the Algerian revolutionists during the fight for freedom. He scored the Algerian Communist party, too, for preferring "slogans such as high wages, vacations, a higher standard of living and family allowances" instead of "armed struggle."

HUGO BLANCO ADDRESSES THE PEOPLE OF PERU

The following letter was written by Hugo Blanco, main peasant leader in the Convención valley of Peru, from his cell in the Mariscal Gamarra barracks at Arequipa. In his letter Hugo Blanco appeals for contributions to help his legal defense. Due to communication difficulties, we are unable to specify an address to which funds can be sent. We hope to provide this in an early issue.

\* \* \*

To the People of Peru:

This trial is not against me personally but against the Peruvian revolution. The reaction claims that it will place the guilty ones in the dock. We will not admit this. In the dock must be placed the oligarchy.

It is precisely because the judgment will not be levelled against me personally, that the Peruvian people and not the camarilla of officers and spokesmen in the service of the monsters must be the judge. And before this judge we must make our exposure of the betrayals of our country, the murders, robberies, thefts and violations committed by the entire oligarchy, especially the landlords in all corners of the country.

This is the most favorable time to do this. The Peruvian people are following the trial, ready to listen and to judge. Whatever we are able to do in this sense will be insufficient. The unions, the federations of peasants, of workers, students, employees, etc., must join to the utmost in this task.

It is my fate to be the one to sit in the prisoner's dock. It will be converted into a tribune of the revolution to accuse the accusers. That is why I must have a record of the crimes of the landlords and of the whole oligarchy to throw it into the faces of the accusers who symbolize the reaction. I ask the comrades to send me this record.

Unfortunately the trial room is not large enough to hold ten million people -- which means that the real judges will not be able to be present. They are in the streets of the cities and towns, in the fields. . . If we want our accusation to reach them, now that history has given us the possibility, it is necessary to prepare millions of leaflets, of pamphlets, perhaps a book. Unfortunately money is required for this and I do not have any. I have never asked for financial assistance, but now I do it not for myself but for the denunciation, for the accusation.

Land or death! We will win!

Hugo Blanco

## UN REQUESTS SOUTH AFRICA TO FREE POLITICAL PRISONERS

The General Assembly of the United Nations voted 106 to 1 October 11 for a resolution demanding that South Africa drop a scandalous trial of political opponents and free all political prisoners.

Nine countries had abstained the day before. (The United States, Great Britain, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Panama.) In face of the overwhelming sentiment against South Africa, which was the only country to vote against the resolution, the abstainers registered their objections over implications that "interference" in the internal affairs of a sovereign country might be involved and joined the majority.

The resolution "requests the Government of the Republic of South Africa to abandon the arbitrary trial now in progress and forthwith to grant unconditional release to all political prisoners and to all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policy of apartheid."

The resolution also (1) condemned South Africa for failing to comply with previous resolutions on apartheid, (2) requested all members of the United Nations "to make all necessary efforts to induce the Government" to carry out the request to release all political prisoners, (3) asked Secretary General U. Thant to report at the end of the session "on the implementation of this resolution."

The trial referred to in the resolution involves six blacks, four whites and one Indian. After being held eighty-eight days in solitary confinement "for interrogation" without being able to consult lawyers, churches or their families, they were told October 8 that they would be placed on trial October 29 on charges of "sabotage."

The eleven are accused of having committed directly or "indirectly" 221 acts of sabotage over nearly twenty months. The government has drawn up a list of bombings, arson, derailments and dynamitings which it lays at the door of the prisoners.

Walter M. Sisulu and Nelson Mandela, two leaders of the outlawed African National Congress party, are among the accused.

The eleven victims face the death penalty under South Africa's fascist-like laws.

## THE NEVILLE ALEXANDER CASE

In the October 4 World Outlook we reported the arrest in South Africa of Dr. Neville Alexander. One of our correspondents mailed us an account of this case as it was reported in the Cape Times of September 28. It is of interest in what it reveals about the character of South African "justice" which led the United Nations to demand the immediate release of all political prisoners. The account, of course, was carefully written to avoid any reprisals from the authorities:

## Brilliant City Man Accused of Sabotage

Dr. Neville Edward Alexander, one of the Cape's most brilliant non-White scholars who was detained under the 90-day clause in July, will face a charge of sabotage at a summary trial in the Cape Town Supreme Court on November 4.

The trial is expected to provide sensational evidence and it is understood that a number of prominent people will be involved.

Details of the charge are not yet available but it is known that Mr. D.B. Brunette who, with Mr. J.E. Nothling, the Deputy Attorney-General of the Cape, will appear for the State at the trial, has been working on the indictment for the past month.

Dr. Alexander, who studied at the University of Cape Town and in Germany, was committed for summary trial to the Supreme Court when he appeared briefly before Mr. H.J. Powell in the Cape Town Magistrate Court yesterday.

### Parents Present

Dr. Alexander, who is single, was dressed in a dark brown coat and fawn trousers when, accompanied by a policeman and several detectives, he was led into the courtroom. He was carrying a small suitcase and a paper parcel.

During the 20-minute hearing, he stood with his arms folded, rocking slightly back and forth. His mother and father were among several non-White spectators who listened to the proceedings.

After Mr. Brunette applied on behalf of the State for a summary trial, Mr. M.J. Richman, of Ress, Richman & Co., asked for bail on Alexander's behalf.

### Bail Plea

He said that Alexander was prepared to accept any "stringent conditions" that might be imposed. He would undertake not to see any associates. . . . "He is employed as a teacher and, as far as I know, his income is the mainstay of the family. I believe his sister is employed, but I understand that she is also detained under the 90-day Clause...."

### Pamphlets Only

Mr. Richman said the charge against Alexander was one of sabotage, but according to the instructions the acts committed had not gone further than the distribution of pamphlets.

"The last important aspect is that Alexander has been in gaol for 76 days, and during that time has been thoroughly examined. He has also not seen any people. A period at home would enable him to readjust mentally to face the trial in the Supreme Court."

Opposing the application, Mr. Brunette said the alleged act of sabotage was a serious one and has endangered the safety of the state.

"The Police are conducting widespread investigations which are not yet finished. Other persons may appear in the investigations and there is a serious danger that Alexander may abscond. Others in this case have already absconded -- one has gone to Bechuanaland and another has simply disappeared."

### Well Treated

...Mr. Brunette said...Alexander had been well treated during his detention, and, as far as the State was concerned, "there is nothing wrong with his mental condition."

The magistrate refused bail.

### ALGERIANS APPROVE CUBA'S STAND ON TEST-BAN PACT

The Ben Bella government was among the first to sign the Moscow-Washington "test-ban" pact. Algeria is especially sensitive to any further testing of nuclear weapons in view of France's program of developing her own stockpile. The de Gaulle government holds that the Evian agreement included permission to carry out tests on Algerian territory in the Sahara.

But the Ben Bella government also understands and sympathizes with the stand of the Cubans in refusing to sign. This is expressed in the following editorial which appeared in the October 10 issue of the Algerian daily, Le Peuple:

\* \* \*

The some one hundred countries that have signed the Moscow treaty certainly did not do this simply to ban carrying out nuclear tests! In truth, with only a few exceptions, most of these states have never had either the intention or the means to plunge into the adventure of atomic armament.

Instead, a great many of them had formally condemned nuclear tests before the adoption of the tripartite treaty.

In adhering to the Moscow treaty, the signatories themselves most often gave the real reason: to add a concrete contribution to the international détente which has begun, to give maximum impetus to this new turn in world history. It was above all adherence to the spirit of peaceful coexistence rather than a text, the letter of which concerns only the few members of the "atomic club."

It is therefore perfectly understandable that a country which is excluded from this coexistence, which is attacked almost daily by mercenaries and officially threatened on every occasion, refuses to trust a treaty the spirit of which is completely ignored so far as it is concerned. This is the case with Cuba.

The Cuban government is not against the Moscow treaty in and of itself. On the contrary, it asks only that the improvement of inter-

national relations be concretized -- Cuba wishes only to pursue her socialist experiment in peace, and asks, as is her right, that others respect her existence and coexist with her. Then only could Havana logically sign the tripartite treaty.

While waiting for this, the Cuban position provides matter for reflection. Peaceful coexistence, to be genuine, must not be established exclusively among the major capitals but must benefit the whole world. In any case, this is what the hundred signatories of the Moscow treaty wished to underline by their gesture.

### GOOD CHOICE FOR PEACE PRIZE

In awarding the Nobel Peace Prize for 1962 to Dr. Linus Carl Pauling, the Norwegian committee made an excellent choice. Announcement of the award was timed to coincide with October 10, the day the nuclear test-ban treaty goes into effect. Dr. Pauling is the leading spokesman of scientists in the United States who have sought to end the testing of nuclear weapons. Only one other person has ever received two Nobel prizes. In 1903 Marie Curie shared the physics prize with her husband Pierre and another French scientist. In 1911 she won the chemistry prize.

Although Dr. Pauling received the Presidential Medal for Merit for "outstanding services to the United States in the Second World War," the State Department denied him a passport in 1952 because of "suspicion" that he had "Communist leanings."

The case rocketed into the headlines but the State Department refused to alter its position until after 1954 when Dr. Pauling won the Nobel Prize in chemistry for his theory describing the fundamental nature and behavior of molecular bonds. Under the influence of Stalin, Dr. Pauling's theory had been attacked in the USSR as incompatible with dialectical materialism.

Dr. Pauling continued to lead the scientific world in the struggle against nuclear testing. In 1958 he organized the collection of 11,021 signatures of scientists in 49 nations to a petition to the United Nations demanding an end to the tests. In the same year he sued the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission to halt nuclear testing.

The Senate Internal Security subcommittee responded to the petition to the UN with a subpoena. The senatorial witch-hunters sought to compel Dr. Pauling to produce the petitions as well as all correspondence relating to the campaign. Dr. Pauling defied his inquisitors. By this action America's world-famous chemist faced prison, but the red-baiting law-makers thought better of citing him for contempt.

When the Soviet government resumed nuclear testing in 1961, Dr. Pauling went to the USSR. In a radio broadcast he told the Soviet people what he thought of this setback to the long campaign to end the threat of nuclear fallout.

The day after receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, Dr. Pauling celebrated by making available to the press an article he wrote for the current issue of Minority of One, a radical American publication. In the article he declares that reliable information shows that the United States has twelve times the amount of nuclear weapons needed to destroy every Russian alive while the Soviet Union has eight times the amount needed to wipe out all Americans.

During World War II six megatons of explosives (the equivalent of 6,000,000 tons of dynamite) were used by all the belligerents combined. This killed 40,000,000 people.

At present, according to Dr. Pauling, the United States possesses 240,000 megatons and the USSR 80,000 megatons, a total of 320,000 megatons. But it would take only 10,000 megatons to "lead to the death of essentially all the American people and the destruction of the nation" and only 20,000 megatons to destroy the Soviet Union.

"As we consider the facts about the capabilities of destruction that are possessed by the Soviet Union and the United States, we are forced to the conclusion that we are doomed to die if the world continues along the path of insanity," Dr. Pauling said.

"Unless some steps are taken immediately in the direction of disarmament, the United States and the Soviet Union and probably many other countries in the Northern Hemisphere will be destroyed."

#### A FEW MORE STEPS ALONG THE PATH OF INSANITY

Two more grim items were reported in last week's press. France has now joined the nuclear club and Canada has been armed with nuclear warheads.

When the French Air Force accepted delivery of the first production models of its atomic bomber, the Mirage IV, the Cabinet issued a communiqué that spoke cryptically of "the creation of new means which the armed forces are beginning to have at their disposal." This was interpreted to mean that de Gaulle has the first models of his "force de frappe."

In a signed article date-lined Paris October 9, Don Cook, feature writer of the New York Herald Tribune, said: "At least one free-falling atomic bomb...has been produced by the French, but there are doubts as to whether the delivery of bombs will match the schedule of aircraft coming off the line."

It was not revealed whether the United States had supplied technical information that might have enabled the French to by-pass testing of their bomb.

On the same day that it was revealed that France now has the bomb, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson told the House of Commons in Ottawa that the Canadian government had agreed to store nuclear warheads for jet interceptors at Harmon Field, Newfoundland, and Goose Bay, Labrador.



Since Canadian interceptors are equipped to handle the American nuclear warheads, Canada may now be well ahead of France "along the path of insanity," as Dr. Linus C. Pauling has aptly termed the preparations for an atomic world war.

#### NORWEGIAN COMMUNIST PARTY STRADDLES IN MOSCOW-PEKING DISPUTE

Publication October 7 of a statement by the leadership made it clear that the Norwegian Communist party will seek to remain neutral publicly in the conflict between Moscow and Peking. Previously the party had seemed inclined in Peking's direction.

The statement, prepared at a week-end meeting of the top leadership, expressed regret over the bitterness that has appeared in Moscow-Peking declarations and over the clashes that have occurred at a government level.

The Norwegian party is "not prepared to take part in the discussion in a manner that may further aggravate the situation," said the declaration. The party hopes, instead, to contribute to "the re-establishment of comradely norms" between parties.

#### INDONESIAN COMMUNIST PARTY LEADERS VEER TOWARD CHINA

Radio Peking said October 5 that Dipa Nusantara Aidit, chairman of the Indonesian Communist party, has called on both Chinese and Soviet leaders to meet in order to restore unity.

Aidit made his appeal in Jakarta at a party conference after returning from visits to both Moscow and Peking.

Previously, it was thought that Aidit was one of the few in the leadership of the Indonesian Communist party who favored Khrushchev over Mao. On October 5, however, the Peking news agency Hsinhua said that while Aidit was in Canton in September, he had indicated that his party would support the Chinese side.

Aidit was reported as declaring that the Indonesian party would "always remain on the side of Marxism-Leninism and of the struggle against revisionism."

With 2,000,000 members, the Indonesian organization is considered to be one of the strongest Communist parties in the world. Its policies, however, have been class-collaborationist and Aidit has consistently supported Sukarno, the head of the Indonesian government.

#### ANOTHER RECORD

According to the Medical Research Council in London, cancer-producing Strontium-90 in the bones of children up to four years old almost doubled last year. The new high was due to nuclear tests in 1961.

GUERRILLA WARFARE STEPPED UP IN ANGOLA

Intensified guerrilla warfare was the response of underground nationalists in Angola to a visit paid the long-suffering colony by Americo Tomaz, who bears the impressive title of "President of the Portuguese Republic." (Tomaz is in reality fascist dictator Salazar's secretary for "national" affairs.)

In a communiqué issued at Léopoldville by the ANLA [National Liberation Army of Angola], the following actions in recent weeks are listed:

- (1) At Camamba, on the highway between Luanda [capital of Angola] and Carmona, six Portuguese soldiers were killed in a skirmish with an ANLA contingent. One Portuguese soldier was taken prisoner.
- (2) In the Carmona region, near the town of Bessa Monteiro, heavy fighting occurred between ANLA forces and colonialist troops. Six Portuguese soldiers were killed.
- (3) Between Madimba and San Salvador, a truckload of Portuguese troops on the way to reinforce the garrison at San Salvador in preparation for the visit of President Tomaz hit an ANLA mine. All were killed.
- (4) While Tomaz was at San Salvador addressing a crowd, a bomb exploded within a few yards of the Portuguese fascist leader.
- (5) In the Bungo area, a Portuguese patrol, lost in the forest, stumbled on to an ANLA encampment. The entire patrol was wiped out.
- (6) In the Quibaxe area, fighting broke out for the first time since the end of 1961. Nine Portuguese soldiers were killed.
- (7) In the Porto Rico region near Santo Antonio de Zaïre, an ANLA detachment fought a pitched battle with militia organized by Portuguese settlers.
- (8) In the Dembos area, a group of Angolese soldiers killed their officers and joined the ANLA. They brought along a good supply of arms and ammunition. In a subsequent battle with the reinforced ANLA group, fifteen Portuguese soldiers were killed.
- (9) In the Cabinda district, the ANLA opened an offensive beginning at the Congo frontier. The aim is to extend operations throughout the district.
- (10) Near the river Dande, the ANLA attacked a convoy of Portuguese troops. Eleven of them were killed.

According to the October 4 Tribune de Lausanne, a Swiss daily, two representatives of the Portuguese government recently made an unofficial inquiry at the Léopoldville headquarters of the Angolan National Liberation Front concerning terms for Portuguese "culture" and Portuguese settlers if Angola were granted independence.

Roberto Holden, president of the FLNA, was reported by the same source to have replied that independence and self-determination as well as agrarian reform, the withdrawal of Portuguese troops and the liberation of political prisoners had to be accepted as prerequisites to any negotiations.

### THE ASTURIAN MINERS STRIKE

The September issue of Frente Obrero(1), the FLP [Frente de Liberación Popular] journal for Spanish workers in emigration, contains a detailed and illuminating account of the heroic three-month-old strike of the Asturian miners and the class solidarity displayed toward them by other sectors of the Spanish working class.

The strike started in Asturias on July 19. It spread slowly into the mining region of León and by the beginning of September as many as 30,000 were out.

The causes of the strike were partly economic, partly social. The Spanish coal mines are undergoing a deep crisis due to their inability to meet competition from the more highly rationalized and efficient methods of coal mines in the U.S., Great Britain and the Ruhr. In order to cut costs, the bosses decided to slash wages by various means -- elimination of overtime pay and premiums, layoffs, etc.

The miners, on the other hand, already had a number of grievances. Prominent among them were the demand for the same number of paid holidays as white-collar workers and the reinstatement of miners deported from Asturias because of the strikes last year.

The strike action was all the more heroic in view of the lack of a powerful union or any real nation-wide organization that could rally substantial support. The employers, in contrast, are solidly organized and have the full support of the Franco dictatorship, its secret police and the Guardia Civil.

In face of this unfavorable relationship of forces, the miners placed special emphasis on political demands such as "trade-union freedom" and "no victimizations." The hope was to facilitate support from other sectors of the working class and to organize another test of strength such as occurred in the spring of 1962.

But as a result of the 1962 repressions, conditions have deteriorated. The nation-wide underground organizations, especially the FLP and the Communist party, have been temporarily weakened. They are not in position to co-ordinate or synchronize solidarity demonstrations or strikes on a nation-wide scale.

The absence of a strong organization and especially of facilities for quick communication and dissemination of news among the strikers has helped the employers in such traditional strike-breaking maneuvers as offering selected groups economic concessions if they will return to work. Such maneuvers succeeded, for example, at the Caudal and Aller mines at the beginning of August.

When the miners organized sit-down strikes in various places like the Nalon and Oscura mines, the Franco government called upon the employers to reply with full-scale lockouts. Some 10,000 miners were thrown out of work in this area but the end result was to give the strike fresh impetus.

On August 19 the lockout was in effect at twelve mines. By August 24 it had been extended to eighteen, affecting 15,000 miners. By the following day, the strikes had spread to León and 29,000 miners were out of the pits.

The miners downed tools at three new mines in Asturias between September 4 and September 7. On September 6, an official government communiqué put the number of strikers in Asturias at 14,886, a figure, however, considerably below the reality.

In the meantime, repressive measures were stepped up. Twenty-five strikers were arrested and taken to the sinister Carabanchel prison of Madrid.

On September 9 the lockout was lifted and the government announced that "numerous miners" were returning to work. Around September 15, however, the government admitted that 12,500 were still on strike in Asturias and 4,000 in León. (The fact was that some 20,000 were still on strike.)

The miners, however, can scarcely hold out much longer. Most of their material demands have been granted, while the repression is becoming more savage. Strikers considered to be leaders are tortured and even their wives are arrested. [See World Outlook October 4.] No financial help has reached the miners and the fascist authorities have placed heavy pressure on employers in other industries not to hire striking miners. [The shortage of skilled workers in Spain tempts employers to hire at least certain categories of miners.]

The latest news is that the strike movement has spread to the Rio Tinto copper mines in Huelva.

---

(1) For a subscription to Frente Obrero, send \$2 or 14s/6d or 100 Belgian francs to Gonzales Deschamps, 259a, chaussée Brunehault, Carnières, Belgium.

#### DRAWINGS OF THE BOSS?

A New York local of the Communications Workers of America authorized a strike against the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, one of the largest and richest enterprises in the world, unless the company stopped using hidden cameras in employees' toilets. Company management said the expensive cameras were set up to trap a person who has been covering the walls with obscene drawings.

## CASTRO RESPONSIBLE FOR HURRICANE?

An October 8 Associated Press dispatch from Miami casts a most revealing light on the mentality of the Cuban counterrevolutionaries. The dispatch reads as follows:

"Cuban exiles expressed hope today that Hurricane Flora would wreck Prime Minister Fidel Castro's revolution.

"They said the hurricane may accomplish what anti-Castro saboteurs had been risking their lives to do -- ruin Cuba's principal crops and thus devastate her economy.

"Now is the time to strike because electric facilities will be out for a good time, bridges are out, rails are washed out, and the only communication in eastern Cuba is by radio," said the Rev. Germinal Rivas, of Junita Revolucionaria (JURE).

"A spokesman for another activist group, Commando L, said: 'It is a pity we were not prepared for this occasion on a large scale. Fidel's people might give a lot of thought now as to whether it is still worthwhile backing him.'"

The logic of this type of thinking is that the victory of the Revolution led by Fidel Castro can be ascribed to the balmy weather which Batista thoughtlessly arranged for.

Such balmy logic is not confined to the Miami "activists," however. The staid New York Times rubbed its hands editorially October 10 as it castigated Castro for choosing this time to refuse to sign the test-ban treaty, to reject a Brazilian proposal to make Latin America a zone free of nuclear weapons, and to "put on a glowing tribute to the Chinese Communists":

"These policy moves," continued the New York Times, "came as one of the most devastating natural calamities ever to hit Cuba -- Hurricane Flora -- destroyed crops, homes, bridges, railways and roads and flooded lands and villages. In Cuba's most prosperous days such a disaster would have ruined the island's economy for the next two or three years. Coming as it does after the drought of 1961-62 and the great economic mistakes and failures of the revolution, the blow was doubly damaging. Already, happy Cuban exiles in Miami are saying, 'now is the time to strike,' and expressing the hope that the hurricane will have blown the Castro regime, as well as eastern Cuba, apart.

"This is the hardest test that the leader of the revolution has yet faced -- and here is he, making it harder. The United States, despite what it thinks of the Castro regime, wants to help the victims of the hurricane, but it is difficult to help someone who is kicking you in the shins, calling you names and showing no disposition to seek help.

"In the case of Fidel Castro and the Cuban revolution, predictions are to be avoided. All his toughness, shrewdness and resourcefulness

will now be needed to get his Government and his revolution out of this predicament."

Hurricane Flora was, indeed, the worst Caribbean storm in the history of the weather department. It blew for five days solid, the wind reaching 140 miles an hour.

In Haiti 2,500 were reported dead and another 2,500 missing. In Cuba, said Radio Havana, "two entire villages have disappeared, washed away by the floodwaters, and there is fear that 4,000 students and workers have perished."

According to the same report, Cuba lost nearly all its coffee crop, about half its sugar crop, and almost all its other crops. That this is not exaggerated can be judged from the opinion of the Miami Weather Bureau that Flora left the worst hurricane devastation in Haiti and Cuba "since the time Columbus discovered the New World."

The counterrevolutionaries, from the foulest cutthroats in the hangouts of Miami to the most cultured wielders of the poison pen in the editorial offices of the New York Times, are gloating over this natural disaster, thinking that it will surely lead the Cuban people to say, "We must get rid of Castro!"

But as they tackle this new burden under Castro's leadership, the Cuban people are much more likely to conclude, "Thank god that on top of a hurricane we don't have a Batista!"

### BEHIND KHRUSHCHEV'S \$1,000,000,000 ORDER FOR WHEAT

By E. Germain

The Soviet Union today faces grave difficulties in food supplies, perhaps the gravest since the death of Stalin. Two successive bad harvests coupled with a considerable increase in requirements -- due to a rise in population and an increase in grain-fed livestock -- have resulted in a big deficit in cereals this year. The deficit can be made up only by heavy purchases of wheat and corn from the capitalist countries, since reserves in the workers states have been systematically lowered in order to stabilize food supplies for the cities during the past decade.

Various figures have been cited as to the extent of projected Soviet purchases, the most reliable being \$1,000,000,000 of which more than \$600,000,000 is earmarked for Canada, from \$250,000,000 to \$300,000,000 for the U.S. and the balance for Australia and France. Last year the USSR bought \$250,000,000 worth of wheat (mostly in Canada).

In addition to the \$1,000,000,000 order, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria are in the market for wheat.

Payment will be made in gold and "Eurodollars" (so-called "accounting units" used for exchanges within the Common Market area). During

September alone the USSR sold \$220,000,000 worth of gold (around 200 tons), an amount equal to total Soviet gold sales during all of 1962. The Soviet government generally prefers to pay for its purchases in dollars -- even if they must be bought or borrowed at high premium -- because of the difference between the cost price of gold in the Soviet Union (commonly estimated at about \$60 an ounce) and the official purchase price of gold in the capitalist countries, which oscillates around \$35 an ounce. As long as this cost differential exists, the Soviet economy suffers heavy losses with every big sale of gold in the West.

It has been denied in some quarters that economic necessity forced Khrushchev to seek these huge quantities of wheat in the capitalist countries. According to this view, the current commercial operations are a clever maneuver through which the Kremlin is developing its policy of "peaceful coexistence."

This is, of course, nonsense. Many foreign visitors have noticed the marked deterioration of food supplies during recent weeks. Even bread queues have reappeared in some of the big cities. Khrushchev has publicly admitted that the harvest was bad this year. His half-hearted essay at self-criticism was all the more damaging, since his reputation was staked on rapid solution of the agrarian problem in the Soviet Union. The Soviet press is full of stories about grave neglect in the agricultural sector -- part of the harvest rotting in the fields of Kazakhstan because of delay in harvesting, the usual accounts of tractors breaking down because of lack of spare parts, etc., etc. Finally, frantic public appeals by the bureaucracy not to use bread or wheat as food for chickens and hogs have underlined the seriousness of the situation.

It is true, however, that heavy Soviet purchases of wheat in the capitalist countries, especially the projected deal of \$250,000,000 to \$300,000,000 in the U.S., have the objective consequence of helping the Kennedy administration, if it wishes, to remove barriers to rapprochement with the Soviet bureaucracy.

Current overproduction of wheat in the U.S., which resulted in enormous surpluses, is one of the main economic problems of the Middle West. This is the classical area of isolationist sentiment and a stronghold of the extreme right-wing opposition to collaboration with the Soviet bureaucracy. The wheat deal will most probably help the Kennedy administration to soften this opposition and to bring the isolationists around to abandoning their resistance to extending commercial relations with the Soviet Union. The sale of industrial equipment (in the field of plastics and chemical fertilizers, for example) may well be a coming step.

A sector of the American bourgeoisie, including some of the more intelligent Eastern bankers and heads of finance capital, have long considered that congressional resistance to widening trade relations with the Soviet Union is absurd and detrimental to the interests of American imperialism -- especially when Wall Street's main competitors, the British, German, Japanese, French and Italian imperialists, are selling an increasing amount of heavy industrial equipment to the Soviet Union, the East European workers states and even China.

The truth remains, however, that these consequences of Soviet entry into the American wheat market are only a by-product (like the unexpected windfall to U.S. imperialism of an amelioration of its deteriorating balance of payments problem). Essentially the purchases were made as a result of the permanent agricultural crisis in the Soviet Union, of the inability of the Soviet bureaucracy and its present Khrushchev leadership to take decisive steps toward solving this crisis.

The permanent crisis of Soviet agriculture has two basic roots: (1) a price and supply structure of agricultural versus industrial consumers goods that takes away the incentives for a constant increase in agricultural production in the countryside; (2) an enormous investment lag in agriculture. Soviet farms, even today, have less mechanical horse-power at their disposal than live horses before Stalin's forced collectivization. The insufficiency of fertilizers is notorious.

The result is tremendous wastage of man-power in the countryside, the average productivity of the Soviet kolkhoznik being not much more than ten per cent of that of the American farmer. While Soviet industry measures up to the highest standards of technology and productivity, Soviet agriculture remains essentially at the level of primitive, extensive methods, even though 1,500,000 tractors are in use.

In 1953, Malenkov and Khrushchev frankly recognized the sad state of affairs in Soviet agriculture and began to try to remedy the situation by radically increasing the prices which the state sets for deliveries from the kolkhozes. Later, Khrushchev made various other concessions to the peasants, the most spectacular being the sale to the kolkhozes of tractors and heavy agricultural equipment which up until then had been property of the state-owned MTS (Machine Tractor Stations).

Each of these concessions undoubtedly yielded results. Output increased and the kolkhozes accumulated huge balances in rubles. But in exchange for these rubles, the Soviet economy proved unable to offer the peasants a growing stream of industrial consumers goods that would have served as incentive for constant increases in production. Instead, attempts were made to siphon away the rubles. Besides tractors, light industrial equipment was offered the kolkhozes. The machines could be used in the co-operative manufacture of such items as tinned food, sausages, cakes, etc., that could be freely sold in the cities in shops owned by the kolkhozes. But again the balance sheet proved to be too one-sided to attract the peasants to both increase output and to observe strict cost-accounting procedures.

Khrushchev again tried to get around the difficulty instead of solving it. He launched his campaign to turn to the "virgin soil" of Siberia and Khazakstan. Huge state farms -- sovkhozes -- were set up in these arid provinces and one million Soviet workers, principally youth, were sent there to create -- often under terrible living conditions -- a plentiful supply of wheat and meat for the Soviet people.

Khrushchev had been warned, however, that without immense irrigation projects, the plowing up of these lands -- a project already studied and abandoned in Czarist times -- would be very dangerous.



After a few years, the topsoil, stripped of grass and shrubs, its moisture depleted, would be picked up by the strong winds that sweep these huge plains unbroken by any natural obstacle, and the world's biggest dustbowl might be created.

Khrushchev disregarded the warnings -- perhaps because they were underlined by the Trotskyists. He gambled -- and lost. For the third consecutive year, the harvest on the "virgin lands" of the Far East was catastrophic. And the dust storms are affecting distant regions. Too late, the Soviet bureaucracy has come to the conclusion that only widespread irrigation and the massive use of fertilizers -- a turn from constantly widening the area of extensive agriculture to increasing intensive agriculture on relatively smaller acreages -- can do the job.

For Khrushchev's prestige, the failure of the "virgin lands" adventure is a terrible blow. Even worse, the shortage of wheat spells trouble in the animal products supply (milk, butter and especially meat) in the coming winter and next year. This is on top of last year's sharp increase in the price of meat and butter which signified a sudden arrest in the uninterrupted increase in the Soviet workers' standard of living for the past ten years.

Khrushchev's policy is identified in the eyes of the Soviet workers with the promise of a better life. Consequently the Kremlin must do everything to bridge over the present crisis. Otherwise the position of the first secretary can soon come into serious question.

In view of all this, Khrushchev's boast not so long ago that by 1965 the production of the "socialist camp" would draw abreast or surmount that of the capitalist countries now sounds like a bad joke. The target date is not far off and there is not the slightest chance that Khrushchev can deliver on his promise.

Khrushchev also boasted that the level of per capita production in the U.S. would be equalled or surmounted by 1970-72. The wheat deal is sad commentary on that promise -- unless Khrushchev meant that U.S. productivity will be outstripped by buying its unusable surpluses!

And what should be said of a self-styled Marxist leader who speaks seriously about the Soviet Union having already achieved socialism and of now entering the stage of "communism" -- when the people lack even sufficient quantities of bread?

Lest we be misunderstood, we repeat once again what we wrote at the time of the Twenty-second Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding the contradictions and the enormous waste due to bureaucratic mismanagement, Soviet economy -- especially industry -- is growing at a rate at least twice if not three times that of the U.S. economy. Already, in national production and wealth, absolute yearly increases are bigger in the Soviet Union than in the U.S. This means -- other things remaining equal -- that the Soviet economy will sooner or later attain the absolute industrial production and national income of the U.S., and still later reach its per capita output and income.

But sober analysis of the economic situation makes this quite improbable for 1970 and even 1975. Only after that date, towards 1980, will the curves somehow cross. In the meantime, humanity will witness colossal revolutionary uprisings and transformations. And these, not "peaceful competition" between the American and Soviet economies, will decide the fate of mankind, the victory of world socialism and the possibility of finally eliminating the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

The Fourth International does not minimize in any way whatsoever the great thrust forward of the Soviet economy. It fully acknowledges the deeply progressive character of its successes, which, to quote Trotsky, express the superiority of planned economy and socialized means of production in the language of steel, cement and electricity.

But the Fourth International fits these achievements into the overall picture of world reality and of world revolution today. There they occupy an important but by no means decisive place. The latest dramatic expression of the permanent agricultural crisis in the Soviet Union is another reminder that it would be hopelessly utopian to stake everything on rapid decisive successes of the Soviet economy. The revolutionary masses of the world -- and they alone -- can successfully overthrow capitalism. To postpone this task until U.S. imperialism is beaten "economically" by a bureaucratically deformed Soviet economy implies fearful suffering for mankind and inordinate danger of nuclear destruction.

Fresh confirmation of the validity of relying on world revolution -- in opposition to the Khrushchevite policy of "economic competition" as the essential means for overthrowing capitalism -- that is the conclusion which should be drawn from Khrushchev's billion-dollar wheat deal.

October 10, 1963

### THE HIGHEST EXPRESSION OF KHRUSHCHEVISM

By Pierre Frank

In the crisis of the international Communist movement, which has been accentuated by the Sino-Soviet dispute, the Khrushchev leadership has been granted the approval of the Central Committee of the French CP. The Chinese leadership was criticized throughout the session that was just concluded, first in passing in a general report by R. Guyot, then in a report by Assistant General Secretary Waldeck Rochet devoted entirely to this dispute, then in a speech by Thorez himself dedicated to nothing but the conflict, finally in a special resolution on the subject. In all, four to five pages of l'Humanité [central organ of the French Communist party] were taken up.

We will leave aside the arguments that merely repeat what is to be found in documents drawn up in Moscow. While the Central Committee accuses the Chinese CP of maintaining "the pretention that one Communist party is infallible," the Thorez leadership itself sticks to its old habit of preparing reports and resolutions in which sentences are lifted in their entirety from Pravda.

Let us note in passing that the venerable custom of slandering opponents has not been lost. (It is true that neither the Soviets nor the Chinese have lost it either.) Thus, we are told, the Chinese hold a position identical to that of de Gaulle; they benefit from the support not only of "renegades," "oppositionists" and "Trotskyists" (they have been given for some time to making rather subtle distinctions); but also from Franco's Spain and Adenauer's Germany -- the latter, apparently, because Chinese documents can be found in these countries! A comic note was nonetheless struck in this. The Central Committee waxed indignant over insults levelled by the Chinese at Khrushchev, forgetting the session a little after the Twentieth Congress when Thorez, banking on the victory of Molotov and Co., characterized the same Khrushchev as a "dwarf."

That Thorez, the last of the Stalinists, accuses the Chinese of defending Stalin, is not without irony. When Thorez declares that in the USSR "a great wind of democracy has blown...a certain liberation is in operation," we can conclude that Thorez does not fear Khrushchev the way he feared Stalin. The victory of the Chinese Revolution was not for nothing, although Thorez will scarcely admit it.

Apropos the "great wind of democracy," a charge levelled by the leadership of the French Communist party is worth noting. The Chinese, they say, "went to immense efforts to spread their writings." Thorez thus reveals his concept of workers democracy. Communists in disagreement with Khrushchev's line, who wish to disseminate their point of view, carry on "undermining activities," "factional work" that endangers "the unity of the international Communist movement." According to this conception of "democracy," each leadership must line up behind the guiding party and the rank and file behind their national leaderships.

The principal argument of the Thorez leadership is that no choice exists but the one between "peaceful coexistence" and thermonuclear war, "peaceful coexistence" signifying not only seeking diplomatic agreements (which no revolutionary Marxist can condemn), but also the march toward socialism exclusively along peaceful roads. In this regard, the French CP leadership completely distort the positions of the Chinese on the one hand, and the Trotskyists on the other -- without mentioning what they do to the positions of Lenin. We quote from the resolution passed by the Central Committee:

"The Chinese leaders advance the 'argument' that there is no 'historic precedent for the peaceful passage of capitalism to socialism.' But the characteristic of Marxist-Leninist theory, its force, is precisely to outstrip action, to clarify on the basis of a profound analysis the principal traits of the historic epoch in which it is engaged. To limit oneself to repeating definitions formulated a half century ago, when imperialism was the determining force of historic evolution, is not only to ignore the profound transformations of the present world, but also to deny the possibility of a creative development of Marxism-Leninism.

"In maintaining that the armed struggle for power is always and everywhere the only valid method, the Chinese leaders are developing old

ideas combatted by Lenin and the International Communist movement against the 'permanent revolution,' armed minorities, 'war as a means of stimulating revolution,' peace which 'justifies' imperialism.

"Such a theory breaks completely with Marxism which has always rejected giving a 'helping hand' to revolutions, which develop in accordance with the aggravation of class contradictions. It is dangerous, because in systematically identifying revolution and violence, it justifies the slanders of the big bourgeoisie who seek to make the people believe that the socialist revolution is necessarily a civil war. It is adventurist, because it ends in isolating the party from the masses and causing the working class to lose its allies, to the sole benefit of the power of the monopolies. The transformation of society cannot be the deed of a faction organized in the dark, the consequence of a plot doing violence to the majority of a people. It can be realized only by millions of men decided to resolve the vital problems posed before the nation."

Trotsky, it may at once be recalled, vigorously combatted the view that favored "exporting" revolution at the point of a bayonet during the years of civil war in Russia (to the Baltic countries, Poland, Georgia), without thereby prejudging the case where an appeal from a revolution in danger requires armed aid.

But in the passage which we have just cited, the lines that denounce the revolutionary struggle for power as well as the building of a party capable of leading such a struggle -- "isolating the party from the masses...a faction organized in the dark...a plot doing violence to the majority of a people..." -- are more or less textual repetitions of the arguments advanced by Blum at the Congress of Tours in 1920 against adhering to the Communist International. One can be certain that they will give Guy Mollet great pleasure.

There is not a single instance of peaceful passage to socialism. This argument, advanced jointly by the Trotskyists, the Chinese and the Cubans is a little embarrassing to the Khrushchevists. Thus they believed it necessary in their resolution to advance an argument that ends up by boomeranging against them:

"Life itself has demonstrated that if the peoples of Vietnam and Algeria had to conduct a heroic war to win their independence, other peoples in Black Africa have conquered it without employing arms."

But what kind of "independence" is enjoyed by the peoples of the Ivory Coast, Senegal, Dahomey, the Brazzaville Congo? In the latter country wasn't there a first attempt at a mass uprising to try to add something to the "independence" provided by the priest Fulbert Youlou? From that "independence" to socialism there is need of a revolution -- and up to this day, we repeat, no such revolution is known to have occurred peacefully. Not because "Trotskyist" or "Chinese" adventurers want it that way, but because the capitalist class has never willingly ceded power.

One cannot but appreciate at their true value these words of Thorez: "...without the support of the proletariat of the metropolitan center, the struggle of our Vietnamese comrades, the struggle of the Algerian people would have been much more difficult."

Thorez prefers to talk about this "support" himself rather than cite the opinion of the Vietnamese or Algerians on the subject. People, it seems, have short memories. However, there are still not a few who will recall that the leadership of the French Communist party characterized Dienbienphu as a defeat. As for aid to the Algerians, it would not be un instructive to draw up a list of members of the party who were expelled for having helped the Algerians in France.

In his speech, Thorez argues that "the revolution of the colonial masses is part of the proletarian revolution." The idea is quite correct. It follows, moreover, from the theory of the permanent revolution although one does not exactly find this expressed in the resolution adopted by the Central Committee. There it is simply a question of an "objective alliance between the workers of the imperialist metropolitan centers and the peoples struggling for their independence."

The colonial revolution is an integral part of the proletarian revolution, of the socialist revolution, because the national bourgeoisie is incapable of genuinely liberating the colonial and semicolonial countries from the imperialist yoke, and only the overturning of bourgeois power, the installation of a workers state can make possible the realization of the democratic tasks while at the same time beginning construction of the premises for a socialist society.

We do not ask Thorez to explain the theory of permanent revolution to us -- he knows better how to slander it -- but if he maintains that the colonial revolution is part of the proletarian revolution, he must explain why, throughout the course of the Algerian war, the French CP leadership, with him at the head, claimed that it was a question only of a national struggle and not of a struggle for socialism; why, even at the moment independence was won, this leadership saw only the perspective of a democratic republic; and why they maintained this position even when the Tripoli program set construction of a socialist Algeria as the goal.

\* \* \*

As for the activities and perspectives of the Communist party in France, the question for a long time has evidently not been that of the proletarian revolution but of "the installation of a genuinely democratic regime," of "profound democratic reforms," in one word of a Radical Socialist program of the best epoch. No lessons are to be drawn from the experiences of the "Popular Front" and of "tripartisme"(1). As for de Gaullism, it will probably fall after some "big national campaigns" the way the walls of Jericho fell at the sound of trumpets!

Truth to tell, this democratic program is proposed only to permit the French CP to vote in the next presidential election for a candidate who might represent "the democratic forces." Another repetition of that

alliance on a bourgeois program of which Marx, a hundred years ago, wrote: "In place of drawing supplemental forces to the proletariat, the democratic party infected the latter with its own weakness."

But a condition is posed: "We have asked," Guyot declares, "that in accordance with democratic procedure place be made for our party in the various existing European institutions where we will come with our criticisms, our proposals, and our suggestions."

What energy! Peaceful ways of transforming the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Economic Community! The entire Khrushchevist program here finds its highest expression.

October 11, 1963

- (1) At the end of World War II the French Communist party formed a coalition with the Socialist party and the Christian Democrats. "Three partyism" helped stabilize the badly shaken structure of French capitalism.

NEXT WEEK

Some of the far-reaching implications of the issues at stake in the ideological conflict between Moscow and Peking can be more clearly and easily grasped by taking into account the viewpoints of other currents whose fate may be involved in the final outcome. Next week we present the translation of an article that does not take a direct position on the main dispute. The policy it advocates, however, stands in such glaring contrast to the one defended by the Central Committee of the French Communist party, which Pierre Frank discusses in this issue of World Outlook, that one may well wonder if the French CP leaders had it in mind as one of their targets.

The article, which has aroused passionate discussion in Latin-American revolutionary circles, is a recent one by Che Guevara titled "Guerrilla Warfare -- A Method."

Meanwhile, have you sent in your subscription to World Outlook? That's \$7.50 or 2/15s. or 37.50 French francs for 26 issues. And you make out the check or money order to Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France.

Imprimerie: 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2.

Directeur-gérant: Pierre FRANK.