

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 12

March 26, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

<u>In this issue</u>	<u>Page</u>
"Tactical" Nuclear Weapons Next?	1
Crisis over Left Communist Victory in Kerala	
-- by Kailas Chandra	4
Does Africa Need a Fidel Castro?	7
The Battle Against the "Burnt-Cork" Stereotype	
-- by Evelyn Sell	10
The Ethiopian Struggle for Freedom	13
The SLL Yields Again to Imperialist Pressure	
-- by Joseph Hansen	15
De Gaulle Bets on Hanoi	20
The Sihlali and Mtshizana Cases	21
The French Municipal Elections	30
British Radio Dramatizes Moscow Trials	33
Lenin-Trotsky Correspondence (Book Review)	
-- by Pierre Frank	34

"TACTICAL" NUCLEAR WEAPONS NEXT?

The Pentagon blueprint for "escalating" the civil war in South Vietnam becomes clearer each day. On March 22 the State Department casually admitted that supplies of poison gas had been delivered to the puppet South Vietnam government and that gas was being used against "Communist guerrillas." The State Department attempted to pass this off as being quite routine. The poison gas now being employed, said the official spokesman, is not deadly; it is only "nauseous."

Nevertheless a shudder went through the world. Johnson's decision to begin employing gas was only too reminiscent of Hitler's gas chambers. This time, however, there is an air of American efficiency about it -- the idea of turning an entire country, if not our entire planet, into a gas oven.

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 3, No. 12

March 26, 1965

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue

Page

"Tactical" Nuclear Weapons Next?	1
Crisis over Left Communist Victory in Kerala -- by Kailas Chandra	4
Does Africa Need a Fidel Castro?	7
The Battle Against the "Burnt-Cork" Stereotype -- by Evelyn Sell	10
The Ethiopian Struggle for Freedom	13
The SLL Yields Again to Imperialist Pressure -- by Joseph Hansen	15
De Gaulle Bets on Hanoi	20
The Sihlali and Mtshizana Cases	21
The French Municipal Elections	30
British Radio Dramatizes Moscow Trials	33
Lenin-Trotsky Correspondence (Book Review) -- by Pierre Frank	34

"TACTICAL" NUCLEAR WEAPONS NEXT?

The Pentagon blueprint for "escalating" the civil war in South Vietnam becomes clearer each day. On March 22 the State Department casually admitted that supplies of poison gas had been delivered to the puppet South Vietnam government and that gas was being used against "Communist guerrillas." The State Department attempted to pass this off as being quite routine. The poison gas now being employed, said the official spokesman, is not deadly; it is only "nauseous."

Nevertheless a shudder went through the world. Johnson's decision to begin employing gas was only too reminiscent of Hitler's gas chambers. This time, however, there is an air of American efficiency about it -- the idea of turning an entire country, if not our entire planet, into a gas oven.

The impression was reinforced by further frightening admissions. South Vietnamese bombers, according to boasts of the air force's operations chief March 21, used "white phosphorus bombs against the Vu Con camp's 40 military barracks housing more than a battalion of North Vietnamese Army troops." United Press International explained nonchalantly that "White phosphorus burns immediately upon contact with air and cannot be extinguished except by submersion in oil."

These horrors are not all. Washington officials admitted March 19 to the U.S. using napalm bombs "in aerial strikes against North Vietnam." As Jack Raymond, special correspondent of the New York Times coolly described it: "Such bombs contain a jelly substance that slows down the rate of burning and increases the area of intense damage. They were used with devastating effect in World War II and the Korean conflict."

Napalm, white phosphorous, poison gas -- how far will this escalation of horrors proceed before the qualitative point is breached and the Pentagon begins using "tactical nuclear weapons" as another "modern conventional arm"?

It is obvious that Johnson is using Vietnam as a testing ground for the weapons designed for World War III.

The escalation is proceeding in other ways, too. The first bombings of North Vietnam were described as "reprisals" for specific attacks on U.S. troops fighting in South Vietnam. This official excuse was dropped almost as soon as it was used. Once begun, the bombings became "measured" strikes against the continual support of North Vietnam for the guerrilla fighters. The measured strikes have now been steadily increased in rate until at the moment they are occurring on virtually a daily basis.

The movement northward has likewise gone in jumps towards Hanoi. American officials have listed their targets. They include industrial areas, populated sectors, the capital itself.

In still another way, the escalation is proceeding. At first, named targets only were bombed. Now the bombings have become indiscriminate. Pilots are sent out with loads of napalm, white phosphorus, high explosives, and these are dumped wherever they please. On March 18 Reuters reported that South Vietnamese planes killed 45 school children. The school, according to the mercenaries, was guilty of flying a "Viet Cong flag."

The enumeration of ways in which Johnson is escalating the war is not yet ended. One of his aims is to soften up world opinion, above all American opinion. The step-by-step procedure is designed by the Pentagon to accustom people to a gradation of horrors. Each step that is accepted prepares the ground for another more sickening step. In this way, the madmen in Washington count on leading the

American people over the brink.

Max Clos, special Saigon correspondent of the Paris daily Le Figaro reported [March 23] on the elation of a "high functionary" at the American embassy.

"Our humiliation is over," Clos reported the unnamed functionary as telling him. "We are no longer suffering defeat; we are now dealing it out."

According to Clos, the functionary then added: "We have shown that we are strong enough to do what we want to without having to take international opinion into account."

Only last October, says Clos, this same functionary was bitter, discouraged and furious: "We can't go on like this," he told Clos then. "It's crazy to let the Vietcong impose a war on us in the field where they want it and where they are expert -- guerrilla war. If we want to avoid defeat, it's necessary to completely change our tactics."

That is what Johnson has done. Adopting the program of Goldwater, he is now risking a nuclear holocaust.

The danger has become enormously increased by the slowness of both Moscow's and Peking's defensive reactions. This has encouraged Johnson and led him to move visibly closer to the point of no return.

Can this psychotic president be brought to reason? On March 9 the Central Committee of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation stated that its revolutionary struggle would be continued no matter what American imperialism did. On March 10 the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam demanded that the U.S. stop its war, withdraw all troops and war equipment from South Vietnam and let the South Vietnamese people settle their own internal affairs themselves. On March 12, the government of the People's Republic of China issued a statement backing this stand.

"We have prepared ourselves," said the statement. "The Chinese people will firmly and unswervingly take all possible measures to support the peoples of Vietnam and the whole of Indo-China in carrying the struggle against the U.S. aggressors through to the very end."

Even in Moscow, Khrushchev's lethargic heirs appeared to be growing uneasy over the deteriorating situation. "The USSR is already taking measures to increase the defensive potential of North Vietnam," said Brezhnev March 23. "I can assure you that we will carry out our international obligations toward our brother North Vietnamese people. Our central organisms are receiving many requests from Soviet citizens wanting to participate in the struggle of the Vietnamese people."

CRISIS OVER LEFT COMMUNIST VICTORY IN KERALA

By Kailas Chandra

BOMBAY -- The final results in the midterm elections to the 133-member Kerala Legislative Assembly held March 5 show that the Left Communist party of India is now the largest party there. It has 44 members of Parliament (including four independents supported by the party). Twenty-nine of these elected Communist legislators are still in jail, detained under the so-called Defence of India Rules.

Central Home Minister Gulzarilal Nanda told Parliament that the detained legislators were a threat to the "security of the nation" and therefore they would not be released. In fact the leaders of the Left CPI detained in Kerala were placed under jurisdiction of the central government the day the election results were announced to prevent their release by the state authorities through "mischance."

E.M.S. Namboodiripad, who has been elected as the leader of the newly elected Left CPI group, has said that he is in a position to form a "non-Congress ministry" in Kerala with the support of his electoral allies -- the Samyukta (United) Socialist party [SSP] and "independents" -- but he would not be interested in such a move unless the elected legislators were set at liberty.

Namboodiripad has said that the CPI would launch a nation-wide mass agitation for the release of about 900 Communists kept under detention in the various states. Other left parties have extended support to the agitation.

The party position in the newly elected Kerala Assembly and the votes polled by different parties are as follows:

	<u>Seats</u>	<u>Votes Polled</u>
Left Communists	40	1,257,878
Right Communists	3	513,384
Congress	36	2,125,749
Kerala (rebel) Congress	23	791,020
SSP	13	498,089
Independents	10	632,281
Muslim League	6	238,919
Swatantra	1	47,105
Peasants' and Workers' party	1	41,501
Revolutionary Socialist party	0	77,107
Jan Sangh	0	32,390
Praja Socialist party*	0	22,764
Malnad Peasants Union	0	16,058

*Last year the former Lohiaite Socialist party and the Praja Socialist party merged to form the Samyukta Socialist party, but a section of the former PSP has come out of the SSP to revive the "PSP."

When the issue of the continued detention of the Communist legislators in Kerala came up for debate in Parliament, Home Minister Nanda defended his position with the ingenious argument that the Kerala polls showed that the Communists were becoming less popular than before. He said the two wings of the CPI had polled only 29.5 per cent of the total votes this time as against 44.5 per cent secured by them in the 1957 general elections. But obviously he was lying even in the matter of statistics.

As a matter of fact, the Left CPI with allied independents polled about 22 per cent of the votes cast in the midterm elections; but the Left CPI, SSP, the RSP, the Right Communists and the independents supported by the left parties together polled 32 per cent of the total votes as against the 33 per cent polled by the official Congress party. The Congress party leaders also claim that if the votes polled by Congress candidates, the rebel Congressmen and the allied independents are added together, it would be 46 per cent!

A smaller number of seats secured by the Congress party in the midterm election has been compared by Nanda to the 29 seats won by the united CPI in the 1959 elections when they polled 39 per cent of the votes. In the 1957 elections, with 35 per cent of the votes, the CPI won 60 seats and formed a government, while the Congress party with 38 per cent of the votes got only 43 seats. This kind of post-mortem analysis might comfort the Congress party leaders but obviously it does not prove anything, nor does it hold out the promise that the Congress would be able to do better next time.

Obviously the Central government, for its own political reasons, has made up its mind not to release the detained Communist leaders. Nanda made this quite clear in his reply to the "censure motion" against him in Parliament last week. He also explained the real purpose behind the mass arrests of Left Communist leaders all over the country.

The main burden of Nanda's statement was that the Left CPI leaders all over the country had "started working on the basis of a blueprint supplied by the Chinese for an armed insurrection in this country with the assured backing of China"! He mentioned two "important landmarks" of this strategy: the Tenali conference in July 1964 when the CPI split into right and left, and the Calcutta conference in October-November 1964 when specific tasks "in furtherance of the programme of subversion were assigned to different people."

By then, Nanda told Parliament, "the stage had already been reached for the Government to step in but the Government preferred to wait and watch whatever secret moves were being made to the detailed Chinese instructions for organising an internal disorder."

He also stated that the decision to take preventive action against "attempts at subversion had been reached much earlier at the highest level but strictest secrecy was maintained about it till all

preparations including contacts with the state administrations had been completed. Round-up operations were launched when the time was ripe."

Nanda went a step further to publicly express his "appreciation" of the Right Communists' "correct stand on the Chinese aggression," mentioning that he had "no quarrel with the radical programmes of communism as such." He said that he would welcome a truly "Indian Communist party which subscribes to a peaceful parliamentary system of democracy with no extraterritorial ties."

Nanda's oft-repeated charges against the Left CPI have not been taken seriously even by the bourgeois press. A demand for a public trial of the arrested Communist detenus has been made by a Swatantra party member of parliament, P.D.Deo, and a staunch anti-Communist, H.V.Kamath, who belongs to the PSP group in Parliament. Both these reactionary groups have demanded that the Left CPI should be banned.

"The Home Minister's statement," said the Free Press Journal of Bombay in its editorial March 15, "contained little that could convince the public that detention without trial was absolutely urgent and necessary." As such, it added, "liberal opinion is bound to be uneasy about the assault on civil liberty and continue to ask why the Government is fighting shy of a trial. . . Some additional details the Home Minister gave about Left Communists' preparation for a violent revolution will not obviously stand scrutiny in any court of law."

The Left CPI leaders have alleged collusion between Nanda and the Right CPI leader, S.A.Dange, in the recent mass arrests. Namboodiripad in a statement issued on March 14 said: "It is true that I have done something which is disturbing him (Nanda). His calculations about a Congress victory and his hope of Dangeites beating us in the election have been upset. The people of Kerala have clearly rejected Nanda's lies and slanders against our party. If he has any sense of shame, he ought to resign."

A demand for the resignation of Nanda as Home Minister has been made by other left leaders including those of the SSP and the Right CPI. The Right CPI's Central Executive Committee is scheduled to meet soon to conduct a post-mortem on the Kerala polls and there are indications that a new crisis in the party's leadership is in the offing. A new move to oust Dange as chairman of the party is also afoot. Dange, who recently returned from Moscow (where he attended the consultative conference of the international CP leaders), appears to have fallen out of grace with the Soviet leadership. An annual allowance of 4,500 pounds hitherto made to him as the general secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress [AITUC] by the World Federation of Trade Unions [WFTU] has been stopped recently, ostensibly because of the objections raised by the Japanese trade-union body affiliated to the WFTU. Dange might be made a scapegoat for the Kerala debacle of the Right CPI and its class-collaborationist line

in relation to the Indian bourgeoisie. The Kerala poll outcome has had a profound effect on the ranks of the Right CPI.

Meanwhile there are moves by the "rebel" Congressmen in Kerala (politically more reactionary than the Congress party) to form a "non-Congress Ministry" with the support of either the Congress party or the Muslim League and the SSP. But the official Congress party leadership has decided not to participate in any coalition ministry. The bourgeois leadership of the Congress party, it would appear, has made up its mind to continue the President's rule in Kerala with the main object of preventing a Left CPI-sponsored Government being set up in the state even temporarily. The Congress leadership knows that if once the Left CPI is allowed to run a bourgeois state administration in Kerala, it could utilise the "constitutional" advantages derived thereby to launch a mass offensive against the bourgeois state on a national scale.

Having failed to "persuade" the Kerala governor, V.V.Giri (a former trade unionist), to release the elected legislators, Namboodiripad has announced his intention to visit New Delhi to meet the president of the Indian Union and Prime Minister Shastri and secure their freedom. But Namboodiripad knows that his mission is not going to succeed. Home Minister Nanda has in fact openly threatened that Namboodiripad and his colleagues would be rounded up if they prepared for a mass agitation for the release of the Communist detenus. Threatened by a serious internal economic crisis (and perhaps egged on by the top American intelligence advisers now in New Delhi) the bourgeois state has started a course that can unleash a new phase of repression against all militant working-class parties and mass organizations and deal a mortal blow to democratic rights in India.

DOES AFRICA NEED A FIDEL CASTRO?

[The following is a translation of an interview which Ernesto "Che" Guevara granted to Boualam Rouissi and which appeared in the March 17-23 issue of the Casablanca weekly Liberation.]

* * *

Question: Mr. Minister, since this is the first time that Cuba has participated as a full member in a conference of the Afro-Asian Organization, I would like to ask you first how you visualize widening this organization to include Latin America?

Answer: I think that the Organization of Afro-Asian Solidarity can be widened to include Latin America quite easily. And the procedural question is not of any importance. The real problem resides in the fact that in Latin America, there is hardly a government

that is struggling against imperialism. It is necessary to designate popular movements. But there are more movements that call themselves popular than really live up to the name. In any case, the Secretariat of the Organization of Afro-Asian Solidarity has been able to work out some concrete proposals on this point.

Q: You have just made a tour of Africa; could you tell us about the aim of your trip as well as your impressions of the general situation in Africa in relation to the needs of the struggle against neocolonialism?

A: The aim of the tour I just made of Africa was to strengthen the ties between Cuba and the African countries. It enabled me to explain the Cuban Revolution and particularly to learn.

I think that the struggle against neocolonialism is a form of struggle against imperialism. The struggle against neocolonialism and the struggle against imperialism can be separated from the tactical point of view, but it must be kept in mind that it's the same struggle against the same enemy. Despite their own differences, the imperialists under the leadership of the USA are united in the Congo and wherever there is a confrontation over an issue of importance for the future of Africa. That's why the struggle against such neocolonialist countries cannot be separated from the general struggle against imperialism.

There is an alternative that appears about as follows:

-- Either the progressive countries constitute a homogeneous bloc in order to struggle against American imperialism in the Congo, and after the victory against imperialism there, continue the struggle against the neocolonialist countries that constitute the bases of aggression (naturally, this is not a military struggle);

-- Or the situation will remain fluid, permitting the Americans to strike separate blows at the weakest countries (it is necessary to draw the lesson of the assassination of the prime minister of Burundi and what followed). And in this case the progressive countries will be partially isolated at the moment when they should struggle against the American penetration, beginning in the Congo.

In short, the battle of the Congo must, for the African countries, have the meaning of a historic stage that will either determine their advance or their regression. Victory in the Congo will show the Africans that national liberation opens the way for the construction of socialism; a defeat will open the way for neocolonialism. Socialism or neocolonialism, that is the stake for all of Africa in the encounter now taking place in the Congo.

Q: Many African countries are still under imperialist domination reminiscent of Cuba under Batista. I would like to ask you to tell us what the characteristic elements of the situation were in Cuba

that brought about the revolution.

A: The situation in Cuba under Batista was not much different from that of the African countries you mention. In particular, Cuba was a neocolonialist country where the national bourgeoisie had played out its role. In this sense, Cuba was already "ripe" for the Revolution. But in another sense, the situation in Cuba was not any "riper" objectively than other places in Latin America; it could even be said that it was more advanced in Guatemala or Argentina.

But what is most important is not the "objective conditions" but the subjective conditions; that is, in the final analysis, the determination of the revolutionary movement. The revolution is not an apple that falls when it is ripe! You have to make it fall, and it was precisely this that was our historic role, especially Fidel Castro's.

Q: The Cuban Revolution has sometimes been considered to be an "exceptional phenomenon". . .

A: There was one exceptional phenomenon in my opinion, that was the presence of a man, who, against the dogmatic conceptions, against the "waiting" or defeatist attitudes, which dominated the revolutionary forces, was able to see further, to show the people the road and stay at the head of the Revolution during the armed struggle and today during the construction of socialism. I don't know if it's necessary to name him!

But the problem remains posed. Is a Fidel Castro indispensable to a revolution?

Within the framework of the Cuban Revolution, perhaps Fidel Castro was necessary to show the road, to demonstrate that it was possible to do what he did with his people. But if Fidel Castro was necessary to our Revolution, more Fidels are not necessary for the other revolutions!

Yesterday the progressive movement was hunting with a magnifying glass for the exact moment when the "objective conditions" and the subjective conditions would coincide and provoke the revolution, without ever finding it, however!

Today, the danger is different -- to start hunting with the same magnifying glass for a Fidel Castro!

And what is lost in the second case is not something small, but political power, which must be the first task of the revolutionist. Until he has obtained it, he has done nothing.

THE BATTLE AGAINST THE "BURNT-CORK" STEREOTYPE

By Evelyn Sell

The economic and political oppression of the American Negro has received wide publicity in the world press. Even more vicious, however, is the psychological oppression of black people which reaches back hundreds of years. Such psychological oppression has taken many subtle as well as obvious forms within American culture. The end result of white supremacist rationalizations and distortions is deeply rooted anti-Negro prejudices among most white Americans and, also, self-hatred among Negroes themselves.

As Malcolm X said, "The worst crime the white man has committed has been to teach us to hate ourselves. . . our hair, our noses, our skins, our African origins, African identity, African characteristics . . ."

In a New York Times Magazine article, "Africans in Darkest New York," [February 28, 1965] a West African delegate to the United Nations was quoted as saying, "When I came here six years ago I liked a certain Negro girl who lived in Harlem. But she wouldn't go out with me because I came from Africa. She said I looked too bushy and her friends would laugh at her for dating a cannibal. But now -- why, the Negro girls love to go out with us. They come up to us on the street and tell us they are proud of us because we are Africans."

A Negro businessman was quoted in the same article: "Half a dozen years ago the Negroes were still ashamed of their African heritage; they wanted nothing to do with people who, they felt, had just come out of the trees. But practically all Africa won its freedom while American Negroes were still fighting for the right to sit at lunch counters. Africans are big men in Harlem now."

What caused white and black Americans alike to regard Africans as "cannibals" and people who "had just come out of the trees?" Why are Africans regarded differently today? How has the whole myth of African savagery been tied in with American Negro characteristics? A partial answer to these big questions can be found by a brief examination of the history of the motion-picture industry's treatment of the Negro as a performer and as subject matter for films. (Hollywood films do not bear the total responsibility, of course, for anti-Negro prejudices but they have played a significant role in creating the stereotyped image of Negroes which most Americans accepted for at least the first half of this century.)

Hollywood Perpetuates the Stereotype

During the early years of silent films (about 1900-1920) all Negroes in movies were played by whites who darkened their skin with burnt cork. The roles played by these pseudo-Negroes were either

stupid, comical characters or Uncle Toms, the devoted slave who loved his master and "knew his place." In 1914, for the first time, a movie about Negroes actually contained real Negro actors. From then on, with the notable exceptions of "Birth of a Nation" and a few others, the practice of burnt-cork whites was gradually dropped.

This pattern will be repeated many times during the subsequent years. Along with progressive innovations, the old distortions still appear. Bad habits die hard in Hollywood -- as elsewhere.

After World War I, D.W.Griffiths, who had already marked the Negro as an arch villain in "Birth of a Nation," started the portrayal of comic Negroes as frightened, cowardly ignoramuses. Another series of films during the 1920's used Negroes as savage cannibals and head-hunters. This helped spread the belief that colored persons belonged in the jungles with wild animals. Generally speaking, the 1920's featured Negroes as servants, savages and, occasionally, as scoundrels.

In 1926 the development of sound, synchronized with the film strip, created a revolution in Hollywood. Sound brought the Negro a new role and provided more jobs. Unfortunately, the new era did not have a very auspicious beginning: the first feature-length talkie, the "Jazz Singer," featured Al Jolson singing Southern-style songs with his face blackened in the traditional burnt-cork manner. But Hollywood, eager to exploit its new technique to the fullest, was quick to see the commercial possibilities of Negro entertainers. In many of the all-talking, all-singing, all-dancing epics, Negro singers, dancers and jazz musicians were imported from Broadway and featured prominently. This forward step had its backward connotations -- it reinforced the American myth that the Negro was a happy-go-lucky, laughing, singing child of nature who spent his life rolling his eyes comically and grinning stupidly at the world.

During the 1930's Hollywood films, reflecting the radical social moods in the United States, produced some admirable departures from the standard stereotypes. Again, these few fine films, incorporating realistic and sympathetic treatments of the Negro, were swamped by a mass of movies depicting the Negro as a half-witted animal.

The themes employed during the 1940's were influenced by the needs of World War II and the desire to promote and depict national unity. During this period Negroes were pushing the "Double V Campaign" -- victory abroad against fascism and victory at home against racism. A number of good films about Negroes were made but they were balanced by the usual tripe. (A good example of the old stereotype was "Gone With the Wind.")

New Developments

Since the end of World War II there have been some shifts in Hollywood's treatment of Negroes as performers and as subject matter. The changes have come about for a number of reasons: intense rivalry

with the new television industry, the importance of the foreign market, policy needs of the U.S. State Department, increased purchasing power of the Negro market and the pressures of the Negro struggle in this country.

For many years Negro performers fought for equal opportunity in the film industry and also for recognition of Negroes as human beings with full dignity. Many outstanding performers turned down roles or turned their backs on Hollywood completely rather than portray stupid servants, scary savages or sly scoundrels. (I interviewed Lena Horne for my high-school newspaper and was very impressed by her impassioned remarks about Hollywood's treatment of Negroes. She had fought for years to play the role of a mulatto in the film "Show Boat" -- but with its usual logic, Hollywood cast a fair-skinned white woman in that role.)

The struggle of individual Negro performers was magnified a thousandfold by the civil-rights revolt that surged up during the last years of the 1950's. With the merging of film and television production, the Freedom Now struggle has affected TV as well as the motion picture. For example, the December 31, 1963, Detroit Free Press reported: "Negro performers have found more and more jobs open to them in television and movies since last summer's racial clashes. The film, 'The New Interns,' will boast some 20 Negro performers.

The December 29, 1963, New York Times reported on a campaign of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP] to gain more jobs within the film industry and gain a fairer treatment of Negroes as subjects of films. "Almost every year for a quarter of a century there had been meetings between representatives of the studios and local Negro organizations. These sessions invariably ended with glib promises -- followed by a few more jobs as extras or as bit players for Negroes."

But in 1963 there was a change. "The N.A.A.C.P. made it clear that the time for stalling was over. It vowed to stage mass demonstrations at theaters, studios and at the New York offices of top executives. . . Soon producers and directors were trying frantically to use Negroes in sequences. No longer were there scenes of large cities or major league baseball parks that did not have a single Negro in sight."

Read that last sentence again.

Incredible as it may seem to people who know that it is virtually impossible to photograph an urban street without showing at least a few Negroes, motion pictures and television for years perpetuated a "whites only" myth. By distortions, by omissions, by outright lies the movie and television screens presented a picture of American life that dehumanized, degraded or excluded the Negro.

Two early TV programs that featured Negroes picked up the old

Hollywood stereotypes: "Amos and Andy" featured two white men with blackened faces and "Beulah" was about a maid who loved her masters dearly.

During 1963 a number of breakthroughs were made in TV dramatic programs and commercials as noted above. Michael H. Dann, vice-president and programming director for the Columbia Broadcasting System, predicted at that time "there will be no role in television that will not be occupied by Negroes in the years to come." Many Negroes were skeptical; the game of token integration had been played too often. Their skepticism was warranted.

During the 1964 season there was no TV program which included a Negro as a regular member of the cast although the previous year "East Side, West Side" featured a Negro actress in a continuing role. By the end of 1964 a report from the New York Society for Ethical Culture praised the networks for their civil-rights documentaries (which reflected the Freedom Now struggles going on) and for their increased use of Negroes in commercials but criticized other aspects of TV programming. Daytime serials focussed on white, middle class, Protestant families. Children's shows presented either "stereotyped images of Negroes or no Negroes at all." Entertainment shows were "lily-white."

The study concluded that "the industry will make changes according to the amount and kind of pressure generated by groups fighting for civil rights. Should the pressure diminish, the industry will decrease the appearance of Negroes."

THE ETHIOPIAN STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

[The following interview was granted by Petros Desta, one of the leaders of the Ethiopian People's Movement Council, to Sirio Di Giuliomaria, Rome correspondent of World Outlook.]

* * *

Question: What is the program and aims of the Ethiopian People's Movement Council?

Abswer: Above all the aims of the Ethiopian People's Movement Council are to liquidate the vestiges of absolute monarchy and feudalism. The program of our party is an honest one. It is not only based on the needs of Ethiopians of all walks of life but is also socialist in content. We are fighting to establish the Republic of Ethiopia; to abolish once and for all the feudal system which has kept our people in subhuman conditions; to effect a radical agrarian reform; to establish a real people's power; and to solve the national minority questions. These are our fundamental aims.

Q: How does your movement fit into the African revolution in its functioning and actions?

A: Ethiopia is one of the oldest nations in Africa. Her untouched natural resources and location in one of the most important parts of Africa, make it possible for her to play an eminent role in the development of the African revolution. Our movement was one of the first to openly call for the formation of International and African brigades to support the Congolese Revolution. Our party enjoys tremendous support and respect among the advanced African revolutionaries. The victory of the Ethiopian workers and peasants over the feudal regime will in turn deal a blow against the imperialist infiltration in Africa. The Ethiopian People's Movement Council has participated in several African conferences and has contributed a great deal to furthering the African revolution.

Q: What are the repercussions of the Sino-Soviet conflict among the African revolutionary movements?

A: It is very hard to say what are the repercussions of the Sino-Soviet conflict in the African revolution. There are many who openly support the Soviet side, while others support China. Some support one side purely for ideological reasons; others offer support for the interest they gain. In doing this they achieve nothing but adding fuel to the flames. As far as we are concerned, we do not support either side, at least for the time being. We support those who deserve the backing of all progressive forces.

Q: Are there signs of increasing maturity of the peasants in Ethiopia? Can you give us any facts on this process?

A: Yes, there are signs of increasing maturity among the Ethiopian peasants. They don't blame their dead father for having left them nothing. They are openly talking now about the need to take the land and to send the greedy landlords to their graves. One of the recent examples of the increasing maturity of the Ethiopian peasants was their participation in the demonstration organized by the students calling for agrarian reform at the end of last month in Addis Ababa itself. Above all the Ethiopian People's Movement Council is transforming their old way of thinking, overcoming their rubbish collection of memories. They are now the potential revolutionary force of the country. To those who have no confidence in the people's power, the Ethiopian peasants will give a fitting answer in the near future. The Ethiopian peasants, under the leadership of their party, the EPMC, will bring more changes to Ethiopia than one can imagine.

Q: What is the influence of the Eritrean struggle on the present political struggle in Ethiopia?

A: The Eritrean Liberation Movement brought some growing awareness to the country. But the Ethiopian people are not yet well informed about their brothers' struggle. However, the armed struggle

waged by the Eritreans against the despotic regime of Ethiopia will have a big influence on the political situation in Ethiopia. We would like to remind you that Ethiopia is not a homogeneous nation. All national minorities will soon follow the example of Eritrea.

Unless some kind of agreement is reached to co-ordinate the struggle and to educate the people in the most scientific way why they should fight and whom they should fight, no movement will go far. It only serves the feudalists to stir up the chauvinistic feelings of one group against the other. The formation of a United Front on a basis of equality will further the struggle both in Ethiopia and Eritrea. Our party spared neither time nor energy in support of the just cause of the minorities.

The minorities must use their guns against the imperial oppressive forces, but not against the Ethiopian people who are themselves oppressed. In Ethiopia a primitive patriotism still exists; therefore, unless a United Front is formed to give the movement a real representative view, the separate struggle of our Eritrean brothers will be very hard, however determined they are and however hard they fight.

To us, the Eritreans are dearest and nearest. We don't want to govern them against their will. We have never had this intention and never will. We are not responsible for the regrettable situation of today. It is a crime committed by the Ethiopian feudo-capitalist regime, which is equally our main enemy.

THE SLL YIELDS AGAIN TO IMPERIALIST PRESSURE

By Joseph Hansen

To most of the world, the crisis over Vietnam appears to be one of the most dangerous humanity has faced since the end of World War II. It may be the beginning of a chain reaction leading to a nuclear holocaust. The key to the entire international situation, it has led to the sharpest differences at the moment in the Sino-Soviet dispute; it has brought the Cuban revolutionary leaders to a new level in emphasizing their independent position; it has precipitated a crisis in ruling circles in the United States; it has touched off a great wave of protests in all countries, not least of all among the American people. Revolutionists everywhere have sought to rise to the occasion, voicing and mobilizing the most effective possible opposition to the warmongering course of American imperialism.

There is one rather singular exception to this universal reaction to Johnson's "escalation" of the war in Southeast Asia -- the leadership of the British Socialist Labour League. Although their policies are generally quite ultraleftist, in this case they have display-

ed none of their usual frenetic excitement. In fact they are models of phlegmatism.

Their first reaction, when President Johnson ordered American planes to undertake "reprisal" bombings in North Vietnam February 7 and 8, offered promise of a reasonable facsimile of the revolutionary socialism which they claim to adhere to.

In The Newsletter of February 13, for instance, an article of a column and a half by Cliff Slaughter appeared under the attractive title "Hands off Vietnam!" It could be argued that it was a serious editorial mistake to shove this to one side of the front page, giving it only secondary importance,* but at least it was a beginning in the right direction.

The slogans recommended by Slaughter were "No Secret Diplomacy! Demonstrate to Stop the U.S. Bombing Attacks! Stop the Labour Government's Support for the War in Vietnam! Withdraw all British and American Troops from Southeast Asia! Hands Off the People of Vietnam!" These were correct, although one might wonder at the reasons for placing "No Secret Diplomacy!" at the head of the list in view of the actual situation at the time.

An additional article by Sarath Kumar appeared on page three. We will return to this.

In the February 20 issue of The Newsletter, the space devoted to the Vietnam crisis was much reduced, which is perhaps understandable from the viewpoint of routine journalism since the single article dealing with the subject was nothing but a report of a speech given by Cliff Slaughter in which he repeated what he had written in the previous issue.

In the February 27 issue, the editors of The Newsletter pushed the Vietnam crisis farther down the front page into a third- or fourth-rate position. The readers were offered a statement by the "International Committee," a joint organism of the Socialist Labour League and the French Verité group.** This statement, which is brief

*The main headline read "CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE." This referred to the failure of the capitalist press to report a lobbying demonstration of 1,000 aged persons and members of the Young Socialists for an immediate rise and back-dating of old-age pensions.

**The majority of the International Committee of the Fourth International joined with the International Secretariat in 1963 at a Reunification Congress that brought the majority of the world Trotskyist movement together after a ten-year split. The SLL and the Verité group rejected an invitation to participate, refusing to even send observers. They alleged that outside of themselves most of the international Trotskyist movement had gone "centrist." They then set up a rump "International Committee."

but not too bad, ends up with the following slogans: "Hands Off the Vietnam Revolution! Withdraw All U.S. and British Troops, Warships and Military Aircraft from Southeast Asia Immediately! Stop Bombing of North Vietnam! End the British Labour Government's Support for U.S. Imperialism! No Secret Diplomacy! All Support to the Revolution in South Vietnam!"

These slogans, again, are good ones; the removal of "No Secret Diplomacy!" from first place being a commendable change. It is to be wondered why the half of the "International Committee" represented by the Verité group have not yet seen fit to publish the statement. Perhaps they were not in agreement with shifting the rank of the slogan "No Secret Diplomacy!" Or it could be that they decided to publish nothing until the whole crisis is over, when it can be analyzed in an atmosphere more conducive to calm, judicious and scholarly thought.

We now come to something truly scandalous. The March 6 issue of The Newsletter does not carry any article whatsoever on Vietnam on the front page. And no articles on page two, or page three or four (which are all there are in the weekly organ of the SLL).

What happened? Did the meeting of the "International Committee" prove paralyzing to everyone on the editorial staff and the whole top leadership of the SLL? Or was this a consequence of directives issued by the "International Committee"? It is noteworthy that one of the slogans recommended by Cliff Slaughter, "Demonstrate to Stop the U.S. Bombing Attacks!" did not appear in the list of official slogans issued by the "International Committee."

But this was the week U.S. imperialism dropped its mask about "reprisal" bombings and launched war on North Vietnam. The SLL leadership had nothing to say about the open move by the White House to start another Korea, a move aimed squarely at the Vietnamese revolution, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union!

The scandalous silence was continued in the next issue. This was the week the U.S. ended all pretense about only limited involvement in South Vietnam. The SLL leadership, these ultralefts who boast about their "Leninism," had nothing to say about the landing of the first contingents of U.S. Marines in South Vietnam!

In the current (March 20) issue of The Newsletter, a feeble twitching on the subject is observable. A routine article attacks the "Sham fight by 'lefts' on Vietnam." This is not about the shameful silence of the SLL leadership but about the weak opposition displayed by such figures as Sidney Silverman. The article ends with a paragraph repeating the slogans issued by the "International Committee." The author, Robert James, is to be congratulated for his diligence in getting them in the same order as the official statement.

Thus it must be recorded that the most militant and timely statement to come out of Britain on the crisis in Vietnam, the most

ably presented denunciation of the betrayal of the Wilson government in its policy in the Congo and Vietnam, was made by Bertrand Russell in a speech February 15 -- and this despite Russell's well-known adherence to the nostrums of pacifism. [See World Outlook March 12.] The Newsletter did not even mention Russell's fighting declaration, still less offer extracts or the complete text. Let not the pages of the ultraleft Newsletter be sullied by anything like that!

It is obvious that for all their ultraleftism, the leadership of the Socialist Labour League have conceded to the imperialist pressure in one of the gravest crises of the post World War II period.

How is this seeming contradiction to be explained?

It is simple. In their own way, the leadership of the SLL are reflecting the attitude of the Wilson government.

In foreign policy, Wilson chose to act the crawling lickspittle of the Pentagon and the White House. He has publicly given his stamp of approval to Johnson's course in Vietnam. But to make his betrayal appear plausible to the British workers, Wilson is compelled to do two things: (1) argue that the Pentagon is merely defending itself from the "attack" of North Vietnam; (2) spread the impression that the danger is not very grave and that he is taking "secret" steps to fix things up through diplomatic channels. He must try to keep the British workers from waking up to the danger.

While he has not succeeded very well in putting over his brazen defense of Johnson's "escalation" of war, he has scored with the second part of his line. The mass media in Britain have collaborated wholeheartedly in the monstrous conspiracy. They play down the danger; they play up the "secret negotiations." To read the British papers or to listen to the British radio, you would never know that Johnson is taking the world along the brink of nuclear war.

Instead of trying to break through this conspiracy, The Newsletter is participating in it.

The source of the pressure on the editors of The Newsletter could not be clearer. In the little they have written in a perfunctory way on the Vietnam crisis, if they mention the danger of another world war, of a nuclear holocaust, at all, they never single it out, never explain it, still less develop it, not to speak of lifting it to the level of a campaign.

In the only analysis worthy of the name offered up to this late date by The Newsletter, the article by Sarath Kumar in the February 13 issue, the danger of a nuclear war even appears to be dismissed.

Kumar's article, which makes some correct points about the policies of the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies, appears to envision that the most likely outcome of the Vietnam crisis is a sell-out by Peking

and Moscow which the U.S. will pick up, thus ending the matter. The perspective Kumar sees is: "The stage is set for some bribe-giving and taking."

What this far-from-Marxist analysis leaves out -- aside from the real aims of U.S. imperialism -- is the colonial revolution. Even if it is granted that both Moscow and Peking are equally willing to sell out the Vietnamese revolution, including seeing North Vietnam smashed militarily, do they actually have control over the Vietnamese revolution? And what about the repercussions of such a raw betrayal throughout the colonial world?

Here we come to one of the great flaws in the international position of the SLL leadership. They downgrade the colonial revolution. They are so convinced of their estimates on this question that they even made it a key issue in splitting from the majority of the former International Committee, holding that the recognition accorded by the majority of the world Trotskyist movement to the importance of the colonial revolution is a sign of "centrism."

We have now been provided with an instructive example of the consequences of the SLL position. By depreciating the colonial revolution, they are led to concede greater possibilities than are open to Peking and Moscow in meeting the demands of American imperialism. By believing it possible for the two bureaucracies to get away with a crass sell-out in Vietnam -- and that this will satisfy the ravenous appetite of U.S. imperialism! -- they come to the position that the danger of a chain reaction in Vietnam, leading to another world war, is not too great. In brief, their course of action shows that they accept Wilson's view of the reality as not inaccurate, whatever they may think of his policies, and that they therefore believe the whole question of American aggression in Vietnam is not as important as, say, the struggle for immediate higher, back-dated old-age pensions in Britain. Ultraleftism thus displays its opposite side, opportunism.

This is not the first time the SLL leadership have conceded to imperialist pressure since they split from the majority of the International Committee and isolated themselves from the world Trotskyist movement. A flagrant instance occurred during the Congo crisis. One of The Newsletter's featured writers echoed the imperialist propaganda about the Congo freedom fighters shooting "helpless white and coloured women and children."

When Ernest Germain called attention to this despicable buckling to imperialist pressure [see World Outlook January 8 or The Militant January 18, 1965], the editorial staff of The Newsletter reacted in characteristic fashion. A letter was published from a reader, W. Hunter, noting correctly that to talk as the author had about the Congolese revolutions was "to yield to imperialism." This was followed by a note from the guilty author confessing his error. And with that the unpleasant subject, like other things filed under the rug

at SLL headquarters, was mentioned no more. As for Ernest Germain! He was singled out for what easily rates as the most energetic campaign undertaken by The Newsletter in the recent period. The main danger faced by the British workers today, clearly, is the "centrism" of this "treacherous" figure.

Left unanswered is the question of how it was possible for the editor of The Newsletter not to notice that one of his main contributors, dealing with no less an important subject than the American-Belgian-British aggression in the Congo, had yielded to imperialism. Apparently the National Secretary of the Socialist Labour League thought it was sufficient to offer up a small scapegoat, the guilty author, and let the much more guilty editor go scot-free.

There is not the slightest indication that a serious examination of SLL positions was undertaken to determine how such yielding to imperialist pressure in the official organ of the Socialist Labour League could have occurred. No lessons were drawn about the dialectical interrelationship of theory and practice and how a gross error in practice is a certain indication of something decidedly rotten in theory. The unspeakable method of singling out a scapegoat was sufficient, it appears, to meet the norms of the SLL.

The consequence was that within weeks another and even worse case of yielding to imperialist pressure occurred. The Newsletter followed up its buckling in the Congo crisis by buckling in the crisis over Vietnam.

It is to be hoped that readers of The Newsletter as alert as W.Hunter will now write to the editors, demanding a change in course. We hope that this occurs and that the pressure will have some influence on the leaders of the SLL. Even at this late date, we should be most happy to see them open up a campaign against American aggression in North Vietnam, with particular attention to the real role of the Wilson government.

But it would also seem to be high time that members of the SLL began inquiring as to what is wrong in the positions of their leaders that can bring them into the parade behind Wilson, shuffling along in a paralytic way with their bedraggled ultraleft banners.

DE GAULLE BETS ON HANOI

General de Gaulle, who has shown that he is not unfamiliar with President Johnson's favorite game of poker, seems to feel that the odds are against the U.S. in Vietnam. De Gaulle's government announced March 16 it was offering Hanoi a five-year credit to buy heavy machinery in France. The credit is said to be \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000. The French in turn will buy high-quality coal from Hanoi.

THE SIHLALI AND MTSHIZANA CASES

[The following report was issued March 8 by the Head Office Abroad of the All-African Convention and Unity Movement of South Africa in Lusaka, Zambia. In several places, we have slightly condensed the text.]

* * *

On February 24, the South African press reported that Mr. Leo Linda Sihlali, a businessman of Queenstown, and Mr. Louis Leo Mtshizana, a lawyer of East London, were arrested in Rustenburg, Transvaal.

Both men were under a five-year ban and, in addition, Mr. Sihlali was under house arrest. They were taken back to their respective home towns and charged with breaking the conditions of their banning orders and attempting to leave South Africa without valid passports. Both men were remanded in custody pending the trial of their cases. Mr. Mtshizana's bail of £500 was estreated.

Behind that bare report lies a tale of suffering and persecution that should arouse everyone who believes in freedom, democracy and equality. It is a tale you will not find in the English and Afrikaans press of South Africa. A blanket of silence is cast over the organisations these men belong to and the ideas they stand for.

The First Victim

Mr. Sihlali was president of the Unity Movement of South Africa until he was banned, put under house arrest and prohibited from membership in any of the organisations affiliated to the Unity Movement. The five-year ban imposed on him also prohibited him from receiving visitors, and compelled him to report to the police at regular intervals.

A graduate of the University of South Africa, Mr. Sihlali had been a teacher in several secondary schools in the Cape. During his teaching career he became president of the Cape African Teachers' Association, which was outlawed by the Verwoerd government for opposing "Bantu Education." He, together with the entire executive of that association, was dismissed from the teaching profession when the new system of education was implemented.

Subsequently the Association decided that he should sue the Verwoerd government for damages for wrongful dismissal. This was in 1957. Several teachers affected by the judgment are still awaiting payment of their damages by the government. But meanwhile the government promptly amended the law to make it impossible in future for teachers similarly placed to claim damages.

We have given the bare facts. But these do not tell the fury

of the persecution unleashed against him, and the unceasing tracking down of an individual for the sole purpose of breaking his courage and spirit of resistance.

From the day he was dismissed from his post, his was an unceasing struggle. It became the job of that department of state, the Native Affairs Department [NAD], which controls and regiments the very lives of the African people, to deny him the right to obtain work, to find a roof over his head and keep his family together. At the time of his dismissal, he was teaching at a secondary school in Butterworth where, incidentally, he was born. On his discharge, the local Native authority on instruction from above told him to leave the area because he had no rights of residence since he did not grow up there. On returning to his home in Queenstown, where he had been brought up and had previously taught for many years, he was warned that he could not live in an urban area, unless he was employed, since he was not born there.

He took his young children to his old widowed mother one hundred miles away; his wife, likewise a qualified teacher, was also not permitted to teach, and had to find work as a domestic servant. For it is the practice of the Verwoerdian regime to visit the "sins" of a man upon his wife, his children, and relatives. Mr. Sihlali himself got a job as a labourer with a building contractor in East London. He had no sooner started work than the Native Affairs Department caught up with him. The police visited his employers. He was summarily dismissed without any reasons given. The NAD, invoking one of the numerous clauses of the Urban Areas Act, threw him out of East London as a "redundant [unemployed] Native."

Now his plight really became desperate. His children became very ill. He was unemployed. He was without a home. His wife was tied to the domestic chores of South Africa and eking out a truly miserable existence. At his mother's home in Kingwilliamstown he found one of his children, as he thought, dying. Against medical advice and his mother's objection, he decided to take the child away with him to Queenstown. But he was forbidden by law to live there. That night, like a criminal, he stealthily entered his home, his own house, there to sleep for the night. The next day he roamed the town, looking for work, dressed in rags to avoid identification by the police.

One of those freaks of circumstances happened. He met an old acquaintance of his, a Jewish shopkeeper who was running a hand-to-mouth sort of business in one of the smaller lanes off the main street, and to him he unburdened himself. With abounding compassion and human feeling, this white man offered him work in his shop. He could not afford to pay him a living wage, but he made it possible for him to remain in Queenstown and to live in his own house, for he was now employed.

The condition of his children deteriorated. His white friend

advised him to call his wife back to look after the children. He would offer her nominal employment. On medical examination the doctor found that his children were suffering from malnutrition. They were starving, a common enough disease when half the babies born yearly die in the location. His job did not solve his problem. On hearing of his plight, his friends rallied to him and with their help he opened up a small general dealer's shop. This venture opened up the next chapter of disasters. He and his friends knew this would result in failure; but in order to get the right to remain in Queenstown he had to be "gainfully employed." He had no business training. His nature and upbringing were in revolt against this kind of life. . . . the long hours from five in the morning to nine in the evening, the endless counting of pennies from the poor. This drab and mole-like existence was foreign to him and his outlook on life.

He soon sank into deep financial waters and his home, heavily mortgaged, was threatened with foreclosure. At this point the long-delayed payment of damages which the court had awarded him against the government was made. All of it was swallowed up by his heavy debts. But this gave him a temporary respite and made it possible for him once more to engage in his political work.

He had fallen foul of the South African police. From 1955 onwards, he was continually harassed by Verwoerd's agents of terror. His home and his shop were constantly raided, books, private letters and even business papers confiscated. It was at this stage that his shop was subjected to frequent visitations by burglars who somehow were never apprehended by the police. Even when he and his family identified some of his merchandise in the possession of notorious characters, the police were reluctant to make arrests and, when they did, the cases for some reason would be indefinitely postponed and the suspects mysteriously released in the end without being brought to trial.

During the general state of emergency in 1960, he narrowly escaped the police raids and fled to Bechuanaland. After a few weeks he slipped back into South Africa to carry on his political work, organising the people in Johannesburg (where he was in hiding, in danger of summary arrest, for he had no pass entitling him to be there). When the police got wind of this, he went to Natal where he continued his political work until the storm blew over at his own home. In 1964, he was placed under house arrest. Thus, he was politically and socially, completely isolated from his fellow men.

By now the older of his children had passed the lower primary and had to be enrolled in the higher primary school. No principal in any of the schools would accept them. The agents of the Native Affairs Department, which now controlled "Bantu Education," had got at them. He had to send his children to some remote schools in the Transkei where the school boards had not received instructions.

It was from this continual campaign of terror that Mr. Sihlali

was trying to flee when he was arrested.

He is now released from the tortures of "freedom" reserved for people like him; saved from the Scylla of a black man's life in the South African society of "free enterprise," he is plunged headlong into the Charybdis of the Verwoerdian dungeons from which there can be no escape. His children now in secondary boarding schools will be cast out for lack of school fees, to starve at home for lack of food, if indeed there will still be a home. Such is the life of a man who dares to oppose Verwoerdian schemes and who dares to claim the ordinary rights of a human being, especially if he is a black in that wonderful and sunny land of ours.

The Second Victim

Mr. Mtshizana is an ex-chairman of the East London branch of the Society of Young Africa (SOYA), an affiliate of the Unity Movement. A lawyer by profession, he figured prominently in the defence of hundreds of men and women charged under the Anti-Communism Act and the Sabotage Act. In the process he fell foul of the police and was himself arrested and charged with unlawful possession of a firearm.

Mr. L. Mqotsi, who appeared for him in applying for bail, vigorously rejected the prosecution's objection that Mr. Mtshizana would flee the country if granted bail. He declared that, on the contrary, his client was keen to stand his trial for he held this to be a trumped-up charge and that the revolver found in his rooms, in his absence, was a plant. He was anxious to expose the perpetrators. He was convicted by the local magistrate. On appeal, the Supreme Court set aside both the conviction and the sentence. The police served a banning order on him.

It was during this period that Mr. Mtshizana was arrested in the streets and handcuffed for allegedly failing to produce a pass on demand by the police. He was kept in the police cells for five hours. When he appeared in court the magistrate dismissed the case. Subsequently Mr. Mtshizana sued the government for damages for wrongful arrest, unlawful detention and malicious prosecution. He was awarded damages against the government.

It was not long before he was involved in one of those peculiar cases that have of late become a feature in the South African courts. Mr. Mtshizana had been briefed to defend a number of schoolboys charged under the Anti-Communism Act. In the course of his duties, he gave certain advice to his clients. The police held that this advice was tantamount to attempting to defeat the ends of justice as it was calculated to weaken the state's case. He was charged accordingly. The local magistrate convicted him and sentenced him to two years' imprisonment. While the appeal was pending, he was allowed out on bail of £500 on condition that he report to the police twice daily -- in the morning and in the evening. This was in addition to the once-a-week report in terms of the five-year banning order. This meant that on

Mondays he actually had to report three times -- once to one police station and twice to another. This has been going on since November 1963.

This case was regarded with great interest by international jurists. A member of this body who happened to be in South Africa at the time indicated his desire to send an observer when the trial came on. Mr. Mqotsi, who briefed an advocate to appear for Mr. Mtshizana, subsequently forwarded a report to this representative. The case was widely publicised in the South African newspapers.

He was still awaiting the hearing of his appeal in the Appellate division of the Supreme Court of South Africa when he was arrested in Rustenburg together with Mr. Sihlali. When this happened his £500 bail was estreated and they were both kept in custody.

With regard to the schoolboys themselves, Mr. Mtshizana never had the opportunity to defend them at the trial because on the eve of the case he was detained under the 90-day law and was kept in custody for three months. During interrogation by the police he was told, inter alia, that his crime was his continued defence of "saboteurs" and his association with the Unity Movement, which was an avowed enemy of the government, and which the government intended to strangle. If he agreed to mend his ways in these regards he would be permitted to continue his legal practice unmolested.

Mr. Mtshizana is the father of three children and has also to support his widowed mother.

The Third Victim

Who is this Mr. Mqotsi who appears for the defence in Mtshizana's case?

Mr. Mqotsi is the secretary of the All-African Convention, a body that federates mainly African Organisations, political, professional, civic, trade unions and peasant committees. He is also, together with Mr. Ali Fataar, a joint-secretary of the Unity Movement which federates African, Coloured and Indian organisations. The All-African Convention is federated to it. Mr. Mqotsi is also general secretary of the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa (APDUSA).

A son of a poor peasant in a village in the Ciskei, who sacrificed much to educate his son, Mr. L. Mqotsi obtained his B.A. Honours Degree at the University of South Africa, and his M.A. at the University of Witwatersrand. He, too, worked as a secondary school teacher and was an executive member of the Cape African Teachers' Association (CATA) until the Native Affairs Department took over African education and imposed the system of indoctrination known as "Bantu Education." He was dismissed from the profession at the same time as all the other members of the executive of CATA. From this point on, he

joined the ranks of the hounded outcasts. With his high qualifications it was not difficult for him to get posts. He soon found employment as a research psychologist in the South African Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR).

Within a month after he started work the police sent a report to the head of the council demanding his dismissal as a political risk. He was given a month's notice to quit. Then the University of Grahamstown offered him a post as a senior research officer. When his pending appointment became known, the officials of the Native Affairs Department, together with the Broederbond, who held high positions in the scientific field, made strong objections to his appointment, declaring that this man had been dismissed from the teaching profession by a department of state for his political activities. As a result he never started work there.

Undaunted he applied for a post at the University College, Fort Hare. He was offered a senior educational fellowship. This entailed research work at the various schools. The NAD stepped in. By this time it was in total control of "Bantu Education."

It made it clear that it would not have a man with Mr. Mqotsi's political beliefs enter any of the schools under it.

Let us explain here that Dr. Verwoerd, the architect of "Bantu Education," in his capacity as Minister of Native Affairs had published a booklet in which he stated inter alia: "People who believe in equality are not desirable teachers for Natives. . . . when I have control of Native education, I will reform it so that Natives will be taught from childhood to realise that equality with Europeans is not for them."

Since Mr. Mqotsi is a confirmed believer in the equality of man, and as it was a matter of principle with him to fight for such equality, he was obviously an enemy of the state, and an avowed opponent of "Bantu Education." He could not be permitted to come within a mile of the precincts of such institutions. He never got the post.

The only avenue left to Mr. Mqotsi to keep body and soul together was to join the ranks of the unskilled labourers. He posted his wife and children to her parents in the Transkei and smuggled himself into East London and tried for a labourer's pass. At this point the Unity Movement started a printing press in East London and published a paper Ikhwezi Lomso (Morning Star). He was put in charge of the press. With this his right of residence in the urban areas was established. The municipality, however, refused to lease him a house at the location. He moved in with friends. The police invoked the Urban Areas Act against the press itself. They threatened prosecution because under the law "No Native or Native Company has the right to lease property without permission within an urban area." The organisation then got two "Non-Natives" to acquire nominal ownership of the press. Meanwhile, Mr. Mqotsi started a subsidiary paper Indaba Zasi

Monti (East London News, a Xhosa-English weekly), in which he lashed out at injustices against people of colour. The police instituted numerous prosecutions for libel. He was acquitted in every case; but this was an unbearable financial drain, which was what the police reckoned on. The Movement came to his assistance, supplying lawyers and financial aid. During the 1960 emergency, Mr. Mqotsi was locked up for two months without trial. Meanwhile, the police had been intimidating the lessor of the premises of the press, alleging that the lease was unlawful since the company was, in fact, Native.

When Mr. Mqotsi came out of jail, he found that the lease had been terminated. The Movement lost all its machinery since no other place could be found to accommodate it. This raised a very acute personal problem for him, for he could not remain in the urban areas without being "gainfully employed." The police demanded his eviction as a "redundant Native." To save him, Mr. Mtshizana, a member of the Unity Movement, gave him articles in his legal office. He hated the legal profession but had no choice in the matter.

After two years he began to conduct cases on behalf of the office, joining Mr. Mtshizana in what had become a centre for the defence of persecuted Africans, particularly those concerned with prosecutions under the Anti-Communism and Sabotage Acts. This is how he came to be defending Mr. Mtshizana when the latter was persecuted, and he was himself charged with attempting to defeat the ends of justice. On acquitting him the judge commented: "There is something unsavoury about this whole case."

Thereupon the police served Mr. Mqotsi with a five-year ban, confining him to the magisterial area of East London. This meant curtailing his legal practice. For by then, they had built up a practice that extended beyond the town into the surrounding rural areas. A peculiar situation arose. Both he and his principal were now banned and therefore prohibited from communicating with each other. This is how the gross irrationality of the Verwoerdian laws have reduced even the legal processes into an absurdity, the depths of which are revealed in the above-mentioned case of Mr. Mtshizana. Those who still believe that rule of law remains in South Africa need only read a record of this case to disabuse themselves of this myth, once and for all.

So vicious is the herrenvolk in South Africa in its vendetta against the individual that it will pay attention to the minutest details of his life in order to degrade and humiliate him. Even though these two men were running a very big legal practice and had earned the respect of the population for their courage and concern for the welfare of their fellow men, they were not allowed to lease houses to live in. Mr. Mqotsi had to occupy a room in the worst slum in the location. A family of six lived cramped in this room where they had to cook, wash, eat, sleep and study. This was not due to shortage of houses. He was not apportioned ground on which he could build a house for himself. Such privileges were reserved only for those pro-

fessional and private entrepreneurs who were willing to co-operate and toady to the authorities in carrying out the Apartheid laws. It was then, because of close police surveillance over Mr. Mqotsi's movements, day and night, that the Organisation decided that, because he could no longer make his contribution to the Movement, he should flee the country. He is now a refugee in Zambia. His wife and children, unable to obtain travel permits to join him, had to acquire exit permits.

The Animosity of the South African Press

What is the source of the animosity of the herrenvolk press to the Unity Movement and all its affiliates, an enmity that forces it to distort news by reporting half-truths or suppressing news and thus presenting to the world a completely perverted picture of the situation in South Africa?

The All-African Convention, founded in 1936, was the first organisation that united all the existing organisations among the African people, including the African National Congress, into one federal body.

It was the first organisation amongst the oppressed people of South Africa to formulate a clear programme, the 10-point programme, demanding full democratic rights for all the inhabitants of the country. It formulated the policy of Non-Collaboration with the oppressors and instituted a boycott of all political institutions created for an "inferior race."

The Unity Movement was the first organisation that called for the unity of all the different racial groups of the oppressed, and actually united them. Postulating that oppression is indivisible, it adopted the programme and policy of the All-African Convention, and thus declared war on the rulers' policy of "Divide and Rule." This was seen as a threat to white domination by the whole of the South African herrenvolk, the Verwoerdian, the Smuts and the Liberal wings alike.

This is the reason why those brave men and women who fall in the battle for liberty are either not mentioned in the South African press, or reported simply as businessmen, lawyers, teachers or as individuals who are being tried for such and such an offence. The press cannot afford to give their political affiliations, for to do so would be at the same time to give publicity to the organisations to which they belong.

The whole world knows of Dr. Nevills Alexander, but no one ever mentions the following facts well known to the South African press, namely:

(a) That Alexander, as a student at the University of Cape Town, belonged to the Cape Peninsular Students' Union (CPSU) which

is affiliated to the Unity Movement.

(b) That before he got a scholarship to Germany he was a member of the Society of Young Africa (SOYA), a youth organisation affiliated to the Unity Movement.

(c) That on his return from Germany he joined a new political organisation formed in his absence, the African People's Democratic Union of Southern Africa (APDUSA), a national political organisation affiliated to the Unity Movement.

(d) That the people who appeared with him during the trial are members of APDUSA.

(e) That all the women in that group were members of the Fund Raising Committee of APDUSA.

In fact, when they were arrested, it was the officials of the Unity Movement who started the fund-raising effort for their defence and support of their dependents, long before the generous support came from the outside world.

We are certain that Dr. Neville Alexander, when he leaves jail, will be the first to raise his voice in protest against the attempts of the South African press to dissociate him from the Unity Movement, thus denying him his political home. Whatever he did or said, in all his adult life, was in the hope of advancing the policy and principles of the Unity Movement to which he was wholly devoted.

There are others of our leadership who are awaiting trial at this very moment. They are Mr. Enver Hassim, treasurer of the All-African Convention, and his wife, Dr. Zuleigha Christopher, chairman of the Durban Branch of APDUSA, and also Karim Essack. They were all executive members of the Unity Movement, and were all detained under the 90-day detention Act.

In this short article we have not dealt with the heroism of the landless peasantry whose plight is much worse than the people here mentioned. We have not mentioned the hundreds rotting in jails in the reserves without trial. Theirs is not a 90-day detention but indefinite detention, depending on the whim of the police. Little is known about the law of the country that gives such unlimited power to the police. We have said nothing about the thousands who were convicted for the unpardonable crime of protesting and resisting the evil juggernaut that seeks to crush them. For them there is no press to tell the world about their sufferings. Only occasionally, when a chief, a government instrument of oppression, dies at the hands of the people, does the press bruit it abroad, shrieking "Murderers! Savages!"

But there is never a word to tell how many of the long-suffering peasantry lost their lives at the hands of the chiefs.

Yes, the world learned about the army occupation of Pondoland in 1960 to subdue a peasant revolt, but not a word about the number of peasants who died there, or the women who were raped; nothing about the crops destroyed, the stock and chickens slaughtered and eaten by these gallant representatives of "law and order." More recently the army has moved once again into Pondoland. This time to stamp out APDUSA which they claim has captured the imagination of the population there and has become the new rallying point for the struggle of the landless peasantry. Once again the press is conveniently silent.

There is material enough in the reserves to fill any daily newspaper for years on end, but the world will never learn of it as long as the conspiracy continues between the Verwoerd regime and the so-called free press of South Africa, a press that seems to be free only to distort the news.

In conclusion we want to express our appreciation and thanks to all those men and women outside our country who generously assisted in many ways and have unstintingly given to our fund-raising efforts.

We appeal for more funds not only to defend those who are facing trial and maintaining their dependents, but to put an end to the intolerable life of a whole people whose crime amongst others is that they were born black and they refuse to live as inferiors.

THE FRENCH MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

PARIS -- The municipal elections in France March 14 and 21 were notable in showing the stability of the out-going administrations, whatever their political label. This held true not only for the small rural towns but also for the 159 cities of more than 30,000 inhabitants, including Paris, for which the Gaullist government passed a special electoral law in hope of polarizing the votes in these cities around the UNR [Union pour la Nouvelle République], on the one hand, and the PCF [French Communist party] on the other. Only 24 shifts in administration occurred, the main beneficiary being the PCF, which now counts 34 mayors in place of 25.

Two main questions are nevertheless posed: (1) Were the government's objectives injured? (2) What were the results of the agreements between the PCF and the PS [Socialist party], in which the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié] and various numerically unimportant bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groupings were involved?

On the first question, the answer is quite clear: the hopes of the UNR proved largely illusory. The unconditionally Gaullist formation was beaten in the first round at Lyon, Marseille, Grenoble, Nice, Dijon, etc. Its main objective was to win in Paris where the Gaullists

took all the seats in the legislative elections in 1962. In Paris, the old bourgeois parties (MRP [Mouvement Républicain Populaire], independents, ultras), after being beaten in the first round March 14, did not want the UNR to win a crushing majority on March 21. Consequently in several sectors of Paris, they refused to withdraw, permitting the slates of the so-called Democratic Union (that is, the PCF, PS and PSU) to win. The result was a municipal council in which the UNR now holds 39 seats, the Democratic Union 38, and the old bourgeois parties 13.

The setback dealt to the UNR should not be equated to a defeat for the Gaullist regime. To do so would be a sign of parliamentary cretinism. Under this regime, municipal rights have been considerably reduced along with those of parliament. The regime is not based on political groupings; the apparatus rises above these. The UNR is part of the apparatus; its men are interested first of all in the profits and perquisites associated with office. Already not badly nourished at the level of the state and its associated structures, they are likewise attracted by the material advantages to be derived from the municipal administrations and it was on this that they suffered a setback.

In face of the divisions among the bourgeoisie, the workers' parties, unfortunately, did not present a much better image. The Socialist party left its federations a free hand, in some instances extending this down to the section level, in order to make whatever alliances might retain administrations or gain new ones. Thus some of them made deals with the old bourgeois parties (Mollet in Arras, Defferre in Marseille. . .) while others joined in a common slate with the PCF and PSU (particularly in Paris and its suburbs). Also in some cases members of the Socialist party went against the decisions of their federation, those in Marseilles agreeing to a common slate with the Communist party, others (for example in towns of the Paris region) blocking with candidates of the MRP, independents, Radicals, and even in certain instances with the UNR. Even before the first round, there was a series of expulsions from the Socialist party, in Paris for refusing to join in a common slate with the Communists, in Marseille for doing precisely the opposite.

This ridiculous aspect of Socialist party policy reflected not only the traditional opportunism of the social democracy but also the existence of layers who have gone beyond this opportunism, now constituting a kind of layer of "socialist" technicians, appreciative of the "efficiency" of the Gaullist government and its institutions and not so distant from the "capable" men of the regime itself.

We turn to the election results. First of all, the out-going Socialist mayors who worked out their slates independently of their party's decisions generally succeeded in getting re-elected. The most flagrant case was Dardel, who won as mayor of Puteaux, a Paris suburb, thanks to bourgeois votes, and as chairman of the General Council of the Seine, thanks to Communist votes.

In Marseille, Defferre won on the second round, following a series of incidents reminiscent of the gangsterism in a Hollywood production, in a struggle against the joint slate of the Communists and a number of candidates in his own party who favored a Communist-Socialist bloc. Defferre won in five sectors out of eight. With practically no candidates opposing him from the right on the second round, he gained the votes of particularly reactionary elements, especially the "pieds noirs" who left Algeria following the victory of the Algerian Revolution and who are especially numerous in Marseille. It is also known that the Elysée (that is de Gaulle himself) intervened so that Defferre's slate would not be opposed from the right. Thus Defferre will make an ideal opponent for de Gaulle in the presidential elections at the end of the year. He was re-elected mayor of Marseille thanks to Gaullist votes which rescued him from the bloc of Communist and Socialist votes. The PCF has no choice but to find a candidate with working-class appeal to run against Defferre.

Another observation, perhaps the most important, should be made about the municipal elections -- the Communist-Socialist agreements did not attract strong support from the peripheries of these two parties. This goes against the usual experience. Municipal administrations were won; but the number of votes remained mediocre. The vote did not always reach what the two parties have previously gained separately.

How is this to be explained? The recantations of the Socialist party certainly helped to create disgust among many voters who saw in the alliances with the PCF, as in the alliances with the center and the right, nothing but vulgar, unprincipled and unworthy deals. But this is only partially the answer, the part involving the responsibility of the Socialist party. The other part concerns the policy of the PCF.

The Communist party denounced the unprincipled deals of the Socialists but offered no real perspective for Communist-Socialist agreements.

Although there were common slates with bourgeois and petty-bourgeois candidates, and although the bourgeois press dubbed these slates with the name "Popular Front," they were not exactly a new edition of the Popular Front. The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois candidates represented nothing comparable to their predecessors of 1936. They were only individuals standing for nothing but themselves, not being spokesmen of organizations like the Radical party.

Some of the joint slates could be said to represent a united front of working-class parties, but they lacked either vigor or bite, or attraction for the working class. In short they lacked a socialist aim. In an atmosphere of sordid electoral deals, these agreements proposing "democracy" sounded like nothing but the small change in the horse-trading. Who cared one way or the other? Under such conditions, the votes for such slates came from workers who wanted to

maintain class lines, but the slates themselves aroused no enthusiasm and won no striking victories.

BRITISH RADIO DRAMATIZES MOSCOW TRIALS

The radio audience in Britain is being offered a series of three dramatized historical programs of unusual interest. Dealing with Stalin's great purges that culminated in the Moscow frame-up trials of 1936-38, they have been prepared by Isaac Deutscher, the well-known biographer of Leon Trotsky.

"In my series of dramatised historical documentaries," Deutscher writes in the Radio Times of March 11, "the hangman and the victims, Stalin and Vyshinsky on the one hand, and Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Bukharin on the other, are the main actors. They speak with their authentic voices: all their utterances are taken from the official records and from archives, and, in a few cases, from eye-witness accounts. Khrushchev, who was among the hangmen during Stalin's lifetime but later spoke for some of the victims, appears in his dual character."

In Part I of the series, Deutscher introduces historic precedents going back to Oliver Cromwell. The purges of the Great French Revolution are presented and premonitions of forerunners and makers of the Russian Revolution.

"Part II," continues Deutscher, "presents crucial scenes of the Moscow Trials, acted out before the Military Tribunal of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., with Vyshinsky, Prosecutor General, delivering his fantastic indictments, and many famous defendants making their bizarre 'confessions' and declaring themselves guilty of huge, unheard-of crimes, which they could not have committed."

In the final part, the scene shifts to Coyoacan, Mexico, where the Commission headed by John Dewey heard Leon Trotsky bring forward evidence to successfully prove what seemed to be an almost impossible task -- to clear his own name and that of his son Leon Sedov and establish their complete innocence of the infamous charges levelled by Stalin.

The radio show picks up the famous revelations at the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party when the truth began to emerge in the Soviet Union itself. "But the story is not yet closed," says Deutscher. "In years to come we shall still be hearing a lot about the Great Purges because the revulsion against the Stalinist terror is now powerfully shaping and reshaping the moral and political outlook of the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe."

LENIN-TROTSKY CORRESPONDENCE

By Pierre Frank

THE TROTSKY PAPERS 1917-1922. (Vol. I: 1917-1919.) Edited and annotated by Jan M. Meijer. The Hague: Mouton. 1964. 858 pp. 90 florins [\$25].

The Trotsky archives at the Houghton Library of Harvard University in the United States, include a file containing copies of more than 800 items (telegrams, letters, documents), composed mainly of Trotsky's correspondence with Lenin and a few other revolutionists in high civil or military posts in the five-year period 1917-1922.

The International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam undertook some years ago to publish this material. Dr. Jan M. Meijer was placed in charge and the first volume has now appeared. It includes 435 items covering the years 1917-1919 along with extensive annotations by Dr. Meijer.

It is a notable bilingual publication, the Russian text and an English translation appearing on facing pages. The work is of the highest scholastic order. Dr. Meijer has checked the documents in the Trotsky archives* against those texts published in the Soviet Union, his aim being to verify their accuracy as to names, dates, references, etc. He notes that in Stalin's time not a single item from the collection was used in attacking Trotsky, although Stalin would most certainly have taken anything suitable if it had existed. He likewise notes that whatever Trotsky's reasons were for assembling the file, which contains only a part of the Lenin-Trotsky correspondence in 1917-1922, the selection made by Trotsky, as the collection itself shows, was not dictated by any likes or dislikes or the objective of bolstering a predetermined view. The compilation was intended as a contribution to the study of the history of the Soviet Union and, consequently, of the world.

Dr. Meijer likewise observes that certain previous publications of some of these documents were not adequate. He indicates the differences in his notes. Some of the items published in Moscow omitted the name of the recipient, utilizing his post instead. The reason for this is obvious; one can only pity the Soviet historians who were compelled to proceed in such a way.

* In 1924, Trotsky conceded to the demand of the Lenin Institute in Moscow and sent them the originals in return for a promise to send him photostatic copies. He received only 58 copies, which are in the Trotsky archives. The other copies were made by his secretaries before the originals were given up.

Volume I, which has just appeared, contains a certain number of documents relating to Brest-Litovsk. They do not add much to what is already known on this subject. (We are not of course referring to the Stalinist lies, nor to the distortions which the post-Stalinists still indulge in, but to the genuine documents on this subject, beginning with the minutes of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party.)

The exceptional interest of this book lies in the documents relating to the civil war and the formation of the Red Army. The second half of 1918 and particularly the year 1919, was the most crucial period in the history of the young revolutionary power, locked in struggle with the uprisings of the Whites and invasions by foreign armies. After having written his History of the Russian Revolution, which deals with the taking of power in October 1917, Trotsky wanted to turn to a history of the Red Army, in which he would most certainly have utilized the documents now published in The Trotsky Papers 1917-1922.

The years 1918-1919 constitute a period without precedent. Even in 1792, the Convention did not have to begin at such a low level either in the state structure or the army as the Soviet power. If a long-established government, whose authority is recognized by the people it heads, runs into such difficulties as to place its very existence in danger in a war, what must be said of a situation where a government's authority is questioned on all sides! Moreover, the hopes aroused by revolutions in Hungary and Bavaria did not last long. In place of receiving aid, the revolutionary power, struggling for its existence, had to seek ways of helping revolutionary Hungary.

These documents give a partial view of the way the leadership functioned at that time, particularly the way two men -- one at the center of the state which was being built, the other at the head of the army that was created in the struggle itself -- saw the problems and solved them.

The documents consist primarily of notes, written in telegraphic style. There is very little about political developments. (These were formulated elsewhere by Lenin and Trotsky in relation to their leadership of broad layers of militants and the masses.) They were not written with the aim of having them published for the education of the workers. They were exchanges of observations, of remarks, with explanations put as succinctly as possible in order to rapidly reach the decisions on which hinged many human lives and the very existence of the Revolution.

It is clear from these documents that the highest decisions depended at certain crucial moments on the positions taken by these two men. Not that the others did not count, did not voice their opinions, did not take part in the decisions, but Lenin's opinion and Trotsky's presence were in certain circumstances decisive.

The reasons for this can be grasped all the better through these documents as they reflect the chaos in which the power, the

Bolshevik party, had to operate. A chaos that extended everywhere. Army recruitment was often followed by massive desertions; discipline vanished faster than it could be forged; the various commands often proved deficient in capacities or qualities; transport and communications often broke down. Supplies were insufficient, arms and munitions were lacking where they were needed and ended up more than once in uncertain hands. Units organized at great effort fell to pieces from one day to the next. An enemy at the frontiers, but also an enemy within. Finally, particularly among the revolutionists, habits and reflexes did not fit the needs of the new circumstances. Quite often they proved incapable of remodeling themselves to fit the new tasks. Under such conditions, even men of great worth could not avoid being defeated, beaten, at times. Consequently they could not but appreciate all the more these two men who, in this chaos showed themselves to be the most clear-sighted, the most resolute. When they saw things eye-to-eye, their positions easily won general agreement.

On reading these documents, one sees the clear relations between Lenin and Trotsky, the reciprocal confidence, which remained even in the times when they differed. They constituted a tacit leading team, and one word is frequently repeated in these texts -- energy. They had to have an exceptional amount to overcome the weaknesses, the insufficiencies. Even among the most intrepid revolutionists, they detected "softness"! In the post held by Trotsky, at the head of the army, particularly in his function of assuring leadership on the fronts where the dangers were greatest, this energy appeared in an extraordinary combination of power of persuasion in some cases, of pure and simple authority without discussion in others, in repressive measures in others. A combination that had to be established in an exact proportion each time under penalty of losing everything.

In the gigantic chaos, the supreme law was the victory of the revolution. Innumerable sacrifices had to be made.

Throughout the advances and the retreats, the victories and setbacks, the vicissitudes that were such that at the end of 1919 catastrophe was but a hair's-breadth from victory, the two who held the wheel firmly in hand, Lenin and Trotsky, never lost sight of the objective of creating a new order. More than once they had to change men in responsible posts, modify an organization, but they never forgot the necessity of establishing a new state, a new army. What difficulties they had to compel respect for everyone's rights and the jurisdiction of bodies! When repressive measures were required, Trotsky displayed rigorous concern for rules and court procedure, to prevent arbitrariness so that revolutionary justice even in the severest of cases might be guaranteed.

Without attempting here to take up numerous questions raised in these documents, we will say a few words on two questions, each of which came up again after the victory in the civil war.

First of all on the question of the differences over the rela-

tive importance of the various fronts during the war. It is probable that military historians will discuss this for a long time to come. This will happen particularly after the foul atmosphere created by Stalin and his crew is completely gone, when it will be possible to speak honestly about Trotsky in the USSR. Brief as the documents are, the characteristics of each front stand out clearly. Petrograd came to a close the soonest. There the proletariat of the city mobilized vigorously in response to Trotsky's appeal. The Eastern front had the most disciplined troops. They were sent to the other fronts to strengthen weaker formations to such a degree that the Eastern front was dangerously undermanned. The Southern front proved to be the most difficult, both in terrain, in relations with the nationalities there, in the peculiarities of the peasantry. Immense difficulties were added by the conduct of the command there (Stalin, Voroshilov, and others). It was there that Trotsky encountered many obstacles in creating a qualified command that would gear its activity into the over-all measures taken by the government. Victory was finally gained, but at what a price. As Trotsky wrote to Lenin:

"On that side the turn-about has been complete. Not even a trace remains of the Eighth Congress opposition. It is true that people have not bought their knowledge cheaply. . . the Donetz Basin, Char'kov, Ekaterinoslav and many tens of millions of puds of grain." (August 11, 1919, p. 655.)

The other question was that of military policy with regard to the "specialists"; that is the former officers of the Czarist army, who were utilized in the Red Army. To succeed in this was not simple and there were mistakes, although not many if the circumstances are borne in mind. One of the greatest difficulties in this field was the hostility among a great many cadres and party members to this policy. The motive, undoubtedly completely sincere, was hostility to introducing methods of rigorous discipline which ran up against the spirit of free discussion that had always characterized the party and the first formations of partisans. But behind this pretext was to be found in actuality the incapacity among many revolutionists to utilize these capacities, an inability to sort out what might be useful in the acquisitions of bourgeois civilization for the construction of the socialist world. From this came complete rejection which was translated into hostility, a mistrust, most often unreasoning, toward the "specialists" and their proposals.

Trotsky vigorously insisted on the turn that must be made in this field. He emphasized very strongly the differences between the army and the party:

". . . The army is, to the highest degree, an artificial organism which always develops vast centrifugal tendencies. Whereas the Party, as such, can allow itself a certain limit in its internal differences of opinion, beyond which it breaks up; and whereas this limit to differences of opinion permissible within revolutionary parties is narrowed down in the extreme in the epoch of revolution, when the

Party is not making preparations for, but is engaged in action -- under the conditions of an intense and implacable civil war, such permissible differences of opinion are, within the army of the revolutionary class, reduced to the absolute minimum. The army is an artificial organism, and the unity of thought and planning which sustains this artificial organism must be maintained with a firmness all the more relentless the more savage be the objective conditions that tend to undermine the army. It is better to have in each division 10 Communists who have been delegated by the Party than a hundred who look on the army as an arena for discussion and for all sorts of group experiments." (March 1919, p. 331.)

The military policy advocated by Trotsky won out in the party, contributing to assuring the victory. But later a good many of those who had fought the policy made a complete about-face. Forgetting all the differences which Trotsky emphasized, the whole "artificial" character of the army, they became the fiercest introducers of military methods into the party, the economy, the entire social structure. The same men who had struggled against military discipline, became the champions of Stalinist bureaucratism.

The Trotsky Papers 1917-1922, because of the nature of the contents and, secondarily, the price of this edition, will have only limited circulation. We hope, however, that it will be found in the libraries of many workers' organizations. We hope, too that Volume II will soon appear.