

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 38

November 6, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

	<u>Page</u>
Johnson's Problems Begin -- by Joseph Hansen	1
Mass Arrest of Left Communist Leaders in West Bengal	6
Negro Vote Goes to Johnson -- by Evelyn Sell	7
Violent Demonstrations Sweep Bolivia	9
Puerto Rican Students Demonstrate for Independence	11
Sudan Demonstrations Gain Big Concessions	11
Japanese Socialists Criticize China's Bomb	12
The Shock Over Khrushchev's Downfall -- by Ernest Germain	13
America's TV Syndrome	17
Election Campaign in Nigeria	18
How to Break the Power of the Press Magnates -- by V. Karalasingham	19
West Bengal Left Communists Hold State Conference -- by Himoo Kalani	24
Ian Smith Backs Up	26
Documents:	
How Was Khrushchev Replaced? (French Communist Students Speak Up for Democracy)	27

JOHNSON'S PROBLEMS BEGIN

By Joseph Hansen

The scope of Johnson's victory was due in the main to the assistance given him by Goldwater. Johnson's Republican twin was remarkably successful in playing the role of the greater evil and at least in this way living up to the title of his book Why Not Victory?

In essence Goldwater's program did not differ greatly from Johnson's. The Mexican biweekly magazine Politica put it rather neatly in a cartoon showing the Arizona department store owner clad in a leopard skin, the Texas rancher in a business suit, each of them carrying an equally heavy club labelled "nuclear war."

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 38

November 6, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

	<u>Page</u>
Johnson's Problems Begin -- by Joseph Hansen	1
Mass Arrest of Left Communist Leaders in West Bengal	6
Negro Vote Goes to Johnson -- by Evelyn Sell	7
Violent Demonstrations Sweep Bolivia	9
Puerto Rican Students Demonstrate for Independence	11
Sudan Demonstrations Gain Big Concessions	11
Japanese Socialists Criticize China's Bomb	12
The Shock Over Khrushchev's Downfall -- by Ernest Germain	13
America's TV Syndrome	17
Election Campaign in Nigeria	18
How to Break the Power of the Press Magnates -- by V. Karalasingham	19
West Bengal Left Communists Hold State Conference -- by Himoo Kalani	24
Ian Smith Backs Up	26
Documents:	
How Was Khrushchev Replaced? (French Communist Students Speak Up for Democracy)	27

JOHNSON'S PROBLEMS BEGIN

By Joseph Hansen

The scope of Johnson's victory was due in the main to the assistance given him by Goldwater. Johnson's Republican twin was remarkably successful in playing the role of the greater evil and at least in this way living up to the title of his book Why Not Victory?

In essence Goldwater's program did not differ greatly from Johnson's. The Mexican biweekly magazine Politica put it rather neatly in a cartoon showing the Arizona department store owner clad in a leopard skin, the Texas rancher in a business suit, each of them carrying an equally heavy club labelled "nuclear war."

Yet Johnson managed to pose as the man of "peace," an all the more remarkable feat in view of his ordering the bombing in the Gulf of Tonkin at the very height of his campaign. Such a belligerent act during a campaign is unprecedented in American electioneering. In the 1952 campaign, for instance, General Eisenhower, running against the liberal Stevenson, took the opposite stance of promising to end the war in Korea, one of the few campaign promises in American history to be carried out.

The image of Goldwater as the brandisher of a nuclear club, an image he deliberately cultivated up to and after his winning the Republican nomination at San Francisco in July, proved to be his most damaging handicap, as he himself was forced to acknowledge as the campaign came to an end. He sought to change this, but could not succeed, as his efforts were far too little and much too late. Only if he had taken the initiative from the beginning in calling for a withdrawal from South Vietnam and promising to carry it out, just as Eisenhower had carried out his 1952 campaign pledge, could Goldwater have offered Johnson an effective challenge on this issue.

Goldwater could not do this because he committed himself to the most bellicose elements in American society and made himself the spokesman of their rabid slogan "better dead than red."

In this muted way the campaign served once again to indicate the depth and strength of the peace sentiment among the American people. This was undoubtedly the most decisive issue in the campaign, as became clear in the development of the demagogy of both Republicans and Democrats by the end of the campaign. Johnson began his summary by assuring the country about his "total commitment to preserve peace while protecting freedom." Of ten final promises issued by Johnson November 2 at Houston, Texas, the first one reads: "I want to reduce the threat of nuclear war, to maintain presidential control over our nuclear weapons, to strengthen our alliances and to advance the cause of freedom around the world."

Of the two men, the American voters judged that Johnson was less likely to press the button that could precipitate a nuclear holocaust. Nevertheless, the feeling was nation-wide that not much confidence could be placed in this sly professional machine politician maneuvering to make sure of the big prize of the White House.

In fact, despite the vote cast for the Democrats, the feeling was never so high that both candidates made a sorry spectacle.

This sentiment was voiced by the Very Rev. Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral, who told his congregation that the tactics and ethics of both candidates offered a sterile choice to the American people.

James Reston, one of the editors of the New York Times, said October 31 [in the international edition]: "It would be difficult

to underestimate the number of people who are going to vote for the President next week with a profound sense of uneasiness, not because he has removed their doubts or convinced or exalted them, but simply because he is the only alternative to Goldwater."

An Ohio clergyman was widely quoted for his observation that "each of them is the incarnation of the worst in his party."

This reflects a widespread opinion. The Gallup polls persistently showed that about twenty per cent of the voters saw no differences on major questions between the two candidates.

At the beginning of the campaign, much was made of the possibility of a "white backlash" on which Goldwater might ride into office. Those who took a more profound view of the class structure of American society doubted that this would prove decisive. Their forecast proved correct. The issue of peace or war turned out to be weightier than color prejudices.

Goldwater's cultivation of the "white backlash" vote invited a smashing blow straight to the teeth. It cost him the Negro vote virtually in its entirety. That vote has become decisive in swinging the key Northern states and cities and has become of increasing importance even in the South.

Here the economic issue acted in the same direction. Bad as things are under the Democrats for the Negro people in the way of jobs and opportunities, Goldwater did his best to display indifference and hostility to the poor. He advanced proposals such as turning the Tennessee Valley Authority [TVA, the giant complex of dams and power plants constructed under Roosevelt] to private industry. He promised to reduce federal expenditures that mean jobs for hundreds of thousands of workers.

Johnson took full advantage of the openings Goldwater offered him on these issues and utilized them to reconsolidate the Democratic alliance with the organized labor movement. This alliance was sealed by naming Hubert Humphrey, one of the Democratic party's best known liberals, as vice-presidential candidate.

Goldwater made no effort whatsoever to outbid Johnson in this field. On the contrary he singled out the naming of Humphrey as evidence of "softness on Communism," a McCarthyite line of approach that has lost its effectiveness. Even Nixon, who made his political career on this issue, was embarrassed by it.

Thus the trade-union bureaucracy which had difficulty swallowing Kennedy's choice of Johnson as running mate in 1960, fell into the arms of the political representative of "enlightened" Southern business and the dominant Eastern rulers in 1964.

Goldwater repelled the senior citizens, the old folk, who

might be thought to incline toward conservatism. He handed this vote to Johnson by opposing even the miserable social-security system now in effect. (The way America treats people past middle age is one of the disgraces of the modern world.)

The rural vote, where Goldwater appeared to have strength even a few months ago, was driven in the direction of Johnson by an ambivalent and equivocating attitude on farm-price supports. This reinforced the peace issue which is traditionally strong in rural America.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, Goldwater's proposed foreign policy appeared altogether too dangerous and adventurous to the Eastern bankers and industrialists who have shaped and implemented the bipartisan course from Truman through Eisenhower to Kennedy. Johnson showed himself acutely sensitive to this class sector. On the one hand he demonstrated his understanding of their basic aims by placing before them a most appetizing present -- the counterrevolution in Brazil last April. On the other hand, he repeatedly demonstrated his suppleness by gestures in the direction of the Kremlin. This combination of strategic firmness and tactical adroitness was appreciated by America's main ruling families. They made up their minds early and threw their full weight behind Johnson.

This soon became apparent in the extraordinarily powerful combination of the press, radio, television and "popular polls" through which opinion was mobilized and expanded for Johnson. Like magic, the egoistic, rather cruel, ambitious Texas Machiavelli was converted into the sensible, understanding, kind-hearted family man best suited to represent everybody in the White House.

The election results showed that the McCarthyism which dominated American politics for a number of years has continued to recede since the turn occurred about 1957-58. But the election does not signify a shift to the left. Diverse and in some areas highly contradictory forces (the labor movement and big business) combined to crush Goldwater's bid for power. To what degree various components of the popular forces are prepared to move to the left was not tested by the election. It did reveal that they are not pulled toward conservatism or headed in a reactionary direction. In this respect the verdict was plain.

The conditions were unripe for a mass mobilization around the program and banner of reaction. Goldwaterism suffered a stinging rebuff as a premature bid for power.

But the deep-lying trends which enabled Goldwater to capture the Republican nomination remain operative. The right-wing forces which took over the Republican machine have not surrendered or retired from the battle. They are rich, powerful, well-entrenched in the political apparatus and the economy. They have strong cadres and connections, a network of reactionary organizations. (The New York Times October 29 gave \$20,000,000 as the estimated funds avail-

able to these outfits annually. The figure is a conservative one.)

The fascist potential in the United States will remain like a time bomb; but for the immediate period it has been buried. Johnson, who succeeded in appearing as "all things to all Americans," is securely in control.

What can be expected from the occupant of the White House? In foreign affairs he will try to extract further concessions from the new Kremlin leaders by aiding them in whatever way he can to consolidate their uncertain positions. He will seek to solicit their tacit aid, if not direct help, in combatting and constricting the colonial revolution. He will also pressure the whole Soviet bloc.

The liberal Kennedy gave the world an armed invasion of Cuba and the involvement of the U.S. in the dirty war in South Vietnam, besides the Caribbean confrontation that put the world on the brink of nuclear war. Johnson will certainly not be more inclined to draw back after liquidating the Alliance for Progress, deepening the war in South Vietnam, threatening to extend it to North Vietnam and ordering the Gulf of Tonkin bombings as part of his electoral campaign. If he feels forced to draw back in one area, such as South Vietnam, he will seek to recuperate in others. His sweeping electoral victory gives him considerable leeway for a more flexible policy than has been followed in recent years by U.S. imperialism. It will certainly not be less reactionary nor less loaded with dangerous possibilities.

On the domestic scene, Johnson faces two enormous problems. One is the Negro revolt, the other is the economic situation.

After the big actions during the summer, the official Negro leaders succeeded in discouraging further mass demonstrations. The excuse was not to play into Goldwater's hands.

But Johnson's election was projected as a great potential victory for the Negro people. The Negro masses will expect something concrete from the promised victory. But after passing the civil-rights bill, the Democratic chief has no new legislation to propose, no measures to provide more jobs. Will the "long hot summer" be succeeded by a "winter of bitter discontent"?

As for the economy, Johnson wrapped himself in the plush mantle of the boom during his campaign. But if this should lose headway in the next year or two, what does he propose? How will he counteract the economic and social consequences of a dip in the "prosperity"? His token "war on poverty" is likely to start off with losing the first battle against unemployment which could not be substantially reduced at the peak of the boom.

One of the big questions now before the United States is the future of the two-party system. The focusing of the most reaction-

ary elements around Goldwater was a harbinger of what is to come. It will inevitably promulgate a symmetrical development to the left. The organized labor movement, like the Negro organizations, will be under great pressure to deliver something from the Johnson victory which they ballyhooed. This will be all the greater because of the reciprocal effect in the two sectors. The victory of the Labour party in Great Britain adds a further element operating in the same direction. Why can't the American trade unions do at least as well as their British cousins in politics?

A great cleavage plane runs through the Democratic party. The development of the class struggle will eventually convert this into a fissure. That, however, is something for the future.

The vote for the valiant Socialist Workers party and for the Freedom Now party (which ran in the state of Michigan) will not be known until the official results are compiled, probably some weeks from now. They met with a good reception during their campaigning, however. The Socialist Workers party reached hundreds of thousands with the message of revolutionary socialism and once again put up a strong defense of the Cuban Revolution as it did in the 1960 campaign.

MASS ARREST OF LEFT COMMUNIST LEADERS IN WEST BENGAL

CALCUTTA, Oct. 31 -- The West Bengal government suddenly swooped down on the Left Communist party [pro-Chinese] in the early morning hours yesterday and arrested nearly half the newly elected state committee, including its secretary, in an apparent attempt to disorganise the All-India Congress of the organisation which starts here today.

Those arrested, numbering more than 23, include the most important organisers and public figures of the party in this state. They also include nearly forty per cent of the West Bengal delegation to the party congress. It is significant that almost all of them are spokesmen of the more radical wing of the party who had won a decisive victory over the moderates and the centrists at the recently held state conference. [See page 24.] Political circles here feel that the government's latest action is also aimed at weakening the voice of the "extremists" at the party congress.

Criticising the arrests, a spokesman of the Central Executive Committee of the Left CPI said that these arrests reflected the government's panic at the growing influence and strength of their party, particularly at a time when the bankruptcy of the government's policy was being increasingly exposed before the masses. He declared also that the party congress would be held as usual and "the congress would follow the correct path to build up a Marxist-Leninist party in India."

NEGRO VOTE GOES TO JOHNSON

By Evelyn Sell

A recent survey by the New York Times indicated that a record Negro vote in the South this year will be solidly for President Lyndon Johnson. One old Negro woman in South Carolina told a Times interviewer, "Lordy, honey, I'm going to vote for L.B.J. He's a Southerner just like us colored folks, and the Good Lord must have sent him to lead us out of bondage."

The massive Negro turnout expected at the polls on November 3 will be the result of intensive voter registration campaigns carried on by civil-rights organizations over the past year. The expected solid vote for Johnson is the result of intensive propaganda designed to give credit for all civil-rights progress to the incumbent president -- who has a twenty-year record of voting consistently with Dixiecrats to block all effective civil-rights legislation. But Johnson cast his eyes on the presidency in 1957 and has tailored his votes and speeches these past seven years to grab off the Negro votes necessary to get into the White House. Many Negroes have been fooled by his recent hypocritical performances.

"This year the edge should go to President Johnson with our votes and the aid of a few white votes," confidently stated Hosea L. Williams, director of a registration drive that enrolled 10,000 new Negro voters in Chatham County, Georgia. In 1960 the Republican candidate, Nixon, won more votes in Chatham County than the Democratic nominee, Kennedy. In Tennessee, where the Republicans have been winning since 1956, a record registration of 200,000 Negroes is expected to bring the state back into the Democratic party control.

The price of voting or even registering to vote comes very high in the South. In Louisiana one frightened young Negro woman explained, "They said if I come back and try to register, they would get me and my mother. But I'm going anyway because all our men are scared and someone has to try." In Mississippi, Mrs. Alberta Kelly lost her job because she tried to register. "After 14 years I now find myself picking cotton for \$2 a hundred. I only wanted to vote."

It is courage such as this that has won civil-rights gains for the Negro people -- but President Johnson is getting the credit . . . and the vote.

Record Negro enrollments in the North are also expected to bring needed votes to the Democrats. Granville Reed, program director of the Chicago branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, pointed out that last winter's voter registration drive raised the number of eligible Negro voters by 39%. About 100,000 more Negroes will go to the polls in Chicago in 1964 than went in 1962. Mr. Reed predicted that 99% of all Negroes will vote for President Johnson.

The most recent Harris survey, released during the week of October 11, indicated that President Johnson would get 96% of the nation's Negro vote.

Despite these rosy predictions, the future is not too bright for the Democratic party and its office-seekers. Growing disillusionment with the traditional parties of American racism and growing reliance on their own independent strength are turning Negroes into new political channels. The new-born Freedom Now party, which is running a total of 39 candidates in Michigan, is providing king-size headaches for the old-line political machines. The Michigan Freedom Now party is still small, still in the process of building up its organization, program and leadership -- but it has already provoked desperate moves on the part of the established power structure.

The Democratic party has arranged to import Negro Congressman Adam Clayton Powell from New York so that he can campaign for the local candidates in the First and 13th Congressional districts. Powell has been hailed for many years as a leading militant Negro congressman and it is hoped that he can enthuse Negro voters in the First and 13th Districts about the Democratic candidates. The Democratic candidate in the First district is a Negro, John Conyers, who had a sure win in November until the Freedom Now party nominated Milton Henry to oppose him.

Henry has been meeting Conyers in head-on debates in which he has stated, "They're talking about the Freedom Now party in the East, they're talking about it in the West -- they're talking about it in the South and all over these United States the white man is afraid because black men have at last begun to acquire power."

The Freedom Now party candidate points out that Negroes elected to office from the two major parties are generally ineffective. "We want to send men into office who are free to articulate the wishes of black people."

The other Democratic candidate whom Congressman Powell is running here to save is Charles Diggs, presently the only Negro congressman from Michigan and one of the few in congress. Diggs helped push through the phony compromise at the Democratic national convention that denied members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party the right to be seated as regular delegates to the convention. He has always been faithful to the needs and wishes of his Democratic party bosses. Running against Diggs is the Socialist Workers party candidate, Richard T. David, also a Negro.

David and his supporters have been waging a door-to-door campaign in the 13th district, handing out literature and speaking personally to the residents. Street rallies have been held in the area. David had been a candidate in the 23rd state legislative district but withdrew when the Freedom Now party candidate was named.

for that office. He has urged all his supporters to vote for and campaign for the Freedom Now candidate and is campaigning in the 13th district where there is no FNP nominee.

David points out in his campaign literature, "At a meeting on Vietnam, Sept. 25, Diggs stated 'I am in agreement with the government's viewpoint in this area (Vietnam) of foreign policy.'

"As a congressman, I would introduce a resolution to bring U.S. troops home from Vietnam and other countries where they are used to support tyrants over the people. I would vote against the military budget which supports this present policy."

Yes, Johnson and the Democrats may very well win this election but the handwriting is on the wall. The creation of an active Freedom Now party in Michigan and the warm response received by Socialist Workers party candidates are symptomatic of the wish to break with capitalist party politics.

VIOLENT DEMONSTRATIONS SWEEP BOLIVIA

Rocked by nation-wide unrest, the Paz Estenssoro regime is seeking desperately to hang on and, if possible, to convert itself, with Washington's aid and advice, into a "strong man" government such as Bolivia suffered before the revolution began in 1952. The means by which this aim is sought are the usual ones. The armed forces have been mobilized to shoot down the opposition. A big witch-hunt has been set into motion. In La Paz alone, 700 arrests were reported.

[It was reported that Vice-President Barrientos intervened to secure the release of women and minors so that the figure was reduced to 200 political opponents who will be put on trial. The move by Barrientos may be part of a clever American manoeuvre to build an image of the vice-president as a more "popular" figure than Paz Estenssoro, thus readying a "spare tire" in case of need.]

A novel twist in the witch-hunt was the way in which the "Communist" issue was brought in. The government claimed that some of the arms used by the miners "in Colquiri and Huani" in defending themselves against government troops were "Made in Czechoslovakia." On announcing this October 30, Foreign Minister Iturrualdo Chinel claimed that the Czechoslovak diplomatic mission had been interfering in the country's internal politics. A portable broadcasting station had been seized, it was claimed, also made in Czechoslovakia. The government announced it was breaking diplomatic relations, and ordered the Czechoslovak diplomatic mission to leave the country within twenty-four hours.

Apparently the government decided to drag in "Czechoslovakia" instead of "Cuba," because it has already broken off diplomatic relations with the Cuban government in accordance with the resolution of the Organization of American States passed last July under U.S. pressure.

Among the Bolivian masses, however, it appeared that a different country was felt to be the one intervening in Bolivian internal affairs. In Santa Cruz, for instance, "mobs" were reported to have torn down an American flag October 27 and to have wrecked the U.S. Information Service office.

Through the blackout on news, it was difficult to piece together an accurate picture of developments in the sharp class struggle. Troops were ordered to march on the tin-mining centers where the working class holds a strategic position. The radio controlled by the mine union at Huanuni said October 29 that troops were shelling the town. At Sora Sora, said the same source, troops blocked a miners' march on Oruro. At least fifty miners were killed by machine-gun fire and many injured in a "massacre." The radio appealed for doctors, nurses, ambulances, Red Cross workers and blood donors.

In La Paz pitched battles were fought at the university where students had set up barricades. The troops overcame the defenses of the poorly armed students. The government was reported to have mobilized 10,000 members of the peasant militia in its support.

The miners' union called a general strike. According to one report, it was to be for twenty-four hours. A different report said it was "unlimited" and that an appeal had been issued for "armed insurrection." More than 26,000 miners responded but the leaders had called it off by November 2.

One of the union demands was that the state of siege proclaimed by the government a month ago be lifted. Continuation of the state of siege (under which constitutional rights are set aside and the government rules as a naked dictatorship) was one of the things that precipitated the current violence.

Ending of the state of siege was one of the main demands of the students in a memorandum which they sent to Paz Estenssoro October 27. They likewise demanded dissolution of the political police and respect for the trade unions and parliamentary institutions.

From exile in Montevideo, Uruguay, former president Hernan Siles Suazo cabled the armed forces not to back Paz Estenssoro. He called for the resignation of the president who rigged an unconstitutional election last May in order to stay in power.

All of Bolivia's major towns were marked by violent street

struggles, with casualties in the hundreds, as Johnson, the imperialist benefactor of Paz Estenssoro ended his campaign for the White House on a pledge of "peace" and "freedom around the world."

PUERTO RICAN STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE FOR INDEPENDENCE

A campus sit-down strike by the Federation of University Students in San Juan, Puerto Rico, October 28, to dramatize the cause of independence for the American colony met with the customary response from the Munoz Marin government.

Police moved in with tear gas and clubs to give the students another lesson in American democracy.

The students responded by throwing stones. They overturned and burned a police patrol car. Nine students were reported injured. Classes were suspended until November 5.

SUDAN DEMONSTRATIONS GAIN BIG CONCESSIONS

The popular demonstrations in the Sudan, which reached almost the proportions of an uprising, ended with deep fissures in governing circles and considerable concessions to the masses who had poured into the streets.

After five days "rioting," Khartoum was reported quiet October 27. General Ibrahim Abboud had dissolved the ruling military junta and dismissed his cabinet.

The general managed to stay on as the president but with sharply curtailed powers. A fourteen-man civilian group was in power. It appointed SIRR-el Khain el Khalifa as premier, announced that a new constitution would be written and called for the restoration of civil liberties and a foreign policy "opposed to imperialism and alliances."

The Associated Press claimed that the Communist party had emerged as a "major force" in the Sudan because four Communist leaders were included in the new government. According to a November 1 AP round-up of the news, the Communist party "encouraged" the "spontaneous" demonstrations and began working for a "national front" to "overthrow the regime."

"Gen. Abboud reacted with unexpected vigor," continues the news agency. "Army reinforcements poured into the city." Violence continued in Khartoum but by the week end the army controlled the streets.

"The front then called for a general strike -- which was totally effective, cutting telegraph communications with the outside world, closing the airfield, closing shops and even forcing army technicians clumsily to man the radio station."

Gen. Abboud was prepared to go on the air with "threats of a total military takeover unless the riots and strike ended." But after the speech was taped, "he faced revolt within his own ranks. Young officers, whose leadership is still unclear, ordered guards around the houses of all members of Gen. Abboud's military government."

The general then "gave in." He "announced the end of the military government and called in representatives of the national front to name a civilian government."

The new government has promised to call a "constituent assembly" and to establish a democratic regime. Its foreign policy will be one of "nonalignment." In addition, Premier Khalifa announced that 500 political prisoners will be freed.

The Beirut correspondent of the Daily Telegraph cabled the London paper October 27, giving his estimate of what had happened: "The Sudan has been shaken by the worst upheavals there since Kitchener reconquered the country 65 years ago. The Moslem north joined the Negro south in a rising against the six-year military dictatorship headed by Gen. Abboud."

With this promising beginning, the Sudanese people have demonstrated that they, too, want to catch up with the twentieth century. The next stages of the struggle may prove to be not long delayed.

JAPANESE SOCIALISTS CRITICIZE CHINA'S BOMB

While visiting Peking, leaders of the Japanese Socialist party expressed strong criticism of China's explosion of an atomic device October 16, the day the delegation arrived. Other disagreements were also voiced, but the sharpest clash occurred over this event.

On October 29, however, the Japanese Socialists joined in a common statement with the Chinese Communists denouncing "United States imperialism" as "the common enemy of the Japanese and Chinese peoples."

The joint declaration said, "The forces of socialism, national independence, democracy and peace in the world have greatly surpassed those of imperialism headed by the United States."

THE SHOCK OVER KHRUSHCHEV'S DOWNFALL

By Ernest Germain

While the mystery over the causes of Khrushchev's downfall is slowly unraveled, the new masters in the Kremlin, far from reversing "de-Stalinization," are frantically seeking to curry favor with all important layers of Soviet society. They have granted increased rights to factory managers, solidarized with the protests of the artists over Khrushchev's manhandling of the abstractionists, distributed the first white flour in a year to Moscow's housewives, and promised a sensational twenty-five per cent slash in the price of meat and butter. Meanwhile the uproar set off in the world Communist movement by the circumstances around the ouster of Khrushchev is still gathering momentum.

The monolithism of the various Communist parties was broken by the sudden destruction of the Stalin cult in 1956. The development of the Sino-Soviet conflict further shattered it. The blind allegiance to all turns and twists of Kremlin policy, so long characteristic of Communist parties in the capitalist countries, was dealt a new powerful blow as Nikita S. Khrushchev, first secretary of the Communist party of the Soviet Union and premier of the government, went down in a secret session of the CPSU's Central Committee.

The blow came as a complete surprise. Of course, there were many indications during the past year that Khrushchev's position had become weakened, due in particular to the series of obvious failures of his policies domestically (agriculture!) and abroad (relations with China and the cohesiveness of the world Communist movement). Nevertheless no Communist party in the world had been prepared or forewarned. And if the surprise over the October 14 action was bad, the complete lack of serious explanation was still worse. The attempt to cover up the real cause -- if only for twenty-four hours -- caught the leaders of the various Communist parties in one of their most vulnerable spots; namely, the continual accusation leveled against them by nearly all layers of public opinion in their own countries that they simply play the sedulous ape and blindly raise their hands to any "new turn" ordered by the Kremlin.

And how were they to explain things to their own members? The ranks had found it hard enough to swallow a number of events in the past eight years -- the shocking revelations of the Twentieth Congress, the brutal suppression of the Hungarian political revolution, the conflict with China, the Kremlin's attitude during the crisis in the Caribbean in 1962, the Kremlin's attitude toward the Sino-Indian hostilities, the sudden revelation of the crisis in agriculture in the Soviet Union, etc., etc. How could they now be asked to take something that plays havoc with the official party line on a most important question? How explain that the theory according to which development of the "personality cult" was a unique phenomenon, due to Stalin himself, which could never be repeated,

turned out to be wrong? Khrushchev himself began to reintroduce it!

The leaders of the Communist parties felt compelled to put up at least a show of questioning Khrushchev's dismissal. For the first time since Stalin converted the world Communist movement into a subservient instrument of the Soviet bureaucracy, Communist parties openly refused to accept an official statement of policy issued by the CPSU and publicly demanded at least supplementary explanations from the Kremlin, in some instances expressing doubts about the correctness of its policy.

The most striking reaction, the easiest to understand, came from the Communist party of Italy. Long discussion over the problem of "de-Stalinization" and Togliatti's so-called "testament" paved the way for the party to publicly question the "degree of socialist democracy" inside the Soviet Union.

Alicata, editor of the daily Unità, official organ of the party, wrote: "Our position is very clear and can be summarized as follows: We hold open reservations, are even in disagreement, on the methods employed in replacing Comrade Khrushchev. We recall the fact that it was not today that we posed to the Communist and labor movement a series of problems concerning first of all the necessity of overcoming the obvious delay in continuing the process of renovation and democratization initiated by the Twentieth Congress. Fresh evidence on this is provided by the way the latest crisis in the USSR developed."

The Italian CP at once sent a delegation to Moscow to gather additional information on Khrushchev's ouster. The delegation was headed by a member of the Secretariat, Berlinguer. In Moscow it met delegations of various West European Communist parties which were there for the same purpose and which had likewise publicly questioned the circumstances of the leader's removal. Among them were represented the Austrians, the Dutch, the Swedish and even the Luxemburgians.

The French Communist party hesitated several days, then finally joined those who questioned the "democratic" nature of Khrushchev's dismissal, also sending a delegation to Moscow.

The Danish, Norwegian, Swiss and Belgian parties joined in the chorus. Land og Folk, the organ of the Danish Communist party, published a series of letters from readers scandalized over Khrushchev's ouster. Party Secretary Noerlund wrote: "What was missing [in the official communiqué] was a word of gratitude to the leader who is leaving, a word which, in this instance, would have been natural."

One of the leaders of the Belgian Communist party, Jean Blume, wrote in the official daily Le Drapeau Rouge that the conclusion to be drawn from the latest events in the Soviet Union is that the

Belgian CP can react differently from the Soviet CP, not only with respect to events in Belgium, but with respect to events in the Soviet Union.

The Central Committee of the Swiss Parti du Travail [the CP] adopted a resolution, stating among other things:

"The departure of Comrade Khrushchev and his replacement have taken place under conditions which, ten days after the event, are still insufficiently explained. . . . One can only regret at the same time the methods used for arriving at a change, even if it was deemed necessary; the sudden aspect of the change, and the absence of clarity on the motives that dictated the change."

The British CP also displayed uneasiness over the circumstances of Khrushchev's ouster, lagging somewhat compared to other West European Communist parties. The London Daily Worker began printing letters criticizing the ouster, and party leader John Gollan also indicated unhappiness in an article published in the October 24 issue.

As for the Norwegian Communist party, it went so far as to ask whether or not freedom of discussion actually exists in the Soviet Union. [See World Outlook October 23.]

In the capitalist countries outside Western Europe, the greatest shock was registered by the pro-Khrushchev Indian Communist party. S.A. Dange raised rather strong questions and also took off for Moscow to get in on the ground floor of the supplementary explanations.

In the workers states outside the Soviet Union, leaders of the Communist parties moved more cautiously. Unrest in their parties could easily flare into a political crisis for the whole country. But they clearly implied their criticism by lavishly praising the prostrate first secretary in face of an absolute blackout in the Soviet press over anything favorable. (Khrushchev's portraits have come down from the walls, and his books and pamphlets have vanished from the book shops.) In general, CP leaders in other workers states expressed "approval" of what the Kremlin did, but at the same time praised Khrushchev, thereby combining submission and rebellion in about the same proportion as in other fields today.

The tone was set by Kadar, Khrushchev's stooge when the Hungarian uprising was suppressed, who literally owes his position to the former first secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. The Central Committee of the Hungarian CP met on October 23 (which happened to be the eighth anniversary of the 1956 revolution!) and adopted a resolution drawing attention to the fact that it was Khrushchev's merit to have initiated the denunciation of the personality cult and to have elaborated the "historical line of the Twentieth and Twenty-second congresses."

This is followed by the statement that "basing itself on the reports received, Comrade Khrushchev appears to have been unable to continue the practical work entailed by his post. It is regrettable that he committed errors in his methods of leadership and that these errors became more extensive because of his age and his impaired health."

After the Hungarian CP leaders, the Polish leaders followed suit, but not until they had met a delegation of the new Kremlin bosses headed by Brezhnev and Kosygin at the Polish-Soviet border. On October 29 Polish party leader Gomulka gave the Soviet leaders a clean bill of health for their "respect for the Leninist norms" in dismissing Khrushchev. Prior to that, the Polish press, too, had praised Khrushchev.

The East German CP organ Neues Deutschland likewise stressed Khrushchev's great merits and the "wise decision of the CPSU, not to deviate from the Leninist course of the Twentieth, Twenty-first and Twenty-second party congresses."

The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Czech Communist party said that "our party and our people have appreciated the activity of Comrade Khrushchev, linked with the general line of the Soviet Communist party in the struggle for realizing the policy of peaceful coexistence, as well as with the denunciation of the false methods of the epoch of the personality cult."

Significantly, the Soviet press has up to now failed to report all these declarations in praise of Khrushchev appearing in the press of other workers states, including Cuba. Only the Rumanian press has published them in full. This is only an apparent paradox. (As against all the other CP leaders in Eastern Europe, the Rumanian party leaders openly opposed Khrushchev while he was in power.) The Rumanian CP leaders are merely taking the dismissal of Khrushchev as a new occasion for asserting their independence from the Kremlin, established as one of the by-products of the Sino-Soviet conflict.

As for the Chinese and pro-Chinese press, the reactions have been cautious. However, it is noticeable that upon the ouster of Khrushchev, they at once stopped public attacks on Soviet policy and the leadership of the CPSU. As a matter of fact, the official message of congratulations sent to Brezhnev and Kosygin on October 15, signed by the four principal Chinese CP leaders, Mao Tse-tung, Liu Chao-shi, Chu-teh and Chou En-lai, contains the following significant words: "It is our sincere wish that the fraternal Soviet people, under the leadership of the CP of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government, will achieve new successes in their constructive work in all fields and in the struggle for the defense of world peace." [Emphasis added.] This is a clear intimation to Moscow that Peking is willing to resume an attempt to at least re-establish normal relations on the state level.

Significantly, too, the Polish leaders, who are said to favor the Italian CP thesis of soft-pedaling the Sino-Soviet dispute and avoiding any public excommunication of the Chinese CP, expressed the same wish in the common Polish-Mongolian statement issued when Tsedenbal visited Warsaw October 31:

"The two parties will undertake efforts to surmount, in a spirit of good relations between parties, the differences which have appeared in the international working-class movement. They consider that the ideological differences existing in the ranks of the Communist movement should not be carried to the level of relations between states." [Emphasis added.]

This implies clear condemnation of such ruthless acts committed by Khrushchev as the withdrawal of Soviet technicians and Soviet help from China, and the granting of military aid to the Indian bourgeoisie against the Chinese workers state, acts which were condemned by the world Trotskyist movement when they occurred. It is probable that the whole world Communist movement will now adopt the same position in an effort to prevent any further deterioration of the Sino-Soviet conflict and any further disintegration in the so-called "socialist" camp.

It should be noted, in passing, that the Stalinist leaders of the Albanian CP constitute an exception to the general tendency. While hailing Khrushchev's downfall, they have at the same time expressed their determination to pursue the "struggle against revisionism" until "all the revisionists are completely exterminated."

The reasons for this violent tone, although characteristic of the Albanians, is not clear. It has been speculated that they may again be acting for the Chinese. This, however, is at least a premature deduction. More likely they are alarmed over the tentative gestures toward rapprochement between the two sides. The "alliance" with the Albanians may yet prove awkward and troublesome for Peking.

AMERICA'S TV SYNDROME

In New York October 27 the American Academy of Pediatrics revealed a widespread new illness in the U.S. which it calls the "tired child syndrome." The symptoms are like those caused by anxiety: chronic fatigue, loss of appetite, headache and vomiting.

Children from 3 to 12 years of age suffering from the syndrome were spending an average of 3 to 6 hours daily in front of the television on week days and 6 to 10 hours on Saturdays and Sundays.

The reason for the syndrome was not indicated. It may be due to the quality of TV programs in the world's richest country.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN NIGERIA

LAGOS -- Preparations for the scheduled December election in Nigeria are occurring in a tense social and political atmosphere. The general strike last June [see World Outlook June 12, 19, September 11] was a very important event in the life of the country and it left a deep impression. The hostility of the masses towards the ruling layers is generally shown quite openly and the government is turning more and more toward outright police methods, above all with trade-union militants and members of the political vanguard.

Since the 1959 elections, the political scene has changed. New parties have been formed, splits have taken place; and it is possible that shifts registered on a regional level and at certain gatherings will find a reflection on the electoral plane. It goes without saying that despite an agreement announced here recently to conduct the elections honestly, there is not the slightest chance of preventing even spectacular trickery and frauds -- including, of course, the use of police pressure.

This is all the more likely since various parties dominate the different regions and each one will try to liquidate the opposition in its own territory. It is sufficient to note in this connection the manipulation of population figures for electoral purposes in the various regions. The census of 1952-53 put the number of inhabitants in the country at 31,000,000; the most recent estimates listed 40,000,000; but now the total is claimed to be 55,000,000 a figure that seems exaggerated even taking into account the high birth rate.

The aspect that appears most paradoxical in the elections is that the two parties which have collaborated in the federal government -- the NPC [Northern People's Congress] and the NCNC [National Convention of Nigerian Citizens] -- head two opposing electoral blocs. The NCNC is in a front with the AG [Action Group] in addition to the NEPU [Northern Elements Progressive Union] to which it was already allied in 1959. The Action Group, which retains greater popularity than the other big parties, held a wider distribution of seats on a national scale in 1959 but it was excluded from the federal government and later also from the Western region which it controlled for a time. In reality the Action Group is the only big party everywhere in opposition and its leader Obafemi Awolowo remains in prison under a very heavy sentence (even if a little paradoxically the main street in the Federal Territory continues to carry his name).

Against the NCNC-AG-NEPU bloc, which has taken the name UPGA [United Progressive Grand Alliance], stands the NNA [Nigerian National Alliance] which includes the reactionary conservatives of the NPC -- who dominate the North and head the Federal government -- and the NNDP [Nigerian National Democratic party] which was formed after a split last March from the AG. Samuel Akintola is the best known leader of the NNDP. Another participant in the NNA bloc is

the DP [Dynamic party], which claims to be socialistic but which in reality includes dangerous elements, even fascist types.

To complete the picture, candidates will be entered by the SWAFP [Socialist Workers and Farmers party], a Khrushchevist grouping which is running under its own banner after being turned down on its offer for an alliance with the AG and the UPGA.

The young NLP [Nigerian Labour party], founded by the former left wing of the SWAFP, has decided despite its recent constitution and practical difficulties, to run a candidate in Lagos -- the well-known trade-union leader M.A.O.Imodu. It will probably run a few others in another region.

HOW TO BREAK THE POWER OF THE PRESS MAGNATES

By V. Karalasingham

[The following article has been translated from the October 9 issue of the Samasamajaya, official Sinhalese weekly of the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary Section) published in Colombo, Ceylon.]

* * *

It is no more possible for the bourgeois press, whether run by private capital or the capitalist state, to have a healthy, socialist and humane outlook than for the College of Cardinals and the papacy in Rome to be socialist institutions or the Asgiriya and Malwatte Chapters* to have a revolutionary orientation. The one is as impossible as the other.

The choking fumes which exude from the editorial, news and features columns of the daily press are the poisonous emanations of the decomposition of capitalist civilisation and culture and their total elimination from our cultural life is only possible by the overthrow of the present rotten society. But the reader has every right to ask, outside the final solution provided by the socialist revolution, have you no answer to the power and influence of the newspaper magnates -- a power and influence which is so completely out of proportion to their numerical strength? Marxism would be a worthless dogma, and not what it is, a guide to revolutionary action, if it did not also provide a bridge between today and tomorrow -- that is, if its slogans and demands, while meeting the current immediate issues did not also by virtue of the very agitation for their realisation inexorably lead towards both the transitional and final solution of the problem.

*Buddhist clerical organisations.

The charlatans of the government, the former leaders of the LSSP [Lanka Sama Samaja party], who having abandoned the method of Marxism long before their final capitulation to the SLFP [Sri Lanka Freedom party] in June 1964, deliberately kept out of the party's propaganda the essential measures necessary both to protect and extend the freedom of the press and to curb the tremendous power of the capitalist barons. Not being interested in the revolutionary conquest of power, the old leadership did not use the method of Marxism to formulate a programme of transitional demands in respect of the newspaper industry. The result was that when the SLFP in July 1960 sought to create a genuine press monopoly under its patronage, the opportunist LSSP leadership gave this reactionary proposal its willing support. Today opportunism has given place to downright servility since it is now specially hired to sponsor an obnoxious bill which does not even make a pretence of fighting the press tycoons in the newspaper industry. A further consequence of this failure is that the broad masses are unprepared to meet the new offensive of the capitalist government. In fact the position is truly alarming in that wide layers are in support of a bill which though in form directed against the daily press is in fact aimed at the masses, in particular those organised in the trade-union movement.

Any measure designed to fight the reactionary press of the capitalist class must strike at the economic power of the private owners, and strike at it in the most effective and merciless manner possible. It must at the same time not assail in however a trifling way the freedom of the press, since this is a right in which the working class is vitally interested, and not a mere "abstract" right as made out by petty-bourgeois camp followers of the bourgeois government. The final requirement of any measure, and particularly of a measure which is sponsored by persons who call themselves socialists is that it must serve to promote the struggle against the capitalist class and also advance the interests of the socialist working-class press. These are the essential conditions which must be fulfilled, not only to receive the support of revolutionary Marxists but to establish the seriousness of the claim that any proposed legislation is intended to fight the press magnates. The deceptive character of the demagogy of Mrs. Bandaranaike's "leftist" hirelings is clearly revealed in the fact that nothing they have said meets the minimum desiderata already mentioned.

What gives the capitalist press its economic power and therefore its infinite superiority over the revolutionary press is the enormous revenue derived from commercial advertisements. More than the income from mass circulations of their newspapers, advertisement revenue is the source of their power. Equally the complete lack of this source of income for the socialist press places the latter in a distinctly disadvantageous position.

It is not only the poor circulation which keeps advertisers away from the revolutionary press. As a matter of policy too, the

big capitalist combines which advertise in their capitalist press do not desire to encourage socialist papers by advertising in them. For them the ultimate danger arising from the growth of a socialist newspaper far outweighs the immediate financial benefits derived from increased sales of their products. That is why they impose a virtual advertisement boycott of the left-wing press. But the revolutionary socialist press catering to the working class and toilers must be given the opportunity to participate in the revenue accruing to the capitalist press lords.

Accordingly the socialist movement must propose that advertisement revenue of all newspapers, weeklies and periodicals must be centrally pooled and this fund divided proportionately among both the socialist newspapers, weeklies and periodicals and the capitalist newspapers. By this means not only is the boycott of the big capitalist advertisers broken, the socialist press too is strengthened financially and a big inroad made into the economic power of the private press proprietors.

Create a Central Advertisement Pool for All Printed Advertising!

Share Advertisement Revenue with All Weeklies and Periodicals!

At the same time the power of the owners in the administration of the newspapers must be curbed in a decisive manner. Today as a matter of policy they set up one section of employees against another. Wages are determined not on any recognised principle but on the whims and fancies of the management.

In fact the award of wage increments is an important instrument in keeping the staff in a near perpetual state of hostility among themselves. By the simple device of arbitrarily picking on employees to whom special emoluments are paid, an elaborate apparatus of stool pigeons is maintained. Journalists soon shed all independence and even the best among them are caught up in the race to catch the employer's eye for his next increment or benefit. That is, they begin to outbid each other in serving the crude class interests of the employers.

This whole pernicious system must be ended, and this can be done only by giving statutory power to the trade unions in the different daily newspapers to determine wages. The press employers must be denied the right of fixing wages!

The trade-union power must extend not only in respect of employees actually engaged in the production of newspapers, like editorial, news and features staff, printing and technical staff, but the unions must also be empowered to fix the salaries of the executive staff not actually engaged in the production of newspapers. It is well known that whole classes of parasites called executives are maintained at inflated salaries and their functions are the

maintenance of discipline and the protection of the capitalist character of the newspapers by the determination of the broad lines of policy. The salaries of those categories not actually linked to the production line of newspapers must be scaled down.

Reduce Salaries of Parasitic Executives!

Give Trade Unions in the Newspaper Industry the Power to Fix Wages!

In respect of the profits of the newspaper industry, today both the state and the private owners appropriate them, the former by direct taxation and the latter by way of dividends on their share capital. Despite the prostitution of the press by the private owners, the planning, designing, production and distribution of a newspaper are as much aspects of cultural activity as any of the more widely recognised forms. Indeed the circulation figures of the daily and periodical press of any country are a fair index of the general cultural level of a people.

This being so, the unrestricted appropriation of an industry, which is basically a cultural pursuit, by the state for the maintenance of its repressive machinery and by private capital for the further consolidation of its economic power cannot find justification in any known principle. Clearly the profits must be utilised for the further expansion and diffusion of culture. And in the case of the profits of the Ceylon newspaper industry which is exclusively devoted to the dissemination of the most reactionary jingoist ideas, what can be a more compensatory and therefore a more satisfying way of achieving those ends of cultural expansion than that these profits be made available to the revolutionary socialist press of the working class for the spread of genuine socialist ideas among the masses?

Not only will socialist propaganda and culture be made available to newer and newer layers of the masses, but the economic power of the capitalist press magnates too will be completely paralysed, and what is most important, the socialist press immeasurably strengthened and stabilised to complete on almost near equal terms with the capitalist press. Severe restrictions must be placed on the distribution of dividends -- dividends to be paid only to those shareholders who have no other means of subsistence! The principle of a means test must be introduced and all shareholders of the various newspaper companies who have other profitable sources of income must be paid no dividends. The net profits after the payment of dividends to shareholders who pass the means test; i.e., needy shareholders, must be distributed among the socialist working-class newspapers.

No Taxation of Newspaper Profits!

Apply a Means Test to Shareholders!

Distribute Profits to the Socialist Working-class Press!

It is well known that the best technical equipment in the printing industry is the monopoly of the daily newspapers. But their job printing departments with their exaggerated quotations are available only to patrons from among the capitalist class. Even if exceptionally the price barrier is overcome, the proprietors shamelessly discriminate against socialist publications and refuse to undertake work from the left-wing parties. At the same time, they show no hesitation whatever in undertaking printing for the UNP [United National party]. The job department of the daily newspapers must be thrown open to the working-class papers and their printing must be executed at cost. The job departments of each of the daily newspapers must be allocated to a socialist weekly.

Open the Job Department to Socialist Printing!

Print Socialist Newspapers at Cost!

Allocate Newspaper Job Department to the Socialist Press!

During election time the newspapers must be compelled to apportion equal space to all parties. Between nomination day and date of polling, space in the daily press must be equally distributed among political parties and all election comment and reports restricted to what appears in the space made available to the various parties. By this means the interference of the press in elections is eliminated without infringing the freedom of the press since all parties in the space allotted to them would both offer comment and report their campaigns. What will be done away with is the fictitious impartiality of anonymous correspondents and leader writers.

Amend Election Order in Council to Compel Newspapers to Allocate Equal Space to All Parties!

In the proposals submitted by us for the consideration of the organised labour movement, the reader will notice the complete absence of any measure curtailing the right of free expression. But at the same time the proposals go to the heart of the matter -- the break up of the economic power of the bourgeois press, and the diversion of these resources, not to the capitalist state but to the strengthening of the socialist press of the working class. In fact both in the struggle for the realisation of these demands and in their realisation alone can the power of the bourgeois press be broken and the struggle against capitalism itself pressed forward. That is precisely why the government of Mrs. Bandaranaike, resting as it does on one section of private property, is so reluctant to proceed on the lines indicated above. To do so would be to undermine ultimately the whole basis of private property itself. The revisionists of the LSSP who have long abandoned the historic interest of the working class and are now contemptibly trailing behind the govern-

ment, in their turn, can no longer advocate genuine socialist solutions which would take the working class nearer its goal. They can only hire their dubious talent in the service of that section of property owners represented by Mrs. Bandaranaike, and therefore must increasingly come forward in support of proposals which a few months ago they themselves would have spurned. That is what is happening now! Mrs. Bandaranaike can well be satisfied that her new servants are worthy of their hire.

WEST BENGAL LEFT COMMUNISTS HOLD STATE CONFERENCE

By Himoo Kalani

CALCUTTA -- The Left Communists of West Bengal, together with their centrist allies, met in a five-day state conference here October 22-27 to consider the draft programme of the pro-Chinese Communist party of India [see World Outlook June 12], preparatory to the All-India Congress of the Left CPI, scheduled to be held here October 31-November 7. When it is remembered that West Bengal constitutes one of the three most important bases of the Left Communists in India (the other two being Andhra and Kerala) and that in 1963 it was the Left Communists of this state who took the initiative in organising the Left Communists all over India around a political platform of opposition to the reformism of the Dange leadership, the political significance of this state conference and its impact on the coming congress can be properly understood.

M. Basavapunniah, representing the central leadership of the left wing, placed the programme before the 365 delegates assembled. Sensing the considerable volume of left opposition to this programme, he made a very conciliatory speech, admitting its lapses, inviting "constructive criticisms" and appealing to the delegates to judge the programme as a whole.

Despite this appeal, most of the speakers were highly critical of the vague and ambiguous formulations of the programme on many crucial issues. These criticisms mainly centred around the draft's treatment of the Indian government's foreign policy, class characterization of the present government, the precise definition of the People's Democratic Revolution and its relationship with the socialist revolution, the prospect of peaceful transition to socialism, attitude towards parliamentary democracy, and the role of the different sections, of the peasantry and of the Indian bourgeoisie in relation to the People's Democratic Revolution.

The resolution, drafted by the leadership of the West Bengal party and finally passed by the conference, partly reflected these criticisms. However, it also showed that the left cadres, despite their obvious radical orientation, still lack ideological clarity

and also courage to defy their leadership when necessary.

The resolution can be divided into two parts. The first part expresses its broad agreement with what it interprets as the basic themes of the draft programme, while the second part puts forward certain amendments to it. However, the interpretation of the programme, given in the resolution, seeks to impart a more radical twist to it and differs, in some interesting respects, from the formulations of the draft itself. The following points in the resolution are worth noting in this connection:

(1) The Indian bourgeoisie is utilising the aid from the socialist countries to strengthen its bargaining capacity vis-à-vis the imperialists, to consolidate its own strength against the masses, and to subserve its own class interests within the framework of compromise with imperialism.

(2) Economic dependence of India on foreign imperialist capital is growing instead of lessening.

(3) In the realm of India's foreign policy, the anti-imperialist element is becoming feebler and feebler; compromise and collaboration with imperialism is becoming much more pronounced and, in fact, the neocolonialist policy of the imperialists is being aided by India. However, the Indian bourgeoisie has its own class conflicts with the imperialists; it is not absolutely subservient to imperialism.

(4) India is facing a People's Democratic Revolution. The ultimate aim of the working class is socialism. After completing the People's Democratic Revolution, it would be possible to enter the phase of socialist revolution as the next step. (Our emphasis.) (This is a regression from the Draft Programme which speaks of the democratic revolution continuously growing over into the socialist revolution.)

(5) The leadership of the People's Democratic Revolution will be in the hands of the working class, the People's Democratic Front being based on the alliance of the workers and peasants. The poor peasants and the agricultural labourers are the chief allies of the revolution, the middle peasants are close allies and the rich peasants, despite their vacillations, are allied forces. (In the Draft, there is no clear distinction among the different sections of the peasantry.)

(6) The section of the bourgeoisie having feeble or no connection with foreign capital has its place in the Front. However, the extent to which they may be actually available, which section of them and when -- all these will depend on the national and international situation and the strength of the worker-peasant alliance.

(7) The Programme must clearly state that the Indian revolu-

tion would be an integral part of the world socialist revolution.

(8) The Congress leadership betrayed the postwar mass upsurges in India, instead of organising and advancing them.

(9) Instead of saying that Communists defend parliamentary democracy, the programme should say specifically that Communists defend parliamentary democracy against reactionary bourgeois attacks to subvert it.

The centrists, led by Jyoti Basu, leader of the opposition in the West Bengal legislative assembly, fared very badly in this conference. The dissenting note on the Draft Programme, submitted by their chief spokesman E.M.S.Namboodiripad (ex-chief minister in the Communist ministry in Kerala) was not supported by a single delegate at this conference. The conference elected a delegation of fifty-four members to represent the West Bengal party at the All-India congress in which the centrists have only three delegates. In the newly formed state committee, composed of thirty-nine members, the centrists were mercifully given four seats by West Bengal's left leadership to maintain the alliance.

IAN SMITH BACKS UP

A stiff warning from the British Labour government October 27 that it would consider any unilateral declaration of independence by the Ian Smith regime in Rhodesia [formerly Southern Rhodesia] "an open act of defiance and rebellion and it would be treasonable to take steps to give effect to it," had the result of temporarily cooling off the racist-minded Rhodesian prime minister.

He shouted "blackmail and intimidation" in the Rhodesian parliament but backed down from his previous position. He said that a "yes" vote in an independence referendum scheduled for November 5 in Rhodesia would not be interpreted as a mandate to declare unilateral independence. Only registered voters, announced in Salisbury as some 80,000 white and 13,000 nonwhite, will take part in the publicity move.

The British Labour government had threatened an immediate trade boycott if Smith went ahead. This, according to Sir Edgar Whitehead, leader of the opposition party in Rhodesia, would mean a drop in exports at once of fifty per cent and would precipitate a depression as bad as the one in the thirties.

Ian Smith's aim is to consolidate a government in Rhodesia patterned after the fascist-like Herrenvolk regime in neighboring South Africa.

HOW WAS KHRUSHCHEV REPLACED?

French Communist Students Speak Up for Democracy

[The following is the full text of a resolution cited in World Outlook last week, stating the stand of the French Communist students on the ouster of Khrushchev. The resolution was passed October 25 by a two-thirds majority of the National Committee of the Union des Etudiants Communistes.]

* * *

The National Committee of the UEC met more than a week after Comrade Khrushchev had been replaced as head of the CPSU [Communist party of the Soviet Union] and the Soviet government. The committee discussed the event in the spirit of solidarity that binds the Communist students of France to the Soviet Union. Conscious of the emotion throughout the University and throughout the democratic forces of our country, the committee decided that it would be useful to make public its opinion on these questions. The truth is that in the struggle for socialism which the UEC is conducting, the image of socialism has great importance. The practices in the changeover place in question the value of the example of the socialist countries in the struggle for socialism. The solidarity that links us objectively to the Soviet Union places great responsibility on us in relation to the mass of students with whom we expect to struggle for socialism.

That is why we consider it our duty to state our disagreement with the methods which, insofar as the facts are known, were employed at the time of the replacement of Comrade K. More than a week after this exceptional event, the Communists and the masses of the entire world are still waiting for the true explanation of the change that took place. The Communist parties have been obliged to send delegations to Moscow. All those who are concerned about this event are left with nothing but the speculations of the non-Communist press. The official reason given -- resignation because of reasons of health, cannot be seriously entertained.

In the eyes of the Communist students, in the eyes of all the students who are interested in socialism, the methods by which Comrade K. was replaced pose in the sharpest way the problem of socialist democracy. How much participation is there by members of the party, the Soviet people, in solving the problems posed in the Soviet Union? How is it possible, eight years after the Twentieth Congress, for the phenomena which that congress sought to break with to be reproduced? This shows how much the problems of the Stalinist and post-Stalinist epoch must be studied in a scientific way, something that has not yet been done in a satisfactory manner, in such a way that the militants might be better able to understand, foresee and control events.

The uneasiness of the students with whom we work, our own questions, lead us to call for the immediate and complete publication of the minutes of the CC [Central Committee] of the CPSU for October 14, including, naturally, what Comrade Khrushchev might have said there.

Doubtless, the grave differences dividing the international Communist movement have something to do with this political overturn. The problem of the unity of the Communist movement is in fact a problem of the greatest importance.

The National Committee of the UEC holds that complete return to Communist democracy in all fields constitutes one of the elementary conditions needed to bring about the resolution of the internal contradictions of the socialist countries and the problems posed in the organization of the workers movement.

But this problem cannot be resolved, in the opinion of the National Committee, except by deepening and continuing the essentially antidogmatic policy, the bases of which were laid down at the Twentieth and Twenty-second congresses, which also pointed out the dangers of opportunism, and in which Comrade Khrushchev, whatever may be the criticisms lodged against him, played the important part assigned by his role.

The grave differences that have arisen in the workers international movement cannot be resolved except by deepening the discussion among the ranks before bringing the debate to a close.

For its part, the National Committee of the UEC, which has sought in practice to draw the necessary consequences of this policy in our organization, will hold to that line; we believe that there is no other policy for the Communists today than the one that came out of the Twentieth and Twenty-second congresses, and that our task is to go forward in deepening it.