

Approved For Release 1999/08/24 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000300020006-2

25X1C10b

25X1X4

Next 4 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 1999/08/24 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000300020006-2



## Significant Dates ▶

### DEC.

- 14 USSR expelled from League of Nations for unprovoked aggression against Poland and Finland. Twenty-fifth anniversary. 1939
- 15 Preparatory Conference of Communist Parties in Moscow [??]
- 17 Simon Bolivar dies, 1830
- 21 Joseph V. Stalin born, 1879
- 26 Mao Tse-tung born, 1893

### JAN.

- 2 Fidel Castro assumes power, 1959 (Sixth anniversary)
- 6 Pres. Roosevelt enunciates Four Freedoms: Freedom of speech and expression, of worship; from want and from fear, 1941
- 8 Charles de Gaulle inaugurated first President of the Fifth Republic, 1959 (Sixth anniversary)
- 10 UN General Assembly opens first session, London, 1946
- 11 UNGA establishes 12-nation disarmament commission to consider regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armaments and armed forces, 1952
- 13 USSR "Doctors' Plot" arrests announced, 1953
- 15 Karl Liebknecht & Rosa Luxemburg, founders of German CP, killed in Spartacus uprising, 1919
- 16 Leon Trotsky exiled to Alma-Ata, 1928
- 21 Lenin dies (Born 22 April 1870), 1924
- 21 Chicom govt orders Tibet representatives to Peking to negotiate "peaceful solution Tibet's status," 1950

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 1999/08/24 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000300020006-2

Next 20 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 1999/08/24 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000300020006-2

November 1964  
Reprint

Dolores Ibarruri's October Message

**Note:** The following is the text of an article by the veteran Spanish Communist leader, Dolores Ibarruri, who became known as "La Passionaria" during the Spanish Civil War. The full text of the article, which commemorates the anniversary of the October Revolution, was broadcast on November 6, 1964, by the Spanish Communist clandestine radio station located in Rumania. The article was also published in Moscow by Izvestiya on November 8, but the indented portion, referring to Nikita Khrushchev and the reaction to his fall from power, was omitted by that publication.

CPYRGHT

Each anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution of 1917 is like a new and moving page of the passing of time and history, like something alive and permanent, adding constructive experiences to the political and ideological reserve of new generations. Although these experiences are different owing to their origins and to the moment when they acquired form and essence, they are all united by the common bond of progress toward the future. These pages contain political events marking milestones, class struggles parallel to the heroic fight of the colonial people for national and social liberation, remarkable achievements and technical and scientific discoveries, structural changes and revolutions, and new forms of popular and national democracies. The constant brilliance of the October Socialist Revolution of 1917 illumines the essence of all this weaving and unweaving of these forms and ways of life.

And it is impossible to understand many present changes and political events if one forgets the great turning point for the world produced by the impact of the revolutionary October, the reflection of that impact in the foundations of the economic and political structure of the world capitalist regime; the political event of the socialist revolution of October 1917 has permanence and instructive effects. Communism is not a ghost; it is a live and acting force with influence, in one way or other, on the evolution of the political and social institutions of all countries, reflected in the desperate efforts by the ruling classes and groups in the main capitalist countries to coordinate and unite their potentialities in a hopeless attempt to stop the progress of socialism.

The capitalist countries were not able to avoid the establishment of socialism in Russia, nor its strengthening, development, and transformation into the fundamental political force of our epoch. They could not stop that after World War II, and thanks to the existence and decisive support of the Soviet Union, new countries separated themselves from the capitalist system to form the socialist camp, which today covers over one-third of the world's territory and population. Nor will they be able to stop the historical development of the people from

(Cont.)

CPYRGHT

crystalizing in new socialist formations that will not necessarily have to be a forced and artificial repetition of the existing ones, although they may take from them all that is useful and fit it into the concrete conditions of every country. By birthright, neither inherited nor bought, as in the biblical legend, but conquered in October 1917 in a most difficult fight; because it won the first of hard-fought combats to break the imperialist front and to establish socialism, and because of its resistance to blockade and aggression in self-sacrificing effort for close to half a century in order to develop and insure the position of socialism, the Soviet Union appears naturally and logically as the historical and political axis of the socialist system.

At the same time, and because of its decisive part and its revolutionary activity, without which the victory of socialism would not have been possible, the CPSU enjoys remarkable prestige among the international working class, among the people struggling for their national and social liberation, among the most advanced progressive forces of the entire world.

On this anniversary of the socialist revolution of October 1917, two facts of different character have drawn world attention upon the Soviet country: the flight of the spaceship with a three-man crew and the changes in the leadership of the government and the CPSU.

I will only mention the cosmonauts to wish them all sorts of happiness, from deep in my heart, as well as to the scientists, technicians, and workers who in one way or other took part in the wonderful feat.

Even in a brief and concise way, I wish to present my humble opinion regarding the changes in the leadership of the Soviet Union, to rebut in a certain measure the perfidious campaign by the bourgeois press and propaganda media trying to confuse public opinion. The removal of Nikita Khrushchev from the leadership of the CPSU and government has provoked various movements of opinion which the opposition is trying to use against the communist parties. The reactions of surprise, concern or fear that such removal may involve changes in the Soviet policy were natural. It must not be forgotten that for close to ten years Nikita Khrushchev personified abroad the policy of peace, coexistence, friendship, and cooperation between socialist countries, general and total disarmament, and peaceful settlement of problems between states of different social regimes--a policy which was that of the CPSU. The statement issued by the CPSU Central Committee, that the policy initiated by the 20th and 22nd congress will not only remain unchanged, but will be reinforced and maintained, is a guarantee not only for the communists fighting in the vanguard for the triumph of this policy, but for all the peace-loving peoples who do not wish to live again through the horrors of war nor to know them again. And this is the important point.

On this 47th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, with the same affection as always toward the Soviet people and with respect for the CPSU and its central Committee, we recall with emotion and revolutionary pride the date of October 1917, which opened the path to a new life, the path of socialism for the peoples; and on this continuity of our affections, of our respect and our loyalty, the firm promise to fight, to maintain united with the international communist movement, lives and throbs; without forgetting that the key to our victory lies in the practice of the proletarian internationalism through unity of will, ideas, and actions within a diversity of situations -- the victory of the forces of peace against the forces of war, the victory of democracy and socialism in the entire world.

Background Use Only  
December 1964

Chairman of the Committee for  
Party-State Control  
Secretary and Member of the  
Presidium, CPSU Central Committee  
Deputy Chairman of the Council of  
Ministers

A.N. Shelepin, one of the youngest of the top officials of the CPSU, is an outstanding example of the ambitious party official who makes a career out of his administrative and organizational talents. In mid-November 1964, he became a full member of the CPSU Presidium. His most important administrative post had been that of chief of the KGB (Committee for State Security) from 1958 to 1961; he was succeeded in this post by Vladimir Yefimovich Semichastny, who appears to be his protege, and it is probable that Shelepin still has a role in making major decisions involving the KGB, the Soviet secret police organization.

Shelepin was born in 1918 at Voronezh, the son of a railwayman. From 1936 to 1939 he studied history at the Moscow Institute of History, Philosophy, and Literature; his later career suggests that he may have spent more time in Komsomol (Communist Youth) activities than on his studies. He served during the Russo-Finnish War in 1939-1940, and then (in 1940) got into full-time Komsomol work in Moscow as an instructor and later as head of the Agitprop Department of the Moscow City Komsomol. In 1943 he became Secretary for Cadres in the All-Union Komsomol and a member of the All-Union Committee for Physical Training and Sport, an organ of the government. Between 1947 and 1952 he was also Vice President of the International Union of Students (IUS), and he led the Soviet delegation to the World Festival of Youth and Students in Prague in 1947. From 1952 to 1958, he served as First Secretary or Chief of the All-Union Komsomol. In this capacity, he had over-all responsibility (in 1954-1957) for sending hundreds of thousands of Soviet youth to the Virgin Lands as "volunteers." During this period he was also Vice President of the Communist international youth front, the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), and he took part in youth festivals, meetings and congresses in various Bloc cities as well as in London and Helsinki.

In April 1958, at the age of 40, Shelepin put youth work behind him and served a short term as Chief of the Central Committee Party Organs Section. Then, in December of that year, he became Chairman of the KGB, replacing General I. A. Serov, who was transferred to the command of Soviet military intelligence, the GRU. Shelepin was the first chief of the secret police not to have spent years in "conspiratorial work." It may be that he was intended to strengthen party control of the police, to improve the public image of the police, or to sweep out some of the bureaucratic cobwebs which had accumulated since the days of Felix Dzerzhinsky. While in this position, he personally conferred the Order of the Red Banner on Bogdan Stashinsky for Stashinsky's murder of Lev Rebet and Stefan Bandera.

In November 1961, Shelepin left the KGB, having become a member of the Central Committee Secretariat a month before. Then at the November 1962 CPSU plenum, Khrushchev established a Party-State Control

Committee, with Shelepin as Chairman. The Committee's activities have not received much publicity, but the Committee is able to take disciplinary action or launch legal proceedings against persons who cause "damage to the cause of building Communism." This usually means corruption or negligence in party or state work, especially in the economy, but could mean any activity the party leaders consider undesirable. Stalin used his control of a predecessor organization, the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate (Rabkrin), as one of his main instruments for gaining control of the party and state bureaucracy by weeding out potential opponents.

Only three men besides Shelepin are both members of the Secretariat and full members of the Presidium: Brezhnev, Podgorny, and Suslov. Further, of those who are both Secretaries and Presidium members, only Shelepin also holds high state office, being a Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers. With his background in the Control Committee and the KGB, Shelepin is evidently one of the most powerful men in the Kremlin.



Fact Sheets

Background Use Only  
November 1964

Communist China's Conquest of Tibet

Invasion and Subjugation. Fourteen years ago, in October 1950, the armies of Communist China invaded Tibet. On 23 May 1951, after six months of resistance during which international bodies failed to respond to calls for help, the Government of Tibet was forced to sign a 17-point Agreement with the People's Republic of China (CPR). This Agreement, among other things, provided that: Tibet's political system would not be altered; the Tibetan people had the right to exercise regional autonomy; and that, any reforms would be carried out solely on the initiative of the Tibetan Government.

The 1951 Agreement was violated by the CPR from the beginning. By early 1952, the Tibetan leaders and people started their doomed struggle against complete Chinese engulfment. The CPR imposed political changes, giving Chinese officials control of regional administrations over traditional local Tibetan government bodies. An illegal program of "social reform" was started, intended to erode and communize the Tibetan society preparatory to absorbing it as an indistinguishable part of the socialized Chinese state.

When Tibetan resistance continued to hamper Chinese efforts to change the society "peacefully," demands for conformity increased and threats against officials became more ominous. After eight years, during which increasingly restrictive and alien measures had failed to subdue the people or radically change their society, Chinese Communist armies again invaded the country. In March 1959, just ahead of Chinese Communist troops, the Dalai Lama fled to exile in India. He was followed by some 20,000 of his countrymen who found haven as refugees in India and Nepal. The economic burden placed upon these countries has been extremely heavy, and international assistance has not alleviated the suffering of nor assured the future of the refugees (who now total some 75,000).

Chinese Communist Territorial Claims and Aspirations. In 1939, Mao Tse-tung claimed that scores of national minorities, including the Mongols, the Uighurs, the Koreans and many others, were fundamentally Chinese and rightfully belonged to China. Since taking power in Mainland China, Communist territorial claims have been increasing and ever more demanding. For example, maps published by the CPR Government represent considerable parts of Burma, Bhutan, Nepal and India, including portions of Kashmir, as part of Chinese territory. The open dispute between the CPR and the USSR has exposed the fact that several territories are claimed by both, adding to the estrangement of these "fraternal, anti-nationalist colleagues."

(Cont.)

Since the subjugation of Tibet in 1959, the CPR has persuaded Burma, Outer Mongolia, Nepal and Pakistan to sign border agreements. In light of some relatively favorable aspects in these agreements, these governments apparently suppressed suspicions which might have remained from the treatment of Tibet subsequent to its 1951 Agreement with the CPR. CPR officials have attempted to persuade the Government of India to negotiate border agreements. But in this case, Indian officials refused to negotiate territory they considered rightfully their own: the Chinese Communists responded with a military invasion of Indian Territory in October 1962. The threat of further territorial incursions continues as CPR troops remain poised along a vast expanse of border joining the two countries.

Genocide and the United Nations. The 14th UNGA passed a Resolution on 21 October 1959 (45 for, 9 against -- Soviet bloc -- and 26 abstentions) in which it appealed for respect to the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people [text attached]. At the 15th UNGA in 1960, when it became clear that the question could not be debated before adjournment, the co-sponsors (Malaya and Thailand) of the Tibetan item on the Agenda pointed out to the Assembly that the Chinese Communist regime had ignored the appeal made by the previous Assembly.

The problem of Tibet was inscribed on the 16th UNGA (1961) Agenda, again by Malaya and Thailand --

"7. Question of Tibet (Item proposed by Malaya and Thailand)  
'The situation in Tibet today has not improved and remains a source of grave concern,' said the two states. Therefore, they were proposing inclusion of the item in the agenda again, 'hoping that the renewed consideration of the question will pave the way for the restoration of the religious and civil liberties of the Tibetan people.' "

The Legal Inquiry Committee on Tibet of the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) devoted a full year to investigating the Tibetan situation. Their report, made available to the UN and published in 1960 (Tibet and the Chinese People's Republic, Geneva) drew three major conclusions, namely:

- 1) acts of genocide had been committed in Tibet in an attempt to destroy the Buddhist Tibetans as a religious group;
- 2) most of the guarantees under the UN Declaration of Human Rights had been violated, including and especially the right to life itself; and
- 3) under international law, Tibet had legitimately regained its status as an independent state before 1951, having been recognized de facto as such by other states in the international community. Tibet had surrendered her de facto independence under the

17-point Agreement with Communist China; however, the Chicomso violated their guarantees to the Tibetan government to an extent which entitled the Tibetans to repudiate that agreement, -- which the Dalai Lama did on 11 March 1959.

As to the methods of genocide used by the Chinese Communists in Tibet, the ICJ report included the following: systematic eradication of Buddhist belief; removal of large numbers of Tibetan children -- particularly those being trained for Buddhist leadership -- to China; murder of religious leaders whose practice encouraged others; and prohibition of adherence to or practice of Buddhism. Subsequent reporting by Tibetan refugees confirmed that these practices were still being used in late 1960 and 1961. With the full facts of this human tragedy before them, the Assembly passed a Resolution on the last day of its session (20 December 1961) which applied the principle of self determination to the Tibetan situation. Fifty-six members voted for this Resolution -- eleven more than had supported the weaker Resolution in 1959. Only the Communist Bloc and Cuba opposed it [text attached].

No action was taken by the UNGA at either its 17th or 18th sessions. However, El Salvador, The Philippines and Nicaragua have inscribed the Tibetan problem as Item 53 on the Agenda in the 19th UNGA (December 1, 1964). It is probable that several additional countries will rise to sponsor this debate over the Chinese Communist's treatment of the people of Tibet.

Resolution on Tibet

14th UNGA

21 October 1959

The General Assembly,

Recalling the principles regarding fundamental human rights and freedoms set out in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly on 10 December 1948,

Considering that the fundamental human rights and freedoms to which the Tibetan people, like all others, are entitled include the right to civil and religious liberty for all without distinction,

Mindful also of the distinctive cultural and religious heritage of the people of Tibet and of the autonomy which they have traditionally enjoyed,

Gravely concerned at reports including the official statements of His Holiness the Dalai Lama, to the effect that the fundamental human rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet have been forcibly denied them,

Deploring the effect of these events in increasing international tension and in embittering the relations between peoples at a time when earnest and positive efforts are being made by responsible leaders to reduce tension and improve international relations,

1. Affirms its belief that respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is essential for the evolution of a peaceful world order based on the rule of law;

2. Calls for respect for the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people and for their distinctive cultural and religious life.

Resolution 1353 (XIV)

Resolution on Tibet

16th UNGA

20 December 1961

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 1353 (XIV) of 21 October 1959 on the question of Tibet,

Gravely concerned at the continuation of events in Tibet, including the violation of the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people and the suppression of the distinctive cultural and religious life which they have traditionally enjoyed,

Noting with deep anxiety the severe hardships which these events have inflicted on the Tibetan people, as evidenced by the large scale exodus of Tibetan refugees to the neighboring countries,

Considering that these events violate fundamental human rights set out in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including the principle of self-determination of peoples and nations, and have the deplorable effect of increasing international tension and embittering relations between peoples,

1. Reaffirms its convictions that respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is essential for the evolution of the rule of law;
2. Solemnly renews its call for the cessation of practices which deprive the Tibetan people of their fundamental human rights and freedoms, including their right to self determination;
3. Expresses the hope that Member States will make all possible efforts, as appropriate, towards achieving the purposes of the present resolution.

Resolution 1723 (XVI)

The following are excerpts from translated articles by Dr. Afana Ossende, an exile from Cameroon and a Communist China sympathizer, who was at one time Cameroon's representative on the AAPSO secretariat. The articles, apparently taken from a book, appeared in the French-language Brazzaville weekly, Dipanda, which generally reflects a Communist Chinese line. Extracts are taken from numbers 47, 26 September 1964; 48, 3 October 1964 and 49, 17 October 1964.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### REVOLUTION IN THE CONGO

Dear readers, we are happy to present to you a book on our revolution by Brother Afana Ossende. He is a doctor of laws and economics. Brother Ossende is a great fighter in the African cause and also in the anti-imperialist struggle. Brother Ossende is from Cameroun and is also one of the most influential members of the UPC (Union of Peoples of Cameroun).

The African peoples and all peoples deprived of their liberty, justice, and peace have expressed a profound sympathy for this revolution. We might mention a few examples here: the Council of Solidarity of the Afro-Asian Peoples, which met in Algiers from 22-26 March 1964 particularly welcomed the revolution in Congo-Brazzaville. The same happened during the economic conference of the Asian peoples held at Pyongyang (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) in June 1964. The 2nd Congress of the UPSA (Panafrikan Labor Union Conference), held from 10-14 June 1964 at Bamako, elected the member from Congo-Brazzaville to its central bureau. In mid-April of that year, a delegation from the permanent bureau of Afro-Asian writers went to Brazzaville to pay proper tribute earned by the Congolese people and by their new leaders.

I would like to dedicate this modest work to these leaders and to this sister nation: all I want to do here is to help publicize their heroic struggle against the common enemies of all peoples of the world: imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism.

Before concluding this introduction, I must say a very simple but a very cordial thank you to the political leaders, to the leaders of the labor unions, of the youth movements, of the women's movements, to the chiefs and responsible officials of the administrative services, to the editors of the revolutionary newspaper Dipanda, in short, to all of my Congolese friends, whose help was infinitely valuable in the preparation of this essay on the revolution in Congo-Brazzaville.

Out of all of the French colonies of Black Africa, only Guinea, under the leadership of Sekou Toure, forcefully rejected the French-African community and approved the idea of immediate independence. But in the other countries, powerful forces were conducting campaigns along the same lines. In Congo-Brazzaville, the Union of the Congolese Youth,

strongly organized for more than 1 year fought heroically against tribalism and for immediate independence. The struggle of these young people, who had the sympathy of the Congolese workers and the complete support of the FEANF (Federation of Students of Black Africa in France) and other forces throughout the world.

We see the first serious crises breaking out in May 1960 in Congo-Brazzaville. We saw that the UJC (Union of Congolese Youth) had for years been fighting for national independence. The authorities labelled this just struggle a Communist-inspired affair. Under this pretext of trying to block Communism, Youlou, the moment the Constitution was approved, forbade the youth organizations from engaging in political activities. But these youth organizations nevertheless succeeded in gradually becoming stronger.

The CGAT (General African Confederation of Labor) also developed definitely along anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist lines.

Starting in 1959, this organization raised the issue of unity among all of the labor unions of the Congo. Under its initiative, a strike was called on 3 May 1960 by the water distribution and electric power companies. This strike lasted 2 weeks and was very successful. In an effort to break this strike, the Youlou government on 10 May announced a so-called "Communist plot." The director of the secret police, the Frenchman Pointu, prepared a long report according to which the struggle for national independence constituted a subversive and Communist activity; anyone who was involved in this struggle was disturbing the public peace. Such individuals would be arrested in the future. That is the report and that is what the government did. On that same day, the leaders of the CGAT and the UJC were arrested and jailed without a hearing for many long months. Popular pressure did not succeed in getting them freed until 14 November 1960. But fortunately prison was a great school of revolution for these labor union and youth leaders; they were able to figure out what they would have to do for their salvation and that of the Congo; they realized that its regime and its straw men were no longer any good but that their own people would have to run the Congo and that their organizations and their unity would have to be strengthened. The August 1963 revolution actually was born during the imprisonment of the leaders of the CGAT and the UJC.

But let me continue to point out the main phases in this process. The struggle of the Congolese patriots began to bear fruit on 15 August 1960; they were successful in proclaiming the independence of the country. Of course, they were still under Youlou, an agent of imperialism; this independence was therefore only nominal, even on the political level. Nevertheless, it did constitute an important step because it offered the patriots more favorable conditions for the development of their revolutionary struggle; this led to the development of African personnel for the higher civil service positions, the creation of an embryo national army, the increase of relations with foreign countries, and above all, an end to the vast deception of the popular masses as a result of the policies of the regime.

(Cont.)

The Congolese patriots managed to exploit these favorable conditions admirably. Despite numerous attempts at creating divisions in their ranks, despite police harassment, despite corruption and repression, the nationalist organizations developed progressively, particularly in the case of the labor unions and the youth movement. In 1961, the labor unions laid the foundation for the unification of the Congolese worker movement. Little by little, by dint of hard work, the nationalist movement became stronger, adding new branches in the form of women's associations, cultural and sports associations, etc. Thus we see that barely 3 years after independence, this movement constituted a very large and very powerful current. The vanguard organizations carried great weight among the masses of the people. This new balance of power emerged quite clearly in 1963. The CGAT held a very impressive Congress at Brazzaville between 9 and 12 May 1963. During this meeting, it felt strong enough to come out openly in support of revolutionary labor unionism and against the so-called apolitical labor unionism which was under the control of the regime. The Congress in particular decided that its headquarters should adopt a position on every international event. In the course of the activities of the Congress, the workers learned of two particularly important news events.

1. President Sekou Toure would visit the Republic of Congo-Brazzaville immediately after the conference of chiefs of state and African governments which was to be held in Addis Ababa from 22-25 May 1963.

2. A telegram from F. Youlou demanded the formation of committees for the creation of a single party.

We must emphasize all of these facts because the labor union Congress session from 9-12 May 1963 greatly contributed to the maturation of conditions for the revolution of August 1963. This was true for a number of reasons.

First of all, the official decision in favor of revolutionary labor unionism did not simply result in the assertion of internal cohesion and in the political maturity, hence the strength of the workers rallying around the CGAT; this operation also enabled the labor union headquarters to commit the working class to the increasingly more decisive battles for the conquest of its own identity and personality and dignity, and for a constantly growing material and cultural well being. This decision, in particular, made it possible to adopt immediate positions on such important current problems as the Summit Conference at Addis-Ababa or the announced visit of President Sekou Toure and Youlou's call for the formation of committees for the creation of a single party.

The workers came up with some quite realistic decisions on the prospects of the conference of Addis-Ababa; they felt that a reunion of the progressive forces was necessary, otherwise the conference would constitute an obstacle, a kind of holy alliance intended to stop the revolution as in the case of the pretended Communist plot in 1960.



With these reservations, they hailed the Addis-Ababa conference as a first step toward African unity which, as we shall see, constituted one of the essential objectives of the August 1963 revolution.

In the immediate future, however, the thing which contributed most to isolating the Youlou regime and hastening the outbreak of the insurrection was the visit by President Sekou Toure and, of course, Youlou's attempt to consolidate his neo-colonialist dictatorship by imposing upon the Congolese people a single party which of course would sell out to the imperialists.

We remember that, in October 1962, Abbe Youlou had made a visit of State to the Republic of Guinea. On that occasion he invited President Sekou Toure to visit the Republic of Congo-Brazzaville. When the visit of President Sekou Toure was announced, the workers decided to make the best of it. For the first time, since 1960, the labor unions of the CGAT decided to participate in public manifestations organized on that occasion. They were actually invited to participate by the Youlou government.

The most remarkable fact is that Youlou, the puppet and corrupt dictator, was publicly criticized with impunity, although the criticism did trigger the applause of the crowd. This was one factor which helped the masses realize once again the justness of the slogans of the patriots and to become aware of their strength. The leadership group was bound to see this as a serious development and as a consequence tried to get closer to the people. Unfortunately, nothing came of this.

In the presence of the Guinean leader, the Abbe President made a speech whose central theme was this: the Republic would have to change its style and would have to adopt some new methods. Youlou went so far as to say this:

"People of the Congo, the President of the Republic of Guinea, our brother, has come to give us a course in civics, nationalism, and patriotism."

"We would like Sekou to tell us not only what he likes about us but also what he does not like about us. Do we all unanimously accept those things that are not in our favor? When Mr. Sekou Toure mentioned some of the things that are in our favor, all of us applauded. But he also said that the people of Guinea, as one man, accepted the idea that a man who earned 400,000 francs should take a cut to 100,000 francs -- and the people of Guinea accepted that. Do you accept this idea, people of the Congo?" "Yes, Yes!", replied the crowd unanimously and Youlou continued as follows.

"Every country had individuals who are called leaders. We have them in our midst, in the Congo, and you will permit me to get these leaders together in order to discuss the entire situation." "Yes!", shouted the crowd.

Youloulou actually did get his team together. But their discussions brought out the exact opposite of what the people had been demanding and of what he had been promising the people in the presence of the leaders from Guinea: the aggravation of repression and misery, instead of an era of liberty, austerity, and social progress for all. From 8 June onward, that is to say, barely 24 hours after the departure of the Guinean guests, the government arrested Mr. Julien Boukambou, Secretary General of the CGAT (today Vice President of the National Assembly and permanent Secretary of the Political Bureau of the National Movement of the Revolution).

The charges against him: he informed his friend Sekou Toure on the shortcomings of the regime! Along with him, there were others who were put in jail; they included Balossa Hanse, today Secretary General of the Union of Congolese Youth, Mbonala Jean-Baptiste, Militant of the CGAT, and Moukongo Germaine, one of the ex-wives of the Abbe President.

In the night from 8 to 9 June, the CGAT, the African Confederation of Believing Workers, the Congolese Confederation of Free Labor Unions, the Postal Federation, and the Federation of Civil Servants decided to organize the masses in support of the liberation of J. Boukambou and his companions.

In view of the vast size of the solidarity movement in their support and in order to avoid disturbances, the police ordered his release on the next day, that is, on the evening of 10 June. On 11 June J. Boukambou and the other labor union leaders organized a great meeting for explanations and protests in which all of the labor union organizations and even the farmers participated.

At the end of that meeting, all labor unions adopted an extremely important decision concerning the creation of a fusion committee. During this meeting, also, Mr. Diallo Idrissa, at that time Secretary General of the Postal Federation and today Secretary General of the Confederation of Labor Unions of the Congo, launched a historical slogan:

"If a labor union leader is arrested," he told the workers, "you just go to the office of the police commissioner; if he is not there, go to the gendarmerie; if he is not there either, go to the prison and rush the prison. If the prisons cannot hold you, they will burst and this will be liberation."

Thus we see that the Congolese working class managed to strengthen its unity and cement its alliance with the farmers during this struggle and prepared itself for an assault on the regime.

Youloulou, for his part, only tried to consolidate his neo-colonialist, anti-national, and anti-popular dictatorship. In the middle of 1963, his efforts were aimed essentially at the formation of a single party. Why? Did the Congo at that time have a truly anti-imperialist party, a party capable of overthrowing the neo-colonialist regime? Absolutely not.

There was no basic difference between the party of Mr. Youlou and the others. This came out into the light of day, for example, in the behavior of Mr. Jacques Opangault, leader of the MSA, who left his ministerial post to join the opposition although this about-face did not bring about any change whatever in the basic policy of the Abbe President. Nevertheless, there was a possibility that one of the President's rivals might exploit the situation for his own benefit and throw out the leadership team and take its place. This was an even greater danger than the danger coming from the popular masses themselves; this was the main thing the clique of Youlou was afraid of. This explains his desperate efforts to domesticate the other political organizations within the framework of a single party which would be under his control. To this end he called a round-table conference in mid-June.

The labor unions demanded that their joint committee be represented within the single party and appointed their representatives for the round-table discussion. Youlou refused to accept these delegates and said that he would admit them only as individuals. The representatives left, slamming the doors behind them. On the evening of the same day, 5 July 1963, the labor unions adopted a decision to extend their activities beyond Brazzaville and to conduct a campaign on the national scale from 5 to 22 July. This constituted a new phase in the strengthening of worker unity and the alliance of the workers with the farmers.

Scared by the sudden rise in popular forces, Youlou, around the end of the month, called the various labor union leaders together with a view to a reconciliation. But on what basis? On the basis of a simple patch-up job on his corrupt and unpopular regime; he offered them two ministerial posts. The labor union leaders agreed to participate in the government on the condition that Youlou dismissed his entire team of administrators. Youlou promised to proceed to this surgical operation and called a new round-table conference for 7 August.

On 3 August, the labor unions organized a meeting at the labor exchange. Youlou sent the police to arrest one of their leaders, Aime Matsika (today Minister of Commerce, Industry, and Mines, etc.).

The workers victoriously opposed this arbitrary arrest. They decided to hold another meeting on 7 August. Youlou, in response, prohibited all meetings, including labor union meetings. The labor unions replied tit for tat: they ordered a general strike for 13 August from 0600 until 1200. They also anticipated that this strike might turn into a general uprising. They therefore gave their militants a number of slogans, particularly the following: No racist manifestations! No attacks on the lives and property of foreigners!

Now the police went after these leaders and they had to scatter. They did not meet again until the evening of 12 August in order to make the final preparations for the strike; we were now on the eve of the three glorious days.

The meeting of the labor union leaders appointed a delegation of five men who would be responsible for finding out, after 0300, whether

the labor exchange was occupied by the so-called public safety forces.

The delegation included the following: Ganga Thauley, Bengui Adolphe, Samba Dominique, Miakassissa, and Gandou Francois.

These men went to the labor exchange at the appointed hour. But the gendarmerie surrounded them at 0305 and arrested them. Only Samba Dominique and Miakassissa were able to escape.

On the morning of 13 August, Brazzaville was at a fever pitch: the government was making feverish preparations for the celebration of the 3rd anniversary of independence, whereas the vast popular masses were increasingly caught up in the excitement of revolution.

At 0715, the workers, responding to the general strike call, began to gather in the square in front of the railroad station, today called Liberty Square. Around 0800, a crowd of about 8,000 persons had gathered to listen to speeches by a number of labor union leaders. Then Samba Dominique and Miakassissa, the two men who had escaped from the group sent to the labor exchange at 0300, arrived on the scene. They announced the arrest of the other members of the delegation. A few moments later, detachments of gendarmerie and police caused clashes with the crowd. "This strike is illegal," said the officer in charge. The crowd responded to him as one man: "Release Ganga Thauley, Gandou Francois, and Bengui Adolphe!"

Similar movements developed in the principal cities of the country, especially at Pointe-Noire and Dolisie. But let us take a closer look at events in the capitol.

The crowd had gathered mainly around the principal public buildings and especially in front of the prefecture. The prefect told the crowd to go away and then ordered tear gas grenades to be fired on the crowd. The ranks of the demonstrating strikers were swelled rapidly. Around 0930 a crowd of about 15,000 people marched on the prison, following the historic order of Diallo Idrissa, which we mentioned earlier.

The first bloody clash with the armed forces of the neo-colonialist reaction occurred in front of the prison; the armed forces were re-enforced there at 0945 by gendarmerie units. Lt. Colonel Vallenet, a Frenchman, gave the order to fire. The Congolese soldiers refused. But the gendarmerie did fire: two persons fell to the ground; a third was hurt by a prison guard; at the General Hospital, a woman, hit by a stray bullet, died. Later on, there were about 52 wounded.

Because of this bloody intervention by the armed forces of reaction, the demonstrators, although unarmed, rushed the prison and liberated the three labor union leaders and about 400 other prisoners.

Through this act, the Congolese workers brilliantly revived one of their old revolutionary traditions: during the 30's the political and labor union leader Andre Matswa had succeeded in organizing a vast

movement for a struggle against racial discrimination and against the regime of colonial slavery. Along with some other patriots, he was arrested and sentenced to a 3-year prison term in April 1930. As soon as the verdict was announced, thousands of black workers went on strike and besieged the court, asking for the release of their comrades.

After the seizure of the Bastille of Youlou, the insurgents went to the radio station, which was still French property, even after three years of independence. They forced the gates of the building and seriously manhandled the station manager.

During this time, another column went to the post office and took it over without any trouble.

All of these successes galvanized the crowd of demonstrators and unleashed avalanches of supporters for the insurrection, including members of the armed forces and other supporters of the regime.

Panic now spread to the group in power; the leaders felt absolutely incapable of stopping this sea of human fury which rushed toward the center of the city from the outskirts in several successive waves.

Communist Use of Labor and Youth Groups  
In Congo (Brazzaville) and Sudan

Coup in Sudan. Riots and demonstrations sparked on October 21 by police bungling in handling Khartoum University student meetings (regarding disgruntled African tribesmen in the southern portion of Arab-dominated Sudan) brought down President Ibrahim Abboud's military government on October 26.

Two elements were decisively important in the Communist-influenced rebellion. The army refused to fire on the riotors and the Communists, who had long prepared for just such an opportunity, quickly seized on the angry student demonstrations and expanded them to include all dissatisfied national groups. Skillfully assessing the potential of civil disobedience and Abboud's uncertain command of the army, the Communists issued a demand for a united front to be made up of workers and professional organizations to replace the military regime. The other political parties took up the demand. Strikes were called. Sudanese students in European Communist countries obediently demonstrated their solid support for "democratic" rule in Sudan. After five days, General Abboud dissolved the military junta which had ruled since the bloodless coup of 1958 and dismissed his cabinet.

The national front proposed its candidates for a civilian Cabinet. Negotiations with Abboud began against a background of the Communist-inspired general strike and further student demonstrations. Non-Communists soon became alarmed at the increasing evidence of Communist strength but were unsuccessful in reducing their Cabinet representation. Abboud and the army finally accepted a 15-man civilian cabinet which includes four Communists, all of whom have traveled in the bloc countries and have Communist front group connections. The national front, in which the Communists are the most important faction, and the civilian cabinet began an immediate purge of the army and police, then requested -- and obtained -- Abboud's resignation. This interim government is to rule until popular elections which are now scheduled for March 1965 -- although the Communist may try to postpone them to gain time for building up a mass following.

Coup in Brazzaville. The background of these events is reminiscent of the Communist-directed riots which led to the downfall of Fulbert Youlou in Congo (Brazzaville) in August 1963. Disciplined Communist cadres from youth and labor groups planned and carried out the successful riots. The provisional government which succeeded to power held elections in December which installed a coalition government under Alphonse Massamba-Debat, a moderate leftist. Included in the government are several Communists, among them Aime Matsika (see p.6 of Dipanda attachment), a labor leader and WFTU official who was prominent in the overthrow of Youlou. Since that time the Congo (B) has moved closer to both the USSR and Communist China which it recognized in early 1964 and which it now permits to train Congo (Leopoldville) rebels in guerrilla warfare and sabotage for the current civil war against Tshombe.

In both countries the Communists had labored long with the key youth and trade union groups which then provided the individuals trained to step into the vacuums of leadership created by each coup.

Sudanese Labor. The Sudan Communist Party (SCP), alone among Sudanese political parties, worked zealously among labor unions, organizing and directing individuals and groups toward federation and training them for political action. By 1957 the Communists whose own political fortunes were at a low ebb, controlled approximately one third of the trade unions. In 1958 El Shafie Ahmed El Shaikh of the SCP organized (by the Communist cell system) the important Sudan Workers Trade Union Federation (SWTUF) of which he became Secretary-General. Significantly, the Communists also succeeded in dominating the largest, richest union, the Sudan Railway Workers Union, where non-Communist cooperation had failed. The SRWU's ability to disrupt traffic and communications to Red Sea ports made it a prize for the Communists.

The Sudanese army took over the government in 1958 and General Abboud dissolved the trade unions. Fourteen SWTUF leaders, including El Shafie, were arrested for their Communist activities. Although it had been supported by the WFTU since 1948 the SWTUF had never affiliated with that Communist international labor organization -- in line with Communist strategy for non-aligned countries.

During the period 1960-63, the outlawed SCP worked persistently, though for a long time unsuccessfully, to form a united front with other political parties. Unable to make headway, the SCP turned back to the trade unions which it soon dominated. In 1963, as Abboud's government moved to liberalize labor policies, the SCP used its labor groups to press demands for legalizing the trade union federation. Fellow travelers were even appointed to the government's committee to study trade union matters. El Shafie was released from prison in 1963 after serving five years and promptly went to Eastern Europe to meet with officials of the WFTU of which he is a vice president. Returning to Sudan he soon stepped up the tempo of Sudanese labor activities.

In the summer of 1964 the government cancelled a national labor conference -- called to discuss legalizing a Federation of Sudan Workers Unions -- since the Communists were likely to dominate the conference and the Federation. The cancellation built up pressures among the frustrated labor groups which the Communists cannily exploited two months later against the government. After the coup, the FSWU chose its Secretary General, El Shafie, to be labor's representative in the cabinet of the new interim government of November 1964. Sudan now has the distinction of having a WFTU vice-president as its Minister of State.

Sudanese Youth and Students. In 1946, ten years before Sudan gained her independence from Great Britain, Communists organized a Sudanese group in Cairo called the Sudan Movement for Liberation but it was not until six years later that the movement began to show any real strength. Communist student tactics were the same as those used elsewhere in Africa: nationalism and student dissatisfactions were translated

into anti-Western actions; Communist countries were held up as proper models for development and champions of anti-imperialism. At the University of Khartoum, Communists are influential in the Student Union which rioted in October (see opening paragraphs).

Large numbers of Sudanese youth obtained Communist scholarships without the knowledge of the Education Ministry whose approval was legally required. The SCP nominated and approved each selectee and expected to be able to use him on his return to Sudan. In 1963 the Ministry of Education itself received direct offers of scholarships from the following which were additional to scholarships administered by the SCP): Bulgaria 18; USSR 33; Poland 7; Czechoslovakia 8.

Students reaching the Communist states are urged to join African or Sudanese student groups run on the Communist cell system. They are used for demonstrations and for other propaganda purposes and are indoctrinated into political activity. On their return to Sudan they are half-educated, perhaps unemployable and over-impressed with their own importance so they soon join the dissatisfied who form the bulk of Sudanese Communist Party followers. Thus is Communist strength built up in the absence of a legal Communist party. Many Sudanese students in bloc countries have reportedly finished their "education" and are hurriedly being sent back to Sudan following establishment of the new national front government.

Congo (Brazzaville) Labor. Dipanda, the Communist-line weekly newspaper in Brazzaville, printed a series of articles from a book by Afana Ossende (extracts are attached) which describe Communist use of labor groups in the agitation and demonstrations which led to overthrow of Fulbert Youlou's government in 1963. (Ossende of course refers to the plotters as "patriots," not "communists.") Soviet and Chinese support to the trade union movement in this political role is no secret. On October 2, 1964 Moscow Radio broadcast a talk praising the role of the trade unions in overthrowing Youlou in Congo (Brazzaville) and Maga in Dahomey. Chinese and Soviet assistance to the Communist-dominated trade unions in Congo includes buildings, equipment, automobiles, salary payments and labor scholarships. Radical pressures from these groups are pushing the government toward an increasingly pro-Communist posture. The leader of the large and influential Catholic trade union federation was arrested in late November, thus weakening one of the principal forces still opposing the leftward trend of government.

Congolese Youth. The members of the national youth federation Union de la Jeunesse Congolaise (UJC) are very close to labor organizers of the WFTU affiliate, Confederation Generale Africaine du Travail and are themselves affiliated with the Communist-led World Federation of Democratic Youth. Although the Communists exploited youth of both Congo and Sudan, the techniques differ. In the Congo a few well trained and indoctrinated individuals in a few key positions wielded influence far beyond their numbers; the infiltration and control of youth organizations on the Sudan pattern was not necessary in Congo.



A typical example of the Communist use of individuals is the management of Dipanda (see Congo-Brazzaville Labor, above). In October 1963 two students (Jean-Baptiste Lounda and Claude Ernest Ndall) returned from three years study in the Soviet Union and commenced publication of Dipanda which has become one of the most outspokenly Communist-line papers in West Africa, generally leaning toward Chinese Communist positions.

Fact Sheet

Background Use Only  
December 1964

Excerpts from Speech by Enver Hoxha in Tirana 28 Nov 64

Broadcast by ATA International Service

\* \* \* \* \*

N. Khrushchev's dismissal is a great victory, but this does not mean the end of Khrushchevite revisionism or of modern revisionism in general. Apart from the big part which N. Khrushchev played in the capacity of leader of the revisionists, the course, policy, and social and economic roots of revisionism have not been liquidated along with him. Khrushchevite revisionism itself, which has brought so much evil to the communist movement, to the Soviet Union, to the socialist camp, and to the people's liberation struggle, has not been liquidated. That is why the Albanian Workers Party, as all true revolutionaries everywhere, should not and will not have any illusions on this point.

N. Khrushchev's downfall marks the beginning of a new state in the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism which will lead to the total defeat of modern revisionism and to the inevitable triumph of Marxism-Leninism. In this stage communists and the people here must more than ever have a clear idea of their future attitude and of the line of their future struggle which have been drawn up correctly by our party, which bases itself on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and on the interests of strengthening the whole communist and workers international movement.

Our party has struggled and will continue to struggle in a consistent manner against modern revisionism, Khrushchevite or Titoist, until its total defeat as a (reactionary?) line, as an anti-Marxist course, as an ideology and a policy which have found their concrete expression in the revisionist decisions of the 20th, 21st, and 22d CPSU congresses.

This position of our party is completely correct and complete with principles, for one could not even contemplate the destruction of revisionism and the victory of Marxism without rejecting and repudiating the ideological and political basis and platform of revisionism.

The present leaders of the Soviet party-government have stated more than once that they are faithfully following the line of the 20th, 21st, and 22d CPSU Congresses, as well as its program approved at the 22d congress. They have also stated that N. Khrushchev's expulsion will in no way touch the essence of the line hitherto followed by the CPSU. It is clear that the future continuation also of this anti-Marxist course, making allowance for tactical nuances which could be used and will doubtless be used in its application and by which they count on deceiving the revolutionaries and the peoples, will not fail to rouse the determined opposition and the open struggle on principle of true Marxists-Leninists.

Our party considers that the true liquidation of the revisionist platform, and consequently of Khrushchevite revisionism itself, must be and will be achieved with the help of the high principled struggle of Marxists-Leninists, in order to repair gradually all the evils which the revisionists have so far caused international communism by their treacherous line.

In the first place, the settlement of the question of Stalin, of the rehabilitation of Stalin as a great Marxist-Leninist, regardless of some insignificant errors which he may have committed, is a great question of principle of great international importance. Our party and all Marxists-Leninists regard the question of Stalin not as a sentimental affair but for what it really is, as a question of line, as a question of principle.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mikoyan, Kosygin, Brezhnev, Suslov, and others have taken an active part in the slanderous attacks against our party and our country. This is why the fact that the Soviet Government is no longer headed by N. Khrushchev does not in the least touch the heart of the problem. The responsibility for all the anti-Albanian activities falls on the USSR leadership, and it is up to this leadership to correct it courageously. Only in this way can conditions of equality necessary to bilateral talks and to the reestablishment of the unity of the socialist camp be created. [underlining added]

\* \* \* \* \*

The turning point can be prepared and reached by revolutionary struggle, by openly condemning and denouncing the treason of N. Khrushchev and his group, for one cannot correct the errors while keeping Khrushchev, while keeping the question of Khrushchev within the limits of the party, as all the modern revisionists try to do. This is an effort aimed at defending treason, for to bring out into the daylight the treason of N. Khrushchev would harm and expose the whole revisionist course on all the primary questions of which we have been speaking.

Like all revolutionary Marxists-Leninists, the Albanian Workers Party will courageously struggle to win new victories over revisionism. Our struggle and the open and principled polemics will continue unceasingly until Khrushchevite positions are annihilated all along the line.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Argentine Parliamentary Elections

The Argentine Congress is currently composed of 192 deputies and 46 senators. Senators are elected for nine years, one third being renewed every three years; deputies are elected for four years and one half renewed every two years. The elections scheduled for 14 March 1965 affect only one half of the Chamber of Deputies and a number of provincial legislatures. Under normal circumstances, this event would attract little attention abroad. However, political tensions have been building up to such an extent in recent months that the elections may become the occasion for a serious governmental crisis.

The most conspicuous, but perhaps least important, factor creating these tensions is the threatened return of Juan Domingo Peron. From his exile in Madrid, the former dictator has sought to control the Peronist movement, often playing one faction against the other. His supporters have been carrying out a noisy campaign calling for him to return to Argentina and personally assume leadership of the movement. Peron's presence in Argentina, or even in a neighboring country, could be the detonating element in a potentially explosive situation. The government has stated officially that Peron is free, like any ordinary Argentine citizen, to return to his native land. However, it has been made clear to him that he may be prosecuted on charges of treason and corruption of a minor. Also, he would face the very real threat of assassination at the hands of some of his former victims. Anti-Peron sentiment in Uruguay is so great that he would not be welcome or even safe there. Although he is an honorary general in the Paraguayan Army and a personal friend of President Stroessner, the latter's government would not want to contribute to unrest in Argentina by furnishing Peron with a base for political operations. In light of the above considerations, it is fairly safe to predict that Peron will not return to Argentina in the immediate future. His threatened return is rather a bugbear which his supporters use to harass and annoy the government, the army, and the anti-Peron parties.

In the congressional elections of March 1962, Peronists were allowed to vote for the first time since Peron was overthrown in September 1955. Upsetting most predictions, they received nearly a third of the popular vote and emerged as the strongest single party. As a result, the elections were annulled by President Frondizi and he, in turn, ousted soon after by a military coup.

For the general (presidential) elections held 7 July 1963, it was again illegal for Peronists to run candidates. This brought about a division within the movement, prompting one faction to enter the elections under the guise of "Peronism without Peron." As a consequence, eleven provincial parties of the "Justicialist Bloc," also known as "Neoperonists," succeeded in electing 17 national deputies. The official faction, comprising the majority of the Peronists, followed the instructions of their absent leader and cast blank ballots.

(Cont.)

One of the valuable and highly negotiable legacies which Peron left to his adherents ~~was~~ control of key unions and positions in Argentina's principal labor organization, the Confederacion General del Trabajo (CGT - General Confederation of Labor), which includes about 85% of organized labor. In January 1963, the CGT was formally reconstituted with half of the six positions on the executive committee allotted to the Peronist bloc of 62 unions and half to the independent bloc, which includes neo-Peronists. The so-called "62 Bloc" forms the hard core of Peronist strength and the instrument of its plan de lucha (battle plan), or long-range strategy. First launched in early 1964, the battle plan includes sit-down strikes, demands for price controls, and constant pressure for the return of Peron. Their demands for repeal of laws outlawing Communist and Peronist activity and for "full political amnesty" have borne fruit: a law was passed repealing most of these restrictions on 16 November 1964.

Originally, the Peronist movement consisted of three branches: political, labor, and women's groups, with Peron as head of the supreme command. Recently the party structure has been completely reorganized: the official wing of the movement is known now as the "Justicialist Party," but not identified with the Justicialist Bloc mentioned above. In the party elections of July 1964, Augusto Vandor, leader of the Metallurgical Workers Union and acknowledged chief of the "62 Bloc" was elected head of the party over the strenuous opposition of Andres Framini, of the Textile Workers Union and, until then, the most powerful of Peron's supporters in Argentina. Framini was elected governor of Buenos Aires Province in the annulled elections of 1962.

Although the followers of Peron form the largest single bloc of potential voters, they still account for barely a third of the electorate. The other two major parties are splinter groups that broke off in 1957 from the old Radical Civic Union (Union Civica Radical - UCR): the Intransigent Radical Civic Union (Union Civica Radical Intransigente - UCRI) and the People's Radical Civic Union (Union Civica Radical del Pueblo - UCRP). In 1958, Arturo Frondizi, founder and leader of the UCRI, won the presidency with 45% of the popular vote. Current president of the party is Oscar Alende. In the elections of 1963, its rival party, the UCRP, polled only about one fourth of the popular vote, but enough to put their candidate, Arturo Illia, in the Casa Rosada for a full six-year term as President. These two parties split originally over personal differences between their leaders rather than ideological ones, although the UCRP seems to be the more moderate and the UCRI more inclined to welcome Peronist, extreme leftist, and even Communist support.

Counting the above and the Neo-Peronist groups, there are 23 parties represented in the Chamber of Deputies and 12 in the Senate. The most important of these are: Union of the Argentine People (Union del Pueblo Argentino - UDELPA), built around the personality of former provisional president Pedro Aramburu; the Progressive Democrat Party (Partido Democrata Progresista - PDP); National Federation of Center Parties (Federacion Nacional de Partidos del Centro - FNCP), a coalition

of both conservative and leftist elements; the Argentine Socialist Party (Partido Socialista Argentino - PSA); the Christian Democrats (Partido Demócrata Cristiano -- PDC); and the Democratic Socialists (Partido Socialista Democrático -- PSD).

It is this excessive fragmentation of the Argentine electorate that has enabled the Peronists, as a well-organized and unified party, to play such an important role, and actually hold the balance of power at times. If the anti-Peronist parties could get together, they could easily form a working majority. The present electoral law, it seems, will only encourage further fragmentation. Under the old Saenz Pena law, which was in force for the 1962 elections, each electoral district -- the 22 provinces and the Federal Capital -- was treated as a single constituency. Voters cast their ballots for a list of candidates from a given party, and two thirds of the available mandates were given to the winning party list and one third to the next highest. Only the first and second parties in a district gained any representation at all. Under the Saenz Pena law, the leading party list almost never reached fifty per cent of the total vote. This meant that two thirds of the seats some times went to a party list polling no more than one quarter or one third of the total votes cast. In the 1962 elections, this led to over representation for the Peronist parties in the districts where they won: 46% of the seats with less than 32% of the votes.

It would normally be expected that such a system would tend to discourage the proliferation of small parties. Nevertheless, over sixty parties presented candidates in the 1962 and 1963 elections. Under the new electoral law, provincial electors and members of the National Chamber of Deputies will be chosen by the d'Hondt system of proportional representation. The representation of all parties will more nearly correspond to their actual electoral strength. However, there is nothing in the new law to discourage the continued fragmentation of the Argentine electorate. All a new party has to do to qualify is obtain signatures of 0.4% of the qualified voters (but not less than 500 nor more than 4,000) in a given electoral district. A party which participated in the annulled elections of 1962 must show verifiable evidence that it received at least 3% of the district vote in that election. Thus the outlook is for an electorate as divided as ever, with the possibility that the Peronists may again emerge as the strongest single party.

In spite of the fact that it looms as the most conspicuous issue in the coming elections, Peronism is not the only problem. Inflation has continued to plague every government in the nine years since the overthrow of Peron and has served to conceal from the people the lack of real progress in the Argentine economy. Pressure for wage increases and other factors have brought about a wage-price spiral that has pushed the cost of living index to 219 as of June 1964, using 1960 as 100. During 1964 negotiated wage agreements have so far resulted in wage increases of between 25% and 30%. Current estimates of unemployment are at 12% of the labor force and up to 25% in key industries such as textiles and steel. Although Argentina is far and away the most highly

industrialized country in Latin America, its gross national product, on a per capita basis, has lagged far behind that of oil-rich Venezuela: \$443 against \$737 -- the two highest in Latin America. Worse still, in spite of the dreams of the Alliance for Progress, which called for an economic growth rate of 2.5% per capita throughout Latin America, the Argentine economy has been in a steady decline. One reliable research organization estimated that Argentina's GNP dropped 3.5% in 1962, measured in constant values, and 5% in 1963. When the population growth is computed in this, the decline was approximately 5% and 6.6% respectively. A record wheat crop, predicted for 1964, might offset somewhat the losses in the industrial sector, but the GNP will probably not reach the levels of 1961 and 1962.

Another major issue in the elections will be the contracts with five U.S. oil companies. Responding to nationalistic pressures, President Illia made good his campaign promises and set about cancelling the contracts a month or so after assuming power. The U.S. companies have so far refused to accept the government offers of settlement, and litigation continues. Meanwhile, Argentine oil production, which the foreign companies had quickly brought up to a level sufficient to satisfy domestic needs, has now begun to decline. The Government oil monopoly has begun to import crude oil.

In the elections next March, several hundred candidates for the 96 seats available will be under pressure from the electorate to declare themselves, eloquently and unequivocally, on some of the practical aspects of foreign policy, economics and civil behavior: the oil contracts, foreign investments, social justice (the putative father of "Justicialism," a term coined during the Peron era), higher pensions, higher wages, shorter hours, more tolerance of street demonstrations, fewer restrictions on Peronist activities. These and countervailing pressures from the more conservative voters will put each candidate on the horns of the democratic dilemma: in order to be elected, he must please a majority of the voters, and in order to please a majority of the voters he may be forced to assume positions at variance with the longrange interests of the country as a whole.

During his nine years in power Juan Domingo Peron succeeded, as few other Latin American dictators had done before, in dividing Argentine society into two irreconcilable segments, undoubtedly more hostile to each other than similarly divided groups elsewhere. The anti-Peronists, especially among the well-to-do and well-informed minority, know what it is like to lose their political liberties, which is what happened under Peron. The descamisados, Peron's formerly "shirtless" followers, know what it is like to be closely identified with the ruling clique in an almost totalitarian state. Through Peron, they have tasted power and found it good. They would like to get it back. It is these tensions that will make of otherwise routine elections a political event of major importance.