

# WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

*Un service de presse ouvrier*

Vol. 1, No. 7

November 8, 1963

21, rue d'Aboukir - Paris-2°

## ALGERIA CELEBRATES NINTH ANNIVERSARY

PARIS, Nov. 3 -- Revolutionary Algeria was able to celebrate a glorious November 1 -- the ninth anniversary of the launching of the freedom struggle against imperialist France. The crowds that filled the streets were in a happy and grateful mood. Threatened by war from monarchist Morocco, the threat had been repelled with but little bloodshed and if the truce that was won by Ben Bella at Bamako was an uneasy one, nevertheless it was a truce that spelled precious time for Algeria.

The threat of counterrevolution in Kabylie seemed still further reduced although not eliminated and the chances of its spreading on a wide scale were clearly remote.

In addition the Revolution had gained importantly in the field of mass consciousness. Dramatic rallies had seen hundreds of thousands of people responding in the streets to the revolutionary appeals of the government against the threat of the counterrevolution.

A three-day congress of peasants in Algiers October 25-27 at which some 2,500 delegates from all over the country participated, had brought the problems of the Revolution home in a new way.

The peasant congress was a remarkable gathering, for the main topic, discussed in the practical, matter-of-fact way of people close to the soil, was how can you best run agriculture along socialist lines under conditions such as Algeria faces at the moment.

In the world press, Morocco's armed assault on Algeria occupied the center of attention. On the surface it seemed to be an unequal match and that, no doubt, was why King Hassan II struck. With a well-equipped, well-trained army, backed by the imperialist West, including Franco, the king had evidently long studied the blow he intended to deliver.

Algeria on the other hand faced an armed uprising in the Kabylie, the country is poor, militarily weak, still suffering the terrible

ravages of the most bitter colonial war in history. What chance did the ragged, politically divided peasants of Algeria have against the sleek mobile forces of Hassan II?

If the attack succeeded, the Ben Bella government might be toppled and with it the threat eliminated of another Cuba, of a contagious deep-going agrarian reform, of a socialist revolution that might become a shining example for all of Africa and the Middle East.

What the monarch and his imperialist backers did not expect was the form of reply. The Ben Bella government openly appealed for political revolution in Morocco. In Algeria the government threw all its forces into mobilizing the people to defend their revolutionary gains and their socialist goals.

These appeals met with an echo among the Moroccan people and Hassan II began to feel that his throne was not altogether secure. Among the Algerian people, fervor mounted to new heights throughout the nation. The recruiting stations were completely unable to register the long lines of people who queued up.

The rest of the Arab world recognized that the Moroccan king did not know what he was playing with and that if new revolutionary fires were not to flare up the conflict must be stopped without delay. The various governments were all the more impelled into action because of the popular sentiment in their own countries in favor of Algeria. The Ben Bella government won the diplomatic contest hands down.

On the military side, too, Algeria had excellent chances of gaining strength against the monarchical-imperialist combination. Arms were made available by Egypt, the East European countries and the Soviet Union. Even Cuba was reported to have decided without the least hesitation to share the precious stock accumulated for defense against the constant threat of invasion by the biggest bully on earth.

Some of the partisans of Hassan II are making out that the monarch came out the winner. Right-wing papers in Paris saw Algeria the loser on three counts: the Algerian forces were pushed back militarily, and Ben Bella suffered a double diplomatic defeat at Bamako October 30 when he recognized that Morocco has border claims and when he agreed to stop propaganda calling for the overthrow of Hassan II.

Under the conditions of the truce, however, Hassan agreed to the withdrawal of all troops to lines to be determined by a four-power commission. [Algeria, Morocco, Mali and Ethiopia.] He also agreed that the frontier dispute should be settled within the frame of the Addis Ababa charter.

Hassan had previously refused to go along with this charter since it calls on the African powers not to raise any disputes over borders. The agreement to withdraw his troops was also a bitter pill.

Clearly, the terms of the truce are not unfavorable to Algeria. Whether the truce will be observed by Morocco, of course, still remains to be seen.

A truce of this character is decidedly in the interests of the

Algerian Revolution. A military conflict, even of purely defensive character, could place an unbearable burden on the weak Algerian economy. What Algeria needs is peace, economic assistance, and time for the revolution to deepen and become better consolidated.

#### MOROCCAN EMBASSY PICKETED AGAIN IN LONDON

LONDON, Oct. 27 -- Carrying posters, "Hands off the Algerian Socialist Revolution!" "Release All Moroccan Political Prisoners," "Hassan, Friend of Franco, Invades Algeria," and many others, members and supporters of the British Algeria Committee picketed the Moroccan Embassy in Queens Gate Gardens yesterday morning.

As on the previous Saturday when a similar group of pickets demonstrated in front of the embassy, a deputation of three went inside and handed a protest letter signed by all the participants to the First Secretary.

The Committee is planning further protests next week.

#### BOOK ON ALGERIAN REVOLUTION PUBLISHED

ROME, Oct. 25 -- A public presentation of a book Algeria and Socialism published by Samonà and Savelli under the editorship of Livio Maitan, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, was held here yesterday.

A considerable crowd participated, most of them Communists and Socialists, who heard a description of the book by Marco Pannella, leader of the Radical party. He took up a series of questions relating to the Algerian Revolution, its tendencies and the experiences that have been acquired.

Algeria and Socialism, which is printed in Italian, includes a series of fundamental texts of the Algerian Revolution that have appeared from the time independence was gained until the constitution was adopted. It also contains the most important speeches of Ben Bella, documents on the trade unions, the first experiences under self-management, etc.

An appendix contains declarations by former leaders of the FLN [Front de Liberation National] who broke at various stages with the present leadership of the Revolution.

In his introduction, Livio Maitan analyzes the crisis of the summer of 1962, examines all the measures taken by the Ben Bella government from the month of October 1962 up to June 1963, underlines the significance of the Algerian Revolution in its process of transition toward socialism, indicates the structural and political limits that remain and concludes on the historic importance of independent Algeria's first year.

This is the first publication of its kind to appear in Europe since the liberation of Algeria.

## DEFEATISM ON BOTH SIDES?

By Joseph Hansen

The editors of The Newsletter, a London socialist publication, seem to have felt some embarrassment over the extremely equivocal position on the Algerian Revolution expressed in their issues of October 5 and October 12. An entire page of the October 19 issue was used to publish a letter from Denis Anderson protesting their errors and unwarranted attacks against the Ben Bella government, together with a reply by Eric Neilson, author of one of the equivocal articles, clarifying where The Newsletter stands.

"Denis Anderson criticises us for supporting Ait Ahmed and Mohamed [sic] Oul el-Hadj. Nothing could be further from the truth," writes Neilson.

"At no time has The Newsletter supported, overtly or covertly the aims of Ait Ahmed."

We are glad to report that The Newsletter is not in favor of the counterrevolution centered in Kabylie, although it would never have been guessed from reading the articles in the issues of October 5 and October 12. [See the extensive quotations in World Outlook October 25.]

In apologizing for the many errors in the article bearing his signature, Neilson writes:

"Admittedly, our information is limited, fragmentary, even episodic. That is in the nature of things.

"But our critic's quotations from 'Candide', reproduced from the Pabloite bulletin 'World Outlook', are not helpful, since the Bulletin was not published till October 11, that is, two days after our article was written!"

One could wish that The Newsletter had published a notice in its issues of October 5 and October 12 warning its readers that its information was "limited, fragmentary, even episodic." Unfortunately, the impression conveyed was just the opposite.

Is it in "the nature of things" for The Newsletter to offer its readers this kind of information? Perhaps. But we call Neilson's attention to the fact that the article in World Outlook which he cites was dated October 8, a day before his error-packed article was written! (If our arithmetic is correct, Neilson claims his article was written October 9.)

The matter would scarcely be worth pursuing if we could be sure that The Newsletter had really rectified its attitude toward the Algerian Revolution. Unfortunately this is not the case. In referring to the conflict between Algeria and Morocco, Neilson offers us the following gem:

"In the event of war between the two states, the attitude of Marxists must be one of inflexible opposition, i.e., of revolutionary defeatism, in relation to their respective regimes on both sides of the frontier."

This position is a little different from that taken by Ait Ahmed who announced that his "revolutionary defeatism" would be suspended until



after the conflict with Morocco was over. From this we can conclude that some socialists in London are more intransigent than some "socialists" in Algeria.

We can also note that it is different from the position of the radical political opposition in Morocco which called for defeatism in Morocco and for full support to the Algerians in defending their revolution.

However, Neilson's declaration continues to leave a big question mark over the pretension of The Newsletter that it represents revolutionary socialism -- at least so far as the Algerian Revolution is concerned.

Morocco is governed by a neocolonialist monarchy whose territorial ambitions are viewed not unsympathetically by the imperialist powers, including the fascist butcher Franco who is a friend of Hassan II. (The Moroccan potentate listed Spain as one of his first choices for a congenial place to hold cease-fire talks with Ben Bella!)

The government of the plebian Ben Bella, on the other hand, has instituted the most profound agrarian reform in all of Africa, has fostered and legalized democratic self-management and Workers Councils, has opposed the neocolonialist tendency represented by such figures as Ferhat Abbas, and is regarded by the Moroccan monarchy as a contagious source of socialist ideas and the potential Cuba of North Africa.

The editors of The Newsletter can see no difference between these two regimes! They advocate revolutionary defeatism in both cases, and since they scarcely have the forces to put such a policy into effect, their practical course is to stand aside, disdaining to take sides in a conflict in which "Nothing less than the whole orientation of North Africa may be at stake," if we are to believe an imperialist mouthpiece like the New York Herald Tribune [Oct. 30].

The editors of The Newsletter evidently felt themselves to be in the frying pan for inadvertently displaying too much sympathy with the counter-revolutionaries of Kabylie. Perhaps they would have done better to stay there than to land where they are now.

#### MORE ON THE "FRONT OF SOCIALIST FORCES"

When the "Front of Socialist Forces" in Kabylie called on September 29 for the armed overthrow of the Ben Bella government, some socialists in other countries of ultra-left persuasion were taken in -- at least for a time -- by the demagogy. [See World Outlook October 25.] The real character of this formation now appears to be generally better understood. An informative contribution to this understanding has been made by David Rousset in the October 19 issue of Le Figaro Littéraire in an article titled "In Kabylie It Was Nothing but a Rebellion of Talkers."

"Today," Rousset wrote, "Ait Ahmed and Mohand El Hadj are hiding in the mountains. What is extraordinary, and in all respects stupefying, is that, for fourteen days, these men, openly committed to a test of force, did nothing but talk. They did nothing else. They talked tirelessly. Before the microphones. Before the cameras. Before anyone that would listen. On top of this they said nothing precise. They condemned the regime without reserve and without growing tired. They never developed any

national program. Like spinning dervishes, they convinced those that came around, it seems, that history was beginning over again, that Kabylie, bled white, dotted with ruins, exhausted and hungry in its sterile beauty was again going to make its grand entrance into the tragic legend of war. They announced this war without moving, arms at the ready, and so persuasively that many people saw it already and, in fantastic fashion, projected on to the peaceable torpor of Michelet, Fort-National and Azazga, the violent and sudden forays of the past seven years, so powerful is memory, so strong the imagination."

Ait Ahmed remained immobile. "He was not able to bring about any rapprochement with Khider nor with Ferhat Abbas. No ally showed up. To the specific accusations levelled over the old crimes of Boussouf and Krim Belkacem, he made no reply. While protesting being placed in an amalgam with Morocco, he believed it opportune to defend the diplomacy of Hassan II. While presenting himself as a genuine socialist, he denounced the Management Committees and vilified the nationalizations. There he might have made some profitable gains, if his alliance with the PRS [Revolutionary Socialist Party] of Boudiaf had not turned the bourgeoisie and the middle classes away from him in advance. So much so that on October 12 he had to flee into the mountains."

As for Ahmed's co-leader, Rousset has this to say: "I am convinced that the only reason that prevented Mohand Ou El Hadj from engaging in combat was that the Kabyle population did not want war. He is not a man to go against the will of his people, even if he has contrary views. Nowhere in Kabylie has the population armed itself against the government. The opposition has no support in the people for war. This is a cardinal observation. The Algerian people, no matter how discontented, how great one may imagine its grievances to be, in no case desires recourse to arms. Any opposition that doesn't understand this is beaten in advance. This fact reduces to shreds the suppositions about a long guerrilla war. If the Kabyle guerrillas once held tough for a long time it was partly due to the mountains but much more to the solidarity of the village and finally because they had Cairo, Tunisia and Morocco active and unattackable. None of these conditions exist today. The population will not agree to enduring a state of insecurity contrary to its most immediate interests. Perhaps they will help insubordinate soldiers to escape. But they will not give them any help in fighting."

Rousset explains the centering of the rebellion in Kabylie as due to an "excess of nationalizations in the commercial sector" that antagonized small merchants, to the lack of immediate benefits to Kabylie from the nationalization of land, and to a certain dissatisfaction in the armed forces over an imagined discrimination against Kabyles in forming the professional staff.

These things must be corrected, he holds. The "sole fact that the peasants of the Kabyle villages would permit the opposition to act, even if restricted to a political level, is a warning that must not be disregarded."

And Rousset notes a point of considerable interest in assessing just how disaffected the Kabyle people may really be. In Algiers the most impressive crowds, mounting to as high as 200,000 have roared their support to the government. The population in Algiers is, however "Kabyle in the majority."

## COUP D'ETAT IN VIETNAM

"Mr. Lodge went to Vietnam to prevent a revolution, not to encourage one." This statement was made by New York Times correspondent Max Frankel in a special dispatch from Washington, October 26. A week later on Saturday November 2 Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge was scheduled to leave for Washington, his task accomplished.

On Friday he postponed his trip. Early in the afternoon Vietnamese troops under the command of fourteen generals and ten colonels had opened siege of the palace held by President Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother Nhu.

The following morning, the day Lodge was to have left, the surrender and subsequent suicide or execution of the two brothers was announced.

In Washington on Friday the State Department categorically denied any involvement of the U.S. government in the coup d'état. State Department spokesmen indicated that while there was "no surprise" in Washington over the event, it had been sprung without their knowledge.

The State Department's denial was accepted at its true value. No one gave it credence, least of all the officials in Washington celebrating the success of the sudden surprise.

General Le Van Kim, a spokesman of the military junta that took over, said in his first statement that the sole program of the conspirators was to continue the "war against communism." He guaranteed maintenance of all previous pacts and agreements, especially those involving the private property of foreigners.

With the coup d'état, the Kennedy administration is rid of a puppet regime whose obscene corruption and brazen espousal of the most reactionary views had become hopelessly embarrassing. Still worse, their way of conducting the dirty war being waged against the Vietnamese people gave rise to more and more fear that it would touch off a revolutionary struggle in which the Diem government might go down, dragging with it the capitalist structure which Washington is seeking to save in Vietnam.

A new set of puppets, along with a few reforms, opens up the possibility of putting a fresh front on the counterrevolutionary imperialist venture. The Kennedy administration also obviously hopes that a refurbished puppet government will inspire fresh energy in the military campaign against the Vietcong guerrilla fighters.

The question remains to be answered, however, whether the maneuver is not too late. Continuation of the dirty war under the guidance of the Pentagon, the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency can quickly tarnish the generals who ousted the hated Diem family.

The Vietnamese want an end to the fighting, an end to the concentration camps set up for the entire country in the form of "strategic hamlets," an end to the oppressive feudal-capitalist structure, an end to the support from abroad that has become the main pillar of the reactionary Saigon regime.

They want freedom now. They will be satisfied with nothing less.

ASTURIANS CONFIRM REPORT OF TORTURE

A report smuggled out of Spain on the torture of striking miners in Asturias [see World Outlook October 4] had considerable repercussions. A group of 102 intellectuals in Spain filed a protest in a joint letter addressed to Fraga Iribarne, Minister of Information under Franco.

Iribarne denied some of the most shocking facts mentioned in the report and then tried a diversionary maneuver. One of the signers of the document, José Bergamin, a Catholic writer, was known to have participated in the Stalinist campaign against the POUM [Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista] in 1937-39. Iribarne recalled this and said that because of his role then, Bergamin had no right to concern himself over the fate of the miners in Asturias.

When the story got back to Asturias, a group drew up a letter which was sent to Bergamin. The text of the letter is as follows:

\* \* \*

Dear Sir,

All the men and women of Asturias, and not only the families of miners, recently learned with emotion about the magnificent gesture which you, together with 101 other intellectuals of our country, made in raising your voice to protest against the bad treatment, the torture and the cruelty of all kinds inflicted on the miners and their wives during the recent strikes.

We express here, along with our emotion, our profound gratitude for the letter of protest which you sent to the Francoist minister Sr. Fraga Iribarne.

We must tell you that everything you denounced was true and that if your courageous text suffered any fault it was in not reporting more examples illustrating the repression.

For your information, we are giving you some additional facts concerning some of these cases of which you spoke and we will cite others:

(1) The miner Silvino Zapico was genuinely tortured at the beginning of the month of September and his genital parts were gravely injured. He is home at present, deaf and blind as a result of the torture.

(2) The miner of "la primera" of "El Fondón" which you mention is named Alfonso Brana. He was given the "third degree" and had a cheekbone broken. Left half conscious by the civil guards in a field near Sama de Langreo, he was rescued by fellow workers. The doctor who was called, on seeing the extent and gravity of the wounds he was suffering from, said that he did "not know where to begin."

(3) The miner caught by the civil guard while he was up on the rain-spouts of the Duro Felguera Company painting "The people will avenge themselves," was Everardo Castro Perez. He was beaten with such savagery and submitted to such grave torture that he went mad. At present he is in the provincial psychiatric asylum "La Cadellada."

(4) Constantina Perez Martinez, familiarly known as "Tina," and

Anita, the wife of Alfonso Brana, did not break down during the interrogation to which they were submitted by the police. They were savagely mistreated. Their breasts were wrung, their heads shaved.

(5) Jeronimo Gonzalez Terente, José Ramos Tevera and some other miners, after having been beaten at police headquarters in Sama de Langreo, were taken by a group of the civil guard and police to a place called "Altos de Juécara" where they were submitted to a simulacrum of execution by a firing squad. They were later transferred to the Carabanchel prison at Madrid where they are now awaiting military trial.

(6) Landino Perez Garcia, a miner, was called to police headquarters in Sama de Langreo. The police accused him of having dispersed money for the support of miners deported in April and May 1962. Ferociously beaten, he received many blows on the testicles. Freed later, he returned home to Blimea where he is bedridden, the doctor having prescribed absolute rest.

(7) Ten other miners of "El Fondón," after having been given the "third degree," were forced by Captain Fernando Caro Leyva to appear at the mine Monday, September 2.

(8) Tonin is a miner of "El Fondón" who after having just been freed from the Burgos prison a couple of days previously was again arrested and tortured. During his stay at the Burgos prison, he had contracted a lung infection. During the "séances" to which he was submitted at the police headquarters of Sama de Langreo, he vomited blood many times. The police left him unconscious in a field near Sama de Langreo.

(9) José, "El Gallego," and another young miner, both of them from "La Mosquitera" mine, were tortured in savage fashion. The former was invalided after being kicked in the testicles. When "El Gallego" came out of the police headquarters in Sama de Langreo, his wife and daughter, who were waiting for him, did not recognize him because of the condition in which he had been left by his torturers.

The men who have directed and executed this systematic plan of torture are already known to you:

The captain of the civil guard Fernando Caro Leyva.

Corporal Perez, who has been promoted to sergeant as a reward for his "skill" in carrying out torture.

Commissioner Ramos of the Social Brigade of Oviedo.

Inspector Sevilla of the same brigade.

We must let you know that the Asturian workers unleashed the strike for very precise and just demands:

For higher wages; for the return of their comrades deported the year before and the restoration of their jobs; for better pensions for miners suffering from silcosis who can no longer work; for genuinely free unions.

You know the response of the regime of Franco and his domesticated unions.

With our profound gratitude.

A GROUP OF MEN AND WOMEN OF ASTURIAS

October 1963

#### GREEK POLITICAL PRISONER DIES

The death of Damianos Hatzidanilidis in the Saint Paul prison has been announced by the International Committee for Amnesty and Respect for the Rights of Man in Greece.

A fighter in the Greek resistance movement during World War II, Hatzidanilidis had been held for eighteen years as a political prisoner, following restoration of the monarchy when the Allies took over Greece after the war. Numerous efforts had been made to secure his freedom because of the illness from which he suffered.

Hatzidanilidis is the seventh political prisoner to die this year behind bars in Greece.

It is estimated that more than a thousand political prisoners are still being held.

#### PERU JOGS OIL COMPANY ON TAX BILL

The International Petroleum Company of Peru, a subsidiary of Standard Oil, has been handed a bill for \$75,000,000 by the Peruvian government of newly elected Belaunde Terry and asked to pay up at once.

The bill is for taxes for the past forty-two years which the company absent-mindedly overlooked paying.

Besides demanding payment of this back bill, the government has indicated that it is considering declaring illegal a 1921 contract covering 166,000 hectares of oil land in the north of Peru. The government wants a new contract that would give it from sixty to seventy per cent of the profits and from 12.5 to 16.66 per cent of the royalties.

If the oil trust does not meet these demands, the government threatens to nationalize all its holdings in Peru.

#### OIL COMPANIES UNDER ATTACK IN ARGENTINA

As a concession to popular pressure, Argentina's new president, Arturo Illia, announced October 30 that his government will cancel "some" of the undesirable foreign oil contracts handed out by the Frondizi regime, mainly to the American monopolists.

The major companies involved are Standard Oil of New Jersey (Esso), Panamerican International (a subsidiary of Standard Oil of Indiana), Tennessee Argentina (Tennessee Gas Transmission of Houston, Texas), Cities Service, Shell (British-Dutch) and the Italian firm ENI (Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi).



Although Illia assured the American outfits that his government "has no intention of throwing out the foreign oil companies," the Americans, who boast of holdings worth \$397,000,000, at once formed a council to protect their companies' interests and began to organize conferences with Argentine officials.

Demands are widespread in Argentina for the cancellation of all oil contracts which were made illegally by Arturo Frondizi before he lost power to a military junta.

#### IMPERIALISTS SQUABBLE OVER CONGO OIL

The government of the Congo Republic has threatened to expel two unnamed representatives of certain oil companies who have spread rumors concerning the allocation of contracts.

On January 19 the government signed a deal with the huge Italian outfit ENI to construct a refinery capable of processing 600,000 tons of petroleum a year.

Representatives of Mobile Oil, Texaco, Shell and Petrocongo complained that they had been in on the ground floor and that the cabinet had even approved an agreement with them to put up a refinery with 900,000 tons capacity. So how were the Italians able to knife them out of it? Through a number of embassies, they put pressure on the government for reconsideration.

The explanation for the Italian success which aroused the indignation of the Cyrille Adoula government was that some influential hands were greased.

The government has not yet enforced the expulsion order nor even revealed the names of those involved. According to certain sources, the American companies are now holding secret talks with the Italians. Since this is the final court of appeal, all hands are awaiting the decision of the oil kings.

#### WELCOME CHANGE IN U.S. PUBLIC OPINION

The decision to sell surplus wheat to the Soviet Union has met with a very favorable response among the American people. Returns from a Gallup Poll, announced October 25, showed that the public favors the gigantic sale by a ratio of two to one.

Additional questions asked in the survey revealed a considerable shift in attitude toward the Soviet Union since 1948.

To the question, "Should the United States and Russia work out a business arrangement to buy and sell more goods to each other?" the response was 55% in favor, 33% opposed and 12% without an opinion.

This contrasts with February 1948 when a Gallup Poll found that sale of products by private American business firms to the Soviet Union was opposed by 72% of the public.

In June 1957 the figure dropped to 50% only to rise again to 55% in March 1959 where it remained until the present survey when the majority shifted completely to the other side.

### DEATH TOLL STILL RISING IN HIROSHIMA

In despair over the hopelessness of ever recovering their health, two residents of Hiroshima, Mrs. Kimiyo Tanaka and Mr. Isamu Yamamoto, committed suicide October 26.

The two did not know each other and the only connection between their deaths on the same day was that both of them were exposed on August 6, 1945, when they were thirty years old, to radiation from the baby A-bomb which was exploded over the populous Japanese city when Truman decided that he was justified in ordering the two greatest single acts of mass murder in history -- the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- because it would "save American lives."

Mr. Yamamoto, a maker of wooden sandals, and Mrs. Tanaka, who had no trade, suffered the agonies of "atomic sickness" for eighteen years before they finally gave up.

Mr. Yamamoto threw himself under the wheels of a train. Mrs. Tanaka left the jets open on a gas stove.

Eisenhower has now confessed that it was clear to him in 1945, ten days before the deed, that it would be a mistake to use the bomb in Japan.

### TELL U.S. TO GO HOME WITH POLARIS BASES

LONDON, Oct. 21 -- More than 400 demonstrators defied wind and rain in Glasgow over the weekend in a march calling for the removal of all U.S. Polaris submarine bases in Britain.

At a following mass rally, speakers opposed British participation in a NATO multilateral nuclear force and supported the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in Europe.

A resolution was passed demanding the immediate release of George Clark, a leader in the campaign for nuclear disarmament.

### ANIMALS LESS FREE THAN YOU THINK

The latest scientific studies of animals in their natural surroundings "have destroyed the extremely widespread idea of the alleged freedom of wild animals," Jean-Claude Soum reports in the October 17 Le Monde. It has been recently discovered that the "notion of territory. . . is very important in the animal world." It is so important, in fact, that even eagles never leave a definite valley, while the far-ranging wolf stays within a radius of twenty-eight miles.

With the advance of scientific technique, it is fascinating to discover how much humans, with their notions of national boundaries and forbidden lands, resemble the rest of the animal kingdom.



## THE EARL BECOMES A "COMMONER"

### And the Tories Win an Aristocratic Image

LONDON -- For the past year the decline in influence and popularity of the Conservative (Tory) Macmillan government has been catastrophic. It began with a sharp rise in unemployment that shook the country out of the synthetic euphoria of the affluent society carefully built up by the ruling class through all its mass media. Abroad Tory prestige had been previously damaged by the failure to get into the European Economic Community (Common Market), blocked by de Gaulle's intransigence; and by the American rejection of the Skybolt missile, which punctured the pretense of an independent British "nuclear deterrent." In addition a number of scandals culminating in the notorious Profumo affair rocked the administration, revealing the threads leading all the way from the aristocracy to the underworld (the so-called Rachman housing racket) in the mad chase for profits and profligate "enjoyment of life," and casting discredit upon the whole fabric of government including the so-called "independent" judiciary.

With the term of the present parliament due to end in 1964, frantic moves were set afoot to change the Tory "image" in time for the elections next year. Pressure for the resignation of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan began to mount in the ranks of the Conservatives, and his departure had been regarded as merely a matter of time since early last summer.

The propitious moment for this event came with Macmillan's discovery that he had an illness requiring an operation. He took the opportunity to announce his resignation. The stench of the scandals had been somewhat neutralized by the signing of the nuclear test-ban treaty with the U.S. and the USSR, which wrapped the mantle of statesmanship upon the tarnished figure of the Tory leadership. The economy showed some signs of temporary improvement. The Conservative party, restive for months, was meeting in annual conference. Whether by coincidence or otherwise, the moment was just right for the change the ruling class saw as inevitable in the presentation of its public political figure.

### The Tory Evolutionary Process

As usual in such circumstances, the rulers went through the whole mumbo jumbo of "customary procedure" to bring forth the new leader. He is not elected by his parliamentary colleagues as is the case with the Labour party or even the now decrepit Liberal party. He is "evolved" by a hocus pocus of consultations which never see the light of day -- the first public indication coming only when the monarch sends for the chosen chieftain, later (on the successful selection of a cabinet) being confirmed by the ceremony in which he kisses the monarch's hands.

In the course of normal development, a new leader is more or less established as a "crown prince" under the former Prime Minister's reign. This was the case, for instance, with Eden when he succeeded Churchill. When a critical situation arises, a question mark is put on the natural second choice. This happened after Suez, when Eden fell ill and had to resign. It has happened also now with Macmillan falling ill and having to resign. In both cases, the most experienced, most popular, next man in the hierarchy was R.A.B. Butler. But Butler is known as the man who "remade" the Tory image in the critical years of opposition between 1945 and 1951,

after the great postwar Labour landslide. Those times required "progressive" adjustments, a more "leftish" look.

Both after Suez and now, apparently, the rulers were in doubt whether this kind of choice was the most effective one to make. Following Eden, they decided finally upon Macmillan rather than Butler as their man -- Macmillan was not quite as identified with the "leftish" course as the latter: no one spoke of "Macmilskellism" as they did of "Butskellism" in comparing the Tory line with the moderate Labour line of Hugh Gaitskell, for instance. On the other hand, Macmillan had been a sort of rebel against reactionary Tory policies before the war. He was, therefore, more acceptable to the solid right-wing core of the party which carries the veto power as well as to the ranks. Although he never surrendered completely to the right wing in the course of his administration -- clashing with its most prominent public spokesman, Lord Salisbury, over African policy so that Salisbury finally withdrew from active public Tory leadership -- Macmillan, after pursuing a gingerly opportunistic course (recognizing the "winds of change" in the former colonies, etc.), nevertheless earned their trust. It was he who did most to eliminate Butler as his successor by the wiliest, most cunning and least "gentlemanly" of ruses. It was Macmillan, also, who introduced and promoted the right wing's most likely candidate, Lord Home. [Pronounced "Hume."] The fourteenth Earl of Home, as his official title was, is flesh of the flesh of the core of the old ruling class, a man who had never rebelled or been accused of the faintest touch of rebellion against it; at the same time he is a man who has known how to adjust adequately enough to the "winds of change" when it became inevitable.

### Vestige of Feudal Times

His record, though modest -- until Macmillan appointed him Foreign Minister three years ago he had held only minor, if not obscure posts -- is sufficiently clear to establish a distinct political physiognomy. Educated at Eton and Oxford, as the top strata of Tory rulers nearly all are, he entered parliament and served for some fifteen years until his old Scottish mining area seat was lost to Labour forever in the landslide of 1945. After another brief interval in the Commons when the Tories made their comeback in 1951, he succeeded to his ancient title and the estates that go with it -- all dating back to feudal times when his forbears were among the tribal chiefs of Scotland -- and thereafter participated in politics from his hereditary seat in the House of Lords.

Among his known acts and views as a parliamentarian are the following: during the prewar depression he thought up a brilliant proposal for solving the crisis in his constituency by sending the unemployed miners en masse to the south of England for employment as domestic servants in that relatively better off part of the country (many retired military officers and colonial civil administrators used to settle there). In 1938 he was one of Chamberlain's lieutenants at Munich, looking askance at Eden's resignation and Churchill's attacks over that policy at the time. He had by himself evolved a doctrine resembling the "better dead than red" one of a later day. In 1944 he made a brief speech in the Commons that foreshadowed much of the Fulton, Missouri, ("Iron Curtain") speech line in 1946 of Churchill who, with almost universal support, took a dim view of this premature and embarrassing statement of ruling-class thought at a time when they were still engaged in the war-time alliance with Stalin. As Commonwealth Secretary in the post-1951 Tory administrations, he was a staunch pillar of support for Sir Roy Welensky and the white settler die-hards in the Central African

Federation (the Rhodesias), trimming to Macmillan's "winds of change" with the utmost composure and deliberation so as to assure the best safeguarding of British investments there.

As Foreign Minister in recent years he has been most noted for buffet-ing the United Nations with aplomb, particularly over the Congo operation, where British mineral interests had to be protected along with the stooge Tshombe in Katanga until the threat of the Lumumbists and the possibility of Soviet intervention could be safely eliminated.

He attributes the "success" of the test-ban treaty to the "tough, realistic" line he has pursued with Khrushchev, and sees the possibility of further progress in decreasing tension as due to the Sino-Russian conflict and the softening up of the Kremlin.

This, in brief, is the political picture of the man whom British imperialists have chosen as Macmillan's successor. For the first time since the 1890's they have resorted to a member of the aristocracy for the main job in politics. In England's unwritten constitution it has been accepted all these years that only a commoner could hold that post, barred since that time to members of the aristocracy. This constitutional hurdle was easily scaled by the rulers. They simply took advantage of a law passed in the last session of parliament which enables members of the aristocracy to formally renounce their titles and so to make themselves eligible for election and participation in the House of Commons. The Earl of Home thus henceforth changes his name and title to Sir Alex Home-Douglas (mere knighthood does not disqualify a man from being considered a commoner).

### "Quaint" Apparatus of Rule

Ironically, the law that made this procedure possible was passed on the initiative of the Labour party after much Tory resistance. It was part of the piecemeal pecking away at the political vestiges of feudalism by the Labour leadership and then owed its success to the drive put on by Anthony Wedgwood Benn (one of the younger leaders) who became disqualified for parliamentary life when he succeeded to the title of his father Lord Stansgate, who had been made a peer to give Labour better representation in the upper house during an earlier Labour government.

The abolition of the House of Lords, where membership is by hereditary title, was inscribed as an objective of the Liberals in their heyday, in 1906. Labour took over as the main opposition to Toryism after the first world war. In the ensuing years, however, the Tories have been able to hang on tenaciously to every vestige of feudalism in the political fabric, and Labour's "attacks" upon these have been the most feeble and half-hearted of all its incursions into the ruling structure of British society. Recently they have agreed to pass as law a Tory measure that makes newly created peers (to establish "political balance") only "life peers" -- that is, only for their lifetime, nonhereditary. This and the measure backed by Wedgwood Benn are the only changes since the bold objective was proclaimed by the Liberals over half a century ago.

The reasoning of the Labour leaders has always been superficial and even flippant. These remnants of the feudal past are "colorful," "quaint," "harmless," "less costly than electing a president (in the case of the monarchy) or a senate." Almost forty years ago, in his famous polemical

pamphlet Where Is Britain Going? Leon Trotsky, analyzing the social structure of the country, pointed out the skillful way the ruling class was using all the trappings of tradition to tie the mass of the people to its rule of exploitation under the facade of democracy. The naming of Home, or Sir Alex Douglas-Home as he will now be known, is another demonstration of this same cunning circumvention of democracy.

There are political pundits who estimate that by bringing this scion of the hoary aristocracy into the leadership of the Tory party, the ruling class handed Harold Wilson and the Labour party the next election on a silver platter. To this observer that seems a very simplistic and doubtful interpretation of the move. It is more likely that the rulers of Great Britain are thus taking a calculated gamble. Their political fortunes came to a low ebb with the decline of the Macmillan administration. They face the distinct possibility of a Labour victory in the next elections. If the old shell game of a tax reduction is made possible by the new upswing in the economy, a refurbishing of their public image with the figure of one "born to rule," with all the traditional strength behind him, might just carry off the "floating vote" of the petty bourgeoisie in an election once more. If not, they intend to entrench on their most solid class positions for relentless battles in opposition to a Labour government. That seems to be the real meaning of Home.

#### ROBERT WILLIAMS ON TOUR IN CHINA

The militant American Negro leader Robert Williams, who was forced to seek political refuge in Cuba when the FBI put on a nation-wide hunt for him on framed-up kidnapping charges, has recently been touring China. He appears to have made a favorable impression and has been honored in many different cities. On October 10 he was the featured speaker at a rally in Peking at which prominent Chinese government officials were present as well as speakers from a number of countries.

The October 18 Peking Review reports Williams' appearance as follows:

"Kuo Mo-jo [Chairman of the China Peace Committee] expressed admiration for the unflinching revolutionary spirit of Robert F. Williams, calling him a contemporary lion-hearted fighter and leader of the American Negroes.

"The 38-year-old Williams, who hails from the state of North Carolina, was forced in 1961 to leave his native country and take up residence in Cuba. Robert Williams, advocating that Negroes must counter violence with violence and take up arms in self-defense, has since 1957 actively resisted the authorities who have been working hand in glove with racists. It was at his request that Chairman Mao Tse-tung made his famous August 8 statement. [The statement, declaring China's support for the "Freedom Now" struggle of the American Negro people, was a sensation in the United States.]

"Robert Williams was warmly greeted at the October 10 rally. After expressing his gratitude to Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese people for their unflagging support to the liberation struggle of the American Negroes, he told the audience how he felt while living in Cuba and visiting China. 'To be in China,' he said, 'with an open mind and eye, is to be

infected with admiration for a dauntless people with a warm love for humanity and world peace.' China and Cuba were forbidden territories for his fellow countrymen, he continued. 'Yes, as a black man, I find in these two countries that for the first time in my life I enjoy the splendid feeling of belonging to the human race. I have experienced for the first time in all my life the lifting of the horrible burden of racial tyranny and the stress of being born black in a white-supremacy world.'

"In his 8,000-word-long speech, Williams brought forth a host of facts to give the lie to the so-called democracy and freedom in the United States and accused U.S. imperialism of its brutalities in racial persecution. 'The Government of the U.S.,' he said, 'is the world's greatest hypocrite. It is the world's greatest enslaver and dehumanizer of the human race. It is a disgrace and a horrible shame to all mankind. It is a threat to the peace and security of the world.'

"Williams assured his audience that 'the U.S. is out to conquer the world and to establish a new world order of "racist democracy," exemplified by Birmingham justice. Those who speak of peaceful coexistence with such savage beasts cannot sincerely have the best interest of all humanity at heart.'

"In winding up his speech, Williams declared that the Government of the United States was an enemy to all the world, and freedom there was a farce. But, 'I take heart in the fact that our people, like the other oppressed peoples of the world, are fighting back. We are bound to win because we are part of the world struggle of all the oppressed peoples.' At the end of his speech, he shouted, 'Freedom! Freedom! Freedom now or death!'"

#### GRAVE DEFICIENCY IN SOVIET AGRICULTURE

The latest issue of the Italian left Socialist weekly Mondo Nuovo has published the full text of a recent report by Khrushchev on the state of Soviet agriculture. While trying to justify the course he has followed and cover up the grave deficiencies of his own agricultural policy -- Khrushchev has imposed his views on the planning of Soviet agricultural production for more than ten years! -- the report contains some interesting admissions. These cast a revealing light on the reasons for the present wheat crisis in the Soviet Union. They also confirm the correctness of the criticism which the Fourth International has directed at Khrushchev's agricultural policy for some years.

Khrushchev states that the Soviet Union is at present producing 20,000,000 tons of mineral fertilizer a year. This compares with 35,000,000 tons in the United States. Khrushchev points out that these figures require adjustment, since American farmers cultivate only 118,000,000 hectares as compared to 218,000,000 in the USSR. Thus to restore the same amount of fertilizer to the soil as is the practice in the United States, fertilizer production in the USSR would have to be increased to 70,000,000 tons. In other words on comparable areas of land, Soviet agriculture invests less than thirty per cent of the current amount in the U.S.

Khrushchev also points out that although an output of 20,000,000 tons of mineral fertilizer is considerable for the USSR, part of it is not used

but only wasted. Hills of it lie in the open for months at railway sidings. Covered with snow in the winter, they offer a convenient site for small boys to go coasting with their sleds.

### CP SEEKS PARLIAMENTARY ROAD IN MEXICO

MEXICO, D.F. --- The recent conference of the MLN [Movimiento de Liberación Nacional] brought to light differences of which only the "experts" were aware up to now between the Communist party of Mexico [CP] and what could be called the official leadership of the MLN. The CP, it should be noted, is within the MLN, since the latter permits either individuals or political bodies to join provided they subordinate themselves to the official leadership.

There has been much discussion in the press about these differences which at times became so sharp that members of the presidium at the conference lost control in face of the rough-house tactics of the CP which went all-out in its efforts to drag the MLN into the FEP [Frente Electoral del Pueblo].

The FEP is the most recent creation of the CP. It was formed last May when the majority of the national leadership of the MLN refused to participate in the 1964 elections for senators, deputies and a new president. (The minority of the MLN was organized by Terrazas and Danzós, leaders of the CP, and the bourgeois liberal former governor of Lower California, Braulio Maldonado.)

The refusal to convert the MLN into a political party or front of political parties caused great disappointment in many quarters, including some of the leaders of the MLN. However, it was the political explanation offered for this refusal and not the refusal per se which was reactionary.

It was argued that the MLN is trying to carry out "democratic" educational work, above all in the countryside and that this campaign does not aim at preparing the peasants for revolution, although they have had enough of electoral promises, but on the contrary seeks to convince them to have faith in a constitution that is not observed in the least by its creators, beneficiaries and main apologists.

To tell the truth, the FEP does not transcend the MLN because of its desire to participate in elections. Khrushchev's partisans are inveterate opportunists who have been reduced to the absurd in seeking to carry out their "theory" of the peaceful, parliamentary road to "national democracy," the "tactical" euphemism the CP uses for "socialism" in order not to frighten people unprepared to go that far. (As for the Moscow-Peking conflict, the CP ardently favors Khrushchev, going so far in defense of his line as to intimidate the rank and file from touching the "poison" of Chinese documents.)

The FEP confronts an embarrassing problem in taking the parliamentary road; that is, the absence of parliamentary democracy. It is somewhat difficult to solve this problem by purely democratic means in view of the absence of democracy in the registration of political parties.

Barred from registering as a party, the FEP has resorted to all kinds of legalistic maneuvers --- court orders, etc. --- and declared war on the

bourgeois government in its own terrain, the constitution and bourgeois legality.

The Venezuelan CP also sought to follow the parliamentary road, but when they were denied parliamentary immunity and were faced by armed attack they did not hesitate to resort to extra-parliamentary means, their theory to the contrary. Not so the Mexican CP.

In the MLN there is much discussion now about the stand of the Chinese and whether they are not right in view of the position of the Mexican CP. In the same sector of the MLN, and not in the CP, are to be found the partisans of Fidel.

(There is a split off from the CP which calls itself the Partido Bolchevique de México which openly adheres to the Chinese theses. But it is very small and at the same time is composed of such out-and-out admirers of Stalin that it lacks any standing whatsoever.)

These forces believe that an electoral struggle in the European style would be suicidal for a revolutionary party in Mexico where the electoral "struggle" is a farce played by the PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional), the party of the big bourgeoisie, and its servile competitors, both bourgeois and "Marxist-Leninist" (among the latter is to be found the Popular Socialist party of Lombardo Toledano).

As yet these forces have not found the needed alternative to the passive policies of the conservative leadership of the MLN.

### ITALIAN CP DEBATES "LEFT-OF-CENTER" GOVERNMENT

By Sirio Di Giuliomaria

ROME -- Two sessions of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist party were called in October within ten days. The first was chiefly devoted to discussing the Italian political situation. It revealed fresh differences within the leadership. The second session, which was not reported in l'Unità, the daily newspaper of the Italian Communist party, unanimously passed a resolution, after brief discussion, on the problems of the international Communist movement.

The first session, October 14-16, discussed a report made by Barca in behalf of the party's National Secretariat. After offering a survey of the domestic economic situation, the reporter concentrated on the short-term political prospects with special emphasis on the formation of a new "left-of-center" government in which participation of the Italian Socialist party is envisaged.

The Italian CP had viewed the previous left-of-center government (headed by Fanfani) rather tepidly. Barca again took the same attitude, stating that "it is not the left-of-center formula in itself which should be discussed and not even the principle of government collaboration between the Socialist party and the Christian Democratic party" (the strongest bourgeois party in Italy). Such a government, he said, ought to be judged in the light of its attitude toward the real current questions facing it, since "Communists have never considered formulas to be more important than real questions."



Confining himself to this axis, the reporter did not venture beyond speculation over the likely concessions to be expected from the Socialist party and the possibility of defeating the plans of the Christian Democratic party and assuring "a positive outcome to the present political crisis." (The nature of a "positive outcome" was left conveniently vague by the reporter.)

A rather lively debate followed. Occhetto, the National Secretary of the Communist Youth, attacked Barca's report from a leftist position. Other members of the Central Committee followed with similar criticisms. Out of twenty-three who spoke, at least nine clearly stood to the left, seven just as clearly defended the report, while the others expressed indecision or confined their remarks to particular questions. No member of the National Secretariat took the floor. This tactic was possibly agreed upon beforehand.

Among those who criticized the report from the left were leaders of important unions (textile workers and agricultural laborers), the vice-editor of l'Unità, party leaders from important cities like Milan, Turin and Rome. The last to take the floor was Natoli, a member of parliament from Rome. His criticism was probably the sharpest.

"There is a point in Barca's report in the final part of his political conclusions which does not convince me," he said. "It is a point in which I find the echo of some of our old reasoning which today looks as anachronistic to me -- and which I think, therefore, should not be advanced again -- as if nothing had happened during the past year and a half. This point was included in the section of the report dealing with the left-of-center question, where the reporter stated that it is not the left-of-center formula which should be discussed but -- in the immediate future as in the past -- the substance of the program hidden under the formula. I do not agree with this."

After these introductory remarks, Natoli stated that it is wrong to wait and see; the program of the next left-of-center government will offer no surprises and it is therefore necessary to step up the struggle to defeat the leading group of the Christian Democratic party. This would by no means signify "a leap into the dark," but the opening of a political crisis which would offer new roads and occasions for fighting for the majority.

Up to this point, l'Unità's report was clear. However a small fumble occurred in connection with the press release about Barca's summary. This summary, in which Barca attacked his critics, was marked by a shift still further to the right. All the newspapers reported it except l'Unità.

(For instance, Avanti, daily newspaper of the Socialist party, quoted the following from Barca's summary: "While we must fight against the plan of the Christian Democratic leadership, we should not slip into the idea of completely rejecting the left-of-center experience, since this would create a vacuum that would likely be filled with a conservative line." Avanti utilized the opportunity to point out the contradiction between this statement and the CP criticism of Socialist party participation in the government. The Socialist party has always justified its support of left-of-center governments with arguments similar to those used by Barca.)

What had happened? After Barca's summary, Spano, one of the members



of the Central Committee, took the floor to ask whether Barca's remarks were going to be published. He warned that publication might create difficulties for the left wing of the Socialist party which is fighting against the line of participating in the government and preparing to carry the fight to the congress of the Socialist party scheduled for the end of the month.

A new discussion broke out and Togliatti himself took the floor to try to smooth out the most embarrassing point in Barca's summary. The decision was that the press release reporting Barca's summary would be drafted on the basis of Togliatti's speech. Great was the surprise, after this discussion, when it was learned that a release reporting Barca's true summary had already been handed to the press.

Since most of the time available had been used up in the discussion over how to handle the press release, no time was left to discuss the resolution on the problems of the international Communist movement. A new session was therefore called after a few days to record a vote.

The resolution that was thus passed repeats the arguments used up to now by the Italian CP in reply to the criticisms levelled by the Chinese Communist party. A noticeable characteristic of the document is the effort to use only political arguments -- they are quite unconvincing -- and to avoid using the language of abuse. Here and there the positions of the Chinese are counterfeited and the attacks follow the Khrushchevist line. The only novelty is the reserve expressed in the conclusion over the proposal to call an international conference of Communist parties. At this stage, it is argued, such a conference could lead only to further sharpening of differences and even a split or to a purely formal and therefore unsatisfactory compromise.

What is the significance of the October sessions of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist party? Before this year's elections were held, when the left-of-center government was viewed as an experiment pending a decision on whether or not to incorporate the Socialist party, the Togliatti leadership was able to check the opposition which began to shape up in the CP with vague criticisms and a "wait and see" policy. This is no longer sufficient, especially in view of the decision certain to be adopted at the Socialist party congress.

The fact that the Togliatti leadership is unable to offer an alternative policy creates dissatisfaction that strengthens critical views. To this must be added the influence of the Sino-Soviet polemics. A part of the leftist opposition can form links with the Chinese.

This explains the rather prudent position of the Italian CP in connection with the proposal to call an international conference of Communist parties. Such a conference might be in Khrushchev's interests, but not Togliatti's. To call a conference under present circumstances in the Italian CP would feed demands for a democratic discussion to determine what attitude the Italian CP should take when the conference convened.

#### U.S. TROOPS IN VIETNAM NOW 16,500

"Authoritative sources" in Washington admitted October 23 that the U.S. has 16,500 troops in Vietnam. Correspondents had estimated the number last summer to be between 12,000 and 14,000.

OUZEGANE TELLS CHINESE ABOUT ALGERIA'S FREEDOM STRUGGLE

[In our issue of October 18, we reported that China had granted Algeria a loan of \$50,000,000 while an Algerian delegation headed by Amar Ouzegane was visiting that country. We also referred to some remarks made by Ouzegane. A more complete report of this important tour and the position taken by Ouzegane was published by the Peking Review of October 18. The text follows. -- Editor.]

\* \* \*

The recent visit of the Algerian Government Delegation, led by Minister of State Amar Ouzegane, has further strengthened friendly relations between China and Algeria. On October 11 it was announced that China has agreed to extend a long-term, interest-free loan to Algeria amounting to 250 million French francs (or 25,000 million old francs).

Invited by Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister Chen Yi, the Algerian delegation during its 10-day stay in China received a warm welcome from the Chinese Government and people. The delegation attended the October 1 National Day celebrations in Peking and later visited Hangchow and Shanghai in east China and Kunming in the southwest. It left China for Indonesia on October 9.

While in Kunming, a famous scenic city in the multi-national southwestern province of Yunnan, Minister of State Amar Ouzegane paid a visit to Yunnan University where he talked to 3,000 students and faculty members on the Algerian people's struggle for national independence.

Amidst repeated applause, the Algerian Minister told the gathering that since 1830, when Algeria became a French colony, his people had never ceased to fight for national independence. He criticized those who had wavered in the revolution or opposed it, including leaders of the French and Algerian Communist Parties. He recalled that, in the early days of the Algerian national-independence movement, the leaders of the French Communist Party arbitrarily issued orders to the Algerians without considering the country's specific conditions.

As if not wishing to be outdone, leaders of the Algerian Communist Party regarded the people's struggle for independence as adventurous and foolhardy, said Amar Ouzegane. Alleging that the workers and peasants were incapable of seizing political power and running the government, they raised such slogans as higher wages, vacations, increased welfare and family allowances, rather than leading the national-independence movement. Consequently, the banner of the revolution passed into the hands of those who were actually fighting for Algeria's independence.

The Algerian Minister of State also told the gathering that, in the course of his people's liberation struggle, certain intellectuals thought that the United States could be persuaded to make the French Government grant Algeria self-government. They did not want to rely on the masses of the Algerian people and carry through the revolution. There were others, he revealed, who maintained that Algerian independence could be gained through parliamentary struggle by Algerians in the French National Assembly. The hard facts, he declared, shattered the illusion that imperialism would grant the people self-government. The only way to obtain independence was for Algeria to rely on itself, to take up arms and struggle by every

possible means to destroy colonialism, he emphasized.

Noting that his people started their armed struggle with only 500 hunting guns against 100,000 well-equipped French troops, the Minister of State recalled that the leaders of some political parties had regarded the uprising as adventurist and a "suicidal operation" which could not last more than three months. At that time the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party also issued a communique condemning the operation on these grounds. These pseudo-revolutionary theoreticians, he said, had forgotten that the Algerian people had completely repudiated the reformist ideology.

The Minister went on to describe how thousands upon thousands of young people joined the fighting organizations and how the Algerian National Liberation Army grew in strength. The struggle was terrible, he declared, and the Algerians lost one and a half million of their people. But the morale of the Algerian fighters was so high that they preferred to die rather than live like dogs under foreign domination. Minister of State Amar Ouzegane told how eager the Algerian officers and men were to learn from the experience of other countries and their methods of gaining victory and how Chairman Mao Tse-tung's revolutionary ideology on revolutionary war spread throughout Algerian towns and villages. As an expression of the Algerian people's friendship for the Chinese people, Minister of State Amar Ouzegane declared, President Ben Bella decided to send a government delegation to China to demonstrate that they would always stand together with their Chinese brothers.

Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister Chen Yi who accompanied Minister of State Amar Ouzegane and his delegation during their tour of the country also spoke. Expressing thanks to the Algerian Minister, Chen Yi said that his speech clearly showed that those leaders who wavered in the revolution or opposed it ultimately would be rejected by the masses. This, the Vice-Premier said, was borne out by both the Algerian and Chinese revolutions. "Only those who take an active part in the revolution," he stressed, "and firmly struggle against the enemy can achieve final victory for the revolution, gain the support of the people and contribute to the revolutionary cause of the people throughout the world."

### NOBEL PRIZE WAS AN "INSULT"

Life, a weekly publication of the Luce family, denounced the award of the 1962 Nobel peace prize to Dr. Linus Pauling as an "insult" to the United States. It held that the award implied that Pauling's long campaign against nuclear tests had contributed to the signing of the Moscow treaty.

In an editorial note, the Paris daily Le Monde observed: "Dr. Linus Pauling was one of the main targets of Senator McCarthy in the epoch of the witch-hunt. It is at least surprising to see attacks now resumed against him."

### H-BOMB PAVES WAY FOR NEW DETERRENT

"I don't know what weapons are going to be used in the next war. But I know very well the ones that will be used in the war after that: the bow and arrow." -- Einstein.

MOSCOW LEVELS NEW ATTACK ON FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

[In World Outlook September 27, we provided a translation of the complete text of an attack on the Fourth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution, published by Izvestia, the Moscow daily newspaper. The article, signed by one "S. Ivanovitch," which is equivalent to "S. Doe," was answered by Pierre Frank, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. His letter of reply to the editor of Izvestia was published in World Outlook October 4.

[This attack against the Fourth International has now been followed by a fresh one, perhaps more significant, since it appears in Communist, theoretical organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. (The September number, which has just come off the press.) The editors of Communist evidently intend to provide a line for "theoreticians" throughout the world who favor Moscow as against Peking. An international campaign against "Trotskyism" has thus been launched.

[The program of Trotskyism; that is, revolutionary socialism, is very much involved in the Moscow-Peking conflict. It therefore deserves to be seriously considered on its own merits. However, neither side is prepared to do this inasmuch as both cling to their heritage of Stalinism. Consequently it is somewhat dangerous, especially for Khrushchev, to raise the issue. Trotskyism, seriously considered, can prove to be contagious.

[Khrushchev apparently believes that "Trotskyism" can be used as a stick to beat the Chinese if proper prophylactic measures are taken to keep it reduced to a mere epithet instead of a program and movement representing revolutionary socialism. The precaution is to ridicule the Trotskyist movement. Hence the rather absurd combination of discussing Trotskyism in the highest theoretical organ at Khrushchev's disposal yet reducing it to the "Correspondence with Readers" column in the form of a reply to an alleged inquiry about the Fourth International. (Must we believe that Communist really gets inquiries about the Fourth International from its readers!) As a further effort at ridicule, the article is humorously signed "S.Ogourtsov" (S. Cucumber).

[Checking the names of staff members of Communist, we find a number of vegetables listed but no "Cucumber." For this job a different government bureau, more closely linked to the political police, may have provided the cool touch required. The anonymity of the piece, however, does not destroy its authoritativeness among the theoretical pumpkins for whom the utterances of a cucumber are no laughing matter. We can now expect many a column in the world-wide press of the Khrushchev faction featuring articles in which sliced cucumber is a prominent ingredient.

[We publish below the full text of this precious document. -- Editor.]

\* \* \*

AN ASSEMBLAGE OF TRAITORS AND RENEGADES

The editors have received a letter from Comrade A.P.Khartchenko, instructor of the Baumansky area committee of the CPSU of the city of Moscow in which he writes: "In view of the open letter of the CC of the CPSU to the organizations of the Party, to all the Communists of the Soviet Union, mentioning the so-called Trotskyist Fourth International which has decided

to support the splitting policy of the Chinese leaders, I ask you to please clarify what this organization represents." We have granted the request of comrade Khartchenko.

The so-called Fourth International is a sect of conspirators devoid of any social base whatsoever, an assemblage of rank opportunists of leftist tendency conducting undermining activities in the workers' movement.

The older generation well recalls what adventurist slogans Trotsky and his political friends advanced, what anti-Marxist opinions they preached on the fundamental problems of the socialist revolution and the world workers' movement.

Always inherent in Trotskyism have been adventurist policies alien to the working class, the absence of principles, duplicity, the traits of anarcho-syndicalism and ultrarevolutionary verbiage. Even before the October Revolution, Trotsky attempted to introduce into Russia the ideology and politics of centrism, of conducting the revolutionary movement onto a false road, of detaching it from the Communist vanguard. After the October victory, the Trotskyists displayed skepticism concerning the forces of the workers of the USSR, their capacity to defend the great conquests, of succeeding in building socialism in our country. They grossly distorted the teachings of Lenin on the character of the socialist state, denying the guiding role of the Marxist party.

Trotskyism was ignorant of the Leninist law of the unequal development of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism which determines the different moments in different countries in which the conditions ripen for the victory of the socialist revolution. Camouflaged behind sonorous phraseology, the ideologues of Trotskyism advocated giving a "helping hand" to revolution by exporting it to other countries, denying the necessity of an evaluation of the concrete situation, of the existence of a revolutionary situation.

V.I. Lenin stood against the Trotskyist conception of giving revolution a "helping hand" by means of war, writing "that only madmen or provocateurs" having no connection with Marxism could dream of the birth of revolution by command, by means of "exporting" it.

As is known, Trotskyism suffered a cruel defeat, it was beaten hollow. The carriers of these noxious ideas were driven out of the ranks of the Communist parties everywhere. Everywhere the masses turned away from these contemptible renegades, rejecting their insolent pretention to lead the workers' movement.

After their defeat, the Trotskyists remained quiet for a certain time, crouching deep in their burrows, then they secretly began to emerge, to gather together their scattered and defeated cadres.

In 1938 the Trotskyists succeeded in organizing tiny splinter groups, in constructing on these bases a guiding center which they called in pretentious fashion the Fourth International. The founders declared that they took as their principal aim the struggle against Marxist-Leninist paths, proposing to work for a certain revolutionary renewal, shunting the detachments of the vanguard down the road of Trotskyism.

Life has completely upset the calculations of the Trotskyist renegades.

Their hoped for international rallying of forces remained as it began, an organization of dwarfs of the splinter variety, working in secret among the masses, having lost contact with living beings. Although the Fourth International has existed for a quarter of a century, it conducts, as its own leaders recognize, only "laboratory experiments." In the band of Trotskyists, quarrels continually occur, groups hostile to one another exist, one acting under the signboard of the "International Secretariat," another under the "International Committee," and a third under the "Latin-American Bureau."

Despite the discords and differences, which mainly involve what methods to use in the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties -- open or clandestine -- the Trotskyist groupings are united just the same in the work of undermining the Communist movement. All the six so-called congresses of the Fourth International were held in secret and were devoted almost entirely to elaborating measures aimed at widening the struggle against the Communist parties. At these different gatherings various "manifestoes," "political declarations" and "communiqués" were adopted containing slanderous elucubrations directed at the Marxist-Leninist parties and calling for the reinforcement of the struggle against them.

The Trotskyist leaders worked out a certain "tactic of entryism," that is of infiltrating their agents into the ranks of the Communist parties and workers organizations led by the Communists.

In their theses on this "tactic," it is stated that no matter how much the Trotskyists are forced to live in isolation, they must work along secret paths, work in secret to recruit to their organizations, to establish by illegal methods links with "useful" people, to orient themselves above all toward opportunist, careerist and unstable elements.

In the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Trotskyists enjoy the support of particular circles of the bourgeoisie, of anti-Communist organizations of all kinds, the right wing of the Social Democracy likewise, and opportunists of all stripes discarded from the ranks of the Communist movement. In the USA and Uruguay, for example, the Trotskyist underworld closes ranks with the remnants of the defunct revisionist groupings of Gates and Gomez. In Belgium -- with the dogmatists led by Grippa. In Brazil -- with the antiparty group of Amasonas-Grabos. In Denmark the Trotskyists have established links with the partisans of the renegade Larsen.

[This is the first place in the document in which S. Cucumber descends the high level of Stalinist theory to the mundane world of facts. Not a single one of the figures he lists is a Trotskyist or has any connection with Trotskyism. John Gates, the former editor of the American Daily Worker, for instance, led a grouping in the Communist party which split to the right after the revelations at the Twentieth Congress. If they are to be found anywhere in politics today it is in the Democratic party where the American Communist party has concentrated its efforts since 1936. Grippa, a member of the Central Committee of the Belgian Communist party was recently expelled for supporting the Chinese position. Larsen, for two decades the leader of the Danish Communist party, was a violently anti-Trotskyist right winger. Expelled from the Danish Communist party after the Twentieth Congress, he is now the leader of the Popular Socialist party. -- Editor.]

In the so-called programmatic documents of the Trotskyist assemblage,

the undermining objectives are covered up by all kinds of demagogic slogans and lying declarations which the Trotskyists propagates as revolutionary ideas defending the interests of the working class. In fact, it is from subjective positions completely impregnated with opportunism, that they base their appreciation of the current international situation, ignoring the fundamental changes that have occurred in the world due to the creation of the world socialist system, not believing in the inevitability of the victory of socialism in world economic competition with capitalism.

The Fourth International occupies adventurist positions in its appreciation of the problems of peace and war, and contrary to the conclusions drawn at the Twentieth and Twenty-second congresses of the CPSU and the Moscow conferences of the representatives of Communist and workers parties in 1957 and 1960, the leaders of Trotskyism have advanced a thesis according to which there can be no unity of action in the struggle against the danger of war, against imperialism, between the peoples of the socialist states and those of the capitalist countries, and that is why it is impossible to avoid a world war.

Contemporary Trotskyism stands against the policy of peaceful coexistence between states having a different social character, identifying this policy with class peace between the workers and exploiters.

The Trotskyists incite armed uprisings everywhere against imperialism by offering a "helping hand" to revolution in all the capitalist countries.

The Trotskyist underworld is bitterly campaigning against the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-second congresses of the CPSU and the Moscow conferences of the representatives of Communist and workers parties on the different forms in which countries pass to socialism. They deny the peaceful road of mass struggle for socialism and consider armed uprising as the sole means of liquidating the rule of the bourgeoisie.

The Trotskyists likewise hold an anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist view in questions relating to the movement for national liberation. They consider the struggle of oppressed nations as "the foundation of revolutionary storms" in the contemporary world, to which must be subordinated all the aims and actions of the world working class, holding the movement of national liberation as the vanguard and the principal force of the world revolution.

The Trotskyist elements try with all their force to denigrate the foreign and domestic policies of the CPSU and the Soviet government. In the materials propagated by them, it is brazenly affirmed that the USSR is trying to reach an understanding with the imperialist powers and that the measures taken by the Soviet Union with the aim of safeguarding peace in the world are in contradiction with Marxist-Leninist teachings. The liquidation of the crisis in the region of the Caribbean sea, leading to the reinforcement of the position of the Cuban Republic has been characterized by the Trotskyists as a policy of "appeasement" toward imperialism, as a retreat in face of the ruling circles of the USA.

The Trotskyist splitters seek by all means to discredit the leaderships of the Marxist-Leninist parties in the capitalist countries. They affirm in slanderous fashion that after the second world war the Communist parties "suspended the class struggle." In the last legislative elections in Italy, the Trotskyists acted in concert with the circles of reactionar-



ies against the CP. In West Germany, the Trotskyist renegades participated actively in provocations against the RDA and the SED and the German CP. In the countries of Latin America, they undertake efforts to undermine the unity of the popular masses who are struggling against imperialism and domestic reaction, advocating the organization of armed uprisings of the workers everywhere without taking into account the concrete forces of the situation in this or that country, playing the game of the enemies of the revolutionary forces.

The Fourth International seeks to utilize for its foul aims the situation created in the world Communist movement by the splitting policy of the Chinese leadership. As was indicated in the open letter of the CC of the CPSU to the organizations of the Party and to all the Communists of the Soviet Union, the Trotskyists have not failed to echo the attacks of the Chinese leaders against the CPSU and the other parties. Again in 1960, the Fourth International addressed a letter to the CC of the CCP in which it was flatly stated that it "welcomes the discussion begun by the Chinese leaders" and "takes their side."

The Trotskyist renegades immediately caught on the fly the dogmatic theses, the anti-Leninist slogans of the Chinese leaders, making clear that these theses and slogans conform to their own concepts. Once again in the same letter to the CC of the CCP, they appealed to the Chinese leaders not to stop midway, but "to develop" the discussion begun by them to obtain the convocation "of a big conference of all the workers organizations" with the participation of the Trotskyists. In the declaration published in July of this year, the Fourth International once again assured the Chinese leadership "of support in their attempt to give the workers movement a revolutionary orientation" and proposed in flattering fashion to unite their efforts in the struggle against the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties.

After the General Staff had begun to intervene by means of complimentary declarations addressed to the Chinese leaders, the local Trotskyist organizations went into action against the workers' movement of the capitalist countries. The organ of the French Trotskyists, the journal "Le Communiste," supporting the theses of the Chinese dogmatists, opened a campaign on "the necessity" of a fundamental "rejuvenation" of the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement. The journal of the Brazilian renegades "Classe Operaria" launched sharp attacks against the CPSU and the Brazilian CP. The Trotskyist journal "The Militant" edited in the USA declared that the position of the Chinese leaders corresponded completely to the positions of the Trotskyists.

[S. Cucumber is a crisp one. A Classe Operaria is published by the Communist party of Brazil which favors the Chinese side in the Peking-Moscow dispute. Le Communiste, edited by Michèl Mestre, represents a minor pro-Chinese tendency in the French Communist party which is strongly opposed to Trotskyism and the Fourth International. Of the publications cited, only The Militant expresses Trotskyist views. Like other genuinely Trotskyist publications it considers that the positions advocated by the Chinese are, taken as a whole, more progressive than those maintained by Khrushchev; but it has strongly criticized Peking's resistance to de-Stalinization and its failure to correctly estimate the catastrophic possible consequences of a third world war. -- Editor.]

The central mouthpiece of the Trotskyist renegades -- the magazine



Fourth International -- recently published an article by one of the Trotskyist leaders, Maitan, in which it is underlined that the Chinese policy is found approbation among the Trotskyists because it bears "an almost striking resemblance to the criticism which the Fourth International has expressed many times in regard to the Soviet leadership." Characterizing the conceptions of the Chinese leaders as "the most progressive" and "the closest to the Trotskyist conceptions," Maitan exclaims with undisguised joy: "We can only confirm this appreciation at the moment when the Chinese are expressing themselves still more clearly on the important current questions."

The Trotskyists not only approve the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, but establish direct contacts with them. The Trotskyist grouping in Ceylon, led by E. Samarakkody, for example, has been in touch for a long time with the Chinese journal "Renmin Ribao." The leader of the Trotskyists E. Modlik co-ordinates his activity with the Chinese representatives in Belgium through the intermediary of the antiparty group expelled from the ranks of the CPB, Grippa. The Italian journal "Il Quotidiano," referring to the Trotskyist "party," announced in mid September that the leaders of the latter had sent an invitation to the Chinese CP to send to their next "congress" an official delegation or representatives to be seated as observers.

[Edmund Samarakkody, a well-known member of parliament in Ceylon, was recently welcomed in the Soviet capital, not Peking, which of course makes him doubly devious. E. Modlik, editor of the Trotskyist German-language publication Die Internationale has, unfortunately, never made the acquaintance of the Belgian Communist party leader Grippa. In Italy, S. Cucumber is correct in putting quotation marks on the word "party" in referring to the Trotskyists since they are not yet numerous enough to appear as a party. As for the invitation to the Chinese to send a delegation to Italy, this is evidence that Cucumber has reached the stage known as completely pickled. -- Editor.]

Such are the facts. [!] Such is the Fourth International. Such are the Trotskyists of today, "worthy partners" of the Chinese leaders.

-- S. Ogourtsov [S. Cucumber]

### CP OF INDIA OPENS WAR ON "TROTSKYISM"

[The signal having been given in Moscow by "S. Ivanovitch" in Izvestia and "S. Cucumber" in Communist for a campaign in which the Fourth International is to be used as a club against the Chinese (See preceding article and World Outlook September 27 and October 4.), the pro-Khrushchev wing of the Communist party of India, headed by S.A.Dange, a supporter of Nehru, has demonstrated its alertness by picking up the material so generously provided and serving it up with a bit of curry for the Indian public.

[The article thus concocted, which we reproduce textually below, appeared in the October 27 issue of Link, a pro-Dange, pro-Nehru Indian weekly. By their servile utilization of the Ivanovitch-Cucumber raw material (with some interesting variations), the editors of Link reveal what perfect control the most obscure hacks of Izvestia and Communist wield over the best minds in the pro-Khrushchev faction in India. Perhaps

we are wrong in this and it demonstrates, on the contrary, the power of mind over matter. We hope our Indian correspondents can enlighten us on this point.

[The article appears in the feature column called "COMMUNIST WORLD" and the country under which it is listed is "CHINA." -- Editor.]

\* \* \*

### Trotskyite Tail

The much publicised interview which Premier Chou En-lai gave to the General Manager of the Reuters had induced certain Western commentators to imagine that the rulers of China were now in a more conciliatory frame of mind and that one could look forward to a slowing down of the abusive exchanges between Peking and Moscow. The Chinese leaders have, however, themselves hastened to disperse such hopes. In the last four weeks the People's Daily and the theoretical fortnightly Red Flag have come out with four joint editorials denouncing four specific aspects of the current Soviet policies. The two papers have also promised to continue the series and "expose" some 80 and odd "lies and distortions" which they have discovered in the Soviet Central Committee's "open letter" of July 14.

The tone if not the content of these four successive editorials is qualitatively new. The Soviet leadership is attacked by name and charged of the most heinous crimes in Communist vocabulary. The language used had never before been heard in the Communist movement. It can only be compared to the language used by the Trotskyites in their abusive polemics against the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement. It is perhaps for this reason that the Soviet press during the recent weeks has often referred to the similarity between the Chinese arguments and the Trotskyite slanders and also hinted at the existence of some organisational collusion between the "petty-bourgeois ultra-revolutionaries" of Peking and the tiny Trotskyite groups in some countries.

Fourth International: As a matter of fact the Trotskyite groups are now of no great practical importance. As Kommunist of Moscow pointed out last week, the Trotskyite Fourth International founded in 1938 has turned into "a sect of conspirators devoid of any social basis whatsoever." Moreover, this narrow sect is constantly plagued by internal dissensions. There are at present three separate and mutually antagonistic [sic] groupings parading under the deceptive signboards of "International Secretariat," "International Committee" and "Latin American Bureau" of the Fourth International. The first functions from France with Walter German as its leader, [\*] the second from the USA with Kennan as its boss [\*\*] and the third has its headquarters in Argentina with Posadas as its chief. Small Trotskyite groups are active in a number of countries including France, Italy, Britain, Austria, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, USA, Canada, Japan, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Mexico, Brazil and, of course, Ceylon. Their main activity is to train ultra-leftist conspirators who can infiltrate the Communist Parties and disorient and wreck them from within.

"Single Front": The Chinese attack on the accepted policies of the international Communist movement have provided the Trotskyites with an unprecedented opportunity and the latter are making full use of it. Already in 1960 the Fourth International addressed an open letter to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party saying that it "welcomes the

ideological debate" opened by the Chinese leaders and that it "stands on the side of the Chinese Communist Party." In July this year the Trotskyite magazine Fourth International published a resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Trotskyite international. The resolution said:

"The 22nd plenary meeting of the Executive Committee of the Fourth International has approved of the historic task of uniting with the Chinese and working towards a single front between the Fourth International and the Chinese Comrades. The Executive Committee greets the Communist Party of China for its ideological struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy. The Chinese comrades are coming closer though yet in a contradictory and empirical form to the Trotskyite programme. The present historical polemics between China and the Soviet Union concern the strategy of the world revolution. The Chinese have accepted the propositions advanced by the Fourth International many years ago." [\*\*\*]

Significant Facts: Peking can certainly argue that it is not responsible if the Trotskyites decide to support its policies. But the matter is not so simple. Firstly, one would like to know why the self-appointed guardians of the purity of the Communist doctrine in China have not thought it necessary to demarcate themselves from their unwanted supporters. Secondly, it is not without significance that Peking is openly trying to mobilise "all true Marxist-Leninists whether inside or outside the Communist Parties" in their support and a large part of the so-called Marxist-Leninists outside the Communist Parties obviously consists of confirmed Trotskyites. Thirdly, most of the pro-Peking Communists who have in the recent months resigned from the Moscow-oriented Communist Parties are functioning in league with the local Trotskyites. The Grippe faction expelled from the Belgian Communist Party thus coordinating its actions with the the [sic] Trotskyite group led by E. Modlik; the pro-Peking minority group in the Italian Communist Party is working in close collaboration with the Italian Trotskyite "party" which has requested the Chinese Communist Party to send an official delegation to its coming Congress; and Sanmughthasan, the pro-Chinese Communist leader of Ceylon who was suspended from party membership last week is hand in glove with the Trotskyite groups led by E. Samarkodi.

One Voice: Finally, and what is most significant, the entire line of Trotskyite propaganda tallies with the Chinese campaign against the Soviet Communist Party. Like the People's Daily of Peking the Trotskyite magazine Communiste of Paris has been asking for a "revolutionary rejuvenation" of the international Communist movement. The fifth congress of the Fourth International held in 1957 insinuated that the Soviet Union "is in collusion" with the imperialist powers and that its policy of peaceful co-existence "has prevented the working people of several capitalist countries from making a socialist revolution in the post-war years". Like the Chinese the Fourth International too regards the present epoch as the epoch of imperialism, wars and proletarian revolutions, considers a new world war to be inevitable, rules out all peaceful changes and holds that an armed insurrection is the only way to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie. The Chinese leaders have only recently declared the colonial struggles to be the focus of world revolution. The Trotskyites have been preaching this idea ever since the end of World War II. Also the Fourth International was the first body to denounce the ideas formulated at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the Soviet Communist Party as revisionist and reformist. The Chinese leaders only echoed them.

Moreover, the Chinese charge that the Soviet Union is degenerating into a capitalist country is obviously borrowed from the Trotskyite arsenal. So also is their argument that if a socialist state does not use its military might to "extend the frontiers of revolution" but wastes its energy in peaceful economic construction it inevitably produces new bourgeoisie elements [sic] within its bureaucracy and loses the character of a revolutionary organism. In fact, the Chinese leaders, if they ever try to differentiate their ideas from those of the Trotskyites, will find it extremely difficult to do so. But the most intriguing aspect of the situation is that they do not seem to have any desire to do so.

\*In the Izvestia original, "S. Ivanovitch" gives the name as "Walter Germain," which is probably intended to refer to E. Germain, a well-known Trotskyist journalist and theoretician. To the Indian Khrushchevites it no doubt seemed more invidious to have a Trotskyite German as the leader of the "International Secretariat" which "functions from France." In Stalinist circles such departures from a prepared text have never been frowned on, falling as they do within the license permitted to artists adhering to the school of "socialist realism." -- Editor.

\*\*The Moscow authority "S. Ivanovitch" lists the name as Cannon. This happens to be accurate. James P. Cannon, who founded the American Trotskyist movement in 1928, still stands for proletarian democracy as he learned it directly from Lenin and Trotsky in the early days of the Communist International. The Indian Khrushchevites preferred "Kennan," who, it is well-known, was ambassador to Moscow and thereby an obvious candidate for "boss" of the "International Committee," which Link locates in the United States. -- Editor.

\*\*\*Unless it has been doctored beyond recognition, the quotation is not from Fourth International, which has sharply criticized the Chinese because of their resistance to de-Stalinization and their failure to grasp the full threat to humanity inherent in nuclear war. Perhaps the quotation is from a publication of some group at odds with the main stream of the Fourth International. As under Stalin, so under Khrushchev, concern for truth and accuracy is scarcely the first consideration in the minds of the prostitutes assigned to engage in "polemics."

Imprimerie: 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2 (imprimé par les soins de l'éditeur)

Directeur-gérant: Pierre FRANK.