

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 1, No. 9

November 22, 1963

21, rue d'Aboukir - Paris-2^e

AMERICAN OIL KINGS LOSE IN ARGENTINA

On November 15 President Arturo U. Illia issued a decree canceling all the contracts in Argentina granted to the international oil cartel in 1958-59 by the then President Arturo Frondizi.

President Illia, who took office October 12, had campaigned on a promise to void the contracts, which were illegal under Argentine law since they stood in violation of the constitution and were never approved by parliament. Illia said that he would not last two months in office if he did not honor his campaign pledge.

The cancellation order specifies that the oil companies shall be indemnified -- but under certain conditions. The Treasury must take into account the amount of "injury" done to the national interests, the damage done by irrational exploitation of Argentina's oil resources, the inadequate accumulation of reserves, the reduction in benefits which the YPF [Yacimientos Petroliferos Fiscales -- the National Oil Department] had to absorb, and finally the taxes which the companies should have paid had they observed the laws of Argentina.

In the light of these conditions, some observers in Buenos Aires characterized Illia's order as "provisional expropriation."

Estimates vary on the amount of money involved. The companies put the figure high, claiming that they have "spent" \$397,000,000 in developing Argentina's oil fields. In an editorial November 14, the New York Times put the figure as "over \$200,000,000." The Chinese news agency Hsinhua [November 2] gave an estimate of \$211,000,000, adding that profits wrested by the oil companies "from the country have come to nearly \$376,000,000."

The companies involved include Pan American Argentina, a subsidiary of Standard Oil Company of Indiana (on a concession of 1,000,000 acres it claims to have invested \$64,000,000 initially and to have "reinvested" \$39,000,000 out of profits); Tennessee Argentina, a subsidiary of Tennessee Gas Transmission Company (a claimed investment of

\$44,300,000); Cities Service (\$40,000,000); Standard Oil Company of New Jersey (\$21,000,000). Companies with smaller investments include Transworld Drilling Company, a subsidiary of Kerr-McGee Oil Industries; Continental Oil; Marathon Oil Company-Union Oil of California; the Royal Dutch-Shell group; Southeastern Drilling Company and ENI [Ente Nazionale Indrocarburi] of Italy.

The announcement that the Illia government intended to cancel the illegal contracts granted by Frondizi -- who was considered in New York and Washington circles to be a "model" Latin-American president (particularly when he ended diplomatic relations with revolutionary Cuba) -- gave the Kennedy administration an acute case of heartburn. The consequence was a striking example of how an imperialist government acts as the executive committee of the ruling class.

A Millionaire to the Rescue

On November 8 Averell Harriman, former governor of New York and a member of America's richest ruling families, arrived in Buenos Aires. He announced on landing that his trip had nothing whatsoever to do with the projected cancellation of the oil contracts. This disclaimer was said to have "surprised observers" in Buenos Aires. They could not imagine him flying that far just because he had his mouth set on one of the steaks for which the country is famous.

Journalists asked Harriman repeatedly if the purpose of his trip wasn't connected with the oil contracts but the multimillionaire just as repeatedly, in accordance with the ethics of his class, stoutly denied "that his visit in Argentina had any connection with the problem of Argentine oil."

However, the truth soon became public property. On November 10 the Argentine government "leaked" to the press that Harriman had been invited to sign a joint statement on the cancellation of the oil contracts but "understandably, did not want to sign."

An "authoritative American source" [probably the embassy] said that "failure by the Argentine Government to act within the concept of the United States position can harm this climate (for foreign capital) and with it the Alliance for Progress."

The demand levelled by the U.S. government, it appears, was "immediate and just compensation. . . ."

According to the Associated Press, "informed sources" said that Harriman's "mission was to save American contracts that are legal -- 'to save Argentina's face and American skin.'"

The same sources said that Harriman "warned Argentine officials of possible consequences of the threatened annulment."

On the same day as the "leak" to the press, representatives of the foreign oil companies met with Harriman. The subject of the conversation was not revealed.

"On Personal Instructions"

Two days later Leo Sauvage sent a dispatch from New York to the Paris daily Le Figaro revealing a few more tidbits about Harriman's trip.

"A cat and dog fight is on between Washington and Buenos Aires where President Arturo Illia, as is now admitted without any beating about the bush in the American capital, flatly indicated to Under-Secretary of State Averell Harriman that he did not have the slightest intention of modifying the projects of his government concerning the nationalization of the oil industry.

"En route for the second annual conference of the Alliance for Progress which has just opened at Sao Paulo and where he represents the United States, Mr. Harriman, on personal instructions of President Kennedy, went first to Buenos Aires in the hope, if not of maintaining the current contracts, of at least blocking their brutal cancellation, considered as imminent, and of obtaining at least, in the absence of new contracts, satisfactory indemnification.

"He failed up and down the line. . . .

"The irritation is all the greater in Washington since it is fed by three aggravating circumstances:

"The Argentine defiance can snowball (an analogous situation exists in Peru particularly); the North American companies can easily be replaced (Mr. Illia's government has already received offers from Italy and even from the USSR); Mr. Kennedy's administration cannot impose its point of view without bringing down the whole edifice of the Alliance for Progress.

"It is no secret, for example, that Mr. Harriman, in his conversations in Buenos Aires, used very strong -- even menacing -- language to make his listeners understand that their attitude not only promised to discourage North American private investment but could compel the administration in Washington, under pressure from Congress, to revise its aid program for Argentina."

For a few days, dispatches from Buenos Aires indicated that Illia might buckle under the pressure. The United Press International said November 13 that a "break" had come in the situation "after sharp and angry reaction from Washington to the Government's planned action, and to unconfirmed reports the Argentine armed forces also had intervened to get President Illia to modify his hitherto adamant position."

If the Kennedy administration had succeeded in getting Argentina's generals and admirals to put additional pressure on Illia, the move failed. The political unrest in Argentina constitutes a powerful counteracting pressure. This was proved when Illia decided that the wiser course was to bow to the popular will and honor his campaign promises no matter how incomprehensible and immoral this might seem to the American oil kings and

their errand boys in the White House and State Department.

AN ITALIAN SOCIALIST VIEW OF ALGERIA

[Under the title "From One Algeria to Another," M.R.Pistone, editor of the Rome monthly Incontri Mediterranei singled out for discussion in the October issue the recent turmoil on the other side of the Mediterranean. The complete text of this interesting editorial follows. Incontri Mediterranei is published in English and French as well as Italian. Since the English edition is not readily available in Paris, we have made our own translation. -- Editor.]

* * *

Mr. Ahmed Ben Bella does not have an easy task, since he finds himself under fire from all of the enemies of independent Algeria (independent, of course, from the neocolonial French forces and those of the rest of the world).

What his adversaries, like Mr. Ait Ahmed and Colonel Mohand, reproach him for is above all his loyalty to the cause of the Algerian peasantry, the same source that furnished the shock troops of the ALN-FLN [National Liberation Army and National Liberation Front] in the war of national liberation, to whom is due the success of the struggle against the French colons who held two-thirds of the arable land in Algeria.

When one speaks of revolution in Algeria, an essentially agricultural country, it is understood that this means first of all the overthrow of the former juridical, economic and social structure of the agricultural economy. The rest is only abstract theory. That is why Mr. Ben Bella -- who has a keen sense of the realities -- grasped the key of the essential problems of independent Algeria when -- in contrast to the chiefs of the former GPRA [Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic] -- he posed from the beginning the problem of distributing the land to the peasants fighting in the ranks of the Liberation Army. And since -- as we have just said -- the arable land was for the most part in the possession of the French colons who, moreover, had left Algeria, abandoning their farms, it was quite necessary to seize these properties as a public utility in order to place them at the disposition of the peasants.

The Algerian nation had no recourse but to pass the decrees of March 1963 on self-management, resolving the problem of the land abandoned by the French colons who were completely compromised with the criminals of the OAS [Secret Army Organization of French terrorist reaction], while granting the workers the most ample rights now in existence on our planet in the question of managing the economy. More than 1,600,000 hectares of European and Algerian land have been placed under this regime, already constituting a considerable proportion of the new agricultural economy of the Algerian nation.

It is natural and understandable that Ben Bella's policy should please the great majority of Algerians as much as it displeases the French colons who fled to France, and the conservatives of other European countries, who are against a serious agrarian reform in their own lands.

The big European press reflects this state of mind, of agrarian conservatism, in relation to Ben Bella's policy. They fear above all that the example of Algeria can set off a chain reaction in the other sectors of the Mediterranean where (in Italy, for example, not to mention Spain) the absence of an adequate agrarian reform has entailed the exodus of the peasants from the underdeveloped regions of the "Mezzogiorno"* toward the most industrialized zones of the Common Market.

At the present time, a large part of the Italian territory is undergoing the gravest agricultural crisis yet experienced. The almost total abandonment of formerly cultivated lands, because of lack of labor, constitutes a problem the study of which is no longer avoidable even by some of the organizations of the landlords that have been opposed to agrarian reform up to now.

This means that it is beginning to be seen what importance for the underdeveloped zones of the "Mezzogiorno" of Italy is implied by the experience of the new agricultural management installed, under the force of historic and social necessity, in the decolonialized countries of North Africa, especially Egypt and Algeria.

In the light of these considerations, it is easier to appreciate the potential role that could be played by the Ait Ahmeds on the one hand and Hassan II on the other in relation to the fundamental interests of the Algerian nation and the Maghreb.**

Everyone wonders if a secret agreement did not exist between them on the unleashing of military hostilities against the Algiers government and Algeria.

In fact, the existence of such an agreement cannot be confirmed. But everything began to develop as if there were a close understanding between the conservative domestic forces and the forces of Moroccan conservatism, so clearly represented by the monarchy.

It is interesting to recall in this respect the declaration made to Candide by Mr. Ait Ahmed, on the eve of his departure for the mountains of Kabylie.

The chief of the anti-Ben Bellist revolt declared in particular: "Don't forget that independence came through a replacement solution, after the bankruptcy of integration. Ben Bella betrayed France and his friends. The nationalizations are nothing but spoliations. . . ."

One must admire the extreme clarity with which Mr. Ait Ahmed expressed himself on the key problems of Algerian politics.

Why then should there be astonishment, if, after the leader of the anti-Ben Bellist revolt took this position, even the Kabyle peasants did not follow the example of the "separatists"?

Why should there be astonishment if the Algerian people seem more than ever determined to support the work of Mr. Ben Bella?

On the dispute over the Algerian-Moroccan frontier, so dramatically

posed by Morocco, the least one can say is that it was badly posed. First of all because it is not by attacking Algeria that such a problem can be solved (a problem common, moreover, to almost all the new African states who inherited it from the colonial regimes). In the second place because His Majesty the King of Morocco knows very well that the frontiers of the Maghreb do not go through Tindouf nor Colomb-Béchar. If however -- after having left the Addis Ababa conference -- he persists in posing this problem in military terms, it must be believed that he rejects not only the common principles agreed on at Addis Ababa, but also the project of a Great Maghreb.

And all this -- it must be stated -- certainly does not add to the prestige of the Shereef monarchy, neither in Africa nor anywhere else, least of all -- in our opinion -- among the Moroccan people.

* "Mezzogiorno" means "noon" in Italian. It is the name given the lower two-fifths of the Italian peninsula. Containing 19,329,335 people [1961 census] it is notorious for permanent unemployment, underemployment, high illiteracy, poor transportation, poor communications and appalling poverty.

** Maghreb -- name given by the Arabs to the North African area now divided into Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. One of the aims of the freedom fighters in all three countries has been to reunite the area.

PRO-CHINESE GROUP DENOUNCES BRITISH CP LEADERSHIP

Deep-going differences in the Communist party of Great Britain [CPGB] were reported in the British press November 11 when Michael McCreery, secretary of a newly formed group inside the party, revealed plans to displace the leadership of General Secretary John Gollan.

The dissidence that has boiled up in the CPGB is a direct reflection of the current conflict between Moscow and Peking but also reflects long-standing rank-and-file dissatisfaction with opportunist policies followed by the Gollan leadership.

The group claims that it has distributed 2,000 copies of a manifesto directed against the party leadership and has met with an encouraging response from the membership. The manifesto attacks Khrushchev and praises the Chinese and Albanian Communist parties.

McCreery said that his group is also acting against "the Trotskyists" who "have been taking advantage of the ideological struggle between Russia and China."

A.H.Evans, one of McCreery's collaborators, said that the aim of the group is to uphold the tradition of Lenin as interpreted "by Stalin" and applied "in China."

The manifesto is headed "An appeal to all Communists from members of the Communist Party of Great Britain." It claims that Gollan "knows full well that Marxists have always held that the capitalist state cannot be

captured and transformed, but must be smashed from without."

The manifesto holds that Gollan's line is "unreal, unrealisable." "The aim is to transform the Labour Party, and then advance to victory at the polls in alliance with this transformed Labour Party, to usher in the legal revolution. But this cosy constitutional perspective has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. By reducing the role of the CPGB to one of transforming existing legal institutions the revisionists have abandoned revolution, abandoned the struggle for working class power and socialism, and replaced it with the aim of winning a few crumbs from the table of the monopoly capitalists."

In a section entitled "The Anti-China Chorus," the manifesto further indicates the sympathies of the grouping:

"In our own country the revisionist faction which controls the CPGB follow Khrushchev in slandering those who uphold the principles of the 1960 Statement. They followed his vulgar abuse of the Albanian Party of Labour with their own public attack upon the Albanian comrades. In January of this year they produced their own public attack upon the Communist Party of China. At the 28th Congress of the CPGB in April, Palme Dutt and George Matthews maligned the Chinese comrades and forced through congress a bogus vote endorsing the January statement."

As for John Gollan and other top officials, the manifesto declares: "In typically hypocritical fashion these men congratulate themselves because they have not used such unpleasant adjectives as Khrushchev, Thorez, Togliatti and company, because they have used the sly innuendo rather than the lie direct."

BETANCOURT CONTINUES PREPARATIONS FOR FRAUDULENT ELECTION

The London Committee of the National Liberation Front [FLN] has again called attention to the curious preparations of the Betancourt government for the elections. The London Committee charges that "the biggest electoral fraud in Venezuelan history" is now being cooked up.

The latest evidence of this is the arrest at the beginning of October of 23 members of congress, including deputies and senators. Sweeping arrests have also been made of opposition political leaders, students and university professors.

Other incidents of similar kind should be noted. The premises of the Unified Trade Union Congress of Venezuela were ransacked and the furniture destroyed. Forty members of the organization, including leaders, were arrested.

Two newspapers, one independent the other an organ of the liberal opposition party, were raided and the presses destroyed.

The press, radio and television have been throttled by tight censorship.

The principal cities, including Caracas the capital, have been placed

under Army control. The National Reservists have been called up.

Working-class areas have been declared military zones and the inhabitants subjected to continual harrassment by the occupation troops.

Betancourt's need for fraudulent elections is evidently due to the unpopularity of the social and economic policies followed by the government coalition (Democratic Action and the Social Christians). The key issues are:

- (1) The complete failure of agrarian reform, one of the principal planks in the platform of promises which brought Betancourt to power.
- (2) A ten per cent increase in unemployment in the last four years.
- (3) Misuse of public funds, particularly to corrupt sectors of the government apparatus.
- (4) Thousands of bankruptcies of small concerns. This is associated with the government's surrender of national resources (oil, iron ore) to foreign monopolists. Profiting from their concessions, these foreign interests gained better competitive position in relation to Venezuelan concerns.
- (5) Persecution of educators and intellectuals for their political ideas.
- (6) The mounting drain on the country's monetary reserves.
- (7) Further accentuation of the already marked differences between the rich and poor.

[For previous article on Venezuela elections see World Outlook October 25.]

POLITICAL SHIFT IN NIGERIA

In an informative article in the Manchester Guardian of November 11, Clyde Sanger, writing from Lagos, indicates some significant shifts in the politics of Nigeria.

Tension rose during the taking of a census, since the results can signify a reapportionment of the 320 seats in parliament. At present the conservative northern area holds the majority.

The situation still remains uncertain as tension may flare again when the results are published. Last year's census had to be abandoned in face of charges from both Northerners and Easterners accusing each other of inflating their numbers.

A general strike was scheduled for November 4. It failed to come off, however, when the Joint Action Council broke up in quarrels.

The Council had held together three trade-union groupings since a

successful general strike in September which forced the government to set up a commission to recommend a new wage structure as well as machinery for periodic review. The new strike was projected in an effort to win an immediate interim wage increase of thirty per cent.

In return for calling off the strike, some of the trade-union leaders were given trips to Britain at government expense. However, "this should not obscure the fact that the unions still pose the greatest threat to the coalition which has run the Federal Government for four years," Sanger declares.

During these four years the NPC [Northern People's Congress] under the presidency of the Sardauna of Sokoto, has consolidated its strength in the north. It has gained enough in the south to give the regional governments a conservative complexion.

The NCNC [National Council of Nigerian Citizens], principal coalition partner of the NPC, once a radical nationalist party led by Azikiwe, is now run by conservative elements.

Chief Awolowo foresaw the swing to conservatism and, as leader of the opposition, tried to change his Action Group party into a radical Pan Africanist organization. This alienated conservatives in his own western region and helped provoke a split with the regional premier, Chief Samuel Akintola.

Akintola's section of the old Action Group has been renamed the UPP [United People's Party]. In coalition with the NCNC, it is known, says Sanger, "to be allied with the Sardauna's NPC."

Sanger's general conclusions, perhaps the most interesting part of his article, are as follows:

"Even if the north is proved to contain some 25 million people and so retains a majority of seats in the Federal Parliament, the beginnings of a Socialist Party's gaining widespread strength throughout Nigeria are being foreseen by many observers.

"Chief Awolowo was in this respect ahead of the times. The success of the September general strike, with a surprisingly strong response in the north, was more confidently hailed as the foundations for a Labour Party. The leaders of one main union group have joined with some Marxist intellectuals in a pressure group called the Nigerian Youth Congress to form the Socialist Workers and Farmers Party, which has grown suddenly strong in several towns.

"Other union leaders dislike this party's leadership and prefer to wait for a party more solidly based on the trade unions. And it seems that from here will soon spring the country's main opposition -- and maybe future Government. Some suggest the Moslem emirates of the North are even the most vulnerable, once a populist movement attacking the disparity of wealth gets going."

NIGERIAN LEFT WING TAKES BIG STRIDE FORWARD

By Denis Anderson

Sanger's article in the Manchester Guardian [see above] confirms reports of big developments in the Nigerian workers movement.

Nigeria, with a population of over 35,000,000, is the largest nation -- in population -- in West Africa. Up till now the center of a reactionary feudal regime, it is crucial to the future of all West Africa. Its labor movement has had a long history and played a big role in the struggle for independence. The general strike of 1945 brought the nation to a standstill and forced big concessions from the British.

The right-wing Congress has been directly supported by the ICFTU. The left wing, under the leadership of the old Nigerian radical leader Michael Imodu, has kept a strong basis, particularly in transport. It is this left wing which, with the Nigerian Youth Congress (that led the big Lumumba demonstrations in Nigeria) and various other left-wing and Marxist groupings, has formed the Nigerian Socialist Workers and Farmers Party [NSWFP]. This party is based upon a scientific socialist appreciation of the Nigerian situation, stressing above all the worker-peasant alliance and the need to cement this.

Clyde Sanger offers valuable comment. His dismissal of the NCNC is to be noted. We cannot share any illusions Mr. Sanger may have in Chief Awolowo. We do, however, appreciate his honest statement concerning how easily the right-wing trade-union leaders were bribed.

The working-class movement in Nigeria is still young, and no doubt it will commit many mistakes.

The birth of the NSWFP at such a fortunate time augurs well for the future. It is a development which we must follow with sympathy and care.

Once the left-wing party reaches the masses in the feudal -- and even slave -- north, it will open up truly revolutionary potentials which have slept for centuries.

One thing is certain: in revolutionary Africa of today, the coalition of Northern feudalist and Eastern and Western capitalists cannot continue for long.

PERUVIAN PEASANTS SEIZE LAND

Ten big estates near Paruro, Cuzco province, were seized by several thousand peasants on October 27, according to a dispatch from Lima.

In face of the massive mobilization, landlords and local police retreated.

Whether this had any connection with the movement organized by Hugo Blanco in Cuzco was not reported.

PORTUGUESE TERROR IN ANGOLA

The GRAE [Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile] has released excerpts from a report received from the underground freedom fighters in the Portuguese African colony. The report accuses the PIDE [International Police for the Defense of the Portuguese State] of stepping up its arbitrary arrests, torture and summary executions in the colonialist jails.

During September, twenty-one people were killed in the streets of Luanda alone. They were accused of opposing Portuguese colonialist rule.

"Tens of thousands of patriots are jammed in the prisons in complete disregard of their rights. Every day, we learn from our people among them, heart-rending and chilling screams are heard from men savagely beaten with clubs," the report declares.

"Patriots who have succeeded in escaping from these prisons tell terrible stories. Often in certain areas of the country, the Portuguese soldiers, after suffering a reversal at the hands of units of the National Liberation Army of Angola, descend on villages and arrest all the inhabitants, men, women and children of all ages. They are then taken to improvised prisons where they are submitted to the most cruel treatment. This includes injection of poisons, burial of the body up to the shoulders leaving the head out to be crushed by tanks, hanging by the feet for beatings that continue until death ensues, insertion of bayonets and other instruments in the rectum, etc."

This, says the report, is "the Christian civilizing mission of Portugal in Africa," and this is what the Portuguese and their Western accomplices refer to when they speak about the "defense of the West."

TWENTY WOMEN AND CHILDREN ESCAPE FROM ANGOLA

Twenty women and children escaped from Angola on September 25, the ALNA [National Liberation Front of Angola] reports. They reached Leopoldville in such condition that two children died as they were being rushed to the hospital.

The refugees were part of a column of one hundred women and children who were escorted 250 miles by patrols of the ALNA.

At the frontier they had the misfortune to fall into an ambush. The Portuguese soldiers cold-bloodedly slaughtered sixty women and children. The others managed to escape and the following night finally crossed the border into the Congo.

GREEK POLITICAL PRISONERS TO BE FREED

George Papandreou, winner of the recent election in Greece, announced November 14 that political prisoners, held as long as eighteen years in prisons and concentration camps, will soon be released on five years' probation. Justice Minister Demetrius Papaspyrou said that 279 "Communists" would come under the amnesty. He did not report how many have died behind bars.

BOMBAY MEETING CELEBRATES ALGERIAN INDEPENDENCE

BOMBAY, Nov. 2 -- The first anniversary of Algeria's independence was celebrated here last night at a meeting held at the Cultural Centre of the UAR [United Arab Republic] under the auspices of the Indo-Algerian Friendship Society.

Mooseinbhoj A. Lalljee, president of the organisation spoke of the long-existing friendly ties between the people of India and the Arab nation.

"We watched with admiration the heroic manner in which the Algerian people fought for their freedom and ultimately now, we are watching with interest the big steps being taken by this important Arab nation to rebuild its own economy," he said.

He expressed the hope that the dispute between Algeria and Morocco could be amicably mediated.

Mr. Lalljee announced that the Indo-Algerian Friendship Society is exploring possibilities for sending trained technicians to Algeria and of inviting Algerian students to attend Indian technical schools and colleges.

Madjusudan Vairale, Maharashtra's Deputy Minister for Power, welcomed the efforts by the organisers of the meeting to further strengthen friendly relations between India and Algeria.

Ahmed Zayat, director of the UAR Cultural Centre, said that Algeria's independence was a victory not only for the Algerians but for all people struggling for freedom and human dignity.

Dr. A.R.Desai of Bombay University stressed the need to explain the message of the Algerian revolution to the masses of workers and peasants in India. He was joined in his appreciation of the Algerian revolution by H.H.Ismail, president of the International Club.

S.B.Kolpe, vice-president of the Indo-Algerian Friendship Society told about what he saw in Algeria during a recent trip there and declared that Algeria, with her socialist experiment of self-management committees of workers, is setting an example for all underdeveloped countries.

Dr. Clovis Maksood, representative of the Arab League Mission at New Delhi, who could not be present, sent a message in which he saluted the beginning of the epic struggle for freedom November 1, 1954. He said that the National Liberation Front which launched that struggle "is now undertaking an even more challenging task of rebuilding Algerian society along the path towards a secular socialist democracy."

Prominent among the guests were the Bombay consul general of the United Arab Republic and the consul of Yugoslavia.

NO FLOWERS EITHER

"What does the atomic bomb mean? That there won't be anybody at my funeral." -- Bernard Groethuysen.

"NEW STATESMAN" SPECULATES OVER ATTACK ON TROTSKYISM

The Moscow correspondent of the London New Statesman [November 1] writes that government circles there believe that recent moves by Peking may indicate the beginning of an effort to bring left-wing unions and socialist-minded revolutionists together on an international scale. To block this, Moscow has issued a call for action. This is the real meaning of the latest "Kommunist onslaught."

"One of the fields in which Moscow wants urgent action taken is that of the international trade union movement," writes the New Statesman's correspondent. "The various proposals for an Afro-Asian trade union conference independent of the WFTU [World Federation of Trade Unions], which are coming mainly from Indonesian trade union centres, are attributed here to the hand of Peking. A vigorous effort is being made to ensure the principle of universality in international left-wing trade union organisations, for the danger in a combination of what they call here Chinese chauvinism and racism with the adventuristic idea Mao is accused of taking over from Trotsky is not underestimated in Moscow. Readers of Soviet political literature are, thanks to Mao, learning a good deal more about the activities of the Trotskyist Fourth International and even of the theories of Trotskyists than has appeared in the press here for many years. And they are being told that the Chinese threat to the Communist movement was the gravest one that it had faced since Trotskyism."

"Whether the Kommunist article is to be considered any kind of prelude for a world meeting of parties still remains a matter of speculation. Soviet sources continue to discourage such speculation, arguing that more harm might be done by providing Peking with a platform in Moscow than by leaving the Chinese communists in isolation."

TIMOFEYEV TACKLES "PERMANENT REVOLUTION"

By E. Germain

The September issue (No. 13) of Communist, the theoretical magazine of the CPSU [Communist party of the Soviet Union] contains an attack on Trotskyism written by T. Timofeyev, a well-known Soviet theoretician, which attempts to deal with the subject on a higher plane than the one taken by "S. Cucumber" in the subsequent issue. [See World Outlook November 8.] The attack, part of a long article directed against the Communist party of China under the title "The Leninist Course of the World Communist Movement and Its Enemies," is as follows:

"While the leaders of the Chinese CP develop their campaign against the general line of the world Communist movement, they move farther and farther away from the Leninist theory of the socialist world revolution. Some of their conceptions do not differ greatly from the Trotskyist theory of 'permanent revolution.'

"As is well known, the essence of the Trotskyist 'theory' of revolution is a combination of ultra-revolutionary gestures and a profound pessimism that blocks practical action in rela-

tion to the perspectives for the victory of socialism and [!] communism in a single or a few countries, if the proletariat of other countries has not yet conquered power. This is also the root of the hypocritical, slanderous thesis of Trotskyism concerning the not-further-defined 'inevitable rebirth,' 'Thermidor,' or 'restoration' of capitalism in those countries where the working class takes power, 'if world revolution comes too late.' This, too, is the basis of the anti-Leninist conception of Trotskyism which alleges that the most important task of the victorious proletariat is not the construction of socialism and communism, but 'putting into motion' revolution in other countries by military means. The modern dogmatists in the leadership of the Communist Party of China take precisely this Trotskyist conception as their fundamental weapon.

"The Marxist-Leninist parties long ago completely deprived Trotskyism of its halo and eliminated it from their ranks as a tendency alien to Leninism, causing it to place itself outside of the ranks of the international Communist movement. A few Trotskyist grouplets, which survive in a few [!] capitalist countries, and their confederation, the so-called Fourth International, are separated from the masses, spending what little strength remains to them in internal squabbles and quarrels, leading a miserable life.

"The Trotskyist elements have of late begun to nourish certain hopes for a revival of their activity in relation to the splitting attitude of the Chinese leaders. Like the Trotskyists, these leaders likewise try to hide behind pseudo-revolutionary phrases and to wear the mask of 'defenders' of Leninism. In the Trotskyist publications appearing in the U.S.A., in France, in Italy and in certain countries of Latin America, bitter attacks are being waged against the policy of peaceful coexistence between both systems as practiced by the Soviet Union. It is characteristic that the ideologues of present-day Trotskyism thereby use the same arguments as the Chinese theoreticians and similarly try to represent the present [!] Leninist general line of the CPSU and of the international Communist movement as 'opportunist.' In appraising the most important questions of international developments, among them the principle of peaceful coexistence between the two systems and also the well-known thesis of the Communist movement which declares that war is no longer fatalistically inevitable under the given circumstances, the position of the leaders of the Chinese CP comes closer and closer to the conceptions of the Trotskyist elements.

"History has demonstrated in a convincing way the correctness of the Leninist and not the Trotskyist theory of the revolution. Does anybody exist willing to defend the idea that the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties should abandon their Leninist course, confirmed by practice, and follow those who want to refurbish Trotskyism?"

As we noted above, Timofeyev strives for a higher plane than Mr. Cumber's goblin tale. Not everything is utterly false. Timofeyev is right in his observation that the Chinese leaders have moved in the direction of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution. He is right in underlining that insofar as the Chinese leaders succeed in developing a consistent criticism of the current Khrushchevite anti-Leninist practices of most of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries, they come "closer and closer" to Trotskyist ideas and theories; that is, the only consistent appraisal of Stalinism and Khrushchevism from the Marxist-Leninist point of view. As for the rest, his presentation of the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution is completely false, a typical Stalinist concoction of slanders and distortions.

It is untrue that Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution is an expression of "profound pessimism," that it holds the restoration of capitalism to be "inevitable" as long as the socialist revolution remains limited to one or a few countries, or that it advocates the extension of the revolution artificially "by military means." It is likewise completely untrue that either the Trotskyists or the leaders of the Chinese CP consider another world war to be inevitable.

The theory of the permanent revolution is based essentially on two theses. The first one is that in the backward countries the main historical objectives of the bourgeois-democratic revolution (national independence and unity, solution of the agrarian question, industrialization), which have not been achieved in the past, can be accomplished in the epoch of imperialism only through the conquest of power by the proletariat, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the destruction of capitalism together with the colonial and any existing feudal elements in the economy, especially industry, of socialist character. The second thesis is that the conquest of power by the proletariat on a national scale does not complete its task. While the proletarian power can initiate the building of socialism on a national scale, it cannot finish the task on that level. The class struggle between capitalism and socialism becomes more and more international in character, reaching its final outcome only in the defeat of capitalism and victory of socialism in the most important imperialist countries.

Contrary to Mr. Timofeyev's rather brazen pretension, history has completely confirmed both of these basic tenets of the theory of permanent revolution while again and again exposing the falsity of the anti-Leninist Stalinist theory that socialism can be built in one or a few countries, the line consistently promulgated by the Soviet bureaucracy, first under Stalin, then under Malenkov and finally under Khrushchev.

In the Soviet Union itself, far from considering the restoration of capitalism as "inevitable," Trotsky and his followers, from 1923 on, projected the industrialization of the country on a planned basis and accelerated scale in order to neutralize the growing weight of the petty-bourgeois upper layers of the peasantry, which at that time were concentrating in their hands the marketable surplus of agrarian production. After fighting against these proposals for five years, Stalin was forced to turn to them in 1928. In applying them, he of course distorted them in a monstrous way. By forcing the collectivization of agriculture, he precipitated a crisis from which agricultural production has not emerged to this day!

In the international field, Trotsky and his followers, and later the Fourth International which they organized, far from advocating any military adventures, consistently defended the revolutionary strategy and tactics developed by Lenin so that Communist parties might utilize the favorable revolutionary conditions that arise periodically in capitalist countries and help provide the working class with the leadership required to win power. Under Stalin and Khrushchev, the Communist parties were reduced to instruments of the Kremlin's foreign policy and compelled to "postpone" efforts to conquer power until the "final building of communism" in the Soviet Union (or, as it is put nowadays, until the Soviet Union exceeds the United States in the per capita production of industrial and agricultural goods).

It was this basically opportunistic course that led the Communist parties into fearful errors and betrayals: in China in 1925-27 (right-wing opportunist liquidationism in relation to the Kuomintang); in Germany in 1930-33 (ultra-left adventurism -- characterizing the Social Democracy as the "main enemy" and refusing to form a united front with it against Hitler thereby opening the possibility for the Nazis to seize power without serious struggle on the part of the German proletariat); in France in the years before the outbreak of World War II when the "Popular Front" was formed to block the working-class struggle for power; in Spain 1936-39 where a socialist revolution was strangled in the name of collaboration with the "liberal" bourgeoisie; in France and Italy in 1944-48 where the most promising opportunities for developing the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat towards the conquest of power were liquidated and the Communist parties participated in bourgeois governments to help rebuild the badly battered capitalist state and capitalist economy that emerged from the war. Many of these errors and betrayals are now -- belatedly -- also criticized by the leaders of the Chinese Communist party, but as yet in only a partial and inconsistent way.

Mr. Timofeyev will have some difficulty in disproving that in every instance in which the revolution culminated in establishment of a new workers state -- in Yugoslavia, in China, in North Vietnam, in Cuba -- it did so against the advice and line of Stalin (or Khrushchev). He will have some difficulty in disproving that in every instance in backward countries where the agrarian question has been solved today, it has followed the conquest of power by the proletariat and the poor peasants. He will have some difficulty in pointing to any country where the agrarian question has been basically solved without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. History, we repeat, has in this respect completely confirmed the correctness of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution.

Mr. Timofeyev says that there are only "a few" Trotskyist organizations "left" in some capitalist countries. He apparently consulted a different source than the editor of the Soviet government's official daily Izvestia which recently admitted the existence of Trotskyist organizations in sixteen different countries. In fact the Fourth International is represented in thirty countries today, a considerable increase since its foundation and since the end of the second world war. If Trotskyism is "withering away," why has the Soviet press decided that a policy of silence is dangerous and that time and space must now be devoted to polemics against it? Isn't the need to discuss Trotskyism -- felt in both the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement -- a rather striking proof of its

vitality, increasing strength and importance?

As for the leaders of the Chinese Communist party, since 1959 they have indeed developed a theory of "uninterrupted revolution" clearly derived from their own experience, which holds that creation of the People's Republic of China signified establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat which in turn carried out the bourgeois-democratic tasks of the Chinese Revolution and began to fulfill socialist tasks. Taken objectively, this amounts to admitting the correctness of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution. Of late, the leaders of the Chinese Communist party have even gone so far as to denounce the theory that socialism can be completed in a single or a few countries, the well-known theory which Stalin counterposed to the theory of permanent revolution and which Khrushchev still upholds today in opposition to "Trotskyism." This move by the leaders of the Chinese Communist party is, of course, a most welcome one from the viewpoint of the world Trotskyist movement.

At the same time, the leaders of the Chinese Communist party resort, curiously, to an obscure 1925 quotation made by Stalin which can be twisted to make it appear that Stalin was not the father of the theory of socialism in one country, but on the contrary, its opponent! They thus assumed the scarcely enviable chore of having to "prove" that Stalin was the protagonist of the theory of "uninterrupted" or "permanent" revolution -- as against Trotsky.

Do the leaders of the Chinese Communist party really believe that they can succeed in accomplishing this self-assigned miracle of putting history completely on its head?

Timofeyev, "Cucumber" and their fellow theoreticians and artists of the pen have judged quite correctly in singling this out as an exceedingly vulnerable point in Peking's position. The leaders of the Chinese Communist party took an impossible stand. It is the height of inconsistency to pose as staunch defenders of Stalin, to praise Stalin as "a great Marxist-Leninist," while at the very same time advocating the theory of "uninterrupted revolution" and attacking the theory of "socialism in one country." The weirdness of such a combination is evident to everyone in the world Communist movement. The Chinese Communists must either draw back from "uninterrupted revolution," from "full support to the revolutionary movement in all countries," from a fight against the theory of "socialism in one or a few countries," as much too hot a dish for their taste, or they'll have to bury Stalin and along with him all his pomp and "works." History leaves no other rational choice.

ROBERT WILLIAMS GIVES PRESS CONFERENCE IN PEKING

Hsinhua, the Chinese news agency, reports that Robert Williams, the well-known socialist-minded American Negro leader now touring China, gave a press conference in Peking November 1 in which he declared that "The American Negro struggle is one of the most significant struggles going on in the world today."

Struggling inside the U.S., he said, "the American Negro is waging a campaign in the heart of social reaction today." He said that "the enemy

of the Negroes is the same enemy of the peoples of Latin America, of Asia and of Africa."

"Our slogan is 'freedom now,'" Williams declared. "We are not going to surrender our human dignity. We are tired of being oppressed. We have decided that we prefer to live with human dignity for just thirty seconds than to live one thousand years crawling at the feet of such savage oppressors. We have decided to resist."

Monroe Case

Williams appealed for world support for the defendants in a trial scheduled for January in Williams' home town of Monroe, North Carolina. The defendants are Mrs. Willie Mae Mallory, Richard Crowder, John Lowry and Harold Reape. They face a frame-up charge of "kidnapping."

"The U.S. is the greatest force for evil in the world today," Williams told the assembled reporters. "It surpasses all other forces of reaction. The U.S. is becoming the new racist colonial nation -- colonial power -- of the world. It is the last great stronghold of social evil, social reaction, exploitation and racism in the world today."

The American Negro leader continued: "We know the significance of our struggle. We are going to resist the racist savages of the barbaric U.S. even if we must stand alone. If we must stand alone against the most powerful reactionary forces in the world, we are going to. And if we must fight their machine guns, their gas, their armored cars, their police dogs, if we must fight them with our bare fingers, we are going to."

"We are not going to fail, because our cause is a just cause and our struggle is a just struggle."

Mao's Statement

In his opinion, militant Negro freedom fighters and civilized whites in America were very happy at the statement of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, calling for support of the Negro struggle around the world. "We who are oppressed are grateful to Chairman Mao. However the same racists who oppress Negroes have labeled the statement a 'racist' statement, calling for the unity of colored peoples against white peoples, and they say that this is 'racist' in its motive. But we who have lived under oppression are accustomed to this tactic.

"We hear people who should be supporting us complaining before the world, not about the savage deeds against Negroes, but attacking Chairman Mao, who is appealing to the peoples of the world, of all colors, of all races, to support us in our just struggle. We know where their sympathies are. We also can see that these people consider South Africa and Portugal worthy to be called members of the 'free world' society.

"We seek redress and relief from racial tyranny and oppression. We believe in those who defend our cause and we are not concerned with slanderous name calling."

In speaking of the persecution of American Negroes under the Kennedy

administration, Williams referred to his own experiences. The first criminal charge lodged against him was for the crime of "sitting on a stool on a public restaurant, a stool reserved for white people only." His second "crime" was "kidnapping" people "that I rescued from death, people who were captured by enraged oppressed Negroes during a race riot. And for this, for my part in saving these people, the government of the U.S. has joined the KKK in seeking me for a possible life-time sentence in prison."

He displayed a poster issued by the FBI while he was being hunted in the U.S. The poster brands him as a "criminal," as being "extremely dangerous," a designation that is equivalent to approving his being shot on sight. A quarter of a million of these posters were placed on display in post offices throughout the United States.

Williams continued: "The Kennedy administration has maintained that it is not a racist government, that it supports the cause of integration and justice for black Americans. This is a lie of a racist hypocrite of the vilest sort."

The "token method" used by the Kennedy administration means that in some instances one out of a hundred thousand, or one out of a million, or even one out of twenty million Negroes "is granted a limited form of integration. This is to make the world think that the Kennedy administration is just, that it is not racist. It is also using the method of pretending to push for a civil-rights bill. But as Negroes, as Americans, we know that a civil-rights bill is not necessary. This method of introducing bills in support of Negroes is for publicity to deceive the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa and even of Europe to believe that the U.S. government is a just government.

"The Kennedy administration is also striving to dominate the leadership of Negro movements and Negro groups."

Bribe Attempt

A week before he was forced to leave the U.S. and seek refuge in Cuba, Williams said, his lawyer was approached by people representing government circles in North Carolina. They said that if Robert Williams would denounce Fidel Castro, and tell the Negroes that "our most effective struggle would be through nonviolence and pacifist methods, they would take me to New York, introduce me to the American people on the major television networks . . . and they would make me one of the biggest Negro leaders in America."

Williams continued: "All over the racist U.S. our people are defending themselves, their homes, their women and children. They are meeting violence with violence. They are fighting the racist police, the KKK, police dogs, machine guns, riot guns, tear gas and even armored cars.

"I am sure that you are going to see more self-defense on the part of our people in the future, despite all the urgings of the Kennedy government and the pseudo-leftists and other phony Marxists who urge us to turn the other cheek."

Williams spoke of the rise in understanding that is occurring among

the Negro people in the United States. "As people struggling for liberation and for human rights in the U.S., we are fast learning that the people who oppress us, the white supremacists of the U.S. who murder little girls in churches in Birmingham, who keep Negroes living in a state of terror, who maintain racial segregation and white supremacy by brute force and violence, are the same people who are murdering in cold blood the innocent and helpless women and children of South Vietnam. The most outspoken racist senators of the U.S. who fight against justice for Negroes are the same people who are most vocal in advocating an invasion of Cuba. These are the same people who justify the slaughter, savage slaughter of innocent women and children in Cuba. We can see also that this is the same racist government who stands up in the UN as the foremost defender on the right of South Africa and Portugal to maintain a seat in the United Nations. This is the most outspoken advocate for denying the People's Republic of China a right to sit in the UN."

U.S. imperialism, he said, had become the common enemy of the Negroes and of the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa.

Impressions of China

On China, Robert Williams said that he was very much impressed. "I am convinced without a shadow of doubt that the interest of the Chinese people in the Negro struggle is sincere and that it reaches even down to the small children of eight to nine years old. I feel never more welcomed in a place in my life since I have been here by so many people.

"With the exception of Cuba, this is the first time in my life that I have ever been allowed to feel that I belong to the human race and that I have the right to exist on the face of the earth with the dignity of man and be treated with equal dignity as all other races."

He spoke of the achievements of the Chinese people. "In the West we have been told by the propaganda media of the U.S. that the Chinese economy is on the verge of collapse, that no consumer goods are being produced in China any more, and that the Chinese are incapable of building heavy industry. I must admit that I have been rather shocked by the success that I have noticed in the factories especially in heavy industry.

"I have heard from the U.S. directly that there is no food in China in the market places. But even in the rural communities, in the small stores, I have found that they are well stocked.

"I have been told that China is a warlike nation, that the people of China are belligerent, are hostile. I find this not to be true. I find the people of China among the most friendly people anywhere.

"I have been led to believe that China is a police state, that the people are being forced to do forced labor at bayonet point. But I did not see anybody being forced at bayonet point in China. In fact, people are being forced by bayonets in the U.S. . . . If this is what they call a police state of terror, then a lot of people will certainly be praying in the U.S. for a police state to be introduced there soon."

[For previous story on Robert Williams' tour in China see World Outlook November 8.]

"PRIVATE ENTERPRISE HAS NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD"

By S. R. Singh

NEW DELHI -- Nine years after the ruling Indian National Congress party first inscribed the goal of a "socialist pattern of society" at the Avadi session on its banner, its highest policy-making body the AICC [All India Congress Committee], met in Jaipur in the first week of November to "redefine" its concept of "democracy and socialism." In the midst of the confused voices raised both by the so-called "right" and "left" wings at the meeting, no final definition of socialism could be evolved. The AICC could adopt only a recommendatory resolution for the consideration of the plenary session of the party at Bhubaneswar (Orissa) in January 1964.

Prime Minister Nehru, who intervened in the debate, confessed that India could not make rapid progress towards socialism because of the "caste-ridden society that clung fast to tradition." So lukewarm was the document ultimately placed before the AICC (it was not released to the press) that he himself was constrained to observe that it did not reflect the "sense of urgency which was in the minds of Congressmen."

There was disappointment, almost desperation, in his voice. He said that it pained him to see that "the monopoly in industry was on the increase." Monopoly was the enemy of socialism, he declared. How did he propose to fight monopolies? About this he kept discreetly silent. He invited all those who "sincerely desired" to achieve socialism to join the Congress or to co-operate with it.

But he was not prepared to entertain a demand for nationalisation of the key sectors of production and distribution and state trading in food grains and other essential commodities. In reply to those who demanded controls, he said: "Controls were no doubt necessary in planning but they provided opportunities for abuse"!

Spectre Haunts Nehru

Nehru complained that the capitalists in India adopted an "unhelpful attitude." He warned that if the "process of ushering in socialism was not speeded up the people might get impatient and discard peaceful methods of economic transformation." At the same time, he held, the Marxist concept of socialism is "out of date and obsolete."

Some very revealing things were said by Congress members about the "milk and water" type of socialism sought in India, which has only under-written private capitalism. Home Minister Nanda, supposed to be a Gandhian socialist and a theoretician of the Nehruite leadership, who moved the main document on socialism, also admitted that there was "concentration of economic power and widening of disparities."

His only consolation was that "things would have been much worse" had there been no planning of the type the Congress had introduced"! He said: "We have to reckon with the inexorable fact of poverty. The limitation of resources for development and the elements of backwardness in the Indian social system limits progress." Nanda also talked of the need for greater participation of workers in management as an expression of the "spirit of democracy and socialism."

U.N.Dhebar, a former Congress president and spokesman of the so-called right-wing Congress members, while seconding the resolution, concentrate his ire against those who "preached methods of class war to achieve economic goals."

The Congress, he said, would "adopt the Gandhian means, organise people on the basis of democracy, and educate the vested interests of their responsibility towards the community."

He, however, thought the minimum basic needs of the Indian people could be met only after twenty years at the present rate of growth. In fact that is the "modest goal" the Congress has set before itself!

Income Ceilings Are Discouraging

K.D.Malaviya, a former Minister for Mines and Fuels, described as a representative of the "left" (he was ousted from the Central Cabinet because of a minor financial scandal), had moved several amendments to give the resolution a more radical coloration. He, however, withdrew his amendments on an assurance that they would be considered at the Bhubaneswar session. In order to prevent concentration of wealth, Malaviya had asked for a ceiling on personal incomes but Nehru countered his plea with the oft-repeated argument that ceilings "discouraged individual initiative."

Malaviya also asked the Government to undertake state trading in food grains and other essential commodities "to bring down prices." He also criticised the land reforms which had so far not resulted in the real tillers becoming the owners of land.

Biju Patnaik, a former Chief Minister of Orissa (who had also resigned his office under the so-called Kamaraj Plan to reorganise the ruling Congress party) made a sensational disclosure. He said one of the problems that faced the country was how "to bring into account the large amount of unaccounted 'black' money -- about Rs. 30,000 crores [\$59 billion] -- circulating all over India." "That," he said, was "almost running a parallel government."

Krishna Menon, former Defence Minister, who had to leave the Cabinet following the India-China border conflict last year, was more forthright in his assessment of the present situation. "We must recognise that we have a capitalist economy," he said. "Our function is to transform this capitalist economy in a democratic society which are in accordance with our democratic structure and traditions and our Gandhian background." This is Krishna Menon, dubbed a "crypto-Communist" by his right-wing critics, at his best!

He referred to the tremendous growth of monopolies in India which had "virtually set up a parallel government." He said that twenty leading banks, which covered three-fourths of the private banking sector, had a total of 188 directors. These directors in turn held 1,640 directorships in various industries! Menon knows his figures.

"Monopolies, however, have one advantage," he quipped. "They are easier to nationalise than the smaller units which are spread out!"

He also confessed that high taxation could never bring about economic

equality. "The only way of dealing with monopoly was at its sources -- the means of production and distribution."

250 Million Live in Hunger

Menon's theoretical generalisation was evidently lost on the AICC because all the "leftist" amendments were allowed to be withdrawn! Menon said that "no fewer than 250 million people are living in a state of under-nourishment and most of the land is owned by a microscopic minority"!

There was also a discussion on the existence of different tendencies within the Congress. While the former Finance Minister Morarji Desai condemned those who talked of the "right" and "left" wings in the ruling party, Home Minister Nanda made a plea for the voluntary liquidation of groupism in the interest "of presenting an integrated picture of democracy and socialism." But Malaviya insisted that there could be "right" and "left" tendencies in the Congress. He said: "The party is like an umbrella or a consortium and there is room for different shades of opinion."

It is obvious that there are different tendencies in the Congress, but the differences between the so-called "right" and "left" wings are not so deep-rooted as to bring about an organisational rift. The differences concern tactics among different strata of the ruling bourgeoisie.

Evidently the "monopolists" who are running a "parallel government" do not at all seem to be unduly perturbed over these periodic debates among Congress members on the thesis of "Democracy and Socialism." At any rate the Indian bourgeoisie realises that it can rely only on the "ubiquitous" Congress led by Prime Minister Nehru to give it a stable administration within the framework of "parliamentary democracy." Besides the Congress leadership has been able to perpetuate the illusion that India is moving along the path of socialism!

Painful Surprise for Dange

In fact the Jaipur session of the AICC did raise high expectations not only among a section of Congress members but also in a section of the labour movement led by the Dangeite leadership of the CPI [Communist party of India] which pursues a policy of critical support to the Nehru government. The CPI has tended to support the so-called "left" wing of the Congress against its "right" wing. But the Jaipur deliberations must have come as a painful surprise to Dange and Co.

The recent maneuver by Nehru to reorganise his Central Cabinet under the Kamaraj Plan by excluding a few unpopular Ministers like Morarji Desai and S.K. Patil has also helped the Dangeite leadership to spread the illusion that Nehru is moving to the left. In fact the reorganisation of the Cabinet has not brought about any real change either in the foreign or domestic policies of the Nehru government.

Nehru is no doubt encountering some opposition from his right-wing party men for his excessive zeal for socialism (lest that might raise the hopes of the hungry masses) and also for his excessive emphasis on non-alignment (to the point of irritating the U.S. some times) while his government has been leaning more and more on Western aid, both military and economic!

The right-wing opposition to him represents the interests of commercial and banking sections of the capitalist class which is apprehensive of various official restrictions and controls and insists on greater "freedom" for private enterprise, while the "left" opposition reflects discontent of the middle-class entrepreneurs and the newly emerging rich peasantry against the monopolist stranglehold of the big bourgeoisie. But the capitalist class as a whole cannot dispense with Nehru and his socialism at the present juncture.

"All Gas"

The capitalist press evidently is jubilant over the Jaipur deliberations which has meant "all gas without any substance." The conservative Times of India summed up the discussion as a triumph of the "realistic" concept of "democracy first and socialism later." It observed in an editorial on November 3: "It [the Congress] is now committed to bring about a radical change without sacrificing any democratic values." In other words, without sacrificing the interests of the capitalist class!

The newspaper said: "Doctrinaires may scoff at this but there is a hard core of practical good sense in trying to avoid the danger of a laissez faire outlook which ignores the urgent need of a poor country for planned development and the hazards of a regimented economy which curbs individual freedom and leaves no scope for individual initiative."

But even this newspaper could not wave aside the dismal state of affairs on the country's economic front. It said: "The experience of the first two years of the Third Plan has been far from happy. There has been no increase in the output of food crops in the last two years and production in several vital industries is woefully behind schedule. There is no room here for mushy thinking."

The newspaper calls for a "new dynamism which lifts the shadow which falls between the theory and its practice," an obvious allusion to the demand for "greater freedom" for capitalists to show their "individual initiative."

"Sense of Cynicism"

But the Free Press Journal, an independent daily, was more circumspect. It observed in an editorial on November 6: "Since the Avadi session of the Congress there has been endless talk on the different facets of socialism but little has been achieved in practical terms. . . . But to Indians, at any rate, it has ceased to be engaging. It has bred a sense of cynicism. Chronic shortages in essential needs like food, clothing and housing, the relentless inflationary pressures, the distorted economy, the continuing inadequacies in education, the swelling army of the unemployed have all contributed to the growing discontent. . . ."

It further said: "Preoccupation with diverse definitions with democratic socialism carries with it the dangers of diverting attention from urgent and essential tasks and of inviting reckless popular impatience with all its unpredictable risks. Thus Shri Nehru was amply justified in warning the AICC that if the process of ushering in socialism was not speeded up the people might get impatient some years hence and discard peaceful methods of economic transformation!"

The liberal Economic Weekly of Bombay wrote on November 2: "Yet another definition of socialism at the Jaipur session is not the answer. Socialistic pattern has been debased into socialistic patter and it cannot be redefined back to life. . . . Controls do not add up to socialism of any type; devoid of socialist purpose they become vast sources of patronage for the powers that be and vast sources of gain for those whom these powers patronise -- witness industrial licensing or trade controls. Even planning merely has underwritten private capitalism. It is no euphemism that private enterprise has never had it so good as since the inception of planning and Congress socialism. The vast investment of public money in the social overheads, in power, transport, and so on, creates the conditions for private profit. That is, after all, the mechanics of growth -- growth yes, but not socialism"!

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT ATTACK ON MARITIME UNIONS RUNS INTO SQUALLS

TORONTO, Nov. 5 -- A trusteeship imposed on five Great Lakes maritime unions by the government of Canada has not only brought U.S. unionists working ports on the south shore out in protest demonstrations, but is acting as an irritant in relations between Ottawa and Washington, between the top brass of the Canadian Labor Congress [CLC] and the AFL-CIO leadership in the United States, and now threatens to take on world-wide ramifications.

The chairman of the three-man trustee body, which has been granted unprecedented powers to administer union agreements, to prevent strikes and boycotts, to fire union leaders, re-write union constitutions and control all the assets of Canada's maritime unions, has appealed for aid to the International Transport Federation [ITF]. The federation, an international labor body of transport unions on both sides of the Atlantic, is meeting this week in London.

The government-appointed trustees are asking the ITF to bring pressure to bear on U.S. unions which are picketing Canadian ships as they attempt to operate out of U.S. ports. The trustees have been emboldened to do so by the fact that on the ITF executive are two top spokesmen of the Canadian trade-union bureaucracy, who, almost to a man, have supported this government intervention in the internal affairs of the union movement that knows no precedent in the history of labor on the North American continent.

The trustees have also in a sense been compelled to appeal to the ITF. Armed with the powers that have been granted them under the pretense of driving gangsterism off the Great Lakes, they have already ordered RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] raids on union offices and have seized records.

(They had had SIU [Seafarers' International Union] boss Hal Banks arrested. Banks was imported by a previous Liberal government to "drive Communism off the Great Lakes." He shortly became notorious for a "do-not-ship" list he used to discipline recalcitrants in the ranks, and for his sweetheart deals with the shipping magnates who openly, while several different governments looked the other way, flouted the labor act. He has now been charged with conspiracy to assault a person in an incident that dates back some six years.)

The three-man body is holding the threat of legal action against SIU ranks who, in protest against the trusteeship, marched on the nation's capital and stayed out for a full week before returning to work.

But despite these far-reaching attacks that the trustees have leveled within Canadian jurisdiction, the opposition of U.S. port workers has seriously crippled their effectiveness.

The difficulties now confronting the trustees were not unforeseen. Fear that the prescription of government trusteeship might only result in a further aggravation of the situation on the Great Lakes brought the U.S. government, in the person of Labor Secretary Wirtz, into the drama, urging Ottawa to practice caution and restraint. No doubt opposition by the AFL-CIO top brass played an important part in this intervention, as the Kennedy administration is dependent on them to deliver the labor vote in the coming elections.

George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, to which one million of Canada's one and a half million unionists are affiliated, proposed a private trusteeship, at first with AFL-CIO representation and then in a final attempt to forestall the government trusteeship, without even this proviso.

Meany's correct position is the resultant of several forces -- the tradition and strength of American labor, which not only doesn't seek but eschews government intervention in trade-union affairs; internal disputes in the top AFL-CIO hierarchy; and least, but not entirely missing, a responsiveness to U.S. port workers who have a healthy reaction of opposition to government intervention in the Canadian section of their union.

Because of their solidarity actions, U.S. unions are having heavy fines imposed on them by the courts. The U.S. National Labor Relations Board is now conducting an investigation as to the validity of unfair labor practices charges laid against U.S. port workers unions by the Chicago McCormick newspaper interests.

The Canadian union movement has been badly disoriented by the craven policy of its leadership which has failed to pose any alternative pole of attraction to the corrupt SIU Banks leadership to militants on the Great Lakes and has gone down the line with government trusteeship.

The parliamentary spokesmen of Canada's labor-based New Democratic party, with one notable exception, have also supported the trusteeship. Indeed, the Tories, Social Crediters and even the declining Communist party, all of them manipulating certain nationalist, some of it even healthy, anti-American sentiments, have been hollering together for increasingly more drastic action from the three-man trustee body. The Liberal party government is anxious to have such a precedent in its antilabor armament but is painfully aware of the complexities of the situation.

The scattering of opposition to the trusteeship, which existed right across the country from the very beginning, has not yet found its voice.

Dissidents in the Toronto Labour Council, the largest in the country were headed off by a phony resolution that suggested opposition in principle but diverted the whole question into the idea of the CLC constituting

an "ethical practices committee" to settle internal union disputes. But his trusteeship does not come from any decisive change in relationship of class forces in the country and subsequent experiences with it will no doubt educate and mobilize new forces in opposition to it and to the treachery of the Canadian trade-union bureaucracy.

NEXT WEEK

"Ross Dowson Explains Algerian Revolution to Canadians." Following a visit to Algeria last summer, Ross Dowson, editor of The Workers' Vanguard, made a trip across Canada. He was interviewed on radio stations in various cities, including an hour and a half over the popular Don Wilson program in Vancouver which features questions telephoned in to the station by listeners. Look for extensive excerpts from this interesting interview in next week's World Outlook.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

[The Lanka Sama Samaja party, Ceylonese section of the Fourth International, held a meeting October 16 to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Fourth International.

[The meeting was chaired by N.M.Perera. Speakers included Bernard Soysa, P.B.Tampoe, Leslie Goonawardene, Edmund Samarakkody and Colvin R. de Silva.

[In connection with the occasion, Leslie Goonewardene, member of parliament and general secretary of the Lanka Sama Samaja party, wrote an article for the press. The full text, which appeared in the Ceylon Daily News of October 21, is as follows. -- Editor.]

* * *

September of this year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the foundation in 1938, in the life-time of Trotsky, of the Fourth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution. The purpose of this short article written in commemoration of that event is to give a brief description of the Fourth International and to consider to what extent its ideas have been borne out by events.

It was in 1924 that an Opposition was formed under the leadership of Trotsky within the Communist party of the Soviet Union [CPSU] to fight the bureaucratic degeneration that had set in within the party and the state apparatus. It was really after 1929, when Stalin expelled Trotsky from the Soviet Union that people in other Communist parties had an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the ideas of the Left Opposition in the PSU and this led to what was known as the International Left Opposition. The aim of this Left Opposition was to fight the degeneration that was developing and to bring back the Communist parties and the Third (or Com-

munist) International to which they belonged to the revolutionary road.

However, with the passage of time it became clear that degeneration had proceeded too far for reform to be effected from within, and that the Third International, which had been founded under the leadership of Lenin to give guidance and leadership to the international revolution, had in fact become an obstacle to it.

The Lesson of Germany

The advent of Hitler to power in Germany (without even a struggle), which had been facilitated by the incorrect policies of the Comintern, and the further degeneration in the Soviet Union, as exemplified by the liquidation of most of the comrades-in-arms of Lenin and the destruction of every vestige of democracy in the Communist party of the Soviet Union, in particular, helped to confirm this conclusion; and in September 1938 the step was taken of forming a new, revolutionary Fourth International.

In much the same way as the first world war witnessed the collapse of the Second International led by reformist socialists, the second world war saw the collapse of the Third International led by degenerated communists. Politically the fate of the Third International was sealed when, after the advent of the Soviet Union into the war, it instructed its sections to support the "democratic imperialisms" in their war. Formally, however, it continued to exist till 1943 when it was unceremoniously dissolved by Stalin from above.

In contrast to all this, the Trotskyist groups and parties of the Fourth International, weak as they were, entered the war and went through it guided by a single clarified, revolutionary line. The murder of Trotsky in Mexico in 1940 by an agent of Stalin did not succeed in destroying the Fourth International. For the potency of his ideas, embedded as they are in realities of our epoch, continue to inspire revolutionists through the organisation that he set up. How many of these ideas have already been vindicated by history, we shall illustrate later.

Rise of Stalinism Explained

It is only the Trotskyists who have been able to explain how it came about that the Third International, founded by Lenin, degenerated into an instrument of foreign policy of the Soviet government, betraying the revolutionary struggle in country after country. It is only they who have an adequate explanation for the peculiar phenomenon of the appearance of the monstrosity of Stalinism in the wake of a revolution which was inspired by an ideology which claimed to be superior to capitalism in every respect.

In brief, the Trotskyist analysis is as follows: After the Revolution of October 1917, a degeneration took place in the state and in the Communist party of the Soviet Union. The basic historical causes for this lay firstly, in the Soviet Union being a backward country in which an illiterate peasantry formed a preponderant majority and secondly in the fact that the Russian revolution instead of spreading, as Lenin and the Bolsheviks had hoped and expected, was isolated in the midst of a hostile capitalist world. In this situation it became possible for a bureaucracy to replace the workers as the real wielders of political power.

The sole aim of this bureaucracy was the preservation of its position and privileges. Since on the one hand its very position was founded on the property system established by the October Revolution it perforce had to defend that system against attempts from within or without to re-establish capitalism. On the other hand, conservative by nature and distrusting the masses, this bureaucracy conceived this defense of the Soviet Union not in a revolutionary manner but in an opportunist manner. And in certain cases -- as in the case of the Spanish Revolution -- this opportunism led it to play an openly counterrevolutionary role.

The validity of this analysis is borne out in ample measure both by what happened within the Soviet Union and by the policies pursued by the international Communist movement.

Since the war the crisis of Stalinism has developed apace. The Fourth International drew attention to this developing crisis even before the death of Stalin in 1953.

Destruction of Basis of Stalinism

The principal reason for the aggravated crisis of Stalinism was the disappearance in the years following the war of the two major historical factors that had contributed to its rise. We earlier defined these two historical causes as the backwardness of the Soviet Union and the isolation of the Russian revolution.

But in the years following the war, thanks to its planned economy on the basis of property relations of a socialist type, the Soviet Union swiftly developed from a backward country into an advanced country, in which an actual majority of the population were now workers and in which a layer of privileged bureaucrats, performing managerial functions, became no longer indispensable.

On the other hand, the years following the war saw the emergence of a series of workers' states across the western borders of the Soviet Union while in the East a new and powerful workers' state arose in the form of the People's Republic of China. In other words, the isolation that had characterised the prewar period gave place to a spread of the world revolution from country to country. Indeed, in the colonial world, this process is still spreading before our very eyes.

It is the position of the Fourth International that these historical factors lie behind the changes which are taking place in the Soviet Union -- changes which, no doubt, were given an impetus by the removal of Stalin from the historical scene.

It is true that the Fourth International as a world organisation is weak. A principal reason for this is the fact that, in most countries, before its ideas could get a foothold among the masses, the masses had already built and given their allegiance to their traditional organisations, either reformist socialist or Communist. However, history has proved and is constantly proving the correctness of the ideas of the Trotskyists.

The changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union after the death

of Stalin are an illustration of this. However much Khrushchev may endeavor to show that the regime of terror under Stalin was due to a "cult of personality," this can never provide a satisfactory explanation. The crimes already revealed show a degeneration so deep and widespread that to a Marxist they are explicable only by a probe into the social roots of the phenomenon of Stalinism. It is only the Trotskyists who have done this.

Nor is this all. The Fourth International considers that the changes that have been taking place in the Soviet Union since Stalin's death mark only the first halting steps in a process that is destined to go forward to the revolutionary regeneration of the Soviet Union through the destruction of the power of the bureaucracy and the re-establishment of proletarian democracy. And events have already taken place to confirm this belief.

De-Stalinisation after Stalin's death has not taken place as a single episode or phenomenon but as a process which has developed under the pressure of events. It suffices to point out that the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU made revelations up to a point. Then came the Twenty-second Congress which took the process several steps further. Is it not apparent that what we have witnessed up to now are still only the preliminary steps in the exposure and eradication of Stalinism?

Theory of Permanent Revolution

Another example of the vindication of the ideas of the Fourth International is provided in connection with the theory of permanent revolution of Trotsky. This theory has been the object of special attack and gross misrepresentation on the part of the antirevolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy. Although the correctness of this theory was proved in a negative way in the prewar period by revolutions like the Chinese Revolution and the Spanish Revolution which were led to defeat by the Third International, it is only in the postwar period that the correctness of the theory has been proved by revolutions that have gone forward to victory.

Briefly, the theory of permanent revolution in relation to backward countries is as follows. In a backward country which still faces its bourgeois democratic revolution, the indigenous bourgeoisie is incapable in this epoch, unlike the bourgeoisie in previous centuries, of giving leadership to this revolution. This role falls on the young working class. This working class, although a minority of the nation, in virtue of its leadership of the bourgeois democratic revolution has the opportunity of coming to power with the aid of the peasantry.

A working class coming to power in this manner will carry out the unperformed bourgeois democratic tasks most thoroughly, but will not content itself with the performance of these tasks. It will go on to the performance of its own socialist tasks. And thus the bourgeois democratic revolution transforms itself uninterruptedly into the proletarian socialist revolution. (In contradistinction to this theory, Stalinism puts forward the theory of revolution by stages, providing for a period of capitalist development between the bourgeois democratic revolution and the socialist revolution.)

The correctness of the theory of permanent revolution was first borne out by the Russian Revolution itself, which reached victory as a socialist

revolution placing the workers in power. In the more than quarter century that followed under a leadership which opposed the dynamic under which the Russian Revolution itself had attained victory, revolutions in backward countries were led to defeat. However, during and after the war, with the weakening of Stalin's hold on the Communist parties, a new era dawned.

Series of Victorious Revolutions

Even before the conclusion of the war, under the leadership of the Communist party of Yugoslavia, the revolution which had commenced as a war of national liberation developed, in spite of the pressure of Stalin, into a proletarian socialist revolution which has not looked backward from that time.

It is a similar thing that took place in China from 1948 onwards. While Stalin ponderously advised that "China is not Yugoslavia," the Chinese Communist party, having learned from bitter experience not to take Stalin's advice, embarked on their war against Chiang Kai-shek and did not look back till they had proceeded on to the socialist revolution and established a workers' state. Today, albeit with a certain lack of clarity, the Chinese leaders have come to accept certain aspects of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution.

And what has happened in more recent times in Cuba? The revolution for national liberation has been won and stabilised by Castro by developing that revolution in accordance with the needs of the situation as they arose into a socialist revolution which established a workers' state.

And there is the even more recent example of Algeria. After victory in the historic seven-year-old war of national liberation against the might of France, it is clear that under the leadership of Ben Bella, Algeria is consolidating its gains precisely by going on to the socialist revolution.

Even when one regards the present conflict of ideas between China and the Soviet Union, one sees a further confirmation of the ideas of Trotskyism.

There are many points of difference that emerge in the debate between the leaderships of these two countries. However, two principal and basic differences, more important than the others, appear to emerge. On the one hand, there is the accusation of China that the Soviet Union has utilised "peaceful coexistence" as a means to soft-pedal the class struggle and depart from the revolutionary path in the capitalist world. But it was the Fourth International, long before Mao, and in a much clearer manner than Mao, that has pointed this out throughout the years.

The other big difference that emerges is on the question of "de-Stalinisation." China is not in favor of this process even to the limited extent that it has been carried out by Khrushchev. China's completely incorrect characterisation of Yugoslavia as a capitalist state is only another facet of this same question. While China's attitude on Stalinism is completely wrong, this does not mean of course that Khrushchev is correct!

However, as stated earlier, even the limited steps taken by Khrushchev

to do away with the more objectionable features of Stalin's regime, point to the correctness of the positions of the Fourth International on this question.

Today, as one looks back on the twenty-five years that have elapsed since the founding of the Fourth International, it is not possible to say that the Fourth International has developed into a powerful world organization as its founders may have hoped. However, this much it is certainly possible to say. Its ideas have stood the test of time.

REPLY TO FIVE PROPOSALS PUBLISHED IN "THE NEWSLETTER"

[A long-standing split in the world Trotskyist movement was healed last June at a Reunification Congress where delegates, representing the overwhelming majority on both sides, adopted a series of documents reaffirming the basic program of the Fourth International and specifying the stand of the movement on the key issues of world politics today. A few holdouts refused to participate in this gathering even to the extent of sending observers. Among the holdouts, the Healy-Lambert grouping in England and France recently published five proposals in The Newsletter concerning their relations with the reunified movement. These proposals were considered by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International at its last meeting and a statement was drawn up in reply. The text of this statement, which was adopted unanimously, follows. -- Editor.]

* * *

In The Newsletter of September 28, in an article bearing the headlines, "Marxists hold International Conference -- Report of Congress of the International Committee of the Fourth International," the following paragraphs appear:

"The final item on the agenda of Congress was a discussion on the present relations between the International Committee of the Fourth International and the International Secretariat. In spite of the deep-going differences, Congress was of the opinion that there were many within the ranks of both organisations who were still unfamiliar with the political nature of the split. Congress believed that everything must be done to encourage the closest working relations under conditions whereby a principled unification of the movement could be achieved. The following proposals were adopted:

"1. That a world congress of the forces of the IC and IS should be convened during the autumn of 1964;

"2. That a joint committee of representatives of the two organisations should regularly meet to prepare this conference and to work out practical ways and means for co-operation in the different countries;

"3. This committee should set out to prepare a joint resolution on world perspectives for the conference. This resolution would outline the points of agreement as well as disagreement. During the preparation of the resolution, all the sections would be constantly informed of the work of the committee. In this way a genuine and positive discussion involving

the differences would be organised;

"4. Congress insisted that this discussion must take place in all sections, not only in the leaderships, but in the ranks. Unless this decision was carried out, it would be impossible for the international movement to develop new cadres which would be able to provide adequate political leadership in the next period. A proper circulation of all documents must take place;

"5. Joint discussion between the members of the sections, particularly in Western Europe, should be organised. Whilst these discussions would deal with the differences, Congress believed that they should be extended to include a discussion on the practical work of the various sections in a way that would bring the members of these sections closer together. Such a discussion would also have an all-round effect on the education of the cadres.

"These proposals are to be immediately transmitted to the International Secretariat, with the hope that the joint work can begin immediately."

After due consideration of the article in The Newsletter in which these proposals appeared, we have reached the following conclusions:

(1) The article reports a purported congress of the "International Committee of the Fourth International." The gathering in question, however, consisted of only a small minority of the International Committee, the overwhelming majority of the International Committee having united with the forces headed by the International Secretariat at the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International last June. A joint leadership of the two forces was elected in proportion to membership and a new body, the United Secretariat, was elected to lead the Fourth International between sessions of the International Executive Committee. The minority which met in London consisted only of the British and French sections of the International Committee plus isolated individuals, some of whom have now been converted by this minority into "sections." This attempt to cover up the true situation makes a very unfavorable impression on us.

(2) The Reunification Congress of the Fourth International which brought together the big majority of the Trotskyist forces throughout the world, ending a split in the movement that had lasted almost ten years, is not recognized by the authors of the article in The Newsletter. Instead they picture it as a "split which recently took place when certain sections left the IC and rejoined the Pabloite ranks." This way of presenting matters constitutes an attack on the reunited Fourth International -- and not the only attack that has appeared in The Newsletter since the Reunification Congress was held. A new move of the same character is the announcement that the name of Labour Review is to be changed to Fourth International, the same name as the official organ of the Fourth International. This step will add to the confusion already created by the counterfeiting operations of the Posadas tendency. These aggressive moves do not speak well for the possibilities of an early fusion of forces.

(3) The five proposals advanced by The Newsletter boil down to three items: (a) the opening of a "discussion"; (b) the organization of "co-

operation"; (c) the holding of a "congress" or "conference" in 1964. The eventual purpose or aim of these three proposals is nowhere clearly stated beyond a vague "all-round effect on the education of the cadres." Nowhere is any indication made that the authors of the five proposals have changed in the least from their position of a few months ago that a conference in 1964 could at best do no more than see whether "reunification" had become feasible. Thus no other conclusion is possible except that the authors still reject an early fusion of forces.

(4) The Newsletter remains completely silent about the documents adopted by the Reunification Congress which the majority of the world Trotskyist movement accepted as the programmatic basis for a thoroughly principled reunification. In place of considering and discussing these documents, the authors of the article talk about doing "everything. . . to encourage the closest working relations under conditions whereby a principled unification of the movement could be achieved." The clear implication of such statements is that the Reunification Congress took place on an unprincipled basis. This interpretation is further borne out by Slaughter's reported attack on the Socialist Workers party for supporting reunification of the world Trotskyist movement. According to The Newsletter, Slaughter gave a "political report" in which he argued that the SWP "have now, in theory and practice, repudiated everything they said at that time by accepting the revisionist programme in its entirety." If the authors of the five proposals wish further "discussion," they should begin by clarifying their position on the documents adopted by the Reunification Congress.

(5) The authors of the five proposals obviously seek to create the impression that they are now favorably disposed toward "unity" -- under certain conditions of course. They have yet to explain: (a) why they rejected the proposals of the overwhelming majority of the International Committee to participate in organizing the Reunification Congress in June; (b) why they rejected an invitation to participate in a conference of the majority of the International Committee with this subject on the agenda; (c) why they refused to send even observers to this conference; (d) why they were so hostile to the Reunification Congress that they categorically rejected an invitation to send even observers.

The basic reason for their hostility toward ending the split and participating in reunifying the world Trotskyist movement is of course quite clear. They developed political differences (Cuba, Algeria, etc.) of such profound character with the majority that they found membership incompatible in a common organization based on the program adopted at the Reunification Congress. The reason for their silence about this is also clear. They do not wish to assume the onus of being against unity. The fact remains, however, that they have demonstratively refused to unite in a common organization in which they would be in a minority. They demonstratively refused to accept the majority decision of the International Committee forces on reunification. They demonstratively refused in advance to abide by majority decision of the world Trotskyist movement on reunification. Since the Reunification Congress they have given no evidence of having changed their attitude on this key question of democratic centralism. Their current five proposals envisaging some kind of vague "unity" in "1964," or still more distant date, constitute further proof of their refusal to accept the principle of democratic centralism which was unani-

mously adopted at the Reunification Congress.

(6) In view of these considerations it is our opinion that the truth of the matter is as follows: The Healy-Lambert groups in England and France, the main holdouts among the members of the former International Committee, feel that their political differences are so profound that any serious move toward bringing their forces into the reunited Fourth International in the near future is excluded. So long as this remains their position, it would be unrealistic to hope for an early fusion of their forces with the main body of the world Trotskyist movement.

(7) As for our position, we stand as before for unification -- on the basis of the principled program adopted at the Reunification Congress -- of all forces that consider themselves to be revolutionary socialists. In relation to the British and French sections of the International Committee, in particular, we call attention to the decision of the Reunification Congress requiring on the part of sections of the International Committee simple ratification of the documents of the Reunification Congress in order to qualify for membership in the reunified movement and representation in the leadership. Up to now both the Healy and Lambert groups have maintained silence on this as well as on the documents adopted by the Reunification Congress. We, of course, would welcome a change in this negative attitude although we state quite frankly that it would require serious evidence to convince us that a genuine change in policy has occurred. We shall watch their press with the closest attention for any signs of lessening hostility toward the reunified movement.

(8) As for "co-operation" now with the Healy-Lambert forces, we are of course ready to meet with their representatives to discuss such matters of mutual interest as may arise from time to time. We suggest, however, that meetings be projected in relation to specific practical questions in which the well-known political differences now separating us publicly can be put to the side.

United Secretariat of the
Fourth International

November 18, 1963.

FIRST RESPONSES TO WORLD OUTLOOK

Colombo: "I must congratulate you on World Outlook which is very useful to our Sinhalese weekly."

London: "World Outlook is a very good job. The type of material is just right and should hit the mark. Interested publications are bound to pick up such items generally overlooked by the press."

Mexico City: "World Outlook appears to us of very high quality and it will help us a great deal. We would like to have a Spanish edition."

New Delhi: "I have been able to make use of the material in World Outlook for numerous articles for Indian journals. Enclosed is an example."

Rome: "I have received World Outlook which is extremely good."

Toronto: "It is a real pleasure to see World Outlook."

Chicago: "World Outlook has been great, especially valuable have been the articles on Algeria, Spain and the latest document of the Chinese Communist party."

Cleveland: "Our attention was called to World Outlook. As we have a special interest in getting the news you specialize in, we should like to subscribe. If there are the first issues still available we shall appreciate getting them also." [Similar requests have now almost exhausted our supply of back copies.]

Los Angeles: "Very much impressed with both the scope and the quality of the reporting. The coverage, particularly of the Algerian revolution, is really first rate and the publication fills a much needed service in closing the information gap in international developments."

New York: "A beautiful job."