

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 1, No. 13

December 20, 1963

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

WILL KENNEDY ASSASSINATION BECOME EXCUSE FOR NEW WITCH-HUNT?

By Joseph Hansen

One of the reasons why the Marxist movement has always vigorously opposed assassination -- aside from the personal repugnance Marxists have always felt toward bloodshed and violence -- is that it is completely futile as a means of weakening entrenched reaction. Still worse, a case of assassination, no matter by whom committed, is nearly always utilized by a reactionary government to whip up a witch-hunt and inflict murderous blows against the radical movement.

Will the assassination of Kennedy be utilized by the forces of reaction in the United States for such a witch-hunt? It is still too early to say definitively. However, certain elements hope to turn the murder in this direction. This should be soberly noted.

One of the indications is the reinforcement given by "government sources" to the allegation by the reactionary General Walker that Oswald tried to assassinate him, too. This story, when first reported by the neo-Nazi National Zeitung und Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung of Munich, Germany, at the end of November was dismissed by responsible European newspapers. It took the American press, with a green light from "government sources" to give the report front-page billing. [See World Outlook December 13.]

Another indication is the consistent campaign in the American news media to gloss over the glaring contradictions in the Dallas police version of the events, to picture Oswald more and more as the proved assassin, and to bring to the fore what is made out to be his "Marxist" convictions.

In Canada this type of propaganda reached truly vicious lengths in an article in the November 30 Toronto Star written by a staff writer, Ross Harkness.

This "expert" pointed to "hate literature" appearing in Canada that can set the scene for "violence" there such as occurred in Dallas.

He cited a leaflet distributed by anti-Semitic forces in Toronto "with-in days" of Kennedy's assassination. The leaflet was headed: "SPECIAL BULLETIN -- WHITE MEN AWAKE." The first sentence read: "Our beloved President J.F. Kennedy was assassinated by Marxist Lee H. Oswald, who was silenced by Jew Jacob Rubinstein before he could expose that COMMUNISM IS JEWISH."

Harkness mentioned other extreme right-wing forces, and the "Front de Liberation Quebecois," a French-Canadian separatist movement, then came to his intended target, which he amalgamated with the racists and terrorists. This target was the Canadian Trotskyist movement which Harkness described as "most secretive."

"The Trotskyists," said Harkness, "are the 'Jehovah's Witnesses' of the Communist movement, so far to the left that even Khrushchov has disowned them.

"Lee Oswald, the man who is alleged to have killed President Kennedy, called himself a Marxist.

"The Soviet press has called him a Trotskyist -- a follower of the murdered Leon Trotsky who broke with Lenin over Communist doctrine.

"Ross Dowson of Toronto, the Canadian Trotskyist leader, told me Oswald's connection with Trotskyism still has to be proved, though some opinions he expressed conform with Trotskyist doctrine."

Harkness included a statement by Dowson as follows:

"Someone says he was a Trotskyist. Khrushchov and Isvestia use the term as a slander. But if it is proven beyond all doubt that Oswald was the assassin, then he was not a Trotskyist. We reject individual terror, assassination, as outside the whole tradition of the Marxist political doctrine."

Harkness sought to cancel the effect of this declaration by throwing in some new smear charges:

"Dallas police said Oswald twice visited Canada to participate in Trotskyist demonstrations. A Montreal detective said he recognized Oswald as a recent participant in a demonstration in that city."

[Did Oswald make a side trip to Montreal on his way to Mexico City?]

The final paragraphs of the article carried the smear still further by picturing the Canadian Trotskyists as seeking "to infiltrate labor and moderate left-wing groups."

In a subsequent issue [December 6] the Toronto Star granted Dowson a few inches to register a protest but this could scarcely counter the intended effect of the long article written by Harkness.

The American Trotskyists of the Socialist Workers party encountered some instances of witch-hunting in the days immediately following the

assassination. They withstood this with the greatest firmness.

Farrell Dobbs, the national secretary of the Socialist Workers party, joined with other leaders of the American radical movement to explain why the Marxist movement is completely opposed to assassination and why the assassin of Kennedy, whoever he was, could not possibly have been a Marxist. His declarations, together with those of the other radical leaders, were published in the New York Times. [See World Outlook December 6.] The attitude of this powerful newspaper is often of great weight in setting tone for other newspapers in the United States.

Dobbs also issued a short statement to the press expressing personal sympathy for Mrs. Kennedy in her bereavement. Since Dobbs conducted a most vigorous campaign against both Nixon and Kennedy in the 1960 election as the nominee of the Socialist Workers party and the only presidential candidate who defended the Cuban Revolution and denounced the projected invasion plans, his statement helped counter the poisonous witch-hunting effort to picture Marxists as unbalanced individuals who revel in bloodshed, gloat in the personal suffering of the class enemy and advocate terror as a means to cure the ills of capitalist society.

The strong statement of the American Civil Liberties Union denouncing the gross violation of Oswald's civil liberties has also helped to counter the tentative moves by reactionaries to use the assassination of Kennedy as an excuse for mounting a new witch-hunt in the United States.

FRENCH PRESS REMAINS SKEPTICAL THAT MYSTERY WILL BE SOLVED

PARIS, Dec. 15 -- The French press continues to maintain an extremely reserved attitude toward the handling up to this moment of the investigation of the assassination of Kennedy. Three instances in the past week will illustrate this.

Léo Sauvage, special New York correspondent of Le Figaro, described [December 11] the "organized leaks" of the FBI report although the investigation by the federal agency is advertised as still going on and far from concluded.

"The result, as one can't help noting on turning the radio dial or glancing at the headlines of the newspapers, is that the atmosphere being developed around Washington's investigation is beginning to recall painfully the one that marked the investigation in Dallas."

Sauvage declared further: "In face of the flagrant -- dumb-founding -- contradiction between the secrecy projected and demanded by the commission [headed by Warren] on the one hand, and the fact, on the other hand, that the conclusions of the FBI have already been placed before the eyes of the public, one can ask, in any case, if in Washington, following Dallas, Lee Oswald is not going to be condemned a second

time before the competent authorities have been able to render a decision,"

Le Monde has documented day by day the glaring contradictions in the case. In the December 12 issue Claude Julien points out that the report made by the head surgeon who attended Kennedy, Dr. Robert R. Shaw, showed that the two shots fired at Kennedy came from opposite directions.

"The fact that the first bullet -- which was not fatal -- came from the front is also established by a photograph taken by a witness of the assassination. The film taken by an amateur constitutes a supplementary confirmation. Another item well indicates that the police in the escort thought that the first shot had been fired from ahead. The motorcycle police, in fact, raced ahead, across the grass bordering the route, in the direction of the bridge which crossed it farther down; that is, as the American papers stressed, 'toward the point from where the murderer appeared to have fired.'

"The presidential automobile at the moment was between the bridge and the warehouse where the gun with the telescopic sight was found. This building was behind and somewhat to the right of the presidential automobile; it seems difficult to believe that a bullet from there could have hit J.F.Kennedy from the front to then lodge in his right lung."

Dr. Shaw asked whether or not Kennedy had turned to the left to speak with Mrs. Kennedy, Julien continues. A Parisian paper, on the contrary, imagined that he must have turned to his right. But the film appears to "indicate that the president was looking straight ahead." This position would be consistent with the particular wound if it were caused by a shot fired from a position in front of the automobile.

The December 14 issue of Paris Match, the French version of Life magazine, carries an article cabled from Dallas by Raymond Cartier and Paul Mathias giving a round up of the case as it stands today. The two authors describe the mounds of flowers at the side of the highway where Kennedy was shot, but say that it is their impression nevertheless that the President's death "caused Dallas only moderate regret." The sentiment expressed by the Dallas Herald almost a hundred years ago at the time of the assassination of Lincoln finds its echo now: "If Almighty God had not ordained this terrible event, it would not have taken place. . . ."

The reporters observe, too, that after the first strong emotion, public sentiment in the United States as a whole has died down. Little curiosity is expressed. Few voices demand a full inquiry. "The calm in which the change in presidents occurred confirms the stability of institutions. Lyndon Johnson's first moves are taking place in the atmosphere of a parade of good economic news: a rise in Wall Street, good inventories at the end of the year, an increase in the production of steel, etc. The skill of the new president is celebrated and, in Washington, a honeymoon atmosphere has followed the depths of sorrow."

The Warren commission was appointed by Johnson because he did not want to risk being accused of hushing things up, they hold. The commission can either approve the results of the investigations carried on up to now or conduct its own investigation, depending on circumstances. Its findings

can most certainly be expected to be made public unless a "terrible secret, susceptible of placing in peril the domestic or international peace should appear in the circumstances involving the assassination of President Kennedy."

The authors believe that it is "psychologically" possible that Oswald could have been the assassin, particularly in view of the psychiatric report made when he was thirteen years old. However, it simply has not been proved that he was the assassin.

Moreover, if Oswald's psychological pattern predisposed him to commit such a crime, the very same pattern is in glaring contradiction to his denial of the killing of Kennedy (and also officer Tippit).

Certain facts involving the possibility of a second gun and the incredible skill and accuracy of Oswald if he is presumed to be guilty and the only one involved have not yet been cleared up.

Still worse, Ruby's entrance into the scene brings in a new element that cannot be brushed aside -- the underworld. Was Oswald killed because he could have revealed the existence of a plot involving others?

There is little chance that this factor will be cleared up, in the opinion of the authors, because of the power of gangsterdom and the very strong possibility that Ruby will get off and even end up as a local Dallas hero.

They close their article by advancing the theory that gangsters utilized Oswald in one way or another and then got rid of him. "The consequences which could follow from this might shake to its foundation the biggest nation of the universe."

PAZ ESTENSSORO PROVOKES BATTLE WITH BOLIVIAN MINERS

The bourgeois Paz Estenssoro regime provoked a new test of strength with the Bolivian working class when it announced that it had arrested two leaders of the union at the famous Siglo Veinte tin mine on charges of alleged "murder" and "misuse" of union funds growing out of resistance of the miners to further encroachments on their hard-won rights.

When the news was learned at the Siglo Veinte mine, the men retaliated December 6 by seizing nineteen hostages, among them four U.S. technicians. They stationed armed militia in the streets to bar any movement of troops toward the mine. In La Paz, December 12, workers and students staged a huge solidarity demonstration with the miners.

[The two union leaders who were arrested by the government, Federico Escobar and Irineo Pimentel, were singled out for victimization by the government in a crackdown at Siglo Veinte last August. See World Outlook October 4.]

The government followed up the provocation of arresting the two mine union leaders by the even bigger provocation of issuing a decree dissolving

the Bolivian trade-union federation, the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana].

With that action, the Paz Estenssoro regime clearly disclosed its aim of completing the dismantling of the main conquests of the 1952 Bolivian revolution.

In the beginning Paz Estenssoro attempted to occupy a "center" position between the right wing of the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario] and the so-called "left wing" led by Vice-President Juan Lechin. Under the inspiration of the U.S. State Department, however, Paz Estenssoro shifted his policy farther and farther to the right and at the same time quite consciously toward a showdown with the miners.

As the New York Herald Tribune expressed it editorially December 13, "any serious attempt to bring order out of chaos in Bolivia would touch off an explosion between the government. . . and the leftist tin miners . . . The attempt, under the prodding and with the assistance of Washington was made."

The vehicle of "the attempt" was a "consolidation" and "rehabilitation" scheme called the "triangular plan." This involved U.S. and West German imperialism and the Bolivian bourgeoisie. It was to be applied by COMIBOL [Corporación Minera de Bolivia, which is in charge of the nationalized mining industry].

The scheme in fact signified that the workers were to pay the costs of "rehabilitating" the mines. This involved suppression of workers control, mass dismissals, the scaling down of social services, etc. It was a government move in applying such measures on sharp scale that led to a strike in the Siglo Veinte mine which then mushroomed into a general mine strike last summer.

The Paz Estenssoro government is now trying to break up the miners' armed militia and their trade unions, two most important conquests of the 1952 revolution.

It is trying to split the peasants away from the workers by calling on the peasants' militia to join with army troops against the miners' militia.

The current situation, however, involves many dangers for the Paz Estenssoro leadership of the MNR. Lechin has already threatened to run for president of the republic against Paz Estenssoro in next year's election. This would split the MNR vote down the middle.

If Paz Estenssoro presses on to an explosive showdown, the working class, headed by Bolivia's 200,000 militant miners, could very well by-pass the wavering and basically conciliatory Lechin leadership. A strengthening of the elements of dual power, which still exist in Bolivia, would then constitute a mortal threat to the survival of the capitalist regime in this country high in the Andes.

In face of such a possibility, it is not excluded that the government will draw back at the last moment.

Paz Estenssoro has delayed for years in carrying his differences with the miners to an open break. He turned against the right wing of the MNR precisely in order to avoid a showdown. Now four years later he finds himself again at the crossroads.

In any case the hold of the center wing of the MNR on the working class has been greatly loosened by Paz Estenssoro's actions and this opens up a new political situation in Bolivia. Only Lechin now stands between the mass of class-conscious Bolivian workers and the revolutionary Marxists represented by the POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario], the Bolivian section of the Fourth International.

Paz Estenssoro has openly sought arms and other forms of military aid from American imperialism in order the better to put the "rebellious miners" down.

Socialists everywhere should call for "Hands off the Bolivian Revolution!" and campaign for the international labor movement and the workers' states to come to the assistance of the threatened Bolivian revolution.

SETBACK FOR THE LEFT IN VENEZUELA

The refusal of the masses in Venezuela to respond to the appeals of the left-wing working-class parties to boycott the elections undoubtedly constitutes a setback for the revolutionary vanguard. It can be expected that they will now give the situation the most serious analysis and consider readjusting their tactics to correspond better with the new relation of class forces.

The Communist party of Venezuela and the MIR [Movimiento Izquierda Revolucionario, a grouping strongly imbued with the concept of emulating the Cuban Revolution] pressed a common line of abstaining from voting in view of the government suppression of the two parties so that they could not participate with their own slates of candidates. However, some ninety-five per cent of the electorate turned out, according to the government, and sixty-nine per cent of the vote went to right-wing parties or the two parties that have formed the ruling coalition. [Betancourt's Acción Democrática and the COPEI, the Social Christian party.]

Many irregularities were exposed but nothing so massively fraudulent as ballot stuffing. Such fakery was scarcely necessary for Betancourt's candidate Raúl Leoni to win the December 2 election for the presidency. Besides illegalizing the main opposition parties, Betancourt arrested their parliamentary leaders on the eve of the elections and kept a big force of military and police forces on display.

According to the official returns, released in Caracas December 13, Raúl Leoni received 957,699 votes, 32.81% of the total. This represented a considerable decline from the vote received by Betancourt in 1958 when he could boast of representing 45% of the electorate. It is the price he had to pay for his turn to the right, his violent opposition to the Cuban Revolution, increasingly open espousal of a pro-U.S. role, and the succes-

sive splits in his party resulting from this course. Betancourt's principal support now rests with the peasantry in the interior of the country.

Dr. Rafael Caldera, candidate of the COPEI, received 589,372 votes, 20.19%. With this, the Catholics practically doubled what they registered in the 1958 election, becoming the second biggest party in the country. Constituting the right-wing constituent of the government coalition with Acción Democrática, they were the main victors in the election. The coalition itself won an absolute majority.

Dr. Jovito Villalba, of the URD [Unión Republicana Democrática], was the main liberal opposition candidate. He polled 551,120 votes, 18.88%. His support came from the urban middle classes which opposed Betancourt as being too pro-imperialist.

Dr. Arturo Uslar Pietri, a right-wing opposition candidate running as an "independent," although he represents the compradore bourgeoisie and the oil companies, polled a surprising 469,240 votes, 16.08%, showing unexpected strength in Caracas.

Vice Admiral Wolfgang Larrazábal, candidate of the FDP [Fuerzas Democráticas Populares], ran as the left-wing opposition permitted by Betancourt. He received 275,304 votes, 9.43%. Larrazábal was so concerned about maintaining his legal status that he did not even protest the illegal arrest of the CP and MIR members of parliament.

Dr. Raúl Ramos Giménez, representative of a new split-off from Betancourt's Acción Democrática which calls itself the "dissident" Acción Democrática, polled 66,837 votes, 2.29%.

Finally German Borregales of Acción Nacional received 9,324 votes, 0.32%.

As a result of the elections, it is speculated that COPEI may increase the price for supporting Betancourt, causing him perhaps to shift a bit to the left and seek a coalition with Villalba and Larrazábal. Whether or not this occurs, the main fact to be noted about the relation of political forces in Venezuela today is that Betancourt, because of his successive shifts toward the right, has become increasingly dependent upon the armed forces. This has greatly strengthened the position of the military. The truth is that Betancourt and his protégé Raúl Leóni are now not much more than pawns in the hands of the officer clique who can dispose of them when they deem it necessary or advantageous.

ANOTHER TRIUMPH FOR AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

Agence France Presse reported from Washington December 12 that the U.S. Army is scheduling experiments with a "revolutionary" rifle that fires darts. SPIW [Special Purpose Individual Weapon] inflicts devastating wounds even if it misses a vital spot. A dart, like the prohibited dum-dum bullet, tends to blow out an incredibly big hole. Another advantage is that it is no burden to carry great quantities of the lightweight ingenious little missile.

ITALY'S "CENTER-LEFT" GOVERNMENT

By Sirio Di Giuliomaria

ROME -- The birth of the new "center-left" government in Italy was hailed by the greater part of the national and foreign bourgeois press. A French newspaper went so far as to call it "a historical step." But declarations of praise and approbation cannot hide the real nature of this government and its prospects.

Let us first clear away the most groundless and fantastic interpretations of the "center-left" policy, which have been advanced chiefly by the most reformist sectors of the PSI [Italian Socialist party].

According to these clever "theoreticians," the "center-left" policy is aimed against the monopolies and, to some extent, it can reduce their power. It is aimed also, we are told, at accomplishing reforms, including a certain amount of economic planning, thus paving the way for a socialist development. Last, but not least, they claim that it is a way to bring the working class into participation in leadership of the state.

A similar "analysis," backed by similar arguments, has been supplied by the PCI [Italian Communist party]. While the PCI has never espoused the above theory as a whole, the leaders have maintained that monopolies can be eliminated without eliminating capitalism (Longo's articles, for instance). The PCI also holds that a government coalition of the PSI and the DC [Christian Democratic party, the party of big business] could be progressive and yield positive results.

However, consideration of the class forces, along with certain significant political events, demolishes this "analysis." It should be noted, first of all, that it is precisely the DC party and its present leadership that represent the interests of the big monopolies. To deny this is equivalent to affirming that the monopolies are not represented in the political leadership of the country and that they stand at the fringe of politics.

Next, it should be observed that most bourgeois papers that speak for big business, either directly (for example, La Stampa, the Turin daily financed by FIAT) or indirectly, take a favorable view of the "center-left" formula.

A minimum of common sense should lead to the conclusion that it is not possible to limit the power of giant monopolies by collaborating with their political representatives. You cannot walk down the road to socialism hand in hand with the worst enemy of socialism, the bourgeoisie. More than a century of working-class experience has shown nothing to the contrary.

We may also brush aside certain superficial aspects of the "center-left" experiment, the claim, for instance, of the PSI leadership that through the DC they aim at an alliance with the Catholic masses while avoiding at the same time forcing the DC into the arms of the right-wing parties. (The DC leaders claim that their goal is to bring the PSI into the "democratic area.")

The "center-left" formula is essentially an operation promoted by leading sectors of the bourgeoisie who aim at improving and better defending their system by modernizing and rationalizing capitalism. The specific political formula varies. For instance, the last Fanfani government, a coalition of the DC, the PSDI [Social Democrats] and PRI [Republicans], claimed to stand on a more "advanced" program than the one proffered by present DC, PSI, PSDI, and PRI government headed by Aldo Moro. This or that formula may offer better social "cover" or greater stability in parliament. The essential factor, however, must be sought in the answer to the following question: Which social class stands to gain most from the experiment and which social class therefore has the strongest interest in promoting it?

The declared aims of the "center-left" protagonists and the program of the newly established government are most instructive in this respect. Pietro Nenni, who is participating in the coalition as a "socialist," issued a statement to the press December 5 in which he listed the following target aims:

- (1) Integral implementation of the constitution.
- (2) Commencement of organic economic programming and the preparation of a five-year plan.
- (3) Putting into effect, as quickly as possible, the reforms promised in the program of the government.

The first two points are advanced by the Nenni Socialists as general propaganda. They are not even contained in the government program. Even if they were carried out this would not alter the bourgeois character of the state, for Italy's constitution is basically bourgeois even if it does speak for greater political democracy. "Organic economic programming," it should be noted in passing, does not mean planning. Moreover, a government that binds itself not to nationalize a single industry and to limit expenditures holds very poor instruments for "programming." In any case, even in their propaganda, these "Socialists" do not propose a single action that might put the capitalist system in danger.

Let us now turn to the program. Before the recent congress of the PSI was held, a group of "socialist-inspired" economists prepared a draft program to be sponsored by the PSI. The program aimed at solving the following problems: (1) Fundamental unevennesses, especially between the industrial North and agricultural South. (2) Difficulties in agriculture deriving from the exodus of farm hands and the need to shift from food production to pasture crops. (3) Backwardness of domestic commerce. (4) Difficulties in the building industry due to speculation in certain fields.

The means advanced to solve these problems always reposed within the capitalist system: an end to the irrational use of resources; greater harmony in the economic development of the country as a whole; more expenditures for schools, homes, scientific research, etc.; better equilibrium in the distribution of income; incentives for rational industrialization of the South through state intervention as an auxiliary to "free enterprise";

elimination of backward agricultural forms such as share-cropping, etc. The program reeked with preoccupation over not hitting profits too much, which might discourage investment, and constant references to Holland, Sweden, Great Britain and the USA as models.

The essence of the program proposed by these "socialist" economists is clear. The aim is a rationalized, modernized neo-capitalism. However, the leadership of the bourgeoisie will not carry out even this program, moderate and neo-capitalist though it is. The reason is simple. It would require sacrificing the interests of certain "backward" sectors of Italian capitalism on the altar of the general interests of the system. This would involve an internal conflict in the class which the bourgeoisie cannot afford at the moment due to the existence of mass organizations of the working class (unions, parties, etc.) which, though led by opportunist leaderships, would press forward at a display of weakness in the capitalist front.

That is why the actual "center-left" government was formed on a far less "advanced" program than the one considered above. Agreement to this constitutes a major capitulation by the PSI. Of the problems raised by the Socialists, only one is offered even a tentative solution -- some land may be expropriated for building purposes.

On the political level, the Socialists made such enormous concessions as (1) Rejecting Communist votes on legislation, if they should happen to be decisive in obtaining a majority, on the grounds that the PCI holds a position "strongly diverging on the big themes of freedom in society and the state." (2) Proffering "loyalty towards NATO, with the political and military obligations thereof." This involves, as stated in the program, that the government will continue negotiating for a multilateral nuclear force. (3) Giving up any nationalizations whatsoever owing to the need "to guarantee to businessmen the certitude of the fundamental economic elements in order that they may face no risks other than those deriving from the market." (4) Relinquishing any aim of placing a government commissioner at the head of Federconsorzi, an agricultural organization controlled by the most reactionary and corrupt DC elements.

What are the prospects for such a government? They are not bright. It faces immediate political difficulties. The left wing of the PSI, which has about thirty members of parliament and which obtained about forty per cent of the vote at the last party congress, states that it intends to oppose the government when the first vote of confidence comes up.

The economic situation is not favorable, particularly in view of the continuing inflation. The big unions are preparing for action and this can prove troublesome to the government, particularly to its Socialist component. The international situation is another source of instability.

In the last instance the fate of the new government may be determined by the policies and activities of the PCI which still commands the loyalty of the majority of militant workers. A certain moderate shift has already occurred in reaction to the shameless capitulation of the Socialists and under the influence of the PSI's left wing, some sectors of which are openly aiming for a split.

Some of the interesting signs include comments on the formation of "center-left" government in editorials written by Pintor, the co-editor of l'Unità, the Communist party paper. Ingrao, a member of the party's National Secretariat, an opponent of the "center-left" formula, although still on an opportunist basis, was chosen as reporter at the last session of the Central Committee. Ingrao was supported by Natoli, at present the member of the Central Committee who stands farthest to the left. [See World Outlook November 8 for a report on how opinion was divided at the October session on this issue.]

THE NEED FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY IN PERU

By Hugo Blanco

The peasantry and the other exploited classes begin their struggle for freedom without a clear understanding of the task they have undertaken, the methods that must be employed, and the nature of the enemies they have to fight.

The exploiting classes not only exercise material domination over the exploited, but, derived from this and as guarantee for its continuation, they sway the minds of the exploited, particularly by means of the radio, the press, the clergy, the educational system, etc.

They try to convince the people that the social system in which they live is the best, that it is eternal, indestructible. They seek to convince them that the authorities, the whole state apparatus and the laws represent the interests of the people and not solely the ruling classes. These mental chains guarantee the material slavery in which they seek to keep the people.

The popular classes, impelled by need, begin to confront their enemies more or less intuitively, but still imprisoned by many concepts imposed by the exploiters.

Hence it is indispensable to have a revolutionary organization -- based on Marxism-Leninism-Trotskyism -- conscious of the role which history has destined the peasant movement to play in the liberation of our country. A revolutionary organization, based on a study of the national and international reality, will orient the peasant movement, linking it to the struggle of the proletariat and the rest of the people for a workers and peasants power.

Such an organization must face not only the oligarchy but also the reactionary ideas disseminated in the popular movement.

In our country many parties and groups of the left exist. This atomization of the political vanguard is of enormous benefit to the oligarchy. It is therefore necessary to get rid of all sectarianism in order to achieve the unification of the forces of the left. We must head toward organization of the Party of the Peruvian Revolution. A beginning has been made in this effort by the Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario (FIR) [Revolutionary Left Front].

It is necessary to state, however, that this union will not be gained by tea parties among leaders, but through revolutionary action which will teach us the correct line.

Arequipa jail, 1963

YOUNG MARTINIQUE REBELS CONDEMNED

PARIS -- Since Algeria became independent, the territories constituting colonies of French imperialism are quite reduced: New Caledonia, the condominium with Britain over the New Hebrides, Reunion, the Pacific islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, the so-called French Antilles (Martinique and Guadeloupe), Guiana, Djibouti. To those French who are little concerned about Algerian problems, interest in what happens in these territories is, unfortunately, still lower.

But to the people of these lands -- no matter how few they may be -- the presence of imperialism is just as intolerable as it was in the former big colonies. These territories are generally baptized "overseas departments" in accordance with the legend that they are nothing but the extension of France. But the masses there live precariously and aspirations for independence therefore arise in various forms according to the specific situation in each territory.

It was almost inevitable that the so-called French Antilles should manifest the strongest movements for independence. This is the Caribbean, close to Cuba; close, too, to the British possessions which have been granted at least formal independence. In Martinique, despite the pressure of the French authorities, the parties of the left, particularly the Communist party, have been powerful and have elected representatives to parliament.

The French authorities in Martinique could not fail to discover a "plot." In January, 1963, they found "documents" in a briefcase stolen from one of the inspirers of the OJAM [Organisation de la Jeunesse Anticolonialiste de la Martinique -- Organization of the Anticolonialist Youth of Martinique], a group that demands "the right of the Martiniquans to conduct their own affairs" (formally this is not a demand for independence).

The police declared that what was involved was "a handful of agitators in the pay, probably, of a foreign power whose aim is to murder the Europeans [whites]; lists of names had been drawn up; a provisional government set up."

Eighteen Martiniquans, doctors, lawyers, teachers, students from nineteen to thirty-three years old, were arrested. The scandal was so flagrant and the only plot in existence was so clearly the one hatched by the French authorities in Martinique against this youth movement, that the case, out of concern for "public safety," was removed from the jurisdiction of the judges in the area and placed before the Seine court. The charge of plotting against the authority of the state was even abandoned, leaving only

the accusation of breaching the integrity of the territory, a charge that requires only a judge without a jury.

During the trial the "proofs" were reduced to nothing and it was the general view at the end that the only remaining accusation was the crime of expressing an opinion or at the very most holding the intention of undertaking schemes that could be considered subversive. The French code does not recognize "intention" as a crime. But, instead of acquitting the defendants or pronouncing a light sentence to save face for the prosecution which has kept some of the defendants in preventive detention for ten months, the Sixteenth Correctional Court of the Seine, while ordering thirteen to be acquitted, condemned five to prison terms.

On December 10, Henri Armangon, Hervé Florent, and Félix Lamotte were sentenced to three years each; Rodolph Désiré to two years and Théodore Lessort to eighteen months.

These sentences tell the Martiniquans and the hundreds of thousands of people still under the French colonial yoke that in those places where they have not built up sufficient strength to win freedom it will not be freely granted to them.

The sentences will find their echo in Martinique in the form of more resolute struggle and more radical solutions. The deputy mayor of Fort-de-France, Aimé Césaire, a fine poet who broke with the Communist party in 1956 and who has been looking for a compromise solution for some years, bore witness in behalf of the defendants at the trial. He expressed his emotion in these words: "It is my personal opinion that this judgment closes the door to a dialogue and I hope that the court of appeals will understand the need to change it."

We need not wait for the opinion of the court of appeals. We have none of the hope expressed by Aimé Césaire. In Martinique there are big planters, vested interests, a colonial administration -- none of this world will give way of its own accord.

ACILOR -- ALGERIA CONFRONTS A CASE OF BUREAUCRATISM

The Acilor steel plant, Algeria's biggest enterprise in heavy industry, was recently the object of special attention among workers, left-wing figures, and progressive elements within the government. Acilor became, in fact, a case illustrating the problem of bureaucratism in a spectacular way.

On November 16, Révolution Africaine, the Algiers weekly edited by Mohamed Harbi, a well-known figure in the left wing of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] who was recently made a member of the secretariat of the central commission charged with preparing the organization's next congress, published a vehement denunciation of corruption and bureaucratism involving the manager and two members of the self-management committee at the Acilor plant.

The following issue carried an editorial by Harbi and an article by Shir Boumaza, Minister of Economy, which cast further light on the phenomenon of bureaucratism as it mushroomed and was cut off at Acilor.

When Boumaza visited the plant, he was surrounded by angry workers who complained in the most urgent way about a monthly wage of only 26,000 francs (about \$52) while members of the self-management committee had been granted up to 400,000 francs (\$800) a month. This looked to them like bribery. They said that despite heated criticism, the self-management committee had failed to respond and put things in order.

Minister Boumaza quickly found that a great deal was out of order. The monthly deficit was around \$50,000 a month. Foreign technicians had been hired at \$2,000 a month. A stock of 900 tons of steel had been sold at far below cost. Waste and corruption were rampant.

Boumaza went into action. Within a half hour the manager was fired and machinery was in motion to change the self-management committee.

In the November 23 issue of Révolution Africaine, Harbi and Boumaza drew a number of lessons from the experience.

Harbi had this to say: "The task to which the government, the administration, the party and the trade unions must give priority is to straighten out the economy and its leadership through a precise economic doctrine. . . . Those militants who have firm socialist convictions and who possess the qualification required for quick and real understanding of economic problems. . . . must concentrate their efforts from now on upon the economy. It is dangerous and risky to leave technical administration in the hands of elements whose socialist and economic training is deficient if they are not even lacking in understanding or actually hostile towards the people's choice of socialism. . . ."

"To straighten out the economy means in the first place rational organization of the self-managed sector of the economy in agriculture and industry. Abandoned to itself, without adequate help or control from the state, this sector could experience financial collapse."

Continuing in the same tone, Harbi declared: "Urgent measures must be undertaken flowing from the experience of self-management as underlined at the recent congress of peasants. . . . creation of a banking system to handle necessary credits and centralize the controlled financial operations of the self-management enterprises; determination by law of the division of income going in part to the national community and in part to the workers; immediate organization of commercial activity and labor planning at the communal level."

Boumaza drew these conclusions: "Industrialization cannot succeed immediately. The formula should therefore be mass mobilization. Especially those workers who have no families should participate in work camps where they can be fed and lodged and work on big construction schemes. Out of concern for justice, the nation must participate in this effort (through the National Solidarity Fund) not by starting strikes in a country advancing rapidly towards socialism but by working and accepting taxes."

In the coming days we shall invest the money of the National Solidarity Fund. This money, increased out of local resources and linked to human investment, will allow us to partially solve this problem [of unemployment] through creation of semihandicraft shops to produce clothing, shoes, building materials, etc."

Looking ahead, Boumaza said: "In collaboration with the government we have started a job which will lead us at the end of the year towards a congress of self-management committees in the industrial sector, where the problems of self-management in that sector will be considered. In a few months we shall take in hand this sector whose weight should determine the country's economic policy. The government hasn't been completely aware of what it possesses here. We haven't known how many plants were operating; there have even been socialist cells in a world which still has a capitalist structure. An exact inventory must be made of this sector. . . ."

BOOK ON ALGERIA DISCUSSED IN MILAN

A forum on "Algeria and Socialism" was held in Milan December 5 under the auspices of the Anticolonial Committee. The discussion took place at the House of Culture, a well-known institution fostered by parties of the left, particularly the Communist party, and centered around the book containing the main documents of the Algerian Revolution compiled by Livio Maitan and published by Samonà and Savelli. According to the Milan edition of l'Unità, the Communist party paper, the meeting was well attended.

The discussion was opened by Saverio Tutino, editor of l'Unità. He underlined the importance of the documents, declaring them essential to a correct understanding of the course of the Algerian Revolution. He said that he was in essential agreement with the preface to the book written by Livio Maitan.

Maitan was then given the floor. He underlined the importance of the crisis in Algeria in the summer of 1962, emphasized the historic significance of the March 1963 decrees nationalizing the land and approving self-management, analyzed the subsequent experience with self-management, and stressed the anticapitalist as well as anti-imperialist nature of the Algerian Revolution. He discussed recent events, referring particularly to the Peasant Congress which marked another success in the course of self-management.

A number of people took the floor. Tutino then replied, underlining the profound significance of the Algerian Revolution which brought forward a whole series of fundamental problems for the workers movement at the present time. He especially criticized the bankruptcy of the labor movement in face of the problem of the colonial revolution and the attitude of the French Communist party toward the Algerian Revolution.

Maitan spoke again, outlining the perspectives of Algerian economic development and underlining the importance of an over-all concept of the development of the world revolution in its different sectors.

The book Algeria and Socialism, compiled by Livio Maitan, has received favorable reviews in the press. The left-centrist weekly L'Espresso offered its readers an analysis of the contents. Paese-Sera, the big daily controlled by the Communist party, spoke extremely well of it. The official Communist party weekly Rinascita, which is edited by Togliatti, said among other things that "the ample preface by Livio Maitan represents, despite a certain polemical tone, a serious attempt to analyze the political struggles and the differences among the Algerian leading group in the light of a complex internal social situation and international factors that weigh on the life of the young state."

ASSOCIATION TO AID ALGERIA ORGANIZED IN QUEBEC

In response to the appeal for nongovernmental aid to Algeria, some outstanding figures in the province of Quebec, Canada, representing various organizations and points of view have sponsored formation of the Association d'Aide et de Solidarité Québec-Algérie.

The purpose of the organization, declares a press release issued by the Provisional Committee of the Association is "to inform the Quebec public about the realities and problems of the New Algeria and to organize a campaign of aid and friendship for this country" as well as to help arrange "cultural and technical exchanges" and to forward requests of French-speaking technicians wishing to go to Algeria to work.

The committee pointed out that Algeria needs medical help, agricultural and industrial technicians, skilled workers, and especially volunteers willing, out of idealism, to share their knowledge with the Algerians.

The committee also stressed the need for material assistance of various kinds such as agricultural machinery, tractors, mobile medical equipment, school supplies and books for libraries.

"Algeria wants us to appreciate the difficulties faced in restoring the country, as well as her efforts and hopes. She wants us also to spread the truth, so often distorted."

The Association is addressing its work especially toward organizations of the workers, to unions, co-operatives, movements of the youth, the intellectuals and farmers of French-speaking Canada.

Among the sponsors of the committee are Jacques Dofny and Alfred Dubuc, prominent figures of the Parti Socialiste du Québec; Emile Boudreau, assistant director for Quebec of the Metallurgistes Unis d'Amérique; Dr. Jacques Ferron, writer and physician; Naim Kattan, journalist; Jean Lebas, maritime inspector; and André L'Heureux, a technical adviser.

The address of the Provisional Committee of the Association is 3405 rue St. André, App. 3, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

WHERE THE ALGERIAN REVOLUTION STANDS TODAY

By Michel Raptis

[During a trip in behalf of the National Bureau for European Nongovernmental Assistance to Algeria, Michel Raptis gave a talk in London November 29 on the Algerian Revolution. He repeated the talk in Rome on December 2. The following is a résumé of his remarks.]

To speak of the Algerian Revolution involves a very big subject which one can scarcely cover in a necessarily brief talk.

What we are dealing with in reality is the uninterrupted advance of an entire people from the first of November 1954 when they rose against the long colonial domination of their country until they obtained independence in 1961, after seven and a half years of atrocious war, and then transformed this war-revolution into socialist revolution.

Algeria is a big country from the point of view of area (four times the size of France) and from the point of view of natural wealth. (I refer particularly to the very considerable wealth in energy and minerals of the Sahara, this Canada, this Siberia of Africa which is destined to experience a development, a future, fabulously profitable for all of Africa.)

But Algeria is a small country from the point of view of its present population which is around twelve million.

If the people of this country have drawn international attention and the sympathy of all the workers for a number of years and if what one calls the Algerian Revolution is a more and more burning subject in world events, this is not due to the specific virtues of the people, despite the undeniable heroism which they demonstrated in their tenacious struggle and which was so decisive in winning their national liberation. The Algerian phenomenon, even in its peculiarities, is a characteristic of a new international dynamic which has appeared in the world since the second world war in particular.

The Algerian phenomenon is a striking example of the new relationship of forces which has been established between the Revolution, imperceptibly transforming the present world, and what could be called in general the Reaction in all its forms; that is, the forces of social conservatism and the international status quo.

The Algerian phenomenon is a powerful expression of the irresistible will animating the so-called underdeveloped peoples to free themselves from their political and economic colonial conditions, and to catch up with the least possible delay to the average level of international economic, social and cultural development.

The transformation of the war of liberation of the Algerian people into a social revolution of socialist character, which has been occurring in Algeria, must be placed and understood within the framework of these general considerations.

When the Algerian people took up arms to fight for national liberation through a struggle of immense, unheard of sacrifices, the opinion still prevailed in wide circles of the European left that this struggle, without the direct and powerful support of the French working class in particular, would prove fruitless.

They were still thinking in terms of schemas drawn from the experience between the two wars, corresponding to a dynamic of the World Revolution quite different from that which became established during and after the second world war.

We now know that the Algerian people, although struggling practically alone for seven and a half years, suffering more than a million dead, against the great world power of France which did not hesitate to bring the bulk of its military forces into action -- this people conquered their independence just the same.

I do not believe that it is necessary in this brief exposition to go into the details of the ensemble of complex reasons -- on the French as well as Algerian side -- which facilitated this outcome. The role, for example, which the orientation of Gaullist policy played in the question of colonial policy and in the framework of the modernization of French capitalism undertaken by de Gaulle to meet the test of European integration in the Common Market.

It is a fact in any case that the Algerian people had to free themselves struggling practically alone.

Their example will not fail, and has not failed already, to greatly influence all the peoples through the world still held under direct colonial domination.

Other lessons of considerable theoretical import for all those, both Marxist and otherwise, who are interested in understanding the forces and the dynamics of the world revolution which our century is witnessing and which is imperceptibly transforming our traditional capitalist world, are to be drawn from the Algerian experience.

The Algerian Revolution, following the Yugoslav, Chinese, Vietnamese and Cuban revolutions in particular have placed fresh value on, and made more understandable, the revolutionary role which can be played in a whole series of countries analogous in structure to Algeria by the peasantry peculiar to these countries, a peasantry devoid of land and living in the so-called "traditional" sector of the economy outside of the capitalist market proper.

It was by basing themselves on this part of the population, the most disinherited, the most deprived, those living among the lofty mountains of the country as well as those crowded into the monstrous shanty towns that surround many of the big North African, African and colonial cities in general, that the revolutionary elements -- a very reduced number -- of the traditional national Algerian movement, sensitive to the pressure of these layers, were able to take the initiative and the leadership of the armed struggle unleashed in November 1954.

This revolutionary role of the peasantry, which was manifested in the unleashing of their revolution, continued throughout the whole period of the armed struggle, since it was precisely the peasantry that furnished the bulk of the effort and the sacrifices. And even after independence, it was always the peasantry and in a more general way the acuteness of the agrarian question which permitted, if not imposed, the social and socialist opening of the Revolution.

In relation to this role of the peasantry, that played by the restricted proletariat in the cities, who enjoy a standard of living incomparably higher than that of the peasants, was necessarily less determinant for a whole period.

But in the socialist phase begun in the Algerian Revolution the role of the proletariat and its ideology will certainly prove to be decisive. In a country like Algeria the dominant sector, both from the social as well as economic point of view is still agriculture. This is divided into two sectors: the modern sector of agriculture which included about 2,800,000 hectares [one hectare = 2.47 acres] belonging to around 22,000 European settlers (of whom some 6,000 held eighty per cent) and some 9,000 big Algerian owners; and the "traditional" sector, including 600,000 Algerians each possessing between one-half and ten hectares of land.

The social Algerian Revolution began by putting under control of the state the agricultural and industrial properties abandoned by the Europeans who, between March and August 1962, fled in mass (about four-fifths out of a total of one million).

In the abandoned fields and factories, there spontaneously arose first of all the embryos of the present movement, characteristic of Algerian socialism, Self-management.

Self-management in Algeria was not a doctrinal choice but a necessity arising from the reality.

In the vacuum created in the economy by the massive departure of the Europeans and also the absence of an efficient state administration and technicians, the only possibility that existed to keep up production was to resort to the democratic organization of the workers in each farm and plant.

In the summer of 1962 it was the workers themselves who took the initiative of constituting Management Committees, charged with carrying on the "vacant" economy of the country.

This spontaneous, but in the beginning restricted, movement was encouraged, amplified and institutionalized by the Ben Bella government. At the outset by the first decrees on Self-management in October 1962, next by those justly entitled "historic" in March 1963.

Imperceptibly under the combined pressure of the objective necessities of the masses and of the Revolutionary Government, the Algerian economy under the influence of its "vacant" sector, slipped into the irreversible road of self-management.

This means an economy largely nationalized and planned but managed by the workers.

At the present time all the land belonging to the settlers, plus 300,000 hectares belonging to rich Algerians, that is, more than 3,000,000 hectares, is under the regime of Self-management, as well as some hundreds of industrial enterprises. Measures in preparation project:

(a) The extension of the agrarian reform to all lands above a certain ceiling -- probably ten hectares of irrigated land, fifty hectares of unirrigated.

(b) The reorganization of the nationalized banking system.

(c) The reorganization of the commercial system, installing the principle of the monopoly of foreign trade by the state.

Thus more rapidly than anywhere else, in the space of a single year, Algeria is moving toward the fundamental economic and social structures characteristic of a workers state -- that is, an economy largely nationalized, planned, but democratically managed by its workers.

I should like to dwell on some of the details concerning the concrete functioning of Self-management in Algeria:

All the permanent workers of a farm or a plant constitute the basic organism of Self-management and it is by far the most important because of the power which it has to definitively decide on all essential questions concerning the management of the enterprise: the Workers General Assembly.

This is the body that elects through secret ballot the Workers Council which in turn elects, always by secret ballot, its executive body: the Management Committee, presided over by one of its members, the Chairman.

The Chairman is assisted by a Technical Director who acts under the authority of the workers' Self-management organisms.

The Director is nominated by the state but only after agreement with the Communal Self-management Council which includes all the chairmen of the management committees in the area of a Commune, plus a representative of the party, the trade unions, the Popular Army and the Administration.

These are the workers' organisms that elaborate the economic plan of the enterprise, that adopt work rules and fix the manner of dividing the revenue that goes to the workers.

With regard to the latter question, I must say that the condition of wages is in fact abolished by the system of Self-management; because if a share, to be determined, of the revenue of each farm and factory must go to the state, representing the National Collectivity, another share of the revenue is freely divided by the workers according to their output by shift and work team.

The more production and productivity increases, the more does revenue

for each worker increase without any ceiling such as wages in the capitalist system where all the surplus value produced by the workers is pocketed by the capitalist proprietor alone.

The co-ordination of the economic activities of each enterprise under self-management with the general objectives of the National Economic Plan, is made through democratic elaboration of the plan, the gearing of each enterprise into that of the Commune, the region, the entire country and vice versa and by the flexible but efficient action of the financial means at the disposal of the state -- taxes, investments, prices.

The aim of self-management is to combine methods of nationalization, planning, and means of marketing, in order to avoid the bureaucratization of the economy in transition from capitalism to socialism, while completely assuring in this process the development and continuous reinforcement of the socialist tendencies of the economy.

The experience of Self-management in Algeria reminds some people of the experience with Self-management in Yugoslavia.

The analogies between the two systems in this field are real and incontestable.

Nevertheless it is necessary to note that Self-management in Algeria:

(1) was a movement that began spontaneously among the workers; (2) was almost immediately encouraged, amplified and made into an institution by the Revolutionary Government from its inception; (3) accords rights and powers to the workers considerably greater than in Yugoslavia, especially in relation to the functions of the Workers General Assembly and the Chairman of the Management Committee under whose authority (as well as the workers organisms of Self-management as a whole) the Director serves.

In addition, in the Algerian system of Self-management it is necessary to underline the importance held by the institution of the Communal Self-management Council, destined to become, among other things, a very important element in the democratic planning of the economy.

This said, it is just to add that the Yugoslav system of Self-management benefits from much longer practical experience which has enabled it to resolve a whole series of questions still posed in Algeria.

Algeria is now building this kind of economy under a Revolutionary Government which could be characterized as a Peasant and Workers Government applying a transitional program in which the economic doctrine comes closer and closer to the Marxist model.

All these radical transformations are being carried out in a climate of extreme mildness despite stubborn resistance, under various forms, by the reactionary forces, both internal and foreign.

The Algerian Revolution has developed up to now under the sign of the generosity and serenity characteristic of its people and of the man who is presiding over their revolutionary destiny: "Brother Ben Bella," as the

peasants and workers of Algeria call him with sincere respect and friendship.

The acquisitions of the Algerian Revolution already belong to the history of the international workers' movement and socialism.

Great difficulties and crises still await the Algerian Revolution. Recent events have demonstrated that the reactionary forces will do everything in their power to prevent Algeria from becoming stabilized as a Democratic Socialist State granting to its workers the greatest rights and powers existing at the present time anywhere in the world.

Its example may well become explosive for the whole Maghreb, all of Africa, the Mediterranean and even Europe. All the more reason, I believe, for the workers of Europe in particular to come in time to the moral and material aid of the victorious Socialist Algerian Revolution.

NEXT WEEK

In Cuba an important theoretical discussion is now being conducted on some difficult economic problems and the applicability in workers states of the law of value in trying to solve them. E. Germain has written an analysis of the issues involved and suggests where to seek the answers. Look for the beginning of this contribution in next week's World Outlook.

BEST BUY

The U.S. edition of the final volume of Isaac Deutscher's biography of Leon Trotsky is still difficult to obtain. The publishers report that this is due to "technical difficulties."

However, the English edition is readily available in London -- and at a considerable saving over the price of the American edition.

To get a copy send 62/5s. (U.K.) or \$6.50, check or international money order, to WIR Publications, 374 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

Book Review

DEUTSCHER'S BIOGRAPHY OF TROTSKY

By Joseph Hansen

[Continued from last issue.]

THE PROPHET OUTCAST by Isaac Deutscher. New York: The Oxford University Press. 1963. 543 pp. \$9.50.

There is justification in singling out this aspect, in emphasizing Trotsky as prophet. It helps create interest in what he had to offer the world. Nevertheless, a certain amount of reduction occurs. At worst, the image, with its undue connotation of extra-sensory intuitive powers, tends to obscure the image of Trotsky as scientist. It contributes to an imbalance in the portrait. Before coming to that, however, it is perhaps advisable to say something about Deutscher's differences with Trotsky, which come to the fore in this volume.

Throughout the biography Deutscher stresses the continuity of Marxist thought represented by Trotsky, evaluates to the best of his ability what Trotsky added to the body of Marxist literature and offers accurate and readable presentations of Trotsky's special contributions. In previous volumes he considered Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, his brilliant work in the field of literary criticism, his outstanding role in the 1905 and 1917 revolutions, his program for the first workers state as it stood isolated in the twenties, his opening of the struggle against Stalinism. In this volume, Deutscher calls special attention to Trotsky's analysis of the nature of fascism and how to fight it -- an addition to Marxism that is little appreciated today, primarily because of the unending campaign of slander against Trotsky.

Most of Trotsky's followers would add to this list, and even put it in the top rank of his achievements, the analysis of the Soviet Union as a degenerated workers' state, particularly Trotsky's estimate of the roots and nature of Stalinism. Deutscher has strong reservations on this. He feels that Trotsky, while making the fundamental contribution, did not see altogether clearly on the subject:

"The Revolution Betrayed occupies a special place in Trotsky's literary work. It is the last book he managed to complete and [constitutes], in a sense, his political testament. In it he gave his final analysis of Soviet society and a survey of its history up to the middle of the Stalin era. His most complex book, it combines all the weakness and the strength of his thought. It contains many new and original reflections on socialism, on the difficulties with which proletarian revolution has to grapple, and on the role of a bureaucracy in a workers' state. He also surveyed the international position of the Soviet Union before the Second World War and tried to pierce the future with daring and partly erroneous forecasts. The book is a profound theoretical treatise and a tract for the time; a creative restatement of classical Marxist views; and the manifesto of the 'new Trotskyism' calling for revolution in the Soviet Union. Trotsky appears here in all his capacities; as detached and rigorously objective thinker;

as leader of a defeated Opposition; and as passionate pamphleteer and polemicist. The polemicist's contribution forms the more esoteric part of the work and tends to overshadow the objective and analytical argument. Because of the wealth of its ideas and its imaginative force, this has been one of the seminal books of this century, as instructive as confusing, and destined to be put to adventitious use more often than any other piece of political writing. Even its title was to become one of the shibboleths of our time."

Deutscher follows with a summary of the book which is quite good (however "Stalinist state" for "Stalinist regime" in a "workers' state" is scarcely a happy condensation). He finds himself in agreement with Trotsky's program against bureaucratism and for proletarian democracy and considers it still relevant "over a quarter of a century after its formulation." Then he indicates one of his main disagreements with Trotsky:

"From the tenor of The Revolution Betrayed it is clear that he saw no chance of any reform from above; and there was indeed no chance of it in his lifetime and for the rest of the Stalin era. But during that time there was no chance in the Soviet Union of any political revolution either. This was a period of deadlock: it was impossible either to cut or to untie the Gordian knots of Stalinism. Any programme of change whether revolutionary or reformist, was illusory. This could not prevent a fighter like Trotsky from searching for a way out. But he was searching within a vicious circle, which only world-shaking events began to breach many years later. And when that happened the Soviet Union moved away from Stalinism through reform from above in the first instance. What forced the reform was precisely the factors on which Trotsky had banked: economic progress, the cultural rise of the masses, and the end of Soviet isolation. The break with Stalinism could only be piecemeal, because at the end of the Stalin era there existed and could exist no political force capable and willing to act in a revolutionary manner. Moreover, throughout the first decade after Stalin there did not emerge 'from below' any autonomous and articulate mass movement even for reform. Since Stalinism had become an anachronism, nationally and internationally, and a break with it had become an historic necessity for the Soviet Union, the ruling group itself had to take the initiative of the break. Thus, by an irony of history Stalin's epigones began the liquidation of Stalinism and thereby carried out, malgré eux mêmes, parts of Trotsky's political testament.

"But can they continue this work and complete it? Or is a political revolution still necessary? On the face of it, the chances of revolution are still as slender as they were in Trotsky's days, whereas the possibilities of reform are far more real."*

*In connection with this, Deutscher refers in a footnote to an attack on his views levelled by James P. Cannon in 1954. Perhaps it is opportune to attempt to clear this up. Some harsh and even unjustified things were said of Deutscher. At the time, Deutscher's theory about the possibility of the self-reform of the Stalinist bureaucracy figured in an internal crisis of the Socialist Workers party. A sector of the cadres and leaders were strongly influenced by Deutscher's theory. A split occurred and some of them capitulated to Stalinism. The crisis was not confined to the SWP but

In The Prophet Outcast Deutscher still holds that "continuous reform" is more likely than "a revolutionary explosion." However, he agrees that this can be only a tentative conclusion. There can be "little or no certitude." He says finally, "At any rate, the present writer prefers to leave the final judgement on Trotsky's idea of a political revolution to a historian of the next generation."

It is not my intention to get into a dispute at this time with Deutscher on "self-reform" or "political revolution," a complicated question. I will only indicate the central issue. The immediacy of a political revolution is not at stake -- the disagreement is not about that. What is involved in principle is the character of the ruling caste in the Soviet Union. In Trotsky's view it was not just a bureaucracy but something more, somewhat like a class in its rapacity and its need to monopolize power but lacking the economic roots and economic stability of a true class. Will such a social formation, out of self-volition, eventually offer the masses effective forms of proletarian democracy? Trotsky held the view that the answer was no, since the effective operation of proletarian democracy would signify liquidation of the bureaucracy as a social formation enjoying special privileges. A negative answer, in turn, implied that political revolution was the only means left to the masses to intervene in their own rule. This did not necessarily mean a "violent explosion" although it would certainly signify a thoroughgoing shakeup undertaken at the initiative of the masses.

None of the concessions granted by Stalin's heirs up to now have affected the political monopoly held by the bureaucratic caste. Trotsky's conclusions would thus seem to have received corroboration from the pattern of the reforms themselves.

From the viewpoint of the world Trotskyist movement, Deutscher's agreement on the validity of Trotsky's program establishes the possibility in principle of practical collaboration with him, even though action, so far as he is concerned, might never go beyond working for "continuous reform." Since advocates of "continuous reform" and "political revolution" have the

affected other sectors of the Trotskyist movement. To many Trotskyists, Deutscher's position appeared as an alternative program which could prove to be a bridge to Stalinism. It was therefore viewed with hostility. It turned out, however, that Deutscher was not interested in recruiting from the Trotskyist movement or in organizing a sect of his own, still less a cult. This spoke strongly in his favor. After the Hungarian uprising another phenomenon soon became noticeable to the Trotskyist movement. Many members of Communist parties, shaken by the events, began reading forbidden literature. Not prepared to touch the works of the devil himself, Deutscher's writings appeared less "counterrevolutionary" to them. Having begun dipping into Trotskyism in this way, they thirsted for more. Through Deutscher, some of them eventually found their way to Trotskyism. Deutscher's position under these circumstances proved to be a bridge from Stalinism to Trotskyism. Trotskyists could not be against that kind of public facility. They therefore began undertaking their own self-reform in relation to Deutscher.

same end in view -- the establishment of proletarian democracy in the workers' states -- a rather wide basis for co-operation exists. To this it can be added that it will doubtless be in the process of seeking to obtain reforms of increasing importance that the Soviet masses will eventually prove in life who saw most clearly and who suffered to some degree from illusions as to the means by which Stalin's alteration of the political structure will eventually be rectified.

* * *

In addition to inability to prophesy correctly how the workers' state would be regenerated, Deutscher holds that Trotsky failed to forecast correctly the pattern which the world revolution actually took in the postwar period. I would not deny that there is an element of truth in the latter assertion. The specific pattern of the Chinese Revolution -- organization of the peasantry into armies and their advance from the countryside to the city -- offers the most spectacular example of a mode foreseen by no one. The Cuban Revolution offered powerful confirmation to what could be deduced in the case of China -- that there is much still to be learned about potentialities in the revolutionary process, in particular about the increasing role of revolutionists of action (foreseen by Trotsky) in contrast to the earlier predominance of the pioneers of theory.

To say that these revolutions deviated from the pattern forecast by classical Marxism does not bring us to the heart of the matter, however. The October Revolution in its time likewise deviated from the forecasts of classical Marxism (Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution was not yet part of "classical" Marxism), yet in the final balancing of accounts the October Revolution offered the most powerful confirmation of classical Marxism. The problems in theory offered by China and Cuba are not qualitatively different. What they point to is the importance of the method to be used in approaching them. This was already indicated by Trotsky -- if not as prophet, then as scientist.

In a Postscript, Deutscher offers some contributions in relation to this. What he says is interesting but not exactly new to the Trotskyist movement which has been discussing these questions since the downfall of capitalism in Eastern Europe.

* * *

In passing, Deutscher notes certain physical characteristics of Trotsky. The likeness grows to photographic accuracy. (Photography always misses somewhat.) This is all the more notable since Deutscher never happened to meet Trotsky and had to rely on the impressions of others besides, of course, the written record.

The portrait as a work of art, one must also agree, is quite good. A reservation, however, must be registered. Deutscher's preoccupation with accounting for the apparent discrepancies between Trotsky's program of political revolution in the USSR and the actual post-Stalin concessions, Trotsky's program of socialist revolution in the industrially advanced countries and the actual advance of the world revolution in the colonial sector, Trotsky's program for rebuilding the revolutionary-socialist move-

ment and the actual organizational weakness to this day of the Fourth International, lead him, in my opinion, to miss something very important. I am not interested here in debating these questions, but in considering how Deutscher's positions affect his finished portrait.

Trotsky was enormously attractive to not a few intellectuals. His power of prediction, his range of intellect and culture showed his mind without the slightest doubt to be one of the greatest the West has produced.

To follow Trotsky's thought in all its ramifications is an absorbing study, as Deutscher's biography proves. It is a challenge to measure Trotsky's theory against the historical reality. The temptation can even be strong to vie with the master by attempting a better construction where it may seem he went wrong. This is perfectly legitimate and one cannot quarrel with such ambitions. They can prove to be productive. A trap does exist, however. The very subtlety, range and depth of Trotsky's thought and the quantity of his productions, which make him so magnetic to intellectuals, can lead one to overlook Trotsky's essential simplicity.

In working closely with Trotsky, one soon noted an extraordinary combination of qualities: enormous energy, unbelievably quick perception and rapport, extraordinary memory, and the mobilization of these gifts in a most efficient and businesslike way. Mobilized for what? A very simple task -- the establishment of planned economy in place of the anarchic relations of capitalism. This was the elementary chore which this genius set for himself as a youth when he decided to choose Marxism as his field. It was the job to which he stuck steadily through the years. He was still working at it when he was struck down.

If you wish to question the wisdom of how Trotsky directed his genius, as Deutscher does in the instance of his seeking to build a new international, it would seem in order to begin by questioning the wisdom of this primary decision.

A case can be made out concerning the abysmal waste of taking humanity's very greatest intellects and compelling them to become occupied with bringing order into our way of organizing the production and distribution of food, clothing, housing, and taking care of the rest of our basic social needs. Trotsky's answer to that is that we do not choose the time we are born into. Our problem as individuals in finding our niche is to grasp the main tasks facing mankind, and, as members of the human race, do what we can to help accomplish them. From Trotsky's viewpoint this also offers a human being the greatest possible satisfaction.

All the rest follows, including the burning importance which Trotsky placed upon organization of the Fourth International.

But like all great men Trotsky had his foibles! Of course. But having granted this can we in all consistency maintain that the biographers of great men, including the biographer of Trotsky, are free from them? If we concede to Deutscher the saving grace of having his own foibles, perhaps it will not be considered out of order to suggest that one of them was failure to see the importance of probing deeply into the meaning of the kind of human relations that Trotsky advocated, sought, instigated, enjoyed,

and participated in organizing, above all at the close of his life, in the light of his enormous experience and when he was at the very height of his intellectual powers. To bring the inner Trotsky into full light, he must be seen, I would judge, in the setting of his active pursuit of these human relations and as they fitted into his own great guiding purpose in life.

Our biographer's usually keen insight deserts him at this crucial point, and in place of all the threads falling satisfyingly into place to disclose the coherence of Trotsky's intelligence and will, the threads fray out into loose ends. Deutscher shows his prophet with eyes growing dim.

How such a clear-sighted genius could fail so lamentably to see things which Deutscher considers obvious remains an unresolved contradiction in the biography. Deutscher seems to sense this. He grants that Trotsky remained unflinchingly optimistic about revolutionary perspectives to the very end; yet he suggests that doubts had begun to creep in. He makes much of Trotsky's argument in the factional struggle that broke out in the Socialist Workers party in 1939 that if the working class proved incapable of meeting its historic obligation then Burnham's anti-Marxist theory of "bureaucratic collectivism" would prove to be the wave of the future, socialism a mere utopia, and all of Marxism wrong. He suggests that Trotsky at bottom discounted the movement he had founded: "his real last will and testament" contains "not a single mention of the Fourth International." Deutscher bears down rather heavily on the theme:

"Thus at the close of his days Trotsky interrogated himself about the meaning and the purpose of all his life and struggle and indeed of all the struggles of several generations of fighters, communists, and socialists. Was a whole century of revolutionary endeavour crumbling into dust? Again and again he returned to the fact that the workers had not overthrown capitalism anywhere outside Russia. Again and again he surveyed the long and dismal sequence of defeats which the revolution had suffered between the two world wars. And he saw himself driven to the conclusion that if major new failures were to be added to this record, then the whole historic perspective drawn by Marxism would indeed come under question."

I think that Deutscher is wrong in believing that Trotsky "interrogated himself." He was answering the interrogations of others, and with the most powerful arguments at his command. Trotsky was as hard as diamond and completely flawless in his view of the long-range course of history. What did Trotsky really do "again and again"? He posed the alternative facing mankind: barbarism or socialism. He did not hesitate to pick up the arguments raised by those who had really begun to doubt and to sicken of the struggle. He spun them to logical absurdity and exposed their theoretical bankruptcy -- their bankruptcy.

Commenting on the "overemphatic and hyperbolic" argument which Trotsky levelled against Burnham, Deutscher comments: "Perhaps only Marxists could sense fully the tragic solemnity which these words had in Trotsky's mouth." It is true that this was the way they sounded to some of the leaders of the opposing faction, but they hardly sounded that way to Trotsky or his closest collaborators.

We can perhaps better appreciate Trotsky's meaning by considering the same basic alternative which he posed as it stands today, almost a quarter of a century later. If the acuteness of the alternative had grown less, without the action of the working class, then the founding of the Fourth International would have turned out to be a utopian project because its aim -- the mobilization of the working class to avert barbarism -- proved to be not necessary. Or if we faced the opposite situation -- an actual perspective of centuries of barbarism, the project likewise would have proved to have been utopian. What is the truth? Neither situation holds. The alternative is still posed, but the delay in determining its outcome has enormously increased its acuteness.

The alternative, socialism or barbarism, has become the alternative: socialism or nuclear ruin. Physicists now tell us -- Trotsky's followers only repeat it -- that war with atomic weapons can signify the suicide of mankind and even the destruction of all the higher forms of life. Trotsky's picture of the possibility of a barbarism in which mankind would have to crawl painfully forward on all fours is idyllic compared to the "tragic solemnity" of the picture now facing us -- a barren planet in which life itself might have to crawl up again from the amoeba or, if lucky, some of the lower vertebrates.

Does this mean that we must abandon hope or that there is room for more doubt than in Trotsky's last years before the outbreak of World War II? On the contrary! The need for socialism is posed all the more imperatively.

This leads us directly to the point of sharpest difference with Deutscher. Who is to be credited with this "success" in intensifying the acuteness of the historic dilemma facing the world? The Second and Third internationals! The life-and-death importance of Trotsky's final efforts to construct a new international has received sufficient confirmation we should think.

A pure pragmatist will demand "All right, where are the revolutions in the West?" The question lacks the intended force because it leaves out the great postwar upsurge, especially in Italy and France, a phenomenon which Deutscher does not consider although it is surely relevant in any discussion of Trotsky's forecasts. Is another upsurge, of even greater potential power, ruled out? In questions relating to the decline of a system and the rise of a new one, sufficient range must be taken, exactly how much range is not easily determined even by a genius-like Trotsky.

Deutscher is so concerned to prove the hopelessness of Trotsky's project of rebuilding the world-wide revolutionary socialist movement that he puts in question a different thesis which he proffers; namely, that Stalin was much more capable than Trotsky estimated him to be. Stalin, as Deutscher proves, was infinitely afraid of the Fourth International. He displayed an obsession over it. Was this merely paranoia, the counterpart to Trotsky's grotesque foible, or did the capable Stalin have a certain amount of reason in his efforts to exorcize the phantom? Why Stalin's extraordinary concern over the sectarian squabbles and impotent goings on of Trotsky's followers? (Other rulers, too, have shown strange disinclination to accept the view that the Trotskyist movement can be dismissed as a "failure.")

It is hard to know exactly what Deutscher thinks Trotsky and his run-the-mill followers should have done in the years when they were fighting the spread of fascism, struggling against Stalinism and the reformism of the Social Democracy, warning of the danger of World War II, posing the historic dilemma facing mankind and seeking to build a revolutionary-socialist leadership.

Trotsky's work in collaboration with the "vulgar" followers who rallied to his program provides one of the best keys to a deeper understanding of his character. Deutscher is grievously blind to this. If you view Trotsky primarily as a prophet, as Deutscher does, this blind spot becomes understandable. It is not easy for a prophet to transfer his gifts; it is even quite a foible to try it. If you look at Trotsky just a bit differently, however, his efforts come into better focus. Let me resort to analogy. In an epidemic it is necessary for a physician to take a leading part in the community defense, utilizing his special knowledge to help organize, with whatever means are available, a campaign to stem the epidemic and eventually eliminate the possibility of its recurrence. In his novel La Peste, Camus offers us the figure of Dr. Bernard Rieux, who finally succeeded in mobilizing his home town against the disease first noticed in the abnormal behavior of the rat population. The team assembled by Dr. Rieux learned a great deal about bubonic plague and how to meet it at the risk and even cost of their own lives. Dr. Rieux, a genuine humanist, offers his highest tribute to these comrades and collaborators in the fearful work they had to undertake together. A certain symbolism is evident in this remarkable novel. The perceptiveness displayed by Camus in the case of his main figure is instructive and well worth pondering.

Deutscher condemns the human material Trotsky had to work with, implying that this was one of the basic reasons for the "failure" of the Fourth International. He feels that the human material which Lenin and Trotsky had at their disposal before the October Revolution was better. In the West, particularly, the quality was poor.

The question, however, is not that simple. As the Spanish Revolution -- to name an outstanding instance -- proved, the raw human material was adequate to the task at hand. The cadres that came to Trotskyism at the time were far from being the worst fighters, the least self-sacrificing, or the least intelligent. The Stalinists, anyway, feared them to an uncommon degree and with good cause because they were of the same rebel type that staffed the ranks of the Communist parties, men and women who were loyal to those parties by mistake, because they had not yet had time or opportunity to understand the difference between the Soviet state and its Stalinist regime.

The tempo of developments, which in general favored the swift growth of Trotskyism, particularly in relation to the Communist parties, turned against the movement in two supreme instances, the outbreak of war and the victory of the Soviet Union. The first event temporarily deferred everything, laying the foundation, of course, for explosive developments later on. The second, a completely progressive outcome, had the contradictory effect of temporarily strengthening Stalinism (as the Trotskyist movement clearly saw at the time) while preparing even more certain conditions for its ultimate liquidation (as the Trotskyist movement predicted).

In any case, on the exceedingly difficult, complex and challenging problem of building a revolutionary-socialist movement, Trotsky and Deutscher are of different schools. Deutscher's deep skepticism was not to be found in Trotsky, not a trace of it. On the other hand, Trotsky was thoroughly familiar with the skeptical attitude, considered it without foundation objectively, held it to be a deadly danger and did his best to immunize his youthful followers against this disease.

Having said this we can grant that the Trotskyist movement did have many difficulties, had its share of temperamental personalities who exercised undue weight in the small organization and who no doubt offered the great teacher problems of little novelty or intrinsic interest. Trotsky's attitude toward his pupils, for his movement was also a training ground, was one of infinite patience. And, we repeat, while he could be acidly ironic he never displayed skepticism, if we may make exception of his well-known reservations concerning followers of petty-bourgeois origin, especially the "intellectual" variety, a subtlety in Trotsky's thought which Deutscher does not examine, since he dismisses the whole subject.

The strangest part is that Deutscher shows the highest regard for Trotsky's followers in the Soviet Union who were butchered by Stalin down to the last man and woman he could lay hands on. Deutscher also indicates Trotsky's feelings toward them. But the emotion Trotsky felt for his Russian followers was not qualitatively different from the warmth he displayed toward all who shared the vicissitudes of the struggle with him, his comrades in China, the rest of Asia, in Latin America, in Africa, in Western Europe, in Canada and the United States.

Trotsky's feelings could not be much different towards them because they, too, to the best of their abilities, were fighting the plagues of fascism, Stalinism, "democratic" witch-hunting and the approaching war. They too shared with him the conviction that what is required to right things in this foul time we live in is basically rather simple. In short Trotsky and his followers, many of them at least, understood each other.

Instead of this unity, Deutscher presents a grotesque mismatch between Trotsky and his followers. And instead of the unity of Trotsky's Marxist outlook and his action in founding the Fourth International, Deutscher presents an irrational contradiction between the lucid vision of a prophet and the ludicrous bungling of a dabbler in petty sectarian politics. In studying the finishing touches to the portrait, where we have been led to expect a standard worthy of the subject, we suddenly become overly aware of the artist. We notice the brush in his hand and hear him arguing his special points of difference with the subject.

Just the same, the portrait is good enough so that looking at Trotsky on Deutscher's canvas, we suspect the Old Man of winking at us over the gesticulating brush. "We have always had trouble with our artists. Let us not ask too much from them, but take gratefully what they can give."

[The End.]