

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 17

April 24, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

Savage Sentences in Dr. Alexander Case	1
FLN Congress Opens in Algeria -- by Livio Maitan	3
The Swing to Labour Is Wide and Deep (London Letter) -- by T.J.Peters	7
British Postal Strike Canceled -- by Alan Adair	11
Will Italian CP Attend That Conference?	12
U.S. Headed for a "Dien-Bien-Phu"	13
Suslov Points to the Danger of "Trotskyism" -- by Pierre Frank	14
Whitsun March Planned in Denmark	17
The Sanctions Show Who Supports South Africa's "Apartheid" -- by Franz J.T.Lee	19
Ranks Stirred by Sino-Soviet Conflict (In the Canadian CP) -- by Harry Anderson	24
The Francisco Abarca Case -- by Fernand Charlier	29
U.S. Censorship Challenged	31
Deutscher's View of the Trotskyists -- by J.B.Stuart	32
Our Candidate for Command of World's Nuclear Stockpile	38

SAVAGE SENTENCES IN DR. ALEXANDER CASE

Dr. Neville Alexander and ten other nonwhite South Africans, including four women, were convicted April 15 in the Cape Supreme Court of "sabotage" and sentenced to prison.

Ten-year sentences were given to Dr. Alexander, a doctor of philosophy and high school teacher, one of the most brilliant graduates who ever went through Cape Town University and who later gained renown as a scholar at Tübingen University in West Germany; Don John William Davis, a minister; Marcus Solomons, a school teacher; Elizabeth van der Heyden, a school teacher; and Fikele Charles Bam, an African law student at Cape Town University.

Seven-year sentences were given to Lionel Basil Davis, a clerk, and Gordon Frederick Hendriks.

Five-year sentences were given to Ian Leslie van der Heyden, a high-school teacher, Dulcie Evon September, a teacher, Dorothy Hazel Alexander, a sister of Dr. Alexander and a high-school teacher, and Doris van der Heyden, a librarian. The three van der Heydens are brother and sisters.

The trial began last November 4, after the defendants had been held under the infamous 90-day detention law. They suffered isolation and even torture until they were dragged into court.

The substance of the prosecution case was that they had organized the National Liberation Front, also known as the Yu Chi Chan Club whose objectives were alleged to have been the furtherance of violence and revolution. In addition to studying standard Marxist classics, the group was charged with having studied books and articles about guerrilla warfare. According to the prosecution this proved a "conspiracy" to commit unlawful and willful acts, which, if they had actually been committed, would have endangered the safety of the public and law and order.

The real "crime" of the defendants, of course, was their opposition to the apartheid policy of the Verwoerd government.

In pronouncing sentence, Judge H.A. van Heerden said there was evidence of discussions on the elimination of the Herrenvolk and plans to introduce the techniques of "armed insurrection into the liberation struggles."

"By means of a combination of political agitation and guerrilla warfare, supplemented by widespread sabotage, strikes and demonstrations," the judge said, "they aimed at the overthrow of the Government."

He described all the defendants as "intellectuals."

Reuters declared that this was "the second major sabotage trial to be held in South Africa since last September. The other trial of Nelson Mandela, a former leader of the banned African National Congress, and eight others, is to be resumed in Pretoria next week."

The trial was at least equally as important as the Mandela case, but the defendants in the Alexander case lacked the resources, both financially and organizationally which has enabled the defendants in the Mandela case to draw international attention, including that of the United Nations, to their defense efforts.

The defendants in the Alexander case had to depend on financial help from friends abroad, most of which came from students in West Germany who also made extraordinary efforts to gain international

publicity, but with little success outside of West Germany.

Under the fascist-like laws of South Africa, the defendants in political trials like these are further handicapped by the fact that they are not released on bail. The government holds them in prison as if they were already convicted and they are thus unable to help organize a defense that goes beyond the narrow limits of what is permitted in the courtroom by the vicious South African legislation.

Legally, the defendants can now appeal the savage sentences -- if the judge grants them permission -- but the costs of an appeal appear to be completely beyond the means of the victims and their few devoted friends abroad. In South Africa, of course, an active defense by sympathizers or persons merely interested in democratic rights is extremely difficult since this would open them to charges of "sabotage," too.

As in other countries under totalitarian rule, where liberation has been won only at the cost of the most heroic self-sacrifice, it appears that South Africa's freedom fighters and future heads of a revolutionary government must suffer the agony of years in prison.

FLN CONGRESS OPENS IN ALGERIA

By Livio Maitan

ALGIERS, April 17 -- The long-awaited National Congress of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] opened yesterday in the Empire theater -- rebaptized "Hall of Africa" for the occasion. According to the information released up to this point, between 1,700 and 1,800 delegates are present. They were elected on the basis of one for every two hundred members of the local organizations of the party. Also entitled to participate are the former regional chiefs of the ALN [Armée de Libération Nationale], members of the former organizations of the revolution such as the CNRA [Conseil National de la Révolution Algérienne], the GPRA [Gouvernement Provisoire de la République Algérienne], the members of the Political Bureau, the editors of the party press, Algerian ambassadors abroad, etc.

A placard in the hall of the theater gives figures on the militants and adherents of the FLN. ("Adherents," according to provisions in the statutes, include, by and large, either sympathizers or probationers.) Militants are listed as 153,316; adherents, 619,610. The figures are divided according to the following federations: Greater Algiers and Blida, Annaba (formerly Bône), Constantine, Colomb-Méchar, Médéa, Mostaganem, Oran, El-Asnam, Ouargla, Saida, Sétif, Tizi-Ouzou, Tlemcen, Amicale des Algériens in France and Europe. The strongest federation is Ouargla, both in absolute figures and according to the ratio of inhabitants in the zone.

After brief greetings from Ben Bella in the name of the Political Bureau, the Congress elected a Bureau to guide the work. Minister of Economy Bachir Boumaza was designated chairman and he is to be aided by Soulyah Houari and Mazouzi as vice-chairmen, and Djermane, Ouzegane, Boubekeur and Ben Hamouda as secretaries.

The Congress, which is taking place in closed sessions (except for the opening and closing ones), adopted rules which included among other things the designation of three commissions -- credentials, political line and statutes, economic and social questions. Any delegate can speak before the commissions whether at his own request or by invitation.

According to article 7 of the rules, members of the Political Bureau, reporters for the federations, and for the national organizations can take the floor.

Article 8 permits members of the GPRA, the heads of the former Wilayas as well as members of the government "to speak in the plenary session on subjects dealing with their administration. With regard to the program placed before the Congress, their remarks must be made within their respective federations."

On the eve of the Congress, there was talk in Algiers and in the foreign press about the possible participation of the former leaders, whether they had retired or had, in different ways, gone into opposition. Most of them had already decided, in fact, to abstain despite the rights reserved to them under the norms stated in convoking the Congress. Those not participating in the Congress thus include Boudiaf, Ben Khedda, Khider, Bitat, Ferhat Abbas, not to mention Ait Ahmed, who is continuing his adventure in the mountainous area of the Kabylie. On the other hand, among those who took their seats in the Hall of Africa -- at least on the first day -- were Belkacem Krim, Abdel Hafid Boussouf and Lakhdar Ben Tobbal.

Ahmed Ben Bella opened the political part of the work with a report presented in the name of the outgoing Bureau. For two hours the delegates, who reflect even in their clothing the composition of the cadres of the FLN (the oldest fellahs being dressed generally in the traditional manner) followed with the keenest attention a report that deserves to be read in its entirety.

The report was very clear, very concrete, very balanced in its various sections and took up the fundamental problems in a masterly way. In short Ben Bella singled out and emphasized the essential and most progressive aspects as well as the experience of the revolution up to the time of the new program for the party over which the Congress is now deliberating, thus showing once again how well he measures up to his extremely arduous tasks.

The report confirms, if further proof were needed, that the Algerian revolution is definitely on the road toward socialist con-

struction -- the process which brought Algeria more and more toward installation of a workers state is continuing and even becoming accentuated. It follows very clearly from the report that the private sector of the economy will have an ever decreasing role and that a new agrarian reform will deal a new blow to indigenous land proprietorship. (Despite everything, this still remains important, if, according to the reporter, "there are in Algeria 8,500 private holdings, each one containing more than 100 hectares [one hectare = 2.47 acres] and 15,000 holdings of more than 50 hectares each," amounting to a total of almost 4,500,000 hectares.) In addition, the government appears to have now decided to "rapidly take in hand foreign trade as a whole."

But what makes the report most significant is the strong confirmation -- there is no mistaking this -- in favor of socialist construction on the basis of workers and farmers democracy and against the bureaucratic and authoritarian conceptions. Once again, it is precisely on this level that the original and highly progressive traits of the Algerian socialist orientation are being affirmed.

Thus Ben Bella, without hiding the existing difficulties or those that might arise in any case even in the near future, remains more than ever a fervent partisan of the institution of self-management, which is actually the key element of the current experience in Algeria. He openly polemicized against any bureaucratic conception of socialism, against any form of "revolution by power of attorney," to quote his formula, and he did not cease stressing the vital importance of an equalitarian inspiration for the revolution. With regard to this, an interesting passage in his report noted the necessity "to set a maximum" in pay for party cadres as well as those in the state and to require all cadres of the FLN to make "a declaration on their possessions, held or acquired since November 1954."

Another central point of the report concerned the problem of necessary renewal of the state machinery and the relations between the party and the state. The program which the party has already been discussing, includes important points as a whole. There are others, it is true, that are less clear and, at bottom, even dangerous. The report appears to place the accent on the most progressive aspects even on this level. Above all the theme, evidently of prime importance, of insisting on avoiding confusing and identifying the party and the state machinery, was developed forcefully.

The Algerian leadership, at least its most experienced men, have without any doubt reflected a great deal about the experiences of the bureaucratized workers states. Moreover, they have already had occasion to directly experience the dangers of bureaucratization. Naturally, this cannot be countered by mere programmatic declarations, but it is of enormous importance to specify the dangers and to denounce them as Ben Bella did, to arm the cadres and the militants.

The parts of the report dealing with the social composition of the party and the need during the current year to accept as new members only poor peasants and workers offer supplementary confirmation of Ben Bella's will to face in an organized and concrete way the problem of struggling against what he himself calls bourgeoisification and degeneration.

The report also posed, at the very beginning in fact, the problem of the "historic chiefs" and the relations between the leaders and the masses. Resorting to an expression, utilized at times against him, Ben Bella affirmed that "there is only one hero, the people." He insisted on the vital necessity of mobilizing the masses, of their conscious participation in the process of political and economic construction. In this way, he formulated inescapable demands and at the same time struck a blow at those among his adversaries who still dream -- moreover without any real basis -- about a possible compromise among the "great" traditional chiefs, in abstraction from the will and the aspirations of the masses.

If one wished to pick out passages in the report which could be considered as reflecting some concessions which Ben Bella is disposed, perhaps, to grant to the right, those passages should be noted that deal primarily with the Islamic conception and the interpretation which the reporter gives it. ("Islam, far from being contrary to our option, is identified, in the minds of the masses, with equality and thus goes in the direction of socialism.") In addition, one cannot pass by in silence the formulation "in principle" that "no post whatever of an even indirectly political character can be confided to foreigners," even if what is meant here is the legitimate desire for freedom from no matter what kind of tutelage.

But, aside from these points and others of less importance, the report, we repeat, took up and clearly expressed once more the most progressive and stirring aspects of the orientation of the Algerian revolution. Ben Bella was able even on this occasion to speak a language that reached the masses in the closest way and the warm applause that greeted the essential passages of his text gave additional proof of this.

All this indicates that in the main the outcome of the Congress will hold no surprises. The opposition of the "great" names, will either not be manifested or will have no genuine echo. The real battle, without doubt, will be the blind, stubborn battle that will take place in the commissions, in the committees, in the corridors.

It is probable, moreover, that the real opposition that counts now, the one, let us say, of the bureaucratic current, will limit itself to struggling for posts in the Central Committee or in the Political Bureau, reserving itself now for later pursuit of its struggle, meanwhile trying above all not to criticize or to offer open combat on the programmatic and political level to the line of Ben Bella and his team, simply trying to slow it down and sabotage its practical application.

London Letter

THE SWING TO LABOUR IS WIDE AND DEEP

By T. J. Peters

Elections to the newly organized Greater London Council have shown a swing sufficient to give the Labour party a majority of over a hundred if a general election were held in Great Britain today. [See World Outlook April 17.] That is the unanimous opinion of practically all the news media here. The Labour victory in the poll for this new and largest of the world's local government bodies is all the more noteworthy because the Greater London Council is the creation of the Tory government. By gerrymandering outlying working-class districts into their "safe" middle-class suburban divisions some time ago, they had hoped to overturn the Labour majority which ruled the old London County Council for over a quarter of a century and thereby sweep this metropolis under their wing.

The elections on April 9 showed, therefore, that not only was Labour winning back the upper layers of the working class, who had strayed off in recent years of prosperity -- middle-class supporters were deserting the Tories in droves and by-passing the decrepit Liberals whom they lately gave a flush of false hope.

The conscious nature of this shift to the Labour camp is underlined by another regulation, requiring local voting to be conducted without party labels, so that voters had to learn the names of Labour candidates and pick them out from long lists that included the better known Conservative incumbents in these marginal areas.

Furthermore the Communist party, which does not play any role of significance in the electoral struggle in this country and is without representation in Parliament, managed to increase its share of the poll in London from the usual less than 1% to over 4%; more than 90,000 out of the some 2,500,000 ballots. It is an indication of the all-round radicalization both in extent and in depth. (Other such pointers include the swing in the Young Socialists at their recent conference to rejection of the reformism of the Labour party, their parent body's program, which the press attributes to the strength of Trotskyism in their ranks.)

The artful aim of the Conservatives was to stage in London a sort of "little General Election" that would serve as a dress rehearsal to hearten their faltering support in the rest of the country, shaken by the scandals and increasing unpopularity since the last year of the premiership of Harold Macmillan. The Tory machine had in fact been put in top gear; so the turnout in many districts exceeded 50% of the electorate, bringing average participation in the poll up to 44%, while ordinary averages for voting in local elections range between 35% and 40%.

Instead the "little General Election" proved to be a crashing demonstration of the bankruptcy of the ruling party on a national scale, the local vote in the hinterland duplicating the London results on the whole with many long-held counties, like Staffordshire, going over to Labour.

An interesting result that looks particularly ominous for the Tories was the vote for a seat at Cornard in West Suffolk during the rural county contests. There, in 1961, the Conservatives won against Labour by 520 to 250; on April 9 Labour received 740 against 565. The parliamentary constituency in which Cornard is located happens to be what used to be considered the safe seat of R.A.B. Butler, the Foreign Minister, regarded by many as the rightful heir to the leadership of the Tory party, whom Macmillan helped his right wing to ditch in favor of Lord Home, now known as Sir Alec.

"Reprieve" until October

Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the prime minister, obviously given the direction of the electoral breeze by his machine men in charge of the London contest, announced on the eve of the poll, after a barrage of coaxing in the entire press, that the General Election would be held in October. That is, the Tories would hang on until the very last constitutionally possible moment. Previously the expectation was June, to enable them to cash in on the momentum to be gained in London.

The October date, cynically justified by the venal press as within the purview of any prime-minister-politician under the British system -- although no previous government within memory has held out to its full term -- proved to be just what the stock market wanted, regardless of the continued uncertainty that a government obviously losing popular confidence is bound to have on trade and international relations. The stock exchange reacted to this "reprieve" with a steady rise in shares prices that completely ignored the London victory, even though Harold Wilson, the leader of the Labour victors, has been dubbed with unintended humor "the pipe-smoking Lenin" by the more choleric men of the City.

One of the reasons for the absence of panic may be gathered from news items buried in the inside pages of the press such as one last week that the Treasury has calmly announced "a massive relaxation of exchange controls which will make it both easier and more profitable for British subjects to take their money abroad for investment in foreign properties." (London Evening Standard April 7.) The speculators and profiteers are showing their appreciation of the decision made by the prime minister to allow them ample time for a flight of capital and such other adjustments as they may find necessary to prepare for the coming of a Labour government in England.

Labour party leadership has so far appeared to ignore this threat, among others, to paralyze government by them from the start.

In fact, they have gone out of their way to discourage support by effective mass action even against the most outrageous sort of Tory shenanigans. A typical maneuver of this kind aims at flooding the country with panicmongering antinationalization propaganda. They hope by such ruses and tricks to retrieve their increasingly diminishing chances of re-election.

Thus postal officials, allegedly to increase revenue, some time ago agreed to accept for unfranked delivery advertising circulars at bulk rate. Millions of these were produced by "Aims of Industry," a notorious Tory propaganda front organization heavily subsidized by big business. The postmen, who have been in a militant struggle for better wages and conditions, spontaneously refused to deliver these circulars in many places.

See Workers as Pawns

The Labour leaders confined themselves to a barrage of parliamentary protests. They delayed the agreement but did not definitively scotch it. On the other hand, they worked with the postmen's union officials to dissuade their members from the contemplated action. They thus indicated that they were not prepared to call upon postmen and similar workers in strategic positions to come to their support by mass action against the certain attempts at financial subversion once the Labour government takes power.

For the social-democratic leaders, the working class whom they represent continues to be a masse de manoeuvre in the electoral game, to be played according to the rules set by the capitalist masters. As long as they ignore the need for extra-parliamentary action and the real democratic power residing in the organizations of the workers, they are bound to be subjected to the blackmail and ultimate control of the financial oligarchy, regardless of all their intentions to "modernize" Britain, to inaugurate a "scientific revolution" for bringing about a society of plenty, and regardless of all their professions of egalitarianism -- whether they be a gloss as in the case of the right wing which is now providing the main support of the "left-of-centre" Wilson, or genuine do-good reform ideas as in the case of the left wing, among which radical views such as those of Anthony Wedgewood Benn on isolated issues of importance (structure of government and international relations) are coming to the fore. The party leadership as a whole bases itself on the idea of a meritocracy of talents, rather than on the democracy of a working-class participating fully in the rule of the country. With such a basic outlook, commitment to Clause 4 (with its insistence on public ownership of the means of production) cannot but remain a dead letter.

Postmen, electric-power workers, railway and bus men, steel workers and dockers have been in action in recent months; and workers in many other industries are restive over the deterioration of pay and conditions -- particularly in the nationalized industries, which the Tory government has utilized to keep the lid down on labor

standards throughout industry as a whole, going so far as to reverse agreements favorable to the workers reached by managements of individual public corporations and bringing constant pressure upon them to refrain from such concessions, often seeming deliberately intent on provoking strike action with which they hope to scare back their falling middle-class support.

Mindful of the increasing possibility of the election of a labor government that would be more attentive to their needs, and under direct exhortation of their party and trade-union leaders, the postmen and others have called off strike and go-slow actions and accepted for the time being independent tribunals. (However, they forced the government to concede labor representation which could lay the case for their demands before the public and thus counteract the vicious antiunion and antilabor agitation of the Tory-run press.)

"Re-thinking" Among the Tories

The Times recently opened its pages to a Tory leader who cynically debunked the "myths" and "humbug" (his words) of Conservative party policy over the past 12 years -- from the Queen as Head of the Commonwealth to "modernization" and the "new planning." His comments could provide a few useful lessons for Labour even if his aim is to stimulate "re-thinking" for a reactionary policy of the ruling class more in tune with present-day life.

The Times has also recently published some outspoken editorial articles of its own entitled "Election Papers." In these it has a few words to say that could well be borne in mind not only by the Labour leaders, but by many who are rightly critical and who aspire themselves to lead the British workers to power.

For instance, the Times editorialist, a cynic who, like the Tory leader featured in the same pages, is not above almost plagiarizing a Marxist view, says: "The political struggle is an extension of the struggle for power which is going on all the time in industry, between shop steward and supervisor, between union official and management, between T.U.C. [Trade Union Congress] and the employers' organizations. On the one side is control of money and machines, on the other control of men's loyalty. Political parties, as such, are concerned only with power, which in a democratic society is dependent on the popular vote. . . . Because there are more trade unionists than employers, the Conservatives are under the general compulsion at least to give an impression of considering their wishes. Because financiers and industrialists control the financial and production machines, and have a tremendous propaganda edifice behind them, the Labour party have to remember that effective government without their acquiescence would be impossible." (The Times April 9.)

The writer then goes on to show how and why "the result of this situation is that the words of both [Tory and Labour leaders] tend to be more radical than their intentions."

The fraud of Tory words is apparent after twelve years in which financiers and industrialists have battered as never before on the workers. The task of Marxists is now to go with the British workers through the experience of trying to make the Labour leadership live up to their words; to show that this is impossible with "the acquiescence" of the financiers and industrialists; to break out of the parliamentary game for which the oligarchy of wealth makes the rules; to mobilize for the full participation of the working class as a whole, not only in establishing a Labour government but in making it an instrument for the transformation of Great Britain into a socialist commonwealth.

A program concretizing such a course is the need of the moment for Labour's revolutionary left wing.

BRITISH POSTAL STRIKE CANCELED

By Alan Adair

LONDON, April 16 -- The one-day strike of Britain's 120,000 postmen, which was scheduled for today by the Union of Post Office Workers [UPW], has been called off. Likewise the two-week ban on overtime that was to have followed. Instead, the UPW leaders have agreed to accept the proposal of Maudling, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to set up a four-man committee to inquire into the post office pay structure.

The committee will be composed of a chairman of academic background, a representative of the employers, a representative of the trade union, and a member of the 1955 Royal Commission on Civil Service. (In that year the commission recommended a semiskilled rate of pay for postmen. The government still opposes this as it would mean a wage boost.)

The committee is expected to hold public hearings and to report in three weeks. Negotiations will then commence between the government and the UPW on the basis of the committee's recommendations.

UPW General Secretary Ron Smith considered Maudling's proposal to be a union victory, since it is only a variant of what his executive have been demanding -- an "independent" inquiry. [See World Outlook April 3.]

The Home government did make some concessions. Negotiations will open almost immediately instead of in 1967. Postmen had been told that an eleven per cent wage increase spread over three years was "final." Now the rate is open to negotiation. A few days ago Postmaster General Bevins was talking about using troops to sort and

deliver mail. Today he is willing to talk "reasonably" with UPW officials.

The union, meanwhile, has been considerably strengthened in a different way. For many years a conservative and backward organization, with only a small percentage of the workers actually holding union cards, it is now taking on flesh. Workers have recently been signing up at the rate of more than a thousand a week.

The threat of strike action had businessmen worried. Last week end the football pool promoters mailed their clients five weeks' supplies of coupons.

WILL ITALIAN CP ATTEND THAT CONFERENCE?

ROME -- The Italian Communist party [PCI] appears to have oriented toward not participating in the conference of Communist parties proposed by the Khrushchevist leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union [CPSU]. For some time it has indicated opposition to the idea, and has sought to put pressure on Khrushchev through Assistant Secretary Longo who took a trip to Moscow. The Italian leaders are again referring, in a more or less veiled way, to their theses about "polycentrism," maintaining this view even after the official position taken by the Soviet heads and the release of Suslov's report.

L'Unità, the party's daily newspaper, has published articles along this line, and the weekly Rinascita featured an editorial by Togliatti which in reality posed the question of the struggle against the Chinese not in terms of excommunication but as if it were a matter of accepting a challenge, letting practice and its results demonstrate in the end who is right in the current conflict.

In fact three tendencies face each other in the party leadership. The Longo-Togliatti group hold that a conference would not be opportune and they don't want it to take place. But, at least up to several weeks ago, they were prepared to participate in case the CPSU actually held a conference. Now doubts have arisen and some circles are of the opinion that Togliatti is ready to change his attitude and not participate under any circumstances in a conference which could only summarily condemn the Chinese. It is known that a letter, expressing this view, was recently sent by the leaders of the PCI to the Soviet leaders and, according to information which leaked out, the decision to send such a letter was taken with only one person opposed; namely, the head of the Control Commission, Scoccimarro, who favored participating. (Scoccimarro is generally considered to have greeted de-Stalinization with but little enthusiasm.)

The rightist group (Amendola, Pajetta, Alicata) is flatly against participating. They are primarily concerned about domestic tactical problems: If the PCI does not go to the conference and does not sign a document excommunicating the Chinese, the party will be in much better position to point to an independent stand, to make good its claim of being a "national," "democratic" party that is not subservient to Moscow. Thus the common arguments of the bourgeoisie and the right-wing socialists will lose weight in this case.

As for the left wing -- a very mild left, in truth -- it also opposes participating, as its leader Ingrao already made clear at the national organizational conference held in Naples. The left wing believes that everything that has been gained in recent years in the way of "autonomous" party life would be put in question if the PCI agreed to passively associate itself in an operation of excommunication. In any case it is not interested in seeing the PCI tied still more closely to the rightist Khrushchevist tendency. The left wing agrees with the idea that the Chinese concepts must be rejected, but thinks this should be done through firm political debate, through practical verification, without splits, without resorting to the methods that featured the struggle against "Titoism."

Will this orientation of the Italian leaders be maintained? Above all, will Togliatti hold firm and not go himself, or send one of his associates to the conference, if Khrushchev cracks the whip?

It is difficult to answer these questions at the moment. The first significant indication could come at the next plenum of the Central Committee, scheduled for April 20, which has only one point on the agenda -- Togliatti's report on the situation in the international Communist movement.

U.S. HEADED FOR A "DIEN-BIEN-PHU"

At a recent discussion in Paris, André Bettencourt, Vice-President of the National Assembly's Foreign Affairs Commission, tolled the bell for the U.S. adventure in South Vietnam.

"The Americans," he said, "have lost the game in South Vietnam and are headed toward a Dien-Bien-Phu. . . In one or two years the Americans will be forced to leave. This will be a sensational thing for the greatest power in the world."

Bettencourt should know. He saw the French expeditionary force of some 200,000 men defeated by the Vietnamese in the historic 1954 battle. Such experts calculate that the U.S. expeditionary force of some 16,000 men will not do any better despite the dollars poured by the U.S. Treasury into "the game."

SUSLOV POINTS TO THE DANGER OF "TROTSKYISM"

By Pierre Frank

What will come from the conversations now being held in Moscow? If figures like Gomulka are in agreement with Khrushchev's general policy (peaceful coexistence, peaceful and parliamentary roads, etc.), they are not necessarily in agreement with him on the early convocation of an international conference of Communist parties. Such a conference, under present conditions, could only seal the division. Khrushchev needs to consolidate the ranks of his partisans, to check the gains of the Chinese, and that is why, having largely lost hope of reaching a compromise with the Chinese, he needs a conference of this kind. But Gomulka, Togliatti. . . each for his own reasons doesn't want a conference that would consummate the split. In Moscow, Gomulka publicly came out for a new conference of Communist parties if it would "contribute to attenuating the sharpness of the ideological and political differences which separate us today from the Chinese Communist party."

Will Khrushchev be able to win Gomulka to his point of view, or will he agree to a compromise? This is one of the most important things to follow in the present phase of the conflict.

* * *

If it is rather obvious that these discussions in the Khrushchevist camp are not taking place in the public square, something else in the Sino-Soviet conflict is presented at top voice for everyone to hear. This is the denunciation of "Trotskyism," the accusations which the two sides keep throwing at each other on this topic, an element in the conflict that is assuming greater and greater importance. The charge is hurled not because "Trotskyism," as superficial commentators imagine, is the gravest, the worst possible epithet among Communist parties. Certainly in this debate there are epithets and slanders, but the accusation of "Trotskyism" is raised on the political level, for reasons that are not at all mysterious, although they are not the same and not even of the same intensity on the two sides.

The argumentation in the latest article of the Chinese [Hsinhua March 31] does not take up more than about twenty-five lines and can be reduced to a syllogism: Trotskyism belongs to the same family of revisionism as the Second International, which rejected revolution. Khrushchev is also a revisionist who rejects revolution. Therefore, Khrushchev should keep the label of "Trotskyism" for himself.

The Chinese documents are not edited by second-string bureaucrats but by the top leaders of the Chinese Communist party. They are not ignoramuses, at least in the big questions. Even if we have no direct way of ascertaining the truth, the texts themselves bear witness that they follow Trotskyist publications. They know very

well that Trotsky organized the Red Army, that he fought Stalin in the twenties and the following years because the usurper of power held to a policy of "peaceful coexistence" which Khrushchev has done no more than continue, etc. In other words, the Chinese leaders themselves, even if there are certain gaps in their knowledge, deliberately distort the truth concerning Trotsky's and Stalin's roles. One senses that they feel a certain amount of fear about their present positions and that they hope their references to Stalin will provide protective coloration.

On the Soviet side, Khrushchev is not exactly one to inspire hope for a profound political explanation. The vulgarity of his thought is as clear in form as in content. Either you are for Hungarian goulash with a side dish of rice, eaten in a pair of pants free of holes; or you want a belt that can be tightened and another war. The choice is obvious: Who wouldn't take a good goulash, especially one liberally seasoned with paprika? ["This cook will prepare a peppery dish," Lenin once said of Stalin.]

But Suslov's report is a serious piece in which things are said as frankly as a Stalinist bureaucrat can say them.

It is of course loaded with deliberate distortions of the Trotskyist and Chinese positions. For example, that they demand the revolution be commenced at once and everywhere, without taking into account the concrete relationship of forces; that the Chinese position on the question of war and peace is a pure and simple repetition of the "Trotskyist" slogan, "neither war nor peace"; that the Chinese renounce peaceful economic construction in favor of the tactic of "revolutionary war," etc.

But on a whole series of questions, Suslov stands on more solid ground.

"Does anyone think perhaps that the Chinese theory making the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America the 'principal zone of the storms of the world revolution' represents something original? No. This is the repetition almost word for word of one of the principal theses of current Trotskyism. One can read in the decisions of the so-called Fourth International (Trotskyist): 'As a result of the successive failure of the two major revolutionary waves of 1919-23 and of 1943-48 -- and of the minor one of 1934-37 -- the main center of world revolution shifted for a time to the colonial world.' (1)

(1) The quotation is taken from one of the key documents of the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International held last June. The document, together with other texts, is available in the October-December 1963 issue of the magazine Fourth International (No. 17) and in the Fall 1963 issue of the American Trotskyist publication International Socialist Review. A copy of the latter publication can be

Here is where the source of the political wisdom of the Chinese leadership must be sought!"

Suslov denounces the Trotskyist theory of the "permanent revolution." The struggle on this question had, he says, "a historic importance," and now "the Chinese leaders in fact impose on us a discussion on the same question." The Chinese theses on the danger of "bourgeois degeneration" repeat what the Trotskyists said about Thermidor.(2)

For Suslov, things are clear:

"In essence the theoretical and political opinions of the leaders of the Chinese CP on many points repeat the Trotskyism long ago rejected by the international revolutionary movement."

That on a certain number of important points, the Chinese came, under pressure of circumstances, to adopt a kind of ersatz of Trotskyist positions is evident to Suslov; he thinks it is equally evident to the Chinese. And he expresses himself in revealing terms:

"The Chinese leaders make out that they have not noticed all this. They probably reason in the following way: 'Present-day Trotskyism is a little-known current and one can profit from their ideas by giving them a "Chinese" aspect.' But in the end the truth always comes out! The Chinese leadership wanted very much to hide the sources from which they drew their ideas; they cannot succeed in dissimulating the coincidence between their views and those of the Trotskyists of yesterday and today."

These words indicate the fear that Trotskyism arouses among the masters of the Kremlin, who, in the arena of world politics, are so powerful. Moscow fears Trotskyism more than Peking does. This is partly because they understand better what it is, but above all because, despite all the concessions made since the death of Stalin, the Soviet leaders feel the growing threat of a society thirsting for freedom and proletarian democracy.

Suslov addresses the Chinese, telling them in substance: You poor fools! What do you think you're doing? You want to combat us

obtained by writing to 116 University Place, New York 3. For a copy of Fourth International write the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, 47, Driberg's Avenue, Colombo 10, Ceylon, or WIR Publications, Grays Inn Road 374, London, W.C.1.

(2)The Trotskyists speak of bureaucratic degeneration, not bourgeois degeneration as the Chinese leaders do. The lie, in the circumstances, explains a good deal.

with ideas that you have taken from the Trotskyists. You can't be unaware of it. You think you are clever enough to get away with it because the Trotskyism of today is a weak current and that it's enough to use Chinese lacquer to cover up everything. You even think it's a slick ruse to credit Stalin with these ideas. But no one will be fooled in the end because the truth will come out. You will not succeed in reviving Stalin, but you will play into the hands of the "Trotskyists of yesterday and today." Against the still living Trotskyism, bureaucrats of all countries, unite!

The bureaucrat Suslov explains the resurgence of Trotskyism as due primarily to a clumsy maneuver of the Chinese. Then, following up with the ideological job assigned to him, he explains the "Trotskyism" of the Chinese by the peasant character of their country. Stalinist logic has its mysteries -- the peasantry engenders a current of ideas underestimating the peasantry. . . . The bureaucrats are rent by a conflict in which they reveal their incapacity to understand why they are deaf to each other and why Trotskyism has returned to trouble their nights and their days.

The conflict will continue to worsen, engendered and stimulated as it is by the revolutionary rise in the world, this revolutionary rise which is renewing revolutionary Marxism in our epoch; that is, Trotskyism.

WHITSUN MARCH PLANNED IN DENMARK

COPENHAGEN -- Young antifascists picketed the Hotel Richmond in blizzard weather March 20 to shout angry slogans against fashionably dressed guests. The ritzy hotel had staged a Spanish festival to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of Franco's fascist regime.

Each time an automobile drew up to the entrance, the chant grew louder: "Down with Franco." -- "Call Off the Fascist Festival." "Hang the Nazis." These were some of the milder slogans.

Police were present in great numbers. After demonstrators tried to enter the hotel and distribute leaflets there, police carried them across the street.

Participants in the demonstration included members of the DKU [Young Communist League], SUF [Young Socialist Forum], Group 61 [an activist organization], the RS [Revolutionary Socialists -- Danish Section of the Fourth International] and Volunteers of the Spanish Civil War. The flag of the latter organization was the rallying center of the demonstration.

The picketing made headlines in the Copenhagen press. What happened the next night was even more spectacular. During the

"Melody Grand Prix," a young man evaded heavy police guards, walked onto the set and unfurled a banner that read: "Boycott Franco and Salazar!"

Plain-clothes cops placed all over the hall prevented any further actions.

The Danish TV had been warned of the planned demonstration and had taken all possible precautions, including the extraordinary police turnout, but the young antifascist nevertheless succeeded in getting through to the TV cameras.

On March 22, the very next day, new demonstrations occurred. This time they were directed against reactionary policies of the Danish government. It is estimated that about 400,000 persons (out of a population of 4,500,000) have been blacklisted for "subversive" political activities. In protest against the use of these secret police files, thousands of people joined in marches. Both in Copenhagen and Aarhus (the next biggest city) large-scale demonstrations were held. All the newspapers carried headlines and editorials about it -- many of them condemning the political police and the very unpopular Minister of Justice Hans Hækkerup.

These events were forerunners for the "Whitsun March." Harald Søbje, a Protestant clergyman, launched the idea in a sermon he preached against capitalism, NATO and the monarchy.

Being a civil servant -- the Evangelical Lutheran church is supported by the state -- the Rev. Søbje was suspended and a trial against him is in progress. During his suspension, he is holding services at a local inn where hundreds of people come to participate in the political discussions after the sermon.

There are good reasons to believe that the projected march will receive strong support from all sectors of the socialist movement. A committee has been set up to begin preparations. It has received encouraging backing from trade-union locals as well as political groupings, antifascist organizations and youth movements. It is hoped that foreign organizations will be able to send observers.

For information about the Whitsun March, write to:

Blovstrødkomiteen
Blovstrød pr. Allerød
Denmark

THE SANCTIONS SHOW WHO SUPPORTS SOUTH AFRICA'S "APARTHEID"

By Franz J. T. Lee

In December 1958 the All-African Peoples Conference, held in Accra, called for a world-wide trade and diplomatic boycott of South Africa. The call was renewed by the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, held in Conakry in April 1960, which was attended by fifty delegates from various African and Asian countries, including China, the Soviet Union and other workers states.

Although the liberation of the masses of South Africa will ultimately be achieved by the South African people themselves, yet such outside demonstrations of solidarity and support, when they are sincere, are welcomed by the African freedom fighters.

In June 1960, the ministers from ten politically independent African states met at Addis Ababa and adopted a ten-point program for sanctions against South Africa. This program called for barring air and seaports to the South African flag, expulsion of South Africa from the British Commonwealth of Nations, the banning of the "sale of Arab oil to South Africa" and intensification of action by the United Nations to include direct intervention.

Prime Minister Hendrik F. Verwoerd retaliated swiftly with a massive build up of military power. Since 1960, military expenditures for the armed forces have increased from R80,000,000 to R208,000,000 [one rand = \$1.40]. The all-white Permanent Force was increased from 9,000 to 15,000 within four years. A Citizen Force of 40,000 and a Commando network in which every white male had to serve for four consecutive years were called into existence. The forces received modern arms; and armament factories were built in South Africa. Air-to-ground missiles, saracens, troop carriers, pistols, ammunition, etc., were bought from England, the United States, France, West Germany and Switzerland. Closer ties were developed with the fascist-like governments in Angola, Mozambique and Southern Rhodesia.

In April 1963, various African ministers again held a conference at Addis Ababa. They called for the immediate implementation and enforcement of their own trade and diplomatic boycotts. They further decided to launch a campaign for the expulsion of South Africa from all international organizations, including those concerned with cultural and sports exchanges.

In February 1963, the African members of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa forced the resignation of South Africa from that body. In July, Kenya, which was host to the UN Conference on Cartography, refused to admit the South African delegates into the country. In August, due to pressure from the African delegations, the South African delegation was "invited" to withdraw from the UN Conference on Tourism. South Africa was excluded from the thirteenth

session of the African Regional Conference of the World Health Organization. In September, the delegates from the African countries walked out of the Conference of the Food and Agricultural Organizations when this gathering failed to exclude South Africa. In the same month, at a meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Washington, the African delegates protested against the presence of the South African Finance Minister. In October, a similar walk-out resulted at the International Air Transport Association meeting. South African participation in the Coming Olympic games in Tokyo has been made conditional, due to efforts to compel South Africa to abandon the apartheid policy in sports.

The African Boycott

Algeria announced a total boycott of South Africa on April 30, 1963, and at the same time broke off all relations with Portugal.

Cameroun closed its sea and airports to South Africa on July 12.

Ethiopia, which had no diplomatic relations with South Africa, announced a total trade boycott and closed her air space to South African planes.

Ivory Coast closed her sea and airports on July 16 to South African aircraft.

Libya closed her air and seaports on August 31 and denied overflying rights to South Africa.

Mauritania also closed her air and seaports and announced a trade boycott of South Africa.

Sudan had already broken off trade relations with South Africa in 1962 and followed this by closing her air and seaports.

Tanganyika announced a total direct and indirect trade boycott on South Africa on September 30.

Uganda placed a boycott on South African goods in November 1962 and has now banned all exports to South Africa.

The United Arab Republic denied overflying rights to South Africa on August 7 and announced the breaking off of all economic relations on September 23. South African ships were banned from UAR ports and UAR vessels were instructed not to call at South African ports. South Africa can still use the Suez Canal but is denied all facilities.

By September 30, 1963, Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Tunisia had all informed United Nations Secretary General U. Thant that they had fully complied with the November 1962 resolution

of the General Assembly.

Trade with the rest of Africa still remains important. About 11% of South Africa's exports go to these countries. The size of this trade is indicated by the following table:

South Africa's Trade with Neighboring Countries

(In millions of pounds sterling. £1 = two rands.)

	<u>Imports to South Africa</u>		<u>Exports from South Africa</u>	
	<u>January-August</u>		<u>January-August</u>	
	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>
Congo	7.9	6.5	2.9	2.7
Rhodesias and Nyasaland	9.0	10.5	32.3	28.2
Mozambique	<u>0.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>5.8</u>
Total	<u>17.7</u>	<u>19.0</u>	<u>40.2</u>	<u>36.7</u>

The Asian Boycott

In May 1963, Burma did not renew a contract for the purchase of 300,000 tons of coal from South Africa. On July 13, India refused landing and passage facilities to South African aircraft, hence cutting off the remaining links with South Africa. Indonesia cut off all commercial and diplomatic relations with South Africa and closed her seaports. In October, Kuwait broke off diplomatic relations with South Africa, announced a trade boycott and closed its sea and airports to the apartheid flag. In August, the Philippine government announced a ban on strategic materials. Exports of hard woods to South Africa, a trade valued at R4,000,000 annually, was abandoned. Malaya also took definite boycott steps.

Japan, Ceylon, Pakistan and the oil-producing countries of the Middle East have taken no action. Japan alone handles well over 7% of South Africa's exports. Ceylon's exports to South Africa -- mainly tea and rubber -- increased between 1962 and 1963. South Africa imports oil worth R36,000,000 a year from Iran. In addition to certain countries in Latin America and Europe, South Africa imports oil from Aden, the Bahrein Islands and Saudi Arabia.

The trade with this area is indicated by the following table:

South Africa's Trade with Certain Asian Countries

(In millions of pounds sterling. £1 = two rands.)

	<u>Imports to South Africa</u>		<u>Exports from South Africa</u>	
	<u>January-August</u>		<u>January-August</u>	
	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>
Ceylon	3.2	4.2	1.2	0.4
Japan	14.0	18.5	23.5	21.7
Hong Kong	1.6	2.6	2.7	2.6
Iran	12.1	10.9	0.9	0.2
Pakistan	6.7	4.1	0.6	0.2
Philippines	0.3	0.3	1.7	1.5
Saudi Arabia	1.3	0.8	-	-
Aden	3.3	3.3	-	-

Measures Taken by Workers States

In 1961 the Soviet Union was a big purchaser of South African wool. In the following year, the Soviet trade organizations were instructed not to buy any South African products any more. All Soviet political and diplomatic relations with South Africa have long been broken.

In 1961 the People's Republic of China broke off all trade relations with South Africa. Early in 1963 South Africa exported R2,000,000 worth of corn (maize) to China. Recently the Chinese government explained that these imports were made through Hong Kong and British intermediaries. At present the Chinese have completely banned all products from South Africa.

In July 1963 Czechoslovakia closed its consular offices in Johannesburg and broke off all trade relations with South Africa.

On July 12 Hungary cut off all economic relations with South Africa. In June the German Democratic Republic severed trade relations and since October 20 has barred South African ships from its ports. Albania, Bulgaria, Cuba, Mongolia, Rumania and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic have similarly complied with the November resolution of the United Nations.

The Imperialist Stake

The following table shows quite clearly the role the big capitalist countries play in preserving the Herrenvolk regime in South Africa:

South Africa's Trade with Certain "Free World" Countries

(In millions of pounds sterling. £1 = two rands.)

	<u>Imports to South Africa</u>			<u>Exports from South Africa</u>		
		<u>January-August</u>			<u>January-August</u>	
	<u>1962</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>
Britain	155.2	99.1	118.2	145.2	99.4	111.3
U.S.A.	134.5	57.4	65.3	42.9	27.1	27.2
France	13.9	7.3	12.1	15.7	8.4	8.7
West Germany	51.3	34.3	43.1	21.3	13.6	15.6
Belgium	7.2	4.0	4.6	19.2	12.3	13.5
Holland	12.5	8.1	8.7	13.0	12.4	8.2
Italy	14.5	10.1	11.8	22.1	16.0	15.3
Canada	<u>12.8</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>15.2</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>3.9</u>
Total	<u>401.9</u>	<u>228.5</u>	<u>279.0</u>	<u>284.3</u>	<u>192.0</u>	<u>203.7</u>
Percentage of total	65.8%	68.2%	70.0%	55.6%	60.0%	61.5%

British and American imperialists hold 25% interest in the seven mining and financial corporations which together control the whole diamond and gold mining industry; the balance being shared by South African, French, Belgian and West German capitalists. These corporations employ more than 500,000 low-wage African laborers.

A total of 70% of the £1,600,000,000 foreign capital invested in South Africa is owned by British and U.S. interests. Foreign capital absorbs about 10% of the country's national income, or about R480,000,000 a year. The British share in profits, dividends and interest or other returns on capital amounts to £145,000,000. The overseas investors have a stake in virtually every strategic sector of the South African economy -- heavy engineering, agricultural implements, textiles, chemicals, motor assembly, shipping, etc.

According to the United States Department of Commerce, the \$700,000,000 in U.S. investments had produced goods and services twice the value of U.S. direct exports to South Africa. In 1960 the value of the production of manufactured goods (excluding mining products and services) by U.S. direct investment enterprises in South Africa amounted to \$305,000,000. In the same year, total U.S. exports to South Africa amounted to \$200,000,000.

United States Direct Investments in South Africa

(Plant and Equipment Expenditures in millions of dollars.)

	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	(planned) <u>1962</u>
Mining and Smelting	15	12	10
Petroleum	10	12	28
Manufacturing	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	<u>33</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>47</u>

It is not necessary to analyze all the sabotage, intrigues and subterfuges practiced by imperialism to block the international and national efforts to deal effectively with the South African question. It is quite clear who Verwoerd's collaborators are and why they will support and protect their economic interests to the bitter end.

The most realistic forecast for the South African revolution is that it will repeat the pattern of the Algerian revolution at the opposite end of the continent, developing over a number of years. When this revolution occurs it will effectively sweep away "white minority rule," and, in accordance with the pattern observable elsewhere, will likely sweep away capitalism, too, along with its imperialist ties.

In the Canadian CP

RANKS STIRRED BY SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT

By Harry Anderson

TORONTO -- The public press of the Communist party of Canada is strongly for Khrushchev. To read the weekly Tribune, including the Pacific edition, it might be concluded that the intense debate in the international Communist movement has had no repercussions whatsoever in the Canadian organization.

Long articles by the old Stalinist fossil Tim Buck have appeared week after week. Togliatti's attacks on the Chinese Communist party have been reproduced, along with similar attacks made by Gus Hall, one of the inheritors of Browder's mantle in the American Communist party. Bert Whyte, long-time correspondent in China, was brought back to add his peculiarly authoritative touch.

Despite this solid phalanx of Khrushchevist marksmen, dissatisfaction is rife in the party. This has been revealed in the internal

discussion held the past months in preparation for the national convention. Some extracts will indicate the thinking of many rank-and-file members.

E.R. Fay of Wainright, Alberta, complains that "the party is in a serious position. It is becoming a party of older people with an average of 58 years." An Alberta leader told a membership meeting, he reports, "that in 1963 he spoke at more funerals of party members than at public meetings and that included elections."

R.J. O'Neil of Scarborough, Ontario, notes the passivity of the party. "I don't think it's an exaggeration to say that the Jehovah's Witnesses are known much more for their activity than ever the C.P. has been over the past seven years."

This is a recurring theme among other writers.

William Mozdir writes that in Vancouver, British Columbia, one of the few areas in North America where the party once had considerable mass support, there has been an almost complete breakdown in discipline. "Members in responsible positions in the labor movement have not attended membership meetings. When meetings of trade union members are called many of these leading comrades have not attended these meetings."

He reports further: "This situation in Greater Vancouver over the past year has steadily worsened. Sixteen clubs in the city, with over half having from 25 to 40 members, the turn out at general membership meetings has been only 40 members with some of the clubs not even having a representative present."

Other writers express alarm at the failure of the Young Communist League to recruit.

A number of letters indicate the impact of the Sino-Soviet conflict, but none more clearly than one from Vancouver signed simply "John." That this is an important letter is indicated by the space given to it -- six and a half closely printed pages of the internal bulletin -- and by the way the top leadership handled it. They divided out the points raised by "John" and tried to answer them in a bundle of letters, some of them under the initials of the authors, two of them signed by Charles Caron and Lionel Edwards, both top leaders in British Columbia.

One of the most interesting features of these replies is that none of them sought to hit back at "John" where he is most vulnerable -- on the question of Stalin. This may be because of their own unsavory record as former members of the "personality cult."

As a spokesman for the "pro-Chinese" tendency in the Canadian Communist party, "John" is worth quoting at length.

"Put Canada First"

Attacking the National Committee's "Propositions" for the 1964 convention, "John" condemns them as a retreat from the 1954 program. Referring to the "Put Canada First" slogan, the main one advanced by the Communist party over the years, but which was also the central slogan of Diefenbaker's Tory party in the federal election last year, the writer says that the "Propositions" lack "any critical analysis of how it was possible for the main political slogan of the communist movement to be taken up and used as the central slogan of the party which has been traditionally looked upon as embracing the most reactionary section of the Canadian bourgeoisie -- the party of Bay and St. James streets."

"Are we to believe," he continues, "that the slogan which serves the interests of the reactionary and nationalist bourgeoisie can, at the same time, serve and express the interests of the revolutionary and international working class? This is apparently a new development in dialectics with which I am happily unfamiliar."

Structural Reforms

"John" calls attention to a paragraph written by the leadership: "The crying need of the working class is to fashion that unity which will make labour a force in the nation, to curb the power of the great monopolies and lead all the people who want a better life in a democratic anti-monopoly movement to achieve the reforms so long overdue and to bring about changes in the structure of the economy in the people's interests."

Here is "John's" comment: "This reference to 'changes in the structure' . . . presents us with a clue as to its source of origin. This off-spring of reformist ideology first saw the light of day at a recent convention of the Italian Communist Party.

"In view of the awe-inspiring international silence which greeted the birth of this infant following the devastating criticism of the Communist Party of China and the sneering reference to the new arrival made at a meeting of the Communist Party of France, there seemed to be some grounds for hoping the mid-wives who officiated at the birth of Togliatti's illegitimate progeny had strangled the babe at birth.

"Our National Committee, however, seem intent on breathing the breath of life into this stinking abortion."

Referring again to this paragraph, the Vancouver critic points out that the working class is relegated to secondary position. "Why -- at a time when the world system of capitalism is in crisis and socialism on the ascendant -- has it become necessary for the working class to restrict its aim to becoming a force in the nation instead of the force in the nation? (prepared to share power, appar-

ently, even with sections of the monopoly bourgeoisie)."

Emphasizing the National Committee's limitation of the struggle to the achievement of "reforms," the author declares: "So it seems that the working class is counselled not to abuse its authority, restrain its revolutionary ardour and apply itself to achieving reforms in a bourgeois democratic society."

According to this, he says, the workers will now help prolong the life of capitalism instead of ending it.

Peaceful Coexistence

Dealing with the National Committee statement item by item, he turns to the section on "peace" and points out that nowhere is responsibility placed for the drive towards war.

"It is the duty of communists to underline at all times, that the causes of war are inherent in the capitalist system," he says. "That the U.S. imperialists are the leading power in this drive toward war while the Canadian capitalist class play the willing role of junior partner. Lacking also is a clear exposition of the fact that the external drive toward war and the internal drive against labour are two sides of the same coin."

He declares that the proposals now before the party "carry with them the clear impression that peace is to be achieved through the co-operative efforts of the imperialists on the one hand and the labour and people's movements on the other."

Test-Ban Treaty

"John" deals at length with the "test ban treaty" which the National Committee statement characterizes as a great victory for peace. "First of all," he argues, "the Pearson government had no intention of testing nuclear weapons and the signing of the treaty was used as a smoke screen to cover up the bringing of nuclear weapons into Canada by the Liberal government."

The antiwar movement was ideologically disarmed by the propaganda surrounding the signing of the treaty, he believes.

"This mood is reflected," he says, "in the present policy and program of the Canadian Peace Congress which is reputed to be the most militant and politically enlightened peace group in the nation.

"Instead of promoting mass public demonstrations of protest they concentrate on sending postcards to members of parliament.

"In place of a demand for Canada to get out of NATO, they issue an appeal for a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw treaty nations.

"They appeal to the NATO bloc countries not to increase their military budgets.

"They abandon the unequivocal demand for the banning and destruction of nuclear weapons and substitute for it a demand for the confining of nuclear weapons to those countries now possessing them."

In another part of his letter, he scores the wrong and contradictory approach of the Canadian Communist party to NATO.

"On the one hand we appear to be for the disbanding of NATO by raising the demand for withdrawal, but on the other hand we call on this NATO we wish to disband to sign a non-aggression pact with the Warsaw Treaty nations.

"It's the adoption of precisely this position that made it possible for the Canadian Peace Congress to say: 'NATO came into being to provide security for its member states.'"

This wrong position, he holds, is due to failure to see the class content of NATO, "to see it as an international organization of counter-revolution."

On the problem of French-Canadian separatism, "John" points out that here, too, there is a retreat from the 1954 position which upheld Quebec's right to secede if the people there wished it.

"Anti-monopoly Coalition"

One of the most telling criticisms made by "John" deals with the "anti-monopoly coalition" policy, long a keystone for the Communist party in its theoretical structure of patriotism and nationalism.

As "John" puts it, "here we have a classical example of the incorrect application of the policy of peaceful coexistence in the field of domestic affairs."

"Capitalists and workers are shown to have a common interest in the pursuit of peace, national independence and democracy: the struggle is against monopoly capital -- which is chiefly U.S. controlled: the national interest and not the class interest is paramount."

This policy, the writer goes on, means linking the interests of the working class to those of the Canadian capitalist class and is tantamount to abandoning the fight for socialism in our epoch.

"Is it not a fact that we are an advanced industrial nation; that the bourgeois revolution has been completed and the bourgeois economy and state power more or less stable for many decades -- that capitalism, in fact, has run its course in Canada?"

He argues cogently that "counselling the workers to aid one group of capitalists over another in exchange for some limited and picayune reforms (which would be taken away from them again on the morrow when the new group became powerful and stable enough) would constitute a betrayal of their class interests."

THE FRANCISCO ABARCA CASE

By Fernand Charlier

BRUSSELS -- Since last January public opinion here has been aroused over the case of a Spanish anarchist who is threatened with extradition to Switzerland.

The case was first publicized by the Comité d'Action contre le Néo-Colonialisme et le Fascisme [Committee of Action against Neocolonialism and Fascism], formerly the Comité pour la Paix en Algérie [Committee for Peace in Algeria].

Francisco Abarca belongs to the Iberian Council of Liberation. Last June and July, this organization launched an operation that included placing incendiary charges in baggage in the terminals of the Spanish air line Iberia. The aim was to discourage tourists from visiting Franco's country.

No matter how one views the appropriateness of this tactic, the fact is that it was not designed to cause damage to planes in flight. The fires set in baggage rooms at London, Frankfurt and Geneva caused no loss of lives.

Francisco Abarca was indicted in Switzerland for allegedly having participated in the action at the Geneva airport.

The Iberian Council of Liberation, however, in a press release sent from Spain last January, claimed full responsibility for the action and said that Abarca was not involved.

The action begun in Switzerland against Abarca comes in the context of a number of steps against Spanish militants in exile. Last fall, for instance, the headquarters of the Federation of Libertarian Youth in Paris were raided.

The anarchists have been singled out especially. Abarca, who was then in France, went to Belgium to get out of line of fire. There he was arrested at the police station when he went to register. An international warrant for his arrest with a request for extradition had just been received from Switzerland. Thus since last October he has been held at the Forest prison near Brussels.

The immediate goal of the campaign launched last January by the Comité d'Action contre le Néo-colonialisme et le Fascisme is to block extradition.

Formally, Belgian law does not grant extradition for infractions of a political character. The only exception is in the case of assassination or attempted assassination of a head of state. This exception was established by a law of 1856, passed by parliament to give platonic satisfaction to Napoléon III, who had been unable to extradite two persons of French nationality whom he accused of having made an attempt on his life. It was under this exception that Cabannes de Laprades of the French terrorist OAS [Organisation de l'Armée Secrète] was just extradited for being mixed up in an attempt to assassinate de Gaulle.

In the case of Abarca, no attempt was made to assassinate a head of state. Consequently he cannot be extradited. Nevertheless, the Council Chamber, which, according to Belgian law must give an opinion as to whether the charges are of a political character, supported extraditing Abarca, holding that a common crime was involved. This is not the first time that Belgian justice has interpreted the law in such a way. The Communards of 1871 were also held to have violated the "common" laws. The grand jury may uphold the Council's view.

The current campaign seeks, consequently, to influence the Minister of Justice to disregard this opinion, since he is not legally obliged to abide by it.

It must be clearly understood that the danger is not that Switzerland, in the present situation, would in turn recognize an extradition request from Spain. To claim this would give the "Socialist" Minister Verneylen a pretext to extradite Abarca to Switzerland in return for a "formal" promise from the latter not to hand him over to Franco. The aim of the campaign thus is to prevent Belgium from delivering him to Switzerland. The goal is to guarantee political asylum not only for Abarca but for all militants in circumstances like his.

The campaign has met with a big response. The Union of the Employees of Liège which belongs to the FGTB [Fédération Générale des Travailleurs de Belgique] gave it a send off. This was followed by support from the whole FGTB of Liège-Huy-Waremme. They organized a mass meeting which included as speakers the Socialist deputy Cools, the left-wing trade-union militant Yerna, and Legreve, the leader of the Comité d'Action contre le Néo-colonialisme et le Fascisme.

When Abarca began his hunger strike the regional organizations of the FGTB of the Center, of Brussels and Namur proclaimed their solidarity.

On the national level, the FGTB union of the public services was the first to back Abarca's cause, followed by the Congrès du Mouve-

ment Populaire Wallon [MPW -- Congress of the Walloon People's Movement], the Socialist and Communist students, etc. Labor stoppages took place March 5 -- the evening before Abarca was compelled to end his hunger strike -- at Cockerill-Ougrée and other plants in the Liège region. A number of locals of the Socialist party passed resolutions in his behalf and denounced commercial relations between Belgium and Spain. The Socialist deputies Glinne and Housiaux took up the case in parliament, etc., etc.

The Communist newspapers, both Le Drapeau Rouge and La Voix du Peuple, the MPW journals Combat and La Wallonie, the newspapers of the left wing in the Socialist movement, La Gauche and Links have featured the campaign, followed in a hesitant way by the official newspaper of the Socialist party, Le Peuple.

The response among the workers up to now has already strongly increased the possibility of blocking the ordinary course of class justice. Still to be held is a big rally against the negotiations with Spain and in favor of the right of political asylum for Francisco Abarca.

U.S. CENSORSHIP CHALLENGED

The American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU], a conservative organization devoted to the preservation of democracy, charged April 13 that the U.S. government is censoring domestic mail as well as alleged "Communist political propaganda" from 26 foreign countries.

Government censorship of foreign mail has long been an irritant to universities, publications and students of foreign affairs. The postal snoopers may destroy mail without notification. An editor is lucky if, after long delay, he gets an official notice telling him to sign a form stating he wants to receive the "subversive" literature addressed to him, otherwise it will be destroyed.

Apparently the ACLU has solid evidence about the domestic censorship, since Assistant U.S. Attorney Eugene R. Anderson, admitted that there had been "some screening" of mail.

The ACLU is challenging the censorship as a violation of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and press. The organization seeks an injunction against the government to block delay in delivery or destruction of mail and a judgment declaring its legal base to be unconstitutional.

Attorney Anderson said that the "screening" of domestic mail involves "certain bookshops" or agents who import foreign "Communist" literature which is then remailed inside the main country of the "free world."

DEUTSCHER'S VIEW OF THE TROTSKYISTS

By J. B. Stuart

[Continued from last issue.]

In fact, the contradictions in these statements are entirely reconcilable from the Marxist point of view. The historic necessity for a new international being established in his mind, Trotsky could not but take a long-range view of its role. It was necessary above all as a repository for unfalsified Marxism, for the continuity of the Leninist concept of the revolutionary organization, as the embodiment of the memory of the working class and the experience of the three internationals that had preceded it. Deutscher alludes to this conception in his account of Trotsky's thought. But then, he poses the question: why was the Draft Program Trotsky wrote for the founding congress "not so much a statement of principles as an instruction on tactics, designed for a party up to its ears in trade-union struggles and day-to-day politics and striving to gain practical leadership immediately"?

Deutscher does indeed imply the answer himself when, after digressing on the uninviting prospects for action and on the actual course of international developments in the ensuing decades different from that foreseen, he concludes this section (p. 429) with a summary of Trotsky's lessons from Marxism and particularly Leninism as applied to the new step taken. But, despite its correctness, Deutscher's account lacks the clarity of an explicit account. For, he fails to tie up the question he raised with the "directing and organizing functions of the party -- the functions that had been at the centre of Lenin's preoccupations" and with Trotsky's conversion to Lenin's view (which he mentions).

Trotsky could not conceive of the new international as one of parties merely proclaiming principles -- it could be viable, in line with his experience, only if it consisted of organizations that applied their principles in intimate everyday contact with the living masses, participated in the actual reality of the class struggle, learned to adapt to new forms and new phenomena and to test ideas over and over again in the light of such contact and activity. That was the broad explanation for the nature of the Draft Program.(3)

(3) In addition, it should be noted, Trotsky wrote the Draft Program after consultation with leaders of the Socialist Workers party which at the time was "up to its ears in trade union struggles" (rise and consolidation of industrial unionism), not to speak of skirmishes in various parts of the country with the incipient fascist movement headed by such figures as Mayor Hague and Father Coughlin.

Whether an organization of this character would have immediate opportunities for successful practical leadership or not did not depend on its ideas or its efficiency so much as on objective developments. The very nature of its principles assumes that revolutionary situations and revolutions are not made -- they arise from contradictions and conflicts in society. The task of the revolutionary organizations is to try to anticipate such situations and to prepare themselves to take part in order to assure success along the socialist direction. Trotsky and the organization he founded anticipated a development of this kind at the end of the second world war, it is true. In line with the character of combat organizations their anticipations were infused with optimism. Indeed, such optimism is indispensable to the whole assumption of combat, of struggle. But, even if it is not borne out and justified in the immediate period for which it is assumed, Marxists have been conditioned by the whole long history of their struggle to adjust to adverse turns in events in the knowledge that their optimism is not misplaced in the long run, based as it is on a scientific analysis of the past and on the conception of their theory as one of successive approximations of reality as it develops.

Trotsky and the Trotskyists expected a revolutionary explosion in the West at the end of World War II that would open up immediately the prospect of a rapid advance to socialism and in the process eliminate the "cancer of Stalinism." Instead, what we have witnessed is the relatively much slower erosion of imperialism, accompanied by another stabilization and a surge of the capitalist economy on the one hand; and on the other, the slower disintegration of Stalinism, accompanied by a great new development of the planned economy of the Soviet Union. Both of these variants taken by history carry within them the seeds of great crises in the future. But even up to now the slower pace of denouement has been punctuated by a continuing series of revolutions in the capitalist world at its periphery, at the weakest links in the chain, to use the Leninist metaphor (Yugoslavia 1944, China 1949, Cuba 1959(4), Algeria 1962 are among the highlights).

(4) In Cuba the revolutionary overturn took place without the leadership of a revolutionary socialist party, and so may be thought to refute the Leninist conception at first flush. But the small group of revolutionary leaders, learning their Marxism in the fire of action and demonstrating the validity of the theory of permanent revolution in combat with the mightiest imperialism in the world, have not made a virtue of this lack of organization nor produced a new theory on it. On the contrary, they have adopted the Leninist concept as their own, and five years after their victory are still engaged in finding a proper form for it in their country. Although having to act in alliance with the Soviet bureaucracy and within its sphere on the international arena as a matter of elementary self-defense, they have combatted Stalinism not only at home, but in all of Latin America, more than anything else on the very question of the nature of the party and, by extension, of the international organization. They may

In the Soviet sphere we have witnessed revolutionary risings against the bureaucracy -- that is, against Stalinism -- in Eastern Germany 1953, Hungary and Poland 1956, themselves ending in complete or partial failure but interlinked with de-Stalinization in the USSR and the break-up of the Stalinist monolith, which began with the Yugoslav rebellion in 1948 and whose most evident expression is the present Sino-Soviet conflict.

So, in spite of all the reservations and qualifications necessary, we can say: While in 1938 we had the proclamation of a new revolutionary international without the apparent prospect of revolutions, today we have a situation fraught with revolution on a worldwide scale without the realization of a new international. Under the influence of the existence of the Soviet Union, Red China and other workers states, revolution at the fringes of the world capitalist structure takes place without the leadership of a Leninist party. From the point of view of the actual difficulties encountered by this paradox, from the point of view of the dangers facing humanity, and from the point of view of the aims of Marxism, it can thus be said that abstractly, objectively, the need for the Fourth International as Trotsky conceived it is not only demonstrated, but shown to be long overdue.

If that is so, what of the actual organization founded by Trotsky? To be sure it has not broken out of its shell to become a big force on the international political arena. Perhaps, as Deutscher says, not even a Trotsky would have been able to find "any effective role for himself" in the postwar period as "the practical man of action" -- if by that is meant leading a movement of mass proportions. In any case, the Trotskyists who carried on the work were faced -- where they had their most sizeable concentrations and most experienced cadres (in the West, that is) -- by major obstacles resulting from the stabilization that came to be known as the "cold war." The Communist workers, under the impress of Soviet survival and victory in the war, remained under the influence of Stalinism and its continued witch-hunt against Trotskyists and thus impervious to large recruitment; the mass of the rest of the working class, on the other hand, repelled by the crimes of Stalinism, tended to identify Communism as such with it, and were thus similarly shut off as a source of recruitment on a broad scale.

Nonetheless, the organization of the Fourth International survived, adapting itself to the limited possibilities of participation in the class struggle, and registering modest gains, extending its contact to ever new countries in whose political life it plays a part and in whose revolutions it is beginning to be involved, although still in the background. With the crumbling of the Stalinist mono-

rightly regard this problem as even more crucial for the future. Inherently, therefore, they confirm the Trotskyist idea on this subject, too.

lith, particularly since 1956, and the rise in the tide of the colonial revolution -- after Cuba, approaching the shores of the imperialist citadels -- this whole picture is beginning to change. The coming period may therefore provide that impetus for the growth of the Fourth International as a link in the developments noted which could confirm Trotsky's vision positively, concretely.

Deutscher notes in his postscript, Victory in Defeat, where he pays tribute to the timeliness of the views of his subject, that in the Sino-Soviet conflict of ideas both sides accuse each other of Trotskyism, and cites this fact as a demonstration of the vitality of Trotsky's ideas. Could we not assume also that the recent attacks in the Moscow Izvestia and Communist on the Fourth International, after twenty-five years' silence, are indications of the vitality of the organization Trotsky founded?

* * *

It is perhaps asking too much of Deutscher to deal with the Leninist concept of the party, necessary as it is to understanding Trotsky's motivation in proclaiming and working for the Fourth International, within the framework of this particular biography, which he has already had to expand to three volumes from what initially was to be a single book. It belongs properly to a Lenin biography for the full treatment it deserves. Since Deutscher is engaged on such a work as his next great effort, perhaps he will do so there in the thorough fashion it deserves, and of which he as a Marxist scholar is certainly capable, and thereby throw further light on its relation to the present question.

As to the application by the Trotskyists of this Leninist concept after Trotsky's death and their role in the development of Trotsky's ideas, if we find the brief treatment Deutscher gives this aspect unsatisfactory and tendentious, we can grant that in a work such as he undertook it could not be dealt with in the detail the subject deserves.

Even so, it is difficult to understand Deutscher's cavalier dismissal of the American Socialist Workers party: "... the S.W.P. remained a tiny chapel, the members of which were zealously devoted to the letter of Trotsky's writing, and later to his memory, but which was never able to acquire any political weight..."

The cadres of the SWP, like the rest of the mainstream of the Fourth International, were won to the basic ideas of Trotsky and not just to "the letter of Trotsky's writing." They remained true to these ideas both as a view of reality and a method of evaluating new developments in it, including the need for a Leninist-type party in seeking effective action. Their capacities along these lines are well illustrated, to take one outstanding example, by their views on Soviet reality which Deutscher could not consistently argue against,

at least in the main outline. The same holds true of other aspects of the world picture, including America, on which new ideas have been elaborated that certainly build on Trotsky's thought, but are hardly chapel services in which Trotsky's writings are taken as dogma. This is not the place to go into detail, although that would indeed be fruitful. Suffice it to mention that there are indeed "ultralefts" calling themselves Trotskyists to whom Deutscher's stigma could apply; but they are among the most vociferous in denouncing the SWP for departing from if not "betraying," Trotskyism.

For a "tiny chapel" devoted mainly "to the memory of Trotsky," the SWP has some rather interesting distinctions in numerous fields of activity. We will mention but one, to illustrate. Since 1948, the party has participated in presidential elections every four years in the United States, not to speak of annual local elections. Anyone familiar with the American electoral system, and with the McCarthyite witch-hunt throughout these years, will understand that this in itself constituted no mean achievement for a revolutionary organization. In the course of the 1960 elections, on radio and television (aside from the press and public meetings), the SWP's was the only voice to come to the defense of revolutionary Cuba. It is true that there was no mass swing as a result, but hundreds of thousands if not millions heard that voice. And, while only a few thousand responded directly in sympathy, the message was not ignored; awakening thoughts were planted in many more minds. In any case, the embattled Cubans through their press did not fail to appreciate these acts of solidarity in the midst of the enemy camp, nor similar ones at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion or the even greater crisis in October 1962. If the SWP is devoted to the "memory of Trotsky" it certainly demonstrated it in a way that did justice to him.

If the SWP has not acquired great political weight -- we cannot dispute Deutscher here -- it is certainly not less weighty than any other radical, left-wing organization in America today, but far in front in this respect.(5)

Deutscher may have misjudged in this case because of insufficient familiarity with the American political scene, with its social fabric. It is not really his field. This mitigating factor comes to mind also in Deutscher's whole treatment of Trotsky in relation to America. Otherwise why would he have singled out on this subject

(5) Mindful, perhaps, of Trotsky's qualifying introduction of his postwar forecasts -- "twenty-five years in the scales of history. . . weigh less than an hour in a man's life" -- Deutscher hedges on his own critique of them: "Whether Trotsky's prognostications about the 'advanced West,' especially the United States, will look as unreal toward the end of this century as they did at its middle, must, of course, remain an open question." (Footnote, p. 428.) Can it be that this reservation on the wisdom of hindsight also includes the Fourth International, and perhaps the SWP, after all that is said elsewhere in the book?

merely Trotsky's attitude toward the American intellectuals? The archives are undoubtedly full of far more pregnant ideas of his on the Negro issue, on the trade-union movement, etc. It is perhaps characteristic also that in the narrative of the 1939-40 struggle, while James Burnham and even Dwight Macdonald are given considerable space, the figure of Cannon receives little attention.

In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the great last struggle over ideas (with Shachtman and Burnham, see In Defense of Marxism) began on the concept of the party, within the Socialist Workers party, and that Trotsky did not initiate it but was drawn into it, as the discussion developed and broadened out politically with the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact and the war in Finland. Deutscher's account of this struggle suffers from lack of verification and amplification with survivors, particularly with Cannon, (6) who played a major role in that period. In view of the author's conscientious efforts to obtain eyewitness accounts from so many others in relation to all kinds of events in Trotsky's last years, this represents a serious gap in his scholarly procedure. It is perhaps understandable from a human point of view why this came about; but just the same the work is bound to suffer from this defect.

In his postscript Deutscher reveals a view on a whole range of political problems since Trotsky's day which most Trotskyists will find substantially the same as that of the mainstream of the Trotskyist movement. They elaborated their positions in the course of discussion and polemic within their organization, often revising mistakes made and refining ideas at first crudely put, learning in the course of the discussion from each other and from writers outside the organization, including Deutscher. Deutscher, a Marxist scholar of great talent, arrived at his views by individual endeavor, although it would indeed be unusual for any Marxist not to be influenced by others too in the give and take of ideological exchange, even in that case. However that may be, the similarity of basic positions evidently indicates similar concern to know the truth and similar care in reaching this end despite the divergence of views on what to do about it. It would indeed be deplorable if this fact -- which, in the nature of such developments, should lead to conscious endeavor at common understanding and joining of effort -- were to be obscured by what history may one day regard as irrelevancies.

[The end.]

(6) Deutscher, while citing various documents pertaining to the 1939-40 discussion, does not even mention Cannon's Struggle for a Proletarian Party. Trotsky, who was not, as Deutscher knows, given to flattery, said of this particular work: "If the discussion had not produced more than this document, it would be justified." Perhaps, in this case, Deutscher overlooked it more because of his inadequate appreciation of the problem of the Leninist type of organization than out of insufficient familiarity with American matters.

OUR CANDIDATE FOR COMMAND OF WORLD'S NUCLEAR STOCKPILE

The Paris daily Le Figaro of April 18-19 carried the following news item, which seemed to us not without its moral:

LE HAVRE, April 17 -- The presence of mind and coolness of a seven-year-old "chauffeur," made it possible without any doubt to avoid a serious accident.

Mr. Claude Soyer had stopped his car on a street on a steep hill to see a merchant of the town, leaving his son Bruno, 7, in the back seat.

He had barely stepped inside the door when the hand brake suddenly let go and the car started rolling. Mr. Soyer rushed after it, but he was too late.

All alone inside the car, Bruno, without getting excited, had also understood that it was necessary to act. He grabbed the steering wheel and succeeded in straightening out the car, in succession avoiding a trolley bus that was climbing the hill, an automobile-school driver, then a pedestrian.

The little boy had the still greater presence of mind not to go ahead into a particularly busy street crossing at the bottom of the slope, but to turn into a nearby street where the car, finally losing its velocity, came to a stop against another parked vehicle.

Bruno was unharmed.

A TIP

The final volume of Isaac Deutscher's biography of Leon Trotsky is available in England at a considerable saving over the price of the American edition. Send £2/5s. [U.K.] or \$6.50 [U.S.], check or international money order to WIR Publications, 374 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1.