



INTERNATIONAL

WORKERS OF THE WORLD — UNITE!

Sino—Soviet Conflict

BY LIVIO MAITAN

EDITORIALS ON: Latin America on the Cuban path; Crisis of the Common Market; New stage in the Nuclear Terror; The Coup d'Etat in Iraq; Coming Independence in Kenya; Coming Revolution in South Africa.

Imperialist Rule continues in Jamaica

BY BEN MONROE

“Arab Socialism” and the Nasserite National Movement

BY A. SADI

Latin America 1962

BY LIVIO MAITAN

RESOLUTIONS ON: Algeria; The conflict between India and China

Contents

EDITORIAL NOTES: Latin America on the Cuban path	1
Crisis in the Common Market	2
New Stage in the Nuclear Terror	3
The Coup d'Etat in Iraq	5
Coming Independence in Kenya: Coming Revolution in South Africa	7
Sino—Soviet Conflict— <i>by Livio Maitan</i>	10
Imperialist Rule continues in Jamaica— <i>by Ben Monroe</i>	17
“Arab Socialism” and the Nasserite National Movement— <i>by A. Sadi</i>	28
Latin America 1962— <i>by Livio Maitan</i>	32
Resolutions on: Algeria	46
The Conflict between India and China	48

All Correspondence and Subscriptions to:

PIERRE FRANK, 64 rue de Richelieu, Paris 2.

Rates: Single copies: 35 cents (U.S)	One Year 4 issues: \$ 1.25
,, ,, 50 cents (Ceylon)	,, ,, : Rs. 2.00
,, ,, 2 Shillings (2/5 postpaid)	,, ,, : 8 shillings

In the Far East, Fourth International is available through the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, 47 Driberg's Avenue, Colombo 10, Ceylon.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, the English Language Edition of the Theoretical Organ of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, is published four times a year. This issue is published by SYDNEY WANASINGHE, 51A, Peterson Lane, Colombo 6, and printed at the Wesley Press, 490, Havelock Road, Colombo 6, Ceylon.



FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

ENGLISH - LANGUAGE EDITION OF THE THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE
INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Number 16

January - March 1963

Editorial Notes

LATIN AMERICA ON THE CUBAN PATH

AFTER the events of October in the Caribbean, the partisans of Imperialism throughout the world have not hidden their hope that the influence of the Cuban Revolution in the other countries of Latin America would mark time and that the objective situation in the continent would even register some amelioration (from the point of view of Imperialism, that is). Some weeks have been sufficient to demonstrate how much without foundation such hopes were.

In effect in no country has there been any evidence of a greater crystallisation of the status quo, but on the contrary, the social and political crisis has not ceased to deepen in one part or another of the countries. Even in the two big countries, whose ruling classes count on a relatively large margin of manoeuvre, the situation, has subsequently deteriorated. It is almost pointless to underline still once more that in such conditions the so-called "Alliance for Progress" can only result in a lamentable failure.

For the other part, the most characteristic aspects of the present stage in Latin America—the development of armed struggles, above all, in the countryside—has acquired a considerable amplitude. In nearly a dozen countries guerilla formations exist and in at least three or four they operate already on quite an important base, with repercussions on the situation in these different countries. In the last weeks, it is Peru and Venezuela which have registered the most significant developments.

It was already discussed at length on Venezuelan armed struggle, where one could sometimes speak of defeat and serious setbacks, and can even criticise certain enterprises as adventurist or even as led by some reactionaries (the Cubans no more spared them their criticisms). But it appears the situation has now evolved in a very favourable way. In the first place the armed formations continue and amplify their activities and make a point of winning the support of those layers of the peasantry towards whom Betancourt has exerted his demagogy and "agrarian reform". Secondly, audacious actions have multiplied in the towns and the urban detachments are now in a position to hold in check the police in certain workers' quarters of Caracas. Finally, the

danger of armed formations of the Right, if it ever existed, appears now entirely removed and in a certain case it has been seen even that certain movements started effectively by rightist officers have been transformed quite rapidly into popular movements with a wholly different orientation. Moreover, one should not underestimate the recent evolution of the Venezuelan C.P. as well as the M.I.R. These two parties are now in their majority for the armed struggle, that is they are quite close to Fidelist orientation. Despite the serious contradictions which exist (notably concerning the real nature of the Venezuelan Revolution and the ultimate aims of the armed struggle) this turn outlined above by these two organisations, which influence the large majority of the masses, above all the urban masses, will play without any doubt an important role of propulsion.

In Peru the revolutionary crisis has matured even more than in Venezuela. We have already sketched in another article in this same number of our review, an analysis of the Peruvian situation. Since then, the mass movement has acquired an even greater amplitude in the struggles of industrial sectors as well as by the mobilisation of the peasants. The Junta of Perez Godoy—which played at Nasserism in the first months of its existence—has been obliged to bring to light its true nature: it represented a relatively "original" attempt to defend the essential interests of conservatism. But in a situation of tension such as that which existed in the country, it was unable to rely absolutely on a passivity of the masses and it had therefore, more than once, to have recourse to traditional methods or repression. At the end of December—beginning of January, after some veritable massacres of workers and peasants, the government took to massive arrests, seeking to deprive all the oppositional forces of their essential cadres. The Peruvian revolutionary Marxists, including comrade Frias, were also struck at by the repression and thrown into prison (according to the latest information they will have to stand trial).

But the movement continues to rise and the brutal attitude of Perez Godoy will be unable to break it.

It is significant that the APRA no more controls the trade union organisations, of whom an important part has already left the Aprist Centre. It held some months ago a conference, which was to be the prelude to a veritable Congress founding a new Trade Union Centre. Already these organisations function in an independent way and the leftist elements play a considerable role. Freed from the limitations imposed by the Aprists, a whole series of fundamental trade unions can thus contribute in a more active and militant way than ever before in the past to the movements which have developed everywhere in the countryside.

However, what preoccupies the military government and the Imperialists even more at the present stage, is the scope of the armed struggle in the countryside. This armed struggle is more and more by way of acquiring a concrete and efficient character as it becomes tied to the peasant movement for the occupation of the land. There are in Peru at the moment some guerilla chiefs who enjoy a very great national prestige and a real support on the part of the peasants in the regions where they operate. The best known is Hugo Blanco, of a revolutionary Marxist orientation and a partisan of the Fourth International who continues his heroic fight in the Concepcion valley despite the ferocious pursuit that his enemies have taken up including the use of helicopters. To express it in terminology current in Latin America, Peru is in the process of following the Cuban path.

Another very important factor for the development in Latin America, is the orientation that Fidel has made in the last weeks. The Cuban leadership has understood to the fundamentals the lesson of the crisis of the Caribbean. It has seen confirmed

all its fears of the attitude of American Imperialism, which at no price will renounce its desire to extinguish the Cuban flame. It takes account that the the military alliance with the USSR—while being a considerable factor—represents no absolute guarantee. Finally it has understood in the clearest way from the past, that in the last analysis, the fate of the Cuban Revolution was strictly tied to the development of the revolution in other countries of Latin America. The speeches made by Castro in January—notably the magnificent speech addressed to the women of the Americas—are even more explicit than the Declaration of Havana in their invitation to the peoples of Latin America to put themselves on the plane of the revolutionary struggle. What is more! Fidel seems to have decided to launch an open struggle against all the traditional opportunist leaderships, including the Communists, who still chatter about “peaceful ways” and alliances with the “national” bourgeoisies and who represent a major obstacle to the unfurling of powerful movements towards their victorious issue.

The vital interest that American Imperialism has in Latin America, the rapid maturation of objective revolutionary conditions in several countries, the existence of Cuba and the role of a leadership such as that of Fidel Castro, are factors which render impossible any intermediary solutions, any solution of a more or less “reformist” type in the style of the Alliance for Progress, etc. The perspective for this part of the world is more than ever that of decisive confrontations between the fundamental social forces. The possibility exists that in the short or medium run Cuba shall not be the only Workers’ State on the American continent.

4th February, 1963

CRISIS OF THE COMMON MARKET

WHEN Great-Britain was on the eve of entering the European Common Market de Gaulle has closed the door on her nose. Gaitskell saw coming the moment when he would become Prime minister—death has destroyed this hope. Thus new conditions are appearing for a time in England, whilst the British working class movement has a new leader, Harold Wilson. Leaving aside here the question of the European Common Market and its perspectives and consequences for Britain, let us see what may be new for the British working class movement.

This movement, together with the Italian working class movement, is the most living one among the European working class movements. Generally speaking, since the end of the second world War, it has the tendency to evolve towards the left. But this tendency, in the traditional British way, evolved only slowly, and it has been tremendously hindered by those who were at the head either of the Labour Party or of the left opposition in this party.

Clement Attlee was succeeded by Gaitskell, a liberal of intellectual type, who, unlike the former leaders of the LP did not go through the usual way in this party. He was brought from governmental cabinets to the top of the party thanks to Attlee and the former right wing trade unions leaders.

A dessicated machine, such was the qualification given to him by Bevan a few years before this same Bevan torpedoed the left wing and came to an agreement with this “dessicated machine” in the hope of bringing back the LP to power.

After Gaitskell’s death, the Labour MP’s—they and not the Party choose the Party leader—were faced with two main candidates: Brown, deputy leader and Wilson. A few months earlier, these same MP’s had elected Brown against Wilson as deputy leader. But if Brown, ultra right winger, was fit for such a post where he acted as a watchdog against the lefts (especially amongst the youth), other “qualities” were required for a leader facing the country and the whole world, all the more because the chances are still very strong that the LP will get a majority at the next elections, thus making its leader automatically the “Prime Minister of Her Majesty.”

Wilson, whose ascension in the Labour Party was more traditional than his predecessor’s has some kind of “leftist” reputation. It is true that he supported Bevan in 1951 when he left the government, that he also fought Gaitskell when the latter trampled down the resolutions voted at the Scarborough conference on unilateral nuclear disarmament. But altogether this “leftism” has been no more than episodic,

and one can find in Wilson's biography other incidents in an opposite direction. Actually one can say that his center position in the LP with a slight bending towards Left is the best that British capitalism could expect: no danger for its interests, and a small something to confuse the weakest and less farseeing part of the Left, in order to add to the present scattering of it.

Wilson's first statements after his election to the leadership of the LP have been very comforting for British capitalism: he has expressed himself unreservedly for the Atlantic Pact and, whilst being formerly opposed to England's entrance into the Common Market, he blamed Macmillan for having through mishandling provoked the humiliation of his country! In the formation of the shadow cabinet, he has left the most important posts to the right-wingers. He shows that he is what all social-democrat leaders aspire to be, a "stateman", i.e., a truthful manager of capitalism when they accede to government.

But, for England, and for its working class movement especially, is raised a very serious question which brings back old feelings, the unemployment question. There is at present around one million unemployed persons. The proportion becomes very alarming in the north of the country. This is the highest figure since the end of the war, a figure which recalls a period between the two world wars. To the unemployment question the British workers are particularly sensitive. It is sure that therefore the left currents will become stronger, especially in the trade

unions where they have already become more numerous. Before long Wilson's leadership will be put to the test.

An unfortunate factor in the situation is the present state of the Labour Left. The latter is at the same time strong and weak. Strong because of the political development of the whole movement towards the Left, weak because of its organisational fragmentation and its lack of a clear political programme. Since its betrayal by Bevan, the Left has not achieved a political and organisational coherence. Far from using its victory in Scarborough, it was begging the right wing leadership until it was defeated. It is scattered in small circles which are not attractive, especially for the big battalions of the trade unions. A part of it besides, is afraid to appear as dividing the party before an Election that may bring victory.

But it is precisely in the firmness and the audacity of a left wing that dwells a guarantee of victory for the British working class movement.

The task of the British revolutionary Marxists is to contribute to the regroupment of the many left forces in the Labour Party and the Trade Unions around a programme of action based on the struggle against unemployment, for unilateral disarmament and for a Socialist Britain that will open the road for a Socialist United States of Europe. Such a regroupment would have a tremendous echo in the solid working class movement of Britain. It would also contribute to stimulating all the European working class movements.

NEW STAGE IN THE NUCLEAR TERROR

ALL those who confidently believed that "they" would never dare to throw nuclear weapons into the balance in a specific conflict received a cruel but salutary awakening in the Cuban crisis. What was seen was an application of a new military concept publicly proclaimed by the spokesmen of American imperialism called "counterforce strategy"; that is, the possibility of launching preventive nuclear war. While the interminable negotiations about ending the atomic tests continue at Geneva, these and many other signs point to the conclusion that we are in fact witnessing a new stage in the terrifying nuclear arms race.

It is worth examining the arguments which the strategists of American imperialism use to justify adoption of this new strategy. According to the "old" strategy, a nuclear war in its first phase would see "strikes" against the main cities and production centers of the enemy; in a few minutes at least 100 million would perish in the United States and 150 million in the Soviet Union (such relative figures are advanced of course to prove that "the enemy" is even more vulnerable than "we" are, but they indicate in any case the extremely high number of casualties to be expected).

Destruction would be completed in a second phase—if anything valuable enough remained to destroy. After the principal centers had been obliterated, the allies of both protagonists, and the "secondary" industrial and urban centers in each camp would be destroyed until the nuclear arms

were used up. But some time ago scientists estimated that sufficient weapons had been stockpiled to destroy at one blow more than half of mankind. And this calculation did not take into account such long-lasting effects as the deterioration of mankind's genetic capital.

In contrast, the so-called "counterforce strategy" would enable humanity to avoid total catastrophe—so they say. American imperialism has such a huge number of nuclear weapons that it can now concentrate its first strike exclusively on the Soviet rocket sites, hurling such showers of nuclear bombs as to wipe out Soviet striking capacity—and still have more than enough nuclear weapons in reserve to conduct an "old" type atomic war. If some Soviet atomic weapons should escape the first American strike, Moscow could not use them out of fear that any attempt to do so would bring instant retaliation in the form of a second American strike that would level all major cities and production centers in the Soviet Union.

This enticing perspective evidently does not take into account the growing Soviet capacity to disperse rocket bases, or the general increasing mobility of rockets (carried on trains, submarines, ships, and airplanes on constant patrol). At the same time, the new strategy abandons completely the old fiction of "defensive nuclear war." The strategists of U.S. imperialism cynically reveal that they are working in accordance with a doctrine of aggressive and preventive nuclear war. We are also given new

impressive evidence of the geometric increase of nuclear rocket stockpiles, of the capacity to "over-kill" the "enemy". Mankind has been warned what to expect.

Would a world swept by this incalculably destructive power still be habitable? This is a question to which no Marxist, conscious of his responsibilities, can answer. It is up to the biologists, the physicists, the physiologists, the specialist in nuclear radiation to say. The answers these scientists give are not very reassuring. Would such a world of radioactive ruins be "ripe for communism"? To suppose so means to forget what historical materialism has taught from the beginning, that a communist society cannot be built on mere consciousness and the enthusiasm of the oppressed—however necessary these are for the revolution—but requires a material infrastructure, a given level of development of the productive forces.

Does this mean that a knowledge of the terrifying consequences of a nuclear world war will "demoralize" the masses engaged in the colonial revolution or the proletarian masses of the imperialist countries or that it will hold them back from carrying out their revolutionary duties? This way of posing the problem is alien to the method of revolutionary Marxism. Marxist method is based upon truth; it proclaims that the truth is always revolutionary. Marxism can never take to lies and deception—in this case a deception so irresponsible as to reach historical proportions—hiding from toiling mankind the exact nature of a threat involving its very existence.

Still more. Those who use this argument about the risk of demoralizing the masses reveal in reality an absolutely unjustified lack of faith in the international proletariat. They do not understand that it is precisely the nuclear threat weighing upon the future of mankind that can become the **main anti-capitalist mobilizing force of the masses** in many countries today. They do not understand the necessity of explaining to the masses that the choice is no longer simply the one between socialism and a less human, more unjust or even barbaric society, but that the real choice today is between socialism and atomic death, that the world will be socialist or it won't be at all! And they do not understand that if this truth is explained with sufficient persuasiveness to the workers of the whole world, these workers will choose socialism more enthusiastically and resolutely than at any time in the past.

In telling the truth to the masses about the danger of atomic death foreshadowed in imperialism's war preparations, the Fourth International appeals to them not to become resigned or submissive or to fall into the trap of thinking that no hope exists but "peaceful coexistence" with the enemy. On the contrary, it appeals to them to fight. Its message to the proletariat is summarized in the formula: **the struggle against the nuclear danger is possible and can be effectively waged provided the capitalist system is consistently weakened by multiplying the assaults against it until it is finally overthrown in the very centers and fortresses of its world power.**

The development of the colonial revolution is undoubtedly a means of weakening imperialism, of reducing the number of its bases and places where it

can hole up, thus reducing the openings left to it. Similarly the *de facto* alliance of the Soviet bureaucracy and the colonial revolution—at least in the sense of its blocking a nuclear attack by American imperialism—greatly reduces the probability of utilizing nuclear weapons against the revolution in the colonial areas. Washington's latest plans tend to confirm in this respect the experiences of the war in Korea and Vietnam and the attack on Suez and the aggression against Cuba. Imperialism hesitates to use nuclear arms in what it calls a "bush-fire" conflict. It prefers to use forces specialized in guerrilla warfare rather than transform these "local wars" waged against the colonial revolution into a full-scale nuclear world war.

This derives from the fact that the imperialist statesmen have reached the conclusion that such a nuclear world war risks becoming suicidal, not only in the social but also in the physical sense of the word. Under these conditions, the "final showdown" is unlikely to break out over a conflict in the periphery. More likely it might come as a **desperate reaction**, a demented attack when all possibility of further retreat and survival is blocked by the inexorable progress of world revolution, by the catastrophic blows the capitalist system will have suffered on all continents.

Can one exclude the possibility that American imperialism will finally capitulate without launching a nuclear world war, after having been beaten on the front of the colonial revolution, after having been completely driven out of several continents, after having lost some of its most important allies, and after becoming involved in increasing economic difficulties until it reaches the verge of being completely outpaced by the technical, military and economic strength of the workers states? Theoretically, this hypothesis cannot be excluded, especially if world war spells not only social but physical suicide for the American capitalist class as a whole, including its leaders. But it would be extremely dangerous to consider this hypothesis as the most probable. And it would be totally irresponsible to base the long-term perspectives and strategy of world revolution on this hypothesis.

The example of German imperialism under the Nazis has shown that at a certain point of its development the logic of the imperialist system becomes transformed into organized madness, and that the blind fury of the crumbling social system overcomes even the instinct of self-preservation. It is not by accident that the extreme right-wing forces in the United States have raised the slogan "Better dead than red." Moreover, a certain margin of uncertainty will undoubtedly remain as long as American imperialism still controls key forces. The launching of a nuclear world war can then appear not as certain suicide, but rather as a "calculated risk" with some margin of hope.

Under these conditions, **the risk of nuclear annihilation will face mankind as long as imperialism still has sufficient economic, technical and military forces at its disposal to launch a nuclear war.** Revolutionary strategy therefore cannot be based exclusively upon the need to weaken imperialism as much as possible **from the outside**; it must also

base itself on the necessity of overthrowing it **from the inside**, the final task being facilitated and prepared by the progress of the colonial revolution and of the workers states. It is the proletariat of the imperialist countries and only they who will have the final word.

At the crucial moment, intervention from the outside could immediately provoke a nuclear holocaust, whereas nuclear weapons, if we may venture a historical prediction, can hardly be used in a civil conflict in an essentially urban country like the United States. It is the proletarian revolution in the United States that will deliver the final and decisive blow to imperialism, thereby liberating mankind from the spectre of nuclear death.

In the meantime, everything working toward the **nuclear disarmament of imperialism**, everything that makes the masses more conscious of the necessity of such disarmament, everything that mobilizes them toward achieving that goal is highly progressive and contributes objectively to helping the victory of socialism in the imperialist countries. If the pacifism of the masses was based in good part on petty-bourgeois illusions in the world of **inter-imperialist wars**, the pacifism of the masses today in imperialist countries threatening **nuclear aggression against the workers states** is an eminently revolutionary sentiment. Revolutionary Marxists must therefore participate actively in the movements favoring **unilateral disarmament of the imperialist countries**, of movements favoring evacuation of imperialist bases on the territories of other capitalist countries. These movements should be directed not only against the nuclear arms bases of the main imperialist power—American imperialism—they should also be directed against the nuclear armament of secondary imperialist powers: Great Britain, France and a “multilateral nuclear force of NATO” perhaps tomorrow Western Germany or Japan.

While playing an active role in movements fighting for unilateral disarmament of the imperialist powers, revolutionary Marxists will at the same time seek to prevent such movements from running into a dead end. The movement for unilateral disarmament in

the imperialist countries is objectively a **political** as well as an **anticapitalist** movement. In the long run, it cannot progress without becoming conscious of this double nature of the struggle, without trying to link up with the labor movement, and without supporting in the labor movement all the forces capable of creating an alternative leadership to the existing bureaucracies which are either brazenly pro-imperialist or paralyzed by the dogma of “peaceful coexistence.”

In Britain and Japan, the two countries where the antinuclear movement is most widespread, the crisis of perspective is already clearly evident—Marches, manifestations of civil disobedience, sit-downs: all this is good in awakening, interesting and mobilizing the masses. But in themselves, none of these combat methods can succeed. **Unilateral disarmament of the imperialist bourgeoisie will be achieved finally only by overthrowing its class power and its state.**

That is why it is the duty of revolutionary Marxists in the antinuclear movement to press for such **transitional slogans** and actions as will help the masses participating in these movements to become conscious of the fact that this struggle is but one aspect of the general struggle against the capitalist class and the capitalist system and for the socialist reconstruction of human society. That is why they should link this antinuclear struggle with slogans for the total disarmament of the dominant bourgeoisie, with slogans for governments to take the place of bourgeois governments really capable of effectively pushing through disarmament as well as a total break with imperialist alliances. The struggle for disarmament, consequently should be tied in with the need to organize working class power in the factories, in the work-shops and in the offices, as the only power capable of guaranteeing that no more nuclear weapons will be manufactured, transported or stocked and that all existing nuclear weapons will be destroyed, the only power capable of destroying all military, political and social structures interested in the demented nuclear arms race.

February 20, 1963.

THE COUP D'ETAT IN IRAQ

THE tragic isolation that accompanied the fall of General Kassem was a final confirmation both of the Bonapartist character of his power and of the total bankruptcy of his actions during the five years following the overthrow of the reactionary regime of Nouri Said. Remaining in power essentially by leaning on dissimilar social and political forces which he utilised one against the other without ever being the consistent defender of any one of them, Kassem, when he was threatened, found no one prepared to defend him. On the other hand, it was impossible for him to count on any mobilisation whatsoever, even of certain sectors of the masses, because his failure to solve the fundamental problems for which the masses had opposed Nouri Said, had divested him of all popular support.

At the base of the revolution of 1958 there had been three essential demands: Arab unity, emancipation from the tutelage of imperialism represented

in Iraq also by the Petroleum Trusts, and radical agrarian reform. Despite his proclamations, his Nasserism at the start, his vehement threats, his promises to the peasants, Kassem turned his back on Arab unity in breaking with Cairo, was incapable of removing the economic stranglehold of imperialism, and carried out only a pretence of agrarian reform. In addition, by refusing any autonomy to the Kurds, he endangered the unity of Iraq itself. In these conditions, the most he could do was to prolong his power by means of severe repression and by exploiting the heterogeneous character of the opposition that arose to him. However, his fate was sealed.

At the time of writing this note, we are not yet in possession of all the necessary information on the precise nature of the new ruling group and of the exact composition of the coalition which has formed the new Government. Certain interpretations and

certain stands taken appear to be founded above all on repression against the Communists and on the speedy diplomatic recognition on the part of a series of countries. These are however factors that are absolutely insufficient or partial. We shall return to the first point. As to the second, it is clear that, in a very fluid situation, everybody (the United States as much as the USSR, and Egypt as much as Jordan for example) has desired to preserve the possibility of exercising an influence, which would have been much more difficult if not impossible in case of non-recognition of the new regime.

The press of certain Communist Parties in particular have spoken of the coup d'état as having a reactionary and pro-imperialist character. It is possible that, in the situation that arose after the fall of Kassem, there was a reactionary component and it is even probable that there were forces which tried to exploit the situation to gain positions, to renew the threats of imperialist intrigue and to introduce their own anti-popular repression. But in the first place, there is no question of this being the principal tendency, and further it is very unlikely that reactionary elements should be on top, such an outcome not being a viable one in the Iraq of today.

There has also been talk of a preventive coup d'état. Without entering into detailed analyses, it is evident that a prolongation of Kassem's regime implied the growing likelihood of sudden outbreaks, of a real revolt of the masses on a large scale. The organisers of the coup were not unaware of this possibility and they were probably concerned to forestall such an eventuality by a change.

They belong to different nationalist and socialistic currents, among which pro-Nasser elements (Aref) and supporters of the Baath party are the best known and probably, at the present moment, the most influential. Their programme is basically to push towards the realisation of the programme that Kassem himself had accepted at the beginning, but which he had subsequently abandoned. It is another matter, by what forms they are hoping to achieve success where Kassem had failed, and above all whether they have a real possibility of attaining effective results. Regarding this, the weeks to come will provide significant pointers; but in any case it is clear that henceforth the new leaders of Iraq will face basically the same problems as those of all the other countries of the Middle East. In a nutshell, this means that there will be posed for them once again the problem of Nasserism—in the broadest sense of the word.

In the Middle East, the national bourgeoisie remains weak and sometimes almost non-existent. It is wedged between the forces of the feudal past and imperialism on the one hand, and the pauperised masses of the towns and villages on the other. It has followed what has happened in Egypt where, in the ultimate interests of the preservation of the bourgeoisie, Nasser has undertaken a fight against the stranglehold of imperialism and against the old ruling strata, by outlining an agrarian reform of a certain importance and by instituting state control over a number of important industrial sectors, with the result that he has secured the support of the masses and the fervent sympathy of the broad layers of people in all the Arab countries. But in

smaller and weaker countries, let us repeat, where the bourgeoisie is restricted and has no solid base, a Nasser-like operation becomes much more difficult and risky (the masses being capable of swiftly going beyond the timid reformist leaderships). That is why flowing from this weakness on the one hand and the need to expand of the Egyptian bourgeoisie on the other, there has arisen the idea of Arab unity: indeed, if this unity were realised in the economic and political sphere, the bourgeoisie of Egypt and the Middle East would appear to have perspectives that are less ephemeral and would be able to accomplish a historically progressive task in a manner similar to what other bourgeois classes in other parts of the world have accomplished earlier.

But intrinsic weaknesses and conflicting interests hinder the realisation of Arab unity, resulting even in the failure of efforts already realised. On the one hand, the bourgeoisie in fact would desire to make sure that the movement inevitably engendered by a real fight for Arab unity will stop at the stage desired by it, while such a guarantee simply does not exist. On the other hand, the bourgeois layers of the countries that are at an advantage in regard to petrol—like Iraq—have little desire to share with other countries—like Egypt—the royalties which they receive from the exploitation of their lands, and they fear besides that, as happened in the case of Syria, Arab unity might be a cover for Egyptian hegemony. These are powerful obstacles, which can only be partially eliminated in case Nasser himself proposes forms of unity which are more supple and mindful of specific interests than that which led to the Syrian failure.

Thus, in the given world context, the Arab bourgeois (or bourgeois-type) ruling classes fluctuate between an aspiration for Arab unity and attempts to find temporary solutions in the framework of the existing national states, between an understanding of the need for a reformist policy of the Nasser type and the fear that the mass movement once unleashed will rapidly go beyond them. The result is a profound instability which has already lasted for years and is destined to continue longer and even get worse.

In such a situation the orientation of the revolutionary movement poses extremely difficult problems: because it is a question really of understanding the real nature of Nasserism, of denouncing its real aims, of not identifying oneself with it but at the same time of not isolating oneself from the deep-going mass movement which wants a real Arab unity, a radical agrarian reform, a complete political and social emancipation, while following the Nasserite leadership which, in its eyes, represents the guide towards these objectives. More generally, it is a question of understanding the inevitably permanent character of the revolution in the Middle East too, and of rejecting all fictitious Stalinist and Kroshtchevist conceptions on a so-called necessary bourgeois-democratic stage and on an alliance with the national bourgeoisie.

The case of the C.P. of Iraq is a dramatic example of the consequences that can flow from a false line. It goes without saying that we join in the protests of the international working class movement against the persecutions aimed at the Communists of Iraq,

with whom we express in this matter our solidarity. But this does not prevent us from saying that it was to a large extent a case of veritable political suicide.

In the revolutionary crisis opened by the overthrow of the regime of Nouri Said, the CP of Iraq deliberately refused to exploit the real possibilities that it had to fight for power and for a socialist solution of the country's crisis. Giving way to the pressure of the Soviet bureaucracy which was aiming above all to establish an alliance with Kassem, duped by its own opportunist formulae, it rejected the criticisms of its own left wing and accepted the perspective of becoming a prop of Kassem, namely to fight for a 'national democracy'. When the conflict arose between Kassem and the Nasserites of Iraq, the CP opposed an orientation towards Arab unity on the pretext that, in a united Arab republic, there would be less democracy than in an independent Iraq, and that then there would be less favourable conditions of struggle for it. By this attitude and by its irresponsible participation in the ferocious repression of Kassem against the Nasserite current, it cut itself off from very important sectors of the masses, while at the same time by giving up a perspective of struggle for power and for a radical agrarian reform, it had weakened, instead of strengthening, its ties with other sectors of the people. As had to happen, given the nature of Kassemism, their support of the Government against the Nas-

serites led to their following the Nasserites into the prisons and their being illegalised once again. It is an attitude such as this that not only led to the break between the CP and the nationalist current that was the most advanced, but today exposes the cadres and militants of the party to the vengeance of all those who wish to exploit the memory of the massacres of Mossoul. We hope that there will be at least one positive gain, namely, that the tragic experience of these weeks will stimulate among the Communist militants of Iraq critical reflections on the line of their party and will impel them to condemn the opportunism of their leaders, tied to the Soviet bureaucracy.

It is in the interests of the Arab revolutionary movement that this process of differentiation should develop and that the conscious cadres should in growing numbers understand on the one hand the permanent character of the revolution in the Middle East and on the other hand the necessity to appear as the most consistent supporters of the fight for Arab unity, in the conviction that it is in the course of this struggle that all the more or less timid reformist leaderships will be left behind by the mass movement which, by its own logic will evolve towards a solution of a socialist character.

21 February, 1968.

COMING INDEPENDENCE IN KENYA: COMING REVOLUTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

THE appointment of Malcolm MacDonald as Governor of Kenya, the visit of Premier Obote of Uganda and President Nyerere of Tanganyika to London to urge a speed-up of Kenyan Independence, the visit of Duncan Sandys to Kenya all will tend to bring forward the date of Independence to around the end of 1963, with elections and full internal self-government in May or June 1963.

However the past months have seen a new political situation develop. The reactionary KADU, with the full support of the settlers, has succeeded in playing on tribal differences and has been able to turn the Kenyan political situation around those questions. The question of regionalism, was conceded by KANU and even though KANU had the intention of severely restricting the powers of the Regional Assemblies, inevitably the question of division of the country into basically tribal units roused all the old tribal loyalties, including inside KANU itself. KANU has seen continual splinterings in these months, and now faces the coming elections a much weaker force than before, and will not succeed in achieving the overwhelming majority it formerly had.

KANU has always been a broad front organisation with the sole unitary objective of Independence. By getting involved in the colonial governmental apparatus, it has already begun to decompose. Besides tribal divisions, the division into roughly Right and Left, which has always existed in KANU has led to a further break-up. But though confusion may seem supreme, the basic difference lies on the question of the land, on the attitude to the British settlers, and of the form of Independence.

British Imperialism has been quite satisfied to allow the situation to drift, content that the tribal passions would do no harm to its interests, and that the "governmental experience" by former KANU militants would also benefit it. But now it is seen necessary to move to Independence, in the fear that the confusion and impatience of the masses may lead to an explosion. Meanwhile it has sought to remove the most explosive factor from the Kenyan political scene: the land hunger of the African peasants. Thus one million acres of formerly European-owned land in the White Highlands is to be settled by 20,000 African families, 12,000 of these in the first year. But even such a crash programme is insufficient to cope with the land hunger particularly of the 2 million Kikuyu, who will in fact see very few of their number given land, and that the scheme itself is aimed at setting up an African 'Kulak' class, and has nothing in common with a genuine land reform. Moreover, the plan aims at arousing tribal jealousies and at setting African against African.

The Right wing of KANU around Tom Mboya, have continued to play a confusionist and reactionary role in the past months. It has been due to their compromising tactics that the KADU has been able to take the initiative and raise reactionary tribal issues to the fore. It is due to them, that KANU now agrees to transfer to Duncan Sandys for his final decision all undecided issues between KADU and KANU, and to abide by his decision. It is due to the right-wing that the constitutional boundaries have been accepted, even though those favour KADU and tribalism in a monstrous way. (For instance, in the Baringo East electorate there are 749 voters, while in

Nakuru East there are 47,017; This is an extreme case, but it is estimated (*MANCHESTER GUARDIAN*, February 20th, 1963) that 3 KANU votes will be worth 2 KADU. It is due to the right-wing that the KANU has capitulated on Regionalism, and where it is even possible that the jurisdiction over land might well be in the hands of the Regional Assemblies, depending on the whim of Sandys.

The left-wing is lacking in clarity on all these issues and it is necessary that they must seek to find the way out of the present confusion and reactionary atmosphere in Kenyan politics. They must base themselves upon one thing—the tremendous militancy of the African masses, and above all the desire of the peasant masses for land. It is impossible for the mass militancy to be sidetracked into tribalist channels for long, for despite whatever reactionary constitutions are worked out, the elementary demands of the masses will burst through. The Land Freedom Army is a guarantee that corrupted politicians will not be able to have everything their own way.

The need is for a strong, clear-minded revolutionary Socialist party in Kenya. That does not mean that a struggle should not be waged within KANU, for it would be wrong to hand the mass loyalties to that organisation over to the right-wing, lock-stock-and-barrel. But equally it is impossible to see the continuation of betrayals without reply and without an alternative being created. Task number one is to break out of the confusion that reigns in Kenyan left wing circles, with concrete policies. Meanwhile the orientation of those who are corrupted and on the right in Kenyan politics will become clearer, and the Left more and more seemingly isolated. But from such isolation the real test of a new orientation will come.

With the question of Kenyan Independence comes the question of the East African Federation. The former "East African High Commission" of British colonialism created a Common Market from the "territories" of Uganda, Tanganyika, Kenya, and Zanzibar. This Common Market was for the benefit of the Kenyan settlers who thus had a market of over 20 million at their disposal, and by taxation manipulation were able to use almost all revenues for the development of Kenya itself, and also ensure that almost all industry was concentrated there. The governments of Uganda and Tanganyika now seek to extend this to an East African Federation with a central government with particular powers over development to see that revenue is equally distributed throughout East Africa. The desperate poverty of the new nations in East Africa make them eager for such a solution. But of course, without socialist measures such a Common Market cannot have a really decisive effect on the situation. Socialists must stand for an East African Federal Socialist Republic, with all the natural and mineral wealth nationalised, the land to the people, and a National Plan of economic development, particularly of industry and of the modernisation of agriculture.

Such a programme would provide an interesting contrast with the concept of the Tanganyikan government of "UJAMAA" or "African socialism" based upon the co-operative movement, and the movement of "self-help". The co-operative movement in all fields in Tanganyika has reached a significant size and now for instance exports over one quarter of

Tanganyika's exports, equalled only by Israel and Denmark. But this co-operative movement which is still expanding lacks even the material base it has in these countries, and starts from an abysmally low standard of living and technique. The only real solution would be massive state aid, the rapid industrialisation of the country etc. But the government still carries on with basically the old colonial apparatus, all imperialist holdings are untouched, the governmental income is meagre, and the amount allotted to state aid of agriculture lower still. In fact "African Socialism" takes the incidentals of Socialism and of the methods of the Workers' States, and ignores its essentials: the expropriation of capitalism. This is above all true of the "self-help" movement which seeks to channel the enthusiasm for Independence and the massive support for TANU, the Government party, into voluntary labour for building wells, football fields, houses, etc... It seeks to mobilise the under-employed in the villages to help themselves. But again it can achieve little: the level of technique remains untouched, there is no real improvement in sight: the "self-help" has a temporary momentum: it will lose it rapidly unless put in the context of a revolutionary mass mobilisation, achieved by the expropriation of Capitalism, and a final definitive attack on feudalism and Socialism. For Socialists in East Africa, it is nevertheless necessary to take cognisance of the reality of co-operativism and put forward demands which would mean the translation of the aspirations the masses have in this movement into reality.

Any East African Federation must overcome the obstacles of reactionary interests, of tribalism, feudalism (in Uganda), and the European Settler interests. More and more it will have to face the obstacles of the nascent African bourgeoisie in East Africa, which will seek to concentrate more and more on its own "nation-building", of ensuring its own profits remain secure.

It remains for those who are genuinely concerned with the interests of the masses, in all the nationalist parties of East Africa and outside them, to study the problem from the Marxist point-of-view, for only a revolutionary Marxist understanding can provide the necessary programme for a forward march to an East African Federal Socialist Republic

One last note: it is necessary to break through the conspiracy of silence that has been tactfully placed around the repression of the Zanzibar Nationalist Party leadership by British Imperialism. For some 16 months now without trial, 15 of the leaders of the ZNP have been jailed by the British Imperialists on faked charges, even though the ZNP was the party which received most votes in the last elections. The ZNP is well-known to be the most Left of all East African parties, and because of this fact, its repression has been hidden by even those on the "Left". It is time the truth was known and a campaign launched for their liberation, particularly in Britain. The repression continues against the ZNP youth organisation, and the Progressive Trade Unions. Free Abdul (Babu) Rahman Mohammed! Free all political Prisoners in Zanzibar!

1962 was a decisive year for South Africa: 1963 will be even more decisive. In 1962 there were over 40 acts of sabotage throughout South Africa. The

Sabotage Bill provided the Death Penalty for sabotage and poster-sticking. Meanwhile the racist Government presses ahead with its plan for "Bentustans," first of all in the Transkei where "Independence" is to be given and a "Black Prime Minister" elected. Needless to say, these are both obvious frauds and are recognised as such by the masses. Already "Prime-Minister—Elect" Kaiser Matanzima lives under the fear of the vengeance of his "people". The spirit of revolt, which temporarily relapsed after the crushing of the Pondoland upsurge, is again in full development in the Transkei.

Below the surface of South African political life, there is tremendous ferment. It is nothing less than the birth of revolutionary consciousness in all the mass organisations, and the formation of the leadership of the South African Revolution. There are a multiplicity of underground revolutionary organisations and groupings. Indeed, over a short period of a year and a few months the question is recognised now as not being a question of whether this is the pre-revolutionary period, and whether a revolution or "violence" is necessary, but **how** and in what way, the revolution will start. It is a period of intense debate, of active preparation, of revolutionary military strategy. There are probably few countries in the world where the writings of Mao Tse Tung, and of Guevara are studied so assiduously as in South Africa. Everywhere there is a feeling of urgency as the enormous contradictions of South African racistist society build up one on the other. No one should be surprised at anything that happens in South Africa in the coming months.

The bubbles of this fermentation below the surface are seen in many forms of sabotage, largely in the cities, murdering of chiefs (certainly no new phenomena), burning of fences, and recently murder of Europeans in charge of a road building scheme across African land, are all symptoms of the simmering which is rapidly reaching boiling point. The killing of Europeans at Pearl by Africans illustrate that particularly in the Western Cape the racistist ideas of the Pan Africanist Congress have led to the formation of POQO ("We stand alone") which starts from a racistist point-of-view of driving the Whites into the sea. POQO lacks above all a revolutionary strategy, and is founded upon attacks by incensed African groups on Whites.....without any sense of a military struggle.

There are few illusions among the South African revolutionaries that sabotage can succeed alone even if at the beginning there were, and it is precisely to the much more difficult task of the launching of a

revolutionary struggle, and surviving the reprisals of the Government, that the attentions are turned. As the AFRICAN COMMUNIST (January—March 1963) comments on the sabotage operations of UMKONTO....." If its present operations form part of a process of training and preparation for the building of a formidable military force, they take on an entirely new significance, whose importance should by no means be underestimated". In fact, the most decisive period awaits the South African Revolution: the construction of a People's Army, in the field, building its strength for the final combat with the White Army. Such an army, almost by definition, means a guerrilla army, and also therefore one largely based on the peasantry. In the building of such an Army no one group has a monopoly. Technique will certainly count, but equally the ability to rally the African peasant masses. More and more the need will be for a revolutionary united front of liberation. Certainly in such a Front those with the clear Marxist and socialist consciousness must seek to lead. But such leadership will flow from the fullest and best participation in the coming struggle.

The recent Congress of the Communist Party of South Africa held illegally in South Africa, and the new Programme adopted there deserves careful study by all interested in the South African revolution. For although the CPSA is small in numbers, its strength in action and influence is considerable. From a formerly opportunist position it has now turned its face squarely to the Revolution. The Programme as well indicates some clear ideological advances which must be analysed and studied and done so publicly. Marxists despite the CP's obvious shortcomings and past failures cannot afford to ignore its new turn to revolutionary struggle.

The world working class movement and its revolutionary Marxist vanguard have the duty to ensure its fullest aid to the developing South African Revolution. The Algerian Revolution has led the way with its fullest aid to the South African Revolution. It is the absolute duty of all African revolutionaries to see that the newly-independent governments, in Eastern and Central Africa in particular, afford every possible ounce of aid for the South African Revolution. There will be more and more evident the need for a revolutionary united front of all Southern Africa against Imperialism and racistist reaction. There is no division of interest between the Revolution anywhere in Southern Africa.

London, 10th February, 1963.

SINO-SOVIET CONFLICT

By LIVIO MAITAN

THE Sino-Soviet conflict, which has lasted now for a number of years, and which has experienced successive resurgences, interrupted by temporary and partial truces, has reached a new level since the month of October 1962. The themes of the debate have not changed essentially: but touchstones like the Caribbean crisis and the frontier conflict between India and China have transferred certain parts of the debate from the domain of generalities of a more or less theoretical nature to the domain of burning contemporary political significance: which has inevitably rendered the polemics harder and more acute and definitively torn away certain ridiculous subterfuges. Things have gone so far that both sides have spoken openly of a danger of schism in the Communist movement, and the Chinese, evidently in the minority, have recalled that minorities can be in the right and that Lenin himself represented only a minority in his struggle against revisionism within the Second International (1)

The Chinese, who found it quite natural to take the initiative in the new wave of debate, have replied, point by point, to all the questions raised since 1959-60: the question of war and of coexistence, the question of the consequences of a possible nuclear war, the question of the colonial revolution and of alliances in the "Third World", the question of paths to socialism, the criticisms of the ideas of the Yugoslav communists (2), in short, almost all the crucial questions of the international workers' movement, which, moreover, had been at the centre of discussion at the Moscow Conference in 1960. A significant sign of a very tense situation was the fact that the Chinese have not hesitated to take up again, obviously with regard to the Soviet Union, the matter of the birth of tendencies of great-nation chauvinism and of a narrow nationalism in the workers' movement, matters already expressed at the beginning of the Hungarian revolution, but rapidly forgotten afterwards. Nevertheless, it has been the two major political questions of the last few months—the blockade against Cuba and the minor Sino-Indian war—which were at the centre of the polemics, and, moreover it has been in taking their point of departure from these concrete problems, especially the first, that the Chinese were led to correct, or to clarify at least, more satisfactorily, their ideas on nuclear war and on the methods of struggle against the menace of war on the part of imperialism.

The Sino-Indian Conflict and the Caribbean Crisis :

It must be said that the attitude taken by the Soviet Union, by other Workers' States and by a whole series of Communist Parties who took the Khrushchev line on the Sino-Indian affair was by itself of a nature such as literally to provoke the Chinese and to impel them towards a deepening of the conflict. It may be disputable whether the attitude of the Chinese leadership on the Indian question was politically correct, whether it would not have been better to anticipate the happy decision of the 20th

November, above all in taking account of the necessity of facilitating the task of the Indian revolutionary movement, for whom the wave of chauvinism organised by Nehru has had grave consequences. But, basically, no hesitation could be admitted when it was a case of a conflict, and indeed a military conflict, between a Workers' State, People's China, and a bourgeois State, more and more conservative in nature such as Nehru's India (4). Khrushchev forgot this completely and, whilst paying hypocritical lip service to a "brother country, in practice he encouraged his Indian "friend" by confirming at the most critical moment of the conflict, the contract to supply MIGs. It must be said that the public reaction in China to the Soviet attitude has been very moderate (5); but there isn't the shadow of a doubt that this attitude represented for Mao an extremely significant test and contributed in very large measure to the aggravation of the conflict.

On the other hand, we must not forget, when it is a question of the problems of what is called the Third World, that the Chinese cannot accept the evolution of economic aid and commercial relations in general on the part of the Soviet Union. As is emphasised in an article which appeared in the same number of our journal, underdeveloped countries led by national bourgeoisies, often very reactionary, receive from the Soviet Union substantial and increasing aid, whilst Sino-Soviet economic relations have experienced a spectacular contraction. Once more, at least in the public polemics, the Chinese have been very discreet on this subject; but no one can ignore the fact that it is a question here of one of the most important factors in the differences. If certain remarks of Chinese origin on the duty of the Soviet Union, which has already attained a quite high economic level, to sacrifice, if only partially, its subsequent development to the end of assisting the other Workers' States to attain the Soviet level—if these remarks might appear somewhat abstract, inspired by a certain amount of idealism, and in sum—what counts for more—even from the strictly economic point of view very disputable, when the criticism concerns the above phenomena it is absolutely justified, even if in principle no one contests the advantage of a Workers' State sometimes assisting even States with bourgeois governments.

The Caribbean affair, which represented the greatest danger of war since the end of the war should, on the other hand, illuminate the different meaning that the policy of coexistence, in principle admitted by everyone, acquires according to the different interpretations and applications to which it is subjected. If for Khrushchev it is represented by an agreement with the US, for the Chinese it consists, on the contrary, above all in a constant and generalised struggle against imperialism, against American imperialism in the first place, a struggle to inflict on it a ceaseless rain of blows, a struggle to stop it unleashing a world war.

If in the Soviet perspective, oriented towards the supreme goal of the preservation of peace, it is legitimate to sacrifice even the necessities of the development of a revolution—something which has already occurred in practice, even though there is naturally a refusal to admit it—according to the Chinese, it is precisely in lending impetus to new revolutions and assuring their “uninterrupted” development that imperialism can be placed in conditions which are most unpropitious for unleashing a general war. (The Chinese emphasis, in effect, that local wars, of a more or less “civil” nature, are inevitable in the contemporary international context and, on the basis of the experience of the last fifteen years, it would be difficult to refute their argument.)

In the concrete case of Cuba, the Chinese, disapproved of the withdrawal of Khrushchev, insofar as they asserted essentially, that a withdrawal of such a nature would encourage imperialism, that it was virtually unconditional (for the five points of Fidel Castro had not been accepted by imperialism) that there was a failure to mobilise the masses of the whole world around the defence of Cuba and for the acceptance of the five points, and finally, that it was absurd to place any confidence in the declarations of Kennedy about the renunciation of any idea of invading the island (6)... The acceptance, on the part of Khrushchev, against the will of Castro, of UN inspection on Cuban soil was a particular target, for, it was said, it is not in asking people to renounce their elementary rights that the hand of imperialism is stayed and a true peace guaranteed.

The replies of the supporters of the Khrushchev line, denouncing an alleged underestimation of the danger of war and of the consequences of a nuclear war on the part of Chinese communists, led the latter to a more precise formulation of their position: something which was certainly necessary, for it was precisely on this level that in the past, various weaknesses had been apparent, weaknesses which had been cunningly exploited by their opponents. We refer above all to the very remarkable articles which appeared in the *People's Daily* on the 15th and 31st of December and which provided timely clarifications.

Thus, we learn that in the Cuban affair the Chinese criticised Khrushchev from a double point of view. “The world knows”—writes the *People's Daily* (15th December)—“that we have neither demanded the introduction of nuclear arms into Cuba, nor hindered the withdrawal of ‘offensive arms’ from the country.” It is thus clear that Mao and his ‘offensive’ supporters criticise the Soviet leaders for their sometimes adventurist attitudes. In the same article they proclaim more generally that “the socialist countries have no need to use nuclear arms for the purpose of replying to and scaring others,” whilst in the article of the 31st December, they write: “We never considered that it is a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish arms as a means of conducting international conflicts.” From this point of view the Chinese criticism has striking analogies with the criticisms that the Fourth International has addressed on many occasions to the Soviet leadership, the fundamental opportunism of which is in no way free of the adventurist follies already characterised. (7)

In regard to the question of war, often discussed in a scholastic way, the Chinese, as in the past, don't dispute that war may be avoided, but they spell out way which is much clearer than was the case in the

precisely the condition for this to occur, viz., the stubborn and united struggle of all anti-imperialist forces, without the least illusion about any “peaceful” wing of the bourgeoisie. It is from this point of view that the repetition of the idea that “imperialism has not-changed its nature,” which in itself might seem a ritualistic formula, acquires its concrete significance.

All this implies that it would be “absurd to believe that one may expect a world without war by peaceful coexistence. It is inevitable that civil wars and wars of national liberation will occur.” In the final analysis, “Marxist-Leninists have always explained that it is only after the imperialist system has been overthrown, and the whole system of the oppression and exploitation of men abolished, and not before, that it will be possible to eliminate all wars and expect a world without war.” (8) This position is far more correct than the Khrushchev line which puts the emphasis on the possibility of eliminating the danger of war even if the capitalist regime continues to exist.

With regard to the destructive force of nuclear arms and the consequences flowing from this, the Chinese have made it plain that their party is quite convinced that “nuclear arms imply an unprecedented destructive power and that, if a nuclear war broke out, it would be an unparalleled catastrophe for humanity” and they recalled their numerous statements of their position on the banning of nuclear arms and tests. But they add that the existence of these new arms doesn't imply, in the first place, a change in the nature of war, that it doesn't justify, secondly, the catastrophic perspectives, envisaged in particular by the Italian leader Togliatti, of the total destruction of humanity or of civilisation (9), and finally doesn't absolutely exclude differences concerning the means to be used to prevent nuclear war. To a political line based on fear and constant withdrawals, they oppose a line oriented towards the mobilisation of the masses. They add that it is necessary to inform the masses of the significance of the new arms to avoid errors of underestimation and to press forward the struggle against the war policy of imperialism.

Just the same, the possibility of a nuclear holocaust is still under-estimated. The hypothesis that a nuclear war on a grand scale might lead to the destruction of human life on earth cannot be shrugged off as “revisionist” or as characteristic of frightened people. It is a matter fundamentally, of a scientific hypothesis—that the majority of competent scientific men consider plausible—and, if the Chinese are in a position to prove it false, they should do so by means of scientific arguments and not by appeals to the first principles of Marxism. At any rate, the final formulations of the *People's Daily* indicate that certain flippant, attitudes—which we have criticised—have been markedly corrected, and even more, that the criticisms of the alleged Chinese adventurism, which envisaged the eventuality of a war quite lightly, correspond to a vicious distortion of the facts of the matter.

The Attack on the Leader of the Italian CP

The logic of the conflict itself has impelled the Chinese to state their criticisms of the policy of “peaceful and democratic roads” to socialism in a

past. Their choice—to some extent determined by defensive necessities—fell on the Italian CP, the strongest party of the advanced capitalist countries and led by a group that has put itself literally in the vanguard of Khrushchevism. If in 1959-60 criticism was limited to summary reminders of the nature of the State and the placing of emphasis on the greater probability of solutions characterised by revolutionary break throughs, now it is much more open and vigorous. The orientation of the Italian CP is gone over with a fine-toothed comb, denounced in certain of its essential aspects (“Italian paths”, interpretation of the present Italian Constitution, concept, of structural reforms, etc.) and characterised as social democratic etc. The Chinese in the course of this analysis even introduce a comparison between Togliatti and Kautsky, who may, quite justly, be regarded as among the ancestors of the notion of the peaceful path to socialism. In fact, the essential points of the Togliatti orientation are very pertinently grasped: the leader of the ICP no longer believes in the necessity of a proletarian revolution, counts rather on a series of structural reforms, considers (if not quite explicitly in his declarations, certainly in his actual political line) that the contemporary Italian State is an instrument which is not necessarily of a capitalist nature, and could be, on the contrary, conquered from the inside and utilised as such by the proletariat in its struggle for socialism (10). This line—say the Chinese—stems fundamentally from an opportunistic interpretation of coexistence. The notions of class-collaboration which were worked out in regard to world politics, are here transferred to the context of internal politics.

Is there concealed behind this last criticism a more general and fundamental one concerning the relations between what may count as an international policy of a Workers’ State and the policy of the communist parties in the countries itself, which should never be subordinated to the diplomatic and tactful necessities, which are transitory moreover, of a Worker’s State or of a bloc of Workers’ States? It is tempting to reply to this in the affirmative, for **Red Flag** recently recalled a formulation by Mao-tse-Tung in 1946 with regard to the compromise between the USSR and the imperialist countries on the international plane. “This compromise does not imply that the countries of the capitalist world are placed in the same boat and themselves undertake compromises. The people of these countries should continue to unleash struggles on the basis of their specific conditions” (11)

What is put in question in this passage is one of the pivots of the classical Stalinist conception. The policy effectively practiced by Mao at the crucial turning-point of the Chinese situation in 1946-7 has shown without any possibility of equivocation that his assertions were not mere abstract dicta (12).

The Soviet Counter-Attack

The long replies by Khrushchev to the most recent criticisms have not brought forward any essentially new element, but they have expressed with a greater clarity the significance of the contemporary policy of the Soviet leadership (13).

In regard, above all, to the Caribbean crisis, the argument is well-known: the attitude of the USSR saved the world from a nuclear war, avoided the

invasion of Cuba, obtained a promise on the part of Kennedy not to undertake new aggressions. From a more general point of view, the Soviet leaders reproach their critics with conceiving of the achievement of socialism through war, with underestimating in an irresponsible way the extreme danger represented by nuclear arms and with preaching a sectarian policy which would lead to the isolation of communists, above all in the capitalist countries (14).

We have already seen that these Khrushchevite reproaches are only partially justified, if not simply false. Is it necessary to recall, on the other hand, that the Khrushchev policy in the matter of the rockets in Cuba brought in its train, in the final analysis, a weakening of the defence of the revolutionary island and that Khrushchev’s attitude has also been disapproved of by the Cuban revolutionary leadership for his acceptance of UN inspection on Cuban soil? Must it be recalled that Kennedy, after an initial declaration which was sufficiently vague, has explicitly refused to give any guarantee? Is it more over so wrong to emphasize, as not only the Albanian scapegoats do but also the Cubans, that in any case we can have no confidence in declarations by the leader of American imperialism? (15)

It may be replied that, after all, the Soviet has declared itself in favor of Castro’s five points, which are so warmly defended by the Chinese. But on all the evidence, we have here only plain hypocrisy; for, in the situation of the Soviet Union, which was directly playing an essential role, support for the five points could mean only a subordination of agreement with Kennedy to acceptance on his part of the Cuban demands. On the contrary, Khrushchev withdrew not only the missiles but also aircraft, without even trying to obtain anything on the lines of the five points which consequently have for him only a purely propaganda value.

As for the more general themes of the polemic, the Soviet has put up yet once more the idea that “even before the complete victory of socialism over the earth, while capitalism still exists in some regions of the world, there will be the real possibility of eliminating world war from the life of society.” (16)

Moreover, they have proclaimed that the merit is theirs if war has not broken out on various occasions, and that Soviet aid to colonial revolutions has played a very important role. Going even further in his own defence, Khrushchev has challenged the Albanians to name a single example of a Communist Party which, in a revolutionary situation, was advised by the CPSU to renounce a perspective of armed struggle.

We do not know if the Albanians have as yet replied. In any case, let us come to the aid of the Soviet leader’s failing memory. That Stalin “advised against” a revolutionary line in China at the crucial moment, is generally admitted. This example alone would suffice, from the fact that it concerns a revolution by a people numbering 600 million! But, in the case of Yugoslavia, a similar thing happened. According to Stalin, the struggle of the Yugoslavs should not have had socialist aims, but should have implied a collaboration with the “anti-fascist”, “progressive” bourgeoisie; and it

was essentially against his instructions that the resistance movement in Yugoslavia was fairly rapidly transformed into a movement for social emancipation. Last but not least: Moscow's prolonged control over the C.P.'s of Latin America led these parties to adopt a line bearing no relation to the needs of the Latin-American revolution—a fact made absolutely clear by the Cuban revolution, which was born, grew up and reached the stage of socialist construction not under the leadership of, but despite, the Cuban Communists, faithful to the Kremlin. (17) Do we need to add, for example, that in the case of the Iraqi revolutions the Khrushchev line thwarted its logical development, that the USSR waited until Evian to recognize the GPRC and that in the critical months through which the economy of independent Algeria is passing, it has not yet undertaken to furnish the technical and economic aid which is nevertheless so necessary?

Moreover, the case of Cuba allows us to understand another disagreement bearing on policy towards the colonial and semi-colonial world. Of course when a revolution is victorious and is threatened by imperialism, the Soviet bureaucracy itself is obliged in its own interest to express its solidarity which includes economic and military aid. But the Cuban experience has changed the Kremlin's fundamental line, which remains that of seeking an alliance with the national bourgeoisies of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, a line obviously implying that one does not in any way encourage—on the contrary!—the socialist development of the colonial revolution. The Chinese, on the contrary, extol the Cuban example, considering it as no isolated or unique case, and on the other hand they do not fail to raise again from time to time the theme of uninterrupted revolution. The disagreement is thus quite evident, even if the Chinese themselves need to be clearer on this fundamental problem for the sector of the world in which, at the present stage, they have the best chance of making their viewpoint triumph.

But the essential content of the Soviet leader's reply in *Pravda* is revealed above all by the enumeration of the tasks of the Communist movement in its struggle against imperialism, namely: to develop the economy of socialist society in such a way that the socialist countries exert a more and more decisive influence on historical development; to pursue a foreign policy of peace that can weaken imperialism and facilitate the struggle of the peoples for their liberty and independence, avoiding any attitude that may assist imperialism in its manoeuvres to divide the forces of peace; to be vigilant in the face of imperialism and ensure the efficient military defence of the socialist camp; to unmask tirelessly the war schemes of the imperialists, to organize better the forces of peace and intensify the activity of the masses for peace, collaborating also with the states which have no interest in new wars; to reinforce the ties with the states of Africa and Latin America which are striving to win or reinforce their independence, to aid the national liberation movement; to contribute to ensuring the collaboration of all the groups and organisations of the international working class. Nothing, absolutely nothing, on the role of the struggle by the international proletariat for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, which nevertheless still represents the supreme guarantee against the danger of a nuclear holocaust!

All this shows clearly that Khrushchev clings more than ever to his conception of the passage from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, a conception that revolutionary Marxists have ceaselessly denounced. For him the principal factor, which in the last analysis is going to decide everything, is the economic development of the Soviet Union and the other workers' states; the struggle of the colonial peoples and of the proletarians of the advanced countries is an auxiliary force which will play only a subordinate role. (18) It is clear that, not just revolutionary Marxists, but the Chinese communists also, can only reject such a perspective, which quite simply wipes out the factor "revolution" and may be justly characterised as reformist—or, if it is preferred, as reformist in a new way.

An International confrontation: the Attitude of the Cubans

To the extent that the Sino-Soviet polemic has widened out on to all the fundamental questions of our epoch, involving at the same time contemporary political events in which others besides the Soviet and China were directly concerned, it has become and is becoming more and more a major confrontation in the world communist movement, among the different tendencies which exist or are prefigured internationally as well as nationally. It is on the other hand clear that, despite all the bureaucratic fictions, the adherence by a leadership to one or the other orientation does not at all imply that unanimity reigns in the ranks.

Khrushchev has succeeded up to now in preserving and reinforcing his position. He has with him in fact the parties of the people's democracies and of the capitalist countries, as well as a whole important series of parties of the colonial or semi-colonial countries, which constitute a large enough majority. But first of all, his camp is not without cracks and differentiation in its very heart: it is clear, in fact, that Togliatti's orientation is quite different from that of Thorez, Gomulka's from Novotny's. There are moreover some parties, even powerful ones (19) which have not wanted to declare themselves clearly, as long as knowledge is lacking on the exact relationship of forces between the different currents which effectively exist in a series of Latin-American or African Communist Parties. This means that the party remains "open", and it would be a gross error to estimate the strength and, still more, the possibilities of the Chinese, on the basis of the mediocre tally of their present allies.

We have repeatedly emphasized that the Yugoslav Communists represented a third tendency in the international Communist movement, whose more positive contribution lies in the experience of workers' councils and the elaboration of a series of quite valid ideas on the question of organization of a socialist democracy. This contribution, the significance in the eyes of the small countries especially of their struggle against tutelage by the Stalinist bureaucracy, and finally the practical aid they have given to certain revolutionary movements (21), have created throughout the world wide currents of sympathy with the Yugoslavs, not to mention Titoist currents which without doubt exist in the workers' states.

But, in spite of this, it is difficult at the present stage for the Yugoslav tendency to become an important tendency on the international scale. In fact, on the chief problems like the orientation towards the national bourgeoisie of the Third World, like co-existence and war, like the roads towards socialism which are basically the problems on which a selection of position is made, the positions of the Yugoslav League are absolutely rightwing and often plainly revisionist. On that level, moreover, they are in danger of appearing as the spearhead of Khrushchevism, being able to state earlier and more explicitly what Khrushchev cannot present to his troops except in successive stages and in a softened version.

It is the Fidelist movement, by contrast, which is playing and will play in future an international role. Born in a completely original form, inspired continuously by a living revolution and stimulated by the objective situation of the whole of Latin America, Fidelism has been able to express a clear and fundamentally Marxist revolutionary line on many key-problems, calling forth a powerful wave in its favour particularly in the countries of South and Central America. It is true that the Cuban leadership has not committed itself in respect of the differences of the communist movement and that Castro has underlined energetically the necessity to maintain unity. This is logical on his part, for Cuba has need of support from all Workers States and in particular cannot compromise the considerable economic aid brought to it by the S.U. (in this domain China would not be in a condition to effectively take over the replacement).

But, if one recalls the basic orientation of the Cuban revolutionaries expressed in a masterful manner in the Second Havana Declaration and their most recent formulations, it is absolutely evident that the Fidelist movement is much closer to the Chinese tendency than to that of the Soviet leadership. In connection with the solution of the crisis in the Caribbean—which involves the more general question of co-existence—the Cuban criticisms of the S.U. especially in connection with inspection by the U.N.O. and the “assurances” of Kennedy—are known. “What is of greatest interest?” Castro declared to the Secretary of the U.N.O. “is not to pay a price for peace now, but to guarantee peace in a definite manner and not to pay every day the price of an imagined peace” (22)

“I wish to state in the first place”, said Castro at the Congress of American Women”, that for us the Caribbean crisis has not been resolved. I wish to say that our opinion, the opinion of the revolutionary leadership of the country, is that a war has been avoided, but peace has not been won: these are two different things.....We do not trust Kennedy’s declarations, and what is more, Kennedy has declared nothing. If he made some promises, he has already withdrawn them” (23).

It is a year since the Second Declaration of Havana defined the line for the whole of Latin America, derived from the victorious Cuban experience. In spite of some minor omissions, this was in reality a rejection of the orientation of the Communist Parties of Latin America (confirmed by the conference of the 81). To the collaboration with the

national bourgeoisie in search of the creation of “independent national democratic states” was opposed consistent revolutionary struggle, basically inspired by the theory of the permanent revolution. To the chatter about the peaceful parliamentary roads—paradoxically indulged in by the Communist Parties in countries where there is not a shadow of a parliament and democracy is but a tragi-comical farce—was opposed the necessity of armed struggle, based in the first place on the poor peasantry. In his speech to the American Women, Castro returned more explicitly than ever to all these questions by aligning himself in a reserved manner with the “brother countries” in respect of the Declaration of Havana and by arguing in a very lively manner against the theoreticians of peaceful roads who have gone as far as to present the revolution itself as an example of a peaceful road. (24).

Since there are involved here for a large part of Latin America, problems of burning contemporary significance, problems which imply questions of orientation and of struggle, the break-out of which is very close or immediate, a conflict between the orientation which still dominates the leaders of the Latin American C.P.’s and the Fidelist lines is inevitable—in fact it has been developing already for a certain time more or less openly. It is easy to foresee that aided by the objective conditions, Castro has great chances of making considerable gains, be it by stimulating almost everywhere the development of new revolutionary movements, or by pushing forward a “Cuban” wing in certain C.P.’s. In this eventuality, Fidelism will appear more than ever as a trend of international communism, which due to its highly progressive aspects could extend its influence to other parties in the world and even to the Workers States themselves. (25).

This is the possible dynamic that Khrushchev should consider to form a more realistic picture of the different forces which are present.

Is a compromise possible ?

The bureaucratic leadership engaged in the conflict—both on the part of the Soviet as well as on that of the Chinese are more and more aware of the danger which the following up and the deepening of such a conflict implies for them, beyond the conscious intentions involved. They are aware that in the long run it will even become impossible for the most shut off leaderships to impose from above a “unanimous” position without the differences growing in the midst of each party. Hence the attempts to hide the polemics during a whole period or to use as scapegoats Tirana and Belgrade, the mutual accusations of having fired the first shot, the different propositions on the duty not to attack brother parties and not to intervene in the internal questions of a Workers’ State or of a Communist Party. What has particularly aroused scandal among the Moscow bureaucrats were the affirmations of the Chinese concerning the minority that could be right and majorities which could be only temporary. In a number of articles—of which those in “Pravda” were already quoted—the Soviet bureaucrats attacked with violence—as if the Chinese who after all had merely recalled a basic truism which no one would have dreamt of challenging at the time

of Lenin—had committed an irredeemable crime! It is true that from point of view of the bureaucracy it could be a crime to spread “dangerous” ideas, some of which might be drawn towards a generalisation of their application. (26)

All this, added to the real necessity to oppose a united front to the moves of world imperialism, creates from time to time a drive towards the seeking of a compromise. As we know, the most serious attempt in this direction was the conference of the 81, the results of which have proved in all cases shortlived. (27). Before the congress of the S. E. D. at East Berlin we thought that there would be a new attempt to redress, at least partly, a situation which had become sufficiently grave. In fact, the Chinese proposed an international congress which would decide the controversial questions while the the Soviet bureaucrats advanced the idea of an extended truce. In all cases it was, in the concrete context, much less the case of an attempt for a tactical compromise than that of tactical skirmishes directed above all to show certain “natural” parties that the responsibility for the tension which has arisen will fall on the others.

To be sure, it is possible that there are other possibilities which are more serious, even ones followed by a truce as we have already experienced. But once again, every solution that would be sought along that road would be only temporary—utterly temporary. The problems under discussion, let us repeat are fundamental problems of this historical stage: no convenient veering away is possible in the long run; especially so since our analysis of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, of the Workers’ States and of the advanced capitalist countries lead us to the conviction that in all domains there will be generally more and more sharp conflicts, more and more open conflicts and nobody will be able to escape from the decisive choice. In the final analysis the result of this whole period of internal crisis of the communist movement, which has already come into the open for a number of years and which is not near its conclusion, will be a regroupment of forces and positions—the necessary prelude to the powerful renewal of the whole of the international labour movement. The bureaucrats of various denominations will be less and less in a condition to block this process to which they had contributed against their intention by their contradictions and their own differences. The Fourth International has already on many occasions defined its attitude: in the conflicts in which the Chinese C. P. is opposed to the Soviet leadership, it is the former which, on a world scale, defends the most progressive positions which are more akin to the revolutionary Marxist positions (28). We cannot but confirm this evaluation at the moment where the Chinese have further clarified certain important points.

All the same the Chinese are hamstrung by sufficiently grave handicaps.

Here we do not refer so much to the material handicaps which do not permit China to do what the U.S.S.R. can do on the level of economic and technical aid—this factor plays a part, as we have seen—but rather to certain positions of the Chinese which are an obstacle to the penetration of their ideas.

We have said a few words on their further definition of their line on the character of destruction by nuclear war. With reference to the colonial revolution they are far from having the clarity of Fidel Castro and they are also inclined towards casual flirtations with the national bourgeoisies. As for the capitalist countries—in spite of articles like that against Togliatti they limit themselves too often to summary analyses, in which the economic situation appears to be judged by completely general schemes rather than by a minute knowledge of the facts.

But their fundamental weakness which Khrushchev and his supporters exploit to the full, is their alliance with Albania and their ties with Stalinist groups in the Soviet Union (the Molotov–Kaganovitch Group) When the Chinese press publishes every day dithyrambic eulogies of Enver Hodja, who openly declares himself a Stalinist, they offer the opportunity to their opponents to accuse them of being nostalgic followers of the “cult of the personality”: which may appear so much more justified since on the problem of de-Stalinisation generally the Chinese have not ceased to maintain silence. At the same time their manner or argument against the Yugoslav communists which recalls stereotyped formulas now fifteen years old are not only of a nature to convince nobody, but, what is worse, discredits those who use it (29).

All this has explanations of which we ourselves have spoken. But the contradiction springs from the fact that the Chinese have in reality not at all a Stalinist orientation, either in international politics or in internal politics (especially economic), even though the country was and still is passing through a phase of an undeniable bureaucratic tightening (30). With even more reason, will the Chinese be constantly driven towards a clarification of their positions on this question also the importance of which within the very scope of the current conflict, they could not underestimate. In the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties, those which would tolerate being considered Stalinists, without reacting can have no success at all. This is even more true for the Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies. If in the final analysis, the internal process in the C.P. of the S.U. itself, will play a part of the first importance in the outcome of the controversy, those who give free rein to doubt concerning their positions in the face of de-Stalinisation, go forth defeated in advance. Not retarded Stalinists but “reformers” who are more consistent than Khrushchev may eventually toll the bell for Khrushchev’s clique.

We are, besides, convinced that here too, the future has other spectacular events in store for us.

FOOT NOTES

- (1) See the article in the *People’s Daily*, reproduced by *Hsinhua Daily Bulletin* of the 15th December 1962.
- (2) On the first stage of the conflict see our article in the *Quatrieme Internationale*, October—November 1960,
- (3) See the article in *Red Flag*, *Hsinhua Daily Bulletin*, 17th November.
- (4) With regard to the official position of the *Fourth International* on the Sino-Indian conflict, see *Quatrieme Internationale*, December 1962,

- (5) See, for example, the already cited article of the 15th December and the address of the Chinese delegate at the East Berlin Congress.
- (6) See especially the articles from Chinese sources reprinted by *Hsinhua Daily Bulletin* of the 31st October, of the 1st, 5th and 30th November. An article of the 15th November contains the following passage: "The experience of history shows that the more resolute the struggle against imperialism, the more the peace of the world will be safeguarded. On the other hand, if one draws back, if one bends over backwards and even begs for peace from imperialism at the expense of the revolutionary people, one will only encourage imperialism to develop in a more aggressive fashion its politics of aggression and war."
- (7) See the resolution of the International Secretariat on the Caribbean crisis (*Quatrieme Internationale*, December 1962) and on the Berlin Crisis (In November 1961).
- (8) See in particular the article of the 31st December already cited.
- (9) In part the Chinese hold to the position, defended also in a passage in the Moscow Resolution (1960), according to which, if war broke out, the general result would be the destruction of capitalism. On the other hand they advance the suggestion of an agreement to exclude the use of nuclear arms on the pattern of the agreements reached in the past with regard to chemical and bacteriological arms (cf. ib.)
- (10) The article against Togliatti is that of the 31st December published in full in the Chinese bulletin of January 1st 1963.
- (11) See the text in the *Hsinhua Daily Bulletin*, 6th January 1963.
- (12) It is now known that Stalin advised the Chinese to come to terms with Chiang-Kai-Shek at any price, and that it was against his advice that the Chinese Communists adopted the perspective of civil war.
- (13) See in particular the text published in *Pravda* on 7-1-63 and the address by Khrushchev to the Congress in East Berlin.
- (14) In East Berlin the Soviet leader spoke of nuclear war in a particularly dramatic tone, envisaged, in fact, irreparable destruction and carnage in the event of war.
- (15) According to the version appearing in *l'Unita*, organ of the Italian CP, Khrushchev said in his speech to the Supreme Soviet on December 22: "If we did not believe in Kennedy's word, we would then have to acknowledge that humanity has only the perspective of mutual destruction." The perspective of the revolutionary struggle first to paralyse and then to destroy imperialism is here quite simply forgotten!
- (16) They are repeating a passage from the Moscow Conference Declaration (1960).
- (17) A text considered fundamental by those concerned—the Moscow Declaration of 1960—is visibly embarrassed by the Cuban phenomenon, which eludes its arbitrary scheme of the so-called state of national democracy, and ignorance of the true nature of the Castro revolution and its fundamental lesson, which implies a striking confirmation of the theory of permanent revolution. The new program of the CPSU—which moreover has pretensions to being an organic historical and theoretical synthesis—does not breathe a single word about the Cuban revolution, that is to say, about the historic event of the first socialist revolution on the American continent!
- (18) The clearest expression of Khrushchevism is to be found in the following passage from the report by Khrushchev himself on the 81-Parties Conference:
- "The victory of the USSR in the economic competition with the USA, and the victory of the socialist system as a whole over the capitalist system, will mark a radical turning-point in history, will exert an even greater influence on the workers' movement throughout the entire world. Then it will be clear even to the most undecided that socialism alone brings all that man needs for a happy life, and they will make their choice in favour of socialism. To win time in the economic competition with capitalism: that is today the most important thing."
- (19) In prime position the Indonesian CP, which on the one hand can hardly escape China's influence upon its own masses, but on the other follows a policy of extreme collaboration with the bourgeois-national Soekarno in the "best" Khrushchevist style.
- (20) The present line of the South African CP, for instance, comes closer to the Chinese orientation than to that of the CPSU.
- (21) Latest example: the quick and important aid in tractors to the new Algerian state, at a moment very critical economically.
- (22) It is indicative of his attitude towards the masses—that Fidel Castro read on television the shorthand text of his talks with U Thant.
- (23) We are quoting from the text published by *Hsinhua Daily Bulletin*, 18th January, 1963.
- (24) One has heard of "Theoreticians" of such a kind, for example in the Italian C.P. Besides, it is necessary to recall that after the talk of Mikoyan to the 20th Congress even the Chinese revolution would be an example of a peaceful road. In his quoted speech Castro accuses the revolutionary organisations in some "brother countries" of having "locked up in a drawer the Declaration of Havana instead of making it circulate, as it would deserve." As regards the roads towards Socialism, without denying completely the possibility of a "peaceful" transition ("we are not dogmatic") he emphasizes that until now there is not one example of that, and that in any case the revolutionary road imposes itself on Latin America.
- (25) The events of March 1962 (the sacking of d'Escalante) and Castro's speeches at the time indicate that the Cubans have placed

(Continued on page 27)

IMPERIALIST RULE CONTINUES IN JAMAICA

By BEN MONROE

After the 6th of August the reigning British Monarch remains at the head of the Jamaican State, and a British Governor General, who acts under orders of the imperialist Government of Britain, is placed at the head of the Jamaican Parliament to obstruct the democratic will of the Jamaican people—Is this political independence ?

It is true that greater powers of rule have been handed over to the ruling capitalist clique of our country—the “Bustamante-Manley clique”—but this is in alliance with the continued rule of imperialism; expressing their partnership in the rule of the country and the plunder of the country’s wealth.

Indeed you have been induced by the oppressors of your country—imperialist Britain and the United States and their native partners—the “Bustamante-Manley clique”—to join them in their celebration of the fake independence of Jamaica.

This celebration, which the oppressors made merry from their plunder of the country’s wealth, did not have any real meaning to the solution of your problems—the problems of mass unemployment, houselessness, nakedness, illiteracy and disease—in general, your problems of abject poverty. Of course, it is their rule of the country—denying you the right to the land and the wealth thereof produced—which have generated these adverse economic and social conditions in which you are engulfed, expressed by your backward living standard. That is why their independence celebration was not rightly for you and could not have signified the end to the long years of imperialist subjugation of our country, nor an end to the enslavement of our people—as in other countries whose independence

celebration has been an expression of real joy marking the turn in their history of suffering imposed upon them by alien rule.

In our country it is the imperialist rulers and their lackeys—the national traitors—who tell us that they have made us free and bade us to celebrate, while their battle-ships with thousands of troops sailed into our harbours with guns trained towards our shores, and their war-planes, hovering overhead, ready for the mass destruction of our city and towns and the homes of our people if we dared to protest this “fraud”. Indeed this was the real characterisation of an oppressors, independence, intimidating the will of our people.

“TREACHERY OF THE BUSTAMANTE-MANLEY CLIQUE”

The subjugation of Jamaica’s sovereignty and the enslavement of our people, by British and United States imperialism in the main, has been prolonged by the very constitutional act which was supposed to make Jamaica a free nation. The August 6 proclamation has, on the contrary established the constitutional rights of imperialism to continued possession of our land and wealth and domination over our people; and, has continued to deny the Jamaican people their right to oppose imperialist oppression and plunder.

Of course, it was not you the Jamaican people who decided that the political status of your country should be after August 6, but imperialist Britain and the treacherous “Bustamante-Manley clique”. And despite these constitutional safe-guards to ensure them that the status-quo remains suitable for imperialist plunder, new military subjugation of Jamaica’s sovereignty, through

the Organisation of American States, is being plotted by the "Bustamante-Manley clique", British and United States imperialism.

We earlier warned of their treachery which was openly displayed in the signing of the "West Indies—U.S. Base Treaty" by the "Bustamante-Manley clique" and other treacherous West Indians, giving United States imperialism the legal authority for military occupation of our country.

This was shattered by the Jamaican people when they struck the "Federation" a death blow.

Now, new military agreements with the United States, to be effected through the Organisation of American States, is proposed by the Bustamante-Manley clique—also the expressed aim of the Manley clique.

We must again state that any military agreements which permits the United States to free military access of Jamaican soil or to establish a military machine controlled and directed by United States military personnel, will in fact be further subjugation of the country's sovereignty.

The question which may be uppermost in your minds is, "why would the Bustamante-Manley clique be aiming to do this?"

But what must be understood is that although this reactionary native capitalist clique is jealous of imperialist plunder and is deeply desirous of taking over full control of the country, their fear of the oppressed mass is what supersedes their envy of imperialism. They are therefore not willing to part company with imperialism.

More-over, once imperialism had drawn the countries of the world into its function the independence of capitalist nations ceased to be a reality—in truth, all nations of the world entered the stage of inter-dependence, an irreversible fact in the socio-economic development of all nations.

On the other hand, it is said that imperialism has been willingly giving the colonies freedom, but this saying contradicts objective reality—it is the subjugation of

nations and the plunder of their wealth by which imperialism maintains its existence. Nay, imperialism will make every effort to maintain its oppression of nations and peoples to satisfy its greed.

Its sharing of power with the reactionary colonial capitalist class is on the basis of their established economic relationship. Herein lies the reason of the military pacts between imperialism and the reactionary capitalist Governments of the subjugated countries, spawning the globe, an essential feature of this new phase of imperialist colonialisation, in which the colonial capitalists willingly act as functionaries of imperialism—monopoly capitalism.

"THE AIMS OF UNITED STATES IMPERIALISM"

On August 7th, just after the formal independence ceremony ended in the Jamaican Parliament, a remarkable event took place—United States Vice-President, Lynden Johnson, drove to our city square and distributed hundreds of United States flags to the Jamaican people, inducing them to raise over their heads the symbol of Yankee rule. This is a true sign of United States intention to gobble up our tiny nation desperately struggling for freedom from long years of servitude.

This reminds us of the close of the 19th century when the people of Puerto-Rico and Cuba, after a bloody war with Spain in their struggle for freedom, were swallowed up by United States imperialism who pretended to be a liberator and defender of freedom.

The difference here in Jamaica is that it is not by the condition of war which imperialist Britain is giving way to the United States, it is by U.S. economic penetration into Jamaica over recent years—a factor evident in all British possessions, arising from the weakening of imperialist Britain by the two world wars and its reliance upon United States imperialism to bolster its existence as a colonial power against the rise in the tempo of the colonial revolution.

The planning to replace British military occupation of Jamaica with United States military occupation is the result of United

States economic penetration of the territory; characteristic of United States military occupation of many countries of the world.

The matter of the proposed entry of Jamaica into the Organisation of American States must be fully regarded by the Jamaican people with the seriousness it deserves.

Under the cloak of defence of the territories of America, United States imperialism has been putting millions of dollars of arms at the disposal of the Latin American dictators to suppress the democratic will of the teeming millions of Latin American people.

It is United States arms, directed through the Organisation of American States, which overthrew the democratically elected Governments of Guatemala, Argentina and Peru over the last decade and gave rise to the huge military machines repressing the mass of workers and peasants, students and intellectuals, and all those who stand on the side of democracy for the broad mass of people. And to make special mention it was United States arms, channelled through the Organisation of American States, which bolstered the Trojillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic for over three decades of barbarous rule, and the Batista dictatorship in Cuba which slaughtered more than twenty thousand Cubans in its last six years of rule, shackling the will of the Cuban people.

It is not only in this part of the world that United States imperialism, through military treaties, has been responsible for the slaughter of millions of men, women and children obstructing the will of the great majority. In Europe, Asia and Africa these monstrous crimes are also being committed by United States imperialism.

On the one hand while the United States talks in the United Nations Organisation of the liberation of the colonial peoples, on the other it is United States arms, channelled through the many military treaties with existing colonial powers, which is bolstering colonial rule. It is United States arms which is slaughtering the peoples of Congo, Angola and the countries of South East Asia. It was United States arms which bolstered French rule in Algeria in the eight years of liberation war fought by the Algerian people, drenching that country in human blood.

But what more could be expected of imperialist United States—a nation in whose very borders the rights of over thirty million citizens is ruthlessly suppressed because the colour of their skin happens to be black?

The Jamaican people will surely be committed to Yankee barbarism if they permit United States military interference into their country.

The United States cunningly refused a base offer on the grounds of world opposition to imperialist military occupation of foreign territories, and for the fact that they calculate that concerning Jamaica, conditions permit the gradual buildup of a massive local force controlled and directed by both United States and British military personnel, aided through the Organisation of American States.

By this means, United States imperialism has been able to shield itself of the blame of ruthless suppression of the peoples of many countries—of Latin America in the main—bringing the native army officers under the corrupting influence of the dollar.

The status-quo in Jamaica which permits this manoeuvre of United States imperialism is in sharp contrast with objective conditions in other countries, such as the countries of South East Asia, where United States troops are occupying these territories against the will of the people.

The treacherous “Bustamante-Manley clique”, in justification of their aim to install Yankee military rule over Jamaica, talks of the defence of the “Western World” as if threatened by a major invasion.

The only threat facing the “Western World” is the threat of social revolution generated by social oppression, the denial of food to the hungry, clothes to the naked, homes to the shelterless, in general, the denial of a civilised existence to the mass people, when civilisation brings plenty to the door of all mankind and this condition is fostered by the reactionary rule of imperialism itself.

What must then be said of the treacherous “Bustamante-Manley clique” is that they have aligned themselves on the side of imperialism and world reaction for the

continued oppression of mankind, and that is the position which they seek to defend.

United States military operation upon Jamaican soil would also pose a new threat to the Sovereignty of Cuba. United States imperialism have made no secret of its aims of aggression upon Cuba, using foreign territories to carry out intrigues, as in the case of the ill-fated "April invasion".

More-over, Cuban counter-revolutionary bands, supported by the United States, have already been operating in our country and now seek legal status from the present regime—indicated by the "Daily Gleaner" of the 14/8/62. But the Jamaican people must be reminded that those who provoke war will only reap the flames of war.

"Citizens of Jamaica! we must not surrender our sovereignty to United States imperialism, it is we who will suffer the humiliation of Yankee domination and bleed from their bayonets and bullets. Nor must we give access to the United States and its bands of counter-revolutionary Cuban renegades to stay on our soil and carry out aggression against the People's Government of Cuba. We must respect the sovereignty of all nations, just as how we are now struggling that imperialism yield our sovereignty. More-over, the struggle of the Cuban nation means something special to us, it illuminates the path we must take to win our sovereignty.

We must therefore rise up in protest against new military subjugation of our country's sovereignty by United States imperialism, aimed at us through the Organisation of American States.

We must demand our democratic right to decide the committal of our country to any international agreement.

We must firmly place ourselves on the side of the people of the world struggling to establish a lasting peace—on the side of the peoples of the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Australia and particularly the peoples of the Socialist countries who have earnestly demonstrated their desire for a lasting world peace. We cannot for one moment contemplate to be on

the side of imperialism which provokes war and threatens the annihilation of mankind.

What we seek is the conquest of a full and prosperous life, that which civilisation holds in store for us, that which only by owning and controlling the national resources—our resources—the land, mines, factories and services by which the wealth of the country is created and distributed, but which are now controlled by imperialism and the reactionary "Bustamante-Manley clique"—and by using them to erase our poverty fully satisfying our material needs and aid our cultural advancement, can it be achieved.

This is not only our objective, but also that of our fore-fathers and the people the world over in all phases of their history. And this is by no means an unjust desire but justly based upon the achievement of our social labour.

It is only those who have been serving the cause of reaction in history—those who have been plundering and dispossessing mankind of the products of their social labour—who have been obstructing the desire of humanity for social progress.

Today it is imperialism which exists, as the core of reaction—oppressing and plundering—that is why we seek to uproot imperialism from our country.

"EXTEND THE STRUGGLE FOR A DEMOCRACY FOR THE MASSES"

Concerning the real political independence of our country, immediate steps must be taken to re-new our agitation for a new constitution for Jamaica, decided upon by the broad mass of the Jamaican people, which must remove all traits of colonial subjugation vested in the present constitution.

It is the extent of political changes effecting the grip of the broad mass of people upon the rule of the country which will enable the extent of their economic and social advancement, for it is the political power of social classes which reflects their economic and social position.

The present arbitrary powers vested in the hands of Britain and the reactionary "Busta-

mante-Manley clique" reflects their present economic domination of the country—partnership in the ownership of the land, mines, factories, services and other sources of wealth dispossessing the Jamaican masses.

The struggle for economic and social advancement of the Jamaican masses is therefore a struggle to strip this reactionary "partnership" of their present economic control of the country, which must be preceded by their gaining of political power.

At present in our country 77 percent of the farm population is forced to live from 14 percent of the country's farm lands, while 350 people—0.8 percent of the total farmers now engaged in farming—owns 45 percent of the country's total farm lands.

And if these tens of thousands of destitute peasant families must be assured of a civilised means of existence, they can only do so by getting land and the necessary services which they are now deprived of by the reactionary "partnership".

The present unemployment rate in our country is in the region of a third of the country's total labour force. And on the other hand more than half the employed workers are receiving an average wage of £2 weekly, while the minimum rate of earning established by Government to enable a civilised living standard for an individual is fixed at £300 yearly.

And if workers must rid themselves of the menace of unemployment, advance their wage levels and improve their living standard to a civilised status, they can only do so by their victorious struggles directed to that end against the plunder of the reactionary "partnership", which must in the end culminate in the workers taking out of their control the factories, services and all means of production and distribution of wealth.

But in this struggle to strip the reactionary "partnership" of economic power, the oppressed mass will first have to contend with their arbitrary powers of rule made legal by the present reactionary constitution and must therefore first seek to dispossess them of these powers. For it is precisely in the struggle for economic and social advancement, which strikes at the interests

of this reactionary "partnership," whose political powers are used to obstruct this advancement.

"THE ESSENTIAL TASK OF THE TRADE UNIONS IN THIS PERIOD"

In this period of struggle the workers Trade Unions have a very special task to perform. It must vigorously advance the struggle of the workers against the exploitation of their labour by monopoly capital and against reactionary Government policies, in defence of their democratic rights.

This struggle must be advanced around a labour programme which entails basic demands of the workers, such as:-

- (a) Higher wages in accordance with the cost of living.
- (b) A standard work week of forty hours without the reduction of pay.
- (c) Social securities for all workers
- (d) Equal wages and social benefits to all women workers as to that of men.
- (e) That Trade Unions have the right to collective bargaining with Govt. concerning all problems affecting workers,
- (f) Immediately seek to repeal the anti-labour laws which obstruct democratic Trade Union action.
- (g) Defend the struggle of the unemployed seeking jobs.

Concerning the latter, the need to embrace this great force is made evident from the fact that the unemployed are constantly used to undermine the Trade Union struggle, and in order to strengthen their struggle against monopoly capital the great force of the unemployed must be turned into an ally of the Trade Unions.

In the process of this struggle the workers are compelled to rid their Trade Unions of servility imposed by Union Officials, which have been deforming the Trade Unions and aiding monopoly capital in its exploitation of the workers.

An essential step to be taken in this direction is the establishing of workers committees in the various places of work, based upon the broadest democratic principles. This will first establish greater unity among workers in their respective places of work,

and enable greater understanding of the many issues around which their struggle will be carried, placing them in a better position to rebuff the treacherous actions of the Union Officials.

The Trade Unions, in their struggle for the advancement of the workers and in defence of their democratic rights, is destined to play an essential role in the struggle of the whole mass for economic and social advancement and for a People's Democracy. It must therefore be conditioned for its historical role.

“THE POSITION OF THE MIDDLE CLASSES”

Concerning the middle classes in our country, who are constituted in the main of the middle peasants, small factory owners and small merchant class, they too are deeply affected by this reactionary alliance dominating the country, and, must play their part on the side of the oppressed masses to effect genuine political changes in the rule of the country—changes effecting broad democracy.

The middle peasants have long been experiencing the barriers of market and the lack of genuine aid to enable their development of farming on a modern scale. This barrier has been effected by the subjugation of the country's agricultural development to facilitate the marketing of foreign farm products in the country.

The struggle of these middle peasants, carried through existing peasants organisations, to effect changes in political administration and reverse the subjugation policy, comes upon further barriers imposed by the reactionary rule, which tends to muzzle these organisations and render them impotent—evidenced by the effecting of Government's dictatorship over these organisations.

And with the rise in the cost of farm labour deepens the contradictions which tends towards the perishing of the middle peasants as a social class.

Threatened with this situation, the middle peasants seek to bolster their position against the further rise in labour costs—as seen in the recent joint declaration of the farmers

organisations to fight the effort of Trade Unions to improve wage levels of farm labour—attempting to impose a barrier against the advancement of the very low living standard of these workers, and, going over on the side of imperialism and the “Bustamante-Manley clique” in this instance.

But the present trend of development in which they are engulfed—perishing as a social class—is irreversible; and the step they have taken will only weaken their position in the struggle against the reactionary alliance of imperialism and the “Bustamante-Manley clique; for they are breaking ties with their most able and reliable ally, the workers, to stand isolated and be crushed. For the principled position of imperialism concerning agrarian development within the subjugated countries cannot be altered—imperialism will always endeavour to maintain its subjugation of agrarian development in colonial and semi-colonial countries in the effort to preserve its present sphere of market.

And with Britain's aim to enter the European common market, the peril of further subjugation looms ahead with the penetration of the European States concerned into British Market.

The middle peasants must therefore place themselves on the side of the oppressed masses and enhance the struggle against this reactionary alliance rule in our country. They must aid in the wresting of political power from the hands of the reactionary clique—so that political power can be shared by the broad masses.

The Farmers Organisations, because of their composition of social forces, therefore have within this period an equally special task to perform. They must work towards effecting fundamental changes within the country's economic policy which at present subjugates the country's agrarian development. And in doing so, seek to win the support of the mass of peasants by genuinely taking up their problems as an inseparable part of the struggle.

Equally important is that the farmers must make every effort to destroy bureaucratic control exercised over their organisations—

both from within and that being imposed upon them by Government, in order that their full strength can be realised in the struggle.

It is also important that the struggle of the farmers be carried upon a programme entailing basic demands of the farmers, such as follows:-

- (a) Establish full democracy within all farmers organisation and that these organisations act as the co-relating bodies between farmers and Government concerning all agrarian problems.
- (b) Land to be made available to all those willing to farm.
- (c) Modern farm tools, tractor service, scientific knowledge, fertilizers seedlings etc., to be made available to all farmers.
- (d) Adequate water supply, electrification, good roads and a modern transportation system.
- (e) Guaranteed market and a modern marketing system.
- (f) Loans and credit to all farmers requiring such to enable them to meet basic domestic requirement during periods between harvest, enabling better conditions of existence for farmers during this period.
- (g) That all phases of the implementation of such programme be free from the control of private interests.
- (h) That modern dwellings be constructed for all farmers thus in need as an inseparable part of the programme for agrarian development. Equally to this must be the modernisation of rural towns equipped with every necessary public service and facilities.

Once the farmers organisation takes up the struggle for the implementation of such a programme involving the socio-economic problems of the peasantry in general, they will succeed in playing an effective part in the struggle of the whole mass against the reactionary rule of our country to effect a People's Democracy, and will in the end win.

* * *

The social position of both small native factory owning and merchant classes is relatively the same.

Concerning the former—no protection is given to the small native owned industries against competitive commodities brought in by imperialist trade. These industries therefore perish, or, in their effort to survive, are swallowed up by monopoly capital, changing their independent national status to that of subsidiaries of imperialist monopoly companies; in which this small factory owning class, formerly independent, is transformed into functionaries of monopoly capital. And these subsidiary industries are not permanent, they exist on the fluctuating conditions of imperialist market which in periods of crisis leads to their closing down presently evidenced resulting from the "New York Stock Market tumble." The petty industrial class is thus being swept out of existence by the tide of history, and, hopelessly struggling to maintain their independent social status is being drawn over on the side of imperialism and reaction.

But they must realise history and support the demand for a reverse of the country's industrialisation policy breaking the economic grip of imperialism upon our country. In which case they too must aid in the wrestling of political power from the hands of the reactionary alliance of imperialism and the "Bustamante-Manley clique", which must be effected in the struggle for a broader democratic rule.

* * *

In the case of the small native merchant class, they too will not be permitted by history to exist as an independent social group—they are presently being swept out of existence by the inroads of monopoly capital into the merchandizing of our country—evidenced in the chain of "Supermarkets" and commercial centres being established throughout the country, pushing the small individual retail shops and stores out of existence. This course is irreversibly leading to the withering away of this class to the level of the socially oppressed mass, and is therefore obligated to aid the masses in their struggle for liberation.

THE TASK OF STUDENTS AND INTELLECTUALS OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

The Students and intellectuals—representatives of particularly the middle layer of society—on account of their privilege to an intellectual up-bringing are called upon to play their special part as an able ally of the oppressed masses, aiding in the struggle for the final liberation of the nation from imperialist subjugation and in the cultural advancement of the masses.

They must contend with the fact that on the side of imperialism—maintaining its culture which is based upon oppression, plunder and war—is to be on the course of reaction in history.

They must be fully aware that particularly within their social layer is concentrated the scientific and technical knowledge for the advancement of the nation.

They must know that it is the service of their class, with all its assets which imperialism has acquired enabling it to oppress millions of human beings and obstruct the general progress of mankind. They too have been made hirelings of imperialism to maintain its existence—the existence of the main force of reaction the world over.

But they must also know and accept that the course of history compels them along the path leading to the advance of civilisation—the inevitable defeat of imperialism and world reaction.

The immediate need to oppose the reactionary alliance of imperialism and the “Bustamante-Manley clique” by all political forces genuinely struggling for national liberation, is made evident by the present bare-faced and wanton abuse of power by this regime disregarding the will of the Jamaican people.

Above all actions, the willingness of Bustamante to commit Jamaica to military agreements with foreign countries even without a parliamentary sitting on the matter demonstrates his preparedness to go outside the bounds of the very parliamentary democracy upon which their rule is based.

And with existing laws giving Ministers of Government arbitrary powers to arrest

and imprison citizens without trial and to muzzle opposition from the people, one can see that it takes little on the part of reaction to transform the present rule of Jamaica to the status of a Latin American dictatorship—in truth this trend of development is towards such an end.

The constitutional powers retained by Britain in the rule of Jamaica must not be expected to block this course of development but on the contrary aids it.

It is imperialism which has been fostering the growth of dictatorships within the subjugated countries by its aid to the most reactionary element among the native capitalist class, for the fact that the establishment of this reactionary alliance—manifested as fascist dictatorships—is in the interests of imperialism, and its only hope of holding down the democratic struggle of the masses in these territories, which, is directed towards the end of imperialist subjugation and plunder.

This very fact has already been experienced over recent years in Jamaica. The ruthless suppression of strikes and other democratic forms of agitation among the masses, and the imposition of reactionary laws upon the country as a step to halt the mass struggle, have all taken place under the guardianship of imperialism; for the reason that the democratic struggle of the Jamaican masses to improve their living standards struck at the very base of imperialist plunder of our country, of which the “Bustamante-Manley clique” have been sharing.

It is therefore evident that the struggle against the rise of a fascist dictatorship in the rule of Jamaica, which looms ahead, can only have the reliance of the social forces earnestly seeking a people’s democracy. And it is these forces which must now toss themselves into the battle against the reactionary alliance of imperialism and the “Bustamante-Manley clique.”

On the part of the middle classes, because of their social status, they are now hesitant to take this road, being led to believe the sayings of the reactionaries that things will soon be better. But existing economic conditions within Jamaica, generated by imperialist subjugation, indicates greater

economic oppression in the very near future, against which the masses will certainly rise up to struggle; a condition which will finally tear down the facade of "bourgeois" parliamentary democracy, unleashing the real barbarous features of their rule. And hesitancy on the part of the middle classes will undoubtedly greatly aid their rule.

It is therefore the task of the intellectual representatives of this social strata, seeing the need for great unity of all social forces sincerely seeking a broader democratic rule, immediately aid in arousing the consciousness of their class to such an end.

And thus, the cardinal factor of the mass struggle in this particular period, is that it must clearly assume the form of a struggle for democracy of the broad mass of the Jamaican people.

"BREAK THE OLD ECONOMIC TIES WITH THE IMPERIALIST NATIONS"

We cannot leave alone the need to break the country's old economic ties with the imperialist nations by which our country is subjugated, and seek to establish new economic relation with all countries wishing to do so for reciprocal benefits.

These economic ties have been in the form of loans and grants, investments and trade.

Concerning the former there could not have been a greater fiasco.

The economic aid required by any country has always been determined on the state of backward socio-economic conditions—relative to the growth of its population and the rate of its economic growth based upon a world standard of social existence. And that this aid is bound to be channelled into a specific type of development.

Under the present condition of a modern world, there can be no real industrialisation without primarily the establishment of basic industries—for example iron and steel, electricity, chemicals, automobile—mainly for heavy duty purposes—and cement, these laying the base upon which other industries will be built without being faced with a bottle-neck position.

Concerning electricity, because of its source of power, it assumes major importance in regards to its greater and greater demand with the process of development of industrialisation. And its production, in accordance with given conditions of its generation in different countries—whether by the flow of rivers, or by the use of coal or oil—may require the aid of other industries.

Along side of this is the need for greater scientific and technical skill which must spring from greater educational facilities.

Because of the need to follow this basic pattern in every under-developed country, it follows that expenditure in this direction is bound to out-weigh that which is directed towards other avenues once real development must take place.

In Jamaica this fact is not shown from a review of the past seventeen years of administration, in which great acclaim have been made of the aid of imperialism in this respect.

Whatever basic industries established into Jamaica have been foreign owned, and function not to aid the further industrialisation of the country, but to assist in the plunder of the country's wealth in the form of profits to the imperialist monopoly companies. While the loans and grants directed to Government have only been used to pave the way for such plunderous investments.

Thus, instead of economic aid, what really takes place is the continuous draining of the country's wealth leaving our people destitute

It is therefore significant that the growth of Jamaica's economic and social problems have exceeded the rate of its economic growth, a development towards chaos.

Beside the standing figures of unemployment, the rate in the rise of unemployment over the last four years have been an average of 16 thousand yearly.

The infant mortality rate in our country now stands at 472 deaths of every thousand live births in last year.

The present need for new houses stands at 300,000 families requirement. And although it was stated by an American housing expert, attached to Government housing programme, that at least twenty thousand new houses must be built each year if this problem must be seriously tackled, Government housing programme have not provided twenty thousand new houses over the last ten years.

Concerning education—according to Government's educational programme over the last seven years, there have been no places provided in elementary schools for an average of over six thousand children each year. And for whatever limited higher educational facilities made available, this have been of no real advantage for thousands whose advanced education and technical training remains latent, with them perishing in the chronic unemployment situation within the country.

And with the lack of other social services within the country, together provides the striking evidence of bankruptcy generated from existing economic ties with the imperialist nations.

The present willingness of the United States to channel aid to Jamaica through the Organisation of American States, to be spent on housing, education and rural water-supply, is also not without reason. This aid is based, as in the case of imperialist Britain, on the condition of surrendering the country's economy to United States imperialism.

More-over, are those in need of houses able to purchase them without first getting jobs and good pay? And are children able to go to school without food and clothing their parents are not able to buy?

We say, if imperialism is earnestly desirous of aiding our development to overcome poverty and backwardness, then release your grip upon our country and cease your plunder of our wealth, for it is by this means which you have made us poor and held down in a primitive stage of existence—give up our land, surrender the factories and services which were built from the plunder of our wealth, and, now using them to the end of more plunder, so that we will be able

to feed our hungry, clothe our naked, shelter our shelterless and enhance our social progress.

We are not fooled by the gifts you are now offering for we know that in truth it is only part of the wealth—the crumbs—of what you have stolen from our shores, and continue to steal daily. We say liberate us if you are so desirous that we should stand as a sovereign nation beside you.

But we are fully aware of your deceptions and know that this you will not do of your own accord, that is why we are prepared to drive you away from our shores.

* * *

On the matter of our trade relation with the imperialist nations, we have been forced, due to their investments in our country manipulating our economy at their will, to buy what they choose to sell us at prices they desire. Yet we cannot sell them what they do not want to buy, and for what they buy they fix the prices.

One of the most glaring examples of subjugation by trade is our bauxite barter deal with the United States.

United States, through this trade agreement, have been dumping on us millions of dollars of their surplus agricultural products yearly, undermining our agricultural development. And on the other hand they have been draining the Bauxite resources of our country at the rate of some 8 million tons yearly over the last four years.

The reactionary "Bustamante-Manley clique" have been saying that if the bauxite barter deal should be annulled, the bauxite industry would go to ruin and so would the country's economy. But could not our bauxite be sold in other countries of the world? More-over, it would be certainly better for us to mine less bauxite yearly and concentrate upon the large scale processing of the ore and the production of the various by-products thus derived; for this process of development would absorb many times the present labour used, circulate more wealth and more widely among the community and boost the economy of our country many times than at present. Certainly, this is the more logical step to take than allowing the

stock-piling of our bauxite in the United States at the rate of over 50 million tons over the last ten years, for with our total reserves estimated at 200 million metric tons, and with the faster rate at which the United States is now preparing to mine, all our bauxite will shortly be gobbled up by the United States.

Imperialist subjugation of our country and plunder of our wealth by unfair trade transactions is evident in all our export trade—sugar, rum, banana, citrus etc.—by their control of the present markets. It is therefore of utmost importance that the present trade ties with the imperialist nations be broken in order to release our country from its present economic bondage, and open new trade ties with countries willing to do so on a mutual basis.

“THREE MAJOR ASPECTS OF THE STRUGGLE”

There are therefore three major aspects of our struggle around which we must promptly engage the reactionary imperialist alliance now dominating our country:—

One—resume agitation for the abolition of this reactionary constitution and for the drafting of a new constitution by the Jamaican people. This will permit the base for a broad struggle against the reactionary alliance rule of imperialism and the “Bustamante-Manley clique”, and greatly aid in effecting the consciousness of the Jamaican people towards real political independence.

Two—oppose United States military subjugation of Jamaica’s sovereignty and all military alignments which threatens the sovereignty of nations, as aimed at through the Organisation of American States, and declare Jamaica on the side of the struggle for peace. This is a direct rebuff of the efforts of imperialism to obstruct the liberation of the Jamaican people and to its aim of war against peace loving peoples.

Three—seek to break Jamaica’s old economic ties with the imperialist nations, opening new ties with countries willing to do so on a mutual basis, and reverse the country’s industrialisation policy to an industrialisation primarily to satisfy the economic needs of the nation. This step is towards the reorientation of the country’s economy, without which there can be no solution to Jamaica’s economic social problems.

In the effecting of this task it is essential to draw into the struggle the broadest—representation of social forces, in order that the will of the broad masses be expressed and that mass consciousness be arrived at around these vital problems affecting the genuine freedom of the nation.

We must firmly declare by our resolute struggle our uncompromising desire for the complete freedom and sovereignty of our country.

What we seek is to provide equal opportunities for all our citizens—the opportunity to jobs, to decent homes and to acquire all the social amenities which constitutes a civilised existence and for our cultural advancement. And all these aims and desires are incompatible with the existence of imperialism and other forces of reaction in our country and are therefore impelled by history to seek our final liberation. “This is our principled position.”

(Continued from page 16)

- themselves in the forefront on the vital plane also of the struggle against bureaucratisation: this can unfortunately not be said about the Chinese.
- (26) The idea that certain debates should not be public, could even be admitted, if all the members of the different parties were able to conduct an effective discussion. But for the bureaucrats this means to discuss among themselves, on the level of the leadership and at most of that of the Central Committees.
- (27) We have, moreover, foreseen this without difficulty in the analysis of the Conference of the 81, published in *Fourth International* of July 1961.
- (28) Apart from the two articles in the F.I. already quoted, viz. the resolution of the 6th World Congress and the resolution of the I.S. after the 22nd Congress (F.I. January 1961 and April 1962).
- (29) The assertion that capitalism is being re-established in Yugoslavia is particularly absurd (attempts to “prove” this are made by pinpointing real phenomena of degeneration which all the same are secondary in the socio-economic context of the country). Besides, the shouts of indignation of the Khrushchevites on this subject should not trouble anybody, for these same gentlemen have used force for many long years and until a very recent date similar formulas and language. Is it necessary to recall that the chaste East-Berlin bureaucrats who hooted the Chinese delegates, still keep in prison “Titoists”, one of whom is Wolfgang Harich, condemned to ten years detention?
- (30) In certain Communist parties there are still “Left-wing Stalinists” who are against Khrushchev, especially on the conception of the peaceful road. They forget that Stalin himself took that stand, as Khrushchev himself recalled in East-Berlin.

"ARAB SOCIALISM" AND THE NASSERITE NATIONAL MOVEMENT

By A. SADI

ARAB socialism" is a new ideological creature born only several years ago in the minds of some Arab petty-bourgeois intellectuals, especially in Syria. It has recently been elaborated and adopted as an official ideology by the Arab national movement led by Abd el Nasser as an "alternative" to communism.

Right from the end of the second world war an uninterrupted series of mass national liberation movements has drawn the colonies and semicolonies, one after another, into a process of permanent revolution. The great successes achieved by the Soviet Union and the other workers states, together with the victory of the Chinese Revolution, have awakened the masses of the colonial countries to consciousness of their wretched material, moral and cultural condition. It has been proved to them that the only way to overcome their misery, low standard of living and low cultural level is the way of socialism. Socialism, therefore, has become the slogan of the masses and the catchword of every party or movement trying to win the masses in every underdeveloped country. But the policy of the Stalinist parties in the Arab world, which has always been to zigzag in accordance with the diplomatic interests of the ruling bureaucracy in the Soviet Union; and especially the attitude adopted by these parties—in the wake of the Soviet government—in such situations as the Palestinian war has antagonized the Arab masses, particularly the socialist-minded intellectuals who used to rally around these parties. Disappointed over the Stalinist parties and over the Soviet Union, these intellectuals began a search for a "new god"—for a kind of socialism independent of the policies and influence of the Soviet Union. The result was a hash of ideas which came to be known as "Arab socialism."

Nasser's coup d'etat in 1952 came at the climax of a great revolutionary upsurge in the Arab world, especially in Egypt. A mighty wave of workers strikes and peasant revolts and upheavals, together with the intensification of guerrilla war against the British occupation forces in the Suez Canal zone, shook Farouk's rule to its very foundations. The monarchy could no longer maintain its hold on the people. Egypt stood on the verge of social revolution. The Palace's last attempt at self-defense was the burning of Cairo on January 24, 1952. But this attempt, intended to demoralize the mass movement and discredit the Wafd government which was responding to the mass pressure, did not save the situation for the throne and its feudal allies. The burning of Cairo was used, indeed, as a pretext to dismiss the Wafd government and to form in its stead a new government which "would not submit to national feelings" and mass pressure. But this new government was born paralyzed. Instead of restoring "law and order," it stood impotent in the face of the mounting revolutionary wave. The crisis was aggravated. In these circumstances, Nasser

and his colleagues launched their coup. Without a single shot, Farouk's rule crumbled like a house of cards.

Nasser's military coup was in fact a desperate attempt to prevent a real people's revolution, which could have developed into a proletarian revolution, and to curb the masses and prevent them from influencing the development of events.

The leaders of the coup, by virtue of their military education and military mentality, never believed in the masses. Indeed, from the beginning they have suspected the people and have always been afraid of them. Their first act after seizing power was to prohibit strikes and demonstrations. When, immediately after the coup the textile workers in Alexandria declared a strike, it was broken by police and military force and two of the leaders were put to death.

In his book *The Philosophy of Revolution* Abdel Nasser says, "Throughout my life I have had faith in militarism"—and so have his colleagues. They want "discipline" and submission to orders, and were shocked by the activity of the masses. They crushed it by the ruthless measures of military dictatorship. In the same book, Abd el Nasser says, "We needed discipline but found chaos behind our lines. We needed unity but found dissensions."

It is true that Abd el Nasser and his colleagues, when launching their coup, had an aim. But it was very vague. They felt the need for political and social reform but had no program. Having seized power, they were faced by a mass of complicated political and social problems to which they had never given thought and before which they stood confused and completely impotent. They even began to regret their "rashness" and "folly" in seizing power. Abdel Nasser had to "confess that after July 23 I suffered fits in which I accused myself, my colleagues and the rest of the army of the rashness and folly we committed on July 23." He admits that "the situation caused me a depressing psychological crisis. But later experience and reflection, and the true significance I derived from them, lightened the reaction of the crisis upon me." Only then did he come to the conclusion "that we are at present in the throes of two revolutions and not one.....One political in which (every nation) recovers its right to self-government from an imposed despot or an aggressive army occupying its territory without its consent. The second revolution is social, in which the classes of society would struggle against each other until justice for all countrymen has been gained and conditions have become stable."

Accordingly the monarchy was abolished and an agrarian reform was decreed. But abolishing the monarchy did not bring the masses "self-government" Even bourgeois democratic rights and liberties were

not granted. On the contrary a firm military dictatorship was established. Political parties were outlawed and strikes and demonstrations were strictly forbidden. The new rulers' fear of the masses never waned. The agrarian reform was limited and on a very narrow scale, but it did improve somewhat the lot of a considerable portion of the peasantry and helped win them to the new regime. The compensation paid to the landowners was expected by the new rulers to be invested in industry, thus helping to industrialize the country. But the landowners, by force of tradition and lack of experience and hope of big profits in industry, invested their new capital in real estate instead. The agrarian reform however, has broken the backbone of the feudal class and put an end to their influence on the political and economic life of the country.

Having failed in drawing private capital into industry, the new regime began to depend on state funds to build new industrial enterprises, and a kind of state control and planning was established.

In foreign policy the new rulers tried at the beginning to reach an understanding and *modus vivendi* with Britain and the United States, relying on their aid. But the United States' refusal to supply arms with which to meet Israel's continual raids forced Abd el Nasser to turn to the workers states for arms. These new friendly relations aroused the rage of American and British imperialism. In insulting terms, both the United States and Great Britain withdrew their offer to help Egypt build the High Dam at Aswan. Abd el Nasser responded immediately by nationalizing the Suez Canal Company. This touched off the Suez crisis which ended with the Anglo-French attack on Egypt with the help of Israel. The help given by the Soviet Union to Egypt during the crisis raised the prestige of the Soviet Union and the Communist parties in the whole Arab world.

At the same time the imperialist attack on Egypt aroused Arab national feelings and the solidarity of the masses in all Arab countries. "Arab Unity" became the general slogan.

In Syria the Communists were gathering strength and influence. This aroused the fear of the weak Syrian bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois Ba'athists, who were virtually in power in Syria at the time. They hastened to unite with Egypt in order to win the help of the strong Egyptian bourgeoisie against the Communists. The Communists stood against the current and opposed unity.

Then came the revolution in Iraq at a time when the prestige of Abd el Nasser was at its highest. He was recognized as the leader of the whole Arab national movement against imperialism and for national unity and social reform. The Ba'athists in Iraq lead the movement for unity with Egypt. But the Communists, who were the strongest party in Iraq and who controlled the trade unions, the peasant committees, the organizations of the intellectuals, and the militia, helped Kassem crush the Ba'athists and the movement for national unity.

This attitude of the Communists against national unity in Syria and Iraq turned the feelings of the masses against them and they began to lose ground.

In Iraq, after crushing the Ba'athists, Kassem turned against the Communists and drove them underground. In Syria they lost much of their influence in the working class, and many of their intellectuals left the party to begin co-operating with Nasser. When Nasser's social reforms antagonized the landowners and a section of the bourgeoisie in Syria, the Communists made a front with the most reactionary elements there. Nasser utilized the occasion to launch a witch-hunt against them, including all means of propaganda and police terror. At the same time he compromised with the reactionary elements, even well-known imperialist agents, to win them against the Communists.

The union between Egypt and Syria was, naturally, to the advantage of the Egyptian bourgeoisie, who were the stronger. Their profits expanded and increased relative to those of the Syrian national bourgeoisie. This antagonized the latter, while Nasser's compromises and cooperation with the most reactionary elements and his dictatorial methods in monopolizing power brought a rift between him and the Ba'athists.

The economic and social measures taken by Nasser in Egypt and Syria proved to be insufficient. Private initiative did not contribute to the development of the national economy. The new reforms helped to enrich many of the Egyptian bourgeoisie. Capital began to concentrate in the hands of a few millionaires. The division of the national income in favor of the capitalists rose from sixty-eight percent before industrialization to seventy-two percent in 1961. But still they did not invest in industry. They all turned to trade and real estate where big profits are sure. The big landowners used every means to evade the agrarian reform laws.

All this forced Nasser to take new and more drastic measures. On July 20, 1961 he issued decrees nationalizing the banks and insurance companies. He also decreed the participation of the state in a number of private industrial enterprises. The maximum property allowed in land was decreased from 200 to 100 acres.

The Syrian bourgeoisie, whose domestic position had been bolstered through the co-operation of the Communists and a section of the Ba'athists and through Nasser's compromises with the extreme right, were shocked by these measures. They used the influence they had won in the army to launch a coup against the Nasserite rule, separating Syria from Egypt.

* * *

The separation of Syria from Egypt came like a bolt from the blue to Nasser. It drove him to review his whole past policies. It opened his eyes to the intrigues and conspiracies of the landowners, the big comprador bourgeoisie and imperialist agents against his rule. He felt the danger in Egypt itself and began to look for support among the people. He realized, he said, that "ages of suffering and hope finally gave shape to the objectives of the Arab struggle. These objectives which are a true expression of Arab national conscience are freedom, socialism, unity." He admitted that a revolution "is not the work of one individual" and that the "value of a revolution lies in its degree of popularity,

in the extent to which it is an expression of the vast masses, in the extent to which it mobilizes their forces to rebuild the future, and also in the extent to which it enables these masses to impose their will on life." He also recognized that "work aimed at expanding the base of national wealth can never be left to the haphazard ways of exploitive private capital" and that "the socialist solution is the only way out to economic and social progress."

On these bases he intensified his measures of nationalization and called for a "National Congress of Popular Powers" which was held May 21, 1962. At the inaugural session, Abd el Nasser presented a "National Charter" which was meant to be a "scientific" program for "Arab socialism" and which declared that "the major economic and social problems confronting our people at present must be resolved on a scientific basis" and "revolutionary action should be scientific." The Charter also states:

"Our immediate aim is to do away with exploitation, and to make possible the exercise of the natural right to have an equal opportunity, to dissolve class distinctions and to end the domination of one class and hence remove the clash between classes which constitutes a threat to the freedom of the individual citizen, and even to the freedom of the whole of the country, by violating the rights of the people which creates the chance of exposing the country to the lurking dangers of foreign forces vigilantly on the lookout to drag it into the arena of cold war and make of it its battlefield and of its people fodder for their guns. The removal of the clash between classes which arises out of interests that can never be reconciled, between those who exercise exploitation and those crushed by exploitation in the past society, cannot overnight lead to the dissolution of all class distinctions or lead to social freedom and true democracy.

"Yet, the removal of the clash between classes makes it possible, by eliminating the exploiting class, to dissolve peacefully class distinctions, and to open the gates for democratic exchange which brings the whole society nearer the age of true freedom."

Let us see now how this aim of "doing away with exploitation" and the "ending of the domination of one class" can be achieved on a "scientific basis," as conceived by the authors of the Charter.

While they admit the necessity of "eliminating the exploiting class," they speak of "dissolving peacefully class distinctions," and state that the "Egyptian people refused the dictatorship of any class." But how can this exploiting class be eliminated? Do the authors of the Charter believe that this class will renounce exploitation voluntarily for the benefit of that utopian free society which they envisage? And if, in the name of the Egyptian people, they reject the dictatorship of any class, for what purpose, then, is their state? Is it necessary to prove now what history itself has demonstrated that every state has been the product of class struggle and that its role always is to defend the interests of the exploiting class against the exploited classes? Every state has been the instrument of the dictatorship of a class. Without the class dictatorship of the proletariat, the exploiting class cannot be eliminated.

However, in an article "Arab Socialism and Communism" in a special issue of the Egyptian review *The Scribe*, an expounder of the Charter rejects class struggle altogether. "We do not believe in the necessity of class struggle," he says, "or in the supremacy of one class over the others." He believes that "this class struggle can actually be checked even in the capitalist regimes of the Western world" and that "the American worker or that of Western Europe has succeeded in acquiring a multitude of rights by more or less peaceful means and has attained a constantly improved standard of living." From this he draws the conclusion that "the class struggle has ceased to be a necessity in order for the proletariat to gain its rights and to attain a decent standard of living which constantly improves."

But how did the proletariat of these highly developed capitalist countries attain their "decent standard of living" if not by class struggle? And has class struggle really ceased to be a necessity in these countries? Then what are the strikes declared so frequently by the working class in the USA and the European countries if not an expression of class struggle? Moreover, has class exploitation ended in the West? Does the attainment of a "decent standard of living" constitute socialism? Does it end class exploitation? According to the author of the article, the answer is, "Yes." He says, "It is socialism which is predominant in these countries." From this one must draw the conclusion that the "Arab socialism" in the minds of the authors and exponents of the Charter is nothing but modern capitalism.

This conclusion is re-enforced by the fact that the Charter recognizes the "existence of a private sector that would, without exploitation, participate in the development within the framework of the over-all plan." Nationalization, according to the Charter, "is not a blow to the individual initiative" but "rather a guarantee to an expansion of the range of general interest."

"The great importance attached to the role of the public sector," the Charter states, "cannot do away with the existence of the private sector. The private sector has its effective role in the development plan. It must be protected to fulfill that part." All that is "now required" from that private sector is "to renovate itself and strike a new path of creative effort, not dependent, as in the past, on parasitic exploitation."

The wolf is told to feed on grass! Private capital is asked not to exploit! The experience of the last ten years seems to have proved to the leaders of "Arab socialism" that capitalists cannot produce but for profit. Therefore they are ready to provide them with "reasonable profit without exploitation." But where does profit come from if not from exploitation?

In the field of agrarian reform, the Charter states that "The Arab application of socialism in the domain of agriculture does not believe in nationalizing the land and transforming it into the domain of public ownership. But from experience and study it believes in individual ownership of land, within limits that would not allow for feudalism." "The revolutionary solution to the problem of land in Egypt is," according to the authors of the Charter "by increasing the number of land owners."

We are told furthermore that the "socialist framework carefully set up by the July laws wiped out the vestiges of exploitation and left the door open to individual investment that would serve the general interest in the field of development. It would equally serve its owners by providing them with a reasonable profit without exploitation."

One cannot deny that the reforms and nationalization measures passed by the new regime in Egypt and envisaged by the Charter are of great importance for the development of the country. But they are not yet socialism. Socialism is not merely nationalization. Socialism cannot be achieved without, first of all, the proletariat seizing power and crushing the old state machine. Nationalization as an economic basis for socialist planning should be without compensation. It is impossible to overthrow the rule of the capitalist class by paying them compensation for their nationalized property and leaving the door open for individual investment and "reasonable" profit.

But what, then, is the class nature of the new Egyptian state? What class is in power there?

The new Egyptian state is a capitalist state and the class in power there is the national bourgeoisie. It could be objected that the new state is nationalizing capitalist property and even persecutes individual capitalists. This is all true. But such measures are taken in the interests of the class as a whole. By "exploiting" capitalists, Nasser means individuals who put their interests above those of the class and who cannot be integrated into his plan of developing industry and the capitalist economy to advance the national bourgeoisie as a ruling class. Egypt is ruled by a bureaucracy which represents the interests of the national bourgeoisie. A bureaucracy in power is always the representative and servant of a class. This servant may sometimes sit on the shoulders of his master and spit in his face but he remains always a servant. Hitler, in spite of his drastic measures against individual German capitalists and in spite of his firm state control over the German economy, remained until the end a servant of German finance capital.

Nasser is not a new Hitler and the new regime in Egypt is not fascism. Hitler, representing highly developed finance capital in its decay, played a reactionary role. Nasser plays a progressive role as the representative of a semicolonial national bourgeois class fighting against imperialism and for the realization of a bourgeois democratic revolution. In fact, Nasserism is not something altogether original. It is a mixture of Kemalism and Peronism in new and different circumstances.

At the time of Kemal Ataturk, imperialism was at its peak of strength while the Russian Revolution was inspiring the proletariat everywhere. The Turkish ruler could not stand the pressure on two fronts. Fear of the proletarian revolution forced him to compromise with imperialism and put an end to his reforms. Peron fell victim to an economic crisis. But Nasserism exists in an era of the weakening of imperialism and the strengthening of the workers states and the rise of the colonial revolution. Imperialism cannot show to the colonial and semicolonial bourgeoisie its teeth and claws. The fear of a proletarian revolution in the colonies and the needs of the cold war with the workers states force imperialism to make every effort to win the bourgeoisie

of the underdeveloped countries. At the same time, the Soviet Union gives utmost help to the same bourgeoisie in hope of keeping them neutral in the cold war. Nasser, playing the role of neutralism, wins help from both sides and utilizes this help to strengthen his regime.

Yet there is no alternative at present to his leadership in the Arab world. The Arab proletariat have not yet built a competent leadership. The Communist parties, with their treacherous policies, have lost almost all influence in the liberation movement. In the beginning they supported Nasser without reservation. After the unification of Egypt and Syria, especially after the Iraqi revolution, they made Nasser the main enemy, going so far as to join imperialist agents in a front against him. While Nasser raises the two main slogans cherished by the masses—socialism and national unity—they oppose both. While declaring that "Arab unity must be built upon complete liberation from imperialism," they do not see the struggle for national unity as part and parcel of the struggle for the bourgeois democratic revolution. They advise the masses to wait for completion of liberation from imperialism before beginning the struggle for unity. As for socialist revolution, they think that the time and objective conditions are not yet ripe. Instead of socialism, they call for a national democratic state "which does not represent one certain class, but relies on the support of patriotic democratic groups, and which opens the way for a peaceful transition to socialism according to the conditions and national characteristics of our country."

In this way the Communist parties in the Arab world have withdrawn from the liberation movement and are now struggling against Nasserism from outside. But revolutionary Marxists should not stand aside from this movement. They should be integrated in it, struggling from within for their own slogans of socialism and national unity. Their main struggle against its bourgeois leadership and for hegemony of the proletariat should be ideological in character. They should explain to the masses what real socialism is and what the role of the working class should be in the movement for socialism. They should make every effort to win the working class to their side and help it to win its independence.

Nasserism, in its present form, cannot live long. It is full of contradictions. It is trying to rely on both the national bourgeoisie and the working people. But the interests of opposing classes cannot be reconciled. Moreover the old ruling classes of landowners and comprador bourgeoisie are not altogether crushed. They are only waiting for an opportunity to launch an attack. A sharp economic crisis in the West would force imperialism to show its teeth and claws. The stoppage of foreign aid would push Egypt into a sharp economic crisis. The working masses would intensify their struggle. The Nasserist leadership would be forced to choose between relying on the working people inside and the workers states outside, and relying on the bourgeoisie inside and imperialism outside. It is not difficult to foresee what path it will choose. Only hegemony of the working class over the movement would save the conquests of the bourgeois revolution and push it forward into a proletarian revolution. This can be done only if the revolutionary Marxists succeed in penetrating the Movement and conquering it from within.

February 4, 1963.

LATIN AMERICA 1962

STRUCTURAL CONTRADICTIONS AND ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES

By Livio Maitan

IT is known—and our movement has not failed to underline it in the texts of its World Congresses—that in several countries of Latin America, the economic development and progress of industrialisation has been on the average more important than in the countries of Asia and Africa. Certain countries in particular—sometimes on the basis of a structure already well advanced—have progressed perceptibly so that this advance, linked with the reinforcement of national bourgeois layers, has posed and still poses the problem of their specific characterisation: does it mean that they are still semi-colonial countries or countries which have reached the capitalist stage properly so-called? However, this economic development has in no way eliminated nor even impaired the basic structural contradictions which can be synthesised as follows:

(a) The rate of economic progress, if it exists, is partially or totally annulled by the fact of the very considerable increase in population;

(b) Industrialisation remains concentrated in certain regions and is limited generally to certain sectors, so that the greatest part of the territory subsists on a backward agricultural economy;

(c) the unemployment and under-employment continues to be an open wound which relegates to the margins of economic and social life literally dozens of millions of human beings;

(d) very considerable sectors of the population in the majority of the countries find themselves before a dramatic choice: to continue to vegetate in the countryside in conditions which do not cease to be aggravated, or to go to the urban centres, with

the certain prospect of being obliged to live without stable resources in horrible shantytowns—the tragic halo around the most part of the great Latin-American capitals;

(e) the domestic social structure and the persistent grip of Imperialism is obstacle No. 1 to much more ample and harmonious economic progress since obviously in these conditions, the economy can have only an unequal, unilateral development related to the needs and interests of foreign investors and limited layers of the indigenous dominant class, while the so-called “liberalisation” of commerce, the absence of control over foreign exchange etc. favour foreign competition, the squandering of reserves with all the consequences that one can easily imagine...;

(f) last but not least, the real Achilles’ heel of the Latin American countries remains the structure of their production and their foreign trade. The drainage of the surplus-value in favour of foreign capitalism is extraordinarily accentuated by the evolution of the prices of primary products on the one hand and industrial products on the other, an evolution which, above all, starting from the end of the Korean War boom, has not ceased to produce a disadvantage for the most economically backward. From the confessions of even official sources, the decline in the price of primary materials is of a nature to cancel the possible effects of all the economic “aid” in the framework of the “Alliance for Progress”.

All these difficulties and contradictions, in themselves explosive, operate in an even more aggravated form in so far as Latin America cannot escape an international confrontation which puts under the spotlight the growing alteration between its

economic development and its level of life, and the development and level of life both of the advanced capitalist countries and the Workers States' on the other hand.

Leaving aside the conjunctural aspects, however disturbing, in certain states (economic paralysis in Argentina, financial difficulties and currency devaluation in Chile and Brazil, decomposition in Bolivia, where there is being carried out a veritable dismantling of national industry), the short and middle term perspectives throw even more gloom over the scene. From all evidence, since without major revolutionary upheavals there is not the least chance that the structural contradictions will be, if not eliminated, at least mitigated, the place of Latin America in international commerce is destined to be degraded even more, above all following the progressive development of the European Common Market and the liaisons of it with a series of African countries.

The data which demonstrates the decline of Latin American trade in the context of world trade is well-known and incontestable. The progress of the Common Market also on the plane of agricultural production—and the protection, both direct and indirect, that the Community assures to its products, has already obliged certain Latin American countries to lower the prices of certain products, with an inevitable fall in returns, which created for them not only difficulties on the European Markets, but also in the countries of the third world where the European countries have attempted and still attempt to penetrate even with their agricultural products.

On the other hand, the Latin American countries risk seeing themselves struck severely by the more favourable conditions which will be enjoyed in the Community Market by the rival products provided by the African countries tied to France.

In this sombre perspective, the financial and technical aid that the countries of the European Common Market have declared themselves ready to accord, will not represent a valid compensation, most of the Latin American countries seeing themselves menaced from outside to the neuralgic point of their present economy (I). More

generally, as we have already underlined, the unfavourable evolution of the terms of trade on the world market for the underdeveloped countries—and a *fortiori*, if the new difficulties are accentuated—will remove all the real efficacy of the effort American Imperialism could make in the direction of Latin America in the interests of safeguarding one of its vital bastions.

THE POLITICAL CRISIS OF THE RULING CLASSES:

The prolongation and aggravation even of the structural contradictions which constitute henceforth, in the majority of the countries, an impasse with little escape, translates itself onto the political plane under the form of (so to say) sublimating itself into a crisis of leadership which reaches a stage of paroxysm. With some exceptions in the course of the last months, nearly all the countries have known changes of government, most often sharp, with coup d'états, spectacular retirement or resignations, and dramatic vicissitudes. Is it necessary to recall the chronic crisis of power in Argentina, the departure of Quadros and the tense fight between the different classes in Brazil, the upheavals in Ecuador and St. Domingo, the extreme shakiness of the Betancourt regime, the military coup in Peru ?

The most significant element and one which is most full of consequences is, basically, the wearing away more and more rapidly of nationalist movements and national revolutionary movements which, at a given stage, polarised the majority or even the totality of the mass movement. The process reached its critical point in Peru, where the APRA lost its majority influence in two-thirds of the country and faces the progressive liquidation of its trade union rampart. In Venezuela, the harsher and harsher repression and a certain rural demagogic reformism—whose swindle is evident—are no longer able to camouflage the bankruptcy of the Democratic Action of Betancourt, which has already registered many splits and departures. In Bolivia, it is only the absence of any concrete alternative in the short run which permits the giving of the false impression of a certain stability of the MNR which in reality, has

lost in large measure its prestige in the eyes of the masses, as was demonstrated among other things by the elections of June 1962, a veritable Pyhrric victory for the **Movim-
iontistas**. (2) Basically, it is as a matter of fact the access or collaboration in power on the part of these movements which has forced them to choices which they were not capable of making and which pushed them to evolve openly towards compromise with American Imperialism, which from now on considers—correctly from its point of view—the Hayas de la Torre, Betancourt and Pax Estenssoro (with his “leftist” appendage, Lechin) as among its most certain allies in Latin America.

Of all the nationalist movements which, beyond their specific traits have a common objective matrix, Peronism alone has saved itself so far from decline. It maintains its hold on the masses and evolves even in a different direction. It is sufficient to recall the inextricable difficulties before which Peron had found himself placed in the years which immediately preceded his fall and the passivity seizing even Peron and his General Staff before the perspective of a return to power, to understand that it is as a matter of fact the withdrawal from power—with a certain halo of the martyr—which saved Peronism from decline and which permits it to still look for a stage with considerable opportunities.

Concerning Chile, the present leadership around Alessandri bases itself on a coalition of forces which can recall more certain European experiences than the experiences proper to other countries of Latin America (which is naturally a reflection of the economic structure and of the particular social composition of the country). But this leadership is also worn out and it is improbable that it can survive as such with the difficult tests which await it in the coming two years. The country is in reality installed in a very delicate transitory phase, where all the forces prepare themselves for the date of 1964 which it would be superficial to judge as being purely electoral, and in this perspective the Chilian bourgeoisie and Imperialism can with difficulty undertake a pure and simple maintenance of the present precarious formula, which loses ground continually even on the electoral plane (3).

In the Latin American storm which rages at its height, the relatively stable situation of a big country such as Mexico represents an important exception. It is however quite clear that the origins of this situation are found precisely in the revolutionary upheavals that Mexico has known during the thirty years before the Second World War. Under the pressure of these upheavals and by the necessity of self-preservation, the Mexican bourgeoisie went far on the way of this bourgeois democratic revolution, which went almost totally by default in the rest of Latin America, by developing even a struggle against important positions of American Imperialism. The revolutionary crisis of thirty years, with its mobilisation of the masses, implied naturally the objective possibility of a socialist result. But this result failed to materialise due to the lack of leadership of the proletariat and peasantry. The bourgeoisie has profited, by assuring itself a large control over the movement of the masses, above all in the towns; by creating for itself a quite considerable economic base; by acquiring a political clarity and flexibility inconceivable for those traditionally conservative Latin American layers, which live timidly under the shadow of American Imperialism and which satisfy themselves with the crumbs from its table. It goes without saying that the foundations of the Mexican bourgeoisie remain in all ways limited, above all in the countryside where there are permanent forces of grave conflicts, even at the present stage. But it would be erroneous to ignore or to underestimate the very specific traits of the Mexican situation and above all not to take account that their existence goes to determine in large measure the forms of the new rise and maturation of the mass movement in the country.

In their crisis of leadership lies an extremely grave threat for the indigenous leading classes. It has on the other hand, in effect pushed towards new and relatively original experiences. These experiences merit being mentioned all the more as they imply a certain evolution of sectors of the army which would break with a tradition of reactionary and routinist conservatism.

Thus, the military coup of July 1962 in Peru was not, in effect, a reactionary type of

coup and should not be compared, for example, with the coup of the Argentine militarists after the March elections. The junta of Perez Godoy was installed to some extent against the oligarchy and against the compradore bourgeois strata and with manifest hostility—at least at the beginning—of American Imperialism which openly supported Haya de la Torre. It is moreover significant that the junta has been supported by the candidate Belaunde, bearer of the aid on the part of the more “advanced” sectors of the national bourgeoisie, interested in a certain industrial development and in a certain amelioration of the general standard of living. (4).

At the same time, the government of Godoy is the result of the reinforcement of certain renovating tendencies which have seen light of day in the army and which are stimulated above all by a certain modernisation of the army itself in step with the evolution of military technique. It expresses above all the exigency of a general modernisation of the country, and it is not only a struggle to obtain the minimum efficiency of the military instrument. A certain number of officers, above all the youth, are taking account of the obstacles which prevent any reform and are disposed to fight against the reactionary sectors more closely tied to Imperialism, which render impossible all progress. From this fact there exists on the part of the military some reformist aspirations and express nationalist sentiments not exempt from a timid anti-imperialism: certain among them do not hesitate to wish for nationalisation and for an agrarian reform. It must be added that, from the subjective point of view, there are a growing number of officers who in no way like being reduced to the role of butchers, in stifling by repression the upheavals that the weaknesses and blindness of the conservatives precipitate.

To put it another way, we see in the Latin American countries the emergence of the outline of a Nasserite military tendency. This tendency has been manifested recently also in Argentina, where the colonel Juan Francisco Guevara has so far been its most active spokesman. In Brazil, the phenomenon is older and already more important.

A wing of the army concentrated above all in the state of Rio Grande du Sud, has decidedly left nationalist positions and openly opposes itself to the out-and-out pro-imperialist tendencies, both political and military. (5).

We shall see later the perspectives in each concrete case. It can be said that in general, all these attempts have only a very limited bearing, the margin of manouvre being objectively and even subjectively very limited. In a continent where the economic perspectives of the base are those that we have outlined, in the framework of a situation where the Cuban Socialist Revolution exercises more and more its influence, where the leading forces are divided and worn out in the face of the masses, there is no chance that “new” formulae will succeed where the old formulae have failed, notably when these formulae dream of military Bonapartism in which the masses would have only a passive role or become fatally the object of repression if they refuse this role.

The true terms of the problem present themselves under a different form. The economic situation is even more on the down grade. There can be no equilibrium, social or political. But will the proletarian and peasant masses, be able to find rapidly effective revolutionary leaderships, which will be capable of regrouping them, of organising them on a national scale and of leading them in a decisive revolutionary struggle? Or indeed will the lack of such a real leadership and the prolonged sterility and paralysis of old formations be a major obstacle for a whole period?

In the first case, the perspective for the formation of other Workers' States in Latin America, even in the short run, would be perfectly realistic. But if the present situation in relation to the leadership factor should continue, it can have the result in certain countries of a prolonged decomposition of the situation, a veritable growing economic social and political disintegration. This has happened and is happening in Bolivia, where the economic situation is worse than ten years ago; where the social crisis remains acute; where the masses are always ready to fight and are fighting effectively; where in conclusion

there are forms of duality of power which have existed for several years. However, despite everything, the bourgeoisie and Imperialism remain standing without the forces opposing them being able to overthrow them and conquer power. This is a dramatic example of a variant which must not be considered as completely unique and exceptional.

THE PEASANTRY, THE POOR MASSES OF THE CITIES, AND THE INTELLECTUAL PETTY- BOURGEOISIE.

While the ruling classes are shaken by their crisis, the mass movement continues to progress both on the plane of a large mobilisation and on the plane of the rapid and progressive political maturation of a series of layers of the vanguard. It would be, of course, erroneous, even naive, to conceive of this process as rectilinear: it can go here or there effectively, with conjunctural set-backs, through zig-zags, with confused fermentations which find no concrete result, or with premature ruptures which, beside the subjective intentions, implies a dangerous dispersion of forces. But, in general, for instance during the last two years, the march has been incontestably going forward with new acquisitions which can have a very great importance even in the coming period.

The capital factor which, in the given objective context accelerated the whole process, was, naturally, the Cuban Revolution. It represented and still represents for Latin America, *Mutatis mutandis*, what the Russian Revolution represented for the European Workers Movement. After the victory of Castro, and the embarkation of Cuba along the road of Socialist Construction, the social and political demarcation line in the continent became clear and profound, not only in the eyes of the vanguard, but also in the eyes of large masses.

Thus the sentiments of hostility to American Imperialism became more conscious and more implacable and, what is more, the consciousness acquired by it that the anti-imperialist struggle can be completed even now in this period with the defeat of

the giant with feet of clay. Thus the perspective of socialism has ceased to appear as a far-distant historical struggle. It clarified itself in a concrete issue, realisable in the short run; it swept away even in the vanguard layers so-called, all the confusion, equivocations, hesitations at "necessary" stages of the Latin American revolution and on the "not realistic" character of a struggle for workers' and peasants' power at this stage of this part of the world.

The influence of the Cuban revolution operates above all among the peasant masses propelling among them the process of maturation which has already its own objective bases. If as we have recalled, there was a certain industrial development and a certain modernisation in the urban sector, the countryside, with the exception of the very limited zones, remains an immense territory of stagnation, of misery, of hopelessness. Following a process in many ways classical, tied to the development of capitalism, to its penetration (even though it be slow and unequal) into the countryside itself, (and following more precisely from the profound and irreversible crisis of traditional peasant agriculture which, in the last analysis, cannot escape from the consequences of phenomena proper to the world agricultural production at this stage, following even the growth of population) any former "equilibrium" is no more possible. Hunger, far from being mitigated, becomes a more direct reality for a growing number of peasants who on the one hand, are pushed to fight in some way, on the other hand leave the villages to pack together in the urban shanty-towns.

By multiple ways—those people who live in the towns but maintaining relations with parents and friends remaining in the villages, and the students who return during the holidays to their home—the peasants of Latin America, even in the most backward zones, receive the news of Cuba, on the revolution which took place there, on the radical agricultural reform etc. Thus their traditional spirit of revolt, stimulated powerfully by the relative and even often absolute worsening of their material conditions, has found a clear ideological expression: *it is necessary to do as in Cuba*. Even more, in larger and larger layers is clarified the con-

sciousness of methods necessary to attain the "Cuban" struggle: the armed revolutionary struggle, the guerilla war. The conviction that it is necessary to undertake such forms of struggle is currently expressed by the peasants above all in the countries where a pre-revolutionary situation existed or developed rapidly.

It is necessary to add that the extreme material poverty and hunger on the land are not the only factors which nourish the spirit of revolt among the peasants. In the last analysis, the reflection of the maturation of the movement is found in the fact that even in the zones where the problem of the land or of physiological subsistence is not posed in an acute form the peasants are mobilised, are stimulated by the Cuban example, because they hope to ameliorate radically their human condition; to be able to escape from their ignorance, to have schools, and no more be struck off from the progress of modern life, which implies above all the distribution of adequate means of communication. There is no doubt that in Latin America also one of the attractions of the city, above all among the young generation, is the hope it gives to break out of the rural isolation and to participate in the collective life of the towns where the contact with progress, (if only with its crumbs, its more malodorous sub-products) is possible even for the miserable occupants of the shanty towns.

Among the petty-bourgeois layers of intellectuals and students the influence of Cuba is equally active. These people have for a long time sought their way. Discontented with a society which cannot assure them a dignified future, revolted by all the misdeeds of Imperialism and of the indigenous ruling classes, frequent experience with the nationalist movements and having been deceived by them, they have hesitated in the absence of proletarian revolutionary organisations capable of expressing a clear orientation. The Cuban Revolution gave an impetus also to the students and intellectual, who become "castroist" in considerable numbers, and in their own countries attempt to organise stata which would follow the example of Fidel and his companions. Despite all the errors and possible limits—we shall return again to

this problem—it is in these circles that are developed at the present time passionate discussions on the concrete ways for the revolution in the different Latin American countries. The problems which are posed are real problems, and revolutionary Marxists will not be able to ignore them, without committing a grave error, for these layers can give an essential contribution in cadres to the revolutionary movement. It must not be forgotten in particular that, as we have mentioned, in the secondary schools and universities there are thousands of youth of peasant origin, who, all studying in the towns, continue to spend part of the year in the villages, or, at least, to maintain contact with those who remain there and represent therefore a capital means of liaison with the peasant movement, for a penetration in the countryside, into the communities etc., of revolutionary ideas and orientations.

Finally, in the framework of the revolutionary crisis of Latin America, a particular role can be played, in certain countries at least, by masses not strictly proletarian, but declassed or more generally poor, who group in the miserable quarters of the big cities. The dozens and hundreds of thousands of disinherited beings who live out a less than human existence in the **barriadas** of Lima, the **favelas** of Rio de Janeiro or even in certain quarters of Santiago are not separated from the radicalising current which flows through the Latin American masses and in the last months have made felt menacing rumblings. In the given situation, they can represent a rupturing force. The youth can above all become the agitators in the brusque outbursts of anger and revolt. The under-employment which has no chance of diminishing the chronic unemployment, the miserable conditions which the arrival of new contingents worsens continually. etc., justify the hypothesis this explosive potential will be still more compressed. If only for the numerical force of these sectors. It would be erroneous to ignore them, to consider them a little traditionally as social sub-products in the margin of a society politically and economically active, or to underestimate the potential they can have as a factor in a revolutionary crisis, even if all evidence is that they will not be the essential motive force. The understanding of this possibility implies the

accomplishment of tasks of propaganda, of agitation and of specific organisation immediately at the present stage.

OLD LEADERSHIPS IN AN IMPASSE AND NEW FERMENTATIONS.

A forecast of the perspective in the short and middle term, starting from the basic elements that we have analysed, should not fail to take note of another capital element: the situations and the orientation of the organisations which have the support of the working class and the peasantry *ie.* the situation inside the vanguard. On this plane, if there exists, on one hand, a very great fermentation with positive tendencies and symptoms, on the other hand, are seen elements less favourable for a victorious issue in the short run of the big struggles of the masses.

The traditional parties of the working class which are the preponderant influence in other parts of the world command except for some well-known exceptions very limited forces which are often insignificant, in the most favourable case, and subsidiary only. If however they could benefit relatively from the radicalisation of the situation and from the repercussions of the Cuban Revolution, they have not been in a condition to draw the essential lessons of that and it is not around them that the majority of the mass movement will polarise at this stage.

On the other hand, the movements or organisations proper in a whole series of Latin American countries find themselves, understandably, in a critical situation. Essentially, these organisations represented, at different stages and forms, a revolutionary nationalist current, composed at the base of the rural and urban masses and led by bourgeois or petty-bourgeois elements, whose action became objectively to undertake a limited anti-imperialist fight in the interest of certain layers of the industrial bourgeoisie. In face of the crucial development of the last years and above all with the formation of a Workers State in the Caribbean all these organisations find themselves faced with some temporary choices. We have already seen that in certain countries they made, more or less openly, a reactionary choice, and

paid for it by a fall in their influence. In others, the different objective conditions permitted them and still permit them to manoeuvre and still guard their control over the masses. This is above all the case with Peronism in Argentina, which, not being in power, has not been obliged to make any immediate concrete choice, and, on the contrary, can place itself quite freely for the moment, with a demagogic high-bid. It is in a much more limited way, the case of the Brazilian Labour Party whose weight has remained quite considerable through the vicissitudes of the last fifteen months.

The consequence of it is that the masses, for example in the two biggest countries find themselves largely blocked or detoured by their traditional organisations. In Brazil, if the influence of the latter, let us repeat, is much less limited, there is a fragmentation of the movement, with different influences in different regions of the country, without there being a really united movement, an organisation which can mobilize nationally a majority or quite a considerable part of the workers and peasants. Everyone on the other hand, takes account of how easily the low level of leadership of the political instrument caused it to play a fundamentally negative role in the crisis that Argentina went through in the immediate recent period.

The most negative thing is that the crisis of certain nationalist organisations has not had the consequence of the decantation of new movements, of new leaderships capable of doing what the others have failed to do, by playing a decisive role at the present stage. Thus, to take only some examples for different variants, the forces that left APRA in Peru forming the Rebel APRA (presently the MIR) have remained extremely weak with contradictory orientations, without a real mass influence. In Bolivia, any new pole of attraction in a condition to win the confidence of sectors disgusted with the MNR has not emerged so far. In Venezuela, where however the MIR had a sudden rise, this same party, blocked by divisions and splits by its lack of ideology and policy as well as the acceptance of the guardianship on the part of the CP, has also been incapable of effectively leading the masses to the taking of power, despite the growing disintegration of the Betancourt regime.

Finally, in a whole series of countries there is an abundance of groups and organisations who assemble valuable, subjectively revolutionary elements, but who still operate on the plane of the vanguard layers, without mass influence and with no possibility of effective action on the political reality. It must be added that there is often a very prejudicial dispersion of forces with separations and divisions which find no justification in fundamental political divergencies. In some countries at least, a work of regroupment could represent the first useful preparatory phase.

But the weakness and the fragmentation of these groups must not make us forget that in the last analysis they are a reflection of the influence of the Cuban Revolution and provoke in the vanguard sectors a promising political and ideological fermentation. That is all the more appreciable as the discussions and polemics which have developed are in no way academic, but most often pose the real problems of the revolutionary Latin American struggle at this stage or in the approaching stage.

Along the lines of the Cuban Revolution all these groups have reached the conclusion that the traditional leaderships, both those linked to international experiences and those proper to Latin America, have failed and that it is necessary to start again from a new basis. Even limited groups can play a decisive role, if they know the outlines of a revolutionary orientation and employ adequate methods of struggle, i.e., concretely they refuse any perspective of a "peaceful" or "democratic" evolution, they understand the necessity of a revolutionary rupture, they organise more precisely the revolutionary armed struggle on the basis of the peasant guerilla with the prolongation of an insurrectional struggle in the towns.

In a still more detailed way, in these groups composed in general of very young elements, but which sometimes include also militants who have had and still do have experience in the traditional parties, it is discussed whether in the specific reality of such or such country the role of the armed peasantry will entirely predominate or, on the contrary, whether it shall only act as a subsidiary force of the decisive struggles of the

masses. The more often one estimates that even where the social composition of the country excludes the first variant, some military actions in the countryside could represent a necessary stimulant for an urban movement which one could consider sometimes as steeped in the routine imposed by the traditional leadership. In countries where the objective conditions are more matured, even this discussion seems outdated, the general solutions being accepted. The effort of analysis is orientated above all towards the specific concrete forms in which it shall be possible to effectively commence the guerrilla, not in demanding teams which arrive from outside, but in close liaison with the struggles of the peasants.

Groups with such a composition and such a nature are naturally all exposed to the danger of the development of adventurist and purely activist tendencies. It is not we who will contest the necessity of the armed struggle's preparation right now, above all in certain countries, which implies a series of measures necessary at this stage already. But it will be necessary to criticise all artificial and fanciful initiatives detached from the real movement and more strongly all premature actions devoted to the failure and the sacrifice of their authors or every kind of amateur or even burlesques enterprises.

The more matured militants seem conscious of these dangers and serious criticism can be heard from their part of some actions even of a certain scope, for example, some insurrectional episodes in Venezuela.

It is not in the framework of this article that we can examine the delicate and complex question of the relations of the revolutionary organisations, formed or embryonic, with the Cubans. It is no secret to anyone that the Fidelist leadership interests itself more and more directly in the development of the Latin American revolutionary movement, and that the more dynamic and best orientated leaders of these parties have no intention of linking up with the CP and of putting themselves least of all under them. On the contrary, they do not spare from their criticisms the leaders of these parties, their political line, by attacking them openly before delegations that

visit Cuba. Following the fundamental line of the Havana Declaration, they insist on the idea of the necessity of a revolutionary rupture, on the role of the peasantry and of the guerilla struggle, in rejecting the "peaceful" ways and the alliance with the national bourgeoisie. That does not signify that the Cubans tie themselves now to such or such a group: they give the impression of acting still on different levels, by propelling left tendencies inside the traditional organisations.

In these organisations themselves, despite the attempts of many leaders to try to reduce the Cuban affair more or less to a question of general solidarity or of propaganda, the Castroist influence is extremely important. In Argentina the differentiation inside Peronism was accentuated; in Brazil the movement of Juliao receives a supplementary impulsion; in Chile the repercussions inside the S. P. and in the trade unions are real ones, not to speak of other countries such as Venezuela for example.

In the Communist Parties, in particular, the Cuban experience has already stimulated some groups and left tendencies which sometimes have separated from the official party (6). It is clear that the bureaucratic leaderships find themselves placed before a major contradiction: on the one hand they can only praise the Cuban Revolution, its leaders and documents such as the Second Declaration of Havana, on the other hand they wish always to impose a political line which is even a negation of the Fidelist orientation, of the basic orientation of the Declaration of Havana. We do not doubt the manouevring skill of the opportunists at the head of the CPs; but by persisting in their attitude, they cannot prevent themselves from being isolated and sterilising their organisations (which can only at the most rally themselves at the last hour as they did in Cuba) or even to see themselves struck by some grave crisis from which left tendencies can emerge. If in a country such as Chile a possible process of this nature would have obviously a very great importance for the formation of a revolutionary movement, having given the force of the Chilian C.P., even where the Communist Parties are very small, the acquisition of cadres and devoted and subjectively revolutionary militants with a correct orientation would have an importance that should not be underestimated.

SPECIFIC REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

The common general traits that one can abstract from the present situation must at no price mean an under-estimation of the specific elements. In reality, in the framework of a very general common evolution there are national situations entirely differentiated, and these differentiations become essential for an understanding of the concrete reality at this stage and for deciding the perspectives of the short and middle term, and more importantly, to express a tactical orientation efficacious in relation to the given process of maturation of different sectors of the mass movement. A very rapid appreciation of the conditions of some countries, chosen a little empirically, confirm these truths. In Peru the crisis of the ruling classes has led to the solution of Perez Godoy, of whom we have already spoken. He provides however a solution eminently transitory, and crucial problems of leadership will be posed again in the short run (for example before the elections, if they take place.)

But the principal interest resides in the developments which were produced and are now taking place inside the mass movement, in both the towns and villages. The crisis in APRA, already open for some time, has been precipitated by the electoral set-back and still more by the lamentable failure of the general strike called by the Trade Union Central in support of Haya de la Torre. Thus the APRA, which no more has the majority influence except in the north of the country is on the way to losing its majority on the trade union level, and in fact a certain number of important trade unions have left the C.T.P., to constitute the embryo of a parallel Centre. The struggle for a new Centre to which must adhere progressively all the trade unions making it possible to avoid vertical ruptures, is the central task of the Peruvian movement at this stage. This Centre will probably be led by men under the influence of the C.P. or generally "socialist" with an important participation of Trotskyists (7). It shall represent a turning point above all in the sense that the trade union movement will emancipate itself thus from the tutelage of all

sectors of the bourgeoisie and shall finally conquer class autonomy.

In the countryside a revolutionary situation is maturing rapidly. In different peasant layers, above all among the Communities, the idea is spreading that it is necessary to follow the Cuban way and to prepare for the armed struggle. Land occupations are not rare and in certain cases the authorities consider it more opportune not to react. In other cases, on the contrary, there are bloody repressions. Let us cite the episode of Francisco Vallejos a young soldier of the Republican Guard who organised a circle of students and who one day, with his students, disarmed the local police and made for the mountains. Rescuing forces arrived however before the foreseen time, there was an unequal battle with the sacrifice of Vallejos and a peasant leader (8). It must be added that a guerilla group has been organised for some time by Hugo Blanco, in the Convention valley, and according to unconfirmed reports has already supported the occupation of land by the peasants(9).

There is no doubt that the developments in the **sierra** and **selva** shall be decisive for the Peruvian Revolution; there is no doubt that conditions exist already for the building of a structure of a peasant revolutionary movement with detachments of **guerilleros**. It is highly possible that in direct liaison with the occupation of lands as the Peruvian vanguard seems to have understood, the armed fight can develop, above all in the first stage. Student layers and intellectuals of peasant origin will have a decisive role in the formation of a conscious vanguard in the villages and to assure in the last analysis a liaison between the urban movement and the peasant movement. The revolutionary Marxists shall not spare themselves any effort to win to their ranks elements with this capital conjunctural connection.

In Chile, the conflicts are not posed in such an acute form, and even in relation to the year 1960 there is a certain slowing-down of the movement. But as we have already mentioned, the conservative Front continues to enjoy a security which is limited, while the Christian Democrats continue to play the 'cavalier alone.' In reality, it is precisely

this party which finds itself at the centre of the tactical preoccupations of the ruling classes. Shall they seek to organise a new formula including the Christian Democrats or even, around a candidate of theirs, shall they accept the perspective of a dispersed struggle in 1964? Are there not people outlining an audacious manouvre putting forward a Christian Democrat—FRAP alliance in the struggle to castrate the possible victory of this latter? It appears to us in any case that the last two variants imply a game a little daring.

On the other hand, a positive factor is represented by the activation of certain peasant layers up till now without any real political weight. That contributed to stimulate in Chile also the discussions on the revolutionary role of the peasants and of a possible guerilla struggle. But, in general, in a country of the Chilian social structure, it is not possible to foresee a predominant role for the peasants: the battle will take place essentially in the towns. On the other hand, even if one wishes to accept the conception of a stimulant role, a spark to set alight the movement—(a conception that the Cubans themselves seem to generalise a little too much) it is clear that in the short run—before 1964—all attempts to pass directly over to the guerilla or the armed struggle in general are destined inevitably to a lamentable failure.

In effect, it must not be forgotten that the traditional organisations, socialist and communist, still exercise a very large hold over the mass movement which cannot be eliminated by ill-considered actions. More concretely, there is a very precise stage that polarises the attention of the worker and peasant masses. In reality, in Chile it is recognised that the expectations of the 1964 elections, could well represent a crucial turning point. Besides there is an almost unanimous agreement on this, inclusive of those who have considered already that in the eyes of the masses the traditional organisations are worn out and who pronounce themselves for independent activity. What is important, is that, in the spirit of the masses 1964 signifies victory for Allende, the candidate of the FRAP, and in its turn this victory acquires a clearly revolutionary meaning as a sort of final

rendering of accounts. The author of this article understood from a direct source that, in one region at least, the peasants have already made out on paper the partition of the land to be translated into action on the morrow of the victory of Allende.

It is therefore clear enough that the majority of the masses still must have their experiences in the traditional organisations. A much clearer polarisation on the Left makes ruptures possible. New re-alignment of forces could be stimulated powerfully by the events of 1964. The possible victory of the the FRAP on the electoral plane will launch inevitably very violent struggles in the country but even a defeat would not probably be accepted passively by the masses (10).

In **Bolivia**, the tenth anniversary of the Revolution suggests a balance sheet little flattering to the MNR. The economic situation is extremely grave for the production of tin has been seriously lowered, the exports both in quantity and value have been reduced by nearly a half, the mines are, almost in their totality idle. There has been no technical renovation, which does not permit one to count on an amelioration in the short run. (11) The other industrial sectors feel heavily the effects of the so-called liberalisation (a little near 60% of the factories have closed in the last years). On the other hand, the results of the agrarian reform have been very modest, even adverse certain in respects.

The wearing-away of the MNR continues and its apparatus bureaucratises itself more and more; the signs of the last elections have already been stressed, the Congress of the COB has been above all the affair of the Lechin apparatus with numerous infiltrations of the C.P. Despite a certain lassitude, the masses still struggle, even coming into the streets, while the peasants are always capable of putting to flight the authorities by their violent demonstrations. Manifestations of duality of power continue to exist effectively.

Unfortunately, as we have already said, the masses disillusioned with the MNR see no other consistent pole of attraction. The COB itself appears largely devoid of content, the militias exist only in certain zones,

and have no national co-ordination. In conclusion, while from the objective point of view it would be legitimate to envisage some revolutionary developments in the short run, the grave lack on the plane of the revolutionary organization and of the revolutionary leadership weighs heavily in a negative sense.

Concerning **Brazil**, whose situation is known in general terms and could not be analysed in more detail in a few. We shall limit ourselves here to underlining two aspects.

The mass movement is still divided, structured under different forms, which vary much from region to region, and unification on a national scale always goes by default. What is worse, it is still far from having escaped the direct or indirect (by the mediation of the trade unions) hold of layers of the national bourgeoisie. To give only some significant examples, in certain sectors it is the Labour Party (PTB) with its trade union organisations which controls the movement; in a town as important as Sao Paulo the majority of the workers follow Janism (the movement of Quadros), to the north-east the peasants are organised by the Left Socialist Francisco Jiliao, considered as Castroist No. 1 in Brazil. If we consider, on the other hand, the political organisations which claim more or less to be Marxist, there are several of them, but none have an important mass influence. The Brazilian Communist Party (Prestes) lost much force and will be incapable of genuine autonomous action, even if it wanted to (which it doesn't). The Communist Party of Brazil is only, if anything, a limited vanguard organisation. The Brazillian Socialist Party counts here and there certainly a little support, even in the trade unions, but it is absolutely ill-assorted; it appears more as a sort of confederation of very different groups than as a united party operating on a national scale (12)

In such a situation, one can understand how the masses and their organisations, despite the explosive character of the situation and the combativity of large sectors, can be reduced often to a watching role in the grand manoeuvres of the different layers and tendencies of the national bourgeoisie.

This was the case twice in the course of the last fifteen months, at the moment of the succession of Quadros by Goulart and in the crisis of September last. The result was that Goulart imposed himself with the help of the masses, obtained a consolidation of his power in the same way and, finally, showed his true face by concluding an understanding with the Right, and lining up with Kennedy for whom he is now one of the most valuable allies in Latin America. This demonstrates that the Brazilian bourgeoisie still possesses trumps which are not necessarily negligible, even if they can dream of no economic or social stability.

All that implies, in conclusion, that the tasks of the revolutionary Marxists of Brazil are extremely difficult and complex and that it is only by scrupulous analyses, without prejudice, and constantly brought up to-date that they can discern the more profound process of the mass movement and be in a condition to play in it a role of propulsion(13)

Argentina has this year passed through an exceptionally acute crisis with the confrontation of several political and military tendencies. We will not insist on known facts, the end of Frondizism, the clash between the "gorrillas" and the "moderns" of the military, the push of the Nasserist tendencies, the manouvres of men such as Alsogaray and Aramburu. At the centre of Argentine political life is to be found the reality of Peronism, which on the one hand prevents any political stabilisation which either eliminates Peron or is against him, while on the other hand it influences the mass movement in a still decisive manner.

In fact one can ask with some reason whether the Argentine bourgeoisie and Yankee Imperialism could again play the card of Peronism, by opening the gates to the exile from Madrid. But the difficulty resides in the fact that in 1962, in Latin America nobody can say whether such events as the restoration of Peron could only be the prelude. In the eyes of the masses, Peron is more than ever the flag bearer of the anti-imperialist struggle, of the fight against the oligarchy, and of their national and social emancipation. His return would be considered as a great victory, increasing their combativity and aggressiveness, and the

movement could go rapidly well beyond the goals that have been fixed by Peron and his Chief of Staff. At the base, it is the General himself who understands all that and, outside verbal proclamations, his concrete actions indicate clearly enough his intention of not fighting effectively for power in the immediate future. The problem could risk remaining always open, the bourgeoisie oscillating between the tendencies to put Peronism out of the game and the necessity of counting on it, should be by an integration in the present system (14) or by recalling it to power in the absence of any other solution.

In a parallel situation, the Peronist movement itself cannot prevent internal upheavals and will suffer from multiple pressures. The differentiations inside it will be accentuated more and more, at the very moment when the situation in the country becomes dramatic, and where, among other things, the influence of the Cuban Revolution will become more precise (15). While the leftist trade union wing of whom Framini is the principal representative, accept voluntarily a turn to the Left, of which Peron himself has understood the necessity, (16) and that the same Framini ranges himself beside Cuba, for example in an interview with an Italian journal (17), the rightist Matera makes an overture to the "moderate" wing of the Army and to the partisans of the integration, by refusing the "left turn" and by acclaiming the Alliance for Progress. (18).

From all this can be drawn the obvious conclusion that, in the general framework of Peronism, will develop a process of vital importance for the development of the political struggle in Argentina and more particularly for the evolution of the mass movement. The revolutionary Marxists should not underestimate or ignore it: the Argentine masses have to have a whole series of experiences before finding other forms of organisations and other instruments of struggle. One can envisage their process of maturation with optimism in the face of the highly interesting fermentations which have occurred recently in the Peronist youth. Some sectors of the youth began to organise themselves with a very solid structure, even if it was only on the

local scale, to organise **commandos**, to publish clanderstine leaflets, expressions of their will for struggle. There is here in embryo the first crystallisation of the proletarian tendency of Peronism, from where can emerge revolutionary cadres destined to play a role in the development of the revolutionary movement of the masses.

* * *

The aim of this article is not to formulate the tasks and tactical orientation of the revolutionary Marxist forces of Latin America. Such a formulation can only result from a collective declaration of those engaged in action and only be sanctioned by the legitimate organisms of our international movement.

However, what we must do is to indicate how the task of the revolutionary Marxists is difficult in a context where pre-revolutionary and revolutionary conditions are existing already or are rapidly maturing, where the vanguard militants and groups still constitute only limited kernel often divided and, even leaving out of account the action of Imperialism and its agents, where some political and trade union apparatus carried out a systematic campaign of disparagement, of isolation, if not elimination, of the most advanced cadres and militants. The Latin American reality even inside some countries—it is sufficient to think of the Brazilian colossus—is very complex and volatile: changes, brusque upheavals are always possible, even to say probable. The revolutionary Marxists must reject all schema as the plague, and hang on to the reality, interpret it dialectically, seizing from it in time the most dynamic tendencies. People who are only able to repeat slogans in a vacuum, always preferably the same for every occasion for every country in the world, who do not understand that the new revolutionary organisations and leaderships will rise from the mass movement's own development and that it is absurd to erect as fetishes small organisations, which, whatever be the spirit of their militants (19), are condemned to sterility, to the mere recognition of the victories others have achieved; to the pretentious role of counsellors. It is

necessary therefore to have the greatest broadness of spirit to understand that the revolutionary roads can be innumerable, and even unexpected. Which signifies that it is never enough to content oneself with summary judgments which become in substance lists of principles, but for each phenomenon to develop a detailed, concrete analysis based above all on a scrupulous knowledge of the facts. The equivalent of an attitude of investigation must be, on the plane of action, the greatest flexibility, the greatest tact, in combination with political decision and the clearest hostility to all organisational fetishism. The revolutionary Marxists must be always ready to take audacious initiatives themselves, where it is objectively possible, correctly integrating themselves in the largest movements which develop independently of their action, and stimulating these movements by taking therein the role of the conscious vanguard. They must also, if necessary, have the courage to recall people to take account of the reality, to understand that the mass movement has its own laws of development, which in relation to ourselves, are in a large measure objective facts which cannot be denied by simple acts of will.

In Latin America also, the revolutionary Marxists enjoy the capital advantage of being part of an historical revolutionary current of an international communist organisation, which has at its disposal a whole theoretical heritage and political heritage as an irreplaceable instrument of knowledge and struggle. But they should not content themselves with this heritage which, at length, can be converted into a handicap if it is not in a state of constant renewal and enriching experience. The Cuban Revolution has demonstrated, among other things how the new dimensions of the revolutionary reality are divulged by a revolution which has attained a high level of self-consciousness. These is still a whole continent as terrain for analysis and action for those who would live be to the height of the extraordinary epoch in which we live.

20 October, 1962.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) A recent interesting report has been prepared by some experts invited to an important meeting at Santiago in Chili by the Secretariat of the CEPAL—In this report even, one recalls, for example, that while the Latin American exports represented 10% of world exports in 1937-38 in 1961 they had fallen to 6.5% of the unitary value of its exports; that in 1934-1938, the countries of the European Community bought more than 11% of the European imports of Latin American goods, against 6% in 1960.....
 - (2) In reality, the abstentions have been very high, up to 60% according to the optimistic official figures. In the big mining centres, only some hundreds of voters voted.
 - (3) See the partial election of September 1962 in Santiago, where the government candidate moved back, while the FRAP and above all the Christian Democrats ameliorated their positions.
 - (4) The comrades of the POR (t) who edit EL OBRERO CAMPESINO expressed this analysis in a declaration issued on 18th July.
 - (5) According to the passages from the book published recently in Brazil it appears that a leader such as Julio gives certain credit to the military, seeing among the generals a "national" and "popular" tendency in the Brazilian Army.
 - (6) We recall, for example, the Communist Party of Brazil, which split from the party of Prestes, and the Leninist Communist Party of Peru.
 - (7) The metal-workers' trade union is led by well-known militants of the POR (t) which has a very good influence also in the building workers' trade union and some other sectors as well.
 - (8) There was also Mayta who died crying: "Long live the Revolution!" and whose name shall not be forgotten by the revolutionary movements.
 - (9) Hugo Blanco, in an interview with journalists, did not hide his favourable orientation to Trotskyism and to the Fourth International.
 - (10) There is a widespread sentiment that a defeat for Allende would only be possible by fraud and that there could be a reaction against such an eventuality.....
 - (11) The modernisation of plant was very seriously held back by the fact that very heavy compensation was paid to the former owners.
 - (12) The SP includes, on the one hand a good number of opportunists and even a minister of the Government, H Lima; on the other hand, left militants who are approaching revolutionary marxism, and a man such as Francisco Juliao.
 - (13) In Brazil, the perspective for guerilla war will be posed sooner or later concretely. It must not however be ignored that in immense countries such as Brazil and Mexico, guerillas in the backward zones could be prolonged for a long period without implying a rapid fall of the central power.
 - (14) This tendency showed some signs after the mid-September crisis.
 - (15) Besides a more general influence, one effect of the Cuban Revolution was to stimulate layers of the vanguard to a reflection and a political and theoretical elaboration which, before, they were not in the habit of.
 - (16) See certain declarations of Peron on the necessity to bring up-to-date his doctrine. The ten points of Framini include: nationalisation of all banks, state control of foreign trade, nationalisation of key sectors of the economy, prohibition on the export of capital, expropriation of the landed oligarchy without compensation, workers control on production, abolition of commercial secrecy, etc....
 - (17) Cf L'Unita, 18 August, 1962
 - (18) See his declarations of 17th October, 1962 to the Foreign Press Association.
 - (19) Even worse if, as is the case in certain organisations which still incorrectly claim to be of the Fourth International, the political level is generally primitive and the organisational structure entirely bureaucratised.
- N.B. The episode even of the attack on **El Banco de Credito** organised by some militants of a Peruvian Trotskyist tendency, is also significant of the climate of the country, above all from the point of-view of the very large and enthusiastic aid that was expressed in the workers' and students' milieux in favour of those imprisoned.

RESOLUTION ON ALGERIA

(1) With the election of the National Constituent Assembly and the designation of Ben Bella as premier, following some three months of crisis, the first stage of domestic political struggle in independent Algeria came to a close.

The victory was gained by the tendency represented by the Political Bureau under the leadership of Ben Bella with the support of the majority of the ALN led by Boumedienne. Boumedienne's support was decisive in bringing Ben Bella to the fore. The alliance between the Political Bureau and the ALN majority—despite differences that became evident on various occasions—tipped the scales for the large majority of the masses in both cities and countryside and caused them to polarize around the present leadership. The “Fanonist” and even “Castroite” orientation of Boumedienne, plus various declarations by Ben Bella (despite contradictions, weaknesses and the orientation of some of his allies), along with significant decisions already made by the new Algerian government, show that the relationship of forces is shifting in favor of tendencies which express, even if in a limited way, the insistence of the masses on basic social changes in opposition to neocolonialism.

The forces that lost out during the various stages of the crisis were quite heterogeneous. Some tendencies could be characterized as conservative in view of their response to the influence of regionalism, of confused and dangerous concepts or even direct and indirect pressure from pro-bourgeois and neocolonialist forces. Other tendencies, like those of Wilaya 4, while unable to express a clear orientation, could not be characterized rightist, pro-bourgeois or pro-neocolonialist.

The situation in independent Algeria was such that it was quite difficult for genuine pro-bourgeois and neocolonialist forces to emerge. On the subjective side, it was difficult for cadres and leaders of the FLN to assume this role in view of their unani-

mous acceptance of the Tripoli program and the success of a struggle in which revolutionary masses played a decisive role. The danger, in a framework inherited from the colonial period, lay in the confusion, lack of clear orientation on specific issues, in hesitation over concrete measures that had to be taken, in lack of understanding of the real social content and potential objectives of the current conflicts and struggles.

Admittedly, some of the cadres, including a few on the leadership level, and vanguard groups inside the FLN might have expressed a more democratic and consistently revolutionary line than that of Ben Bella and his collaborators. It is also true that on a wider scale leftist tendencies appeared in various sectors (trade unions, *El Moudhjid* and even among supporters of the Wilayas opposed to the Political Bureau). But the cadres and groups that could have expressed a clear political line, first, acted on a narrow base in view of their lack of concrete mass support; secondly, proved to be too incohesive to play the role of catalyzer during the crisis.

Consequently, despite weaknesses and vacillations, despite bureaucratic and even bonapartist tendencies, the leadership around the Political Bureau, represented chiefly by Ben Bella and supported by the ALN majority, succeeded in prevailing as the tendency which in the struggle for power expressed more closely than the others at the moment the domestic and international needs of the revolution. On this plane, we repeat, among the specific alternatives, victory went to the more progressive assemblage of forces.

(2) After the election of the National Constituent Assembly a new stage opened, not less crucial than the previous one. All problems are now posed in acute form. Even in the immediate future important developments of various kinds are possible. It is in the coming period that the decisive battles will be fought against all attempts at neocolonialism.

As recent events bear witness, mass pressure, far from diminishing, has increased, especially in the countryside. Impelling immediate needs, deep revolutionary feelings that matured among the masses during the long heroic struggle, refusal among both the peasants and the poor of the cities to abandon hope for the concrete social fruits of the victory—all these factors point to new progressive advances, so that the possibility of the Revolution stagnating or retreating is remote at present. Among the more positive indications in recent weeks have been the decision of the Algerian government concerning management of properties abandoned by proprietors, which signifies a blow against the national bourgeoisie, particularly in the countryside, as well as against the French colonialists, and the courageous stand in defence of Cuba.

The incohesiveness of various leftist groups and tendencies added considerably to the confusion among large sectors of militants, but it would now seem clear that many militants, cadres and leaders have drawn the most fundamental lesson of the colonial revolution; namely, that to be really victorious the revolution must be "permanent"; it must continue, firmly rejecting from the very beginning every attempt to introduce neocolonialism. These elements will play a more and more important role.

In addition it must be underlined that in the present atmosphere of the Revolution, as reflected partially in the first debates in the National Constituent Assembly, any tendency to impose a leadership and its proposed measures by bureaucratic, paternalistic methods through the monolithism of a single party and state institutions, will be resisted. Democratic methods of leadership will be more and more strongly demanded at all levels.

As we have said before, a requisite for positive development is a genuinely revolutionary, democratic, popular structure for the new state. Both in the cities and in the countryside the masses must be able to actually exert their own power, freely express their own will, and carry out the measures which are enacted in their own interest. Some embryonic forms of such organs,

with real objective contents, already exist, whatever their genesis or however debatable their proceedings. It is necessary to begin from just these embryonic forms in order to develop them into genuine organs of the new power and to extend the understanding of this basic necessity from small minorities to larger and larger sectors of the masses, whose active participation in these state organs is an essential condition for the continual progressive development of the revolution.

At bottom the problem remains of constructing an adequate political instrument. It is not simply a question of the best formula for government, or of which team, but of rebuilding the FLN as a revolutionary party with mass influence. In brief it is the problem of political leadership of the revolution in the widest sense which urgently demands solution.

Serious dangers face the revolution. In case construction of an adequate political leadership is long delayed so that passage of essential measures is postponed in the face of tremendous economic and financial difficulties, dangerous neocolonialist tendencies could arise and under pretext of "putting an end to the chaos and confusion" try to impose plausible measures based, possibly, on promises or even token "aid" from imperialist sources. Through a circuitous path like this, neocolonialism could hope to chalk up some successes and to slow down, even if only temporarily, the development of the revolution toward its basic social outcome.

(3) The Fourth International, which has supported the heroic struggle of the FLN from the very beginning and which continues to call for unconditional support to the Algerian Revolution, offers critical support to the present government of independent Algeria. While expressing criticisms based on its own positions, the Fourth International supports and will support all the revolutionary and progressive decisions which have been and will be adopted by the Algerian government.

The Algerian revolutionary Marxists are convinced of the urgency of giving the FLN a new structure, to be decided on by a

national congress after a fully democratic discussion at all levels. The FLN should adopt a basic political program and firmly organize itself along the lines of democratic centralism.

The revolutionary Marxists are not in favor of mere unity without distinctions. We urge revolutionary unity among all revolutionary tendencies and forces and suggest that the cement for that unity be the implementation of the Tripoli program. On this clear political basis it will be possible to ascertain which forces are really fighting for a revolutionary solution and which forces, on the contrary, are ready to play a conservative pro-bourgeois role. In this way it will be possible to overcome the present division among various leftist tendencies, to bring in other forces that are still hesitant or fearful, and build a real revolutionary tendency as the essential driving force of the Algerian permanent revolution.

At the same time, the revolutionary Marxists will fight for the construction of democratic popular committees, elected from below, as the real organs of power. As we have indicated, it is necessary to start with the embryonic forms which already exist and from concrete experiences understandable to the masses.

In a more general way, the revolutionary Marxists will propose a program with a

socialist content, insisting on the absolutely urgent necessity for a radical agrarian reform, of nationalizing the basic industrial sectors, the banks and transportation system, of introducing economic planning, of instituting a monopoly of foreign trade and nationalization of foreign commercial enterprises.

As for immediate measures, the following are suggested:

(a) Cancellation of the debts of peasants and suspension of the payment of rent for land.

(b) Workers and peasants administration of all factories and farms abandoned by their owners.

(c) Establishment of workers control in all banks and industries.

(d) Establishment of people's control over all food stocks, housing, rents, etc.

Concrete steps such as these, taken within the framework of the general orientation we have indicated, will enable the Revolution to move forward to new important steps and overcome all the obstacles by which imperialism hopes to prevent a repetition of the brilliant Cuban experience on the shores of the Mediterranean.

November 4, 1962.

RESOLUTION ON THE CONFLICT BETWEEN INDIA AND CHINA

THE I.S. of the F.I. states that in the conflict between China and India the revolutionary marxists stand resolutely for the defence of the Chinese workers' state, it condemns the attitude taken by Nehru's government which gave rise to the conflict and tries to prolong it with aims concerning a reactionary internal policy and to justify the strengthening of its military apparatus with the aid given by the imperialists, it condemns the impermissible vacillations of the Soviet bureaucracy and the attitude taken by the majority of the leadership of the Indian C.P. and by other Indian organizations which claim to belong to the working class, which have succumbed

to the chauvinist pressure by forgetting their duty of solidarity towards the Chinese revolution. At the same time, the IS calls upon the government and the C.P. of China, while defending themselves against Nehru's attack, to take into consideration the interests of development of the revolutionary mass movement in India, to conduct themselves towards the Indian masses as real internationalists and in this way to make it much more difficult for Nehru to create chauvinistic hysteria in India at a moment when the Indian masses are increasingly aware of the bankruptcy of Congress rule.

November 3, 1962