

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 23

June 5, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

Page

In the Asturias Coal Basin	1
The Death of Nehru	4
Japanese CP Expels Two Top Leaders	5
"Pravda" Again Points to Specter of Trotskyism	6
Congolese Guerrilla Fighters Forge Ahead	7
South Africa's Prisons Like Nazi Camps	21
Caprivi Seeks Independence	8
Loan Made to Meet South African Ransom Demand	8
Step Toward Labor Unity in Ireland	9
West German Students Given Hearing in East Germany	9
Belgians Demand Freedom for Abarça	12
Negroes Battle to End Prejudice in Unions -- by Evelyn Sell	12
World Trade Conference Draws to an End -- by Fernand Charlier	15
On the Methodology of "Sectarianism" [Lukács Decides between Mao and Khrushchev] -- by P.L.Carp	22
The Mysterious Case of the 40 Microphones	31
Noted in Passing:	
Practice-What-You-Preach Department	11
One Country Where Private Property Is Still Sacred	14
Insecticide Production Opens New Possibilities	16
Documents:	
Trotskyist Leaders Discuss World Situation	17
The Lesson of the Coup d'Etat in Brazil	18

IN THE ASTURIAS COAL BASIN

The heroic strike action of the Spanish miners in Asturias, which began a month and a half ago, is reported to be coming to an end although as many as 10,000 to 15,000 were still stubbornly refusing to go back to the coal seams last week end.

Up to now Spain's fascist government has not undertaken brutally repressive measures against the illegal strike, perhaps reserving this for later when the strikers have reached the point

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE - Hebdomadaire

Abonnement, 26 numéros : 37,50 F, à Pierre FRANK, 21, rue d'Aboukir, Paris (2^e).

of exhaustion.

A vivid account of the situation in the coal fields, written by special correspondent José Antonio Novais, appeared in three installments in the Paris daily Le Monde [May 29, 30, 31].

An Andalusian, Luis Santiago Lopez, is quoted as saying: "The fact is that if we're not going to work, it's because we've had enough of being cheated day after day."

"I've been here five years," the striker continued. "Where else could I go? Here at least you eat every day. On the average I make three thousand pesetas a month [about \$50]. But it's a mouse trap, much worse than the 'tercio' [the Spanish Foreign Legion]. You can't get out of it. There's no hope. . . . To be a miner or driller, to get decent wages of from six to seven thousand pesetas, you have to be born in Asturias. Otherwise it's impossible to learn the trade."

While new workers are coming to the mines, others are leaving. Vicente Toro, a labor delegate in Oviedo, told the correspondent of Le Monde: "In the last three years or so, fifteen thousand Asturian miners, among the very best, have gone to other countries. The workers are leaving; as for capital, it has stopped coming in."

Antonio Novais describes the area:

"The Asturias coal basin is mountainous. The minister of housing had blocks of houses built in the towns for the miners, especially the immigrants. But in the hills there are small places often with less than a dozen houses and this is where the Asturians generally live. While the miners in the towns are practically proletarians, those in the villages are semirural. Almost all of them have small patches of land which they own. A company bus goes by each morning to take them to work. When the bus comes down empty, this means there is a strike. Generally the 'tough ones' live in the hills, the miners, the drillers -- those who decide on a work stoppage in a mine."

A miner of Vimanés told him, "Look, the Asturian is noble, open, a braggart. We are joining in the strike because we've had enough. . . . Promises, always promises, nothing more than that."

You would never guess that this big, strong-looking miner had silicosis.

"Here silicosis is our daily bread. . . . The Ministry of Labor seems to have set up norms that are favorable for us. But then you should see how they are carried out."

The Asturian is an individualist, in the opinion of Le Monde's correspondent. "An underground political organization hardly exists. The strike, a product of an intolerable social situation, is led by

a minority of natural leaders who were formed little by little in recent years. In Asturias purely ideological questions seem to count for very little. What counts is the prestige of a man capable of moving his comrades. The Vimanos miner is one of them."

This "natural" leader of the miners offered a further opinion: "The strike is lost and has been since the beginning. . . . In Spain it is difficult for the workers to win a strike, but it's the only weapon we have. The unions are useless. The strike is at least a union of the workers. Every lost strike tightens the bonds among the Asturian miners."

In Oviedos, Antonio Novais interviewed a graduate of a social school, who told him: "Up until 1950, Asturias was a concentration camp. The 'regulars' -- Moroccan troops -- and the 'tercio' were established in the region. Not a miner budged, but later things changed."

"What is the cause of this strike?"

"The first strike in Asturias took place in 1958; then came the one in 1962. Since then you could say that it has practically never stopped. As immediate cause of the present strike, you could cite mainly the delay in elaborating the new work regulations promised in 1958. In November 1963, Mr. Solis, minister secretary of the Movement and national delegate of the unions [the fascist Movement and government unions are referred to], assured the representatives of the Asturian miners who went to Madrid to see him, that the government was going to soon work out another plan for transforming the coal field. They even promised publication of the regulations by the first of the year. Later they talked about April, then May . . . The miners have had more than enough; the resumption of the strike was inevitable."

"And what are they demanding?"

"I have read a rough draft of the text presented by the mine commission. It includes two points which, knowing the bosses, are not likely to be approved. On the one hand they are supposed to lay out 800 million pesetas in accordance with wage increases. The miners want a monthly increase of around two thousand pesetas for the underground workers and fifteen hundred for the surface workers. The regulations also envisage a system under which representatives of the workers could check the company books. . . . Naturally the bosses will never agree to that formula."

Even the small minority of miners who admit to being pro-Franco have been affected by the strike, as the following curious statements, made by a delegate of the José Antonio Circle in La Felguera, show:

"In a Phalangist or syndicalist state, strikes must be banned and work subordinated to the interests of the nation. But we live

under complete capitalism. Vertical syndicalism was not conceived for a capitalist state like the one we live under. In the best of cases, this makes our unions unworkable. . . . when they're not leaning on the side of the bosses. . . . "

THE DEATH OF NEHRU

The death of Nehru May 27 set loose the usual flood of ritualistic verbiage in the bourgeois press about the passing of a "giant" among men.

The eulogies, however, were not without a grain of truth. Nehru was a top success in building a public image that had little in common with the real person behind the mask. And he stood in a class by himself for skill in representing the interests of the capitalist class of India in most difficult circumstances.

Nehru carefully cultivated the appearance of a suave, cultured, democratic, pacifist-minded, socialistically inclined but Western-oriented leader of the "Third World," who, instead of doodling at conferences, preferred to finger a freshly cut rose.

In actuality, he was short-tempered, inclined to authoritarianism, and as calculating a politician as the bourgeoisie has produced anywhere on earth. The fourteen years he spent in prison under the British imperialists did not prevent him, after he came to power, from engaging in mass jailings of political opponents. So much for his democracy.

His pacifism was a reflection of the weakness of the Indian bourgeoisie in relation to the big imperialist powers on the one hand and the rising might of the Soviet Union and China on the other. His "socialism" served two aims. It brought the power and resources of the Indian government to bear in the efforts of the Indian bourgeoisie to reach the point of economic "take off." It offered "pie in the sky" to the Indian masses who sought during World War II to tear their country free from the grip of imperialism and to take it down the path blazed by the Soviet Union.

In neither of these aims did Nehru achieve an outstanding success. Indian capitalism remains weak and rickety for all its rapaciousness. Deep unrest stirs among the Indian masses, for in addition to the example of the Soviet Union, they now have the growth of China as a gauge of what they might achieve if they break out of the capitalist framework. What Nehru did gain was postponement of crucial decisions -- at fearful cost to the Indian people whose standard of living remains one of the most abysmal in the entire world.

Nehru did not impose a dictatorship on India such as Chiang Kai-shek imposed on China. This was not thanks to his own inclina-

tions or to the logic of his policies. It was due to the surging rise of the colonial revolution throughout Asia and beyond which compelled Nehru to give the Indian show window an attractive trim. It was due, also, to the ferment in India and the continued pressure of the class struggle.

As a bourgeois nationalist opponent of imperialism, Nehru, like his mentor Gandhi, became endowed with considerable aura. This was in part due to the policy of the Communist party during the years of struggle for freedom. By supporting British imperialism during the war and defaulting in leading the mass combat for independence -- in accordance with Stalin's prescriptions -- the Communist party forfeited all respect and the Indian capitalist politicians profited from this.

The aura, however, had already greatly faded and in recent years Nehru found it increasingly difficult to contain the class struggle and to win more time for the Indian bourgeoisie. Signs of his "tiredness" were repeatedly observed and commented on. It is a characteristic of the class he represented. The Indian bourgeoisie is already old and tired although he has just appeared in the world scene as an independent -- more or less independent -- force.

What has proved most exhausting to this bourgeoisie and its representatives is the perspective of a great new resumption of the mass movement that broke British political control in India. With Nehru's death, this process may well be speeded up.

JAPANESE CP EXPELS TWO TOP LEADERS

TOKYO -- The Japanese Communist party expelled two of its top leaders, Y. Shiga and I. Suzuki, May 21, because of their public position in support of the Moscow treaty banning the testing of nuclear devices in the atmosphere.

The two leaders were members of the inner grouping of the Central Executive Committee and are well-known members of parliament. Their support of a Khrushchevist line was intolerable to a leadership committed to Peking.

The rightist majority of the Socialist party hailed Shiga's action in voting for the test-ban treaty. The leftist minority in the same party is opposed to the treaty, in accordance with its sympathy for Peking, but in casting its votes adhered to the discipline of the majority.

It is quite clear that the deepening rift over the test-ban treaty foreshadows two antinuclear weapons congresses next August. Soviet delegates will probably attend the congress sponsored by the

Socialist party; Chinese delegates will attend the one sponsored by the Communist party. The left wing of the Socialist party, finding itself in a difficult situation, will probably boycott the congress organized by their own party.

"PRAVDA" AGAIN POINTS TO SPECTER OF TROTSKYISM

The May 27 issue of l'Humanité, the newspaper of the French Communist party, reports from Moscow that Pravda celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the Thirteenth Congress of the Communist party of Russia by "placing the accent on the important role of this session in the struggle against Trotskyism. . . "

The dispatch, which was telephoned to l'Humanité, continues: "The difficulties which the Party encountered at the time were still further aggravated by the fact that the Trotskyists, after the death of Lenin, sought to assemble all the anti-Party elements in order to develop their splitting activity. The congress completely approved the policy conducted by the Central Committee in the struggle against Trotskyism."

Why this odd celebration forty years later? A quotation is offered from Pravda: "The significance of this defeat inflicted on the Trotskyists by our Party, the instructive character of this historic experience, are particularly evident today, enabling one to understand the petty-bourgeois, neo-Trotskyist positions now adopted by the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party."

Pravda's celebration is an obvious retort to Peking's accusation that Khrushchev is more "Trotskyist" than Mao. What Khrushchev really reveals, however, is that his anti-Stalinism is only skin deep. By celebrating Stalin's 1924 victory, he celebrates the beginning of the process that led inevitably to the one-man dictatorship, the blood purges, the frame-up trials, the weakening of the defense of the Soviet Union -- all the abominations in fact which Khrushchev himself was compelled to admit, if only in part, at the Twentieth Congress. Khrushchev is against the end of the process; but hails its beginning!

And without intending it, he joins the Chinese in indicating once again that Trotskyism -- the living ideas of revolutionary socialism -- cannot be obliterated. Even less than Stalin himself can Stalin's disciples bury Trotskyism, no matter how often they announce its death!

CONGOLESE GUERRILLA FIGHTERS FORGE AHEAD

Guerrilla fighters in the Congo made a new and significant gain in opening up a third front, occupying the important towns of Albertville and Baudouinville in northern Katanga and winning control of the whole Congo shore of Lake Tanganyika.

Up to now, the Congolese guerrilla fighters held two fronts, the first one in Kouilou in the western Congo, the second in Kivou province in the eastern Congo. In the second front, an important victory was scored May 19 when guerrilla fighters occupied Uvira, not far from the Kivou capital city of Bukavu.

Uvira is at the northern end of the Congo shore of Lake Tanganyika. Using Uvira as a base, a column of guerrilla fighters marched south and seems to have succeeded in occupying Albertville and Baudouinville without any serious resistance.

In fact, it seems certain that the soldiers of the "National Congolese Army," commanded by the imperialist stooge Gen. Mobutu, refused to oppose the guerrilla forces at Uvira; and, at Albertville and Baudouinville, they joined the ranks of the freedom fighters.

The guerrilla forces have set up their own administration in Uvira (for Kivou) and in Albertville (for northern Katanga). Their leader is said to be Soumialot, who states that he is serving under the command of the Committee of National Liberation in Brazzaville, where most of the refugee leaders of the Congolese nationalist parties are assembled. He says that he is not connected with Pierre Mulele, the leader of Kouilou guerrilla fighters, who also declares that he is serving under the Committee of National Liberation.

At the moment the situation among the Lumumbist, nationalist forces is not clear. Some, like Gbenyé, who headed the Lumumbist opposition in the Léopoldville parliament before it was suspended by Kasavubu, seem to be willing to negotiate with Belgian and U.S. imperialist forces in constituting an alternative government to the present Adoula regime. They even have contacts with the extreme right-wing reactionary forces around Tschombé. Accused of embezzling funds, Gbenyé was expelled from the Committee of National Liberation. The Committee is now headed by Bocheley-Davidson but it is not clear how much real authority it wields over the Kouilou, Kivou and northern Katanga guerrilla forces.

U.S. imperialism has been exerting pressure on the government of the small kingdom of Burundi to stop helping the Kivou guerrillas.

Meanwhile United Nations forces are scheduled to withdraw from the Congo on June 30, and the Léopoldville clique look with foreboding at the projected ending of massive foreign assistance in the face of rising popular resistance. They are negotiating feverishly with Belgian, U.S., West German and French imperialist representatives for continued military aid after the UN forces leave.

CAPRIVI SEEKS INDEPENDENCE

Kibwai, the president of the recently formed Caprivi African National Union [CANU], is in Lusaka soliciting the support of the Northern Rhodesia government.

The aim of the CANU is to attain self-government (independence) for the Caprivi Strip, and it is petitioning the United Nations as part of its strategy. The CANU is opposed, in particular, to the imposition of a Bantustan [segregated reserve] in Caprivi.

The Caprivians number some 15,000 people and live in the narrow tongue of land between Angola and Northern Rhodesia in the north and Bechuanaland in the south. They have close tribal and linguistic affinities to the Lozi and Makololo people of Barotseland, Northern Rhodesia. They live at a very low level of subsistence and most of the men are recruited as contract laborers for the South African mines.

The Caprivi Strip is of enormous strategic importance, too, as the South African Defense Department considers that it may be through this region that an African Liberation Army would launch its first attack on South Africa. The Defence Force, in addition to using the territory as a training ground in tropical warfare, has also equipped it with a radar station and placed units of ground troops there.

LOAN MADE TO MEET SOUTH AFRICAN RANSOM DEMAND

The demand of the South African government for payment of £ 331 by Dr. Kenneth G. Abrahams, under threat of throwing out his father and mother from their home, was met by a loan while funds were being collected. [See World Outlook May 22 on appeal for help.] A two-week deadline on payment was set by Vorster, Minister of Justice.

"This is ransom money exacted by the state after I had been kidnapped by police thugs," Dr. Abrahams stated. "The demand was made on May 1, and the money had to be paid within two weeks, or the house they are now occupying would be attached and sold. Even now we have had no official notification.

"Not satisfied with having hounded us out of the country and having separated us from our family and children (whom we have not seen for nearly a year now), Vorster and his Special Branch are wreaking vengeance on my family for my 'crimes.'" Dr. Abrahams' crimes are political; namely, opposition to the apartheid policy of the Verwoerd government.

The South African police have persecuted the family for some time. "Last year," said Dr. Abrahams, "the Special Branch invaded my family's residence on more than one occasion in the predawn hours and rummaged through all their private belongings -- even though I had not stayed with them for seven months. Then the Special Branch had the impertinence to enquire which furniture belonged to me and which to my mother, as mine, they threatened, may be confiscated. Recently they have been making enquiries as to the whereabouts of my duplicating and photostatic machines, allegedly used by the National Liberation Front. Apparently these must also be taken into custody."

STEP TOWARD LABOR UNITY IN IRELAND

DUBLIN, May 25 -- This country's second biggest union, the Workers Union of Ireland [WUI], with a membership of 30,000, ranging from factory workers to airline pilots, has decided to affiliate to the Irish Labour party.

The decision will almost double the number of trade unionists affiliated to the Labour party and is sure to have an effect on other major unions not yet pledged to support Labour.

Heretofore the only real liaison between the Labour party and the major unions has been the economic committee comprised of Labour deputies and leaders of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions acting from time to time as a national council of Labour.

Now it is felt that the decision of the WUI has almost sealed the issue and that other unions will feel compelled to follow suit.

WEST GERMAN STUDENTS GIVEN HEARING IN EAST GERMANY

HAMBURG, May 27 -- The West German left-socialist student organization, the SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- Socialist Student Association of Germany], whose affiliation to the Social-Democratic party was broken by the right-wing leadership of that party because of the students' militant Marxist convictions, was invited by the East German authorities to participate in the "German Reunion," a mass youth festival organized by the Ulbricht regime for May 16-17.

The SDS replied that it was willing to participate provided that it could have its own reporter at one of the discussion panels to be held at the festival. This request was rejected by the East German authorities on May 14. However, the next day the decision was reversed and the SDS received a written statement that its conditions had been accepted.

The SDS thereupon sent a delegation of three, including Helmut Lessing, vice-chairman of the organization. He made a report at a panel discussion of some 300 participants, 100 from West Germany, 200 who were members of the FDJ [Communist Youth of East Germany] and who, of course, had been carefully selected by the Ulbricht regime.

Lessing took sharp issue with anti-Communism but was quite critical of the bureaucratic regime of the German Democratic Republic. His main points along these lines were:

(1) Opposition to the rigged Stalinist trials held in East Germany, particularly the condemnation of "our friend Heinz Brandt." (Brandt was an oppositional German Communist who spent ten years in a Nazi concentration camp. A correspondent of Metall, newspaper of the metal workers union, he was kidnapped in June 1961 by the Stalinist police and condemned at a secret trial to fifteen years at hard labor. Significantly, a few days after the East German Youth Festival, Brandt was suddenly freed.)

(2) Opposition to the transformation of socialist theory into a dogma. For critical scientific examination of all facts. This, Lessing held, does not contradict full participation by scientists in the fight for socialism.

(3) Science and scientific research require unlimited freedom of information. "The possibility of obtaining information freely is not only a condition for intellectuals to engage in scientific work. In a process of real emancipation it is also a condition for the formation of critical judgment in all men." Later in his remarks Lessing said: "No political system which tries to prevent people from making up their own minds -- by deciding what information should or should not be made available -- has the right to call itself socialist or democratic."

(4) Social science must start by recognizing the real contradictions in society. Where the existence of such contradictions is not taken into account, a tendency develops to consider their manifestation to be a consequence of the influence of an alien foe and to hold that the demand for greater freedom "only adds grist to the mill . . . of the imperialist enemies of freedom" (Politbureau member Kurt Hager). In concluding this point, Lessing said: "In the German Federal Republic, the SDS is considered to be an organization of the extreme left. But unity cannot be forged with political forces that repress with inquisitorial means any in their own country (GDR) who, without questioning the fundamental economic structure, hold 'deviationist' positions on other issues."

(5) "Bureaucracies," Lessing said, "always speak in public about the alliance with science and the intellectuals. But in practice they all too often do not tolerate scientists who analyze social reality in a deep-going way. What they want instead are theoreticians engaged in research in small isolated compartments, who perhaps dis-

cuss with their colleagues, but for the rest limit themselves to making available to the authorities the results of their work, leaving it up to the authorities to decide what is correct, what incorrect, what can be used and what can't be. It is in this context that we in the SDS have viewed the struggle for the independence of our organization. We were unwilling, and we are still unwilling, to bargain over the results of research. We are particularly grateful for the support which we received from well-known scientists who didn't hesitate to suffer expulsion from the SPD, since they were members of the party. By taking this stand, they demonstrated against the concept of the party bureaucracy on limiting scientific discussion among socialist intellectuals."

In conclusion, the SDS vice-chairman expressed the hope that a serious and democratic exchange of opinions with the FDJ could be continued in public.

This report was followed by a long discussion. Among the participants was Professor Klaus Fuchs (the famous atomic scientist who was condemned as a "spy" in Britain after the Second World War). He was rather noncommittal. Politbureau member Hager sounded rather bitter in the remarks he offered. Lessing had observed that contemporary socialist literature by such authors as Oskar Lange, Paul Sweezy, Maurice Dobb, Eugen März and Joan Robinson can be bought freely in Western Germany but cannot be found in East German book shops. Hager's response to this was that Sweezy is a "Trotskyist."

This brought loud laughter from the audience.

The East German press did not publish Lessing's report. However it reported the discussions which it touched off. This was sufficient for intelligent readers to catch the drift of Lessing's remarks.

The importance of granting a hearing to a figure like Lessing is considerable. It is the first successful attempt to hold a public discussion of this kind in East Germany in which an anticapitalist, socialist position was heard that included critical observations aimed at the bureaucratic Ulbrich regime. It enabled the audience to gain a much clearer idea of the character of the left-socialist forces in West Germany.

PRACTICE-WHAT-YOU-PREACH DEPARTMENT

"It is absolutely necessary that Hanoi and Peking decide to leave their neighbors in this part of the world alone, and so all our efforts will be bent toward requiring them to make that decision." -- U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in Saigon during a four-hour stopover May 31.

BELGIANS DEMAND FREEDOM FOR ABARCA

BRUSSELS, May 26 -- Two demonstrations were staged here on May 17 and May 23 for the release of Francisco Abarca, the young Spanish Anarchist militant who is threatened with extradition to Switzerland. [See World Outlook April 24.]

The first demonstration, organized by the "Club Fedrico Garcia Lorca," was supported by the Communist organizations.

The second, organized by the Jeunesses Socialistes Espagnoles, was supported by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes Belges.

Each of the demonstrations brought out several thousand persons in support of Abarca and the Asturian strikers.

A decision is awaited from the "Chambre des Mises en Accusation" concerning a ruling by the "Cour d'Appel" on the extradition request.

The "Chambre des Mises en Accusation" met May 20; and, after hearing the arguments of the lawyers, adjourned to deliberate over what decision to hand down.

NEGROES BATTLE TO END PREJUDICE IN UNIONS

By Evelyn Sell

Negro workers are caught in a vicious squeeze. On the one hand, the capitalist educational system denies them adequate training. Because of this, most Negroes are ill-prepared to meet the challenges of an automated-nuclear age where special skills are needed. Unskilled jobs are rapidly vanishing and the inadequately educated, products of inferior schools, face an extremely bleak future.

On the other hand, even when Negroes do manage to acquire special training they are blocked from the best jobs by the Jim Crow patterns which capitalists have created and nurtured for so long. The bosses have long used the successful divide-and-conquer technique to keep white and Negro workers from joining together in unions to protect the job rights of all. Even where unions do exist, anti-Negro propaganda and job competition under conditions of capitalist insecurity have led many unions to keep Negroes out of their ranks.

One of the major demands of the Freedom Now movement has been: "Equal Job Opportunities." Mass demonstrations, economic boycotts and unrelenting pressure on businessmen and government officials

have succeeded in winning some jobs for Negroes. Militant protests by Negro groups have opened up opportunities in apprentice training programs. Unfortunately, the same pressures must be applied to union leaders and misguided union members who have been able to maintain a privileged position in the working class only at the expense of the rest of the workers.

A good example of how racial discrimination operates in a labor union was provided by the New York City Plumbers Local 2, AFL-CIO. The City Commission on Human Rights had requested a building contractor to hire some plumbers from a minority group. The contractor complied by hiring three Puerto Ricans and one Negro. When these four men showed up for work at the Bronx Terminal Market construction site, the 34 white plumbers and the 7 white apprentices walked off the job.

The Run-Around

The union claims that the problem centers on the fact that these four men do not have union cards and, as good union members, plumbers refuse to work with nonunion men. The truth of the matter is that when these fully skilled workers applied for jobs the bosses told them, "We can't hire you until you get a union card," and when they applied for entrance into the union they were told, "We can't accept you until you have been hired by an employer." Given the run-around by bosses and union, these four men were forced to work at nonunion jobs at a much lower rate of pay.

As one of the Puerto Ricans said, "There finally has to be a break for us. . . All we ever get is the garbage work that nobody else wants to do."

Outraged by the plumbers' refusal to work with Negroes and Puerto Ricans, members of the East Side and Bronx chapters of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] have been picketing the union headquarters. They have blocked entrance into the headquarters by linking arms, lying down and sitting-in. Union bureaucrats were unable to get into their offices and union members who tried to force their way through the picket line were immediately caught up in a scuffle that had to be stopped by watchful police.

A large force of police are keeping their eye on the picketing and have encouraged the white plumbers to lodge complaints against the civil-rights demonstrators. So far, the unionists have not done so although they stand across the street from their headquarters, glaring and mumbling at the pickets.

One of the picket leaders, Blyden Jackson, told reporters, "The day we let them in will be the day they go back to work with the three Puerto Ricans and the Negro up at that Bronx construction site."

"Amazing Genius"

On May 13, almost two weeks after the white plumbers' walk-out, Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, told delegates to the fiftieth anniversary convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America that strong measures were necessary to end union discrimination against minorities. He proposed that unions discriminating against Negroes be placed under a trusteeship or even be purged by the parent body. He said that unions had long shown an "amazing genius" in keeping Negroes out. Now is the time for organized labor to show the same genius in bringing Negroes into the ranks of the union movement.

The union bureaucrats are among the last persons who should be appealed to for help in ending discrimination within unions. They aren't even militant on behalf of the white union members -- they wouldn't dream of fighting the bosses on the issue of Jim Crow. As a matter of fact, they have been co-operating with the bosses to stifle militant unionism and to keep Negroes out of the choice jobs.

It is the white rank-and-file unionist, squeezed in his turn between the profit-hungry bosses and the privilege-hungry union bureaucrat, who has the most to gain by joining in a common struggle shoulder to shoulder with his black brothers. It is true that many white workers have been educated by capitalism to discriminate against Negroes and other minority peoples. It is also true that the industrial union movement in this country was built by similarly brain-washed white workers who learned in the heat of struggle that their best allies in the fight against the bosses are Negro workers.

The rise of industrial unionism in the 1930's came with a suddenness and vitality that surprised all but the revolutionary socialists who understood the true capacities of the working class. White and black joined together despite all the capitalist brain-washing to build the CIO. The future will bring the same common struggle against the same common enemies: the bosses and the union bureaucrats. The present Negro revolt is the opening stage of the titanic struggle between the working class as a whole and the capitalist system.

ONE COUNTRY WHERE PRIVATE PROPERTY IS STILL SACRED

A 62-year-old fruit dealer, Victor Ernest Dunn, was sentenced in England May 20 to eight years preventive detention. A woman who bought 12 pounds of apples from the peddler found the weight short. Thus she was cheated out of 1s.10-1/2d. [\$.20]. Judge Claude Duveen called the "apple king" a "fraudulent rogue" because it wasn't his first offense and said "the time has come when you be put away for so long that these honest people no longer suffer from your depredations."

WORLD TRADE CONFERENCE DRAWS TO AN END

By Fernand Charlier

In a preceding article on the World Conference on Trade and Development [see World Outlook May 22]*, we noted that the USSR had proposed at the beginning of the gathering that a permanent world trade organization be set up, but had withdrawn the proposal in face of milder proposals advanced by the national bourgeoisie of certain underdeveloped countries (Latin America among others). The Paris daily Le Monde of May 26 has just confirmed this estimate, observing that "the cautious optimism of the secretariat of the conference, on this subject [the problem of institutions] was fed by a new source: the USSR, which demanded a new world trade organization, now admits in a document the necessity of 'interim' proposals."

The imperialist countries had proposed for their part to maintain all the proposals of the GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade], to hold a conference only every three years, and to designate a commission in which the imperialist countries would hold half the delegates.

These countries are now in process of amending their own resolution in order to meet the national bourgeoisie of the underdeveloped countries half way. The area of agreement as they see it should be: timing of conferences (every two years instead of every three), and setting up of a permanent trade council in which the underdeveloped countries would hold a majority. . . but in which votes would be weighted according to the importance of the foreign trade in each country (so that the imperialists would never be in a minority!). All this would be placed within the framework of the United Nations. (Le Monde, May 24-25.)

The haggling over proposals that would in no way change the general basis of the problem did have the effect of dissipating many illusions about the conference. The participants no longer say much about its effectiveness and the chairman, Abdel Moneim Kaisouny of the United Arab Republic, declared, according to the May 26 Le Monde, that the recommendations "of the next conference will without doubt be better"!

On the proposal of the Algerian delegation, the seventy-five countries on the road to development, who were represented at the

*Two corrections should be made in the preceding article: Exchanges from the workers states to the industrialized capitalist countries should read 19% of the total foreign trade of the workers states, and obviously not 0.19%. In addition, the exchanges between the workers states and the underdeveloped countries did not suffer from the strengthening of mutual ties among the workers states. (p. 19.)

Geneva conference, presented a resolution advocating the strengthening of co-operation among the underdeveloped countries and the "establishment of complementary industries on an interregional, intraregional and subregional scale, without prejudice to the right of the countries involved to industrialize and diversify their economies."

The Algerian move struck a positive note in contrast to the loss of initiative suffered by the USSR when it withdrew its proposals (which were, however, supported by Burma, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria and Syria), thus underlining the correctness of criticism of the timorous attitude of the bureaucratized workers states at the conference. It was not us this time but the Bulletin of the European Economic Community (May 1964, No. 5), which noted that the tone of the speeches from what it calls "the countries of the East" was in general "very moderate."

These bureaucratized workers states are far from advancing policies at economic conferences the way the first workers state did in the early days. By way of indication the letter can be cited that Chicherin, People's Commissar of Soviet Foreign Affairs, wrote to Krzizhanovsky: "Only a government free from the yoke of the interests of the stock companies and others can advance a healthy program for the world economy, even if only within the framework of the existing regime. If these interests, and other sordid interests, do not agree, this will be a blow they deal themselves which can only heighten our prestige." (Letter of February 12, 1922.)

INSECTICIDE PRODUCTION OPENS NEW POSSIBILITIES

In a press conference May 26, British scientists employed in research on bacteriological war made the optimistic forecast that they will be able to synthesize the poison of botulism. It is a thousand times more toxic than the deadliest known gas.

The great advantage of biological and chemical arms over nuclear weapons, directors of the research center stressed, is that they can be produced by any country having sufficient industrial and scientific resources to manufacture an effective insecticide.

The British specialists in this type of weaponry have already delivered to the armed forces a nerve gas designed to paralyze and weaken an enemy. Another gas knocks out the will to fight. A chemical substance a thousand times more powerful than the one now in production is projected.

The "peaceful" and "defensive" aims of research in this field were stressed by the directors. They said that it was certain most British scientists would refuse to work on deadly gases and bacteriological products if any other aims were projected.

TROTSKYIST LEADERS DISCUSS WORLD SITUATION

The International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, elected by the 1963 Reunification Congress, held a plenary meeting in Switzerland at the end of May. It was attended by twenty-four members and alternates and four observers.

A report on the activities of the Fourth International since the Reunification Congress was given by Comrade Pierre Frank. A counter report was given by Comrade M. Pablo. Frank's report was adopted by a vote of fifteen for and four opposed.

Comrade Livio Maitan gave a general political report and presented an analysis of the world situation which will be printed in the next issue of Quatrième Internationale and other publications of the Trotskyist movement in various languages.

A lively discussion followed this report. Key points included the increasing social and economic contradictions flowing from the growth of automation in the USA; the tension observable in several workers states between the bureaucracy and the vanguard of the workers and intellectuals seeking socialist democracy; the new advances made by the African revolution, particularly the problems posed by the latest developments in the Angolan struggle; the latest developments in the Sino-Soviet conflict and the present situation in Ceylon.

On the latter question, the members of the Committee discussed the governmental crisis in Ceylon which opens up promising possibilities for a new advance towards the establishment of a workers and peasants government. A report was made on the coalition overtures advanced by the government party, the SLFP [Sri Lanka Freedom Party -- Holy Ceylon Freedom Party], to the LSSP [Lanka Sama Samaja Party -- Ceylon Equal Society Party], Ceylonese section of the Fourth International. The members of the International Executive Committee expressed unanimous opposition to any coalition in which the LSSP would serve in the role of captive to the bourgeoisie. A coalition of that kind, it was held, would mean in practice that the LSSP would be associated with the bankruptcy of the present government and the slashing of social services which offers the only way out of the present financial crisis unless the framework of capitalism is breached. The IEC called on the LSSP to counterpose to these proposals a vigorous campaign for a United Left Front government on the basis of a socialist program that would signify a break with imperialism and capitalism in Ceylon.

The general line of the political report was adopted unanimously by the Committee.

A report on the situation in Latin America following the military coup d'état in Brazil was given by Comrade E. Germain. This opened a discussion on the causes of the coup, the responsibilities for it and the lessons to be drawn. Special emphasis was given to

the new dangers it raises for the Cuban Revolution and the mass movement in Chile.

It was decided to address an appeal to all communists, socialists and other revolutionists in Latin America concerning the meaning of the events in Brazil.

During the meeting, the body paid tribute to Alfred Rosmer who died May 6. Although Rosmer was not a member of the Fourth International, he helped found the movement and was held in high esteem by Trotskyists throughout the world.

To Revolutionists of Latin America:

THE LESSON OF THE COUP D'ETAT IN BRAZIL

The Second Declaration of Havana Offers the Only Road!

The working class of Brazil has just suffered a grave defeat. This defeat, of course, will not last for a long time. The reaction has no chance whatsoever of stabilizing the situation in Brazil. None of the explosive factors there can be eliminated by the "gorillas" [reactionary officials of the military caste] now in power. The millions of landless peasants are still starving in the Northeast; the masses of agricultural workers still remain serfs on the big faciendas; the unemployed drawn to the big cities still live in the frightful favelas; the flight of capital among the ruling classes continues; the run-away inflation is worse than ever; the imperialist grip on the main resources of the country remains as strong as before. All the objective factors, consequently, remain to give rise to a new wave of mass struggles in a coming stage.

But these considerations do not mean that the defeat was any the less real or serious. Fifteen thousand working-class and anti-imperialist militants have been thrown in prison. The trade unions and Peasant Leagues have been decapitated. The terror unleashed by the "gorillas," and even more so the shock and disorientation caused by an foreseen defeat have depressed and disarmed the masses, leaving the initiative to the enemy.

The international effects of the Brazilian defeat are not less grave. The usurping regime has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. It is exercising heavy pressure on all the governments of the rest of Latin America to follow this road. It is supporting the efforts of the Venezuelan rulers, lackeys of Yankee imperialism, to unleash an attack against Cuba under the form of "sanctions" against the "subversive plots" of Cuba in Latin America. It is eager to head a "holy crusade" of the Latin-American oligarchy against the

"Communist threat" emanating from Cuba.

Thus the events in Brazil, following those in Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Argentina and Ecuador, prove that Yankee imperialism does not hesitate at overthrowing any regime in Latin America, even those adhering to bourgeois democracy, that continues normal relations with revolutionary Cuba, and that it is ready not only to unleash terror but even to take the world to the brink of a nuclear holocaust in its rabid desire to overthrow Fidel Castro, who dared to defy American imperialism in a continent it considers its own empire.

These events are a warning to all peoples. But especially the peoples of Latin America, the masses of workers and poor peasants in this vast continent, who only yesterday watched with greatest hope the rise of the anti-imperialist and anticapitalist forces in Brazil, must ask themselves how these forces let themselves be driven back and beaten so easily by a handful of reactionary generals. The reply to this question involves fundamental questions of revolutionary strategy and tactics in the Americas, and constitutes the main lesson to be drawn from the Brazilian defeat by the communists and revolutionists of all these countries.

The regime of the "gorillas" was able to install itself so easily because the Brazilian masses were disoriented by the so-called "progressive" parties, including the Brazilian Communist party, concerning the possibility of a "peaceful and parliamentary road" toward the destruction of the pro-imperialist, oligarchical power. They were disoriented concerning Goulart's "resolution" to undertake a resolute struggle in behalf of "structural reforms." They were disoriented concerning the will and the capacity of Goulart to "resist the assault of reaction."

The events in Brazil show once again that although the "national bourgeoisie" is capable of undertaking limited mobilizations of the masses to wring concessions from the oligarchy and imperialism, it is incapable of mobilizing these masses sufficiently to break the fundamental structures of the state, of the reactionary army and private property. Faced with choosing between such a mobilization or capitulation before the oligarchy, the "national bourgeoisie" prefers to capitulate. The experience with Goulart, after Quadros, and Vargas is extremely instructive in this respect. It shows that the masses cannot place confidence in anyone but themselves, that they must count only on their own forces to win out against the oligarchy, imperialism and capitalism. Only their own struggle led by a revolutionary proletarian party is capable of carrying the battle against reaction through to the end.

The events in Brazil show once more that all the regular armies of Latin America are reactionary to the core. When the first signs of decomposition appeared in this army, when first the sergeants, then the marine riflemen became insubordinate, reaction im-

mediately prepared for a coup d'état. It was the duty of the workers parties to at once prepare to arm the proletariat in order to meet the reaction with something besides empty hands. The big battles in Latin America will be decided by arms. This conclusion, which leaves nothing of the Khrushchevist lucubrations about a "peaceful road," must be emphasized by all the revolutionists of Latin America.

Some persons have learned nothing from events of the day. At the last presidential elections, the Brazilian Communist party flirted with generals and bourgeois politicians like Adhemar de Barros who played a prominent role in the reactionary conspiracy. For the next elections he is already at work on a new electoral farce. The Communists and other revolutionists of Latin America must draw the conclusion from the events in Brazil that the "constitutional struggle" in itself does not point a way out and that in most of the countries what is required is the road of Fidel Castro, the "insurrectional road," the "road of guerrilla warfare."

Rejecting the subordination of the mass movement to the leadership of the national bourgeoisie, rejecting the "peaceful" and "constitutional" road; understanding the importance of the armed struggle, the revolutionists of Latin America must understand at the same time that the anti-imperialist revolution will, like the Cuban Revolution, be a permanent revolution, an uninterrupted revolution, that land cannot be given to the peasants, the country cannot be freed from the imperialist hold, except by leading the proletariat and the poor peasants to power, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, creating a workers state, and thus assuring the transition of the anti-imperialist revolution into a socialist revolution as proclaimed by the Second Declaration of Havana.

A year ago, Prestes, the leader of the Brazilian Communist party, proclaimed that the "road of Fidel Castro is not applicable in Brazil." The defeat suffered by the masses is the sad commentary on that bankrupt line. It teaches the Latin-American revolutionists to the contrary that the road of Fidel Castro and only the road of Fidel Castro is the road to victory in Latin America.

The Fourth International appeals to all the revolutionists, all the Communists, all the socialists, all the resolute anti-imperialist revolutionists, to constitute a powerful anti-imperialist and anticapitalist united front, to draw inspiration from a strong spirit of solidarity, to join together in a vast front of combat that resolutely takes the revolutionary road based especially on setting up guerrilla fighters wherever it is geographically and materially required.

It is in this way, and only in this way that defeats like the one in Brazil can be avoided, that the defeat in Brazil will be made up, relief will be brought to the Cuban Revolution through an immense Second Front on the Latin-American continent itself, that new and important defeats will be inflicted on Yankee imperialism, that new

victories for socialism will be won in the Western Hemisphere.

International Executive Committee
of the Fourth International

SOUTH AFRICA'S PRISONS LIKE NAZI CAMPS

The eleven defendants in the Dr. Nevill Alexander case have been sent to prison while efforts are being made to find the £5,000 [\$14,000] necessary to initiate an appeal.

The eleven members of the National Liberation Front were found guilty of violating the fascist-like laws of the South African government, which ban political opposition to the official apartheid policy. They were sentenced to terms ranging from five to ten years.

What are conditions like in South Africa's prisons for political prisoners like these?

A rough idea can be gained from the following letter, written by an eyewitness:

"One thing I can tell you is that they suffer a lot. They are really brave and courageous. Their spirits are very high but that is what the Herrenvolk is trying to break.

"People on the outside cannot realise what the political prisoners are suffering today. Robben Island can compare with Belsen camp; it is not a prison. . . . I know what I am talking about. The only thing left for them (the Herrenvolk) to do is to kill them -- and that is what they are trying to do.

"I don't think it will be long before they do it. They are kept isolated in separate cells. They work in the quarries breaking stones and pushing wheelbarrows. They are not allowed to talk with one another. They are heavily guarded. And their food is not even fit for a dog.

"For the time being they still treat them with respect, but if the appeal does not succeed then it will be worse for them -- then the kicking and beating will start, same as in Belsen.

"They thank everyone on the outside for what has been done, but a great deal more is necessary, as there are hundreds on the Island rotting. Things will have to move fast. . . .

"In the meanwhile parliament is still in session, passing even more drastic laws. It seems as if nothing can stop them."

Lukács Decides Between Mao and Khrushchev

ON THE METHODOLOGY OF "SECTARIANISM"

By P. L. Carp

1.

The newest politico-philosophical essay by Georg Lukács(1) is a truly amazing document! It may be considered a faithful reflection of the anxieties and the moods which agitate and torment the Communist intelligentsia in Eastern Europe. Unfortunately -- this reflection is more distressing than comforting, awakens more apprehensions than hopes. . . .

Lukács starts out with the harshest possible condemnation of the Stalinist regime which (in his words) "systematically and contemptuously rendered null and void even the barest minimum requisites of humanity" [emphasis added], and under which the very "reality of personal life perspective was turned into an illusion without basis." What an agony of despair (and shame) is expressed in these bitter words!

Lukács is, of course, not deluded by the hypocritical official interpretation of the Stalin era. To call all this the "cult of personality" -- he cryptically remarks -- "is not at all adequate to the tasks of discovering the depth and breadth of the reality." The essential causes of the tragedy must lie deeper, much deeper! But where? Here we face our first disappointment: As a true ideologist, although one using excellent Marxian formulas, Lukács contents himself with substituting one ideological explanation for another -- in place of the alleged "cult of personality" we are offered the innate tendency towards "sectarianism" which has plagued the working-class movement from its very beginnings and which, in his view, reached its climax with the advent of Stalinism. Unsatisfactory as this explanation is, it is still on a higher level than the miserable phrase of the "cult of personality"; all the more so, since as an outstanding theorist and an adroit debater, Lukács is able to present some illuminating thoughts, even while defending a wrong cause.

This applies especially to those passages of his essay which deal with the methodology of "sectarianism" in the history of the working-class movement. Lukács proves here convincingly that the main "vice" and the greatest weakness of "sectarianism" consists in its "intellectual structure," in its inherent inability to apply the dialectical method, and especially the categories of "mediation"

(1) "Reflections on the Sino-Soviet Dispute," Studies on the Left, Winter 1964, pp. 22-38.

without which it is impossible to connect the "abstract" with the "concrete," the "principles" with socio-historical reality. All this is very true (although its connection with the Sino-Soviet dispute seems highly dubious); and in this respect Lukács' philosophical remarks offer a fine example of Marxian thinking.

2.

However, even the dialectical method has its limitations and can easily be misused. A good example of it is Lukács' essay in which the methodological neglect of the categories of "mediation" is ascribed solely to "sectarianism" and in which the other side of the coin is conveniently overlooked.

This other side of the coin is, of course, reformism in all its manifestations. Whereas sectarianism "always and everywhere attaches particular actions directly to the movement's ultimate -- and thus necessarily abstract -- principles" [emphasis added], discarding in the process "all the dialectical mediations between principle, strategy and tactics" (Lukács), reformism discards all mediations for just the opposite reason: because its adherents lose themselves entirely in "particular actions" and because there remains nothing with which these actions can be "mediated" (aside from some rhetorical generalities, void of any reality and content). It was the leading theorist of social-democratic reformism, Eduard Bernstein, who coined the famous phrase: "The aim is nothing, the movement everything!" In this phrase the "aim" and the "movement" are conceived of as two absolute opposites, separated from each other by an unbridgeable gulf. And in this contraposition lies the very essence and the whole philosophy of reformism -- which never recognized the necessary dialectical interrelation between the "aim" and the "movement" and never understood that the "movement" can derive its inner impulse and its content solely from the "aim," whereas the "aim" itself must be constantly rectified and enriched by the "movement." Thus, reformism, instead of "mediating" between the aim and the movement, degenerates into pure empiricism; it places its faith in the intrinsic wisdom and self-propelling power of the "movement" and relegates the "aim" ad kalendas graecas [to the Greek calends]. . . .

3.

But what did reformism mean by "the movement"? Certainly, not only the everyday struggles which brought about political and economic reforms in the fabric of capitalism, but -- above all -- the mighty trade-unionist and party organizations which the working class was able to build in relatively tranquil periods under the conditions of bourgeois democracy. Hence the "organizational fetishism" which characterized the policies and pervaded the mentality of the West European Social-Democratic parties in the epoch of the Second International and which contributed so greatly to their shameful collapse during the First World War. Leon Trotsky therefore

wrote as early as October 1914:

"Condemned for decades to a policy of opportunist waiting, the Party took up the cult of organization as an end in itself. Never was the spirit of inertia produced by mere routine work so strong in the German Social Democracy as in the years immediately preceding the great catastrophe. And there can be no doubt that the question of the preservation of the organizations, treasuries, People's houses and printing presses played a mighty important part in the position taken by the fraction in the Reichstag toward the War."(2) [Emphasis added.]

And Lenin somewhat later (1915) put the same observation into a deeper philosophical context:

"An instructive picture," he wrote. "These people have become so corrupted and so stupefied by bourgeois legality that they are not even able to grasp the mere thought of the necessity of other, illegal organizations, destined to lead the revolutionary struggles. . . . Here you have before you the living dialectics of opportunism: the mere growth of legal organizations, the simple habit of narrow-minded but conscientious philistines creates a situation where in a time of crisis these same conscientious philistines become traitors whose only aim is now to strangle the revolutionary energies of the masses."(3) [Emphasis added.]

In other words: To the social-democratic and union leaders of that time the evolutionary, peaceful growth of their organizations became imperceptibly an "end in itself" and therefore incomparably more important than the hazy socialist "aim" proclaimed ritually on festive occasions. . . . Here we see again that the lack of "mediations between principle, strategy and tactics" characterized -- contrary to Lukács -- not only the "sectarians," but even more so their very antipodes: the worshippers of the "movement," the reformists!

4.

Up to this point we have confined ourselves to a purely "ideological" sphere because what was said above referred to the Social Democracy prior to the First World War and could therefore be still regarded as phenomena inside the working-class movement. However, even before that war there emerged in every Social-Democratic party of the West a powerful party apparatus which began to manipulate and dominate the membership and which gradually reduced inner "party democracy" to a mere shadow. (How well we know this process from the experiences of the English and continental trade-union movement!) And this alone sufficed to bring about a qualitative change,

(2) Leon Trotsky: The Bolsheviki and World Peace, pp. 204-5.

(3) Lenin: Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, p. 315.

since every apparatus has a life of its own and tends to become independent of the social forces which created it. Now the party hierarchy felt no need for any mediation between the "aim" and the "movement." On the contrary, the "aim" itself became imperceptibly a mere abstraction as the "movement" (i.e., the apparatus) accommodated itself more and more to the existing social order and acquired a "vested interest" in its preservation.(4) This development became sufficiently clear after the First World War, when the Social-Democratic parties had to assume "the heavy burden of responsibility" and participate in the local, provincial and national governments; with this, the party and union apparatus became even more estranged, "alienated" from the masses, and ever more part and parcel of the state -- this "most alarming of all fetishes, with the great knife between its teeth. . ." (Trotsky.)

5.

But how does all this apply to the Communist movement which was born out of the struggle against Social-Democratic reformism and whose aim was the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist order?

The answer to this question goes to the very heart of the dialectical method. Lukács stresses repeatedly in his essay how in the process of socio-historical development ever "new mediations appear as the old ones lose their validity, or undergo more or less essential modifications." What he fails to stress, however (and what is even more important), is that in this continuous process of change not only the old "husks" are being discarded, but also new "kernels" come into being! He who would not take into account the necessity of ever new "mediations" would certainly be a poor Marxist; but he would be even poorer if it escaped him that in the historical development of society every form and function can grow into a new "content," essentially different from the previous one. Thus, in the process of dialectical change, the old Social Democracy ceased to be the working-class party it had once been; thus, although for different historical reasons, the Russian Communist party, too, lost

(4) Paul M. Sweezy relates the following story about the well-known Social-Democratic theoretician, R. Hilferding, as told by a Marxist writer who was a close acquaintance of Hilferding in 1933: "I remember distinctly," says this writer, "having spoken to him a few days after Hitler was appointed chancellor and asking him whether he thought that the time was ripe for the unions to call a general strike. Even then, in the first days of February 1933, he was sitting in a comfortable easy chair with warm felt slippers on his feet and remarked with a benign smile that I was a young firebrand and that political skill consists of waiting for the right moment. After all, he said, Hindenburg is still the President, the government is a coalition government, and while Hitlers come and go, the ADGB [the German trade-union federation] is an organization that should not risk its entire existence for a fleeting political purpose. It was only a

with the passage of years its revolutionary character and became an instrument of entirely new social forces. . . .

Of course, Lukács will not agree with the last assertion. In his eyes, the Khrushchev regime is the legitimate heir of the October Revolution and its policies a "realistic" continuation of Marxism-Leninism. Never mind. To refute him, we have to proceed from his own premises and to show how these premises are constantly at odds with the political conclusions which he draws from them.

Lukács postulates that, in accordance with true dialectical thinking, "particular actions" must be always directed by the "aim" and the aim must be realized by the actions. But what is in truth the "aim" of the present-day Soviet regime and how do its actions correspond to this aim?

According to the official doctrine, the aim of the Soviet regime has been and still is the establishment of a communist society throughout the world. But who does not perceive that for the Soviet leadership this professed aim has become indistinguishable from the concrete aims of the Soviet state? And who can deny that the policies of the Soviet government serve exclusively national Russian interests, regardless of the needs of the international working-class movement?!

6.

Here we must resume our previous argument. The founders of the Soviet state, Lenin and Trotsky, conceived of it primarily as an instrument for promoting the European socialist revolution; after achieving this goal, the Soviet state was expected to gradually "wither away" -- the sooner, the better.(5) When, however, the hopes for a revolution in the West began to fade in the mid-twenties, this primary aim of Bolshevism retreated more and more into an indefinite future and the specific Russian interests and problems were placed in the forefront. Now again, although imperceptibly and behind the smokescreen of clumsily construed Lenin quotations, the "aim" became "nothing" and the preservation of the Soviet state -- "everything"!

few days later that he was hiding at some friend's house being already sought by the Gestapo." [Emphasis added.] (In the book: K. Marx and the Close of His System, p. XVIII.)

(5) Now we are, of course, told by Soviet ideologists: "It is only the modern Revisionists who maintain that the problem of the dying away of the state is the most important and most basic question on which the future of socialism depends." [Emphasis added.] (Osnovy sovetskoy filosofii, 1960, p. 535.) New times, new songs. . . .

A corresponding transformation overtook the original Bolshevnik party. We have stressed how greatly the growth of the party apparatus contributed to the degeneration of Social Democracy. In the Soviet Union, however, the party apparatus, with the victory of Stalinism, became identical with and indistinguishable from the state machinery -- and this added to it an entirely new quality. It is relatively easy to endure the manipulating practices of the party or union bosses, as long as they are not endowed with coercive means (such as police, prisons and the like). But what endless misery when both -- the monopolistic party apparatus and the state machinery -- fuse together into one totalitarian system!(6) Where this happens -- as it unfortunately happened in Russia -- there cannot exist any other "aim" than that of the omnipotent party-state apparatus, to whose power every individual and every social group is mercilessly subjected. . . .

Of course, Lukács does not and perhaps even cannot see it this way. For him the whole twenty-five-year period of Stalinist rule is an endless chapter of "dogmatic," ultra-leftist "sectarianism" -- motivated, to be sure, by the best of intentions, but nevertheless bent to apply, ruthlessly and mercilessly, "always and everywhere," the "methods of the civil war" (which, incidentally, ended in Russia in 1921)! Yes, he even manages to depict the inglorious role of the Hungarian Rakosi as a period, "when the selection of Party cadres. . . was carried out in accordance with revolutionary catchphrases derived from civil-war conditions."(7) In other words: Here survives the legend of the "staunch revolutionary Marxist," Stalin, whose only fault was his "subjective dogmatism" and his strange predilection for "compulsory measures". . . . Whereas, in reality, Stalin was -- and had to be! -- an arch-"revisionist" and the main corrupter of and "deviator" from the ideas of Marx and Lenin! Simply because his "aim" and his "historical function" was not the promotion of international socialist revolution, but the preservation (and expansion) of the existing Soviet state. Of course, from a historical viewpoint even the degenerated Soviet State represented a tremendous step forward; despite Stalin's crimes. Still the bitter truth cannot be concealed even under the smoothest "dialectical" verbiage. . . .

(6) In this respect, our best witness may be Lukács himself who until the death of the tyrant had to insert into his even most scholarly works (such as his treatise on the young Hegel) the most humiliating eulogies to Stalin and the crudest recriminations against his adversary Trotsky. . . .

(7) There is, of course, a grain of truth in this contention -- since the Stalinist regime meant a perpetual administrative war not only against the unfortunate peasantry, but also against the nominal bearer of the state power, the industrial working class. But this was quite a different "civil war" than Lukács has in mind.

7.

But did not Stalin at times also pursue "ultra-leftist" policies? Such as his dreadful forced collectivisation of the peasantry or his identification of Social Democracy with Fascism? Here we see again how easily dialectics can be turned into pure sophistry. (8) In a genuine working-class movement "right" and "left" tendencies are something natural, growing out of the organic development of the movement itself. They are, therefore, in a sense healthy phenomena, signs of the vigor and strength of the movement (even if they must sometimes be considered "infantile maladies"). Quite different, however, are the administrative "zigzags" of the degenerated party-state apparatus which has become an "end in itself." Since they do not reflect the spiritual growth of the working-class movement, but solely the transient needs of the apparatus, they acquire a new character which makes it impossible to equate them with seemingly similar phenomena of the past or to see in them a somewhat modified rebirth of the "traditional division between Right, Center and Left" (9)! (Alas, the sophist is always afraid of the infinite richness and diversity of the "concrete," or -- to put it in Lassalle's words -- he suffers from an intellectual "horror pleni." He therefore anxiously sticks to formal analogies and old labels, even if these labels have lost all their meaning. . . .)

Unfortunately, this is also true of Lukács: Just because he clings desperately to the old symbols, he has to confine himself to an abstract investigation of the methodological roots of various political trends, completely ignoring their incomparably more important social roots. As a result, the materialist dialectician Lukács offers an essentially ideological -- and idealistic -- interpretation of the Sino-Soviet dispute! On reading his essay one could assume that the bitter quarrel between the Russian and the Chinese governments does not at all stem from the specific material (social as well as political) interests which divide both adversaries -- but merely from their ability (or inability) to find proper dialectical "mediations". . . . Thus, all the concreteness, diversity and complexity of the real relationships between the degenerated Soviet state, the Chinese bureaucracy, the working class and national liberation movements and Western imperialism is reduced to a scholastic squabble about the real or imaginary sins of "sectarianism"!

(8) Lenin defined as "sophist" a way of thinking which is bent to stress the "external similarities of various cases, torn apart from the inner coherence of the events." [Emphasis added.]

(9) We quote here Isaac Deutscher's essay "Three Currents in Communism," printed in the same issue of Studies on the Left. (In Deutscher's eyes Khrushchev is the representative of the "Center," and the Stalinist "diehards" Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovitch. . . . representatives of the "Left"!)

8.

But why this lacuna in Lukács' reasoning? The answer is simple: However much he detests and abhors the Stalinist past, Lukács still rejects only the results and symptoms of Stalinism, but not its essence -- the nationalist doctrine of the "construction of socialism in one country." He may therefore well admit that the Stalinist system (10) represented "a gigantic, strictly centralized apparatus, or a pyramid consisting from the top down of ever smaller Stalins"; but he will never concede that this "pyramid" only reflected the ascent of a new social stratum -- the party and state bureaucracy; a stratum which for stringent historical reasons succeeded in the mid-twenties in replacing the short-lived rule of the Russian working class, and whose power was literally built on the bones of a whole generation of the old Bolsheviks. . . . It is evidently still too early to call this stratum a social "class" in the Marxian sense of the word; we do not yet know whether it is a progenitor of a new social formation or merely a temporary parasitic growth. (This fateful question can be decided only by the development of the class struggle on a world scale.) But whatever may be the future of the party-state bureaucracy, without acknowledging its existence and its paramount role it is impossible to understand what goes on in the so-called Soviet Orbit. In this respect, however, Lukács' dialectics and Lukács' Marxism are indeed very poor tools. . . . (11)

9.

This manifest weakness of Lukács' analysis is all the more disturbing when we measure his latest essay against his early work Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein. [History and Class Consciousness.] It was in this brilliant work that Lukács interpreted and developed Engels' idea of the "false consciousness" which characterizes the thinking of all ruling classes. From him we learned that the consciousness of the bourgeois class -- sharp and lucid as long as it faces the tasks of organizing the capitalist rule and of subjecting to it the precapitalist forms of production -- becomes by necessity

(10) But what about Khrushchev?

(11) We are not sure whether the same does not apply also to Isaac Deutscher's views. Although Deutscher is the author of a brilliant biography of Trotsky, he never shared Trotsky's interpretation of the social role and significance of the Soviet bureaucracy. On the contrary: he always tended to explain the advent of Stalinism in an essentially idealistic manner either as a "revenge" taken by the pre-revolutionary past on the revolutionary internationalism of Lenin or as the "relative eclipse of European Russia in favor of the backward Asiatic and semi-Asiatic periphery." To him "Stalin, like Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor represented the Church in revolt against the Gospel." [Emphasis added.] (Isaac Deutscher: Stalin. A Political Biography, pp. 360-2 and 382-3.) And to us such impressionistic literary images are even less satisfactory and less palatable than the emaciated post-Stalinist dialectics of Lukács. . . .

dimmed and obscure when it encounters problems which transcend the limits of capitalism and whose solution demands a new social order. (12) But does not the same -- mutatis mutandis -- also apply to the Soviet bureaucracy? Can we expect it to have a real, "genuine" understanding of the historical development and of its own social role? The obvious answer is -- no. As the main beneficiary of the regime and the sole possessor of the state power, the Soviet bureaucracy must seek the perpetuation of its economic privileges and its political domination. Hence its deeply ingrained conservatism, which manifests itself not only in its predilection for the "status quo" and for the "inherited" national borders (even if these borders were "inherited" from Russian Czarism), but also in its incessant quest for all sorts of "eternal values" in every sphere of intellectual life -- in sociology, economics, philosophy, morals, arts, and in the entire social superstructure; a quest which strikes even an inexperienced eye and which contrasts so grotesquely with the cultural Sturm und Drang of the twenties (13). . . . To demand from this social stratum a genuine dialectical thinking -- which, in Marx's words, "regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement" and "is in its essence critical and revolutionary" (14) [emphasis added] -- is to demand the impossible. The Soviet bureaucracy, as it is today, cannot but have a "false" consciousness of the contemporary world, cannot but deceive itself and others with petty-bourgeois illusions. And if Lukács does not see this, we can only repeat his own sad words: "How much more readily are things lost than regained." (15) [Emphasis added.]

(12) cf. G. Lukács' Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein, pp. 65-6.

(13) Of course, every philistine will tell you that all this is only "natural" and that, after passing its stormy years, every revolution has to "settle down" and to accept a set of "established" truths and values. But, even if this were so -- why do these "values" resemble so much the petty bourgeois values of the existing capitalist society, with its idolatry of the state, its rabid nationalism, its stuffy philistine morals, etc., etc.?

(14) K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, pp. 25-6.

(15) The quoted essay in Studies on the Left. We have not dealt with the exoteric part of Lukács' essay in which he tries to provide a "philosophical" interpretation of Khrushchev's policies. Here his argument runs as follows:

"At the time of the First World War, Lenin accurately affirmed the indissoluble connection of imperialism and war. The Khrushchev speech in 1956, offering as it did the perspective that world wars were no longer inevitable, was just as sharp a break with the Lenin thesis as the Lenin thesis was a break with the thesis of Marx that proletarian revolutions can occur only in the most developed countries (and then successfully only on an international scale). Lenin depar-

THE MYSTERIOUS CASE OF THE 40 MICROPHONES

The U.S. State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency suffered one of the worst shocks in the history of the two departments when they tore open the walls in the American embassy in Moscow and discovered 40 microphones. It wasn't the principle of the thing that shook them -- both departments have heard about microphones and their uses -- but the quantity. Moreover, they had been placed in the walls when the building was prepared for American occupation some twelve years ago and had never been detected. How can you live that down?

The American cloak-and-dagger men naturally considered it perfectly normal of the Russians to plant microphones. Equally normal, of course, was their periodic search for alien listening devices in which they brought to bear their famed experience, ingenuity, American know-how and electronic gadgets (probably lie detectors). Why did all this prove unavailing?

Well, who would have thought that the Russians could invent a microphone beyond the capacity of American know-how to detect for more than a decade? And immediately after the previous Russian achievement -- a microphone planted in the eagle of a wooden reproduction of the Great Seal of the United States, presented as a gift to the ambassador, which hung over his desk from 1945 to 1952 before it was finally detected!

The newspapers in the U.S. played it up big with pictures of the guilty microphones on the front page. Soviet morals were given indignant exposure. . . while the rest of the world laughed at the way the Russians had fooled the know-it-all Americans.

The Dutch took the occasion to rub it in. They revealed that they had found out some years ago that their embassy was bugged. According to a Netherlands weekly, here's how they did it:

The ambassador took two "magnificent Siamese cats" to Moscow. These friends of man detected right away that all was not normal in the customary mice runs. They arched their backs and "scratched furiously at the wall." They didn't like the Russian sounds back-

ted from this Marxist hypothesis on the basis of Marxist method. A half century later, Khrushchev went beyond the Lenin thesis on the basis of Leninist method. In each instance these men recognized the historical developments which had transformed an earlier truth into a falsehood and transformed what had been progressive into a force which was putting a brake upon the altered present." [Emphasis added.] (Studies on the Left, p. 23.)

It is sad to see that Lukács' former eulogies of Stalin -- which one can assume were indispensable to Lukács' survival -- have now been replaced by voluntary eulogies of. . . . Khrushchev!

firing in the microphones.

The Dutch proved they not only had good brains to whom to assign the task of detecting hidden microphones; they showed that they knew how to make the most of their finds. The microphones obviously provided a precious new channel of communication with the Russians.

Thus "two diplomats" sat down comfortably, near a hidden microphone, and complained -- probably to the Siamese cats -- about how slow Russians are at fixing things like the sewer running out of the embassy. Result: Sewer fixed "the next morning."

Tulip bulbs held up at customs? Sat down again and complained to the cats about Russian thoughtlessness. Result: Bulbs delivered "twenty-four hours later."

What about the next chapter in this thriller of international espionage and counterespionage? Will the Americans, having learned not to take any wooden eagles, now take a lesson from the Dutch, begin keeping Siamese cats and stop acting like vandals toward the art work in their walls? That remains to be seen.

Anyway, our condolences to the patient Russians who are evidently reluctant to give up the idea that there must be at least some times when an American diplomat says something honest.