

# WORLD OUTLOOK

## PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 27

July 3, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2

In this issue:

	<u>Page</u>
Imperialism Sets Up a New Saviour in the Congo.....	1
Kivu Was Always Lumumbist -- by Anicoet Kashamura.....	5
General Taylor's Task -- by Joseph Hansen.....	8
Italy's "Center-Left" Cabinet Breaks Down.....	11
Cuban Notebook:	
"A Billion Times Better than Before. . . ."	
-- by Ernest Mandel.....	13
A Disquieting Fishing Contest.....	15
Venezuela's Struggle for Freedom (Cuban Revolution and Freedom Now Movement).....	16
Equality on a Silver Platter? -- by Evelyn Sell.....	19
Hands Off Southern Arabia!.....	21
Pauling Again Warns on Nuclear War.....	22
How Important Is the Individual in Making History? -- by William F. Warde.....	23
Must Reading in Both Peking and Moscow.....	33

### IMPERIALISM SETS UP A NEW SAVIOUR IN THE CONGO

June 30 marked an important turning point in the history of the Congo. On that date the United Nations occupation of the Congo came to an end. On that date, too, President Kasavubu's four-year mandate as head of the Republic of Congo ended and the Congolese parliament completed its first term.

As the deadline neared, anxiety rose among imperialist circles and their stooges in the Congo over possible collapse of the neocolonialist Kasavubu-Mobutu regime. Their main figurehead, "socialist" Premier Cyrille Adoula, publicly admitted the bankruptcy of his stewardship. He is virtually powerless outside of the "European" [white] quarter of Leopoldville and even there his authority has come under increasingly serious challenge from underground forces. Vast reaches of the country, including the provinces

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE - Hebdomadaire

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

WORLD OUTLOOK specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for labor, socialist, colonial independence and Negro freedom publications. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of WORLD OUTLOOK. Unsigned material expresses, insofar as editorial opinion may appear, the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. To subscribe for 26 issues send dollars 7.50 or 2/15 s. or 37,50 francs to : Pierre Frank, 21, rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2<sup>e</sup>, France.

of Kouilou, North Katanga, Eastern Province and large sectors of Kivu, have set up new Lumumbist administrations which do not recognize the authority of the puppet central government.

As for Mobutu's army, it is disintegrating. Repeatedly, contingents of the army have refused to engage in pitched battle with insurrectional formations. During one of the skirmishes in Kivu, General Mobutu himself had to lead the advance, like a feudal warlord, in order to get some of his own soldiers to start marching in the same direction.

Capitalists abroad reveal their pessimism over perspectives in the Congo. In Brussels, quotations on the stock of the most powerful Congo trust, Union Minière, have dropped to barely ten per cent of their highest point in 1957.

Both the Belgian capitalists, who are most directly interested in tapping the Congo's huge natural wealth, and those in the U.S., who feel most acutely that it is their duty to "save the Congo for free enterprise" and keep it from "going Communist," have been frantically looking for a way out -- some way to prevent their neocolonialist regime from going down like a house of cards. The solution they seem to have decided to try out is a rather curious one. They are pushing out into the center of the stage a new saviour, a figure by the name of Moïse Tshombe.

This is the South Katanga tribal politician who, through various tricks and stratagems and a liberal supply of grease, succeeded in first becoming premier of the province of Katanga, then head of the "independent" country of Katanga. This operation, mounted in direct collusion with Belgian military personnel and Belgian capitalists, was carried out when the Congo first achieved independence in July 1960. Tshombe's treachery triggered the huge internal crisis in the country that eventually led to the occupation by United Nations troops.

The use of UN military forces, said the General Assembly resolution, was to help restore the country's unity; the real aim was not openly stated. But it soon became apparent with the ouster of Premier Patrice Lumumba and his subsequent foul murder. Eventually fighting broke out between the UN troops and Tshombe's "gendarmes." Tshombe was deposed and this sinister figure then went into exile in Madrid, where Franco's fascist regime extended him every courtesy.

Tshombe did not return to the Congo directly from Madrid. He stopped off first at Brussels where he had long talks with Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak and U.S. Ambassador Douglas MacArthur III. The cordiality of these briefings of the prospective Chiang Kai-shek of the Congo, as reported by the press, leaves no doubt that Tshombe is returning to his field of operation with the mandate of imperialism -- above all, the mandate of President Lyndon Johnson.

Tshombe was carefully groomed during the final stage of the UN occupation of the Congo for his new role of saviour, unifier and pacifier of his country. This grooming was rather essential, for too many people were aware of how he destroyed the unity of the country by taking Katanga into secession, how he paralyzed the central government by withholding more than two-thirds of the taxes and customs on which it depended, how he directly participated in the murder of Patrice Lumumba and how he sought to cover up the crime. He became deeply associated in the public mind with the scum in his entourage -- OAS bandits fresh from backstabbing in Algeria, former German SS men still smelling of the gas chambers, Cuban counterrevolutionaries looking for temporary jobs before again invading their own country.

One of the main moves in this careful grooming for his new role as "arbiter," the man above all the tribes and political parties of the Congo, was the splendidly timed "revelations" he made to a reactionary Belgian journalist about the murder of Lumumba in which he white-washed his own role and hung the rap on Cyrille Adoula. [See World Outlook February 7 and February 14.] (The generally accepted version of that murder still remains that one of Tshombe's main lieutenants, his former Minister of the Interior Munongo, personally killed Lumumba, after the Congolese leader had already been badly maimed through frightful mistreatment on the plane that brought him from Leopoldville to the Katanga capital of Elisabethville.)

Upon his arrival in Leopoldville as imperialism's own trusted man, Tshombe at once called in Kasavubu, Adoula and the main leaders of various neocolonialist parties and sects. He made it clear that he wanted a ground-breaking operation -- a general amnesty for political prisoners and an invitation to the Lumumbist leaders to return from exile. To make his new liberal halo look really authentic, he demanded the immediate release of Antoine Gizenga, Lumumba's most prominent lieutenant and former vice-president of the Adoula government who has been imprisoned on an island in the Congo river although parliament has repeatedly called for his release.

Another maneuver not to be overlooked was Tshombe's stop-off at Bamako, the capital of Mali, on his way from Brussels to Leopoldville, where he evidently made a bid for a stamp of approval from all the African independent states as to his "legitimacy."

The imperialist press co-operated deftly in this game by playing up the "popular" response to Tshombe's reappearance in the Congo. Perhaps some "demonstrations" did occur. Their spontaneity is another matter. Tshombe is a well-heeled saviour. He has several million dollars in gold and hard currency on tap in European bank accounts, while the other Congo leaders of his temperament, training and loyalties are flat broke. His arrival as a "live" one was bound to create a good deal of excitement among the

bar flies.

Tshombe's reappearance has, of course, a deeper meaning in the context of Leopoldville politics. The bankruptcy of the Adoula government has entailed extensive unraveling of the state fabric. The politicians themselves constitute the hardest, most avaricious nucleus of the Congo compradore bourgeoisie-in-formation. Nothing less than their immediate livelihood and future prospects are involved in keeping up the state apparatus. Since no faction is strong enough to impose its rule on the whole country, they are driven toward a general compromise that would affect all the local and regional politicians and chiefs. Tshombe still retains authority in the country's richest region, South Katanga, and has the full backing of the colonial masters there. Thus the decision to make him the nominal head of a government of "national reconciliation" is not so illogical as it may seem.

For Tshombe to succeed in his assignment, however, an essential condition remains to be fulfilled. The Lumumbist insurrectional groups operating in various areas must be persuaded to accept Tshombe, to co-operate with him and to take posts in his government. Will they do this? Can they accept a neocolonialist stooge who still has some 2,000 armed "gendarmes" on the shelf in Angola where they have been keeping in form under the guidance of the Portuguese colonial masters?

Unfortunately, there is great danger that many of them will be tempted. Gbenye, who led the MNC-Lumumba [Mouvement National Congolais] parliamentary group in Leopoldville after Gizenga's arrest until he himself had to go into exile, reportedly negotiated directly with some important Belgian financial groups for the "reintegration" of the Lumumbist forces into "Congolese legality." He was expelled from the Committee of National Liberation in Brazzaville, formally on charges of embezzlement of funds, but one of the main guerrilla leaders in the Congo, Gaston Soumialot, still recognizes his authority. Many former Lumumbist leaders are said to have become demoralized and corrupted.

In addition, they have fallen into such suicidal maneuvers before. During one of the peaks of the civil war, Gizenga, who headed the rival central government of Stanleyville and had a strong army and controlled most of the north and east of the country, accepted "reconciliation" with the Leopoldville government. The result was destruction of his base, his subsequent loss of the post in the coalition government with which he had been paid in return for dismantling his Stanleyville stronghold and his eventual arrest and imprisonment.

Lumumba himself made two colossal errors. Instead of strengthening his revolutionary base and mobilizing the population in the style of Fidel Castro, he invited in the United Nations. When this led to his being deposed as premier in Leopoldville, he

did not retreat at once to Stanleyville where he had a strong following and could have organized a counterbase from which to recover his position. He stayed in Leopoldville in order to personally protest and argue the illegality of Kasavubu's moves against him. The tragic result was his martyrdom.

Most of the radical political leaders of the Congo have not yet drawn the necessary conclusions from such mistakes. Many of them are ready to commit the same errors twice. Perhaps the influence of the Chinese Communist party and similar tendencies will help the opposition to Tshombe's blandishments. The revolutionary instincts of the guerrilla fighters who have been mobilized in the struggle will weigh in the same direction.

It remains to be seen, however, whether -- in the absence of a revolutionary party -- these tendencies will prove sufficiently strong to prevent the Lumumbist leaders from dropping into Tshombe's web, thereby granting him the opportunity he seeks to achieve a kind of temporary neocolonialist stabilization. If they prove alert to the trap, Tshombe's "national reconciliation" will turn out to be nothing but a regroupment of conservatives -- against the rising tide of the Congolese revolution.

## To Understand the Events in the Congo

### KIVU WAS ALWAYS LUMUMBIST

By Anicet Kashamura

[This article appeared in the June 27 issue of the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche, from which it has been translated. Anicet Kashamura was born in 1928 at Kalehe in Kivu province. Trained as an accounting clerk, he became interested in politics between 1950 and 1956 while working for the Water Board. In 1958 he came to prominence as leader of the Centre de Regroupment Africain (CEREA). Two years later he became Minister of Information in the Cabinet of Patrice Lumumba. When counterrevolutionary forces brought this government down, he attempted to escape from Leopoldville together with Lumumba but was captured by Mobutu's troops. He managed finally to escape to Kivu where he set up a government that was linked for a time with the Gizenga regime in Stanleyville.]

\* \* \*

In January, Pierre Mulele, who was in the underground, opened an insurrectional movement against the constituted authorities. The inhabitants of Kouilou had decided to face the cannons, the bombs, the machine guns of a power imposed from abroad, with spears and arrows.

Is Mulele a Communist? No. Everybody knows that in the Congo political labels are used with little attention to their exact meaning. In our country there are many people in the left; to isolate them, it is customary to place foreign labels on them.

Mulele appeared in a situation which was humanly insupportable, and everyone is behind him: the Communists, the Socialists, Christians and democrats. Only a heart of stone could fail to respond to conditions under which people have to carry out surgical operations with razor blades, conditions close to barbarism. Mulele started from the principle that present conditions do not yet make it possible to mobilize the whole Congolese people.

In Kivu, on the contrary, the Lumumbist parties (MNC-Lumumba, UFPC-Balubakat and LUKA) formed a popular front. Aside from that the revolutionary character of the province of Kivu is well known. It was there that the famous left socialist party was born, the CEREA, which later broke into several factions of which the largest, the left wing, took the name of UFPC (Union des Forces Congolaises).

A region with an elevation of some 6,500 feet, Kivu enjoys a climate that is perpetual spring. In January 1961 a workers and peasants government was established in this province over which I had the honor to preside and whose Minister of Justice was Gaston Soumialot, the present head of the insurrectional movement in Kivu. At that time a genuine fighting temperament began to be formed in the people. The workers occupied the offices and plants abandoned by the white colonialists; the peasants occupied the plantations. Since there was lack of labor, they began to organize self-management; the workers and peasants of Kivu thus demonstrated what a black man can do when he works in freedom, as Patrice Lumumba predicted.

I, too, have been charged with being a Communist because I refused to shoot at an underfed population that had taken over the biens vacants [vacant property]. It should be added that they were not really biens vacants, since they belonged to the Congolese people.

In 1962 the peasants commanded by the revolutionary leader Alexandre Kabare occupied Bukavu; it took the guns of the UN to compel them to return to their mountains. In December 1963 the Lumumbist parties registered a victory at the elections, winning 86% of the votes. One could ask how the insurrectional center was able to establish its center in the territory of Uvira, the least Lumumbist part of Kivu. The Lumumbists, in fact, are backed by 60% of the population there, whereas the figure is as high as 95% in the other regions.

The explanation is that Uvira occupies an important strategic position. It involves a port on Lake Tanganyika where gasoline

in particular is stored. The only automobile highway in the east of the Congo, about 68 miles long, crosses the insurgent region for about 38 miles. In the Ruizizi plain a plant has been constructed belonging to the biggest sugar enterprise in Central Africa. The Lumumbists know, of course, that it is not enough to occupy a town like Uvira to claim victory. This is only a stage which opens the road to further success.

At the moment the Lumumbist strategy is to seek international alliances that could destroy the clique of opportunists, real African Chiang Kai-sheks. As Fidel Castro said in Havana May 1: "May the American leaders realize their errors and the stupidity of their policy. . . ."

\* \* \*

[Since this article was written, new events have occurred on the Congo front. The Lumumbist Youth Movement of the Balubakat has again taken Albertville after retreating in the face of counter-revolutionary forces a few weeks ago. They have announced establishment of a provisional Lumumbist government. Such provisional governments have now been declared in three provinces: Eastern Province, Kivu and North Katanga. The insurrection has spread to Maniema and South Kasai.

[The reactionary "Congolese National Army" has launched a desperate counteroffensive in hope of separating the Kivu revolutionary forces from those of North Katanga and of strengthening the defenses of Bukavu, the capital city of Kivu.

[During this counteroffensive such horrible deeds were committed by the repressive forces that even some of the ministers of the puppet regime of Adoula-Kasavubu rebuked the army in public. In response to this, General Mobutu, one of the real dictators in the Congo, threatened to halt all operations until his forces were publicly cleared of all "infamous accusations."

[Among the Lumumbist forces, two trends seem to be appearing. One is headed by most of the members of the "Committee of National Liberation" established in exile in Brazzaville. This tendency favors "national reconciliation" with even such neocolonialist stooges as Tshombe, whose private "army" of mercenaries is now hiding out in Angola awaiting the departure of UN forces, and Kalonji, who was personally responsible for the murder of most of the Lumumbist leaders in 1961.

[The other trend, especially strong in the eastern Congo, is said to be inspired by the Chinese Communist party. This trend wants to establish a popular Lumumbist government in the liberated areas and then extend it to the whole country.]

## GENERAL TAYLOR'S TASK

By Joseph Hansen

Johnson's decision, announced June 23, to name the top general of the United States, Maxwell D. Taylor, as ambassador to South Vietnam caused a ripple of apprehension throughout the world.

The Democratic senator from Oregon, Wayne Morse, declared that the U.S. "is headed for war in Asia and will be hated for the next 500 years by a majority of mankind." He added that he had told Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and General Taylor that their statements in a secret briefing given the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had convinced him that "the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States."

How immediate is the threat? On this crucial question, Johnson was deliberately vague. An essential in the practice of psychological terror, as taught by the Dr. Strangeloves who stand at the elbow of the Texas rancher, is not to say everything. . .

The American people, however, do not like to be left in the dark, particularly in relation to threats that could escalate into another world war. Like the rest of humanity, they live in deep anxiety under the shadow of the nuclear weapons which proved to be the main fruit of victory in World War II. The American press was at once filled with interpretations of Johnson's move.

J. William Fulbright, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is considered to be the most knowledgeable congressman in this field, said: "The emphasis in South Vietnam, of course, is primarily a military one. But I don't think there has been any decision to escalate the war beyond the borders of South Vietnam."

The New York Times observed editorially [June 25]: "Since General Taylor is known to be opposed to any expansion of the war, his appointment may also be interpreted as indicating the President's decision to give the present policy further trial."

James Reston, Washington correspondent of the same newspaper, said, "This Administration is not prepared either to launch any spectacular offensive against North Vietnam or to accept any spectacular defeat there, particularly in an election year." (For the safety of the world, the U.S. Constitution ought to be amended to make every year an "election" year.)

Hanson W. Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times and a well-known spokesman for a sector of the Pentagon, voiced an almost identical opinion [June 26]: "The Taylor appointment, in addition to the psychological and political importance emphasized by the President. . . represents clearly a 'hold-the-fort' operation -- a continuation and intensification of present policies until



after the election, unless a tremendous emergency intervenes."

Walter Lippmann went so far as to state [June 26] that it is his impression a decision has been taken in a direction opposite to widening the war: "The real policy, I venture to think, is about like this: there is not and cannot be such a thing as a military victory in the civil war, and an attack on North Vietnam will not cause the Viet Cong rebels, who are predominantly South Vietnamese, to surrender to Gen. Khanh. To attack North Vietnam would be, therefore, a quite incalculable risk -- incalculable as to what could be gained by it and incalculable in what it would provoke.

"The only tolerable outcome, therefore, is a settlement by negotiation in which China and the United States are the principals, with the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain and India participating as mediators and eventual guarantors."

It is difficult to tell how much of this is wish-thinking. Lippmann has been advocating precisely this kind of policy.

C.L.Sulzberger, the New York Times specialist in foreign affairs, sees the move from still another angle. He points out [June 27-28 edition of the International edition] that France, despite the most excruciating effort, proved incapable of counter-ing "revolutionary warfare" as practiced by the people of Indochina. After "exhaustive studies of revolutionary warfare" the French tried again in Algeria. The result "was the disastrous O.A.S. military conspiracy in Algeria -- which they also lost, after almost losing France."

In Malaya, the British found that a "12-1 superiority is usually required to defeat skilled guerrillas." "However," Sulzberger adds, "revolutionary warfare, a kind of four-dimensional variety, seems almost undefeatable."

This is what the U.S. is up against in South Vietnam. New weapons, new techniques, new tactics -- all the devices of "armed non-intervention" -- were brought to bear. "But we failed to distinguish between guerrilla warfare and China's new doctrine of revolutionary warfare."

The White House and the Pentagon are floundering for an answer: "Thus General Taylor's crucial task is not only to check the dry-rot in Vietnam. It is also to discover a successful formula for revolutionary-counter-warfare,\* perhaps the most important assignment any U.S. ambassador ever had."

---

\*The persistence of America's revolutionary past shows up in the most unexpected places. Sulzberger's tongue trips on "counter-revolutionary warfare."

A certain parallel obviously exists between the mission assigned to General Taylor and the one assigned to General George C. Marshall by Truman in 1946. Marshall was sent as an envoy to China in hope of blocking the victory of the Chinese Revolution by bringing the Communist party leaders into a coalition government with Chiang Kai-shek. They were willing, but by an odd and fortunate quirk of history, the Generalissimo was not. Marshall's mission ended in failure.

Marshall, however, was made Secretary of State by Truman and his name became associated with the famous Plan that saved capitalism in Western Europe from an outcome like the one in China. Perhaps Johnson had this precedent in mind when he decided to send General Taylor to South Vietnam.

The assurances being made to the American people by columnists in the capitalist press that General Taylor's appointment really signifies nothing new and that they can relax, stand in obvious contradiction to the impression which the White House and the Pentagon are seeking to make abroad. Johnson declared June 28 that the U.S. is "prepared to risk war" with China. Planes armed with nuclear weapons are on patrol duty, greater military forces are being massed in the area, the borders of South Vietnam have been crossed in several instances. Even if Johnson aims "only" at a bluff, this has its logic, too. What if the bluff doesn't work?

Johnson seems to be following the pattern of Kennedy's 1962 ride to the brink. On June 19 an administration spokesman in obvious imitation of Kennedy said that the U.S. is "ready to fight alone if necessary," and that it will not heed "cooling off" efforts of its allies. "It will not permit its allies to influence any war decision because it is felt that American national security interests in Southeast Asia and the Pacific are too important to be decided by others." The spokesman appears to have been Secretary of State Dean Rusk himself.

On June 24, an unnamed "American official" was quoted by the Associated Press to have said, in commenting on the U.S. course in South Vietnam: "The only consolation, and it's a rather negative one, is that I'm afraid we are going to louse this thing up so badly as to precipitate a major war. That, at least, we know how to deal with."

The anonymous official could prove to be right. But where would be the historians to record the fact?

ITALY'S "CENTER-LEFT" CABINET BREAKS DOWN

After six months and ten days in office, Premier Aldo Moro's "center-left" coalition government resigned June 26 following a defeat in parliament over a secondary question -- state financial aid for Roman Catholic schools. That the government should be forced out over such a matter appeared to some observers to be due to a pure "misunderstanding." In reality, it is symptomatic of the deep contradictions lodged from the beginning in this coalition and of the fundamental impasse in which bourgeois democratic parliamentarism finds itself in Italy.

The "center-left" coalition between the Christian Democrats, the Nenni Socialist party and two small parties of Social Democratic and Republican stripe, was ballyhooed as a great historic event, representing a joint venture between monopoly capital and the labor bureaucracy aimed at (1) "modernizing" and "rationalizing" the functioning of monopoly capitalism, the better to meet stiffening competition within the Common Market, and (2) breaking the influence of the Communist party over the majority of the working class through social reforms coupled with long-term economic expansion. It was hoped that this would weaken, perhaps even split, the CP-led sectors of the trade-union movement.

The project back-fired. This was due to several factors.

First of all, opposition to forming a "center-left" coalition was high among conservative bourgeois circles. This led to delay in putting it together and to incapacity to give it an attractive appearance before the working class even from the point of view of pure demagogy.

Secondly, its ultimate formation coincided with a turn in the economic situation in Italy -- the end of the period of rapid expansion, the outbreak of large-scale inflation, and the beginning of a reduction of private investment coupled with lay-offs in big factories. Financial and economic tension was heightened by the beginning of a flight of capital. [See World Outlook April 10.]

Due to this specific situation, the Moro cabinet, virtually from its inception, was torn between two conflicting courses -- to go ahead with the long-range "structural" reform program advocated by the Nenni Socialist party (especially budget minister, Giolitti), and to alleviate the immediate financial and economic difficulties of capitalism by imposing a wage freeze on the working class as projected by the Christian Democrats.

Thirdly, the formation of the Moro government coincided with an incipient offensive of the capitalist class against the labor movement instead of a period of considerable concessions. The clear capitalist attitude weakened the right-wing tendencies in the Italian labor movement, and tended to arouse the combativity of the working

class and to induce a strong polarization of left-wing forces.

One of the immediate consequences was a split in the Nenni Socialist party when it entered the government. [See World Outlook January 24.] Another effect was a gain in votes for the Communist party in local elections after the coalition came into being, and increased difficulties for the right-wing leadership of the Communist party in putting a brake on working-class struggles. Strike after strike has flared up as the workers seek wage increases to keep up with the steady rise in the cost of living. As a matter of fact, a strike in the printing plants made it difficult to inform the public in detail about the downfall of the Moro government.

Thus the government crisis is clearly an expression of the contradictions which constituted the underpinning of the "center-left" government from the beginning. Since a coalition government of this type is a necessity for the capitalist politicians, given the present composition of parliament, the crisis is at the same time an expression of the impasse into which Italy's whole postwar, bourgeois-democratic, parliamentary system has landed -- at a time when the needs of the capitalist economy are sharply antagonistic to the existence of a strong, militant labor movement.

Intensive efforts are being made to patch up the coalition. The only alternative to this within the framework of parliamentary legality is a minority Christian Democratic cabinet (like the one headed by Amintore Fanfani before the Moro cabinet came in). It would be dependent on support from the Nenni Socialists and an occasional helping hand from members of parliament farther to the right. This solution, however, is unpalatable to the allies of the Christian Democrats. If they remain obdurate, dissolution of parliament would become inevitable. However, most bourgeois circles fear an early election since it could register even greater political polarization in the country, with significant gains for the Communist party on the one hand and the Liberal party (the strongest right-wing formation) on the other.

It is significant that for the first time in many years, certain Italian capitalist circles are toying with the idea of a coup d'état carried out by the carabinieri or the navy and air forces. This was reported in the Paris daily Le Figaro [June 29], a paper that is generally well informed on moods in bourgeois circles.

The thought of a coup d'état, remote as it may appear, reflects growing awareness of the blind alley in which bourgeois democracy stands in Italy as a result of the balance of class forces. It gives added weight to the analysis and program of action adopted at the recent session of the Central Committee of the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari, the Italian section of the Fourth International.

The Italian Trotskyists call on the workers not to limit themselves to merely defending trade-union rights and opposing

attempts to freeze wages but to consider the deepening social and political crisis maturing in the country.

They call on the workers to defend the idea of a socialist Italy, of putting in power a workers and peasants government composed of representatives of all working-class parties and committed to transcending the limits of capitalism.

In the absence of such a bold approach by the working class, say the Italian Trotskyists, there will be mounting danger that the capitalists themselves will start working for an extra-parliamentary solution of the crisis in a "gaullist" sense.

A "solution" along those lines would require as a precondition the serious defeat and demoralization of the working class. Since this is not now the situation, any attempt by the bourgeoisie at a coup d'état would seem highly premature, for it could provoke an immense reaction among the Italian proletariat.

### Cuban Notebook

#### "A BILLION TIMES BETTER THAN BEFORE. . . ."

By Ernest Mandel

[Ernest Mandel, editor of the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche, recently visited Cuba. He reported his over-all impressions to readers of La Gauche some weeks ago. (See World Outlook, May 29.) He is now continuing with sidelights.]

\* \* \*

The seven hundred fishermen of the town of Manzanillo -- one of the main ports of the province of Oriente, near the Sierra Maestra -- were fair game for the fish merchants before the Revolution. The dealers were proficient at organizing superabundance during the good season; the fishermen had to sell their catches at a small fraction of the price paid by the consumers. The revenue was not sufficient to keep the fishermen going for the rest of the year. So they fell into debt to the dealers and had no choice but to accept their offers. . . .

In addition, their equipment was old and dangerous. People were poor and didn't buy much fish. Many fishermen were unemployed a good part of the year.

The Revolution changed all that. An old fisherman told us when we questioned him: "Things are a billion times better than before. It's as different as night and day. Here, everybody is

behind Fidel and the Revolution."

Besides increased income, the fishermen enjoy freedom, dignity, peace of mind, the certainty of working for the welfare of the people, the pleasure of working together without degrading competition.

It was not difficult to understand his arithmetic.

The Revolution freed the fishermen of Manzanillo from the slavery of the market and servitude to rapacious dealers. They set up a co-operative which guarantees fixed prices to the fishermen for each kind of fish -- 26 centavos a pound for fish called "sierra"; 40 centavos for shrimp, etc. The co-operative in turn sells the fish to a commercial unit of the Fishing Institute, ECOPEMAR. It charges a little bit more than it pays. The difference covers its costs of operation, investments (refrigerators, new boats) and re-equipment of boats. Eighty per cent of the fishermen have turned their boats over to the co-operative -- twenty per cent continue to retain ownership (from now on they must cover the cost of repairs and re-equipment themselves).

For 1964, the norm of production has been set at a catch of 2,000,000 kg. [one kilogram = 2.20 pounds]. Up to now the catch has averaged out at 250,000 kg. a month, even though the first months of the year were the "dead season."

Total income for the 700 fishermen, with their 372 big and small boats amounts to around 200,000 pesos a month, the average fisherman getting 250 to 300 pesos a month, some of the more successful reaching 400 pesos a month; that is, two to three times the earnings they made before the revolution. The legal exchange rate for the peso is \$1 U.S.; its purchasing power is about 50 cents. The figures are obvious -- not bad for an underdeveloped country, is it? This is what explains the revolutionary enthusiasm of the fishermen. . . .

The co-operative has a very democratic structure; it enjoys a large measure of self-management. The administrator, a government functionary, is named by the Fishing Institute. His pay is 250 pesos a month (that is, less than the bottom bracket among the fishermen). He is assisted by a committee of five fishermen, elected at a general assembly, who discuss all the problems of management and investments and who can ask for recall of the administrator. Sharing of the profits is decided on by the general assembly.

The Revolution not only brought the fishermen of Manzanillo full employment and a decent standard of living (the sale of fish has greatly increased in the island). It also made it possible to replace the filthy hovels in which many of them used to live with a beautiful new village of graceful buildings whose gay colors shine in the sun. The co-operative decided the day it was founded in

July 1959 to build the new village; it was complete two years later.

Will the fishermen become a privileged layer in the country? No. As their catches increase, thanks to more and more modern equipment placed at their disposal, the price of fish will go down. Their income cannot go above the present level, at least for some years to come. But they know that this lowering of the price of fish automatically increases the real revenue of the whole working population of Cuba. And they accept this perspective with enthusiasm; they have only one desire: that the Cuban people as a whole reach the standard of living they have achieved and that they will be able to defend with all their might the Socialist Revolution.

### A DISQUIETING FISHING CONTEST

A strange news item appeared in the June 30 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde. Among 320 fishermen who participated in a fishing contest in the Seine, only 41 caught any fish. The catch was 81 small specimens -- the total weight being less than four and a half pounds. "In addition, many of these fish were sick and suffered from anatomical anomalies."

The fishermen's association, which has 80,000 members in the federal department, expressed "concern." For quite a while, the fish population in the Seine has been declining because of mounting pollution, visible at times in rafts of detergent suds, but nothing like this has been seen before. Moreover, while pollution has been worsening in tributaries to the river, fish still survive in the smaller streams. Le Monde concludes that something unknown is involved, the nature of which "should be determined."

As ardent pisciculturists ourselves, we should like to call the attention of Le Monde to a remarkable coincidence in the United States. There the country's main river, the mighty Mississippi, "father of waters," has been virtually depopulated of fish in its lower reaches. The few still found are in toxic condition.

The cause is considered to be a certain insecticide washed into the streams from America's farms in minute amounts.

Even the oceans now show contamination, insecticide having been found in marine plants in the Arctic. What is most alarming is that the poisons, ingested with food, are accumulating in human beings. When will the tolerance limit be passed?

The need for socialist planning thus becomes evident in completely unforeseen ways. The capitalist system, if it is permitted to continue in its anarchic way, will finally doom humanity, if not through the bomb, then through insect powder.

VENEZUELA'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

Cuban Revolution and Freedom Now Movement

[This is a continuation of the interview held by a representative of the Venezuelan Committee of the Fourth International with Comandante Elias Manuitt in the mountains of Falcon. See World Outlook June 26.]

Q: Comandante, what do you think has been the effect of the socialist revolution in Cuba upon the revolutionary process in Venezuela and Latin America in general?

A: Well, the process of the liberation of Cuba has opened the eyes of the peoples of Latin America; and these peoples, after the Cuban triumph, realize that it is possible to attain liberation -- that when a people determines to liberate itself, it achieves it. What is needed, simply, is the determination. And the Cuban people and their leader, Fidel Castro, offer a brilliant example of combativity and all that a people are capable of when they decide to emancipate themselves completely.

Cuba's war of liberation and Latin America's war of independence seem very similar to me in many respects. At first, Bolívar and Sucre were called extremists and troublemakers. They started with their little group here in Venezuela, and they started growing and growing, and, before you knew it, all America was liberated. Naturally, it was free for a short time only. Then came a new imperialism, more refined, more powerful, more aggressive, richer, that took over all of Latin America.

This other owner; that is, North American imperialism, took possession of our economy -- the copper in Chile, sugar cane in Cuba, petroleum, iron, in Venezuela, bananas in Central America, etc. What they did was to take over from the Spaniards. And what we are doing is to take over likewise from the Liberators, without imagining that we have their merits, without imagining we have their greatness, their brilliance. We are simply following the example they set. We have inherited their struggles, their unbreakable decision to block foreign interests from trampling on our territory and taking over our economy. They were few when they started but they transformed themselves into an army that covered all of America.

In Latin America's new war of liberation, Cuba leaped ahead of us. We set the example in the first war of independence and now they are setting the example. So they are paying us back with the same coin and we appreciate the Cubans and the leaders of that revolution -- the people, the exploited masses that are finally happy and free, for the example they have set for us.

This is an example that should be followed not only by all



the peoples of Latin America, but by all the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world.

So the Cuban struggle has really greatly influenced our struggle. It has served to awaken not only the masses, but also some leaders who were dreaming of pie in the sky.

Q: What is your opinion of the revolutionary movements in Latin America and, concretely, the existence of guerrilla groups in countries like Peru, Argentina, Guatemala and Colombia?

A: I view that as something very positive. The presence of these guerrilla groups influences the advance and the triumph of Latin America's liberation -- which takes us back to the same thing. When Venezuela was fighting for liberation from the Spanish yoke, armies -- we could call them guerrillas, that is, armies of liberation -- also surged up in Argentina, in Chile and other countries.

After the Cuban example, a single country here in Latin America cannot attain its liberation in an isolated form. The war in Latin America has to be a simultaneous war to triumph. Imperialism has now learned from the Cuban example. Imperialism now knows what is meant by the expropriation of its assets, of its interests in Latin America and it will not let these things go without a fight. And, naturally, the stability of the struggle in Venezuela influences the rest of these countries. The Americans, having much greater interests in Venezuela than in any of the other countries, cannot afford to lose this battle.

They exploit them all in any case, but here the exploitation of the Venezuelan people is more fruitful for them. Here the bite is bigger than the one they had in Cuba. Because of this, it is necessary to develop an offensive in all of Latin America. You have to remember that all beginnings are difficult. Three or four start; but in the long run they grow. Not only in terms of combatants but in the hearts of the masses, of the humble, who begin to see in these groups in the mountains, the future army of liberation, the only one that can take them out of the subhuman misery in which they live, and the only one that in a truly disinterested manner, fights for them.

Therefore I admire them -- the decision of all these revolutionists to start their liberation. I respect the opinion of some leaders of some countries who try to gain power by peaceful means. I respect their opinion, but at the same time -- and you'll excuse me -- I would state that I am sure they will not be able to maintain power by such means.

Q: Next to the appearance of guerrilla groups in all of Latin America, what are your views on the struggle which the American Negroes are carrying forward at present?

A: I completely solidarize myself with the movement of the Negroes in the United States, simply because it is part of the freedom movement of all peoples. There, the most exploited, the most oppressed, the most discriminated against, are the Negroes; that is to say, the Latin Americans of the United States. I would picture them as the Latin Americans of the United States -- a people determined like us to win freedom. . . . They now begin to see their future, they now have a vision of the future, and they now believe -- and they have every reason for it -- that they can win their independence, their real economic, political and social independence. There are 22,000,000 Negroes in the United States, 22,000,000 Negroes who are not all in the struggle today. But in time this movement, as is logical, will continue to grow, and a moment will come when the North American whites will forget about color and solidarize with the Negroes. And they will realize that these Negroes are also North Americans and that like them, they are exploited.

We know all too well that in the United States, too, the people are exploited. . . . The North American economy is centered around a few families who exploit the people. They will realize later that their struggle is not only the struggle of the Negroes, but the struggle of the North American people as well against the exploiting classes and the government.

### Special Statement

[In addition to the above remarks, Comandante Manuitt later made a special statement on this subject, as follows:]

I would like to take advantage of the opportunity you offer me, and, in the name of the FALN [Armed Forces of National Liberation] shall we say -- because I know this represents the views of all its members in general -- send fraternal greetings of solidarity to all the North American Negroes who are fighting against the misery, against the indignities to which they are submitted by the Yankees, the real Yankees.

Let the North American Negroes know that they can count on our full support, our full solidarity, and that their struggle is ours, and that their struggle is in our hearts. And that each time we see them sic the dogs on them, to attack them as if they were dogs themselves, our blood boils, and frankly we wish we could be there, be there fighting at their side to end the infamy which is being perpetrated on them.

Let the North American Negroes know that in the Venezuelan people they have a major ally. We sympathize with their struggle which must and will grow day by day because they are human beings and have a right to live like human beings. And also that the weapons that we Venezuelans have are at their disposal, at their service. In our mountains, we offer them a revolutionary handclasp.

of solidarity.

And they should keep in mind that the struggle that we have undertaken here is not only in behalf of the people of Venezuela. It is in behalf of all the oppressed, discriminated against and exploited peoples of the world. If they cannot fight there -- some of them -- they can come here, because our struggle is everyone's struggle, and for everyone.

### EQUALITY ON A SILVER PLATTER?

By Evelyn Sell

The United States Senate finally passed the controversial civil-rights bill after a record-smashing 83 days of debate. Although the Senate made over 100 changes in the bill it is certain that the House will promptly approve the measure and speed it on to President Johnson so that it can be signed into law in time for America's Independence Day celebration on July 4.

All 100 senators were on hand for the vote on the civil-rights bill so that we have a very interesting and revealing set of statistics. The final vote was 73 for and 27 against. Of those voting for the bill 46 were Democrats and 27 were Republicans. Of those voting against, 21 were Democrats and 6 Republicans. This means that almost 69% of the Democrats voted for the bill and 31% voted against. A solid one-third of the Democrats in the Senate went on record as against civil-rights legislation -- and this is the party that poses as "the best friend the Negro ever had!" This is the party that gets 80% of the Negro vote election after election!

The Republican party, in percentage terms, made a much better showing in this particular instance. Almost 82% of the Republican senators voted for the civil-rights bill while only 18% voted against the measure. However, the senators voting against were 5 Goldwater supporters and Goldwater himself. Since Goldwater is presently the leading contender for the Republican nomination for president, there is a great amount of consternation and speculation about his "No" vote and what it would mean if Goldwater did run for president.

The liberal wing of the Republican party has been working hard to woo away some of the Negro votes from the Democrats. Goldwater is now appearing as the champion of the so-called white counterrevolution. Predictions are that if he runs, Goldwater will grab away many Southern racist votes from Democratic nominee Johnson who strongly supported passage of the civil-rights bill.

Politicians in both parties are trying to second-guess the

voting trends and moods among the American people. The shrewder guessers will win the presidency for their party. But will the Negroes and civil-rights supporters win anything with either capitalist party in office? Past performance proves that there is actually little choice between the twin parties of American capitalism. Call them Demopublicans or Republocrats, they're both essentially the same.

The real victories for civil-rights have been and will continue to be won in the streets. The introduction of this current civil-rights legislation was designed to get the battles out of the streets and into the law courts where sharp lawyers and the long delaying tactics of bourgeois justice would emasculate civil-rights gains and prolong the Jim Crow system.

The capitalist politicians have, of course, hailed passage of the civil-rights bill. They're acting as if they have just handed the Negro people equality on a silver platter. They're trying to create the illusion that without them and their phony Congressional dramatics Jim Crow would never be destroyed. A typical comment was made by President Johnson who called passage of the bill "a major step toward equal opportunities for all Americans."

"I congratulate senators of both parties," the President said, "who worked to make passage possible."

What really pushed through the civil-rights bill was the mounting Negro revolt in this country and the promised "long hot summer" of civil-rights demonstrations. The bill was passed at this time to head off the summer's activities but it appears that instead militant Negroes will now intensify their struggle in order to test the effectiveness of the new legislation.

Even the more conservative Negro leaders greeted the bill's passage with mixed sentiments. Roy Wilkins, head of the huge National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP] said the approved bill was "a giant step forward, not only for Negro citizens but for our country." Then he added that he believed the "law may reduce the number of demonstrations but I cannot predict that it will eliminate them."

Martin Luther King, Jr., and James Farmer of the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] have promised continued demonstrations in the South to test the bill's provisions this summer. James Foreman, one of the leaders of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee [SNCC] said that the first group of students trained for an assault on Mississippi Jim Crow will leave for the South June 22.

There is no cease-fire in the war against segregation and second-class citizenship. Negroes have learned their lesson well. There is little reliance on fine-sounding laws but there is great confidence in their own abilities to make civil rights a living

reality through militant struggles.

Richard Henry, head of the Detroit Group on Advanced Leadership [GOAL], voiced the sentiments of many Negroes when he said, "We welcome passage of the bill in that certain aspects represent a possible legal improvement, especially with regard to public accommodations and vote guarantees." But -- "There is no evidence yet that this bill will be enforced any better than past civil-rights measures."

Enforcing the bill will, ultimately, depend on the strength of the Freedom Now movement. The long hot summer is ahead.

### HANDS OFF SOUTHERN ARABIA!

[The following appeal has been issued by the editorial board of The Arab Revolution, an Arabic magazine.]

\* \* \*

The most brutal and inhuman war going on in Aden for the past few weeks, which has included deporting, starving, bombing villages and killing innocent women and children, etc., has been carried out by the British Army against the people of Radfan to enforce the reactionary, imperialistic policy of the Conservative party. It is a pity that the leaders of the Labour party support these barbaric and savage military operations.

For so many years the people of the occupied Southern Yemen (Aden and protectorate Sultanates) struggled for their independence under the leadership of the Aden Trade Union Congress, and lately the People's Socialist party, suffering imprisonment, torture, deportation and political assassination. At the same time the British government supported the most corrupt element, the feudalists and the sultans, forming the superficial Southern Arabian Federation against the will of the people, to keep and strengthen its rule and the rule of its allies.

The British government organized the so-called Southern Arabian Conference on the 9th June in London, in the hope that it would reduce tension in Aden, but the conference represents one side only -- the British government, its agents, puppets and followers of the corrupt sultans and feudalists. This superficial "puppets conference" does not represent the people of occupied Southern Yemen because the forces of the people with the biggest mass following in the Southern Yemen, the Aden Trade Union Congress and the People's Socialist party and the rest of the national groupings did not take part in the conference. Who are the real representatives in this conference? The British government only and

its supporters.

We appeal to all our friends, freedom- and peace-loving people, to the rank and file of the Labour party, trade unions and all progressive elements to give their support and solidarity to the heroic struggle of the people of occupied Southern Yemen under the leadership of the People's Socialist party and the Aden Trade Unions and to protest to the British government and demand --

- (1) An immediate stop to the brutal war in Aden.
- (2) The withdrawal of all military forces.
- (3) Immediate negotiations with the representatives of the people of Aden, at its head the People's Socialist party for the right of self-determination and independence for Southern Arabia.

The people of occupied Southern Yemen demand their rights; and, in order for us to succeed, give us your support.

#### PAULING AGAIN WARNS ON NUCLEAR WAR

At a news conference in Bonn, Germany, June 29, Dr. Linus C. Pauling, the only scientist in the world to enjoy the distinction of winning two Nobel Prizes [for Chemistry and Peace] said that the odds on an atomic war breaking out in any given year are one in twenty.

It was not reported how he arrived at this figure or whether it signified that such a war is almost certain once within twenty years. But other thought-provoking figures were sent out on the wires.

Dr. Pauling said that it would take only ten per cent of the stock pile of nuclear weapons now available to kill 800,000,000 people in the most advanced parts of the world.

All the inhabitants of the United States, the Soviet Union and Europe would fall victim.

In some out-of-the-way areas like Australia there might be survivors "but mutations would cause such changes that I am not sure we could say that humanity itself survived."

When the American scientist won the Nobel Peace Prize last October, he said: "As we consider the facts about the capabilities of destruction that are possessed by the Soviet Union and the United States, we are forced to the conclusion that we are doomed to die if the world continues along the path of insanity."

HOW IMPORTANT IS THE INDIVIDUAL IN MAKING HISTORY?

By William F. Warde

I.

In the third chapter of The Prophet Outcast, the final volume of his biography of Trotsky, where he treats of "The revolutionary as Historian," Isaac Deutscher discusses the role of personality in the determination of social events in a highly instructive context. The problem is raised in connection with Trotsky's appraisal of Lenin's place in the Russian Revolution.

Deutscher holds that Trotsky shuttled between two discordant positions. In the History of the Russian Revolution, a letter to Preobrazhensky in 1928, and in his French Diary Trotsky maintained that Lenin was absolutely indispensable to the victory of October. It would not have been achieved without him. Elsewhere, in The Revolution Betrayed, says Deutscher, Trotsky reverted to the orthodox view of historical materialism which subordinates the quality of the leadership to the more objective factors in the making of history. Is this a wavering on Trotsky's part?

Marxism does teach that no individual, however talented, strong-willed or strategically situated, can alter the main course of historical development, which is shaped by supra-individual circumstances and forces. Therefore, reasons Deutscher, the revolution would have triumphed in 1917 with other leaders even if Lenin had been removed from the arena by some accident. Trotsky himself, or a team of other Bolshevik chiefs, might have filled his place.

Deutscher divines that Trotsky's lapse into a subjectivism bordering on "the cult of the individual" in regard to Lenin was motivated by a psychological need to exaggerate the role of individual leadership as a counterweight to Stalin's autocracy in his mortal political combat with him. He seeks to correct Trotsky by reference to the ideas expressed in Plekhanov's classical essay on The Role of the Individual in History. This was a polemic against the Narodnik school of subjective sociology which exalted the hero as an autonomous creator of history at the expense of the masses and other objective determinants of the class struggle. Arguing against the thesis that the collective demand for leadership could be supplied by only one remarkable individual, Plekhanov pointed out that the person hoisted into supreme authority bars the way of others who might have shouldered and carried through the same tasks, though in a different style. The eclipse of alternate candidates creates the optical illusion of the sole irreplaceable personality. If the objective prerequisites are ripe and the historical demand forceful enough, a range of men can fulfill the indicated functions of command. The Chinese and Yugoslav examples, writes Deutscher, demonstrate how rising revolutions can utilize men of smaller stature than a Lenin or Trotsky to take power. The class

struggle can press into service whatever human material is available to fulfill its objectives.

This theme has an importance surpassing Trotsky's judgment on Lenin's significance for the Russian Revolution or Deutscher's criticism of Trotsky's alleged inconsistencies on the matter. The reciprocal action of the objective and subjective factors in the historical process is one of the key problems of social science. It is no less a key to revolutionary practice in our own time.

Historical materialism unequivocally gives primacy, as Deutscher emphasizes, to such objective factors as the level of the productive forces and the state of class relations in the making of history. But there is more to the matter than this.

### A Relative Relation

In the first place, the social phenomena divided into opposing categories are only relatively objective or subjective. Their status changes according to the relevant connections. If the world environment is objective to the nation which is part of it, the nation in turn is objective to the classes which constitute its social structure. The ruling class is objective to the working class. The party is subjective to the class whose interests it represents and aims it promotes while groups, tendencies, factions and their combinations are subjective to the movement or party which contains them. Finally, the individual has a subjective status relative to all these other factors, although he has an objective existence in relation to other individuals.

In the second place, the multiple factors in any historical process do not, and indeed cannot have, an equal and simultaneous growth. Not only do some mature before others but certain of them may fail to achieve a full and adequate reality at the decisive moment, or indeed at any point. The coming together of all the various factors essential for the occurrence of a particular result in a great historical process is an exceptional or "accidental" event which is necessary only in the long run.

The leadership, collective and individual, embodies the conscious element in history. The influence of an individual in determining a course of events can range from negligibility to totality. The extent of his effectiveness in action depends upon the stage of development of historical conditions, the correlation of social forces, and the person's precise connection with these at a given conjuncture.

There are long stretches of time when the strongest-willed revolutionist cannot in the least avail against the march of events and practically counts for nothing in redirecting them. On the other hand, there are "tides in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, lead on to fortune."



Ordinarily, individual action takes place somewhere between these two extremes. What men do -- or do not do -- in their personal capacity affects to some limited degree the velocity and specific features of the main line of development.

The case in point is: where and when can an individual exert the maximum weight and become the decisive force in the outcome of a struggle? This can happen only when his intervention is inserted at the culminating point of a prolonged evolution when all the other factors of a more objective sort have come into being. These set the stage for his decisive role and provide the means for carrying through the purposes and program of the movement he represents.

The great man, who helps start a novel line of development in any field, comes as the last link in the assemblage of conditions and the concatenation of events. We are all familiar with the straw that breaks the camel's back or the drop that overflows the cup. The individual who makes all the difference serves as the precipitant that transforms quantity into quality in the process whereby the new supersedes the old.

However, he must intervene at the critical turning point of development for his action to have so decisive an influence. Such fortunate timing, which does not always depend upon his own awareness, permits him to become the final cause in the cumulative sequence of conditions which are necessary determinants of the outcome.

### Variation in Historical Spans

The discrepancy noted by Deutscher between Trotsky's observations that Lenin was indispensable for the October victory and that the objective laws of history are far more powerful than the special traits of the protagonists involved is to be explained by the difference between the short and the long run of history. The calculus of probabilities applies to human history as well as to natural events. Given enough chances in the long run, the forces representing the objective necessities of social progress will break through all obstacles and prove stronger than the defenses of the old order. But that is not necessarily true at any given stage or in any instance along the way. Here the quality of the leadership can decide which of the genuine alternatives growing out of the prevailing conditions will be realized.

The conscious factor has a qualitatively different import over an entire historical epoch than it has in a specific phase or situation within it. When antagonistic social forces vie for supremacy on a world-historical scale, such favorable and unfavorable circumstances as the character of the leadership tend to offset and cancel one another. The underlying historical necessities assert themselves in and through the aggregate struggles and override the more superficial and chance features which can decide the

upshot of any particular encounter. Moreover, an ascending class in the long run benefits more than its opponent from the accidents of development since the receding class has less and less reserve strength to withstand and overcome small variations in the relation of forces. The total assets of the one increase as those of the other diminish.

Time is an all-important element in the conflict of contending social forces. The indeterminate phase when events can be diverted in either direction does not last long. The crisis in social relations must be resolved quickly one way or the other. At that point the activity or passivity of dominant personalities, groups, parties and masses can tip the scales on one side or the other. The individual can enter as the ultimate factor in the total process of historical determination only when all the other forces in play are temporarily equalized. Then his added weight can serve to tip the balance.

Almost everyone can recall occasions where his own intervention or that of others proved decisive in resolving an uncertain situation. What happens in the small incidents of life applies to big events. Just as the single vote of the chairman can decide when the forces on an issue are evenly divided, so the outstanding qualities of great figures are manifested when history arrives at a deadlock. Their decision or decisiveness breaks the tie and propels events along a definitely different line. This holds for counterrevolutionary as well as revolutionary tendencies. Hitler was important because he took Germany into fascism and war. But he did not direct German or world history into a qualitatively new channel. He simply helped write a further horrible chapter in the death agony of capitalism.

Lenin's imperishable contribution was the push he gave to opening an entirely new path for Russian and world history, re-directing it from the dead-end of capitalism onto the new beginning of socialism.

### The Problem of Possibilities

This brings us back to the specific problem Deutscher discusses. He does not question the fact that in the actual unrolling of the 1917 Revolution Lenin functioned as the final cause in the October victory. The difference between Deutscher and Trotsky concerns the uncertain realm of historical possibilities. Could another revolutionist such as Trotsky, or a combination of them, have assumed Lenin's place?

Trotsky somewhat categorically said no. Deutscher objects that if others on hand could not have performed the same job of leadership, then the position of historical materialism on the lawful determination of events must be abandoned. Either the objective or the subjective factors decide; it is necessary to choose between them.

In my opinion, Deutscher here takes a too constricted and one-sided stand on historical determinism whereas Trotsky employed a more flexible and multisided interpretation based upon the interrelation of mutually opposing categories. He tested his conception, first in practice, then in theory, in the successive stages of the Russian Revolution where the importance of the conscious factor stood out with remarkable clarity.

### In the Light of Experience

The type of leadership was very different in the two revolutions of 1917. The February Revolution was not planned or directed from above. Trotsky points out in the chapter of his History, "Who Led the February Revolution?", that it was led "by conscious and tempered workers educated for the most part by the party of Lenin." As educator and organizer of these key workers, Lenin was to that extent necessary to the February overturn, even though he was not on the spot in person.

Between February and October he became more and more decisive because of his resolute and far-sighted stands at a series of crucial moments, starting with the reorienting of the Bolshevik cadres in April and culminating in his insistence on insurrection in October. According to Trotsky, Lenin's role could not have been duplicated. This was not simply because of his personal gifts but even more because of his exceptional standing in the Bolshevik party which was largely his creation.

The question of leadership in the Russian Revolution had a dual aspect. While the Bolsheviks led the workers and peasants to victory, Lenin led the Bolshevik party. His paramount role came from the fact that he led the leaders of the revolution.

Trotsky knew better than anyone else how Lenin could sway the higher echelons as well as the ranks of his party. His authority was a considerable help from April to October in getting his correct proposals adopted over the resistance of other Bolshevik chiefs. This accumulated capital of prestige was not at the disposal of others, including Trotsky, who had a different organizational history and relations. That was the objective basis for his opinion that the October Revolution would most likely not have taken place unless "Lenin was present and in command."

To be sure, it is not possible, as Deutscher remarks and Trotsky himself recognized, to be utterly categorical on this point. But Trotsky's conclusion, which is to be found in all his writings after October and before the rise of Stalin, was not based upon a regrettable lapse into excessive subjectivity. It came from applying the Marxist dialectic to the facts as he witnessed and assayed them. If he was wrong, it was not because of any deviation in principle or abandonment of method induced by unconscious political-psychological motives, which Deutscher considers to be the case, but

the result of misjudging the facts.

## II.

Sidney Hook has entered this controversy from the opposite end. In a review of The Prophet Outcast in the May 11, 1964, New Leader he seizes upon Deutscher's criticism of Trotsky's subjectivism for his own purposes. Instead of condemning, he compliments Trotsky for discarding the dogmas of dialectical materialism and attributing "the most important social event in human history" to the purely personal and contingent circumstance of Lenin's presence in Russia. In his eyes the October Revolution was the accidental consequence of the work of an individual. Hook repeats the view expressed in his book on The Hero in History, cited by Deutscher, that the October Revolution "was not so much a product of the whole past of Russian history as a product of one of the most event-making figures of all time."

Whereas Deutscher in the name of Marxist orthodoxy inclines to make the objective factors virtually self-sufficient and thus underrates the crucial importance of Lenin's leadership, Hook practically nullifies the other and prior determinants by making the October victory wholly dependent upon a single individual. His approach falls below the standards of the most enlightened liberal historians who at least placed objective factors on a par with the ideas and intervention of great men.

### Trotsky's View

Hook has to falsify Trotsky's standpoint in order to convert him into a pragmatist as superficial as himself. Trotsky's History is explicitly devoted to demonstrating the necessity of the Russian Revolution and its specific outcome as the result of the whole previous evolution of world capitalism, the backwardness of Russia complemented by its concentrated industrial enterprises and advanced working class, the stresses of the First World War upon a decayed Czarist autocracy, the weakness of the bourgeoisie, the failure of the petty-bourgeois parties and the bold vision of the Bolsheviks headed by Lenin.

Trotsky delineates the operation of this determinism in living reality by narrating and analyzing the interconnection of the salient events from the February beginning to the October climax. The successive stages of the revolution did not unfold haphazardly; they issued with inexorable lawfulness one from the other in a causally conditioned sequence. The aim of his theoretical exposition was to find in the verified facts of the actual process the effects of the objective necessities formulated in the laws of the class struggle applied to a backward great power under twentieth century conditions. He had already anticipated and articulated these in his celebrated theory of the Permanent Revolution.

Trotsky viewed the Bolshevik party as one of the components of this historical necessity and Lenin as the most conscious exponent and skilled practitioner of the political science of Marxism based on these laws. It was not purely fortuitous that Lenin was able to play the role that he did. He was no chance comer. "Lenin was not an accidental element in the historic development, but a product of the whole past of Russian development." For years he had prepared himself and his party for the task of steering the expected revolution to victory.

There was no foreordination in the full compass of the pre-conditions for October extending from the history of Russia in the world to the political foresight and insight of Lenin. Their joint necessity was proved in practice. Nor was the actual course of events realized without the concurrence of many accidental circumstances favorable or unfavorable to both sides.

It was, for example, a lucky chance that the German General Staff for its own reasons permitted Lenin to travel from his Swiss exile back to Russia through Germany in time to redirect the Bolshevik party. It was an historical accident that Lenin remained alive and active throughout the crucial months; it could have been otherwise and indeed Lenin thought his murder quite probable. In that case, if we credit Trotsky, the socialist outcome implicit in the situation could not have been achieved in 1917.

This means that the history of the twentieth century, which is now unthinkable apart from the Russian Revolution in all its consequences, would have been quite different. Not in the broadest lines of its development but certainly in the particular course and features of the irrepressible contest between the socialist revolution and its capitalist antagonists.

There is nothing un-Marxist, as Deutscher seems to think, in acknowledging this. To link "the fortunes of mankind in this century" with Lenin's activity in 1917 is not subjectivist thinking; it is a matter of fact. Conversely, Lenin's absence could well have subtracted that margin of determinism from the total conditions required for victory which would have made the subsequent sequence of developments in the world revolution quite different.

The great fortune of the Russian people and all mankind is that in 1917 both accident and necessity coincided to carry the struggle of workers and peasants to its proper conclusion. This has not always happened in the decades since.

#### "The Historical Crisis of Mankind"

Deutscher weakens his case considerably by focusing attention on Russia. The role of Lenin and his party stand out more clearly and sharply in the light of the defeats suffered by the working class elsewhere in Europe and Asia during the 1920's and

1930's, in the last analysis because of the lack of a collective and individual leadership of Bolshevik-Leninist caliber. The October victory coupled with the post-October defeats convinced the once dubious Trotsky of the decisive role of leadership in an objectively revolutionary situation. These experiences led him to the generalization which was the keystone of the founding program of the Fourth International, adopted in 1938, that "the historical crisis of mankind is reduced to the crisis of revolutionary leadership." That is why he dedicated the last years of his life to the task of attempting to assemble such a leadership under the banner of the Fourth International.

Deutscher's disagreement with Trotsky over Lenin's part in the Russian Revolution is directly connected with his differences with Trotsky over the latter's role in the post-Lenin period. Deutscher regards Trotsky's assertion that the foundation of the Fourth International was "the most important work of my life -- more important than 1917, more important than the period of the civil war, or any other. . ." as an aberration. The energy devoted to the Trotskyist groups was largely wasted, he believes, since the objective conditions were not suitable for constructing a new International. In his opinion, Trotsky would have been better advised to remain an interpreter of events instead of vainly trying to change their course by means of a rival world revolutionary organization.

J.B. Stuart has undertaken to answer Deutscher's criticism of Trotsky's unrealism in connection with the Fourth International in the April 17-24 issues of World Outlook and there is no point in repeating his arguments. Here we are primarily interested in the real rationale behind Trotsky's positions.

Deutscher contends that Trotsky misjudged Lenin's importance in the winning of the Russian Revolution and his own role in the period of world reaction after Lenin's death for psychological reasons which ran counter to Marxist objectivity. Trotsky actually derived his position in both cases, it seems to us, from his conception of the needs of the revolutionary process in our time. He thought that all the major objective ingredients for the overthrow of capitalism had in general ripened. What was missing for new Octobers was the presence of leadership of the type supplied by Lenin and the Bolsheviks in 1917. Such cadres had to be created to prevent the incompetent and treacherous bureaucracies heading the different sectors of the workers' movement from ruining more revolutionary opportunities. Thus world political, rather than individual psychological necessities, accounted for his conclusions.

### III.

It is true, as Deutscher points out, that revolutionary power was conquered in Yugoslavia and China with leaderships trained in the Stalinist school which do not match the standards of Lenin's

Bolshevism. The 1963 Reunification Congress of the Fourth International took cognizance of this development in its resolution, The Dynamics of World Revolution Today: "The weakness of the enemy in the backward countries has opened the possibility of coming to power even with a blunted instrument."

However, the document hastens to add: "The strength of the enemy in the imperialist countries demands a tool of much greater perfection." For the taking of power in the capitalist strongholds as well as the administration of power in the degenerated or deformed workers states, the building of new mass revolutionary parties and their unification in a new international organization remains the central strategical task of the present period no less than in Lenin's and Trotsky's day.

### The Cuban Revolution

This dialectical unity of the objective and subjective factors in the making of a revolution has been both exemplified and theorized by Fidel Castro and his close associates. If ever an historic event could be considered the work of one man, that was -- and is -- the Cuban Revolution. Castro is truly its "líder máximo" [main leader].

Castro has explained, notably in his December 21, 1961, speech on Marxism-Leninism, how the founders of the July 26 Movement did not wait for all the objective conditions required for revolutionary success to emerge spontaneously. They deliberately set about to create the still missing revolutionary conditions by fighting. Their guerrilla warfare did bring about the moral, psychological, political changes needed to overthrow Batista's tyranny. The general lesson of their experience for the further struggles against Latin-American dictatorships has been formulated as follows by Che Guevara in his handbook on guerrilla warfare: "It is not always necessary to wait until all the conditions are ripe for the revolution; the insurrectional center can create them."

The transformation of the balance of forces in favor of the progressive side by the initiative of a small band of conscious revolutionary fighters dramatically demonstrates how decisive the subjective factor can be in making history. Yet Castro would be the first to caution against an adventurism which ignores objective conditions, to disavow any cult of the individual, and to acknowledge that his intentions would have miscarried and his combatants would have been rendered powerless without the response they received, first from the peasants in the mountains and then from the masses in the rural and urban areas. The sensitivity of the Cuban leaders to the interplay of the subjective and objective factors in the development of the revolution and its regime at all stages has brought them to a deeper understanding of the ideas of Marx and of the need for a party like Lenin's.

## Assassination of Kennedy

Recent events ninety miles from Cuba have highlighted the twofold aspects of the individual's weight in history-making. Kennedy's assassination last November did not seriously interrupt any operations of the U.S. government or shift its course at home or abroad. After assuming executive authority, Johnson has pursued essentially the same policies as his predecessor, albeit with a Texas brand rather than a Harvard accent. Thus the abrupt removal of an extremely popular and powerful personality has proved to be inconsequential compared to the automatism of capitalist rulership. Procapitalist individuals come and go; the system remains.

At the same time the holder of supreme office in the United States controls more massive military power than any other person in the world or in human history. On June 4 Johnson boasted that the national strength "is stronger than the combined might of all the nations in the history of the world."

The President can release enough bombs to destroy all mankind. Who can question the overwhelming importance of the individual when one man's decision can terminate human history on this planet? Kennedy was eyeball to eyeball with this possibility during the 1962 Caribbean crisis.

To be sure, the man in the White House does not act as an isolated individual. He is the chief executive of the United States, commander-in-chief of its armed forces, and, more significantly, agent of the profiteers who run the economy and government. His personal role by and large accords with the objective necessities of monopolist domination; and, in the last analysis, the fundamental interests of the ruling class determine his political conduct.

But his representative functions do not nullify the fact that he alone is delegated to make the final decision and can give the command to press the H-button.

Personal decision is the crowning expression of social determinism, the last link in its causal chain. The social determinism operative in the world today is divided into two irreconcilable trends, stemming from opposing class sources. One is directed by the capitalist warmakers whose spokesmen in the United States have stated that they will not refrain from using atomic weapons if necessary. The other is constituted by the masses of the United States and the rest of the world who dread this prospect and have everything to lose if it should occur.

Which of these contending determinisms will prevail? The fate of mankind hangs in the balance of this decision. To dispossess and disarm the atomaniacs headquartered in Washington, a revolutionary movement of tremendous dimensions and determination will



have to be built. No single individual will stop them. But victory in the life-and-death struggle for world peace against nuclear annihilation will require the initiative and devotion of individuals who, though they may not possess the outstanding leadership capacities of a Lenin, Trotsky or Castro, can act in their spirit.

June 5, 1964

### Book Review

#### MUST READING IN BOTH PEKING AND MOSCOW

DYNAMICS OF WORLD REVOLUTION TODAY. The Workers Vanguard Publishing Association, 81 Queen Street West, Toronto 1, Ontario, Canada. 1964. 44 pp. \$.35.

This document has probably never been read by most bourgeois commentators on the Sino-Soviet dispute. Why should they be interested in an analysis produced by the Fourth International, which as yet holds power in no country and exists as only a small force in most areas? Yet the top experts in both Moscow and Peking studied this document with the closest attention and no one less than Mikhail Suslov, leading ideologist of the Khrushchev bureaucracy, quoted from it in a major speech dealing with the dispute.

In reporting to the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union in April, Suslov said: "Does anyone think perhaps that the Chinese theory making the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America the 'principal zone of the storms of the world revolution' represents something original? No, this is the repetition almost word for word of one of the principal theses of current Trotskyism. One can read in the decision of the so-called Fourth International (Trotskyist): 'As a result of the successive failure of the two major revolutionary waves of 1919-23 and of 1943-48 -- and of the minor one of 1934-37 -- the main center of world revolution shifted for a time to the colonial world.' Here is where the source of the political wisdom of the Chinese leadership must be sought."

The quotation cited by Suslov appears in its original context on page 3 of this pamphlet. It is part of a key resolution passed at the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International held in June 1963.

It is, of course, an exaggeration to say that the document is the source of the "political wisdom" of the Chinese leadership. Nor is it the source of the "political wisdom" of Khrushchev, whom the Chinese, in turn, accuse of being a bigger "Trotskyist." But

it must be admitted that both Mao and Khrushchev do display a certain political wisdom in making sure that their brain trusts pour over the publications of the world Trotskyist movement.

In making this document easily available, the Workers Vanguard Publishing Association has done a service for all those interested in the process of world revolution. They state their reasons as follows:

"We are reproducing it in pamphlet form because we consider it the most significant writing that has appeared in years on the developing world socialist revolution. It answers many key questions posed before the working-class leadership -- particularly on the interrelationship between the forces of the colonial revolution which are persistently bursting through the national stage onto the socialist stage of development, the rising tide of political revolution in the workers' states that strives to remove the bureaucratic clique and re-establish socialist democracy on the planned economies there, and the forces for the socialist transformation of the advanced capitalist sectors of the world."

PLEASE NOTE -- SUMMER SCHEDULE

During July and August, World Outlook will reduce its frequency of appearance. The next issue will thus be dated July 17. The regular schedule will be resumed in September.