

a labor press service

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

50¢

Un service de presse ouvrier

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2, France

NEW YORK OFFICE: World Outlook, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

Vol. 5, No. 24
June 16, 1967

The Israeli Victory:

Setback for Antiwar Movement



Cuban Position in the Mideast Crisis



Kremlin Sees "Trotskyism" in China



Youth Problem Hits Italian Communists



Lessons of Greek Coup d'Etat

Documents:

Remarks Concerning the Left in Israel

Reba Hansen, Business Manager,

P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station,

New York, N.Y. 10010

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 \$7.50 or £2/15s. or 37.50 francs to: Reba Hansen, Business Manager, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010.

THE ISRAELI VICTORY -- A SETBACK FOR THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

of colonial people beginning with North Africa and ranging through India and China around the world to Cuba.

The colonial peoples hoped for an Arab victory. It was their pressure that induced even pro-imperialist regimes, such as King Hussein of Jordan, Hassan II of Morocco and Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia to line up against the Israeli government.

The Jewish communities outside of Israel were swept by chauvinism. They offered the new generation of antiwar fighters, who have only read about war hysteria, a good example of this reactionary psychological phenomenon.

Even participants in the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam were caught up in the fever. The International War Crimes Tribunal did not escape unscathed, no one less than Jean-Paul Sartre joining the Israeli side.

Martin Luther King, who recently went quite far in denouncing the U.S. role in Vietnam, signed an advertisement in the June 4 New York Times virtually calling on the Johnson administration to intervene militarily in the Middle East.

In New York, where there is a large Jewish community, more than \$20 million was raised in a few days and comparable amounts were pouring in from other areas. The degree of chauvinism could also be judged from the comments of the liberal columnist Pete Hamill, who has written very good material on the Vietnamese situation.

In his column in the New York Post of June 9, for instance, Hamill said that Nasser "seems to be running for most likely politician since Mussolini to end his career hanging upside down in a gas station."

By way of comparison, a Chiang Kai-shek rag, the China Daily News, described Nasser as "a lunatic" with "megalo-maniacal aspirations..." (Quoted in the May 28 Free China Weekly.)

The most important shift by far, however, was the one taken by the Kremlin.

Brezhnev-Kosygin led the Arabs, particularly Nasser, to believe that they would support them in the confrontation with Israel and its imperialist backers. However after the single military round in which the Israeli government pulled its combination "Pearl Harbor" and "blitzkrieg" -- as it has been freely and favorably described in the New York press -- the Kremlin capitulated to the U.S. after secret talks in the corridors of the



BREZHNEV
Peaceful

The swift outcome of the confrontation in the Middle East -- a military victory for Israel -- is being pictured in the West as a gain for "peace," if only a temporary one.

It was, however, a setback for the colonial revolution and by that token a blow to the forces standing in the way of the U.S. imperialist course toward another world war.

The Middle East crisis, following hard on the heels of Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam to such a pitch as to give rise to forebodings on all sides that perhaps the opening stage of World War III had already begun, divided international public opinion into two broad camps.

On the one side stood the Israeli government, powerfully backed by U.S. imperialism, deftly abetted by Harold Wilson and cheered on by such notorious figures as Nguyen Cao Ky and Chiang Kai-shek.

On the other side stood the masses

United Nations.

The June 9 Wall Street Journal described the gloating in the Johnson administration as follows:

"Euphoria envelops the White House as the Soviet chickens out of the Arab war.

"LBJ was in direct contact with Kremlin bosses while Israel blitzed their Mideast clients; after initial stickiness, he found Moscow cooperative. More Russian bombast is expected, for face-saving. But the White House judges the Soviet will soon revive an atmosphere of broad East-West detente, maybe even try again to drag Vietnamese Reds into peace talks.

"Russians grouch privately there was no excuse for Nasser's letting his planes get wiped out on the airfields. They conclude they wasted billions trying to build Arab military muscle. The Arab nations turn equally bitter at the USSR's failure to enter the fray against Israel.

"Washington watches to see if recent minor reshuffling of the Soviets' committee-style leadership will now shake major figures."

Peter Grose, writing in the June 9 New York Times from his post in Moscow, hints further on the behind-the-scenes negotiations between the Kremlin and the White House. When the question of a cease-fire came up in the United Nations, the Soviet delegation insisted that it be accompanied by a demand for the withdrawal of Israeli forces.

"Mr. Fedorenko's private talks with Arthur J. Goldberg, the United States delegate, that morning," writes Grose, "had apparently convinced him that the additional Soviet demand would not be acceptable to the United States."

Or, reading between the lines, the U.S. wanted a cease-fire after the Israeli ~~armies had pulled their~~ "Pearl Harbor," thus putting them in better position to retain their conquests.

"So the Politburo faced the problem of either insisting on the announced Soviet position and running the risk that delay would allow further Israeli advances or accepting the unconditional cease-fire. They chose the latter, only to discover that the Arab states then rejected the resolution and the Israelis seized further military objectives yesterday....

"The Arabs presumably think the Russians let them down..."

Philippe Ben, the UN correspondent of the Paris daily Le Monde, noted that



JOHNSON
Coexistence?

after categorically opposing the U.S. cease-fire resolution on June 5, Fedorenko, after consulting lengthily with Moscow the following day, made a complete about-face.

The Le Monde correspondent believes that Fedorenko at least consulted with the Arab representatives. However, he notes, when they took the floor, they gave the impression that "their cause had been sacrificed." He cites as an example the statement of Adnan Pachachi, the Iraqi minister of foreign affairs: "This is an unconditional capitulation to Israel."

Philippe Ben believes that the Soviet leaders came to the conclusion they had made a "grave error" in supporting Nasser. "Their about-face, still more radical than the one made by Mr. Khrushchev October 1962 during the Cuban crisis, is typical of the attitude which the Kremlin adopts to cut down the costs when experience proves that it has bet on the wrong horse."

In an editorial June 8, Le Monde, in noting the hopes which the Arab states

had placed in the Soviet Union, asked, "But is she going to take risks in behalf of Nasser, which up to now she has refused to take in favor of the Communist Ho Chi Minh?"

Nasser hinted obliquely at a betrayal in his speech of June 9 announcing his "resignation." Johnson, he said, handed the UAR ambassador a message May 26 "asking us for restraint and not to be the first to open fire. Otherwise we would face serious consequences."

"The same night," continued Nasser, "the Soviet ambassador asked to see me urgently at 3:30 A.M. and told me that the Soviet government strongly requested we should not be the first to open fire."

"On the morning of last Monday, June 5, the enemy struck."

The betrayal committed by the Kremlin does not, of course, excuse the role of Nasser in leading the Arab people into the military trap set by the Israeli government and the Pentagon strategists. The major axis of Soviet foreign policy since early in Stalin's career has boiled down to seeking an understanding with American imperialism. This simple fact is no doubt much clearer today among the Arab peoples than it was on the eve of the Israeli blitzkrieg.

Nevertheless it was reasonable to also hold open the possibility that the Kremlin would seek to strengthen Soviet defenses by playing a positive role in the Middle East crisis; i.e., a role in support of the Arab peoples.

This situation related directly to the Vietnam war. A strong stand in the Middle East could relieve the pressure of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam and even compel the White House to reconsider its dangerous course in Vietnam.

In other words, the Middle East situation could have been converted into the counterthrust which observers on all sides have considered to be long overdue in the sheer interests of Soviet defense.

Consequently throughout the colonial world where pressure has been mounting to bring more effective aid to bear on the side of the beleaguered Vietnamese freedom fighters and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Middle East crisis appeared in a double light -- as a grave new danger but also as an opportunity to embroil imperialism in new difficulties.

This is an added reason for the bitterness in the Arab countries and elsewhere over the treacherous course followed by the Kremlin.

Flushed with their easy military

victory, which is ascribable to long planning and years of stockpiling military goods in Israel, as well as careful teamwork between the Pentagon and the Israeli generals, the Washington strategists will undoubtedly display fresh arrogance and a still more truculent attitude.

The worst war hawks, their ranks now swelled by the addition of newly converted doves, may well take another calculating look at the present Soviet leadership. Is it reasonable to expect that the USSR will ever have a weaker leadership? The Kremlin now resembles nothing so much as the soft underbelly of the bureaucracy, and one that displays a most attractive yellow color.

If a "Pearl Harbor," followed by a "blitzkrieg," were pulled on China, for instance, might not that country prove as vulnerable as Egypt at the hands of the well-oiled Israeli war machine?

Isn't there an analogy, if not more, in the relationship between the Israelis and the Arab states and the U.S. war machine and the Soviet bloc as a whole? If China were attacked through a "preemptive strike" would not the Kremlin simply stand aside, "saving face" by engaging in "bombast"?

In a certain sense, the White House has succeeded in utilizing the Middle East crisis as another probing operation for further escalation of the war in Vietnam. The Kremlin responded to the test by rolling over at the first really critical moment and playing dead.

Antiwar fighters the world over must consider this result with the gravest attention. For it means that they must step up their own independent efforts.

In this they will find new common ground with the freedom fighters in the colonial sector whose first reaction to the Israeli military victory was to turn sharply to the problem of how to get rid of corroded regimes like the one headed by Nasser and to replace them with revolutionary governments.

The gravity of the defeat in the Middle East must not be underestimated. It follows not only Johnson's latest escalation of the war in Vietnam but the coup d'état in Greece.

On the other hand, the crisis may well have set in motion forces of great depth and power which could quickly open a new chapter in the Arab revolution. One of the first consequences would be the toppling of a series of regimes; and the Kosygin-Brezhnev team would not be long in feeling the repercussions.

CUBANS DENOUNCE UN BLOW AGAINST ARAB CAUSE

[When the Soviet delegation at the United Nations capitulated to Washington and voted for a cease-fire resolution that did not demand the immediate withdrawal of Israeli armies that had invaded neighboring countries, the Cuban government issued a statement characterizing such a cease-fire as tantamount to imposing surrender on the victim in face of imperialist aggression.]

[A translation of the statement, which was issued June 7, follows.]

* * *

Analysis of all the news, data and facts related to the initiation and development of the dramatic events in the Middle East proves beyond doubt that the United Arab Republic and the other Arab peoples were victims of a treacherous surprise assault by the armed forces of Israel, which, instigated and supported by imperialism, perpetrated this aggression that threatens the freedom and integrity of the Arab nations.

The Arab nations today constitute fresh victims of the global strategy of world imperialism. These events, which have aroused indignation among peoples everywhere, are but part of a series of unending aggressive moves by the imperialists carried out in various parts of the world.

It is the same policy and strategy of global piracy and crime that is being inflicted on the peoples of Vietnam and Laos; it is the same hypocritical and criminal policy that resulted in the military intervention in Santo Domingo, in provocations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and in the use of the "green berets" as military adjuncts and props of the dictatorial, military "gorilla" governments of the Americas in an effort to halt the advance of the liberation movement in our continent.

NGUYEN CAO KY HAILS ISRAELI BLITZKRIEG

Positions on the Middle East crisis are quite clear in Vietnam. In Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh issued a statement supporting the Arabs and condemning the U.S. and Britain.

In Saigon, on the other hand, Nguyen Cao Ky said June 8: "I'm for Israel. As we live far from Israel, we do not know what part America and England played in this but we see that Israel alone is fighting many other countries."

The Central Committee of our party, in a declaration May 18, 1967, warned the world against the dangers that this imperialist policy represented for all the peoples. No country can feel secure because Yankee imperialism can tomorrow launch new aggressions in Korea, in Cambodia, Syria, the UAR, Algeria or Cuba, to mention only a few examples.

The prediction made by the Central Committee of our party has been proved right in the Middle East today. For this reason, the Cuban Revolutionary Government, fully aware of the principles formulated in this declaration of our party, reiterates its strongest solidarity with the Arab nations facing imperialist aggression today, and condemns this aggression.

The Cuban Revolutionary Government states its support of the UAR delegation's rejection of the Security Council's agreement to limit itself to ordering a cease-fire without condemning the aggressor and holding responsible the imperialism that armed and instigated it. This is tantamount, as stated by the UAR delegation, to imposing surrender in face of imperialist aggression.

The Cuban government will support the government of the UAR in any attitude of resistance that it may adopt in face of the shameful and bungling agreement of the United Nations Security Council.

[The government of the United Arab Republic subsequently felt forced to accept the cease-fire.]

It is very painful for the peoples of the world to observe the government of the United States demonstrating joy over what it no doubt considers to be a political, diplomatic and military victory for imperialism.

He maintained that the Arabs were backed by "international Communism" in a plot to involve the U.S. in another war. Ky praised the Israeli armed forces, saying he thought they "did a wonderful job."

In July 1965, the Saigon puppet won world notoriety when he said, "People ask me who my heroes are. I have only one -- Hitler." He admired Hitler, he said, because of the way the dictator "pulled his country together..." Ky added, "We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam."

THE KREMLIN SEES "TROTSKYISM" IN "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

By George Saunders

The Soviet Communist party leadership has recently come out with a theoretical appraisal of the course of events in China. It is worth reviewing, not because it adds much to our knowledge or understanding of the Chinese situation, but because it indicates the kind of tactics the Soviet leaders are following in the new phase of the Sino-Soviet dispute accompanying the "cultural revolution."

The appraisal in question appears in the journal Kommunist, theoretical organ of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), and is entitled "The Cultural Revolution in China and Petty Bourgeois Adventurism." Written by one G. Shakhnazarov, it was printed in the third issue of the journal for 1967.

The article attempts to go beyond mere name calling or repetition of dogmatic assertions (although it's not free of these typical features of Stalinist polemics). It tries to grapple with some real issues, to poke some holes in the real weaknesses of Maoist policies. But the lack of fundamental objectivity can be judged from the bald equation Kommunist makes between Mao's ideas and policies and those of Leon Trotsky. No mention is made of the true parallel in Soviet history -- the policies and practices of Joseph Stalin, the previous "great genius" foisted onto the working-class movement.

A central theme of the article in Kommunist is that the Chinese events are the fruit of a wrong political line against which Moscow warned from the start. If only the Chinese had adhered to CPSU policies, China's troubles could have been avoided. The opening paragraph states this clearly enough:

"When the first signs appeared of the deviation of the Chinese leaders from the general line of the world Communist movement, the fraternal parties revealed the sources of these ideological errors and warned the Chinese leaders against entering upon a dangerous and unprofitable path. Unfortunately, no one in Peking wished to listen to these friendly warnings, but with growing fanaticism and blindness they pursued the course they had chosen."

This course, according to Shakhnazarov, led China into disaster economically, socially and politically, and in the realm of foreign policy. Careful analysis of the causes and lessons of this disastrous policy line is necessary, says the Kremlin spokesman, "because in

the given instance the international Communist movement has encountered not some isolated delusions and errors but rather a unique attempt to put into practice -- on the scale of the most populous nation of the world -- the entire complex of techniques and methods of petty bourgeois adventurism."

Thus Kommunist tries to give a theoretical explanation in pseudo-Marxist terms for the Chinese developments. A whole complex of ideas and policies called "petty bourgeois adventurism" is allegedly involved. That is a "very dangerous" thing but don't ask our Kommunist theorists to explain it too precisely. It's just bad; that's the main thing to remember.

"Petty bourgeois adventurism is the most dangerous enemy of the revolutionary movement." Moreover, "such a danger grows a hundredfold when it comes into alliance with nationalism and when it is propagated in the name of a party that enjoys authority in the eyes of the popular masses. This is exactly the character taken on by the events in China." (We will return to the Soviet theoretician's charges of nationalism and great power politics below.)

The Kommunist contributor commends the Chinese party for its long years of orthodox struggle "under the banner of Marxism-Leninism" and its early years in power when "relying on the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the Chinese people created an industrial base and made significant gains in economy and culture."

But trouble started in 1958 "when Mao Tse-tung imposed his erroneous policy course upon the party." Is there an attempt to explain how this was possible historically, socially, in class terms? Does Shakhnazarov give us a Marxist account of the origin and evolution of Mao's wrong course? Judge for yourself:

"Behind every action of the Mao ruling group, both within China and on the international arena, are hidden not only, and perhaps even not mainly, ideological considerations but political calculations as well. Thus the notorious 'great leap forward,' which brought the economy to the brink of disaster, had a definite political aim along with its ideological roots: to bring the material base under the hegemonistic pretensions of Mao Tse-tung.

"However that may be, the great leap repeated the Trotskyist theses about 'skipping' over stages of social development; such features of petty bourgeois

thinking as adventurism, complete scorn for objective laws of development, and blind faith in the power of 'revolutionary' phraseology all found expression.

"The same hegemonistic pretensions impelled the Chinese leadership to put forward its program of world revolution. And again, this program coincided almost to the last detail with the slogans of Trotsky and his followers, filled as it was with the spirit of petty bourgeois 'revolutionism.'

"In other words, regardless of the concrete goals that may have motivated this or that political action of the Chinese leadership in recent years, almost all of them bore the mark of petty bourgeois thinking, having nothing in common with Marxist-Leninist teachings on socialism." [Emphasis added -- GS.]

Thus we learn from our Soviet "Marxist" that the roots of Mao's wrong course are, on the one hand, "hegemonism" and, on the other, "Trotskyism." That is, the Mao group is power hungry -- or to paraphrase the bourgeois original of this shoddy piece of explanation, "power mad." As for the charge of Trotskyism it is no more than an epithet. Shakhnazarov nowhere expands or tries to justify his assertion. He relies on his readers' lack of knowledge of the subject.

In its more serious attempts to deal with the cultural revolution, especially in its Part One, the Kommunist article hits at many of the actual weaknesses and illogicalities of Maoist policies. Kommunist's treatment of the subject is typical of the treatment currently found in the Soviet press in general. And it is interesting that many of the criticisms coincide with those of revolutionary socialists, although of course they are made to prove different points.

The first point Kommunist makes is that the cultural revolution is anti-cultural. Schools have been closed, the scope of what is taught has been reduced, and the recitation of Mao's writings has been promoted to a semimagical status as a solution to all problems. The cultural heritage of past ages is scorned and trampled upon. Kommunist rightly deplores all this. Soviet intellectuals attack this aspect of Mao's policies with real feeling, experiencing the burden of such policies themselves to this day.

Shakhnazarov points out that of course, the main aim of Mao's campaign is not "cultural" at all. The brunt of his drive is against his opponents in the party, in the government, and in important mass organizations. Thus, the ideological content of the cultural revolution boils down to "a cult without culture."

On the social content of the campaign, Kommunist asserts that it is not proletarian but petty bourgeois. Such is the class nature of the student Red Guards, at any rate, says the Kremlin theoretician. And he disputes a Peking theory that students always start workers movements and then draw the masses in.

The Soviet commentator points tellingly to Red Guard clashes with workers, to peasant disturbances and provincial uprisings. These testify to widespread opposition among the masses, he says, ridiculing Jenmin Jibao for declaring that if workers revolt against Mao, then they are necessarily bourgeois.

Shakhnazarov also effectively rebuts the charge of "economism" which the Maoists direct against workers seeking higher pay (or as the Peking propagandists put it, workers "taken in" by officials who give them more pay).

"The natural aspiration of people to ensure their livelihood is called 'private property instinct,' 'loss of revolutionary spirit,' 'bourgeois and revisionist stock in trade,' etc. In this struggle against the just demands of the toilers the true essence of petty bourgeois adventurism shows itself most clearly. Having disrupted the process of planned economic development [with the "great leap"], Mao and his collaborators find nothing better than to preach asceticism, to counterpose to real, vital needs, the 'revolutionary spirit.' To them it's of no consequence that the main goal of socialist revolution is precisely to ensure the toilers the conditions of a truly human existence."

Kommunist gets into less solid territory when it takes up the political content of the cultural revolution, the antisocialist tendency of which allegedly shows most clearly in the matter of power. The fact that the party cadres are the basic object of attack, regardless of their records of service to the revolution, is seen as especially ominous. The revolution in power vitally needs a backbone of cadres, asserts the Kremlin organ, cadres hardened in proletarian ideology and practical experience. To try to remove them is to threaten the revolution itself. The question of whether they might have become even partly a privileged layer is not taken up in this "objective" review.

The counterrevolutionary thrust of Mao's campaign is stressed by quotes from several alleged leaflets that appeared in Peking. In one, workers of Foochow attribute to Red Guards the declared aim of "overthrowing the proletariat and its dictatorship." In another, workers of Szechwan are quoted protesting "the fascist actions of counterrevolutionaries," referring to Red Guards who, "like fas-

cists, beat up forty old revolutionaries."

Kommunist's China expert considers it most ominous that state as well as party organs are attacked; the Young Communist League and trade-union organizations have been dispersed; purges have been instituted in the army, police, and organs of state security. While the Maoists declare that "the old state machinery must be broken up" and "power seized by the revolutionary masses," what is actually involved, according to Kommunist, is the "conscious dismantling of the whole system of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

"If 17 years after the victory of the socialist revolution, attempts are made to overthrow the whole structure of political organization of the society, if the vast majority of leading cadres are declared a 'black band taking the capitalist road,' there can be no doubt that such a campaign is an attempt at counterrevolutionary overturn and is essentially directed against the socialist gains of the Chinese people."

From this passage it would seem that the Kremlin ideologists are toying with a "theory" of capitalist restoration in China. Thus they would answer the Maoist charge of a "fascist" Soviet Union in like coin. What is significant here is not the name calling but that neither side can admit the possibility of antiproletarian or bureaucratic political institutions existing in contradiction to an economic structure that is socialist in form. In short they can't admit the need for a political revolution to resolve this contradiction by instituting forms of proletarian democracy such as Lenin and Trotsky stood for.

* * *

Having analyzed the ideological, social and political character of the cultural revolution, Kommunist goes on in Part Two of the article to trace the historical development since 1958. Once the petty-bourgeois "revolutionistic" line of Mao was introduced, its economic expression, the "great leap," inevitably led to its political expression, the "cultural revolution." This followed because the economic disaster aroused such deep discontent that political repression was eventually necessary.

Kommunist asserts that the great leap created dissatisfaction among party and government leaders, managerial and technical personnel, military men and intellectuals, as well as the mass of workers and peasants. The serious character of this discontent remained unknown to the outside world because of the tight,

"militarized" rule that Mao had imposed. But it was so strong it drove him to this new step.

According to Shakhnazarov's account, Mao decided to strike a blow at the growing disillusion with and opposition to his policies, especially among the youth. Youth disaffection was a special concern to the aging Mao, for it threatened his "immortality," his future reputation. (The Soviet theorist doesn't cite his bourgeois source here.) Thus, by mobilizing the Red Guards, Mao allegedly aimed at twin goals; to tie the youth to himself and to smash the party apparatus.

It is obvious that our Kremlin Sinologist has completely left out one causal factor. That is, the international situation -- an especially strong factor if you look at the timing of the "cultural" campaign. The dramatic failure of Mao's collaborationist line in Indonesia was the overture to China's internal convulsion. There have been strong hints that Mao's critics in the party were spurred on by that fiasco to raise their criticisms of the senile leader. Also the increasing senselessness of his sectarian policy in regard to united action by workers' states to stop imperialist aggression in Vietnam must have strengthened divisions in the Chinese party. The cultural revolution attempts to reimpose by force a unity of thinking that was shattered by events. But all of this escapes our stalwart "China expert."

One can also search in vain in the Kommunist article for any discussion of the question of bureaucratism in the Chinese party in relation to the current developments. Mao is called "power mad," but no social base for this personal aberration is indicated. A social sector of privileged officials who might find the seemingly mad policies of Mao to be within their narrow-minded interests? The possibility is not even incidentally considered. We are left with pure idealism -- wrong ideas that have no social roots (except for a vague, unspecified petty bourgeoisie). A layer of students is surely not base enough for a policy to be imposed on an entire nation. And if the army is Mao's power base, wherein lies the petty-bourgeois nature of the People's Liberation Army? Shakhnazarov can not even raise such questions, let alone answer them.

It is not surprising, then, that Shakhnazarov handles very clumsily the antibureaucratic phrasemongering to be found in the polemics of the protagonists of the cultural revolution. The Maoists have used this as a device to arouse youthful militants and clearly stirred up a hornets' nest. Shakhnazarov can see that, but he can't explain why it occurred, except that it's one more example of "petty

bourgeois adventurism and revolutionism."

He deploras the antibureaucratic element as an especially dangerous feature that could open up the floodgates:

"The Red Guards are a blind instrument in the hands of Mao and his stooges. But such organizations, regardless of the wishes of their founders, have a tendency to take on their own motive force, to break out of control, a tendency to elaborate their own political program. There is reason to suppose that such a program would be shot through with a petty bourgeois spirit foreign to Marxism and the true interests of the cause of socialism in China.

"This may be corroborated by an analysis of the disparate demands raised at various times in the wall bulletins of the Red Guards. In them is found a total negation of the role of economic conditions in social life and a desire to leap over a series of necessary stages in social development. They advocate wage levelling. [!]"

Such an "antisocialist" demand leads Shakhnazarov to the resounding conclusion: "a full complement of the elements of a petty bourgeois anarchist program."

In the case of the Maoist "re-organization" of government on the model of the Paris commune, Shakhnazarov does not have to polemicize against an overly "anarchistic" idea. He simply points out that it hasn't happened. The Shanghai "commune" was not set up on the basis of universal suffrage; it consisted of army representatives and appointees from Maoist groups. The regime that Mao is trying to build, concludes our China expert, is "a terroristic military dictatorship with all the consequences that must flow from that."

The kind of terrible consequences could be graphically illustrated for the readers of Kommunist. All Shakhnazarov needed to do was mention the Soviet experience in the 1930's, the late 1940's and early 1950's. But our theoretician does not draw this parallel, so close to his readers.

* * *

Part Three of the Kommunist article deals with Mao's foreign policy. If in other areas the Soviet commentary was partly valid, here it loses all objectivity. The rigid demands of "peaceful coexistence" dogma come into their own, and the Kremlin theorist takes on the role of agent provocateur.

Petty-bourgeois consciousness,

Shakhnazarov tells us, is the ideal breeding ground for the firing of nationalist passions. Even in the great leap forward Mao was supposedly instilling a "great power" psychosis. Today the Red Guards, according to Kommunist, want to impose their values and the thoughts of Mao upon the whole world. In short, they are troublemakers and disturbers of the peace.

Kommunist's insinuation of aggressive and expansionistic aims on the part of the Chinese leaders or people flies in the face of the facts. The "nationalism" attributed to the Chinese must be measured in the light of the U.S. blockade of China, the escalating war in Vietnam and the clear threat of military attack. While it constitutes a deplorable departure from proletarian internationalism, it is not the same as the great-power chauvinism of expansionary imperialism. To equate the two is to play into the hands of imperialism. But let us taste the full provocative tone of this theoretical organ of the CPSU on this question.

Some excerpts from alleged quotes from Red Guard newspapers are offered. One editorial supposedly declared that "the combat task of Red Guards is to free mankind and remake the world with the help of Mao's thought." Shakhnazarov comments, "The paper leaves no doubt regarding what means the Red Guards are preparing to use to change the world. 'Insofar as our Red Guards are soldiers,' the editorial explains, 'they will fight. We are the mighty reserve of the heroic People's Liberation Army. It is necessary to prepare for carrying on a world war.'" (The original Chinese context probably spoke of a world war that imperialism was threatening to unleash, as in Vietnam. But Kommunist spares us the contextual framework.)

The quote from the Red Guard paper continues: "The great proletarian cultural revolution is a great military training ground with the aim of preparing for carrying on a people's war." (A war of resistance, not one of aggression, is clearly meant, but again we are spared the context.)

Kommunist continues: "The so-called 'revolutionary rebels' are not at all interested in whether they have the right to interfere in the affairs of other peoples. They are simply sure of their historic Messianic role -- such is the result of educating the youth in an openly chauvinist, great-power spirit."

Accusations and insinuations of this kind coincide exactly with those of the U.S. imperialist government and its propaganda organs. Johnson and Co. are busy justifying the Vietnam war by the very same Big Lie, that "Red China" wants to conquer the world and impose hunger and terror on Americans. Now they can add:

"Why even the Russian Communists admit it's so." Not only is this a total violation of internationalist and revolutionary traditions, it is utter blindness on the part of the Soviet ideologues. For the imperialists will not hesitate to use this same ammunition against the Soviet system when their interests warrant.

There are some additional minor points worth noting. For example, Kommunist explains Mao's extreme anti-Soviet policy by his need for a scapegoat to turn attention from his own errors and as a stick with which to beat opponents (by accusing them of Khrushchevism). However, parts of Kommunist's own article lend credence to Mao's charges of Soviet collusion with American imperialism, the basis on which he is able to whip up so much frenzy.

There is another passing point of some validity. If normal democratic conditions existed in the Chinese Communist party, says Kommunist, the "mad" and egoistic notions of one person would not be put into practice. Hence Leninist norms and socialist democracy in the party and government are necessary for a socialist system. True enough, but how does Kommunist explain the absence of democracy in the Chinese Communist party in the first place? No better than it has in the past explained in relation to social and economic bases the Stalinist "deviation" in the Soviet Union from

Leninist norms.

But let us close this review of the Central Committee organ's latest contribution to "Marxism" with a quote that brings out its essential purpose. There is one lesson above all that the reader is urged to conclude from this study of events in China. Too much militancy or "revolutionism" inevitably leads to trouble. If people would only adhere to the mature policies of Soviet diplomacy, all would go well.

"In our time, when new peoples are entering upon the road of socialism, when the broadest social layers [?] are adhering to the revolutionary movement, it is of exceptional importance to understand that petty bourgeois adventurism in domestic policy, 'revolutionism' and militant chauvinism in foreign, lead only to national catastrophe. They are hostile to the fundamental interests of the working class, the peasants, and other toiling sectors of the population, as hostile to the interests of particular peoples as to the general interests of the revolutionary forces, for they undermine unity [?] in the struggle for common goals."

Rather than see Maoism for the peculiar combination of ultraleftism and opportunism that it is, the Soviet theoreticians would like revolutionists all over the world (especially restless ones like the Cubans) to conclude from the fiascos in China that militancy of any kind should be abandoned.

SOLIDARITY RALLY IN NEW YORK FOR HUGO BLANCO

New York

A protest meeting to free Hugo Blanco was held here June 9. A large number of speakers representing a broad cross section of the American left addressed the audience of 135, demanding freedom for the imprisoned Peruvian peasant leader. The meeting was sponsored by the Militant Labor Forum.

The meeting was chaired by George Novack, the well-known Marxist philosopher and author. In opening the meeting he drew special attention to the cases of other political prisoners in Latin America, particularly Régis Debray in Bolivia; Víctor Rico Galán and Adolfo Gilly, and a number of Trotskyists in Mexico.

The first speaker was Edward Boorstein of the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners.

He pointed out that "Hugo Blanco has been fighting our battle, because anybody who is fighting in Peru, in Cuba,

in Africa or in Asia, is taking a chunk out of imperialism. The enemy is one. The battle is one."

The black freedom movement was represented by speakers from the Congress of Racial Equality and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee.

Ron Clark of CORE was quite ill but said he felt so strongly on the subject that he got out of bed to come. He said that "Black people have empathy for Hugo Blanco. We are the only group who, like Hugo Blanco, are fighting for survival. We have to give the people of the world an alternative to capitalist exploitation...We have to move from protest to action to help free the Hugo Blancos of the world."

John Wilson of SNCC spoke of the world as a big plantation run by American oppressors. He said "There is trouble down on the plantation, and one of the biggest troublemakers is Hugo Blanco."

A leader of the Puerto Rican Pro-Independence Movement (MPI) called for freedom for Hugo Blanco. Pedro Juan Rua, New York organizer for MPI declared:

"It is gratifying for us to come today and see that a representative section of the U.S. left speaks out against the brutal repression of Latin-American freedom fighters, my historic brothers in the continent, by the pro-imperialist regimes. For us in the Puerto Rican Independence forces, Hugo Blanco represents, like many others, the courage and 200-year-long struggle of the Latin-American masses against class oppression, colonialism and racism, firstly against Spain, today against the rapacity of U.S. imperialism."

Enselmo Rodriguez, a spokesman for the Casa de las Americas, said:

"We Cubans in New York -- I refer to those who are with the Cuban Revolution -- we give our whole support to this campaign to liberate Hugo Blanco... Anywhere in the world people fight, that is our fight." He closed his remarks with the slogans of the Cuban Revolution, "Patria O Muerte! Venceremos!"

Irving Beinen, a member of the coordinating committee of the radical news-weekly, the National Guardian, and an antiwar activist, said:

"We have a big debt to Hugo Blanco. We owe a debt of struggle to the oppressed of the colonial world." Describing the active struggle of Hugo Blanco, he said, "We need to learn this kind of commitment in this country."

Peter Henig of the large radical student organization, Students for a Democratic Society, commented:

"I don't see how we have Hugo Blanco in jail while Rockefeller and others are running around free."

A number of messages were received from important figures who were unable to attend in person. Many of these were copies of cables sent to Peruvian President Fernando Belaúnde Terry.

Such a message sent June 6 by Paul

J. Lyons, executive director of Amnesty International of the USA declared: "Amnesty International strongly opposes abuses of political prisoners. We are highly disturbed over reports of beatings of Hugo Blanco by military guards."

Paul Sweezy, co-editor of Monthly Review, sent a message which read in part:

"It would be advisable for you to release Hugo Blanco, not simply as a matter of elementary justice but for the sake of the reputation of yourself and the government you head. If you fail to heed this advice, coming from so many men and women of good will and principle all over the world, history will surely judge you with utmost harshness."

John Gerassi, author of The Great Fear in Latin America, wrote to Peru on May 26:

"As a long-time friend of your great country and one who has enjoyed its hospitality as an editor for Time and Newsweek magazines and as a correspondent for the New York Times, nothing has made me sadder than the news of the arrest, confinement, and mistreatment of the great peasant leader Hugo Blanco... May I respectfully point out that, to all the poor peoples of the world and to all the democratic forces here in America, Hugo Blanco is a genuine hero, who will go down in the history of your country as one of its greatest figures...."

Other messages were received from Dr. James Petras, research associate, Institute of International Studies, University of California at Berkeley; Dr. Connor Cruise O'Brien, former high official of the United Nations in the Congo now teaching at New York University; Michael Myerson of the Tri-Continental Information Service; and Professor Louis Menashe of the Columbia University Social Science Department.

Other speakers included Theodore Torre-Bueno, a Peruvian-American; and Richard Garza of the Socialist Workers party.

The audience voted to send a message to Belaúnde Terry demanding amnesty for Hugo Blanco.

SPRING MOBILIZATION MEMBERS SEND PROTEST TO BELAUNDE

One hundred and twelve participants in the May 20-21 Washington, D.C., conference of the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam -- the coalition of forces that organized the mammoth April 15 antiwar marches -- signed a petition addressed to Peruvian President Belaúnde Terry protesting the

torture of Hugo Blanco.

The Peruvian Embassy in Washington received a delegation May 25 and accepted the petition. The action was initiated by the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners, P.O. Box 2303, GPO, New York, N.Y. 10001.

MILITANT YOUTH A PROBLEM FOR ITALIAN CP

By Sirio Di Giuliomaria

Rome

One of the chief characteristics of the present antiwar movement in many countries is the fact that its vanguard and most militant sector is the youth. In Italy as elsewhere, this involves primarily the students. The current issues to which they are most responsive is the war in Vietnam and the revolutionary orientation of the Cuban leaders.

The growing radicalization of the students is causing great embarrassment to the PCI (Italian Communist party). On the one hand it affects the rank and file of their own youth; on the other it stimulates the rise of an independent left movement among the students which the PCI, owing to its opportunist line, is incapable of controlling.

This trend is beginning to stand out with increasing distinctness. Since the April 12 demonstration and the first teach-in at Rome University [see World Outlook, May 19, p. 511], some new incidents, rather unpleasant for the Communist bureaucrats, have occurred.

In Florence, a national youth mobilization for Vietnam turned into a leftist demonstration over which the PCI had no control. The participants hissed the speaker representing the Socialist party; and when a Catholic speaker started addressing the meeting, they left the square and marched towards the American consulate.

Many copies of Che Guevara's message were sold at the demonstration. (The message was published as a pamphlet by La Sinistra, a radical monthly magazine.)

In Venice a public meeting and a demonstration were organized despite the opposition of the PCI.

The PCI has reacted in the traditional Stalinist way. At a session of its Central Committee on May 17 most of the speeches were against the left minority groups. Such expressions as "groups which, rather than extremist, I would define as defeatist" (Amendola) "groups which are carrying on a poisonous fight against our party" (Ingrao) punctuated the various speeches. Even the PSIUP (Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity) was referred to in this way. For instance, one of the speakers said: "Recently the actions of these groups are being echoed in the PSIUP press, even in contradiction with its political orientation."

In the same session of the Central

Committee, Amendola, the reporter, attacked the position of the Cuban revolutionary leadership. He said: "There are people who demand three or four Vietnams, which other peoples ought to support. For such armchair strategists it is always the others who ought to move. And what about us? What should we do? This is what should be clarified.

"We rejected a long time ago," he continued, "the theory of a 'leading country'; now certain groups want China and Cuba to be referred to as leading countries."

This position with regard to the leftist groups and the Cuban line was applied at a public meeting in support of Vietnam organized by the Rome Chamber of Labor, the provincial council of the CGIL (General Confederation of Italian Labor). The program included a march May 18 to a meeting place and speeches by union leaders (a Socialist and a Communist).

At the assembly point, groups of pro-Chinese tried to carry their own banners and distribute their own leaflets. They were immediately attacked, beaten and even knocked down by special squads organized for the occasion. Their banners and leaflets were burned. They were called all sorts of names to incite the crowd against them. "Fascists," "provocateurs," "who pays you?" -- this was the way they were addressed by squad members. The same expressions were used everywhere, showing that they had been suggested by the organizers of the squads.

Leftist militants intervened and protested that the march and the meeting had been called by the unions and this conferred a united character to the demonstration.

The reply was that the slogans had already been set; i.e., "peace for Vietnam" and "freedom for Greece," and that if they wanted to use other slogans, they could organize their own demonstration.

The political basis of the hooliganism was evident: the Communist and Socialist leaderships of the unions had agreed on a very weak political orientation for the demonstration. The political line of the PCI on Vietnam is to exert pressure on the Socialist party, which is in the government, and thus obtain a change in the policy of the Italian government.

During and especially after the meeting, the squads went into action. This time those who protested, including

some PSIUP militants, were also beaten.

It was noticed by many that some of the members of the squads were not even members of the unions (for instance, some PCI full-timers were in the forefront). Even girls were beaten.

In spite of this hooligan atmosphere, members of the Fourth International distributed a leaflet explaining the case of Pfc. Howard Petrick and appealing for solidarity and contributions to be sent to the Petrick Defense Committee.

The distribution of the leaflet was marked by opposition and discussions but no real incident occurred. The Trotskyists were not attacked for various reasons:

(1) Their policy is to participate in meetings and other political demonstrations with material which fits in with the character of each meeting and with slogans understandable by wide sectors of those involved. The pro-Maoist groups, due to their sectarian concepts of political action, intervene in all meetings and demonstrations with practically the same slogans, regardless of the purpose of the meetings. Thus, in the Rome meeting, they displayed banners with Mao's portrait and distributed leaflets accusing the CGIL, which had organized the demonstration, of being "opportunistic."

(2) Up to now the PCI bureaucrats have been reluctant to attack the Fourth International sharply and openly. They know that there would be a reaction among their own rank and file; and even people who do not sympathize with Trotskyism would react to an attack against Trotskyism launched in the old Stalinist style.

However, it soon appeared that what the PCI bureaucrats had to check was not "groups," but a whole situation which developed against their orientation. A single fact spoke volumes:

On May 18 the squads came into action against groups who, among other things, pressed for organizing a more militant march after the meeting to go to the U.S. embassy. On the following day, after the news reached Rome that the U.S. had opened an attack in the Demilitarized Zone in Vietnam, the PCI was obliged to publish a special issue of its daily, inviting everybody to demonstrate at the U.S. embassy.

The PCI leaders were worried that sufficient persons might not show up and so they made the invitation a wide one, including the pro-Maoists. This demonstration was a success. No squads came into operation. Thousands demonstrated in

a militant way. The police limited themselves to protecting the embassy and no serious incident occurred.

Different slogans were shouted alternately. Some chanted, "Free Vietnam" and "Peace in Vietnam"; others chanted, "Red Vietnam"; "Ho Chi Minh"; "Che Guevara"; "Quit NATO" and "War, no; Guerrillas, yes!"

When the demonstrators marched to Palazzo Chigi (where the office of the prime minister is located), people at the windows of the Rome office of the PSU (the United Social Democratic party, which is in the government) in a nearby building waved their flag as a way of greeting the march. Part of the crowd started shouting, "Unity," while another part shouted, "Quit the government!"

This division of supporters of the Vietnamese people between a left and a right wing, with the youth joining the left in bulk, has become a major characteristic of the antiwar movement during the past few months. Other significant facts can be cited which took place after the May 19 demonstration.

On May 22 a very militant meeting was called at Rome University in support of Vietnam. Among the speakers was Professor Cini, a Communist who had just returned from Vietnam where he had gone in behalf of the Russell Tribunal. Professor Cini granted an interview to La Sinistra, causing great embarrassment to the PCI leadership which expelled the editor of this publication not so long ago. A very militant demonstration in front of the U.S. embassy concluded the meeting.

On May 24 a Vietnam "veglia" (wake) was organized in the central square of Piazza Navona in Rome. This time two means were adopted to prevent a left orientation from coming to the fore. (a) Speeches, songs, films were planned to last until late at night in order to exhaust the participants and cut down the crowd to such small size as to make a march impossible; (b) the usual squads went into action to destroy "unofficial" banners and prevent groups from distributing leaflets.

The effort was unsuccessful. The PSIUP youth had brought banners with slogans such as "Two, three, four, five Vietnams"; "For the Freedom of Vietnam"; "Let's Quit NATO"; "No to the American peace."

They also distributed a leaflet which said, among other things: "Let's tell the 'pacifists' of all tendencies that as long as they do not distinguish between aggressors and those assaulted, their 'pacifism' smells of deception and equivocation....Solidarity with those fighting against imperialism in Bolivia,

Venezuela, Peru. Guatemala, Nicaragua, Colombia and Guinea. Long live the revolutionary leaders Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, Amilcar Cabral!...Solidarity with Communist China....Let's quit NATO."

The squads immediately went into action. However, this time they encountered a compact front of militants from all left tendencies (PSIUP and PCI left-wingers, Trotskyists, Maoists) who lined up in front of the banners ready for battle.

The squads lowered their belligerency to the verbal level. They were immediately out-numbered, blocked and pushed back to where they had come from.

The square was half empty by 11:30 p.m. Those remaining were mostly youth. The bureaucrats had forgotten that youth can get along on occasion with surprisingly little sleep.

As soon as the meeting ended, as many as 2,000 persons, chiefly youth, started a push towards the police barriers shutting off the street leading to the Senate. This was an obvious diversion, for suddenly a score of young men started running and left the square through a side street. All the others followed and in five minutes the square was empty. The whole crowd went down the street, shouting slogans in favor of Vietnam.

The march went through the center of the city and reached the U.S. embassy at about 1 a.m. A united spirit was established as the march proceeded. Everyone was free to shout whatever slogan he wished and to swell the volume of slogans started by others. No PCI leaders were to be seen with the exception of minor figures. The PCI had been caught by surprise, not foreseeing that a march could be organized in that way.

The U.S. embassy was besieged. The police had blocked off the Via Veneto, putting buses across the streets to increase the strength of the blockade.

The demonstration continued in a peaceful way although its tone was very militant. The police for a time simply guarded the embassy while the demonstrators sat in the streets around the building, singing revolutionary songs and shouting anti-imperialist slogans.

At about 3 a.m. the police charged very brutally, using their belts. Many were injured. More than 100 were arrested and taken to a police station. Some of them were held over for trial on charges of conducting an "illicit demonstration."

The bourgeois press claimed that about thirty police were injured during the charge. The U.S. ambassador to Poland,

who was walking along Via Veneto, showing some American students how demonstrations are permitted in a "democratic" country, was mistaken for one of the demonstrators. He was unmercifully beaten by the police.

It seems that the U.S. ambassador to Italy remained unconvinced about the "efficiency" of the Italian police and called for the marines from the nearby base in Naples. According to *L'Unità*, the daily newspaper of the PCI, the call was for an emergency contingent of 1,500 marines to defend the embassy.

The May 24 march proved once again that the PCI leadership, with its present political line, is incapable of leading or even controlling large sectors of the youth. Graduates of the school of Stalinism, the thought that perhaps it would be well to change their line does not even occur to them. Their first idea is to resort to the use of violence against those standing to the left of them.

In an assembly of the active cadres of the Rome Federation of the PCI, Enrico Berlinguer, the regional secretary, harshly attacked the left groups. They should not be "underestimated," he said, "especially in Rome, where the centers of anti-Communist provocation are located."

The left groups, he continued, from a social point of view are "small groups of petty-bourgeoisie who base themselves on a phrasemongering revolutionism." However, "they should not be underestimated, but on the contrary fought against and isolated, for they could cause serious damage if we did not reply to their actions."

According to Berlinguer, the damage would be: (1) disturbances and even provocations during united demonstrations as occurred in Florence, Venice and Rome; (2) denigration of the PCI and the CGIL; (3) spreading an atmosphere of nonconfidence in mass political action in sectors that are not politically firm.

"The fight against these pressure and provocation groups," Berlinguer concluded, "is a prerequisite therefore for the success of a united policy. (United with the Social Democratic party. -- S.D.G.) It should be firmly carried out, as we have done in the past weeks and days with very good political results."

With such a line can the PCI overcome its current difficulties with the youth? This is quite doubtful despite the strength of the PCI apparatus and the mass support the party enjoys.

The events at the recent National Congress of the UGI (the association of radical students which includes members of the PCI, PSIUP and PSU) is quite in-

dicative. The Communist leadership found itself in a minority within the Communist tendency on the political line as a whole. On a special issue the division was very sharp -- whether to make an alliance with the PSIUP or the PSU.

The left was for the PSIUP, while the national secretary of the Communist Youth, Petruccioli, was for an alliance with the PSU. He got only a small minority.

The left Communists and the PSIUP could have won a majority at the congress if the PCI and PSU bureaucrats had not resorted to one of their old tricks -- they invalidated the mandates of all the delegations where the left held a majority. They were able to do this by applying a very antidemocratic statute that permits the outgoing leadership to vote.

The result was that the left Communist and PSIUP tendencies walked out of the congress. After this, the congress approved the line proposed by the Social Democrats and elected a leadership composed of nine socialists of various tendencies (the PSIUP was excluded) and only four Communists. An alliance between the Communists and the PSIUP would have given the left a strong majority!

An interesting recent turn in Italy is the attractiveness of the Cuban

line to left sectors. The monthly La Sinistra announced a special issue on Cuba with big posters that appeared on the walls of the main political centers throughout Italy.

What worried the PCI leadership was not only the favorable results of this action but the fact that the job of putting up the posters was done by teams of PCI militants who wanted in this way to show their solidarity with the magazine and the Cubans.

The revolutionary Cuban line is a big headache for the PCI leaders. Aside from the open attacks levelled by Amendola in his report to the Central Committee, more stringent attacks are being voiced in private discussions.

Among the arguments used by the squads in Piazza Navona when they tried to haul down the PSIUP banners were the following: "You are bloodthirsty: so many people are dying in Vietnam and you want five more Vietnams!" "What do these slogans mean: that we have to start up guerrilla war in Italy?" "This line might be good for Cuba, not for Italy."

Of course, when you lack a serious political line, you can only attack a revolutionary line with arguments that are completely ridiculous.

THE LESSONS OF GREECE

By Ernest Mandel

[The following succinct commentary on the broader import of the military take-over in Greece for the revolutionary forces of Western Europe and the rest of the world was written by the well-known author of Traité d'Economie Marxiste, soon to be published in England and the United States. It appeared in the May 13, 1967 issue of the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche of which Mandel is editor-in-chief.]

* * *

It is too soon to draw up a definitive balance sheet of the military take-over in Greece. We still lack the necessary information, especially on the extent of the popular resistance since the coup d'état.

But certain lessons are already imperatively evident and it is time for them to be absorbed by all workers and vanguard militants.

(1) Any assumption that the acute-

ness of social contradictions will be softened -- internationally or nationally -- and the stability of democratic liberties will be guaranteed and socialism can gradually triumph through the peaceful parliamentary and electoral road has once again been refuted. The maintenance of these liberties is a function of a determinate relationship of forces between the contending classes.

When parliamentary democracy incurs the risk of no longer serving the interests of big capital, and the latter is not paralyzed by the action of the masses, this regime can be castrated or discarded within a few hours.

(2) The illusion that we live in a regime where the real power is in the hands of parliament, or the voters, has likewise been refuted. Parliament and the electorate hold no more than a superficial and limited power. The decisive power is in the hands of capital and the "armed men" in its pay. The state is not parliament but an apparatus based on

these "armed men."

Those who refuse to see this obvious fact and simply affirm that we live "under democracy," while forgetting or concealing the bourgeois nature of this state, deceive themselves or deceive others.

(3) The arrest of all the militants of the left -- including, according to General Patakos, numerous people that the dictatorial regime itself considers "innocent" (Le Monde, May 11, 1967) was carefully prepared by a system of blacklists, informers and wire-tapping devices operating for years. This system functions in all the NATO countries, under NATO's cover, within the framework of the struggle against "internal subversion," including Belgium (now NATO headquarters).

It has been reinforced in our country within the framework of the measures taken "to maintain order" voted for by the Belgian Socialist party. Those who have endorsed NATO as an instrument for defending "democracy against communism" should now be red-faced.

(4) Those who deny that there is any difference between a bourgeois democratic regime in which the workers have a minimum of liberties to organize trade unions, prepare strikes, stage demonstrations, publish papers, and a dictatorial and fascist regime, and who wrongly employ the term "fascist" to designate regimes which are not so, have once again exhibited their political stupidity, a stupidity that is worse than mere foolishness.

UNDERGROUND "PATRIOTIC FRONT" ANNOUNCED IN GREECE

A bulletin was distributed in Athens May 22 announcing the formation of an underground "Patriotic Greek Front."

The aim of the "Front," said the declaration, "is to unite and define the democratic resistance of Greek patriots against the dictatorship."

According to the bulletin, "The initiative in creating this Front was taken by political men of the left, the center and the right, which represent all the patriotic, democratic and anti-fascist forces of the country."

One of the aims of the Front is "to form a national union government composed of representatives of all the political tendencies, a government that will restore individual and democratic liberties, and undertake to organize free elections as quickly as possible."

The multiclass "front" sounds

Such a view disarms the workers confronted with the threat of a "strong" or fascist state which can still be crushed if the workers combat it in time with sufficient force and vigor.

Go now and explain to the eight thousand Greek political prisoners, to the workers deprived of their trade unions, that the military take-over has changed nothing, since fascism already prevailed in Greece before the colonels took power!

(5) The military coup d'état followed upon formidable demonstrations of the Greek working masses in the summer of 1965. At that moment the masses were disposed to overthrow the monarchy and dismantle the army, if not to take power and bring about the downfall of capitalism. Their leaders curbed their struggle and penned them into a purely electoral perspective. That demobilization has now borne its bitter fruit.

Every extensive mobilization of the masses which is halted halfway without fundamentally modifying the relation of forces provokes demoralization among the workers and a thirst for revenge in the camp of reaction. The entire history of the twentieth century confirms this law. We lived through its application in Belgium after the general strike of 1960-61.

This is a warning to those artful tacticians who wish to start this business all over again and are likewise preparing the triumph of the "strong state" in this country -- provided the masses let them get away with it!

like a reedition of the old people's fronts set up by the Communist party. These fronts paved the way to disaster in a whole series of countries.

The CP engineers of defeats and setbacks would have done better to pause long enough to analyze the reasons for the current victory of reaction in Greece.

Prime responsibility must be placed at the door of the liberal bourgeoisie and their lieutenants in the labor movement who deliberately substituted class collaboration for class struggle in the battle against the reactionary forces entrenched around the Greek monarchy.

The only class that can lead the way out is the working class under the guidance of a revolutionary Marxist party. That is what the bulletin should have started with.

IRISH REVOLUTIONIST GIVEN FIVE-YEAR SENTENCE

By Sean Reed

London

An international solidarity campaign has been opened to secure the release of an Irish revolutionist imprisoned in Dublin. The details of the case are as follows:

On May 6 Joe Dillon, a 22-year-old Dublin Republican and a member of the No. 2 branch of the Irish Transport and General Workers Union, was sentenced to five years in gaol.

He had been charged with attempted armed robbery of a rent office at Harmonstown Estate, Dublin, in December 1965.

The Irish police did not arrest Joe Dillon until six months after the incident. Then on the night of June 6, 1966, he was seized in his home by members of the Special Detective Unit of Dublin Castle (who specialize in political cases), taken to Dublin's police prison and put on an identification parade with two other Republicans from the Raheny, Harmonstown area.

Witnesses were produced -- the rent collector, the owner of a car taken on the night before the attempted robbery and a number of local people who were in the rent office at the time. None of the witnesses identified any of the people on the parade.

All the arrested men were released within a few hours -- except Joe Dillon.

Before his arrest, he had been offered bribes by the Special Branch [Irish political police] to inform on the IRA [Irish Republican Army] and other bodies. When he refused, he was told that the Special Branch would "get him."

A year later he was brought to trial and found guilty of taking a car without the owner's consent, and illegal possession of a revolver with intent to rob and endanger life.

The only evidence was a thumbprint on the driving mirror of the getaway car. A police witness stated that this bore fourteen points of resemblance to Dillon's print. (Scotland Yard normally demands 21 points of resemblance before they will make a positive identification.

The sentence was passed by "Justice" O'Caomh, an in-law of President De Valera and attorney general for the Fianna Fail regime for many years.

Even he had to admit that he was "probably in error when I impose a sentence of five years," and was "leaving myself open to criticism." Which was putting it mildly.

No matter what the background to the case, this alone should call forth the strongest protest from the Irish, British and world labour movement. But there is more to it.

For years the rump of the semi-legal Irish Republican Army has acted as a substitute for a revolutionary movement in Ireland, functioning as a safety valve to prevent the bourgeois republic from bursting at the seams.

One such antirevolutionary tendency, in alliance with certain Stalinists, is at present in control of the IRA and seems set to follow the path already trodden by De Valera and Co.

Joe Dillon, an active Republican, was one of the leaders of an opposition grouping inside the IRA which was moving towards a Trotskyist position. This is the real reason why the Special Branch decided to "get him" and why such a savage sentence was meted out.

The Fianna Fail tenants of power have a vested interest in maintaining the present leadership's control of the Republican movement. The five-year sentence served (a) to remove Joe Dillon personally from the political scene, and (b) to deter others from following in his footsteps.

For these reasons the largest possible protest on an international scale should be mounted. The Irish Militant, a Trotskyist paper, has appealed to defenders of civil liberties in other countries to support the protest movement in Ireland, which is demanding Joe Dillon's release.

Protests and appeals should be directed to Brian Lenihan, Department of Justice, Merrion St., Dublin 3, Ireland.

JAPANESE STUDENTS BATTLE POLICE AT U.S. AIR BASE

Police arrested 48 Zengakuren students May 28 at a demonstration at the U.S. Tachikawa Air Base near Tokyo. Pro-

testing planned expansion of the base, some 4,000 students battled 2,000 riot police as they tried to enter the base.

SOME REMARKS CONCERNING THE LEFT IN ISRAEL

[The following document, written last January, was submitted for discussion among the members of the Israeli Socialist Organization. As outlined in a statement published in World Outlook June 2 (p. 557), this grouping stands in opposition to the Israeli government. It advocates taking the road to socialism and forging Israeli-Arab unity in the framework of a socialist federation in the Middle East.

[We are publishing the full text of "Some Remarks Concerning the Left in Israel" due to its interest in the light of the current crisis in the Middle East.]

* * *

The left-wing parties existing today in Israel were all founded before the state of Israel came into existence; no new left party was formed after 1948 (apart from splits which had a brief existence before joining another party). Therefore, in order to understand these parties one must analyze their history prior to 1948.

This history is (exempting one notable case: the CP [Communist party]) the history of the Zionist left; i.e., the history of a nationalist left.

* * *

In order to give the reader an idea of the unusual character of Zionism and its left wing consider the following fact:

All Zionist parties, from the rightist "HERUT" ["Freedom"] to the leftist "MAPAM" ["United Workers party"], whatever their enmity on the Israeli political arena, are members of "The Jewish Agency." This agency is the organizational backbone of Zionism. One of its various activities is fund-raising among Jewish communities all over the world. (Although we do not possess exact figures it is not exaggerated to say that it raises sums of the order of £40 million [U.S. \$112 million] annually.)

This money finances all Zionist activities; a considerable part goes to subsidise the Israeli economy (mostly the agricultural sector, the Kibbutsim, etc.), another part to finance the Zionist parties, all of them -- from Herut to Mapam.

These parties receive according to their size and bargaining power between £0.3 million [U.S. \$840,00] to £0.8 million [U.S. \$2,240,000] annually, each.

Thus, a Zionist party can finance a large daily paper, pay wages to many party officials, and keep a whole political organization running although the rank and file hardly pay membership fees or their newspaper subscriptions.

This peculiar circumstance enables political parties to exist long after the social forces that brought them into existence ceased to exist.

* * *

The Zionist left originated in Czarist Russia (mostly Poland) in the closing decades of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth.

The Russian Jews participated actively in all anti-Czarist parties. In the SR [Social Revolutionary], Menshevik, Bolshevik, and others. Martov and Dan, Radek and Zinoviev, Trotsky and Rosa Luxemburg, are only a few of the revolutionaries of Jewish origin who participated in the revolutions of 1905, February 1917 and October 1917. (These revolutionaries were, of course, anti-Zionists.)

The percentage of Jews among the revolutionaries was always greater than their percentage in the population. This was the result of a few factors: (1) Jews tended to concentrate in the urban areas. (2) A large Jewish proletariat existed in Poland (mostly in the textile industry). (3) There was a large Jewish intelligentsia in Russia. (4) The Jews were oppressed by the Czarist regime not only as proletarians, but also as a national minority.

The persecution of the Jews gave rise to social and economic interests, which eventually gave birth to a number of political parties.

A whole spectrum of left-wing parties came into existence, all seeking to alleviate the plight of the Jews as proletarians as well as members of a (national) minority group.

The main difference between these parties was between Zionists (a minority) and non-Zionists.

The largest party was the BUND ["Fraternity"]. This was basically a Social Democratic party of the Second International, which, under the conditions of Czarist Russia, was driven to the revolutionary side. The Bund never aimed at political power, only at improving the lot of the Jewish proletariat.

Lenin waged a long ideological

struggle against the Bund, insisting that the proletariat must be organized on a territorial basis (i.e., all proletarians living and working in the same region or country, irrespective of their nationality) whereas the Bund claimed that existing circumstances of national persecution forced the Jewish proletariat to defend their daily rights as a national minority especially as considerable parts of the Polish proletariat participated in anti-Jewish riots.

The Bund, however, never accepted the Zionist principle that only in an independent national Jewish state can the Jewish proletariat become free. The Bund was nationalist but not Zionist.

When Hitler exterminated East European Jewry, the Bund was exterminated, too. Remnants still exist in the USA, Latin America and Canada as a result of mass immigration of Jewish proletarians in the first decades of this century.

The ideologist of the Zionist left, who contested the ideas of the Bund as well as those of Lenin, was Ber Borochow. He formulated the idea of the "Inverted Pyramid," meaning, briefly, the following: every nation consists of a pyramid of social layers; a broad basis of peasants, a layer of proletarians, then a layer of transport and services, civil servants; on top of this -- the self-employed, artisans, doctors, lawyers, intellectuals, scientists. In the Jewish case this pyramid was deformed; many lawyers, doctors, intellectuals, and other middle-class occupations, with few, if any peasants, and little proletarians. Therefore he claimed that the social structure of the Jewish people must first be rectified before it could undergo a transformation to socialism. This meant that the Jews must first establish a national state and therein become peasants and proletarians and only after accomplishing this step could they proceed to the step of revolution. (Theory of Steps.)

Following this theory in daily practice, the Zionist left preached and practiced emigration. After a period of training and indoctrination they sent their recruits to Palestine, mostly to the agricultural settlements. Ben-Gurion, Eshkol, Lavon, and many other prominent Zionist socialists who later became leaders in Israel came from these parties.

Some of these parties continue these practices even today in the U.S. and Latin America. We refer to HABONIM ["the Builders," affiliated to MAPAI], and HASHOMER HATZAIR ["the Young Guardian" affiliated to MAPAM].

These parties had sharp political conflicts with all those parties which

aimed at a transformation of their own societies; ideologically they upheld the principle that no transformation of society can ever overcome anti-Semitism. They considered the persecution of national minorities to be a permanent feature of mankind (a view which the revolutionaries strongly opposed). Politically they diverted many people from participating in revolutionary politics by their "emigrate to Palestine" policy. When the founder of political Zionism, T. Herzl, met the Czarist foreign minister Plehve (a notorious anti-Semite), he mentioned explicitly the last point in order to persuade him to grant permission for mass emigration of Jews from Russia.

* * *

The primary division in Israeli politics is between the Zionists and non- or anti-Zionists.

The division into right and left is of secondary importance (both subjectively and objectively).

The division inside the Zionist left is a family affair. Once, there was a considerable gap between the Social Democrats (Mapai) and those who considered themselves revolutionaries (Mapam), but in the last decade it narrowed so much, and the whole political spectrum of the left shifted so much to the right that ideological and political feuds gave way to a squabble for economic benefits.

MAPAI ["the Palestine Workers party"] has, for the last three decades, been the central party in Israeli politics (for reasons we shall explain later). Originally it was a Social Democratic party preaching gradual and peaceful transition to socialism. About a decade ago it dropped this aim, in order not to antagonize the USA, on whose direct and indirect support Israel depends for its existence.

In Israel there exist three major power structures: the Histadrut, the Jewish Agency, the official government. Mapai was always the largest in the first two, hence -- also in the third.

Its main asset is the fact that it is in power, thereby possessing all benefits resulting from power, which in the special case of Israel are all-embracing. Its voters are, mostly, people who might lose their jobs, salaries, possibly houses and health insurance, by voting otherwise.

Mapam is the second largest party of the Zionist left. It was formed in the forties as a bloc of bodies, the most important of which was Hashomer Hatzair.

* * *

Mapam is torn between nationalist Zionist practices (e.g., expropriating fellahin [Arab peasants], as in the case of the village Biri'm in 1952) and internationalist slogans. This is reflected in the slogan in the heading of Mapam's daily paper Al-Hamishmar ["The Guardian"] which reads: "To Zionism, Socialism, and friendship between nations." The order is significant. Whenever Mapam was forced to choose between Zionism to Socialism, or between Zionism to Internationalism (and this happens quite often in Palestine), it chose Zionism, justifying this by the "uniqueness of the Jewish case."

One has to remember that the internationalism of a party like Mapam has to be tested not by its policies towards the U.S. but first of all by its policies and practices towards the Palestinian Arabs.

In words Mapam supports socialism, the USSR, Cuba, the people of Vietnam. Once in a while it organizes a demonstration; but the nearer the issues come to Palestine -- the more nationalistic it becomes.

Thus, Mapam supported the Suez campaign to the full, its ministers stayed in Ben-Gurion's Suez cabinet and justified (they still do!) the Israeli aggression. Later, when Ben-Gurion was forced to withdraw from Sinai and the Gaza strip, Mapam organized mass demonstrations against the withdrawal, insisting on the annexation of the Gaza strip to Israel.

Mapam refuses to recognize the right to self-determination of the Palestinian Arabs, or the right of the Palestinian refugees to repatriation; recently it went so far as to oppose a UN proposal to hold a referendum among the refugees to find out whether they prefer restitution payment to repatriation.

In Israeli politics Mapam does not play an independent role; it follows the lead of Mapai (sometimes reluctantly, but always submitting in the end). However, it does play a significant role in presenting Zionism to socialists and left-wing intellectuals in both the East and the West. Thus Mapam publishes a special periodical in English (New Outlook) for the West; also, Israeli ambassadors to Eastern countries like Poland or Yugoslavia are often Mapam leaders, whereas for negotiations with right elements the Israeli government sends a right winger, and to Afro-Asian conferences -- (often) a dark-skinned Jew.

Mapam's name is often connected with Kibbutsim, although most other parties (including the extreme rightist Herut and the religious parties) run a few Kibbutsim of their own.

A Kibbutz is a communal agricultural settlement. Its members join it voluntarily and are free to leave at any time. The members do not own anything privately except a few clothes. The land belongs to the Zionist organization, the means of production, too -- but they are donated to the Kibbutz. All labour is carried out communally, decisions on policy, development, investment, election of chairman, secretary, treasurer, etc., are made by the general meeting of all members.

These elements of "Free Socialism" fascinated many intellectuals and socialists in the West, and are much advertised by Mapam all over the world.

A closer scrutiny reveals some flaws:

(1) The Kibbutz is usually a one-party affair, people voting Communist were expelled from Kibbutsim of Hashomer Hatsair and those voting Mapam -- from Kibbutsim run by Mapai, etc. There is little political tolerance in the Kibbutz.

(2) The Kibbutz is part of a whole ideological setup. Namely: "From the Commune -- to Communism"; or -- let us fill the country with Kibbutsim [Communes] and eventually the majority of the population and economy will be of the Kibbutz type; i.e., a peaceful transition to Communism. Reality proved this to be a fallacy. All Kibbutsim are in debt to the government, private banks and firms. Without constant subsidies from Zionist institutions they would have been unable to exist. Fuel, cash, fertilizers, water, electricity, and machinery, have to be bought from sources external to the Kibbutz, and the products must compete in the market with goods produced by others, sometimes -- by Arab fellahin. The Kibbutz (whose creation was largely motivated by the Borochow ideology) proved to be uncompetitive and was kept alive by Zionist subsidies.

(3) Faced with this reality, the Kibbutz turned to industrial activity. At first processing its agricultural products but gradually moving into other fields such as plastics, crockery, furniture and a host of other light industry products. However, the small population of a Kibbutz (a few hundred) could not provide the labour force for both agriculture and industry. Since giving up the agricultural activity would be tantamount to betrayal of the principles of Zionist socialism, the Kibbutz was forced to employ hired labour from nearby towns. Thus the communal Kibbutz society became a communal exploiter of hired labour. Usually the Kibbutz members act as overseers in their factories while the hired men do the less professional jobs. When work is over, the hired men go back to

town. For them the Kibbutz is an employer like any other capitalist, except that capitalists don't preach socialism.

When a strike occurs in a Kibbutz factory, the owners call in the police without scruples.

The slogan "From the Commune -- to Communism" proved doubly false. It did not bring about a transformation of Israeli society to socialism, let alone Communism. Instead, the Communes themselves were transformed from phalansteries into collective exploiters, profiting from hired labour. The history of the Kibbutz (indeed the history of the whole Zionist left) is the history of a Social Democracy corrupted by nationalism and the harsh economic realities of capitalist economy.

A point often overlooked is the significance of the Kibbutz for Zionist colonisation. A spirit of pioneering, collective, organized labour, a social structure specially suited to absorb newcomers, to defend itself, to carry out, through great personal sacrifices, unprofitable economic tasks in order to establish Zionist presence in a hostile area -- these are the reasons why Zionist institutions financed the Kibbutzim, whether they belong to Mapai, Mapam, Herut, or the religious parties.

* * *

The reader might get the impression that most activities of the Zionist left centered on the Kibbutz. This is by no means the case. Though the Kibbutzim played a significant Zionist role, their membership in Palestine (and later in Israel) never exceeded 5% of the Jewish population. The Zionist left created another establishment whose importance, power, and wealth exceeded by far those of all the Kibbutzim put together. This is the HISTADRUT ["Organization," or in full, "The General Organization of Jewish Workers in Palestine"].

This giant was founded in 1922 by the Zionist left as an instrument for creating the Jewish proletariat. Today it owns a giant industry, banks, shipping, airline companies, the largest construction firm in Israel, a major share in nearly any economic branch in Israel, the largest health insurance system (there is no national health insurance in Israel). One out of three in the population pay membership fees to the Histadrut. Those who do not -- lose their health insurance. Ninety percent of the Jewish workers are members of the trade unions run by Histadrut.

Although the Histadrut calls itself in English, "The General Federation of Labour in Israel," thus aiming to

create the familiar image of a federation of trade unions, it is unique in its aims and structure. Its Zionist characteristics outweigh by far its trade unionist ones, its present character having been shaped when it was established four decades ago.

In the early decades of this century, when the first Zionist socialists came to Palestine, they discovered that most of the earlier Jewish settlers (noticeably in the colonies established by Baron Edmund de Rothschild before the founding of the Zionist organization) employed Arab labour. How was it possible to transform the Jews into peasants and workers when Jewish landowners and capitalists preferred to employ Arab labour? they asked. As an answer they launched the Kibbutsim movement and (somewhat later) the Histadrut. Moreover, they started a nationalist campaign against all Jews employing Arab labour: "As Zionists you ought to create a Jewish working class in Palestine, and not to employ Arabs," they cried. All through the twenties and thirties their main slogan was, "Jewish labour only," and they terrorized both Jewish employer and Arab worker.

The main instrument in this campaign was the Histadrut. It was not established for organizing the Jewish working class but for creating it. Arab workers were not accepted as members as a matter of principle; the Histadrut was "for Jews only," as its name (in Hebrew) clearly said. It did not aim to defend the class interests of the Jewish workers either but called on them to make sacrifices, work harder, earn less, for the sake of establishing and (nowadays) strengthening the Jewish state. When the capitalists complained that Jewish labour was more expensive than Arab, the Histadrut often paid the difference out of its own funds and with other Zionist institutions launched the "Buy Jewish Only" campaign, implemented a boycott on Arab products, etc.

To this very day, the membership card of every Histadrut member reminds him of his duties, not the least important: to teach the new immigrants Hebrew -- hardly a task for a common trade union, but a typical task for a nationalist organization.

When some socialist Zionists feebly objected to this negative policy towards the Arab workers, they were reminded that the Arab workers were unorganized and that it was the duty of a trade union to fight against employment of unorganized labour. Curious as it may seem -- this argument was effective.

The Histadrut is probably the only trade union which has a "Department for Trade Unions." This is so because its ac-

tivities as owner and employer outweigh its activities as trade union. Actually the Histadrut owns the trade unions much as it owns the health insurance. In many unions the Histadrut officials appoint the secretaries of the unions. Where these are elected, they must first be approved by the officials before they may be recognized by the employers as representatives.

As an extra precaution, all membership fees (amounting to about 7% of the income of a member) are collected directly by the central organization; the local unions receiving their allotments from the central authorities. Thus, the central authorities maintain a firm control over the entire Israeli working class. When an "unauthorized" strike occurs, the strikers find themselves without a strike fund, facing the possibility of losing their job for good (if the employer happens to be the Histadrut itself) and sometimes -- as in the seamen's strike of 1951 -- opposed by everything in the country which the Histadrut can mobilize against them. The only analogue to such a state of affairs is, paradoxically, an "unofficial" strike in a Stalinist regime, where likewise such a strike implicitly antagonizes the official ideology, challenges the foundations of the Establishment, and often causes the regime to mobilize all its means (army included) for swiftly crushing the strikers. Usually the strikers are very surprised by such a reaction because they are rarely aware of the hidden implications of their action, and only meant to defend their economic interests -- a task their trade union failed to carry out. Considering that the Histadrut is the largest employer in Israel and, simultaneously, the "Federation of Trade Unions," one realizes its enormous power. It is a state within a state, the backbone of the Israeli society and economy. Historically it is the legitimate father of the state of Israel (as the socialist Zionists claim). It preceded the state and by its nationalist policies created a Jewish working class.

He who controls the Histadrut, controls Israel; Mapai has controlled the Histadrut for about 30 years -- and also Israel (prior to 1948 it meant the Jewish community in Palestine). It is not by accident that Ben-Gurion, one of the founders of Histadrut and one time its secretary general, was the most significant premier of Israel. The present premier, Eshkol, and other leaders like Lavon, Namir, all had a similar past. The right wing of Zionism never achieved power in Israel (or Palestine) and was never strong enough to dethrone the left. It never constructed anything as powerful as the Histadrut, and even today is not a serious opponent for it. The only possible opponent who could overpower it, is the

state itself. But a struggle between the state administration and the Histadrut requires either a schism in Mapai or an election victory to the right. Considering the fact that economic pressures and baits are employed in the elections and the enormous financial, economic, and organizational means of the Histadrut, the right has a very slim chance. A military dictatorship by generals of Mapai (which consolidated its control of the army during Ben-Gurion's reign) is a more likely possibility.

The question of whether the Histadrut can be transformed from within and become a revolutionary tool, or at least a normal trade union, or whether it must be overthrown like any other institution of the existing Zionist state apparatus before any essential change can occur in Israel, has been a perplexing problem for revolutionary-minded Israelis.

The Israeli Communist party (rather "the two factions of the CP," as it split in 1965) vehemently rejects any suggestion of a struggle against the Histadrut as an institution. The CP considers the Histadrut purely as a trade union (though perhaps a "reactionary" one). They refuse to recognize its essentially Zionist character (they consider any struggle against Zionism as "irrelevant," "outdated," "unnecessary," etc.). They even oppose any campaign for establishing a national health insurance system (which Ben-Gurion, as premier, tried to organize in order to transfer some power from the Histadrut to the government), because they consider this as transferring an asset from the working class (i.e., the Histadrut) to the bourgeoisie (i.e., the government).

* * *

Of the three Zionist socialist parties (Mapai, Mapam and Achdut Haavoda [Unity of Labour]), none advocates revolution.

Mapai ceased talking about socialism about a decade ago, sometimes muttering to Social Democrats or trade unionists from abroad that Israel is "of course a Free Socialist society." For proving this statement the visitors are as a matter of routine taken to some Kibbutz and this convinces them. Of course, when J.F. Dulles visited Ben-Gurion he was not taken to a Kibbutz.

Mapai is viciously anti-Soviet, supported French imperialism in Algeria, supports U.S. imperialism in Vietnam, initiated and actively participated in the Suez campaign. It is the mainstay of Zionism in Israel. The struggle between its factions (Ben-Gurion and some of his followers split off in 1965) is for power, not ideological or political differences.

Achdut Haavoda is a faction which split off Mapai sometime in the past for personal and ideological trifles. It hardly differs from Mapai in its foreign or interior policies, but as it runs a few Kibbutsim and is financed as an independent Zionist party it can go on vegetating.

Mapam is the traditional left extreme of Zionism. Its main constituent once advocated revolutionary ideology; and, for the unique case of the Jewish community in Palestine, peaceful coexistence between classes till a Jewish state be created. As it happened the state came into existence, the revolutionary ideology dissipated, the peaceful coexistence remained.

Mapam advocates friendship with the USSR, denounces U.S. imperialism. In Zionist and Israeli issues of defense, labour, etc., it trails behind Mapai, occasionally uttering leftish noises. When it happens to be outside a coalition government that is usually not because it opposes some Mapai policy so strongly that it refused to join the coalition, but because Mapai preferred different partners.

It refuses to join a "Popular Front," which the CP has repeatedly suggested, on the ground that the CP is non-Zionist (though recently one faction of the CP crossed the ideological barrier into Zionism) but Mapam never considered the antisocialist policies of religious or right-wing Zionist parties an obstacle for a joint coalition in the Jewish Agency or government.

The main role of Mapam is to mobilize the goodwill of socialists and left intellectuals in the West for Zionism.

* * *

Outside the Zionist camp exists the CP. The history of the CP (as yet unwritten and unknown to most of its present rank and file) is the history of its splits over the question of Jewish-Arab relations in Palestine (and since 1948 in Israel). It was torn between Zionism and Arab nationalism ever since Stalin imprinted his nationalist policies on the Communist movement.

The CP was born out of a split which occurred in a conference held in 1922 in Dantzig by the "Zionist Workers (Left)" party on the issue of choosing between joining the newly formed Communist International and the Zionist Congress. Those who chose Zionism (Lavon) eventually became leaders of Mapai. Those who chose Communism later founded the Palestine Communist party [PCP]. Some of these leaders, like W. Averbuch, were deported by the British to Russia in the

twenties and thirties where most of them were exterminated by Stalin.

Briefly, the difficulties of the CP were as follows: The founders of the party, the cadres, were Jewish immigrants from Russia, so too was their ideology and their political experience. The very fact that they arrived in Palestine meant that sometime or other they were Zionists. When they realised that they were part of a nationalist, colonisatory society which constituted a minority in the Palestinian society and which had little sympathy for their internationalist, anti-imperialist policies, they directed their efforts towards recruiting Arab members and influencing Arab society.

Not only had they little knowledge of Arab language, history, uniqueness, customs, etc., but under the impact of Zionism the Palestinians became more nationalistic and fell under the influence of reactionary religious leadership.

In the Arab community too there was little chance of spreading internationalist, socialist, revolutionary ideology. Faced with the reality of two hostile, nationalistic communities combating each other by mass movements (general strikes, rebellion, armed underground movements, etc.) which the CP could not ignore, it was forced to shape a policy towards two conflicting nationalist movements. In 1936 it supported the Arab rebellion; in 1948 the establishing of Israel. On both occasions it split.

The last split occurred in 1965, again on the issue of policy towards Arab nationalism and Israel. One faction considers it as its duty to criticize the policies of Arab nationalist leaders towards Israel. They object to identifying Israel with imperialism, accept the facts established by Zionism as final, accept the existing status quo, and adopt a more "constructive" criticism of Israeli policies. They consider any fundamental critique of Zionism as "irrelevant." This faction relieves Mapam of its duties as the left extreme of the Zionist camp. They are tired of being unpopular in the Jewish population, try to become "respectable" and hope eventually to become mediators between the Zionist establishment and the USSR (whereas the latter prefers to deal with the Zionists directly).

The other faction continues the previous line and refuses to be "modernized." It is reluctant to criticize Arab nationalist reactionary tendencies since it considers this to be the duty of Arab internationalists. It maintains the previous "unconstructive" criticism of Israeli policies. It does, however, insist (just like the other faction) on "transforming the Histadrut from within." The eclectic character of such policies high-

lights the source of the numerous splits.

Both factions of the CP vie for recognition by Moscow; both denounce Peking; both are headed by leaders from the Stalin era who pursue Stalinist policies (alas, without the guiding hand of Stalin) both employ the old Stalinist organizational methods. It is a case of a Stalinist party torn between two antagonistic nationalisms.

The CP always did, and still does, recognize the right of the Palestinians to self-determination, and of the refugees to repatriation, yet, following Moscow, they oppose changes in the territorial status quo, thus sanctifying annexations made by Ben-Gurion in 1948.

Both factions fail to recognize Zionism as a major cause of the Israeli-Arab conflict, and cover this up by the formula of "recognize the right of the Jews and of the Arabs in Palestine to self-determination." What if these rights are materialized and the self-determined Jewish state chooses Zionism (as happens to be the case)? To this the CP has no answer.

* * *

In 1962 a small new left wing was formed, calling itself the "Israeli Socialist Organization." Its monthly Matspen [Compass] advocates de-Zionization of Israel as a necessary step towards any

socialist revolution in Israel as well as any rapprochement with the Arab world. It refuses to sanctify any status quo and opposes the policies of "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism, capitalism or Zionism.

It refuses to subject revolutionary policies to the interests of the USSR or China. It considers nationalism to be the main weakness of the anti-imperialist forces and the best asset of imperialist policies. It believes that genuine internationalist revolutionaries can cooperate and eventually bring about a unification of presently antagonistic nation-states. This is a task which the nationalists cannot accomplish.

At present this organization has little influence on Israeli politics (though its very existence is a pressure on the CP and non-Zionist nationalists); but qualitatively it is an essential ingredient to future developments, for only through a clear and firm rejection of Zionism and any other sort of Israeli nationalism (there is a non-Zionist type) can a link be established between revolutionaries inside Israel and those acting through the Arab world.

Such a link is necessary for achieving the historical task confronting revolutionaries in this area in the next few decades; namely, that of establishing a Unified Socialist Republic from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf.

SUMMER SCHEDULE

World Outlook will go on its summer schedule with the next issue. There will thus be some irregularity in its appearance but it will average out every other week. At the beginning of September

we will resume on a weekly basis.

The change in schedule will not affect subscriptions since these are automatically extended.

In this issue

Page

The Israeli Victory -- a Setback for the Antiwar Movement	610
Cubans Denounce UN Blow Against Arab Cause	613
Nguyen Cao Ky Hails Israeli Blitzkrieg	613
The Kremlin Sees "Trotskyism" in "Cultural Revolution" -- by George Saunders	614
Hugo Blanco Case:	
Solidarity Rally in New York for Hugo Blanco	618
Spring Mobilization Members Send Protest to Belaunde	619
Militant Youth a Problem for Italian CP -- by Sirio Di Giuliomaria	620
The Lessons of Greece -- by Ernest Mandel	623
Underground "Patriotic Front" Announced in Greece	624
Irish Revolutionist Given Five-Year Sentence -- by Sean Reed	625
Japanese Students Battle Police at U.S. Air Base	625
Documents:	
Some Remarks Concerning the Left in Israel	626